

Appendix

Small Business Wants To Know When
the Federal Trade Commission Will
Enforce the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission recently ordered three oil companies to stop coercing their dealers to handle certain brands of tires, batteries and other automobile accessories.

Testimony presented to the FTC showed that the major oil companies involved in the action used very vigorous methods in forcing their dealers, or service station operators leasing their stations, to handle only items approved by the major oil firms.

Although the oil companies were ordered to stop coercing the service station operators, the FTC found nothing wrong with the conduct of the major rubber companies in giving special discounts and paying special commissions ranging from 7 percent to 10 percent.

Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, commenting on the FTC decision writes:

If the major oil companies are to continue to receive these huge commissions from the rubber companies, they will have to continue to send out their salesmen, to talk to station operators on behalf of the rubber firms paying commissions to the company.

Thus, the anticompetition phrase of the order is most likely to fall by the wayside.

For who, but FTC, can be so naive to believe an oil company salesman, charged with getting certain tires and batteries into service stations handling his oil and gas, will confine his activities to gentle persuasive argument, especially when he has a quota to meet?

I include herewith for the information of my colleagues the following items dealing with this subject:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,

Burlingame, Calif., February 24, 1960.
Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: In view of the vital interest all independent factors in the automotive servicing field have as to the ties existing between big factors in both the oil and rubber tire industry, and the "gravy train" these big factors are enjoying at the expense of the independents, we believe that the insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the statement I made before the subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee on December 9, 1959, and also the current small business column "Washington and Small Business"

sponsored by the National Federation of Independent Business, and appearing in weekly newspapers throughout the Nation would all furnish to your colleagues basic facts in this major economic problem.

I know that your action in this will be welcome information and will be noted by independent factors in your congressional district, a goodly number of whom the writer is personally acquainted with due to his experience in that industry for half a century.

The truth of the matter is, by the Federal Trade Commission's own report furnished to the Temporary National Economic Committee, that report led us to believe that this arrangement between big oil and big rubber was outlawed as a violation of Federal statute. Our hopes and expectations were dashed when we noted the examiner's report of November 18, 1959 approving the override commission paid by big rubber companies to major oil companies on the indirect sale of tires, batteries and accessories.

Thanking you for your continued cooperation in help to small business, and with high regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

Probably one of the weirdest decisions in its history was handed by Federal Trade Commission in case against Shell, Texaco and Atlantic Refining Co. and Goodyear, Goodrich, and Firestone.

The three oil companies were ordered to stop coercing their dealers to handle only certain brands of tires, batteries and other accessories.

The testimony was quite strong that these major oil companies used very vigorous methods in forcing their dealers, or service station operators leasing their stations, to handle only items approved by the major oil firms.

In addition, the testimony further developed that in a typical year of 1955, the major oil companies were paid commissions ranging from 7 to 10 percent. For example Shell received \$3.4 million from two tire firms, Texaco \$4.8 million.

Now comes the strange part of the FTC findings. Although the oil companies were ordered to stop coercing the service station operators, the FTC could find nothing wrong with the conduct of the major rubber companies in giving these special discounts to the oil firms.

The FTC position was that the major oil firms earned these commissions by performing certain services. These great services were such things as recommending to the service station operator that he handle tires and other accessory items as a means of getting more revenue into the station. Another great and valuable promotion aid was extended by the major oil companies in suggesting to station operators methods of displaying these items.

Another service performed was that of the oil company salesmen calling on the service stations with the favored rubber company salesmen.

Other testimony developed that the oil company salesmen often told the service

station operators what tires and accessories they could handle, or else.

But for these "promotional" services, FTC found oil companies earned millions paid them by big rubber.

This decision is bound to cause some bitter debate in Congress when it convenes shortly.

It will perhaps be called FTC's great Pollyanna decision.

After all, if the major oil companies are to continue to receive these huge commissions from the rubber companies, they will have to continue to send out their salesmen, to talk to station operators on behalf of the rubber firms paying commissions to the company.

Thus, the anticompetition phrase of the order is most likely to fall by the wayside.

For who, but FTC, can be so naive to believe an oil company salesman, charged with getting certain tires and batteries into service stations handling his oil and gas, will confine his activities to gentle persuasive argument—especially when he has a quota to meet?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON D.C., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 9, 1959.

Subject: Petroleum, relating to marketing of TBA items.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am more than pleased to have the opportunity to appear before your committee which, after all, follows up your committee's splendid action in the hearings on distribution problems in the petroleum filling station field as it relates to the sale of tires, batteries, and accessories.

I am referring to the splendid action of your committee of March 28, 1955, that continued on in the closing days of March, April, May, and June 1955. I had the privilege to give testimony on April 28, 1955, and our interest continues up to this time on this major problem.

Since my last appearance before your committee—as a matter of record—I am more than pleased to advise the committee that our membership, comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men nationwide has shown a considerable, healthy increase in its total membership, and the record may disclose that the membership now totals approximately 150,000.

On direct nationwide mandate of our members we are committed to take every action possible (1) for a vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, and (2) where the laws are weak, to bring about the necessary amendments.

We deem the problem before your committee, in the way the TBA items are being handled is a clear violation of the law and for that reason, and that reason alone we are urging a complete, drastic investigation of the overall problem.

This problem that is before your committee has been before congressional committees and the antitrust agencies, to my knowledge as an independent member of the rubber tire industry, for the last 19 years.

In this, it is interesting to note that on page 563 of the hearings of April 28, 1955, Mr.

Sheehy, of the Federal Trade Commission, advised the committee:

"The United States case came up prior to World War II, and that arose out of complaints received at that time, and they have been coming along more or less since then. During the war period, naturally, the situation was completely changed, and then following the war they continued to come along until the Commission set this whole thing down for investigation."

Well do I recall, Mr. Chairman, that in my private capacity (1941) I personally filed a brief on this subject matter, including others, with the Federal Trade Commission, alleging violation of the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, in the Senate Small Business Committee this subject matter was amply exposed due to a nationwide investigation that committee made of the problem (1942).

It is interesting to note, from the same testimony given by Mr. Sheehy on April 26, 1955, on page 554 of the printed hearings, he said:

"For example, approximately 90 percent of the leased stations of one oil company purchased sponsored TBA products. The degree of exclusivity varies with the product. It is highest on the tire lines (perhaps from 75 to 90 percent), substantially lower on the battery lines (perhaps from 45 to 50 percent) and almost negligible on the accessory line (perhaps as low as 3 percent)."

I particularly call to your attention in the quoted statement where he said: "It is highest in the tire lines (perhaps 75 to 90 percent), substantially lower on the battery lines." This is very important to keep in mind when one reviews the release of the Federal Trade Commission, Examiner's Report, of November 18, 1959, as it relates to the relationship between the Texas Co., Atlantic Refining, Shell Oil, Goodrich, Goodyear, and Firestone Tire & Rubber Cos.

Again from the statement of Mr. Sheehy appearing on page 552 and 553 of the printed hearings where he said:

"An oil company, having the commission arrangement with a tire company, keeps the tire company informed as to the identity of its leased and contract stations so that they may be approached as potential customers of the tire company for TBA products. Thereafter, the filling station, when approved by the tire company, is contacted by salesmen of the tire company and the oil company. If the station decides to buy the tire company's TBA products, it is assigned a supply point where it must purchase them. The supply point may be a tire company store, district office, wholesaler, or an oil company dealer operating as a tire company wholesaler. The designated supply point accepts orders secured by its salesmen or those of the tire or oil companies, delivers the goods, and bills and collects from the filling station. Periodically the tire company reports to the oil company, setting forth the names of the filling stations and their net purchases of TBA products from the tire company as reported by its various supply points. The total sales as shown by these reports are the basis for computing the commission paid the oil company."

"In addition to identifying filling stations as potential TBA customers, the oil companies are paid the override commission for encouraging the filling station operators to continue handling the sponsored TBA products, soliciting orders therefor, and engaging in various other activities to promote the sponsored lines."

It is very interesting to note this operation as to the permission mutually agreeable to both parties as it applies to that important segment, tires and tubes. It must be understood for the record, that from my knowledge of the petroleum industry, and it is to their credit, they don't handle anything unless it is profitable to the petroleum companies.

We believe, and the witness should know from a half a century as an independent member of the rubber tire industry, that the same relationship will continue, the coercion will continue one way or another, until the law is vigorously enforced.

It is to be noted in the examiner's report of November 18, 1959, that it in substance, exonerates these three rubber companies from the granting of override commissions where we in independent business have been under the impression or delusion that this has been a violation of Federal statute, and further, my opinion is more or less confirmed by the expressions time and time again of other factors in the rubber tire industry. In fact they wondered: "When will the laws be enforced"? and why should they sit on the sidelines and refuse to make similar contracts?

When the November 18, 1959, examiner's report came down exonerating the three major "rubber companies on the override commission subject, it is important to note that the vice president of the Texaco Co. stated:

"There is no violation of the FTC Act, in our recommending that dealers purchase tires, batteries, and accessories from companies whose brands are nationally known and have widespread distribution and good customer acceptance."

It is self-evident that what was at stake with these major petroleum companies was more than merely urging the dealer to handle nationally known brands of TBA items.

Independent business of all descriptions in the automotive servicing field has a tremendous stake in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, particularly as it applies to their industry. I say this because of the power exercised by these major petroleum companies to control and dictate to the independent filling station operator as to the overall policies.

There was recently reported by Look magazine the results from the 23d annual national automobile and tire survey, which disclosed service stations sold 33.4 percent of all new tires and 29.5 percent of all retreads bought in the last 12 months.

Mr. Chairman, our principal interest in the overall proposition before your committee is that 300,000 or more independents in the automotive servicing field, which includes the smaller producers, will under our free enterprise system have the privilege to operate in fair competition with all other suppliers to that industry.

It is interesting to note that on this override commission—which is the gravy train for the petroleum companies, that a similar arrangement is now being instituted by the Phillips Petroleum entering into the tire recapping field, the arrangements to be handled, I believe, by two or three major rubber companies and one of the smaller rubber manufacturers.

Upon getting notice of this action we immediately contacted the antitrust agencies, and we particularly call to your attention the letter we received under date of October 29, 1959, from Mr. Frank C. Hale, the FTC's chief project attorney, in his answer as to the opposition, and you will particularly note in the quoted statement of the unfair method of competition on the override commission:

"Under the arrangement, oil companies are paid a commission by rubber companies on sales of [TBA], made direct to retail dealers handling the gasoline of the oil companies. The complaints which have been issued by the Commission allege that such [arrangements] constitute an unfair method of competition in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act in that [independents] are foreclosed from a substantial share of the market by virtue of [oil company coercion] urging their dealers to handle the products of the particular rubber company with which override agreements have been made."

Without being unduly critical of the action of the FTC, it is necessary to quote the opinion that was expressed by the FTC, that appeared in the Senate Small Business Committee Report of 1943, where the committee reported the FTC's statement as given to the Temporary National Economic Committee: They told that Committee:

"The Federal Trade Commission in report prepared by the Temporary National Economic Committee, stated that 'Investigation and complaints brought by the Federal Trade Commission have gone a long way toward eliminating the practice of tire companies granting an override commission to the oil companies for permission to sell their station tires and tubes.'"

So in view of this, your committee is to be complimented at this time for further checking into the situation, and our plea to you and your committee is that unless this arrangement that is now existing between major oil and major rubber companies as it relates to the override commission is corrected it will result in: (1) Major petroleum industry dominating and controlling the rubber tire industry, and (2), placing the exclusive sale of this important commodity, tires, tubes, batteries, in the hands of giant rubber producers and giant petroleum companies, and the final result will be a definite captive group in the independent servicing field, and reducing the smaller producers in the respective lines to next to nothing.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note—very interesting—that a day prior to the opening of your hearings the TBA group, made up of the petroleum interests, and probably well attended by the big rubber industry, will hold its annual meeting December 7 and 8, at the Chase Park Plaza Hotel in St. Louis. This is very significant, and the urge may be to increase their position.

Let me repeat that if the present statute is weak on this point, and protects monopoly in one form or another, than it will be in order for Congress to immediately enact corrective legislation to protect the free enterprise system.

President's Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the President's Conference on Occupational Safety begins its meetings to promote greater occupational safety in this country.

The objectives of the conference include reassessment of safety practices and review of equipment, work practices and training methods to build safety more firmly into the pattern of American work.

Despite efforts to promote greater job safety, the 1958 toll was 1,820,000 occupational accident victims, of whom 13,300 were killed, and another 76,700 suffered some degree of permanent disability.

We recognize that, today, work patterns are being revolutionized by technological advances. To meet the challenge of promoting safety in a changing world, more than 40 leaders of labor, business, science, education and government, will take part in panel discussions.

during the 3-day conference on nine phases of the safety challenge, ranging from safety education to the establishment of improved safety standards.

During the conference, delegates will seek to find new ways and means for safeguarding the American worker in a rapidly changing environment.

Attending on a voluntary basis, the delegates are to be highly commended for their constructive efforts to lessen vocational hazards for the American worker.

Recognizing the significance of this conference, I request unanimous consent to have an available list of delegates—which, although regrettably not complete, is most impressive—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of delegates was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN

L. G. Arnold, Eau Claire.
Otis G. Berger, manager, Barron County Electric Cooperative, Barron.
M. F. Biancardi, manager, Safety Services, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.
S. J. Boehringer, President Boehringer Engineering Products, Inc., Milwaukee.
Edward M. Brabant, Blackhawk Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.
F. W. Braun, vice president, Accident Prevention, Employers Mutual Liability Insurance Co., of Wisconsin, Wausau.
Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Brenner, Milwaukee.
J. L. Cantrell, Miller Brewing Co., U.S.A. Division, Milwaukee.
F. S. Christiansen, Personnel Director, Twin Disc Clutch Co., Racine.
R. W. Christensen, Safety Supervisor, West Bend Aluminum Co., West Bend.
William E. Breese, associate chairman, department of commerce, Milwaukee.
Clark J. Fischer, safety engineer, safety commission, Milwaukee.
Warren E. Fuhrman, safety director, Milwaukee Gas Light Co., Milwaukee.
Bernhard, Gettelman, Collector of Customs, Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, Milwaukee.
Frank A. Hausheer, executive vice president, Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, Madison.
Mrs. Ted Hoyer, president, Ted Hoyer and Co., Inc., Oshkosh.
Miss Anne Klotz, R.N., supervising nurse, Pabst Brewing Co., Milwaukee.
Raymond J. Koltes, Red Arrow Sales Corp., Madison.
Raymond A. Langmack, Langmack's, Beaver Dam.
Gregg R. Meyers, director of safety and security, Pabst Brewing Co., Milwaukee.
G. M. Nequette, vice president, safety and personnel, Central Wisconsin Motor Transport Co., Wisconsin Rapids.
M. A. Nugent, superintendent of safety, Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco.
V. E. Nylin, chairman, Department of Agriculture, Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology, Platteville.
Professor H. C. Olson, Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology Department of Drivers Education, Platteville.
Donald F. Possell, Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.
Murdoch G. Pryor, safety manager, Allen-Bradley Co., Milwaukee.
John H. Rouse, Commissioner, Industrial Commission, Madison.
Brother Leo V. Ryan, Director, Continuing Education, Marquette University, Division of Adult Education, Milwaukee.
Frank Tuttle, Baltimore Operations Manager, Ansul Chemical Company, Marinette.

Peter P. Weidenbruch, President, Damrow Brothers, Co., Fond du Lac.
C. F. Young, Safety Director, Eaton Manufacturing Co., Kenosha.

Address by G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams to the United Northwestern Realty Association on February 18, 1960:

Next week is Brotherhood Week. But I would like to jump the gun a little and talk about brotherhood today. Actually, brotherhood is an everyday occupation. We set aside a special week only to remind ourselves that such a week should not be needed.

Let me tell you of my ideas on brotherhood. Many people often talk as though brotherhood were an invention of the U.S. Supreme Court. Others discuss brotherhood as our least expensive way of buying good public relations in a world that is one-third nonwhite. But neither of these factors are central to my belief in brotherhood. To me brotherhood is a biblical command. If we are to be true to our religion, we must live brotherhood.

In the very first chapter of Moses, it is said: "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him."

In Acts we find: "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10: 34). St. James said: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well. But if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin" (2 James 8).

In other words, discrimination is bad, evil, sin.

Realtors, more than any other profession north of the Mason-Dixon line, are in a special position to help American fulfill its promise of equal opportunity for all. Incidentally, I am going to use the word "realtor" in a generic sense rather than the term of art that it is—it is so convenient.

When it comes to fulfilling the promise of equal opportunity, housing is to the North what voting and education are to the South.

As long ago as 1866, the U.S. Congress passed a law which reads: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right in every State and territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property."

Obviously, the ideal of this old law is still far from fact. But the challenge of this ideal is more pressing than ever.

We in the North like to sit in our armchairs and condemn Little Rock, the closing of Southern schools, and the refusal of Southern registrars to sign up Negro voters. We like to discuss and decry the horrors of the South from the security of our own living rooms, which in the majority of cases are located in 100 percent white neighborhoods.

This is sheer hypocrisy. It is also costly hypocrisy. For as long as we crowd minority groups into already overcrowded areas, we breed slums, juvenile delinquency, health and fire hazards, and a host of similar social blights. The sorry state of the slum dweller himself is well summed up in

the name of a Mexican-American slum in a west coast city. It is called Sal si Pudes—Get out if you can.

It seems to me that we have to get out of our dual standard of morality, one for the North and a different one for the South. We have to clean up our own backyard, and our front yard, and the rest of the neighborhood, too. The promise of a free, open society cannot be indefinitely postponed.

Therefore there has again been introduced into the Michigan State Legislature a measure which will have as its supreme purpose to do away with all discrimination and to include housing just as one of many subjects. The main feature of the new law will be the conciliation technique which has proven so successful in our fair employment practices law.

When we first introduced the FEP law, it was said that it could not be done. For 7 years, it was bitterly fought. But it has been done. And, what is more, with passage of the law, resistance seemed to vanish and employers gave full cooperation. In fact, many employers who previously were afraid to hire minority group members for fear of losing customers welcomed the new law. It gave them a legal framework for their conscience.

Today I call upon you for the same cooperation and spirit of conciliation which has made our FEP law a success. I know that cracking the color line in housing is much tougher than in employment. Housing, after all, is the only commodity left which the Negro cannot buy on the open market. He can buy oranges, cars, even dinner and lodging, but not housing. When he goes to purchase a house, as often as not he finds the door is slammed in his face.

Today I appeal to your sense of religion, to your sense of humanity, to your sense of American destiny. I call upon you for help and sympathetic cooperation. You can help make a historical contribution to America.

We cannot keep slamming doors in a man's face indefinitely. The practical advantage of setting up conciliation machinery now is that Michigan can provide for the peaceful opening of its doors. The real advantage is that no man will have to avoid looking his neighbor straight in the eye for fear of something he has on his conscience.

Because of the rigid residential segregation which now exists, many myths surround the question of racial integration in housing. Chief among these is the myth that property values go down in direct ratio to the color spectrum—the darker the hue of the tenant, the lower the value of the property.

The whole thing is somewhat personal to me for a couple of reasons. In Georgetown in the city of Washington, I was part of the white migration into a Negro area. As a matter of fact, we had Negro families next to us, and on one side of the house we had a Negro church with a marvelous choir and our friends enjoyed joining us to hear the singing.

The other reason involves newsmen George Stark, a well-known Detroit, who is a vestryman at St. Paul's Cathedral. One evening he was riding homeward with me in this very area. We got to talking and he told me a story I have never forgotten.

He said one night when he got home a neighbor and fellow member of the Homeowners Improvement Association rushed in, terribly agitated and visibly excited. The neighbor said, "George, what in the world shall we do? A colored family has moved in next door to you; what will happen to our neighborhood?" George said he waited just half a minute and then said to his friend, "Why there is just one thing we can do, and that is to invite them to become members of our Homeowners Improvement Association."

They did just that, and the new family proved to be very careful housekeepers, tended their property carefully, and were the very best of neighbors. They borrowed salt and eggs back and forth and George said that, when his wife was ill, the neighbor wife took a genuine personal interest that was much appreciated.

Study after study has been made of this problem. Some show property values fall because people panic and "sell scared." Others show property values rise because demand for segregated housing is overwhelming. Others show that, in the long run, property values remain the same.

The Upjohn Institute Research Report on Integrated Housing in Kalamazoo came to this conclusion: "Actually the sales records indicate that mixed neighborhoods have no effect on real estate values."

Taken together, the studies show one thing only—that minority group occupancy, in and of itself, will not affect property values one way or the other.

That is why the realtor is so important. The realtor can be the conduit of myths; or he can be the killer of this false folklore. The unscrupulous realtor can pile up handsome profits by trying to stampede the "sell now before it's too late" psychology and spreading rumors that Mrs. Smith sold yesterday, Mrs. Jones will sell tomorrow.

Or the realtor can be the conscience of the community. He can be the one to correct false impressions. He can assuage the occasional panic-stricken client. He can, in other words, make a fair housing law work. He can lead us into Christian living, into the life of brotherhood blessed by all religions.

Many realtors I have spoken to have told me that they would like nothing better than to sell to Negro families wherever they wish to buy, but that this would lose them their white clients. That is the great advantage of writing a no-discrimination clause into Michigan's law. Realtors then would all be in the same position, and those of good will, the overwhelming majority I am sure, will get State backing for their personal principles.

What is more, I think the claims clients make are often exaggerated. That people do not always do what they say they will do is dramatically demonstrated by the sociologist who, in 1937, traveled the country with a Chinese couple, asked for services at 67 hotels, auto camps, and tourist homes, and was refused at only one. Six months later he sent out a mail questionnaire asking if "members of the Chinese race" could be accommodated. Over 90 percent said, "No."

Thank you for the opportunity of talking with you this morning.

Editorial Support for a Department of Urbiculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been very gratified by the strong support manifested all over the country for my proposal to establish a Department of Urbiculture. This Department would draw together under one roof the scattered programs and agencies in the Federal Government which are concerned primarily with the problems of our cities.

It is my firm conviction that the better coordination and cooperation of these programs which would be made possible by a centralization of operations will pay off in more efficient and effective Federal assistance to our urban centers. At the same time, the establishment of a Department of Urbiculture need not mean that the Federal Government would assume additional programs of municipal help.

A recent editorial in the Elmira Telegram, an outstanding newspaper in my State, points up some of the strong arguments for this addition to our governmental machinery. I am delighted to have this editorial support for this proposal and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elmira Telegram, Jan. 31, 1960]

NEED FOR URBICULTURE

One of these days enough Congressmen will notice the solid commonsense in Senator KENNETH B. KEATING's proposed Department of Urbiculture to get such a department set up.

Urbiculture is a \$4 word having to do with the care and feeding of our sickly cities. We have a Department of Agriculture because most American used to live on farms and have their problems there. KEATING says that logically we now should have a Department of Urbiculture because most Americans long since have moved to the cities and created whopping new problems there.

We are spending money on uncoordinated Federal programs to help cities now. It is KEATING's belief that in close cooperation with State and local governments, the new department could develop national programs to combat smog, slums, and traffic snarls.

It seems obvious that someday this will be done. New York State has pioneered by setting up an office of local government, but many urban problems cross State boundaries. If the Constitution were being written now, it is a good bet that a Department of Urbiculture would be in it.

U.S. Citizens Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a good suggestion has come to me from John and Jean Edwards, owners and publishers of the West Side News of Kingston in western Pennsylvania, whom I have known for a long time.

I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and the people of America, this excellent idea which certainly merits serious consideration.

The suggestion follows:

WEST SIDE NEWS,

Kingston, Pa., February 25, 1960.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you as the result of thoughts that have come to me in connection with the census that is being taken this year. Briefly, my thoughts are these: When you are born in United States

you are given a birth certificate. When you take your first communion or join the church or have a Bar Mitzvah, there is mild celebration. When you become an Eagle Scout there is a ceremony and you get a badge. When you are graduated from high school or college, you are dressed up in cap and gown, speeches are made at you and about you, you receive gifts and are presented with a diploma. If you join a lodge, there is some to-do, "welcome to our select little circle," and so forth. However, when a youngster becomes a citizen—that is, attains his majority and becomes an active working citizen, through the right to vote—there is no ceremony, no presentation of a certificate, no nothing. A parent may take a young person to the polls to show him how to vote for the first time, as my father took me. But that's about all there is to it. Now a naturalized citizen must stand before a judge in a court room while an oath is administered to him, and he is presented with a certificate of his citizenship. But not so with us native-born citizens. We have sworn no oaths, we have received no certificates, we have not had our names inscribed, except on the voting lists.

Now, I believe that U.S. citizenship is deserving of more than that. I believe that becoming a U.S. citizen is vastly more important than any other status one can attain; certainly, is a basic. You have to be a citizen first. Besides that, U.S. citizenship carries with it great responsibility and obligation. So, when a youngster becomes 21 years of age, he should be subject to a ceremony, an oath should be administered to him that he will strive all his years to be a good citizen, and he should be presented with a certificate of citizenship; then, his name should be inscribed in a Great Book of Citizens in Washington. This should be an occasion for the youngster to be presented with gifts and to be the honored guest at dinner. A great fuss and to-do should be made of him, for on this day he has attained citizenship in the United States, a truly impressive station in this world and in his life.

For one thing, this formal entry into citizenship would make the youngster more cognizant of the privileges and obligations of citizenship—it should be included in the oath that if physically possible he will participate in every election. Also, it could be a deterrent to crime. Of course, to some, the ceremony and oath would mean nothing; but to many it would mean brighter, happier citizenship. Social security records are an authentic record of our citizens, but it still isn't a record of citizens as such. Many of us have sworn allegiance to the Government through association with the armed services or governmental service, but these were not oaths of citizenship necessarily.

To carry the idea a little farther, if we need a new holiday, say along about the middle of October, there could be a holiday established when all the new citizens would be honored.

Obviously, this is not a matter about which the editor of a weekly newspaper can get much done. I haven't even mentioned it to anyone else. By rights, it is a matter that could be handled only by a legislator. So, I must remind you that I was once your constituent, when we lived in Dormont.

If there is any merit in the idea, I would like to see something happen, because the way it is now my four children will sort of glide into citizenship, taking it more or less for granted, except for what I am able to do personally to impress them with the importance of their obligations as citizens. They should be the subjects of celebration, they should be required to make an oath, their names should be inscribed in the Great Book in Washington, and they should receive a certificate of citizenship to remind them always—particularly at each election—of their obligations to be good citizens.

I wouldn't want any sort of credit nor recognition in connection with this idea. Maybe it has been suggested before. But if you can do anything about it, you will be aiding a former constituent with four future citizens on his hands, who is in need of help to impress them with the fact that U.S. citizenship is the honor and privilege of their lives.

Again, I wish you well, Congressman. And I hope to hear from you soon.

Warmest personal regards,
JOHN and JEAN EDWARDS,
Owners and Publishers, West Side News.

Dillon Proposals for Free World Economic Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a vitally important economic program directed at mobilizing the energies and resources of the free world in the current struggle for freedom is being developed by most of the leading industrial nations of the world, being dealt with for the United States by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State. His recent address in Cincinnati brilliantly summed up the outlook for the economic integration of the free world in the sixties. Under Secretary Dillon's remarks foreshadow the capability of a breakthrough in our efforts at finally developing the free world's potential for the development of its own economies and the development of the less developed areas, and a counter-thrust to the Soviet economic offensive which has been mounted against the democracies of the West. I ask unanimous consent that Under Secretary Dillon's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW ERA IN FREE WORLD ECONOMIC GROWTH
(Address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, at sixth annual conference on international affairs, sponsored by the Cincinnati Council of World Affairs, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 19, 1960)

I am pleased and honored to be here with you tonight as you conclude your thoughtful examination of our country's role in international economic affairs. Your panel moderators have reported well on your discussions of the United States and its relationship to the European Common Market, the newly-developing countries, and the Communist economic offensive. It is against this background that I wish to discuss the prospect for free world economic growth as we enter the sixties.

The outlook for the sixties has been shaped by forces which gathered momentum during the postwar period and the fifties, by the remarkable recovery of Western Europe and Japan from the ravages of war—by the accelerated expansion of our own economy—by the substantial growth in economic power of the Soviet Union—and by the mounting insistence of hundreds of millions of newly-independent peoples on sharing in the material blessings of the modern world.

These developments have set the stage for a whole new era in the sixties. One of its predominant features will be the great socioeconomic revolution which is sweeping the newly developing areas of the free world. This force represents the legitimate aspirations of the free world's underprivileged peoples for a better life. These peoples, numbering more than a billion, hold in their hands the future balance of world power. They wish to live in freedom. But to them, freedom from want is of overriding importance. They are learning that they cannot enjoy their newly won political freedoms without an adequate measure of economic progress. They are exerting tremendous pressure on their leaders to achieve progress through one means or another.

Herein lies a great challenge for us in the sixties—and a great danger as well. The stakes are high—possibly no less than the continued existence of individual liberty on this planet. In cooperation with other free world industrialized nations, we must assist the newly developing countries in their struggle to improve their people's lot in order that they can maintain their confidence in progress under free institutions. This will require both capital and know-how in substantial amounts throughout the sixties. The alternative is terrible to contemplate. For if these peoples cannot see hope of progress in freedom, they will surely collapse in chaos and disorder and in their desperation they will try the totalitarian route which is being offered them day and night by international communism.

The Soviet leaders are fully aware of the challenge to our system and to theirs, which is posed by the aspirations of the newly emerging areas. They have accepted this challenge and are proclaiming their confidence of success in economic competition with our system of free institutions. The present economic strength of the Soviet Union and its continued rapid progress make it clear that this is a most serious challenge. To meet it, we of the industrialized free world must see to it that our own economies continue to grow and strengthen at the same time that we provide a helping hand to our less privileged friends in the newly developing lands.

The industrialized free world enters the sixties in a position of great economic strength. Postwar economic recovery is complete in Western Europe and Japan. Prosperity has reached new, all-time highs in the United States and Canada. The industrialized countries of the free world have the means and the ability to surmount the challenge of the sixties. What is needed is the will and determination to succeed. The prize of success is well worth the effort. For, as the newly developing countries grow in freedom and as it becomes clearer that the way of freedom has been irrevocably chosen by the great majority of the peoples of the earth, the power of their example will prove irresistible—even within the ramparts of the Communist empire. This is the surest way to a secure and lasting world peace, the supreme goal of all mankind.

Although the prospects for a concerted effort to speed the free world's progress are bright, the task is truly formidable. It is one to which we shall have to continue to bring leadership in the sixties, just as we did in the late forties and the fifties.

Now, let me explain what I mean by leadership: I most assuredly do not imply superiority or domination. For reasons not of our own making, we have a dominant position in the postwar economy of the free world. But that clearly abnormal period has now passed, with the resurging economic strength of our industrialized allies. What we seek today, as in the past, is partnership with our fellow members of the interdependent community of free nations, in which no

one nation has a monopoly on human skills, energies, or inspiration. Within the framework of that partnership, however, there is a continuing need for leadership. As the most materially favored member of the free world community, we must accept this responsibility in meeting the challenge of the sixties.

Let us recall that even before the Second World War ended the United States had taken a leading role in planning for a more effective international economic system than the one that had broken down so disastrously in the thirties. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had been agreed upon by 1944. So had the International Monetary Fund. And much preliminary work had been done along lines which shortly thereafter evolved into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Although wartime planners for economic peace had done their work well, they underestimated by a wide margin the magnitude of the immediate postwar economic crisis in Europe and Asia, which developed with frightening speed and intensity in 1946 and 1947.

Germany and Japan were occupied and we had to find and develop policies that would enable the German and Japanese peoples to put their productive genius back to work. Great Britain and our continental allies were also in difficult circumstances. Despite its tremendous productive potential, the European economy was nearing a catastrophic collapse. There seemed to be no prospect that ordinary methods could bring about a recovery in time to avoid chaos.

Bold action was called for. We responded with the Marshall plan, which made a historic contribution to the restoration of economic health and vigor in Western Europe. Our policies in Germany and Japan were remarkably effective in helping to reestablish an economic base that could support democratic institutions. Success came rapidly. By the early fifties, nearly all of the industrialized states of the free world were beginning to push ahead on their own power.

As the need for American aid to Western Europe tapered off we turned our attention increasingly to the less developed countries, which now receive the great bulk of our assistance. We took an active role in the technical assistance efforts of the United Nations. We created a new lending institution of our own, the Development Loan Fund, to supplement the work of our long-established Export-Import Bank. We participated earlier this month in launching the new Inter-American Development Bank. And we are now taking part, with like-minded countries, in establishing another new institution to be called the International Development Association, which will operate as an affiliate of the World Bank, and which is designed to make capital available to the less developed countries on flexible terms.

Throughout the period of postwar reconstruction, we vigorously put forward our firm belief that liberal international trade policies are essential to free world economic progress. We have endeavored to demonstrate that belief in our own trade arrangements. Despite some setbacks, our overall record is one of which we can justly be proud. Until fairly recently, however, ours has been a rather lonely position. The industrial nations, with few exceptions, clung to exchange controls and severe quantitative import restrictions to protect their meager foreign exchange reserves. Many of the less-developed countries also maintained import restrictions for balance-of-payment reasons. In addition, most of them felt that a measure of protectionism would foster much needed industrial growth.

We were tolerant of the trade restrictions applied by our friends and partners during the era of the so-called dollar shortage.

But today the situation is very different. Most of the industrial nations have built their gold and foreign exchange reserves to quite satisfactory levels and have made their currencies convertible in international trade. Their manufacturing industries are now generally competitive with ours. Meanwhile, their gains in reserves have come largely from U.S. stocks, with U.S. balance-of-payments deficits running at far larger rates than can be long sustained. Throughout the past year, therefore, we have been making it clear that we believe recovery has proceeded to a point where restrictions on trade imposed to meet the financial problems of a decade ago can no longer be justified.

Fortunately, the need to do away with discriminations against imports from the dollar area has been recognized by the other industrialized nations and in some of the newly developing areas as well. Action to eliminate discriminations recently taken by Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the Netherlands, and India, has left only a few remaining discriminations against dollar goods in these countries. During the last 6 months, steps to substantially lessen discriminatory restrictions were also taken by France, Germany, Japan, Finland, Turkey, Spain, Singapore, Malaya, Ghana, and British East Africa. This progress continued last month, when Portugal, Kenya, and the United Kingdom, Japan, and Italy, announced that discriminatory restrictions on many products from the dollar area would be eliminated.

The drive to remove quantitative import restrictions on dollar goods has received so constructive a response and has developed such momentum that we can look forward confidently to further advances in the coming months. We can reasonably hope that by the end of the year, discrimination against our exports will be almost a thing of the past.

As a result of these moves, potential markets for many important American products—covering a wide range of our industrial, consumer, and agricultural output—have greatly increased. This is true not only in the industrialized countries, but also in the newly developing lands, whose present need is for capital goods, but whose peoples will eventually offer a tremendous market for consumer goods.

But the opening of long-closed markets does not in itself guarantee a rise in our exports. It does provide the needed opportunity—but it is up to private American business to capitalize on this opportunity. A substantial export surplus has become a vital necessity if we are to continue to carry our free world responsibilities. We in Government are determined to do everything in our power to help in this export drive.

Accordingly, the Department of State is working with the Department of Commerce and other agencies in giving urgent attention to this vital matter. We are studying means of stimulating a greater interest in foreign trade in American business circles and of providing better U.S. Government facilities, both at home and abroad, to assist American firms in selling their goods and services to foreign countries.

The Department of State has, of course, a very strong interest in this program, and we are seeking ways of improving the operations of our commercial staffs abroad. We also intend to make full use of all the members of our diplomatic missions and consular offices in expanding U.S. exports. We are giving greater attention to increased U.S. participation in trade fairs. And we are intensifying our efforts to promote travel to the United States.

Other problems related to trade have recently been emerging in connection with the European Economic Community, or Common

Market, and the European Free Trade Association.

The Common Market will bring together the six countries of France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, in a full customs union, with free trade inside the market and a common external tariff. The community will also develop other common financial and administrative institutions. The European Free Trade Association, on the other hand, provides for free trade, without a common external tariff, among the seven countries of the United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Portugal, and Austria.

It is our purpose to work with the countries of both the Common Market and the Free Trade Association to reduce trade difficulties between them and with other countries, to avoid new discriminations against our own exports, and to encourage them to reduce tariffs in accordance with the basic principles of the GATT. In this way we hope also to ease frictions between the members of the two groups.

The problem of world trade goes hand-in-hand with the complex and difficult problem of stimulating growth in the newly developing countries. This task will require the combined energies and talents of the entire free world for many years to come. The United States cannot provide the needed capital alone. We do not propose to diminish our own role. But Western Europe and Japan, because of the great improvement in their monetary reserves, are now financially capable of mounting a sizable effort which could powerfully assist our own, thereby greatly adding to the overall strength and cohesion of the free world.

There is also the problem of how the great energies of private enterprise—American, European, Canadian, and Japanese—can be mobilized for the development task. Ways must be found to increase the flow of private capital and initiative to the developing countries if the basic free-world resource we call private enterprise is to make its fullest contribution to growth. If we are to have the resources to do these things, our own growth in North America and in Western Europe must be accelerated.

There is still another long-range problem which the industrialized free nations will have to face with growing urgency in the years ahead. It is the acceptance into their own markets of raw commodities produced by the newly developing nations today, and of the manufactured goods they will produce tomorrow. None of these nations will be satisfied to remain a one-commodity area forever. They all insist on diversifying their economies and on raising their standards of living by industrialization and by world trade in a variety of goods.

These, then, are the major economic problems facing us as we enter the sixties. We in Government have asked ourselves three questions:

First, how can we help to redirect the emerging trade rivalries within Western Europe into constructive channels which will reinforce, rather than weaken, world-wide trade, and will avoid the risk of serious harm to our exports and those of other friendly countries?

Second, how can we help mobilize the energies and resources of the other industrialized free nations to assist the development-hungry areas of the world?

Third, how can we work together to maintain a rapid rate of sustained growth in the economies of the industrialized free nations themselves?

In considering these questions, it is readily apparent that bold action is called for in the sixties, just as it was in the forties. We have responded with a new approach to the task of stimulating free world economic growth—an approach designed to meet the problems of the future.

This approach, which I had the privilege of outlining last month in Paris before a special meeting of the 20 governments which are members or associates of the OEEC, has three basic elements:

First, the linking of North America with our friends in Europe in terms of broad coordinated economic policies which would provide for close cooperation in a wide range of matters. This involves reorganizing or reinvigorating the OEEC, which was originally established to assist in the most effective use of Marshall plan funds and which has continued to serve as a forum for cooperation in trade and other economic fields. A special committee of four, nominated by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Greece, and roughly representatives of the different economic interests in the OEEC, has been asked to determine how the work of the 18-member OEEC can best be revitalized and broadened through a successor organization in which the United States and Canada would also become full members. OEEC has succeeded outstandingly in its major tasks, but many of the functions for which it was originally created have now been largely accomplished. It can, however, serve as the foundation for a reconstituted organization geared to the challenges of the sixties. The special committee is now consulting interested governments and organizations, and is expected to report its preliminary findings to the 20 governments early in April.

The second element of our proposal is the establishment of an interim group where the Nation's best able to provide bilateral capital assistance to the developing countries can discuss common problems in this field. Such discussions are needed because the urgent task of increasing the overall level of assistance to the developing countries cannot await the formation of the new permanent organization. This Interim Development Assistance Group will include the United States, Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Portugal and a representative of the Commission of the European Economic Community. We also hope that Japan will join in its activities. The first meeting of the group, which is to be held in Washington next month, will launch a series of consultations in which we will exchange ideas and experiences with a view to increasing the total amount of assistance available for development purposes.

The third and final element of our proposal is an examination of the problems of commercial policy to which I have referred in connection with the six and the seven. The 20 governments and representatives of the Commission of the EEC which attended the meetings in Paris last month are participating in a committee on trade to look into these questions. In establishing the committee, it was agreed that it should also keep very much in mind the commercial interests of countries not included in the six or the seven. In line with this objective, the executive secretary of the GATT is to participate in the committee's discussions, which will begin some weeks hence.

I am pleased to be able to report that our initiative has been well received by our friends and allies. The Paris meetings at which agreement was reached on these three proposals took place only a month ago. Yet officials of the participating governments had scarcely returned to their desks before work began in earnest preparation for carrying out the tasks we have set for ourselves. Although we are embarked on long-range projects, we are approaching them with a sense of urgency which the problems of stimulating free world economic growth in the sixties manifestly requires.

We are looking forward with considerable anticipation to the results of these meetings, which have been launched in a genuine

spirit of cooperation. We hope and expect that they will result in progress in coping with some of the free world's trade problems. Perhaps most important is the fact that there is now a great awareness in Western Europe of the increasing role which Europe is bound to play in providing assistance to the developing countries, and that there exists a very genuine desire on the part of the other capital-exporting nations to cooperate in this common endeavor which is so vital to the preservation of freedom.

We are indeed coming into a whole new era in free world economic growth. We are on the threshold of a major breakthrough. If the response of our friends and allies to our initiative of last month is as constructive and as generous as I have reason to believe it will be, then we need have little fear for the future. The great steps we are about to take toward freer trade and accelerated economic progress can carry us forward to new heights of prosperity and well-being as members of a peaceful and secure community of free nations which offers maximum opportunity for every human being to know a better life.

Thank you.

The Lee Group of Papers—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent publication of a handsome volume on the newspaper-radio-TV family of the Lee group in a communications domain which extends from mid-America to the mountains, made for exciting reading in that it emphasizes the American dream and what can be accomplished by dedicated men working toward a goal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to pay tribute to this family and to have these remarks appear in the Appendix of the Record so that others may become aware of this wonderful achievement.

There are many great newspapers in the United States; great, not in the sense of physical bigness, but in qualities of character, intellect, and leadership. The Lee group of newspapers which extends from our great Midwest to the Rocky Mountains, since the 1880's has operated and grown on those qualities of character, intellect, and leadership.

Increases in a newspaper's circulation and advertising cannot be ascribed to luck. Often a newspaper may have unbound financial resources, a superb editorial and executive staff, a completely equipped modern plant and a potential circulation and advertising field ripe for development—and yet drift pathetically into failure. The history of American journalism illustrates these comments.

What then is the open sesame to newspaper success? May I offer the assumption that the success of the Lee group of newspapers rests on belief in and a dedication to our system of free enterprise and complete loyalty to freedom of the press.

The character and purpose of the founder of the Lee group, Alfred W. Lee, should be especially noted now. The story of the Lee papers is a record of the growth of an idea, born in the mind of the founder. He believed that a newspaper should be a community institution—a shining example of free enterprise—operated to be independent of all influences other than the good will of the people who support it.

Employed in the bookkeeping department of the Muscatine Journal, Mr. Lee observed the business methods of John Mahin of the Journal.

Lee purchased the Ottumwa Courier on April 1, 1890. Then came the acquisition of the Times at Davenport, the Muscatine Journal, the Courier Post at Hannibal, Mo., and the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune.

The ingredients contained in the principles of free enterprise and freedom of the press are given expression in the following words which appeared in the Davenport Times in 1899 when A. W. Lee acquired that newspaper:

The Times will be subservient to no faction or clique, nor will it depend upon political favor or influence.

We believe that a newspaper is a commercial enterprise and should be conducted on strictly business principles, seeking patronage solely on its merits. We pledge the best newspaper that can be published at a profit.

Mr. Lee died suddenly in 1907 and his widow put her trust in the Davenport Times publisher, E. P. Adler. He became what we might term "a builder" of the Lee group. He purchased the Davenport Democrat, one of Iowa's oldest dailies.

The Lee group went outside the State of Iowa to embrace the Wisconsin State Journal—Madison—the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune, in Illinois the Kewanee Star-Courier, in Nebraska the Lincoln Star.

The third president of the Lee group, in its 70 years of service to American journalism, is Lee P. Loomis, the present chieftain. Today he presides skillfully over the newspapers and radio and television stations in five Midwestern States and one Western State. He also is the publisher of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette, a member of the Lee group.

An account of the Lee group, which would include the complex and astonishing process which brings to many thousands the record of events from the four corners of the world, would of necessity pay tribute to countless men and women whose talents and time have been and are dedicated to this organization. They, too, are exponents of our American way of life—exponents of free enterprise and the priceless heritage of freedom of the press.

Opponents of free enterprise, who would seek to destroy it, could be greatly perturbed by the activities of the Lee group. Each paper is editorially independent. This is a distinguishing attribute by which Lee group journalism can be accorded a position of influence and leadership. Neither can free enterprise exist without vision and foresight

nor without high ideals and strong convictions nor without the courage to defend them. Such factors exist in the Lee group's activities in the Midwest and in Montana.

Typical of the great strides in the publishing field achieved by this family are the success stories of the papers in the First Congressional District of Iowa—the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal and the two Davenport (Iowa) dailies, the Morning Democrat and the Daily Times.

It is fitting that we pay special tribute to these papers because they are the core of the family's success.

The Muscatine Journal dates back to 1840 and is actually the ancestor of today's sprawling Lee group. In its early days, the publisher was John Mahin, brother-in-law of the Lee founder, A. W. Lee.

A far cry from the primitive but positive beginnings, the Journal today operates in a modern plant. It offers photography and engraving services, four-color printing, and Associated Press Photofax.

H. L. Nelson, the Journal publisher, and Walter Russell, the managing editor, have developed an organization which has been responsible for a 1959 circulation figure of 10,000.

In Davenport, the round-the-clock journalism provided by the Daily Times, the Morning Democrat and the Sunday Times-Democrat, serves eastern Iowa and western Illinois with some of the most comprehensive coverage in the United States.

The struggling Davenport Times was added to the Lee group in 1899, and under E. P. Adler, the builder of the Lee chain, the Davenport Democrat was purchased in 1915.

The Morning Democrat observed its centennial on October 15, 1955, with the publication of 10 sections over a period of 10 days. Today's circulation is at the 23,000 mark, growing at the rate of nearly 1,000 a year since moving into the morning field 8 years ago. The Democrat circulates in the 14 counties of the rich farm and industrial area around the Quad Cities.

The publisher of the Morning Democrat, Henry B. Hook, and his managing editor, Forrest Kilmer, have reason to be proud of the first place award which the Morning Democrat received this year for outstanding topography in competition with 227 other papers in the Inland Daily Press Association.

The Daily Times, the second paper in the Lee organization, traces its ancestry back to 1878. It is the survivor of nine struggling dailies on the Davenport scene. With a circulation well over 30,000, it has always been a potent force for progress.

The Times publisher is Philip D. Adler, son of E. P. Adler. At 23 he was publisher of another Lee family paper, the Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier. Philip Adler is carrying on in the fine tradition of his father who helped bring A. W. Lee's vision of a group of Midwest dailies into focus.

The brilliant managing editor of the Daily Times is M. A. Fulton whose jour-

nalistic leadership continues to be a pace setter in the Midwest.

From the days of Benjamin Franklin down to the present, no other American institution has served the public welfare with more courage or with more effectiveness with more perseverance or more unselfishness, than has the American press. Factually the pen has indeed been mightier than the sword. It has followed the flag in peace as well as in war. It has been the right hand of progress; the forerunner of law and order in the cities and villages of our Nation.

The Lee group has not only maintained its own rights—the freedom of the press—but with courage and consistency, throughout its existence, has been the effective defender of freedom of speech and freedom of enterprise.

My salute to the Lee group is not for the promotion of these newspapers, but rather it is to give special thought, grateful thanks, and sincere congratulations to the importance of the purpose and the people involved.

Mergers of Power and Authority Serious Problem in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I call attention to the address which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], delivered to a convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists entitled "Mergers of Power and Authority Serious Problem in United States." The address is reprinted in the November 16, 1959, edition of the N.A.R.D. Journal.

As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have read the distinguished Senator's comments carefully and with great interest. He displays a keen insight into the grave problems confronting the American small businessmen. I hope that Senators and everyone interested in the welfare and the problems of small businesses will read the Senator's comments. Surely the 4 million American small and independent businesses are the foundation of our free enterprise system, and all of us need to redouble our efforts in behalf of this important segment of our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator SYMINGTON's comments be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I express my deep appreciation for what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has just said. As we know, he is an authority in the Senate in the field of small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGERS OF POWER AND AUTHORITY SERIOUS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES—CONVENTION ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON

I want to welcome you to my hometown and to tell you what a great privilege it was to accept the invitation that was given to me by one of my beloved colleagues, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN of Texarkana, Tex.

Our economic system is a healthy and vigorous one. It has room for free enterprise of all sizes. We don't need cartels or a corporate state to assure the full production of goods and services in America. And the short-run advantages of a big operation are often overcome by the long-run disadvantages of monopoly.

CONCERNED ABOUT "GIANTISM"

As perhaps some of you know, I came out of business, small and medium-sized business, to go into government. I speak from the standpoint of my own experience. And that is why so many of us have become increasingly concerned about the growth of what may be best called "giantism" in the manufacture and distribution of commodities.

Three years ago, the vice president in charge of finance for a great corporation here in St. Louis said to me: "STUART, you know you hear a lot about small business and big business, but I don't think that those terms are quite applicable."

At the time I left business 15 years ago, small business was a maximum of 500 people or a company that did not dominate its industry. Today in my opinion small business can be 10 or 15 thousand people. And at that time this man gave me a word for what is going on in this country today, not only in business but in every segment of this economy: giantism. I have never heard a better word to describe the problem that so many people are running into steadily—this consolidation in all segments of the economy of power and authority. In the case of business it is done through the concentration of wealth.

Independent operators are trying to check this trend by more flexible and imaginative sales practices, but they are beginning to realize the growing danger to their future involved in this concentration and consolidation of economic strength. Smaller enterprises, for example, find it much harder to help themselves when the Government fosters and approves the steadily rising interest rates.

Federal Reserve Board studies have shown that in periods of tight money smaller businesses receive less money in bank loans while the giant businesses get more. The figures on that are very interesting.

It is true, and of course as we all know, one of the most important costs of business today is the price of money. And in that connection, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN has been a Horatio at the bridge with respect to this particular problem, articulate and intelligent in warning about the danger of high interest rates.

In Missouri today, every good farmer, every successful farmer I have met whose operations are below the giantism concept of agriculture, when asked, "What has been the greatest addition in your costs in the last 10 years," has said, "The additional price that I have to pay for money to carry me over until I make my profit." So it is not just in industry that this problem of interest rates is getting more and more serious.

Today we are in another credit squeeze. Unless we are careful it may be the most severe in recent years. I am an industrialist by training, not a banker, but I remember many things. There have been three depressions in my lifetime. The one in 1907 I

don't remember since I was only 5. I recall 1921 because my father was a judge on the bench when real estate went bankrupt, and 1932 I remember best of all, for the reason that I went broke myself.

SENSE SAME OLD TRENDS

And as we see these things that are going on today in the handling of money, we sense the same old trends. I believe it was George Santayana who said, "Those who will not recognize the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them."

In August 1957, the President of the United States said the way to lick this growing inflation is to look before you buy. Six months later, in February 1958, he and his administration said the way to lick this recession is to buy. These things change very, very fast.

Today this administration wants to raise all interest rates on all Government bonds and as soon as that is done the interest rates to all business will increase. And to me it is hard to understand why we now want to prolong interest rates well above 4½ percent, when only a few months ago we offered 12-year, 4 percent Government bonds, got subscription offers for a billion and a half, but sold 600 million. Last year we offered 8½-year, 3 percent long-term Government bonds and had a subscription of 6 billion and only sold a billion and a half. In other words, the Government could have borrowed the money it needs at lower rates, but it didn't, so now it is forced to pay higher rates.

Now when you juggled the economy through manipulation of the price of money, in my opinion, you are doing a very, very dangerous thing to everybody.

And now I would like to speak briefly about a subject you as druggists are especially concerned with.

FRUITS OF MEDICAL SCIENCE

Here in America we have widespread distribution of the fruits of medical science and this has given our people a very high level of health. However, in many other countries, unfortunately almost the reverse is true. Smallpox, malaria and many other diseases which we in the West have conquered, take a heavy toll in Africa and Asia. Despite the great progress made in reducing infant mortality, we should remember in Asia one child in six never lives more than 1 year. Our faith and our educators teach us one life is as good as another regardless of nation or creed.

The great challenge we face, therefore, is to make the discoveries of our medical science available to all the peoples of the world.

I believe we should lead the way in an international attack on disease so as to give everybody a longer and more prosperous, happy life, to increase happiness and productivity over the years. If there is anything I have learned in the years I have served in Government, it is that poverty, disease, and hunger breed communism a great deal more than Marxist teachings themselves.

The symbol of communism today may well be considered by many people in underdeveloped countries to be a pennant on the moon. Don't misunderstand me. I am very sorry about this. I think it is significant that we weren't the first to orbit a satellite 2 years ago.

But on the other hand, America's symbol from the standpoint of the future in this country that we all love the most, could well be village dispensaries stocked with the modern drugs which bring a better and a longer life. In this connection, I would hope that all of us would support the Health for Peace Resolution which passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives. It is a resolution that authorizes \$50 million a year for an international program to be administered alongside

of American foreign policy. It is a good first step on the Federal level and should help us to develop our drug business abroad. Private groups can work effectively in this field. They can follow the lead of the Medico Organization and its heroic jungle doctor, a native of our town of St. Louis, Dr. Tom Dooley, of whom we are mighty proud.

Around the world many other diseases go unchecked. Trachoma and related illnesses attack 420 million people per year; 400 million people have hookworm. Each year the less fortunate countries of the world report 200 million cases of malaria which result in 2 million annual deaths. In a peaceful world these enemies of humanity must be countered there as they are here.

Now we have a justifiable pride in increasing our life expectancy. But let us remember that in India today, a child when born has a life expectancy of 32 years. In Burma and Pakistan, it is a little better, 35. Over here, it is 69.

The world today is a totally different place than it ever was before. It is almost hard to put it in words. I have one little illustration. Not too long ago I had to make a talk on George Washington and I found that it took him from 4 to 8 days to go from Philadelphia to Washington, D.C., 148 miles, depending on the condition of the roads. You fly it today in a commercial airliner in 40 minutes. I flew in a plane last summer at a speed that would cover those 148 miles in 8 minutes. We have another plane under construction, the X-15, which will do it in 3 minutes, and I have seen the design for a plane that will make the trip in 30 seconds. So when you go in 150 years from 4 to 8 days to 30 seconds, I think it is fair to say you are moving right along. And I think we have to understand our economy a great deal more than most of our citizens do.

THEORY ABOUT PAST AND FUTURE

There has been a lot of theory about the past as applied to the practicability of the future. I am afraid that, as a Nation, we may be thinking too much about what we are against and not recognizing those things we are for. Perhaps we are a little too much against communism instead of being for a free and prosperous and secure life.

The other day I got a letter and I really had to laugh. It came from one of the biggest business executives in this town. He wrote to me and said: "Why don't you go to work and get the help and get the money necessary for urban redevelopment? Why are you lagging behind?"

It was a nice letter, well written, with kind regards at the end. "Why are you lagging in flood control? Why don't we get a Federal housing building program? What is the matter with the Jefferson Memorial? We are 20 years overdue. Please see that a bill is passed to maintain our highway system."

So I wrote a letter saying "Acknowledging your letter of" such-and-such. "I am very anxious, as all of our congressional delegation is, to see everything happen to our community that happens to other communities. That makes us competitive in this country and with the rest of the world."

And all of a sudden, out of a clear sky, I get a letter from the same man saying, "Dear Senator, I want you to know I have had enough of this Federal spending" . . . and so forth and so on.

You know, having been a little businessman and marrying the daughter of a farmer (which didn't help me much in getting along with my business), I sometimes wonder what we really stand for as we think about our country. Several times, when in business, I went to my board of directors and said, "Look, I want to dig a hole and put some-

thing on top of it and put machinery in there, and if we do that, we will make a better product and it will be better for the stockholders."

Everytime the proposal was presented properly and was right, they said, "Go ahead." We dug the hole and expended the money and we made investments in the future of our company and we were very proud. We put it on the balance sheet as an asset, and presented it as such, and everybody seemed pleased that it had been done.

Now, that was for a certain group of stockholders and it was fine. But unfortunately the reverse is true for some reason, when we talk about all of the stockholders—the 177 or 180 million people in the United States that have a stake in our Government.

TAKE STOCK IN THIS WORLD TODAY

We all have to take stock in this world today. We have to take a good hard look at this visitor from Russia, Khrushchev. I am glad he came over here, because it gives him a chance to feel the things that we have in this country, the great basic economic strength, the great basic technological strength, and above all the great moral and spiritual strength that we have because of the faith we have in our institutions.

Khrushchev is very clever. He is very agile mentally. He was asked about Hungary and he said, "If you have a rat in your mouth, sometimes it is hard not to swallow it or spit it out."

Fair enough. Khrushchev met the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles, a great public servant, and he said to Mr. Dulles, "I read your reports, too." I thought Mr. Dulles' answer was quite appropriate. He replied, "I trust you get them legally."

The message I would like to leave with you is, where are we headed as a country? It is very important for a reason that I will mention. If we had a vote here this afternoon in this hall, I am sure we would agree that the most vital thing in the world is the attainment of a just and a lasting peace. That is the thing we want more than anything else in the world. But how are we going to get it? What should be our tactics?

History and logic prove that the only way we can get it is through some form of universal agreement for disarmament. Why should that be true? The Communists cannot be relied upon. We have made 53 agreements with the Russians and they have broken 54. We would like to trust them, but based on the record we can't.

DISARMAMENT KEY TO PEACE

Now is we agree that a negotiated disarmament is the key to peace, then we today only have one thing to answer or decide as people. Based upon the record—the record of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and many in addition, do we have a better chance of attaining that peace if we negotiate from a position of weakness relative to our opponents, or if we negotiate from a position of relative strength?

There is the whole story. And by strength we don't mean physical strength any more than we mean economic strength and technological strength and psychological strength.

This problem, then, is closely related to those we were discussing earlier. We must avoid consolidation in any segment of our economy. We must maintain an economic freedom, a spiritual freedom and a technological freedom. We must keep enough physical strength so we can be free. In that way, we can all attain what we all want more than anything else in the world, the opportunity to pass on to our children the heritage that has been given to us, the heritage of a free people.

Benjamin Nields III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I have prepared in memory of my friend Benjamin Nields III, of Rye, N.Y.

The cryptic phrase "Ben Nields III, died" may mean little or nothing to the stranger reading it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but when noted in the local press of Westchester County, N.Y., it signified to multitudes of men and women the passing of one of the county's most distinguished and beloved residents.

Ben Nields was a young—48 years of age—attorney of superb character, winning personality, and magnanimous disposition. He gave much of his time to charitable work and was keenly interested in his government, both local and national. As chairman of the cancer drive in his community he showed highly developed administrative talents, and won the admiration of his colleagues and the gratitude of the people of the area.

Ben read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD religiously, and it is fitting that this eulogy appear in these pages. He would have made a great Congressman had fate so decreed, for he was an exemplary leader in the finest meaning of the word.

Few men have had a happier family life than Ben. Devoted to his lovely wife, Sheila, and dedicated to his fine son Ben, IV, he experienced the blessings of filial and wifely affection.

Ben was my opponent in the congressional primary. At all times he was most gentlemanly, a natural facet of his good breeding. Entirely devoid of vindictiveness or personal rancor, he was always objective in his approach to his goal, and at all times eminently fair.

As I listened to him divulge his philosophy of government and delineate his approach to national issues, I concluded that here was a man who pledged himself to a life of service to his fellows and his community. His passing leaves all that knew him poorer in spirit, and saddened of heart.

Following is an editorial from the Mamaroneck Daily Times, February 27, 1960, which sums up accurately his contribution to Westchester:

EVEN WHEN HE LOST, HE SERVED

The death of Benjamin Nields III, of Rye, is a distinct loss to Westchester and its political system. Because of his campaigns for Congress and because of his interest in having issues discussed openly and thoroughly, two elections in the 26th Congressional district were distinguished by an informed electorate.

Mr. Nields believed in debate and argument on the complex problems which face Westchester and the Nation. As such, he frequently cleared the air within his own Republic Party and in the Democratic-GOP

election battles that followed. No one ran silently for office when "Ben" Nields sought election—nor when he was not running, for that matter.

It is not unusual for the man who causes debate and the free flow of ideas to go without election to an office. And so it was with "Ben" Nields. He lost in his bid for the Republican nomination for Congress in 1954, and again in 1956 when he campaigned as an insurgent. But, thanks to his efforts, no one could say that the public had not been given opportunity to sound out the ideas of the candidates.

Finally, not the least admirable aspect of this young man's character—he was only 48—was the fact he always had been the best of good losers. He held no grudges. He was not petty. When the people spoke in a primary election in which he had been a candidate, he accepted the verdict and on more than one occasion, without sacrifice of principle or loss of self-respect, he took up the cudgels for men who had beaten him.

Over the years, Mr. Nields had been assistant chairman of the National Taft-for-President Club, had been a member of the Rye City Planning Commission, and leader of a host of charitable and civic movements both in his home community and in the county at large. He had been, in other words, a fine, vigorous American, true to the traditions of his fine American family.

Federal Financial Assistance for School Construction and Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary and analysis of S. 8, as amended by the Clark-Monroney amendment on February 4, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF S. 8, TO AUTHORIZE FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND TEACHERS' SALARIES AS AMENDED BY THE CLARK-MONRONEY AMENDMENT ON FEBRUARY 4, 1960

SUMMARY

SECTION 1. Short title: The bill may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. Findings and purpose of act: The Senate found that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by States and local communities to build schools and to increase teachers' salaries, there are still serious shortages of classrooms and of teachers which require action on the part of the Federal Government. The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal financial support to help meet both the problems of financing adequate school facilities and teachers' salaries, or both, as the States may decide, and thereby to strengthen our Nation's educational system.

SEC. 3. Assurance against Federal interference in schools: "In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system." It is significant that, even without this disclaimer section, the opportunity

for Federal control of educational policies simply does not exist.

SEC. 4. Authorization of appropriations: Authorizes appropriations to be made for each fiscal year of a 2-year period beginning July 1, 1960, of \$20 multiplied by school-age population.

SEC. 5. Allotments and payments to States: The U.S. Commissioner of Education shall allot funds to each State on the basis of the State's school-age population, income per child of school age, and effort for school purposes of the respective States.

The allotment ratio for any State shall be \$1 less the product of 50 cents and the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for all the States except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 25 or more than 75 cents.

The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"Child of school age" and "school-age population" refer to those between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive.

SEC. 6. Maintenance of State and local support for school financing: The allotment of any State shall be reduced by the percentage the State school effort index is less than the national school effort index during the second year. Reduction will be reallocated among the remaining States. The amendments to this section are technical rather than substantive.

SEC. 7. State applications: Provisions whereby the State education agency of each State desiring to obtain an allotment shall make application to the Commissioner.

SEC. 8. Matching by States and local communities: Provisions to insure that after the first year a State must have increased its expenditures for elementary and secondary education from State and local sources over its share of Federal funds. State and local sources use the base school year 1959-60.

SEC. 9. Period for use of funds and certification by States: Upon receipt by the State, funds allocated under this act shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds. The State education agency shall certify that funds have been distributed and expended according to provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. Labor standards: This section provides that the State education agency shall give assurance to the Commissioner that workmen employed on school construction projects financed by allotments under the bill will be paid wages in keeping with the prevailing wage rates in the area as determined by the U.S. Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

SEC. 11. Definitions: This section is self-explanatory. The definitions are stock definitions commonly used in legislation. "Teacher" is defined to be what each State educational agency deems a teacher to be; "teachers' salaries" is so defined that funds may be expended only as compensation for teaching; "school facilities" does not include athletic stadiums, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events, for which a general public admission is charged.

The Principal of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House

an honor accorded Mr. Fred Landolphi, of New Jersey. Mr. Landolphi, who is principal of the South Side High School, in Newark, has been designated "Principal of the Year."

I am proud to know Mr. Landolphi, and I personally feel that no one is more deserving of the honor. His outstanding 29-year record as an educator has been culminated by his achievement in the South Side school, where his dedication and success moved the faculty to nominate him for the "Principal of the Year" competition. Mr. Landolphi's efforts have won the confidence of faculty and students alike.

I should like to include in the RECORD a tribute which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger of February 28. One of the things which this article points out is that Mr. Landolphi has personally solicited funds from friends and alumni so that more of South Side's graduates can go on to college.

The article follows:

SOUTH SIDE SAGA—PRINCIPAL BUILDS, WINS CONFIDENCE

(By Roger Harris)

When Fred Landolphi of South Side High School was designated Principal of the Year, his students greeted him with confetti and cake.

The celebration was greater than any following a major athletic triumph, for Landolphi had done a great deal for the school, and the school was eager to show its appreciation.

Landolphi took over as principal of South Side in 1951. At that time, the job was considered an unenviable one.

"Morale, good manners, scholarship, loyalty, and devotion had reached an unpleasant ebb," his faculty said, in its nominating petition to Arthur C. Crofts Publications, sponsors of the national contest.

"Today," said Landolphi, "teachers are glad to come to our school. Faculty and student morale are both high and nearly a quarter of our students go on to colleges."

Landolphi sees his success at South Side as merely another application of a principle that has guided him throughout a 29-year teaching career.

"You have to give the kids a feeling of confidence," he maintains. "You have to let them know that you're interested in them and that you only bawl them out because you care for them. Then you have something."

"Remember that many of these children are underprivileged and have terrible home lives—some of them so bad that it sounds like something out of a novel."

"It's wonderful to see kids with a real disadvantage, a 10-year handicap, make good. That's the biggest satisfaction I get in this job."

Educator Landolphi has been watching kids make good since 1931 when he came from the campus of Rutgers University with his master's degree to a teaching job at Arts High School.

After teaching history for 11 years in city schools, he was appointed vice principal of Arts High School in 1947 and then occupied a similar job at Weequahic High annex. The same year he moved to the board of education offices to take over the secondary school guidance program.

Landolphi found the administrative job a challenge and rewarding, but left it to take the job at South Side High because "I love to work with kids."

There was plenty of work to be done. "I certainly couldn't have accomplished it without my faculty," he emphasized. "I

think I've got the best darned teachers in the world."

Another aspect of the school which Landolphi is especially proud is the South Side scholarship fund.

The principal noted, upon assuming office, that while the most gifted of his students were able to win scholarships, other youngsters with great potential were denied a college education because of poverty.

He has spent countless hours soliciting funds from the school alumni and has finally developed a worthwhile program. At present, 20 South Side graduates are being supported in college by the fund.

What with attending all school athletic and social events and ministering to the alumni, Landolphi finds the job a long and an arduous one.

"But the thrill of watching a kid develop and make good is the greatest thing in the world," he says. "There's no satisfaction like it."

Federal Contracts and Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the important provisions in the administration's civil rights proposals would provide for a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts to succeed the President's Committee on Government Contracts. Unfortunately, this proposal has received very little attention. I do not believe there can be any reasonable argument against prevention of discrimination in employment under contracts paid for out of Government funds. All persons contribute to the support of the Government without regard to race; it follows that all persons are equally entitled to fair and equitable treatment in work paid for with Government funds.

The New York Times on Sunday editorially endorsed this proposal to give the President's Committee on Government Contracts statutory backing. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1960]

FEDERAL CONTRACTS AND BIAS

The President's Committee on Government Contracts, of which Vice President Nixon is chairman, deserves applause for its forthright resolution calling on all Government agencies which have contracts with private firms to direct their compliance with the antidiscrimination provisions in their contracts which are required by the Government. Included for special mention should be two members of the committee—President Meany of the AFL-CIO and President Reuther of the United Automobile Workers—who pledged an all-out drive to get local unions of federation affiliates to stop practices that prevent Negroes from getting Federal contract jobs.

A good test of the future effectiveness of this welcome cooperation between the committee and organized labor would be prompt action in the case of Local 26 of the Electrical Workers in Washington, embarrassingly

typical of conditions in the capital. Negroes are effectively excluded from jobs on Government work by agreements between employers and the union to hire only those referred to them by the union. But local 26 bars Negroes from membership and refers only whites.

The employers, of course, should hire Negroes and the union should admit and refer them. Mr. Meany has given extraordinary evidence of his devotion to the antibias cause by his pledge to furnish qualified Negro electricians to employers who will hire them, regardless of local 26. And the committee has a critical role to play in getting them to do this. Also, local 26 should remove the color bar—another job for Mr. Meany and the federation.

Apart from calling national attention to violations of the antidiscrimination provision in Government contracts, the Washington electricians' case has been useful in raising the whole question of the status and powers of the Committee on Government Contracts. Any agency performing its function should have more of both—especially statutory backing rather than a continuing existence by a mere Executive order as now. After all, the case of the electrical workers in Washington gives only a hint of the prodigious task it should perform.

A New Look in Passports?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since Miss Frances Knight has taken the reins of the U.S. Passport Office, she has shown that an agency of the Federal Government can keep up with the times. Under her direction, great savings of time and money have been made, and increasingly efficient and courteous service has been afforded the American traveling public. We of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida are particularly pleased with her farsightedness in establishing a U.S. passport field office in Miami, thus extending the Agency's service to the southernmost part of the United States. I want to here include an article taken from the Miami Herald of February 24, 1960, which cites just one more example of her constant service to the American traveler:

A NEW LOOK IN PASSPORTS?

Old ways of doing things often are taken for granted, but not by Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Federal Passport Office.

She has taken a fresh look at the product of her Office, unchanged for years. It is a 20-page booklet, measuring 3½ inches by 6½, covered with green cloth. Miss Knight finds several things wrong with it. For example:

It's too big. The size was chosen to fit into a man's inner coat pocket. Yet 57 percent of the passports lost last year were lost by men. More women travel abroad than men, and Miss Knight says a smaller passport would fit more easily into a woman's purse.

The cloth cover is unsatisfactory. It frays. In damp weather, it comes unstuck from its backing. Besides, why is it green? Miss

Knight is having tests made of plastic in blue, maroon and gray as well as green.

Commercial travelers quickly fill the 20 pages. Miss Knight thinks the document should have more pages—say, 50.

Miss Knight's aim is to streamline the passport into the handiest possible form to do its job, which is to serve as the international identification of U.S. citizens abroad.

This may seem a trivial matter, but we think not. It illustrates the virtue of challenging constantly the way things are done in Government, as elsewhere, and striving for improvement.

Change for the mere sake of change is idle, and sometimes change can be for the worse. But wherever there's a better way, let's find it.

The Policy Committee of the Rochester Association for the United Nations Backs International Conference on Problems of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for several years I have advocated that the nations of the world take steps to head off legal and other disputes which will inevitably arise as we press forward with the conquest of outer space. We must lay down the rules of the road before vested national interests and conflicting claims make amicable agreements impossible.

It may well be that the convening of an international legal conference to discuss these problems holds the best promise for success in this area, and certainly the United Nations must play a leading role in all these efforts. I have, therefore, read with particular interest a resolution recently adopted by the Policy Committee of the Rochester Association for the United Nations on this subject.

The resolution notes some of the problems which will inevitably arise as space explorations continue, and specifically urges the United States to take the lead in urging the holding of an international legal conference under U.N. auspices at the time of the scientific conference which has been proposed.

I am delighted at this latest example of the alert and informed activities of the Rochester Association for the United Nations. This large and important group has worked long, hard, and effectively for the promotion of the United Nations and its ideals. I salute them for their latest efforts, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution recently adopted be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(A statement from the Rochester Association for the United Nations Policy Committee)

"Space activities must to a large extent be an effort of Planet Earth as a Whole."

This philosophy underlies the U.N. approach to the legal, political, and scientific problems and opportunities presented by man's epoch-making probes into outer space.

Few seriously question the importance of space exploration to the future peace and prosperity of this planet. It is generally agreed that space development and exploration will ultimately become of necessity a shared international concern. The existence of rival space efforts, besides being prohibitive economically, could in the end result in projecting current military rivalries to the limitless dimensions of outer space.

Many scientists foresee that the space timetable for the next 10 years will include: satellites for weather control and communication, man in space, colonies on the moon and orbiting platforms for use as research stations and points for further space probes. These developments are now out of the realm of science fiction. They clearly indicate the need for cooperation and control.

A specific example of the need for agreement is the lack of rules on the use of radio frequencies which is already interfering with communication in space activities. Even more serious is the problem of territorial claims, a matter which will be more complicated if a nation claims possession of the moon before regulations are agreed upon. Although making no territorial claims, the Russians emphasized in official announcements at the time of their moon shot that red pennants were delivered to the surface of the moon.

An encouraging precedent for workable control of outer space is the Treaty of Antarctica negotiated by 12 nations, including the United States and the U.S.S.R. The Antarctic Treaty, which emphasizes scientific work rather than territorial gain, is unique in that military activity is banned from a continent. There is also provision for vetoless unilateral inspection in the treaty.

The establishment by the 14th General Assembly of a permanent Committee for International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is an encouraging step toward cooperation and regulation. The resolution setting up the permanent space committee suggested that plans be made for a scientific conference under U.N. auspices in 1960 or 1961 for the exchange of experience in the peaceful uses of outer space.

The RAUN Policy Committee suggests that now is the time to face the urgent legal problems that are already arising in connection with outer space. The policy committee recommends that the United States take the lead in urging that an international legal conference be convened under U.N. auspices at the time of the proposed scientific conference.

The implications of the space age demand serious thought on the part of all who are concerned with the future of mankind. If the philosophy that "space activities are to a large extent an effort of Planet Earth as a whole" is accepted, then through the United Nations and other international agencies patterns for cooperation and control can be found.

Mrs. David M. Allyn, Mrs. Albert Craig, Jr., Mrs. John W. Branch, John W. Branch, Joseph C. Briggs, Richard M. Buxbaum, Dr. Otakar Kutvirt, Jerome P. Lysaught, Miss Catherine N. Nevius, Dr. Prentiss Pemberton, Frank A. Steinhilper, Henry C. Walter, Edward P. Curtis, Jr., Chairman.

Freedom's Last Hope or "Anyone for Tennis?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1960, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, made an excellent presentation at the Ohio State University School of Journalism, setting forth his thoughts relating to our fight for human freedom. Mr. Hoyt is an excellent journalist who has contributed much to the freedom of the press throughout the United States. I recommend the reading of his excellent address which is as follows:

FREEDOM'S LAST HOPE OR "ANYONE FOR TENNIS?"

I am glad to be here on this podium to follow those distinguished newspapermen who have spoken here, and whose cumulative remarks furnish an informative and vital critique of journalism.

These are able men: Ethridge, Brucker, Johnson, Carter, and Wiggins. I have long respected their cogent comments on journalism.

I congratulate Fred Maguire and the Ohio State University School of Journalism for founding this, the Maxwell lecture series. Such a continuing public search for knowledge is a vital part of democracy in action.

We must continue to remember that we live in a democracy even though some of our citizens and some of our political overlords occasionally forget it.

A democracy, of course, is different from a dictatorship. For example, it would be hard to imagine the editor and publisher of either *Izvestia* or *Pravda* addressing the University of Moscow School of Journalism on news and truth, even if the University of Moscow had a school of journalism, and if *Izvestia* and *Pravda* lived up to the meaning of their names, which translated are News and Truth.

It is important now for us to remember that if we are to compete successfully with dictatorship, we must strengthen democracy; and one of the ways to do that is through discussion, frank and free.

It is well, too, to remember that this country, this America, was founded on the New England town meeting; on the conflicting voices of citizens ever engaged in search for the truths so necessary to bulwark freedom and insure its necessary growth.

And so the seeking has gone on through the ages.

The history of our country is written in the great debates: as to the form of government we were to have; as to whether the Union would or could endure; as to whether we would enter wars to fight for human freedom.

And now the greatest of all the great debates is being joined.

This debate is more important than the great debate in Athens in which the Greek philosophers urged the Athenians to add the social system of Sparta to the culture of Athens; it is more vital than the discussions of slavery that preceded the Civil War; more significant than the words that were spoken

in the world before World War II or the Korean incident; for the very fact of freedom now may be at stake and possibly the very existence of the human race itself.

Because today, at long last, man has the power to destroy himself—and completely. It is doubtful that any living thing on earth could survive all-out nuclear warfare.

The best insurance against that nuclear war is the strength of America, a nation that believes in peace and goodwill and is committed to live and to let live.

Only a strong America can save the world from destruction, and only a strong America can prevent its falling under the rule and domination of imperial communism. Make no mistake: the choice is as simple as that.

And so what is this great debate upon which we now enter?

It is whether affluence and prosperity alone equal strength.

It is whether America, having lost primacy among nations, can afford not to maintain parity.

It is whether we can afford not to match Russia in space exploration, in education and in missiles.

It is whether the President is right or wrong when he says we have nothing to worry about.

It is whether or not America indeed has lost her way.

Some of you may have wondered about the title of this talk: "Freedom's Last Hope or 'Anyone for Tennis?'"

The first part is obvious, but the subtitle may puzzle some persons a little.

To me, the subtitle is the best possible short diagnosis of our trouble.

The expression "Anyone for Tennis?" is an old one. It pops up every once in a while and so interested me that I asked our librarian to check its source. Apparently it first appeared as a laugh line in a musical comedy in the 1920's.

In this play, sort of a society melodrama laid in Newport, one of the characters, let's call him Reggie, was not only a playboy, but a tennis playboy. In the most dramatic moments of the play, whenever disaster threatened, Reggie would appear, impeccably clad in white sweater, white trousers and white shoes, racket under his arm, to demand loudly: "Anyone for tennis?"

The phrase, to me, represents a turning away from reality.

In any event, there is today an obvious unwillingness on the part of public and press alike to face up to the hard facts.

The hard facts include a fight for survival, in which fight so far we often have been second best.

Last month Walter Lippmann wrote a column which, in my judgment, is one of the great utterances of history.

In this column, Mr. Lippmann, a man not given to loose talk, referred to the President's recurrent emphasis on consumer goods as evidence of national strength.

Then Lippmann said:

"There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union."

"But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the life-giving principle of national power."

Lippmann closed this important column—which column I wish every American could read—with these moving words:

"While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what

must not be allowed to end is our parity with the greatest powers.

"For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

"Nobody can say as yet when the Nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency.

"The voices that will serve this country, and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things.

"They may not as yet do well in the Gallup polls. But they will be listened to sooner or later."

So far, generally speaking, instead of stern voices demanding hard things, the voices we have heard in this country are the smooth voices of complacent men, suggesting that we have nothing to worry about. Mostly these are the voices of the administration.

A few newspapers have protested, a few columnists have cried out, some politicians have screamed loudly; but for the most part, the public has heard the pleasing purr of our economy and applause for its performance.

The strongest voices heard now are those of men who seek the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. Unfortunately, these men have not clarified the issue as to our present ability to defend ourselves and the implications of our backwardness in space and educational development. Also unfortunately, some of their soundest criticisms are brushed off as politics.

But stern voices must be heard and will be heard. Foremost among those whose voices can save America must be the newspapers.

Their voices, which are often raised in eloquent defense of freedom of the press also must now, in other words, be raised in behalf of future security of the Nation.

I do not imply that the press should ever slacken its fight for the people's right to know. This is a proper interest for journalists to promote; but there is another interest, which might be called the freedom of responsibility—a freedom which will further guarantee freedom of the press itself.

My point is that the press has something more urgent than freedom of information to talk about—the survival of our democratic society. Meanwhile, it can conduct its fight for freedom of information more effectively than ever by making full use of aggressive and enterprising city editors and reporters.

If our civilization goes down the drain, one of the reasons will have been the failure of our newspapers to meet the challenge of responsibility.

The arrival of the space age puts a grave new responsibility on the newspapers and the newspapermen of the country and on the schools which train the newspapermen of tomorrow.

These responsibilities include:

1. The development of a new breed of writer to translate the abstruse language of science and space into terms which the ordinary reader can understand. In addition to covering local, national, and international news, newspapers must now cover news relating to the entire universe.

2. The stimulation of public understanding of the importance of space. The attitude of Charles E. Wilson, the former Secretary of Defense, that the first sputnik was a "neat scientific trick" still prevails in many places in Washington and throughout the country.

Newspapers must create awareness that space activities are vital to national defense. For the first time in history, this country is becoming vulnerable to possible attack because of Soviet gains in space and missile arts.

We hope that we have a military deterrent sufficient to discourage such an attack, but

there is a responsibility to inform the American people of the inherent dangers and the steps which must be taken to overcome them.

Space activities are also vital to national prestige. Ability to penetrate and cope with space has suddenly become a measure of a country's standing among nations and will be viewed by many people over the world as a measure of the success of democracy vis-a-vis communism.

As William Hinds, science writer of the Washington Star, puts it, "The country produces the best satellites in space is not going to have any trouble convincing people that its political system yields the highest dividends in accomplishment and progress."

The advance of knowledge in such fields as communications, navigation, weather control, etc., create new problems in newspaper coverage. For example, our scientists are now talking about earth-circling satellites for such things as worldwide television broadcasts. They expect to be able to photograph from a height of 300 miles objects on earth that are no larger than 7 feet in diameter. They believe satellites with tape recorders could be used to deliver within a few minutes the messages in all the mail which now moves daily between the cities of the world.

Space has moved from the comic pages to the front pages, and, as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, explains, the people who do not understand the importance of this new dimension are comparable with those who saw no practical use for the explorations of Columbus or the expeditions to tame the western frontiers of the United States.

The creation of popular support for this country's space projects is another responsibility of the press.

We have already learned that in the space race there are no prizes for place or show. The winner takes all. These projects run into high costs—\$107 million in fiscal 1961 for our program to put a man into space, \$230 million for only 1 year's effort on the Saturn program to develop a manned vehicle capable of going to the moon and back. Costs such as these are sure to get involved in politics, and our space efforts will lag unless there is public understanding of the need for them.

There is a heavy responsibility on the press to alert the country to the fact that our space effort will be duplicative, needlessly expensive, and short on accomplishment if it continues to be fragmented between a variety of agencies.

At the present time, we have the National Aeronautics and Space Administration working on the problem of putting a man into space and the development of a vehicle which can go to the moon.

Then we have the Office of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense working on missile problems.

Also in the Defense Department is the Advanced Research Projects Agency, working on missiles and the development of solid fuels.

The research department of the Air Force is assigned the task of developing reconnaissance satellites; the research department of the Navy is working on the development of navigational satellites; and the research department of the Army is working on the perfection of a communications satellite.

We rely on coordinators and committees to keep these various agencies from overlapping in their work; but the fact remains that all of these six agencies are concerned with common problems—such as thrust and guidance—and duplications in effort are unavoidable under such a system.

In journalistic language, it would be like a newspaper with six managing editors. Or in plain language, like a ship with six navigators.

These duplications have stemmed in part from Mr. Eisenhower's bland delusion that

space explorations have no relation to development of defense systems and that, therefore, space work can be assigned to a civilian agency while missile and satellite work is assigned to a variety of military agencies.

Well-informed persons contend that such separation, into civilian space work and military space activity, is arbitrary and unrealistic. It is as unrealistic as are Mr. Eisenhower's frequent denials that we are engaged in a space race, a view which is not shared by any of our leading space experts and scientists, as far as I can determine.

As General Medaris, a former chief of the Army Ordnance Missile Command at Huntsville, Ala., said the other day, "If we are not in a race with the Russians, we are spending far too much money in an effort to catch up."

Another responsibility is the creation of better understanding of this country's critical shortage of scientific manpower. According to Dr. Herbert York, the Pentagon's Director of Research, the shortage of scientists is a limiting factor on our space progress no matter how much money we might provide.

Which brings up the newspapers' responsibility to education. The fact is that Russia, until recently considered a backward country, is producing more scientists, more engineers, more technicians, and more linguists than we are, and at a time when we can ill afford to be in second place in these all-important categories. Thus it is the job of newspapers to bring these facts home to our people. If the newspapers don't, who will?

These and other pressing problems of our times give newspapers greater importance than ever. But let me say again that this great importance implies the need for a deeper sense of responsibility in the presentation of information.

Printing the news clearly, objectively, and dependably is more vital than ever. A recent speech by Ed Barrett, brilliant head of the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, supports the thesis that news is now a better sales bet than entertainment for newspapers.

Printing the news, clearly and objectively, is still the prime responsibility of the press in making our democracy work.

Democracy necessarily involves such freedoms as the right of any person, however unorthodox his views, to think and speak these views with impunity so long as he does not do anything that is a clear and present danger to the Nation.

This right is actually the same freedom of speech that we admire so much when applied to people who express only conventional ideas.

We have defamed too many persons whose principal offense was to be unconventional and thereby have left gaps in our educational system, our foreign service, and our military and scientific research programs.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that a new line of argument, potentially dangerous, is beginning to show up in the missile, space, and defense debate. Vice President NIXON, Senator DIRKSEN, and others are beginning to take the position that those who speak disparagingly of our defensive strength are doing a disservice to the country.

Senator DIRKSEN said after a meeting at the White House, February 8, that public testimony on defense may be helping potential enemies. He questioned the wisdom of talking in public about—for example, the number of submarines or bases this country has. He said press coverage, and particularly radio and TV coverage of hearings, has amounted in some cases to providing help for potential enemies.

Mr. NIXON, about the same time, was saying in Milwaukee that criticism of national defense can be destructive when un-

due emphasis is put on our weaknesses, without similar emphasis on our strengths. He warned against critics who play a numbers game regarding our missile strength.

If this should turn out to be the new administration line to silence criticism of national defense in an election year, the line will not be effective.

This line will not silence critics. It actually may serve to point up to the public what the real issues are between the President and his critics.

And what are the real issues?

The real issues are, I believe:

1. That the President does not see clearly the importance of space—space exploration and space vehicles.

2. That the President does not see clearly the pressing need to develop our greatest potential, the mental resources of all our people, through national aid to stepped-up education.

3. That the President does not see clearly that it is not so much our present ability to defend ourselves that is at issue, but where the United States will stand among the nations, 10 years hence.

The President has been consistent in his refusal to see that there are any dangers to the Nation in our second-place position in the space race even though his own advisers see it clearly enough.

George V. Allen, chief of the U.S. Information Service, is greatly concerned that American prestige is suffering all around the world as a result of the spectacular Russian firsts. Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, the President's scientific adviser, sees our scientific and technological contest with the Soviets as involving "today our national prestige and tomorrow, perhaps our very survival."

These differences between the President and the men around him in positions of trust indicate to me a serious lack of unity of purpose and understanding in our national leadership. It is to these differences that the great debate will be addressed.

In closing, I refer again to the words of Walter Lippmann who said: "We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run."

As the great debate makes this point clear and as the American press fulfills its obligation and presents the facts, I am confident that the American people will demand the right to run, will run and will win.

Mayor of Ripon, Wis., Decrees Job Safety Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in response to the President's recommendation that Governors and mayors join in observing February 28-March 5 as Job Safety Week, I am delighted to report that Wisconsin communities are responding in a constructive, creative way.

Recently, the Ripon Commonwealth Press published an article outlining the proclamation issued by Mayor John H. Wilson, of Ripon, establishing the designated period as "Job Safety Week" in that splendid community.

I request unanimous consent also that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ripon Commonwealth Press, Feb. 25, 1960]

MAYOR DECREES JOB SAFETY WEEK FEBRUARY 28-MARCH 5

To heighten public interest in job safety, President Eisenhower has called on the Nation's citizens to observe the week of February 28 to March 5 as "Job Safety Week."

To increase the impact of the proclamation at the local level, Mayor John H. Wilson issued the following statement:

"Whereas each year there are a number of workers in the city of Ripon who are injured in the course of their employment; and

"Whereas the loss to the city of Ripon in dollars, in wasted skills and in human bereavement is beyond calculation; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that none of those tragedies was inevitable; that methods exist or can be devised to eliminate almost all occupational accidents; and

"Whereas the President's Conference on Occupational Safety is meeting in Washington March 1-3, where 3,000 leaders from all walks of life and all parts of the Nation will seek in concert to discover and devise means to reduce that toll;

"Now, therefore, I, John H. Wilson, mayor of the city of Ripon, Wis., do hereby join with the President of these United States and with the Governor of the State of Wisconsin in establishing the week of February 28-March 5 as Job Safety Week and call on all the citizens of our community to join hands in making Job Safety Week a success and job safety a reality during all the weeks to come."

Castro Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the 1956 amendments to the Sugar Act the Philippines alone received no increase in quota. It is hoped that in the present Congress when consideration is given to a further extension of the act more equitable provision for the Philippine sugar producers will be made.

According to the Philippine Sugar Quota Administrator the sugar crop of the Philippines for the year 1959-60 which is now being harvested will turn out a record postwar production of 1,556,785 short tons. After providing for local consumption requirements and export quotas to the United States and to the world's free market, the Philippines will have an additional supply during the calendar year of 1960 of an estimated total of 377,195 short tons of centrifugal sugar. Therefore, the Philippines will have a surplus in excess of 300,000 which they will be in a position to supply to the United States if the Congress allows them to participate in increased consumption when we consider amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, this year.

Article II, paragraph I of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 states, and I quote:

The establishment herein of the limitations on the amounts of Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouses, in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future.

I do not believe that the Congress will again pass up the chance to give the Philippine sugar industry an opportunity for expansion.

The Philippine sugar industry is to be congratulated on its return to a record postwar crop production when you consider that this industry was completely devastated by enemy action in World War II.

I take the liberty of quoting in full an interesting editorial appearing in the Journal of Commerce, New York, February 17, 1960, entitled "Castro Shows the Way":

CASTRO SHOWS THE WAY

Whatever else may be said of the current political phenomenon of Cuba, Dr. Fidel Castro, we do feel he has produced the most convincing demonstration thus far of the desirability of revising extensively the U.S. Sugar Act of 1956.

For one thing, he has just arranged to double Cuba's present rate of sugar sales to Russia over a period of 5 years. True, this deal provides for payment partly in bartered goods so the cash return will be less than if the whole 5 million pounds were sold elsewhere in the market. But that is not of direct concern to the United States. Suffice it to say, for the moment, that one result of the Castro-Mikoyan deal is to ease somewhat the responsibility the United States has long taken on itself in supporting the Cuban economy by concentrating most of its sugar buying there.

For another, both in his words and official acts Dr. Castro has displayed a vituperative distaste for the American Government and for American business. In brushing aside all attempts to negotiate the "differences" he himself created, he has shattered virtually beyond repair any claim he might ultimately advance for favored U.S. treatment in sugar purchasing which might be extended for purposes of political stability.

So for once, the United States can review its sugar policy without worrying too much about either the immediate economic or political affects that a change in it might create in Cuba. And this, at the moment, is a most welcome thought.

It happens that the present Sugar Act expires at the end of this year and must then either be extended "as is" or revised.

And it also happens that while Castro is busy forfeiting any claims to special U.S. consideration, another far more deserving government in the Pacific is trying hard to find some means of selling more sugar to the United States—namely, the Philippines.

Finally, we recall that nearly four years ago, when President Eisenhower signed the Sugar Act of 1956, he said: "When new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present Sugar Act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased (U.S.) consumption as is now provided for other countries in this bill."

So if ever the circumstances were tailor-made for the type of change Mr. Eisenhower indicated in 1956, they are just that now, and Manila can be duly grateful to Dr. Castro for having made them so.

But to say this is not to suggest that Congress should now go hog wild with the Sugar Act and riddle it with clauses and prohibitions aimed primarily at making life

tough for Castro, regardless of the consequences to broader American interests.

If Congress follows this course—and some of its Members are talking as though they'd like it to do so—the results could be a rigid and distorted sugar policy that ultimately might do far more harm than good.

On the other hand, Congress could supply the administration with a really effective instrument for dealing with Dr. Castro by simply granting the administration the authority it is apparently considering but has not yet officially sought to adjust all foreign sugar quotas at will. Under such a system, the President could make available larger sugar quotas to the Philippines, and perhaps to other areas, gradually, tightening up on Cuba's quota so long as Castro pursues his present course, but then easing up if he (or a successor) shows any capacity to act rationally.

It is much to be regretted that Chairman Harold D. Cooley, of the House Agriculture Committee, has already expressed his flat opposition to such a grant of authority.

Perhaps Mr. Cooley, and some others of similar persuasion, were irked by Mr. Eisenhower's promise not to reply in kind to the attacks Dr. Castro has lately been making on the United States. But if so, we think they misread his meaning. Not to reply in kind is one thing; actually it would be beneath the dignity of any U.S. Chief Executive to conduct and express himself on the level that seems to come so naturally to Cuba's present boss.

But if Dr. Castro has interpreted these words as meaning that the United States is resigned to letting him have his cake and eat it, too, he couldn't have made a worse guess.

REA Record of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include copy of a letter which I received from David A. Hamill, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, regarding the activities of his agency during fiscal 1959. Mr. Hamill presents a record of real progress and achievement on which he and the REA cooperatives of the country are to be congratulated:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1960.

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: Enclosed is a copy of my report on the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration during fiscal year 1959. It was a record loan year for REA's telephone program, as well as a year of continued growth for borrowers in REA's electric program.

During 1959, REA's electric borrowers connected 132,000 unserved rural establishments. Three-fourths of these were non-form consumers. At the same time, the average use of electricity continued to rise, and REA borrowers sold nearly 14 percent more electric power in fiscal 1959 than they did in 1958.

During the year, 250 electric loans were approved amounting to \$177,292,100, bringing

total loans since 1935 to more than \$3.94 billion. Principal and interest payments to the Government rose to more than \$1.1 billion, and over \$146 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Only two borrowers were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1959. Net worth of borrowers amounted to 16.6 percent of their total assets at the end of calendar 1958.

REA telephone loans in 1959 set a new record of \$99 million. A total of 223 loans were approved, including loans to 54 new borrowers. They brought the total number of telephone companies and cooperatives participating in the program to 665.

Loans since start of the telephone program in 1949 rose to \$575 million by the end of 1959. When construction is completed, this money will provide modern telephone service for 1.2 million subscribers. More than 180,000 new subscribers were connected during 1959.

Telephone borrowers made payments to REA of more than \$8.8 million during 1959. At year-end, 95 borrowers had a balance with REA of nearly \$1.6 million in advance payments, and the number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments had been reduced to 13.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HAMILL,
Administrator.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the genial publisher of the Pekin Daily Times, my good friend, Mr. Dean McNaughton, writes a choppy editorial which appears daily on the front page of his paper. I say choppy not in a derogatory sense, but rather to characterize as best I can the style of writing which is peculiar to the McNaughton family. The style should not detract, but as a matter of fact accentuates the points which Mr. McNaughton seeks to emphasize in his editorial comment.

The particular editorial which I should like to have reprinted in the Record at this point appeared on February 26 and deals with public housing. It points up the tremendous cost per unit of public housing and the loss to the community in real estate taxes. The editorial follows:

[From the Pekin Daily Times, Feb. 26, 1960]

PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Dean McNaughton)

Fred Dancy threw a scare into us last night.

Fred is executive director of Pekin's public housing layout at 19th and Broadway.

In yesterday's Times Fred wrote that our little block of 50 houses lost last year, including amortization, \$33,108.83.

"That's impossible," I thought. I questioned an appraiser.

"The loss is more than \$33,108.83."

The appraiser said that the local Housing Authority pays to the city \$3,360.14 in lieu of taxes, less than half the going rate. "The loss to the city is about \$4,000."

Things began to look blacker.

I spoke to a lawyer.

"The loss is more than \$33,108.83 plus the \$4,000."

The lawyer insists that the Government must tax us more than \$33,108.83 to have \$33,108.83 available to feed back to our local housing authority. (Government pays the losses.)

Let's use \$3,310 (10 percent) as the Government charge for collecting the money from us, running it through the budget, and hauling it back to Pekin.

Our total loss on our local layout now amounts to \$40,000 a year. I didn't pursue the idea any further.

I happen to favor public housing in distress situations.

But let's not take on any more units at a \$40,000-a-year loss until we're able to submit our \$250 monthly book order at the library.

Fred issued a timely warning.

Your Fight in Congress: An Address by Hon. Carl Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a splendid address made at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 22, 1960, by our distinguished colleague and Democratic Whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. Mr. ALBERT's speech is one of the most powerful presentations that I have ever read as to the justification for the legislation enacted in past years relating to rural electrification, and for the continuation and strengthening of the same. There is no Member of Congress better able to discuss this important activity than the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. He is not only one of the ablest and most dedicated Members of Congress, but one of the best friends that rural electrification in America has in the Halls of Congress.

The address made by our distinguished friend should be read as widely as possible.

The address follows:

YOUR FIGHT IN CONGRESS

(By Representative CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma)

This is the 25th year of rural electrification in America. Twenty-five years ago next May 11, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order No. 7037 creating the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time only about 10 percent of the farms in the United States were electrified. Today more than 95 percent of the farms of this country are connected to electric lines. You have said: "Let there be light and there was light" in every American countryside. This, my friends, is only the beginning. It is only prologue to things that are to come.

The silver anniversary of rural electrification in America is more than a mere chronological dividing line between the past and the future. It comes at a time when legislative decisions of major importance must

be made and issues resolved. This is a good time to look back and appraise the lessons of history. This is also a good time to look forward, to survey the situation ahead, and to gird for impending battles.

Strong forces have opposed REA from the beginning. In 1936 when the venerable, white-haired, 74-year-old George Norris rose to move consideration of rural electrification in the Senate of the United States for the first time, the New York Times was reporting:

"The U.S. Chamber of Commerce asked that the economy drive be started immediately and that the first goal be the defeat of the Norris-Rayburn rural electrification bill.

"Harper Sibley, president of the chamber of commerce, remarked that the organization's membership had voted emphatically in favor of retrenchment in Federal expenditures and against new enterprises. The Norris-Rayburn bill, he said, contravenes this principle."

This statement was from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1936. This is one organization that has not even changed its script in 25 years.

Another group that usually opposes everything beneficial to rural electrification is the power lobby. If this job had been turned over to the private utilities, it would not have been finished in a thousand years.

In 1935, Morris L. Cooke, first REA Administrator, called on power officials to survey the extent of rural electric development and its capability. The power executives reported back: "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served." This was in 1935 when only 10 percent of all farms were electrified.

The power companies have never been interested in the concept of service to farmers through area coverage. They are profit-making organizations only interested in "skimming the cream." They have refused to go out into the country and serve people, and yet they have begrudged every little struggling co-op every profitable customer that might connect to its lines. "Farm electrification is what Congress meant," they shout. Congress meant no such thing. The Rural Electrification Act, as George Norris so often pointed out, was intended to serve all people in all homes, farms, and establishments in the unserved rural areas of America.

When the very first funds were made available to REA, Administrator Cooke invited the good offices of the power officials in spreading the word in the ranks of their industry that the REA was operating and anxious to make loans for area coverage in rural communities. But the power firms made next to no effort to obtain any loans, and in his first annual report, the Administrator said:

"Before December 1935, it became apparent that the industry was not going to use even a substantial portion of the funds available for rural electrification, and farm organizations of a cooperative character forged ahead as the principal borrowers."

That was the story in 1935. That is the story today. Rural electrification is based on service and therefore belongs in the co-operative movement. Destroy the service concept and you destroy the co-ops. Kill the co-ops and you kill REA.

Because service is the very heart and soul of REA, it has also been indispensable to its success to keep it free from partisan politics. It is strange how history repeats itself. In the very first conference committee on the very first REA bill, George Norris won the battle against partisan control of the office of the Administrator. We fought that same battle again in Congress last spring when, with the largest vote in the history of the House of Representatives, up to that time,

and by a margin of only 4 votes, we failed to override a Presidential veto of a resolution designed to take control of the REA from the hands of a politically appointed and politically minded Secretary of Agriculture. Although we lost this battle, that big vote on REA, that show of tremendous strength, has already paid many dividends. Among other things, it explains, in my judgment, the reason why the administration has backed away from its bill to send REA to Wall Street.

There was still another argument in the first REA conference committee. This involved the matter of interest rates. One group wanted to provide that interest rates on REA loans should never be less than 3 percent and might be higher than that at the discretion of the Administrator. Senator Norris, who was defending the liberal version of the bill in conference, insisted that charges should not exceed 3 percent. He opposed higher interest rates on the ground that the entire intent and purpose to provide electricity to farmers would be endangered. He insisted that if the interest rates were advanced high enough, farmers would be discouraged in their efforts to procure the benefits of electricity in their farm and home operations and their undertaking would be financially unsound. It was finally agreed to fix the interest rate at the identical figure that the Government had to pay in its financing program on long-term bonds. Under this program, interest rates to co-ops never reached 3 percent. Yet the enterprise was a very profitable one to the Government, which, during the war, was borrowing money at the lowest rates in history. Although interest rates to cooperatives were fixed at 2 percent in 1944, the Government may still boast a profitable return on its REA loans over the years.

Proponents of high interest rates and tight money policies are in the saddle in the executive branch of the Government today. They are moving forward on every front, making it mandatory that every cent the Government borrows shall cost the taxpayers more. They are doing everything in their power to increase interest rates paid by the Government and to pass these increases on to Government borrowers such as rural electric co-ops. If REA interest rates were not fixed by law, they would be raised before the end of this week, and they would be raised even if it put in financial jeopardy every rural electric cooperative in the country. Sound financing has been indispensable to the success of REA. The interest rate on loans is 2 percent, and we intend to keep it there. We are going to fight every attempt to make this program a victim of the tight money policies of the present administration. We are going to keep the loan program in the hands of the Rural Electrification Administration, where it is, and where it belongs. We are going to resist to the limit every effort to turn the business of rural electrification over to private banking interests. We are not going to subject the future of rural electrification to the mercy of Wall Street. In this field, as in many others, from the time of George Norris to the present, eternal vigilance has been the price of victory.

What we have been saying about the effect of interest rates is, of course, also true of power rates. "An abundance of power at rates they can afford to pay" has been the battle cry of every friend of rural electric co-ops since the program started. If power development and power costs had been left to the private utilities, the REA movement would have been foredoomed. The utilities tipped their hand the very day that REA was born. In their report to Administrator Morris Cooke in 1935, the committee of power executives stated their position in unmistakable language in a simple sentence

that anyone can understand, and I quote verbatim: "The problem of the farmers is not one of rates, but the financing of wiring and purchasing of appliances." The REA Administrator rejected this theory as showing on the part of the companies "a lack of appreciation of the significance of rates and other costs to progress in rural electrification, and especially a lack of vision as to what could be accomplished by a vigilant and consistent program of rural electrification looking toward area coverage."

The most significant thing about the early development of REA was the simultaneous development of public power. It was no accident that the same George Norris who authored the first REA bill also fathered the Tennessee Valley Authority. From the early 1930's to the present time, the greatest champions of rural electrification in Congress—men like Norris, Rankin, Rayburn, and your Clyde Ellis, the men who put it on the track and made it go—have also been the leading advocates of the development of the water resources of this country, including the production of low-cost hydroelectric power. If this fight had not been made, if power development had been left exclusively to the private utilities there would be no rural electrification as we know it today. There would be no competition to keep down the cost of power. There would be no yardstick to measure its value. Public power is the handmaiden of rural electrification. Without the former, the latter could not survive. You and your member organizations depend upon the Federal power program for your existence. More than 450 rural electric cooperatives buy all or part of their energy from Federal agencies. There is nothing in your future which affects you so much as the public power policy of the United States.

Public power policy is, always has been, and always will be interwoven with the water resources policy of the country. You cannot separate the one from the other. Your own future is tied to both. In a broader sense, the entire economy of the Nation is tied to both. "Growth" is a bigger word in our economy today than ever before. We must grow at a faster rate in the next 25 years than in the last 25 years in the face of the challenge of Soviet Russia's progress. In recent years, Russia's rate of growth in power generating capacity has been far greater than our own. She has four projects completed or underway, each greater in capacity than Grand Coulee Dam. During Khrushchev's recent visit, he boasted that he would bury us economically. He made it clear time and time again that he regarded the economic race as even more important than the military race. It is a race we cannot afford to lose.

In the face of all this the present administration has embarked upon policies designed to slow down the development of our water resources and to make impossible their complete ultimate development for the maximum overall benefit of our country. At a time when Russia is speeding up construction of all major water projects, the Eisenhower administration has adhered to a program of no "new starts". This administration until this year had not presented a single recommendation for authorizing or starting a new Corps of Engineers multipurpose project since 1953. Time and again the President has vetoed authorization bills for flood control projects and for rivers and harbors development. He twice vetoed the appropriations bills designed to provide funds for modest water development and conservation programs last year, a veto which was finally overridden because Congress decided they were not only important but imperative. Time and again Congress has been frustrated by the agencies administering these programs. Time and again they have refused to spend money appro-

prized by Congress for certain projects or have postponed expenditures authorized for projects, upon which the national economy including the co-op movement depends. Time and again the administration has called for legislation aimed at the jugular vein of rural electrification. One by one the Congress has fended off these attacks.

Now the time has come when we must go into the whole question by reasserting the right of Congress to determine policy in the field of resources development. In this area as elsewhere in our constitutional system, we must make this "a government of laws and not a government of men". We must have legislation which will set true standards for project evaluation, place project planning on a comprehensive multiple-purpose, regional basis, and make available at reasonable costs to those who purchase the service, the benefits from reimbursable features. The experience of the past 7 years has taught us that we cannot have a loose and disjointed water policy capable of being shipwrecked on the shores of administrative caprice and subject to the whims of whatever administration happens to be in power. We must have legislation declaring the intent of Congress by setting legal standards which will bar the application of administrative devices designed to sabotage worthwhile programs.

H.R. 8, the Trimble bill, which declares these intents and sets these standards in realistic terms, is now pending in the House of Representatives. S. 1591, the Kerr bill, a related measure, is pending in the Senate. So far as rural electric cooperatives are concerned, this is the most important legislation introduced in Congress since the Norris-Rayburn Act of 1936. The Trimble bill reasserts the right of Congress to determine our water resources policy and to develop all the great river basins of this country. The bill establishes firm, legal standards to determine cost allocations and justifications in multipurpose projects. The administrative device known as the "separable costs-remaining benefits" method of cost allocation and similar devices are a misconstruction of the intent of Congress. Historical precedent and commonsense call for the incremental method of cost allocation. The separable costs-remaining-benefits method deserts the concept of power as an incidental purpose which it really is. Its application results in an artificially inflated rate structure which puts a burden on rural electric cooperatives and other buyers of Government power. Good projects are made to seem undesirable by use of a formula deliberately contrived to assign a disproportionate share of their costs to power and so inflate the cost of power to co-ops as to place it entirely out of their reach or to make it an impossible burden. Postconstruction changes in allocation of power costs inevitably result in higher power rates. In my Congressional District there are 5 co-op customers for power from the Southwestern Power Administration. Originally SPA allocated approximately 30 percent of project costs to hydroelectric power. At the present time approximately 52 percent of project costs are allocated to power. The result of this was inevitable. In 1958 the Federal Power Commission authorized a 27 percent increase in power rates in the Southwest. Since this increase went into effect, three of these co-ops have had rate increases ranging from 11 to 16 percent to their members. They attribute at least 60 percent of this increase, not to increased operational costs, not to inflation, but directly to the fact that they have to pay more for power.

One could search forever and never find sound economic justification for still another artificial device used by Government agencies known as taxes foregone. You are all familiar with the practice of charging as an annual cost against multipurpose

projects the figure representing the tax contribution of a privately financed steam plant that might be expected to develop were a Federal plant not built. The Trimble bill would scrap this arbitrary and fallacious justification standard which was tailored by administrative agencies to stifle Federal water resources development.

In the area of project justification, the Trimble bill provides a realistic method by extending the maximum payout period to 100 years or the useful life expectancy, whichever is lesser. Useful life expectancy is the logical yardstick to measure project worth. Many of the projects now under construction have an estimated life span ranging from 50 to as much as 500 years and beyond. It is ridiculous to base project feasibility on the ability to meet a requirement that reimbursable costs of Federal reservoirs be repaid in not more than 50 years. Of all the gimmicks used to inhibit resources development, this is perhaps the most unreasonable.

Still another unrealistic measure of benefit-to-cost ratios is the policy of ignoring recreational benefits. The Engineers assess these benefits through careful studies. They can tell us almost to the dollar what the recreational benefits are today and they further tell us that the sky is the limit on future benefits because recreation is a booming industry and tourism is on the march. Yet the Corps of Engineers is not permitted to submit recreation evaluations to Congress nor are they included in the benefit-cost ratios. Failure to recognize recreation benefits is first of all unrealistic and second is a deliberate and false reduction of project justification. Some 100 million people annually use the recreational opportunities offered by Federal reservoir projects. In many projects the recreation benefits alone are sufficient to offset the entire cost of the project over its useful lifespan. The Trimble bill provides for broadening the scope of benefits that could be assessed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in figuring benefit-to-cost ratios. The Trimble bill forces recognition of recreation benefits as an important fact of life in resources development.

Our national commitment to an expanding economy rests upon the continued development of our resources. We cannot continue to tolerate, without grave risk to our national productivity, the trend in administrative agencies to obscure the real purpose of water resources development by substituting involved formulas intended to prevent, rather than determine, project feasibility. Administration policy reflects in most cases the attitude that water resources development is not very desirable.

Inevitably this mental block to Government leadership in resources development has resulted in arbitrary methods of justifying projects and allocating their costs. The enactment of the Trimble bill will stop these self-defeating practices. This bill is a matter of highest priority to all friends of rural electrification in this session of Congress. If the principles embodied in this bill are accepted and properly implemented during the next 25 years, then what is past is merely prologue to the untold potentialities of the future. The proper development of our water resources is the No. 1 domestic problem in the United States today. The correlated overall development of all our great watersheds will change the face of America. It will make the deserts blossom. It will tame the raging rivers. It will save the soil. It will electrify the farms. It will spin the wheels of industry. It will open new jobs and new opportunities to all the people of our country.

The summons of the second half of the 20th century requires us to energize America's rural powerlines as fast as farmers can hook equipment and appliances onto

them. The natural wealth of the United States is our common trust. The development of this wealth must move along on every front. The relationship between industry and resources development grows closer every day. Your growth is good for the country and the country's growth is good for you. The first 25 years of rural electrification have established a framework of justice and equity in which rural people can do their indispensable part for the greater strength and safety of our Nation. You have created a new society in rural America. You have given rural life a new dimension. You have made a spacious future for farm people in which they can share equally, work in dignity, and live in peace.

Ostrich-like Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, made a speech last week before the Charlotte (N.C.) Textile Club regarding the position of the present administration concerning textile imports. His remarks offered no hope for the American textile industry which is fighting a battle for survival against an alarming increase in the importation of textile products manufactured overseas.

The Southern Textile News of February 27, 1960, carried a very fine editorial pointing out the inconsistency in Mr. Kearns' speech before the Charlotte Textile Club and calling attention to the serious economic condition prevailing within the textile industry.

I believe my colleagues in the House will find the editorial most interesting, and I request unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the Record:

OSTRICH-LIKE BUREAUCRATS

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs in the U.S. Commerce Department, made a speech before the Charlotte Textile Club this week.

To say that it was a disturbing talk, as it was appraised by ACMI President James A. Chapman, is putting it mildly.

If the substance of Mr. Kearns' dissertation could be construed as merely his own personal opinions, it would be disturbing, but if looked upon in the true light of reflecting the thinking of the U.S. Commerce Department, it is calamitous.

One of Mr. Kearns' most ill-advised statements was that imports of foreign textiles were not one of the industry's major problems.

If Mr. Kearns had bothered to step downstairs in his own Commerce Department where they keep tons of statistics, he would have found that imports of cotton yarns in January of this year totaled more than imports of these yarns in the entire year of 1959. Yes, according to Mr. Kearns, that should pose no problem to American spinners.

We hope Mr. Kearns is a subscriber to the Saturday Evening Post and if so that he will turn to page 31 of this week's issue and read an article entitled, "Is Foreign Aid Jeopardizing American Jobs?" The author

of this article, Demaree Bess, is not an employee of the Commerce Department, unfortunately, but he has been studying and writing on America's international relations since 1924. We would therefore term him somewhat of an expert on this subject.

Mr. Bess cites the instance of American Enka which recently thought it worthwhile to build a \$25-million rayon staple-fiber plant at Asheville. The profitable operation of this plant and employment of its thousands of employees was made possible only by an act of Congress in 1958, plugging a loophole in the antidumping law which had enabled European producers to sell rayon fiber on the American market at prices American manufacturers could not meet. How the U.S. Treasury Department has reversed that legislation. The Treasury ruling, in short, has made American Enka's costly new plant unprofitable.

Yet Mr. Kearns maintains imports pose no problem.

The Commerce Department agent also might take a look at the full page advertisement in this issue of Southern Textile News placed by J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., employer of 34,000 American workers. Tangible evidence is presented here that foreign imports not only are a problem to the textile industry but also to the national economy as a whole.

If Mr. Kearns had not been acquainted with such facts as presented here, statements he made in his Charlotte address might be charged up to ignorance. But such is not the case. Every possible means has been utilized to acquaint the Department with the serious damage being done to a vital industry by foreign imports.

It is high time the Congress should take drastic action and take the matter out of the hands of ostrichlike officials such as Mr. Kearns.

Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the February 25 issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried an article concerning my esteemed colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, BRUCE ALGER.

This distinguished Texan was first elected to the Congress of the United States by the citizens of the Dallas area in 1954. Since then this promising young American has served his constituency with ability and influence; he has served his Nation with patriotism and in accordance with the principle of "the National interest is the Dallas interest." Through hard work, effective organization, and great ability this outstanding Texas Republican has made a major contribution to the patriotic cause of his fellow Americans.

BRUCE ALGER became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in January 1959. It has been my privilege in the interim period to carefully observe his work. He is a staunch advocate of sound principles in the difficult areas of fiscal and monetary affairs. Congressman ALGER is motivated by a zealous determination that the America of the future

shall be a better land of human liberty and individual economic opportunity for every citizen. He does not pursue a course of political expediency in solving today's national problems with a gimmick and thereby deferring the permanent solution until sometime in the future. To BRUCE ALGER today's problems demand today's solutions.

BRUCE ALGER's very considerable achievements in his young political life have already gained national recognition. He has reflected great credit on his constituents who have honored themselves by electing him to public office.

In closing I would point out that because of this young American's integrity, wisdom, and patriotism, his accomplishments are accomplishments in behalf of a better and stronger America. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include the article from the Christian Science Monitor which is captioned "ALGER Success Story":

ALGER SUCCESS STORY: AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE SOUTHWEST
(By Bicknell Eubanks)

DALLAS.—The perennial problem of the Dallas County Democratic leadership is: What to do about BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. ALGER is the only Republican Congressman from Texas. He is one of the few Republicans ever to go to Congress from the Lone Star State. Except for one other, some years ago, he has proved to be the most durable.

The prospect of winning the Democratic nomination to Congress in Dallas County has lost much of its luster as a result of Mr. ALGER's successes. Before 1954 the Democratic victory was considered the same as election. But Mr. ALGER changed all of that in 1954, he registered a severe upset when he defeated one of the most popular and influential Democratic politicians in Dallas County, former Mayor Wallace Savage.

Mr. ALGER, who was a real-estate dealer of no known political aptitude, injected himself into the general election campaign amid considerable doubt as to his political judgment. Many Texans, especially in Dallas County, who were supposed to know better, wondered at his willingness to take on such a formidable task. But Mr. ALGER cheerfully began working his way toward a major upset victory. He personally solicited votes in downtown office buildings, among housewives, and along the streets.

When the votes were counted, he was in. The political wisecracks contented themselves by agreeing with each other that it was just a fluke.

But in 1956 another powerful Democrat, District Attorney Henry Wade, tried his hand. He was just as unfortunate as Mr. Savage. Mr. ALGER's victory over Mr. Wade was perhaps even more sensational, for Mr. Wade appeals to a much wider range of political opinion than Mr. Savage.

Again in 1958, another good vote getter tried his hand—State Representative Barefoot Sanders. Besides having an alluring name of considerable political value, Mr. Sanders also has shown a broad political approach. It was thought he might attract enough independent voters to unseat Mr. ALGER.

But Mr. ALGER, like the Mississippi River, just kept "rollin' along." Observers here now say he is going to do it again this year.

His opponent will be former State Representative "Joe" Pool. Mr. Pool has gotten the somewhat dubious honor of opposing Mr. ALGER by default. He is the only one to file for Democratic nomination and thus

will be nominated without opposition in the spring primaries. He is not regarded as a strong contender.

The irony of Mr. ALGER's successes, from the Democratic point of view, is that liberal-minded Democrats look upon him as a man who must be taken out of public office at almost any cost, and conservative Democrats feel somewhat the same way, although not with as much enthusiasm.

The conservative Democrats actually agree with many of Mr. ALGER's political views.

What really bothers them is that Mr. ALGER's continued success will result in a situation that might become hazardous to conservative Democratic candidates.

For one thing, Mr. ALGER has the real advantage of having to run only one race. But any potential Democratic opponent faces the prospect of three races. He has to run against the field in the first Democratic primary. Then, if he cannot get a clear majority, he has to run against the second highest candidate in the runoff. Finally, he has to make the big campaign against Mr. ALGER.

All of this costs money, takes time, and puts the candidate in the position of alienating more voters because he has to put himself on record more often, while Mr. ALGER can keep quiet and attend to his business of being a Congressman.

There are those Democrats who believe that if Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat), of Texas, should be the Democratic presidential nominee, his pulling power would help in a race against Mr. ALGER. That opinion, incidentally, is shared by many Republicans.

The Texas Republican organization, meanwhile, is making some threats of putting a candidate into the field against Senator JOHNSON in the fall. Senator JOHNSON has no opposition in the Democratic primary in his bid for renomination to the Senate.

Should Senator JOHNSON win the Democratic presidential nomination in the summer, he will be running for two offices next fall—for President and Senator.

This is permissible in the Lone Star State under what is known locally as the Garner law. This law was put on the books back in 1932 to permit John Nance Garner to run for reelection to the National House of Representatives and for Vice President on the ticket with Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Garner won both races in Texas. He promptly resigned from his House post and served two terms as Vice President.

Strong Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently carried a news article containing the views of Capt. Soren Willesen, of Boston, famed sea captain of two World Wars, on the need for building a strong American merchant marine.

Captain Willesen has devoted his life to the sea and continues to play a vital role in shipping activities. He has had an unusual and colorful career; and, under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Times reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

**SHIPPER OF TWO WARS BEMOANS PEACETIME
NEGLECT OF SHIPPING**
(By George Horne)

A seafaring man who probably commanded more ships during World War II than any other shipmaster was in New York the other day talking about the low state of the merchant marine.

A former New Yorker now living in Boston, Capt. Soren Willesen is a man who does everything in a big way.

He said that he had been talking since 1909 about the need for a strong American merchant marine, and that he sometimes felt he was not making much progress.

He is executive vice president of Sprague Steamship Co. and president of the Boston Marine Society. He was in New York on company business.

"We are at another low ebb in shipping," the captain said. "The tramp shipping segment of the industry is really in the doldrums, competing with foreign-flag tramps that are modern and fast—all built since the war. We haven't built any."

"Unless the tramp industry gets some aid such as an extension of the subsidy provisions to such vessels, this part of American shipping will be exterminated."

"Coastwise trading is also just about extinct. All the big coastal and intercoastal operators are either out of business or in shoal waters, and it was their fleets which formed the backbone of U.S. transport in both World Wars. But this country habitually forgets about shipping in between wars."

Captain Willesen's personal logbook has some dramatic entries.

He won his laurels as the most active shipmaster by what other seafarers might call legerdemain. He had gone ashore after a career that began in 1909 as a cadet on the old schoolship *Newport* in New York.

Assigned by the old Maritime Commission to supervise shipbuilding work at South Portland, Maine, he saw scores of new Liberty-type ships slide out of the building basins.

For part of the war period he delivered new ships to their owners, signing on as master on a total of 70 freighters. Usually he was master for only a day, and he never got out of Portland harbor with his charges.

In World War I, Captain Willesen was torpedoed on the cargo transport *Dora* 700 miles from her destination in France.

The British warship *Savage*, homeward bound after extended convoy duty, rescued the *Dora's* crew. All were safe 30 minutes after the torpedo hit.

But the *Savage* was short of food and "we lived on crackers and Scotch whisky," said the captain, adding, "I got my taste for the latter at that time."

In July 1917 he was navigator on the transport *Saratoga* in New York harbor when she was hit by the ship *Panama* off Staten Island.

Excursion boats, tugs and other craft moved swiftly in and rescued 1,338 men in 15 minutes before the *Saratoga* sank.

Nothing so exciting has happened to Captain Willesen lately. But he is only 84 years old and he said he hadn't given up yet.

**Gimmicks, Gadgets, and Gaudy Plans Are
No Substitute for Solid Postal Service**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the quality

of the Nation's postal service. This concern prompts the comments I am about to make about the Post Office appropriation for fiscal 1961.

Basically my thoughts are that the Post Office Department should lay aside postal operation by experimental innovation and that truly solid service should be restored. Postal employees and mail users are aware that gimmicks, gadgets, and gaudy plans are no substitute for service.

Mr. Speaker, one of the deepest sources of employee dissatisfaction has been the Post Office Department's distribution guides system. Not one postal employee or supervisor has come to me with kind words to say about the system and yet the hearings before the subcommittee indicate that there is general employee acceptance of the new program. On page 13 of the hearings, for example, Postmaster General Summerfield said:

The morale of the people in the Department who participated in (the distribution guides) program is higher than it has ever been.

On page 213 of the hearings Assistant Postmaster General Barnes says that the guides were requested by many clerks. Mr. Barnes said that in pilot experiment only 33 of 1,250 clerks in the Brooklyn, N.Y., post office were not performing satisfactorily under the guides and that 10 of those were justifiably under the level because of physical handicaps. This, Mr. Barnes said, left a remainder of 23 of 1,250 who were not performing satisfactorily. We could assume that this ratio of 1 to 60 would indeed support the claims made by the Postmaster General about high morale. No amount of protest to the contrary will persuade postal employees that the guides system is anything other than a speedup. If postal productivity is low, let the Post Office Department admit it frankly. If output must be raised, let this also be candidly confessed but let the Post Office Department not cover the fist of the speedup with a soft glove of claims that morale was never better and that the employees themselves made the request against which now they are protesting very bitterly.

In the State of North Dakota we are faced with train withdrawals and postal employees have made very excellent cases for the inauguration of highway post office service to replace discontinued trains. I participated at Jamestown, N. Dak., early in October 1959 in a meeting at which representatives of the Minneapolis postal region also were present. The regional people were unable to refute the case made by the employees for added highway post office service. The routes have not been furnished, answers to the employees' claims have not been given and the Post Office Department's testimony indicates that only 10 highway post office routes are to be supplied throughout the Nation during 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing which the Post Office Department might do to provide a really significant improvement in postal service would be to reinstate a second residential delivery so that overnight mail service might be restored without creating a lot of postal factories

at untold future expense to the taxpayers. Under the new plan which the Post Office Department is proposing, my State will have a transportation center at Fargo. This is very good in its own way but it will apparently mean hauling some mail back and forth across the entire State of North Dakota and it is certainly not an adequate substitute for a sound transportation network with railway and highway post offices interlacing the State. Most disappointing of all perhaps is the Post Office Department's rigid view in regard to adjustments in postal pay. The Post Office Department claims that postal pay scales compare "very favorably" with salaries in private industry. No explanation is given. The National Association of Letter Carriers has developed figures to show that in many communities postal employees receive anywhere from 25 to 75 cents an hour less than do garbage collectors.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must make certain that the Post Office Department will not wring the reduction in appropriations from the postal employees. Nor can we tolerate a further reduction in the already deplorable postal service. I hope, on the contrary, that the Congress will promptly take positive steps to restore postal service and to ease the economic plight of the loyal postal employees.

St. David's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of Wednesday, February 24, 1960, which comments on the meaning of St. David's Day that is observed officially today, March 1:

ST. DAVID'S BANQUET

While Tuesday, March 1, is St. David's Day, as no individual with Welsh blood in his veins has to be reminded, the St. David's Day Society of Wyoming Valley will celebrate at Hotel Sterling on Saturday night, February 27, with the 81st annual banquet. There is no hard and fast rule about holding the dinner on the anniversary itself, although that is usually the case. This year, as a matter of convenience, the society decided to anticipate the big day or night by 72 hours.

To this community, the annual St. David's Day gathering for the sons and daughters of Wales is a highlight of the year. This is explained not only by the large segment of the population they constitute, but by the sentimental ties with the land of their forefathers.

What makes this especially significant is the activity of the new generation. At the turn of the century, with hundreds of immigrants in our midst, it was understandable that interest in this event was high. The surprising development is that it has not diminished with later generations. In fact, the outlook for the St. David's Day Society and the St. David's Day observance is unusually bright in view of the new blood that

is being infused constantly. This is a most healthy sign for the organization.

Wyoming Valley, today as well as yesterday, offers proof that the Welshman abroad is the best Welshman. Americans of Welsh extraction fall in that category, for their attachment to Welsh traditions is strong, as these affairs, as well as the eisteddfods and song festivals, attest.

St. David's Day commemorates the anniversary of the death of St. David, but it is anything but a sad occasion. He is believed to have died in 561 which would mean that the observance next year will mark the 1,400th year, evidence in itself of the place St. David occupies in the affections of the Welsh people.

Wales today has a population of approximately 2 million and, while it officially is a part of Great Britain, it preserves its ancient culture, customs and language. In recent years, there have been rumblings in the wake of a movement to give Wales dominion status or a measure of freedom in keeping with the general trend throughout the world.

No matter what develops along these lines, St. David will continue to be the revered patron of this ancient land.

ASCAP Members Approve Consent Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, early this year the membership of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, more familiarly known as ASCAP, approved the terms of a consent decree agreed upon by the society and the Department of Justice under which certain revisions are made in the election of ASCAP directors, of the survey of members' music performed and in the distribution of royalties.

After the tabulation of member votes on the issue, ASCAP issued a press statement which described the outcome as a vote of confidence for the society's board. Under unanimous consent I include the ASCAP statement as part of my remarks in the Record.

The material follows:

OVERWHELMING VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ASCAP BOARD

By an 83.03 percent weighted vote and a more than 67 percent numerical vote, the members of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) have approved the terms of a consent decree agreed upon by the Department of Justice and the society.

Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan of the U.S. district court announced the vote January 6 after the votes were tabulated in court by five teams of certified public accountants who have been sworn in as officers of the court. Judge Ryan approved the consent order January 7 and with the consent of ASCAP and the Government designated the Honorable John E. McGeehan and the Honorable Irving M. Ives to examine periodically, as is necessary, the society's survey of performances and to report to the court.

Commenting on Judge Ryan's designation of Judge McGeehan and Senator Ives, ASCAP President Stanley Adams said:

"ASCAP commends these distinguished citizens on their willingness to serve. We believe they will make a distinct contribution to the musical life of the Nation in which the members of ASCAP play such an important part."

The new decree amends the consent judgment of 1941 as amended in 1950. It provides revisions in the election of the society's directors, of the survey of members' music performed, and distribution of royalties.

Mr. Adams, in commenting on the outcome of the voting, said: "The society's board of directors and its management are tremendously gratified by the membership's overwhelming vote on behalf of the consent decree. We look upon it as a vote of confidence by the members in their directors and its management."

"The new decree is the result of more than 12 months of hard work between the Department of Justice and the society's counsel and management to revise the ground rules under which ASCAP operates. Under the new decree ASCAP will continue as a progressive organization constantly re-examining its procedures and making changes wherever and whenever they will benefit the society's entire membership. I wish to commend highly the work of our general attorney, Herman Finkelstein, and our special counsel, Arthur H. Dean, for their efforts in bringing this decree to its successful conclusion."

Soviet Anti-Semitic Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1955, when I visited the Soviet Union, I suspected that Jews are not wanted in Russia by the Communists. Subsequent events have unquestionably borne out this feeling of mine. The following article by David Lawrence, which appears in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, further buttresses my convictions:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITIC DRIVE REPORTED BY HUNGARIAN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 29.—The Soviet Union's complicity in the anti-Semitic demonstrations recently in various countries, including West Germany, has long been suspected, but it remained for Dr. Bela Fabian, chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, to reveal what has been suppressed, namely, the background of the conspiracy.

It develops that for several months prior to the swastika painting on synagogues in West Germany, the Soviet Union was carrying on an anti-Semitic campaign but the news was not allowed to get out.

Dr. Fabian, writing in U.S. News & World Report, tells of these occurrences:

"In Baranovich, Bendery, Kishinev, Kiev, Minsk, Voronezh, and Wilna, Jewish cemeteries were desecrated and memorials defaced. No punitive actions were taken against the perpetrators, which also shows that they were inspired or encouraged by the authorities."

Dr. Fabian says that in the last 6 months of 1959 a large number of synagogues in various parts of the Soviet Union were closed down. He names 20 different cities, and

declares that there now are only 60 synagogues functioning in the entire Soviet Union. He states that in Moscow, where there are 600,000 Jews, only 1 synagogue is permitted to remain open. The windows in this church building were broken on New Year's Eve and further damage done a few days later. Dr. Fabian adds:

"Discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union may be seen by the following facts:

"1. Each Soviet citizen has to have an internal passport that serves as a certificate of identity within the country. Ordinary Soviet citizens have only the place of their birth marked on the cards, while those of the Jews are marked by the word 'Evrei'—Jew.

OTHER DISCRIMINATIONS

"2. Jews cannot be civil servants or army officers. Since 1949, no Jews are admitted to Soviet military schools.

"3. The world was shocked that, under the czars, Jews numbering 5 percent of the student body were allowed to study at Russian universities. Today, there are no more than 1.5 percent, while at the universities of the Ukraine no Jews are admitted. Today, there are still Jews who practice medicine and are employed as teachers and professors, but now they are excluded from the medical faculty, from training schools for teachers and from training schools for diplomats.

"4. Jews are gradually being pushed out of administrative jobs in industrial plants. Nowadays, they even rarely hold the job of a foreman."

A great deal has appeared in the press of the world about the desecration of Jewish places of worship and this has usually been attributed to "hooligans."

PROOF HARD TO GET

The West German Government investigated and found many instances in which there was a tie-up to the East German Communists. But proof in such circumstances is difficult to get because the underground techniques are effective. No Communist contacts the youth directly, but the Soviet apparatus extends to many universities in different countries and it is not a difficult matter for intermediaries to start anti-Semitic demonstrations without the risk of being exposed.

When news does leak out, it is given casual attention. Thus on October 4, 1959, hoodlums set fire to the synagogue at Malakhovka, a suburb of Moscow. It was on the second day of the Jewish New Year services. The 70-year-old wife of the caretaker was strangled and her body thrown into the flames. News of this was not carried in the Soviet press. Discussing the anti-Semitic demonstrations in West Germany, Dr. Fabian asks:

LIQUIDATION GOES ON

"Who was interested in compromising the Liberal-Democratic Chancellor Adenauer of Germany before the summit conference? Who would profit by breaking up the united front of the Western alliance?

"It is obvious that this anti-Semitic campaign did not serve the interest of West Germany—now waging a battle of life and death for Berlin and for the reunification of Germany—as, for this country, not only the support but also the sympathy of the free world is essential. The weakening of West Germany's morale and the disruption of Western unity would profit only one power: the Soviet Union.

"The anti-Semitic campaign would also serve to camouflage the tragic fact that, within the last 6 months, the Soviet Union is the only country to introduce legally and in practice the Nazi principles of Nuremberg."

"The Jewish question is the skeleton in the Soviet cupboard. As long as silence is maintained, the gradual liquidation of Jewry goes on.

DENIED BY KHRUSHCHEV

"History may repeat itself. Had the world raised its voice in time—before Hitler sent millions of Jews to the gas chambers, and not after when there was nothing one could do but lament—millions of lives would have been saved."

The customary denials are issued by Khrushchev when asked about anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. He declares that religious freedom prevails and that where Jewish churches have been closed it has been because of alleged anti-Soviet activities.

Perhaps the most curious aspect of this whole business is the readiness with which some of the leftwing elements in the United States have been so ready to pooh-pooh and dismiss as absurd the idea that the Soviet espionage apparatus may have been back of the well-coordinated movement throughout the world to paint swastikas on synagogues.

Tragic Death From Common Household Detergent—A Warning to All Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and appalled today at the circumstances set forth in a letter I received from one of my constituents in Wishram, Wash. I remembered that the attention of the Members of this House, as well as that of all parents in our country, was called not long ago to the dangerous and often fatal results that had occurred when children were allowed to play with the plastic bags now largely used by cleaning plants to return cleaned garments. I believe that the attention of the Members should be brought to the matters contained in this letter, and that parents should be made aware of the dangerous contents of the dishwashing detergents sold throughout our country, and used in more and more homes every day. Apparently, the lethal contents of these detergents are not listed on the labels of the packages, nor is there any warning of danger on the labels. I have communicated with the Federal Trade Commission, urging that this matter be looked into, and I hope that the manufacturers of these detergents will cooperate by listing contents on their labels and by printing a plain warning on their packages. Excerpts from my constituent's letter follow:

A little Wishram girl, 16 months old, died the other day, in spite of all a modern hospital and able doctors could do, from swallowing a small amount of a commonly used dishwashing detergent. The package label contained no warning whatsoever concerning its lye or other caustic content, does not in fact list or identify the contents. The grief-stricken parents are desperately anxious to get swift action on a nationwide basis to prevent a repetition of this tragedy, but they get no encouragement to believe that any action they can initiate will get any but a slow-moving investigation. Their doctors express shock that anything so lethal should be permitted to be sold and bear no warning. There apparently is no

antidote. The fatal damage was done instantly.

They appeal now to you through me in the hope that you can and will report the matter to the proper Government agency at the earliest possible moment, following up with legislative action, if necessary, every package can have a warning label attached, a striking label, though not even that, nor any listing of the nature of the contents we repeat was on the package in question nor on any other they have examined since.

The child was Kay Williams. Date of the accident was February 15. Date of death was February 18. Autopsy revealed severe internal damage—esophagus destroyed, etc.

This entire community is aroused. We will all deeply appreciate anything you can do to bring about fast action that will prevent another such tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this up with the proper Federal agency, and I hope that all manufacturers of such detergents will cooperate in placing warning labels on their packages. But, most important, I want to call attention to this tragedy, so that American parents will be warned of the dangers in these products. Legislative action, and action by the manufacturers and by Federal agencies all take time, and I hope that, by inserting this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I can perhaps save some of that time, and perhaps save another family from such a tragedy.

Jack Riley's Olympic Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein a pertinent and very interesting article from a recent edition of the Washington Evening Star entitled "U.S. Hockey Coach Crosses Up Experts."

The Nation is greatly thrilled by the magnificent victory of our stalwart American hockey team in the Olympics.

The win demonstrated what vigorous leadership, combined with talent, fine playing ability, and courage, can do in competitive athletic contests.

Our great, fighting hockey team made an enviable record that will long serve as an inspiration for American youth interested in athletics.

The players are entitled to great credit for their wonderful work, and their inspiring coach, Jack Riley, is entitled to special gratitude for his superb organizational work and unexcelled leadership.

The victory was not easy to achieve. Our boys were pitted against the very toughest competition throughout the games. Their Russian victory was particularly outstanding because the Russian team was comprised of expert players who were thoroughly experienced and fired with real determination to win. Their sportsmanship was commendable. They were hard-hitting and spirited, and

they were fair and sportsmanlike throughout the game. They were good losers and good sports.

Our boys played a hard, aggressive, fair game and their work and thrilling victory reflects great credit upon them.

We may all be proud of these fine, young American boys who recorded the outstanding victory of the winter Olympic games. I am especially proud of our Massachusetts boys who are members of this great victorious team—the Cleary boys, Bill of Cambridge, and Bob, of Westwood, whose father, uncle, and family are valued friends of mine; Jack Kirrane, of Brookline and Jack Rodenheiser of Malden, all of whom, together with their teammates, covered themselves with glory.

I repeat, we can well be proud of each and every one of these fine young Americans who demonstrated to the world in these contests the competitive prowess, skill, and determination of American youth.

As for Coach Jack Riley, it is almost impossible to measure and adequately express appreciation for his tremendous leadership and achievement. In assembling, training, and inspiring this great team, he rendered a service that has few, if any, parallels in the history of American sport.

This victory marks Jack Riley, not only as a great coach, but as a great leader, and the Nation may be thankful indeed to have a man of his high character, intelligence, ability, and zeal for leadership training our young men at our great U.S. Military Academy and in Olympic competition.

I tender Coach Riley and all the members of his history-making team my heartiest congratulations and express the hope that their tenacious spirit will permeate our other competitors in the Olympic games.

The material from the Star follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 29, 1960]

U.S. HOCKEY COACH CROSSES UP EXPERTS—BIG GAMBLE PAYS OFF

SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF., February 29.—"No one figured us for better than third place—but we beat 'em all," said Jack Riley, mastermind of the U.S. Olympic hockey triumph.

During the winter games, the 39-year-old American coach kept repeating in his crisp Boston accent:

"We hope to be the first American hockey team to beat the Russians and win an Olympic gold medal."

Self-styled experts told Riley he could build a snowman on the Equator easier. And why not? The American players hadn't much more than met each other before last Christmas. Riley's irregulars were a pickup team from hither and yon—Boston insurance salesmen, Minnesota carpenters, servicemen, a television salesman from Wisconsin, a husky fireman from Brookline, Mass.

CLEARYS COME THROUGH

Riley, who has been coach at West Point for 10 years, took a gamble on the Yank squad and won. Eleven players threatened to quit when he added the Cleary brothers of Boston—Bill and Bob—just an hour before the player deadline on February 4.

The 11 resented that the Clearys, busy with their Boston insurance business, hadn't been practicing with the squad.

"I told them if they wanted to come to Squaw Valley as the second best team, OK—I didn't. I said we'd go as the best, or not at all."

The Clearys turned out to be stars on the Yank team that swept five games for the United States first Olympic hockey gold medal.

The world champion team that Riley pulled together is scattered to the winds today—players have gone back to their Army camps, jobs, wives, and kids.

WAS DARTMOUTH STAR

Riley, too, is happy the hectic tension is over and he can resume life at West Point with his pretty wife, Maureen, and their four sons—Jay 9, Mark 7, Robert 5, and Brian, 8 months.

"I got some great hockey players coming up," said Riley, who could always manage a smile even during the hottest hours of the Olympic competition.

Riley, who looks younger than some of his players, was an Ivy League hockey stand-out at Dartmouth where his brothers, Joe and Bill, also starred.

He was a Navy pilot during World War II—cruising the Pacific in a twin-engine PBM patrol bomber. After the shooting was over, Riley went back to a Boston insurance business and his first love—hockey.

Riley was a high scorer in the 1948 Amateur Hockey Association and on the U.S. team that went to the Olympics at St. Moritz, Switzerland, in 1948. He was player-coach on the American team that finished third to Czechoslovakia and Canada at the 1949 world's championship at Stockholm, Sweden.

Jack took the job at West Point on a temporary basis—and fell in love with coaching hockey. He is also assistant athletic director and has just signed a 3-year contract.

Riley doesn't drink or smoke. He lives quietly—except when in Olympic competition.

"I've never been under such tension," said Riley, who sweated his lads through every game. "I'll certainly be glad to get back to the Point and play MIT and some of those other schools."

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to comment briefly on the unsuccessful attempt to override the President's veto of the bill, H.R. 3610, which would have increased Federal grants for the construction of sewage treatment works.

In 1956 the Water Pollution Control Act was amended to include such a 10-year program and authorized \$500 million in matching funds to assist communities in the abatement of pollution, but set a limit of \$50 million to be spent in any one year. As to individual projects, restriction was made to limit the Federal share not to exceed 30 percent of the total cost or \$250,000, whichever was less.

Numerous sewage treatment facilities have been constructed throughout the

United States under this program, including several in my own congressional district in upstate New York. While stream pollution has not been completely eradicated since the Federal assistance program was initiated 4 years ago, such was not the intent of the law, which by its own provisions anticipated a 10-year program. Unfortunately some State governments have failed to meet their responsibilities along this line but the majority will agree that the Federal program has established an incentive to local communities. While I am not an advocate of Federal handouts, the monies provided under this 1956 act appear to have been adequate and justified by the benefits achieved.

No project has come to my attention which has been delayed due to insufficient Federal funds, and should such an exigency arise, and annual supplemental appropriation could hardly be said to be unknown to the Federal Government. I cannot help but feel that this maneuver to nearly double the annual appropriation from \$50 million to \$90 million was politically motivated to gain a campaign issue. During my 10-year tenure in Congress, I have yet to see one Federal aid program diminish, and particularly in an election year when there is sought "something for everybody." In view of the taxpayer's burden, I feel that we should uphold the President and give some thought to fiscal responsibility.

Robert A. Eyerman, Wilkes-Barre Architect, Elected to Fellowship in American Institute of Architects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of Saturday, February 27, 1960, which reports that Mr. Robert A. Eyerman, well-known architect of Wilkes-Barre, has been elected to fellowship and membership in the College of Fellows in the American Institute of Architects. This is indeed an impressive distinction, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Eyerman is only the second architect from the large area of northeastern Pennsylvania to receive a fellowship in the 103-year history of the institute. I would like to take this opportunity and means of warmly congratulating Mr. Eyerman on the high honor bestowed upon him by the American Institute of Architects.

The article follows:

ROBERT A. EYERMAN, WILKES-BARRE ARCHITECT, ELECTED TO FELLOWSHIP IN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Robert A. Eyerman, Wilkes-Barre architect, has been elected to fellowship and membership in the College of Fellows in the American Institute of Architects.

Formal notification of Mr. Eyerman's selection was received today by the Northeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Institute of Architects from the national headquarters. He is one of 43 architects so honored in the Nation for 1960.

Founder of the architectural firm of Robert A. Eyerman & Associates, he will receive his fellowship formally on April 19 in San Francisco, Calif., at the 103d annual convention of the institute.

SECOND IN 103 YEARS

Mr. Eyerman is the second architect from the northeastern Pennsylvania region to receive fellowship in the 103 years of the institute's existence. The other fellow from this region is Col. Thomas H. Atherton of Forty Fort.

In making the announcement upon Mr. Eyerman, the local chapter stated it nominated him for fellowship on the basis of his achievements in service to the institute and his achievements in public service, two of the five categories upon which fellowship is bestowed.

Son of Edward Eyerman, Sr., Wilkes-Barre general contractor and former city building inspector, he is married to the former Alice Hopkins of New York City. The couple resides at Bear Creek. They have a daughter, Mrs. Jean Eyerman Prushinski, and granddaughter, Laurie Kim Prushinski, Dover, Del.

RECEIVED DEGREE FROM CORNELL

Mr. Eyerman attended Wilkes-Barre city schools, graduated from Wyoming Seminary, and received his degree in architecture at Cornell University in 1933. He returned to Wilkes-Barre and started his practice in the office of the late architect Clark Wright Evans, and has continued in private practice here since.

Some of his projects include the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport, Eberhard Faber pencil plant and the addition now under construction, King Fifth Wheel, the VA hospital chapel and numerous industrial plants in the area. He presently is drawing plans and specifications for the YMCA all-purpose building. Mr. Eyerman also was the architect for many residences throughout Wyoming Valley.

In civic affairs, he has been active in Red Cross disaster service, Kiwanis International, YMCA, civilian defense during World War II, Wyoming Valley Council of Boy Scouts of America, VA hospital fund, and Bear Creek Lions Club.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DIRECTOR 20 YEARS

He has been an active member of the Little Theater since 1933 and served as chairman of several membership drives. He is one of the organizers of the Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce and served as its first president. He also was one of the organizers and first president of the Pennsylvania State Junior Chamber of Commerce. He has been a director of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce 20 years and has served as a director of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, Inc., since its inception in 1940.

Mr. Eyerman has served as a director of the Children's Service Center since 1943 and as trustee of the YMCA since 1946. He served on the committee which compiled the new Wilkes-Barre city building code and has participated in the city's traffic and parking discussions. He is a life member of the senate of Junior Chamber International.

He became a member of the northeastern Pennsylvania chapter in 1944 and served as secretary-treasurer in 1946 and 1947. He was elected chapter president in 1952 and has been a director for the chapter area to Pennsylvania Society of Architects since 1953. He also has held various offices in the Pennsylvania Association of Architects.

A Jewish View of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rabbi Albert H. Friedlander, spiritual leader of Temple B'nai B'rith of Wilkes-Barre and Kingston, Pa., which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News on Thursday, February 25, 1960. Rabbi Friedlander is identified with the National Conference of Christians and Jews which sponsors Brotherhood Week.

The article follows:

A JEWISH VIEW OF BROTHERHOOD

(By Rabbi Albert H. Friedlander)

"Brotherhood: believe in it, act it, support it" has been made the slogan of Brotherhood Week. During that span of time, all of us have been made aware of the greatness of the American heritage which constantly reminds us that we are brothers, engaged in a common task.

The birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington dramatize this heritage. They remind us to follow Lincoln's teachings, to act "with malice toward none, with charity toward all." And, in a letter to a Jewish congregation, George Washington rejoiced in a country which "gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." Brotherhood Week thus becomes a pageant of America, of a country living under God, with liberty and justice for all.

Brotherhood is part of the American heritage. Why, then, these reminders? Are they necessary? Unfortunately, the answer to that question has to be "Yes." We do need reminders. Everyone agrees on the principle of brotherhood; few act upon it.

The great religions of our country all place brotherhood at their core. It is manifestly impossible to believe in God as the Father of humanity without accepting the corollary that all humans are brothers, children of the same Father. Yet many, even when they accept this, forget that religion is more than a creed to which one subscribes: it is also the deed that makes life meaningful.

Our beliefs must bring us to action if they are to have meaning. And, during Brotherhood Week, we might well examine ourselves and ask: Have I tried to understand my fellow man? Have I reached toward my neighbor in friendship? Have I considered the rights and privileges, the happiness of others? All of this must be part of our approach toward brotherhood.

And brotherhood must be supported. Wyoming Valley has a proud record here, one that can serve to inspire other communities. Confronting grave economic problems, unemployment, and disasters, the citizens of this community have nevertheless created great institutions of learning, hospitals, playgrounds, justifying their reputation of being a community with a heart.

Our United Fund is only one aspect of the fundamental cooperation on which our city is established. And yet it is not enough. If we are to continue towards achievement of the American dream, we must make sure that our horizons continue to expand, that understanding between man and fellow man will ever grow deeper, that no one is left without help, that everyone is given hope and confidence in his fellow man.

New areas always open up; old prejudices are banished and laid aside. Mental illness is no longer considered a crime, but is seen as a sickness; newcomers are no longer suspicious strangers, but are seen as good friends who need our help; and the more we learn about our neighbors, the more we try to understand him, the closer we come. Long ago, the Old Testament, in the Book of Leviticus, enjoined us:

"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Let us then turn in love toward one another. For when we turn in love toward our fellow man, we take another step toward God. This is the meaning of Brotherhood Week. It is also the meaning of life.

Tolerance and Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, mutual tolerance and respect are an important part of our American way of life and the outstanding newspaper, the Montclair Times, published and distributed in Montclair, N.J., a community which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has published an editorial that states very clearly the significance of these two words.

Under unanimous consent I include it with these remarks so that it can be a permanent record:

[From the Montclair Times, Feb. 25, 1960]

TOLERANCE AND RESPECT

It should not be necessary in a country founded upon the democratic principles of tolerance and respect for the viewpoints of others to set aside a period of 7 days as "Brotherhood Week."

And yet, once again in this year of 1960, strife and friction rampant even within the United States between peoples of differing colors, faith and national origins makes it necessary for the scheduling of special exercises designed to bring these peoples closer together.

Certainly in such an enlightened community as Montclair, populated as it is by a vast majority of people of above-average intelligence, admonitions to be tolerant and respectful of the rights and privileges of our brothers should not be needed.

Let all within the community remember that mutual tolerance and respect are priceless attributes which are earned and not given in the sense that orders are carried out by a private in an army.

Anyone who doubts this or feels that it is not as it should be has only to study the relationships between two children in the same family. Generally, while the formative years may bring their share of scrapes and semimajor battles, a deep and abiding love born of the natural give-and-take daily relationships grows from understanding, tolerance and respect.

And these characteristics can never be one-sided to be effective. They must be freely given and accepted on both sides. Let all of us during this Brotherhood period resolve in all our relationships to bring to them more tolerance and respect, much-needed commodities in a world torn by mutual distrust and suspicion on all sides.

Civil Rights for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 29, 1960, I had the distinct pleasure of attending a luncheon conducted by the Day Care Council of New York, Inc., at the Hotel Astor which was attended by over 1,000 patrons. Over 75 public officials attended this festival which was designed to inform the interested people as to the activities of the child care centers and the status of legislation in the Federal Government and the State legislature which would set up a national program for day care centers. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York and I introduced companion bills providing for Federal appropriation on a cost-sharing basis with the States and the communities. The representatives of the various day care centers enthusiastically endorsed our legislation. Senator JAVITS' bill is S. 1286. My bill is H.R. 7760.

The speakers included Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief of the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who spoke of the "National Lines of Day Care"; Commissioner Raymond W. Houston, New York State Department of Social Welfare, who spoke on the "State Horizons of Day Care"; Commissioner James R. Dumpson, New York City Department of Welfare, who spoke on the subject of the "City Perspective in the Day Care Program." Mrs. Jacob K. Javits substituted for her husband, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and delivered his address. Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, president of the Day Care Council, spoke on the "Completed Picture of Day Care."

The speech delivered by Mrs. Guggenheimer impressed me tremendously. I believe that the readers will enjoy the speech as much as I did in listening to it, and I am, therefore, inserting her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Her speech follows:

Distinguished guests, members of the Day Care Council, Congressman SANTANGELO and friends, Senator JAVITS unfortunately was unable to attend this luncheon conference and we were pleased to listen to his remarks spoken through his personable and charming wife, Mrs. Javits. We want the Senator to know that we understand the reasons for his absence. However, this was a matter of exigency, around the clock Senate meetings on civil rights. I am sorry he had to stay in Washington, but at least it was in a good cause and we wish him luck.

We thank him and Congressman SANTANGELO for their part of our 1960 picture called Federal legislation. My familiarity with this is so little encompassing that I can cover it with a sentence. We desperately need a national day-care program; we desperately need good care in every part of the country for all children who are being neglected because they do not have adequate supervision during the day—and in order to achieve this, our legislators must be told about the need—and even more about the long-term results of neglect. Senator JAVITS for the last 2 years has introduced a bill call-

ing for \$25 million for the establishment and maintenance of day-care programs. There has been relatively little nationwide support, and I would like to state that this lack of support is based on nationwide ignorance. I would like to pinpoint ignorance further by saying that New York State is surely high on the list of delinquents in its lack of concern for the neglected child.

We have recently been frightened—appalled—by the wave of callous and ugly crimes committed by children. We seem to have been clinging, despite all evidence to the contrary, to the rather maudlin, utterly enchanting Victorian concept of childhood. While electricity has replaced gaslight, and cars have replaced horses and buggies, and television has replaced the family circle, life in our urban communities has become increasingly impossible for children. The disappearance of the traditional family—the absence of grandmother and grandfather, the smallness of apartments, the lack of neighbors because of the constant disruption of neighborhoods, the change in tradition and morality, the lack of thoughtful planning in the absorption of newcomers—all these have led to the final erasure of the Victorian image of childhood. What we are failing to do is draw the modern picture. We know that there has been a staggering increase in the numbers of mothers in the labor force—this despite aid to dependent children programs—and that this increase is not affected by the presence or absence of day-care services. Only the welfare of the child is affected by that. We do not need statistics in New York City to know that there are tens of thousands of children who play unsupervised in our streets during the day. A walk through any of our overcrowded neighborhoods will tell the least observant of our perambulators that—we don't even need rag doll hit-and-run headlines to confirm this.

At the risk of being Ciceronic, I would like to say how long, oh, leaders of New York State, will you continue to devise short-range cures for long-term problems? How long will we have 3,000 children on waiting lists in day-care centers, areas where there are no centers to list those who wait—and how long will we tolerate the conditions that destroy our children for which we—not the immediate perpetrator of the hit-run crime—should be registered as the criminals? This, when we have been offered a seven-point delinquency program—when what we need is a comprehensive child welfare program that envisions spending whatever funds are required—as liberally as we spend funds for roads or nightclubs or other conveniences and pleasures—that will truly keep the children of this State from suffering neglect or abuse—and that will not offer merely a panacea for cases known to the courts.

Here in New York City—because it's spring—at least in the ballroom of the Astor—I'm going to ask our jigsaw puzzlers to put in the first part of the picture we're going to assemble. I am proud of being part of a program that has tried to provide for at least 6,000 children in this city the best we know how to provide in the fields of health, education, and welfare—that has kept as its goal the best interests of children and their families, and that has in some small measure succeeded in giving the children entrusted to its centers something like the American concept of a fair chance. I'm sorry Senator Javits isn't here—because I would like to say to him that we hope he will succeed in his fight for civil rights and, most particularly, in his fight for day care, which is essentially a fight for the civil rights of children.

Bureaucratic Welfareism in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the welfare state promising security from cradle to grave often succeed in painting a deceptive picture of unlimited abundance and bureaucratic omniscience.

Unfortunately, history is replete with instances in which a polity has subscribed to the spellbinding promises of the government paternalist who seeks to impose the welfare state philosophy on the people. History also tells us that welfare stateism is soon followed by deprivation of liberty, decline in individual initiative, and weakening of the national vitality.

It is axiomatic that the government can give nothing to the people that it has not first taken away from the people. It is also axiomatic that the providing of so-called security by a government is followed by bureaucratic controls over the beneficiaries of that security. Therein lie the principal weakness and fallacy in welfare stateism.

Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an article on the experience of Sweden with the welfare state. The tenor of the article suggests that there is widespread dissatisfaction and disillusionment with Sweden's welfare state experience. The article suggests that the architects of the welfare state are likely to be voted out of office next September.

The Swedes have learned from disheartening experience that it is not possible to find governmental answers to every social problem that might confront their people. They have learned the inevitableness of the welfare state carried to its logical extreme resulting in the Government taking more than half of the national productivity for redistribution back to the people. They are also feeling the disastrous inflationary pressures that are a part of welfare stateism.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Swedes have gone further in developing the welfare state than the citizens of our Nation have been willing to do. However, Sweden's preeminence in this field of governmental paternalism might not exist if our advocates of federalization of every governmental function had had their way. The proponents of the welfare state in the United States promise Federal funds for schools, sewage disposal, medical care, housing, urban renewal, farm regimentation, electric power and every other aspect of our daily lives that offers an opportunity for Government subsidization. These welfare-state proponents should remember that the promising is easy, the perform-

ance is more difficult, and the paying is much more difficult.

The time is long overdue for us to give real heed to the proven philosophy of government that the echelon of governmental obligation that is closest to the people should do the job; where matters do not require the intervention of government, the government should not interfere.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will include the article contained in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "When a Country 'Goes the Limit' in Welfare, Here's What Happens":

WHEN A COUNTRY "GOES THE LIMIT" IN WELFARE, HERE'S WHAT HAPPENS—IN SWEDEN, TAXPAYERS ARE REBELLING

STOCKHOLM.—Sweden may have the answer to a question that bothers a good many Americans. The question: How big can a welfare state grow before it runs into strong voter opposition?

The answer: It can grow vastly bigger than anything comparable in the United States.

In Sweden the welfare state is in political trouble. The latest pension plan, favored by the Social Democratic government, was enacted by 115 to 114, with the plan saved from defeat only because the Communists abstained from voting. An election in September will be fought around the welfare issue.

Sweden has become the most highly developed of the world's welfare states. It has gone to the point where defense accounts for 25 percent of the Government's spending, while welfare accounts for 35 percent. In United States by comparison, defense accounts for about 45 percent of the Government's cash spending and welfare accounts for about 25 percent.

In Sweden it seems that almost everybody is taking in everybody else's washing.

Income taxes, levied in important part to support social security, take about 35 percent of the wages of a skilled worker. There now are to be a 4 percent transactions tax and an increased tax on fuels to provide more money for the social security system. There is a question whether taxes, even so, will meet the whole bill.

Christmas every day? Almost everybody in Sweden's welfare state gets something.

An example of retirement benefits: A Swede who has averaged \$6,000 a year in income can retire at age 67 on a pension of \$3,660 a year, based on a percentage of his earnings in his best years. By contrast, the United States has a flat ceiling of \$127 a month, \$1,524 a year, on social security payments to a worker retiring at age 65.

National pensions up to now have been financed by taxes. But costs of a new supplementary pension scheme are to be borne almost solely by employers.

Pensions themselves, though, are only part of it.

For retired Swedes with smaller incomes, there is a rent allowance, paid by the local government. The National Government supports extensive sickness insurance. Low-income families pay nothing for this insurance. Those with higher incomes pay a maximum of \$6 a year. Sickness insurance covers cost of hospital care for a maximum of 2 years, traveling expenses to a hospital and three quarters of the doctor's fee.

Many medicines are available at no cost. Diabetics, for example, pay nothing for insulin. For other prescribed medicines there is a discount of 50 percent if the cost is over 60 cents. Adults pay reduced dental fees

under the national health-insurance plan. In many cases fees are waived. Children up to age 15 have their teeth cared for at no cost. Even the alcoholic is watched out for. The Government pays for hostels where he can live under supervision while continuing to work at his job.

Vitamins free: There are many other Swedish welfare benefits. For example, the Government makes a flat, tax-free payment of \$80 a year to parents for each child under 16. Children also receive free health supervision up to school age in national child-welfare centers, and, during school years, from school doctors and nurses. If a child proves difficult to bring up, free advice may be obtained from child-guidance clinics. The State pays costs of vitamins and inoculation against disease.

Children under 14 are given vacations which cost the parents nothing if their income is low enough. These children may travel free once a year to any part of Sweden and back. They may attend holiday camps or visit private homes outside their home district, with their subsistence paid by the Government.

Day nurseries and nursery schools are available to preschool children at fees which even those of minimum income can afford. Children receive free meals during school hours. And, if a child comes from a poor family, there is a clothing allowance.

Study allowances are awarded for children in secondary and vocational schools who have to live outside their home districts to receive the training they need. These allowances include maintenance grants and traveling expenses.

In the later school years, students can obtain state scholarships for short training courses in vocational fields. University education is available on state study loans of up to \$700 a session.

Some financial aid from the Government is assured for all children from birth through the years of university education. But Government social benefits begin for the Swedish child even before he is born.

"Rewards" for motherhood: Before giving birth, a working mother-to-be is paid \$3 a day by the state for a maximum of 90 days. At the birth of a child each Swedish mother, regardless of her financial status, receives a cash grant of \$54. For women of low incomes, the state pays an additional \$120 at the birth of a child.

There are many other benefits for mothers besides such cash grants. No matter what her income, the Swedish mother receives free services of a trained midwife before, during, and after the birth of her child. She gets hospital care during confinement at no cost. Prenatal clinics provide free examination and consultation.

While her children are growing up the Swedish mother continues to receive other state benefits. A housewife with at least two children under 14 and whose taxable income meets a certain standard may take a free vacation trip to any place in Sweden. The Government also subsidizes holiday homes at which vacations may—but do not have to—be spent. And in some cases cash grants are provided to housewives for vacations.

Special subsidies are paid to widows and widowers with children. Children left fatherless because of industrial accidents receive direct financial support from the Government. Widows of industrial-accident victims also receive special aid.

Loans at 3 percent. In the field of housing, there are not only rent allowances but fuel allowances for low-income families. For those who want to own their own homes a Government allowance is granted where money borrowed from a bank costs more than 3-percent interest. And the Government itself makes additional housing loans at 3-percent interest. Part of such a loan is

free from payments on principal or interest for 10 years. At the end of the 10 years, the homeowner may be excused from repaying the loan at all, if the Government agrees.

Beyond all this, the Swedish Government extends its social-welfare benefits into such fields as unemployment insurance, aid to military-service draftees, and free legal advice. Almost every problem the human being encounters, financial or otherwise, is, at least in part, the responsibility of the Government under the Swedish system of social welfare.

Yet social ills are increasing under Sweden's cradle-to-grave welfare system. The country's suicide rate is climbing alarmingly. Robberies and burglaries have doubled in the last 10 years. Juvenile delinquency figures have tripled. Arrests for drunkenness have nearly tripled.

Some Swedish psychiatrists have suggested that many suicides are committed over marital or other emotional problems because the welfare state has provided such extensive cushioning that some people just cannot face up to personal emergencies.

Now there are signs that a good many Swedes—particularly young people starting out in business and the professions—are turning away from such extensive "Government paternalism." Also building up is a feeling that the workingman, paying more and more taxes to receive Government benefits, is just "taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another," as one political leader here describes it.

Inflation headache: Some economists are warning that the welfare state's built-in inflation could take Sweden to the point where it will have to devalue its currency.

In the face of skyrocketing costs, substantial tax increases and mounting budget deficits, you can get expert political opinion that the Social Democrats—architects of the welfare program—are likely to be voted out next September.

As a result of all these things, there is widespread feeling in Sweden that the welfare state finally has grown too big for the country's own good. But that point was not reached until the whole setup grew far beyond anything yet undertaken in the United States.

Editor Discusses the Cuban Sugar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10570, which provides for reducing Cuba's sugar quota by the amount it exports every year to Soviet Russia and to allocate this amount among the sugar-producing countries of the Western Hemisphere. I am convinced that this action on our part would remove an important economic prop from the Castro regime and would make it clear to Castro what we think of his flirtations with the Communists.

Since I introduced my bill there have been a number of favorable comments on my bill in letters, newspaper stories, and articles. Among the latter is an article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers,

which was published in the New York Journal American on Sunday, February 28, 1960, in his "Editor's Report."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record that part of Mr. Hearst's report in which he discusses the Cuban sugar situation and what our attitude should be:

EDITOR'S REPORT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Another thing we all ought to think about is what to do about Castro's Cuba, and in particular the sugar quota under which we have been buying approximately half of the Cuban crop at premium prices 2 to 3 cents above the world market rate.

Two bills that have been introduced into Congress—one by a Democrat and the other by a Republican—are similar in purpose and reasonable in intent.

In the House, Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York Democrat, is sponsoring a bill that would cut U.S. buying of Cuba's sugar by the amount she exports to Russia under the new trade-barter deal. This is 1 million tons a year over the next 5 years. Mr. ANFUSO proposes that this amount be allocated among other sugar-producing countries in this hemisphere.

In the Senate, a bill by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona Republican, proposes just about the same thing.

So many people are genuinely perturbed by the turn of events in Cuba that it occurred to me it would be of interest to find out how the sugar quotas happened to be established and for what reasons. Without becoming too technical or getting into economic calculus, the research came out as follows:

Until 1934 this country had a tariff on raw sugar of 2 cents a pound to help U.S. beet sugarcrowers and Louisiana cane sugarcrowers. This also helped and caused an increase in sugar production in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, duty-free U.S. dependencies.

The quota system was born of the depression. In 1934 the Secretary of Agriculture was directed to establish shares (quotas) for domestic and foreign production on the basis of historic trade patterns. There were three objectives: to protect the domestic sugar industry, to assure adequate supplies at stable prices and to promote our export trade by paying foreign producers above the world price and supplying them with dollars to buy from us.

In the assignment of foreign quotas, Cuba has been placed in a privileged position, due to historical ties of friendship and the fact that Cuba was a good customer of our goods and a considerable part of its sugar industry was American owned.

As the Sugar Act now operates, mainland U.S. producers, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands get fixed quotas totaling 5,424,000 tons—based on an estimated basic need of 8,350,000 tons. The Philippines, however, since it gained independence is now on a rising tariff scale.

Cuba gets a fixed quota of 96 percent of the difference between the estimated basic need and the fixed domestic and Philippine quota. All the other countries divide the remaining 4 percent of the difference.

In actual figures Cuba's fixed quota is 2,808,000 tons, and when requirements above the basic need are added, its assignment this year is 3,119,000 tons. In addition, it enjoys a 20 percent tariff differential. The duty on Cuban sugar is 50 cents a hundred pounds compared to 62½ cents a 100 pounds for full-duty countries.

The big point I want to establish out of all this background is that Cuba's privileged position has been based on both friendship and self-interest.

Friendship has gone in the violence hostility of Castro's government toward our country.

Self-interest also has gone in the Castro government's confiscation of American property, in the process of Communist nationalization of all property and industry going on there, and in the barter deal with Russia, with its invitation to Communist infiltration.

Every American to whom I have talked recently in my travels about this country agrees that we should not meekly and passively take Castro's anti-American acts and provocations any longer. This opinion was hearteningly shared by some of the leading Latin American statesmen and businessmen the Hearst task force met in our just-concluded trip.

Therefore, it seems to me the proposals of Senator GOLDWATER and Representative ANFUSO should be enacted into law.

Let's start by transferring at least that portion of the Cuban sugar quota equal to the amount in Castro's Russian deal to Latin American countries that are our friends—Peru, Brazil, Mexico and others that produce sugar and won't insult us for the privilege of selling it to us.

They will sincerely appreciate and be grateful for this move—not heap abuse upon us for our consideration.

Besides, 96 percent of our business to Cuba, and only 4 percent to all our other friends never did make sense.

Now is a perfect time to correct that cockeyed situation.

Conquest of the Ocean World From Top to Bottom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 18, I addressed this body with a lengthy, detailed informational speech, referring to the Soviets' planned expansionist activities in all the many broad phases of oceanography over practically every ocean of the world.

By the way of contrast, I referred to the relatively meager programs which are being authorized and funded by the United States to meet this ever-increasing expansion by the Communist nations.

In order that the RECORD may be kept in balance through information of some of our activities in this vital area of oceanography, I am pleased and privileged to incorporate, herewith, the foreword as written by Richard Vetter, Executive Secretary, Committee on Oceanography, National Academy of Sciences, to the following feature articles appearing in February issue of *Navy*, the magazine of seapower.

FOREWORD

(By Richard Vetter, Executive Secretary, Committee on Oceanography, National Academy of Sciences)

Our Nation is excited by, and concerned with, the conquest of outer space. This is as it should be for outer space is exciting and important. Less obvious, but of more practical importance, potentially as exciting—is the conquest of our "inner space"—

the oceans. Both are important to our Nation's future. However, we must not overlook one while pursuing the other.

This feature presentation of the *Navy League's* magazine states this case in concise and imaginative terms.

(EDITOR'S NOTES. Members of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences are not only in full accord with the position of this presentation and unhesitatingly emphasize that "man's knowledge of the oceans is meager, indeed, when compared with their importance to him." This is highlighted in their report to the Committee's Government sponsors, namely, Office of Naval Research, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation. The same has been conveyed to the Congress.)

The report contains features which I believe are unique. It does not call for a crash program requiring an abrupt and unsettling expansion of oceanographic research activity such as was forced upon us in the space field by the Russian sputnik. A gradual replacement of obsolete ships, and an orderly increase in facilities and scientific manpower is proposed. Unlike many advisory committee reports, it is sprinkled liberally with dollar signs to indicate the amount of effort required in each of several fields to maintain a well-balanced program.

The response to the report in the Government agencies (particularly the Navy and the National Science Foundation) has been most gratifying; and that of Congress beyond our fondest hopes. (Senator MAGNUSON has introduced a bill incorporating many features of the committee report and Congressman BONNER appointed a special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which immediately began a series of hearings.) Public interest is becoming extensive and sincere.

Why this sudden interest in oceanography? The oceans are a new frontier for man's conquest, but this has always been true; the oceans have always been with us. The new ingredient is modern technology. With new materials: plastics, special steels, aluminum; with new devices: electronic computers, aircraft, deep diving bathyscaphs, stable platforms, acoustic transducers; with new techniques for the collection, telemetry and analysis of data, a host of oceanographic problems have been "whittled down to size." Man's mental and physical capabilities have been magnified immensely and formidable problems encompassing tasks which could not have been attempted a decade ago are now within our reach.

This new frontier and its opening must not escape our attention, for with worldwide expanding consumption of energy, materials, and food; with expanding demands for vast amounts of environmental knowledge upon which costly and vital weapons systems depend; with an exploding world population; many nations are turning to the sea.

At present our critical national need for knowledge of the oceans is for defense. Ten, fifty, or one hundred years hence it may be for food. Whether for defense, food, or commerce, our Nation as it looks to the future must look more and more to the oceans.

CONQUEST OF THE OCEAN WORLD—PART I FROM TOP TO BOTTOM

As the world's No. 1 maritime Nation, the United States is belatedly beginning to realize it cannot boast command of the breadth of the seas until it also commands them from top to bottom. For here is the last frontier—the dark frontier of another and hidden world. With oceans covering two-thirds of the earth's surface, there remain 300 million cubic miles of water lying beneath us unexplored, unknown.

(The first major effort at a breakthrough into the fathomless depths with all its hazards is currently being undertaken in the Pacific off Guam, where the famed Navy bathyscaph is attempting a 7-mile plunge to the deepest ocean trench in the world. For details see companion piece to this article titled "Descent Into Terra Incognita.")

Man's knowledge of the oceans is meager, indeed, when compared with their importance to him. That's the way the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences puts the proposition. And little wonder. For within the hidden realms of this 300 million cubic mile vacuum may rest our future security scientifically, economically, and militarily.

The sooner we take a serious look at this space beneath us—as seriously as we have been gaping at the outer realm above us—the nearer we will be to really understanding the meaning of seapower to our lives, our well-being, and our safety.

"From the point of view of military operations there is no comparison between the urgencies of the problems of the oceans and those of outer space. The submarine armed with long range missiles is probably the most potent weapon system threatening our security today. It seems clear that the pressures of establishing effective bases, and of protecting ourselves from attack, are relentlessly driving us into the oceans." Thus, speaks the 1959 report of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences.

And to put the threat of undersea superiority, especially in the Atlantic, even more to the point, the famous 1960 edition of *Janet's Fighting Ships* (London) suggests any war with Russia will be won at sea and from under the sea.

Editor Raymond V. B. Blackman writes: "Russian leaders have stated that in a future war the struggle at sea will be of immeasurably greater consequence than it was in the last war."

"They well realize the vital importance of the positive control of the seas in the grand strategy of Great Britain and the United States and their clear intention is to isolate North America from Western Europe."

The Russian fleet of 400 to 500 submarines, *Janet* points out, including guided missile and atomic-powered underwater craft, could conceivably wreak great havoc on the 25 million tons of American and 20 million tons of British shipping in the Atlantic.

Projecting the sea picture to 1967, *Janet* calls attention to the fact the United States will have 75 nuclear-powered subs, 40 of them guided missile craft, and comments: "It may well be that these will become capital ships around which the Navy of the future will be built."

Let's put it bluntly: key to our survival, then, would seem to lie in the ocean depths. Thus instead of meager drop-by-drop financing for basic ocean studies, it is recommended we spend \$651 million over the next 10 years. Even that in comparison to what we are spending in moonshooting and outer space exploration is regarded as niggardly by those who understand the peril confronting us if the U.S.S.R. ever attains the upper hand beneath the seas.

Echoing this statement and the flat opinion of the Academy of Sciences is famed Navy scientist and inventor of the Momsen submarine lung, Vice Adm. C. B. Momsen, U.S. Navy (retired), who holds that undue emphasis currently is being placed on the invasion of outer space and is out of all proportion to the grim realities immediately facing us here. Our future, he states, is on the earth, in and below the ocean.

Admiral Momsen, in concert with other naval intelligence and with the top scientists of the day, leans to the opinion that

he who controls the seas—not just coast to coast but from top to bottom—can conceivably control the world. In a word, the threat to the United States, with the greatest exposed coastline of any country in the world, is not from the air but from beneath the oceans. If there ever is another Pearl Harbor or sneak attack, that attack will come from a space where a major surprise is possible, namely, from thousands of feet down under.

Our own *Polaris* weapons system and nuclear subs are the tipoff, very likely to be matched and improved upon by Russia, which, at the moment, is regarded as far ahead of us in the all-important field of oceanography through a crash exploration program. To begin with, the Russians have already built and are operating the first oceanographic submarine, the *Severianka*, which has been operating in the arctic. It is common knowledge that surface icebreakers are of limited value compared to properly equipped submarines.

The submarine-launched missile combined with mobile fleet domination on the surface represents the ultimate in military offensive force.

There is a distinct advantage in being able to cruise, hide, find harbor, and fight for extended periods of times at depths of 2½ miles or more beneath the surface. Seven miles is the ultimate objective, where the pressure is 8 tons per square inch.

Provided the *Nautilus* and her ilk of nuclear sister subs could withstand these deep-ocean pressures, we would have this supreme instrument and exploration of the depths could be rapid. But we do not. That's where basic ocean study or oceanography comes into find out about pressures, depths, mountain ranges, long plateaus, sound detection, and currents that sweep back and forth at 75 miles per hour.

A whole system of maneuvers, communication, sonar detection, and probably even new weapons for undersea fighting will have to be developed before there is any real conquest of the seas. But these things will come as surely as Russia's Sputnik I. The question is, who will be first with the most? And what are we doing to meet this challenge? The answer is, precious little. With billions scheduled for missiles, rockets, and for the outer space program—as important as these may be—Congress has been penurious.

Marine science in the United States presently is the concern of only a few hundred persons, led by such dedicated men as Dr. Maurice Ewing, director of Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory; Dr. C. O. D. Iselin of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; Dr. Robert Revelle of the Scripps Oceanographic Institute on the Pacific coast; and those in the Office of Naval Research under Adm. Rawson Bennett and those in the U.S. Navy's Electronics Laboratory.

What do we require to explore fully the hidden continent so that we can turn it to our advantage scientifically, economically, and militarily? Immediately, we need ships built and geared to this specialized study. Right now the United States has 11 ships, many of them makeshift jobs ill suited to play any real part in rolling back the water curtain to find what is there in the way of plantlife, fish, minerals, and petroleum. The National Science Foundation has just awarded \$3 million for an all-weather science ship as the forerunner to a program calling for 22 ships by 1970.

The oceanographers advocate, however, much more in the line of equipment. We need bathyscaphs that can descend without harm to the oceans' ultimate depths of 37,000 feet. We need anchored towers and floating buoys.

Better than a ship also would be vertical floating tubes. Dean Athelstan Spilhaus of the Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, draws this Jules Vernish picture:

"These vertical floating tubes, will be hundreds of feet long, cigar like in shape, heavy on the bottom and projecting a few feet into the air at the top. These will be moored in one place. The men in this tall tubular buoy floating in the sea will be able to live, watch, and record the physical and biological interplay never before observed. Initially we may use submarine hulls standing on end for these buoys, and in the not-too-distant future permanent stations of this kind will be scattered all over the oceans. Not only will they be useful for understanding the sea but they will be mid-ocean lighthouses and emergency shelters for submarine or surface ocean travelers and fishermen; and represent a watery dew line or distant early warning system against subterranean attack.

"As well as these anchored buoys, there will be manned, drifting buoys traveling slowly with the currents, and for each manned buoy, drifting or moored, there will be numerous unmanned ones at surface, mid-depths and bottom, sending what their instruments measure automatically to the manned stations to be retransmitted by radio to great central storage computing and analysis centers, either on land or at sea.

"These networks of buoys in and on the sea will not replace surface oceanographic ships but will, rather, increase the need for them because the buoys will have to be supplied, attended, and their data collected," Dr. Spilhaus points out. "Aircraft flying above the sea also will be used to gather the information about the oceans. From an aircraft at high speed a view of the ocean can show currents, wind streaks, boundaries between water of different kinds, and concentration of marine life. Also, the buoys in the sea can transmit their data from the depths first by sound to the surface and then by radio to an aircraft flying above them. The airplane could question many buoys at the same time and get a synoptic or simultaneous bird's eye picture of the situation," Dr. Spilhaus continues: "The airplanes, too, can drop measuring instruments which, as they sink down into the depths, transmit the conditions of the different layers through which they pass. We may expect to see large mother ships letting down bathyscaphs and sending up helicopters to gather the total data that we will need about the sea. Not only these special vehicles for oceanographic research but also ocean liners and fishing vessels can be equipped with continually recording instruments which, without interfering with their normal business, can chart temperatures, salinities, abundance of plant and animal, plankton, and fish populations. Only by the use of all of these can we hope to obtain the world map of the huge oceans relating their physical conditions to the distribution of life in them. This map will give us the basis to understand the complicated relationships that will enable us to make useful predictions for fisheries, for ocean travel, for underwater communications, and out of it will come many other uses of ocean forecasting."

Obviously—getting back to our "first line of defense"—both the offensive and defensive submarine fleets have a tremendous stake in this subterranean mapping. Here is a vast limitless battlefield and no reconnaissance maps or other important intelligence with which to guide our antisubmarine warfare and/or our retaliatory units.

Since the world beneath the sea is the operating area of the true submarine, detailed information about this environment (previously of minor consequence to surface ships and aircraft) assumes tremendous importance to the submarine.

Just as there are on land, networks of radars which plot aircraft positions to prevent collisions, it cannot be too long before there will be a counterpart of these criss-cross networks in the sea. This is to say, there will be submarine beacons radiating sound beams for the guidance of underwater ships.

Specifically, Dr. Spilhaus makes this prediction:

"Sound receivers must be coupled together in a vast underwater spider web of millions of miles of cables which, like our radar surveillance in the air space, can keep track continuously of normal comings and goings, yet single out any stranger in our midst. To identify friend from foe is one of the most difficult underwater problems the Navy has."

More than that, the Navy itself points out quite simply, "The task of navigating a submarine at high speed and deep submergence without accurate bottom information can be compared with driving a 10-ton truck on the freeway blindfolded."

The problem of locating and identifying enemy submarines at distances beyond the effective range of their weapons is a difficult one. To date the most effective means of locating and identifying submerged targets is by use of sound techniques, called sonar. These techniques involve echo ranging, that is, bouncing a sound beam off a submerged target, or, listening to the noises made by the target.

But in water, sound transmission varies with changes in the temperature, density, and salt content of the water. Temperature differences between water layers present the most critical problem, for the sound beam is reflected or refracted to a varying degree.

Once a submerged object has been detected by the sonar beam, the problem becomes one of identification—is it a whale? School of fish? Friendly surface ship? Or enemy submarine? All give sonar reflections.

In addition, when we listen for target noises we discover that the ocean which has been characterized as a "silent world" is, in fact, anything but. "Actually the ocean is a 'liquid jungle.' Survival depends upon how well we know this environment, and whether, like Tarzan, we can tell the friendly sounds from the unfriendly ones—the monkeys from the tigers," states the Navy Department.

Victory or defeat in future wars may well hinge upon superior knowledge of the seas. One of the vital supporting elements of sea power is oceanographic research. Through this research the Navy will be in a better position to perform its missions under—on—and over the sea.

Our scientific, economic, and military future may likely be locked in the world's oceans. The key to this future lies in study and research in these vast ocean areas. Each of us as an American citizen must be aware of the importance of this last frontier on earth.

Although our small corps of oceanographers and supporting scientists have made a good start on an effective oceanographic research program—"making do" with existing equipment—there is an urgent requirement for new equipment and modern facilities.

We need new ships, and submarines, laboratories and engineering facilities plus trained manpower.

Today we trail the Soviets in numbers, tonnage and quality of seagoing research ships. We also trail in manpower devoted to the job of exploring the seas. Urgently needed then is a clear cut, long range program designed to regain our country's lost leadership in the exploration of innerspace.

Fortunately there is such a plan in the report the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

The basic five-point recommendations are as follows:

1. The United States should double its basic research during the next 10 years.
2. The present effort in oceanwide surveys should also be doubled.
3. The support of applied marine sciences, particularly military defense, should be expanded.

4. The Federal Government should assure long range budgetary support.

5. All available facilities, private foundations, universities, industry, and Government agencies should be coordinated in a maximum expanded program.

In support of this national program the Navy has developed its own 10-year program. The Navy's program calls for increased emphasis in the following areas:

"Basic and applied research: The Navy is expanding support of these two types of research. They go hand in hand. Through basic research we obtain fundamental knowledge—without thought of specific application. The success of applied research, however, depends upon this fundamental knowledge.

"The Navy program calls for more new laboratory facilities—and financial support for the education of future oceanographers. Increased emphasis in both are basic to an expanding oceanographic program.

"At the present our knowledge of the ocean bottoms is limited to waters 100 miles from shore. Our efforts must be greatly expanded, particularly if we are to meet anticipated military needs. To accomplish this—and other tasks—increased procurement of oceanographic research ships and equipment is being programmed.

"The future possibilities of the oceans are limited only by the imagination, awaiting exploitation by men of vision."

CONQUEST OF THE OCEAN WORLD—PART 2

DESCENT INTO TERRA INCOGNITA

Locked in a windowed gondola, 6½ feet in diameter, two men on January 23 looked out from a bathyscaph on a scene none had ever witnessed before, the bottom of the ocean's deepest trench—7 miles below the surface in the Pacific's Marianas.

This record plunge represents the most important breakthrough in the science of oceanography to date. It marks the forerunner to conquest of the Ocean World. Scene of the project (using the famous U.S. Navy bathyscaph built by the Piccards 2 years ago at a cost of \$200,000) is a location off Guam in the South Pacific. Called the *Trieste*, the Navy's bathyscaph was piloted by Dr. Jacques Piccard and Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy.

Capt. John Phelps, U.S. Navy Commanding Officer of the Navy Electronics Laboratory at San Diego, which directed the dive, estimates the pressure on the *Trieste* at 7 miles down was approximately 16,833 pounds per square inch. The full plunge required many dives before bottom was touched, according to Franz Kurie, technical director of NEL.

Destined to be future pilots or hydro-nauts will be the following four men: Dr. Andres Rechnitzer, Dr. Jacques Piccard, Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy, Commanding Officer of the *Trieste* and Dr. Robert S. Dietz, consultant and marine geologist.

The two hydro-nauts selected sat in cramped quarters in virtual darkness and were clothed against temperatures close to the freezing point. Conservation of electric battery power called for the inside blackout which was relieved by pinpoint lights on the instrument panel while outside huge search lights played on the eerie scene around the *Trieste* for observation and photography.

The dive is important to the development of antisubmarine warfare devices against the Soviet's huge submarine fleet. The dive was no mere stunt. On the contrary the dive, with the aid of photography and sensitive instruments to check life and currents at the seafloor level, is designed to obtain in-

formation for development of the nuclear submarine. It also will represent a giant stride in oceanographic research, and will point the way to further and larger explorations at various areas throughout the world.

The gondola of the *Trieste* is supported by a 58-foot float of steel three-eighths of an inch thick. The float contains 30,000 gallons of high octane gasoline providing buoyancy and to offset the severe pressure at maximum depths. As the gasoline contracts, sea water will flow into the compartments creating an even pressure over the entire steel hull.

The bathyscaph also will be loaded with 13 tons of small iron pellets as ballast. These can be dumped at the rate of 1 ton every 3,000 feet to control the speed of descent. Fully loaded the *Trieste* weighs 75 tons, empty about 30 tons.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, this epochal feat was appropriately recognized by our Government when President Eisenhower decorated Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy, and Jacques Piccard. It may be somewhat anticlimactic now, but to complete the RECORD, the following information should be available to point up the critical and vast scope of this accomplishment. This is really one of America's sputniks of the sea. If we are to survive in the great American tradition of leading the world, it is urgent that we apply our technological and scientific resources to the realization of more and more oceanographic progress:

RECORD PLUNGE IN BATHYSCAPH TO OCEAN'S DEEPEST

An attempt to descend more than 7 miles into the deepest depression in the earth's surface will be made early this year by a team of Navy scientists, it was learned yesterday.

Two hydro-nauts still to be selected, will make the record-smashing dive in the Navy's bathyscaph, *Trieste*, in the Pacific Ocean's Marianas trench—or Challenger Deep—about 200 miles southwest of Guam. The floor of the trench, estimated at 37,500 feet below the surface by the Navy, is the lowest point in the world.

If successful, the dive will not only more than double the previous undersea diving record of 18,600 feet, set last month by the *Trieste*, but will provide information for the development of nuclear submarines.

TEST DIVE BEGINS

The diving, under the direction of the U.S. Navy Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, Calif., and Dr. Andres B. Rechnitzer, scientist in charge of the bathyscaph project, will begin the first 2 weeks of January if the weather is favorable. Shallow test dives have already begun off Guam, and anywhere from 3 to 10 plunges will be necessary before the expected maximum depth is reached, according to Dr. Franz Kurie, technical director of the NEL.

The two men who will sit inside the bathyscaph's cramped gondola in darkness for 11 hours or more will be selected from the following four: Dr. Rechnitzer and Jacques Piccard, who together piloted the *Trieste* to its 18,600-foot dive (Mr. Piccard designed and built the \$200,000 submersible 2 years ago with his father, Auguste); Lt. Don Walsh, officer in charge of the *Trieste*, and Dr. Robert S. Dietz, project consultant and marine geologist.

THE BATHYSCAPH

The main structure of the *Trieste* is a 58-foot float of steel three-eighths-inch thick. Loaded with 30,000 gallons of high-test gasoline, the float provides the buoyancy for the gondola attached to its under side. At 37,000 feet down, the pressure on the hull will be more than 8 tons per square inch, but as the gasoline contracts, sea water will flow

into the compartments, creating an even pressure all round.

In addition, the bathyscaph carries 13 tons of small iron pellets about the size of BB shot as ballast. These can be released at rate of 1 ton for each 3,000 feet of descent to control the speed of dive. Empty, the *Trieste* weighs 30 tons, but it picks up an additional 45 tons when fully loaded.

Everything is run by batteries, the meters for measuring water current, lights for photography, echo sounders, salt and oxygen content and temperature measurers, underwater sound telephone and bathometers. To conserve the limited supply of power the sitting in the Gondola 6½ feet in diameter, will descend in darkness. Only the instrument dials will be illuminated.

What will the hydro-nauts find when they hit bottom?

"We have no idea," Dr. Kurie said. "But we usually find more life than we expect. One thing for sure, though, it will be very cold and very dark." He estimated the temperature at just a few degrees above freezing at 37,500 feet. The men will have only the heat of the instruments and warm clothing to keep them warm, again because of the power shortage.

WHAT MAY BE LEARNED

Dr. Rechnitzer outlined the reasons for the dives. They are not to set a new undersea diving record. "Direct observations of the biological and physical phenomena of the sea, a study of the behavioral responses of organisms to light and sound and an examination of the water currents near the sea floor are among the objectives," he said.

Among the so-called "fringe dives" will be improvement of present day—and future—ship construction techniques.

"It is reasonable to assume that submarines will, some day, be operating in depths measured in thousands of feet instead of hundreds," Lieutenant Walsh pointed out, "and the experimental nature of the *Trieste* allows more freedom of engineering change than would be practicable on a mass-produced naval vessel."

"What Brotherhood Means to Me" as Observed by Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Exchange, and Optimist Clubs of Downey, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a front page news item appearing in the Downey Leader, for Monday, February 22, 1960, one of the most widely read newspapers in the important city of Downey in the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif. Because this is Brotherhood Week all over our Nation, I believe that this newspaper story of how this week is being observed by the Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Exchange, and Optimist Clubs in the important city of Downey will be recognized as a significant occasion as well as a timely one:

WHAT BROTHERHOOD MEANS TO ME

Downey service clubs will celebrate Brotherhood Week tomorrow at a joint

luncheon of the Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Exchange, and Optimist clubs at the Downey Woman's Clubhouse at Paramount and Lubec.

Norman O. Houston, outstanding Negro layman, is scheduled to be the speaker. Houston is president of Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co. at Los Angeles.

The program is being sponsored by the Religious Activities Committee of the Downey Chamber of Commerce, headed by Dr. Joe L. Campbell, and coordinated by James Gillespie and Irving Rosen.

Approximately 250 members of the five service clubs are expected to be on hand at tomorrow's luncheon meeting.

Comments on the meaning of brotherhood by outstanding Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders of the community are carried herewith:

"PROTESTANT"

(By H. A. West, member Downey Christian Business Men's Association)

"Brotherhood, to my mind has many aspects. In a general way it means a common bond of interest in, and a concern for all fellow human beings.

"It is a fellow feeling toward others, whether they are in full agreement with my point of view or not.

"It brings a sense of responsibility for their welfare which breaks through all barriers of race or color, class or creed.

"It must be based on benevolence; it must be manifested by unselfishness; it must be motivated by love.

"It is the spirit of brotherhood that stirs men to relieve the hunger and suffering of a needy world; it is the spirit of brotherhood that rouses men to liberate the oppressed; it is the spirit of brotherhood that longs to enlighten the illiterate and the unlearned; it is the spirit of brotherhood that genders respect for the individual, rather than treating him as a tool of a totalitarian state.

"Brotherhood in its truest sense is concerned also for the spiritual welfare of others, in a yearning to share the freedom and joy in the things of the spirit.

"One of the characteristics of the early church, and still a manifestation of true Christian brotherhood, is a warmth of fellowship that is indefinable but unmistakable. It is epitomized in the hymn so often sung in Christian circles.

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love,
The fellowship of kindred minds
Is like to that above."

"True brotherhood is prompted by the love of Christ, who was Himself the greatest teacher of brotherhood, and who in His mission as Savior of the world, was Himself its highest embodiment.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

"JEWISH"

(By Mrs. Marvin Stern and Rabbi Lloyd Goldman, Downey Jewish Temple)

"Brotherhood is an endless circle like the wedding band on one's finger or the many different kinds of wheels which make our lives go round. It is composed of a series of events growing continuously until we have a complete and unbroken circle which never stops.

"As we mature we find that the more responsibilities we undertake, the more our world expands. Instead of concentrating on merely our own loved ones, we find it important and essential to widen our scope of interests for our children's sakes as well as our own, and this is brotherhood in its truest form.

"Brotherhood is accepting and respecting one's neighbors as Joe or John or Mary—not as Protestant, Catholic, or Jew.

"Brotherhood is an over-the-fence discussion with one's neighbor, or the borrowing of a half a cup of sugar, or the easygoing exchange of baby sitting from time to time.

"Brotherhood is the men getting together to help each other install gaslights as a block project without thought as to each other's religions or beliefs.

"Brotherhood is a toast on Christmas eve which includes 'a merry Christmas—a happy Hanukkah—and above all health and happiness for all.' Brotherhood is a group of women getting together to go out collecting for a cancer drive, or a heart fund, or a community chest, or working for a local nonsectarian thrift shop, or a parents club or PTA, or any one of a dozen national and local charities which help us all, no matter the color of our skin or how we worship God.

"Brotherhood is walking into a schoolroom full of children and admiring them as individual charmers rather than thinking that one is Protestant, Catholic, or Jew.

"Brotherhood is the realization that though you don't have too much in common with your cleaning woman, it's only because of a different environment and education—not because our skins are different shades. Our birth and death throes are as similar as our love for our children.

"All of these things lead us to believe that brotherhood is something that we not only celebrate 1 week of the year, but is something that is as natural and normal a part of our every day living as is the act of breathing in order to keep alive—and that's how it should be.

"CATHOLIC"

(By Michael N. Hajjar, grand knight, Knights of Columbus)

"The term 'brotherhood' is probably one of the most abused words in our language.

"It would seem that every utopian dreamer sees the 'brotherhood of man' as the catalyst which will energize his chimeric theories into working reality, while the promoter or the politician finds the expression a convenient means of adding an air of nobility to his slogans.

"The dreamer, of course, overlooks the fact that brotherhood does not necessarily indicate compatibility or destroy human avarice; the promoter takes it for what he sees in it: a sales aid.

"The result is that most of us get pretty tired of having the word 'brotherhood' thrown at us and the expression has lost a great deal of its basic meaning.

"This is too bad.

"For brotherhood is a noble concept, and all men are brothers in the sense that we have a common origin, move through life to a common and inevitable goal, and are all marked with signs of human frailty.

"One who feels this spiritual kinship is never blind to the faults of his fellows but his feelings about them are tempered by remembrance of his own failings. He would not harm another—and he knows that words often do more harm than violence. He is happy at the successes of others, sympathetic during their trials. He finds even these simple rules difficult to follow, but in trying to follow them, he ennobles himself—and his brother."

Let's Get Our National Monetary Policies Back on Sound and Sane Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the 18th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Co-Op As-

sociation, held last week in St. Louis, Mo., 6,000 representatives of 1,000 rural electric cooperatives across the Nation unanimously adopted a resolution urging Congress to hold fast on the tight money issue, to fight off compromises and to get our monetary policies back on a sound and sane basis. I would like to include their resolution in the Record:

NRECA delegates resolve:

Whereas the Congress is about to take up a bill which would compromise the traditional interest rate ceiling and thus remove one of the last effective bulwarks protecting us and all consumers from the ever-spiraling interest costs that are being imposed everywhere under the tight-money policy; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, will give the President the authority to establish interest rates at any level he chooses, a fiscal power the Congress has never before seen fit to hand over to any President at any time; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, will touch off a chain reaction that can result only in crippling damage to such programs as rural electrification, resource development, housing, farm credit, education, small business, slum clearance—not to mention the extra costs it would inflict on national defense and Government operations at all levels; and

Whereas the President has recommended that the Congress increase the REA rate to the level of interest on long-term issues, plus an additional amount: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we who are assembled in the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association representing 1,000 rural electric cooperatives and their 16 million individual member-consumers appeal to the Congress to defeat this legislation and begin forthwith a drive to get our national monetary policies back on a sound and sane basis.

The Voice of the Voter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of candidates of either political party including presidential hopefuls who are worrying about the farm vote next November, I offer some grassroots opinions of prospective voters.

A self-styled young farmer from Williams, Minn., writes me he wants the Government out of his hair. Specifically, his complaint is as follows:

I read with interest your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 10, 1960, and heartily agree with you except in the third paragraph where you say "no one has benefited." There have been plenty of people who have benefited but they are not the family farmer. When elevators can be built and paid for in 5 years through Government subsidy or when big operators can get loans of several hundred thousand dollars someone is being benefited. I am not opposed to big farmers as such but am opposed to them being big at the expense of other taxpayers.

Here are some other comments which strongly indict present acreage and price supports and call for a return to the law of supply and demand such as is contained in the provisions of my farm bill, H.R. 10350:

As a farmer it is my opinion the present farm program is nothing but a racket. We should return the control of the farms back to the farmer as soon as possible. Those on the inside circle have really done well at the Government's expense.

Down with the present farm law and all those who are back of it.

I cannot understand as a sensible policy why the Federal Government will grant the Reclamation Bureau millions of dollars to put more land in production and at the same time place 28 million acres in the soil bank; besides paying 1½ million a day for storage for surplus production.

Price supports result in a two-way cost to the consumer. First for the support, second for the higher cost of the goods.

I think price supports are a discrimination against any other business. Farming is a business the same as any other and should be treated as such. No one forced the farmer into his farm and his product should be put on the open market the same as anything else. I am a boat builder and no one pays me to build boats that I can't sell. I am just as good as a farmer and I want to be treated the same.

It is a crime to pay a farmer for what he doesn't raise and to guarantee to pay him a certain price for his crop. I am tired of it.

Do you want my vote next election? I vote every election.

If we have price supports for agriculture then it should be a program to affect all types of agriculture and not just a few who have more influence than others.

There is no reason why we should pay \$5 a sack for flour when we have such a surplus of wheat. We, the housewives and mothers, could use twice as many wheat products if given half a chance.

I am in favor of a gradual return to the normal supply and demand situation.

There should be no need for agriculture price support. People must eat, there is always a market for food.

Price supports as such are not doing the job. Farm income is not being kept in line yet farm program expenditures are mounting.

Is District of Columbia a Capital or a Colony?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1960, there appeared an editorial on the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia. It is well done and I should like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

A QUESTION OF JUSTICE: IS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA A CAPITAL OR A COLONY?

In the manner of a railroad president who plays with model trains in his office, the U.S. Congress still insists on taking time out from the urgent business of world leadership to play city council.

The city, of course, is Washington, disfranchised colony, the showcase of democracy whose residents are barred from voting for Presidents, Senators, or Congressmen, and are not even trusted with management of their own municipal affairs. Executive power is in the hands of three Commissioners appointed by the President (two resident civilians and one from the Army Corps of Engineers). Local ordinances are passed, and local taxes levied, by Congress, which is hardly structured for the job of running a city.

In 1944 the locally crucial post of chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee passed to the late Theodore Bilbo, who was hardly what the local citizenry would have been likely to choose as mayor, or even as dogcatcher. But, as today, the people had no choice.

Five times in recent years the Senate has passed bills aimed at giving the District limited home rule. Each time the House has balked, and the reason is as un-American as the result: a tight little knot of southerners controls the House District of Columbia Committee and a majority of the District's population is Negro.

Residents of the District have never had the right to vote for Presidents, but their lack of local franchise is more recent. The city was chartered in 1802. From then until 1871 it had an elective council. Beginning in 1820 it also had a popularly elected mayor. But in 1871 Congress repealed the charter and established a territorial-type administration; in 1874 this, too, was abandoned, and the present, totally voteless system inaugurated.

The District is more than a city. It is—and was established as—the Nation's Capital.

It is appropriate that residual authority, perhaps in the form of veto power, should rest with Congress, with the President, or both. But the people who live there have rights too. If we believe in representative democracy, surely we must believe in it for the city we enshrine as its symbol, the city from which we proclaim our democratic ideals to the world.

This means the right to help choose a President, to be represented in the Congress, and to choose the managers of its own local affairs.

It's high time Congress acted to grant the people of its host city those rights its members so often point to as the cornerstone of the Republic.

Special for Brooklyn Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the fair borough of Brooklyn houses the 10th largest post office in the United States in volume of mail. For many years the present structure has been inadequate and the postal workers have worked in the most cramped and outmoded quarters.

In that connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of February 19, 1960:

SPECIAL FOR POST OFFICE

The drive in Washington for \$1,500,000 repair and modernization of Brooklyn's 68-

year-old general post office is welcome news, but with one important reservation.

The big if is whether the job is regarded as the solution to Brooklyn Postmaster Quigley's mounting woes, or whether it is realistically planned as a stopgap until the borough is given the postal facilities it deserves.

Mr. Quigley, the most authoritative voice on Brooklyn's post office needs, has long maintained that a new, vastly larger general post office is required in a more strategic location.

Modernization of a cramped, ill-designed structure is not going to provide the space needed to handle the 70-year growth of mail volume.

Repairs to the building in the Civic Center probably won't enable it to do the job of a post office near a railroad, which is the kind of location Mr. Quigley says is a must.

The stature of the Brooklyn Post Office is reflected in its rating as 10th largest in the Nation, even though it serves a borough and not an entire city. But, it is recognized by the Post Office Department as a first class city.

Since 1946, its postal income has risen from \$13 million a year to \$33 million in 1959.

Repairs, however, will not make a glittering coach out of the aged pumpkin in the Civic Center.

A Tale of Two Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article from the American Legion magazine for February 1960. Those who favor strong Federal Government and Federal controls should ponder the message in this article, for strong Federal controls can lead all too easily to nationalization.

The article follows:

A TALE OF TWO RAILROADS

When the chips are down, which is the more successful—private enterprise or government ownership?

This question is being debated all the time, in many countries. Answers tend to bristle with "if," "yes but," "maybe," or "it depends."

Why not look at the world's unique big-scale example, where both kinds operate side by side? Here are two businesses, both in the \$2.5 billion financial class. Both sell the same kinds of service. Both strive to make a profit. One fails to do so; the other steadily pays dividends. Perhaps a closeup view may reveal some aspects of these two giants that argument and theory can't make plain.

Canada is their home. The two largest railroads in the Western Hemisphere run coast to coast. The slightly larger one in terms of mileage is the Canadian National Railways, government owned. The other, the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., is a corporation owned by its stockholders. You can buy its shares on a stock exchange. In no other country will you find a comparable situation, where railroad transport services are about equally divided between private enterprise and public ownership.

To see these big, impressive organizations in their own backyard I flew from Boston

to Montreal in a Viscount passenger plane of Trans-Canada Air Lines, a subsidiary of Canadian National. No competition here from the Canadian Pacific. But in Montreal it was different. There I found the two transportation giants battling it out in the air, on the rails, over the highways and waterways, from one end of Canada to the other—real, tough competition. So when you talk about railroads in Canada, you are talking about a lot of other means of freight and passenger service too.

The referee is the Government, which makes the ground rules, and also owns the Canadian National. Canadians are very much sold on the spirit of fairplay, which is part of their tradition. Whenever the people of Canada think they detect favoritism in the transportation business, they holler. And the referee pays attention.

The airways scrap of the 1950's is a good example. Trans-Canada Air Lines, owned one-half by Canadian National and one-half by the Government direct, had a monopoly on transcontinental flights. The private line, Canadian Pacific Airlines, an integral part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, couldn't get a Government license to set up competing service. Monopoly is sweet, and hard for anybody to surrender. But the people's protest became so clamorous the Government had to yield, and in May 1959 the new Canadian Pacific Airlines coast-to-coast schedules began, using turbo-prop Bristol Britannia aircraft.

"To be sure," I heard in St. James Street, the Wall Street of Montreal, "the Canadian Pacific Airlines boys are permitted to make only one flight per day each way, Montreal to Vancouver. But the Government just wasn't ready to face up to an old-fashioned laissez-faire competitive battle. We take on these things a bit gradually, don't you know."

"To express the basic transport difficulty in financial terms," another St. James Street source explained, "the Canadian Pacific—rails, air, highways, waterways, hotels, whatnot; all rather large, you know—was so inconsiderate as to turn in a profit of \$36.4 million in 1958, as against a deficit of \$51.6 million on the part of the Canadian National. To permit the gap between the two performances to grow even wider by permitting both to run from scratch on the coast-to-coast flight matter would have been too much. So the privately owned airline has still to carry a slight handicap."

A third financial man said rather grumpily that Canada has socialism trying to get along with capitalism in its basic transport industries, and that this just can't work.

Socialism? President Donald Gordon of Canadian National doesn't talk like it. He said in London last summer:

"As for the Canadian National Railways, as a national policy, and indubitably in the national interest, its operations, its organization, and its business principles must be modeled upon those of private enterprise. . . . To insure the efficiency of its day-to-day operations the yardstick of success must be found in its profit and loss account."

Nowhere I went in Canada were Mr. Gordon or his associates in management described as Socialists, and their integrity is never in question. These men have fallen heir to a most difficult task—operating a government enterprise in a generally free economy—and I suspect that privately they don't like it much.

Mr. Gordon's opposite number in the competing organization, President N. R. Crump of the Canadian Pacific, said at his 1959 annual meeting of stockholders: "The Canadian people as a whole have never consciously or deliberately sought socialistic answers to their problems in transportation or in any other field."

I did not attend this meeting, as I was elsewhere in Canada at the time; but that par-

ticular statement made a hit with stockholders, just because it indicates the traditional fairplay attitude that Canadians like to see. Mr. Crump was not calling names. But he knew which team he was on, for he added:

"If public [government] enterprise were subject to the same ground rules, including penalty for failure in meeting the test of the marketplace, then competition with private enterprise would be possible without prejudice to the principles of the market mechanism. But if public enterprise has access to capital without regard to cost, then sound economic principles governing growth and progress are jeopardized and an added burden is imposed on the taxpayer."

A journalist assigned to Ottawa, the national capital, was somewhat more forceful. He told me:

"We have got this big socialistic enterprise, the Canadian National Railways, hung around our necks like an albatross. Most people didn't really want it in the first place in 1923, and nearly everybody would be delighted to be rid of the monster as a Government business. But let's face facts. It's too late. The government-owned railway is a permanent liability that the people of Canada have got to support with tax money."

"I am proud of the Canadian National, with good reason. It's a fine railroad—its subsidiary companies also turn in the best jobs they can. The fact that I don't like the type of ownership doesn't mean I think the management personnel incompetent. Far from it: they stack up with the world's best. But there is a sickness in socialism that never shows up in advance."

How did Canada get into government ownership of the giant Canadian National Railways in the first place? I have been traveling up, down, and across Canada for a great many years, preparing articles and economic reports. I recall the postwar depression of the early 1920's, when Rod Mackenzie's Canadian Northern was in a bad way financially; the Grand Trunk System was in danger of collapse; and the half dozen or more components that were to be made part of the Canadian National were on their last legs. The Government stepped in and rescued them by taking them over and forming a nationwide railroad empire rivaled only by the privately owned Canadian Pacific. The Canadian people were driven in a time of desperation to take this drastic step of government ownership, almost against their will.

This 37-year-old experiment has proved conclusively that the two incentives that make a private enterprise succeed are lacking in a government enterprise; namely, the reward for accomplishment and the penalty for failure. Before examining some of the evidence of this, let's take a glance at some pretty big arithmetic:

Over the 18-year period from 1941 through 1958, the privately-owned Canadian Pacific paid its stockholders \$368 million in dividends, and paid income taxes amounting to \$340 million to the Canadian Government.

In this same period the Government-owned Canadian National paid no income tax.

And in those 18 years the Canadian Pacific earned a profit of \$669 million while the Canadian National suffered a loss of \$653 million. That meant big spending money for Canadian Pacific Railway shareholders, big taxes for all Canadians.

The Canadian National had a good year in 1953, and paid the Government nearly \$250,000 in dividends on preferred stock. But 5 years later, with railroad operating revenues of \$705 million, its 1958 loss was \$14 million; the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1958, taking in \$467 million in railroad operations, showed a profit of \$55 million. Both had revenue from other activities—the Canadian National \$9 million and the Canadian Pacific \$17 million.

Why these incredible differences? I got two one-word answers by interviewing Canadian shippers, the men who pay the freight. One was "integration." The other was "enterprise." These two points of view give perfectly. Both seem valid to me.

Here's an example of integration that showed a lot of imaginative enterprise: A major headache to railroads, in the United States, as well as Canada, has been the rise of air and truck transportation. The Canadian Pacific launched a pilot plant operation on the west coast, to see whether package shipments—less than carload lots—could be handled through one management no matter how they traveled. Today you can ship from Vancouver by rail, truck, piggyback, or air, in any combination. This service is integrated in control of solicitation, handling, transportation, and accounting. It worked so well in 1959 that it will be extended throughout Canada. The shippers said it saves time, money, trouble, and bookkeeping.

The Canadian National will follow suit. That's it, the Government railroad isn't as free to experiment, to find new ways.

Another example: Both railroads own a string of fine hotels across Canada. But the managements' attitudes are different. The Canadian National, after its experience in building a splendid new hostelry in Montreal, the Queen Elizabeth, has flatly announced it will build no more new ones. The rival Canadian Pacific completed and opened in February 1959 an addition to the Royal York in Toronto that makes this 1,600-room hotel the largest in the British Commonwealth. With enthusiasm, the Canadian Pacific Railway sees itself as "providing facilities for the needs of an expanding nation." (Did you know Canada will have a population of 18 million in 1960?) So while the Government hotel enterprise wants no more, the private enterprise is alert to new places that will yield a profit.

How about the St. Lawrence Seaway? Everybody asks that. Some diversion of freight tonnage from both railroads is inevitable, perhaps a great deal.

"It isn't a threat: it's only seven-twelfths of a threat," a Canadian Pacific Railway official remarked. He referred to the fact that the winter freezeup will probably halt Seaway traffic to far inland ports part of the year. The Seaway, that liquid turnpike that will transform much of Canada's midwest, just as in the United States, also can be looked on by railroaders as a challenge and an opportunity.

The piggyback system of freight shipment—by which wheeled vehicles ride on flatcars, then take off on highways to make deliveries—gave somebody a big idea. Why not a fishback? Why not adapt the same method to freight vessels? So the Canadian Pacific Railway is developing a line of containers suitable for this traffic. This imaginative idea will help shippers pack their freight so that it can travel by land or inland sea, according to the season. The Canadian Pacific Railway rails will provide a usable alternative when the inland waters are frozen over.

As 1960 opened, the Canadian Pacific had had 6 months' experience with its newly streamlined organization. The country, previously divided into eight districts, is now divided into four regions—Atlantic, eastern, prairie, and Pacific. This cuts down overhead tremendously. This is part of the integration policy that seems to go right down the line. For example, rail, air, and steamship tickets can all be purchased at the same place; and the same salesman will help find accommodations at a Canadian Pacific Railway hotel. And if he pushes Canadian Pacific Railway express or Canadian Pacific Railway communications services, that's what he's paid for doing. The

customer doesn't get mixed up trying to find his way to a dozen offices in the same city.

More statistics could be cited—many more—such as comparison of fixed charges ratios, the input of \$50 million more into the Canadian National in 1958 despite a deficit of \$51 million, and so forth. The big point, however, is not in the figures, but in the philosophy and policy. What actually is happening in Canada is that a loyal group of hard-working and able managers are struggling with an impossible adversary—the sickness that is socialism, no matter how one tries to avoid the term.

Can the economic disease be cured? Is it really too late as the Ottawa journalist insists? Or is one big, courageous step all the Canadian Government needs to take? Such a step would simply be to start treating the Canadian National Railways like a private enterprise. To do so, the Government would have to: (a) Set up an income tax account for this railroad on the same basis as its competitor; (b) simplify the corporate structure, streamlining it into an integrated whole (there were 79 corporations in the Canadian National Railways complex 5 years ago, 45 1 year ago, more than 30 still); (c) tell the railroad to keep its hand out of the government till; no more subsidies—when an operation loses money, cut it off.

Ah, what a capitalistic Utopia, with every institution required to fish or cut bait, turn in a profit or sell out. The political screaming that would ensue would shake the polar icecap.

But lest U.S. citizens gain the notion that it is only the Canadians who have drifted into socialistic enterprise without knowing it, let us be aware of the following: The inland waterways system of the United States is wholly supported by the taxpayers, not by the users; barges ride toll free in channels kept open by the Government for their benefit on the pretext of military necessity. The various State-chartered authorities are exempt from property tax, exempt from Federal tax on their securities; none is operated on a basis of full self-support and contributions to taxes. Port facilities, bridges, airports, toll roads do not pay taxes; they collect them, without calling them taxes. The country's major highway system is a public utility. Such a facility is capable of standing on its own economic feet, as other public utilities are required to do.

Will the railroads of the United States of America succumb to the economic disease that is socialism? Of course we know that such a thought is ridiculous, until we recall the words of President Crump: "The Canadian people as a whole have never consciously or deliberately sought socialistic answers to their problems." But in times of economic difficulty, such an answer sometimes seems so easy.

Improved Federal Accounting: One of Our Great National Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary to improve and to modernize the accounting procedures of the United States. Many thoughtful men honestly question whether or not the Congress and the President can continue to manage this monstrous Government.

In my opinion it will be impossible to give the taxpayers efficient management unless we bring our accounting procedures into the 20th century.

Mr. T. Jack Gary, Jr., brother of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, has recently published an article entitled "Improvement in Federal Accounting: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges." I recommend this article to every Member of this Congress as a thoughtful and intelligent exposition of the problem, what we have done about it to date, and what we can do in the future.

The article follows:

IMPROVEMENT IN FEDERAL ACCOUNTING: PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

(By T. Jack Gary, Jr.)

On January 9, 1959, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General of the United States released the 10th annual progress report under the Joint Program To Improve Accounting in the Federal Government. A decade is a significant time period for purposes of historic accountability. Therefore, this seems to be an appropriate point at which to take an inventory of progress in Federal accounting. Let us ask ourselves the following questions: (1) What have been the major accomplishments during the last 10 years? (2) In solving the problems of the past have we created new problems for the future? (3) What are the most pressing matters to which we should devote our future efforts?

WHERE WE WERE 10 YEARS AGO

It seems to me that the most dramatic manner in which to present the tremendous achievements in improving the Federal Government's accounting during the last 10 years is to describe briefly the procedures that masqueraded under the guise of accounting 10 years ago. Up to that time there had been little change in the legalistic concept of accounting through the settlement of the accounts of accountable officers which was adopted at the time this Nation was founded.

Warrant system

Perhaps the most stultifying force in the development of modern accounting in the Federal Government was the warrant system. This misconception of internal control resulted in interminable handling of paper and duplication of record keeping within the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office with frustrating delays on the part of operating agencies in obtaining funds which had been legally made available to them by the Congress.

Under the warrant system receipts were required to be "covered into the Treasury" by means of a covering warrant. Appropriations were made available first to the Treasury Department through the issuing of a warrant only after the most profound deliberations by both the Treasury Department and the GAO to determine the number and title of the appropriation account. The covering and appropriation documents required signatures of both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller General. The final step in making appropriations available to the agencies was accomplished by the drawing of a requisition and accountable warrant by the agency against the funds in the Treasury Department.

The observance of this ritual resulted in delays of as much as 2 weeks in making funds available to the agencies which the Congress had provided for the payment of the Government's creditors. Moreover, at each point in the involved process where action was required, a set of accounting records was established. This resulted in the following duplication of recordkeeping, all in addition

to the records maintained by each agency which had primary responsibility for administering and accounting for the funds made available to it: (1) five sets of receipt accounts were maintained; (2) appropriation warrants were posted to five sets of records; (3) five sets of records were maintained for requisitions and accountable warrants; (4) disbursements were posted to six sets of accounts; and (5) public debt transactions were entered in seven different records.

Legalistic approach to auditing

Auditing procedures of the Federal Government 10 years ago were based on the same legalistic concepts as accounting. As a matter of fact, the accounting and auditing processes were so hopelessly intermingled that it was often difficult to distinguish one from the other. Many of the duplicative accounting records mentioned previously were maintained for so-called auditing purposes.

The procedure for settling the accounts of certifying officers of agencies for which the Treasury Department acted as disbursing officer is illustrative of the cumbersome nature of these auditing procedures. The steps in this process were as follows: (1) The agency responsible for incurring an expenditure forwarded the original voucher, after examination and certification by the certifying officer, to one of the regional offices of the Treasury Department's Division of Disbursements, where the check in payment of it was drawn. (2) At the end of the month the regional disbursing office summarized these vouchers on an account current and forwarded them to the Chief Disbursing Officer in Washington. (3) The Chief Disbursing Officer gathered together all original vouchers for each agency monthly and transmitted them to the central office of the agency. (4) A so-called administrative audit was performed on these vouchers by the agency, after which they were forwarded to the GAO. (5) The GAO separated the vouchers by type (travel, contract, transportation, etc.) and sent them to specialized sections where they were minutely examined and returned with notations of exceptions. (6) The vouchers were then matched up with the transmittal document, and after months, often years, of haggling with the individual who officially approved the vouchers for payment, the account was finally settled. The remarkable thing about this process is that the documents were not either lost or worn out from handling before they finally came to rest.

Checks issued were subjected to duplicate handling in their payment by the Treasurer of the United States and reconciliation to the disbursing officers' accounts by the GAO. The Post Office was singled out for special audit treatment. Audit procedures for this large segment of the Federal Government's operations involved the maintenance of the official accounts of the Post Office Department by the GAO.

Inconsistency and lack of accounting principles

We become quite concerned today over whether the Federal Government should use the accrual, obligation, or cash basis of accounting. Ten years ago there were several cash bases in use. Receipts were accounted for on the basis of collections, deposits, and covering into the Treasury. Disbursements were recorded on the bases of audited vouchers, checks issued, and checks paid. These inconsistencies resulted in the preparation of financial statements which purported to show the same information but were in disagreement by millions of dollars.

The most serious deficiency in accounting principles insofar as the control of costs and the use of accounting as a tool of management is concerned was the failure, except with respect to certain Government corporations, to observe the accrual basis of ac-

counting. The need for functional costs resulted in an abortive attempt to make obligations incurred serve the purpose for which accrued costs were designed. This resulted in a considerable amount of guesswork, since in many instances it is not possible to determine the functional purpose for which materials and supplies are to be used at the time that orders are placed for them. Moreover, even when this is possible, the obligation basis of accounting does not relate the recording of materials and supplies in the accounts to the period of time in which the end use of them is accomplished. Therefore, performance budgeting could not be satisfactorily instituted on the basis of obligations incurred.

Finally an oversimplified approach was taken to the prescribing of accounting systems. Every agency of the Government was supposed to maintain its accounts exactly as prescribed by General Regulations No. 100 issued by the Comptroller General. This regulation provided a cumbersome system of appropriation accounts in which were to be recorded obligations and disbursements. It not only was entirely unsuited to business-type activities of the Government but also ignored the management needs of non-business-type activities for accounting information with which to control costs.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

Some choose to refer to the changes that have taken place during the last decade under the joint program to improve accounting in the Federal Government as an evolution. I would not suggest that it has been a revolution, although there has been some bloodshed along the way. However, the word evolution connotes a slower pace than that at which this program has moved. In substantiation of this position I would like to present a summary of accomplishments under this program.

Improvements in central accounting

It seems appropriate to summarize first the improvements in the central accounting, financial reporting, and auditing processes. This approach may be questioned because the real achievement has been in the use of improved departmental accounting as a tool of management. Nevertheless, I submit that departmental accounting was so restricted in the straitjacket of central accounting requirements as to make it absolutely essential to get rid of these archaic processes in order to create the proper atmosphere for the development of modern departmental accounting systems.

The Comptroller General voluntarily divested his office of central bookkeeping activities. This included the transfer of the official postal accounts to the Post Office Department, which has subsequently developed a modern accounting system responsive to its management needs.

The interminable and devious flow of paper incident to the settlement of accounts of certifying officers has, for the most part, been eliminated through the extension to practically all Federal agencies, of on-the-site auditing by the GAO, which, with minor exceptions, was previously applied only to those agencies for which it was required by the Government Corporation Control Act. A new approach to auditing, which has been termed by the GAO as the "comprehensive audit," has been instituted, which concerns itself with how effective management policies of the agencies have been formulated and executed, as well as whether statutes have been observed and whether the books are in balance.

Perhaps one of the most successfully planned and executed electronic computer programs is the present method under which the 400 million checks issued annually by the Federal Government are paid and reconciled through use of electronic computers. Both

the payment and reconciliation functions are now performed by the Treasury Department under a constant post audit conducted on the site by GAO audit staff. This change not only has resulted in a savings of \$1,500,000 annually but provides more timely and effective control than could have been possible without the use of electronic computers.

The Treasury Department has accomplished an extensive program for the streamlining of its central accounting and reporting procedures. A single set of appropriation, fund, and public debt accounts is now maintained by the Treasury Department in lieu of the numerous ones previously mentioned which were maintained by the Treasury and the GAO. These accounts are maintained on modern accounting machines. Certain of the detailed public debt accounts, as well as the payment and reconciliation of checks previously mentioned, have been converted to electronic computers.

A common basis of cash accounting has been established throughout the entire Federal Government. The result has been that the monthly statements of receipts and disbursements published by the Treasury Department are now in agreement with similar reports submitted by the individual agencies to the Bureau of the Budget. It follows, therefore, that the summary of receipts and disbursements contained in the annual budget, which is prepared by the Budget Bureau from the agency reports, is in agreement with the "Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances" issued annually by the Treasury Department. Previously plugs which amounted to as much as \$300 million were required to bring the budget summary of receipts and expenditures into agreement with annual figures published in the Daily Treasury Statements.

The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 provides that "the Comptroller General of the United States, after consulting the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning their accounting, financial reporting, and budgetary needs, and considering the needs of the other executive agencies, shall prescribe the principles, standards, and related requirements for accounting to be observed by each executive agency, including requirements for suitable integration between the accounting processes of each executive agency and the accounting of the Treasury Department."

This has been done.

Improvements in departmental accounting

Certainly the most widely publicized and probably the most significant accomplishment of the joint program is the extension of the accrual basis of accounting. Ten years ago only those activities of the Federal Government of a business-type kept their accounts on an accrual basis. The use of this basis of accounting for purely spending programs was indeed an innovation. This, of course, was essential to the obtaining of program costs for the purpose of controlling costs and instituting performance budgeting.

As agencies began developing new accrual accounting systems, it was found in many instances that the method of financing their programs was not suitable to this new concept of cost control. A diversity of appropriations and administrative allotments could be made to work, however clumsily, under a method whereby control of cost was to be accomplished through controlling obligations against objects of expenditures. However, the use of multiple appropriations and allotments for the financing of a single program made the installation of accounting systems to produce program costs by organizational units practically impossible. The result was that, as a prelude to the installation of modern accounting systems in the departments and other agencies of the

Federal Government, substantial reductions and other simplifications were made to appropriation structures and administrative allotment processes.

In the development of simplified means of financing it was found that agencies in which operations were predominantly of a spending nature had some activities with business-type aspects. Also, a need developed in some instances for a means of temporarily financing costs that were applicable to several programs. This had to be done in order that the distribution of these costs could be made to the applicable programs on a use basis instead of by guesswork at the time funds were committed for the common costs. These two problems were resolved by the use of revolving funds that are not subject to the restrictive requirements of appropriation accounting.

The use of accrual accounting to provide performance and program costing and budgeting began under the joint program on an experimental basis. It was subsequently extended to many Federal agencies. The success and soundness of this approach to financial management in the Federal Government is evidenced by the passage by the 84th Congress on August 1, 1956, of Public Law 863. This statute amends the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 to require all agencies of the Federal Government to maintain their accounts on the accrual basis as a means of facilitating the preparation of cost-based budgets. The act also requires that the agencies' accounting systems include adequate provision for monetary property accounting records.

Accounting improvements at the departmental level have not stemmed merely from the desire to do a more precise and technically acceptable accounting job. The tremendously increased expenditures and complexity of activities of the Federal Government have made it necessary to get better financial tools for management. Thus the accounting organizations of many of the agencies have been modernized as well as their accounting systems. There has been an increased use of the controllership type of financial organization. This has resulted in better coordination of accounting and budgeting. It has also stimulated the development of financial analysis and internal auditing.

CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Despite the tremendous accomplishments during the last decade under the Joint Program to Improve Accounting in the Federal Government, I am sure there is no one participating in this program who feels that it is time to rest on our laurels. It does seem, however, to be a good time to attempt to identify those problems which deserve the most urgent future consideration. It is certainly of extreme importance that the interest and talent that the program has generated be directed in the areas in which they will be most productive.

Completion of what has been started

The first effort required is to do more of what has been done in the past. Regardless of the spectacular accomplishments of the past, the size of the Federal Government is so gigantic that there are still large segments of it which have not yet installed modern systems of accrual accounting. Even in those agencies which now have modern accounting systems responsive to the needs of management there is the constant process of refining in order to make them more useful. Perhaps the least-developed phase of those accounting systems which have recently been modernized concerns nonexpendable property or fixed asset accounting. There is still more to be done than has yet been accomplished in this area. Also, merely because the central accounting processes have been extensively simplified

and modernized is no reason to assume that these procedures have reached a stage of perfection.

In the Defense Department, which spends the largest part of the Federal budget, methods of procurement with the attendant flow of material from the Government to contractors and back again create obstacles of a most serious nature to the utilization of accrual accounting.

For example, funds made available to one installation will be used by it to authorize another installation to contract for the construction of an end product (tank, airplane, etc.) and to authorize another installation to contract for a component of the end product (engine) to be shipped to the prime contractor for installation on the end product. Most of these contracts are on a cost-plus basis for the total number of items produced with deliveries scheduled over a period of time as the units are completed. The contractor for the component or the end product, therefore, has no need to know how much each of the units produced by him costs. Further, it would be difficult to justify the additional cost to the Government of requiring the contractor to provide unit accounting of these items. Moreover, the cost of the component is of no interest to the contractor for the end product, since he is being paid on a cost-plus basis merely to install the component on the end product. Finally, when the end product is completed (and again this will likely be on a time schedule of delivering certain quantities periodically), it may be shipped to a military installation different from the one which contracted for it or is paying for it.

The explanation above is necessarily involved. However, the complications in applying accrual accounting to such transactions are readily apparent, particularly since these procurement practices constitute the rule rather than the exception in the Defense Department. Some satisfactory answer to this problem must be found before accrual accounting can be adequately applied throughout the Defense Department.

HAVE WE CREATED NEW PROBLEMS WHILE SOLVING OLD ONES?

Accounting staff

The principal motivating force behind the joint program at its inception was the Accounting Systems Division of the General Accounting Office. There were on the staff of this Division some 60 able and dedicated accountants who assisted in the improvement of central accounting and worked with individual agencies in the development of departmental accounting systems.

About 2 years ago under a reorganization of the General Accounting Office the Accounting Systems Division was abolished, and except for a small policy staff its technicians were spread throughout the audit organization of the GAO. Simultaneously the Bureau of the Budget increased its accounting systems staff. This was in accordance with recommendations of both Hoover Commissions that the responsibility for prescribing accounting systems should rest with the executive branch of the Government.

In a joint program under which the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General participate cooperatively, I have no strong feeling with regard to which of these officials should have responsibility for prescribing accounting systems. The fact is, however, that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has so far been unable to obtain appropriations sufficient to employ one-third of the technical staff that previously comprised the GAO Accounting Systems Division. The need, as the joint program gathers momentum, is for more qualified systems accountants to assist in the development of accounting systems and procedures. There-

fore, unless the Bureau of the Budget is able to obtain sufficient funds and recruit qualified staff of at least the number that were previously employed by the GAO Accounting Systems Division, it would appear that a big price has been paid for the transfer of this responsibility to the executive branch of the Government.

Are we overselling accrual accounting?

The use of accrual accounting has provided invaluable cost information at the operating level where costs are controlled. However, the value of accrued costs in the Federal Government tends to diminish as progressively higher levels of management are reached. This can best be illustrated by contemplating that happy day when it will be possible to prepare consolidated financial statements for the entire Federal Government on the accrual basis. What useful purpose would such financial statements serve?

Need for cash basis: It may be argued that it is important to now the cash resources of the Federal Government. This information, however, is published daily by the Treasury Department. Of what value is a total figure for receivables without knowing the nature of the programs and contractual relations from which these assets resulted? The total investment of the Government in inventories is of little use to management, since it will be comprised of a conglomerate of items with such differing characteristics with regard to use, physical shape, turnover, and the like, as to defy any generalization about whether inventories are too high or too low. Current liabilities and working capital ratios are not of the same significance in the Federal Government as in commercial practice, since the Government borrows whether short or long term on the faith of the public and its general financial stability rather than the liquid assets available for repayment of the loan.

It has been suggested that the Federal Government should include in its fixed assets not only those which it has purchased but also the value of all the natural resources which it owns. Aside from the ability to value accurately these properties, it is difficult to determine what useful purpose such information would serve. The amount of the Federal Government's long-term debt is important, but, as is true of cash, this information is readily available and frequently published by the Treasury Department.

Introduction of accrual accounting in the Federal Government has been confined almost entirely to expenditures. The application of this basis to income presents a different problem. The largest source of the Federal Government's income is derived from income taxes for which there is more overpayment in advance of assessment than there are unpaid assessments. Unlike deficiency assessments the amounts of overpayments cannot be immediately determined but must await the subsequent filing of income tax returns. The pay-as-you-go plan for income taxes therefore, makes it practically impossible to determine at any given date on an accrual basis the revenue from this source.

In view of this it would seem that the cash basis now used is the most satisfactory one upon which to determine the operating outcome of the entire Federal Government. This basis, however, is not merely the lesser of two evils. Because of the gargantuan size of Federal revenues and expenditures, the flow of cash to and from the Federal Government has a profound effect on the economy of the Nation. Thus periodic information of this nature is valuable as an economic barometer. Moreover, the end result of the Government's taxing and spending is an increase or decrease in the public debt. These considerations, it would seem,

are most important at the national level and require a cash basis of accounting.

Need for obligation basis: As support for the accrual basis of accounting has grown, the use of obligation accounting has fallen into disrepute. There appears to be a sincere conviction on the part of many, if not a majority, of accountants within and without the Government, that the obligation basis of controlling expenditures should be replaced by accrued expenditures. This has resulted in the passage in August 1958 by the 85th Congress of Public Law 85-759, which provides for placing appropriation limitations on accrued expenditures. Before discarding the obligation concept completely, I submit that we should recall the purpose for which obligation accounting was developed and consider carefully whether it may be the best suited for this purpose.

The general use of obligation, or encumbrance accounting as it is sometimes called, postdates the use of accrual accounting. It is by no means an ancient concept but was developed to control the expenditure of funds within maximum amounts made legally or administratively available because neither the cash nor accrual basis completely satisfied this objective. It is not an invention of the Federal Government. On the contrary it is almost universally used by local and State governments and is recognized by the National Committee on Governmental Accounting, the State and local authority on governmental accounting, as a general accepted principle of governmental accounting.

Despite the support which may be garnered for the obligation basis of accounting, principles must be justified because of their value rather than in relation to who advocates them. The essence of the obligation basis of accounting is to record charges against funds at the time legal commitments are entered into but only to the extent that funds are available. This is the only point at which the initiative rests with the spender as to whether or not an expenditure will be incurred. Although certain restrictions may be placed on the vendor, the initiative for converting an obligation into an accrued expenditure is largely with him.

This situation is recognized in Public Law 85-759, which provides that "whenever any liabilities are incurred within the limitation provided for in any fiscal year (whether or not recorded in such fiscal year) nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the making of payment therefore in any subsequent fiscal year." Moreover, the accrued expenditure limitation is recognized to be an additional limitation rather than one which is to take the place of an obligation limitation. Even the most ardent advocates of accounting for appropriations on an accrual basis readily admit that some form of contract authorization will be required for the procurement of materials requiring long leadtimes and that obligations will need to be recorded against these authorizations. This is a device that was used extensively during World War II but proved so unsatisfactory that its use has been discontinued by the Congress.

All three accounting bases needed: It is my opinion that it would be as grave a mistake to attempt to make the accrual basis of accounting serve the purpose for which obligation accounting was designed as to attempt the reverse, as previously mentioned. All three bases of accounting are required in the Federal Government—the cash basis to determine the budget surplus or deficit on a national basis, the obligation basis to control expenditures on a broad basis within the amounts legally made available, and the accrual basis to control costs on a functional or program basis and to provide an essential element for performance budgets.

Accounting systems have been developed and installed and are successfully operating

in certain agencies of the Federal Government which produce accrued costs and obligations to the extent and for the purposes required, integrated in a single system of accounting which in turn is integrated with the cash requirements of central accounting. It seems to me that the most productive efforts would result from extending this concept throughout the Federal Government rather than attempting to make accrual accounting mean all things to all people.

Are we carrying accounting too far?

Whenever a phase of administration has been neglected and suddenly comes to the fore, there is a tendency for the pendulum to swing too far in the opposite direction. This has been noticeable to some extent in the implementation of the Joint Program, particularly in the Defense Department. For example, there is prescribed for all installations reporting to the same command a functional account classification which is detailed beyond the point of being able to classify costs from available accounting documentation except by guesswork. Moreover, the classification is detailed beyond the point of being any use to the management of the installation, and it is difficult to foresee the value of this detail at the Pentagon level. There is a point beyond which the further detailing of accounting information not only is more costly than the results will justify but also is illogical. From this point on, informed estimates should be used to supply further detail, if it is indeed required. The more summary information produced by the accounts should be used as a point of departure with scientific sampling techniques used to the extent appropriate for obtaining further detail.

There also seems to be a practice, as directives are passed down from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, for each administrative layer to add more detail to them. By the time these directives reach the installations for which they are intended, they are so specific with regard to both procedure and standard forms to be used that the installations are placed in a straitjacket, insofar as their accounting systems are concerned, similar to that previously produced by General Regulations No. 100.

Although the Defense Department is an operating agency, it encompasses the largest portion of the Federal Government, and its activities are exceedingly diverse and complex. For this reason even the smallest organizational elements in the Pentagon are often fairly well removed from the points of operations. The approach to the promulgation of accounting directives at this level therefore should be confined to overall financial reporting requirements, leaving sufficient flexibility at the installation level to develop detailed accounting procedures to meet individual needs. This is not to say that installations should not be given assistance in developing adequate accounting systems or that a satisfactory method of solving a problem at one installation should not be made available to other installations that are struggling with the same problem. However, it should not be assumed that what is good for one installation is per se good for all of them. That is to say, a distinction should be made between the issuing of directives which should be confined to principles and minimum financial reporting requirements on the one hand and the circulation of detailed procedures which should be purely suggestive on the other.

Extension of comprehensive audit

There are many areas in the Federal Government to which the voucher-type audit still applies. It is recognized that conversion from the voucher to comprehensive audit is a tremendous undertaking. However, accounting in the Federal Government can

never be considered to be completely modernized or adequate until this conversion has been completed. In doing so there are two inherent dangers that need to be avoided. The degree to which the comprehensive audit is concerned with management provides a temptation for the auditor to manage the agency instead of audit it. Also to the extent that the audit delves into problems not of a purely accounting nature it is important to make doubly sure that the individual assigned to the engagement is at least as well qualified in that particular field as those whose judgment he may have reason to question.

CONCLUSION

Progress made in the improvement of the Federal Government's accounting during the last decade is perhaps the outstanding accounting accomplishment of all time. Certainly there is nothing as big and diverse as the Federal Government, and accounting improvements have been of a sweeping nature. However, because of the size of the task, there still remain large segments of the Federal Government which have been touched lightly, if at all, by this program of accounting modernization.

The extension of new concepts of accounting and auditing to the entire Federal Government even today is a formidable task. In the Defense Department, which spends a major share of the Federal budget, the complexities of procurement methods with the resulting flow of material backward and forward from the Government to the contractor pose a major obstacle to the application of the accrual basis of accounting. Even in those agencies that have installed modern accounting systems there is a constant need for further refinement to make them more responsive to the needs of management. The further development of nonexpendable property or fixed-asset accounting is a case in point.

Finally, it may be that new problems have been created in the process of solving old ones. For example, the accrual basis of accounting may well have been oversold; accounting classifications in some instances may be too detailed to serve any useful purpose; and the extension of the comprehensive audit to all the Federal Government may carry with it a temptation for the auditor to manage rather than to audit.

Agricultural Stabilization Program Is Costly Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the February 29, 1960, issue of the Washington Daily News contained an article by Lyle C. Wilson which points up the awful price to the taxpayers of the wasteful and ineffective agricultural stabilization program.

Under unanimous consent to include extraneous matter I have here Mr. Wilson's article which appeared under a title "Ike Cut It Too Thin":

President Eisenhower was a piker the other day when he tossed at the taxpayers the fact that it costs them \$1.5 million a day for the wheat program.

That is at the rate of about \$1,000 a minute. Peanuts, Mr. President; the wheat bite

is merely a part of the cost of agricultural stabilization.

Agricultural stabilization costs the taxpayers more than \$3,750 a minute. It costs about \$5.4 million a day. That is not a patch on spending for national defense or for interest on the national debt. It is a big, fat figure, however. It will be the center of a lot of racket in this year's presidential campaign.

There are only three brackets of taxpayers each of whose annual contributions to the Treasury would pay for the stabilization program. The mother lode of personal income tax is to be found among those citizens whose adjusted gross income ranges from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year. There are nearly 5 million such citizens.

On the average they would be heads of one-car families, worried, hard-working men. Collectively, the taxpayers in this bracket are relieved each year of about \$3 billion. The stabilization program costs about \$2 billion.

There are about 3 million taxpayers in the \$6,000 to \$7,000 gross income bracket. They pay into the Treasury nearly \$2.4 billion each year. The third rich vein of income-tax paydirt is among the \$10,000 to \$15,000 men and women. There are about 1 million of these. They ante up slightly more than \$2 billion annually.

The point of all of this, if any, is that the entire take from many millions of taxpayers is required to pay for an agricultural program about which one fact, at least, is not disputed. That undisputed fact is this:

THE PROGRAM DOES NOT WORK

If anyone in or out of Government is content with the farm program, he has yet to stand up and be counted. If the program is wasteful, as charged, and ineffective, as is conceded, the taxpayers are paying an awful price for the failure of statesmen to get the program on the tracks.

Few statesmen and no practical politicians expect any satisfactory solution to the farm problem this year or next or, perhaps, thereafter. The farm problem has been troubling American politics since the quickie agricultural depression which followed World War I. The farm problem steadily has become (a) more difficult and (b) more expensive. That trend is likely to continue.

Farmers have the Indian sign on U.S. politicians. The farm vote is loaded—with dynamite. U.S. politicians handle the farm vote with care. They are as careful now as they were 40 years ago, which is astonishing. In 1920, the farm population of the United States was a booming 30.1 percent of the whole. By 1959, the farm population had shrunk to 12 percent.

The farm population was only 17.7 percent of the whole in 1948, but you and I and Thomas E. Dewey will not forget what farm voters accomplished in 1948.

The farmers voted Democratic that year, for Harry S. Truman.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Estonians are one of the smallest nationality groups in Europe in terms of population, comprising no more than a bare million during most of their recent and present history. But they have had a proud

tradition as a free and independent nation.

After they were brought under the Russian regime in 1710, they struggled for their freedom for more than 200 years. Finally they attained it early in 1918, proclaiming their national independence on February 24. Then the Estonian Republic was founded and a democratic constitution was adopted. They governed themselves and lived happily for two full decades under their democratic institutions. Industrious, gifted, public spirited, and patriotic, they worked hard to make their small country a safe and happy place in which to live and enjoy life. Such was their existence when world events overtook them, and thereby they lost their independence and their happiness.

Today that once free country is again part of Russia, this time more firmly chained to Soviet Russia and Communist totalitarianism. Unfortunately the tyranny there is so much more efficient and therefore more cruel that it seems difficult to shake off its oppressive yoke. But brave and sturdy Estonians are struggling against their Communist oppressors relentlessly and with all the means at their disposal, in the firm belief that in the end their righteous cause will win. On the 42d anniversary of their independence day, February 24, I wish them luck and fortitude in their struggle for freedom.

Farm Bureau Plows Wrong Furrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to enter into the RECORD the following editorial from the *La Grande Observer of La Grande, Oreg.*, dated February 17. It deals with the controversial disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act:

FARM BUREAU PLOWS WRONG FURROW

A copy of the American Farm Bureau Federation's newsletter came into the office this week. In its review of congressional action on current legislation we found a bone to pick.

The letter advises all bureau members to oppose Senator JOHN KENNEDY's bill to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act.

Disclaimer affidavit happens to be a bad name for a piece of legislative balderdash. It is contained in the act which passes Federal funds to colleges and universities, funds which the schools pass on to students as loans.

Before a student receives such a loan he must sign (1) a loyalty oath and (2) an affidavit swearing he does not belong to or support any organization intent on overthrowing the U.S. Government.

It is the second portion which Senator KENNEDY is trying to eliminate. Farm Bureau policymakers contend it should remain.

The disclaimer is an oath of negative loyalty. Swearing you don't intend to upset the good old United States of America became popular in the black days of McCarthy. It is an unfortunate leftover from that era.

Having to swear a lack of disloyalty is an insult to the integrity of those of whom it is required and a sign of weakness and fright on the part of those who ask it.

The only time a government asks such a question is when it suspects almost everybody of plotting treachery. A few years back our Government was driven to this position by mass hysteria.

By now the sickness of universal suspicion has generally been washed out of public life. To allow a sign of it to remain in the disclaimer affidavit is to place on exhibit weakness which we honestly believe no longer exists.

Furthermore, if someone actually is a member of an organization intent on overthrowing the U.S. Government, he most certainly is not going to reveal his plans merely on being asked.

Objections to the disclaimer have been widespread since the passage of the National Defense Education Act. A number of schools have refused the offered funds because of the insulting requirement.

In the Farm Bureau's argument in favor of the disclaimer, there is the following paragraph:

"We are convinced that the support for the elimination of the disclaimer affidavit does not come from American college men and women, but comes instead from college administrators and professors."

This just isn't true. There are thousands of intelligent college students whose good sense balks at the negative loyalty question.

And can this be an argument in favor of something—to say that college administrators and professors are against it? Before this paragraph turned up we thought America respected its men of higher education. We will continue in this belief.

The Farm Bureau is plowing a wrong furrow when it comes to loyalty and college loans. More power to Senator KENNEDY in ridding our educational legislation of a blemish that was born in darker days, and now deserves a decent burial.

Roosevelt Disliked Questions on Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article which appeared in the *Pilot* published in Boston, Mass., on February 27, 1960: ROOSEVELT DISLIKED QUESTIONS ON RELIGION

On November 8, 1908, shortly after the election of William Howard Taft, whom Theodore Roosevelt had chosen to run as his successor, the following letter was published. Written by Mr. Roosevelt to J. C. Martin of Dayton, Ohio, it deals with the apparently perennial question of whether a Catholic can or should be elected President of the United States:

"MY DEAR SIR: I have received your letter, running in part as follows: 'While it is claimed almost universally that religion should not enter into politics, yet there is no denying that it does, and the mass of the

voters that are not Catholics will not support a man for any office, especially for President of the United States, who is a Roman Catholic. Since Taft has been nominated for President by the Republican Party it is being circulated and is constantly urged as a reason for not voting for Taft that he is an infidel (Unitarian) and his wife and brother Roman Catholics. * * * If his feelings are in sympathy with the Roman Catholic Church on account of his wife and brother being Catholics that would be objectionable to a sufficient number of voters to defeat him. On the other hand, if he is an infidel, that would be sure to mean defeat. * * * I am writing this letter for the sole purpose of giving Mr. Taft an opportunity to let the world know what his religious belief is.'

"I received many such letters as yours during the campaign, expressing dissatisfaction with Mr. Taft on religious grounds; some of them on the ground that he was a Unitarian, and others on the ground that he was suspected to be in sympathy with Catholics. I did not answer any of these letters during the campaign, because I regarded it as an outrage even to agitate such a question as a man's religious convictions, with the purpose of influencing a political election. But now that the campaign is over, when there is opportunity for men calmly to consider whether such propositions as those you make in your letter would lead, I wish to invite them to consider them, and I have selected your letter to answer because you advance both the objections commonly urged against Mr. Taft, namely: that he is a Unitarian and also that he is suspected of sympathy with the Catholics.

"You ask that Mr. Taft shall 'let the world know what his religious belief is.' This is purely his own private concern; and it is a matter between him and his Maker, a matter for his own conscience; and to require it to be made public under penalty of political discriminations is to negative the first principles of our Government, which guarantee complete religious liberty and the right to each man to act in religious affairs as his own conscience dictates.

"Mr. Taft never asked my advice in the matter, but if he had asked it I should have emphatically advised him against thus stating publicly his religious belief. The demand for a statement of a candidate's religious belief can have no meaning except that there may be discrimination for or against him because of that belief. Discrimination against the holder of one faith means retaliatory discrimination against men of other faiths. The inevitable result of entering upon such a practice would be an abandonment of our real freedom of conscience and reversion to the dreadful conditions of religious dissension which in so many lands have proved fatal to true liberty, to true religion and to all advance in civilization.

"To discriminate against a thoroughly upright citizen because he belongs to some particular church, or because, like Abraham Lincoln, he has not avowed his allegiance to any church is an outrage against that liberty of conscience which is one of the foundations of American life. You are entitled to know whether a man seeking suffrage is a man of clean and upright life, honorable in all his dealings with his fellows, and fit by qualification and purpose to do well in the great office for which he is a candidate; but you are not entitled to know matters which lie purely between himself and his Maker.

"If it is proper or legitimate to oppose a man for being a Unitarian as was John Quincy Adams, for instance; as is the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, at the present moment Chaplain of the Senate, and an American of whose life all good Americans are proud, then it would be equally proper to

support or oppose a man because of his views on justification by faith, or the method of administering the sacrament of the gospel of salvation by works. If you once enter on such a career there is absolutely no limit at which you can legitimately stop. So much for your objections to Mr. Taft because he is a Unitarian. Now for your objections to him because you think his wife and brother to be Roman Catholics. As it happened they are not; but if they were, or if he were a Roman Catholic himself, it ought not to affect in the slightest degree any man's supporting him for the position of President.

"You say that 'the mass of the voters that are not Catholics will not support a man for any office, especially for President of the United States, who is a Roman Catholic.' I believe that when you say this you foully slander your fellow countrymen. I do not for one moment believe that the mass of our fellow citizens, or that any considerable number of our fellow citizens can be influenced by such narrow bigotry as to refuse to vote for any thoroughly upright and fit man because he happens to have a particular religious creed.

"Such a consideration should never be treated as a reason for either supporting or opposing a candidate for a political office. Are you aware that there are several States in this Union where the majority of the people are now Catholics? I should reprobate in the severest terms the Catholics who in those States (or in any other States), refused to vote for the most fit man because he happened to be a Protestant, and my condemnation would be exactly as severe for Protestants who, under reversed circumstances, refused to vote for a Catholic.

"In public life, I am happy to say, that I have known many men who were elected and constantly reelected to office in districts where the great majority of their constituents were of a different religious belief. I know Catholics who have for many years represented constituencies mainly Protestant and Protestants who have for many years represented constituencies mainly Catholic; and among the Congressmen whom I know particularly well was one man of Jewish faith, who represented a district in which there were hardly any Jews at all. All of these men by their very existence in political life, refute the slander you have uttered against your fellow Americans.

"I believe that this Republic will endure for many centuries. If so, there will doubtless be among its Presidents Protestants and Catholics, and very probably at some time, Jews. I have consistently tried while President to act in relation to my fellow Americans of Catholic faith as I hope that any future President who happens to be a Catholic will act toward his fellow Americans of Protestant faith. Had I followed any other course I should have felt that I was unfit to represent the American people.

"Yours truly,

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

Formation of the American Hellenic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADENAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BRADENAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1960, the American Hellenic Congress, a federation of the leading 19

American Hellenic organizations in the United States, was officially established.

The declared purpose of the American Hellenic Congress is "to enlarge the areas of service to the United States and to create an awareness of the challenges and opportunities of the United States as a nation and of its citizens as individuals."

In addition to the Orders of Ahepa and Gapa, component members of the American Hellenic Congress include: The Pan Arcadian Federation of America, the New York Federation of American Hellenic Societies, Pan Laconian Federation of the United States, the Thracian Federation, the United Chios Societies of America, Pan Epirotic Federation, the Cyprus Federation of the United States, Federation of Pan Mesinian Societies, Pan Rhodian Federation of America. Other nationwide groups which become component members of the Congress on or before December 31, 1960, will be accorded the status of charter members.

The first elected officers of the American Hellenic Congress are distinguished and respected Americans of Greek origin. They are: National chairman, Dean Alfange, member of the New York bar and past supreme president of the Order of Ahepa; honorary national chairman, His Eminence Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America; national secretary and Washington counsel, Peter N. Chumbris, counsel to the U.S. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee; general counsel, Gregory G. Lagakos, member of the Philadelphia bar; treasurer, Dr. Abraham Michaels of Philadelphia; national vice chairmen, Pericles Lantzounis of New York, Constantine Rorris of Columbus, Ohio, and Demetrius Tsintolas of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times of February 19, 1960, from Mr. Dean Alfange concerning the formation of the American Hellenic Congress:

FORMATION OF HELLENIC CONGRESS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:
Though unnoticed in some quarters, an important event which gave substance to a long cherished ideal took place on January 31 in New York City. It marked the launching of a federation of Pan-American Hellenism under the aegis of the American Hellenic Congress. The distinguished churchman, His Eminence Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America, was named honorary chairman of the congress which will achieve de jure status upon ratification.

The component members of the new federation are the leading nationwide American Hellenic organizations, including those which are largest in numbers and oldest in point of service. Though each retains its identity, they will henceforth speak with a united voice in the councils of American affairs.

The American Hellenic Congress will strive, as stated in its charter, "to enlarge the areas of service to the United States and . . . to aid in the great process of shaping our national purpose" by coordinating the solid contributions to America by Americans of Hellenic descent.

That those whose ancestors lit the lamps of culture have seen fit the more effectively

to aid in confronting the challenges to a way of life bequeathed to us by ancient Hellas is, I think, a milestone which deserves to be recorded.

DEAN ALFANGE,

Chairman, American Hellenic Congress,
New York, February 9, 1960.

Our Nation's Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL HOGAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following speech:

OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS

(Remarks by Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at the 15th Annual Convention, National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., January 21, 1960)

I feel that I know your problems pretty well, because during my entire professional career I have been primarily directly involved in using, or making designs for the use of, the stone and other materials that go into the construction of foundations and pavements and structures of a better, more wonderful America. This has included construction for highways and dams and buildings and all that they entail.

As a boy in Utah, I used to take our mountains as a matter of course, as so much rock, or little value except to look at. But as I grew older I came to realize that stone is one of our great natural resources. For one thing, it provides the aggregates without which we could not build the great network of highways that is now taking form all across America.

The magnitude of the highway building program may be illustrated by some figures that we in the Bureau of Public Roads have just compiled. For example, nationwide receipts (and receipts pretty well reflect actual expenditures) for highways are expected to reach \$11.4 billion this year, an increase of 10 percent over the 1959 total of \$10.3 billion. More than half of the increase is attributable to increased revenues flowing into the highway trust fund.

Federal funds will account for slightly more than one-fourth of all highway receipts in 1960, and State road-user taxes and other State income for 53 percent of the total. Highway receipts as each level of government are expected to increase in 1960, but the percentages of total revenues supplied by the States and local governments continue to decline as Federal funds increase.

As you know, most Federal funds are not expended directly, but are paid to States as Federal aid in reimbursement for work performed. The States also transfer to local governments about one-fourth of all State road-user tax revenues as State aid for local roads and streets. Taking into account these intergovernmental transfers, the States in 1960 will administer \$7.2 billion of highway funds, or about two-thirds of the total. Federal-aid reimbursements to the States, however, are expected to decline \$400 million (14 percent) from 1959 as a result of these factors: (1) Completion in 1959 of most of the "antirecession" projects financed with Federal-aid "D" funds; and (2) depletion of highway trust fund reserves and the necessity to limit Federal payments in 1960 to avoid creating a deficit in the fund.

If you can bear some more statistics, here are a few figures that may interest you.

Total long-term debt outstanding for highway purposes at the end of 1958 was almost \$12.3 billion. It is estimated that there was an increase of \$485 million in 1959 and an increase of \$630 million is estimated for 1960, with the total outstanding debt reaching \$13.4 billion by the end of this year. State obligations for highways will account for \$9.4 billion of this total, those of local rural governments \$1.1 billion, and of municipalities \$2.9 billion. The total debt will be almost equally divided between obligations for toll facilities and those for toll-free facilities.

Capital outlay (expenditures for right-of-way and construction) is estimated to reach \$6.7 billion in 1960, slightly less than in 1959. The effect of the decrease in Federal payments in 1960 will be offset to some extent by increases in State highway income available for capital expenditures.

Expenditures for maintenance, for administration, research, and highway policing, and for interest on bonds, are expected to show increases in 1960.

Highway construction expenditures (excluding right-of-way and preliminary engineering costs), are estimated to exceed \$5.6 billion in 1960, a decline of about \$140 million from 1959. Construction expenditures on the Interstate System will account for one-third of the total in 1960, and nearly three-fourths of the total will be expended on the various Federal-aid systems.

So much for current statistics on the modern highway program. It may be of interest to look back and see how it all started. The Federal Government got into the picture in 1893 when an Office of Road Inquiry was set up in the Department of Agriculture. Its purpose was to study methods of roadmaking and demonstrate the most improved types by building short sample sections throughout the country. In that same year, 1893, the Duryea brothers built the first gasoline automobile.

Seven years later there were 8,000 automobiles in the United States. By 1916 annual motor-vehicle production exceeded one million for the first time, and the Federal Government entered the roadbuilding field on a nationwide scale. The initial Federal-Aid Road Act, passed in 1916, was a basic and far-reaching piece of legislation.

That act, now nearly 44 years old, laid the foundation for the cooperative Federal-State highway program in existence today. The patterns and purposes established then have been strengthened and improved over the years, and are still in the best traditions of dedicated public service.

Under the Federal law, the States have the initiative and prerogative in selecting roads to be improved and the type of improvement. The States are responsible for surveys, plans, and specifications, for letting contracts, and for supervision of construction—all subject to approval by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Legislation since 1916 has authorized increasing amounts of money and broadened the basic concept of our highway needs and how to fill them, but the generic act fostered a cooperative spirit and approach that underlines and strengthens the Federal-aid highway program even today.

Before we look at the present program and the problems it is designed to meet, let's add just a little more perspective. Perhaps the simplest way is to look back, to the year 1921 for example, when about 10.5 million motor vehicles were registered and the total road and street mileage in this country was just over 2.9 million—not quite three vehicles per mile. Here and there a few streets and main roads were crowded. But the real problem was felt to be how to provide more hard-surfaced rural roads—to get the farmers out of the mud.

By 1930 road mileage in this country had passed the 3 million mark, but motor-vehicle registrations had hit 26.7 million—that figures out to 8.8 motor vehicles per mile of roadway. Moreover, and this is tremendously important, vehicles were larger and faster, and near big cities and industrial areas congestion was developing on many key routes. Accidents were casting a grim and darkening shadow over the whole country.

By 1941 the figure was about 11 vehicles per mile, with every reason to believe that this ratio would go much higher. At the same time, earlier warnings had multiplied. Patterns of congestion were becoming widespread and huge traffic volumes on many routes were threatening the very existence of downtown areas. Traffic fatalities read like reports from a battlefield.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 recognized the basic nature of these problems. It authorized the first specific funds for Federal aid in urban areas. It provided for the selection of a Federal-aid secondary system, the farm-to-market roads, and it called upon the States and the Bureau of Public Roads to designate a national system of interstate highways limited in extent to 40,000 miles and connecting the important cities and industrial areas of the country. Requirements of the national defense were carefully considered, for we had learned that modern defense is built around industry, that many of today's highways are an integral part of an elaborate assembly line carrying raw materials, parts, semi-assembled units, and the finished products that sustain both defense and civilian activities.

Slowly, painfully, it had become clear that in order to solve our many traffic problems, urban and rural, in order to equate the motor vehicle with our way of life, we needed a bold new approach—a plan that would not only assure us an Interstate System of super-highways, but would also greatly increase the traffic-bearing capacity of many presently overburdened routes.

That is the declared purpose of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Sparked by President Eisenhower's dramatic message to the Governors' conference in 1954, the new act called for a 41,000-mile network of interstate highways built to standards which will handle the types and volumes of traffic predicted for the system in 1975. We are looking 15 years ahead, to the time when at least 100 million passenger cars, trucks, and buses will be on the go—a gain of around 45 percent over the 70 million in use today.

The great expansion of the highway-building movement in 1956 posed several heavy demands on the country—for men, machinery, materials, and—of course—money.

The manpower shortage was chiefly in engineers. I believe the supply is improving, partly because of the educational programs sponsored by the American Road Builders' Association, the Associated General Contractors and other organizations. They have helped to point out to the students and young engineers the advantages of specializing in highway work. States have set up more realistic salary brackets to be competitive. If our engineering potential has increased, so of course has the weight of the expanding highway program, but for the present the outlook is favorable. Aerial surveys, photogrammetry and electronic computers have combined to take a lot of the drudgery out of highway engineering and are making possible more effective use of engineering talents.

Machinery has also improved. In excavation, for example, one big self-powered scraper can do the work that required hundreds of pick-and-shovel men 35 years ago. Better machines developed by the equipment manufacturers have also reduced surfacing costs. There is still room for improvement in machinery and methods for building structures. And I hope more uni-

formity and simplification in the plans and specifications from State to State will effect additional economies.

On the whole, mechanization of road-building and the improvements in equipment, with consequent increases in the productivity of man and machine, have made highway building an efficient industry and have kept down the bills that the taxpayers must meet.

It is in meeting the demand for materials that your organization can be of greatest service to the country. An estimate made a couple of years ago by the Bureau of Public Roads, and still pretty valid, was that \$6½ billion would be spent for sand, crushed limestone, gravel, slag, and crushed stone used in aggregates. In quantity, this would mean about 4½ billion tons. It includes not only commercially produced material, but also the aggregates produced on the job by the construction contractors from local pits and quarries.

It may come as a surprise to some people to learn that the supply of aggregates is not unlimited. Many States have become concerned at prospective local shortages and at the cost of transporting the materials from more distant sources. In reply to a questionnaire sent out by the Bureau of Public Roads, asking whether the States believed that the known supply of aggregates was ample to take care of highway needs until 1972, we learned the following: The supply was not considered adequate in Colorado, Mississippi, or Oklahoma. In Florida it was adequate for at least 10 years, Kansas adequate in the eastern third of the State, Nebraska was short on crushed rock, New Hampshire expected a gravel shortage, New York expected a shortage of fine aggregate and bankrun gravel, Oregon short in the southwest and northwest part of the State, Pennsylvania short of coarse aggregate in the northwest part of the State and fine aggregate in the central part, Virginia short of coarse aggregate in Suffolk district. Other States had minor shortages of some types of aggregates in certain areas.

I am sure that I speak for the State highway departments, as well as the Bureau of Public Roads, in asking your cooperation in conserving the higher types of aggregates for special needs, and in supplying the lower grades where they will serve the purpose just as well. This is not a problem merely for this year and next, but for many years to come.

You will probably find it useful to keep in touch with the State highway departments in your sales area, in order to learn their requirements. Except in a few instances, no actual procurement of materials is done by the States or the Bureau of Public Roads, and your real customers, of course, are the highway construction contractors, of whom there are 6,000 or more.

Considerable road and street construction will likely be generated near the Interstate System in your districts. These may be Federal aid projects that are parts of the primary and secondary systems, or they may be financed entirely by the States or localities. At any rate, it may be to your advantage to watch out for them.

Your national organization can be of service to you by keeping in touch with the Bureau of Public Roads and with the American Association of State Highway Officials, which has headquarters in Washington.

I have given you some indication of the vast size of the country's highway effort. The roads of the ABC program, which have prior claim to the highway trust fund, are being improved at a substantial rate. We can also take pride in the physical progress of the Interstate System in the last few years.

In the 3½ years of the new program we have completed over 100,000 miles of construction on our Federal-aid systems, in-

cluding more than 20,000 bridges, at a construction cost of about \$8 billion. Of this total 5,800 miles are on the Interstate System. We have under construction nearly 24,000 additional miles of which over 4,300 miles are on the Interstate System. Contracts have been awarded during this 3½-year period for approximately \$13½ billion of improved Federal-aid highways for America.

As you know, the excess moneys in the highway trust fund have been depleted. In brief, Federal contributions are limited to the trust fund, and its income has not kept up with the authorizations voted by Congress. For the fiscal year 1961 we have been able to apportion to the States only \$1.8 billion for the Interstate System, as compared with the \$2 billion authorized by Congress in the 1959 act.

As the legislation now stands, we shall be able to apportion \$2 billion for fiscal 1962.

In his budget message of January 18, President Eisenhower reminded the Congress that last year he had recommended an increase in the motor-fuel tax of 1½ cents per gallon for a period of 5 years, to meet estimated requirements in the period that lies immediately ahead. The Congress, however, provided only a 1-cent increase, and for a period of less than 2 years. The President has now again urged the Congress to increase the fuel tax by the additional one-half cent, and to continue the tax at the 4½-cent rate until June 30, 1964; at the same time repealing the diversion of automotive excise taxes enacted last year.

The President also recommended, in his budget message, that \$900 million be provided for the ABC program for each of the fiscal years 1962 and 1963.

I cannot, of course, predict what Federal legislation will actually be passed this year, or in future years.

So far as the Federal-aid highway program is concerned the unsolved problems are two. The first is the determination of the means of financing the program. In 1961, it is expected that Congress will take up the problem and make a determination, largely on the basis of two reports on which the Bureau of Public Roads is working. One will be a revised estimate of the cost of the Interstate System, and the other will be a study of the benefits that the various classes of highway users, as well as nonusers, receive, so that Congress can determine an equitable distribution of taxes.

The second is public understanding of what our new highway system will mean to the country, its value to the economy and the individual driver, and the fact that we are not actually making expenditures but investments. This public information problem is up to all of us.

The outlook for your own business seems favorable. The volume of construction should steadily increase, until a peak and leveling-off period is reached within the next 2 to 5 years. For the present and immediate future the demand for crushed limestone products is certain to remain high.

Reply to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of March 1, 1960, entitled:

REPLY TO CUBA

The State Department's latest note to Cuba will, we believe, be generally approved in this country. The note welcomes the Cuban Government's expressed willingness to negotiate outstanding problems between the two nations, and invites Cuba to submit concrete proposals looking to the opening of such negotiations. The note pledges our Government "to continue by its conduct and through its utterances to reaffirm the spirit of fraternal friendship" between our two peoples. The note rejects the Cuban condition that negotiations be contingent upon a pledge that no unilateral action affecting Cuba be taken by the executive or legislative branches of our Government. The latter position was, of course, inevitable, if only because under our Constitution the executive branch cannot commit the legislative branch.

Much now depends upon how Premier Castro and his associates react to this note. If they are wise, we believe the men in Havana will realize that the basic position of our people has been enunciated time and again in President Eisenhower's statesmanlike declarations. Despite what many Americans believe to be substantial provocation, the President has called for patience upon our part and for continued efforts to improve relations between our countries. He has made no threats and issued no ultimatums. And our good faith was demonstrated again only 10 days ago when our Government promptly apologized after it has become known that a plane which had taken off from a Florida airport had flown over Cuba without that nation's authorization.

At this delicate moment in the relations between our two nations it would be highly constructive if the Cuban reply were to show the same spirit of good will and desire for amicable negotiation that the U.S. Government has exhibited.

Storm of Protest in Nation's Capital Over Pakistan's Barring U.S. Jewish Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FARBSSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, a well-known, authoritative, and recognized news service, has published information to the effect that Pakistan is barring U.S. Jewish personnel and that as a result of the position taken by the Pakistani Government our personnel policy has favored their position. Because of the distress that this has caused me, I have communicated with the Secretary of State of the United States to determine whether the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration are presently screening, formally or informally, individuals considered for assignment to Pakistan or any other country, which countries are listed in the following articles:

STORM OF PROTEST IN NATION'S CAPITAL OVER PAKISTAN'S BARRING U.S. JEWISH PERSONNEL

WASHINGTON.—Members of the U.S. Congress indicated they intend to take action aimed at securing the annulment of a reported "gentleman's agreement" developed

between Pakistan, on the one side, and the State Department and the U.S. International Cooperation Administration, on the other, barring American personnel of Jewish faith from assignment to the U.S. Embassy and the U.S. Economic Mission in Pakistan.

The existence of such an arrangement was revealed to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency by highly placed U.S. Government sources. A measure of confirmation of the agreement was indicated here by the Embassy of Pakistan. The arrangement was described as informal as distinct from the formal agreement made by the United States with Saudi Arabia barring American Jewish personnel from being sent for service to the U.S. base in Saudi Arabia.

Members of the U.S. Senate said they were opening a study on the Pakistani issue in the light of a belief that it is a violation of the Morse-Javits amendment to the 1959 Mutual Security Appropriations Act. This amendment called on the President to oppose religious discrimination against Americans by nations receiving U.S. aid. Pakistan, a predominantly Moslem country, but not a member of the Arab League, receives massive U.S. aid.

Candidates for assignment to permanent duty in Pakistan, the JTA learned, are now being informally screened to weed out the Jews. The heads of the Pakistan desks in the State Department and ICA keep the Jewish factor in mind when passing on personnel for service in Pakistan. There are no written instructions to this effect.

Muhammed Huq, press attache at the Pakistan Embassy, said his country admitted Jews as tourists but barred "Israelis and Zionists because we do not recognize Israel." He said "we are tolerant of other religions but do not desire Israelis or Zionists."

The State Department denied that any screening of Jews took place before foreign assignment except in the case of Saudi Arabia. The ICA said it had "no comment" on the report except that its personnel had made no official complaints on the agency's policies in Pakistan. It had, the JTA was informed, no official information to confirm charges of discrimination.

It was learned, however, that a number of individuals of the Jewish faith, employees of American agencies, had been barred from assignments in Pakistan because of the new pattern of selection. In instances where the religion of the individual was in doubt, it was learned, the individuals were asked privately if they were Jewish. This was done on an informal, man-to-man basis.

The State Department, it was said here, does not consider Jews for assignment to any country that informally advises it would prefer not to receive Jews. The ICA and the U.S. Information Agency appear less content about the "gentleman's agreement" on assignment of personnel, but they apparently follow the State Department's lead.

Several years ago, the State Department entered into an agreement with the Saudi Arabian Government not to assign Jews to service in that country. The United States also acceded, without apparent resistance, to sentiment in the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon against assignment of American Jews for service there.

In one known case, an individual with a Jewish-sounding name was posted for assignment to Jordan. The Jordanian Government inquired specifically into his religion. The U.S. authorities, instead of rejecting the inquiry, called the man aside and asked him. It turned out that he was a member of the Unitarian Church. He was admitted.

In another known case, prior screening had failed to block the appointment of a man with a Jewish-sounding name. The host government interrogated Washington and the appointee was informally interrogated. He happened to be an American of German

descent whose name was similar to a common Jewish "name." He was shocked to learn of the practice and confided to Jewish friends about it.

Secretary of State Herter was asked Tuesday to explain the new policy barring American personnel of the Jewish faith from assignment to U.S. diplomatic and aid missions in Pakistan, by Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York Democrat, member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Representative FARBSTEIN told Secretary Herter that any measures to weed out Jews from among personnel assigned to Pakistan "would be a distinct violation of every American tradition and of the Morse-Javits amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1959." The amendment calls on the executive department to withhold aid from nations discriminating against Americans on the basis of religion.

Representative FARBSTEIN asked Secretary Herter whether the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration are "presently screening, formally or informally, individuals considered for assignment to Pakistan or any other country," to determine religious affiliation as vocation "qualification." He cited an "authoritative news agency" report that such a practice involving Pakistan had gone into effect. The report had originated with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

A formal request was made by Representative FARBSTEIN for a detailed report on current policies of the State Department, involving assignment of American Jews to Pakistan and a number of other Moslem nations. The other nations included Saudi Arabia, United Arab Republic, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, and Yemen. An administration request for additional appropriations to Pakistan is now before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

(By Milton Friedman)

About the time of President Eisenhower's December visit, Pakistan informally urged American diplomats to assign no more American Jews to U.S. diplomatic and economic aid missions in that Moslem nation. A few Jews already in Pakistan could remain for the time being. Officials agreed, passing the word by subtle means. The informal but strict order went out: Eliminate Jews from among assignees to Pakistan.

Immediate compliance came from the Pakistani desks of the State Department and International Cooperation Administration in Washington. It leaked out to employees, Jewish and non-Jewish, who resented the new policy.

They considered it outright anti-Semitism and an affront to the dignity of U.S. personnel, including officials of Jewish faith. American compliance was seen as translation of foreign bias into an American gentleman's agreement affecting U.S. citizens.

Other news spread within executive department circles. The administration was giving in to Moslem attempts to discourage even transit visas for U.S. officials of Jewish faith. Such officials needed to transit various Arab airports if they were to perform their duties. Sometimes the duties included the implementation of technical and economic aid for the very nations that practiced such flagrant bigotry.

Officials used a rationalization long familiar to Jews. The concession was made to Pakistan for the Jews' "own benefit and comfort" to promote "a better social climate and to avoid embarrassment." Wouldn't the Jewish employee be happier in Bangkok or Rangoon?

For public consumption, Government spokesmen vigorously denied existence of the new policy. Behind the scenes there was a frantic scramble to learn how it all leaked out.

One official asked not to be named because he was a career man. He said the Pakistan development was "utter expediency." He found it reminiscent of real estate operators who justify restricted neighborhoods. He blamed administration indifference to the spirit of the Morse-Javits amendment. That amendment called on the President to use discretion in giving economic aid to nations that practice religious bigotry against Americans. In Pakistan, the amendment was ignored. Jewish employees of the U.S. agency actually channeling aid to Pakistan were insulted with impunity.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 726, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of
New York, at 91st Anniversary Dinner
of Manhattan College Alumni Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] at the 91st anniversary dinner of the Manhattan College Alumni Society at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City on Saturday, February 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The world we live in is described as a two-power world. Those two powers are Soviet Russia and the United States—and, by extension, the two-power concept includes on the one hand the cluster of satellites that add to Russia's mass, on the other, the nations of the free world that share with America the ideals of democracy and of the dignity of man.

The term "power," used in this global sense, normally has but one meaning in the mind of the free-world citizen. It means the relative military posture of the two opposing ideological blocs. It means the force of their nuclear muscle, the thrust and accuracy of their missiles, the refinements they have achieved, or are achieving in the art of mass annihilation.

In the face of this two-power confrontation, with all the potential of menace it involves, there occurs what is to me a deeper, graver, source of concern. It is the tendency of the individual citizen to feel overpowered and submerged by events over which he feels he has no control. It is his sense of being a powerless spectator, sitting in a colosseum, knowing two worlds can collide before his eyes, and hoping the show will never start.

The paradox is plain. What we seek to defend, with all this terrifying new hardware of space, is the identity of man as a free spirit. Yet man, as he contemplates the instruments of destruction, is dwarfed by his own Frankenstein. His own creations belittle him in his own eyes. He feels that somebody has invented a game too big for him to play. History becomes, not something he makes, but something he reads about.

The truth of the matter is that this great new era of cosmic fireworks—this race to the stars—this awesome rehearsal for disaster—is not the true essence of the two-power struggle in our world. It is only the outward mark. It is the weapon a man fights with—not the cause he fights for.

And what cause are we fighting for—what are we struggling to preserve? In our hearts we all know. The most precious thing we all possess is the soul God gave us—the

freedom He breathed into us—the dignity He made our birthmark.

But precious though they are, we sometimes are prone to treat these treasures as though they were burglarproof, as though they were beyond forfeit, beyond loss.

I shall not speak tonight of the lands where mass robbery of human dignity has occurred. I shall confine myself to the threat as it exists here in America—and of the ways in which the challenge of that threat must be confronted.

We are many winters removed from the bitter cold of Valley Forge—where freezing, tattered Americans knew, with a certainty hard as steel, what they were fighting for. Today we look upon freedom as an heirloom handed down—as rightfully ours as our very names. Only when a Pearl Harbor grabs us by the throat—and we have to fight ourselves free do we sense that freedom has a price tag on it—and that tag reads blood and sacrifice—as well as vigilance.

It can well be said that this Nation, built on the rock of eternal values, is suffering the slow erosion of those values. That the pressures of prosperity, of success, of easy living, are washing away the pillars of the spirit, of character, of toughness, that are the true foundations of any civilization worthy to endure.

I do not wish to overpaint the picture—but I am sure that each of us, in his heart, feels occasional qualms of uneasiness over the drift to apathy, to a way of living unfired by inspiration, by ideals, by high purposes—a design for existence whereby taking rather than giving—getting rather than earning—pricing rather than evaluating—becomes the pattern of life.

Several years ago the American people were shocked to learn of American soldiers defecting to communism. How could this happen, the cry went up. Didn't the Army indoctrinate these boys with the principles of Americanism? That very reaction is typical of the times. In a Nation where everything is packaged so perfectly, why didn't the Army package the loyalties of the G.I.'s in a neat, hermetically sealed container, impervious to the germs of a foreign ideology?

We all know why. Because a man's strength of character is not—and never will be—a G.I. issue. The Army can give him a gun to protect his life, but the armor his spirit wears was forged long before his enlistment.

No, there's no "survival kit" of values except the one that a man brings with him—whether to the Army, to college, to business, to the professions—or to the day-by-day challenge of life.

That is where the areas of responsibility open up. And where, in the United States of 1960, we must face the fact that our emphasis has been dismally one-sided. Physical upbringing of our children appears to preoccupy us more than this spiritual and intellectual upbringing. Believe me, I am all for taller, healthier, handsomer young Americans—but not emptier ones, not spiritually undernourished, intellectually underfed children.

Again, I fear our concept of "packaging" education in easy-to-take academic programs, wrapped in loving care and guaranteed not to hurt—can explain the incompleteness of the educative process. The "marshmallow" courses—so light, so palat-

able, so predigested—are a temptation hard to resist. The tough courses—the ones you have to bite into and chew—the ones with the unpleasant taste—even though the teacher tells you it will disappear—these are the courses that whip sleeping craniums into wakefulness—prod brains into action, toughen the mind and the character—and build strength into the spirit.

Let us keep in mind that this "soft diet" in today's education wasn't invented by our young people. It's a reflection of the "age of softness"—of the age where doors open for you, chores are done by buttons, not muscles, and luxury has become one of the inalienable rights.

It's all very laudable, of course, not to want to put a machine out of work, but, our trouble here in America is that, inevitably, softness permeates our moral as well as our physical and mental fabric. This is the dangerous tendency, where values become blurred in the public mind—and the line between right and wrong, between good and evil is crossed as blithely as though it had been painted out by an indulgent Deity.

Only such a blurring of values can explain the present-day "gold-rush philosophy" that measures everything in terms of what it costs rather than what it signifies. This leads unfailingly to a veneration of things rather than principles. It makes success something that's tallied in a man's bank account rather than in his soul.

This is not to condemn the concept of materialism in our lives. Materialism is a fact of existence. We have to be materialistic to survive, as a people, or as individuals. It is only when materialism becomes an end in itself—when it becomes a kind of tribal religion, with Mammon as its Deity—when it tends to drive a wedge between man and his spiritual identity, that it becomes the sworn enemy of man, the potential destroyer of the moral structure on which destinies depend, not merely careers.

In times past the code of expediency was to a great extent confined to certain elements of our society—the avowed opportunist, the confidence man, the amoralist, the criminal. Today, when the tendency is to glorify getting—and let the principles fall where they may—opportunism seems to have become a career with an ever widening, ever vicious appeal.

This constant nibbling away at the values on which good lives and great civilizations are built requires no lists of illustrations from me tonight. All of us are too familiar, far too familiar, with the modern language of payoffs, collusion, fast buck deals, protection-for-pay, organized theft of union dues—yes, and such petty manifestations as the meat-cheat scandal—these and the many other forms that adult delinquency takes. And the loss in honor is a national loss, not merely a personal forfeit. Worse than the effect of any bomb is the "fall out" of contamination that an evil example or an evil precept showers upon the people of our land.

In Soviet Russia the state has operated on man for the removal of his immortal soul. The operation has hardly been an unqualified success. You do not separate man from his God by an official decree. But what is happening in Russia must give us pause. The channels of spiritual love, of religious dedication are being forcibly redirected to a

kind of mock spirituality that makes the state the supreme, sovereign, and eternal master of man. All the fires of loyalty, all the muscles of energy are committed to the greater strength, the greater prestige of this man-made master.

It is in the face of this very zeal, of this intense commitment to the Communist ascendancy over the world, that we Americans must shake ourselves out of our moral lethargy, reaffirm the noble and eternal purposes of our lives, and infuse ourselves with the drive and the dynamism by which free men have always preserved the things they held most dear. We must propagate a respect for the good and the true. We must know expediency for what it is—enemy, not friend—a way of dying rather than a way of living. We must take a national and individual morality off the gold standard, and put it back where it belongs—in the soul and in the conscience of Americans.

In this day "know thine enemy" is no less binding an obligation than to "know thyself." We have only to consider the present Communist infiltration of Cuba to realize how real, how immediate, and how ominous is the danger that confronts the free people of this hemisphere. Cuba is Russia and Red China's most noteworthy victory in the Caribbean.

Despite the great historic bonds of friendship between Cuba and America, despite our warmth of feeling for the fine people of Cuba, the fact remains that like a ship boarded by pirates, Cuba stands menacingly off our shores—a grim belligerent, armed with an alien ideology and eager to sail against freedom and democracy—to attack and to destroy. Cuba is the opening wedge that Soviet Russia and Red China have shaped and sharpened to drive into the free Americas. Their massive propaganda attack in Central and South America is a part of the grand strategy: The splitting of the United States from her traditional allies and the concurrent spread of the blood red of communism over the map of Latin America.

In the light of this fateful campaign, I feel strongly that the time has come to re-study and reevaluate the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine presently applies only to external aggression, and not subversion and infiltration. Time and events may now dictate its rewriting, in terms of this actual, modern day internal threat to our hemisphere defense.

Since the subject of defense is such a preeminent matter of national interest, and deservedly so, I feel that the true perspective in this matter has been distorted by a preponderant emphasis on what I might call a "competitive numbers game" rather than on the true, live, and existent capability of this Nation to discourage attack by virtue of the deterrent power of annihilation that we have at our command. We are vividly aware that this counterbalance of retaliatory power must grow as the danger grows—and the President has made it plain that the requisite commitment of talent and money and resources will continue to be made, boldly and imaginatively, to assure our continued unassailable posture of defense in the face of the Soviet threat. The American people, as always, are prepared to pay the price of freedom—but it should be the exact, soundly reckoned price—and not one inflated by hysteria and false fears.

In our time, space has become the exciting new frontier. Progress is measured in the successive breakthroughs to newer, higher areas in the great immensity. Rapt in our gropings toward the galaxies, we fail to see the tremendous and challenging new frontiers that confront the human spirit. We had to fight to create this Nation. We still must fight to keep it strong, to preserve it from threats from within no less than from dangers from without. This is, essentially, the personal responsibility of each one of us, not the anonymous mass responsibility of

a faceless bloc of people. For history is created by individuals—let us always remember this—by people like yourselves. No free-man is ever submerged by history unless he thinks he doesn't count. And then he really ceases to count.

Speaking of the citizen's role in society reminds me of the Russian citizen who lived in a small Soviet village. On election day he dutifully went to the polls. An official handed him a sealed envelope to drop into the ballot box. Our little Russian started to tear the envelope open.

"Hey, what do you think you're doing?" demanded the election official. "I just wanted to see who I'm voting for" said the peasant. "Are you crazy?" bellowed the official. "This a secret ballot."

I spoke a moment ago of the new frontiers that challenge the courage and the imagination of Americans. I am confident that the basic spirituality of our Nation is such that we still possess the reserves of strength that a time for greatness calls for. Apathy and the cult of expediency are only symptoms. They are not a fatal disease. To recognize them—to isolate them—to fight them at every turn—that is the nontransferable responsibility of free men.

In the great world struggle for freedom, it is not enough to be on the side of the Lord. We must remind Him—night and day—by word and deed—that we are on His side—and that we are worthy of the strength, the courage and the love He pours into our hearts.

Proud of Their New American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an editorial that appeared in the February 27, 1960, issue of the Honolulu Star Bulletin entitled, "Proud of their New American Citizenship."

This editorial warmly depicts the great devotion and gratitude of our "new" Americans in Hawaii.

The editorial follows:

PROUD OF THEIR NEW AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Native-born Americans have no full realization of the emotional tug felt by aliens as they take the oath of American citizenship.

Many of these new citizens are well advanced in years. Some are physically feeble. Yet they have spent many hours in the classroom learning American history and institutions. And when they come at last before the naturalization judge for the final ceremony, they stand proudly erect as they accept their new obligations as Americans.

It is not easy to shed a lifetime of allegiance to a homeland rich in tradition and national spirit.

What emotions must have surged through the heart of 93-year-old Hyakutaro Kato, the oldest alien in Hawaii to become an American citizen. What memories must have flashed through the mind of Toyozo Dol, 91, as he put aside allegiance to the Japanese emperor and proclaimed his adherence to the American Constitution and the institutions of democracy.

Many born to their citizenship take it for granted.

No such attitude was exhibited by an eld-

erly Japanese man on Molokai, too feeble to attend the naturalization ceremony. Judge Cable Wirtz administered the oath of citizenship virtually at the deathbed of this intensely devoted new American.

The three elderly new Americans discussed were all of Japanese nationality.

Japanese make up a very large percentage of the citizens who have been naturalized since the passage of the Walter-McCarran Act removed race as a barrier to citizenship.

An almost equally large number of new citizens are Filipinos who have decided to make America their home and to take part fully in the life of their new homeland.

In smaller numbers there are Chinese, Koreans, other Asians, and a good many Europeans.

All approach American citizenship with a sense of dedication and high resolve. Many have known suffering and injustice in the lands of their birth. Most of them have for the first time found opportunity and real freedom under the American flag.

One does not become an American merely by expressing the wish and taking an oath before a judge. Each applicant must meet residence requirements, be vouched for by responsible citizens of long acquaintance, and pass demanding tests in American history and institutions, including basic constitutional law.

Thus reaching the final goal is accompanied by a sense of personal achievement which helps to explain the justifiable pride with which the new citizens stand in court and take the oath of allegiance.

All Americans should feel a sense of pride also that citizenship in our country is so earnestly sought after. There could be no finer tribute to our way of life.

Civil Defense Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the County Board of Commissioners of the County of Roseau, Minn., in support of adequate civil defense appropriations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas civil defense is a necessary part of local government to educate and train the civilian population in ways and means of survival in times of disaster or emergency; and

"Whereas local government is authorized and directed to create local organizations for civil defense in political subdivisions of the State, and to cooperate with the Federal Government with respect to carrying out of civil defense functions, to the end the most effective preparations and use may be made of the Nation's manpower, resources, and facilities for dealing with any disaster that may occur; and

"Whereas local government does not have the necessary funds available to carry out the administration and training programs as prescribed by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization nor in conformity with the recommended survival program of our State; and

"Whereas organization, administration, training of personnel within the local civil

defense organizations, education of the general public in the carrying out the survival program to the extent that an attack by the enemy would result in lesser casualties is primarily a responsibility of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the last Congress passed H.R. 7578, now Public Law 85-606, authorizing Federal assistance to individual States and local governmental civil defense organizations financially, to make possible an adequate coordinated program for the safety of the people and our economy, but failed to provide the necessary appropriations to carry the intent of the law; and

"Whereas the leadership provided by Director Leo A. Hoegh, of the ODCM, outlining the necessity of a definite course of action and recommending certain funds be appropriated for this program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States in its nonmilitary civil defense program, concur with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and with the recommendations of Director Leo A. Hoegh in providing the necessary appropriations requested to make effective the intent of Public Law 85-606 to the fullest extent;

"That in reconvening of the Congress in January 1960, immediate appropriations be made to facilitate the carrying out of the program; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Minnesota, to Director Leo A. Hoegh, and Col. H. A. Schon, Civil Defense Director, State of Minnesota."

STATE OF MINNESOTA.

County of Roseau, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and full copy of a resolution duly adopted by the board of county commissioners at their February 17, 1960, meeting.

EDGAR OUREL,

County Auditor.

Congress Should Not Preempt the White House Conference on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following exchange of correspondence I had with former Congressman Robert W. Kean, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the 1961 White House Conference reveals the reason why Congress should await the results of the Conference.

Let us not waste the \$2 million we have already appropriated to bring thousands of goods minds together to suggest solutions to problems of our aging population. Certainly we should get the benefit of their advice rather than enact legislation in haste and without proper study.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 11, 1960.

The Honorable ROBERT W. KEAN,
Chairman, President's White House Conference on Aging, care of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing to solicit information for the House Ways and Means Committee concerning activities of the President's

White House Conference on Aging. I am informed that State conferences on the aging will be held this year to arrive at recommendations which will be made to the White House Conference in January 1961. These recommendations will probably cover the gamut of housing, recreation, health care, adult education, etc. Your group will have expended in Federal moneys nearly \$2 million under Public Law 908 (85th Cong.) which Congress enacted in 1958. Additionally, you have authority to accept gifts from private groups to further supplement expenditures which will be required to make for an effective conference.

Certain organizations are bringing pressure on Congress to consider solutions to some of the problems of the aging during this year. These pressures urge action, especially in the field of health care of the aged, and would have Congress act without the benefit of adequate study and investigation of these problems—problems which were acknowledged by Congress to be so vast and so complicated as to require a White House Conference at a large expenditure of effort and funds.

My request is for you to give assurance to members of the House Ways and Means Committee that the problems under consideration require the best thinking of such a group of delegates as will attend and participate in State conferences this year and the White House Conference next year, and, further, that dedicated people are at work now performing a chore assigned to them by the Congress.

Would you please be kind enough to furnish the full membership of the Ways and Means Committee with a status report?

Sincerely,

N. M. MASON.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,

EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Washington, D.C., February 19, 1960.

HON. NOAH M. MASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NOAH: I have your letter. It is true that if you include salaries of those who have been assigned to aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there will be a Federal expenditure of approximately \$2 million to carry out the provisions of Public Law 85-908. Most of the funds appropriated for 1959 were used to provide financial support to the States for preparation for the national conference.

No gifts have been received from private groups, nor are any authorized under law. You ask for a status report?

The conference will be held at Constitution Hall here in Washington, January 9-12, 1961.

In preparation for the conference, Secretary Flemming appointed me on May 1, 1959, as chairman of a National Advisory Committee. He has appointed 148 members to this National Advisory Committee to plan the conference with representation from every State. An attempt has been made to have broad citizenship coverage.

This advisory committee had its first meeting last June here in Washington and made decisions as to the composition of the conference, etc., which decisions were accepted by the Secretary.

It was decided that there be 2,800 delegates: 1,740 to be appointed by the Governor of each State. It was decided that the number of these delegates should roughly be based upon the number of Members from each State in the House of Representatives. Six hundred and sixty to be appointed by the Secretary from national organizations which have been active in the field of aging. Approximately 150 will be the members of the National Advisory Committee. And an additional 250 will be appointed by the Secretary—chiefly interested persons and ex-

perts in the various Government departments.

It was planned that this will be a citizens' conference, not merely a conference of specialists in the field so it was agreed upon that it would be recommended to the Governors that two-thirds of the delegates whom they appoint be those who are not specialists in the field of aging.

It was decided that there should be 20 fields for special consideration at the conference.

At a later date I appointed each member of the Advisory Committee to a planning committee allocated to one of these fields. I appointed a chairman well qualified to study the subject and a technical director was allotted to each committee. These chairmen met in Washington last July and with the aid of the technical directors and consultants have been preparing papers giving background information as to the basic facts and issues in each of the 20 fields. Outlines on most of these subjects have already been sent out to the States. It is expected that the final papers will be completed on March 15.

One objective of these papers is to have available information in the hands of each State before they hold their State and local conferences. This should save unnecessary work and duplication, for under the wise provisions of section 202 it is specified that the States after their State conferences are to make recommendations to the White House Conference on Aging. So you will see the conference is planned to work from the bottom up, not from the top down.

Nearly every State has already scheduled a time for its State conference. We are eagerly awaiting these recommendations and we expect that they will be compiled and included in the conference agenda for careful study.

A meeting of another subcommittee was held last week to make specific plans for the conference itself. It is planned that the conference will break up into at least 100 small workshops, of not less than 20 nor more than 30 people, to go over the State recommendations and to make their own recommendations on the subject with which they are concerned. In this way every delegate can take an active part in the conference.

Then these small groups will report to one of the 20 sections covering the subject which they have been studying, and representatives of these sections will, in turn, make a report to the final plenary meeting.

It is hoped that the reports will include both sides of suggested remedial action in these fields and comments on State recommendations, but there will be no balloting at the plenary session.

It is believed that in all probability most of the recommendations will be for State and local activity which seems most effective in this field, though certainly some suggestions as to additional executive and legislative action at the Federal level may be included. In general, at present, the Federal Government activity has been very much greater than at the State level.

The planning committee chairmen are expected to meet here in Washington on April 21 in order that they may work out how the workshops will be conducted.

A second meeting of the Advisory Committee will be held on May 12 to approve the recommendations of the various subcommittees, etc., etc.

As you know, the law provides for a report, including recommendations, to be made to the new President by April 9, 1961.

The fact that the law was passed by a Democratic Congress, under sponsorship of Democratic Members, was signed by a Republican President and is being administered by a Republican Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, leads me to hope

that in every activity the conference will be truly nonpartisan. It must be in order to assure its success.

I will, of course, be happy to give any further information to any of my old and good friends on the Ways and Means Committee.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. KEAN,
Chairman, National Advisory Committee.

Address by Claude R. Wickard on
Rural Electrification and the Agricultural Hall of Fame and Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a distinguished Hoosier, Claude R. Wickard, made a very excellent address at the 18th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis, Mo., on February 25. Claude Wickard served as REA Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture under two Presidents, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. In the St. Louis address he had occasion to comment on the program to establish an Agricultural Hall of Fame and Exposition. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME AND EXHIBITION

(By Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture)

I am most grateful for the privilege and the honor of addressing your great annual convention once more. The last time I addressed your annual convention was 7 years ago in San Francisco when I appeared before you as a bureaucrat. Then I had to speak under bureaucratic restrictions and inhibitions. Because I was under bureaucratic limitations, I couldn't even tell you that I knew that my days as a bureaucrat were nearing an end. I know that some of you sensed that was true because you came to me to personally express your sentiments in the matter. Today I can tell you how much I appreciated your remarks and today I want to tell you how grateful I am to all of you for your cooperation and for your patience and tolerance for my efforts to carry on the responsibilities of REA Administrator.

I did not attend your first convention here in St. Louis 17 years ago. As Secretary of Agriculture, I felt that I was under some severe bureaucratic limitations. Some of you, I am sure, remember that in REA and elsewhere, there were some very bitter controversies concerning your origin and purpose. I was beseeched by sincere friends of REA to denounce you. Perhaps I took the easy way out—the bureaucratic way out—to stay aloof from your early efforts to organize a national association.

Today, as a plain citizen and a member of an REA financed cooperative, I can say just what I think.

First, I want to tell you how pleased I am that you have gained the membership and

influence that you now have. I gain much satisfaction and assurance from your plan to carry the fight to the battle ground chosen by the enemy. The battleground I refer to is the public press. I want to congratulate your president and his board of directors for recommending this plan of action and I commend you co-op officials and members for approving it. It is so wise that you are celebrating REA's silver anniversary in this manner. Otherwise there might never be a golden anniversary celebration. To put it even more bluntly, you are engaged in a fight for survival.

In 1935 your opponents tried to see that REA died aborning. Ten years later they tried to persuade the Congress to decide that there was little or no need for appropriations for the REA postwar activities. In later years they used every tactic in the Congress, and even in the courts, to stop REA cooperatives from obtaining their legal share of power generated by publicly financed hydroelectric plants. They have been equally determined to keep you from putting in your generation and transmission systems. They want to control your source of power and thus keep their hands on your throats, ready to choke you when the time seems propitious.

We won those battles, but it wasn't easy. As an ex-bureaucrat, I can now say some things that I think should be said. In all these battles I had the full support of the President of the United States. At first, it was Franklin Roosevelt and later, it was Harry S. Truman.

Again as an uninhibited ex-bureaucrat, I would like to make a statement about another man which I have never before made publicly. A great part of the credit for the success of your organization and the REA program belongs to your General Manager Clyde T. Ellis. We are so fortunate in having as our leader a man who has so much vision, courage, and determination.

Almost invariably when I talk with veterans in the REA battles of the past, I hear expressions of fear because so few people now realize how difficult it has been to bring rural electrification to its present attainment. When later generations take over, there will be even fewer people who will have any knowledge of the struggles that took place in this field. I agree that this is a matter for genuine concern.

In the last couple of years a movement has started which should go a long way toward meeting this problem of ignorance and indifference. I refer to the program to establish an Agricultural Hall of Fame and Exposition. This program is well under way. A good start has been made on collecting, by public subscription, the \$5 million required by present plans.

A 409-acre site has been purchased. It is located 12 miles west of Kansas City and is bounded by the Kansas Turnpike, U.S. Highways 24 and 40, and State Route 7.

It is fitting and advisable to elect to this Agricultural Hall of Fame men who have made great contributions to the progress of American agriculture. But that is just a part of the program to graphically and realistically preserve for and present to the visiting public what has taken place in the past so that from the lessons learned, we can build more soundly for the future.

In my opinion, nothing could be more important and even soul-stirring in this project than the story of rural electrification if it is told properly.

Clyde Ellis and I are on the board of governors of this Hall of Fame project. I am not on the committee to select the men to be honored. However, I hope that when this committee begins its deliberations, it will give serious consideration to the selection of Senator George W. Norris. During his 40 years in the U.S. Congress, George Norris led more successful battles for

reform and for human rights than any other man. Despite the threats, vilification, and nefarious tactics of the selfish and greedy interests, George Norris never wavered or flinched to do his duty as he saw it.

More than one of his colleagues in the U.S. Senate told me he had the most influence upon the voting in the Senate because he had the respect and confidence of all who knew him.

Just before the end of Senator Norris' long and useful congressional career, my wife and I had the great honor and privilege of entertaining him and his good wife in our Washington apartment.

When the evening meal was finished, we gathered around his chair to glean words of wisdom and to worship at his feet, so to speak.

I started the conversation by making reference to the fact so many of his colleagues who fought by his side in the cause of humanity seemed to lose faith and courage and even became embittered as time wore on. My question was, why did he so steadfastly hold to his course through defeat as well as victory. In his very quiet but convincing manner, he replied by telling us the story of his boyhood on a northern Ohio farm. Because of his father's death, following the runaway of a team of horses, and his brother's death in the Civil War, George Norris at a very early age had to assume many of the responsibilities of a father and breadwinner for the rest of the large family. He became accustomed to privation and hard work. Through all this, his mother exerted upon him an influence which guided him through his illustrious career.

The night he told one story about his mother which I have never seen printed. In those days the wheat harvest brought an opportunity to earn some needed money, since the grain was cut by sickle and bound by hand. On this particular occasion, George was working in the harvest field a few miles from home and it was late on Saturday night before he arrived home.

When he arose the next morning, his mother asked him to sit down with her before he did anything else. She said, "Did you come straight home last night?" George replied, "Yes." Again she asked if he were with a group of men who were guilty of arson the night before. George assured her he knew nothing about it. Whereupon she folded her hands in a prayer of thanks.

This was what had concerned her so much. A machine called the Marsh harvester had been put in operation by a neighbor. This machine cut and bound the wheat into sheaves. Obviously it would displace several men who needed work to support their families. So the men on this night set fire to this machine.

George's mother wanted him to know that it was sinful to burn the machine even though it threatened to reduce or destroy a good source of livelihood for her family. It was George Norris' boyhood experience and his sympathy for the farm women of America that gave him the vision and the determination to bring electricity to rural America.

In George Norris' autobiography, there is a chapter called "Lighting the Farms." I want to read to you four short paragraphs from that chapter.

"I therefore regarded the REA not only as a necessary twin development of the TVA but a step which would extend the blessings of electricity to agriculture throughout the Nation."

"It was a great national undertaking, the utility of which was clothed with the most decent sentimental aspirations."

"I knew the heat of those summer days in a farm kitchen in the Deep South or the Great Plains, where humidity and the blazing sun combined with the stove to create unbearable temperatures. I had seen the drudgery of washing and ironing and sewing

without any of the laborsaving electrical devices. I could close my eyes and recall the innumerable scents of the harvest and the unending, punishing tasks performed by hundreds of thousands of women, uncomplainingly and even gaily and happily; growing old prematurely; dying before their time; conscious of the great gap between their lives and the lives of those whom the accident of birth or choice placed in the towns and cities.

"Why shouldn't I have been interested in the emancipation of hundreds of thousands of farm women?"

At your first convention here in St. Louis in 1943, you had Senator Norris as one of your speakers. I quote one paragraph of his speech that day:

"Oh, how we feel, who are as old as I am, if you've lived the same kind of life I had to live and see my poor old mother, when I was just a baby toddling up the hill, carrying a pail of water, going to the pump and pumping the water, sometimes for the cattle and the horses, always for the house, and carrying it in. I can see her yet taking out of the garden a lot of lettuce, taking it over there near the pump and pumping the water to wash it and get it ready for the next meal."

In 1942 because of some inept handling of his campaign, Senator Norris was defeated in his bid for reelection. He did not want to stand for reelection but some of his ardent supporters prevailed upon him to do so. His defeat saddened him immeasurably. That sadness was reduced by the recognition you gave him in your first annual convention here in St. Louis.

Let me read two sentences from his autobiography which refer to that recognition:

"That final journey to my home in McCook from Washington was marked by an incident which, entirely aside from the personal pleasure it gave me, seemed to lift the curtain of the future."

"In St. Louis at the national convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at which 725 rural electrification projects were represented, I was given a silver plaque upon which were engraved farm buildings connected with REA lines and the Norris Dam."

I have no authority to assure you that Senator Norris will be given a place in the Agricultural Hall of Fame. I can only say that in my opinion, no one person has worked harder, longer, and more effectively for the welfare of rural people. I just don't see how he can be overlooked when the time comes for choosing the men to be so honored.

However that may be, we must keep faith with him and others who made possible the emancipation of farm women and the lightening of the burdens of all rural people through the rural electrification program. We can best keep the faith by keeping up the fight to preserve and improve this program. Your silver jubilee publicity campaign is one effective way of doing this.

Making it possible for the Agricultural Hall of Fame and Exposition to tell the story is another way. We electric cooperative people will have a special opportunity to contribute to the fundraising campaign for this project. Through the good work of Ken Holm and Albert Hauffe, South Dakota cooperative people have already pledged a sizable amount of money. I hope that other States will respond in a similar manner. Such response will help tell the story of rural electrification, in the years ahead, to thousands and thousands of people who otherwise would never have it brought to their attention.

The Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is my honored privilege to be a member, by election, of the Old Guard City of Philadelphia, as well as the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands, and it is through those associations that I have become better acquainted with the unvarying dedication of these inspired patriots to those things that have made our Nation great.

High on the administrative lists of these patriotic organizations are the names of three old friends of mine; namely, Col. Albert E. Herrmann, Capt. Harry S. Burr, and Col. William H. McIntyre. They have distinguished themselves in the military service of their country, in service to their disabled comrades and in the support of human dignity and freedom generally, and it is in their behalf that I am pleased to include with these remarks a brief outline of the preamble and organizational structure of the commands to which they have brought honor and in which they are honored:

CENTENNIAL LEGION OF HISTORIC MILITARY COMMANDS

The Centennial Legion was organized in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 4, 1876, to perpetuate the military organizations who served and protected our country in the early days of its history prior to, during, and subsequent to the Revolutionary War, and to unite together such military commands as still exist, or their successors, in one body, pledged to keep alive their ancient traditions and preserve the records of their military achievements; to foster patriotism, encourage national defense, and aid in upholding the national institutions of the United States in their integrity; keep alive a spirit of fraternity and benevolence among the Armed Forces of the United States; to inculcate respect for its flag and constitution, and obedience to constituted authority; to recognize and honor all citizens who have served or are now serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, its Reserve Forces, and the National Guard of the several States or of the United States; to uphold allegiance to the United States of America and to defend same against all enemies, foreign, or domestic.

The Centennial Legion is the only organization in the world of its character. It is a composite of the citizenry representing every epoch of this country's history.

In the declaration chamber of the Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on Flag Day, Monday, June 14, 1928, a permanent organization was perfected, articles of incorporation were entered into, and the charter was granted by the State of Maryland on the 14th day of December 1935, and was incorporated as the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands.

The first commander of the Centennial Legion was Gen. Harry Heth, of Virginia,

who took office on July 4, 1876. In 1926 when the permanent organization was perfected, Col. Thomas S. Lanard, of the State Fencibles was elected commander. In 1930 Maj. Wellington Wells of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston was elected commander. He was followed by Col. Edward Havemeyer Snyder of the Old Guard of the City of New York in 1932. In 1933 Col. Charles E. Lochhard of the Second Company Governor's Foot Guard was placed in command. In 1935 Brig. Gen. Frank A. Hancock, retired, of the Fifth Regiment Infantry, Veterans Corps, Baltimore, Md., was elected and continued as commander until January 1955.

Capt. Harry S. Burr, of the Veteran Corps, 1st Regiment Infantry, NGP of Philadelphia, Pa., was elected as commander and served until January 1957. Lt. Col. Donald P. Sherman, of the Old Guard of the city of New York, was elected commander and served until 1958. On February 1, 1958, Capt. Augustus J. Migell, of the Ancient and Honorary Artillery Company of Boston, was elected commander, and on January 31, 1959, Col. Wellington B. Searls, USA, Ret., and who was reelected national commander on January 31, 1960, and is now the national commander of the Centennial Legion.

National officers, CLHMC, elected 1960-61, are: 1st vice commander, Maj. Patrick F. Zito of the Putnam Phalanx, Hartford, Conn.; 2nd vice commander, Lt. Col. George Rosenblum of the Old Guard of the city of New York; 3rd vice commander, Lt. Col. O. H. Linck, of the Richmond Howitzers, of Richmond, Va.; and treasurer, Brig. Gen. Aylwyn P. Williams, USAR, of Havertown, Pa.

National directors by States are: Pennsylvania, Capt. Harry S. Burr, Col. Albert E. Herrmann, and Brig. Gen. Aylwyn P. Williams; New York: Lt. Col. George Rosenblum, Col. William H. McIntyre, and Maj. Charles E. Merritt; Maryland, Col. Wellington B. Searls; Massachusetts, Lt. Col. Walter T. Anzoni, Lt. Col. Loring Lucas, and Lt. Martin F. Bashian; Connecticut, Maj. Patrick F. Zito, and Maj. Everett H. Kandarian; Rhode Island, Lt. Col. William I. Baker; New Jersey, Capt. William J. Boyer, Jr.; Delaware, Lt. Col. James G. Maloney; New Hampshire, Maj. A. Erland Goyette; Virginia, Lt. Col. O. H. Linck and Maj. George F. Marable; North Carolina, Maj. Herman L. Bishop; South Carolina, Col. Rudolph D. Zobel; Georgia, Col. Raymond A. Spitzer.

The following historic military commands are members of the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands of the Thirteen Original States:

New Hampshire: Amoskeag Veterans. Massachusetts: Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, First Corps of Cadets, Lexington Minute Men, Second Corps of Cadets Veterans Association, Fusilier Veterans Corps, National Lancers, Lawrence Light Guard, Veteran Association of the First Corps of Cadets, Worcester Continentals.

Rhode Island: Newport Artillery Company, RIM, Kentish Guards, RIM, United Train of Artillery Veterans Association, Bristol Train of Artillery, RIM, Cranston Bules, RIM, First Light Infantry Regiment, RIM, First Light Infantry Veterans Association, Varum Continentals.

Connecticut: First Company Governor's Foot Guards, Second Company Governor's Foot Guards, First Company Governor's Horse Guards, Second Company Governor's Horse Guards, New Haven Grays, Putnam Phalanx, Sedgwick Guards.

New York: 8th Regiment Veterans Association, NGNY, Veteran Corps of Artillery, State of New York, 107th Infantry, New

York Army NG, Utica Citizens Corps Veterans' Association, Washington Greys (258th FA Bn NYARNG), Old Guard of the City of New York, Troy Citizens Corps, Veterans of the Seventh Regiment, Defendarm Association, Veteran Association of the 71st Regiment, NYNG, Veteran Association on 12th Infantry, NGNY.

New Jersey: Morris Guards, Hq 102d Armd. Cav. NJAENG.

Pennsylvania: Veteran Corps, First Regiment, NGP, Veteran Guard, Third Regiment, NGP, Artillery Corps, Washington Greys, Washington Infantry of Pittsburgh, State Fencibles Infantry, Old Guard, State Fencibles, Old Guard Infantry Corps of National Guards, 2d Regt. NGP, Old Guard, City of Philadelphia, Inc.

Delaware: American Rifles (156th AAA Bn. DNG.).

Maryland: 175th Infantry (Fifth Maryland) MdARNG, Veteran Corps, Fifth Regiment Infantry, MdNG.

Virginia: 1st Virginia Infantry Regiment, Richmond Light Infantry Blues, Richmond Grays, Danville Grays, Richmond Howitzers.

North Carolina: Fayetteville Independent Light Infantry.

South Carolina: Washington Light Infantry of Charleston, S.C.

Georgia: Georgia Hussars, Irish Jasper Greens, Republican Blues, German Volunteers, Old Guard of the Gate City Guard.

The city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, along with the 175th Infantry (Fifth Maryland) MdARNG and the Veteran Corps, Fifth Regiment Infantry, MdNG, will be the host this year to the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands of the Thirteen Original States at Baltimore, Maryland on September 23, 24, and 25, 1960.

Lincoln's Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Lincoln's Birthday it was my privilege to participate in services in his memory at the Lincoln Club of Los Angeles. During the course of the evening, a very learned address, entitled "Lincoln's Greatness," was delivered by Mr. Martin Diamond, of Claremont Men's College. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S GREATNESS

What constitutes Lincoln's greatness? In what does Lincoln's greatness lie?

That we love him is good for us, and it does us credit. But to understand rightly what it is in Lincoln that warrants love would do us still more good, and would even do us honor. I do not pretend fully to understand Lincoln's greatness. But I propose to examine with you tonight, briefly, some of the ways men have viewed Lincoln and to learn, from a critical examination of those views, the direction in which our minds will have to move if we are to comprehend and thus appreciate this man.

I propose to examine two popular views of Lincoln and—not to neglect that portion of the populace from which I come, the academy—a certain academic view of Lincoln.

In what I say about these views of Lincoln you will notice an underlying concern with the general problem of political leadership. We will want to see what Lincoln's greatness teaches us for an understanding of the kind of political leadership we need now, that men always need.

How do we love Lincoln? As what, for what? May I tell you how my own love for him was kindled? Perhaps you will recognize in this something of your own experience. When I was a boy in grade school, there was always in my classrooms a framed picture of Lincoln. It was always located just over one of the blackboards. I remember distinctly that it was always covered with chalk dust. And there—as in a gauzy film shot of a Hollywood heroine—was the silent, sad, infinitely kind countenance of Mr. Lincoln. This countenance with its soft, deep, brown eyes instantly confirmed the stories one had heard of sentry boys fallen asleep on duty, condemned to death, but saved when Mr. Lincoln tearfully answered a mother's prayer. This is the man of sorrows Lincoln, the gentle, the tender Lincoln. But the harsh fact is that during the Civil War 267 soldiers were executed for various derelictions of duty and all this with Lincoln's tacit approval. How could it be otherwise, given the terrible circumstances of the war he had to fight? Do I scoff at the Lincoln of my classroom, whom I have portrayed deliberately with an exaggerated bathos? Not in the least. But the view of the tender Lincoln must be enlarged to comprehend the hard Lincoln, in whose armies 267 men were executed, who slapped men into jail and suspended the writ of habeas corpus, who drew unto himself extraordinary executive power, and who pressed his generals to vigorous attack, to destroy armies and not to take cities. The tender Lincoln of tears is a true, but only partly true Lincoln; it ignores the other side of the man, and thus lessens him. It does not do his greatness justice. We have all known and loved gentle men. But gentleness alone—no more than strength alone—does not constitute greatness. If we are to see Lincoln in a way that squares with the greatness we assign to him, then we must go beyond the popular view of the tender Lincoln. We must go beyond that view, preserving its truth but adding to it that which renders more fully the man's greatness. In this way. Yes, he was a gentle man, but he was steel when steel was needed. He forced the crisis of the Union with his famous house divided policy, and this was no tender thing to do. He fought a war, and wars are not won by gentleness. But the soul of a nation is saved, and that the peace that follows war is won by the gentleness of soul of he that does the implacable and terrible things that have to be done in crises and wars. And, to vary a famous modern prayer, he had the intellect, the wisdom to distinguish the things that call for strength from the things that call for gentleness. Lincoln was hard only when and only insofar as hard measures were truly required. It was thus, by his profound understanding of the nature of politics and of the political situation he faced, that he could meet every test with the strength it required, and yet bequeath to his Nation a heritage of moderation and kindness.

This is why we tend to forget that Lincoln pressed the Constitution to its utmost limits, and perhaps beyond. It is because we know he wisely discerned, as far as any man can, what was necessary and exerted power only as it was necessary to his great purposes. We forget, or better, we vindicate his conduct because we know that he never was victimized by the exertion of power never came to enjoy it for its own sake, apart from the great ends to which he was dedicated. I offer one quote from Lincoln

to support my point. You all remember these words from the second inaugural. "With malice toward none, with charity for all." We sometimes forget the words that follow: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." It is the combining of charity and firmness that makes Lincoln great.

Let me leave this point with one further indication of my meaning. Lincoln wielded great power, and at times wielded it nearly dictatorially. You all know Lord Acton's famous and valuable statement. "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely." There is something in Lincoln which goes against Acton or, rather, warns against too simple an agreement with Acton. I think Lincoln shows us the greater wisdom of a wiser man than Acton. I mean the great French writer on America, Tocqueville, who wrote: "Men are not corrupted by the exercise of power or debased by the habit of obedience, but by the exercise of a power which they believe to be illegitimate, and by obedience to a rule which they consider to be usurped and oppressive." There is much more to this problem but I must leave it at this. Lincoln, by his superb and just compound of the tender and the strong has taught Americans how not to be corrupted by the exercise of power or by obedience to it. He teaches us how to face—with a proper fear and yet with a reasonable hope—how to face the task of governing men in a free republic. It is easy to be soft, it is easy to be hard. It is greatness to be both gentle and strong and to know when and how to be each. John Drinkwater in his play has Lincoln say, "I accepted this war with a sick heart." Yes, his heart shrank, but his head and hand were ready to the task. That is his greatness, and we must love it in its fullness.

I turn now to another popular view of Lincoln. Lincoln the common man. He was one of us, this loud laughing, sometimes rowdy, tall galoot of a man. This is the view of Lincoln as the wisecracker, the joke teller, the simple man of homely truths. The poor boy, without education, without advantages, who made good, who was "plain folks" writ large. Is this a true view? Will the Lincoln thus portrayed fit the mantle of greatness we lay upon him? Again I do not scoff. But we must go beyond this. There were a thousand, 10,000 men then, and 10,000 men now who fill this bill. Joke tellers as funny, men without advantages who have made good. It is wrong and it is demeaning to Lincoln to exaggerate his commonness. Let me paraphrase Lincoln to make my point. He was of us, and he was for us, but he was not by us. He was of us, yes. He had our ways, our speech, he sprang from this soil. And he was for us. He bent his efforts to our well-being, he gave infinite dignity to our principles of popular government, and he cared for us. But he was not by us. We did not make him what he was. He was greater than that. His greatness of soul and mind belong not to us, but to man as man. He transcended the conditions of any society as such. But what we can claim, what we can everlastingly claim is that we did accept this prince of men, we gave ourselves to him, we let him lead us, and we have the sense to love him. It is the noblest claim of democracy that this man of humble origin could rise from our ranks, and through our ways, to the height of human achievement.

Let me be specific. Common man? Uneducated? We all remember the story of his scratching his sums on a shovel, by the light of the fireside. True. Fine. But if we flatter ourselves that that is all, that a simple education, a good clear head, and lots of practical experience is enough for the greatness which is Lincoln, we go wrong. Let me remind you of some things about his education. I do not, of course, mean the schoolroom. I mean his studies. Unfortunately,

and as I know only too well, schoolrooms and studies are not always synonymous. As it were, you can lead the student to the schoolroom, but you can't make him think. Lincoln was an extraordinarily well-read man. I have been going over the list of books he read. Merely to name some will make my point. The Bible, Shakespeare, Aesop's Fables, Robert Burns, Lord Byron, Milton, Gibbons, Paine, Euclid, Bacon, Feuerbach, Fichte, Paley, Homer, Plutarch, Cervantes, Blackstone, Story's and Kent's Commentaries, and dozens more. He read lots of history. He mastered some science. He even devoured a Greek grammar. And, of course, he read nearly all the great speeches and writings of American statesmen, and much American history. And, of course, he read more journals, papers, periodicals than I could here list. Let me add this: When I say he read these great books, I mean he really read them. He read intensely, studiously. He committed to memory endless pages of what he had read. He was in the deepest sense a learned man.

What is my point? I want to show what is lacking in the view of Lincoln as common man. Certainly Lincoln had frontier wit, but he had also the brilliance and depth of Shakespeare. He had the best of cracker barrel commonsense and he had also that philosophical wisdom that comes only from intense scholarly, intellectual study. He had the richness and flexibility that comes of practical experience and he had the depth and rigor of the trained philosophical mind, the depth and rigor that comes only to the uncommon mind and that comes only with an uncommon devotion to intellectual reflection. The view of Lincoln as common man is true, but only partly true. Frontier wit, cracker barrel commonsense, practical experience—these make him a splendid fellow. When to this is added genius honed by intense study and reflection we begin to perceive Lincoln's greatness. Frontier wit, cracker barrel commonsense, and practical experience. This was by us. This we gave him, and in this he was only the best of what all Americans had in some degree. But the genius reaching out to the company of great minds in every age and place, that is beyond us. We may give thanks that he happened among us and that we had it in us to accept him. Let me put it this way. He was not, as some would have it, a "cross-section of humanity," but rather a man who shows us to what height the human nature can reach. He was the "common man's uncommon man." We must learn to love his uncommonness and pray that such will rise among us again, and prepare ourselves to accept and not reject it.

I have been speaking of the qualities of Lincoln during this examination of two popular views of Lincoln. Now let me turn to an academic view of Lincoln. Here we will examine especially the policies of Lincoln. It is appropriate to my profession that, during this little talk, I should give you at least one reading assignment. There is a new book on Lincoln that I must mention because I owe it so much. In my brief comments on this academic view of Lincoln, I will be drawing on it heavily and therefore must mention it. I know the author well enough to know he will forgive me my reliance on his work. The author is Prof. Harry Jaffa. The title of the book is "Crises of the House Divided." I recommend it to your attention.

Now to this academic view of Lincoln. It goes by the name "revisionism." In recent years, certain historians have come to revise the established views on the Civil War; hence revisionism. Since trends in scholarship often involve revision of earlier views we have these days several schools of revisionism. I am talking now about the Civil War revisionists. The center of this view is the opinion that the Civil War was a needless

war. It was not, in Seward's phrase, an "irrepressible conflict"; rather it was a repressible conflict. It was a tragic breaking down of our political process, of the give and take, the bargaining and compromise of politics. Extremists arose, North and South, the abolitionists and the "peculiar institution" defenders of slavery as morally sound; and they passionately injected moral issues into politics, thereby inflaming the political situation. And thus the breakdown of compromise, secession and the terrible Civil War. If only the wisdom of a Clay had prevailed, if only politicians had stayed calm and pragmatic all would have worked out. Thus revisionism. But what about slavery? Perhaps the Union would have been saved, but what about slavery? The revisionists have an answer to this. There was no need to fight. The Union could have been saved, compromise would have worked, and slavery would have died a natural death. How so? Because there was a natural limit to the extension of slavery. It would have been unable to advance farther into territories whose soil, climate, and circumstances made slavery unprofitable. And in time it would have died of unprofitability and opprobrium in the South itself.

Now what has all this to do with Lincoln? Why he is the villain of the piece. The anonymous villain, I hasten to assure you. Few are so bold as to name and blame him fully. But there is no other possible implication. While Lincoln was no abolitionist, it was he more than any other man who drew the line on slavery. On this Lincoln was implacable. And that meant that he was implacable on the one issue where the North had to give if secession was to be avoided, because the right to extend slavery into the territories was the very issue to which all of the passions of the South had been drawn. It was Lincoln who molded and hardened northern resistance on the very thing where resistance meant southern secession. Thus he is revisionism's implicit villain. And even more. In the house divided speech, Lincoln made clear the meaning of his policy on the territories. Its whole aim was to turn the Nation's face against slavery, to stop it in its tracks and thus "to place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction." While Lincoln assured the South that, because of constitutional necessity, he would not take action against slavery in the existing States his territorial policy was aimed at the ultimate extinction of slavery everywhere, in territories and States alike. This is what Lincoln meant by his statement that the Nation could not endure half slave and half free, and this was what the South knew he meant. Villainous is it not? It was Lincoln who made the conflict irrepressible. The only way to repress it was to conciliate the South, to abandon any restraint upon slavery. And this Lincoln would not do, nor allow the Nation to do. There was a man who wanted to repress the conflict, and he is the implicit hero of revisionist historians. Stephen A. Douglas. Douglas' policy of popular sovereignty was aimed at extinguishing the political crisis of slavery, by removing it from the Nation's jurisdiction and placing it within the jurisdiction of the localities, the States or territories. Indeed, he denounced Lincoln as being a tyrannical nationalist, who wanted to destroy the Federal character of the Union. Douglas and his policy were the last remaining hope that the crisis might be averted. But in the famous debate of 1858, it was Lincoln who, though losing the election, forced Douglas into such utterances as destroyed his policy and his standing. When the debate was over Lincoln had destroyed the last remaining hope that the crisis might be averted. From that moment events rushed headlong to war. Villainous is it not?

Why did he do it? Revisionism, the

academic view I am discussing, answers explicitly or implicitly, he did it as a politician, an ambitious man desperately seeking issues, the agitation of which would prevent Douglas' domination in Illinois. That is, he took a position ruinous to his Nation for the sake of his own political advancement. I needn't say that this is a view of Lincoln which does very little justice to his greatness. How may he be rescued from this fix? It all depends upon the question of whether slavery was in the way of dying a natural death or whether it needed the hard push Lincoln gave it. All are agreed now that slavery had to go. In justice to Douglas it is probable that he too thought it had to go, and thought his policy the best way to permit it to die. I cannot tonight give the long and careful argument Lincoln offered to sustain his position that the time had come to hold fast against slavery. But as far as I understand him, I agree with him wholeheartedly. I offer you the barest outline of his argument. The American situation regarding slavery was worse in 1858 than it was in 1776 or 1789. From an evil tolerated as a necessity in the expectation that it was dying, millions had come to view it as a positive good. The defense of this positive good was leading millions of men into a denial of the full meaning of the Declaration of Independence, into a denial of the noble principles upon which free government must rest. And nature would not stop this growing and fatal evil. Once before men had hoped it would fade away, but the cotton gin had caused a new birth of slavery, by making it profitable again. Who could say—with new means of simplified labor, of mass production occurring daily—that technology would not give new life to slavery by making it profitable. Soil and climate would not stop slavery because men, driven by economic interest and doctrinal commitment, would find ways to use slavery. Consider only how slavery could have been employed in the mines—the classical occupation of slaves—in the new southwest. No, said Lincoln, it had to be stopped politically, affirmatively and hard. He held back his hatred of slavery, was utterly loyal to the Federal principle of the Constitution with regard to slavery in the existing States. But he found—and this was his superlative skill as a political leader—the great issue—prevention of slavery in the territories—which would rally the majority of the nation back to its ancient faith, to the defense of the Declaration and its principles against the claims of slavery, and thereby to purify the Republic.

I say he was right. When would slavery have died its natural death? 1862? 1863? 1875? 1890? 1900? The imagination boggles at the horrible thought of that disease continuing in our Republic. I say Lincoln was right because he knew a moral issue when he saw one, because he had the superlative skill to win the consent of Americans to his side on that moral issue, because he had the firmness to do what had to be done, and because he did it so that charity might come again to the Nation. On the view of Lincoln held by some of my academic colleagues, he is reduced from greatness to baseness. But they are wrong. His greatness may be vindicated. I have tried to show you what has to be thought through in order to vindicate his greatness. Knowledge of Lincoln does not cool one's ardor. On the contrary, to know him more is to love and honor him more.

One last word and I am through. What does Lincoln teach us regarding political leadership? Emerson said of Lincoln that he was "the executive of the best public sentiment of the country." That tells us much that we need to know about political leadership. Great political leadership is not a matter merely of techniques and means. Nor is it a matter merely of mouthing pious aspirations. Political leadership must be

judged by the ends and purposes to which the led are advanced, by both the ends and purposes it offers and by the extent to which men are brought to fulfill those ends. Great political leadership makes a nation nobler than events could have made it without that leadership. Never was this more superbly done than by Lincoln.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Storage Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written about the investigation into the U.S. grain storage costs, which would give the impression that those who store farm commodities for the Government have been carrying on their business outside the law—or that they have been making huge profits to which they are not entitled to under law.

The facts are, of course, that the rates for storage were set by the Government, not by the people who store these commodities in their own storage facilities, so it is plain to see that if the storage rates are too high it is not the fault of the owner of these storage facilities; hence, it is unfair and unjust to attempt to hold them up to public scorn.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will remember that before 1953 it was necessary for Congress to appropriate each year hundreds of millions of dollars for CCC grain bins and for storage facilities of every nature, over and above the amounts appropriated since 1953. Why? Because in 1953, shortly after the Republicans took control of the White House and Congress, we passed a law which permitted private industry, farmers included, to write off for income tax purposes over a period of 5 years capital investments for the building of agricultural commodity storage facilities which encouraged the building of such facilities enormously, by not only the dealers in such commodities, but also by our farmers and other people who had money to invest.

That rapid writeoff law applied also to farm machinery because we felt that since private investments in all facilities for military supplies and storage were allowed the rapid 5-year writeoff for income tax purposes, then surely private investments for the production and storage of feed, food, and fiber—the most essential military commodities—were also entitled to it.

I have given these facts in order to clear up in the reader's mind the history of this grain storage program. I am sure you remember the unjust criticisms which were directed at the 80th Congress during the 1948 campaign by Mr. Harry Truman and others in his party, claiming that the Republican 80th Congress had not appropriated enough money for grain bins, only to learn after that election that the contracted ship-

ments of such bins from the factories had been unduly delayed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure good profits—and, no doubt, too good in some instances—have been made by those who store CCC commodities, but I'm also sure that after most of those companies paid their local, State, and Federal taxes, their insurance and their high overhead expenses of doing business, and after deducting depreciation and upkeep on their bins and buildings, the repairs on their trucks, shellers, loading and unloading devices, and so forth, that the net returns to total investment would show an entirely different picture than the stories and figures we read about in the newspapers these days.

And again may I say, let us not forget that they did not set the storage rates.

Here is a letter which I feel deserves to be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

McARTHUR CHEMICAL Co.,
Eldridge, Iowa, February 6, 1960.

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: During 1958, our county ASC man encouraged us to go into the business of storing Government grain. After investigation, we decided to erect a 130,000-bushel bin. There were doubts as to getting the site filled, though we were strongly reassured that there was more than enough corn coming in. Our building was ready late that summer, but we only received some 58,000 bushels of corn. Our revenue was \$9,200. Our costs were \$8,030 which includes insurance, monthly inspections, fumigation, taxes, interest, and depreciation based on 10 years. We figure no labor because that was equalized by receiving charges. Nor have we included any reserve for spoilage loss and shrink. That leaves a net profit of \$1,170 on \$34,000 investment, or 3 percent return.

However, during 1960 we should be able to make a reasonable profit because we now have 93,000 bushels of corn. But, of course, this is assuming that there is no reduction in storage rates.

When making the decision on what the rate will be, please bear in mind the reason for private grain storage. That is because heretofore there was excessive spoilage in Government bins. Consequently, private enterprise was invited to store grain at a fee set by the Government. So it doesn't seem fair to lower this fee.

Granted, there are cases of high profits. For instance, the faux pas wherein a party leased a Government building for \$28,000 and grossed almost \$2 million on it. This and other cases are not representative and, therefore, not admissible evidence. The average, small operator must be studied and considered because he went into the storage business at the Government's request and on the Government's terms.

Very truly yours,

M. McARTHUR, Jr.

Minnesota's Own Children's Ranch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recent Senate approval of legislation de-

signed to combat America's juvenile delinquency problems reflects a growing awareness of the problems and the needs of our young people. I wish to call attention to the achievements of a special program operated in Minnesota by the Volunteers of America in line with the purposes of the delinquency control legislation we passed here in the Senate.

The Bar-None Ranch, Minnesota's Own Children's Ranch, located in Anoka County 32 miles from Minneapolis, receives boys and girls referred through the Hennepin County Department of Court Services and the Anoka County Probation Office. These boys and girls come to the ranch for an intensive weekend program of work and play, group therapy, and personal counseling.

This experimental program begun last October shows a tremendous potential cost-saving in treating and rehabilitating children who have got into trouble with the law. It is possible that similar projects near large cities throughout the United States can rehabilitate many children through weekend programs which are far less costly than complete institutional care.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the Bar-None Ranch from the Minneapolis Tribune of January 31 and a subsequent letter to the editor by Lt. Col. Robert E. Nolte, executive director of the Volunteers of America in Minneapolis, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Lieutenant Colonel Nolte is one of our most respected and admired citizens. I have known him for many years and am honored by his friendship.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune,
Jan. 31, 1960]

"RANCH" OPENS NEW VISTA TO DELINQUENTS
TO THE EDITOR:

The January 31 Sunday Tribune story about the Volunteers of America Bar-None operation ("Bar-None Ranch Offers New Approach to Delinquency Fight," by Daniel J. Hafrey) vividly portrayed some of the interesting developments in our weekend ranching program.

Hafrey is correct in calling this effort a fight against delinquency. But especially significant is the fact that in each of these lives the battle for success is being won by the parents and the youngsters themselves. They are not being forced to conform. They are seeking and finding a new way of life.

These parents admit that somewhere they've made mistakes. They still love their children and want to help them.

We can honestly say that the success of the program is due as much to the interest and zeal of the parents of the weekend ranchers as it is to the fine professionally trained and experienced staff working with the boys and girls.

All of the parents agree in advance to attend six group sessions. Many of them continue to attend these sessions long after the requirement is fulfilled, driving 70 miles for each visit. These parents and their youngsters are making a significant contribution to society's quest for an answer to the delinquency problem.

As a parent of five children with many mistakes behind me, I enjoy meeting every Sunday afternoon with these folks, whose courage exceeds my own. How many times

they have said, "We know we've made mistakes. Help us and we'll do our best."

We of the Volunteers of America are thrilled with this new addition to our other Bar None Ranch services. Its success thus far has come because of the excellent background work of the department of court services, which has made possible a diagnostic and treatment approach to each child's problems. This has been followed through by an excellent ranch staff headed by Jack Fallon of the court services department.

Hats off again, though, to these courageous parents. In finding some answers to their children's problems, and in letting the stories be told, they help all society.

Lt. Col. ROBERT E. NOLTE,
Executive Director, Volunteers of
America, Minneapolis.

BAR NONE RANCH OFFERS NEW APPROACH TO DELINQUENCY FIGHT

(By Daniel J. Hafrey)

ST. FRANCIS, MINN.—When 13-year-old Joe first started coming to Bar None Ranch for weekends, his pockets were loaded with candy and small change.

"I'll give you 15 cents if you'll play ping-pong with me," he would tell a counselor. "Will you let me drive the tractor?" he would ask Dick Ketcham, farm supervisor, proffering a candy bar.

One Saturday morning he walked up dejectedly to Ketcham in the barn.

"I don't suppose you'll let me drive the tractor today," he mumbled with a sidelong glance at the burly farmer. "I haven't got any candy bars."

This is where the education of Joe began. "Listen, boy," said Ketcham, who claims no knowledge of psychology or social work. "Do you think I let you drive the tractor because of your candy bars?"

"I let you drive it because you like to do it and I think you can do it. If I didn't think you can drive the thing all the candy bars in the world wouldn't change my mind."

As far back as he can remember, chubby Joe, who lives alone with his doting widowed mother, has tried to buy friendship. Also, he's skipped school with regularity and engaged in petty theft with the same regularity.

That got him before Juvenile Judge Thomas Tallakson and to Bar None.

Now look in at the comfortable office of Lt. Col. Robert Nolte, national youth director for the Volunteers of America, who own the ranch, and executive director of the organization's Minnesota division.

Sitting across the table from a pair of giggling, fresh-complexioned teenage girls, Nolte asked: "Let's hear, girls, what you hope to be and have when you grow up."

Said blond, petite Jean: "I want to be a singer. I want a family, four kids, a nice husband who doesn't run after other women and doesn't drink too much. He must be a good Christian and go to church. I want a church wedding. I want a small house, a good car, no furs and lots of love."

Added brunet, bubbly Betty: "I want to be a secretary or a beautician. I want a family with 13 kids and a nice husband. He doesn't have to be handsome, but he must be a gentleman. He must not drink. I want a big house, a boat so we can water ski, a station wagon and nice clothes. And we'll all go to church."

This, in part, is where the education of Jean and Betty began.

Nolte, who is too modest to claim much knowledge of psychology and social work but has a great deal of both nonetheless, as well as much commonsense and vast experience, looked up after a moment and asked:

"Do you think you can get the kind of nice men you want the way you are living now?"

Jean and Betty smoke heavily. Their language would make a stevedore blush. Both have a long history of conflict at home. At

15, Betty is a compulsive drinker. At 15, Jean has run away from home repeatedly and lived with older men.

That got them before Tallakson and to Bar None.

Joe and Jean and Betty are not the youngsters' real names. But there are girls and boys at Bar None with just these problems. All three are taking part in what Tallakson calls a new and wholesome approach to the growing challenge of juvenile delinquency.

It grew out of a feeling on the part of Nolte and his wife, each in volunteer work for 25 years, that existing youth programs seem to bring no concrete changes in delinquency.

"Giving them recreation, sports, and handicrafts just isn't enough," said Nolte. "We need a more realistic approach that will try to get to the bottom of these youngsters' difficulties."

Nolte went to Paul W. Keve, director of Hennepin County court services. No one is more aware than Keve of the pressures of growing numbers of delinquents, insufficient probation and parole staffs and the overcrowding of juvenile institutions such as Red Wing Training School or Glen Lake Home School.

Besides wanting to save the money required to build new institutions, Keve always is looking for new, more effective ways of treating delinquents.

From the meeting of the two men resulted the new program—first of its kind in the Nation which, Tallakson believes, may set a new pattern.

"Weekend ranching" means that delinquent boys and girls on probation are left at home during the week so they can continue school and lead a normal family life.

On Friday afternoons they are taken to Bar None for 2½ days of hard work, supervised recreation, and intensive counseling. There are farm and housekeeping chores, horseback riding, skating, tobogganing, parties, and indoor games.

Central to the whole program is close supervision and continued counseling, said Jack Fallon, a young, self-assured probation officer from Keve's office who runs the show.

Saturday nights the youngsters break up into small groups for group therapy under guidance of a staff member. They are encouraged to talk out their problems, to try to understand what has led them into delinquent ways. The youngsters comment on and criticize each other's actions, thoughts, and attitudes.

Group therapy, relatively new in Minnesota, has been acclaimed elsewhere as producing good results in treating persons with emotional and behavior problems, adults and juveniles alike.

There's more than the formal sessions. Fallon and his staff are on hand at all times to make a telling point with a boy or girl when necessary.

A counselor may interrupt hay-pitching chores at the barn to talk over his behavior with a boy. Or he may take aside another after undue boisterousness at lunch.

Early Sunday afternoon the parents arrive. They may spend a few hours with their children in the cheery, spacious lodge. Or they may wander down with the children to the lake for skating or sledding. Or they may just go for a walk.

Around 3 p.m. there is a group therapy session for the parents. Again, under guidance of experienced staff members, the parents are encouraged to talk, are helped to understand what has gone wrong with their children, what they may have contributed to their delinquent behavior and what they might do to improve things.

Once again, the exchange between parents is an essential part of the process.

After the session there is a buffet supper for parents, children, and staff. Then the parents take their sons and daughters home for another week of life at home and school.

Launched in October, the program now serves 17 boys and 8 girls. Nobody knows yet how long they will stay there or whether all will benefit. But a stay of 8 to 10 months is a good guess.

Hennepin and Anoka County court services pay Fallon's salary and transportation. A citizens' committee now is trying to raise the \$23,000 it takes to run the program for the first year, in addition to Bar None's free facilities.

Said Nolte: "We think this is a more realistic, deeper reaching approach. This way we don't uproot a child. When he goes to an institution he must readjust all over to living at home after discharge."

"This way he lives his normal life all week long. But over the weekend he gets much more intensive treatment than he could get from an overloaded probation officer. Then, too, the weekend is the time of greatest opportunity for getting into trouble at home. By getting them to the ranch we avoid that."

Added Tallakson: "One of the virtues of the program is the recognition that you can't deal with a child in isolation. Many delinquency problems go back to the home. This program recognizes both the parents' rights with regard to their children and their duties."

Already, said the judge, the program has shown encouraging results.

What Tallakson didn't say, but what helps too, is that parental visits are part of the conditions on which a child goes to Bar None. If a parent refuses to come, his child may end up in Red Wing since he would not benefit from weekend ranching.

The same thing may happen if the child absolutely refuses to go to the ranch. So far, Fallon said, there hasn't been a child who simply couldn't be persuaded to give it a try, although some approach it with real fears.

Tallakson's point was illustrated by one woman whose son has been rebellious, truant and runaway and whose father had threatened to "break his backside down until he minds."

After a half-dozen Sunday visits she conceded that "maybe not all the fault is Jim's. Maybe part of the fault is ours, too."

Said a father whose son by a previous wife just couldn't get along with his stepmother, and who has been skipping school, stealing, and setting fires:

"Down at the plant I run a lot of men and have no trouble. But I have never been able to run Bob. Here at the ranch is the first time anybody can get to him. I sure appreciate what they are doing for us here."

Bob himself, a likeable 11-year-old tow-head who looks as if butter wouldn't melt in his mouth—until he opens it to speak—unwittingly summarized best what to Fallon, Nolte, and Keve is the gist of the program, what they are trying to give their young charges.

When his turn came to lead a song during the after-lunch pandemonium, Bob conducted with gusto a song containing the following lines:

"You must go and stand your trial
You have to stand it by yourself
Oh, nobody else can stand it for you
You have to stand it by yourself."

Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed another of my regularly

conducted polls of public thinking in my congressional district. The poll was based on some of the extremely important issues facing the Congress and the American people today. Total response far exceeded my expectations and the tabulated results virtually constitute a referendum of my district.

My polls are in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers, mailed to the registered voters in the district, regardless of political affiliation.

The district is very representative and is composed of many varied interest groups. It has the wealthy, the poor, and the so-called middle class. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries, and productive farmlands. Its political complexion is slightly Democratic.

The percentage tabulation of the answers on the poll I have just conducted are included below without comment. I trust the results will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

POLL RESULTS

1. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, prophesied a \$4.2 billion surplus for the next fiscal year. Do you feel this surplus should be used to reduce the national debt instead of reducing taxes? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

2. He also declared that our defense installations and aggression-deterrent weapons were adequate to our needs. Do you agree? Yes, 65 percent; no, 35 percent.

3. The budget will recommend for space exploration about twice as much money as was available this year. Would you vote? Yes, 69 percent; no, 31 percent.

4. A bill is pending to provide tax-paid medical and hospital insurance for people eligible to receive social security benefits. Does it have your support? Yes, 53 percent; no, 47 percent.

5. Public Works appropriations, which contain provisions for flood control and rivers and harbors improvements are often labeled "pork barrel bills." Do you oppose them? Yes, 48 percent; no, 52 percent?

6. Has the time come when the United States should insist that the prosperous industrialized nations of the free world join in contributions to aid the underdeveloped non-Communist nations? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

7. Do you believe that the full force and power of the Federal Government should be employed to guarantee the civil rights of all citizens? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

8. The Congress will again be asked to provide funds for urban renewal projects. Do you favor this program? Yes, 41 percent; no, 59 percent.

9. A key issue: Do you favor increased Federal spending to expand the economy in preference to reduced spending to retard inflation? Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

10. There will be a bitter controversy over whether or not to raise the legal interest rate that the Government may pay on long-term bonds. Would you vote "yes" or "no"? Yes, 48 percent; no, 52 percent.

11. Would you favor legislation prohibiting the sale and serving of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial airlines? Yes, 63 percent; no, 37 percent.

12. Legislation is pending to increase minimum wages above the present floor of \$1 per hour. Should it be passed? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

13. (Answer by number.) If a Democrat is to be our next President, do you favor (1) Stevenson, (2) Symington, (3) Kennedy, (4)

Humphrey, (5) Johnson, (6) Somebody else? (1) 20 percent; (2) 12 percent; (3) 35 percent; (4) 7 percent; (5) 13 percent; (6) 13 percent.

14. (Answer by number.) If a Republican is to be our next President, do you favor (1) Nixon, (2) Rockefeller, (3) somebody else? (1) 69 percent; (2) 20 percent; (3) 11 percent.

Medical Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we Americans have come to realize that a strong civil defense program can be an effective part of overall deterrent strength against enemy attack. If a nation has the plan it must have to recover quickly from an all-out attack, those who might launch such an attack will think long and hard before making any such decision.

Any such program must obviously rely heavily on medical civil defense. In an article in the February 1960 issue of the Journal of the Medical Society of New Jersey, Jack R. Karel, M.D., discusses this vital matter. Dr. Karel is chairman, Civil Defense Committee, Union County Medical Society; medical coordinator, Union County Civil Defense and Disaster Control; and a member of the Special Committee on Disaster Medical Services, the Medical Society of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CIVIL DEFENSE¹

(By Jack R. Karel, M.D.)

History has shown that when the "chips are down" the doctors of this country were ready for any medical emergency that arose, whether it was in war, floods, hurricanes, explosions, railroad accidents, and so forth.

Since World War II, regardless of the apathy (a word I am beginning to detest) amongst the general public and the medical profession particularly, the lack of proper leadership by the Federal Government, the Congress, and State executives throughout the United States and especially by lack of medical leadership in the State medical societies, certain county medical societies in collaboration with the county civil defense and disaster control organization have gone ahead and developed excellent medical civil defense organizations. This has been possible only through the concerted effort of a hard core of individuals dedicated to civil defense. Many of them have given much of their time to the enhancement of local medical civil defense organization. In the past 4 years this constant pressure and enlightenment of the medical profession is beginning to bear fruit.

There is much to be done yet in enlightening every doctor about his medical civil defense responsibilities, but the opening wedge has been made. Naturally, more progress will be made in some areas than in others,

Footnotes at end of speech.

but progress there must be. In this atomic and hydrogen age, space and missile activities, time is of the essence. The medical profession is the most important division of civil defense. We doctors must not falter and get behind the times. We must not show any sign of helplessness. We must demonstrate with our knowledge that survival is possible, especially when proper precautions are taken ahead of time. We must not sell ourselves or America short.

What can we as doctors do to enhance the capabilities of survival in the nuclear age? We can surely do something—giving a very small amount of time—even as little as 1 hour a month, or more if possible, to the cause of medical civil defense throughout New Jersey. If we do this, we will show the general population of America that we doctors are not deaf when asked to think about defending ourselves against a possible nuclear attack.

How can we by devoting a small amount of time contribute to the survival of this country? The answer is to devote this time to the medical civil defense program in each municipal and county civil defense organization. Medical civil defense may be divided into the following categories, each of which will be briefly touched upon: organization, emergency first aid, hospital disaster plans, radiation defense, and civil defense emergency hospital.

On March 10, 1955, the Governor of New Jersey signed a proclamation entitled "The New Jersey State Disaster Control Plan" part of which is as follows—"I do further proclaim that the aforementioned New Jersey State Control Plan and the requirements, rules and regulations set forth therein shall, according to their respective terms be binding upon all political subdivisions, public agencies, public officials and employees and upon each and every person of the State." This was the beginning of the State, county and municipal civil defense organization as we have it today.

EMERGENCY FIRST AID

Every doctor must become familiar with newer concepts of treatment in this nuclear age of such urgent conditions as hemorrhage, fractures, blast damage, shock and burns. Doctors must learn that the key to management of disaster victims is Sorting.² Under this heading the following divisions come into focus:

1. Casualties requiring minimal treatment.
2. Casualties requiring immediate care.
3. Casualties whose surgical treatment may be delayed without immediate jeopardy to life.
4. Casualties whose therapy will be expectant (the most critical group).

To be effective, each municipal civil defense organization must have readily available medical teams to go to the scene of a disaster, able to function individually or to set up first aid medical posts throughout the community, for example, in schools. A mobile team to go to the disaster areas might consist of two doctors and a nurse or one doctor, one dentist and a nurse. Each should have available and easily transportable a first aid emergency kit about the size of an army foot locker containing essential medical supplies. The first aid medical post team would be a larger medical organization for emergency service.

Every hospital must have a hospital disaster plan, for only then will the hospital be able to cope with large numbers of injured in a disaster. The plan must be tried out so that the organization will function smoothly. The Boy Scout organization and rescue squads are very cooperative and willing to assist in this endeavor.

RADIATION DEFENSE

Every doctor must become familiar with the medical aspects of nuclear radiation. He must learn more about alpha, beta, and gamma

ma rays than he ever learned in medical school. He must have some basic knowledge of bomb fallout and how the bomb causes blast damage, burns, and hemorrhage. It is essential that he know how much radiation a person can take each day and how much is lethal. The field of radiation is now a most important medical problem.

THE CIVIL DEFENSE HOSPITAL

The final category in medical civil defense is that which has come into being during the past 3 years and which is essential near potentially critical areas. This is the emergency civil defense hospital. It is a 200-bed, completely equipped hospital. The equipment, when packed, weighs approximately 13½ tons. The packaged unit can be loaded into one large van truck and transported when needed. The mission of this civil defense emergency hospital is to provide early hospitalization for the seriously ill and injured casualties as close as possible to the stricken area for life saving, initial and reparative treatment or surgery. It is recommended that the supplies and equipment be set up in a preselected public building in time of emergency. Modern school buildings not more than two stories in height are preferable.

In establishing the medical organization for these civil defense emergency hospitals, the disaster plans of the fixed hospitals must not be disturbed. Doctors for the emergency hospitals must come from those not having an assignment in a hospital disaster plan. To accomplish and arrange a competent staff for the civil defense hospital, it is advisable that there be collaboration between the civil defense committee of the county medical society and the county civil defense coordinator and his medical coordinator. Before such a meeting takes place, the council of each county medical society must announce its policies to the complete membership and must stress each member's responsibilities to civil defense.

Civil defense is here to stay and has become a way of life whether we like it or not. By joining in voluntarily with the thousands in other walks of life, to enhance the capabilities of civil defense, we will be contributing immeasurably a most important factor for our survival and the survival of this country, and giving notice to our potential enemy not to underestimate our people.

¹ Developed from an exhibit at annual meeting of the Medical Society of New Jersey in Atlantic City, Apr. 25 to May 1, 1959. Dr. Karel is chairman, Civil Defense Committee, Union County Medical Society, medical coordinator, Union County Civil Defense and Disaster Control, and member of the Special Committee on Disaster Medical Services, the Medical Society of New Jersey.

² Ziperman, H. H.: Symposium on Management of Mass Casualties. Brooke Army Medical Center, M317-18: 116 (1958).

Inflation Is a Deadly Menace to All Segments of American Life

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, inflation has long been recognized as the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem. Today we are congratulating ourselves on what appears to be a current lull in

rising prices. While we may be entitled to congratulate ourselves, nevertheless there must be no cessation of our anti-inflationary efforts. Constant vigilance is the price of avoiding further inflation. I heartily concur with the opinion of President Eisenhower and many other responsible leaders of American thought that inflationary pressures continue to be a dire threat to the American economy.

Past experience has taught us that without continued efforts to curb price advances and to restrain inflation-breeding situations, renewed increases in prices may well occur. We must not be complacent. We must not allow the dollar to be further deflated. It is for this reason that I am speaking to you today and urging that all thoughtful Americans unite in a common effort to oppose rising prices.

As the Committee for Economic Development has recently stated, continuing inflation will:

Undo one of the major achievements of recent generations. Never before have so many people, even of the lowest income groups, owned some liquid assets such as bank deposits, savings bonds, insurance policies, and savings and loan shares. With this has come a great independence and freedom of the average man. Inflation will eat away the values of these savings. Workers who now have a large investment in private and public pension funds would be among the chief victims of the process, since they will be forced to rely on fixed pensions, whose value has been eroded by inflation, to support themselves after they retire.

Recently, I read a headline, "December Living Costs Drop to October Level." This is encouraging news. However, let us not be deceived. We must not forget that from 1940 to 1953 the cost of living increased 91 percent and that during President Eisenhower's 7 years in the White House the cost of living has increased 9.8 percent. In other words, during the 20-year period the total increase is over 100 percent. Although it is quite true that the average increase last year, 1959, was less than 1 percent, we must ask the question, Will the price spiral be renewed? Prices for food, clothing, and durable commodities, including automobiles, were lower in December than in previous months. Nevertheless, service items, including medical care, transportation, light and heat are still mounting.

It is common knowledge that the dollar today is worth less than half its 1939 value. In other words, in 1939 a dollar was a dollar. From 1939 to 1952 the dollar dropped 48 cents or to 52 cents. Despite President Eisenhower's efforts since 1953 to halt the decline in the value of the dollar, today, the experts tell us, a dollar will only buy as much as 48 cents did in 1939.

A few startling statistics will explain this deflation of the dollar. Since 1939, food costs have risen 150 percent, medical costs 111 percent, rents 90 percent, and gas and electricity 17 percent.

Inflation has been called many things. Essentially, it is a continuous and unchecked general rise in prices.

Inflation has been explained by several different theories. The methods used in tackling this monumental problem de-

pend, of course, upon the approach to the problem. According to the classical economic theorists, inflation is essentially a monetary matter. When money and credit rise out of proportion to the output of goods and services—prices rise. I am sure we all have frequently heard the definition of inflation as "too much money chasing too few goods."

Currently, however, inflation is also being analyzed in terms of cost-push factors. That is, many economists and other experts believe that rising costs, particularly wages, rather than the forces of demand and supply in the marketplace, tend to cause increases in prices. Certainly this analysis appears valid as applied to the 1957-58 uptrend in prices. The price rise in those 2 years occurred in the face of unemployment and excess productive capacity.

Whatever the controversy concerning the causes of inflation, there can be no question as to the effects of unchecked price rises.

Let us look squarely at some economic facts. According to the latest survey of Consumer Finances of the Federal Reserve Board, the average family income in the United States in 1958 was \$5,150. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is no princely sum. Furthermore, in that year 20 percent of all families had incomes of \$1,890 or less. What effect would a resurgence of inflation have on the average American family? How could the American home survive further deterioration of income through a renewal of inflation?

The dire experience of the past should warn us against the dangers of the future. A man with a wife and two children, who earned \$5,000 in 1942 needed about \$9,300 last year to be as well off. What of the \$5,000-a-year man today? What will be his plight in 17 years?

Those who are most severely affected by steep advances in prices are our senior citizens, retired persons, and those approaching retirement. The income of these individuals cannot be boosted with every increase in prices.

Today there are more than 15 million older citizens in the group of those 65 years of age and over. These senior citizens comprise between 9 and 10 percent of the population. In contrast, there were only about 9 million older persons among us in 1940. In view of the steadily increasing proportion of older people, we may expect 25 million aged 65 and more by 1980. In other words, Americans are living longer and there are more of them.

As the proportion of seniors in our total population expands, so does the number of retirees. Almost half a million persons are added each year to the number of retirees.

In this wealthy land of ours which takes such pride in high standards of living, the median income of all persons 65 years and over was under \$1,000 as of March 1958.

At least 1½ million of our citizens and a considerable number of dependents are living on private pensions. Monthly benefits total \$950 million. Eighty-five percent of these private pension plans have been started since 1940.

However, the value of a 1940 pension of \$150 per month has been more than cut in half, in terms of purchasing power. What will happen to these retirement systems if inflationary forces once again gain momentum? Another 13.5 million persons are receiving old-age, survivors, and disability insurance under the Federal social security system. Although old-age and survivors insurance benefits have been increased several times in the past few years, the average monthly old-age pension in 1959 was only \$73.

There are now at least 57.8 million workers covered by old-age and survivors insurance programs. Renewed inflation would take a tragic toll of the future welfare of these citizens.

In addition to persons living on retirement, there are about 2½ million recipients of public old-age assistance. Payments currently average almost \$65 a month, compared with \$19 in 1939. Over the years, public old-age assistance has had to keep step with inflationary tendencies. How far will \$65 stretch 10 years from now?

Inflation has corroded the benefits of pension and annuity plans. In addition, the value of many other different forms of savings has shrunk in the wake of spiraling prices.

As I mentioned earlier, an unprecedented number of Americans own bank deposits, bonds, insurance policies, and savings and loan shares. These Americans have followed the ideals of thrift and savings. Many are planning to supplement retirement incomes, provide for their children's education, for a vacation or for an emergency. Such Americans have been unsuspectingly robbed of the full value of their savings by inflation.

To demonstrate the toll that inflation has taken of financial assets, one study showed that a given sum of money invested in various media on December 13, 1948, would have had the following real value 10 years later: Cash in the bank, a loss of 16.7 percent; preferred stocks, a loss of 25 percent; U.S. Treasury bonds—2½s of 1967-72, a loss of 29 percent.

How the value of the Government bond has plunged over the years is a notorious chapter in our economic history. I have just quoted one example. There are many others, with especial reference to the smaller denominations of savings bonds, so important to the average American. The value of currently outstanding investments in U.S. savings bonds amounts to around \$49 billions. How can we urge Americans to be patriotic and "Buy U.S. Savings Bonds," if the future value of these securities dwindles and dwindles?

In addition to Government savings bonds, savings accounts in savings and loan associations have mounted to about \$48 billions. Accounts in mutual savings banks and in savings accounts of commercial banks have a value of \$34 billions and \$60 billions, respectively.

An unprecedented number of Americans own life insurance—about 280 million of us. Preliminary estimates place

the value of all life insurance now in force in the 50 States and Puerto Rico at \$534 billions.

I am stressing the evils of inflation because of my concern with maintaining the future integrity of these vast investments.

My warnings concerning inflation include the wage earner. It is an undisputed fact that the American workman "never had it so good." To quote a recent study by a well-known international labor union, "the average wage in 1958 was 157 percent of what it was in 1948; prices in 1958 were 130 percent of what they were in 1948."

But we forget that inflation has levied an indirect tax on wages and salaries.

A very revealing table, appearing in the January 1960 Economic Report of the President, likewise illustrates the tribute exacted by the pirate inflation. Average spendable weekly earnings of a worker with three dependents amounted to about \$25 a week in 1940. In 1959, this spendable weekly income had climbed to about \$30 or an increase of \$5. However, inflation has cut the value of this dollar gain almost in half.

About 3.4 million workers are covered by cost-of-living increase provisions. As the cost of living advances, an increase in hourly wage rate is guaranteed. Let us think for a minute. These gains may be very costly to the workers receiving them. As labor costs are raised, so then are prices in these industries. Thus the products of such industries become less and less competitive with those of other domestic industries which are not bound by escalator clauses in wage contracts. And, too, industries which grant cost-of-living wage increases become less and less competitive with imports from countries abroad where wages are so much lower than in the United States.

Prices chasing wages which in turn chase rises in the cost of living can only spell economic disaster by pricing goods out of the market. Thus apparent wage advantages of today run a serious risk of being wiped out tomorrow.

I have reviewed briefly the tragic tale of the economic hardships inflicted upon millions of our citizens by inflation.

It is all well and good to talk about inflation. The big question is, "What can we do about it?" The administration has utilized a variety of measures to restrain inflation. So some extent these have been effective. Excessive Government expenditures above and beyond receipts have an inflationary influence. This we all know. I believe that the President's hold-the-line budget should assist materially in the continuing restraint of inflationary forces.

The President has made provision for a \$4.2 billion surplus. This he proposes to use in paying off some of the huge national debt. Such action will surely in the President's own words, "help counteract inflationary pressures." When the Federal Government cannot meet its expenditures by revenues, it must turn to borrowing. Such fiscal actions usually add to the supply of money. Thus, with some debt retirement, the amount of funds in circula-

tion will actually be reduced. This in turn will diminish inflationary tendencies.

In examining the national budget, we must constantly view Government expenditures with a critical eye toward economy. I do not mean that we should shortchange the defense and national security of our country. But we must be assured that we have the most efficient organization for production of arms. As President Eisenhower insists, we must be assured that we receive a dollar's worth of arms for every dollar spent.

Now let me turn to other means of dealing with inflationary trends in the economy. As we have seen, excessive expansion of money and credit frequently produces upswings in prices. The Federal Reserve Board is the chief regulator of the monetary system in the United States. Various courses of action are available to the Board to contract the supply of money and credit, by restricting the lending power of commercial banks. This goal is accomplished through open-market operations, raising reserve requirements of member banks, and raising the discount rate.

With interest rates raised to an all-time high through action by the Federal Reserve, the high cost of borrowing funds has tended to place a check upon feverish business activity, and in turn, upon prices.

Management of the national debt is also a prime factor in controlling inflation. I have praised the President's intention of paying off some of the national debt. However, there is another aspect of debt management which requires our attention. Many financial specialists believe that a great proportion of the debt should be in longer term securities than is now the case. Meeting payments on short-term debt and constant refinancing requires borrowing and more borrowing. This in effect increases the supply of money and credit. As the President has suggested, a helpful move would be to eliminate the ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates on long-term Government securities, those maturing over 5 years. Thus the Treasury would have greater flexibility and market appeal in sale of intermediate and long-term bonds. Consequently, undue expansion in the supply of money and credit would be curbed.

So much for monetary and fiscal measures utilized in coping with inflation.

No honest discussion of inflation can overlook the recent prolonged steel strike.

It is the situation in the steel industry which may contain the sparks of renewed inflation.

As I have indicated, there are the proverbial two schools of thought concerning causes of inflation. The newer school emphasizes rises in price levels as a result of boosts in wage rates above improvement in productivity.

The recent steel strike is a case in point. Steel production is basic to our economy. But for 116 days the steel furnaces were idle. As a result one-half a million workers were unemployed.

Let us examine the steel settlement for a moment. The many clauses of the new contract add up to this: Wage and fringe benefits up to 40 cents an hour over a 30-month period.

Despite the increases in wages steel management has announced that there will be no immediate price increases. Nevertheless, Mr. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., has stated that for the past 20 years, employment costs have been upped on an average of 8 percent a year and prices have been increased 5.5 percent.

On the heels of Mr. Blough's statement many ask this question: How then can we escape another advance in the price of steel, even though employment costs have been raised less than half of the above 20-year average?

They assert it is true that improvements in productivity have been emphasized as a means of preventing advances in prices. However, those skeptical insist that a sincere, all-out effort will be needed to stem another upturn in prices of steel. Yet their attitude is one of doubt. They ask: What effect would another rise in steel prices have on the economy as a whole?

They remind the public that steel is used in all kinds of machinery, buildings, railroads, automobiles, trucks and in many other ways. They stress the fact that steel literally pervades our entire life. Finally, the skeptics ask: How is it possible, then, in the event that steel prices are raised a notch in a few months, say, that a general surge in prices can be avoided?

Concluding, they urge a more positive and stringent approach to the problem of the pressures on the general price level exerted by strikes for increases in wage and fringe benefits.

In this connection, many suggestions have been put forward. The President stated in his state of the Union message that he will "encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table." Such discussions presumably would deal with general problems of the economy, such as the disaster of inflationary prices, as well as questions relating to specific industries. Such friendly talks will be helpful, I am sure.

Other tools for dealing with strikes have been suggested. Factfinding boards of inquiry which are empowered to make recommendations should be established as soon as a strike is declared, some say. Others say the Federal Mediation Service should be called immediately into a labor controversy. Some feel that in the last analysis we may be forced to establish compulsory arbitration, with representatives of consumer interests well represented on the arbitration panels. It may well be that all of these procedures should be included within the possibilities of labor law yet many urge that those stubborn cases which refuse to give way to settlement within a reasonable period of time should be submitted to compulsory arbitration.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have reviewed the story of the ravages of inflation. I have discussed those measures which have been successfully instituted in

fighting this scourge of our economy. In addition, I have felt impelled to warn against the possible renewal of price upswings. To guard the economic security of our country we must institute additional machinery now for preventing further erosion of the economic foundations of our Nation.

Crack the Filibuster, and No Yielding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, contains some very pertinent comments on the current civil rights debate.

The editorial warns against the danger that Senators reluctant to shut off debate would be agreeable to weak legislation. It points out correctly that civil rights diluted would be a triumph for the filibuster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRACK THE FILIBUSTER, AND NO YIELDING

Yesterday was more of the same in the Senate, and no one could be sure how much longer the small southern minority would go on filibustering.

To the complaints of "ordeal of torture," the relevant answer, of course, is that the southerners can any time stop the torture by agreeing to a vote on the pending civil rights legislation.

But they are clearly not ready for surrender, and thus it must be assumed that the minority has trust in lungpower and quorum calls to the point where the majority yields either completely or accepts compromise.

This, however, isn't happening. For one thing the windbagery has only just begun. Senator JOHNSON, with perhaps a sense of humor, thinks there ought to be plenty of debate (around the clock to provide ample opportunity) on insuring the Negro's right to vote. And this is precisely what the southerners are getting until such time as enough of the majority may or may not become restive enough to invoke cloture.

In our opinion, there is nothing much lost in letting the so-called debate go on for a while. Certainly the minority is proving to the public the emptiness of its case.

But what the majority should understand is that there must be no resort to compromise. True enough, Senator RUSSELL denies that he has any thought of "wrapping an olive branch around a white flag," but we imagine the Georgian would listen to terms.

This is precisely the danger—that the Senators reluctant to shut off debate would be agreeable to weak legislation. Thus the southerners would in effect gain a victory, because when it comes to making the Negro vote an actuality there has to be strong law. Civil rights diluted would be a triumph for the filibuster.

If this thing has to be settled by a test of physical endurance, so be it. But let's have a law with meaning.

The Growing Problem of Footwear Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1960, I had the pleasure of meeting with officials of the United Shoe Workers of America, AFL-CIO in Washington, D.C. Present at this meeting were Mr. George Fecteau, president; Mr. Angelo G. Georgian, general secretary-treasurer, and many others. Due to serious illness, Mr. John Jankowski, President of the Independent Shoe Workers Union of Brockton, was unable to attend.

This group is greatly concerned about the growing problem of imports of footwear into the United States and I submit the following facts to the Members of Congress:

Imports of footwear of all types have increased from 3,601,000 pairs in 1949 to 80,508,000 pairs in 1959. Practically all of this increase has taken place in the last 5 years—since 1954. In 1954, footwear imports of all types—leather, rubber, and other materials—totaled less than 8 million pairs. In 1959, they totaled over 10 times that number.

Over the same period, our exports of all types of footwear have been declining. We exported 5,759,000 pairs in 1949, as compared with less than 3,750,000 pairs in 1959.

In other words, in 1949 we exported roughly six-tenths of a pair of footwear for each pair we exported. In 1959, we imported over 21 pairs for each pair we exported.

Dollarwise, imports of all types of footwear have skyrocketed from about \$6 million in 1949 and \$11½ million in 1954 to nearly \$94 million in 1959. On the other side of the picture, the value of our exports of all types of footwear, which totaled over \$19 million in 1949, had fallen to less than \$12 million in 1959.

While the greatest increase in imports has been in rubber footwear, there has also been an alarming growth in imports of other types of footwear. Nonrubber footwear imports in 1959 were over twice as large, in numbers of pairs as in 1957, and nearly four times as large as in 1954. The number of pairs of men's, youths' and boys' leather shoes imported in 1959 was twice as large as in 1957 and more than eight times as large as in 1954. In women's, misses, children's, and infants' leather shoes, the increase was even more striking. Imports in this classification in 1959 were about 2½ times as large as in 1957 and almost 13 times as large as in 1954.

Continuation of this trend cannot fail to have serious consequences for American shoe workers and their employers. Imports of nonrubber footwear grew from only about 1 percent of domestic nonrubber footwear production in 1954 to over 3½ percent in 1959. If rubber footwear is included, the increase in relation to domestic production is even more striking. Imports of footwear of all kinds have grown from about 1 percent of domestic production of all kinds of footwear in 1954 to over 10 percent of domestic production in 1959.

While the average value per pair of our leather footwear exports has been rising since 1954, the average value per pair imported from many foreign sources—Italy, Switzerland, West Germany, France, and Spain—has decreased. Large numbers of shoes in

the leather classification came in during 1959 from Japan, Hong Kong, Mexico, and Czechoslovakia at very low average values—as low as 57 cents a pair average value for women's shoes in the leather classification from Hong Kong.

Friends of the American shoe worker must not lightly disregard these alarming trends in footwear imports. Unless proper consideration is given to the protection of the American shoe worker from competition from underpaid foreign labor, he will find his employment prospects, his income, and his standard of living seriously affected by the rising tide of footwear imports.

Disposal of Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I know that many Members are following the outstanding series of articles on India appearing in the Washington Post and written by J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post. Mr. Wiggins has just returned from an extensive tour of that nation.

The third article in this series, dealing with disposal of American surpluses in India, was a particularly searching examination of this troublesome field.

Mr. Wiggins, who comes from my neighboring State of Minnesota, well knows and understands the problems of American farmers who are being hampered by the great production which has resulted from their improved technology and efficiency, but he also rightfully points out that there are many weighted considerations which must be taken into account when disposing of the great American agricultural surplus.

I commend this article to the attention of all who are seriously concerned about the surplus problem in this country and the hungry problem abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS HUNGER FOR SURPLUSES OF UNITED STATES

(The executive editor of the Washington Post has just returned from an extensive tour of India. This is the third of a series of stories reporting his findings.)

(By J. R. Wiggins)

India's food deficits and America's surpluses ought to go together like the "love and marriage" and a "horse and carriage" of the song hit.

They are as complementary as the parts of a mortise and tenon joint.

They do go together, to a degree. Under Public Law 480, the United States, since 1956, has agreed to furnish India surpluses worth \$959.73 million. These have been paid for in counterpart funds, the rupee accounts of which are expendable in India and thus do not add to India's foreign exchange problems.

They have gone largely to projects under India's 5-year plans.

These programs have included more than 10 million tons of wheat and 350,000 tons of rice.

BILLION A YEAR FOR STORAGE

They have come out of the bulging warehouses of America's surplus agricultural commodities, on which the country is spending \$1 billion a year for storage (more than \$1 million a day for wheat alone).

To a sixth grade student of arithmetic it looks as though we could save \$1 billion a year by giving India the whole stock—kit and kaboodle.

Why haven't we?

One of the reasons for my trip was to find out why India didn't ask for more and why we didn't send her more—if not all—of our surpluses.

There are encouraging reasons to believe the program will be stepped up. Among them is the projected visit of S. K. Patil, Minister of Food and Agriculture, who is bringing to the United States his plan to put from 1.4 million to 5 million tons of wheat in reserve storage. Patil began to mull over his plan long ago. He got more steamed up over it as the result of figures supposed to have been given President Eisenhower:

"Every year the earth produces 1.7 billion tons of food. Divided equally among the planet's 2.8 billion people this would furnish a diet of 2,350 calories to each one. But the United States has surpluses worth \$9.2 billion—1.4 billion bushels of wheat."

STORAGE BINS ABUILDING

The Indian Government has begun to add to storage capacity and to buy land for more bins. A dispersed storage is envisioned so that supplies may be quickly available in case of crop failures. The plan has the interested backing of the Prime Minister. Patil is thinking of initial storage of 55 million bushels.

This is a needed and a useful and prudent thing to do in a country with limited storage facilities and the menace of local shortages. It costs the United States 17 cents a bushel to store grain; some Indian experts think they can store it for 7 cents. (FAO figures do not show this discrepancy.) It would meet a greater need at a lesser cost in India. It would help to stabilize prices in India too.

The best place to store grain (and the cheapest) is in the bellies of hungry people. There is (according to social scientists) no large-scale starvation in India; but the odds are they are well-fed scientists. There are plenty of people who can and should eat more. Even 130 million bushels in Patil's outside plan wouldn't notably diminish the wheat stocks we are piling up at 400 to 500 million bushels a year.

OBSTACLES ARE LISTED

What holds up a larger movement? What are the obstacles in India?

There is some fear that accumulations of counterpart funds in rupees might have an inflationary effect, or at least put into foreign hands too much control over Indian monetary stability.

Some Indian officials fear Indian farm output might slow down if relieved of the pressure of stark necessity.

There is some fear that heavy in-shippments would unsettle the markets of Indian farmers and thus slow up their production.

There is uncertainty about the ability to handle the off-loading and dock storage and transport of a greatly accelerated movement. Wheat shipments are all off-loaded in bags at a rate as slow as only 1,000 tons a day compared with 5,000 tons off-loading rate for bulk grain at modern terminals.

Flat storage construction might cost from 35 to 70 cents a bushel and not all experts agree it is as good as upright concrete stor-

age which costs from 75 cents to \$2 in the United States. (This would be another drain on foreign exchange.)

In the Indian Government there is an astonishing unanimity of belief that food grains should not be brought in under title III in the form of grants for charitable distribution except in cases of flood, famine, and disaster. I heard warnings about demoralizing the needy with free contributions that I hadn't heard since debates on the relief bills of the 1930's in the United States.

Worry was expressed that our surpluses will not last forever and India might develop a dangerous dependence and then be suddenly left without American grains.

Many of these objections to larger intake of wheat do credit to Indian prudence, pride, and independence. They are, in part, however, considerations that a short diet for Cabinet Ministers probably would remove.

OBJECTIONS IN UNITED STATES

In the United States there are also objections based on:

Shipping costs. (Often compounded by returning ships empty.)

Skepticism about the adequacy of storage in India (and pest control).

Fear of offending other grain exporters. (The Joint Wheat Utilization Committee, representing Canada, Australia, France, Argentina, and the United States, may help solve this issue.)

These attitudes, on both sides, are not altogether of imaginary origin. Still, there are those commercial warehouses bulging with 1,028 million bushels of wheat, those Commodity Credit bins with another 39 million bushels, those old Liberty ships with their 37 million bushels. (Fall of 1959 figures.) And there also are those hungry people.

It seems as though most of the legitimate fears of India could be met by more formally tying the food imports and their counterpart funds to a program for improving Indian agriculture at the same time. Some of them have been spent for this under existing programs. But what if the rupee accounts were committed officially to building drainage ditches, irrigation canals, bunds, terraces, farm-to-market roads, godowns (or storage pits), buying seed, building fertilizer plants and educating farmers? Then the American surpluses would fill the current and impending gap between production and need; and would hasten the day when there would be no gap to fill.

Apart from the mutual economic advantages of such an accelerated program there is that other consideration cited by Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

"... never before in history was it possible to say, as we can say now, that the kind of poverty that destroys individual dignity and stifles individual creative effort is not necessary."

Some of the simple agricultural construction projects that would increase India's farm output would also attack its problem of underemployment and unemployment—most of it in rural villages. P. C. Mahalanobis, director of Indian statistics, has used figures that show 20 million Indians are employed less than an hour a day, 27 million less than 2 hours, 45 million less than 4 hours. He recently said he had heard it stated in another way—that there are 30 million people who work 5 days a month, 40 million who work less than 10 days a month, 53 million who work less than 15 days a month. This, of course, is no fault of the thrifty and would-be industrious Indian workers. To help diminish this staggering economic waste might greatly advance India's progress toward a self-generating economic growth.

Texas Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today is Independence Day in Texas.

The glories of my home State's history, and the caliber and courage of the men and women who produced that history, deserve a good deal better—and a considerably longer—commemorative speech than I am prepared to deliver here today. I will not even try to do them justice.

But before we continue the business at hand today—before we occupy our minds and energies with carping criticisms and indignant rebuttals about the state of the Nation's defenses—continue our worrying over America's possible weaknesses in relationship to the military might of a potential enemy, I believe that it would be of real benefit to all of us to just sit and ponder for a moment what must have occupied the minds of our forebears on another March 2—in 1836.

In much of the country, business was going on pretty much as usual. In Connecticut, they were getting ready to enact the Nation's first incorporation law, I am told; and a Mr. McGuffey was working on the final draft of his reader to be published later that year. His textbook might or might not have been hastened had a Federal grant been available to help finance its preparation. It might have been improved had the advice and counsel of some office of education been available to Mr. McGuffey. But I rather doubt that even the possibility of such advantages ever occurred to him or to anybody else in that early day.

Business as usual? Yes; to some extent. But a time to try men's souls too. In March of 1836, our people had every reason to have confidence in themselves and in their leadership. Andrew Jackson was President—the same Jackson who had whipped a superior foreign force at New Orleans. True, we are not aware of what gap might have existed in our weaponry at the time. I seriously doubt that Jackson was. In another part of this continent the intrepid missionary, Marcus Whitman, had already got his little band of pioneers underway on a trek which would take them all the way to the Columbia River in Oregon. And there they would stay. What do you suppose the odds against them were?

And in Texas when a small group of determined men gathered at Washington on the Brazos and on March 2 asserted Texas' independence, the desperate battle at the Alamo was already underway. This war, for those of you who may not recall it, began when a detachment of troops sent to seize a single cannon in Gonzales, Tex., were confronted by a group of volunteers who had mounted a flag on the cannon bearing the words, "Come and Take It."

Certainly such was the spirit, too, of the men who laid their future on the line at Washington on the Brazos.

As I said at the outset, it's futile for us to try to pay adequate tribute to these men or to the defiant confidence and courage they demonstrated whenever the chips were down. Perhaps it is enough that we here today pause a moment to remember the cost of the heritage entrusted to us. Enough, if we resolve to deal with today's problems and today's dangers in a way that would make them as proud of us as we are of them.

County Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as administrators and legislators face up more and more to the problems facing metropolitan areas and other regions in the United States today, many of the persons most concerned with the problem are taking a closer look at county government.

Here, they point out, is an existing unit of government that has not been used to its fullest possible extent. Here is a unit of government that, even if it cannot cope with all the challenges now facing our city-suburban areas, can certainly offer many more services.

As we in the Senate discuss metropolitan problems and propose new studies to help us understand the difficulties we face, we should certainly pay close attention to the potential part that counties could play if streamlined to meet new conditions. Though one State has abolished county government in recent months, others may find that counties will meet future regional needs better than, or in conjunction with, new regional governments which may be created.

Mr. President, an article by John W. Tramborg, New Jersey commissioner of institutions and agencies, discusses this question in the January 1960 issue of New Jersey County Government, the publication of the New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders. An editorial by the editor in chief, A. Paul King, in the same issue also explores the question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DECADE FOR DECISION—THE SIXTIES

The 1960's offer county governments in New Jersey their greatest chance for service in this century. A rapid turn of our times has made this an exciting decade for decision. In it our counties will play a tremendous role for the common progress—may well gain guarantees of home rule and optional charters, if that is their wish.

Dramatic changes have increased the county's ability to serve more completely a

rich, new era of suburban maturity and urban renewal. As never before, the traditional part played by the counties in ordering progress is being brought to light. Its leadership must be bold to seize endless opportunities to serve with courage, forthrightness, and imagination.

This decade will see the reformation of the New Jersey county—shucking off old ways and girding on fresh powers to do the jobs demanded of its freeholder boards. The quiet ferment of title 40 revision (counties and municipalities) is at work in the legislature. In this, the county's part is bound to be enlarged, because it is the logical unit to perform many new regional functions.

Also, a devoted cadre of freeholders is urging a better balance of responsibilities between the State, the counties, and the municipalities. It includes such foreseers as Lawrence M. Lear (Cape May); Richard J. Coffee (Mercer); Karl E. Metzger (Middlesex); Joseph S. Holland (Mercer); and Frank C. Dalrymple (Hunterdon).

This adds up to a healthy state of affairs for New Jersey county government. It will serve the sixties as never before in its history, gathering strength to refine its functions. It will widen its ability to serve more people with greater improvements. This is the beginning of a brilliant and heartening decade for decision.

THE COUNTY CHALLENGE OF LEADERSHIP
AND IMAGINATION

(By John W. Tramborg)

The challenging question has been raised whether New Jersey should not follow Connecticut's example of abolishing county government by legislative action. Because I am convinced that county government is not only important, but essential, I view this question with some concern. I should like to help in any way I can to stem the rising tide against county government. How has a belief in county government been weakened? What must be done to sustain the county?

Every county official has to search his conscience for the answer. He must ask whether he is being responsive to the demands and needs of his county constituents who elected him to office; if the framework in which he works can withstand modern criticism; if he is giving his best performance as a public official. It does little good to talk about responsibility if all of us do not perform in an equally responsive fashion to the challenges placed before us.

There is no assurance that county government will continue to exist in New Jersey or elsewhere unless county officials are willing to meet the test for survival with leadership, imagination and vision. They must demonstrate that they are responding to the changing world. In this endeavor they can count on the support of everyone to improve the administration of county affairs through county government.

Politics and the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I call to the attention of my colleagues and the country a most informative and persuasive editorial on the student loyalty oath of

the National Defense Education Act. This editorial appeared in the February 10 issue of the highly respected Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer.

Last year an attempt was made to repeal both the loyalty oath and the so-called Communist disclaimer affidavit. It failed. This year a move to repeal only the Communist disclaimer has tentative approval, but no other safeguard is offered as yet to replace the disclaimer in the interest of protecting against perversion of these funds by Communists and their fellow travelers.

Then too, last year a substitute was proposed for the Communist disclaimer which would have eliminated the affidavit and simply made it a Federal offense for anyone to accept such a loan while belonging to an organization listed by the Attorney General as "totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive." Violation would have been punishable by appropriate penalties. Unfortunately, this proposition never came to a vote by the Congress.

Both the loyalty oath and the Communist disclaimer affidavit were part and parcel of the bill as presented originally for a vote of the membership of the Congress. If a change is now in order, it would seem that the logic presented in the Enquirer editorial would be a compelling factor and suggests a solution which could not conceivably impinge upon academic freedom; which is in no sense discriminatory; and which simply applies the statutory safeguards applicable to all Federal employees to those students privileged to receive the grants and loans made available under the National Defense Education Act.

The editorial follows:

POLITICS AND LOYALTY

There are growing signs in Washington that the Democratic Congress will repeal or radically amend the loyalty affidavit now required of college students under the Federal student loan program. Under present law the applicant for such a loan is required not only to take an oath of allegiance to the United States but also to file an affidavit that he does not believe in and is not a member of any organization that believes in overthrow of the Government by force.

It's not the oath of allegiance but the affidavit of nonbelief that has irked many students and even more educators. No such requirement is made in the case of businessmen who receive Federal loans or farmers who receive Federal subsidies or veterans or their dependents who receive pensions. The students argue that they are singled out as special objects of suspicion.

In addition, President A. Whitney Griswold of Yale raises the point that the affidavit conflicts with the first amendment to the Constitution which guarantees freedom of belief and conscience. This has stirred up a somewhat misty debate. On the other hand, it is possible to share President Eisenhower's view that the affidavit is justifiably resented.

What has been ignored is that much controversy could have been avoided if the Senate had accepted the amendment offered by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, last year, imposing penalties on anyone accepting a loan while belonging to an organization on the Attorney General's list of totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive groups. That amendment never came to a vote, but the bill of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, to repeal the affidavit alone did, and was passed 46 to 45. However, a motion by Democratic

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana, caused it to be sent back to committee, where it died. Now Democratic Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is bringing up precisely the same measure.

Senator MUNDT is expected to offer an amendment that would restore some of the prohibitions contained in the affidavit, without raising the dubious constitutional question of what a student is or is not permitted to believe in. Whether that amendment goes through or the Kennedy bill for outright repeal of the affidavit is passed, the Senate could have avoided months of controversy by keeping the question out of politics last year.

The Rights Issue Stirs Ill Feeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Star of March 2, 1960, entitled "The Rights Issue Stirs Ill Feeling."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS ISSUE STIRS ILL FEELING—DEMONSTRATORS IN SOUTH ARE REMINDED ACTIONS AID IN SPREAD OF RESENTMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Resentment, hypocrisy, deep-seated antagonisms, political selfishness—all these are part of the background of what is being called a civil rights debate in the United States Senate.

Little is apparent of the feeling that disputes can better be resolved if a conciliatory spirit prevails. Instead, friction and bitterness are being engendered daily—indeed, it is actually promoted as a means of getting publicity.

The "sit down" demonstrations in the South, for instance, are regrettable evidences of the mistaken theory that progress in a controversy can be made by stirring up more and more hostility between the groups involved.

Even many of those citizens who not so long ago were crying out for law and order seem strangely silent when Negro and white demonstrators enter private business establishments and refuse to leave seats pre-empted by them in the restaurants until ousted forcibly.

Reports from the South are that many people who enter the stores and see the demonstrators are beginning to send unfriendly glances toward all Negroes they see. This is the way bad feeling is spread and violence provoked. One wonders whether the instigators of the sit-down stunts have taken into account the damage to race relations which has already been done by the demonstrations in the restaurants and lunch rooms.

The debate in the Senate is supposedly over voting rights. This is not the basic issue. For the South does recognize the right of a qualified citizen to vote. The controversy is over the method that shall be used to determine whether a voter is qualified. The theory is advanced by Northern proponents of so-called civil rights legislation that the Federal Government shall police the registration of voters—

hitherto predominantly a State function. In the North as well as the South, literacy tests are required, and in some States property must be owned as a qualification for voting.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution says that the right of citizens to vote shall not be abridged because of race or color. This amendment was declared ratified in 1870, but the legislatures of States like California, Delaware, and New Jersey rejected it. Even New York State, after first voting to ratify, then voted to rescind its ratification.

There is a moral question, too, as to whether the amendment was really ratified by the will of the people's elected representatives in three-fourths of the State legislatures. For in the South the legislatures were dominated by military forces sent there by the Federal Government after the war was over. Ratification of amendments to the Constitution was compelled, in some instances, at the point of the bayonet.

The South hasn't forgotten all this. Many of the wounds of those days were healed in part by the 1896 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. It approved the many State Supreme Court decisions of the previous 25 years, including those in New York and Ohio, which upheld the principle of "separate but equal" facilities for education. Now that the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has completely upset the 1896 ruling, the South feels it has been mistreated all along the line, beginning with the forced acceptance of the amendments to the Constitution by illegal legislatures in the years following the War Between the States.

The southern Senators know they are outnumbered. But they wouldn't be true to the sentiments of their constituents if they didn't use every proper occasion to debate the issues. Extremists on both sides are beclouding the issues. The controversy is being used to gain votes in the North for so-called champions of civil rights, but hypocrisy is evident because protection for the citizen in his right to cross a picket line in a labor dispute is ignored. There apparently will be no legislation on that phase of civil rights.

What's the answer? A significant statement was recently made in a new book written by W. D. Workman, Jr., of Columbia, S.C., a veteran of World War II, whose newspaper and magazine writings have brought him civic, industrial, agricultural and military awards in addition to some in the field of journalism. His book is entitled "The Case for the South," and he writes:

"Short of utter amalgamation of the races, a thing utterly unacceptable to white Southerners, there is no solution to the problem of race relations: There can only be a continual adjustment and readjustment of relationships. The sense of race, no less than those of religion or of nationality, is so deeply embedded in man's nature—both conscious and unconscious—that it cannot be eradicated in the foreseeable future, if indeed it should be eradicated. Some persons, whose impulses can be regulated or whose incentives can be manipulated, may rise above, or descend below race consciousness, but the masses are not likely ever to shed their recognition of race.

"Whatever may be the future of race relations in America, this much seems evident: That neither satisfaction nor peace can come from any coercive mingling of the white and black races against the will of either, and that little hope can be entertained for any assimilation of one in the other. There remains, then, only the prospect of accommodating their differences in a pattern of peaceful coexistence based upon a friendly tolerance and helpful understanding. It is the recognition of racial distinctions, not their denial, which will lessen the tensions and enhance their adjustment."

Statement by Martin B. McKneally Before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement of principles and objectives made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the national commander of the American Legion, Martin B. McKneally.

This program is certainly of the greatest possible interest to all Members of Congress. The fine spirit of true patriotism is here and is heartening and refreshing.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1960

On behalf of the American Legion I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee for the purpose of presenting the 1960 program of the American Legion for the rehabilitation and economic welfare of veterans and their dependents. The national commander of the American Legion has no assignment of greater importance.

To share this privilege and responsibility I have with me today many members of the American Legion and of the American Legion Auxiliary. From every State, they are in Washington to participate in the 37th Annual National Rehabilitation Conference of the American Legion. The conference will commence this afternoon and continue through Friday, noon, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

The purpose of the conference is to provide a forum in which community, State, and national representatives of the American Legion, together with the responsible Government officials, might discuss problems encountered in the day-to-day administration of veterans' benefits and services; and, seek solutions acceptable to all concerned.

We are aware of your busy schedule but we would be greatly honored if any of you could find time to attend one or more sessions of the Conference and join with us in our discussions.

Many of those who accompany me this morning are already well known to Members of your committee. I do wish to introduce to you the young man on my left, however. He is Robert H. Hazen of Portland, Oreg., chairman of our national economic commission. I am sure the gentleman on my right needs no special introduction. As chairman of the American Legion National Rehabilitation Commission, Bob McCurdy of Pasadena, Calif., is often referred to as "Mr. Rehabilitation." He has long been a leader in the American Legion's fight for the rights of the disabled, while continuing to insist upon programs and principles that are fair both to the veterans concerned and to the taxpayers of this country.

The American Legion is fortunate to have men of such caliber, ability, and understanding as Bob McCurdy and Bob Hazen devote so much of their personal time and effort to the cause of veterans and their dependent survivors.

The American Legion realizes its good fortune in its association, in connection with

its responsibilities to the veterans of three wars, with the members of this committee, and takes this opportunity to salute the members of the committee for their courage, wisdom and objectivity. It need not be observed that in all of your progressive and splendid enactments in behalf of the cause of veterans the spirit which characterized your committee has been one of nonpartisanship. No higher praise can come to such a group.

The American Legion recognizes that the able chairman of this committee has worked hard to great effect in curing the weaknesses and correcting the defects and integrating the law with reference to veterans matters. The American Legion is deeply grateful to him for his interest in the disabled veteran, and lauds him as a great contributor to the welfare of the veteran, and by that means the welfare of our country.

The American Legion notes with sorrow the passing of Congressman Stephen V. Carter, of Iowa, and wishes the record of this meeting to show its regret. Congressman Carter, although his membership on this committee was for a short period of time only, demonstrated a keen interest in the needs of veterans.

For the accomplishment of our legislative program on behalf of veterans, we are dependent upon the members of your committee and our other friends in Congress. Needless to say, our proposals will only be as effective as they are sound. Therefore, just as we solicit your help in translating our thoughts into law, we invite your counsel and advice.

We want you to feel free to utilize our channels of communication and service. Every veteran in America is within reach of some service officer of the American Legion. Our service network forms a very effective medium for both the dissemination and the gathering of information. It is a well-seasoned sounding board for the testing of new ideas in veterans' affairs.

Those with me today are but a portion of the thousands of individuals who are in daily touch with the Nation's veterans, largely on a volunteer basis, in the name of the American Legion. They see and talk with the men, women, and children whose lives have been vastly improved; whose sufferings have been alleviated; and whose talents have been utilized for the good of the country, as a result of the laws over which your committee has primary responsibility. They also see cases that need additional help—help that can come only in the form of new legislation, or revitalized and liberalized existing legislation.

It is this latter group of cases that gives rise to our legislative program. Relief-seeking resolutions, adopted in community posts of the American Legion, are channeled upward to department and national conventions. Only those with merit become a part of the program that we bring to your committee for consideration.

The current rehabilitation and economic legislative program includes resolutions adopted as early as our 1958 national convention. To save your time, I shall speak only to those resolutions that have been added to the program since my predecessor, Preston B. Moore, of Oklahoma, appeared before you 1 year ago.

A full listing of all resolutions forming a part of our current program is attached to my statement. At the appropriate time, Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director of our legislative division, and other staff officials, will be happy to present the views of the American Legion on specific legislation concerning these resolutions.

With your permission, I shall cover what I deem to be the more pressing and vital of these issues by subject categories.

SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

The American Legion believes it is appropriate to grant increases in the rates of disability and death compensation.

The monthly rates of disability compensation were last increased effective October 1, 1957, at which time the amount for total disability was raised by slightly more than 24 percent; whereas, the amounts for ratings less than total were raised approximately 10 percent.

Since 1957, practically all other forms of pay and allowances over which Congress has control have been increased, including civil and military salaries and retirement pay, railroad retirement, and social security benefits.

The rates of death compensation have not been increased since 1954. It is true that many widows, children, and dependent parents did receive higher awards beginning January 1, 1957, by switching to rates of dependency and indemnity compensation under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act. But those who were not in a position to take advantage of that act should hardly be expected to continue indefinitely at death compensation rates without a cost-of-living increase.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics announced only last Thursday that the Consumer Price Index for January was 125.4, only two-tenths of a point down from its alltime high of last November. For those veterans and widows who must rely on their VA compensation check, this index might more realistically be described as a "survival index."

The American Legion also believes it necessary to reestablish balance in the compensation program by making the amounts payable for the several disability evaluations accurately reflect the degree of disability; and, by providing additional amounts for veterans with dependents when rated less than 50 percent in degree on the same basis as for those rated at 50 percent and above.

The rates of disability compensation were first thrown out of balance in 1952 when the amounts payable for ratings of 50 percent and above were increased by 15 percent; whereas, amounts for ratings below 50 percent were increased by only 5 percent. Subsequent legislation has further distorted the relationship between one rating and another insofar as the respective amounts of compensation are concerned. For example, the amount of compensation today for a 90 percent disability rating is not 90 percent of the amount payable for total disability; rather, it is less than 80 percent of this amount.

Disparity in the amount of compensation payable, as compared with the percentage evaluation, tends to defeat the principle upon which the rating schedule is based. The schedular ratings are intended, insofar as possible, to reflect the average impairment in earning capacity due to the various kinds and degrees of disability. The amount of compensation payable for a given percentage evaluation should bear the same relation to total compensation as the percentage bears to 100 percent disability. The degree and the dollars should coincide.

It is understood that your committee has had the matter of disability ratings and compensation under study for some time. It is hoped that your investigations will culminate in upward adjustments of compensation during this session of Congress.

We also are aware that the Veterans' Administration is conducting related studies, possibly with a view to making major modifications in the rating schedule. It would appear that the impetus for such studies derives from certain recommendations which were contained in the report of the Bradley Commission.

The philosophy underlying these recommendations is in opposition to that held by

the American Legion. In particular, the Bradley Commission recommendations relative to the VA rating schedule seem to stem from considerations of economy rather than justice. Such recommendations would eliminate most if not all of the 10 and 20 percent ratings. They would put in jeopardy the average-impairment principle. In addition, the time-tested extraschedular statutory awards would be discarded for new and vague norms for disability evaluations.

We are confident your committee will provide opportunity for a full hearing on any legislative proposals to modify the VA rating schedule.

VA HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL PROGRAM

American Legion service officers and field representatives continue to report that VA hospital managers are experiencing difficulty in operating at maximum capacity under their inpatient and outpatient fund allocations. For this reason, we are inclined to question the adequacy of the President's 1961 budget requests in these sensitive areas. The amounts are considerably short of what are considered necessary by the operating services.

We feel sure that you will do what you can to prevent any reductions in the proposed VA budget on the part of the Congress.

It is gratifying to see that the budget will include funds to commence construction of the badly needed replacement hospitals at Martinez, Calif., Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C., plus additional amounts to launch the 12-year modernization program. The American Legion acknowledges with deep gratitude the part played by your committee in bringing to pass this essential effort to prevent further deterioration of the hospital facilities.

I bring to your attention that the VA hospital system is facing a crisis of another kind, and one which will also require your most earnest interest. I refer to the rapidly advancing number of patients who are chronically ill, yet have received maximum hospital benefits. The VA is experiencing great difficulty in placing such individuals in satisfactory non-VA institutions. As the veteran population grows older this problem will be magnified greatly. Steps must be taken forthwith to arrive at an acceptable solution.

This matter has deeply concerned the American Legion for some time. We have concluded that the VA must be provided with new authority to cope with the situation. In recent hearings before your Subcommittee on Hospitals, staff representatives of our national rehabilitation commission presented a proposal based on a resolution adopted last fall by the national executive committee of the Legion.

We ask that the Congress grant the VA authority to construct convalescent cottages on the grounds of five widely scattered hospitals in order to conduct a pilot study of ways and means to meet the impending crush of cases. It is suggested that selected patients be discharged to such cottages for appropriate medical supervision and nursing care.

Such a proposal could have many far-reaching beneficial effects. It would release an otherwise occupied hospital bed for use by a veteran requiring active treatment. It would lengthen the time for which the 125,000 authorized bed level might adequately serve our basic hospital needs. It would provide ideal opportunities for research in geriatrics without tying up more expensive hospital beds.

More important, however, it could well lead to solutions for dealing with the great bulk of cases yet to come. In the meantime, the VA would be continuing its efforts to rehabilitate all patients of this type, with a view to restoring their capacity for independent living.

The addition of convalescent cottages should make for a more balanced hospital community. Administrative details relative to the transfer of a patient from a hospital bed to a cottage, or back again as required, should be held to a minimum. We visualize that the buildings should be as homelike as possible; that is, they should avoid both the appearance and atmosphere of an institutional setting.

Regardless of the details, we deem it essential that steps be taken soon to meet this threatening issue. I respectfully urge your serious consideration of our proposal.

LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

The American Legion believes that the life insurance contract rights of otherwise eligible World War II and Korean conflict veterans should be reopened for a limited time. When the right to apply for amounts or additional amounts of national service life insurance was removed, many veterans were prevented from securing the desired protection because of personal circumstances.

It would be simple justice to make the coverage available to them, if only for a short time. We suggest a 1-year period following date of approval of the enabling legislation in which the veterans concerned might apply. It is agreed that the administrative cost on insurance so issued should be borne by the policyholders.

ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS

The American Legion supports the maintenance of not less than one VA regional office in each State, and opposes the closing of any office that, by reason of its location, provides the necessary services with a minimum of inconvenience to the veterans in the affected area. We further oppose any curtailment of VA services through workload consolidations.

We view with a great deal of concern the reported reduction of contact offices. It is difficult to understand the rationale which says that this will lead to greater efficiency. It is my belief that internal efficiency of the Veterans' Administration is not the ultimate thing to be desired. In all these matters the concern is for service to the veteran, and that only. Not even the desire for internal efficiency must be allowed to interfere with that. Such a rationale defeats the purpose for which the American people demanded that the Veterans' Administration be ordained.

LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

The American Legion believes that the loan guarantee program for World War II veterans should be extended for 2 additional years; and, that the program for both World War II and Korean conflict veterans should be revitalized by taking steps to insure the renewed and continued flow of private investment into GI home loans.

The World War II program is scheduled to end this coming July 25. We ask that it be continued to July 25, 1962. We further ask that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be provided with the same authority to regulate the interest rate on GI loans as the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner now exercises over FHA loans.

PENSION PROGRAM

The American Legion has no current resolution seeking amendment of the new pension law. The 1959 national convention went on record in support of H.R. 7650, the bill introduced by your chairman that became Public Law 86-211.

This action by the convention was based upon the same reasons that our organization, under the leadership of the then commander, had earlier supported your committee in the development of the legislation. The numbers of needy veterans and dependents to be benefited, as estimated by the Veterans' Administration, made

it imperative that we do so even though we had requested rates higher than those contained in the bill.

Our national staff and our department service officials are carefully scrutinizing the interpretations placed on the terms of the law by the Veterans' Administration, with particular regard for the more controversial features such as the counting of a spouse's income and the corpus of estate test. Likewise, we are interested in the procedural instructions for implementing the law. This will be a major topic of discussion during this week's rehabilitation conference.

When the law takes effect next July 1, we will closely observe its impact on the pension program as a whole as well as on individual cases. Naturally, we are very curious as to whether the VA's predictions as to numbers and percentages of cases to be favorably affected will be borne out in practice, since these figures played such a large part in our decision to support the legislation. It is important to note that the President's 1961 budget request to service the new law is \$225 million; whereas, the first-year cost estimate had originally been placed at \$308 million.

Surely, by the time of our national convention next October, we should have more concrete data both as to the law's effect and its possible defects.

While this completes my brief résumé of the major aspects of the Legion's 1960 legislative program for veterans, I should like to say a few words about some related and equally important issues.

The American Legion is not unmindful of the high cost of veterans' benefits; and, it is obvious that many of our current resolutions would require additional expenditures of public funds. We have pointed out, however, that the cost of veterans' readjustment and rehabilitation programs is in reality a delayed cost of conducting war. We have likewise called attention to the fact that the annual Federal expenditures for veterans' programs, expressed as a percentage of our yearly gross national product, have remained almost constant for close to three-quarters of a century even though the veteran population has fluctuated widely in that time.

Further, we sincerely believe that so long as the principles upon which our veteran programs are based remain sound, the cost will never be out of keeping with the Nation's ability to pay.

Those who, on grounds of false economy, seek to destroy veterans' benefit programs, discover upon investigation that the underlying principles are unassailable. Failing to find fault with principles, they turn the attack on the veterans themselves. By this strategy, they hope to undermine public support of the benefit programs.

Thus, they spread misconceptions as to the nature and cost of benefit programs; they magnify and distort minor issues out of all proportion to their statistical and monetary importance. They attempt to disparage the significance of the sacrifices made by servicemen in time of war; to discredit the time-honored axiom that a special status accrues to those citizens who have borne arms in time of national peril; and, most wretched of all, to cast doubt upon the very patriotism of veterans.

This attack is the more curious inasmuch as recognition of the honorable and special status of the Nation's veterans is an act of patriotism in itself. Obviously, veterans are no less patriotic today than when they made themselves available for unlimited service in time of war.

We are certain that all members of your committee share this view, and that you deplore these unjust attacks upon our veteran population as much as does the American Legion.

Jimmy Driftwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last fall I had the good fortune to visit and speak at Mountain View in Stone County, Ark. At the meeting I met James C. Nearris, better known in America as Jimmy Driftwood, the creator of the "Battle of New Orleans," one of the most popular songs in recent years.

Jimmy Driftwood is a fine man, a genuine mountain man, with a natural talent for folk music. He sang for the meeting which I attended and was warmly received. I consider it an honor to have such a man among my constituents.

Recently the Arkansas Gazette carried a story about Jimmy Driftwood. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Feb. 21, 1960]
JIMMIE DRIFTWOOD, NATION'S FAVORITE HISTORIC TEACHER, MAKES A SUBJECT LIVE THROUGH SONG

(By Betty Buchanan)

The name of Jimmie Driftwood is synonymous with the terms "folk singer" and "composer" and his creative talents were brought to the Nation's attention last December when the Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences awarded him a coveted "Grammy" for the most popular song of the year, "The Battle of New Orleans." He had composed it and he sang it that night to a television audience of several million people. But these are not Jimmy Driftwood's only abilities. He is also a teacher, unique in his method and sincere in his purpose.

George Peabody College of Nashville gave him the honorary degree "Doctor of American Folklore" last August, with the remark that "there never was a schoolteacher like Jimmie Driftwood."

How right they were. Jimmie's unique method of teaching grew out of his desire to stimulate his students' interest in history. In this effort he began singing some of his own compositions to his history class at Snowball High School, strumming his accompaniment on the guitar made by his grandfather 40 years ago from a fence rail, an ox yoke, and the headboard of an old bedstead.

This unusual history lesson, needless to say, made the boys and girls perk up. They began to show an interest in history they had never shown before, asking pertinent questions about the various incidents. The next thing Jimmie knew they were suggesting still other subjects from the textbook for him to set to music.

And so, Jimmie Driftwood composed more and more ballads for the purpose of teaching history, never dreaming he would ever sell one.

He not only composed but he also collected folksongs from far and near, often traveling hundreds of miles to track one down. When RCA Victor expressed a desire to record these early American folksongs, his large collection was immediately brought out and put into use. Then, when he was

asked to record the album called "The Wilderness Road," Jimmie got his students to help him select the songs to be recorded.

"The kids picked songs that went over big," Jimmie disclosed. "You know, kids are not diplomatic; they tell you the truth about what they like or don't like without hedging around. And when it came to selecting songs for 'The Wilderness Road' they didn't try to please me; they just selected the songs they liked. And because they did such a fine job, I have let them choose most of the songs to be recorded ever since."

Driftwood is often awakened in the middle of the night by a song crying to be born, with the tune and lyrics coming to him simultaneously. He immediately gets up, takes his guitar to another part of the house to avoid disturbing his family, and gets to work on the composition.

"When I'm working on a song," he drawled, "time means absolutely nothing to me. I invariably get my biggest surprise when I look in the mirror after spending 4 or 5 days on a composition and see what a mess I am, with several days' growth of beard."

"If I am driving the car when the song comes—and that's often the case—Cleda, my wife, writes down the words as I sing them, and when I can stop I jot down the notes. Nowadays," he added, "when I'm composing a song, I consider what my students have told me concerning their likes and dislikes and write it accordingly, because, as you know, it's the kids who do most of the record buying today."

Jimmy has been writing songs for a long time, in fact he wrote his first poem when he was 8 years old, and began setting them to music when he was 12. It all started when his third grade teacher asked the class to write poems for the next day's assignment. She complimented Jimmy's poem so much that for some time afterward she was showered daily with poems written by that little boy. He used to make up tunes to fit the words in old song books he resurrected from the attic, and it wasn't long before he was setting his own poems to music.

As for teaching school, he was initiated into that profession before he, himself, completed high school. As a boy of 16 he rode a mule 8 miles both ways to teach an eight-grade, one-room school in Stone County. And for the next 25 years he not only taught but also attended school, graduating from Arkansas State Teachers College in Conway.

Home-loving Jimmy Driftwood refers to himself as a "plain man of the hills." His rise to popularity in the folksong field, and his sudden wealth (his income reportedly jumped from \$3,000 a year as a high school principal, to \$100,000 last year from song royalties and guest appearances) have not changed him. His Ozark charm and culture are genuine, and his sense of values has not been altered. He is the same warm and friendly man he was 4 years ago before fame came his way.

So far, he has not purchased the poor man's dream car, as so many newly rich entertainers have done; he still drives his old car of 7 or 8 years vintage. Neither he nor his wife sport flashy clothes and jewelry; they dress conservatively. His stage attire consists only of a buckskin jacket decorated with beadwork, a bolo tie, and cowboy hat work with his usual conservative sport shirt and trousers. * * * and of course, his grandfather's homemade guitar.

The Morris (Driftwood's real name is James C. Morris) are using their new wealth to send their 19-year-old son, James Franklin, to Arkansas College at Batesville, about 75 miles from their home, and to make improvements on the home they built with their own hands 5 years ago near Timbo. Their 16-year-old son, Alan Nixon, is a sophomore at the Timbo High School.

Possibly the most outstanding improvement they are making in their home is the installation of plumbing, a necessity they have not had before. A smokehouse, which will be a storage place for their own cured pork and Cleda's canned goods, is also being constructed, and they are enriching their 200 acres of land with Arkansas lime.

Two years ago Jimmy gave up his school at Snowball in order to start touring the country singing the ballads from his album, "Early American Folksongs." And this past year Cleda discontinued her teaching so that she could accompany her husband on his personal-appearance junkets.

Concert stages, radio, and TV microphones never have frightened Jimmie. He is as much at home before a large audience as he is in the schoolroom. Nevertheless, on the Grammy Awards Presentation he believes he must have been a little more excited than he realized because, as he recalls, "My throat felt awfully dry before I went on stage." With all the excitement, however, Jimmy says his biggest thrill was, and always is, "to know I'm going home."

Even though he gave up his school, Jimmie has not given up teaching. Today he is teaching American history in song. Young minds are being stimulated by his catchy tunes about our American heritage, a few of which are: "Tennessee Stud," "Soldier's Joy," "Sailor Man," and of course "The Battle of New Orleans." Three and a half million records of these historical ballads have been sold throughout the land. Teenagers in 50 States are writing disc jockeys asking questions about American history, and Jimmie is credited nationwide by teachers and disc jockeys alike with "creating an unusual interest in history."

But Jimmy's teaching does not stop here, either. He has made three education films in Hollywood, one of which, called "Get Along Boys," concerns the pioneer westward movement of the last century. These films, using a different approach as far as film education is concerned, will be used in schools all over the Nation, and that different approach is Jimmy's own unique teaching method. He sings his song and then gives a brief lecture on that particular incident. The Los Angeles School Board members are so completely sold on Jimmy's films that they are using them throughout their entire school system.

Jimmie has written about 1,000 songs in his 42 years and has stored most of them in a trunk. In fact, "The Battle of New Orleans" was resurrected from this storage bin. Now when he is asked to make an album he goes to his song trunk and pulls out a few he thinks will be appropriate, and uses these along with several new compositions to make up the album.

It is safe to predict that Jimmy will never quit writing songs. That would be like asking him to stop breathing. The same goes for teaching. As long as Jimmy Driftwood can write and sing his songs he will continue to teach Americans the rich heritage of their freedom-loving, democratic Nation.

The Late Tom Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, may I express the deep and earnest regret of the Florida delegation over the sad news of the death of the Honorable Tom Ray-

burn, beloved brother of our distinguished Speaker. We extend our sympathy to the Speaker and to each member of the family in their bereavement and we stand shoulder to shoulder with them during this sad and trying period.

Shameful Summit: The Story of Roosevelt at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, excerpted from a new book entitled "Roosevelt's Road to Russia," written by George N. Crocker, in an article entitled "Shameful Summit—the Story of Roosevelt at Yalta," which was published in *Human Events* of January 28, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAMEFUL SUMMIT: THE STORY OF ROOSEVELT AT YALTA

(Excerpted from a new book "Roosevelt's Road to Russia," by George N. Crocker, former law school dean)

Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inauguration was held on January 20, 1945. Three days later, he boarded the cruiser *Quincy*. For several months his fondest dream, next to his reelection, had been another love feast with "Uncle Joe" Stalin. ("I like this man," he had told Frances Perkins, "and I want to keep on good terms with him.") But now the Russian dictator had made it plain that if the President of the United States wanted to see him, he would have to trek to Russia.

All of the President's advisers except Harry Hopkins opposed his going. Cocksure, ill-prepared, and, as at Teheran, with no strategy beyond his old obsession that the important thing was for Stalin to "like" him, he ignored them and went across the world in an ostentatious spectacle of personal vanity and power which was to be his last. The Yalta Conference was held in February. On April 12, Roosevelt died.

Just before he left for Yalta, he received some momentous news at the White House. Secretary of War Stimson and Gen. Leslie R. Groves, director of the Manhattan project, which was developing the first atomic bomb, informed him that the success of the A-bomb was "a 99 percent certainty" and that it "would probably be ready in August."

This could have dissipated any lingering doubts that the United States, unaided, and without storming the Japanese homeland, would be able to blast Japan out of the war. But already there were no doubts in the minds of those best able to know, and Mr. Roosevelt knew this.

The previous July he had gone to Honolulu. There, Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, commander of the naval forces in the Pacific, had told him, in the presence of Adm. William D. Leahy, that "Japan could be forced to accept our terms of surrender by the use of sea and air power without an invasion of the Japanese homeland." Since then, what was left of the Japanese fleet had been crushed in the battle of the Leyte Gulf in October, the

Philippines had been retaken, B-29's were bombing Japan from Guam, Tinian, and Saipan, and Japanese peace feelers had been put out.

When Roosevelt went to Yalta, he kept MacArthur and Nimitz far away. He asked them nothing, told them nothing; yet they were the two men most qualified to counsel him on the Pacific war. The neglect would be incomprehensible but for the fact that he already knew what their advice would be and it was not compatible with his plans. At this stage elementary statesmanship, for the security of American interests in the Far East, required that the Soviet Union be, at almost any cost, dissuaded and forestalled from entering the war with Japan. Roosevelt went to Yalta and secretly did just the opposite.

Woodrow Wilson may have been naive at Versailles after World War I, but he was a meticulous scholar and was never casual. Roosevelt approached Yalta as if he were on a vacation. In fact, Harry Hopkins' notes frankly say: "I was sure the President would wind up by going to the Crimea, the primary reason being that it was a part of the world he had never visited and his adventurous spirit was forever leading him to go to unusual places and, on his part, the election being over, he would no longer be disturbed about it for political reasons."

Roosevelt's health was obviously deteriorating. ("His face had a transparency . . . and often there was a faraway look in his eyes. . . . I felt that he had a slender contact with life," Churchill writes.) But the malodorous decisions finalized at Yalta—for slave labor, forcible repatriation of refugees, the uprooting of millions of human beings in Europe from their homes and lands, the breaking of pledges of the right of self-determination, and similar brutalities—which have made Yalta a symbol of international turpitude cannot be blamed on the President's illness.

The plain fact is that Roosevelt had succumbed to Stalin's wiles back at Teheran in December 1943. There the two—often over Churchill's objections—had stacked the deck with which the game was played out at Yalta, but the deck had been hidden away until after the fourth term election of November 1944.

The *Quincy* took the President to Malta, where he joined Churchill. Transport planes waited them and their entourages of some 700 people across the Aegean and Turkey and the Black Sea to the Crimea. Roosevelt flew in his luxurious new four-engine plane, the Sacred Cow, which was equipped with elevators.

This, indeed, was the purple path of adventure. President Roosevelt and his retinue were domiciled in Livadia Palace, built as the summer home of Nicholas II. The British were housed in Vorontsov Villa, 12 miles away, and the Russians, cleverly, occupied the Yusupov Palace, midway between.

The Soviet secret police were everywhere and were under the personal command of the notorious Commissar L. P. Beria, who was destined to be denounced as a monster and executed after Stalin's death. Beria's duties at Yalta were, no doubt, exacting, but not unpleasant. For example, he had the opportunity to jolly up with Roosevelt, his daughter, Mrs. Anna Boettiger, Secretary of State Stettinius, and the others at a dinner at the Russian headquarters, which included 20 courses and 45 toasts. Also draining vodka at this wassail were Andrei Y. Vishinsky, the grisly public prosecutor at the liquidation purge trials Stalin had staged from 1935 to 1939, and V. M. Molotov, who in August of 1939 had contrived with Hitler's Von Ribbentrop the unholy pact which signaled the start of World War II. Such a feeling of fraternity welled up in Mr. Roosevelt, in the company of Marshal Stalin and Messrs. Beria, Vishinski, and Molotov, that he offered a

particularly saccharine toast in which he observed that the atmosphere at the dinner was "that of a family."

Alger Hiss was brought to Yalta as an expert from the State Department. His influence there should not be magnified. However, James F. Byrnes saw him "frequently consulted by Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Stettinius" in the conference room, and Hiss himself later testified before a congressional committee that "I helped formulate the Yalta agreement to some extent." Indeed he did. Some of his handwritten notes went back and forth between President Roosevelt and himself. At the plenary sessions, the three heads of state and the senior officials sat at a great round table. Where was Alger Hiss? He sat with Harry Hopkins behind the President.

Yalta was, of course, Stalin's show. He was the star. At the conference table, he was at once the most blunt and the most subtle. As a host, he overwhelmed his impressionable guests with lavish care, so that Churchill telegraphed home that the Russians' "prodigality exceeds belief." On one occasion somebody said casually that there was no lemon peel in the cocktails. The next day, a lemon tree, loaded with fruit, was in the hall, brought from far away by air.

Mesmerized from the start, Roosevelt presented a spectacle that can only be described as pitiful—this fading President, floating slowly out of this life, outmatched and outwitted at every point, mouthing meaningless clichés, and dripping with flummery in the presence of the dictator.

How did the host of Yalta look in the flesh? "He has got an unpleasantly cold, crafty, cruel face," wrote Alanbrooke in his diary, "and whenever I look at him I can imagine his sending off people to their doom without turning a hair. On the other hand, there is no doubt he has a quick brain."

Sly and disarming, Stalin was an expert at the Communists' forensic device of giving special emphasis to an assertion of which the exact opposite was the real truth. "I am talking as an old man; that is why I am talking so much," he said at a dinner at the Yusupov Palace on February 8. "But I want to drink to our alliance. . . . In the history of diplomacy I know of no such close alliance. . . . In an alliance the allies should not deceive each other. Perhaps this is naive? Experienced diplomats may say, 'Why should I not deceive my ally?' But I as a naive man think it is best not to deceive my ally even if he is a fool." Yet no man at the table could have doubted that Stalin would make an alliance with the Devil, or with angels, if it would be to his advantage, or break it whenever it suited him.

At the end of the 8-day conference, a public communique and secret agreements were signed. Poland was to be dismembered. Some 11 million people who lived in the eastern half of prewar Poland were to be surrendered to the Soviet Union without any semblance of a plebiscite. Thus, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill decreed Soviet annexation of 48 percent of Poland's territory and about one-third of her population. No Pole was present.

The Polish Government-in-exile, under which whole regiments of Poles were fighting valiantly for the Western Powers in Italy and on the western front, was now betrayed, and the Lublin committee, a group of Polish Communists trained for years in Moscow in Stalin's tough school, was described in the communique as "the present provisional government of Poland." This meant the surrender of Poland to communism.

For 4 days Churchill fought against this faithlessness, but his American colleague would not stand fast with him. Sharp differences between Churchill and Stalin came

to the surface the first day this subject was discussed. That evening, the President made a fatal move. He compromised his independence by sending a letter to Stalin in which he announced: "I am determined there shall be no breach between ourselves and the Soviet Union." With that statement he admitted that if Stalin made an issue of Poland, the United States would give way. Thus fortified, Stalin tossed the Prime Minister and the President only some high-sounding words to take home, about "free elections." Admiral Leahy quickly recognized the loosely worded formula as a "phony," and spoke up before it was signed. "Mr. President," said Leahy, "this is so elastic that the Russians can stretch it all the way from Yalta to Washington without ever breaking it." Roosevelt said he knew that.

A huge chunk of Germany was to be torn off and given to Poland as a sop for the mayhem to be performed on that unhappy country; some choice morsels, such as the ancient Germanic city of Königsberg, were to be donated to the Soviet Union outright; the rest of eastern Germany was to be spread-eagled for forced communication by Russian masters, since occupation by the Red army meant nothing less than that; and the fate of Berlin was left in a fog. How and when this nightmare would ever end was too unpleasant a subject to be faced at Yalta.

Ten million Germans were doomed to be turned out of their homes and set adrift on the roads to flee westward, for all the territories to be detached were ethnically German. What followed Yalta was a mass expulsion which Churchill himself was impelled to allude to as "tragedy on a prodigious scale." Actually, never in history, even in the worst of pagan times, has there been such a millionfold uprooting of human beings, and Churchill admitted in the House of Commons in August of 1945 that it was "not a good augury for the future of Europe." The Atlantic Charter, at the beginning of the war, had pledged against "territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," but at Teheran and Yalta this pledge had been torn to shreds.

Roosevelt had always taken pains to pose as a humanitarian, so it is not surprising that the agreement for forced human labor was kept out of the public communiqué and put into the secret protocol. That relapse into barbarism of past ages was hidden even from James F. Byrnes, a member of the American delegation. "Had I known it," he writes, "I would have urged the President to oppose the inclusion in the protocol of any provision for the use of large groups of human beings as enforced or slave laborers."

Another dark moral blot upon the Yalta record was the promise to Stalin that the Russian nationals rounded up by the Americans and British in Germany, France, and Italy would be deported to Russia, by force if necessary. There were about 2 million of these. Some had been captured by the Germans; others had voluntarily fled from communism early in the war. Many were found in German uniforms, but others were civilian escapees who only wanted to find freedom. Most of them begged not to be sent back to Russia, knowing their fate would be the firing squad or Siberian slave camps.

The State Department had decided to disallow forcible repatriation and abide by the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war, but a message was dispatched to Washington from Yalta overruling this decision. As a consequence, when the war ended a sickening drama was enacted. All the Russians were herded indiscriminately—screaming, in tears, at bayonet point or dragged bodily—into boxcars

and sent to Russia. Not the slightest attention was paid to the Geneva Convention, the doctrine of asylum, or the humane regard for individual choice which had ameliorated man's cruelty in less barbarous years. The gruesome spectacle was singled in many memories, but not until 10 years later, when the State Department published the so-called "Yalta Papers," was it known for sure that this unholy crime against humanity had been cannibalized at Yalta.

After lunch on the afternoon of February 8, Stalin and Roosevelt, like two arch conspirators slinking off to hatch the direst plot of all, vanished behind the locked doors of a room in Livadia Palace. At the President's request, Churchill was not there. In this room, Stalin was bribed, with Japanese and Chinese territory and concessions and vast stores of American equipment, to enter the war against Japan "2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered."

This is one agreement which was never broken. The Soviet Union entered the Pacific war 6 days before Japan surrendered and 2 days after the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. Her contribution to Japan's defeat was nil, but she walked off with spoils of victory of incalculable value. It is this secret deal that General Patrick J. Hurley, Roosevelt's Ambassador to China, characterized, after he learned of it, as a "blueprint for Communist conquest of China," and that William C. Bullitt, who had served by appointment of Roosevelt himself as Ambassador to Russia and to France, called "entirely dishonorable" and "potentially disastrous to the United States." Bullitt has written: "No more unnecessary, disgraceful and potentially dangerous document has ever been signed by a President of the United States."

The evidence is overwhelming, from many sources. Roosevelt's generosity to Stalin that afternoon in Livadia Palace was a willful caprice of his own. There was no force majeure pressing on him. He faced no Hobson's choice. He should have spurned what he was bargaining for even if it had been tendered as a gift. The Russophilism which possessed his mind at this time blinded him to all other considerations. The claim that he acted under military advice has always been a sham.

James F. Byrnes was kept in the dark about this agreement, too. Roosevelt did not tell him about it at Yalta, nor when they were back in Washington. "When the President returned," Byrnes attests, "he did not mention it to me and the protocol was kept locked in his safe at the White House." It was not until some time after Roosevelt's death that the safe in the White House yielded the astonishing document, to the surprise of the new President.

Yalta was, of course, more than the unhappy culmination of Roosevelt's long series of blunders in Weltpolitik. It was a moral debacle of unimaginable evil to the world. But from a power standpoint alone, it climaxed the pattern of action which made the Soviet Union the dominant power on the Eurasian land-mass, a result which, according to documentary evidence, Roosevelt and Hopkins had anticipated with equanimity at least as far back as the Quebec Conference of August 1943, and to which they had given persistent support. In these days, Winston Churchill, according to his own words, moved about "with an aching heart and a mind oppressed by forebodings." When we cast the light into the dark recesses of the summit conferences of World War II, we find that Churchill's strategy for the war and the peace was repeatedly thwarted by Franklin D. Roosevelt in favor of Stalin's desires.

What did Roosevelt tell the American people when he came home from Yalta? In a carefully staged performance, he addressed a joint session of Congress sitting in a wheel

chair. "This conference concerned itself only with the European war and the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war," he swore. This was, of course, a falsehood, for he had in his safe the secret agreement signed at Yalta concerning the Pacific war. He had, it is true, promised Stalin to keep the secret, but had he also promised to perjure himself before the Congress of the United States?

Then came the glittering words: "The Crimea Conference . . . spells—and it ought to spell—the end of the system of unilateral action, exclusive alliances, and spheres of influence, and balances of power . . . I am sure that—under the agreement reached at Yalta—there will be a more stable political Europe than ever before."

This may well rank as the most blustering, the most reckless—and the most wrong—prediction ever made within the walls of the National Capitol.

By this time, American public opinion was so drugged by wartime propaganda that it was possible for the President to make such a statement and be believed by millions. There were voices of dissent, too, and widespread uneasiness in the country, but people believed because they had made great sacrifices for—they hoped—something, and they desperately wanted to believe. Optimism had always gushed from the summit conferences—from the Atlantic Conference, from Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, Tehran, and now from Yalta, the end of Roosevelt's road to Russia. People had been lavish in their hope and trust. But for decades they and their children were to pay for the folly.

Resolution of the Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on this date the Committee on Science and Astronautics agreed to a resolution expressing sympathy to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, upon the passing of his brother, Mr. Tom Rayburn.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following resolution:

Resolution extending the sympathies of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and to his loved ones:

Whereas the Speaker of the House of Representatives has suffered the loss of his brother, Tom Rayburn; and

Whereas it is recognized that the bond of love and respect between the Speaker and his brother could not be exceeded; and

Whereas "Mr. Tom" had served long and faithfully as bulwark and anchor of the Rayburn family home in Bonham, Tex.; and

Whereas by his unstinting devotion to, and labor on behalf of, his home, his community, his State, and his Nation, "Mr. Tom" helped ease the great burden which has so long rested upon the shoulders of a great Speaker: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives hereby expresses its deepest sympathy to the Speaker of the House and to his family upon the passing of Tom Rayburn in his native State, March 1, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That the Speaker be notified of this resolution by the chairman of the committee; that a copy of this resolution be made part of the permanent archives of the committee, and that this resolution further be placed in the RECORD of the Congress of the United States.

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman,
CHARLES F. DUCANDER,
Executive Director.

Controversy in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by the Panama Canal Society of Florida, signed by Macon A. Turner, in which they set out their views with respect to the present controversy going on in Panama. I commend it to the Senate for their attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF FLORIDA,
St. Petersburg, Fla., January 12, 1960.

By the terms of a treaty entered into between the United States of America and the newly created Republic of Panama in 1903 and ratified by the highest tribunals of these nations on February 23, 1904, and December 2, 1903, respectively, it is stated in article II thereof that, "The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control" of a delineated piece of land now known as the Canal Zone. There is no uncertainty about the choice and use of the word "grant." It was placed there in that best form of a contract and its use approved by the most brilliant and keenest legal minds of the Republic of Panama.

The treaty further states: "The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned in article II . . . which the United States would possess and exercise if it were sovereign of the territory . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

Please note in view of the communistic inspired aggression of November 3 and 23, 1959, we repeat, "To the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority." This is the binding, bilateral agreement never abrogated which misguided agitators are now trying to break by coercion and force.

It is common knowledge that there is neither a higher nor more binding agreement between nations than a treaty properly negotiated, signed, and ratified. The Hay Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903 to which the Republic of Panama and the United States of America were signatories was such an agreement.

The consideration necessary in all contracts was considered ample. The United States received exclusive jurisdiction to a parcel of land and the Republic of Panama received \$10 million in one lump sum, with the United States further promising Panama a \$250,000 annuity. The United States at that time also guaranteed the independence

of the Republic of Panama, an independence which wasn't worth the breath of its declaration without such guarantee. There was also a multitude of other obligations which the United States was to assume and did so; but comb the treaty word for word and one will find little if anything which was Panama's to give without our sponsorship, economic backing and guarantee of freedom.

Since the United States sponsored the independence of Panama, and we use the word "sponsored" advisedly, it has lived up to each and every one of its promises. Beyond and above its obligations it has been ever ready with assistance, whether it was in the nature of cash, gifts, loans, medicines, food, supplies, teachers, scholarships, agricultural machinery, seed, or other aid immeasurable in value. In a section of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936-39 the United States increased the annuity payment from \$250,000 to \$430,000. In 1955 the United States increased the \$430,000 annuity to \$1,930,000. This was incorporated in the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955. We also gave Panama about \$25 million worth of real estate in the city of Colon and the railroad stations, buildings and yards in the cities of Colon and Panama.

We, former employees of the U.S. Government, members of the Panama Canal Society of Florida, have spent nearly our entire lives on the Isthmus of Panama. Some of our fathers, we are proud to say, arrived with Colonel Gorgas in 1904, braved the many lifetaking fevers and other obstacles and helped construct one of the great wonders of the modern world, the Panama Canal. Some of us have children working for our Government on the Canal Zone. Although transplanted from many States of our native land, in over half a century we acclimated ourselves and learned to love the Isthmus—for it became our home. We not only found many of its people to be excellent neighbors, but formed many lasting ties and warm friendships.

November 3 is Panama's day of independence, heretofore happily celebrated by the citizens of the United States and those of Panama. However on November 3, 1959 these memories of international friendship were rudely shattered by a small, but violent minority of Panamanians refusing to listen to reason but instead following the leadership of Cuban mercenaries, communistic travelers in their midst, and radical leftwing misguided demagogues of their own.

Not content with the bloodshed and the malicious damage committed on the Canal Zone, the crazed anti-American mob proceeded to the U.S. Embassy where they disrespectfully hauled down the flag of our country and despicably tore and defiled it. Our Embassy officials listened to orders on the radio from their headquarters to the Panama police or Guardia Nacional telling them to stay away from the Embassy. Not a policeman showed to quell the riotous action.

To add insult to injury and further infamy, the Panama radio and press immediately after the November 3 demonstration, commenced calling for another march upon the Canal Zone, abused the good Governor of the Canal Zone and insultingly denounced the U.S. Government in most vicious and scurrilous language. Again the hoodlums marched and again U.S. citizens and soldiers were injured trying to stop the crazed abusive mob from committing further injury and damage.

We, retired employees of the Panama Canal, who left so many good friends in Panama, cannot comprehend this lamentable and pitiable state to which they have permitted their actions and consciences to deteriorate.

Just what are the desires of these disillusioned, ill-advised, misguided "pot-of-gold" seekers?

They scream, yell, and shout "sovereignty." No less a dignitary than William Howard Taft when he was on the Isthmus of Panama in 1904, as Secretary of War, declared that Panama was titular sovereign of the Canal Zone. He did not enlarge upon the definition and meaning of this and never did he state that this included jurisdiction over our grant. At best a titular sovereign is but nominal, it is one who is such in name only, a sort of honorary designation. The fact remains as is so clearly stated in the Treaty of 1903, the Republic of Panama granted to the U.S. Government the area now known as the Canal Zone in perpetuity as if it were sovereign to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." That is the irrevocable, indisputable and nonabrogated law of the Republic of Panama and the United States of America. May our President and our Congress with God-given strength keep it so.

Somebody who go his abacus counters mixed is yelling for 50 percent of the Panama Canal's gross income. Just how long would the goose live which has been laying the golden eggs for Panama under such fan-fetched ridiculous bookkeeping? Quoting from the official Panama Canal Company's Statement of Revenue and Expenses, we find that the total revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, was \$87,250,871. The operating expenses and deductions were \$83,837,339. This leaves a net revenue of \$3,413,532. Our annuity to the Republic of Panama for our grant is \$1,930,000 or 56 percent of our net revenue.

Echoes of "equal pay for equal work" boldly resound. Yet the minimum wage on the Canal Zone is \$1 per hour and has been so for some time whereas the Panamanian Assembly recently passed a bill establishing a minimum rate of 40 cents an hour in the Republic.

For more than 56 years we have given and given in to the Republic of Panama. Our gifts have been cast upon troubled waters and have brought home to us in America nothing but disrespect for our flag, our country and our citizenry. We should now certainly be firm believers in the adage that the quickest way to lose a friend is to give or loan him money.

La Hora, La Nación, Critica, La Estrella and El Dia, all publications printed in the city of Panama, as well as their radio stations, blatantly declare that the flying of the Panamanian flag on the Canal Zone is but the beginning of their demands and they will neither terminate nor cease until the Panama Canal is theirs.

Some months ago Gen. Robert E. Wood, who was Chief Quartermaster of the Panama Canal during its construction days had the following to say: "Our State Department should inform the Panamanian Government in no uncertain terms that we have a treaty; that we will observe it; and that we shall not amend the treaty further. We should also request them to clean house of communistic agitators. . . ."

As this new year dawns we have continued and absolute faith in the dedicated men employed by our Government. With their profound knowledge and ability and our country's great reservoir of clear thinking and reasoning, we have no doubt that this grave question will be resolved without loss of honor to our great Nation or its citizens. That our sons and daughters working, traveling or residing on the Canal Zone may live their lives unmolested, free from insult, proud of their great country, their heritage and their citizenship.

Respectfully,

MACON A. TURNER,
President, Panama Canal Society of
Florida.

World Court Is Packed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address by me to the House on January 13, dealing with the Caribbean situation with special reference to the Panama Canal, one of the key points stressed was the danger that a proposed rescission of the Connally reservation to the U.N. World Court resolution of August 2, 1946, would involve to continued U.S. sovereignty over that key waterway.

Since that address there have been numerous published statements and resolutions, including a joint resolution passed by the Commonwealth of Virginia, in strong opposition to the proposed rescission.

Thus, I read with special interest the February 28, 1960, weekly newsletter of Thurman Sensing, which I quote with the text of the Virginia resolution:

THE WORLD COURT IS PACKED

(By Thurman Sensing)

If the Connally amendment to the World Court resolution is repealed, the United States will be subjected to an international judicial tyranny. A handful of judges, appointed by the United Nations—including neutralist and Iron Curtain countries, will be able to rule on U.S. tariff laws, immigration laws, economic relations with foreign countries, and the American presence in the Panama Canal Zone.

The story of this amendment goes back to 1946, when the then Senator Tom Connally of Texas made a six-word addition to a resolution approving American participation in the World Court. The resolution itself said the court wouldn't have jurisdiction over domestic matters. But the original language of the resolution left unclear who would decide what is or is not a domestic matter. Senator CONNALLY added these words, "as determined by the United States."

The meaning of this amendment is that the United States cannot be sued in the World Court without its consent. This is the same situation that prevails within the United States, for the United States cannot be sued in a Federal district court without its consent.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, and Senator JAVITS, Republican of New York, two of the most extreme liberals in the Senate, have banded together to repeal this protection for the United States. The President and apparently the Vice President mistakenly lend support to the repeal move.

To repeal the Connally amendment would be like repealing the Monroe Doctrine or other great legal documents protecting the national interest. Repeal will be an invitation to the enemies of the United States to engage in legal harassment of this country.

The rise of the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations insures that the United States and its free world allies will have a very small voice in selecting future judges of the World Court. In all likelihood, the court will be made up of a Russian, a Czechoslovakian, a Ghanian, an Indian, a Cuban, and other judges with little or no desire to treat the United States with fairness. In other words, the advocates of repeal of the Connally amendment are urging that the sovereignty of the United

States be subjected to men who dislike the American way of life. The World Court is a stacked court, and one that is even more radical and bent on judicial tyranny than Earl Warren's court.

Repeal would enable the World Court to interfere with race relations in the United States. It would also enable the Court to order U.S. ships and Marines out of Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, or demand continued sugar subsidies. Repeal would open the way for Asians to insist that handsome immigration quotas be opened to members of the yellow race. Indeed there is no limit to the amount of troublemaking, or to the number of invasions of national sovereignty, that the World Court would stir up.

Some of the advocates of repeal are perfectly open in expressing their hopes and wishes. Walter Lippmann, syndicated columnist, said recently that "We have an interest that every property dispute, as with Castro today, should be decided by a court, and not left to propaganda, coercion, and force." And what chance would the United States have before a World Court dominated by neutralist and Communist nations? None at all, of course. No doubt the United States would be branded an aggressor in Cuba and told to compensate Dictator Castro with American assets on the island.

The seriousness of the threat to American sovereignty contained in the repeal proposal should be made apparent to all thoughtful citizens. Elimination of the Connally amendment would be a heavy blow to the United States.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 41, OPPOSING RESCISSION OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT TO THE WORLD COURT RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 2, 1946, OFFERED FEBRUARY 5, 1960

Whereas in 1945 the Senate of the United States, without adequate debate, ratified the pact known as the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the attendant publicity featured two key points in this Charter: (1) to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and (2) to deny the right of the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state; without which, the Charter would not have been accepted by the United States; and

Whereas on August 2, 1946, the Senate of the United States ratified the United Nations World Court resolution but in so doing, in line with our system of constitutional government, provided that the United States would not accept compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, the last six words being known as the Connally amendment;

Whereas since May 1, 1958, there has been a subtle campaign by internationalists of various types aimed at rescission of the Connally amendment;

Whereas the rescission of the Connally amendment would expose the United States to serious juridical dangers before an international court of 15 judges, only 1 of whom can be from the United States;

Whereas Communist nations have judges on the Court but do not and will not accept its jurisdiction; and

Whereas the damages inherent in such rescission would expose various U.S. domestic issues to judicial interpretation of such international tribunal; and

Whereas the compulsory jurisdiction of such tribunal would endanger not only the constitutional powers of Federal agencies as delegated in the Constitution of the United States but also those powers reserved to the States and to the people; and

Whereas U.S. Senate Resolution 94 would, by repealing the Connally amendment, re-

move that safeguard against usurpations by an international judicial tribunal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of delegates, the senate concurring, That (1) rescission of the Connally amendment would jeopardize the Constitution of the United States and impair the powers reserved to the States and to the people; and (2) copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all members of the Virginia delegation in the Congress, and to the Governors and presiding officers of all legislative bodies of all the States.

The Role of Small Businesses in America's Defense Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to call attention this morning to an excellent and informative article, "The Role of Small Business," by Elliot E. Wentworth, vice president of the Cincinnati Vulcan Co. This article is contained in a publication entitled, "The General Electric Defense Quarterly," which includes a number of excellent articles on our various defense needs and programs. Mr. Wentworth is himself an official of a small business which has done work for the Government. In a frank and forthright manner, he discusses the problems involved in negotiating and carrying out a Government defense contract. He refers to "mountains of paperwork" and the "beastly slow flow" of funds which in many instances are characteristic of Government contracts and subcontracts.

Nonetheless, Mr. Wentworth makes it very clear that the small businessman has a definite and very important function to perform in the organization and construction of our overall defenses. He cites the responsibility of small businesses to participate actively in our defense effort and points out further that many large corporations depend very heavily upon the valuable assistance provided to them by small businesses.

Mr. President, I know that this excellent and thoughtful article will be of interest to countless American small businessmen, who have or who in the future intend to contract work for the Government. The Federal Small Business Administration provides many valuable and important services and often significantly assists these businesses in bidding for and financing Government contracts. Their efforts combined with constructive and forward-looking attitudes on the part of small businessmen such as Mr. Wentworth have contributed greatly to our various defense programs.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Wentworth for his article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record in order that other small businessmen may have an oppor-

tunity to read and study this excellent analysis of the role of small businesses in Americas defenses.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS

(By Elliot E. Wentworth)

There are thousands of small businesses throughout the United States having the opportunity to participate in the over-all concept of an adequate defense system in a sound economy. But, do their managements always appreciate this opportunity in view of the fact that the bulk of all defense contracts is placed with large, nationally known manufacturing and engineering companies? Published figures from Washington indicate that \$90 billion of defense contracts placed in a particular period went directly to large organizations, and only one-half billion directly to small companies. Here is the problem, the potential pool, and the great opportunity for small business. It is time for small business to take a new look at its own evaluation of its place in this market.

MANY OPPORTUNITIES

Just as these large companies have their responsibilities to the Nation, to their immediate buying public, to their employees, to their managements, and to their stockholders, so too have smaller companies (those employing 500 or less people, according to the Small Business Administration standards.) An appreciation of the opportunities in the defense marketplace by many of us in small business who may have products and services to sell there will not only improve our positions in that sprawling market, but even more basically will allow us to contribute some small part to the growth line of the overall national economy.

It is almost trite to remind ourselves that the whole economy is no stronger than the sum of its parts. Therefore, the great national organizations which are furnishing services and equipment to the Army, Navy, and Air programs properly expect their many thousands of small "feeder" or subcontract suppliers to be healthy and vigorous in their own economic and social identities. This very expectation creates immeasurable small business opportunities. As a member of a smaller company employing approximately 450 people when operating at peak capacity, I find it difficult to agree with those who suggest that it is extremely difficult and even hazardous to bid on and work for prime contractors tied directly to the defense effort.

PROBLEMS OF SUBCONTRACTING

Haven't we often heard managements of small companies say that they would much prefer to avoid the terrific strains of subcontracting with large organizations doing primarily Government defense business? Perhaps justification is based partially on the following arguments:

1. The question of quoting on all of a project or none.
2. The 'beastly slow flow' of funds from the Government agency to the large prime contract company to the small subcontractor.
3. The serious difficulty in often not being able to get adequate working capital to finance internally when large amounts of company funds are so tied up.
4. The mountain of nine-copy paperwork involved.
5. The superimposed inspection system required.
6. The sheer pressure of defense expediting, being asked for unusual preference over peacetime work going through the shops.
7. The pressure of heavy experimental costs without a commensurate coverage in orders.

These complaints are a few of the many

which impel small company managements to eventually shy away from facing up to a national responsibility and a social opportunity to participate and grow in a continuing guns and butter economy.

SMALL COMPANIES HAVE A VOICE

Why shouldn't representatives of small companies feel free to call for a change of thinking concerning such problems by larger defense contract organizations? Is it a lurking fear that whoever they might be—if they are the customers—they cannot be approached on legitimate complaints? But, if there is an attitude of indifference or complacency toward the whole problem of national defense and survival, then each of us has his small part in asking himself what must be done to change, and change quickly.

The small company's strength and growth potential lies in the genuine dignity each of its members feels in working for that group. Since that group's real competition is in its own ability to be continually more competent, if each employee recognizes a high purpose in working not only for a wage, but for a common company and national cause, his enthusiastic attitude will reflect in improved efficiency for his company. The sum of all such improved efficiencies will mean a better product at a power price for both the guns and the butter markets making up such a large portion of the overall American economy. This then is true economic advancement in the best sense of the world.

DIVERSIFICATION PAYS OFF

Our company has some good experience in this defense economy. It has included engineering and manufacturing contracts for diverse type of defense program work. For example: (1) Development studies in a semi-research area for a large chemical group, (2) equipment for an important arsenal on the east coast, (3) a series of military engine test-stands for a large engine manufacturer, and, (4) heavy fractionating tower units for an important technical agency of the Federal Government.

The technical experience gained in process in such jobs has been helpful in bidding projects involved in the peacetime markets of the chemical, petrochemical and the petroleum industries.

Obviously, the small company needs added volume to cover fixed overhead burdens which tend to slowly increase in an inflationary interval such as the entire postwar period. Thus, any overhead hours recovered on a defense subcontract are just as helpful as those recovered in work processed on those month in and month out projects wherein the end products may ultimately be used by companies manufacturing synthetic industrial alcohols, acids, and other chemicals.

PEACETIME SERVICES AN ASSET

It is a fact that as the volume of peacetime services is enlarged, there is added opportunity for the smaller company to invite research and/or development thinking with companies involved in the defense effort. And why not, if peacetime services emphasize the importance of continuing development studies in order to maintain a strong competitive position?

So it is that development studies are often invited by the companies tied directly to defense. Their sympathetic approach to the problems of small companies doing this kind of added work is well known. Costs are realistically approached and the responsibility for the paying of such costs is often borne by the base companies. And this is the way it should be, inasmuch as our experience has indicated that the nondefense manufacturers expect to have such preliminary costs included when contracting on overall jobs. In other words, practical experience at least suggests sitting down with the large com-

panies and thinking through on the problems involved before going ahead.

Thus, the plea is that managements of both large and small companies ask themselves—wherein can they find a common ground of cooperation in serving each other, in this good purpose thinking—each really needing the other? Not only then are their immediate groups benefitted, but their social responsibilities to the Nation are carried forward, and thus a whole people is protected and improved simultaneously.

Clean Elections Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn., on January 28, 1960:

CLEAN ELECTIONS BILL

The first major piece of legislation to come before the current session of Congress, the so-called clean elections bill, has passed the Senate. The 50-to-39 vote, however, was hardly an impressive victory for so important a measure, and it appears the bill may not even reach the House floor.

This is unfortunate, for the bill proposes election law reforms that are long overdue. In fact, the basic law which the bill proposes to amend—the corrupt practices act—was drawn over 35 years ago.

Campaign spending limits set in 1925 are not realistic in 1960. They have not been realistic for many years—and the fact is that the spending limits have been honored more in the breach than in the observance.

An analysis of 1958 spending on congressional races by Congressional Quarterly, for example, showed that reported totals came to only about \$5,000 per candidate—hardly enough to wage a serious campaign for Federal office. No one can learn, under present law, how much unreported money goes into the campaigns.

Another loophole is that primary campaigns involving Federal offices—which are tantamount to election in one-party States—are not covered by the reporting requirements. Significantly, some of the heaviest opposition to the Senate bill came from southern Senators.

There remains an unresolved area of controversy concerning the wisdom of superimposing Federal laws on certain election matters now under State regulation.

But the direction of the Senate bill, we feel, is healthy. Controls are tightened even though spending limits are raised (except in the case of individual contributors). Heavy emphasis is given to fuller disclosure of the sources of campaign funds—and this is a matter of vital concern to voters.

If the house takes the easy way out by pigeonholing this bill, it will be demonstrating a callous disregard for the people's right to know. In effect, failure to bring the bill to the floor would be the equivalent of condoning flagrant evasions of the present law.

The Senate has recognized the problems—although not all of them—and has offered a portion after many previously unsuccessful efforts. Let's not let the matter die there.

Red Missiles in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States on February 24, 1960, during his address to the Brazilian Congress in Rio de Janeiro, took advantage of the opportunity to warn the nations of the free world of the mounting dangers of the all-powerful state and its "unenlightened system of tyranny." As to the extension of such doctrines to the Western Hemisphere he declared that "we would consider it intervention in the internal affairs of an American state if any power, whether by invasion, coercion or subversion, succeeded in denying freedom of choice to the peoples of any of our sister republics."

That statement, Mr. Speaker, has been heralded over our Nation as a reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine and it has been so interpreted in other nations. But it is not sufficient.

As will be seen from a thoughtful news story in the February 21, 1960, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., by Anthony Harrigan, which I shall quote, the Presidential statement to the Brazilian Congress does not go far enough. The Congress of the United States must assert its views in unmistakably clear terms. This I endeavored to do in House Concurrent Resolution 445, which is still pending.

The indicated news story and House Concurrent Resolution 445 follow:

RED MISSILES IN CUBA WOULD THREATEN UNITED STATES

(By Anthony Harrigan)

What action will the United States take if Fidel Castro asks the Soviet Union to help defend Cuba by installing missile bases on Cuban soil?

There's a question that puts the Cuban problem in perspective. For what is a more logical follow-up to the Soviet-Cuban trade pact than a military pact between the two countries? Soviet Deputy Mikoyan, who visited Cuba earlier this month, is on record as saying his government will supply Cuba with MIG jet fighters if Castro asks for them. Should Soviet military aircraft be sent to Cuba, Soviet missiles can't be far behind.

So a very real possibility exists that within a year Soviet missiles, manned by Red "technicians" will be in position on Cuban soil. Cape Canaveral, U.S. rocket testing facility in Florida, would be at point blank range. The H-bomb materials plant here in South Carolina would be well within range of such missiles, many of the great military and industrial centers of the United States would be easy targets.

For more than a decade, the Soviets have been saying to the American Government: How would you like to be encircled by military bases? They strenuously object to U.S. ground forces in Europe and Japan, and to U.S. airfields and missile base in North Africa, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other lands along the perimeter of the Communist empire.

The American people never imagined that a similar situation could confront this Na-

tion. No one dreamed that the Soviets would be able to set up rocket bases in this hemisphere. Now such an action is not a remote possibility, but a probability—unless the United States takes firm and prompt action.

Will the United States act to prevent establishment of Soviet missile bases 100 miles south of Miami? It would seem inconceivable that any administration could ask the American people to send military forces to Formosa and, at the same time, ignore the threat in Cuba.

For generations, wide seas and the Monroe Doctrine, which bars foreign involvement in this hemisphere, have protected the American people from threats on this side of the Atlantic. Suddenly, this Nation is faced with a new challenge—an active communist conspiracy at work in a Latin revolution. If any question existed as to the foreign character of the Castro revolution, it was dispelled when the revolutionary government of Cuba formally accepted Soviet aid.

Unless free Cubans who are refugees from Castro's tyranny receive help from Uncle Sam, the cause of freedom in Cuba will expire. The United States should invoke the Monroe Doctrine, declaring to the world that Castro's Cuba is falling under the influence of a European power and poses a threat to peace and freedom in this hemisphere.

Many observers of Cuban affairs realize that a necessary step in the removal of Dictator Castro is withdrawal of U.S. recognition of his regime on the grounds it is not representative of the Cuban people but dominated by foreign influences.

This action might mean confiscation of U.S. properties in Cuba not yet touched by Castro's regime. But it is only a matter of time, anyway, before those properties are seized by the revolutionary government.

With recognition denied Castro, permission should be granted free Cubans to establish a government in exile in the United States. As things now stand, patriotic anti-Communist Cubans are refused the right to form a government opposed to the dictatorship.

Once free Cuban leadership were established in the United States, moderate elements in Cuba would have a symbol of hope and a rallying point. The financing for a free Cuba movement should not be hard to find in the United States. No doubt many private citizens would be happy to contribute to such a movement. If the U.S. Government can contribute billions to a free China movement on Formosa, why couldn't it help freedom-loving Cubans? When Castro was conducting his revolution, the State Department managed to overlook shipments of arms to his units in the Sierra Madre Mountains.

The State Department is still managing to overlook the political activity of Castro agents in New York and Miami.

To cut off the flow of Soviet arms to Castro is a necessity if Cubans are to regain their freedom. The way to do it is to halt ships bringing arms to Cuba, regardless of nationality. The United States threatened to do this when arms from Iron Curtain countries were sent to Guatemala in 1954.

No question exists as to the ability of the U.S. Navy, operating out of Guantanamo Bay and Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, to halt Soviet arms shipments. All that's needed is determination on the part of the United States to protect itself against aggression in this hemisphere.

If the 7th Fleet will fight to keep Red China's warships from attacking Formosa and Free China's ships, the U.S. Government should be able to use the Atlantic Fleet to bar arms shipments to Cuba.

Unless bold measures are employed, Cuba will become a Communist police state and

Soviet missiles will be emplaced on Cuban soil.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 445

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

Incremental Price Supports for Wheat and Small Grain Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the rest of our national economy is in a state of unprecedented prosperity, the agricultural segment obviously is "out of step." Inflation and other effects which have accompanied the steady increase in standard of living and income in our nonfarm population have increased substantially the costs of operation to the farmer, while at the same time, the prices he has received for the fruits of this production have been steadily going down. This just does not make sense to anyone who stops to think about it. It certainly, in firsthand terms, does not make sense to the farmer.

Obviously, this situation has been caused, to a large degree, by the inability of our present farm laws to cope with the problem at hand. That these laws are not solving the problem goes without saying and would not be disputed by anyone.

But getting agreement on a new set of laws to supplant these old, ineffective ones is another matter.

I would venture to say, however, that a plan which would give to the farmer the opportunity to voluntarily deal with his problem, which would assure to him an increased gross and net income, which would assure reduction in the large agricultural surpluses presently costing our taxpayers so much and depressing the markets for these crops, and which would offer the definite possibility of eventually adjusting supply to the market while still providing a floor during transition periods, will meet the needs and desires of all interested parties and overcome their objections.

The bill which I have proposed today with regard to wheat and other small grain crops I believe fits this description. It offers and provides for the following 10 goals:

First. It offers opportunity for the farmer to achieve full parity prices and his rightful share of our gross national income.

Second. It offers less Government control to the farmer and provides him with the opportunity of voluntarily curtailing production to meet demands.

Third. It offers sufficient incentive to the farmer which will encourage a very high percentage of compliance. Experience has surely proven that no program will be effective to any greater degree than the extent to which we can expect to get compliance.

Fourth. It presents no problem of administration. All of the provisions of the bill can be successfully and effectively administered through the township, county, and State committees and the regulations which govern our present program.

Fifth. It permits the law of supply and demand to function within the provisions of the legislation so that acreage shifts from one crop to the other will be governed by prices as determined by supply and demand.

Sixth. It deals with the entire national productive unit of wheat and small grain feed crops and reductions are required from actual planted acres, giving assurance that compliance will produce a reduced total production.

Seventh. It offers a reduced price support on wheat to those who make no contribution to a reduced production and eliminates the present loophole permitting anyone to seed 15 acres by permitting him to collect a payment in kind if he elects to keep these acres out of production entirely.

Eighth. It does not permit the acres taken out of production to be used in producing other crops that can further enhance the surplus situation.

Ninth. Compliance with this program will be less costly to the Government in that it will reduce surplus costs and so be beneficial to consumers and taxpayers as well as to farmers.

Tenth. It will permit the law of supply and demand to again function as soon as present surplus stocks have been diminished to a point of having only adequate supplies in cases of emergency.

That this program can achieve these desired objectives. I think is emphasized by statistical research compiled by our office which indicates that if our total

production of all the crops covered by this legislation had been reduced by an average of less than 8 percent during the past 10 years we would have had no growth in our total surplus stocks. Consequently, provisions for reduced acreages by 20 percent, as included in this legislation, provide sufficient reduction to allow for the disappearance of surpluses on hand today.

Some of you, in the light of these 10 objectives, may say they sound like an impossible "have our cake and eat it, too" set of goals. Before I am charged with this, however, I urge you to familiarize yourself with the mechanics of the proposal.

The bill is based on a system of incremental price supports and is a combination of the two bills which I proposed last year, one dealing with wheat and one with the remaining small grain crops. It has been substantially revised so as to incorporate provisions dealing with a payment-in-kind, cross-compliance, the 15-acre exemption, and the importation of foreign agricultural commodities.

Under this proposal, a small grain farmer could voluntarily achieve a higher price support in proportion to his efforts in helping to reduce the surpluses in these crops, as exemplified by the following table:

Wheat		Corn, barley, oats, rye, soybeans, flax, grain sorghums	
If the percentage of his acreage allotment withdrawn from production is not less than—	His level of price support in percentage of parity price shall be—	If the percentage of his acreage average withdrawn from production is not less than—	His level of price support in per centum of the parity price shall be—
5.....	70	5.....	70
10.....	80	10.....	80
15.....	90	15.....	90
20.....	100	20.....	100

Farmers choosing not to participate in this incremental program would receive 60 percent of the parity price for their grain crops.

The acreage-average referred to in the above table with regard to grains other than wheat is the average annual acreage which a farmer has devoted to the production of any combination of these crops during the past 3 years. The acreage allotment referred to in the section of the table pertaining to wheat is the wheat allotment established for each farm by law and directive. A reduction in such acreage will be treated as though it had been planted to wheat for purposes of maintaining wheat history.

To qualify for incremental price supports under this bill, a farmer must reduce his acreage by at least 5 percent in both wheat and other small grain crops. This "cross-compliance" is necessary to effectuate the purposes of the bill, which is a real reduction in production, and not just the retirement of the least productive acres on each farm.

To help provide for the expenses involved in taking this land out of production, a farmer will receive a per-acre payment not in excess of \$10 per acre for land of the highest assessed valuation,

and scaled down proportionately from this figure. This payment can, in effect, be in either cash or grains, and the payment-in-kind provision of this part of the bill is such that it should encourage this further means of reducing our surpluses.

The land which is taken out of production is not to be planted to any other crop or to be used for grazing, so as not to aggravate any other surplus problem.

The steps outlined above, will, in my estimation, go a long way toward providing the farmer with a more fair and just share of the national income, while at the same time reducing the costly, market-depressing surpluses presently on hand. But two other provisions are necessary to really make them effective.

The first is a provision that repeals the 15-acre exemption presently in effect. It has been shown that 15-acre producers are contributing a substantial amount to our surpluses, and until we deal with this exemption, it is my opinion that no proposal will be truly effective.

My bill provides that a farmer who does not plant a crop to, or graze, wheat acreage previously under the 15-acre provision will receive a payment-in-kind equal to two-thirds of the product of the normal yield for the farm and the number of acres withdrawn from production. He will thus be receiving aid in taking this land out of production, and at the same time we will have taken a further step toward reducing our wheat surplus.

I have on previous occasions during this Congress called to the attention of this body the effect which importation of foreign agricultural commodities is having on our farm surpluses and total farm program. I will not reiterate these observations here, except to say once again, by way of example, that American farmers have not produced enough barley and oats during the past 10 years to provide for our own domestic consumption and exports, and yet prices of these two crops, as well as many others, have been constantly decreasing to almost the disaster point, while surpluses have been increasing due to imports.

The legislation which I proposed today provides that the President shall institute an investigation whenever it would appear that agricultural commodities are being imported in such amounts as to interfere with the laws and price-support programs for those crops. This should serve as one more step toward reducing our surpluses and effectively administering our agricultural laws for the good of the entire Nation.

This then is the bill. It does, I believe, offer a solution to the two most pressing agricultural problems today—lowered farm income and mounting Government surpluses. By dealing with the first of these problems it offers to the farmer the opportunity to achieve an increased gross and net income, and therefore assures his part in the continued development of our small towns and their churches, schools, and businesses. It gives him the opportunity of voluntarily achieving full return for value received—something that is lacking today.

And by dealing with the second problem, it will cut down the large surpluses in storage, and thereby, the large tax burden which is required to buy and store these commodities. It looks forward to the day when the surpluses will be completely eliminated, and the program will be needed only as a backdrop to insure against the building up again of as large a surplus as we today have to deal with.

This is a political year. It seems that every journalist from here to Los Angeles predicted, even before this session had gotten underway, that no new farm bill would be forthcoming. But might I submit for your consideration my opinion that our appeal to farm people or to any other segment of our population, as parties or as candidates, will never be any better or stronger than the extent to which we can prove to them that we are capable of dealing with their problems in a manner that will serve to strengthen their individual opportunity in their respective fields, in compliance with the principles of a nation which offers a freedom of opportunity.

And, even more important than this, we must deal with this situation if we are to entertain the hope that our Nation will continue to offer agricultural stability and maintain its position as the best fed nation in the world. It would be well for us to remember that periods of prosperity have always been gained by tackling the most difficult problem and with persistence, accomplishing what seemed like almost impossible solution.

It is in this spirit, that I offer this bill for your consideration.

Associated General Contractors' Executive Injects Race Issue in Fight Against Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the public hearings on H.R. 9070—situated picketing—Mr. Robert Patten, executive vice president of Carolinas branch, Associated General Contractors of America, appeared and made some very damaging statements regarding the labor unions of North and South Carolina.

For 14 years, Mr. Patten as a hireling of the Associated General Contractors of America has carried on an antilabor fight against unions and union membership.

I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter written by a representative of a union, Claiborne S. Woods, secretary-treasurer, North Carolina State Conference, B.M.P.I.U. of A., and a column appearing in the Durham Labor Journal, Durham, N.C., refuting his remarks.

I might add that the per capita income for North Carolina is \$1,384 per year, while the per capita income for South Carolina is \$1,218.

The letter and article follow:

DURHAM, N.C., February 25, 1960.

HON. E. J. HOLLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was attracted by a newspaper report that appeared in the Durham, N.C., daily papers on February 24, 1960. Of all the gross misstatements I have ever read, the report made before a congressional committee by Robert Patten, executive vice president of the Carolinas Branch, Associated General Contractors, is the most exaggerated.

According to the paper, Mr. Patten reported that the workmen in the Carolinas do not desire to be unionized. The truth of the matter is that the people that Mr. Patten serves have so intimidated their employees that in a great many cases the people fear for their job to the extent that they are reluctant to affiliate with an organization to represent them. Mr. Patten should have advised that the union that he represents is doing everything in its power to prevent its employees from becoming unionized, even to the extent of firing known members.

Mr. Patten should have told the committee of the understanding that is in existence in the Carolinas among members of his union, that they will not employ organized workmen when it can be avoided. He should have told of the near starvation wages that exist here and that he, as a highly paid individual and servant and officer of the general contractors union, is largely responsible for the condition.

Mr. Patten was a deliberate and purposeful perjurer when he testified that virtually all construction locals are entirely segregated and should the industry become unionized, many Negroes would lose work. It so happens that I am in a position to dispute Mr. Patten's allegations and I also know that Mr. Patten is aware that he misinformed the committee.

Of the 40 local unions in the two Carolinas encompassing trowel trade members, including bricklayers, plasterers, stonemasons, tilers, etc., there is only one case of a segregated local and this is in a large city where three locals exist. Of the three locals the colored local has the greatest membership. Practically all of the 40 locals plus the State organizations are headed by a group of mixed officers and in many cases all of a local's executives are of the Negro race.

Mr. Patten is fully aware of the harmonious relations that exist here among the building tradesmen and his only interest in any of the Carolinas' building tradesmen is to keep them down to where the general contractors can work them for far below their worth.

I sincerely trust that the committee will overlook Mr. Patten's statements and realize that he is a paid opponent to decent wages and that the committee will act in favor of the low-wage earner.

Very truly yours,

CLAIBORNE S. WOODS,
Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina
State Conference, B.M.P.I.U. of A.

[From the Durham Labor Journal, Feb. 26, 1960]

ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS EXECUTIVE
INJECTS RACE ISSUE IN FIGHT AGAINST
UNIONS

Robert Patten, of Charlotte, who is executive vice president of the Carolinas branch of the Associated General Contractors of America, in Washington to fight unionization of workers in the two Carolinas, has expressed his alarm that "many thousands of deserving

colored persons would be thrown out of work * * * if construction in the area became completely unionized."

Patten states that "virtually all construction locals in our area are entirely segregated." Further along he said, "Nonunion contractors prefer to employ colored men on such jobs as laborers, bricklayers, and plasterers."

Patten knows that local laborers' unions in the two Carolinas are integrated, and their membership, for the most part, is composed of Negro men. Indeed, in his hometown of Charlotte the laborers' local union is officered by Negroes.

Patten also knows that unions of bricklayers, plasterers, cement finishers, and other trowel trades in North Carolina has integrated conditions. Bricklayers Local 10 in Durham has about 50 percent Negro membership. Local 731 of the Plasterers in Durham is officered by Negroes.

Patten, whose organization, the Carolinas branch of the Associated General Contractors has no Negro membership, is blatantly drawing a red herring across the path of those who should see that his real objective is to obstruct the organization of construction workers, both white and colored, in order to perpetuate the miserably low wages in the construction industry of the Carolinas.

North Carolina is among the lowest of the States in per capita income, and Mr. Patten has done his part in keeping it that way. This paid minion of the General Contractors has been able to keep construction wages in this State far below the average of other States where union contractors make fair profits and pay fair wages.

The subcommittee of Congress before which Mr. Patten cried out for the poor colored man has only to look at wage comparisons in the construction industry in the United States to satisfy itself whether this hiring of an all-white association is really worried about the poor workingman, whatever his race, in the two Carolinas.

Hawaii's Role in World Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, in summing up his impressions of his 9 days' visit to the United States, remarked that the racial harmony and social equality among the 600,000 people of Hawaii, where he spent 4 days, were most impressive. He noted that the people of the varied ethnic groups in Hawaii were "getting on very well."

The Indian philosopher-statesman added:

If that (racial harmony and social equality) could be extended on a wider range, if we can implement ideals granting political equality to underdeveloped people and use technological devices to redeem them from drudgery, from cramping toil, we may go a fair way toward the establishment of a world commonwealth. But what prevails in Hawaii does not prevail in many other parts of the world. That is our difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an editorial appearing in the February 25, 1960 issue of the Honolulu

Star Bulletin This editorial entitled "Hawaii's Role in World Brotherhood" describes the role of the world brotherhood movement in Hawaii to foster racial harmony and social equality:

HAWAII'S ROLE IN WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Statehood has given Hawaii a new role in the world brotherhood movement.

It has become the focal point of efforts to build East-West understanding and friendship—officially as well as through volunteer groups which have labored for years to broaden the influence of Hawaii's aloha spirit.

Hawaii's election to Congress of two men who are of Asian ancestry—Senator HIRAM L. FONG and Congressman DANIEL K. INOUE—has proved a conspicuous and powerful example of exactly the sort of harmonious mingling which World Brotherhood advocates and promotes.

The week February 21-28 is observed as World Brotherhood Week. A busy schedule has been arranged by Dr. and Mrs. William Z. Shimer, Honolulu leaders of the movement, and an eager and energetic corps of volunteer leaders.

Music, arts, the theater, sports, fashions—emphasizing the international flavor—are being recruited to assist in getting the message across that in the differences of cultural expression there are untold riches waiting to be discovered and appreciated.

World brotherhood exists to help people meet, understand and appreciate those who spring from different cultural backgrounds in the hope that mutual understanding and respect will pave the way for world peace with freedom.

The task is long, the way is hard. But some progress can be measured. Statehood for Hawaii was one of the longest forward steps of the past year.

Religion in American Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Harry Golden, editor of the *Carolina Israelite* and author of many books, including the masterpiece "Only in America," has been commended by America's No. 1 newspaperman, James "Scotty" Reston of the *New York Times*. Mr. Reston delivered a speech before the Inland Press Association in which he said:

Harry Golden of Charlotte, N.C., is writing some of the best editorials in America today.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Reston and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Harry Golden which appeared in the *Carolina Israelite*, January-February 1960 issue:

RELIGION IN AMERICAN POLITICS

I have been invited to address the delegates to the mock national convention organized by the undergraduates at Oberlin College in Ohio. Some of the leading Democratic presidential aspirants as well as Mr. Nixon will address the convention. I will speak on "Politics and Religion" and I would like here to give a few preliminary remarks on this increasingly important subject.

In his book about America, Lord Bryce wrote that six Southern States excluded

from public office all those who denied the existence of a Supreme Being. He found that Pennsylvania and Tennessee declared ineligible for public office "whoever did not believe in God and in a future life in which rewards and punishment would be equitably distributed." For a long time in Maryland and Arkansas no one could be empaneled as a juror who did not believe in God and the rewards and penalties of a future life.

Happily, these disabilities against the freedom of conscience have virtually disappeared in America. Lord Bryce might not think us perfect, but he would nevertheless be deeply impressed in the freedom of the individual to deal with his religious conscience as he sees fit. Freedom of religious conscience is due to the fact that churches (I include temples, synagogues, mosques, and witness-houses) are not only respected but considered an integral part of our civilization. We had a religious civilization in America before we had a secular civilization. It was a Protestant civilization which left every man the master of his own conscience. Though our separate religious faiths are now becoming secularized, freedom of conscience still remains paramount.

That truly great man, President Theodore Roosevelt, saw this paramount importance of free conscience and the confusion the religious issue injected in politics clearly as far back as 1908, when he campaigned for William Howard Taft his successor.

Letters which demanded to know if it was true that Taft was a Unitarian swamped Mr. Roosevelt. In addition to the charge that Mr. Taft was a Unitarian, there circulated a strong rumor that Mr. Taft's wife and brother were Roman Catholics. "Underneath," charged the gossip mongers, "Mr. Taft nourishes a dangerous love for the Roman Catholic Church." This was serious anti-Taft propaganda. The Protestant Churches disliked Unitarianism because it denied the divinity of Jesus and the existence of the Trinity. Add to this the 1908 attitude toward Catholicism and you will see that Mr. Taft, as Plato once said, was fighting some powerful shadows.

To Mr. Roosevelt's credit, he refused to answer any of these charges. He would not honor the question by mail nor would he dignify his platform by replying publicly. Privately he said these questions were "profane," that they were unworthy of citizens of a great republic.

When Taft had won the election, only then did Roosevelt decide to answer these charges against his successor and only because he realized his own tremendous influence on the American scene. In answer to a direct question, "What is Mr. Taft's religion?" Mr. Roosevelt replied: "That is Mr. Taft's private affair, a matter between him and his Maker which concerns only his innermost conscience. The demand that he make a public declaration of his faith denies the first principle of our Government which guarantees every individual full religious liberty and the right to conduct himself as his conscience dictates."

Mr. Roosevelt went on to say that if anyone was interested it was not true that Taft's wife and brother were Roman Catholics. "But even if they were," he asked, "even if Mr. Taft himself was a Catholic, what of it? How can the citizens of the United States allow themselves to be influenced by petty bigotry. How can they refuse their vote to a worthy candidate through antipathy to his religious faith? This Republic of ours will last for centuries. Without doubt there will be among its Presidents Protestants, Catholics, and very probably at some future time, also Jews." Roosevelt was happy to have in his own cabinet seated side by side Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish members, every one of whom had been chosen by reason of his character and ability.

Project Walrus: The Role of the U.S. Merchant Marine in National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, early this month the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council released a searching and significant report on "The Role of the U.S. Merchant Marine in National Security."

The study was conducted last summer by a panel of distinguished Americans, of varied technical and business background, under the chairmanship of former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy (retired). Called Project Walrus, the program takes its name from the well-known lines of Lewis Carroll's "Through the Looking-Glass":

"The time has come," the Walrus said,
"To talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing-wax—
Of cabbages—and kings—
And why the sea is boiling hot—
And whether pigs have wings."

The very able NBC news commentator, Robert K. McCormick, reviewed this report in a broadcast several weeks ago. I was impressed by Mr. McCormick's concise yet complete and thought-provoking comments, and secured a copy of the transcript which I request permission to insert in the RECORD at this point: TRANSCRIPT OF RADIO BROADCAST FEBRUARY 1, 1960, BY NBC NEWS COMMENTATOR ROBERT MCCORMICK

The man who makes the same mistake twice is to be pitied; the man who makes the same mistake three times is to be despised. The old saw fits the United States perfectly, in the way it has handled its merchant marine. Before World War I, we were caught with a ghastly shortage of ships to carry our men and weapons to the scene of the fighting.

Came World War II—and the same thing happened. And if we have world war III—or even a serious brush-fire war—we will be caught again.

A special panel set up by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council says that our merchant fleet—the ships owned by or under the control of the United States—isn't enough to handle a cold war, let alone a warm one. The panel was headed by Adm. Arthur Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our merchant marine is dwindling away to a ghost fleet, because of our high costs both in construction and operation; Government subsidies can't (or don't) make up the difference.

Meanwhile, the Communist-bloc fleet is not only growing at an alarming rate, but the ships are thoroughly modern, even providing air-conditioned quarters for crews. This fleet is being used as an economic weapon, and by displaying its sleek streamlined beauty in ports all over the world, it is making a deep propaganda impression.

Radford's panel says our only hope is to modernize and mechanize our own ships. We should have what's called a unitized system of handling cargo, one form of which is the business of having cargo all packaged when it reaches the dock; the packages are simply

hoisted aboard the ship. This process can be partially handled by automation, and part of the actual handling of the ships themselves could also be done by automation.

And our ships should be faster—some capable of 30, or even 40 knots. And cargo should be concentrated. One ship should carry goods to England and France, for example, and another to Italy and Greece, rather than having each ship leapfrog from one port to another unloading a little here and a little there.

If these things were done, Radford's panel says, our ships could be run economically enough so that with much smaller subsidies they could compete with foreign ships, whose costs are so much less than ours.

We should even have "over the beach" unloading facilities to get cargo ashore where there are no adequate docking facilities—especially in underdeveloped countries.

And then, if a war came along (large or small) we would, for once, be prepared, so far as shipping is concerned.

American merchant marine operators, the report says, do not now have much incentive to cut costs—because Government subsidies pay three-fourths of them anyhow. And the unions involved won't want to give up their featherbedding practices, which are sometimes outrageous.

It won't be easy. But, if we don't move, this will be the third time we've made the same mistake.

James N. Cole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Essex Farmer and Homemaker, monthly periodical published by the trustees of the Essex County Agricultural School at Hathorne, Mass., concerning the passing of one of the kindest and finest persons that I have ever met.

James N. Cole was not only an instructor at the Essex County Agricultural School and a counselor for the boys, but he took a great deal of interest in outside activities to help and assist students and other boys in the community to be worthwhile citizens.

His passing is mourned by all of us since it will not only be a great loss to his school, the county of Essex, and the greater Lawrence area, but to his countless friends and admirers.

The article follows:

SCHOOL SADDENED BY LOSS OF INSTRUCTOR COLE

James N. Cole passed away suddenly at his home in Methuen, Monday morning, January 25, 1960. He was 55 years of age.

Previously to his appointment as assistant instructor in physical education in 1939, Mr. Cole was boys' counselor for after-work activities and the general supervision of boys working on the school farm.

During his years of service, Mr. Cole made a host of friends as it was his responsibility to organize and conduct campus tours for visitors. Everyone who knew Mr. Cole was impressed by his deep sincerity and enthusiasm for the school and its students. He was especially fond of describing the school

grounds and farm facilities as the one area where a person could derive complete satisfaction. He was really happy at this school, and he conveyed that same feeling to all who knew him.

Mr. Cole was largely responsible for the success of our guidance program. He was constantly promoting the school and publicizing its many educational opportunities.

Mr. Cole was responsible for coaching the junior varsity football and the hockey teams. He taught "West Point" sportsmanship as well as the techniques of these sports, and in competition his teams exemplified the character traits which he instilled in them by precept and esprit de corps.

Mr. Cole is sadly missed by the students, the alumni, and his associates here at the school, and our deep sympathy is extended to his family.

Fish Oils Combat Cholesterol and Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, statistics indicate that heart disease is our Nation's greatest killer. High cholesterol content is considered an important factor in the incidence of heart attacks. Consequently, news of scientific progress in reducing excessive cholesterol content is of vast significance to every American.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has experimented extensively with unsaturated fish oils. Tests on animals have revealed noteworthy declines in cholesterol levels. Since these experiments are continuing, I am sure the Bureau will have even more significant results to report in the future.

Naturally, we in the State of Maine, with an economy dependent upon a thriving fisheries industry, are glad to hear this news. It has been recognized that in addition to fish, we have available in the ocean depths a vast untapped source of nutritional matter. Now, this discovery of the preventative value of fish oils should open an important new frontier of medical research into the medicinal properties of fisheries products. This discovery may well signal the rejuvenation of an industry which has been severely affected by increasing imports and production costs.

The following article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald details the results thus far achieved by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

FISH MAY MELT THAT CHOLESTEROL

(By Nate Haseltine)

Relief may be in sight for persons worried about high blood cholesterol count, a factor in heart attacks and other consequences of artery clogging.

The relief may come in capsules of fish oil which, in animals at least, has shown quick and dramatic reductions of excessive cholesterol levels. The special oils have been made available for human trials.

Let it be said at the start that, the role of cholesterol in the bloodstream, and any casual part it may play in heart attacks and

strokes, has long been controversial. Even more controversial is the role of cholesterol-rich foods in diet.

The newest findings come from a series of research projects of fish body oils conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and by the Hormel Institute of the University of Minnesota operating under a Bureau contract.

Key findings of the research are that (1) many fish oils are composed largely of unsaturated fatty acids, which make so-called soft fats; and (2) these components, fed to test animals, reduced their blood cholesterol levels in direct proportion to the degree of their softness.

The research showed that about half of the body oil of most species of fish is unsaturated, and that about 10 percent of it is "highly unsaturated." This latter fraction is the part that is exciting to medical investigators.

It is this fraction—and Bureau scientists have developed a way to separate it from the calorie-laden remainder of the fish oil—that is undergoing careful clinical trials. Its potential for reducing blood cholesterol levels is about three times that of vegetable oils. And the vegetable oils (corn, etc.) are noted for their softness.

The animal research with the fish oil fraction showed that the ingested material acted almost immediately in lowering the animal's blood cholesterol level. By contrast, the cholesterol-depressant activity of linoleic acid (the active ingredient of the vegetable oils) must be taken for about 2 weeks before any significant reduction can be observed, the investigators said.

The cholesterol-reducing activity of vegetable oils led to diets which included a daily swig of corn or safflower oil. It was recommended on the presumption that the oil would neutralize blood cholesterol buildup blamed on the intake of animal fat and animal fat products (saturated, or hard fats). The Food and Drug Administration, however, recently cracked down on such promotion of salad oils and shortenings of vegetable origin.

"Any claim, direct or implied, in the labeling of fats and oils or other fatty substances offered to the public that they will prevent, mitigate or cure diseases of the heart or arteries is misleading and constitutes misbranding," said Food and Drug Administrator George P. Larrick.

He was speaking of the use of the soft oils as a dietary supplement, rather than as a substitution for hard fats in the diet. Many medical investigators agree that the health of Americans would be improved if the diet contained a better balance between the too abundant animal fats and the little-used soft fats.

Second only to the findings in the fish oil research that the oil fractions readily reduce blood cholesterol levels was the development of a method to separate this beneficial part from the rest. It means that the patient would be taking only one-tenth of the calories (weight builders) he would have to take if given the whole oil.

Donald L. McKernan, director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, said that the Bureau is now undertaking the preparation of the oil fractions on a pilot-scale basis, using a centrifugal molecular still. Samples are being made available, without charge, to responsible researchers, he said.

The soft fat features of fish oil can also be used to promote fishery products in diets, to bring about a better balance between the hard and soft fats in meals. Many medical authorities have advocated increasing soft fat consumption and decreasing the hard variety.

The researchers haven't yet devised a soft fat index of fish to show which might be best for an anticholesterol diet, and which might be best for the capsule concentrates.

They say that the most common and readily available fish with high oil content include herring, mackerel, menhaden, mullet, salmon, sardines and anchovies, and tuna.

Menhaden would probably be the fish of choice for the capsules. It is caught in abundance, and is used largely in the making of fertilizers. It is not considered a food fish, but it yields considerable amounts of the soft oil fractions, the researchers noted.

Saturated fats, such as lard or the fat around a sirloin steak, harden at low temperatures. Unsaturated fats do not readily congeal, remaining liquid at room temperatures. This is the property which permits oil-laden fish to move freely in water of low temperatures.

Maturity Needed in Arms Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times Picayune of February 29, 1960:

MATURITY NEEDED IN ARMS DEBATE

In discussion of the momentous question of our national strength for the deterrence of war and, if need be, for defense, every last one of us Americans should constantly remember well our supreme concern: effective service of our purpose.

Obviously partisan and personal considerations should be strictly subordinated.

Intelligent, sustained endeavor should be uppermost neither to foster dangerous overestimates of our strength, nor also perilous underestimates of it.

Despite political and individual concerns, the vast majority of Americans, we believe, earnestly desire to avoid both these dangers. But doing so under the pressures of current conditions—worldwide, national, and personal—calls for unremitting endeavor on the part of the wisest and best informed to consider and express ourselves with maximum responsibility, maturity, and accuracy.

Loose and exaggerated expressions as to our military power could make for a complacency or even overconfidence that could be disastrous—for a relative weakness that could fall of adequate service both to the prevention of war and the meeting of attack.

Likewise, unbalanced, distorted assertions and calculations presenting false conceptions of national weakness could involve similar danger.

Our leaders, from the President on down the line of authority, who know most about our actual military capacities and about those of the Soviet Union and other lands, are under an awesome responsibility to deal with and talk about such matters with the greatest wisdom they can possibly attain. Only in that way can they serve the aim of security and peace, which most should constantly concern us all. Political and personal impulses and considerations will—all of us being human—have their influence at times. But steadfast vigilance should be maintained against such influence becoming uppermost.

The people generally cannot, of course, expect to know all that our leaders know. That means that citizens should ever be watchful lest their opinions and influence be exerted under dominance of excess emotion or ignorance. It does not mean that the people

should be deprived of as clear and full an understanding of our national position as it is wise and feasible to give. Lack of that could make for acutely disturbing feelings and divisions among us.

Let us all ever bear in mind the overriding aim of building an all-round, united strength that, so long as need be, will operate effectively to discourage any aggression.

But in striving to that end let us take particular care against giving any unwarranted impression of weakness or fear that would tempt Russia or any other leaders to military adventures.

And in all this perilous business of seeking in competition a military deterrence of war—a very uncertain enterprise at best in this age of stupendous power and anxiety—let us never for a moment forget that, despite every discouragement, we should press on ceaselessly to advance the cause of true peace by agreement and dependable international controls. On March 15 West and East will be meeting again with that proclaimed purpose. Secretary Herter, just the other day, once more impressively declared our fervent desire to forward sincere and fruitful negotiations. President Eisenhower repeatedly avows that desire. All of us should give it support and expression, acutely concerned as we must be meanwhile with the business of deterrence and defense.

War Claims Act of 1948

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to propound an inquiry about H.R. 2485. Does the bill cover property loss claims of American nationals living in Shanghai at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. It does not. It is my understanding that warning was given to these people who resided in that area at the time, and for that reason they are not covered under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman is talking of property losses now?

Mr. HAGEN. Property losses in China.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. Beginning with 1937, those property loss claims are covered under this bill.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I stand corrected. I misunderstood the gentleman's question.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank the gentleman and commend him and the members of his committee for the value of this legislation. I have followed it from the outset because I am personally aware of the hardship caused large numbers of U.S. citizens through the aggressive action of the Japanese in China and other por-

tions of the Far East prior to, during, and after Pearl Harbor. I am pleased that they will be compensated for property losses incurred from such actions. Such reimbursement is just because their presence in Shanghai and other foreign ports of call served the purposes of our great country as well as their own purposes.

City and Farm Folks Must Hang Together or They Will Hang Separately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in an open letter to the Members of the 86th Congress, the editors of the Progressive Farmer made a plea for a concerted effort on our part to work out a farm program which will insure a healthy agriculture now and in the years to come. They pointed out the very real interdependence of city and farm people and how a depressed agriculture has an adverse effect on the entire economy of our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this letter in the RECORD:

OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ladies and gentlemen, a long time ago, a famous American said that if we do not all hang together, we will all hang separately. That's what the Progressive Farmer wants to talk over with you in this letter.

We want to talk to you about what may be the most serious, and certainly the hardest, domestic issue you will face this year, the farm problem. If you let yourself be "sold" by some of the easy, glib talk going the rounds these days, you may strike a damaging blow at all Americans who live in towns and cities.

You're going to hear a lot in these coming months about these things: how old farm programs have failed, how taxpayers could save millions if they didn't have to pay storage bills on farm surplus, how farmers could be more "competitive" if they weren't propped up by Government price-support programs, how farmers want to get rid of Government controls.

Some people will try to sell you on the idea that because of these shortcomings in our present farm program, we should throw the whole thing out the window.

If you fall for that line we may all be hurt badly, city man and farmer alike.

We're speaking on behalf of farmers, sure. Our main interest is in a healthy agriculture. But the American people who are not farmers have a vital pocketbook concern with a prosperous agriculture, too.

If most of the people in the district or State you represent are not farmers, you have a special interest this year in seeing what can be done to help keep agriculture prosperous.

Does that sound farfetched?

It won't to people who work in plants making farm machinery, autos, trucks, fertilizers, chemicals, building materials, and hundreds of other farm-used materials. Fewer sales of machinery, motor vehicles, and all the other items just listed mean more

layoff days, less overtime, less money in the pay envelope for a lot of city folks.

Farmers rank with the biggest customers of the steel and oil industries. Do the millions who get extra income from steel and oil stock dividends feel happy when the buying power of a big customer like the American farmer slumps? Of course not.

Maybe you have heard some fellows say: "Why should we city boys worry if farm prices drop some? Cheaper food will be popular with city voters."

Frankly, it would. Cheaper housing would be popular, too. So would cheaper clothing. But while the Secretary of Agriculture asks for lower farm prices we don't hear the Secretary of Labor asking the Congress to cut minimum wages. If he did, he'd be laughed out of town. We don't hear proposals to cut wages in those fields of agriculture that lie beyond the farm gate—in the food-processing and distributing industries. And that's where you'd have to go to take any substantial bite out of grocery bills.

We think city people are too smart to believe they'd come out ahead in the long run if farmers were depressed. A lot of them are old enough, as all of you in Congress today are, to remember that low farm prices in the 1930's brought no flush of prosperity to Main Streets and big cities. City people want a fair, stable food price policy in an economy where everyone gets a fair share.

Agriculture is more than people who work and live on farms. There are about 6 million more people who produce for and serve the farmer. They had families. Another 10 million men and women process and distribute farm products.

Agribusiness employs nearly 4 out of every 10 Americans. None of these will be permanently happy with any policy that leaves their farm partners seesawing on the edge of trouble.

Consider the advantages that have come to factory workers since Congress passed legislation starting a strong farm program.

In 1929, an hour's pay for the average factory workers would buy 6.4 loaves of bread. Now it buys 11.3 loaves. The hour's pay bought 1.2 pounds of round steak then. Now it buys 2 pounds. It bought 3.9 quarts of milk then and 8.9 quarts now.

The Agriculture Department has predicted that average retail food prices, which declined in 1959, will drop again in 1960. In view of the fact that industrial prices generally are rising, is it just to claim that the farmer has been subsidizing the buying public in recent years?

Farm production, which is still rising, gives the American buyer the world's best diet in return for less than 25 percent of the buyer's income. For this same diet 30 years ago, the buyer would have had to spend 48 percent of his income.

City people would not have reaped these benefits if there had been no farm programs to keep some element of stability in farm prices.

Competent economists tell us that through the last 25 years, Government farm programs have increased farmers' net incomes by as much as 20 to 50 percent in years when incomes would have been lowest because of too much production.

In the last six years, it is estimated that our much-abused farm programs have held net farm income one-third above where it would have been without the programs.

What should you do about the farm program? We agree with Chairman ALLEN J. ELLENDER of the Senate Agriculture Committee that "the families which use the food and fiber products grown on American farms must be told the truth . . . the campaign of misunderstanding which threatens to divide city buyers from rural families must be ended."

We believe that you and all other Members of Congress of both parties from farm and

city want to end these senseless charges against farmers.

The farmer's problem today is that he can produce more than he can sell at a fair price. The individual farmer has no way to influence markets in which millions of producers compete.

We suggest that in working out a new farm program, fair to buyer and producer alike, you will want to consider the special character and problems of each commodity. Only with many approaches can best use of our various and far-flung agriculture be made for all our citizens.

In the case of many commodities, sensible proposals have been made, but rejected. Present programs are meeting the test for some commodities such as sugar, wool, and others. It will be to the advantage of everyone in our Nation for us to get together on proposals in a spirit of compromise, try them out, and see if they will work.

Yours truly,

Eugene Butler, Clarence Poe, Alexander Nunn, W. C. Lasseter, Sallie Hill, Joe Elliott, Romayne Smith, Pete Head, O. B. Copeland, the Editors of the Progressive Farmer.

A Greeting to the All-African People's Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Committee on Africa, an organization of which I am proud to be a member, will hold its second annual African Freedom Day celebration next month. In recognition of that event, I would like to have printed in the Record "A Greeting to the All-African People's Conference from Americans." This was signed by 87 distinguished Americans who were leaders in various walks of life. Among the signers were 18 Members of Congress of both political parties, of whom I was one.

In my travels around the country, I have noticed an ever-increasing identification on the part of American people with the freedom movement in Africa. The great majority of Americans, whether they be in labor, business, professional circles, or in Government, realize that the African motivations for freedom are quite parallel to the great principles on which our country was founded. We wish our African brethren well in attaining their noble goals and aspirations.

I ask unanimous consent that "A Greeting to the All-African People's Conference from Americans," together with a list of the signers, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the greeting and list of signers were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A GREETING TO THE ALL-AFRICAN PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE FROM AMERICANS

It is a privilege to extend greetings and felicitations to the delegates at Tunis on the convening of the Second All-African People's Conference.

We followed with hope and confidence the proceedings of the First All-African People's Conference 13 months ago in Accra. With profound belief in the right of Africans to liberty, equality, and dignity, we now await the deliberations and decisions which shall insure that soon all Africa will be free.

Certainly the far-reaching results of the Accra Conference signal great expectations for Tunis. The fact that men and women, representatives of Africa's racial and cultural diversity, meet together to speak and act as one, gives new hope for freedom to the peoples everywhere on the continent. It also signifies to others that Africa is determined to be united as well as free.

The number of independent African states is rapidly increasing, and 1960 will see several new countries with combined populations of 40 million people, at the very minimum, achieve their freedom. The colonial walls are tumbling all over the continent. Surely, 1960 will be known as the African Year.

These great events impel the remainder of the African Continent, from the peoples of Algeria in the north to those of the Union and Mozambique in the south, to race toward freedom. But the way is not equal for all. Today in southern Africa ugly racial oppression is imposed by a temporarily dominant minority; for those who suffer there the struggle for national sovereignty, political freedom, equality, and dignity, is indeed onerous.

As Americans citizens, mindful of our heritage, aware of the gap between ideal and practice in our own society, we pledge our help to you. Our President has recently, though briefly, visited two African nations. We will work for the active implementation of President Eisenhower's frequently expressed desire to give meaningful economic aid to African nations. We will urge official American political support for the independence of those trust territories and colonies not yet free—as the American Committee on Africa has done at the United Nations and elsewhere since 1953.

Bandung and Accra have shaped history. Now Tunis distinguishes itself as host to a forum of significant planning for historic political change.

We are proud to extend our greetings to you at this momentous time.

SIGNERS OF THE GREETING TO THE ALL-AFRICAN PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE, JANUARY 25, 1960

1. Sadie T. M. Alexander.
2. Roger Baldwin.
3. Prof. John C. Bennett.
4. Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, Michigan.
5. Pres. Sarah Gibson Blanding.
6. Judge Jane M. Bolin.
7. Henry S. Canby.
8. Walter C. Carrington.
9. Mrs. Samuel McCrea Cavert.
10. Pres. Rufus E. Clement.
11. Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, Pennsylvania.
12. The Rev. Dr. Henry Hitt Crane.
13. Mrs. Ethel Clyde.
14. Max Delson.
15. Robert Delson.
16. Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Democrat, Michigan.
17. Fred Ferber.
18. The Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick.
19. Lewis Gannett.
20. Dr. Sabine Gova.
21. Oscar Hammerstein II.
22. Lorraine Hansberry.
23. The Rev. Dr. Donald Harrington.
24. Maxwell Harway.
25. Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, Pennsylvania.
26. Dr. John Haynes Holmes.
27. George M. Houser.
28. Dr. Homer A. Jack.
29. Mrs. Sophia Yarnall Jacobs.

30. Representative BYRON L. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado.
31. Pres. Robert L. Johnson.
32. Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota.
33. Representative GEORGE A. KASEM, Democrat, California.
34. Ella Kazan.
35. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York.
36. Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts.
37. Emily Kimbrough.
38. The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.
39. Elizabeth S. Landis.
40. William B. Landis, Jr.
41. The Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence.
42. Hon. George M. Leader.
43. Stanley D. Levinson.
44. Dr. John A. Mackay.
45. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, Minnesota.
46. B. F. McLaurin.
47. Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, Democrat, Vermont.
48. Frank Montero.
49. Henry Lee Moon.
50. Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon.
51. John Murra.
52. The Rev. Dr. C. Kilmer Myers.
53. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr.
54. Dr. F. D. Patterson.
55. Irving Pfiaum.
56. Clarence Pickett.
57. The Rt. Rev. James A. Pike.
58. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, Oregon.
59. Prof. Saunders Redding.
60. Prof. Ira deA. Reid.
61. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, California.
62. Hon. Francis B. Sayre.
63. William X. Scheinman.
64. Adelaide Schukind.
65. Prof. Hugh H. Smythe.
66. Pres. Edward J. Sparling.
67. Mark Starr.
68. Hope R. Stevens.
69. Rex Stout.
70. Irwin Sull.
71. Norman Thomas.
72. Dr. Howard Thurman.
73. Sacha Volman.
74. Noah C. A. Walter.
75. Peter Weiss.
76. Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, New Jersey.
77. Representative ROY W. WIER, Democrat, Minnesota.
78. David C. Williams.
79. Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, Wisconsin.
80. Charles S. Zimmerman.
81. Prof. Stringfellow Barr.
82. A. Philip Randolph.
83. Bayard Rustin.
84. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota.
85. Dean Walter G. Muelder.
86. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
87. Nelson Bengtson.

Job for Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of February 6, 1960:

JOB FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

James A. Farley's proposal (see "This Week" section of today's News) to make "all former Presidents lifetime, nonvoting Senators-at-large" is a good one, though not a new one. Mr. Farley himself notes that it was mentioned in Congress as long ago as 1889. The idea has been pending in bill form for at least 13 years; we know, because we endorsed legislation to put it into effect that long ago, and have urged its passage several times since.

Giving ex-Presidents nonvoting status in the Senate, as Mr. Farley notes, could be done by statute; to make them full-fledged voting Senators would take a constitutional amendment. But the main purpose of giving them seats there would not be to change the voting structure in any case; it would be to "keep and use the wisdom and abilities of our Presidents after they have left the White House."

Every President, as Mr. Farley suggests, acquires a priceless and unique experience that should be made constantly available to Congressmen seeking his help and advice. Giving him a Senate seat would accomplish this; it would also provide an unparalleled forum for a former President to speak out on major public questions; and, in a very practical sense, it would be better than a mere pension as a means of providing adequate remuneration, official status and secretarial staff for all ex-Presidents. Maybe Mr. Farley's article will stir enough public interest in this proposal to get it enacted at long last. We hope so.

The Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The Informed Will Hold On to Our Rights." This editorial was written by the courageous editor of the Prentiss (Miss.) Prentiss Headlight, Mrs. F. A. Parker, and was published in the February 18, 1960, edition of that paper.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that most Americans today are more than familiar with certain articles and sections of the Constitution of the United States since they have witnessed, by means of television or other media, suspected and known criminals, hoodlums, and the like, taking refuge in the protections of the Constitution. I believe Mrs. Parker's editorial clearly states cogent reasons why the majority of the citizens of America should learn their rights under the Constitution. The editorial follows: ONLY THE INFORMED WILL HOLD ON TO OUR RIGHTS

In this day, when so many people have the erroneous impression that the Supreme Court rather than the Constitution is the law of the land, we are happy to note that the Memphis Commercial Appeal will begin a series of 22 installments next Sunday in presenting a condensation of "Your Rugged Constitution" by Bruce and Esther Findlay,

a book enthusiastically endorsed by leading educators and businessmen throughout the United States.

The Memphis paper says: "that our readers and their children may better understand and appreciate our proudest American heritage, the Commercial Appeal will serialize one of the most revealing treatments of the Constitution of the United States ever written."

The book, written by Dr. Bruce Findlay, superintendent of schools in Los Angeles, Calif., assisted by his wife, a social studies supervisor, gives a simple explanation of each section of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, in simple, easy-to-understand language.

We sincerely hope the explanations will be true to the meaning incorporated in the document by the founders. Surely, there is a need today, and there has been a need through the years, for deep study and real understanding of the meaning of the Constitution, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The Constitution of the United States, together with the treaties and Federal laws passed in accordance with its provisions, is the supreme law of the land. Surely, if anything is clear to the student of the Constitution it is that: no man or set of men should rule the people, but that the people of the individual States of these United States are capable of creating their own local government, and should be left free to choose their own associates, run their own schools, and provide the registration and voting qualifications of their own people. This great document has been amended only 22 times in all of its proud history, and the first 10 of these amendments are embodied in the matchless Bill of Rights, the hub, wheel and safety valve against Federal dictation and rule, the kind now being arrogated by the Warren Court and the bureaucrats in Washington.

The Federal Government is made up of individual States, that by no manner or means gave away all of their rights to the Federal Government . . . we have a two-way government . . . that of rights reserved by the peoples of the States as guaranteed in the 9th and 10th amendments in the Bill of Rights . . . and that given over to the Federal Government. We also have a Federal Government made up of three different and separate departments and functions, so designed that one could not lawfully encroach upon the duties of the other. Executive power is vested in the executive department headed by the President of the United States. All legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States, and this body is the only arm of the Federal Government that has the power to make and enforce laws. The judicial powers are vested in the Supreme Court, composed of nine men who shall hold their offices during good behavior, and supposed to be separate and distinct from the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

Section 4 of article 3 of the Constitution says in words that even a wayfarer, though he be a fool, may understand: The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government . . . and, just what is a republican form of government? It is a form of government where the people rule through their elected representatives or officers elected by them at the polls.

Under the Constitution, brought into being by the God-fearing, God-led founders, every State in this Union has the right to make its own register-voting laws . . . run its own schools . . . and choose its own associates, despite the preaching to the contrary by some people who have swallowed, hook, line, and sinker, the sop sired

and bred by the Communists who seek our destruction.

Yes * * * we desperately need to know our rights as individual States under the Constitution and fight until hell freezes over to keep these rights.

Revival of the Hoary Old Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 27, 1960, edition of Labor. The windmill joust continues, as Labor so aptly points out: WELFARE STATE HOAX IS TROTTED OUT AGAIN

A hoary old hoax about the welfare state has been revived, this time by U.S. News & World Report, a weekly magazine appealing largely to businessmen. The magazine reported in the February 8 issue that in the next fiscal year the Federal Government will spend \$20 billion for welfare.

Under President Eisenhower's budget for that year, the article says, "21 cents of every \$1 goes for welfare." These figures are cited as proof that America is becoming something terrible called the welfare state.

Actually, the article and its figures are full of bugs which falsify the picture. Some of the major ones can be pointed out as follows:

1. Included in the \$20 billion for welfare is \$12.8 billion for old-age and disability pensions paid under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. Not a single dollar of this \$12.8 billion is contributed by the Government. Every dollar comes from contributions by employers and employees.

Thus, much more than half of the alleged Government spending for welfare vanishes when the facts are analyzed.

2. Also as Government spending for welfare, the article lists \$985 million for civil service retirement pensions. Actually, most of that money is contributed by the Government employees. Their contributions are supposed to be matched by the Government, but it hasn't been doing so fully, and won't under Ike's budget.

Thus, another large chunk of the alleged welfare spending by the Government vanishes in the light of the facts.

3. Likewise included in the \$20 billion is \$1.9 billion for jobless benefits paid under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. Every dollar of that is contributed, not by the Government, but by employers. Thus another huge slice of the Government welfare spending vanishes.

The social security, railroad retirement, and civil service pension and benefits listed above—even after subtracting the money the Government does contribute to the civil service fund—add up to about \$15 billion. Thus, only about \$5 billion is left of the \$20 billion falsely pictured as Government welfare spending, and even the \$5 billion shrinks when subjected to further analysis.

4. Perhaps even more significant is the trick the article used in order to make it possible to falsify the picture. That trick depends on the fact that there are two Federal budgets.

One is the "regular" budget—the only one generally discussed in Congress and reported in the newspapers. This one estimates the total tax revenues in the coming fiscal year,

and the total amount of money the Government will spend from those revenues. Ike's budget puts this spending at about \$60 billion.

Anyone reading the magazine article would get the impression it is talking about this "regular" budget. Actually, the picture it gives is mostly based on a different one—the so-called "cash" budget. This one was barely mentioned in the budget message sent to Congress by Ike. However, he did point out that the cash budget, unlike the regular budget, includes the money taken in and spent by the social security, railroad retirement, civil service retirement and other "trust funds," which do not belong to the Government but are administered by Government agencies.

The President estimated that, as shown by the "cash" budget, the Government will pay out a total of \$96 billion during the coming fiscal year, and that this will include about \$16 billion from the trust funds, on top of \$84 billion from tax revenues.

In other words, Ike made it clear that the regular budget and the cash budget are two different things, and that the \$16 billion is not Government spending because the money doesn't belong to the Government. It belongs to the people who contributed to the social security, railroad retirement, civil service and other trust funds.

The magazine article did not make that clear. On the contrary, it caused its readers to believe that the entire \$20 billion to be paid out for "welfare" is Government spending of Government money.

Why did the magazine revive this hoary old hoax and bring it up to date? The article itself suggests the answer. It attacks the Forand bill, which would provide medical and hospital care for old folks under the social security and railroad retirement systems, as a sinister proposal to extend the welfare state.

Brucellosis Eradication Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and resolution:

MENDOCINO COUNTY BRUCELLOSIS-FREE

UKIAH.—Mendocino County was among the first in the State to be declared a modified certified brucellosis-free area, Roderick A. Shippey, farm adviser has announced.

Spearheaded by the Mendocino-Trinity Cattlemen's Association, the program was completed in near record time. In being a brucellosis-free area, cattlemen can ship cattle anywhere in the United States with a clean bill of health, Mr. Shippey said.

The program initiated by the cattlemen themselves, consisted of blood testing a percentage of their cattle.

When reactions were found, the entire herd was tested and the reactors slaughtered.

Modern research has produced a vaccine which, used on calves, gives the animals a lifetime immunity to the disease.

RESOLUTION RE FEDERAL BUDGET (FISCAL YEAR 1961) FOR FEDERAL-STATE BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION PROGRAM

Whereas the fiscal year 1961 budget proposed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for eradicating brucellosis is considerably

less than funds available for this purpose during the current fiscal year; and

Whereas Federal funds allocated to the States for brucellosis eradication during the current year resulted in suspension of the brucellosis program in a number of important cattle counties and prevented inauguration of the program in others; and

Whereas we have been advised that the budget proposed would only permit brucellosis eradication activities at the current level, with some limited extension into new areas during fiscal year 1961; and

Whereas it appears that under the proposed budget the program could not be extended during the next fiscal year into many important cattle areas, including several dairy counties of California, thus delaying completion of the brucellosis eradication program indefinitely in such areas and permitting the disease to become further established and eventually resulting in greater costs for eradication and creating an economic burden on cattle owners in such areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the California State Board of Agriculture, meeting in Sacramento, Calif., on February 15, 1960, That this serious situation be brought to the attention of the Congress, and that they be urged to increase the amount of funds budgeted for the fiscal year 1961 for brucellosis eradication from \$15 million to \$20 million in order to prevent this important work from being seriously delayed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL and the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, U.S. Senators from California, to Members of the House of Representatives from California, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the proper officials of our sister States.

Antarctic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to inform the Members of the House that on February 4, 1960, the American Association of Patriotic Societies at its annual meeting unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the recent Antarctic Treaty which would internationalize the Antarctic. This treaty has yet to be confirmed by the Senate.

The association also urged that the Antarctic areas explored by the United States be claimed by our Nation. A like resolution was adopted by the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense during its annual meeting on February 5.

House Joint Resolution 97, which I have introduced, declares the rights of sovereignty of the United States over those areas which she has explored, and reserves her rights to other areas.

Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I have said many times that our veterans of World War I are the forgotten men of our times. While I have voted in favor of all veterans' legislation, I think it is most regrettable, bearing on the tragic, that the Congress has not seen fit to give greater consideration to the welfare of those who served in the uniform of our country in the First World War. I would remind my colleagues again that it was the veterans of World War I, serving in the Congress of the United States during the tense days of World War II, who led the fight to put upon the statute books of this country the kind of measures which saved the veterans of that war from having to face the same economic conditions and privations which confronted the men who came back from World War I.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that a fine veterans' organization, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., had its beginning in my native State of Ohio.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a fine article by my dear friend, Mr. Doyle Ditmars, publicity officer of the Ohio department, entitled "Ohio, Birthplace of V.W.W.I.," in order that my colleagues may become better acquainted with the aims and objectives of this organization:

OHIO BIRTHPLACE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Many men and women who served in the First World War, still living in Ohio, have never heard of the organization, the Veterans of World War I.

I wish to direct those remarks to veterans of that war in this community to acquaint them with some of the aims and objects of our organization, which was formed in Cleveland back in 1949.

The group had a small beginning. It has now grown and established departments in every State of the Union. But it still is not large enough in membership to attain its objects and secure just rewards for war service to which we are entitled. To accomplish those objects, we must secure more members. We must add more barracks to the 2,000 now established. There are 73 in Ohio. Of the 2,600,000 veterans of our war remaining, we should have a membership of at least a million.

To acquaint the men and women of this community with our organization, and perhaps interest them in establishing a unit (or barracks), I wish to present our program.

1. To coordinate veterans of World War I into an organization for their mutual benefit, pleasure, and amusement, giving them the opportunity of personal contact, in order to keep alive friendships and memories of World War I.

2. To cooperate fully with all veterans' organizations, so that the best interests of all veterans of all American wars may be served.

3. To stimulate communities and political subdivisions into taking more interest in veterans of World War I and their problems,

as well as the widows and orphans of such deceased veterans.

4. To uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, as well as the individual States of the Union.

5. To fight for our national security, in order to protect Americans from enemies within and without, to the end that our American way of life shall be preserved.

6. To fight all alien forces, particularly and especially Communists, whose objectives are to deny our very existence as a free people.

7. To secure for veterans of World War I the same policy and treatment by our Government accorded to Civil and Spanish War veterans, who through patriotic service and sacrifice to their country, have earned and to which they are justly entitled.

8. To work for cost-of-living increases to veterans now receiving service connected pensions.

9. Work to secure pensions for widows of World War I veterans comparable to that now being paid to Spanish War widows.

10. Establish an Accredited Claims Department, so that every World War I veteran may always secure friendly, trained, and experienced representation before the Veterans' Administration.

11. Secure hospitalization for all World War I veterans without the "pauper's oath" and income limitations.

These are some of our objectives, in addition to working for a liveable pension for every man and woman who served 90 days or more in the first World War. THIS IS YOUR OUTFIT. It was formed FOR YOUR benefit. Only those who served in the first war are eligible to join. We are all getting older! Our time is running out. Three hundred die every day.

World War I veterans of this community, get together and talk it over. It requires but ten (10) members to get a barracks charter. You can add to that number as other buddies wish to join. For further information, write me at my address. I can give you the name and address of the barracks commander nearest you. Don't put it off. Do it now.

DOYLE DITMARS,

Department Publicity Officer.

HOLMESVILLE, OHIO.

Song of the Independent Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, adopting the motto "To what avail, a plow or sail, or love of life, if freedom fail?" a stock farmer in North Georgetown, Ohio, sat down and wrote a song he calls "Song of the Independent Farmers." He dedicated it as follows: "to my fellow countrymen who value their freedom under the Constitution of the United States of America." I do not know what the music of Farmer George Saffell's song sounds like, but the words sure sound good. Here they are:

We can't grow wheat, we can't grow cotton,
Our freedom now has been forgotten.
Had our fill, won't take from the till,
Subsidies make the granaries fill.
Oh, how did we get in such a pickle.
Over our farms hangs a hammer and sickle.

Scale of Justice is out of balance,
No jury trial decides our grievance.
Three little men in each county seat
Have all the power no judge will defeat.
Free enterprise helped make this country great.
Let's throw out the act of nineteen thirty eight.

They took Doc's car and Simpson's money
Sold Yankus out which was not funny.
Stangland's tractors have been returned,
The rest of us are yet to be burned.
And our little wheat made all this trouble,
The Justice Department is seeing double.

CHORUS

Just to run our own farms with no help
from Uncle Sam
That supply and demand would keep us
from this jam,
But the people got soft, would not help in
our fight.
But we'll never give in 'cause we know that
we are right.

Interest Rate Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a communication from Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Accompanying this letter was an emergency resolution adopted by his association on February 24, 1960. The letter and the resolution expressed criticism of the legislative proposal to adjust the interest rate ceiling applicable to long-term U.S. marketable securities so as to facilitate proper debt management on the part of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by the lack of understanding of this urgent national problem that was reflected in Mr. Ellis' letter and in the resolution. I immediately responded to Mr. Ellis in an attempt to dispel the numerous misconceptions he had in regard to this legislation.

One of Mr. Ellis' misconceptions is that the 4 1/4 percent interest rate ceiling on marketable bonds has kept the interest rate down. The fact is that the ceiling has not kept the interest rate down; it has forced the Treasury Department to rely heavily on the short-term money market at rates in excess of 4 1/4 percent in managing the public debt.

A second of Mr. Ellis' misconceptions is that the President of the United States establishes interest rates. The fact is that interest rates are established under our free enterprise economy by the laws of supply and demand in much the same manner that other prices are established. The interest rate is the price of borrowing money.

A third misconception on Mr. Ellis' part is his belief that the enactment of legislation adjusting the archaic 4 1/4 percent ceiling will touch off a "chain reaction" to the detriment of such things as farm credit, small business, and housing. The fact is that the interest rate ceiling

by confining the Treasury to short-term borrowing has raised interest costs to the small businessman, the farmer, and the homebuilder.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of Mr. Ellis' tragic misconceptions. The issue of interest rate legislation will be debated in the House of Representatives in the near future and at such time we can give detailed consideration to the urgent national problem of proper debt management.

I understand that other Members of the Congress have received similar communications from Mr. Ellis.

So that Mr. Ellis' letter and my reply to him may be a matter of public information, I will insert both the original communication and my reply in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1960.

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
House Office Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. ARENDS: The attached resolution appealing for your help in opposing a compromise on the interest-rate-ceiling issue has just been adopted by our association board of directors and the membership. This action was taken at our 18th annual meeting now being held at St. Louis, where we have nearly 6,000 of our system directors, managers, members, and friends registered and in attendance.

We sincerely urge you to give this expression your earnest consideration and then your vigorous support.

Respectfully yours,
CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDED BY THE NRECA BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP IN GENERAL SESSION AT ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 24, 1960

Whereas the Congress is about to take up a bill which would compromise the traditional interest-rate ceiling and thus remove one of the last effective bulwarks protecting us and all consumers from the ever-spiraling interest costs that are being imposed everywhere under the tight-money policy; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, will give the President the authority to establish interest rates at any level he chooses, a fiscal power the Congress has never before seen fit to hand over to any President at any time; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, will touch off a chain reaction that can result only in crippling damage to such programs as rural electrification, resource development, housing, farm credit, education, small business, slum clearance—not to mention the extra costs it would inflict on national defense and government operations at all levels; and

Whereas the President has recommended that the Congress increase the REA rate to the level of interest on long-term issues, plus an additional amount: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we who are assembled in the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association representing 1,000 rural electric cooperatives and their 16 million individual member-consumers appeal to the Congress to defeat this legislation and begin forthwith a drive to get our national monetary policies back on a sound and sane basis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1960.

MR. CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electric Co-
operative Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: I have your letter of February 29, enclosing a resolution adopted by the membership of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association on February 24, 1960.

I note that the caption on the resolution suggests it was adopted on an emergency basis. Such hasty consideration is certainly reflected in the misunderstanding evident in the resolution of both the problem which the Treasury faces at the present time, and the solution which the House Ways and Means Committee has proposed. The bill referred to does not remove the interest rate ceiling on long-term marketable securities but merely provides a limited exception to the ceiling.

Your resolution fails to recognize further that the present ceiling has already added substantially to the current interest cost on the public debt by forcing the Treasury to do all its financing through short-term borrowing. This has resulted in pushing interest rates in the short-term market far above those on long-term securities, reaching the highest levels in almost 40 years. The Congress has a duty to see that this unwise pressure on short-term interest rates ceases immediately.

Your resolution furthermore ignores completely the fact that one of the segments of our economy most hurt by high short-term interest rates is the American farmer who must meet demands for seasonal loans and other short-term needs at rates which are much higher than if the Treasury were able to meet at least some of its requirements through borrowing beyond 5 years. The Treasury cannot do its borrowing in a vacuum—it has to do it in competition with all other borrowers. If the Treasury is completely denied access to borrowing beyond 5 years it obviously must add to the already heavy volume of demand for short-term funds. Qualified experts have testified that short-term rates would be perhaps as much as one-half of 1 percent lower if the Treasury were not forced to do all of its borrowing in the short-term market in competition with consumers, farmers, and small businessmen.

The statement in your resolution that "This bill, if enacted, will give the President the authority to establish interest rates at any level he chooses, a fiscal power the Congress has never before seen fit to hand over to any President at any time" ignores four facts: In the first place, in our free enterprise economy the prevailing interest rate is the barometer of the relationship between the demand for credit and the supply of savings determined through the individual decisions of literally millions of Americans. Secondly, the President already has authority to sell U.S. securities on short-term issues, at whatever interest rate the market demands, and has had it for more than 40 years. Thirdly, no responsible President or Secretary of the Treasury is going to borrow money at any rate of interest other than at the very lowest rate he can, consistent with the public interest. Fourthly, the bill reported by the House Ways and Means Committee does not remove the ceiling—it merely permits certain exceptions to be exercised, with definite limitations.

The report of the House Ways and Means Committee on its bill makes it very clear that the intended purpose of this bill is to permit the Treasury to manage the debt effectively, economically, and efficiently. It is in the best interests of 177 million Americans and the strength of the free world that

the Secretary of the Treasury be given authority to manage the public debt in the least inflationary manner possible.

In your resolution you indicate criticism of the Federal Reserve System and place yourself in favor of an undefined monetary policy that is "sound and sane." It is my conviction that the Federal Reserve's flexible monetary policy has been skillfully handled and deserves the support of all thoughtful citizens. Every American has much to gain by the proper management of the public debt and by other sound financial policies, in helping to avoid inflation which can seriously impair the confidence of our people in the American dollar. Excessive short-term borrowing by the Treasury is inflationary in that it, in effect, adds to the supply of money in the country and is only one step removed from "printing press" money.

No one has more to lose from inflation than the farmer who, under inflation, finds his crops priced too low and the costs of his purchases mounting every time he goes to the market. This fact is well recognized by the leading national farm organizations. I would like to remind you that the National Farm Bureau has adopted a resolution supporting the removal of the 4½-percent ceiling in the interest of the farmer as well as all other citizens. In addition, the master of the National Grange has supported the removal of the ceiling.

All Americans—including the 16 million which you mention in your resolution—can only be harmed by a further erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar since it eats away at the value of their savings. The best way to insure further deterioration in the value of the dollar and impaired confidence in our national economic strength is to try to force down interest rates artificially in the vain hope that some other means may be found to fight inflation, short of complete regimentation and socialization of our economy.

In conclusion, therefore, I would suggest that your board of directors and membership consider a little more carefully your ill-advised action which is based on an obvious lack of understanding of both the problem and the proposed solution. This matter of proper debt management is too important for politically motivated caprice.

Very truly yours,
L. C. ARENDS,
Member of Congress.

Adm. Jerauld Wright Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

MR. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's most important military leaders, Adm. Jerauld Wright, has just retired after a most distinguished career. Though relatively unknown to the public, Admiral Wright has been a key figure in the defense of the United States and the free world. For the last 6 years he has served with distinction as commander of the North Atlantic Treaty naval forces, as commander of the U.S. Atlantic Command, and commander of the Atlantic Fleet.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks the following editorials, which indicate the remarkable services Admiral Wright has rendered our country:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 29, 1960]

AN ADMIRAL RETIRES

Adm. Jerauld Wright retires today at Norfolk, Va., after 42 years of distinguished service. In dual ceremonies, international and national, he will relinquish the responsibilities of heading up three of the world's major commands. For almost 6 years he has worn three hats: Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic of NATO; Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Command, and Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet.

Jerauld Wright deserves richly the honors done him today. As commander of the world's first international ocean command he contributed greatly to developing the military structure of the NATO alliance. And in his dual role as Commander in Chief of U.S. Atlantic forces he worked intensively to maintain their strength, particularly in his efforts to increase the fighting power of our antisubmarine forces.

Admiral Wright served in both the Atlantic and Pacific in World War II and held many vital naval posts in the peacetime years. He also served in World War I after graduating from the Naval Academy at age 19. He was the youngest member of his class and one of the youngest ever to graduate at Annapolis.

We wish him well in retirement. Certainly he merits a "well done" for his many fine achievements in four decades of service to his country.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 29, 1960]

A TOP COMMANDER RETIRES

America and the free world have lost an outstanding military leader and defender of the peace with the retirement at Norfolk today of Adm. Jerauld Wright, veteran of two world wars and the current cold war. "Jerry" Wright, as his friends here and abroad knew him, is relinquishing three important commands—Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), commander in chief of the Atlantic Command, a unified American group of Navy, Army, and Air Force elements, and commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet. In this triple role he has headed powerful forces on which we and our American and European allies have relied to help keep the cold war from becoming hot.

Admiral Wright, as he leaves active service today, can look back on a 42-year career of varied, colorful, and often dangerous service in peace and war. As a junior lieutenant he served with allied antisubmarine forces in World War I. Between wars he had sea and land assignments—the latter including tours as naval aide to Presidents Coolidge and Hoover. Washington came to know him well then. Early in World War II he had the storybook assignment of landing surreptitiously by submarine on the north African coast with Gen. Mark Clark and others to make contact with French resistance officers. He commanded a second submarine operation which evacuated French General Giraud and his staff from southern France. Later he participated in numerous assaults and landings on Japanese-held isles in the Pacific.

Recognized as an expert on amphibious warfare and joint operations, Admiral Wright was a natural selection in 1954 as Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic. In this post he has commanded the world's first international navy, composed of the Atlantic forces of all the NATO powers. He has worked tirelessly and effectively to organize this navy into a coordinated, co-

operative defense fleet, ready for any emergency. As he turns his commands over to another outstanding officer, Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, we are glad to learn that Jerry Wright plans to make Washington his permanent home. We hasten to welcome him back as friend and neighbor.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1960]

THE UNSUNG ADMIRAL

Adm. Jerauld Wright, who retired at Norfolk yesterday after 42 years in the U.S. Navy, served his country well without ever writing disputatious memoirs or otherwise causing clamor about his assignments or views. This did not mean that Admiral Wright lacked conviction or purpose; far from it. As commander of NATO forces in the Atlantic for the last 6 years, he held one of the free world's two most important unified commands (the other being that of General Norstad as NATO commander in Europe), and one which required considerable acquaintance with diplomacy in addition to military proficiency. But Admiral Wright shares some of the self-effacing quality of the late Gen. George C. Marshall in his shunning of personal publicity. His distinguished career, starting with graduation from Annapolis at 19, included combat service in both World Wars and assignments in the Pacific as well as Atlantic in World War II. He is the second generation in his family to attain top military command (his father was the late Lieut. Gen. William Mason Wright), and when he turned over his command yesterday he had served on continuous active duty longer than any other officer of recent years. He and Mrs. Wright, who will now make their home in Washington, will receive many salutes of warm good wishes.

James Zetek: Entomologist and Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal undertaking has produced many graduates of distinction from that great project. Though the canal was primarily an engineering and construction endeavor, the leaders it has produced were not limited to engineers, but have included many to attain fame in other fields.

Among these was Dr. James Zetek, formerly of Chicago, Ill., who came to the Canal Zone in 1911 as an entomologist for the Isthmian Canal Commission at the time when the renowned William Crawford Gorgas was chief sanitarian of the isthmus.

A man of high intelligence, boundless energy, and great driving force, young Zetek dedicated his life to a great purpose—the study of tropical insects in relation to medicine, sanitation, and economics.

This led him into original investigations into such matters as the ecology and behavior of the mosquito as vectors for malaria and yellow fever, the study of fruitflies, termites, and forest inhabiting mollusks, as well as destructive forms of marine life.

The results of his many years of inquiry, which have been extensively published in scientific literature, form a vast store of knowledge. His writings are an enduring monument to one of the most outstanding personalities ever associated with the Panama Canal enterprise and merit stressing in the permanent annals of the Congress.

William R. McCann, of Hopewell, Va., himself a distinguished engineering graduate of the canal enterprise, has sent me an interesting letter from Clayton J. Embree of Quarryville, Pa., together with an obituary notice in a recent issue of the *Lions' magazine*.

Mr. Embree's letter and the notice follow:

FEBRUARY 23, 1960.

DEAR MCCANN: The enclosed clipping was in the *Lion's magazine*. I do not know if you ever knew Dr. Zetek, but he was a wonderful man and certainly knew a great deal about insects. We were having trouble with the greenheart look sills; and I dug out a part of one and took it to him and he stated that it seemed to be a different species, had a new pallet or tail. He sent some of them to Washington for identification and they stated that they were a new kind, they are called Zetekii.

Another of his hobbies was snakes, he kept a live boa constrictor in a cage under his laboratory table, as well as others. I asked about the coral snake, and he said that its nervous disposition was such that it would not live in captivity. He had a number of houses built on Coronada Island trying to make them proof against the termites; whether he succeeded I do not know.

Kindest regards,

C. J. EMBREE.

Noted entomologist, Dr. James Zetek, the "baron" of Barro Colorado Island, died at the age of 73. His death was due to a cardiac condition, aggravated by pneumonia. A member of the Balboa, Canal Zone Lions Club, he had retired 3 years ago because of his heart trouble. Dr. Zetek, a native of Chicago, went to the Canal Zone in 1911 after graduating from the University of Illinois. He was with the Canal Zone Sanitary Department, the Board of Health Laboratory, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture prior to being named research specialist of the Canal Zone Biological Area when it was established in 1923 by the U.S. National Research Council. The area, on Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake, has become a center for the study of tropical life and attracts scientists from throughout the world. It was taken over by the Smithsonian Institution in 1946. While building the area into a top center in its field, Dr. Zetek also gained renown for his own findings and was recognized as a leading authority on termites.

Rickover's Blueprint for Better Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, at probably no other time in American history has our Nation taken such a penetrating look at its schools. Contribut-

ing immensely to this national debate has been Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, whose genius at cutting through dense, bureaucratic fog is well known.

Several prominent educators have criticized Admiral Rickover's views. But I am sure the good admiral would not want anyone to swallow his views without careful examination and debate. In this way Admiral Rickover is making an invaluable contribution to our schools. He is encouraging both educators and laymen to examine their assumptions about education and to evaluate their local school systems.

Another example of Admiral Rickover's contribution to the national debate on education appeared in the nationally circulated *American Weekly*, on February 28, 1960:

THE ANGRY ADMIRAL'S PLAN

(By Frances Leighton)

(Hyman Rickover, father of the atomic sub, warns that Russia's educational system is better than ours—and tells what we have to do to build brains for survival in this superscientific age.)

Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover of the U.S. Navy is seriously concerned about America's educational system. He feels that Russia is swiftly moving ahead of us in the sciences and the professions and that time is running out on our chances of catching up.

His consuming interest in education began when he headed the American team that gave the world its first atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*—and found that men with the educational know-how for nuclear power development simply weren't readily available.

He set out to find the reasons why, and came up with some startling facts:

Though our schools had admittedly always been behind northern and western Europe in genuine education, we'd had one tremendous advantage: Our high schools were free and graduated more students than European countries; but, now, Rickover discovered, the situation has changed. All advanced European countries have free education up to 18 years of age. What's more, European colleges are cheaper, and in Russia not only is college free, but students are paid room and board and given pocket money besides.

He found that Russian children graduated at 17 from a 10-year school, do as well by the record as our most talented children after 2 years in college; that in algebra and physics they reach a level achieved by only a small percentage of college entrants here; that by 1961 Soviet graduations are expected to be 60 percent larger than those in the United States.

"The real race we are in," he said, "is a technological race—to see whose educational system best prepares youth for the world of modern science—the communistic or the democratic?"

"What are we to do?"

The admiral, in his blunt, realistic fashion, answered his own question:

"We have no choice. The time has come for a crash program in education. Let's put aside pride and prejudice and stop quibbling about the usurping of States' rights and the cutting of tax dollars and start thinking about our children. Let's pass on to them the knowledge and wisdom of the past."

"The important obligation of Congress is to get into this educational problem, to find out the real truth, and to take steps to remedy the real defects."

And then he set forth the following 10 points he considers essential as a guiding code for the revitalization of education in America:

"1. Lengthen the school year. Only in America do children have such a short school term. All other children go to school 6 days a week, 10 months a year. They are in classrooms 240 days or more as compared with 180 days for American children. American children spend too many years in the lower schools. Surely we could do in 10 years the work we now stretch to 12 years of schooling."

"2. Decide that the primary function of the school is to educate the mind. The home and the church are the places to train our youngsters to be social creatures and the school should be free to concentrate on developing their minds. A vast amount of marginal stuff that clutters our school schedules is of questionable use. Such training ought never to be substituted for the real business of schools, which is to instruct children in basic subjects that will give them a better comprehension of the world they live in."

"3. Cut out emphasis on competitive sports and increase the physical fitness of all children. We have all but eliminated competition from education and transferred the competitive feeling to school sports. Interscholastic and intercollegiate games in which only a handful of star athletes take part are an American phenomena, unknown elsewhere."

"Physical education in Russia and the rest of Europe is centered on developing the body of each child. A study of European children, shortly after World War II, showed that, despite the war and years of inadequate nourishment, the European children were healthier than our own youngsters."

"4. Toughen the curriculum and reduce electives. I think our curriculum should eliminate all the soft courses and get back to a hard-core basic standard. The Russian student graduating from the 10-year school must pass an examination in seven subjects—Russian language and literature, a foreign language, algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry and history—a much broader field of knowledge than our college board achievement tests."

Our own snap courses may shortchange our children for the future. They will have to compete in a world so improved educationally that we cannot afford to stand still. It takes a long time to produce highly educated professional men. If we don't do this through our educational system we will inevitably be outstripped by Russia."

I am particularly disturbed by our concept of electives for school children. Here we have minors whom we carefully protect under our law because we know they cannot judge wisely and may therefore harm themselves if we let them decide important matters themselves; yet we let these same minors choose the subjects they wish to study in school—to make decisions which will influence them for the rest of their lives."

In the United States it is quite possible that, left to his own devices, a potentially talented child may squander his best learning years on easy know-how courses which require no homework but which earn him the same credit toward a high school diploma as academic subjects."

"5. Set national standards of education: Not all our children are alike. Unbelievably, our high school diploma tells us nothing about the scholastic achievements of its possessor. We made our mistake in downgrading the curriculum until it met the lowest levels of competence instead of setting up different types of secondary schools for different types of students."

In European countries there are three kinds of diplomas. The British have the O, the A, and the S Certificates, standing for "Ordinary," "Advanced Level," and "Scholarship Level." On the Continent the final examinations are usually set up by a body composed of eminent scholars and laymen.

To me there is nothing more important than to change our educational system so that it will provide the best possible education for every child: slow, average and talented.

I believe the single most important thing that needs to be done is the creation of a body to set national standards. The Federal Government should set standards for education. That would give parents a norm—a yardstick to measure what their children should learn and have learned in school."

"6. Grant Federal aid to education: It seems to me we give too much weight to the fact that education is not mentioned in the Constitution. Isn't the honest labeling of educational diplomas as important as honest labeling of drugs? We regulate what goes into people's mouths, why can't we recommend what should go into their heads?"

Every boy and girl in this country, regardless of social status, should have the same opportunity for a good education. The dollars spent on education are the cheapest, with the greatest return. The waste of money on missiles and other technical projects may be laid to inadequately educated people. Why are Members of Congress willing to appropriate large sums of money for things which they are not sure will succeed, but hesitate to help education when the return on the investment is certain and great."

"7. Cut the cost of college education: In Russia, Britain and France every able student can go to a university at no cost to his family and scholarships are based on tests—special exams are given at 11 or 12, and 17 or 18 to determine who should pursue a university education and who should advance in other fields of endeavor."

We have the curious situation that it actually costs more in the United States to become a professional man than in most of the European democracies. There is much evidence that the education dollar buys less good schooling in the United States than in any country in the world."

Congress must determine to what extent we should help worthy college students. I am not saying we should go so far as to pay students to go to college as they do in Russia, but I do believe we should at least help the student working his way through college to the extent that he can make his educational costs tax deductible."

"8. Find additional incentives for getting more of our capable students to college: Somehow we must convince our children that their future depends on their becoming really educated. Today military power is almost wholly a matter of technology and this in turn depends on well-educated brain power. By 1961 Russia will have about 2 million scientists and engineers—20 percent more than we will have. In one way Russia's low standard of living—about one-third of ours—gives her the advantage in this matter of incentive."

A child in Russia will work his head off to get to college and raise his standard of living. He cannot take over his dad's business as he can here and have readymade success."

"9. Change our basic attitude toward teachers: How can we have proper respect for our schoolteachers in America if we see them forced to earn extra money operating checkout counters in grocery stores and working at other part-time jobs? Our best teachers leave the profession for industry."

The teaching profession should be the most noble in the land. What is the use of sending children to college if we don't have properly qualified teachers to teach them? And why don't we have qualified teachers? Simply because of low salaries. The highest paid man in Russia is the head of the Academy of Sciences. He gets the equivalent of \$50,000. A university professor in Russia is

paid the same as the head of a large industrial organization.

One way I feel that the Federal Government can aid education is in direct aid to teachers.

"10. Start teaching languages: In Russia today, 50 percent of the students going to secondary schools are being taught English—about 10 million Russians are studying English. By comparison, a few thousand Americans are studying Russian."

I am not advocating that we adopt the Russian political system or anyone else's. I am merely urging that we look around and see what others are doing and not delude ourselves. We must not again say that the Russians do nothing well. And for a long time we assumed they were so far behind us scientifically we did not bother to translate their technical reports. Yet they've orbited the heaviest object into space.

As a hopeful note to show that we are waking up to the world around us, I cite a recent story about the PTA members of 28 Fairfax, Va., schools who have voted to have foreign languages incorporated into the regular curriculum for elementary and intermediate schools. They ask that language study start in the third grade.

If we are to keep our position in the world today and to influence people in international relations, we must become a multilingual people. One reason that Russia has gotten so far with other nations is that she has taken the trouble to learn to communicate with them in their native tongue.

Can we afford to do less?

Full Granaries—Empty Pockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. MCGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, we often hear the charge that the farm program is keeping the "inefficient" operator on the farm. And we have heard statements from people who point to the bumper crops of the past 2 years as proof of the prosperity of the farmer.

I feel that neither statement is correct.

In the first place, 5 million people have left the farm in the past 10 years. This terrific depopulation has taken a toll of the marginal farmer. Unless this trend is slowed, the corporation farm will become a part of our economy by necessity. With the rather large numbers of unemployed people with us, we must give careful consideration as to the possibility that good efficient farmers are being driven from the land where they should be kept to provide food for the future.

The fallacy of the "good crops mean prosperous farmers" theory also has many proofs. One of the finest documentations of the status of the farmers came to me in a letter from M. W. Dunlap, a banker at Douglas, Nebr. Like many smalltown bankers, Mr. Dunlap also assists farmers in making out their income tax returns. The community of Douglas in eastern Nebraska is familiar to me, although it is not in my congressional district, because it is the locality of the birthplace of my father.

It is a good agriculture area where diversified farming is most common with traditionally a relatively high percentage of farmers carrying on substantial livestock operations. The Douglas community has for the past 2 years had better than average crops.

The only distress that is present is in the falling incomes of the farmers. Mr. Dunlap wrote to me that he has completed 200 income tax schedules for the year, 141 of which were for farmers. He has sent a tabulation of the results. In considering the information, it is important that the investment of the farmer be considered. The exceptional \$5,100 net income is not the farmer's pay for his labor. It is his return on his labor, his farm machinery, and his land.

Mr. Dunlap, in his letter to me, points out the danger to the entire economy of the Nation if this basic industry which is a \$40 billion annual consumer market and which is the No. 1 customer of the petroleum industry, an extensive market for steel goods, and so forth, continues to suffer further.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point the table which Mr. Dunlap has made up of the results of his service in income tax schedules preparation. Be assured that there are no gimmicks in this picture. It is a true cross section of an average eastern Nebraska agriculture community:

Gross income	
19-----	Less than \$1,000.
27-----	Between \$1,000 and \$2,000.
22-----	Between \$2,000 and \$3,000.
20-----	Between \$3,000 and \$4,000.
10-----	Between \$4,000 and \$5,000.
10-----	Between \$5,000 and \$6,000.
31-----	\$6,000 and over.
Net income	
42-----	Net loss.
30-----	Less than \$500.
19-----	Between \$500 and \$1,000.
13-----	Between \$1,000 and \$1,500.
8-----	Between \$1,500 and \$2,000.
6-----	Between \$2,000 and \$2,500.
1-----	Between \$2,500 and \$3,000.
8-----	Between \$3,000 and \$3,500.
5-----	Between \$3,500 and \$4,000.
1-----	Between \$4,000 and \$4,500.
4-----	Between \$4,500 and \$5,000.
1-----	\$5,100.

Staying Ahead of the Soviet Union in the Competition for Survival—We've Got To Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the 1960 Olympics have come and gone. As they close up the arena at Squaw Valley and the competitors make their way back to their home countries, many a thoughtful American is pausing to ask why it is that the United States came out such a long way behind the Soviet Union in the final scoring. Not only did the Soviet

Union win the 1960 winter Olympics, but they won it by gaining more than twice as many points as their nearest opponent. And this fact is all the more startling when we realize that until 4 years ago the Soviet Union had never won any kind of medal in winter Olympic competition. I know that some observers will say that the Olympics do not represent team competition but only individual competition, and others may say that the winter Olympics are not really important; let the Russians win them anyway. And yet at a time when there is the most profound kind of competition between the Soviet and American ways of life, the tremendous Russian progress in this field of athletics in a few short years cannot help but be noticed throughout the world and cannot help but be interpreted as perhaps another straw in the wind in this vital struggle.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in an article which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post written by Bill Furlong, of the Chicago Daily News Service. Mr. Furlong, writing from Squaw Valley, makes this blunt statement:

The Russians won the winter Olympics for the same reason they're winning the race in space—because they're eager and we're not. Of all the reasons, the last is the most important. The other three can be overcome—but only after the last one is overcome.

Mr. Speaker, does this not look like the same thing that we seem to be running into also in the race for space and the construction of superior military power? Have we Americans indeed lost the desire to excel? Have we lost the old competitive spirit? Is it true that in space and in the race for military superiority and in the competition to produce the best educated engineering and scientific brains, just as in the competition for gold medals in the winter Olympics, "they're eager and we're not"?

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is one bright spot on the horizon, and that is the performance of the American Olympic hockey team. As Mr. Furlong puts it—

It also was determination which led to the U.S. success in hockey—for by all odds, both Canada and Russia had better talent and better teams. Yet our players wanted so much to win that they swept over superior opponents.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the same must hold true in our competition with the Soviet Union in other fields as well. To stay ahead we must first of all want very badly to stay ahead. In all of our talk about our technological improvement and our industrial might, let us not forget that the most important quality of all is the determination to stay ahead and win.

The concluding sentence of Mr. Furlong's article applies not just to the winter Olympics, but to the whole gamut of the desperate competition between American freedom and Russian communism in which we find ourselves today: "All it takes is to care enough to win."

The article follows:

IN OLYMPICS, AS IN SPACE, EAGER RUSSIANS TAKE GREAT PRIDE IN DEFEATING CAPITALISTIC NATIONS

(By Bill Furlong)

SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF., February 29.—Why did we lose?

Why did the Russians romp away with winter Olympic honors and the United States finish far behind?

The reasons:

The United States as a whole is not interested in winter sports. Our preference is to go south to Florida, not to engage in the vigorous sports of the northlands. The Russians, on the other hand, have made a point of engaging in winter sports—largely because it is, like Canada, a north country.

Even for those athletes interested in winter sports, the training season is short—2 or 3 months at the most. By way of contrast, the training season for nations like Russia and Canada is 5 months or more.

We ignored certain events, such as cross-country skiing, particularly for women. The Russians "loaded up" in those events—and the medals they won in those events count just as much as the ones in the prominent events.

The Russians are interested in winning any contest with capitalistic nations. Thus the Russians won the winter Olympics for the same reason they're winning the race in space—because they're eager and we're not.

Of all the reasons, the last is the most important. The other three can be overcome—but only after the last one is overcome.

The Russians showed the way. Until 4 years ago, they had never won any type of medal in winter Olympics competition.

Then in 1956—after being blanked for 32 years—they captured 14 medals, including 5 gold medals.

That was no accident. The Russians went about it with great calculations and skill. They have the natural resources: (1) a huge population inured to the rigors of the far north, and (2) an extended training period.

The Soviet Government merely provided the opportunities to work on winter sports.

An example: There are 32 Olympic-sized speed-skating rinks in Moscow alone.

There is only one in the United States—here at Squaw Valley (and it may eventually be closed or torn up).

"They have 10 rinks for really good skaters in Moscow and 10 more for mediocre skaters and the rest for beginners," says Eddie Rudolph, a speed skater on the U.S. Olympic team.

The result: A series of Russian victories in speed skating—and a worldwide trend toward the Russian style of skating.

"It is more designed for speed skating, while the American style is a little bit more like hockey skating," explains Eugen Grishin, the Russians' top speed skater.

The U.S.S.R. also shrewdly loaded up on the events ignored by the United States. We had virtually no entrants in the two women's cross-country skiing events (the 10-KM race and the 3 x 5 KM relay race).

The Russians had many entries—including several of world championship caliber. We had a poor team in the biathlon. Russia had a number of skilled entrants.

The combination of shrewdness and determination catapulted Russia to the front.

Determination was a significant factor—even to the United States. "We worked hard and we wanted to win," says Grishin.

It also was determination which led to the U.S. success in hockey—for by all odds, both Canada and Russia had better talent and better teams.

Yet our players seemed so much to win that they swept over superior opponents.

There is hope for the future. We're improving in speed skating.

All it takes is to care enough to win.

We're Accepting Communist Policies To Share the Earth and Share the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article written by Mr. Holmes Alexander and published in the New Orleans States-Item on December 15, 1959, entitled "We're Accepting Communist Policies To Share the Earth and Share the Moon."

WE'RE ACCEPTING COMMUNIST POLICIES TO SHARE THE EARTH AND SHARE THE MOON

WASHINGTON.—"It's going to be a while yet," said C. L. Closelooker, the research man, "before I throw my hat in the air for the 12-nation Antarctica treaty."

Mr. Closelooker ought not be such a spoilsport. Practically everybody in Washington seems to favor the treaty, which amounts to an international quitclaim on the 5 million square mile continent. He ought to be like practically everybody else.

"Maybe so," said Closelooker, who insists upon a close look at these things. "When Khrushchev was in Washington, he took the same big-hearted, scientific, socialistic viewpoint about the moon—it belongs to everybody, which means that it belongs to nobody. But I can't find anything in the American Constitution where it comes out for 'share the world'."

Well, the trouble was that Mr. Closelooker didn't have the scientific spirit of Christmas—that is, the spirit of the International Geophysical Year. Was there ever such global giving as this treaty? There are seven free world nations—Argentina, Australia, Britain, Chile, France, New Zealand and Norway—which have staked specific claims in Antarctica. Four other free world nations—the United States, South Africa, Belgium and Japan—were participants in IGY. Then, of course, there's Russia.

"That's the way I see it, too," said Closelooker. "The 11 free world nations are pooling their interests with one Communist nation. Maybe it's all in the IGY spirit, but it just doesn't seem a very good way to contain the growth of communism or to spread the cause of freedom."

But the South Pole land mass, which is twice the size of the United States, becomes the first continent ever to be dedicated wholly to peaceful, scientific purposes. The President has called the agreement "a significant advance toward the goal of a peaceful world." The New York Times agrees with those who call this treaty a model for other international accords.

"That's what bothers me," said Closelooker, a man who is never stamped by popular excitement. "Should the U.S. Senate ratify this treaty, we will have a dandy model for settling international disputes over Berlin, Formosa, the Panama Canal, the Caribbean sea, the Sino-Indian borderland—in fact, everywhere that the interests of the free world clash with those of communism. By establishing the 'share everything' ratio at 11 to 1, by freezing all free world claims, and by socializing whenever there is any doubt as to ownership, we will have a formula over which the Red nations would never dream of going to war. Why should they?"

But Mr. Closelooker didn't understand. The United States has spent many millions

supporting South Pole expeditions before and during IGY and since October has flown 28 American newsmen, 1 U.S. Senator, numerous scientists and VIP's to Antarctica, yet never have we made any official territorial claims.

"Well, why haven't we done so?" demanded Closelooker stubbornly. "I have before me a 1954 magazine article by the late Rear Adm. Richard Byrd, who asks: 'Are We Losing a Continent?' Since 1951, under two Presidents, Representative TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington, has been introducing a joint resolution for our declaration of sovereignty over certain areas of Antarctica which rightfully belong to the United States."

And nothing has been done? "Nothing," said Closelooker. "From reading the exchange between Representative TOLLEFSON and the White House, I can see why. Congress won't claim territory unless advised to do so by the administration. And the administration won't make a claim unless instructed to do so by Congress."

U.S. Proposal on Law of Sea Sovereignty Is Fishery Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 12, 1960, there appeared a news item in the Japan Times, I am informed, which has to do with the forthcoming Geneva International Conference on the Law of the Sea.

In a dispatch from Seoul, Korea, an American was quoted after meeting with Republic of Korea President Syngman Rhee to the effect that the Korean leader seems to agree with the U.S. proposal for a 6-mile territorial waters limit with an additional 6-mile fishery limit.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, that our State Department keeps indicating to me that the United States has not publicly or privately jeopardized our historic fishery rights by support of compromise proposals.

Now the U.S. official quoted in the Japan Times was Arthur Dean, chief U.S. delegate to the Geneva meeting which is to be held by 86 nations starting March 12, 1960. So when Mr. Dean tells reporters, as he did, "I think Rhee seems to agree with the U.S. proposal," perhaps it is proof as I have been saying that the United States has been lining up votes for a compromise.

Anyone who knows about our Pacific Northwest fishery will recognize that the U.S. proposal sells out completely the American fishermen of the west coast who have historically fished off the 3-mile limit of British Columbia. Our bottom fish industry has no other place to fish.

Our officials seem more interested in eliminating a major cause of friction between Japan and Korea than to protect our own interests.

It appears that the United Nations-sponsored meeting may agree on new

zones of sovereignty. If the fishing zone is extended, the only hope for the Puget Sound and Washington State fishermen will be the Senate and its refusal to approve the Geneva Treaty.

The U.S. proposal in fishing sovereignty is an international giveaway.

Jet Costs Fly High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, an article "Costs Soar on Estimates of Air Alert" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on February 22, 1960, under the byline of Allen M. Smythe. In view of our keen interest in getting a dollars value for every dollar spent in our defense program, I believe that Mr. Smythe's article will prove interesting and information. The author, Allen M. Smythe, brings out some interesting facts on the increasing expense to the taxpayers of any airborne alert of our military bombers.

The hesitancy of Pentagon officials to release costs on jet engines raises some questions in my mind. Do the large engine builders have accounting systems that show the exact toolings, research, overhead, and production costs of these engines? Have Pentagon officials asked for such a breakdown of costs? Do defense changes and modifications raise the costs unnecessarily high? What became of the plans to unify the buying and to standardize the size of jet engines?

The sudden and emotional appeals to Congress to hurry and approve enormous funds for an airborne alert is in a familiar pattern. These appeals, like the recurring visits of Russian submarines to this side of the Atlantic, are remarkably well timed with the hearings on defense appropriations. We now have a 30-minute ground alert at many of our air bases. In recent articles and speeches, defense experts have stated that any enemy attack by liquid-fueled ballistic missiles would cover a period of several hours. If so, the enemy would expect unacceptable damage from our retaliatory forces.

In the report of July 8, 1957, of the House Armed Services Committee on aircraft engine costs a contract for J-57 jet engines at \$390,000 is recorded. For the larger J-75 a price of \$575,000 was paid. The author was very restrained in his comparison of prices. According to my computations there have been several contracts in which jet engines have cost over 10 times their weight in silver.

The article reads:

COSTS SOAR ON ESTIMATES OF AIR ALERT—BILLIONS NEEDED FOR JET ENGINES

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Recent discussion of the need of an airborne alert for the Nation's eight-engined heavy B-52 bombers could result in the

purchase of thousands of extra jet engines that cost five times their weight in silver. To this would be added at least 30 percent for parts if operations were held in ideal weather and other normal conditions. For Arctic or desert use the parts could add 120 percent to the original cost.

Budget-minded legislators were aghast when they heard estimates of hundreds of millions of dollars for partial alerts. Recent cutbacks in military aircraft have sharply reduced the building of jet engines and have substantially raised the price. Where purchases were once made in thousands they are now made in hundreds. Increased material and modification costs would tend to hold prices at the present levels even if additional engines are ordered.

The trend in weapons toward missiles has left only two major builders of military jet engines, General Electric and Pratt & Whitney. The latter has only about one-half the military business of 3 years ago. Curtis-Wright, Allison and Westinghouse are no longer important factors in the industry.

JET FIGURES HIDDEN

Over protests from the public relations sections of both the Navy and Air Force, procurement officials refused to release exact figures on present prices paid for jet engines. Although unclassified, they claimed it would violate the "proprietary rights" of the manufacturers. They claimed that releasing the complicated prices would cause "misunderstanding and controversy" as the airlines are charged higher prices. The airlines denied this and stated they paid for no development costs and bought or rented powerplants below the cost to the services.

The B-52 bomber requires 8 mounted J-57 engines plus 8 spares plus parts for the 11 engines. The J-57, built by Pratt & Whitney and under Navy management comes in three main models: the all-steel, the titanium and the recently developed turbofan. It was learned that these models cost the taxpayers approximately \$200,000, \$270,000 and \$350,000. Any airborne alert will require extra KV-135's, the aerial refueler of B-52, which mounts four all-steel J-57's with one extra spare.

The B-58 medium bomber which might participate in an airborne alert is propelled by four J-79 jet engines. This new lightweight engine, made by General Electric, is under Air Force management. Its production contract, reported to call for a target price of \$260,000, has been cut back and final price negotiations at above \$400,000 are expected.

Pratt & Whitney also builds the J-58 and J-75 engines under Navy contracts. The J-57, now 6 years old, is approaching obsolescence. Vice Adm. E. W. Clepton, Chief of the Office of Naval Materiel, states that the development cost of the J-57 was over \$400 million. If all costs are included, any jet engine, he says, will cost a half billion dollars.

MANAGES PRATT & WHITNEY PLANT

The Navy keeps management of the Pratt & Whitney factory because of the volume of contracts it issues. The multiengine bombers and tankers of the Air Force use thousands of these engines bought by the Navy. Six years ago the Air Force asked for control of engine building at Pratt & Whitney.

After being turned down, the Air Force persuaded the Ford Motor Co. to tool a large Federal tank factory in South Chicago for J-57 and J-75 production. A reported \$400 million was spent to make the plant capable of outproducing the rest of the world. The first production contract for J-57's ran over \$500,000 per engine. It is now a standby plant.

Some Pentagon officials believe the Air Force could save by reopening this plant for an airborne alert. Others would give the

Air Force control of Pratt & Whitney regardless of any alert. The Navy disagrees.

Ex-Secretary Charles "Engine" Wilson succeeded in cutting down the number of models of jet engines but not cost. A credulous Congress criticizes but obtains no results. Congressman GERALD FORD, Republican of Michigan, member of the powerful Appropriations Committee, pointed out recently that the Pentagon spends more for small parts of these engines than the cost of a new automobile engine. Fellow members of his group speak of them as "jeweled power plants" and "gold-plated jets."

A Family System of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we should realize that Government cannot dictate the policies and programs for our Nation's farmers, that rather it should be the role of Congress to provide through enabling legislation flexible guidelines which will permit those engaged in agriculture, commodity by commodity, to determine their own destinies at the local level. In other words let producers at the grassroots develop a program of their own choosing.

It is agreed, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the political fence that American agriculture is in real trouble, that because this is true our whole economy is threatened. Small farmers are literally battling for survival. I heartily agree with those who claim that unless the devastating trend under the existing program is not reversed and replaced by a bold new approach to the farm problem, we will soon see throughout the land monopolistic control of the farming industry which will result in a situation where subsidies paid to farmers will appear as nothing compared to the higher prices paid by the housewife for food and clothing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that within the framework of the bill H.R. 10362 which I recently introduced along with a number of my colleagues, an enabling act, will offer farmers the opportunity to adopt a program of their own in a cooperative effort to achieve a balance of supply and demand—all within the spirit of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act at a minimum cost to the Government. No doubt there are corrections and amendments to be made in the bill, and I am sure they will be made in the course of hearings before the Committee on Agriculture as we listen to the various producers who have peculiar knowledge of the problems involved on their specific commodity.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this bill would operate in a tremendous savings to taxpayers particularly as it positively prohibits further acquisition and storage of commodities by the Government and provides for an already disposal of stocks on hand, and in view

of the reasonable limitations placed on the amount any one producer could receive. I am also confident that the income of family farmers would be improved under this legislation and that it would assure adequate food and fiber to our consumers at reasonable prices.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial dated February 25, 1960 from the Farmer's Hub, a fine newspaper published at Millersburg, Ohio in my congressional district, which I am glad to say endorses the idea of a self help program for our farmers as provided in H.R. 10362.

The editorial follows:

A FAMILY SYSTEM OF AGRICULTURE

"To perpetuate the family system of agriculture against all forms of collectivism; to stop further accumulation of burdensome surpluses and to dispose of Government stocks now on hand within a reasonable time" is the purpose of a new farm bill introduced in Congress on February 10 by Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING of the 17th District.

Congressman LEVERING said that the Government is now spending \$1½ million daily for surplus grain storage and has \$9½ million worth of surplus grain on hand. His bill, LEVERING estimates, would provide a program costing not more than \$500 million annually as compared with the \$5 billion annual cost under the present farm program.

LEVERING's proposal is to let the bona fide farmers of each State elect committeemen who would meet in a national conference and decide on programs for commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture had determined would be in surplus for the ensuing year. The national farmers committee would then determine on one of several "control" programs.

Choice would be offered between direct payments with limits on production, on marketing agreements similar to the milk marketing plan; on paid minimum prices or some other plan appearing best. LEVERING would limit payments to any one individual to not more than \$5,000.

The Levering bill is a direct answer to President Eisenhower's challenge to the Congress to write its own "sound farm program".

Indus River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times, of March 2, 1960, entitled "Indus River Project."

INDUS RIVER PROJECT

A billion-dollar enterprise that would improve the lot of 50 million people and help Indian and Pakistan to fortify their growing sense of common destiny in the face of the Communist menace has come a long step nearer realization with the announcement by the World Bank that six nations stand ready to join in financing the Indus River project. This project, developed by the World Bank,

calls for equitable sharing of the waters of the Indus River system between the two nations for both irrigation and hydroelectric power for the economic development of one of the greatest river basins in the world.

The nations prepared to participate in this enterprise, which in size and in the number of people affected exceeds the Soviet-financed Aswan Dam for the Nile basin, are the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and West Germany. Together with the World Bank they would provide more than half of the funds needed, partly in grants, partly in loans, with the United States contributing by far the largest share.

The actual start of the project now depends on a final water sharing agreement between Indian and Pakistan. But since accord has already been reached in principle and on many of the details involved, the final agreement that has been 6 years in the making is now expected during the next 2 months. India and Pakistan have already settled most of the border and financial disputes that arose between them from the partition of the Indian subcontinent, and agreement on the Indus River would cap a progressive rapprochement that should also facilitate solution of the last remaining conflict over Kashmir, where much of the Indus River system originates.

One must assume that growing realization of a common interest in the project provides the real basis for the agreement—a basis that is necessary if the project is to flourish in the future. But there is no doubt that Chinese Communist pressure on both countries contributed to it, with the result that Communist China appears to be playing the same role in uniting India and Pakistan that Soviet Russia played in uniting the West.

Education and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, in the years since the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision, no domestic question of greater importance has faced the American people than education and civil rights. Despite the crucial importance of leadership on this sensitive issue, such leadership on a national level has been largely missing.

An exception, a major instance where leadership has been given, is in the hearings and the report of the Commission on Civil Rights. While its major recommendations lie in the field of voting rights, the Commission's activities have also been highly important in the field of education.

As a member of the legal staff of the Commission, Mr. Harris Wofford, Jr., now associate professor at Notre Dame Law School, is in an excellent and unusual position to report on Education and Civil Rights. He did so on November 12, 1959, at the Indiana Conference of Higher Education. Mr. Wofford's widespread reputation for competence, objectivity, and reliability lend particular substance to what he has to say. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his speech as follows:

EDUCATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Harris Wofford, Jr., associate professor, Notre Dame Law School)

Perhaps as educators the last thing you really want to hear about is education. But recently in Chicago I gave a report on the Commission's findings and recommendations in its primary field of study, the investigation of sworn complaints that citizens are being denied the right to vote by reason of their color or race. There I made the case that this is the primary field for Congressional action and for large-scale, hard-hitting Federal enforcement.

As you may know, the Commission appointed by the President consisted of three members from the North, and three from the South. The three southern members were conservatives widely respected in their region, and at least two of them were on the record as segregationists. But they were all also lawyers and public servants—John Battle had been Governor of Virginia; Doyle Carlton, Governor of Florida; and Dean Storey of Southern Methodist University Law School had served on the Hoover Commission as well as having been president of the American Bar Association. So when complaints were finally submitted to the Commission, these men had no doubt about their professional and public duty and the Commission unanimously voted to conduct full field investigations and then to hold a public hearing in Montgomery, Ala. And having heard the sworn testimony and studied registration records disclosed to the Commission under court order, they joined in a unanimous finding of facts on the various ways qualified Negroes were being denied the right to vote in a number of counties. Later, in the report submitted in September to the President and Congress, they unanimously joined in four recommendations designed to strengthen the Federal Government's power to protect the right to vote. And two of the three southern members joined in the far-reaching recommendation that in cases of discriminatory denial of the right to vote the President should be empowered to appoint temporary Federal registrars to register for Federal elections citizens qualified under State law applied without discrimination.

That five of the six Commissioners could agree on such a recommendation is evidence to me that this is the place on the civil rights front where the largest advance can now be made, where the greatest efforts at Federal enforcement should be concentrated. If progress on this front can be made in the next few years in enabling Negroes to vote in the deep southern areas where they are denied that right, then later further progress can be expected on other civil rights fronts in that region.

But there is not much that people in Indiana can do about voting rights in the South. In passing, though, I should report that the Commission's Indiana State Advisory Committee, headed by Jack Scott, the former mayor of South Bend, reported that there are no Negro residents in 30 of the State's 92 counties, and that in some Indiana communities there have been signs advising "Niggers don't let the sun go down on you here." I don't know whether such signs are now in existence, but our Indiana advisory committee noted that "if one cannot establish residence in one-third of the State, he cannot meet the qualifications for voting," and concluded that in this way in parts of Indiana the Negro "is being deprived of his right to vote by indirection."

There is another subject the Commission studied—discrimination in housing—which does have considerable pertinence to Indiana, as to all States and cities. But I am going to report on that in South Bend next week. So that leaves me tonight with the third field of Commission study—school desegregation.

A RELUCTANT IMAGINATION

It was with something like this hesitancy that the Commission itself approached the subject of education. By the act of Congress the Commission was specifically directed to investigate alleged denials of the right to vote. The act also instructed the Commission to study and collect information and make recommendations concerning other denials of the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution. As Senator EASTLAND said, in opposing the act, the equal-protection-of-the-laws provision in the 14th amendment means what the Supreme Court has interpreted it to mean, and since the Court has applied the provision in many fields the Commission's duties were "as broad as the desires of the Commission." The Commission's scope, said Senator THURMOND, "was limited only by the imagination of the Commission and its staff."

The trouble was that at least three of the six members of the Commission had no desire whatsoever to take up the hot potato of desegregation. They wanted to focus on the right to vote, on which southern practice was mixed but most southern opinion, at least openly, conceded that all qualified citizens should be able to vote. But they recognized that Congress had given them a duty to study other denials of equal protection and it did not take much imagination for the Commission's legal staff to report that the most urgent and the most important matter of equal protection, as well as the most controversial, was the problem of desegregation that had been brought to a head by the Supreme Court's reinterpretation of the equal protection clause as applied to compulsory separation of the races in public schools.

Moreover, the Commission could not dodge the subject on the ground that some other agency of Government was handling it. Particular cases were of course before the Federal courts, and the Commission decided not to intervene in those situations. But the judiciary was clearly in need of help. The President had not publicly and defiantly said: Earl Warren has made his decision, now let him enforce it—as Andrew Jackson reportedly said of John Marshall. But the President had taken a largely hands-off position, except for a brief effort at mediation with Governor Faubus followed by the resort to force at Little Rock. Repeatedly the President refused to say whether he thought the decision was right or wrong. At one press conference he said he had not even disclosed his opinion on the subject to his wife.

Nor was the Department of Justice doing anything much more than following the court cases and standing ready to restore law and order when violence occurred in any particular situation. In 1957 the administration had asked Congress to give the Attorney General power actually to initiate desegregation suits. This so-called part III of the proposed civil rights bill would have permitted the Government to plan an overall strategy for desegregation and to take the initiative in advancing it through the courts instead of leaving the pace and the course of desegregation to be set by private litigants, mainly the NAACP. But the administration soon withdrew its support of part III on the ground that this would only further agitate white southern tempers at a time when a cooling-off period was required.

ABDICATING BY THE EXECUTIVE

Now let me give you a final, almost incredible, example of the general lack of planning or action by the executive branch. In surveying what already had been done in this field, the Commission's staff discovered that the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—where we had gone expecting to find at least the essential statistical information—had

ceased collecting any information about the racial composition of public schools and had done so on principle. This was HEW's rather unique response to the Supreme Court's decision. Since the Court had held that racial discrimination had no place in the field of public education, the Office of Education decided that information about continuing racial discrimination had no place in its program.

This is about like a police department ceasing to collect information on homicides because murder had been declared illegal, or like a hospital ceasing to receive patients with a certain disease because a cure had been found. When the Court said that the Constitution was colorblind, it could hardly have expected that this would be read to mean that the executive branch of the Government would colorblind itself. Rather, I am sure, the Court must have expected that the executive branch would do everything in its power to face and help meet the large and serious problems of transition resulting from the school decision. It is, after all, the President who is sworn, and the executive branch that exists, to see that the laws are faithfully executed—not the courts.

So the Commission on Civil Rights, an independent agency established by the Congress and the President in the executive branch of the Government, with no power to do anything but study and make recommendations, decided reluctantly to see if it could make a contribution to this part of the American dilemma. Actually, its members were better qualified to do this than anything else in the field of civil rights. For four of the six members were educators: Two college presidents, Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame, and Chairman Hannah of Michigan State University; and two members were deans of law schools, Vice Chairman Storey of Southern Methodist, and Dean Johnson of Howard University.

CULTIVATING OUR NEUROSIS

By taking up this divisive subject the Commission was following the old psychiatric principle of cultivating your neurosis. It sought to turn the weakness of the Commission—its built-in 3-to-3 regional division—into a strongpoint. For the deep disagreement between the North and the white South on this issue means that the great due process of our Constitution, the process by which we govern ourselves, is still at work and is still necessary. The Court has spoken and the law of the land is now clear. And in a republic, as Justice Brandeis says, the law "is the potent, the omnipresent teacher" that "teaches the whole people." But teaching takes time, as I am beginning to learn, now having taught a first-year class for 2 months. Or as the Commission stated in its report, "there remains the enduring American problem of obtaining the consent of the governed." An official dialogue by men of stature, representing the differing viewpoints, might, we hoped, make a contribution to the national process of persuasion that is the grand design of the Constitution.

Let me assure you that it was a dialogue that took place. Governor Battle of Virginia told the President when he accepted appointment that he would represent the strong southern viewpoint. The white South, by the way, generally appeared to be well satisfied with the composition of the Commission. Senator RUSSELL said he considered it to be "one of the ablest Commissions which has been designated around Washington in my time." The Senator is not satisfied with the outcome, but the subsequent dissatisfaction of the white South may also be part of the process of persuasion.

NO SOCIOLOGISTS WANTED

At first the predictable stalemate in the Commission generated frustration through-

out the staff. When the staff proposed that the Commission meet with a group of carefully selected experts on the problem of desegregation—educators, historians, political scientists and sociologists—the Commission said no, it did not want to risk giving any ground for having it said that the Commission had been brainwashed by schoolmen, and especially not by sociologists. When, in somewhat perverse fashion, the staff later actually proposed employing a particular sociologist, the Commission made it clear that it was not going to repeat the mistake of the Supreme Court. The southern members of the Commission were too well aware of the distortion and magnification in the public eye of Justice Warren's one ill-fated footnote in which Gunnar Myrdal's classic study of the "American Dilemma" was cited by the Court, along with several articles by sociologists or psychologists showing how segregation injures Negro children. In fact, we were later cautioned against even referring to Myrdal in any manner in the final report, and particularly not in a footnote. Perhaps the Commission was wise to shy away from sociologists and to place its whole reliance on lawyers; at least, as lawyers, we on the legal staff were not too dismayed by the decision. But prudence doesn't always pay. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I read with some delight the attack on the Commission's report by Senator EASTLAND who noted triumphantly that Myrdal was not even mentioned. Senator EASTLAND added: "My conclusion is that the U.S. Supreme Court has more courage than did the Civil Rights Commission."

When I say that the Commission said no, I do not mean that every member took that position. But during most of its work the Commission proceeded by a kind of Quaker rule of unanimity, or I might better call it the Calhoun principle of the concurrent majority. In this case at least it proved to be a relatively good procedure. A premature resort to majority voting would have ended all prospects of the rule of reason and might have merely meant a deadlock.

THE NASHVILLE CONFERENCE

As it was, the Commission proceeded carefully. It decided to hold a hearing or conference of officials from school systems that had experienced some measure of desegregation since the Supreme Court decision. Superintendents of schools, principals, or members of school boards came to the 2-day conference from 12 States and the District of Columbia. They came from rural school districts, small towns, cities of medium size, and large cities. They included all the border States and the Southern States of Arkansas, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Significantly, the conference was held in Nashville, Tenn., the city that had adopted the grade-a-year desegregation plan, beginning with the first grade and including a voluntary transfer provision under which a student in a racial minority in his neighborhood school could ask to be transferred to a school where his race was in a majority.

At first Nashville school officials were decidedly cool to our coming there, but at the end of the conference the superintendent of schools Mr. Oliver invited the Commission to come back, saying it had been a great and valuable experience. Mr. Oliver said: "This is the first opportunity that I have had to sit down with a group of fellow men and listen to what they have to say and find out what they think and how they are dealing with this problem." For those of us listening to the testimony and the questioning of each participant the most encouraging development was the way the initial discomfort turned into a kind of competitive cooperativeness.

As they exchanged and compared experiences and discussed the varieties of plans and problems, there emerged a feeling that each of these districts was a pilot plant. For better or worse, these were the available models for desegregation, and I think the participants went home with more of a spirit of pioneering in a great common venture, and with less of a sense of isolation.

WHAT THE COMMISSION LEARNED

For the Commission all of the testimony was instructive and much of it was deeply moving. The courage of some of these men, struggling to save public education against a wave of community hysteria; the inventiveness of some, in devising gradual plans that overcame much of the community opposition; the lessons that were learned by all are recorded in the published transcript of this Nashville conference. Much of it is included in the full 600-page report of the Commission. Enough is included in the 200-page abridgment to convey the spirit of modest hope which most of us took home from Nashville. I think it is part of what led Governor Battle to say of his whole Commission experience that he "learned a whole lot."

The two main facts that emerged from the Nashville conference, and from the staff's other studies in this field, facts which the Commission unanimously found in its report, are: first, that with enlightened community leadership school officials can adopt reasonable, manageable desegregation plans that fit differing local conditions, and that, as the Commission found, "A variety of plans have proved to be successful. * * *"; and second, that desegregation need mean no lowering of school standards. The Commission unanimously found that "In many instances desegregation has been used by the local community as the occasion to raise its educational standards." In district after district officials testified that they had finally been forced to face problems that had been too long neglected, and that as a result remedial programs have been adopted for the handicapped, who include a considerable portion of the Negro children, and advanced programs have been established for gifted students, among whom are a not inconsiderable number of Negroes, too.

WHAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDED

From all of this the only substantial recommendation that the Commission agreed upon was that the Commission on Civil Rights be authorized "to serve as a clearinghouse to collect and make available to States and to local communities information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts to comply with the Supreme Court mandate either voluntarily or by court order, including data as to the known effects of the programs on the quality of education and the cost thereof"—and further that the Commission be authorized "to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions; and to mediate and conciliate, upon request, disputes as to proposed plans and their implementation."

The idea of a center for technical assistance in desegregation has been proposed in various forms by both the administration and by congressional champions of civil rights such as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, and the idea of a mediation service in this field was proposed in the last session by LYNDON JOHNSON. It may be that the fact that the Commission, with its three southern members, unanimously joined in making this recommendation to Congress, and that the Commission is already in existence, so that no new agency has to be created, will result

in affirmative congressional action on this in the next session. I hope so.

A CONDITION ON FEDERAL AID

I should mention that the three northern members of the Commission made an additional proposal affecting your domain to which the southerners took strong exception. They proposed that all Federal aid to higher education be conditioned upon the agreement of recipient institutions to admit all qualified students without regard to their race. With more than \$2 billion a year of Federal funds going for educational purposes and to educational institutions, the three northern commissioners—all university men themselves—felt that an attestation of nondiscrimination should be required by the Federal Government, so that the Government would not be aiding and abetting the violation of the public policy established by the Constitution. While the withholding of Federal funds from any secondary and elementary school would be complicated by and might run counter to the Court's policy of gradual desegregation, the Court has not applied the all deliberate speed formula to higher education but has required the immediate admission of qualified Negroes to such institutions. Therefore, these three Commissioners proposed that the Federal Government, by Executive order, apply a similar policy in its distribution of Federal funds.

UNANIMOUS STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Your opinion on the wisdom of so conditioning Federal grants to higher education would be interesting. But more important perhaps than any of these particular proposals or recommendations was the agreement of all six Commissioners on a joint statement of the problem. The "two fundamental premises" which the Commission adopted were:

"(1) The American system of public education must be preserved without impairment because an educated citizenry is the mainstay of the Republic * * * and;

"(2) The constitutional right to be free from compulsory segregation in public education can be and must be realized, for this is a government of law, and the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land."

"The problem, therefore," said the Commission, "is how to comply with the Supreme Court decision while preserving and even improving public education. The ultimate choice of each State is between finding reasonable ways of ending compulsory segregation in its schools and abandoning its system of free public education."

Little enough to say—and yet it was a shock to the white South, an educating shock, I hope, that three strong southerners would agree to say it. One reason it is important to have this said is that the President of the United States has not himself said it, or said it yet with any clarity or conviction. Nor has Congress in any way acted to affirm its support of the Court's new interpretation of the 14th amendment, although the 14th amendment specifically states that "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

The Commission found that community leadership was a precondition for successful desegregation. I would add that national leadership by the President and by the Congress is another precondition, and one that has also been missing on this problem, and most of all I would say, leadership by the President. For everyone knows that Congress is split on this issue, but it does not follow that the President should be of two minds and be similarly paralyzed. Yet what

has there been between the platitudes and the bayonets?

The Commission did not say this. But it did say that to eliminate discrimination "some dramatic and creative intervention by the leaders of our national life is necessary." And between the lines of the Commission's report is the answer to what seems to me to be the impasse in the President's mind on this problem. I would appeal from the President to the President on this ground. He says that this is a problem rooted in the minds and hearts of men. But he also has shown in Little Rock that he will carry out his duty to enforce the new law of the land even with bayonets if necessary. It would seem that according to the President's own logic if he is to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed" then he must give the leadership required to change the minds and hearts of the people of the white South.

"Time is essential in resolving any great and difficult problem, and more time will be required to solve this one," as the Commission said. But, paraphrasing Justice Frankfurter, the Commission added that "it is not time alone that helps, but the constructive use of time." "Law," reported the Commission to the President and Congress, "must be inventive, creative, and educational." So you see I am back to Justice Brandeis' opinion that the U.S. Government "is the potent, the omnipresent teacher" in our public life.

MEDIATION AND SYMBOLIC ACTION

Having raised this issue, I suppose I should illustrate the kind of inventive, creative, and educational action that might give substance to the platitudes and make bayonets unnecessary. Mediation is part of what I mean. Some agency like the Commission should have been working at this since 1954. Mediation on the highest level, conducted in part by the President personally, should have gone on persistently and should be going on today. Immediately following the Court's decision, when much of the South's response was one of anticipated compliance, the President might well have called together the southern Governors and stated the problem in about the terms that the Commission's report now 5 years later—5 years too late—states it. The possibilities for very gradual, even token compliance initially, should have been spelled out, along with the drastic Federal enforcement powers that would be used if necessary, and the chaos that would come from no compliance. This case should have been taken to the people and even now, with the Commission's report in hand, it should be taken to the people. No one is in a better position to reach the people than the President of the United States. And his actions can speak louder than his words. Not only should the whole executive branch be directed to act consistently with and in imaginative support of the Court's decision, but the President's own symbolic actions can reach and move the hearts of people. Even in the last hour at Little Rock I would rather have seen him personally go to accompany those nine Negro children into school, and make a personal appeal to the students and their parents and the Nation, rather than fly in the paratroopers. This is an age when symbolic actions are required to penetrate the maze of mass communications and the complications of modern life. Symbolic action is the language that heads of state and leaders of people must use to be effective on great issues. Gandhi demonstrated this in Africa and in India. The President, in a sense, is doing this in regard to world peace through the current exchange of visits with Khrushchev. This, the most important domestic problem, also requires his direct personal intervention.

THE MASSIVE DEMORALIZATION

But I do not want to end on such a high level, or leave the focus entirely on the South. What makes this problem so great and so general is not the white resistance but, as the Commission's report states, the massive demoralization of a substantial part of the Negro population both North and South—and soon, over half of Negro Americans will live in the North. As the Commission says, "This is the legacy of generations of slavery, discrimination, and second-class citizenship." But history aside, it is causing a present crisis—I should say, compounding the crisis—in the public schools of the great northern cities, and it is confronting the higher education of Negroes with a heavy challenge in addition to that facing American higher education generally.

On this problem the Commission's report throws little light. In its housing study in northern cities the Commission found the dark facts of increasing de facto school segregation resulting from residential segregation and from the exodus of whites from neighborhoods or schools in which Negroes begin to predominate. One witness in Chicago cast what seemed to me a glimmer of light. Excellence was the key to integration, he suggested. The "way to insure the success of an integrated school is to make that school a great educational institution," he said. The "superb mathematics teacher at Hyde Park High School does more for integration," he said, "than a ton and a half of human relations experts."

THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

But I do not want to rest on a note you have been hearing or sounding yourselves for a long time. Let me try a more direct connection. The demoralization of the American Negro will be ended, and he will find himself, when his sights are lifted to the world of opportunity and challenge awaiting him in the second half of the 20th century. He, like the white southerner—among others—has a skin disease, or more accurately, fears he has one. Part of the remedy is ending the discrimination that is afflicting him. But another part of the remedy must be taking his mind off his own skin and turning it to the larger questions and possibilities. I realize that I am just giving a definition of the task of education, and especially of higher education. But perhaps because of his more acute educational crisis the American Negro may give a lift to all of American education. For he must leap over the old inadequacies and literally shoot for the moon. The Negro engineer of rocketry, the Negro atomic physicist, the Negro lawyer or political scientist or economist or sociologist who is trained to meet the new problems of this century will find plenty of jobs awaiting him. The old trades are full of vested interests arrayed against him. But the new world of automation and atomic energy, of economic development and social revolution, of the rise of the colored continents of Asia and Africa, of global competition by differing ideologies, economies, and technologies—this new world is waiting for the American Negro who is educated for it.

The high school, college, or university that has a curriculum designed for this new world will be successfully integrated because it will have raised its sights from the partial domestic problem of integration that is vexing us to the whole great integration going on throughout the world. In other words, if we can discover how to end the demoralization of the American Negro we will know how to end the general American demoralization that is holding us back from playing our full part in this fast-moving century. If the American Negro can find himself, as a first-class citizen of the world, then there is hope for us all.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, even though the words "independence" and "freedom" are meaningless when they are used in reference to the captive nations under Russian domination, it is still a good thing for us to observe anniversaries of such days as Ukrainian Independence Day, which was commemorated on January 24.

Such days provide an excellent opportunity to remind ourselves of the high cost of freedom, the need for constant vigilance on the part of every citizen of every free nation, if their countries are to remain free and independent, and the fact that we must continue to explore every possibility of helping the captive nations regain their freedom. They also give us an opportunity to strengthen the faith and hope of these enslaved peoples.

On January 24 Ukrainians of Maryland observed the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian National Independence with a large rally in Baltimore. Those present adopted a memorandum which I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, as follows:

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, MARYLAND CHAPTER, ON THE OCCASION OF COMMEMORATING THE 42d ANNIVERSARY OF THE JANUARY 22, 1918, PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

The following memorandum has been adopted by the Americans of Ukrainian descent of Maryland on the observance held on January 24, 1960 at YWCA, Patterson Park Avenue, Baltimore, Md.:

"A. INTRODUCTION

"We, the delegates and representatives of the Ukrainian American organizations, who are organized in the Baltimore chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, have assembled on this historical day of January 22, 1918, proclamation of Ukrainian national independence, to discuss and deliberate problems which have a direct bearing upon us, as citizens of this great and democratic Republic, the United States of America.

"The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which is sponsoring this 42d commemorating anniversary celebration on January 22, 1918, is a national American organization representing 55 major national Ukrainian American organizations, which embrace several hundred local organizations and societies, such as veterans' posts, fraternal lodges, youth and women's organizations, social, culture, and sport associations, as well as several political clubs and groups. It has over 115 branches which in the aggregate operate in more than 30 States of the Union. The UCCA is a member of the All-American Conference to combat Communism, of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED), and of the American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R.

"Its two publications, the Ukrainian Quarterly and the Ukrainian Bulletin, are valued as highly specialized reviews, and are read by many U.S. legislators, various U.S. gov-

ernmental agencies, and press at large, as well as by many foreign governments which are interested in the plight of the enslaved non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.

"Founded in 1940, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America speaks for at least 1,500,000 American citizens of Ukrainian background and origin. In the past and at the present time it has been a staunch advocate of the liberation of the Ukrainian people, as well as the other non-Russian peoples enslaved by Moscow. It opposes any and all appeasement of the Kremlin, and advocates a wholehearted, unstinting support of the enslaved non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. It supported the peaceful policy of liberation as announced by President Eisenhower in 1959—Captive Nations Week.

"President Harry S. Truman in the past, and President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in recent years, have lauded the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for its loyal and patriotic work for America and for the courageous support and assistance it has extended to the enslaved Ukrainian nation, which fights on for its freedom and independence. Conversely, the Soviet press and Soviet officials have bitterly denounced the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, castigating it as a 'tool of Wall Street and American imperialists.'

"B. UKRAINE

"The Achilles heel of the Soviet Russian Empire

"When the revolution in Russia broke out in 1917, and at the moment that the Russian Czarist Empire was undergoing a transformation into a Russian Communist empire, Ukraine threw off its oppressors and proclaimed the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, capital of Ukraine.

"Ukraine's example was followed by other nations enslaved by Moscow, who also broke away from the Russian Empire to form a group of independent, sovereign states. In this manner, the Russian Empire was dismembered and for some time Russia was rendered impotent. This factor saved Western Europe from Russian Communist aggression immediately following World War I.

"However, the Russian Communists had the military advantage. They threw up a successful political smokescreen, which succeeded due to the sympathy of the Western World with the idea of saving the 'Indivisible Russian Empire' and the West's failure to comprehend the national liberation movements within the former czarist prison of nations. As a result, after a 3-year war lasting from 1917 to 1920, Communist Moscow reconquered Ukraine and all but a few of the other nations which had liberated themselves from Russian domination. The only successful exceptions were Poland, the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and Finland. The Russian Empire was reconstituted as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Under a hypocritical constitution, the individual republics were granted sovereign rights, but in reality they became absolute captives of Moscow.

"This enslavement of nations was effected through the instrumentality of the totalitarian Communist dictatorship, whose power was centralized in Moscow in the hands of the hierarchy of the Russian Communist Party.

"Having established its totalitarian dictatorship in Ukraine, the Russian Communists proceeded to execute their policies of maximum plunder and exploitation of the Ukraine nation.

"To carry out these policies, a bloody terror, without precedent in human history, was instituted. Mass genocide and large-scale deportations to forced labor camps in the northern and eastern regions of the U.S.S.R. implemented this program.

"The ultimate objective of all these measures was the total destruction of the Ukrainians as a nation. Thus, on a grander scale, the Russian Communists followed the trail blazed by Czar Peter I. Many millions of Ukrainians were murdered, and many millions more were deported to a slow death in Russian concentration camps.

"During World War II, the Ukrainians replied to this Russian terror and genocide by boycotting the Soviet defense effort and by armed insurrection against Moscow.

"The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) was formed. Other enslaved peoples of the U.S.S.R. followed this lead, and as a result the Russians found themselves at the brink of disaster.

"However, the U.S.S.R. was saved from internal disintegration by the vandalic policies of the Hitlerite Germany toward the enslaved non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. As a result, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army was compelled to fight on two fronts—against both the Russians and the Germans, without any assistance from the West, which was allied with Russia. At the same time, the Russians received tremendous assistance from the West, both militarily and in the form of vast stores of supplies. This alone saved the tottering Russian war machine from destruction. Then, far-reaching political concessions were made to the Russians by the Western Allies. Thus were the Russians saved from the total defeat and the dismemberment of their Empire into its constituent national parts. And thus was it made possible for the Russians to enslave many more free nations of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia.

"As a consequence of World War II, Russia was able to impose its Communist totalitarian slave system upon one-third of the world's population.

"As a result of this territorial expansion, and great industrial growth, the direct outcome of wartime conquest and peacetime subversion, the Russians have become a great military power and are now prepared to turn their strength against the still free West, their sole surviving enemy.

"Therefore, just as the enslavement of Ukraine by czarist Moscow 250 years ago was the springboard for the growth of Russia as a world power, and just as the resubjugation of Ukraine by Moscow in 1920 became the basis for the creation of a new form of Russian imperialism, the U.S.S.R. the reoccupation of Ukraine by Moscow in 1944 and 1945 was the beginning of another period of Soviet Russian expansion to such a degree that Russia now menaces the entire free world. In all these instances, the resistance of Ukraine to Russian enslavement, and Ukraine's struggle for national independence, formed the first line of defense of the Western World, its culture and civilization, against barbaric, imperialistic Moscow.

"The history of Ukraine's enslavement comes as a gruesome sample of Moscow's enslavement of other nations. History illustrates that the aim and methods of Moscow have never changed and were always directed toward establishment of a world empire.

"This program has been perpetuated throughout all of Moscow's history, beginning with Muscovy and continuing into the present Soviet era. Russia has always pursued an unlimited expansionist policy with the ultimate goal, the domination of the world. Moscow has ever aspired to become a 'Third Rome,' Russian policy has distinguished itself by broken treaties, subversion, fraud and falsification, with military aggression as an instrument of this policy. Throughout Russian history, power has always been centralized in totalitarian Moscow.

"Bloody terror and genocide were always a planned part of the program, and indispensable for the survival of this system.

"However, the Western World does not appear to understand the full scope and character of the Russian imperialist menace. Nor does it comprehend that Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. are the West's first line of defense against Moscow.

"Traditionally, the West has always lent support to the myth of an indivisible Russian Empire. Even today, the frightful peril which the U.S.S.R. constitutes to the West is analyzed only from the social-political standpoint of international communism. International communism is just a disguise for old fashioned, historic Russian imperialism. Unfortunately, in the United States, there are still many so-called Russian experts who are blind disciples of the discredited theory of an 'indivisible mother Russia,' and who continue to be hostile to the liberation of Ukraine and the other captive nations, and who shudder at the prospect of dismembering the Russian empire and giving freedom to the enslaved peoples.

"We American Ukrainians in the United States of America call upon the entire free world to heed in a timely manner this mortal danger from Russian Communist imperialism, to understand the tradition and unwavering objectives of this system which dates back to the days of Peter I.

"We call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large to the fact, that this Russian Communist empire is being held together solely by a web of terrible terror. The enslaved nations within this empire are the natural allies of the free world in its struggle against Russian imperialism. This struggle can be won by the free world only if this alliance is firmly cemented.

"The battle between communism and the free world will be won or lost on psychological issues and not by the mobilization of military forces and techniques, which, with their ghastly potentialities, automatically act as deterrent against an armed conflict on a large scale. The rumbling of hydrogen bomb explosions, the beeping of the Sputniks and the explorers—these are but the boisterous accompaniments to the battle being fought for human souls, wishes, and hopes.

"Ukraine, with its territory and natural resources, has always been the source of the Russian empire's strength through much of its history. But the Ukrainian people have nurtured a centuries-old hatred of their Russian oppressors and at every opportunity have fought imperialist Moscow. This makes Ukraine the logical starting point for the events that will ultimately bring about the ruination of the Russian Communist Empire. Ukraine has always been in the forefront of the struggle of all nations held captive by Moscow.

"Ukraine will prove to be the West's major ally if the West supports her aspirations for national independence and the right of the Ukrainian population to guide its own destiny following the dismemberment of the Muscovite prison of nations, the U.S.S.R.

"Ukraine has fought Moscow continuously since 1709, with no outside aid except for a brief alliance with Sweden. During this time, the nations of the world have vainly sought to coexist with Russia. Today the free world is attempting to buy peace through negotiations with Moscow, little realizing that it is toying with catastrophe. The more prolonged the negotiations, the greater the danger.

"Treaties, conferences, and negotiations with Moscow lead to a dead-end street. Instead, the West must ally itself with the cause of the captive nations within the U.S.S.R. and elsewhere, who possess an explosive potential greater than any nuclear weapon yet developed.

"Khrushchev has given the West his definition of coexistence. For the West, this definition is synonymous with catastrophe. The only alternative is a well planned and executed program of liberation. Only through such a program will it be possible to ultimately eliminate the threat posed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to secure peace and freedom for all people. The struggle of the non-Russian peoples, among whom the Ukrainian are the most numerous and most determined, is vitally important to the entire free world and particularly to our own United States, now the unchallenged leader of the free world.

"Our President, the Senate and the House of Representatives have expressed their concern and sympathy to all the captive nations by enacting the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

"The 42d anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence is the most fitting and appropriate occasion to repeat and make known to the world once again that Ukraine and the other so-called Union Republics of the Soviet Union have been imprisoned in the Soviet Russian prison of nations for the longest time and that they fully deserve to be liberated in the interest of peace, justice and security of the whole peace-loving peoples, and primarily in the interest of the United States of America.

"All moral and material forces should be put in motion in order to help the Ukrainian national elements to keep alive their unconquered spirit, to prove by deeds that the Ukraine is not forgotten and that she stands equal in the thoughts of freemen with all other captive nations. This could be done by openly demanding her full sovereignty and by acknowledging her equality in the family of free nations.

"Above all, it is high necessity to understand finally that the Ukrainian question is not an internal problem of the Russian nation or state which was yesterday called Tsardom and today Soviet Union.

"Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Maryland Chapter: Klemens B. Babiak, William Tatchyn, Stanley Stelmach, Anatole B. Bulawka, Theodore Caryk, Andrew Rad, John Rad, Walter Stelmach, Walter Romanowsky."

Also, I would like to include my remarks, prepared for delivery on that occasion:

I am indeed grateful for the honor and privilege of having been invited to join with the members of the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress of America and your other distinguished guests on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian national independence, which has been officially proclaimed by the Governor of our State and the mayor of our city.

We meet today with mixed emotions: First, to acknowledge our gratitude to Almighty God and to those freedom-loving people of the world that 42 years ago the Ukrainian people achieved their national independence. At the same time, we fully realize that the time has not yet come for an anniversary observance of total rejoicing because we know only too well that the yoke of oppression still exists for the people of the Ukraine under communistic domination—that the struggle continues and there is the need for each and every one to reassert and renew his efforts as well as encourage one another to work for the regaining of the independence proclaimed in 1918 at Kiev.

We know the Ukrainians have borne the yoke of the Kremlin longer than all other groups that are bent beneath its crushing weight—biding their time with smoldering patience, against the day of liberation which will surely come.

We know that despite every effort to suppress it, the yearning for liberty is unquenchable among Ukrainians and that tyranny has only served to stimulate it rather than stifle it.

Among those whose freedom has been suppressed by Russian Imperialism, none give their present masters and overlords greater cause for apprehension than the 45 million Ukrainians, who today comprise the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain and the second largest non-Russian nation in central and eastern Europe.

Ukrainians have suffered more than any of the several scores of oppressed national groups in the Soviet Union—in concentration camps—slave labor camps—in prison—and in the desolate Siberian wilderness.

But we take courage in the fact that these brave people are spiritually and physically endowed with the necessary strength and fortitude to withstand the tyranny to which they are still subjected.

In the end, truth and justice will prevail—that is our hope, that is our prayer—and God willing, it will be so.

And when that day comes, the Ukrainians of Baltimore will have two great reasons to give thanks as you so nobly did just this past Thanksgiving Day. You will not only be pilgrims of the 20th century, but patriots of the 20th century as well.

In conclusion, as your Representative in the Congress of the United States and as your fellow American, let me assure you that this beloved country of ours has not and will not abandon her interest in the needs and welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of central Europe. We will carry on with every means at our disposal the efforts to resist further aggression and to lead the way toward the liberation of oppressed peoples everywhere.

Labeling Packages of Detergents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, since placing my remarks in the RECORD yesterday regarding the tragic death of the little girl in Wishram, Wash., who swallowed some dishwasher detergent, I have gained some further information which I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, as well as to the attention of parents in our country.

I have talked with officials of the Federal Trade Commission about its responsibility in this matter of labeling containers of dishwasher detergents, and I have learned that the Federal Trade Commission has no authority—no authority at all—to require that such detergents be labeled with any kind of label—neither one listing the contents, nor one calling attention to the dangerous properties of these products. The Commission only has such authority in the cases of products which are dangerous in normal use.

Further, I have learned that there is no agency of Government which does have such authority.

In investigating further, Mr. Speaker, I have found that there is legislation pending in the Congress, introduced last March in the Senate by Senators MAG-

NUSON and BUSH, S. 1283, and introduced in the House by Congressman ROBERTS, H.R. 5260, which would require labeling of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use. I have been advised that this bill would cover these electric dishwasher detergents. It is also my understanding that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is about to report the Senate bill with a favorable recommendation. This bill would place responsibility in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for determining the hazardous substances and for requiring proper labeling of packages. I want to call the attention of the Members to these bills in the hope that congressional support for the legislation will become so great that the bill will be passed during this session. I want to urge that remedial action be taken by the Congress to prevent another such tragic circumstance as the death of this little girl.

Also, Mr. Speaker, since putting my statement in the RECORD yesterday, I have received several calls asking for clarification of the type of dishwashing detergent which caused this tragic death. The product involved was one of the specially prepared detergents for use in electric dishwashing machines.

Tax Rate Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1959, my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., and I joined in cosponsoring legislation, H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, designed to provide long-overdue reform of our onerous income tax rate structure which has had such a stifling effect on the development and growth of our free enterprise economy.

This legislation would provide across-the-board tax rate reduction so that the maximum surtax rate applicable to individual and corporate incomes would be 42 percent. Under this legislative proposal the Federal Government would no longer be a majority partner in the private economic undertakings of our citizens.

Recently my esteemed committee colleague, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, addressed the 10th annual midyear conference of the Tax Executives Institute meeting in Washington, D.C. During the course of his remarks Mr. CURTIS advocated a downward adjustment of maximum individual and corporate taxes to a level of below 50 percent. My able colleague from Missouri has very wisely directed public attention to the damaging economic consequences that flow from the rate schedules and substantive provisions of our present Federal tax structure.

As a prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, TOM CURTIS has gained a reputation as one of our Nation's leading authorities on tax law and economic policy. His well-considered observations before the Tax Executives Institute reflect the validity of that deserved reputation.

Mr. CURTIS' remarks before the membership of the Tax Executives Institute should be required reading on the part of every American citizen. I will include Mr. CURTIS' remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS B. CURTIS BEFORE THE TAX EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE MIDYEAR CONFERENCE FEBRUARY 15, 1960

President Waychoff, distinguished guests, and members of the Tax Executives Institute, it is a pleasure for me to attend this banquet meeting of your 10th annual mid-year conference. I have long been aware of the TEI membership's competence in tax matters; I am also now personally aware of the quality of your very kind hospitality.

At the outset I would like to acknowledge the commendable job your managing director, James C. Rivers, has done in arranging this meeting. His capable work in connection with your conference is consistent with the splendid job he did as one of the top officials of the Internal Revenue Service and does currently as the fellow in charge of your national headquarters.

I come to you from a series of Lincoln Day dinners in the Midwest section of our country. Those meetings were more partisan than I presume you would have me be tonight. While the political tenor of those Lincoln meetings might be somewhat different from what is expected now, I earnestly submit to you that the fundamental objective of the Lincoln Day meetings is not too different from our interest tonight, namely, responsible citizenship. The difference is that tonight we place special emphasis on tax considerations.

I regret that I could not be present last night to hear the address of that distinguished American and my good friend, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier. As Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, he is doing outstanding work in behalf of less government bureaucracy and for a more vital free enterprise society. Because I did not hear Steve's talk last night and because I know from personal experience that he and I think a good deal alike in terms of economic philosophy and tax policy, there is some danger that I will allude to matters previously covered by him. I hope I will not impose repetition on you.

In presenting some observations on taxes I might begin by observing that man's greatest progress since his historical beginning has not been in the area of tax policy.

Taxation dates back to the beginnings of civilization. As organized society came into being, taxes were a concomitant phenomena necessary to the support of governing institutions and the government services rendered. Five thousand years ago in the dynasty era in Egypt we now find archeological evidences of tax collectors, tax rolls, and tax structures which were necessary to the financing of public endeavors. History is fraught with instances of wars and rebellions waged because of tax burdens. Indeed, we all recall the stirring words of that Revolutionary patriot James Otis to the effect that taxation without representation was tyranny. The remark of this patriot has prompted some current-day wags to speculate what that great American might have

said about taxation with representation in the light of present experience.

Tonight I would talk about some convictions I have in regard to tax policy and then end on the note of what seems to be in prospect in the tax legislative area this year. This suggests an ambitious undertaking, but I promise to be brief.

Justice Cardozo once said with respect to our colonial Founding Fathers that they "knew more about ways of taxation than some of their descendants seem to be willing to concede." The last 170 years, and certainly the period of the last 40 years cannot be regarded as years of marked improvement in what our Founding Fathers wrought in the way of tax policy. We have piled tax on tax and compounded substantive complexity in our endeavors to meet the insatiable demands for spending by the various echelons of government. We have now reached the point where Federal, State, and local governments spend approximately one-third of our net national product. This simple but shocking statistic demonstrates the distance we have gone toward socializing the economic endeavors of our citizens.

Our Nation's present day tax structure is too much an area where angels fear to tread. In saying this I do not mean to impugn the expertise of you tax executives. I am saying instead that even with your experience I know you are daily confronted with uncertainties and imponderables. I refer, for example, to the matter of the Gordian knot of taxation—deduction, depreciation, or disallowance. This might be termed the 3-D dilemma of taxation.

The present day malaise in the area of taxes can be attributed in large measure to the fact that tax policy decisions were made by default rather than with considered deliberateness because we pursued the course of expediency when in reality we should have been dealing with tax issues with courage and forthrightness. The Congress, the Treasury, and even the courts have devoted the last 40 years to too much preoccupation with revenue raising considerations. We have had insufficient concern with the economic implications of our shortsighted tax endeavors. We have in effect proved that taxes can thwart economic growth instead of establishing the principle that sound tax policy can contribute to achieving the kind of nation we seek.

I do not mean to be an alarmist or hypercritical; I do mean to stress my deep conviction that tax policy not only can but urgently should be better than it is.

Well before the formal pronouncements of Adam Smith, it was recognized that the most powerful motivation for productive economic activity is the incentive of economic gain—namely, profits. In the United States and in other industrialized nations of the free world we have disregarded that basic principle by the establishment of unconscionably oppressive progression in tax rates; a progression that constitutes a departure from anything that can honestly be passed off as recognition of ability to pay. We have been persuaded to this departure from sound tax policy by the partisan demagog who have extolled mediocrity and have placed an anchor on individual initiative.

We have been more vigilant in closing tax loopholes as they have appeared than we have been in alleviating tax hardships. We have adopted incentive features in our tax structure in behalf of social and philanthropic groups in our policy; we have been indifferent to the need for maintaining strong and vital incentives for risk-taking economic endeavors.

This enumeration of neglect and avoidance of responsibility has had its price. Taxes have become one of the predominant factors in the making of economic decisions with the result that we have uneconomic decisions and less good utilization of re-

sources. Another price that we have paid stems from the role taxation has had on capital accumulation and investment. One of the basic elements in a directly free enterprise system is the freedom of entry into industry. Yet, the problem of accumulating capital under our present tax system and the uncertainty of retained reward for risk taking is discouraging to the new entrepreneur and gives an advantage to the established business.

I have referred to the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. This proposition is predicated on the philosophy that the equitable distribution of the incidence of tax could be effected by relating tax liability to income. Section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code adopts the language of the 16th amendment to our Constitution and says that gross income means all income from whatever source derived. The code sections preceding section 61 and the sections following section 61 are largely devoted to dealing with exceptions to that comprehensive rule.

Some people have justified the steep progression in our rate structure on the grounds that these exceptions and special privileges make necessary such progression in the interest of tax equity. It is my belief that such a contention is placing the cart before the horse. It is the steep progression that has caused the clamor for special tax treatment.

I also submit that the existence of fairness in a tax system does not depend upon progression or upon the differentiation in tax liability between people who are differently situated. Instead, fairness depends on whether there is reasonable equality of treatment of the people who are similarly situated. I do not mean to imply by this observation that I have joined the ranks of those who advocate sweeping elimination of some of the fully warranted special treatments in the substantive provisions of our Federal tax law. I am merely demonstrating the fact that progression of itself does not produce fairness.

With respect to the wisdom or lack thereof in the various proposals that have been made for broadening the tax base I would point out that another essential element of fairness in the tax structure is that a tax system must not impair incentives to work and incentives to keep one's property working. The national wealth requires that our citizens, our productive assets, and our savings be put to rewarding economic purpose in our free enterprise society. We cannot as a Nation be rich and lazy at the same time.

In the past three decades we have been prone to deprive the economic doers in our society of proper incentives and this has been conducive to the channeling of our assets into outlets that are not productive. Our tax system accords exemption from income taxation or accords other preferential treatment to certain types of bond investments. The funds from such investment may be used for good purpose but they cannot be characterized as risk undertakings. Our estate and inheritance taxes encourage the utilization of trusts to hold property which too often is removed from the area of risk investment. We have the phenomenon of tremendous growth in pension plans. Another factor weighing against the involvement of capital in risk endeavors is the need for liquidity to pay death taxes. These tax inducements away from risk undertaking have tended to deprive our economy of the incentives to invest; the basic factors of economic productivity are less persuasive with our citizens than are tax considerations.

In criticizing deficiencies in our tax structure, I necessarily assume an obligation to propose remedies.

Commenting first on our rate structure, I assert that it is politically immoral and fiscally uneconomic for our Federal Government to take more than 49 percent of any dollar of income earned by a taxpayer. The much discussed need for achieving and maintaining a high rate of economic growth warrants our having the courage of our convictions and utilizing our future economic growth to finance a downward adjustment of maximum individual and corporate taxes to a level below 50 percent.

Turning to the substantive provisions of our tax structure, I believe that the economic incentives to growth through the endeavors of our free enterprise society, as distinguished from Government enterprise, must be stimulated. We must measure up to the challenge of our potential not only to successfully meet the competition of International Communism but also to make our Nation a better place in which to live for all our citizens. Examples of tax changes that would contribute to these objectives would be a further liberalization of depreciation allowances, and in this connection should certainly be included a realistic revision of our antiquated bulletin F. We must ease the impact of double taxation wherever it exists and we must seek to assure that all income is taxed at least once in the year in which it is earned.

An important change that should be made in our tax structure in the interest of scientific and technological advancement is the allowance of a tax credit for endeavors in the area of basic research. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 4797, which would stimulate greater basic research endeavor on the part of the private segment of our economy and thereby place less responsibility on the Federal bureaucracy for such endeavors. I am personally convinced that greater results can be achieved in basic research under the auspices of free enterprise than can be attained under the aegis of Government enterprise.

I have necessarily touched briefly on only a few of the more important and more urgent needs of tax reform. The responsibility for bringing about meaningful tax reform is one that must be shared by every American citizen seeking not personal gain but instead patriotic progress. This is an undertaking in which the members of TEI acting in their individual capacities as business executives must have a leading part. By working at this urgent task with diligence and with selfless dedication you can do much to assure the attainment of these ends.

Earlier in my remarks I promised you some observations in regard to what I believe the prospects are for tax legislation in this 2d session of the 86th Congress. Because of political conventions to be held in July, this year Congress will engage in, I hope, a relatively short session. That likelihood makes it doubtful that any major changes in our Federal tax structure will be undertaken by the Committee on Ways and Means although with respect to particular areas of the Internal Revenue Code it is likely that some action will be taken.

As most of you know, the House of Representatives has already acted favorably on a bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, H.R. 9662, making technical revisions in subchapter J, concerning the income taxation of estates and trusts, and subchapter K, concerning the taxation of partners and partnerships. It is my expectation that this legislation will be enacted into law this year.

Legislation pertaining to subchapter C is likely to be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. I am not going to undertake to delineate in any way the changes that might be made in this very difficult area but such legislation will deal with only limited aspects of the problems involved. These changes will embody many of the recommendations of the subchapter C ad-

visory group and they will be directed toward the closing of some loopholes; the alleviation of some hardships; and most hopefully of all, the ending of the very great confusion arising from the attribution rules contained in section 318 of the Code.

Before July 1, 1960, the Congress will act on legislation extending the corporate rate for another year at its present level of 52 percent and similarly extending most, if not all, of those excises that are scheduled to be reduced on July 1, 1960.

I do not anticipate any changes in the taxes used for financing the Federal aid highway program in 1960, but point out to you that a report is due from the Commerce Department on highway user cost allocations by January 1961. It is my belief that this study will be used as the basis for finding solutions to our highway financing needs over the life of the current highway development program which is projected through the early part of the next decade.

The Committee on Ways and Means has completed its action on H.R. 5 dealing with the income taxation on foreign income. This legislation originally was designed to make rather sweeping changes with respect to the tax treatment of income derived from abroad. As approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 5 has been very significantly watered down. The deferral concept is retained in the establishment of a foreign business corporation and in addition section 367 of the code is made inapplicable to transfers of assets within the activities of the foreign business corporation. Grossing up of the foreign tax credit is applied to the foreign business corporation. Without expressing a prejudgment of the propriety of the grossing-up requirement, I would state my conviction that if this concept becomes a part of our Federal tax law in this limited area, it will be used as a precedent for the extension of the grossing-up principle to other types of foreign operations. It is my personal belief that before provision was made for grossing up the committee should have accorded interested persons an opportunity to express their views on this point in public hearings. I am not sure that H.R. 5 as it is presently constituted will pass the House of Representatives, but if it does the effort will probably be made to expand the scope and character of H.R. 5 during Senate deliberations on this legislation.

Another bill of interest dealing with the taxation of foreign income is H.R. 10087 which provide an election to a taxpayer to utilize an overall limitation instead of a per country limitation with respect to the foreign tax credit. This bill has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and will likely pass the House of Representatives in the near future.

Action may also be likely in the area of cooperative income. The change, if any, will be modest in scope and will probably be in the direction of remedying the avoidance feature created by the Carpenter line of decisions.

In addition to these tax changes that I have enumerated, it is probable that the Committee on Ways and Means will also act on certain bills of very limited application during the consideration of what is referred to as Members' bills. I will not at this time undertake the very speculative and inconclusive task of suggesting to you what the subject matter of those bills might be.

Because of the pendency of the Connelton case before the Supreme Court involving the cut-off point on sewer pipe clay and the implications the Supreme Court's action on this case will have in other depletion areas, I do not believe that the Committee on Ways and Means will take action on legislation making any major change in the natural resources provisions of our tax law.

You will notice that I have so far referred to the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means will or will not take a certain action. I have done this deliberately. Much more uncertain is what may occur in the Senate of the United States. You are well aware of efforts made last year that almost met with legislative success to repeal the 4 percent dividend received credit. This amendment was approved by the Senate and was deleted at the last minute in conference. I foresee a continuation of endeavors in the Senate to repeal this section, to make the restricted stock option provisions more stringent, to tighten up on capital gains, to reduce the depletion allowance, and to make other changes in our tax structure. For the most part these efforts will be made in order to lend an alleged aura of fiscal responsibility to liberal spending schemes by claiming that such schemes are being financed through the claimed added revenue that would be raised. This real prospect of a frontal attack on our free enterprise economy demands the utmost vigilance and active opposition of all of us who believe in our traditional American way of life.

In recent months there has been a great deal of interest in and publicity about tax reform that holds out to the public the tax platitudes of simplicity, improved fairness, and less onerous tax rates. These discussions have been predicated on the proposition that by broadening the tax base we will achieve the objectives of simplicity, fairness, and lower rates.

I do not believe that these objectives will be attained in 1960. Such an endeavor is of necessity a long-range project and such basic changes will not occur in this Congress. Therefore, it is realistic to note that the outcome of the election to occur this November will have an important bearing on the long-range tax outlook.

I would close this discussion of taxation by referring to the fact that the majority of our tax problems are attributable to problems created by the spending proclivities that have been rampant in our Nation over the last three decades. We have unfortunately given a very thorough testing to the mistaken notion that the Government can spend the taxpayer's dollar better than the taxpayer can. In the six Federal budgets that have been prepared since fiscal year 1955, which constituted the low point in Federal spending in the last decade, we find that total spending has aggregated an increase of \$59.1 billion over the 1955 level. In these succeeding 6 years if we had been successful in keeping the level of expenditures at the 1955 level, we would today have had a total of almost \$60 billion that could have been used over the intervening period for tax reduction and debt reduction.

Our spending policies have not only produced mounting indebtedness in three decades, but they have also injected inflexibility in tax policy. In the interest of at least a semblance of fiscal responsibility in the short run, we have foregone tax adjustments that are vitally and urgently needed. The advocates of the "affluent society" through Government spending supported by higher tax revenues have had too much influence in determining our tax policy.

If we are to prevail in our endeavors to maintain international preeminence and achieve a greater measure of national vitality, we must reject the advocates of the economy regimentors. We must pay meaningful heed to the requirements of increased availability of investment capital balanced with greater consumption capacity by our growing population through increased productivity of our private economy. These are matters on which it is urgent that we as individual citizens and as members of the business community must have strong convictions and we must practice those convictions if we would avoid the conviction of our practices.

tions if we would avoid the conviction of our practices.

At the beginning of my talk I forewarned you that I have come from a series of Lincoln Day speeches. I have to this point, I believe, demonstrated admirable restraint in forbearing from reference to timely Lincoln. I will breach that forbearance in the form of a benediction and paraphrase a remark Mr. Lincoln made in February 1860, just 100 years ago, to the effect that in tax policy let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

National Issues of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

MR. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Wednesday evening, January 6, 1960, to be the speaker at an interesting meeting in Philadelphia sponsored by the Citizenship Clearing House. A number of local institutions participated, including the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Beaver College, Chestnut Hill College, Drexel Institute of Technology, and Ursinus College participated. La Salle College was the host.

My remarks on that occasion were as follows:

Dr. Courtney, Commissioner Osser, distinguished representatives of both great political parties in the field of government, and students of government, I am glad to have the opportunity to be the alternate speaker this evening, in view of the necessary absence of Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., the Democratic city chairman. Mr. Green must remain in Washington because he is a member of the Democratic study group, which is now meeting, and because of his membership on the powerful Ways and Means Committee, which is also the Committee on Committees of the House of Representatives, which handles committee assignments.

I am also aware of the presence of some of the outstanding political leaders of the Democratic Party in Philadelphia, who could easily qualify as principal speakers. My good fortune stems from the nature of the topic, which relates to my work as a member of the congressional delegation from Philadelphia. The president of the City Council of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, has submitted a memorandum relating to the city program for the use of the students gathered here, and the Honorable Charles A. Weiner, Democratic floor leader in the Pennsylvania State Senate, has likewise submitted a memorandum on State issues.

A great opportunity is today available for political leaders to advance programs for the next decade which all Americans should consider and which the future public servants and political leaders should study. This meeting presents leaders of our two great political parties who are serving the citizens in various levels of public office and students of government who will be the public servants and officeholders of the future. What greater forum can be obtained for the serious consideration of governmental objectives which the officeholder of today sub-

mits to the possible officeholder of tomorrow?

We stand on the threshold of a new era: an era wherein we can turn our thoughts and energies to building a Nation in which the people of the country can reap the benefits of an expanding economy of plenty and achieve security for an entire lifetime. New technology and new scientific discoveries make possible this economy of abundance, with a higher standard of living and work opportunity for all. Building for the common welfare will require a fundamental change in orientation of Government. An opportunity to establish and support a program to bring about a new approach to a new decade, a policy to promote the general welfare of all people.

The two party system opens the avenues for bold new measures and policies to all who are interested in development of good government which will provide the greatest advantages to the people of our country. Those who present the policies and philosophy of the great Democratic Party which is today leading the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a brilliant future, are glad to have the opportunity of sharing with you students of government who have gathered to consider the presentations which may have a tremendous effect on the America of the next decade.

The Democratic Party appeals to the greatest number of citizens because it advocates good government at all levels, city, State, and National. Mediocrity has never been accepted as the ideal in America, yet it does seem that there are many today who accept it, and in the name of "middle-of-the-road" would have us believe that we cannot separate between good and bad, hot and cold, and fish and fowl in politics. Not everyone, however, has been misled by the more or less open and approved efforts to reduce public life and personalities. The people of the country must look to the Democratic Party to provide national goals and a program to meet the difficult problems of the next decade.

LET US CONSIDER THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

From a national viewpoint the really big question confronting our people today is how to produce enough persons competent to overcome the Soviet lead in the vital fields of science and technology. The educational problem is one of greatest concern to all persons interested in the survival of our country. It does not extend merely to the cost of education and the consequent request for scholarships and loans, but also to the matter of admissions and the shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers. Our country's determination to equal Soviet achievements and to respond to the prodigious efforts of educators has resulted in a greater number of students than ever before. But the cost of education has also increased and Federal aid is one of the solutions to the problem. The necessity of educating our youth in a stronger program is so essential in competing with the Soviet system and so vital to the security of our country that it rates consideration in the budget for national defense.

The future of our cities is an issue

The United States is fast becoming a Nation of city dwellers. In the last 10 years, a million people have left the farms and rural areas, while 30 million more people have crowded into cities, towns, and suburban areas. Thanks to modern machinery and scientific methods, fewer farmers are now able to feed millions more people, and pile up enormous surpluses at the same time. The Democratic Party recognizes that the concentration of people in the cities of our country is a normal development in view of our industrial and commercial enterprise. The future of our country lies in

the continued progress and improvement of cities, large and small. The great cities of Pennsylvania are in need of Federal support to overcome many problems. The leading cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have shown what can be done on a local and State level in building and developing the metropolis of the future where people can work and live in comfort and security. But complete accomplishment of the programs to fully develop the potentials of cities requires Federal help. Transportation problems can only be solved by Federal contributions. People who live on the perimeters of cities seek to get in to work and out to their residences with a maximum of speed and safety. The suburban areas of our large cities now number millions of residents. Mass transportation financing and other plans to provide the vital needs of movement are urgent in the program of supporting our city life.

The development of our cities can only continue by the replacement of blighted areas, by new housing construction and proper planning for the future. Urban renewal and development have been the subjects of national consideration but they must be extended and advanced, remove blight as quickly as possible and establish new areas for living to increase the facilities of the communities which are so vital in the maintenance of our great industrial centers.

Our cities need Federal help to develop the hospital and medical services which have been established in the great educational centers and in the general communities. There are many installations which are Government owned which can be used by our cities when not needed for national emergencies. These should be owned by our cities and used by our Government in times of need. The highway program to provide suitable and safe ingress and egress to our cities needs Federal support for proper development. America is a country on wheels and mobility has always been a great factor in the development of our strength and progress.

The foreign policy issue

In the field of foreign policy the most important problem relates to disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons. A determined effort must be made to control the production and testing of nuclear weapons on a worldwide basis leading to every possible method which can be advanced for reduction in manufacture of arms consistent with suitable and careful inspection devices leading to worldwide conformity with the program.

Negotiations and conferences with other nations leading to achievement of world peace should be continued and encouraged subject to our support of existing treaties and the United Nations Organization.

The worldwide bases established by our country do not constitute a sufficient defense line in view of the development of the nuclear weapons and missiles. It is therefore urgent that our military and defense establishments reconsider our position and methods of defense in order to devise a more effective system in the light of current conditions and changes in weapons now available to our opponent in case of conflict.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor published a very recent book called "The Uncertain Trumpet." In this morning's newspaper George Fielding Elliot calls it a frightening and a timely book. Permit me to read you a few short paragraphs of the review.

"For here, at the outset of an election year, we find an officer who has been Chief of Staff of the Army and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during 4 years of the present administration, and has laid down those high responsibilities only a few months ago, telling us with solemn conviction and with much supporting evidence that our present ability to deter the Soviet

Union from launching a nuclear attack on this country is declining so rapidly that the Nation faces a serious crisis commencing in 1961."

"Chillingly reminiscent of Sir Winston Churchill's narrative of British refusal to face reality in the 1930's is General Taylor's account of his plea to the National Security Council in 1958.

He was speaking on this occasion, by previous agreement, for the Navy and Marine Corps as well as for the Army, and with the implied approval of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles."

"Yet the outcome was a memorandum to the services from Secretary of Defense McElroy stating 'that there had been no changes in the international situation to warrant any significant revision in national security policy'—which was followed by really frantic attempts to compel the dissenting Chiefs of Staff to give public support to a budget based on this assertion."

"This 'should be done now, before another annual budget projects past mistakes even farther into the future.' The change will be expensive; but, the general warns, 'there is no living with communism as an inferior.'"

Is there any excuse for this situation? Can this attitude of the administration be hung on the altar of inflation?

Labor and management issue

The problems presented by the growth and management of unions should not be solved in a punitive manner so as to retard and restrict their development. The amendments which have recently been added to the Taft-Hartley law were the result of a massive lobbying and pressure campaign on Congress for government regulation of unions and their power to win higher wages and working conditions. The organization of workers has been a major factor in the progress and strength of our country and every avenue of cooperation between management and labor should be encouraged in order to develop a harmonious relationship in which both can operate. This will improve the conditions under which our country can forge ahead in its development and progress.

The executive department and the Congress should encourage programs for production and employment based upon a sufficient use of our manpower, skills and technology. The Congress should enact legislation consistent with the program of progress and development which can reasonably be achieved under peacetime conditions. The Employment Act of 1946 contains provisions which can further such objectives.

Civil rights

The principles of equality and equal opportunity in education, employment, housing and other fields must be supported if we are to establish a stronger democracy in which all people can honestly be included. The laws leading in this direction should be respected and supported and the Supreme Court's efforts to interpret the principles of law in favor of such action should not be counteracted by legislation which will hamper the program for equal rights which will make our country an example of equality and justice in the world.

Once democracy is achieved in the South, that area will cease to be a sanctuary for runaway plants seeking sweatshop open shop conditions.

Social security

In a broad sense the problems of the retired worker, the aged citizen and the youth can be included in the field of social security. Disability or death of a worker endangers the life and security of the dependent. The older citizen should be able to live in health and comfort. The youth of our country, which is our greatest asset, should be helped

in avoiding pitfalls and in proper development. Expansion of social security benefits for the worker and the aged should receive serious consideration from Congress. The youth who is tempted in his development should be protected from conditions which will affect his proper growth and future. Legislation to drive out filth literature and programs to develop our youth in their training and occupational needs should be considered.

Economic future will certainly be an issue

The future of our country lies in the development of our productive power in the next decade. There should be an overall plan for revisions of our tax structure to place more purchasing power in the hands of low-income families. Our Federal outlays for resource development, public assistance for the needs of our people should be increased. Efforts should continue toward building the institutional devices for the needed governmental and business cooperation which will improve public economic policies.

This does not mean that our party advocates a spendthrift Government. A steady increase in Government spending and even more so in private spending are essential parts of an overall policy to build our national strength. We are lagging in primary military strength, science education, and many other things. This is not because we lack the material potential to do much better. It is because we are not trying hard enough to marshal these potentials.

There is an erroneous belief that our economy cannot afford to do more. We are still trying to protect our economy by scaling down our demands upon it in accord with its relatively low actual rate of performance. It is obvious that we could afford what we have, if we lifted our economy's actual performance closer to its great potentials.

Our gross national product in the decade of the fifties could not reach \$500 billion. In 1959 it was less than \$480 billion. This was approximately the volume of all goods and services produced in a year. This included all our products, agricultural and industrial, the schools, roads, and hospitals built, the defense weapons made, and all services performed for compensation by everybody.

In the next decade we can reach an economy of more than 600 billion. But this will depend upon the vigor and wisdom of our policies and programs. By full use of our tremendous and ever-increasing productive power, we can do more than meet our national security needs. We can also achieve so much plenty at home, and add so much to plenty elsewhere, that the economic problem of shortages of important things might be virtually ended here and reduced to manageable proportions overseas.

This is the outlook and policy which invites our efforts in the next decade. This is the opportunity which a forward-looking citizenry can seize and follow with great vigor and likelihood of success. This is the challenge which will make greater the America of the future.

in Congress, and the American people, an article by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WATER MOELLER.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this article which appeared in the February 1960 issue of This Day magazine:

How Much God Is There In Government?

(By Congressman WALTER MOELLER of Ohio)

The answer to the question in the title of this article is probably that there is as much God in government as there is God in the hearts of the American people. We can say this in America whereas it cannot necessarily be said of more than a few other nations in the world, for we are as close to being a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" as has ever existed on the face of God's earth.

Certainly it cannot be said of the godless government of Communist Russia, where God still lives in the hearts of millions of people despite every effort to root Him out. Far less could it be said of Poland, for another example, where a devout people are subjected to the merciless whims of an atheistic regime, leavened only by the more or less powerful influence that the Roman Catholic Church and its followers can still bring to bear.

How much God there is in the hearts of the American people reflects the quantity and quality of God, or of religious motivation, in the policies and practices of government, arriving eventually at an answer to the corollary question, "How much God is there in America?"

The people who make up our Government, who determine its policies, who pass its laws, who administer its daily operations, and who pass judgment in the courts on our crimes and on the constitutionality of our laws, are, in a large sense, a cross section of the greater population. It is true that there is something at least slightly extraordinary about them, or they would not be in Government. In the cases of a President, a Supreme Court Justice, or even a Member of Congress, there is usually something more than slightly extraordinary before such a position may be achieved. This extraordinariness, however, is not usually of the kind that makes them either more or less religious than the average individual. Thus it is fair to say that where God is concerned, He moves the man in government to about the same extent that He moves the man in the street.

From this we make the assumption that government, as far as its moral or religious composition is concerned, and as far as its net worth godwise is concerned, is no more or less than a summing up of net worth of the individuals who make up government.

There is, however, no human brain, nor combination of brains, nor electronic computer which can exactly assess these individual godly net worths. We have no unit of measurement upon which to rely, for God and His impact upon the minds and hearts and actions of men is not to be measured in pounds or inches, but is simply a weightless and boundless evidencing of the eternal Spirit evoked by Jesus Christ when He said, "Before Abraham was, I am."

For this reason we must turn to the external evidences we can find to substantiate or disprove the existence of God in our Government, such as the moral qualities of the laws which govern us, the mercy and the justice with which these laws are administered, and in the public acts and the private reputations of the men and women who form the Government of the United States.

As I write this, the Congress of the United States has just finished writing legislation to control the corruption and the racketeering which has dominated certain aspects of the American labor movement. Here in microcosmic form we may examine the in-

fluence of God and the Godlikeness of the motives which have touched the legislative processes since America began. Here we have an issue which is as close to Godlikeness confronting godlessness as any we are likely to find. Here we have not only the problem of individual sin, but also the problem of a great social and moral issue involving the conscience of mankind. How did we as legislators and as Christians, Jews, or freethinkers react?

Brought to bear upon us were the most powerful forces in American political and economic life. Groups representing labor and capital, the two great and often divergent economic powers, were there. Political leaders from our two great parties wielded every stratagem available to them. Cleavages developed within the parties, based on a combination of geographical and philosophical differences.

Some individuals faced the problem with a strictly practical weighing of the possibilities of political gain or loss.

Others, and I think the majority, devoted themselves to prayerful thought and to close examination of the social and moral issues involved.

Examination of the debates on this legislation discloses that many Members, for example, called attention to some passage from the Scriptures or to some generally accepted moral truth to bolster their arguments, thus indicating that the Congress is not oblivious to what Holy Scripture says, and that our legislators often do rise above their own material interests and those of their party or their constituents to a higher spiritual level.

Many may quarrel with the terms of the new law. Many have questioned the motives of those who stood on either side of the issue. Yet it is my honest belief that the new result was a clear justification of our democratic processes and of our reliance upon our legislators to permit the hand of God to guide them in the performance of their duty to Him and to the people of the United States whom they are elected to serve.

Let me turn for a moment to the morals and the mores of those who make up the Government of the United States. From my personal experiences up to this time, I am convinced that there is a basic structure composed of deeply honest and sincerely devout religious-minded people upon which the frivolous and the at times sinful is only a facade, more evident to the undiscriminating eye than the solid foundation to which it has attached itself. Further, as we reach positions of real importance among those who exert a significant influence upon public policy and its administration, the moral stature of the individual grows with few exceptions.

On Capitol Hill and elsewhere in our Nation's Capital there are prayer breakfast and luncheon groups which meet at regular intervals and discuss their responsibilities and the issues of the day in terms of religious values. I have attended some of these gatherings, and while I am unable to accept all the conclusions reached, each time I came away with the conviction that the search was made for the divine will, and that the door opened for the presence of God in the deliberations.

It is commendable to know that in the U.S. Capitol, just off the rotunda, is a Prayer Room where men and women of every faith visit daily and renew in prayer and meditation their private and public oaths of devotion to God and country. Further, each of the Houses of Congress has its fully appointed Chaplain and each session of the Senate and of the House is opened with prayer.

It is by these things and by many other signs that I have come to accept the fact that the majority of the men and women in our Government do have a very definite

How Much God Is There in Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues

religious influence in their lives which motivates them as they, amid all human weakness, endeavor to enact just and equitable laws for the land.

In Government, as elsewhere, the number who say, "Thus saith the Lord," and that His will must be advanced, is always too few. It raises a challenge for Christian men and women to make service in the Government their ambition. For true it remains also to this day: "Evil triumphs when good men fail to speak."

Clean Elections Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the big unfinished pieces of business pending before this body is the Senate-passed clean elections bill. There can be no question that the Senate of the United States confounded its critics and covered itself with a certain amount of glory when it passed this strong, effective and realistic measure a little over a month ago. By the same token there will be little question that the House of Representatives has failed itself and the American people should we adjourn this year without taking action on this important measure.

We hear so much these days about "Payola," the need for higher ethical standards in business, in unions and in Government. How can we dare sit in judgment on our fellow citizens if we publicly demonstrate an unwillingness to make certain that we ourselves are completely above suspicion in our own chosen field of endeavor: politics.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my colleagues, and particularly my colleague from Arizona who has long been conspicuous in his efforts on behalf of an effective, clean election law, to urge that this House face up to its responsibility in this field and to report out of committee and enact into law a meaningful Federal election law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include an editorial from the February 1 issue of the Harrisburg News on this subject. The editorial follows:

A CLEAN ELECTIONS LAW? THERE'S HOPE, BUT NOT MUCH

For a brief period last week there was reason to hope that Congress was finally going to face up to a realistic reshaping of the laws controlling contributions and expenditures in Federal election campaigns.

The clean elections bill passed the Senate and went to the House. There it ran head-on into the familiar political facts of life. A goodly proportion of the House membership, including the chairman of the committee to which the bill was referred, had different ideas of what is realistic.

The provisions of the bill are almost punitive and a clear violation of States rights, said Representative OMAR BURLESON, Democrat, of Texas, who heads up the House Administration Committee.

Representative BURLESON and many of his fellow southerners are particularly piqued by the fact that the controls outlined in the bill would apply to primary as well as general elections. In the Democratic South the primaries are usually the whole show.

Then, too, there are the politicians in both parties and from every section of the country who don't mind at all the gimmicks and tricks that campaign committees constantly use to evade the old election laws. Bring up to date committee spending limits and put an enforceable lid on contributions? That's getting a bit too realistic for some of the political pros. They'd just as soon keep the lid loose and keep the campaign committees multiplying. In this way there is really no control on contributions or on spending, and present law is meaningless.

The bill, as the Senate passed it, is a good one. It should become law if for no other reason than that expressed by Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona: "In my opinion, nothing has done more to put a cloud of distrust over politics and politicians than our antiquated and unrealistic election laws."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity pur-

chasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbt, Watkins M., Va.	4000 Mass. Ave.	Cannon, Clarence, Mo.	1713 House Office Building	Gavin, Leon H., Pa.	4801 Conn. Ave.
Abernethy, Thomas G., Miss.	6278 29th St.	Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.	2122 Mass. Ave.	George, Newell A., Kans.	3842 Macomb St.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.	4000 Mass. Ave.	Casey, Bob, Tex.	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.	5115 Allen Terrace	Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.		Glenn, Milton W., N. J.	
Albert, Carl, Okla.	3108 Cathedral Ave.	Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.		Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.	
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.	University Club	Chamberlain, Charles E., Mich.		Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), Pa.	
Alford, Dale, Ark.	4000 Mass. Ave.	Chelf, Frank, Ky.		Grant, George M., Ala.	
Alger, Bruce, Tex.	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.	Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.		Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.	
Allen, Leo E., Ill.	3108 Cathedral Ave.	Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.		Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.	
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.	4201 Cathedral Ave.	Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), Ill.		Green, William J., Jr., Pa.	
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.	Clark, Frank M., Pa.		Griffin, Robert P., Mich.	
Andrews, George W., Ala.		Coad, Merwin, Iowa		Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), Mich.	
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.	4815 Dexter St.	Coffin, Frank M., Maine		Gross, H. R., Iowa	
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.	4815 Dexter St.	Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.		Gubser, Charles S., Calif.	
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.	Collier, Harold R., Ill.		Hagen, Harlan, Calif.	
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.		Colmer, William M., Miss.		Haley, James A., Fla.	
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.		Conte, Silvio O., Mass.		Halleck, Charles A., Ind.	
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.	Cook, Robert E., Ohio		Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.	
Avery, William H., Kans.		Cooley, Harold D., N. C.		Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.	
Ayres, William H., Ohio		Corbett, Robert J., Pa.		Hargis, Denver D., Kans.	
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.		Cramer, William C., Fla.		Harmon, Randall S., Ind.	
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.		Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.		Harris, Oren, Ark.	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.		Curtin, Willard S., Pa.		Harrison, Burr P., Va.	
Barden, Graham A., N. C.		Curtis, Laurence, Mass.		Hays, Wayne L., Ohio	
Baring, Walter S., Nev.		Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.		Healey, James C., N. Y.	
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.		Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.		Hébert, F. Edward, La.	
Barrett, William A., Pa.		Dague, Paul B., Pa.		Hechler, Ken, W. Va.	
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.		Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.		Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.	
Bass, Perkins, N. H.		Davis, Clifford, Tenn.		Henderson, John E., Ohio	
Bass, Ross, Tenn.		Davis, James C., Ga.		Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.	
Bates, William H., Mass.		Dawson, William L., Ill.		Hess, William E., Ohio	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio		Delaney, James J., N. Y.		Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.	
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.		Dent, John H., Pa.		Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa	
Beckworth, Lindsey, Tex.		Denton, Winfield K., Ind.		Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.	
Belcher, Page, Okla.		Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.		Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.	
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.		Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.		Hogan, Earl, Ind.	
Bennett, John B., Mich.		Devine, Samuel L., Ohio		Hollifield, Chet, Calif.	
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.		Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.		Holland, Elmer J., Pa.	
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.		Dingell, John D., Mich.		Holt, Joe, Calif.	
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio		Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah		Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.	
Biatnik, John A., Minn.		Donohue, Harold D., Mass.		Horan, Walt, Wash.	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), Ga.		Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.		Hosmer, Craig, Calif.	
Boggs, Hale, La.		Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.		Huddleston, George, Jr., Ala.	
Boland, Edward P., Mass.		Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.		Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.	
Bolling, Richard, Mo.		Dowdy, John, Tex.		Ikard, Frank, Tex.	
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), Ohio		Downing, Thomas N., Va.		Inouye, Daniel K., Hawaii	
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.		Doyle, Clyde, Calif.		Irwin, Donald J., Conn.	
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.		Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.		Jackson, Donald L., Calif.	
Bow, Frank T., Ohio		Durham, Carl T., N. C.		Jarman, John, Okla.	
Bowles, Chester, Conn.		Dwyer, Florence F. (Mrs.), N. J.		Jennings, W. Pat, Va.	
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.		Edmondson, Ed, Okla.		Jensen, Ben F., Iowa	
Brademas, John, Ind.		Elliott, Carl, Ala.		Johansen, August E., Mich.	
Bray, William G., Ind.		Everett, Robert A., Tenn.		Johnson, Byron L., Colo.	
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.		Evens, Joe L., Tenn.		Johnson, Harold T., Calif.	
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.		Fallon, George H., Md.		Johnson, Lester R., Wis.	
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.		Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.		Johnson, Thomas F., Md.	
Brooks, Jack, Tex.		Fascell, Dante B., Fla.		Jones, Charles Raper, N. C.	
Brooks, Overton, La.		Feighan, Michael A., Ohio		Jones, Paul C., Mo.	
Broomfield, William S., Mich.		Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.		Judd, Walter H., Minn.	
Brown, Charles H., Mo.		Fino, Paul A., N. Y.		Karsten, Frank M., Mo.	
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio		Fisher, O. C., Tex.		Karth, Joseph E., Minn.	
Brown, Paul, Ga.		Flood, Daniel J., Pa.		Kasem, George A., Calif.	
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.		Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.		Kastenmeyer, Robert W., Wis.	
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.		Fogarty, John E., R. I.		Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.	
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho		Foley, John R., Md.		Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), W. Va.	
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.		Forand, Alme J., R. I.		Kelth, Hastings, Mass.	
Burke, Frank W., Ky.		Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.		Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.	
Burke, James A., Mass.		Forrester, E. L., Ga.		Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.	
Burleson, Omar, Tex.		Fountain, L. H., N. C.		Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.	
Byrne, James A., Pa.		Frazier, James B., Jr., Tenn.		Kilday, Paul J., Tex.	
Byrnes, John W., Wis.		Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., N. J.		Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.	
Cahill, William T., N. J.		Friedel, Samuel N., Md.		King, Cecil R., Calif.	
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.		Fulton, James G., Pa.		King, David S., Utah	
		Gallagher, Cornelius E., N. J.		Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio	
		Garmatz, Edward A., Md.		Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.	
		Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.		Kluczynski, John C., Ill.	
		Gathings, E. C., Ark.		Knox, Victor A., Mich.	
				Kowalski, Frank, Conn.	
				Kyl, John, Iowa	
				Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.	
				Laird, Melvin R., Wis.	
				Landrum, Phil M., Ga.	

Appendix

Government and the Arts: An Interview With Howard Lindsay, Distinguished Dramatist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there has been in recent years a very real growth of interest in the fine arts both in the Federal Government and in the State and local governments as well, we are told by Howard Lindsay, well-known dramatist.

The Congress has been studying the matter of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, as recommended several times by President Eisenhower, and this legislation will be favorably reported in the near future by the House Education and Labor Committee, and the Senate Education Subcommittee.

The New York State Senate passed within the last few days legislation to establish a New York State arts council, and legislation for similar purposes—based, however, and more soundly, on the establishment of an educational and cultural commission in the New Jersey State Department of Education—has been introduced in the New Jersey State Assembly by my friend and colleague, Assemblyman Charles Farrington, of Princeton, N.J.

Such an educational and cultural commission has been repeatedly urged by Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers University, the State university of New Jersey. Dr. Gross declares such a commission is of the utmost importance to assist and advise New Jersey in its quest for significant educational and cultural goals. It is a certainty that New Jersey's educational, cultural, business, and civic leaders are as aware of the rich financial dividends such an educational and cultural commission would provide New Jersey as are their counterparts in New York State who are working for the New York State Art Commission. What is needed in New Jersey is more of the kind of informed and dedicated leaders who are leading the successful fight for this art legislation in New York State, particularly men of the caliber of Howard Lindsay, Dr. Howard Hanson, Harold Weston, Lloyd Goodrich and others.

Here in the Nation's Capital Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Senator MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD have sponsored significant cultural legislation to preserve from destruction historic and beautiful Lafayette Park across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House. Also to be preserved, under the terms of the

Murray-Mansfield plan are the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, the Commodore Stephen Decatur House, and the old Belasco Theater.

I include here as part of my remarks several items which illuminate the subject which I have been discussing, including an excerpt from a recent interview with the distinguished American author and dramatist, Howard Lindsay, which was broadcast over radio station WYNC, New York City:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1960]

FINAL CURTAIN

A fine old theatrical relic and the graceful home where Dolly Madison once lived now appear doomed by the General Service Administration's latest plans to "improve" Lafayette Square. Only those with hearts of ice could be wholly unmoved by the impending change. The Belasco Theater, second only to the National in local eminence, once carried such lustrous names on its playbills as Sarah Bernhardt, Mrs. Fiske and DeWolf Hopper. During its years as a USO center, it basked in a brief Indian summer before the Treasury Department turned its velvet-and-gold interior into a vault for Disbursement Office records. And now the shade of L. Stoddard Taylor, the Belasco's last manager, will surely sigh at the news that his 65-year-old stage will soon make way for a Court of Claims given to more prosaic drama.

No less poignant is the fate of the Dolly Madison House a few doors up on H Street. The second oldest private dwelling on the square (Decatur House is older), and once the home of the Cosmos Club, the house is celebrated as the place where Dolly Madison spent the years of her widowhood. It is a house rich in associations on a square limned in history. A catalog of those who have lived around the park evokes the Republic's heroic days: Daniel Webster, William H. Seward, John Hay, Henry Adams, James G. Blaine, Henry Clay, Charles Sumner, Roger B. Taney, Gideon Welles, Stephen Decatur and John Randolph of Roanoke.

Long ago, the decision should have been made to preserve the residential character which predominated around the square until World War I. The opportunity has been thoughtlessly thrown away. The GSA is preparing to raze most of Jackson Place to make way for a monolithic office building; the AFL-CIO was permitted to build a headquarters mosque that towers grotesquely over St. John's Church; and now one of the city's choicest locations will be awarded to the Court of Claims. Even at this late date some hard questions ought to be raised about whether a courthouse would make the most appropriate use of such a desirable site.

With a little more foresight, the square could have remained as a pleasant patch of the past—with a refurbished Belasco serving, perhaps, as a repertory theater. The chance has long since gone, and our grandchildren may well reproach us for failing as guardians of a heritage worth saving.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

Washington, D.C., March 2, 1960.

SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you and

to express the appreciation of the clubwomen of the General Federation of Women's Clubs for your courageous efforts to save the historical monuments of our country, particularly your latest effort to preserve the Dolly Madison House, the Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square near the White House.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs were very enthusiastic in their efforts to restore Independence Hall in Philadelphia where the Government is spending millions to restore that national monument for the benefit of not only this generation but also for future ones. The General Federation of Women's Clubs spearheaded the program for restoration of Independence Hall and I want to assure you that this organization will support your efforts to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square in our Nation's Capital. We feel this will be a national shrine, not just another historic spot in the District of Columbia.

May I suggest that we believe the people interested in saving these particular buildings should have an opportunity to make public statements regarding their desire. We urge you to have hearings by the proper Senate committee. We know that the House did not hold hearings when they considered the request that the site of the above-mentioned buildings be used for the construction of a District Claims Court.

Again let me tell you that as good patriotic Americans the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs appreciate your efforts and will support you in trying to get your bill passed so as to save these historic monuments.

Most sincerely,

MISS CHLOE GIFFORD,
President.

S. 3128

A bill to designate as national historic sites Lafayette Square and certain buildings in the vicinity thereof, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lafayette Square, the buildings known as the Dolly Madison House, located at 1520 H Street Northwest, the Benjamin Taylor House, located at 21 Madison Place Northwest, and the Decatur House, located at the northwest corner of H Street and Jackson Place Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia, are hereby designated national historic sites. Hereafter, so much of the property as may be in Federal ownership shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and in accordance with the purposes of the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 2. The old Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a municipal art center for the Nation's Capital. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to restore the old Belasco Theater to a condition at least equal to its condition at the time it was acquired by the Federal Government. The District of Columbia Recreation Department shall assist the Department of the Interior in the restoration and management of the old Belasco Theater as a municipal art center.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
MUNICIPAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM,
New York, N. Y., February 19, 1960.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Harold Weston has told us of your interest in one of WNYC's programs—"International Interview"—where Mr. Howard Lindsay was the guest and where he discussed governmental activities on the arts, as well as the proposed New York State Arts Council.

This program, which is one of a regular series presented by WNYC with the cooperation of the Foreign Press Association, has a very respectable sized audience. We are enclosing herewith a transcript of the program on which Mr. Lindsay participated and which was broadcast on WNYC at 6 p.m. on February 19.

We would be delighted if you saw fit to have this inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR N. SIEGEL,
Director.

INTERNATIONAL INTERVIEW—BROADCAST ON
WNYC AND WNYC-FM, FEBRUARY 19, 1960

Mr. ROUSSEAU, Your city station, in cooperation with the Foreign Press Association, presents another "International Interview." Here, now, to open this evening's transcribed program is our Moderator, Seymour N. Siegel, Director of Radio Communications for New York.

Mr. SIEGEL. How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, in cooperation with the Foreign Press Association, we present "International Interview." Our guest in tonight's "International Interview" is Howard Lindsay, dramatist, actor, producer. Mr. Lindsay has been the author or coauthor of more than 20 plays and he has been associated with Russell Crouse and Rodgers and Hammerstein in writing "The Sound of Music." He has written "Call Me Madam!" also with Russell Crouse and Irving Berlin. He has had something to do with the writing of "The State of the Union" and, of course, he is best known with having had something to do with writing "Life with Father." He also created the part of "Father" in "Life with Father." As a producer, he offered "A Slight Case of Murder" written by himself and Damon Runyon. He has coproduced with Russell Crouse "Arsenic and Old Lace," "The Hasty Heart," "Detective Story" and many others. What's important, too, is that he is the fifth president of the Players Club. Many of you may know that the first four presidents were Edwin Booth, Joseph Jefferson, John Drew and Walter Hampden. He is the past president of The Authors League of America. He is the vice president of the Dramatists Guild. He is chairman of the board of the new dramatists committee. He is the chairman of the National Council on the Arts and Government. And a very interesting item—he is vice chairman of the committee for modern courts here in New York State. In any event, here to interview Mr. Lindsay, are correspondents of The Foreign Press Association who will now introduce themselves.

Mr. LEISTIKOW. I'm Gunnar Leistikow, correspondent for 10 Scandinavian newspapers.

Mr. ROHDEN. I'm Mak Rohden, representing the "Wiener Zeitung" in Vienna, Austria.

Mr. STEINITZ. My name is Hans Steinitz, correspondent of "Der Bund" in Berne, Switzerland.

Mr. STEINITZ. Mr. Lindsay, we come to the issue of what help and assistance a government on all levels—Federal, State, and city—can and ought to give, or not give, to a theater activity. Coming from Europe where this is a matter, of course, as you know, I have always been struck in all these years in

my being stationed in this country to what extent it is denied to various government levels to intervene in cultural activities, sometimes with the argument that the Federal setup interdicts or forbids the Federal level to be active which in all other countries with the Federal setup, in Canada also, in Africa or Switzerland, or Germany, or others as well. It does not hold good because there all levels participate and here, under the argument of the Federal separation of power, no government level interferes in the theater with the result, of course, that the theater has been compelled to become a commercial venture and going as you said, I quote your own words, "the lazy path of successful stories." I know that there are endeavors and plans afoot to change that and to do something about it. Could you tell us about some of them, especially as I believe you have a hand in some of them yourself.

Mr. LINDSAY. I am not sure entirely that we understand each other, Mr. Steinitz. There is nothing that forbids the government from interesting itself in the theater, supporting the theater, subsidizing the theater. It is not in our tradition, and you are quite right about that. We have had no experience in it and, as a matter of fact, I think the government on the whole in this country has been for a great many years, although this is no longer entirely true, rather suspicious of the artist. They have not regarded the artist as a very sensible and sane man. He is a bit of a dreamer and someone rather impractical, and so they rather shied away from any association with the artist. However, there has been of late a very great quickening in the interest of the government, both Federal and in the States, and in a great many municipalities in the arts, not entirely in the theater, but in some places solely in the theater. A good example of that would be the fact that Governor Rockefeller in his speech to the present legislature called for the establishment of an arts council in New York State, and a bill has been introduced to implement that. He proposes that there will be a council of 15 men appointed by the Governor with the consent of the senate (I don't mean men—it could be men and women—15 people) who will make a study of the field and report back to the legislature recommendations of the ways that the State could promote interest in drama, dance, opera, painting, music, and the other arts. That's very encouraging. New York City, of course, is the cultural center of this country. Now, it doesn't need this. This is for the benefit, I think, of New York State and that will mean that other places in the State outside of New York City, will receive more theater, hear more music, will see more exhibition of pictures.

Mr. STEINITZ. Would that arts council, sir, have a budget of its own enabling it to become active, or would it just be somebody to pull from the sidelines or encourage from the sidelines?

Mr. LINDSAY. Now, the first budget which presumes to cover only the original survey and recommendations is for \$50,000 a year. That, I think is a—in present times with the high taxes that we are paying—I think that is a rather generous and bold request, and I think possibly at the beginning that would be certainly enough. Now, this does not presume that we are later going to ask the government of New York State for subsidies. This is not in our tradition, but we might ask them for enough what is called in this country "pump priming." Do you know what "pump priming" is? You pour water down a pump in order to start it going, and that small amount of water that you pour down gives you a great flow of water when the pump has been primed. This interest in the arts is very necessary because of the amount of leisure time the American has today, the short work week, and all of the aids to the

housewife to cut down her work, also the realization that a whole man needs an interest in the arts, needs training of his emotions, his taste, and it gives him greater relish for living, and it's very heartening that the Governor has done this and, of course, all of us who are interested in the arts are extremely hopeful that this bill will pass, and that the citizens will be interested enough to get behind it.

Students Look for Chance To Exchange Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the shape of the future may well be determined not by guns, bombs, and bullets—if war can be averted—but by constructive ideas—the creative, imaginative process through which new things—once dreams and visions—are transformed into reality to create a better life for mankind.

Around the globe today, barrier after barrier to exchange of ideas are either being torn down or hurdled.

The exposure of more people to more ideas—of their own and other lands—will, I believe, create a richer, more inspiring reservoir of cultural, informational, intellectual, scientific, and practical ideas for promoting a better life.

Particularly, mass media—radio, television, publications, and others—as well as more people-to-people contacts—are creating new channels for the interflow of knowledge.

Today, in our universities we find a growing number of students searching with zealous intellectual curiosity into the ways of life of peoples in other lands.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal carried an informative article by Peggy Daum, entitled "Students Look for Chance To Exchange Ideas." The article reveals many of the ways in which the youth of the world, through educational institutions, are seeking and finding new and different ideas not only to satisfy their curiosity, but to enrich their lives. Reflecting the kind of idea exchange which is essential if the people of the world are ultimately to understand each other and live in peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENTS LOOK FOR CHANCE TO EXCHANGE IDEAS—STUDYING ABROAD CARRIES OPPORTUNITY, RESPONSIBILITY, COLLEGE PANELS SHOW

(By Peggy Daum)

College students from the United States and foreign countries, meeting at Alverno College last weekend, took a careful look at themselves in order to understand one another better.

What they found is a need for greater opportunity to exchange the ideas they all are willing to give and receive.

Dr. Yu-Min Chou, a native of Formosa and an economics instructor at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, summed up the idea by referring to Kipling's much quoted line: "They say, 'East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,' but here we do," he observed. It is in actually meeting with one another that students can try to appreciate why people on the other side think the way they do, he said.

Dr. Chou was one of three faculty members and four students participating in panel discussions of what the international student and the American student have to offer each other in the world of cultural values and in the world of student life. A presentation of instrumental music, dance, and song demonstrated what students can exchange in the world of the arts.

The program, cosponsored by the international relations clubs of Cardinal Stritch, Mount Mary and Alverno Colleges, was held in observance of Pax Romana Day, Sunday. Pax Romana is an international organization of Catholic college students.

TRADITIONS ABANDONED HERE

Representing America in a discussion of cultural values, Eugene Woelfel, instructor in mechanical engineering at UWM and a former president of the International Students Club at Marquette University, noted that the United States has the characteristic culture or stage of advancement which it now enjoys because its early settlers were "an amalgam of many nationalities who didn't adhere to any traditions. They weren't bound to old traditions," he observed, "because they came here for a new life."

Since there was no necessity to do things as their grandfathers had, Americans progressed until "we have achieved material maturity but haven't reached a state of intellectual maturity."

This intellectual maturity could be lacking, Woelfel said, either because it was lost when Americans' forefathers broke with tradition or because material progress emphasized the young and the strong to the neglect of the wise and of authority. "The young and the strong do not respect their elders," he noted.

POSSESSIONS TO EXCHANGE

In the light of these characteristics of American culture, Woelfel enumerated three possessions which American students can offer to people from other nations: Technical knowledge which has provided the leisure time great thinkers said is necessary to develop the higher faculties; an encouraging and fostering of new ideas, showing the advantage of progress to tradition-bound countries; a sense of tolerance, equality, and happiness.

From the foreign student, he said, Americans can also learn three things: An appreciation of intellectual and esthetic values, particularly from the Europeans; an insistence on the preservation of one's own culture, particularly from Asians and Africans who don't want to be slaves to the capitals of Europe; a deeper understanding of the intellectual faculties, of wisdom, and an appreciation of the role it plays in all men's lives.

SEES CONFLICTS ARISE

Speaking for Asia, Dr. Chou, himself a student until last fall, approached the exchange of cultural values from a visiting student's point of view.

"Because cultural heritage causes people from different lands to react differently to the same things, conflicts arise when they are together," he observed.

But although students come from diverse backgrounds, they do have one thing in common: All are interested in improving world conditions, in learning how to live together in harmony, he said.

Eliminating the conflicts, then, is a matter of learning "not so much what we can exchange but how we can exchange with each other."

The "how" of reaching mutual understanding, he said, is the exchange of ideas in direct contact. If this direct contact is lacking, communications can give an image which leads to bias.

There is good opportunity for this direct and personal approach in American schools, Dr. Chou told his student audience. Special treatment is nice, but the foreign student doesn't particularly like it, he said.

"He wants to belong to the gang, to be included in coffee breaks between classes, in dormitory bull sessions. He wants to get together and talk in a situation where there can be a frank exchange of ideas."

Some foreign students, he noted, tend to forget their cultural heritage, but most do not.

"And they're interested in learning about American cultural heritage and appreciating it, or they wouldn't be studying in this country."

EUROPEAN SPOKESMAN

Dr. Isidoro Montiel, professor of modern languages at Marquette University and a former professor at the University of Madrid, noted the period of rapid change and challenge which nations entered following World War II.

New technological demands will undoubtedly be met, but in doing so, he cautioned, the world of cultural values must be preserved and realized fully.

"The major objectives are a transmission of cultural heritage and a further development of intellectual, emotional, spiritual, and philosophical potentialities of the individual so each one can fulfill his own destiny and contribute to the realization of the values of a free society."

Dr. Montiel listed 13 values which he considered worthwhile for students to exchange. They included these ideas:

The twofold duty of a student in another country is to learn and to inform. "Curiosity and talkativeness are Americans' secret weapons," he said. The Spanish student has to know more than bullfights, the American more than cowboys and Hollywood movies.

"A student should recognize the unique worth and dignity of his own personality and individuality, but he must also establish an attitude of exemplarity. The foreign student must never become a traitor to his religion, culture, home, and traditions."

A mutual understanding and social communication on spiritual, intellectual, and cultural levels provides the most effective way to solve problems and exchange important developments, he said.

"The students should want to see the foreign country and its people not with the eyes of the tourist but with the unlimited purpose to comprehend it in its totality, including its individuality and strangeness."

The student abroad should have optimism and hope for the future, what in this country is called the American dream, Dr. Montiel concluded.

STUDENTS COMPARE LIFE

Students representing Africa, America, Asia and Europe noted the differing effects student life in their countries has upon themselves and the world around them.

Raphael Wanguo, a Marquette University student from Kenya, noted that college life rates more attention and the college student is a more important part of the population in this country than he is in Africa.

"In many African countries college life is a new thing and in some the colleges are few," he said, citing the example of two schools, one a junior college, serving all of East Africa.

Because the student body is a very small and unimportant part of the population, the impact of its activities is not felt much beyond the college itself. Student activity, particularly political activity, is strictly regulated by college authorities, he said.

"Many people are ready and willing to get rid of foreign rule but the student is even more ready and willing," he observed. "Western missionaries have taught him about democracy and high standards of living . . . but while he remains in school the African student cannot argue his case or make himself understood."

TAKE ACTIVE POLITICAL ROLE

Maria Teresa Ungson, a graduate student at Marquette, indicated the situation is quite different in the Philippines.

Because almost everyone goes to college, there is a large student population, she pointed out. The students participate in school activities like those here, but perhaps the most powerful student organization in the Catholic country, she said, is called Student Catholic Action. Another branch is an active alumni group.

When the truth about the Communists who almost overran the country in 1948, came to light, she said, it turned out that most of the Communist leaders were students. "To counteract the Communists, SCA adopted their cell technique, working with small groups of people, and have had success since taking over the method."

Today, Miss Ungson observed, students continue to have great influence upon the political life of the Philippines. "Once the students are behind a candidate, he's in business," she put it.

She cited cases of student rallies and student lobbying which affected national legislation.

In comparison students in the Netherlands are quite unconcerned about politics, observed Anton de Witte, also a graduate student at Marquette University.

While the situation in his homeland is far from typical of the rest of Europe, the quietness of political life explains why there are no student political groups, he said.

Students are not counseled as to where to go to school, what to take, how to apply for scholarships, and so forth, he noted. The small percentage which goes to 6 years of university work does so on its own advice.

Because the secondary education is harder than it is here, the graduate entering college at 18 is a more mature student, he added.

ECONOMIC DIFFERENCE

A more serious differentiation, he said, develops between the students who support themselves by working and those who are supported by their parents. Those in the latter group usually belong to an organization called the Student Union, a sort of lone fraternity.

Sports do not hold the dominant place they do on American campuses, de Witte said. Debating is the most popular activity.

"A member of the debating team has the status of an all-American football player," he said, making note of an academic difference.

Kathy Kilkenny of Delavan, Wis., a student at Mount Mary College, described the myriad activities and interest groups available to the American student who goes to school for the benefit of campus life and, incidentally (Miss Kilkenny made it almost an aside), attends classes.

"He soon learns it's not grade 13 in high school, however," she pointed out, "but a place where he's to learn how to learn, and he won't get anywhere unless he grows up."

He learns about government, not by taking an active part in politics, as Filipino students do, but by participating in student political organizations, she said.

The American student, she said, is "in a hurry to get educated, get out, get married,

get a job, and make a place for himself in this uncertain world. Most of all, he wants to be safe.

"The intelligent man or woman who finds out what education means has grown up."

Lawmaker on Hoffa Purge List Defends Vote on Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by our colleague, Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, which appeared in the Des Moines Register of February 29, 1960:

(By THOMAS B. CURTIS)

(The author of the following article, a Republican, has been a Member of the House of Representatives for 10 years. His district is one of the strongholds of the Teamsters Union.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Fifty-six Congressmen have been marked for political purge by James Hoffa, general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

I am one of those Congressmen, representing St. Louis County and South St. Louis, home of Harold Gibbons, Teamster executive vice president, and Sidney Zagri, director of Hoffa's purge campaign.

Most of us on the Hoffa purge list will run in the November 8, 1960, elections. Forty of us have banded together in the committee to reelect Hoffa-threatened Congressmen to offer a solid front to the threats of Hoffa and to delineate a choice for our citizens:

Shall Hoffa or the American voters have the final voice in choosing a Congress?

HOW THEY GOT ON THE LIST

To "qualify" for the Hoffa purge list a Congressman had to (1) have voted for the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act and (2) have won an election victory in 1958 by less than a 5-percent majority.

Fifty-three Republicans and two Democrats made the list in this way. The 56th, Representative WILLIAM AYRES, of Akron, Ohio, despite his convincing 36,000-vote victory in 1958, was marked for purge because of his membership on the House-Senate conference committee which drafted the final version of the law.

The purge campaign is based on the fallacy that the act is union busting and that those who supported it are antilabor.

This is untrue. The 56 named, plus 173 other House members who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, did so to curb abuses in the labor-management field revealed to the Congress and to the public. As its name plainly states, the law aims at the unscrupulous employer as well as the unscrupulous labor leader.

Since most of the abuses exposed were perpetrated by Hoffa and his close associates, it is clear why they were angry at the Congress for protecting the public interest and the rights of working men and women.

RIGHT-TO-WORK PROPOSALS OPPOSED

Propaganda opposed to the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act characterizes those who voted for it as either blind in their disregard of labor or servile in yielding to the pressures of big business. I object to this attack on the motives and integrity of Congress.

Had I any reason to feel that the law was a vindictive assault on the labor movement,

as it has been called by its opponents, I would have voted, worked, and spoken against it, just as I have from 1954 to the present against the right-to-work proposals that have been presented in Missouri during that time.

There is nothing in this law requiring the overwhelming majority of properly run unions to do anything which they were not previously doing nor to prevent them from doing anything that they were.

Response to the creation of the Committee to Reelect Hoffa-Threatened Congressmen has been spontaneous, widespread, and encouraging. Civic leaders, editors, and commentators have commended the committee's formation.

RESPONSE FROM MANY PEOPLE

Many people throughout the Nation have responded. Letters are flowing into the House Office Building offices of the temporary committee cochairmen, Representatives AYRES and CARROLL KEARNS, of Pennsylvania. These letters offer voluntary services and money to offset Hoffa's huge slush fund, his main weapon for waging political war.

The public response has highlighted the Hoffa purge list as on honor roll on which my colleagues and I are all proud to be named.

Surely no one wishes to deny Mr. Hoffa his right to engage in political activity. To flourish, our system of government requires a maximum of political activity and our committee would not strip anyone—an individual, organization, union, or corporation—of his legitimate right of political advocacy.

We do not condemn Hoffa for his exercise of this right; rather we commend him. We urge, however, that our citizens also exercise their rights in this field and prevent a special interest from usurping the powers of the public at large.

This is the only way to counter the Hoffa purge. The hundreds of thousands of interested, thinking citizens who refuse to let their rights be snatched away by a special interest group must act.

Those who cared enough to demand the Landrum-Griffin labor-management reform act by an unprecedented deluge of mail, those who resent the threats of a bully can help. To show this interest they must support those Congressmen Hoffa would purge.

A WAY FOR POPULAR PARTICIPATION

We honestly believe we are right. We were right to work for a law curbing a small but dangerous element in labor leadership that has perverted the movement for personal power.

We are right in banding together against the purge of a well-heeled special interest. We are opening the way for popular participation in a drive that will show it is not Hoffa, but the voters, the American people, who will name their Members of Congress next November 8.

This is the crux: do the voters endorse our action or do they not?

If those who agree with us do not register their convictions at the polls, then we are doomed to the purge Hoffa has decreed.

Have no doubts, Hoffa with his huge slush fund for this purge will succeed unless the people rise and prove that they are the true rulers under our form of government.

Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix a press statement issued by the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, SCAD. The statement makes reference to correspondence between the State Department and myself, which I initiated to clarify the position of the Department in a matter of primary concern to State officials. In the course of this correspondence, it became clear that the Department was not seeking to inject itself into the State matter, which involved the application of the New York law against discrimination.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE COMMISSION AGAINST

DISCRIMINATION,

New York, N.Y., November 26, 1959.

Commissioner Elmer A. Carter, chairman of the State Commission Against Discrimination, announced today that the State agency has determined not to appeal a decision of Supreme Court Justice Henry Epstein which, last July 15, reversed a SCAD ruling which had granted an exemption to the Arabian American Oil Co. under which it was permitted to make preemployment inquiries as to religion for jobs in Saudi Arabia.

Commissioner Carter said that the decision not to appeal Judge Epstein's ruling was based upon recent information that tended to show that the U.S. State Department's attitude in the matter has undergone changes since 1956 when the original SCAD ruling was upheld. The original ruling was made in 1950 and subsequently sustained in 1956 by SCAD on the basis of representations by the State Department that a bona fide occupational qualification for Aramco's operations was in the best interest of the country.

Legal questions raised by Judge Epstein in his decision will be presumably resolved in an independent appeal from the decision now being undertaken by Aramco, Commissioner Carter said.

Elks Name Nine to John Brown Gallery of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 28 the Negro Elks National Education for Citizenship Banquet was held in Washington at the National Press Club. It was sponsored by the department of education under the leadership of one of my Tennessee constituents, Lt. George W. Lee, the grand commissioner of education of this great order that boasts of a membership of over 500,000 in the United States and many of the islands of the sea. The order is ably led by Robert H. Johnson of Philadelphia, the grand exalted ruler, with a woman's auxiliary headed by Mrs. Nettie Carter Jackson, of New York City, the grand daughter ruler.

Merit awards were given to:

Mrs. Christine Ray Davis, staff director, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives. For overcoming obstacles of race and sex and striding unerringly into a position of unusual responsibility.

B. CARROLL REECE, Congressman from Tennessee, for a long and distinguished career marked by unselfish devotion to his people, a heroic stand for freedom for all citizens under trying circumstances, and service to war veterans.

E. Frederic Morrow, administrative officer for special projects group, Executive Office of the President of the United States. For bringing excellence, enthusiasm, and restraint to the pinnacle of the Negro's climb in the elastic field of government and for laying the stepping stones upon which Negro youth may aspire to tread.

PAUL DOUGLAS, Senator, State of Illinois, for constant and unwavering devotion to the cause of freedom of all people and for setting a standard of excellence for the corps of elected officials of the United States.

Val J. Washington, director of minorities, Republican National Committee, for demonstrating a type of leadership in a great political party which serves to radiate to Negro America an inspiration to great achievement.

Lt. Col. Daniel James, Jr., air staff officer, directorate of operations, the Pentagon. For heroic leadership as a flight commander in World War II which led to a top level assignment in the Pentagon and extraordinary achievement in the service of his country.

Simeon S. Booker, Jr., chief of the Washington bureau, Johnson Publication. For unusual perception in the sensitive field of journalism which has brought to thousands a vital understanding of the Nation's processes of self-government.

A. Philip Randolph, international President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. For standing stalwart as the laborer's advance guard and fighting gallantly against any odds toward the achievement of full equality and uncompromising dignity for the workingman.

KENNETH B. KEATING, Senator, State of New York. For devoted and dedicated service to the United States as Congressman and Senator from New York and for providing our Nation with an enviable brand of leadership in one of its most trying periods.

It is fitting that this great occasion should be recognized, it primed the wells of enthusiasm and stirred the pride of all the people strikingly devoted to our country and its great history.

The junior Senator from New York and I have not at all times agreed on matters that touched upon the delicate and extremely complex human relations question, but we are in full agreement on the deep admiration of the Elks' scholarship program. Many are not aware of the Elks' accomplishments in providing scholarships in American, Canadian, and Mexican colleges and universities for young men and women.

Since World War I, this organization has provided some 900 scholarships at a cost of \$1,500,000. Currently it has 46 youths getting higher education in some of the best schools, and during the past year it has been carrying on a campaign, under the direction of its grand commissioner of education, the capable George W. Lee, of Memphis, to raise

\$100,000. The campaign will end in August at the Chicago Grand Lodge where scholarships in large number will be handed out.

This remarkable self-help effort is a good example of what Negroes can do for themselves under intelligent leadership without relying upon others for alms. It is something of which all of us should be proud, and certainly no other Negro group has even approached it.

The progress of any group is gaged by the proportion of educated people in its midst who are equipped to avail themselves of the opportunities presented; ignorant, uneducated people can have all the civil rights there are and still not advance themselves very much.

Under unanimous consent I include Senator KEATING's address and the one delivered by A. Philip Randolph, vice president of the AFL-CIO, to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—A CHALLENGE FOR 1960

(Address by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, at a banquet given by the I.B.P.O.E. of W., upon the occasion of receiving a Merit Award at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., January 28, 1960)

Thank you very much for this great honor. I shall deeply treasure this merit award, and it will occupy a prominent place in my Senate office. I know personally of the dedication to freedom and justice and of the outstanding courage and integrity of the others you have tonight singled out for this recognition. I am very proud to have been joined with this distinguished group of Americans to receive your award.

I want to discuss with you tonight one of the most important problems before this session of Congress—the urgent need for new civil rights laws.

The present civil rights situation in the country—despite much progress in recent years—is deplorable. The constitutional dream of equal justice and equal opportunity for all Americans has been shattered by a lynching, by scores of school and church bombings, by mob action against children seeking a proper education. Groups such as yours multiplied a thousand times in assemblies across the Nation can justly cry out for action against these shocking betrayals of our democratic heritage.

I believe that no American's liberty is safe unless the liberty of all Americans is protected. There can be no second-class citizenship under our Constitution. There can be no differences in the rights of men created in the image of God.

Throughout my career in Congress, I have fought to strengthen the civil liberties of the people of America. Discrimination against any American because of his race, religion, or national origin is abhorrent to me. It is an ugly, evil practice. My love for my country, my pride in its heritage, my complete devotion to its democratic ideals, compel me to struggle against those who would undermine our freedoms. The lynching mobs, the bomb throwers, the hatemongers are worse than ordinary criminals. These men betray America. In every sense, they are subversives who would destroy our laws and violate the most sacred principles of our precious Republic.

It has been almost 6 years since the Supreme Court's decision declaring school segregation unconstitutional. Yet, in five States—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—not a single Negro child has been admitted to an all-white public school. At the same time, thousands of children, white and colored, have been deprived of all schooling for periods ranging up

to several months. Other thousands of schoolchildren have been forced to use inadequate makeshift facilities. It has been estimated that over 1 million pupil days of schooling have been wasted just in the last 2 years.

The extremists have resorted to every kind of device to frustrate compliance with the law of the land. In some States, a rash of pupil placement laws have been enacted, in others automatic school closing statutes, and in still others a system of allegedly private schools supported by State funds has been instituted.

Can you imagine all of this frantic activity to keep a colored child from sitting next to a white child in a classroom? The children are the immediate innocent victims of a blind prejudice nurtured by years of unremedied, unequal treatment of Negroes. But the whole country ultimately suffers from this madness. We need a better educated America to meet the challenges of our age. American children forced to get their lessons in makeshift schoolrooms in buildings with inadequate facilities will not readily develop into the top scientists and other leaders of the future. The antics of the die-hard segregationists in the South are a blow to our hopes for these youngsters.

Despite some progress in these last 5 years, due in no small measure to the efforts of the NAACP, and the optimism I have that we can improve these conditions, I am frankly alarmed at the damage already done in this area. We have the right to be impatient about the slow progress in carrying out the Supreme Court's ruling. I do not intend to sit back and watch the Court's mandate die of old age.

It has been more than 2 years since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957—the most far-reaching provisions of which dealt with the enforcement of voting rights. Yet where do we stand in the field of voting rights today? Here are some facts from the report of the Commission on Civil Rights issued in September 1959—the second anniversary of the 1957 act.

In many Southern States, less than 25 percent of the eligible nonwhite residents are registered to vote.

In Mississippi, less than 4 percent of the 41 percent of the voting age population which is Negro, is registered to vote. In 14 counties in Mississippi with a Negro population of voting age of over 50,000, not a single Negro was registered.

Are these incredible figures the result of indifference on the part of Negro citizens in the South? Let's look again to the report of the Commission for the answer:

A Negro minister in Florida who suggested from the pulpit that Negroes should register and vote was subsequently denied a small bank loan despite the fact he had a highly solvent co-signer.

Negro citizens in Sunflower County, Miss., in which only 114 out of 18,949 voting age Negroes are registered, stated that when they tried to register they were turned away. A Negro public school principal in Charleston, Miss., which is in Tallahatchie County, Miss., in which not one of 9,235 voting age Negroes is registered, testified that he tried to register 16 times, twice a year, for 8 years. Every time the registrar simply told him he could not register.

There are many, many other similar illustrations of flagrant denials of the right to vote to Negro citizens in the South. Many of these Americans actually were fearful of recounting their experiences to Commission investigators because of fears for their physical and economic well-being. One Negro man in Florida, told an investigator that he refused to be interviewed, "because they would bomb my (business) out of existence if I ever talked with you." Can anyone dispute the deterrent effect of such fears on Americans who want to exercise their citi-

zanship rights? These facts should make us all a little bit ashamed, because what they add up to is proof that a part of America is unable to participate in our democratic way of life.

I pledge to work unceasingly in this session of Congress for measures which will guarantee equal opportunity to all Americans. I will not settle for promises, phony assurances, or weak proposals on any of these issues. We had too many of these in the last session of Congress. In a bill introduced by the majority leader, it was actually proposed that these hard won legal rights be made subject to conciliation; that the whole subject be treated like another form of collective bargaining. Well, I hope we never reach the stage in this country when the judgments of a court or the requirements of a law are made subject to review by a director of a conciliation service. The recognition and enforcement of a person's civil rights it not a subject to be bargained about.

Now what do I mean by effective civil rights legislation? First of all, I mean a bill which will deter lynching for all time by providing a discretionary death penalty for deprivations of civil rights resulting in the murder of the victim. Under the present law, a person who, under color of law, deprives a citizen of his civil rights, can be imprisoned for not more than a year no matter what injury results. These penalties obviously are inadequate in lynching cases and must be increased. We cannot allow another Charles Mack Parker case to go unremedied.

Secondly, I believe it is essential that we enact legislation to give the Attorney General the right to prosecute civil actions in all cases involving denials of equal protection of the laws and not just in voting cases. This power is needed particularly in school cases. The NAACP has done a magnificent job, but the Government has its own responsibilities in this area. This was part III of the 1957 act as it passed the House of Representatives. I am now more convinced than ever as to the merits of this provision.

I have never been able to understand the deep hostility with which this provision is viewed by some Members of the Congress. Under a host of Federal statutes the whole weight of the Federal Government, including the legal resources of the Department of Justice, are made available to enforce Federal laws which certainly are no more significant to our national welfare than the provisions of the Constitution involved in equal protection cases.

The FCC, for example, will argue a case all the way up to the Supreme Court to defend the granting of a license to a broadcaster or a rate increase to the telephone company. The NLRB will exhaust every available remedy for the benefit of an employee whom it finds has been subjected to antiunion discrimination by his employer or coercion by his union. The ICC will defend shippers from unfair rate charges without any investigation of the ability of the shipper to prosecute his own claim. In all these cases, there is a public interest in the enforcement of the law which we have agreed, without too much controversy, makes it appropriate for the Federal Government to intervene. Is there any less public interest in enforcement of the law most important to our country, the Constitution?

But even enactment of an antilynching law and the grant of authority to the Attorney General to bring civil injunctive suits would not do the whole job.

We also need a law to guaranty prompt relief to otherwise qualified citizens who are being denied their right to vote by reason of race, color, religion or national origin. The appointment of temporary registrars has been suggested as an administrative remedy for these cases. Just 2 days ago,

the Attorney General, after conference with the President, submitted a new proposal under which the courts would appoint U.S. voting referees. I shall favor whichever procedure appears to me, after hearings, to promise the most effective relief to the victims of State voting deprivations. The registrar proposal may have some advantages, but the Attorney General's proposal has the distinct merit of being applicable to voting as well as registration and is more closely related to the existing framework for prosecuting such cases. Actually there is no reason to consider these proposals mutually exclusive. We may need both as an administrative and judicial remedy to do the whole job. The best solution may be a dual approach, and I am now drafting a new bill which will combine the best features in both proposals.

Experience with the Kaspers and Faubuses in Little Rock and other cities shows a need for a Federal law to punish those interfering by force with court orders in school cases. The deplorable rash of bombings of schools, churches and synagogues, and homes in the past several years shows the need for a Federal antibombing law. The difficulties with which the Department of Justice and Civil Rights Commission have been faced in obtaining documentary material needed to evaluate cases and policies in this field shows a need for Federal laws requiring the preservation of voting records under court process if necessary. The difficulties which local school boards have had in attempting to carry out, on a voluntary basis, desegregation plans show a need for a Federal grant-in-aid program to help local communities carry out such programs. The impact on the children of servicemen in areas in which the schools have been closed in defiance of Federal law, shows the need for authority to provide extra educational facilities for these innocent victims of community desegregation controversies. And there is no justification for not acting on the President's request to give his Commission on Nondiscrimination Under Government Contracts, full statutory authority.

These are the outlines of a program which would justify the name, civil rights. If these proposals sound far reaching, it is only because so much needs to be done. In light of the facts they are in reality very moderate steps for furthering the liberty and equal opportunity of all our citizens.

It will be a hard struggle to get this kind of program enacted in this session of Congress. Members of Congress in key positions in the House and Senate will be trying to block our efforts. A filibuster will have to be overcome. But there is no finer mission for the energies of Americans. I pledge my complete dedication to the task. With your help and encouragement, we can succeed.

ADDRESS BY A. PHILIP RANDOLPH AT THE NATIONAL EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP BANQUET OF I.B.P.O.E.W., NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 28, 1960

My dear friends, first of all permit me to say that I am honored for the privilege to share in this occasion.

We are here because Negroes are not yet fully free. Negroes are not yet fully free because the Civil War revolution was never completed. The Civil War revolution was never fully completed because the new industrial and financial rulers of the North considered it unnecessary since the Union had been saved.

Because of the fact that we are in the midst of a crisis in the civil rights revolution now underway, it is well for us to look back to note and evaluate the crisis which followed the close of the Civil War revolution, during which time the major rights of Negroes were systematically nullified and virtually cast into the ashcan of history.

It is important to point out that in every crisis there are two major forces: (1) Danger; (2) opportunity.

There is always danger that the cause may be lost and there is opportunity that it may be won. Whether it be lost or won depends primarily upon the policy and action adopted and carried on by the people who have a stake in the cause of freedom and human justice.

As another example of political indifference and unconcern we have the hideous experience of a brutal murder in Mississippi, with the killers identified, their premeditation and conspiracy known in full detail, but neither State nor Federal Governments able even to punish them for disorderly conduct. An utter and complete breakdown of law disgraces the Nation, terrorizes its citizens, and neither party has yet proposed that a Federal antilynch law be enacted.

The list could be extended. The heart of civil rights legislation, section 3, still remains in a congressional pigeonhole. An FEPC law to extend economic opportunity and security for Negroes is still another forgotten bill.

Why have reactionary forces been able to frustrate, delay, and obstruct not only these urgently needed laws but the enforcement of the Supreme Court decisions of 1954 as well?

The answer is simple. This tragic condition proceeds from the fact that the leaders of nations do not act from motives of pure justice. Instead, they seek to maintain a peaceful balance amongst the contending forces that comprise the nation. No group knows this better than southern reactionaries and their northern allies. They have always employed the technique of creating confusion and diversions, with the object of damaging the peaceful pursuits of government and the social order. Their object is to compel the liberal forces to submit if they want a peaceful and quiet community. Tragically, liberal forces have submitted in their quest for an end to disruption.

The pattern of reaction since Reconstruction days has been based on these factors:

1. The Government and the liberals speak of justice and progress but more profoundly desire internal peace.
2. The Government and liberals finally yield to the demands of those most capable of creating maximum pressures and social discord.
3. That Negroes are not capable of creating counter pressures that can be more forceful and embarrassing to Government than those reaction create.

To state the condition suggests its solution. Our task is to find the nonviolent ways to bring direct and powerful pressure to bear upon Government, offsetting and countering the pressure of reaction.

We cannot permit the Nation to seek a false social serenity by sacrificing the human rights and needs of millions of its citizens. We must make it clear that we will not permit such a false peace to exist but will create and conduct a wide variety of actions constantly, so that social calm will not prevail until our demands have been met.

We must make it clear that if reaction can win by creating discord in the community, peace cannot be found by abandoning our rights to reaction because we shall not be quiet, polite, or content until justice is firmly in our hands.

We must make it clear that democracy cannot be mutilated while we sit passively, silently, and submissively.

To this end, I intend to call for marches on the political conventions of both major parties, Democratic and Republican. The Negro people must stand up before these conventions and say to the Nation and the world, "We want to be free now."

The concrete demands and just grievances of the Negro people presented as they march before these conventions is a weapon that will circle the globe as a moral missile.

Such a project, the first of its kind in American political history, will mobilize the power and resistance within the people and will demonstrate that the Negro is aware that he holds the balance of power in many key States. It will give the parties and candidates clear warning that we intend to use our ballots to support only those forces that will take a firm and unequivocal stand for justice now.

Our marching will furnish clear warning that if rash promises are not kept we will march again and again to State capitals and to the Nation's Capital.

We are challenged to demonstrate that when we are contemptuously brushed aside we will retaliate. We are challenged to prove that when political leaders and parties yield to reactionary pressures we, too, have the will, the determination, and the capacity to inflict penalties politically. We are challenged to prove that Negro interests cannot be dismissed or ignored with impunity.

We can meet these challenges by marching at the conventions to declare to the Nation and the world that we shall never, never relax our pressure until full freedom is won.

The University of the Air FAA Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Oklahoma City and Oklahoma generally are especially interested in the Federal Aviation Agency because the great FAA aeronautical center is located at Will Rogers Field. A sprawling jet-age campus there accommodates FAA's schools in air safety and air traffic control and other FAA operations. Temporary headquarters have been set up at nearby Norman, Okla., for the agency's new Civil Aeromedical Center.

Oklahoma's pride in the FAA Center and in the achievements of our very able Federal Aviation Administrator, Gen. Elwood R. "Pete" Quesada is made very clear in an editorial from the Oklahoma City Times of February 23, 1960.

I want to add my own praise for the great accomplishments of the center and for the admirable leadership of Pete Quesada.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Oklahoma City Times editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERS AT OKLAHOMA CITY

"Pete" Quesada, head of the Federal Aviation Agency, is pictured in a recent magazine story as a "temperamental, mail-fisted, blunt-talking ex-fighter pilot," but he is getting such fine results out of the newly created Agency that he has disarmed most criticism.

Oklahoma City has special interest in his administration, not only because he is well known in the city but because the FAA facility at Will Rogers Field is the second largest concentration of FAA employees in the world, and is expected to be the largest.

The most significant aspect of Quesada's

dynamic leadership in FAA is that this Agency is making a head-on attack on the most tragic problems in aviation, such as the recent rash of air disasters, with symptoms of internal bombing, and the accidents involving seemingly inexcusable midair collisions which have occurred from time to time over the years.

The sudden coming of the jet age has made the problems infinitely more difficult, and the fantastically increasing air traffic would make the barriers seem almost insurmountable except to men of courage, know-how and imagination.

A dozen planes take off and land every minute at the 567 U.S. airports, and those airlines alone carry 152,300 passengers more than 2,200,000 miles a day, zigzagging in all directions.

The old CAA and CAB performed well during their tenures, but it soon became evident that a comprehensive, airtight control was essential, so FAA was designed to replace them and streamline the problem into workable proportions.

When "Pete" Quesada began operations he naturally incurred some friction, including that furnished by air pilots organizations. However, he turned up examples of practices which were too easygoing for the modern age. For instance a Boeing 707 started into a near fatal dive while the pilot was out of his cockpit pleasantly chatting with the passengers. A fatal accident with 15 lives lost was revealed, in which it was found that the captain had not taken the required medical examination for 3½ years, was 2 months overdue on the required proficiency test, and was therefore legally unqualified to fly. The company records for which he was responsible were falsified to conceal these facts.

Quesada says that between 50 and 52 percent of our air accidents are attributable to human error, and this is much larger than any other single cause.

The first method of guarding against accidents is to improve cockpit discipline and airplane maintenance. The fundamental requirement is that a pilot must remain in his cockpit during flight.

Other criteria of proper conduct have to do with making an instrument approach to an airport in bad weather. The pilot must have in front of him the procedure that is applicable to that particular airport, with regard to the "fix," with altitude implications.

One of the newly promulgated regulations has to do with the age of pilots.

While of course it is true that some people age faster than others, it is obvious even to the layman that there is need for fairly rigid standards, with arbitrary age limitations, otherwise favoritism would be charged.

The health factor is being properly stressed at the Oklahoma City installation. Temporary quarters for this study are in the south Navy Base at Norman, about 20 miles south of Oklahoma City.

The foregoing angles give only an indication of the vast importance and scope of FAA. Quesada has a brilliant record of achievement to back him up. In Congress he has been greatly aided by Senator Mike MONRONEY.

Censorship by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the right of the people to petition the Congress

of the United States is as old as the Constitution itself.

Today the scope and pace of our activity in Congress and other legislative bodies is such that infinite care must be exercised to prevent our being insulated from public opinion as we legislate for the good of all of our people.

To hamper by any means, insidious or unintentional, the open and candid expression of opinion by our people at the forums provided by the Constitution would undermine the Democratic processes by which we remain free.

The economic system under which we live today is shaped by political action through legislation.

A union member, a business owner, a stockholder, a customer, each in his or her own economic capacity has a vital interest in our activity as Members of Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1959, I introduced H.R. 7123, a bill to amend section 162, the "Ordinary and Necessary," business expense section of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

My bill, H.R. 7123, would amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code, which permits tax deductions for "Ordinary and Necessary" business expenses, by adding this short paragraph, which reads:

Expenses lawfully incurred in supporting or opposing or otherwise influencing legislation in the Congress or in a States legislature or in the legislative body of a county or other local governmental agencies or in any submission of proposed legislation to the voters, shall be allowed as proper deductions from gross income.

The reason for this legislation is quite simple and the urgent need for it arises from the fact that present internal revenue service regulations very likely may prevent such tax deductions to the great detriment of our Democratic process. This regulation provides that expenditures related to a business or the production of income are nonallowable for tax purposes if for "lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office, or for carrying on propaganda including advertising, related to any of the foregoing purposes."

Within the Government itself is a huge and highly active body of protagonists for one cause or another, for one legislative act or another.

Silenced by restrictions, no facet of our economy can carry on a trade or business on a basis of equality with those working the other side of the street.

The Internal Revenue Service regulation at issue, unless clarified by congressional action, very likely may prevent tax deductions of such expenditures related to a business, or payments to a union organization, or business association.

Carried to its ultimate conclusion, a purchaser of advertising in a newspaper or magazine, a local chamber of commerce, a trade association, national, State, or local education and civic or voters groups all may be denied the right of professional and political activity or expression of views which is and must remain the sinews of our democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, no tax law, or administrative interpretations should be permitted to stand that would impair the ability to communicate freely to all sections of the public or elected representatives, views on legislation affecting the economic lives of our citizens, either through advertising, membership in an organization, distribution of literature or any other form of lawful communication.

If we dilute the right of our citizens to petition for good laws by punitive taxation we deny them the right of self-protection from damaging and destructive legislative action.

We cannot legislate in a vacuum.

Individuals, unions, companies, and associations should have their legal rights protected in communicating with the Government or the public without being labeled "propagandists."

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, compel in justice our taxpayers to defray the whole cost of governmental pressures for legislation without a compensating business tax reduction to offset the costs which they must incur in their own defense against policies with which they disagree, or may affect their rights to do business or stay in business.

It is all very well for some to say tax sanctions imposed on communicating with Members of Congress, either directly or indirectly, do not abridge first amendment rights, but simply makes the cost of such activities nondeductible for tax purposes. However, those who hold these views, if they be practical men, realize that the imposition of punitive taxes is one of the most effective deterrents to the exercise of the constitutional rights of every citizen to freely express his views. The free expression of views can hardly be deemed as against public policy.

This same conclusion was reached by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Speiser v. Randall*, decided in 1958 and found at 357 U.S. 513. In this case the Court said in part as follows:

It is settled that speech can be effectively limited by the exercise of the taxing power . . . the denial of a tax exemption for engaging in certain speech necessarily will have the effect of coercing the claimants to refrain from the prescribed speech.

On December 29, 1959, the Internal Revenue Service, after full notice and 2 days of public hearings, in which there was wide participation, issued these final regulations governing the deductibility of ordinary and necessary business expenses, incurred in activities connected with the promotion or defeat of legislation, directly or indirectly. Regardless of whether the activity takes place in Congress, a State legislature, a town council, or whether the issue has by referendum or initiative petition been put squarely up to the people to legislate. In addition, this regulation would make nondeductible, in part at least, dues paid to a labor organization or a trade association if such organization or association engages in any of the named but undefined activities.

Lastly, the regulation would make suspect as "propaganda" any advertisement or similar public expression of views

which an Internal Revenue agent may decide is in some way connected with the promotion or defeat of legislation. To be suspect, an advertisement would not have to mention a specific bill, or even deal with any specific matter then pending before the Congress or a State or local legislative body. Similarly, any editorial expression by a newspaper or other public communications media relating to affairs of Government could be deemed "propaganda" with resulting tax consequences.

Still another anomalous situation has arisen in connection with a representative of a business, business association, or a labor organization voluntarily appearing before a committee of the Congress or other legislative body. Under the Federal regulation of lobbying act, passed by Congress in 1946, mere appearances before a congressional committee are exempted from the registration and reporting provisions of the act. However, under the new IRS regulation the expenditures incurred in such appearance may not be a proper tax deduction even though the company or organization paying the expenses of such witness have a direct and vital economic interest in the subject being considered by the committee. This could inhibit and dry up express viewpoints and put out of action legitimate organizations contributing much to our economic and moral well-being.

At hearings before the Internal Revenue Service, some 45 organizations, including the three major labor organizations, appeared to protest the regulation. In addition, more than 150 other groups filed statements objecting to this invasion of their right to petition and express their views on matters governmental.

The Internal Revenue Service tried to do a thorough and conscientious job in issuing this regulation. Without the benefit of precise guidelines laid down by the Congress in this field, they have been very seriously handicapped in arriving at a fair and equitable solution.

Concern over this problem has been brought about by the ever-increasing involvement of all levels of government in the daily activities of each and every citizen, of each and every State, of each and every country, school district, town and city in our great country. Because of this growing governmental involvement, every citizen feels it more and more necessary to petition his Government and his Representatives in connection with many of his business or livelihood problems. To add to his already almost overwhelming problems by denying him some modicum of tax relief for expenditures he has made in attempting to gain help in the solution of these problems or the economic survival of his business is manifestly unfair, undemocratic, and punitive.

So that my colleagues will have no misunderstanding, the application of this Internal Revenue Service regulation is of little or no significance as a revenue-raising device. This has been acknowledged by high officials of both the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department. What is involved

is punitive taxation on certain activities which are highly necessary to out-sound democratic processes. When the right of free and continuous access of all of the people to their elected Representatives is hindered or stopped because of punitive and unintended tax regulations controlling business expenditures, then legislative clarification is imperative.

Without precise and definite guidelines laid down by Congress, the Treasury Department will find it impossible to achieve a fair, nondiscriminatory, permanent administrative solution to this vexing and growing problem.

The purpose of the revenue laws is to derive money to support the Government and pay for required public services. Tax laws should not be utilized for penalizing any taxpayer who lawfully wishes to express his views on legislative problems.

It is for these reasons that I introduced H.R. 7123 and urge my colleagues in Congress to give this bill their urgent support and sponsorship on a thoroughly nonpartisan basis.

Delhi Tech Forums—A Unique Method of Building Effective Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 25, 1960, His Excellency William M. Q. Halm, Ambassador of Ghana to the United States, visited the campus of the State University Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi, N.Y., to participate in an educational event of unusual merit. The General Education Division of Delhi Tech, with the cooperation of the student union, is sponsoring a forum series on "World Trouble Spots and the United States," during the course of which the Ambassadors of Ceylon, Ghana, Pakistan, Israel, and the United Arab Republic will present their views on regional problems and spell out the role they believe the United States should play in their respective regions.

The unique feature of the Delhi Tech forums is the opportunity given to each Ambassador to spend considerable time meeting informally with small groups of students enrolled in the international relations and economics courses at the college. Each Ambassador also addresses a large audience of faculty, students, and area residents.

Meeting with foreign ambassadors provides Delhi Tech students with an opportunity to exchange ideas, develop insight, and gain an understanding of the attitudes and values of people the world over. This person-to-person approach to the study of international relations encourages students to critically analyze and examine facts before formulating opinions on the vital foreign policy questions of the day. In a

democracy such as ours, an informed public opinion is vital, since the objectives of United States foreign policy must have the approval of our citizens.

My purpose in calling attention to one of the instructional techniques used at Delhi Tech is to point up my belief that our colleges and universities must continue to provide our young people, in ever-increasing measure, with the theoretical and practical intellectual tools essential to informed and intelligent citizenship. The State University Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi is making a notable contribution to the pursuit of effective citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the excerpted address of His Excellency William M. Q. Halm, Ambassador of Ghana to the United States on "The Obligations and Reasonable Demands on the United States by Africa." This address was delivered to the third Delhi Tech forum on Thursday, February 25, 1960. Ambassador Halm was introduced by Prof. Edmund Clark of the college faculty.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What has happened in Ghana since 1957 is symbolic of what is yet to happen in other parts of Africa, despite the many diversities of that continent.

First of all, what is this development that gives coherence and similarity to this great continent with a territory four times the size of the United States inhabited by no less than 220 million people of various races? It is simply this—the assertion by Africans of their right to the basic human values that have given motivation to the whole of human history—freedom, enlightenment, development, dignity. Whether in west or east Africa, north, central, or south Africa, the struggle which has sparked off the conflagration, to some a symbol of hope, to others a sign of despair, is simply the struggle for these human values. We see this struggle in Africa as a universal historical process. It is the same struggle that propelled Britain from Roman colonization, through the Norman conquest, through Magna Carta, the bill of rights, and the reform bill to the statute of Westminster. It is the same spirit that produced the Mazzinis and Garibaldis of Italy, Kemal Ataturk of Turkey, and the Founding Fathers who established this great Republic of yours.

But in Africa this historical process has long been denied its natural fulfillment because of considerations based on race. The African, it is alleged, is primitive because he is African; he has no history or civilization because he is African; his intelligence quotient is zero because he is black; he is content with what he has, does not complain because he is black; he cannot govern himself because he is African; he is alleged to be the victim of superstition and the terrors of nature and therefore the legitimate objective of missionary zealots, commercial adventures, and colonizing imperialists, always to be kept alive with just so much food, shelter, perhaps clothing; the unwanted servant of a powerful master race made more powerful by technological progress erroneously identified with civilization.

What the critics failed to emphasize was the long record of history and enlightenment behind many of these African states: Egypt has had an uninterrupted civilization for more than 6,000 years. The history of Carthage and its relation to the history of

Rome is well known to Latin scholars. In the Middle Ages the great Negro empires of Songhai, Melee (now called Mali) and Ghana flourished in the Niger basin at a time of historical darkness in Europe. They had seats of learning at Sankore and Timbuctoo to which men came from Europe in search of learning. They had a well-organized society with an aristocracy founded on intellect and culture, fine architectural forms, music, and dancing. In our own Ghana, long before the white man came, we had developed advanced forms of social, political, and religious life which so surprised the Europeans with their basic democratic content, that it was made the basis for a long time of the so-called system of indirect rule in which process they destroyed the democratic basis of it and paved the way to some of our present problems. Further south in the Rhodesias, the ruins of Zimbabwe have been recognized as relics of a high form of Bantu civilization before the white man came. But there is always almost pathological reluctance on the part of some Europeans, as Professor Dike, of Nigeria, says, even when presented with the evidence to accept the fact of African civilization and culture.

I have prefaced my talk with the foregoing remarks because of the vital emotional part Africa's past has played in the independence movement, because much of this movement is regarded not as the dawn of something new but the restoration of an ancient heritage which was temporarily lost, a recovery of our dignity, culture, value, and self-development—qualities which Africans think they cannot secure now till they have secured the key which is freedom. Thus the great dictum by the Ghana Prime Minister which echoes now all over Africa, "Seek ye first the political kingdom and all other things shall be added unto you." This is what makes 1960 the "magic year of African destiny." How do we see the position and obligations of the United States from such a background?

Let me describe first of all what image the United States has traditionally presented to Africa. Africans have seen and dealt with a number of white nationalities. Having been subjected for such a long time by the Europeans they have perhaps been in a better position to judge accurately the temperaments and attitudes of these nationals better than most. Your Frenchman comes in and straightaway proceeds to create a little French elite wedded to French logic and French ideas of liberty, fraternity and equality. He mixes intimately with this class and leaves the rest to stew in what he regards as their strange mysteries and practices.

Your Englishman comes in, imperially sporting a cane and wearing a khaki helmet, is condescendingly courteous to the local dignitaries, says how very interesting the practices of Africa are, withdraws into the aloof settlement of an English lord on his estate, leaving the practices to develop, but how he cannot say. The German stamps everything with teutonic order and regimented progress willy nilly.

Your American comes in, goes everywhere, anytime, enjoying it all, but damning everything and everybody. This is, of course, on the people-to-people level, but nevertheless diplomatic and official relations too have thrown up the modern character known as the "Ugly American."

However, there is another image of American which is more important for Africa. There is probably not a single educated African who is not familiar with American history. Although most of us come to American history via British Empire history, when we study the War of American Independence or "The great Rebellion" as the British choose to call it, we soon come to know the

truth and admire the anticolonial nature of your independence movement. We see George Washington as the great leader he was, a nationalist at heart and not a partisan in politics. We learn by heart the great principles enunciated by Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers and feel the heart-throb which these noble words evoke: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." We remember Washington's "Farewell Address" in which he warned the people earnestly against parties "with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical denominations" because of "the baleful effects of the spirit of party generally." We learn of the period of strain on the unity of your nation which precipitated the Civil War and the conclusion we come to after all this study about the position of this country is * * * "Here is a great country whose history, constitutional development and national political philosophy will make it sympathetic to the present struggle for freedom in Africa."

This political position of the United States in the World today as we see it is further reinforced by the great material wealth and power which it possesses. American science and technology, wedded to rugged individualism has created in this country what is probably the highest standard of living in the world. You have a total national product of some \$485 billion and a per capita income of some \$1,180 as compared with Ghana's \$194 and an average of \$120 for the whole of Africa. While I do not consider it to be my legitimate function to tell you what the position and obligations of the United States should be, I think it is necessary for you to learn what Africa's hopes and expectations are and what we think prevent the fulfillment of these hopes and expectations from America.

As I have said the priority No. 1 struggle in Africa today is a struggle for independence all over the continent. Any power which advances the success of this struggle will be seen as the friend of Africa. Any power which does less than this will appear otherwise in African eyes. Can such a position and obligation be assumed clearly and definitely by the United States? So far the evidence points to the negative. True, the United States, has, even if belatedly, hailed the independence of new nations in Africa. Ghana was recognized by the United States without any difficulty; so was the Sudan. There was, however, a dragging of feet with regard to Guinea, an example which typifies the main difficulty of the United States in this respect—its position in the cold war.

The United States as leader of the so-called Western Powers, is engaged in an ideological conflict with the East under the Soviet Union. Because of the need which the United States feels of the alliance of these Western Powers it is handicapped in its capability of declaring its support for the colonial territories held by these metropolitan powers in Africa. This compromises the United States very greatly in the eyes of Africa. Even on the ideological level, the United States is forced into strange bed-fellows, for who can honestly say that Spain, Portugal, France, and Belgium, to mention a few, are democratic countries, in the sense in which Americans say they understand it, and who can say that the colonial policies of these countries in Africa are democratic? What is it that prevents the United States from coming definitely to the side of freedom in the present struggle which is taking place in the Central African Federation, Kenya, the Union of South Africa, and Portuguese territories?

The present impression created by America is that it has no African policy even if it

has an African Division at the State Department because it persists in looking at Africa through the eyes of either London, Paris, Brussels, or Moscow. Whatever independence has been achieved in Africa has been achieved by Africans themselves without help from outside. On this political level, therefore, although the obligation of the United States is clear to us, there is not likely to be any reasonable demand that can be made by Africa upon the United States, in view of its known position in the cold war.

There could, however, be in the United Nations a field in which the United States could exert pressure generally on the metropolitan powers in debates or questions involving racial discrimination and human rights. But there is a far more important field politically in which the position of the United States places certain obligations upon it and upon which reasonable demands could be made by Africa on the United States. It is this. Most of the emerging nations usually emerge with a very strong one-party system of government which appears to yield more power than Americans are willing to understand. In Guinea, for example, there is only one party. In Ghana there are two parties but the Government Party is firmly entrenched. Americans (not the American Government) are apt to jump to the conclusion from this that there is dictatorship in the country.

Africa has the right to remind Americans of their own early history, in this respect. Washington did not consider himself a party man and even advised against party politics. Lincoln had to fight the South in order to impose the Constitution upon that part of the country and thus preserve the Union. It was not for nothing that these two American patriots did what they did. In the same way it must be recognized that these African nations have peculiar problems in preserving unity which often call for drastic legislation in the interest of national unity and the preservation, indeed, of their newly won independence itself. Nationalist movements and revolutionary movements are often an amalgam of various forces which on the attainment of the immediate objective, tend to want to knock each other out. Knocking each other out is a risky thing for a new nation and must therefore be prevented at the cost of anything else. The first task of any government is to govern.

Secondly, the forms of democracy must not be confused with the content of democracy. There is great democracy in Ghana today, even if we do not have the forms you are used to in America. Moreover, democracy is not a static thing. There are many intelligent people today who would deny that you have democracy in America. All life is a series of social change, and political experiments must be seen in their overall objective rather than their immediate forms only. Institutions are the products of society and as such different societies will produce different institutions. In judging and criticizing these young nations, therefore, we expect your tolerance, understanding, even sympathy, not sweeping generalization and condemnation.

So much for the political demands that Africa can make upon the United States. What are the economic demands which it can reasonably make? This is very important, because it is probably here that the United States is in a position to redress the balance of its political balance sheet with Africa. The purpose of all independence movements in Africa is not political independence per se. It is to win this as an instrument to be used in fostering rapid economic development which will yield fruits in the form of higher standards of living for the people in their lifetime.

The fact of poverty which is so characteristic of Africa does not stem from a poverty of resources so much as a poverty in development, our lack of technical know-how, and lack of capital. The degree of prevalence of one or the other of these varies from country to country. Lack of capital, which is basic, is due to the low income caused by low productivity in these countries. The circle is vicious because low incomes never generate sufficient savings to produce the requisite level of capital necessary to assure further growth in the economy.

Taking the question of capital formation alone, how much is needed at all? A United Nations special committee formed to examine this question estimated this at \$19 billion a year, of which \$5.2 billion was estimated as domestic savings. But it was estimated that the rate at which such capital could be absorbed would be \$2.5 to \$3.5 billion a year for all the underdeveloped territories. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Executive Director of the United Nations Special Fund, has estimated \$40 billion for the next decade, or \$4 billion a year. Of the \$3 billion currently being invested in foreign economic aid, the United States has been contributing approximately \$1.5 billion in pure economic aid as opposed to military aid. If this rate continues for the next 10 years, the total would be \$15 billion. The U.S. share of the additional \$30 billion in investment needed would be approximately \$15 billion, making a total U.S. investment for the decade of \$30 billion.

Last year, of \$1,476,321,000 of U.S. economic aid, only \$72,925,000 was sent to Africa, less than was sent to Europe, South Asia, Near East, or Far East. While we recognize the obligations of the United States to other parts of the world, surely a larger part of this could be channeled to Africa.

There are moreover certain principles which must be observed in making such capital available to Africa:

1. It must generate self-sustaining growth and must not be looked upon as indefinite.
2. It must be examined irrespective of cold war considerations or strategic value.
3. It must be flexible and not limited only to bankable projects. Thus formal principles of credit-worthiness and capacity to repay should not stand in the way of necessary, but perhaps not economically paying projects.
4. It must involve governmental planning and coordination of a kind and scale not properly appreciated by the American mind.

These principles are likely to be required by most African nations because of their neutralist outlook on international affairs and the special requirements of these territories. If the United States can reorient its traditional attitudes regarding the primacy of private investment over Government investment say through the Export-Import Bank, and Development Loan Fund, this would go a long way towards meeting a reasonable demand and need.

This is necessary because in many of these territories the preconditions which would attract private capital do not exist. In Ghana alone we have since 1951 spent as much as \$328 million out of our own resources creating such infrastructure at the same time as social services. We have embarked on a 5-year development plan costing as much as \$678 million. The capital side alone is great but the infrastructure is still needed. It is so with many other countries in the area. Thus the needs of this area are twofold: (1) Capital assistance and (2) the establishment of the infrastructure to sustain such provision of capital. In these two fields we think reasonable demands can be made by this area on the United States.

In solving the first problem, the United States will perforce have to work within the framework of a development plan prepared by the receiving country. This at once poses a problem for the United States. You are wedded to the economic philosophy of private enterprise. Your great wealth and progress have by and large been created by the individual enterprise of individual Americans motivated solely by considerations of profit. In the emerging nations of Africa though such a business class exists, it does not exist in the strength, numbers, and resources that can assure further development. Ruled by a progressive elite who have tasted the benefits and amenities of 20th century civilization, these nations are committed to pulling up from scratch their millions of citizens whose lives have been cramped by the nonavailability of the good things of life. The United States will have to step in and pick certain basic development projects of the countries concerned and help those countries to build their projects which may be a hotel, an airport, a railway, a network of roads, a harbor, or a power project like the Volta River project we contemplate in Ghana. This is what the IDA is intended to do when it starts operating under the World Bank.

Since capital itself will flourish best only in conditions of political stability, efficient administration, managerial and technical know-how, and organizational capacity, technical assistance will assume as large a place as capital assistance as described above. This is what in effect the ICA and the special fund of the United Nations are trying to do with the limited resources at their disposal. Their present contribution is far too small for the gigantic needs of the areas they serve. The provision of experts in the technological, engineering, scientific, agricultural, and health fields, not only to carry out specific assignments, but to train others on the spot who can train many more of their countrymen in these modern techniques which alone can service incoming capital. Thus the building of research laboratories and training institutes in these areas, will be a reasonable demand on this country. Thirdly, surveys of natural resources of those underdeveloped territories will be a vital need of these areas. These are services America can provide because we know you have the know-how and the experts who can multiply these skills abroad.

I do not wish to give you the impression that these things are not being done at the present time. They are being done, but the motive, method, scale, and adequacy of these various programs are extremely questionable. From the last report of the ICA, you will find that Africa received the smallest portion of the Development Loan Fund and the second smallest of technical cooperation. Much of the foreign aid of this country went into defense support. Now we do not question the type of national priorities which the United States has set itself. We for our part, as President Sekou Touré said plainly, recognize as valid only the division of the world into the rich and the poor; the developed and the underdeveloped; any help from any part of the world that helps in bridging this gap of plenty and poverty without compromising our political sovereignty will be acceptable. Perhaps the whole question of the development of underdeveloped areas must be unified under an international control, to remove entirely the dangerous political element. This is a task for the giving nations to solve, not ours; and we expect the United States and the Soviet Union to undertake such a task. In the present world with its bilateral, multilateral, and international agencies we shall seek wherever we can get.

Canal Zone Sovereignty: New York Panama Canal Society Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many months radical agitations aimed at wresting control of the Panama Canal have mounted. Culminating on November 3 and 28, 1959, in attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone that had to be repelled with force, our failure to assert our just rights at Panama have made our country a laughing stock of the world.

Unfortunately, important elements of the press, such as Foreign Affairs and the Washington Post, have failed to present the true issues. The result has been that large numbers of our citizens are not informed as they should be and, for a time, the ideas of pro-Communist forces have had unrestricted play in the mass media.

Notwithstanding the obvious blackout of news on the Panama Canal situation, informed elements in the country have made themselves felt in the form of resolutions to the Congress and letters to its Members.

The latest organization to pass such a resolution was the New York Society of the Panama Canal of which Col. John J. Fitzpatrick is Secretary-treasurer.

The resolution follows:

To Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress:

The New York Society of the Panama Canal has made and adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas article II of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 provides:

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal of the width of 10 miles extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the centerline of the route of the canal to be constructed, with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, shall not be included within this grant); and

"Whereas article III of said treaty provides further:

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned and described in article II of this agreement, and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said article II, which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority"; and

"Whereas the United States, pursuant to said treaty, expended approximately 400 millions of dollars in the construction of the contemplated canal and also expended the lives of hundreds of its citizens during the construction period; and

"Whereas the United States paved the streets of the cities of Panama and Colon and constructed water and sewerage systems

in both of said cities at its own cost and expense despite the fact that both of said cities are expressly excluded by said treaty from the control of the United States; and

"Whereas the United States has meticulously performed its obligations under the said treaty and the treaties amendatory thereof; and

"Whereas recent events in Panama indicate clearly that the Republic of Panama, urged on by agitators, Communists, and political candidates, has evidenced an intent to repudiate the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty and the treaties amendatory thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the New York Society of the Panama Canal, a voluntary association of men who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, That the State Department of the United States is hereby urged to advise the Republic of Panama in no uncertain terms that the United States has lived up to its treaty obligations and that it expects the Government of the Republic of Panama to do likewise; and be it further

"Resolved, That in the event the State Department of the United States fails to take appropriate action to safeguard the treaty rights of the United States in and to the Panama Canal that the Congress of the United States be urged to take appropriate action by concurrent resolution or resolutions, couched in no uncertain terms, that the United States does not propose to yield any part of its treaty rights; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of State and to the appropriate congressional committees having jurisdiction over Panama Canal affairs."

Respectfully,

JOHN J. FITZPATRICK,

Secretary-Treasurer.

Perspective on Air Safety Problems and Programs of the Federal Aviation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the recent constructive hearings of the Subcommittee on Aviation, chaired by our able colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], have brought into focus the problems of air safety in our changing and growing general pattern of civil aviation with emphasis on air transport operations.

My attention has been directed to an editorial, "Perspective on Safety" in the magazine Aviation Week, February 8, 1960.

Robert Hotz has authored this viewpoint on the work of the Federal Aviation Agency under the administration of Elwood R. Quesada.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the thinking expressed by Mr. Hotz that "the immediate problem is to push modernization of navigation, traffic control and airport facilities as fast as possible, and to develop an effective industry-Government relationship that will keep pushing toward this goal," and I also commend to my colleagues other

provocative and praiseworthy comment in this editorial.

I request that the Aviation Week editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE ON SAFETY

(By Robert Hotz)

Senate hearings conducted by Senator MONRONEY's Subcommittee on Aviation have provided a good perspective on the air safety problems facing civil aviation, particularly the air transport industry. One of the main considerations of the Senate group has been to explore the efficacy of the Federal Aviation Act which created the Federal Aviation Agency a little more than a year ago. It is certainly appropriate to review the operations of this agency to determine whether it has produced the results that this legislation was aimed at.

It is pretty clear from the testimony of most witnesses appearing before the Monroney subcommittee that, while there are many minor differences of opinion on how the Federal Aviation Agency should function, there is general agreement that the act has stood its initial test of time, and the FAA is roaring down the right track.

Biggest criticism of FAA has been of the speed and alleged arbitrariness of its rule-making procedures. There has been an acute need for accelerating the prolonged and often pointless debates that made the old rule-making process so ineffective and kept it so far behind the current operational problem of aviation. We can understand the feeling of urgency that has stimulated Elwood R. "Pete" Quesada, the FAA Administrator, to compress this rulemaking cycle. We can also sympathize with his impatience at having to listen to the shrill and monotonous tirades of special interest pleaders who infest Washington and use the headlines they gain attacking FAA to impress the dues-paying members of their respective special groups.

However, it is apparent that whatever the validity and justice of its case, FAA would do well to provide for more informal and public discussion of its proposed rules rather than adhering strictly to the letter of administrative procedures. It is also evident that, while "Pete" Quesada needed to throw the book at violators of air safety regulations without fear or favor to establish the fact that he meant business, some of his subordinates have carried this intent beyond reasonable grounds in some instances and have descended to a nit picking and over-legalistic approach to safety enforcement.

There can be no sympathy from the public or air transport industry for the type pilot behavior cited by "Pete" Quesada in his testimony before Senator MONRONEY's group. FAA must continue to prosecute this type of irresponsible, willful violator with all the vigor at its command. The Air Line Pilots Association and other pilot groups must support this type of safety enforcement or lose their effectiveness as legitimate spokesmen for the majority of pilots who have a most sincere interest and the biggest stake in safety achievements.

Nobody believes that pilots who slept with their feet on the radar, barred FAA inspectors from the cockpit or flew into a mountainside in broad daylight are typical of the majority of airline pilots. But they are typical of an irresponsible minority who must be combed from the aid by concerted action, beginning with company qualification programs and supported by FAA as a last resort.

Airline top management too must devote considerably more attention to its safety problems and provide more support for its operations' people in their clashes with comptrollers over the admittedly high cost

of many safety contributions. FAA safety regulations are aimed at providing minimum standards, and some airlines have been consistently ahead of FAA in adopting new safety devices, such as airborne radar, and in exceeding FAA requirements in such areas as copilot qualification and the retirement of obsolete equipment. Airline operations' personnel have been more acutely conscious of safety problems as they arise and are vigorous in their attack on them. But all too often, they fall short of achieving their goals because of top management indifference or misunderstanding.

Airlines will find their mailboxes containing less FAA violation notices if they do an increasingly better job of policing their own backyards. Virtually everybody testifying before Senator MONROE's group agreed on the major unsolved safety problems facing aviation in traffic control and terminal facilities. As we have pointed out so often, the current FAA leadership cannot be held accountable for this deplorable lag in developing, financing, and installing a modern electronic navigation and traffic control system and high intensity lights. This is the area that needs concerted effort by all elements of aviation, including Senator MONROE's group and their legislative colleagues in both the House and Senate.

This is the area where, without effective action today, the safety problems of tomorrow are certain to be compounded. We are getting a little impatient with the monotonous criticism of FAA Administrator Quesada as a "one man show" and "dictator." For it is in this vital area of trying to make up for the precious time lost by a series of "nomad" CAA administrators, who fumbled and bungled these vital programs, that the first year of the FAA has required the vigorous drive displayed by "Pete" Quesada to overcome the inertia of the broad-seated bureaucrats.

We earnestly hope he can instill more of his vigor into the lower tiers of FAA leadership that he will leave behind him when he retires. There is little profit for anybody in the aviation business in continuing the special interest sniping that has muddled the Washington aviation scene in recent years. Real safety achievements do not come from regulations or legal proceedings. They can be achieved only by a genuine spirit aimed at topnotch performance all down the line.

The immediate problem is to push modernization of navigation, traffic control, and airport facilities as fast as possible and to develop an effective industry-Government relationship that will keep pushing toward this goal long after the current FAA leadership has retired.

Eradication and Control of Saltcedars in the Streams of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution providing for a program of research and experimentation toward the eradication and control of worthless saltcedars in the streams of the Nation. Our extremely limited water resources, particularly in the Western States, are being drained needlessly of an estimated 25 million acre-feet annually by these water-consuming growths.

All of us have been greatly concerned for many years regarding the tremendous wastage of water, as well as damage caused, through failure to provide proper dams and reservoirs on our rivers. Great progress has been made in that direction through the dedication of our legislators to the development of adequate controls. However, it is well realized much remains to be done in this area and businessmen and civic leaders are cooperating to the fullest extent in urging and planning action for the protection of one of our most valuable national assets, our water resources.

During the last Congress, legislation was enacted to determine methods for conversion of brackish and saline water into usable quality. This step has resulted in extensive research by the Interior Department Office of Saline Water which has produced experimental methods for converting nonpalatable water into a quality acceptable for human consumption and utilization. Some progress has been made since that program was inaugurated and their is great hope for future benefits to be derived from these methods of research.

The present Congress is continuing those efforts to provide all possible aids for increasing beneficial supplies of water. As a matter of fact, I presented some of this same information to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources when it held hearings in Albuquerque last fall. It is my understanding that the great interest expressed in this subject in Albuquerque was duplicated in all cities where this committee held hearings. Therefore, it is quite evident that the citizens of the various States recognize and are concerned over the problem of water supplies.

My own State, New Mexico, has suffered and continues to suffer economically from its shortage of water resources. In the few irrigated areas of the State, it has been well proven that New Mexico can rank with other outstanding States of the Nation in agricultural production—if there is adequate water. Not only is agriculture limited by such aridness but industrial expansion in the State is held to a minimum because large corporations hesitate to locate their facilities in an area which has a history of continuing water shortages.

It is for these many reasons that I urge passage of the resolution I have introduced. Through its provisions, the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Geological Survey, as well as State and local water authorities, will conduct a 5-year study of the development of tamarisks and similar phreatophytes. This program will include research into the botanical, hydrological, and climatological factors influencing the growth of saltcedars. As a result of that research, it is hoped economical methods will be developed for eradicating and controlling their growth.

To my knowledge, only limited research in this field has been carried on previously. In 1951, phreatophytes were removed from 35 miles of the Rio

Grande near Elephant Butte Reservoir in New Mexico with resultant saving of 200,000 acre-feet of water in the following 5-year period. Therefore, we know the eradication of saltcedars will salvage a great deal of water each year. The real problem is how we can do it as economically as possible. Previous attempts to control saltcedars have consisted of mowing the extensive growths as well as spraying them. However, in addition to being extremely expensive these methods proved to be complete failures. Even though the plants were cut, their seeds were strewn into the rivers and spread rapidly.

Although the greatest concentration of these parasites now exists in the Western States, they spread at a fantastic rate and present a real threat to water resources in much of the rest of the United States.

Because I believe my resolution represents the first real and constructive step toward an adequate research program into the control of saltcedars, I urge favorable action upon it as soon as possible.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am pleased to present a letter from my friend and constituent, Mrs. Gara Lyon, of Anchorage, Alaska, on the subject of the equal rights amendment, and ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1960.

Senator E. L. BOB BARTLETT,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I note by the Seattle paper of Sunday, February 14, that the equal rights amendment has been unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is now pending before the Senate.

I daresay that it is unnecessary to urge you to vote for this but I am making the request in any event. I sincerely feel in this day and age when so much is made over civil rights this is long overdue.

The Business & Professional Women's Clubs, the only nonclassified club open to all business and professional women, have long endorsed this bill. You may perhaps recall that our club was against the change in the social security law which lowered the retirement age for women to 62 for two reasons. First, since women are outliving men at the present time, at least, we felt it was not realistic and also that women not legally trained would be misled into believing they would get full benefits at an earlier age, merely by virtue of belonging to the female sex. In talking with quite a number lately I have found that some have been so misled.

I thoroughly disagree with Alice Leopold of the Women's Bureau that women would thereby lose legislation designed to preserve

their creative function. I can see no more reason for that than the repeal of any other legislation designed to protect certain classes of workers in many fields.

With reference to the social security law I would like to make one comment on equality. As you know many, many women operate small businesses, the writer among them, and in so doing we are required to pay into the social security fund with no matching funds from an employer.

It is all my hard earned money and I have to pay it in whether or no. Then, in the name of justice, why should not my husband be able to draw on that if I should die, whether he was dependent upon me and whether or not I was currently covered at the time, if I had full coverage.

If I could take the same money and put it into an annuity I could designate any residual beneficiary I pleased. If there are any equal rights in such a discriminatory law I fail to observe them.

It is quite possible that an equal rights amendment would not cure this situation and that it might take special legislation aimed at this particular law but I merely cite that as one example of inequities now existing. Of course, many states have glaring examples. Even our beloved Alaska has one or two, though our laws are far superior to average.

Any help you can give us in this matter will, I know, be deeply appreciated by the workingwomen of this country.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GARA H. LYON.

American Legion Program for Rehabilitation and Economic Welfare of Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fine statement of the national commander of the American Legion, Martin B. McKneally, before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I commend this statement to the Members.

STATEMENT BY MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1960

On behalf of the American Legion I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee for the purpose of presenting the 1960 program of the American Legion for the rehabilitation and economic welfare of veterans and their dependents. The national commander of the American Legion has no assignment of greater importance.

To share this privilege and responsibility I have with me today many members of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary. From every State, they are in Washington to participate in the 37th Annual National Rehabilitation Conference of the American Legion. The conference will commence this afternoon and continue through Friday noon, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

The purpose of the conference is to provide a forum in which community, State, and national representatives of the American Legion, together with the responsible Government officials, might discuss prob-

lems encountered in the day-to-day administration of veterans' benefits and services; and, seek solutions acceptable to all concerned.

We are aware of your busy schedule but we would be greatly honored if any of you could find time to attend one or more sessions of the conference and join with us in our discussions.

Many of those who accompany me this morning are already well known to members of your committee. I do wish to introduce to you the young man on my left, however. He is Robert H. Hazen, of Portland, Oreg., chairman of our national economic Commission. I am sure the gentleman on my right needs no special introduction. As chairman of the American Legion National Rehabilitation Commission, Bob McCurdy, of Pasadena, Calif., is often referred to as "Mr. Rehabilitation." He has long been a leader in the American Legion's fight for the rights of the disabled, while continuing to insist upon programs and principles that are fair both to the veterans concerned and to the taxpayers of this country.

The American Legion is fortunate to have men of such caliber, ability, and understanding as Bob McCurdy and Bob Hazen devote so much of their personal time and effort to the cause of veterans and their dependent survivors.

The American Legion realizes its good fortune in its association, in connection with its responsibilities to the veterans of three wars, with the members of this committee, and takes this opportunity to salute the members of the committee for their courage, wisdom, and objectivity. It need not be observed that in all of your progressive and splendid enactments in behalf of the cause of veterans the spirit which characterized your committee has been one of nonpartisanship. No higher praise can come to such a group.

The American Legion recognizes that the able chairman of this committee has worked hard and to great effect in curing the weaknesses and correcting the defects and integrating the law with reference to veterans matters. The American Legion is deeply grateful to him for his interest in the disabled veteran, and lauds him as a great contributor to the welfare of the veteran, and by that means the welfare of our country.

The American Legion notes with sorrow the passing of Congressman Stephen V. Carter, of Iowa, and wishes the record of this meeting to show its regret. Congressman Carter, although his membership on this committee was for a short period of time only, demonstrated a keen interest in the needs of veterans.

For the accomplishment of our legislative program on behalf of veterans, we are dependent upon the members of your committee and our other friends in Congress. Needless to say, our proposals will only be as effective as they are sound. Therefore, just as we solicit your help in translating our thoughts into law, we invite your counsel and advice.

We want you to feel free to utilize our channels of communication and service. Every veteran in America is within reach of some service officer of the American Legion. Our service network forms a very effective medium for both the dissemination and the gathering of information. It is a well-seasoned sounding board for the testing of new ideas in veterans' affairs.

Those with me today are but a portion of the thousands of individuals who are in daily touch with the Nation's veterans, largely on a volunteer basis, in the name of the American Legion. They see and talk with the men, women, and children whose lives have been vastly improved; whose sufferings have been alleviated; and whose talents have been utilized for the good of

the country, as a result of the laws over which your committee has primary responsibility. They also see cases that need additional help; help that can come only in the form of new legislation, or revitalized and liberalized existing legislation.

It is this latter group of cases that gives rise to our legislative program. Relief-seeking resolutions, adopted in community posts of the American Legion, are channeled upward to department and national conventions. Only those with merit become a part of the program that we bring to your committee for consideration.

The current rehabilitation and economic legislative program includes resolutions adopted as early as our 1958 national convention. To save your time, I shall speak only to those resolutions that have been added to the program since my predecessor, Preston B. Moore, of Oklahoma, appeared before you 1 year ago.

A full listing of all resolutions forming a part of our current program is attached to my statement. At the appropriate time, Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director of our legislative division, and other staff officials, will be happy to present the views of the American Legion on specific legislation concerning these resolutions.

With your permission, I shall cover what I deem to be the more pressing and vital of these issues by subject categories.

SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

The American Legion believes it is appropriate to grant increases in the rates of disability and death compensation.

The monthly rates of disability compensation were last increased effective October 1, 1957, at which time the amount for total disability was raised by slightly more than 24 percent; whereas, the amounts for ratings less than total were raised approximately 10 percent.

Since 1957, practically all other forms of pay and allowances over which Congress has control have been increased, including civil and military salaries and retirement pay, railroad retirement, and social security benefits.

The rates of death compensation have not been increased since 1954. It is true that many widows, children, and dependent parents did receive higher awards beginning January 1, 1957, by switching to rates of dependency and indemnity compensation under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act. But those who were not in a position to take advantage of that act should hardly be expected to continue indefinitely at death compensation rates without a cost-of-living increase.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics announced only last Thursday that the Consumer Price Index for January was 125.4, only two-tenths of a point down from its alltime high of last November. For those veterans and widows who must rely on their VA compensation check, this index might more realistically be described as a "survival index."

The American Legion also believes it necessary to reestablish balance in the compensation program by making the amounts payable for the several disability evaluations accurately reflect the degree of disability; and, by providing additional amounts for veterans with dependents when rated less than 50 percent in degree on the same basis as for those rated at 50 percent and above.

The rates of disability compensation were first thrown out of balance in 1952 when the amounts payable for ratings of 50 percent and above were increased by 15 percent; whereas, amounts for ratings below 50 percent were increased by only 5 percent. Subsequent legislation has further distorted the relationship between one rating and another insofar as the respective amounts of compensation are concerned. For example, the

amount of compensation today for a 90-percent disability rating is not 90 percent of the amount payable for total disability; rather, it is less than 80 percent of this amount.

Disparity in the amount of compensation payable, as compared with the percentage evaluation, tends to defeat the principle upon which the rating schedule is based. The schedular ratings are intended, insofar as possible, to reflect the average impairment in earning capacity due to the various kinds and degrees of disability. The amount of compensation payable for a given percentage evaluation should bear the same relation to total compensation as the percentage bears to 100 percent disability. The degree and the dollars should coincide.

It is understood that your committee has had the matter of disability ratings and compensation under study for some time. It is hoped that your investigations will culminate in upward adjustments of compensation during this session of Congress.

We also are aware that the Veterans' Administration is conducting related studies, possibly with a view to making major modifications in the rating schedule. It would appear that the impetus for such studies derives from certain recommendations which were contained in the report of the Bradley Commission.

The philosophy underlying these recommendations is in opposition to that held by the American Legion. In particular, the Bradley Commission recommendations relative to the VA rating schedule seem to stem from considerations of economy rather than justice. Such recommendations would eliminate most if not all of the 10- and 20-percent ratings. They would put in jeopardy the average-impairment principle. In addition, the time-tested extra-schedular statutory awards would be discarded for new and vague norms for disability evaluations.

We are confident your committee will provide opportunity for a full hearing on any legislative proposals to modify the VA rating schedule.

VA HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL PROGRAM

American Legion service officers and field representatives continue to report that VA hospital managers are experiencing difficulty in operating at maximum capacity under their inpatient and outpatient fund allocations. For this reason, we are inclined to question the adequacy of the President's 1961 budget requests in these sensitive areas. The amounts are considerably short of what are considered necessary by the operating services.

We feel sure that you will do what you can to prevent any reductions in the proposed VA budget on the part of the Congress.

It is gratifying to see that the budget will include funds to commence construction of the badly needed replacement hospitals at Martinez, Calif., Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C., plus additional amounts to launch the 12-year modernization program. The American Legion acknowledges with deep gratitude the part played by your committee in bringing to pass this essential effort to prevent further deterioration of the hospital facilities.

I bring to your attention that the VA hospital system is facing a crisis of another kind, and one which will also require your most earnest interest. I refer to the rapidly advancing number of patients who are chronically ill, yet have received maximum hospital benefits. The VA is experiencing great difficulty in placing such individuals in satisfactory non-VA institutions. As the veteran population grows older this problem will be magnified greatly. Steps must be taken forthwith to arrive at an acceptable solution.

This matter has deeply concerned the American Legion for some time. We have concluded that the VA must be provided with new authority to cope with the situation. In recent hearings before your Subcommittee on Hospitals, staff representatives of our national rehabilitation commission presented a proposal based on a resolution adopted last fall by the national executive committee of the Legion.

We ask that the Congress grant the VA authority to construct convalescent cottages on the grounds of five widely scattered hospitals in order to conduct a pilot study of ways and means to meet the impending crush of cases. It is suggested that selected patients be discharged to such cottages for appropriate medical supervision and nursing care.

Such a proposal could have many far-reaching beneficial effects. It would release an otherwise occupied hospital bed for use by a veteran requiring active treatment. It would lengthen the time for which the 125,000 authorized bed level might adequately serve our basic hospital needs. It would provide ideal opportunities for research in geriatrics without tying up more expensive hospital beds.

More important, however, it could well lead to solutions for dealing with the great bulk of cases yet to come. In the meantime, the VA would be continuing its efforts to rehabilitate all patients of this type, with a view to restoring their capacity for independent living.

The addition of convalescent cottages should make for a more balanced hospital community. Administrative details relative to the transfer of a patient from a hospital bed to a cottage, or back again as required, should be held to a minimum. We visualize that the buildings should be as homelike as possible; that is, they should avoid both the appearance and atmosphere of an institutional setting.

Regardless of the details, we deem it essential that steps be taken soon to meet this threatening issue. I respectfully urge your serious consideration of our proposal.

LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

The American Legion believes that the life insurance contract rights of otherwise eligible World War II and Korean conflict veterans should be reopened for a limited time. When the right to apply for amounts or additional amounts of national service life insurance was removed, many veterans were prevented from securing the desired protection because of personal circumstances.

It would be simple justice to make the coverage available to them, if only for a short time. We suggest a 1-year period following date of approval of the enabling legislation in which the veterans concerned might apply. It is agreed that the administrative cost on insurance so issued should be borne by the policyholders.

ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS

The American Legion supports the maintenance of not less than one VA regional office in each State, and opposes the closing of any office that, by reason of its location, provides the necessary services with a minimum of inconvenience to the veterans in the affected area. We further oppose any curtailment of VA services through workload consolidations.

We view with a great deal of concern the reported reduction of contact offices. It is difficult to understand the rationale which says that this will lead to greater efficiency. It is my belief that internal efficiency of the Veterans' Administration is not the ultimate thing to be desired. In all these matters the concern is for service to the veteran, and that only. Not even the desire for internal efficiency must be allowed to interfere with that. Such a rationale defeats the purpose

for which the American people demanded that the Veterans' Administration be ordained.

LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The American Legion believes that the loan guarantee program for World War II veterans should be extended for 2 additional years; and, that the program for both World War II and Korean conflict veterans should be revitalized by taking steps to insure the renewed and continued flow of private investment into GI home loans.

The World War II program is scheduled to end this coming July 25. We ask that it be continued to July 25, 1962. We further ask that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be provided with the same authority to regulate the interest rate on GI loans as the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner now exercises over FHA loans.

PENSION PROGRAM

The American Legion has no current resolution seeking amendment of the new pension law. The 1959 national convention went on record in support of H.R. 7650, the bill introduced by your chairman that became Public Law 86-211.

This action by the convention was based upon the same reasons that our organization, under the leadership of the then commander, had earlier supported your committee in the development of the legislation. The numbers of needy veterans and dependents to be benefited, as estimated by the Veterans' Administration, made it imperative that we do so even though we had requested rates higher than those contained in the bill.

Our national staff and our department service officials are carefully scrutinizing the interpretations placed on the terms of the law by the Veterans' Administration, with particular regard for the more controversial features such as the counting of a spouse's income and the corpus of estate test. Likewise, we are interested in the procedural instructions for implementing the law. This will be a major topic of discussion during this week's rehabilitation conference.

When the law takes effect next July 1, it will closely observe its impact on the pension program as a whole as well as on individual cases. Naturally, we are very curious as to whether the VA's predictions as to numbers and percentages of cases to be favorably affected will be borne out in practice, since these figures played such a large part in our decision to support the legislation. It is important to note that the President's 1961 budget request to service the new law is \$285 million; whereas, the first-year cost estimate had originally been placed at \$308 million.

Surely, by the time of our national convention next October, we should have more concrete data both as to the law's effect and its possible defects.

While this completes my brief résumé of the major aspects of the Legion's 1960 legislative program for veterans, I should like to say a few words about some related and equally important issues.

The American Legion is not unmindful of the high cost of veterans' benefits; and, it is obvious that many of our current resolutions would require additional expenditures of public funds. We have pointed out, however, that the cost of veterans' readjustment and rehabilitation programs is in reality a delayed cost of conducting war. We have likewise called attention to the fact that the annual Federal expenditures for veterans' programs, expressed as a percentage of our yearly gross national product, have remained almost constant for close to three-quarters of a century even though the veteran population has fluctuated widely in that time.

Further, we sincerely believe that so long as the principles upon which our veteran programs are based remain sound, the cost will never be out of keeping with the Nation's ability to pay.

Those who, on grounds of false economy, seek to destroy veterans' benefit programs, discover upon investigation that the underlying principles are unassailable. Failing to find fault with principles, they turn the attack on the veterans themselves. By this strategy, they hope to undermine public support of the benefit programs.

Thus, they spread misconceptions as to the nature and cost of benefit programs; they magnify and distort minor issues out of all proportion to their statistical and monetary importance. They attempt to disparage the significance of the sacrifices made by servicemen in time of war; to discredit the time-honored axiom that a special status accrues to those citizens who have borne arms in time of national peril; and, most wretched of all, to cast doubt upon the very patriotism of veterans.

This attack is the more curious inasmuch as recognition of the honorable and special status of the Nation's veterans is an act of patriotism in itself. Obviously, veterans are no less patriotic today than when they made themselves available for unlimited service in time of war.

We are certain that all members of your committee share this view, and that you deplore these unjust attacks upon our veteran population as much as does the American Legion.

Six Hundred Honor Mayor Zeidler at Testimonial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that progress in rural and urban communities throughout the country depend, to a large degree, upon many things, including, first, effective, forward-looking leadership; and second, broad citizen support for progress; third, availability and proper utilization of human and natural resources.

Recently, 600 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis.—one of our great U.S. cities, and an increasingly important port on America's fourth seacoast—honored Mayor Frank P. Zeidler at a testimonial dinner.

The citizens, including public officials, labor, business, civic leaders, and Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, gathered to pay tribute to Mayor Zeidler for his 12 years of dedicated service to the fine community of Milwaukee.

During the testimonial dinner, Mayor Zeidler was presented with an award by the Fraternal Order of Eagles for outstanding public service; a citation from the Milwaukee chapter of the Sigma Delta Chi, an outstanding national professional journalistic fraternity; and other recognitions, as well as expressions of warm appreciation from his fellow citizens.

Over the years, I have been privileged to work with Mayor Zeidler on a great many projects of interest to Milwaukee. In each of these endeavors, I have found Frank to be a dedicated public servant, deeply devoted to fulfilling the needs of the community as he saw them.

Reflecting the esteem of fellow citizens for the modern-day leadership which Mayor Zeidler provided the community, I ask unanimous consent to have an article by John K. Kole, published in the Milwaukee Journal, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZEIDLER'S LEADERSHIP IS PRAISED AT TESTIMONIAL ATTENDED BY 600—WORK IS LAUDED AS SOURCE OF INSPIRATION TO MAYORS OF MANY OTHER CITIES

(By John W. Kole)

Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee for 12 years, was honored Monday night by his fellow citizens.

More than 600 persons representing all segments of the community—public officials, labor, business and other civic leaders, plus scores of plain, ordinary citizens—paid tribute to Zeidler at a testimonial dinner at the Eagles club.

Zeidler, 47, has been Milwaukee's mayor since 1948. He decided last October not to seek a fourth 4-year term this spring after his doctor warned that the continued strain of the office could harm his health.

The community sentiment was expressed in huge letters over the speaker's table: "Best Wishes Frank."

Joseph E. Dillon, mayor of St. Paul, Minn., said of Zeidler:

"His leadership in Milwaukee, in this metropolitan area, in the State of Wisconsin—and, yes, throughout the entire country—has been a deep source of knowledge, of inspiration and of challenge to me and to many other mayors in many cities."

CITIZENS' HELP PRAISED

District Judge Robert W. Hansen, acting as toastmaster, said Zeidler "epitomizes to many, many people personal integrity and a willingness to stand up and be counted for a cause that is a lost cause."

When Zeidler spoke late in the program, he spent almost as much time praising the thousands of citizens who had helped him during his administrations as the dinner speakers had spent praising him.

For more than 30 minutes he ticked off names of persons, city bureaus and departments and civic boards, commissions and organizations.

FATHER INTRODUCED

He started with him family, telling the audience that his wife, Agnes, five daughters and a son had been extremely understanding in putting up with his being away from home so much. All were guests at the dinner.

He called his father, Michael W., a barber, "the sage of 16th Street, who had raised three or four generations of Marquette students." Michael Zeidler had been introduced earlier by Hansen as the only man in the history of Milwaukee who has had two sons as mayor.

(Frank Zeidler's brother, Carl, was mayor from 1940 to 1942 before he was lost at sea while serving in the navy in World War II.)

After he had finished with his long list of personal tributes, Zeidler said:

"I owe so much to all of you I cannot remember it all."

Zeidler was given the Fraternal Order of Eagles first Fiorello La Guardia award for outstanding service in public administration.

Given in honor of the late mayor of New York City, it was presented by Arthur S. Ehrmann, editor of the national Eagles publication. Ehrmann was one of 14 who ran against Zeidler in the 1948 mayoral primary.

The mayor was visibly moved by another award, a bronze plaque inscribed in Braille from the Badger Association of the Blind, a

statewide organization of blind persons that promotes the welfare of the visually handicapped.

It was presented by Louis Seidita, of 2610 North Farwell Avenue, a blind man who operates the concession stand in the new municipal building. For many years Seidita operated a stand in the city hall.

IN EVERY SENSE A LEADER

Seidita praised Zeidler: "He is in every sense a leader, a leader who has shown profound concern for persons from all walks of life. We are greatly indebted to him for his constant regard for our welfare and his encouragement of our increased participation in the life of the community."

The association operates the Badger Home for the Blind, 912 North Hawley Road.

DINNER ONE OF TWO

Zeidler also received a citation from the Milwaukee chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalistic fraternity, praising his continuing opposition to news suppression.

"What else would you expect from the son of a barber?" Zeidler said. "Before there were newspapers, there were barbershops."

The dinner, one of two planned in Zeidler's honor, was sponsored by a committee of civic leaders headed by Richard S. Falk, assistant to the president and secretary of the Falk Corp.

Resolution Adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Ansonia, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append herewith a statesmanlike resolution of the Lithuanian-American Council of Ansonia, Conn.:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Ansonia, sponsored by the Ansonia Lithuanian-American Council, and held February 28, 1960, at St. Anthony's Hall to commemorate the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Kremlin rulers, in conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of international law, invaded Lithuania and, against the will of the Lithuanian people, annexed her to the Soviet Union;

"Whereas the people of Lithuania have been and still are suppressed by the most cruel means of the Communist dictatorship—her culture is distorted, her industry and agriculture ruined, her youth by thousands every year deported to the remote virgin lands of the vast Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the Soviet dictatorship constantly strives to extend its rule over new territories in Europe, Asia, and in Africa, ultimately seeking world domination: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the Greater Ansonia area, call upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to prevent further spreading of communism in the free world; be it further

"Resolved, That this mass gathering urges the Government of the United States not to trust the Soviet braggings about the peace-

ful coexistence between East and West, and to be cautious with the Kremlin leaders when dealing with them at the forthcoming summit conference; and finally, be it

Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuanian people and to other enslaved European nations."

ANSONIA LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN
COUNCIL.

STANLEY BUJANAUSKAS,

President.

OLGA SAVITSKAS,

Secretary.

Dated February 28, 1960.

Expert Backing for a Federal Department To Deal With Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Dr. William L. C. Wheaton recently penned a provocative and interesting article about the idea of establishing a Cabinet-level department to deal with the problems of America's urban residents. Dr. Wheaton is president of the National Housing Conference and director of the Institute for Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. He is therefore uniquely qualified to give expert testimony on this subject.

In this recent article, which appeared in the December 1959 issue of the *National Civic Review*, Dr. Wheaton says:

Because of the economic importance of cities, their political importance and social importance, we believe they deserve representation along with other major groups in the Cabinet of the President. Only when they secure that representation will the needs of urban areas be reflected in national policy.

Mr. President, as sponsor of S. 2397, to provide for the creation of a Department of Urbiculture, I am glad to have this informed backing for this idea. I am hopeful Congress will soon respond to the need for urban representation in the highest councils of our Federal Government. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wheaton's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A NEW CABINET POST?—DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT WITH ITS HEAD A WHITE HOUSE SPOKESMAN, CLAIMED AS URGENT NEED

(By William L. C. Wheaton, president of the National Housing Conference, director of the Institute for Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and professor of city planning at that institution. This article is Dr. Wheaton's address before the National Conference on Government of the National Municipal League, Springfield, Mass., November 18, 1959.)

Two-thirds of the American people now live in urban areas. During the next 20 to 25 years our population will increase by 100

million people. Virtually all this population growth will occur on the suburban fringes of metropolitan areas. At that time, 80 percent of our population will become urbanized, leaving only 20 percent in farm and rural nonfarm areas. Already more than three-fourths of our economic wealth and productive capacity is concentrated in cities comprising less than 3 percent of our land area. These cities are our greatest source of economic and military strength. Our national welfare is dependent upon their continued efficiency as instruments of production in our economy.

Despite these unchallenged facts, urban areas continue to be grossly underrepresented in State legislatures and in Congress. They are taxed heavily to pay the costs of governmental services to others and receive no corresponding benefits in return for their tax contributions. Urban people are willing to continue to carry their fair share of the costs of government. But we can no longer close our eyes to the fact that the tax drain on cities is impairing their ability to remain efficient wealth producers. Unless they can obtain the funds they need to modernize transportation systems, rebuild blighted areas, clear slums, invigorate declining industrial districts, educate and provide for the health of their children, American cities may decline in efficiency and be unable to carry the huge tax loads for defense and aids to other areas which they have done in the past.

Traditional goals of reapportionment and fairer legislative representation are essential to the long-range welfare of urban areas, but this will be a long and tortuous process, one unlikely to be completed in the foreseeable future. In their search for fairer representation, urban areas also have recognized that the center of power in our society has shifted in this century from the State governments to the National Government and from the legislative bodies to the executive. Certainly the last session of Congress demonstrated the overwhelming power of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Indeed some form of representation in the executive branch may be almost as important as reapportionment, for it is in the White House that many of the most important decisions regarding our society are made.

Even the most cursory examination of the organization of the Federal Government reveals a considerable imbalance in Federal administrative structure. The farmers, now comprising less than 20 million people, are represented by an enormously powerful Agriculture Department offering a vast array of services. Business is represented at the Cabinet table by a Secretary of Commerce, who ostensibly represents several million business firms and who works hard for some of them. Our 15 or 20 million organized workers are supposed to have representation in the Department of Labor. The Western States, containing but a fraction of the population, are represented by the Department of the Interior. The Cabinet, in short, consists largely of representatives of minority groups, special interests or special programs. Each of these had its historical justification and any reasonably objective review would demonstrate that each contributed in a major way to the advancement of American civilization.

But our urban areas are not represented at the Cabinet table and our Federal programs, as a consequence, are ludicrously inadequate in facing urban problems. Failure to face or deal with the problem of civil defense is an example. Failure to face or deal with the problem of mass transit in cities is another example. Recurring conflicts between highway and urban renewal programs and our inability to launch a mass housing program that will help cities are other illustrations. We do not even have any Federal program of research which is developing a

systematic body of knowledge on urban problems.

The Department of Agriculture can tell us what crops are planted on almost every acre of ground in every county in every season of the year for the last quarter century. No Federal agency has any data on urban land use of any sort. The urban land is worth much more than the farm land and holds 5 times as many people and produces far more wealth. We know precisely how many farm buildings there are in the United States, but we have no data on the number of factory buildings. We spend more money on research on potatoes than we do on urban economics. We spend 20 or 30 times as much money on farm housing research as we spend on urban housing research.

Now let us review the proposals which have been made to give greater recognition to our urban areas in the Federal administrative structure. Twenty-two years ago, the President's Committee on Administrative Management called attention to these needs and urged that the Bureau of the Budget assume responsibility for the coordination of policies affecting urban areas. At the same time, the committee urged field level coordination of Federal administrative agencies so as to reduce conflicts between Federal programs. In the same year, the National Resources Committee urged establishment of a program of urban research in the Federal Government and the establishment of a coordinator of urban policies. It also urged a thorough examination of the impact of tax and fiscal policies on urban and other areas. Now it would appear that 22 years provides ample time for the test of an idea, or should we wait for another 22 years?

As recently as 3 years ago we saw a revival of the coordinator idea. Indeed, we have had at least three coordinators charged with some responsibility in this area—Gov. Howard Pyle, Robert E. Merriam, and Gen. John Stewart Bragdon—and we are all familiar with the results. I suggest that the history of Federal administration amply demonstrates the utter failure of coordinators as a means for solving major long-range problems.

The second class of suggestion is that there should be an interdepartmental committee on urban affairs. This dodge has produced some of the most spectacular failures in Federal administrative history, as our experience with river basin committees, civil defense, the National Housing Council, and others amply demonstrates. It seems there can be no argument that interdepartmental coordinating committees provide a forum for discussion between bureaucrats guaranteed to produce no significant change in policy or other effective action. This is not to say that they are not useful means for administrative coordination, merely that they are not very helpful in resolving national policy issues.

Finally, there are proposals for the reorganization of Federal departmental structure. Here I believe history is instructive and shows a persistent need for a Federal Department of Urban Development and Housing. The President's Committee on Administrative Management of 1937 recommended establishment of two new Federal departments—one dealing with social security and another dealing with public works. In subsequent years the Security Agency was established first as an agency and later as the present Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Department of Public Works was not established. Instead, these functions were divided between a newly created Federal Works Agency and a newly created Federal Loan Agency. In the war years, the necessity for concentrating on war housing resulted in another reorganization which combined some works and some loan functions in the National Housing Agency and transferred remaining loan functions to the De-

partment of Commerce. During the post-war years, the remaining functions of the Federal Works Agency were transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or other Federal departments, so that the present Housing and Home Finance Agency contains many of the elements originally proposed for a Department of Public Works and later placed in the Federal Works Agency or the Federal Loan Agency. Under the acid test of 20 years of trial and error, the Housing Agency has proven to be a viable package of Federal programs, while the works and loan concepts have been tried and found wanting.

If we examine the Housing Agency we find that it is no longer a housing agency. It contains programs of housing and urban renewal and I remind you that 20 percent of urban renewal in the future can be the renewal of commercial and industrial areas. It contains the operating remains of the shelf of public works ideas. It contains the Bureau of Community Facilities with a program of aids to local community facilities and public works, and for many years served the building and planning functions of Federal education and health programs. The Housing Agency administers a program of grants for local, county, and State planning assistance and assorted other functions, all affecting the development of urban areas. Indeed, the only major development aids of the Federal Government to urban areas which are not now contained in the Housing Agency appear to be urban roads and highways and aids for school buildings and hospitals, to the extent that we have such programs.

In short, I would contend that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has already become a department of urban development and housing in all but name and prestige. The HHFA has a budget and staff which exceeds that of some Federal departments so that, on grounds of size as well as permanence, departmental status would appear to be justified.

Of the arguments against a Federal department dealing with urban problems, only one appears to have any substance. This is the contention that a department of urban affairs would be a monster embracing most of the activities of the Federal Government. Indeed, that would be the case if we were to try to consolidate in one department all Federal programs dealing in any way with urban areas. We would then have within such a department a division of labor, a division of business, a division of health, education and welfare, a division of conservation, and so on. This argues persuasively against a department dealing with all urban affairs.

The same objections cannot be raised against a department of urban development and housing. During the next 20 years, urban development problems will be the most urgent ones facing our cities and towns. During these years, they must accommodate a population roughly double their present figure. They will be obsessed with the problems of providing housing and community facilities and with the problems of financing this enormous development. The crucial problems of future cities will be framed by the development activities of the next generation.

It is sometimes argued that a department organized on geographic grounds cannot embrace all the problems encompassed in its particular area. This is true of all Federal departments. The Agriculture Department, primarily serving agricultural areas, is also concerned with the marketing of agricultural products in urban areas. It deals with local produce markets and with international trade in agricultural products. Similarly, a Federal Department of Urban Development and Housing, while concentrating on urban areas, might have some programs of aid to

other areas, while some other departments conduct programs of aid to urban people.

The primary reason for a Federal Department of Urban Development, however, is to secure a seat at the bargaining table for our urban communities. Decisions are made in the White House. Urban areas are not represented there today. They cannot be adequately represented by persons who do not command the national prestige, influence, and power characteristic of department heads. In Washington, unfortunately, the flaming sword of truth is a poor substitute for the broad ax of influence. In Washington, influence is largely measured by prestige, payrolls, and budgets, and only a Cabinet officer commanding ample amounts of these can represent urban people. A department representing cities would have this influence and it would have the ability to represent all urban interests at the Cabinet level, something no coordinator can ever have.

Further on this point, if you will examine the Cabinet officers of the last 25 years, you will be struck by the scarcity of former mayors in the President's Cabinet. There have been a few, but only when a mayor has first gone on to be a governor or a Senator has he achieved Cabinet status. This is a grievous deficiency in our national political affairs—our richest seed bed for political leadership, the cities and towns of our country, has been seriously neglected in national affairs. Surely no one can bring a more vivid experience of the needs of American society to Washington than one who has been mayor of one of our great cities.

Eight years ago, the National Housing Conference recommended to Congress the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development. In subsequent years, this recommendation has secured the support of the A.F. of L.-CIO, American Municipal Association, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the many civic, religious and patriotic organizations which have played an active role in the development of housing and urban renewal legislation.

We believe fervently that our cities are now overwhelmingly the most important aspect of American life and that the political leadership of American communities has a far more profound understanding of the problems of 20th century America than any other group of political leaders. Because of the economic importance of cities, their political importance and their social importance, we believe they deserve representation along with other major groups in the Cabinet of the President. Only when they secure that representation will be needs of urban areas be reflected in national policy.

Recent Events in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL
LABOR RESEARCH, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

HON. JOHN C. DREIER,
Ambassador to the Organization of American States, U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: American public opinion is shocked and revolted by the recent events in the Dominican Republic. The Trujillo dictatorship has unleashed a cam-

paign of terror against the Dominican people which, according to reports reaching us, has assumed mass proportions. Thousands of innocent people have been thrown into prisons and their lives are in grave danger. If our Western civilization and the ideals for which it stands are to survive, we cannot accept in silence this brutal act of extermination carried out against our brother Dominicans.

We are aware that the Council of the Organization of American States has recently considered a resolution to condemn Trujillo's brutalities, and that the question has been referred to the Peace Committee.

However, in view of the grave situation that exists in the Dominican Republic, despite Trujillo's claim that he has crushed all opposition, we urge the members of the Organization of American States to establish at once an ad hoc committee which would bring to bear the moral force of democracy and human decency to safeguard the human rights of the helpless Dominican people. The situation in the Dominican Republic not only threatens the lives of innocent men and women but also endangers the peace of this hemisphere.

Again, we respectfully suggest that appropriate means be provided to enable the Organization of American States to intervene urgently and effectively, within the spirit of its charter and within the OAS decisions reached in Santiago de Chile in 1959.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS,
Chairman.

Washington, Lincoln, and Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following address by George E. Stringfellow before the Kiwanis Club of Staten Island, N.Y., on February 11, 1960, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison:

Thank you, fellow Kiwanians, for your invitation to address you on Edison's birthday. This is the third time you have asked me to speak to your club. I am complimented by your invitation for a repeat performance.

Each of the 12 months in our calendar year is important. However, I think that February is one of the most important in that Washington, Lincoln, and Edison were born in February.

It was in February that Washington said, "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

It was in February that Lincoln said, "Let us have faith that right makes right and in that faith, let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."

I shall mention briefly the philosophy of Washington and Lincoln and will deal more extensively with Edison, with whom it was my privilege to have been a daily business associate during the last decade of his long and productive life.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington was born February 22, 1732—228 years ago. Washington looked after the welfare of our country as a father looks after his child. He fought for and helped make our country grow strong. He guided it when it was young and gave leadership in developing the greatest form of gov-

ernment, in the words of Gladstone, "Ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

No man in the history of the world did more for his country than Washington did for ours. He and his associates gave us a system of government which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. Nowhere in the world do men enjoy as much freedom and as high a living standard as we, thanks to Washington's courage and wisdom. Washington truly earned the imperishable title of "Father of His Country."

Our forefathers bequeathed to us a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of the Government. Our benefactors gave us a system of government that recognizes the dignity of the individual and encourages high moral and ethical standards. They gave us a system of government born of the principle that all men have the right to pursue happiness and to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Our forefathers gave us a system of government which provides everyone an opportunity to make the most of what he has and rewards him according to his ability. They did not subscribe to the philosophy that government owes everyone a living.

Our forefathers glorified the individual, not the state, as the Communists do. They worked like Trojans to build a strong America and they roared like lions to establish and maintain freedom. They had granite in their character and iron in their backbones. They kept government the servant of the people and so must we, if we are to remain free men, and thus be worthy of our great heritage.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln was born on February 12, 1809—151 years ago tomorrow. He was one of the world's truly great men. He will live always in the minds and hearts of people everywhere. In his memorable Gettysburg Address and in other speeches and writings, Lincoln expressed his belief in the American people and in our system of government. He never lost touch with the people and millions knew him for what he was, "Honest Abe."

Lincoln held the Nation together in the trying 1860's and thus preserved the system of government which made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country, but to the betterment of the world.

THOMAS A. EDISON

Thomas A. Edison was born on February 11, 1847, and today we celebrate the 113th anniversary of that great event.

It is generally recognized that Edison was the world's greatest inventor. How, you may ask, did Edison, a poor boy, raise the money to build and equip his research laboratory and staff it with capable assistants.

Edison raised the money by the sweat of his brow and the exercise of his fertile brain. Edison received no subsidy from his government, as is all too often the case today.

Edison was known as the "Genius of Menlo Park." He was asked on one occasion to define "genius." He replied, "Genius is 95 percent perspiration and 5 percent inspiration."

One of Edison's first major inventions was the Universal Stock Ticker, which he sold for \$40,000. He used much of the proceeds from the sale to build, equip and staff his laboratory.

Edison believed in and practiced the four basic principles of management: (1) plan, (2) organize, (3) delegate, (4) supervise.

Edison's favorite invention, the phonograph, was patented February 19, 1877. It was the most original of his 1,100-odd inventions. Having conceived the idea of recording and reproducing sound, Edison sketched

his idea on a scrap of yellow paper and handed it to John Kruesi, one of his assistants, with instructions, "Kruesi, make this."

A few days later Kruesi handed the inventor a queer-looking contraption. Edison wrapped a sheet of tinfoil around the cylinder of the device and, as he turned the crank that revolved the cylinder, he spoke these historic words, "Mary had a little lamb," into a brass horn attached to a recorder riding on the tinfoil. As Edison reversed the operation of the contraption, he heard those words repeated and thus was born sound recording and reproduction as we know it today.

Edison's most widely known and used invention is the incandescent lamp which illuminates the world. As you perhaps know, radio and television are predicated upon the principle of the incandescent lamp.

If Edison had lived under a Communist state, it would have been necessary for him to have gone to the "Bureau of New Ideas of the Division of Engineering of the Office of Social Improvement" to obtain essential commodities with which to experiment in his efforts to produce the electric light and his 1,100 other inventions. It would have been necessary for Edison to have revealed his educational qualifications to the Communist bureaucrat. Having none, Edison would doubtless have been denied the use of materials for his experiments and thus we would have been deprived of the electric light and the other great inventions which Edison's genius and industry produced which have enriched the world.

If Washington and his associates had not given us our system of government, if Lincoln had not held that Government together in its most trying period, it is safe to assume that Edison would not have made his great contribution to civilization.

Ours is a great system of government. It is our duty and our responsibility as citizens to keep it intact as it was passed on to us by our wise benefactors.

If we heed the advice of Washington and Lincoln in matters of government and if we emulate Edison's industry, integrity, and initiative, the future of America will be beyond man's comprehension.

"America," said Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the wisest of Americans, "is another name for opportunity. Her whole history appears like a last effort of divine providence in behalf of the human race."

Ohio to Lake Canal Planned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Steubenville (Ohio) Jeffersonian entitled "Tunal Is Not a Dream" describing a plan for an underground canal from Lake Erie to the Ohio River:

TUNAL IS NOT A DREAM

A bold and dramatic plan for an underground canal from Lake Erie to the Ohio River may bring another industrial revolution to 14 mid-America States—affecting 20 million people.

Ernest Humphrey of Geneva, Ohio, who is the creator of "tunal" (a combination of the words tunnel and canal), has spent the last 20 years working out the engineering plans along with T. L. White, a nationally renowned engineer who helped design the New York

aqueduct which is longer and nearly as big as tunal.

Tunal will provide an 87 mile canal from the Ashtabula area to the East Liverpool area. The channels would provide two lanes of water, each 13 feet wide and 18 feet deep filled to a depth of 8 feet, moving at a speed of 5 miles per hour.

MID-AMERICA AFFECTED

This plan would connect mid-America with foreign ports for all kinds of freight, both to and from, and eliminate high costs of transportation. More particularly, Tunal will be a boon to the steel industry in the Ohio Valley and Greater Pittsburgh areas because it will allow cheap shipments of iron ore from Canada—and offset the movement of the industry to locate in the Chicago area where the ore is now being shipped to meet with another important ingredient of steel and coal. The significance to the steel industry is graphically portrayed on the next page of this informative reprint.

An almost unlimited number of barges could ply the canal. The barges are designed to be 10 feet wide, 50 feet long and 9 feet deep and displace 3,000 cubic feet when loaded. Forty small pumps would keep the water moving evenly and no locks, dams or complicated equipment would be involved. Openings every 4 miles will provide access to the barges.

FINANCIALLY FEASIBLE

Humphrey points out that tunal, costing \$200 million to construct is far cheaper than the \$3 billion suggested for the overland canal. He adds that excavations for tunal will be actually less than the freeway in Ashtabula County, Ohio. In order to make a level flow of water on top of the ground, Humphrey says, considerably more dirt would need to be excavated.

As for competition with other modes of transportation, Humphrey estimates that a ton of freight could be hauled for 50 cents as opposed to the present rate of \$3.44 on the railroad, besides the savings of time by tunal. Moreover, Humphrey says that tunal can handle all types of freight unlike the limitations imposed on the belt line and the proposed pipe line to the Lake Erie area.

Humphrey even has economy figured into the excavations, claiming that the dirt can be used as fill for the lake-sewer highway. The shale from excavations could be sold to potteries, he adds.

At the rate of 50 cents per ton he figures tunal would gross \$900,000 daily at a cost of \$1,000 for operation.

CANAL NOT NEW

Similar canals have been used in Europe for years. The New York aqueduct which carries water to the city of New York is big enough to drive a truck through and is longer than tunal, Humphrey points out.

Humphrey got the idea in 1939 when he read an article suggesting an overland canal to the Ohio River from Lake Erie. Since that time, the designer has spent the past 20 years perfecting the plan to include engineering outlays.

Thomas G. Masaryk, "Champion of Liberty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 110th birthday anni-

versary of one of the world's great champions of liberty. I refer to Thomas G. Masaryk, founded and first President of Czechoslovakia. Though that nation now sadly finds itself under the heels of a ruthless tyranny, the flame of liberty ignited by Masaryk long ago is still aglow. A special stamp commemorating the birthdate of this great statesman is not only a fitting testimonial to his contributions to freedom but will serve as a reminder to the people of Masaryk's benign nation and others throughout the world that the causes for which he stood remain an inspiration to liberty-loving peoples everywhere, and that freedom, though seemingly crushed in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and other countries, will rise again.

Monopoly Is Stifling Invention and Innovation in American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, since many Congressmen have a deep interest in small business and the difficulties which now beset this vital segment of the American economy, I wish to share with them a letter which I received recently from Edward Wimmer of Cincinnati. An expert in this field, Mr. Wimmer is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. He also writes a weekly column on business problems for the Cincinnati Enquirer. His letter shows that bigness is not only crushing small and independent business and stifling competition, but also is stifling invention and innovation. His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: I congratulate you in having a part in the hearings conducted by the Patents Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, for the purpose of determining some of the difficulties encountered by small businessmen and other individuals, in the field of invention and innovation.

The day of the Ben Franklins, the Fords, Firestones, the Marconis, and Bells, who made their greatest discoveries in basement laboratories and leaking lofts, and who, from the most humble beginnings, saw their discoveries revolutionize human affairs, are probably gone forever.

To mourn their going, or to lament that we now live in a world almost lost to the man of small means who makes a new discovery, but who is unable to breathe his own life into its development, will get us nowhere. What we need to do, I think, is to fully explore the reasons for this unhealthy situation, and hope that some measure of light may be thrown on why the average man feels he has no chance to develop his inventions or to profit from them.

Even in our colleges, the attitude of youth is that invention and innovation should be left to big business, because, as most young people will say, "Big business has the brains, the laboratories, and the money." How many young people can we find today who are thinking of better ways of doing things? And, to be realistic, what would happen to

the small man or the youth seeking an audience with big business for risk capital to launch a new or improved product?

As to investment capital, consider the report that less than 1 percent of the huge loan funds of the big insurance companies went to companies with less than \$100 million in assets, and ask any stockbroker or investment banker if he is interested in promoting a new stock for any new enterprise of small beginnings.

We all know that the fundamental aim of patent laws is to stimulate invention by rewarding inventors. I believe there has been a miscarriage of this end objective due to a miscarriage of our antimonopoly laws. Consider, also, the oft repeated charge that big corporations have bought up thousands of inventions, only to put them on the shelf. The inventor was poorly paid and the consumer may have been deprived of tremendous gains, but what do we know about this situation?

During the early years of our country and, in fact, right up to the decade before the big chains and corporate combines began to take over, new adding machines, radios, soap powders, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and literally hundreds of thousands of other innovations and inventions found ready marketing capital, and the smaller merchants over the Nation would take on anything new and give it a chance to win public acceptance.

Giantism in manufacturing and distribution has changed the whole area of hope for the small innovator or inventor, and the result has been not only a drying up of initiative but a swift disappearance of risk capital in all its forms.

Our tax laws, of course, are responsible to a great extent for this drying up process. High interest rates make their contribution, and there is the labor union problem and other factors entering the picture, but, in my humble opinion, no study of the hardships faced by the man with an invention can arrive at any fruitful conclusion unless the main problem—too much bigness—is faced up to.

We have heard the harrowing tales about the small inventor who exhausted himself trying to prove that he had a patentable product or improvement on existing products, and how in the end he sold out to some big business that later "made a killing" on his discovery. * * * These tales are told so often that they have contributed greatly to the aforesaid attitude of American youth.

Our contention, therefore, has been that the Government should make risk capital invested in inventions or in new businesses at least partially tax free, with profits the first few years equally protected. If something like this isn't done, there will be no available capital for the beginners in any field.

At this writing there are some 35 commercial banks with nearly \$70 billion in deposits, which is 34 percent of all bank deposits in the United States. Twenty mutual savings banks have 37 percent of all savings bank deposits. Twenty life insurance companies hold 77 percent of total life insurance assets, and 20 investment trusts control 67 percent of the assets in that field. The pension funds are now building up tremendous investment pools, and imagine anyone approaching these institutions for money to market a new invention on a limited basis.

It ought to be clear that on one hand the big chainstore systems are merging and wiping out their smaller competitors, narrowing the market for new innovations by men of small means, while on the other hand the Government knocks out the smalls and narrows the market by loading small businesses with such burdensome reports, and burdensome taxes and regulations that only the strongest business can survive.

Therefore, isn't the problem of opening markets and protecting discoverers of new

things and innovations, a question of what to do about the growing power concentrated in fewer and fewer hands? Or, if all this pregnancy of giantism is as good as its advocates say, would it not be desirable to make the monopoly complete?

When we look back only a few years, we find that the first radio, washing machine, adding machine, typewriter, or almost any other invention that became a great part of our way of life, had its beginning with small people. That most of the really big discoveries in the field of invention originated in humble surroundings. We are well aware that men of means were constantly on the lookout for new things, new ideas that contained a possibility of profit, but now these men of wealth say that fortunes have to be spent in developing new products, and "what have you got when the Government gets through."

Free, competitive, independent enterprise is the core of the free market system, and it is the core of the problem of reopening the areas of invention and innovation to oncoming generations. If the hearings held by the Patents Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics can throw light on the need for more ways to rekindle the inventive spirit that made our Nation the envy of the world, it will render a real service to the future.

In conclusion, I would like to add that no committee of Congress can overlook the destructive effect loss-leader selling has had upon the decisions of smaller companies to introduce a new product, nor how loss-leader selling has retarded improvements in older, well-known products. Risk takers will say: "Sure, it's a good idea. It would sell, but we'd no more than get it on the market when some cut-throat would offer it at cost and down would go our distribution."

Would We Trade Capabilities With Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from "Battle Line," Republican National Committee, volume 4, No. 16, March 3, 1960:

WOULD WE TRADE CAPABILITIES WITH RUSSIA?

The Democratic Party, uniting in destructive criticism of the United States as "second rate" to Russia militarily, apparently would be willing to "swap" what we have for what the Soviet Union has.

What would the Democrats be giving away in such a hypothetical situation? On February 21, President Eisenhower outlined our defense posture and gave this powerful and accurate description of our military capability:

"This is a force not unduly dependent upon any one weapon or any one service, not subject to elimination by sudden attack, buttressed by an industrial system unmatched on earth, and unhesitatingly supported by a vigorous people determined to remain free. Strategically, it is far better situated than any force that could be brought to bear against us.

"As we have strengthened these defenses, we have helped to bolster our own and free world security by assisting in arming 42

other nations—our associates in the defense of the free world."

If we traded with the Soviet Union—exchanging our defense capabilities for theirs and trading our strategic situation for theirs—here is an outline of the position the United States would be in:

ICBM's: If we traded places with Russia, we would have an operational ICBM but so would our enemy. In a few years, we might be able to have a few more first-generation ICBM's—if we made such a decision. But, in the meantime, the enemy would be successfully developing second-generation ICBM's and submarine missiles, more flexible and more reliable, and these would be moving into the enemy arsenal by the time we could achieve a mathematical superiority in first-generation ICBM's.

Jet bomber: If we traded places with Russia, we would be faced with a nuclear bomber force 4 to 5 times larger than our own, and our continent would lie almost defenseless against it. The enemy bomber force, also carrying missiles, could fly from a hundred bases, from all directions, at once—and its forward bases would be in such nearby places as Venezuela, Newfoundland, Puerto Rico, Bermuda, Central America, Hawaii, and Alaska. We would have nothing comparable.

Naval forces: If we traded places with Russia, a few hundred miles off our coasts would be cruising enemy naval forces, with aircraft carriers capable of launching nuclear bombers, and missiles. We would have nothing comparable. In a few months, joining this enemy naval capability would be the awesome Polaris submarines each with 16 ICBM's. We would have nothing comparable.

Forward bases: If we traded places with Russia, we would be faced with the power of thousands of fighter aircraft, bombers, tactical missiles, pilotless aircraft, and IRBM's at dozens of bases scattered throughout nearby Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands. We would have nothing comparable.

Air defense: If we traded places with Russia, we would have our few ground-to-air missile defenses clustered around a few metropolitan centers, and elsewhere would have to rely on obsolete antiaircraft guns. The enemy, in contrast, would have a worldwide system of radar warnings, a powerful all-weather fleet of jet interceptors, substantial ground-to-air missile bases, and promising development of anti-missile missiles.

Ground forces: If we traded places with Russia, we would face a quarter of a million nuclear-armed enemy troops in Mexico and Canada and these would be allied with large and powerful forces of other nations in our own hemisphere. We would need large ground forces to defend our borders, maintain internal security, and maintain our domination of a restless satellite empire. We would have none of our troops at forward bases close to our major enemy.

Collective security: If we traded places with Russia, in contrast to our tinderbox of satellite nations subdued by military dictatorship, the enemy allies, all freemen, would be banded together in collective organizations and treaties which would ring us with about 250 strategically located bases for planes and nuclear missiles in addition to ground forces.

National economy: If we traded places with Russia, except for a few dramatic exceptions, our economy would be of Civil War era. Our population would be concentrated in one-half of the country and we would be offering bonuses for settlement of the other half. Fifty percent of our labor force would be engaged in agriculture.

To make the economy of the United States equal to that of Russia, here is what would have to be done:

We would have to, among other things, get rid of three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our hydroelectric capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, over half of our aluminum production, 90 percent of our natural gas production, two-thirds of our copper production, 95 percent of our electric motor output. We would have to tear up 14 of every 15 miles of paved highway, get rid of 19 of every 20 autos and trucks, tear up 2 of every 3 miles of railroad track, get rid of 60 percent of our railroad freight cars, sink 8 out of every 9 merchant ships.

Standard of living: To make ours equal with Russia, we would have to do these things, among others: destroy 80 percent of our housing, destroy 80 million TV sets, destroy 9 of every 10 telephones and radio sets, reduce passenger cars to our 1915 level, cut meat consumption by 60 percent.

What reasonable person would join the Democrats in believing that "Russia is best" and the United States "second rate"?

One Hundred and Tenth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: The silenced Czechoslovak people in the homeland are not permitted by their communist oppressors to celebrate publicly the 110th anniversary of the birth of their beloved President Liberator Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, March 7, 1850.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia speaking on behalf of the captive people take the liberty to ask you to remind the American public of Masaryk's greatness.

The more the free world must resist the onrush of totalitarian forces, the more Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, begins to stand up as one of the greatest thinkers and statesmen of this century. For Masaryk considered democracy the only form of government worthy of the dignity of the modern free man. His whole life was spent in fighting for the idea of democracy. He took issue with the teachings of Marx, he denounced Bolshevism; and the volunteer army of the Czechoslovak Legionnaires, whose commander-in-chief he was, was the first army that stood up with arms to the Bolshevik expansion already in 1918. In his "Making of a State" Thomas G. Masaryk clearly analyzed all perils of democracy and outlined the way for mankind to prevent its downfall. Throughout his three terms as President of the Czechoslovak Republic, the founding of which was largely attributed to his efforts, he continued as democracy's strongest champion. T. G. Masaryk was the first statesman to propagate the unification of Czechs and Slovaks in a common state. After he went abroad to organize the Czechoslovak liberation movement—in cooperation with Milan Rastislav Štefánik and Edward Beneš—he succeeded to convince the Allied governments to endorse the setting up Czechoslovakia, a Re-

public of Czechs, Slovaks and Carpatho-Russians. (These last joined the united movement of making a new state voluntarily later.) As a result Czechoslovakia became a flourishing island of peace in a world tossed about by disorders and revolutions.

Exactly 40 years have elapsed since Czechoslovakia, headed by President Masaryk, inaugurated its new democratic constitution. It was altogether a modern constitution which encompassed and guaranteed all basic freedoms. Its preamble purposely paraphrased the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to demonstrate the ideological proximity of the two nations.

Thomas G. Masaryk lived by the ideals so dear to every American since he was inspired both in the struggle for his nation's independence and in his function as President by the ideas of Jefferson and Lincoln. In his radio message to the American people, the 87-year-old Masaryk said: "Czechoslovakia proudly accepts the ideals of Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson. Let others find a solution to their own problems, but let us not allow them to touch our most important treasures: freedom of soul, freedom of word, and freedom of race." This was 6 months before his death and a year and a half before Czechoslovakia ceased to be a free republic, losing its hard-acquired liberty.

Thomas G. Masaryk, then, lived by the ideals which are so close to all Americans and which have made the United States big and powerful. His wife Charlotte, a great support to him in times of hardship, was an American. Small wonder, then, that Masaryk once upon a time called America his second homeland. In issuing of the Thomas G. Masaryk "Champion of Liberty" postage stamps commemorating the 110th anniversary of his birth, the United States is reminded that it is paying tribute not only to a great philosopher, statesman, and human being, but also to one of its closest and most devoted friends.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia thanks you sincerely for anything you will deem appropriate to commemorate the great Czechoslovak educator and scientist, the intrepid fighter for liberty and truth, the great statesman and architect of democracy, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic and propagator of the federating of Europe and the free world.

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. JURAJ SLÁVIK,
Vice Chairman, Executive Committee.
Dr. PETR ZENKLI,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

Industries Principally Responsible for Heavy Unemployment in Distressed Labor Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two fact sheets compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee, 99 University Place, New York City, which point up the need for enactment by Congress in this session of area redevelopment legislation now pending before the House Rules Committee, such legislation having passed the Senate last year:

AREA EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION COMMITTEE, NEW YORK, N.Y.

FACT SHEET No. 42.—Industries principally responsible for heavy unemployment in distressed labor markets (November 1959)

Distressed labor market	Industry principally responsible for heavy unemployment	Distressed labor market	Industry principally responsible for heavy unemployment
CONNECTICUT		NORTH CAROLINA	
Small:		Major: Durham	Tobacco, textiles.
Ansonia	Brass.	Small:	
Bristol	Brass, clocks, and watches.	Fayetteville	Textiles, military installation.
Danielson	Textiles.	Hendersonville	No year-round employment.
Norwich	Do.	Kinston	Textiles, construction, tobacco.
Thompsonville	Do.	Lumberton	Textiles.
MAINE		Mount Airy	Do.
Major: Portland	Metal.	Rockingham-Hamlet	Do.
Small:		Rocky Mount	Tobacco processing, agriculture, textiles.
Biddeford-Sanford	Textiles, textile machinery.	Rutherfordton-Forest City	Textiles.
Lewiston-Auburn	Textiles, shoes.	Wilson	Tobacco.
Very small:		SOUTH CAROLINA	
Oahls	Pulpwood, sardines, lack of year-round jobs.	Small: Hampton	Underdeveloped area.
Eastport	Do.	VIRGINIA	
MASSACHUSETTS		Major: Roanoke	Synthetic fiber, railroad repair shops.
Major:		Small:	
Brockton	Shoes.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	Coal mining.
Fall River, Mass.-R.I.	Textiles.	Richlands-Bluefield	Do.
Lawrence	Do.	Carroll and Grayson	Lumber textiles.
Lowell	Do.	WEST VIRGINIA	
New Bedford	Do.	Major:	
Springfield-Holyoke	Ordinance, air conditioning.	Charleston	Coal mining.
Small:		Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	Railroad repair shops, machinery, stone and glass products, defense industries.
Newburyport	Shoes.	Wheeling, W. Va., Steubenville, Ohio	Coal mining, pottery and glass products.
North Adams	Textiles, electrical equipment.	Small:	
Webster-Southbridge	Textiles.	Beckley	Coal mining.
Very small:		Bluefield	Do.
Clinton	Abrasive, metal.	Clarksburg	Do.
Gloucester	Food processing.	Fairmont	Do.
Great Barrington	Textiles.	Logan	Do.
Plymouth	Lack of year-round jobs.	Martinsburg	Metals.
Hyannis	Do.	Morgantown	Coal mining.
RHODE ISLAND		Parkersburg	Chemical.
Major: Providence	Textiles.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, W. Va.-Ohio	Synthetic fibers, coal mining.
VERMONT		Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	Lack of year-round job opportunities, coal mining.
Very small: St. Johnsbury	Lumber and timber products.	Welch	Coal mining.
NEW JERSEY		ALABAMA	
Major:		Major: Birmingham	Mining and railroad equipment.
Atlantic City	Lack of year-round jobs.	Small:	
Trenton	Metal.	Anniston	Military establishment, iron foundries, textiles, lumber.
Small:		Florence-Sheffield	Leather, textiles, chemical.
Bridgeton	Dredging, apparel, textiles.	Gadsden	Textiles.
Long Branch	Apparel, lack of year-round jobs.	Jasper	Coal mining.
Very small: Wildwood	Growth in labor force exceeds economic growth.	Talladega	Textiles, ordnance.
NEW YORK		KENTUCKY	
Major:		Major: Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	Household appliance, ordnance, chemicals.
Buffalo	Auto and aircraft.	Small:	
Utica-Rome	Textiles, aircraft, and machinery.	Corbin	Coal mining, railroads, lumber.
Small:		Hazard	Coal mining.
Amsterdam	Carpet.	Madisonville	Do.
Auburn	Machinery, textiles.	Small:	
Elmira	Machinery, electrical equipment.	Middlesboro-Harlan	Do.
Gloversville	Gloves.	Morehead-Grayson	Railroad repair shops, clay refractories.
Jamestown-Dunkirk	Railroads, furniture.	Paintsville-Prestonburg	Coal mining.
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon	Apparel, textiles.	Pikeville-Williamson	Do.
Plattsburgh	Mining, construction.	LOUISIANA	
Wellsville	Oil refining.	Small: Opelousas	Underdeveloped.
PENNSYLVANIA		MISSISSIPPI	
Major:		Small: Biloxi-Gulfport	Food processing and construction.
Altoona	Railroad repair shops.	TENNESSEE	
Erie	Refrigerators, freezers, and air conditioners.	Major: Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	Textiles, iron foundries.
Johnstown	Bituminous coal mining.	Small: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	Coal mining.
Pittsburgh	Coal mining, machinery.	OKLAHOMA	
Scranton	Anthracite coal mining.	Small:	
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	Anthracite coal mining, textiles.	Ardmore	Oil well drilling and military installation.
Small:		McAlester	Coal mining, military installation.
Berwick-Bloomsburg	Railroad equipment.	Muskogee	Chemicals (military).
Butler	Railroad equipment, limestone quarries.	Okmulgee-Henryetta	Mining, stone, clay and glass products.
Clearfield-DuBois	Coal mining, railroads, stone, clay, and glass products.	TEXAS	
Indiana	Coal mining.	Major: Beaumont-Port Arthur	Oil drilling and refining, machinery and equipment.
Kittanning-Ford City	Coal mining, limestone quarries.	Small:	
Lewiston	Synthetic fiber, iron and steel forgings, railroads, and clay products.	Galveston-Texas City	Chemical and petroleum products.
Meadville	Slide fastener and electrical machinery.	Laredo	Antimony and Federal installation.
New Castle	Machinery.	Texarkana, Texas-Ark.	Ordnance, military installation.
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville	Oil-refining equipment and primary metals.	Karnes City	
Pottsville	Anthracite coal mining.	ILLINOIS	
St. Mary's	Electrical machinery.	Small:	
Sayre-Athens-Towanda	Railroad repair shops, machinery.	Centralla	Nonferrous metals, shoes.
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel	Coal mining, railroad equipment, textiles.	Harrisburg	Coal, fluorspar mining, nonferrous metals.
Williamsport	Textiles and automobile.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort	Coal mining and radio.
FLORIDA		Mount Carmel-Olney	Coal mining and petroleum refining.
Very small: Apalachicola	Commercial fishing.	Mount Vernon	Railroad cars.
MARYLAND			
Small:			
Cumberland, Md.-W. Va.	Textiles, mining and railroad repair shops.		
Cambridge	Food processing.		
Hagerstown	Aircraft.		
Garrett	Mining.		
Very small:			
Crisfield	Food processing.		
Elkton	Ordnance, automobiles.		

FACT SHEET No. 42.—Industries principally responsible for heavy unemployment in distressed labor markets (November 1959)—Con.

Distressed labor market		Industry principally responsible for heavy unemployment	Distressed labor market		Industry principally responsible for heavy unemployment
INDIANA			MISSOURI		
Major:			Small:		
Evansville.....		Mechanical refrigerator, aircraft parts and autos.	Cape Girardeau.....		Lead mining, glass, railroad repair shops.
Terre Haute.....		Coal mining and railroads.	Flat River.....		Farming and shoes.
Small:			Hannibal.....		Mining and chemicals.
Connersville.....		Machinery.	Joplin.....		Shoes.
Vincennes.....		Coal mining, shoes.	Washington.....		
MICHIGAN			Very small:		
Major:			Caruthersville.....		Cotton producing.
Detroit.....		Automobiles.	Marshall.....		Farming and shoes.
Flint.....		Do.	Versailles.....		Farming.
Small:			COLORADO		
Adrian.....		Do.	Very small:	Trinidad.....	
Bay City.....		Automobiles, machinery.	MONTANA		
Iron Mountain.....		Auto bodies, iron ore mining, lumber.	Small:		
Marquette.....		Iron ore mining, lumber.	Butte.....		Copper mining.
Monroe.....		Automobiles.	Kalispell.....		Logging and lumbering.
Port Huron.....		Automobiles, primary metals.	NEW MEXICO		
OHIO			Very small:		
Small:			Raton.....		
Athens-Logan-Nelsonville.....		Coal mining, stone, clay, and glass products, shoes, printing.	Deming.....		
Portsmouth-Chillicothe.....		Shoes and construction, atomic installation.	Las Vegas.....		
WISCONSIN			WASHINGTON		
Small:	La Crosse.....	Automobiles and aircraft.	Small:		
KANSAS			Aberdeen.....		Lumbering.
Small:			Anacortes-Mount Vernon.....		Lumbering, food processing.
Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons.....		Depletion of oil and natural-gas reserves, ordnance.	Bellingham.....		Shipbuilding and lumbering.
Pittsburg.....		Coal, lead, zinc mining, and ordnance.	Bremerton.....		Shipyards, military installation.
MINNESOTA			Port Angeles.....		Lumbering, military installation.
Major:	Duluth-Superior.....	Iron ore, lack of year-round opportunities.	Yakima.....		Food processing.
			ALASKA		
			Anchorage.....		No year-round employment, underdevelopment.
			Fairbanks.....		
			Juneau.....		
			Ketchikan.....		
			Petersburg.....		

FACT SHEET No. 42A.—*Industries primarily responsible for heavy unemployment in chronically distressed labor markets*

Industry	State	Chronically distressed labor market	Industry	State	Chronically distressed labor market
I. Mining industries:			II. Quarrying:		
A. Anthracite	Pennsylvania.....	Scranton. Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton. Pottsville. Johnstown. Pittsburgh. Clearfield-DuBois. Indiana. Kittanning-Ford City. Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount-Carmel.	A. Limestone	Pennsylvania.....	Butler. Kittanning-Ford City. Plattsburgh. Apalachicola. Bridgeton. Calais. Eastport. Gloucester. Cambridge. Crisfield.
B. Bituminous	do.....	Cumberland, Md.-W. Va. Garrett. Big Stone Gap-Appalachia. Richlands-Bluefield. Charleston. Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio. Beckley. Bluefield. Clarksburg. Fairmont. Logan. Morgantown. Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, W. Va.-Ohio. Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs. Birmingham.	III. Fishing and seafood processing.	New York..... Florida..... New Jersey..... Maine..... Massachusetts..... Maryland..... Mississippi..... Washington.....	Biloxi-Gulfport. Anacortes-Mount Vernon. Yakima. Wellsville. Mount Carmel-Olney. Ardmore. Beaumont-Port Arthur. Durham. Kinston. Rocky Mount. Wilson. Danielson. Norwich. Thompsonville. Biddelford-Sanford. Lewiston-Auburn. Fall River, Mass.-R.I. Lawrence. Lowell. New Bedford. North Adams. Webster-Southbridge. Great Barrington. Providence. Bridgeton. Utica-Roma. Amsterdam. Auburn. Gloversville. Newburgh-Middletown-Bacon.
	Maryland.....		IV. Oil refining	New York..... Illinois..... Oklahoma..... Texas.....	
	Virginia.....		V. Tobacco	North Carolina.....	
	West Virginia.....		VI. Textiles	Connecticut.....	
				Maine.....	
				Massachusetts.....	
				Rhode Island.....	
				New Jersey.....	
				New York.....	
				Pennsylvania.....	
				Maryland.....	
				North Carolina.....	
				Virginia.....	
				West Virginia.....	
C. Other mining:					
1. Fluorspar.....	Illinois.....	Harrisburg.			
2. Iron ore.....	Michigan.....	Marquette. Iron Mountain. Duluth-Superior. Plattsburg. Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons. Pittsburg. Flat River. Butte. Laredo.			
3. Lead and zinc.....	Minnesota..... New York..... Kansas.....				
4. Copper.....	Missouri.....				
5. Antimony.....	Montana..... Texas.....				

FACT SHEET No. 42A.—Industries primarily responsible for heavy unemployment in chronically distressed labor markets—Continued

Industry	State	Chronically distressed labor market	Industry	State	Chronically distressed labor market
VI. Textiles.....	Alabama.....	Anniston. Florence-Sheffield. Gadsden. Talladega.	XII. Automobiles.....	Michigan.....	Bay City. Iron Mountain. Monroe. Port Huron. La Crosse. Buffalo. Utica-Rome. Hagerstown. La Crosse. Evansville. Springfield-Holyoke. Elkton. Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio. Talladega. Louisville. Corbin. Morehead-Grayson. Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.. Pittsburg. Coffeeville-Independence-Parsons.
VII. Apparel.....	Tennessee.....	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	XIII. Aircraft.....	Wisconsin.....	
	New York.....	Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.		New York.....	
	New Jersey.....	Bridgeton. Long Branch.		Maryland.....	
	Pennsylvania.....	Scranton. Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.		Wisconsin.....	
VIII. Logging and lumber.....	Maine.....	Calais. Eastport. St. Johnsburg.	XIV. Ordnance.....	Indiana.....	
	Vermont.....	Carroll and Grayson.		Massachusetts.....	
	Virginia.....	Anniston.		Maryland.....	
	Alabama.....	Corbin.		West Virginia.....	
	Kentucky.....	Iron Mountain.		Alabama.....	
	Michigan.....	Marquette.		Kentucky.....	
	Montana.....	Kalspell.		Texas.....	
	Washington.....	Aberdeen. Anacortes-Mount Vernon. Port Angeles. Bellingham.	XV. Railroads and repair shops.	Kansas.....	
IX. Shoes.....	Maine.....	Lewiston-Auburn.		New York.....	
	Massachusetts.....	Brockton. Newburyport.		Pennsylvania.....	
	Illinois.....	Centralia.			
	Indiana.....	Vincennes.		Maryland.....	
	Ohio.....	Athens-Logan-Nelsonville. Portsmouth-Chillicothe.		Virginia.....	
	Missouri.....	Hannibal.		West Virginia.....	
		Washington.		Indiana.....	
		Marshall.		Missouri.....	
X. Leather.....	Alabama.....	Florence-Sheffield.	XVI. Stone, clay, glass, pottery.	Pennsylvania.....	
XI. Metal and products:					
A. Fabricated.....	Maine.....	Portland.		West Virginia.....	
	Massachusetts.....	Clinton.			
	New Jersey.....	Trenton.		Kentucky.....	
	West Virginia.....	Martinsburg.		Oklahoma.....	
B. Brass.....	Connecticut.....	Ansonia.		Ohio.....	
		Bristol.		Athens-Logan-Nelsonville.	
C. Clocks and watches.....	Connecticut.....	Do.	XVII. Chemicals.....	West Virginia.....	
D. Air conditioners.....	Massachusetts.....	Springfield-Holyoke.		Alabama.....	
	Pennsylvania.....	Erie.		Kentucky.....	
E. Refrigerators.....	do.....	Do.		Oklahoma.....	
F. Textile machinery.....	Indiana.....	Evansville.		Texas.....	
	Maine.....	Biddeford-Sanford.		Missouri.....	
	New York.....	Elmira.	XVIII. Federal and military installations.	North Carolina.....	
G. Electrical equipment.	Massachusetts.....	North Adams.		Alabama.....	
	Pennsylvania.....	St. Mary's.		Oklahoma.....	
H. Machinery.....	New York.....	Meadville.		Texas.....	
		Utica-Rome.			
		Auburn.		Ohio.....	
		Elmira.		Washington.....	
	Pennsylvania.....	New Castle.	XIX. Shipbuilding.....	do.....	
		Pittsburgh.			
		Sayre-Athens-Towanda.		North Carolina.....	
	Indiana.....	Connersville.	XX. Agriculture.....	Missouri.....	
	Michigan.....	Bay City.			
	Texas.....	Beaumont-Port Arthur.			
	West Virginia.....	Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio.			
I. Railroad equipment.	Pennsylvania.....	Berwick-Bloomsburg.	XXI. Lack of year-round job opportunities.	Maine.....	
		Butler.		Massachusetts.....	
		Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.			
	Alabama.....	Birmingham.		New Jersey.....	
	Illinois.....	Mount Vernon.			
J. Others.....	Pennsylvania.....	Lewiston (forgings).		North Carolina.....	
		Meadville (slide fasteners).		West Virginia.....	
		Oil City-Franklin-Titusville (oil-refining equipment).		Minnesota.....	
	Alabama.....	Anniston (iron).		Alaska.....	
	Tennessee.....	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga. (iron foundries).			
	Kentucky.....	Louisville, Ky.-Ind. (household appliances).	XXII. Inadequate growth.....	New Jersey.....	
	Illinois.....	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort (radio).		South Carolina.....	
XII. Automobiles.....	New York.....	Buffalo.		Louisiana.....	
	Pennsylvania.....	Williamsport.	XXIII. Construction.....	New York.....	
	Maryland.....	Elkton.		North Carolina.....	
	Michigan.....	Detroit.		Mississippi.....	
		Flint.	XXIV. Depletion of natural resources.	Kansas.....	
		Adrian.			

Source: Area Employment Expansion Committee, New York, N.Y.

Gettysburg Battlefield**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial appearing in the Sunbury Daily Item, of Sunbury, Pa., on February 19 last, as follows:

Gettysburg battlefield holds a secure place in American history, but with one of its important segments slated for sale, word comes from Washington that funds allocated by Congress to acquire additional land have been spent elsewhere. The reason given is that failure of local authorities to enact zoning regulations ruled out purchase of the desired property by the National Park Service. As a result the \$450,000 allocated for this purpose was committed to the acquisition of additional land at Manassas (Bull Run) battlefield.

Commercialism has been permitted to become rife on the Gettysburg Battlefield which has far more than its quota of souvenir stands, hotdog palaces, auto junkyards, motels, and housing developments. Now with the land on which the first day's fighting in the battle which turned the tide of the Civil War available to any fast-buck operator, diversion of funds intended to protect this world shrine from further encroachment is attributed to dillydallying on the part of small-time officials. To what extent buckpassing is involved in this impasse cannot in fairness be stated. It should be entirely obvious, however, that Congress and the National Park Service have obligations to the people in the matter of preserving this hallowed ground. A request now before Congress for \$400,000 for further purchase of Civil War battlefield land in the fiscal year beginning July 1 may be meaningless in halting another serious incursion of commercialism, but Gettysburg merits serious and special consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee that has heard considerable testimony on this subject I would like to clarify the situation by pointing out that the 1961 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, as it passed the House on February 16, included provision of the full budget request of \$400,000 for the continued acquisition of Civil War battlefield lands by the National Park Service. In recommending this appropriation, which included \$200,000 for acquisition of lands at Gettysburg, the Committee on Appropriations felt it expedient to continue the same stipulations placed upon acquiring such lands by the House and Senate last year to the effect that these funds should not be spent by the Department of the Interior until such time as adequate zoning laws were developed by local authorities to prevent commercial development and that the funds should not be used to acquire the Adams County Poor Farm.

As general background to this subject, it must be realized that the Federal Government now owns and maintains 18,000 acres of Civil War battlefield lands, including 2,800 acres at Gettys-

burg. The cost to the Federal taxpayers of acquiring these lands, with the accompanying requirement of roads, buildings, utilities, etc., is evidenced by the fact that at Gettysburg alone the Government has spent over \$3 million during the last 10 years. The Park Service plan of last year was that during the next 4 years an additional \$5 million worth of land be acquired at Civil War battlefield sites. This included a proposal to acquire an additional 691 acres at Gettysburg at an estimated cost of \$2,415,000. With such large expenditures involved, I believe that the general public now will appreciate the necessity to assure that future acquisitions are protected from commercial development on adjacent properties. If not, we have the never-ending problem that one purchase necessitates still another purchase as we move on down the street.

The action of the House of Representatives this year in providing the funds and continuing the provision requiring adequate local zoning is in line with the testimony received by the committee during its hearings. The net effect of such testimony was that the committee not necessarily open its pocketbook, but rather that it keep an open mind on this subject until local authorities have had an opportunity to do something about the problem.

Current efforts along three lines, if successful, should solve the problems at Gettysburg. First, local authorities are now working toward the adoption of necessary zoning regulations. Second, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association has been organized and is proceeding with a nationwide fundraising campaign which should provide significant revenues to be used for acquiring additional lands. Third, under consideration is a possible exchange plan which would permit the National Park Service to swap some of the present property owned by the Federal Government for property such as that in Adams County which is of greater historical significance. Although certain legal complications must be overcome, these do not appear insurmountable.

No Deterrent Gap in Our Defenses**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the main excerpt from the address of Hon. Robert K. Gray, secretary to the Cabinet, before the Missouri Association of Republicans at St. Louis, Mo., on Saturday, February 13, 1960, which deals with our military defense:

No army, political or military, wisely goes into battle without an appraisal of its enemies and the issues involved. With peace, progress, and prosperity at hand, it is obvious that the Democrats are going to have

to center their guns on other issues. In the brief time that remains for our discussion tonight, let us meet head on the issue to which they have been giving most attention in the recent press—the defenses of America and the so-called missile gap.

Having devoted a lifetime to military planning and national defense, having led the Allied Forces in the liberation of Europe, as a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at home and as former commander of SHAPE overseas, it is easy to see why Dwight Eisenhower puts the highest emphasis on our national security and the preservation of the American way of life. It is easy to see why he considers defense needs before he considers any other when preparing his national budget, for America can afford what she must afford for her security.

It is interesting to note that in the years following World War II when the Russians were getting their headstart in the missile field, the Democratic administration, until its last year in office, never spent so much as a million dollars for research and production in this area. In fact, your Republican administration is spending 10 times as much each day on ballistic missile programs as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952.

To cover the embarrassment at having left America at the starting gate for 6 years, Democrats would now have us pour money and men into crash programs which would accomplish only the disruption of the sound and orderly existing missile programs on which our skilled research and development manpower is being taxed to the fullest.

Despite their talk of gloom and doom and during the period when they have raised congressional appropriations on domestic issues by many billions of dollars, it is significant to note that the President's budget requests for major military appropriations have not been significantly changed in the last several years. This seems clear evidence that the Democrats appreciate the complete adequacy of the Eisenhower defense budget, and that when making their dire predictions they are really more political than perturbed.

If these debates over America's preparedness were motivated by sincere conviction they would be excusable. To beat false drums for political purposes, however, is costly to a democracy which depends upon an informed public for its greatest strength.

To start a war of aggression is completely against our American principles. America's defense arsenal has been built to protect our Nation and her allies from attack and to present to those who might consider war against us the prospect of total annihilation in exchange for their folly.

Our military needs, both strategic and tactical, are different from the Soviets. The weapons in our arsenal, both in kind and number, must be tailored to our needs and not to theirs. We arm ourselves for a different purpose. Our intentions and our policies are as different as our geography. A perfect case in point is the intercontinental ballistic missile controversy now raging in the Nation's Capital. From Russia's standpoint, full emphasis on intercontinental ballistic missiles makes sense. This is one of the few ways she can reach America, a target thousands of miles from the borders of the Iron Curtain countries. On the other hand, Russia's coast is flanked by our allies; Norway on the west, Turkey on the south, and Japan on the east. From these vantage points, intermediate-range ballistic missiles are just as effective. You obtain no greater explosive power from a bomb dropped on a military target just because it traveled thousands of miles to reach its destination.

We gain nothing by this numbers' game the Democrats would have us play—this insistence that we have as many marbles of the same color in our bag as the perspective enemy has in his. It is ironic, isn't it, that the party that claims that we Republicans worry too much about the arithmetic

of budget balances, apparently would have us substitute the adding machine for judgment when it comes to providing for the Nation's defense.

This Nation has now in being over 1,500 SAC bombers, each of them capable of carrying a bomb scores of times more powerful than the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. We have over a 1,000 B-47's, again each of them capable of carrying a bomb hundreds of times more powerful than the one that destroyed Hiroshima.

With the same capability, we have several hundred B-52's. We have 15 carriers, each with 50 planes, each plane capable again of carrying nuclear weapons hundreds of times as powerful as those which brought complete destruction to Japanese cities in World War II. We have several squadrons of Thor intermediate ballistic missiles located in England and Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missiles located in Italy. We have hundreds of tactical bombers based in Western Europe and the Far East. And before this year is out, we will have the Polaris submarines with their 1,200-mile range capable of reaching 90 percent of the industry and people of the Soviet Union. We have in our American arsenal today the horrible, terrible ability of creating thousands of Hiroshimas. It is not saber rattling to say that the Soviets know that the United States has the ability, right now, in being, to destroy the Soviet Union. Make no mistake about this. No aggressor today can knock out the deterrent striking power of America and her allies.

The important thing to be noted by politicians in America and by America's enemies wherever they may be is that there is no deterrent gap in our country's defense arsenal.

Those who preach the false doctrine that America is unprepared because she has not assembled the identical weapons of aggressor nations, endanger the very country they profess to save, in at least four ways. First, they run the risk of creating a defeatist attitude in America. This would be bad if it were justified; it is wholly unforgivable since it is not. Second, they shake the faith of our allies in the strength of America. Third, their talk of weakness influences uncommitted nations and fourth, if they are too persistent, they may eventually convince one of Russia's parochial generals that these phrophets of gloom are right, that we are indeed weak, and thereby entice the Soviets to make the horrendous, horrible mistake of beginning World War III.

It is time for politicians for the sake of pet projects and political fortunes to stop selling America short. We are a first-rate country with a first-rate military strength and with a first-rate economy . . . thanks to our Republican President, backed by a handful of determined Republicans and their joint efforts to distinguish in this country between the desired and the truly necessary.

As a party, what the Democrats have been up to in the past 7 years marks more clearly than ever before one basic difference between our two organizations. It is best illustrated by a table, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of the last session, and which listed 20 big spending bills introduced in the House and another 20 introduced in the Senate, together with their estimated cost. Every one of these "wild blue yonder" proposals was sponsored by a congressional Democrat. You may find this hard to believe but the grand total of this shopping list came to over \$326 billion over an average period of only 5 years. This amount is \$30 billion more than the entire national debt today.

Now make no mistake. Many of these proposals include improvements we would all welcome for America, but not at the expense of destroying our American tradition of personal initiative, and our national solvency.

As a party we stress the importance of faith in the individual, restrained Government leadership, and determination to guard against the growth of power in Washington. In simple terms, I believe the basic difference between our two parties is this: both parties want more and more, better and better things for America and for Americans. But we Republicans recognize that only a socialistic form of government attempts to provide these services from a Federal bureaucracy. In a democracy, free-spirited citizens have traditionally proved their ability to provide these improvements less expensively for themselves.

To state it one more way, we Republicans believe the current do-it-yourself craze can be wisely applied to many of the demands we Americans make on our Government.

Many support this philosophy and yet call themselves Democrats. And I must say that if, by family tradition or personal habit, a man prefers to call himself a Democrat, he will get no quarrel from me if he supports our party's philosophy and backs its candidates.

As we Republicans face this election basking in a party unity which does credit to us all, it would be easy to sympathize with the harangues of the Democrats, to forgive their name calling, and to overlook tactics as obvious as a mustache drawn on the Mona Lisa.

But we have a job to do. As responsible Republicans we must present the facts to our fellow citizens less interested or less informed. If you and I and our fellow Republicans do our part in the coming campaign and put across to the voter the image of our party—that image found in the composite of its platform, its record, its incumbents, and its candidates, then all of us can mark this 1960 in red ink on our calendars for it will be a great year for our cause.

Action Is the Need, Not Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in the Journal of Commerce for Friday, February 5, 1960, there appears an article which has just been brought to my attention. It clearly sets forth the need for some realistic thinking concerning the future of our merchant marine. I commend the reading of this article to all my colleagues who are interested in this phase of our national defense and commerce.

SHIPPING OUTLOOK—ACTION IS THE NEED, NOT WORDS

(By Stanley Mantrop)

The annual budget message handed down to Congress by the President contains suggestions for an additional study of merchant marine matters. What puzzles us, as well as the shipping industry, is just what this new study is expected to turn up.

Studies of this nature have been going on for years. In fact, one of them, conducted in 1930, resulted in the passage of the 1936 Shipping Act.

This proposed new study like every one which preceded it—and there have been many—turned up only one conclusion. This country needs a strong merchant marine for defense as well as for the country's foreign

commerce. And if the United States is to have a merchant marine it must be subsidized to exist.

The industry feels, and rightly so, that it should have received a better break in the President's budget message. In short, at the very least it should have contained suggestions of a more constructive nature in connection with future policy for the merchant marine.

It could also have shown more determination and greater realism by the Government in facing up to its obligations in relation to the merchant marine.

There is no doubt but that the bulk of the American-flag fleet is fast reaching the obsolescence stage and that steps must be taken to get a major building program underway as quickly as possible. And this takes money—much more than the Government has allocated or proposed in this year's budget.

This year's allocation would provide for financial support for only 14 new ships which is far short of the figure the industry feels it needs to meet the competition it presently faces.

There is merit to the industry's view that the money being proposed in the budget for new construction subsidy payments is far from adequate in view of the industry's claim that at least 300 new ships will be needed shortly to replace this country's overage tonnage.

On the other hand, it must be admitted the industry, in many cases, has been slow in meeting its construction obligations under its contracts. But in all fairness it must be pointed out that the lines must get greater Government support, and be assured of greater economic returns from its present ships before large new sums can be allocated by them for ship replacements.

Each year in the last 10, the Maritime Administration has been unable to obligate all its construction funds even under a modest construction program as that presently being proposed because of the slowness of the subsidized lines to finalize contracts for construction. However, the industry has had little in the way of incentive to make capital expenditures for new construction.

The illusion that the merchant marine can carry on without subsidy as some believe should be dispelled. And no amount of new studies are going to alter this fact.

If the United States wants a merchant marine it will have to be continued under subsidy. And this might very well include the tramp ship fleets if the Government feels they are important to the welfare of the country.

The tramp operators have been rapping at the Government's door for a long time seeking some financial aid in order to exist and something is going to have to be done if this segment of the industry is going to survive.

Nobody will deny, and this includes the Government, that this country's tramp fleet is virtually over the hill and is made up of overage ships. And there is little likelihood the industry is going to be able to replace the ships from the present day financial returns—or lack of them.

There is no doubt but that the shipping industry's plea for a realistic approach to the maritime industry's problems has merit. The time has long since passed when new studies can produce anything new that will solve some of these perplexing problems.

The time has come for the Government to determine whether or not it wants a merchant marine. If it does then steps must be taken to support it to the fullest.

Clearly what is needed is not more words, but more up-to-date competitive merchant vessels capable of serving the United States efficiently in war and in peace.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times, Oliver Emmerich, has written an excellent editorial on the danger of proposed legislation which may lead to socialized medicine.

I commend this editorial to the membership. It follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times, Feb. 20, 1960]

AGAIN THE CLAMOR IS HEARD FOR SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Oliver Emmerich)

If our system of government were easy to maintain, it would be in force all over the earth.

The high standard of living in countries with freedom of action proves the value of our ideologies.

But people are either too unenlightened as is the case with primitive people or too enslaved politically as is the case with the Iron Curtain countries to enjoy the system which we enjoy.

The trend in America today moves us to ask ourselves, "Do we want the kind of government we have today or do we want to swap it for a different kind of government?"

With this prelude we discuss a proposition which has the elements of popular appeal and also is a part of the system of state socialism—free government medicine for the aged.

Are men inhuman and wicked when they oppose such a thing as free medicine for the aged? People who advocate it say that men are evil if they lend a deaf ear to human misery.

Is President Eisenhower an evil man? He said:

"If the time ever comes when large numbers of our citizens turn primarily to the Government for assistance in what ought to remain a private arrangement between doctor and patient, then we shall all have suffered a great loss . . ."

Even the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Arthur Flemming, said:

"We are convinced that the objective of making adequate medical care reasonably available to our aged population should, so far as possible, be achieved through reliance upon and encouragement of individual and organized voluntary action."

The Farm Bureau is an organization which is close to the rural people of America and seeking to lift the income and living standard of farm people.

The Farm Bureau has long opposed programs which may lead to socialized medicine. The proposal to provide for health care of the aged, whether retired or not, and for survivors entitled to benefits, is a long step in this direction.

We fear the proposition of compulsory health insurance and medical aid for the aged is another step away from the private enterprise system which has done so much for the American people.

In the United States we have such a high standard of living that we subconsciously believe that this standard is worldwide. It is a far cry from that in a country such as India where a man may own a tree and regard its branches and its shade as shelter for his family.

The Baptist Standard, an organ of the Baptist Church, expressed the idea. It said: "Whatever concerns human welfare should concern the Christian churches. Consequently, we have sought to study the proposal (H.R. 4700) closely before voicing an opinion on it. The conclusion is that this could be one of the most far-reaching bills to face the Congress because it could easily be the forerunner of socialized medicine and one more big step toward the total regimentation of American citizens by their own Government."

"Everyone needs hospital insurance, but the National Treasury is not the place to get it. When the Government pays the bill, it will ultimately name the doctor and the hospital."

In Washington again the cry for socialized medicine is on. It failed in previous efforts. Now a new approach is used. This time the goal is sought through a series of steps. Medicine for the aged is one. Compulsory health insurance is another. Meanwhile our American ideology is being tested.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted at the annual banquet commemorating the 42d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence held in East Chicago, Ind., on Sunday, February 21:

Whereas the peace-loving and progressive Lithuanian Nation, notwithstanding its loyalty to international treaties and agreements, fell victim to unprovoked aggression and military invasion of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had rightly and deservedly enjoyed for many centuries in the past; and

Whereas, because of their manifest and unmistakable anti-Communist attitude, the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, backed by their kinsmen in the free world, represent an active and reliable outpost in the present defense front of the free nations against international communism; and

Whereas the Soviet dictatorship constantly strives to extend its rule over the new territories in Europe, Asia, and Africa and seeks to dominate the whole world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this gathering appeal to the Government of the United States to respond to the demands of our times by giving wise and coordinated leadership to the troubled world aspiring to peace, justice, and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our consensus that American leadership in the fight for freedom and peace will be best exerted by inaugurating strong and dynamic policy aimed not only at preventing further expansion of Communist imperialism but also at abolishing the fruits of all past Kremlin aggressions; be it

Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights of self-determina-

tion to the Lithuanian people and to other enslaved Eastern European Nations.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
President, Lithuanian American Council.
Rev. PETER CELESIUS,
Secretary, Lithuanian American Council.

The 10th Pennsylvania and the War of 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some facts concerning the glorious 10th Pennsylvania Volunteers who served in the War with Spain in 1898. My esteemed friend and fellow Pennsylvanian, former Senator Edward Martin, then a youth of 19, served in this regiment and I know I speak for him when I say that it is one of the proudest, fondest memories of a life crowded with service to his State and his country. I may add that Senator Martin has, in his time, served in all grades of the service from buck private to major general; he is the recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster; the Order of the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the American Legion Distinguished Service Medal. He was placed on the initial general staff eligibility list; he has served his State as auditor general, State treasurer, adjutant general, Governor and finally, Senator of the United States.

As a Pennsylvanian, it seems fitting to me to insert for permanent reference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the contemporary press comments on the parade of the 10th Pennsylvanians on September 30, 1899, in New York City in honor of the homecoming of Admiral Dewey from the great victory at Manila.

There are 94 surviving members of the "Fighting 10th" Pennsylvanians. I am sure that all Members of this House and of the Senate will join with me in profound salutation of these heroes of long ago. The statements follow:

The Sun said:

"At the end (of the Pennsylvania line) came the veteran 10th. The men were in khaki trousers, blue flannel shirts and service hats that looked as if they had seen really more service than any hat ought to be called upon to endure. They came in the same attire they wore when they marched abroad the transport at Manila and cheered for the country to which they were returning after their hard service. And they looked veterans and carried themselves like veterans, every man of them. When the admiral caught sight of the 10th's flag he took off his hat and held it down to his side, and he looked at those worn colors as a man looks at that which he loves, and stood so, uncovered and with his face turned toward them, until they had passed under the arch. It was the most impressive sight of an impressive day, for it took the mind away for a moment from the glory of the pageant to the stern work of war of which that glory is

but a symbol, and to the American soldiers who are doing that work under other tattered banners in the Far East.

"It was the reception of the day, by all odds, and there was no let up until the last 10th man has gone by."

The Herald said:

"The 10th Pennsylvania was fresh from Manila, where it had been, its brave colonel and many another, too, and the welcome was a hearty one. The word passed from mouth to mouth, 'Here comes the "Fighting 10th"'" and flags and handkerchiefs fluttered, while a roar of welcome rose and rolled like a great wave down the line of march. The regiment made a splendid appearance. Their shabby campaign-worn uniforms were a change from the spic-and-span splendor of New York's showy attire that on this occasion was mightily appreciated. They marched in the faded blue flannel shirts they wore at Manila, with the brown campaign trousers and leggings, often soiled and faded, and the crowds got afoot on every hand and bawled. They were a splendid lot of men, too, and fitted well their grim, business-looking garb.

"When the color company came along, bearing the battle flag, worn to tatters with use and exposure, the mere skeleton of the Stars and Stripes, enthusiasm burst all bounds. Many remarked that splendid though the reception of the 71st had been, the regiment had missed a great point by appearing on parade in full dress uniform rather than in the rough garb of Saritoga."

The Times said:

"Pennsylvania was represented by some of its best troops, and the appearance of the 10th Regiment of that State, recently returned from Manila, was the signal for tumultuous cheering on every hand. These troops, bronzed and worn with their service in the Philippines, constituted one of the distinctive features of the parade. The torn and stained condition of the buff uniforms told an eloquent tale of service in the field, and the men's faces and hands were almost the same color as their uniforms.

"They looked like veterans, and they marched with the ease and uniformity of veterans. The regimental flag, which the bearer held proudly aloft, was in shreds and begrimed with smoke and powder."

The Tribune said:

"The Governor of Pennsylvania caused the crowd to shout and the admiral's hat to come off again, and good, hardy soldiers the men looked who followed him. And it was when the 10th Regiment of that State, fresh from the Philippines (or, rather, anything but fresh), in flannel shirts and khakis, came past, that the crowd fairly lost its head and hurrahed till it had no voice left. And the American people don't want expansion? Then that stand was occupied by some curious chance collection of foreigners. The admiral's hat was off again. It was curious that the things that pleased the crowd most were always the ones that brought the admiral's hat off his head. The admiral's hat was quite a barometer to American opinion."

The Journal said:

"The Pennsylvanians came, and it was left for the 10th Pennsylvania to harvest the tribute which in these times must fall to the grimed, hard and sunburned and sometimes, fever-whitened fighting man. The tumult which awoke at the sight of them seemed to fall on deaf ears. They strode down the noisy avenue as if they were going to a feast of tack, sowbelly and canned tomatoes, and looked grim about it, as they well might. After Dewey and Admiral Schley, and perhaps Governor Roosevelt and his stunning escort, the honors of the day fell to the dirty men with immobile faces, shaded under worn service hats, who so short a time ago came home from the Philippines."

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years, I have made an annual survey of public opinion in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio on important national issues. The response to each of these polls has been, without exception, most gratifying and informative. Its results represent, I believe, an excellent indication of prevailing thinking in southeastern Ohio.

Many of my colleagues here have expressed an interest in this poll and its findings. The questions which are included in the 1960 survey are as follows:

1. Do you believe it advisable that the Federal Government balance its budget and reduce the national debt? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Are you in favor of providing Federal tax benefits to companies which will employ greater numbers of persons over 50 years of age? Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do you believe that the Defense Education Act should be changed to eliminate the requirement that students receiving Federal loans take loyalty oaths? Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Would you favor Federal aid for school construction even though it would require tax increases or deficit financing? Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Do you feel that the \$45½ billion requested for defense next year is sufficient for our national security? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Would you favor granting the President the power to veto parts of appropriation bills passed by Congress in place of the present system requiring his acceptance or veto of entire bills? Yes ☐ No ☐
7. Do you support a temporary increase in the Federal gasoline tax of one-half cent per gallon to pay for the highway construction program? Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Do you favor changes in the Taft-Hartley Act to eliminate the power of States to enact their own right-to-work laws? Yes ☐ No ☐
9. Are you in favor of the United States greatly increasing spending in its program for the exploration of outer space? Yes ☐ No ☐
10. Do you believe Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Are you in favor of proposals to give up U.S. ownership of the Panama Canal in favor of international control? Yes ☐ No ☐
12. Do you feel that Congress should enact legislation to give the Federal Government greater power in negotiating settlements of prolonged nationwide labor-management disputes? Yes ☐ No ☐
13. Do you support a national fair trade law whereby a manufacturer could require that his product be sold to a consumer for a stated minimum price? Yes ☐ No ☐
14. Do you favor increasing the hourly minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25? Yes ☐ No ☐
15. Do you favor ending agricultural controls and the termination of price supports? Yes ☐ No ☐
16. Do you favor legislation to provide medical benefits under the social security program financed by an increase in the tax? (Present social security law provides that the combined employee-employer tax will become 9 percent on incomes up to \$4,800 in 1969.) Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Would you favor the Federal Government exercising greater surveillance over practices in radio and TV programs and advertising? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Do you believe Congress should pass civil rights legislation providing Federal guarantees of individual voting rights in Federal elections? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Are you in favor of policies which seek to fight inflation through increases on interest rates for installment credit buying? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Do you feel that the chances for world peace are better today than they were 10 years ago? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Would you support legislation to provide a Federal pension of \$100 per month for all World War I veterans at age 65? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Are you in favor of continuing our present policy of purchasing sugar from Cuba at prices higher than those prevailing on the world market? Yes ☐ No ☐

Comparison of Russian and American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the following report on Russian and American education, which I prepared with the invaluable assistance of Mrs. Margaret Sahlin Malone, of the Education and Public Welfare Division of the Legislative Reference Service. Mrs. Malone, a West Virginian and a former student at the Institute for Russian Studies at Columbia University, is an example of the outstanding West Virginians in many fields of endeavor.

The report follows:

A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN EDUCATION

About a century and a half ago, General Lafayette, a great friend of American freedom and independence, warmly affirmed before our Congress that the United States reflected "on every part of the world the light of a far superior civilization." I wonder how many of us gathered here now has the uneasy feeling that this light may be flickering and dimming in the eyes of many of our friends in other countries. We, ourselves, are beginning to awaken to the fact that there are weaknesses in our civilization which threaten our well-being.

Recently, one of our own countrymen addressed our Congressmen, and the American people, in terms far different from those of Lafayette. He pinpointed a weakness which everyone of us must be concerned about if we are to maintain the superior civilization which is our heritage. I should like to quote a few of the words of Adm. Hyman Rickover, because he posed a problem and a challenge of great significance.

"I could not help wondering," the admiral said, "whether we in this country—privileged as we are to live in a land blessed with every material possession anyone could possibly wish to have—whether we are worthy of the great tradition established over 175 years ago. Are we not neglecting the things of the mind in our near total absorption with comfort and material wealth, with having a good time and with getting by with as little effort as we can? It is this emphasis on a

good time and on avoiding effort which prevents our children from becoming as well educated as children abroad. To become educated takes sustained effort, hard work, excellent instruction by teachers who themselves are excellently educated and who thoroughly know their subjects. Frills, know-how subjects, easy snap courses may seem agreeable to our children today, but they shortchange them for the future. They will have to live in a world where other people are better educated than they. The world outside the United States is being transformed so rapidly and so completely that we cannot afford to stand still. In my opinion we are not adequately planning for the future. Education must be given priority in our scheme of things. Education benefits both the Nation and its individual citizens. It takes a long time to produce highly educated professional men. If we don't take steps now to make sure we do this through our educational system, we will inevitably be bypassed by Russia."

Admiral Rickover, like many others in this country, has compared our educational system with that in the Soviet Union and has found it wanting. It seems painfully apparent that Soviet schools are in many ways doing a better job of training their young people to meet the needs of their society than we are doing to meet the needs of our own.

Soviet schools are not perfect. The Russians do not think so, and there is no reason why we should think so either. Their newspapers often point to what they call shortcomings, which they say must be overcome. They have children who are going to schools which operate on multiple shifts. Some of their textbooks are mediocre, and some of their teachers are, too. Education, though free, is not equally accessible to all. This is especially true of higher education, where the number of students who wish to continue their education is far greater than the number the state is willing to educate. Premier Khrushchev himself has criticized the way the admissions process has been operating. "There are considerable defects," he said, "in the very practice of selecting young people for admission to higher educational institutions. Although there are competitive examinations for admission to higher schools, it must be admitted that frequently it is not enough to pass an examination to enter a higher educational institution." Mr. Khrushchev continued: "There is good reason why young people entering higher educational institutions quite frequently say that after they have won in the admission competition, the competition among the parents begins, and it is this that often settles the matter."

I mention a few of the defects in the Soviet system, and repeat Mr. Khrushchev's words simply to emphasize that it is possible for the Soviet student to be short-changed, too. He doesn't have a corner on the educational market. He does, however, attend school under a system that has virtues we would do well to examine.

Russian school curriculums are, I believe, well designed to meet the needs of a citizen of the modern world. The fact that students in the present 10-year general schools are required to study physics, chemistry, and advanced mathematics means that there is a well-trained corps upon which the universities and institutes can draw in turning out able engineers, scientists, and teachers. Those who do not go on to get a higher education have the training and background to become more knowledgeable and productive workers, and better informed citizens.

I do not believe there can be any question that the Soviet 10-year school curriculum provides for more thorough training in mathematics and science than most of our own schools are offering. Russian students

are required to study mathematics 6 days a week throughout their schooling. Each student who has completed his 10-year education has therefore acquired a thorough grounding in advanced mathematics, and has been exposed to studies that few American students ever become acquainted with. In 1956, for example, only 9.2 percent of our public high school students, who were in the grade where trigonometry is usually taught, were studying that subject. Only 7.6 percent were studying solid geometry. In the Soviet Union, every 10-year school student is required to take these subjects.

The same kind of comparison can be made in the sciences. The Russians believe that all of their young students can benefit from a knowledge of physics and chemistry, and require that they study them. We, far from considering these subjects as requirements, often do not teach them at all. For example, physics is not even offered in 12,000 of our 21,000 high schools.

We in the United States have awakened late in the realization that our country, and our children, are being handicapped by a neglect of foreign language teaching. We know now that we desperately need people who can speak French and German, and Russian, Arabic, and Chinese as well. Yet even the people who have command of one of the familiar Romance languages are few and far between, and the person who knows one of the more esoteric languages is a rarity indeed.

The Russians, on the other hand, begin teaching their children a foreign language when they are in the fifth grade, so that before they complete the secondary school they have had an opportunity to become thoroughly familiar with the language. When they enroll in a university or institute, most of them are required to continue foreign language study in order to pass the foreign language examination given when their academic studies are completed.

This description does not, of course, apply to what we might describe as the Soviet Union's "language elite." There are many Russians who are getting even better language training than that I have just described. In 1956 the Government initiated a new program which has proved overwhelmingly popular among the students and their parents. A number of schools in central Asia have been authorized to start teaching a Near Eastern or Asian language to students in the second grade. The plan is that the children will study the language for several years and then have it as the medium of instruction for all their classes. In this way they will grow up thoroughly at home with one of the world's more difficult languages. This same kind of foreign language program, it should be mentioned, is also being conducted in Moscow and Leningrad.

Items appearing in the Soviet press indicate that the Russians are becoming more and more concerned about teaching their children a foreign language at a very early age. A letter to the editor of *Izvestia*, the official government newspaper, contained the following observation: "The study of a foreign language should begin with the nursery school. Some parents have been organizing groups of preschool children and inviting a person who knows a foreign language to teach them. Isn't it possible to select nursery-school teachers who know a foreign language?" The writer concludes: "This can and must be done."

One of the primary obstacles to improving language training in the United States is the lack of qualified teachers. Since the tremendous emphasis on language training is fairly recent in the Soviet Union, the Russians, too, have this problem. But whereas we are tending to let our language crisis go unresolved, the Russians are taking measures which will assure them of an adequate army of language experts for their schools.

In addition to training thousands of language specialists in the universities and un-specialized pedagogical institutions, they have established a dozen pedagogical institutes of foreign language. These special institutes are designed to provide a highly skilled supply of language teachers to meet the needs of the schools. It should also be noted, I believe, that one of the greatest areas of expansion in all Soviet institutions of higher education has been in foreign language training. The Russians clearly have given language training a high priority rating. And their brilliant scientific achievements have showed us all too clearly what they can accomplish once a goal is set.

In the Soviet Union, the one sure vehicle for success is education. Perhaps it is because of this, rather than an innate love of learning, that the Soviet student is willing to work so hard. But whatever the reason, the fact is that most American students would be appalled at the effort which their counterparts in the Soviet Union put into their studies. Russian students carry a full load of classes 6 days a week. These days are not broken up with study halls and extracurricular activities. The time in school is spent in the classroom, and homework and other pursuits are undertaken after school hours. Many times libraries remain open in the evenings so that students will have access to the books they need.

Because education is considered so important in the Soviet Union, the educator is looked upon with respect, and is compensated accordingly. Compared to American teachers, the teacher in the Soviet general school is poorly paid. But compared to others in the Soviet society, which is a more meaningful basis for comparison, he earns a handsome salary. Beginning teachers are often able to earn salaries equal to those of beginning doctors and engineers, and they are eligible for periodic increases according to length of service.

Persons teaching in universities and institutes are even more generously rewarded. It has been estimated that a Soviet professor earning a typical salary for his rank may make as much as 12 to 15 times the salary of a typical unskilled worker, or 3 to 5 times that of a typical highly skilled worker. Many professors, of course, have salaries far above this range. American professors, who are at the very top of our academic scale, would be stunned at the idea of being paid such high salaries. Even the football coaches do not always do that well.

Speaking again of money, I think we might get some idea of the value the Russians put on education by taking a look at their budget. In 1959, they allocated 94.4 billion rubles to educational and cultural needs. This figure represents 13.5 percent of the total budget. This is an amazingly high figure when you consider the enormous pressure on the Government for development of critical areas of the economy and for defense expenditures. It has been estimated that the Soviet expenditure for general education purposes represents about 8 percent of their gross national product.

We in the United States and in West Virginia, have been rightfully impressed by what we have learned about Soviet education in the last 2 or 3 years. We have learned that the Soviet people, though infinitely poorer than we, have evolved a school system that is turning out young scholars who have received an education which in a number of ways is superior to that which many of our students here have an opportunity to get.

The explanation for the high quality of Soviet schools is no secret. The schools are a potent weapon against us, but they are not based on an unknown formula. I believe that anyone who bothers to read a little about the Soviet system will promptly

conclude that the little Ivans and Olgas of Russia are getting good educations because they, their parents and the State have dedicated themselves to this goal.

Last fall the first official U.S. education mission to the Soviet Union issued a report on its trip, entitled "Soviet Commitment to Education." Shortly thereafter the Christian Science Monitor published an editorial on this report, which I would like to quote to you in part:

"Perhaps Soviet education's greatest asset," the editorial reads, "stems not from methods or mechanics at all, but from what the mission calls the people's 'grand passion' for schooling—a nation intelligent but hitherto largely illiterate for whom the doors of learning have just yesterday been thrown ajar. This is an enormous asset. It can compensate for any number of shortcomings in method, pedagogy, and instructional facilities.

"It can instill the willingness to work hard and long. It can inspire the abler students to pursue their studies higher and higher and attract able teachers to teach them. It can assure that the educators and the educated are rewarded with both money and status."

The editorial concludes: "Not so much state-provided equipment, state-formulated curriculums, or state-set study loads so challenge American education as does this grand passion for schooling."

I frankly wish that we in the United States had a little more of this grand passion for schooling, because if we did—with all our great wealth, our bright, healthy and able youngsters—we could have a society of unequaled strength, wisdom and vigor. The light of a superior civilization that Lafayette applauded would be a bright light, indeed.

With or without this passion, however, there are a number of things we absolutely must do if we are to survive as a democracy in a free world. We must strengthen our study programs. Physics and chemistry must become requirements for all capable students, as must advanced mathematics. Language study should be introduced in the early grades, and should be continued long enough to give the student a mastery of the language. The smattering of high school French or Spanish our boys and girls are now getting is totally insufficient for any useful purpose. Our courses in history and in English literature and grammar must also be expanded and improved. The Russians quote with glee the complaints of our universities that our students cannot even write grammatical sentences. We cannot afford to share their amusement. We have high school students in this country who are unable to identify the names of Hitler or Khrushchev, and who cannot find France on a map. We are only deluding ourselves if we think we can hand these students a high school diploma and call them educated.

If we expect our children to be well taught, we must also see to it that they have an adequate number of well-trained, dedicated teachers. Unfortunately, we are not doing this now. The teacher shortage throughout the country is critical. The situation in West Virginia is almost desperate. A recent study on higher education in the State showed that only a small percentage of the students who receive degrees in education from one of our West Virginia institutions remains in the State to teach. One major reason for this, of course, is the very low salary scale of West Virginia teachers. According to estimates for the last school year, our State ranked 41st in the Nation in average salary paid to classroom teachers. I fear we cannot continue to place such a low value on the services of the men and women who are responsible for educating our young people.

Providing our children with adequate classrooms, equipment and good teachers is

not cheap. But money for education is probably the most rewarding investment we can make. The Russians have learned this lesson. So far we have not. So long as one of our children is sitting in an overcrowded classroom, or is denied the opportunity to learn because of lack of facilities or a teacher, we are doing him and ourselves an irreparable injustice.

Long before the days of the Russian revolution, a great Russian liberal educator, K. K. Ushinsky, observed that the cause of education was "one of the greatest causes of history—a cause on which kingdoms and generations rest." This man was not a Communist. It is a pity, I believe, that his words seem to have had more meaning for the Soviet regime than for our own free country—because I agree, as I am sure you must, that the cause of education is one which will determine our own course of history.

The Pioneer Spirit in Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered before the Research and Demonstration Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded on February 11, 1960, at Dallas, Tex.:

THE PIONEER SPIRIT IN REHABILITATION
(By JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from Rhode Island)

I am particularly glad to be here, for it gives me a warm feeling of participation in the making of rehabilitation history. The fervor of the crusader and the daring of the pioneer are in the spirit that moves our program forward, and it is inspiring to me as a legislator to see some of the ferment of ideas that lead to practical results for rehabilitation and health, based on legislation in whose formulation and enactment I have had some part.

Long before the birth of Christ the Greek historian Thucydides gave us the dictum that history is philosophy learned from examples. There can be no more fitting lyric for the program of vocational rehabilitation than that. We have just entered the stage of building examples of modern rehabilitation methods. As our pioneering projects mature, a more vital and dynamic philosophy of rehabilitation emerges. It is leading to goals that may sound high in casual reading, but we have an aroused people back of us, and the examples and philosophy we are developing will, I am sure, be exciting reading for those who will eventually set down rehabilitation history.

It is my particular pride that I can join you here on especial terms of intimacy with your problems. For more than a dozen years much of my legislative life—and some of my private life, too—has been devoted to the problems of disability. In this work I take great joy. It is satisfying and worthwhile, and more intensely so because of the privilege I have had to bring before Congress, either as chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Appropriations, or as ranking minority member, the annual appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The resurgence of interest in the mentally retarded is one of the great satisfactions of our legislative group. We have witnessed

the phenomenal growth of the National Association for Retarded Children and its many affiliates, and we rejoice in their collaborative efforts with other organizations in moving forward against mental retardation. Not only are they effective in their own right, but they are also powerful as a catalytic agent in the efforts of other groups and organizations. They are particularly effective in stimulating the establishment of selected demonstration projects for the mentally retarded, now numbering 21 over the country, to evaluate and to prepare retarded persons for employment.

The vocational rehabilitation program in this country is a prime example of democracy in action. I feel that on all counts it must be the public program closest to the people. When the individual need for public assistance goes beyond monetary requirements, and is complicated by disability of a wage earner or a wife, then the starker aspects of need and dependency rise rapidly. That is where our principal activity now lies, in getting the disabled person back to productive capacity.

It is in additional areas of aid for the disabled that we are projecting new thought. If we in the Congress are to continue to give you people in the active program a roadway to progress, we, too, must pioneer in imaginative ideas and legislative proposals. We must take the broadest possible view of rehabilitation needs, and refine adequate proposals to the point where they can be guides and aids to new areas of rehabilitation.

The emerging new philosophy of rehabilitation has widened our concept of an adequate program. In all conscience we have had to give greater attention to the problems of the aging. We in the Congress, those of you in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the State rehabilitation agencies, a special staff in the Department, plus experts outside these groups, are studying ways to bring special rehabilitation service to the aged, in intensive preparation for the White House Conference on Aging, to be held next January in Washington, D.C., under provisions of a measure introduced some time ago.

From the standpoint of the public rehabilitation program, there are many facets to this planning for the aged. The vocational rehabilitation program is usually defined as a process designed to help disabled persons reach vocational, economic, and health potentials commensurate with their residual abilities—with the avowed purpose of reducing dependency. Yet there are thousands of older persons over the country, clearly unable to gain any vocational or economic benefits from rehabilitation services, yet who could be removed from a state of dependency in institutions, nursing homes, and family circles, through special services that will enable them to care for their daily needs, and give them independent lives free of custodial care or constant attendance.

This is one of the things we have been thinking about in Congress. It is my hope here to give you a viewpoint in a legislative program that would expand rehabilitation into this field, and on others that have been made.

In January of 1959 I introduced a bill in the House—H.R. 1119—which has the broad purpose of providing rehabilitation services to handicapped persons who can be aided in achievement of an ability for independent living, even though they may not be capable of productive employment.

We who support this measure want to launch a new attack on dependency by rehabilitating many such persons to the point where they are capable of self-care. We want to provide the means for public and private workshops and other facilities that will abet these projects, and provide funds that will make this aspect of rehabilitation as flexible as those now in practice. For we continue to believe that dependency is

measured both in dollars and human values, and that independence means a saving of dollars and an increase in self-respect. This is a pioneering action that makes sense to us, and we shall continue to press for legislative action on the bill for independent living.

Our new thought on rehabilitation has put in perspective another category of disability, this time running to the other end of the age scale. There are several millions of persons who suffer from speech and hearing defects which hamper them severely in their efforts to become self-supporting members of their communities. Many of them are children, unable to hear their parents' voices, to hear a song, to whom such things as television and movies are almost meaningless. Others are adults, whose hearing is impaired by war, industrial service, or ear disorders.

Perhaps three-quarters of these with speech and hearing difficulties could be helped greatly and many rehabilitated into employment, if enough speech pathologists, audiologists, and teachers were available to diagnose, train, and teach them.

Today there are about 2,000 certified speech pathologists and audiologists in the Nation. We need 10 times that many. To meet the educational needs of some 30,000 deaf children requires the training of some 500 teachers of the deaf each year. We are presently training less than a third of that number. Some 400 especially trained pathologists and audiologists are graduated each year, against a need for 1,500.

Last August I introduced a bill by which these needs could be met. It provides for grants to public and nonprofit institutions engaged in training teachers of the deaf. It provides for grants to institutions of higher learning for training speech pathologists and audiologists. Within a few years after enactment of such a measure we would not be faced with the distressing statistics that scarcely more than 1 in 5 children of school age who need the attention of a speech correctionist are getting it. The bill would mean not only the filling of a great rehabilitation need, but would also create the opportunity for many young persons to build careers of lasting humanitarian service for themselves.

One cannot be in my position for so long as I, listening to the views and experiences of medical men, of scientists and researchers, and public health experts, without arriving at some deep convictions about public health needs.

Much of the pageant of medical achievement in the United States and over the world has passed before congressional committees on which I have served. And on a recent trip to Europe, where I served as a delegate to the World Health Assembly in Geneva, I had opportunity to see both the substance and the spirit of international cooperation in the health sciences. I spent many hours with the more than 80 delegates from nations within the World Health Organization. I came away with a great awareness of the tremendous needs and opportunities for an intensified program of research that would extend into all aspects of the problems of disease in man, and for a market expansion of these programs which apply today's new knowledge for the improvement of man's health.

There are seven National Institutes of Health just outside Washington at Bethesda, Md., that do a tremendous job of research into cancer, heart, allergic and infectious diseases, dentistry, mental health, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, and neurological diseases, and blindness.

I have had the privilege of actively participating in appropriation actions that have

so dramatically increased funds for enlarging the Institutes, funds that have increased from \$4 million in 1946 to \$400 million in 1960, including, for the same period, a rise in funds for research grants from \$40,000 to \$205 million this year. And, as a corollary, there is provision for \$85 million to train researchers and technicians, so that the burgeoning research program shall not falter for lack of trained workers.

In January of 1958, Senator HILL and I were meeting with some eminent medical men in Washington. We had just listened to the President's message on the state of the Union, in which he said it could well be a world objective to make a more unified effort against such diseases as cancer, heart, and mental illness. The subject came up for discussion in our group. It was at this time that we started talking about an effort to provide U.S. leadership in a program that would in time focus international attention on these and other wreckers and killers of mankind, by lessening the time for world medical knowledge to reach all people.

As a result of many discussions with many persons, Senator HILL and I introduced bills to establish another Institute at Bethesda for international medical research. It would become a storehouse for medical information, and a world clearinghouse for medical advances as they occur. The Senate has passed the measure, which has become known as the health-for-peace bill. The measure introduced in the House is still awaiting action, which I hope will not be long delayed.

In my view, the measure is a worldwide declaration of war against disease and disability, uniting the fight that is carried on individually in every country. It is a clear and unmistakable act of brotherhood, and more than that is within enlightened self-interest.

Perhaps Arnold Toynbee, one of the eminent historians of our time, summed up some of the hopes for the time after this proposal becomes law, when he wrote in the *New York Times* a few years ago, "The 20th century will be chiefly remembered as an age in which human society dared to think of the welfare of the whole human race as a practicable objective."

And Dr. Howard Rusk, in his statement in a hearing on the bill said, "Medicine has never been anything but international. Its history is the most beautiful evidence of internationalism that exists in the world—microbiology came from Holland, bacteriology from France, penicillin from Great Britain, insulin from Canada, cortisone from the United States, sulfonamides from Germany." This is truly an underscoring of the international character of medical progress.

And Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, put another aspect of the health-for-peace bill in eloquent language last spring, when she said in a hearing:

"It is my firm belief that a well-planned and well-defined international program in these fields would offer an unparalleled opportunity to advance peace and understanding among mankind."

"There are vast areas of misunderstanding and mistrust among nations today, born primarily of differences in social, economic, and health standards, national mores, and the problems of education and communication. But, in this sea of differences there are islands of quick understanding, honest affection, and mutual trust. One of these is the internationally shared dream of all peoples that the specter of disease and the humiliation of the dependent cripple shall not forever be an inescapable part of their lives."

This is pioneering into medicine and rehabilitation on a world scale. We have positive need for the benefits that such an In-

stitute could bestow. Certainly some of them could be in the area of mental retardation. A new outlook on this disability has developed in the past few years, simply because more is known about it. There is continuing medical and psychiatric research and this country has taken a strong lead in demonstration of the vocational possibilities of the retarded.

There is a wider understanding of the true differences between mental retardation and mental deficiency. Much is made of the fact that mental retardation is hardly ever to be regarded as a static condition. The slowness to learn that is the mark of the retardate is sometimes so susceptible to special education that results have occasionally been outstanding, with some persons going far beyond usual academic limits, after appropriate services.

Since September of 1958 we have had Federal legislation that will be of pronounced significance to the slow learning child. This legislation, which originated in the Senate, and which I supported with all my energy, authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to institutions of higher learning to help these schools to train professional personnel in the education of the mentally retarded children. When there has been time for this legislation to show tangible results, I am sure we shall see marked improvement in preparing the mentally retarded for fuller participation in the usual activities of life.

You will undoubtedly be interested, too, in some of the research going on with support from the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. In collaboration with a number of institutions, the Institute is conducting a long-term, nationwide study of 40,000 mothers and children in an attempt to discover the biological causes of retardation and other neurological conditions such as cerebral palsy. It is an attempt to find out what and why things go wrong during pregnancy, childbirth, and early infancy to cause these conditions, and there is hope that medical leads into the causes of retardation will be found.

Certainly one of the end products of the whole battle against the effects of mental retardation is in the activities of you researchers and managers of special projects for the mentally retarded. The projects that have been in operation for enough time to produce some tangible results that can be measured had given training to well over 750 retarded persons by the end of 1959. Ten of the projects were able to estimate that from 20 to 30 percent of those served in their centers will reach employment. A marked increase is looked for in the number of placements in the years ahead, because of the larger number of persons to be served, greater emphasis on placement and a growing amount of experience.

There can be no gainsaying the enthusiasm of this group to venture further into the lesser known aspects of rehabilitation. They carry on what has always been a pioneering effort, for the public program began only 40 years ago. It has grown by trial and experiment, by perseverance and imagination, and by hard work.

The Nation is being rewarded by the rehabilitation of handicapped persons at the rate of more than 80,000 each year. The Federal Government, the State rehabilitation agencies, and the scores of other organizations interested in the welfare of the disabled are tooling up not only for greater numbers but for methods that will reach more categories of the disabled, with services that will give them greater capacity for employment, for independence and the other satisfactions and privileges that all of us hold dear.

Nixon Versus Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another newspaper, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, has abandoned its support of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson. In an editorial in its February 28, 1960, issue the Courier explains why it can no longer support Benson and suggests a course of action for Vice President Nixon, the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

The editorial follows:

NIXON MUST ABANDON BENSON BUT NOT TRY
TO OUTBID DEMOS

Somewhat speculative stories out of Washington last week declared that Vice President Nixon is forming his own advisory committee on farm policy and will not follow the program advocated by Agriculture Secretary Benson.

We believe such a course is inevitable. It is fashionable in some conservative quarters to assume that Benson is everlastingly right from the viewpoint of sound economics, however unpopular his program may be from the political standpoint. But, while the Courier originally held that view, events have forced this newspaper to abandon its support of Benson.

In the first place, his administration of the soil-bank and the crop-storage programs has been inexcusably poor.

In the second place, his program of bribing farmers to support his decontrol program by paying price supports for uncontrolled production has been disastrous for corn. He now proposes the same thing for wheat. We question the ethics of seeking to obtain an objective by deliberately trying to make a situation so bad the public clamor for a change will be irresistible.

In the third place, Benson has simply not developed a realistic plan. He has attempted to wreck all the control features of the previous program; yet he drains the Treasury by paying out subsidies which accomplish nothing in the way of reform. As the Courier has said before, if we're going to spend these billions of dollars on a farm program, let's spend them to buy what we want—a reduction in production. Benson has merely poured out the money without getting anything in return—not even the good will of farmers.

In elaborating a new farm program, however, Nixon runs the hazard of alienating some of the people whose support at the polls would be necessary for his capture of the farm vote. Certainly any kind of direct payment plan, which would make farmers mere employees of the Government, will be furiously resisted in the better agricultural areas of the Midwest. And if Nixon gets into a contest with the Democratic candidate over who is going to promise the most for the farm vote, the Democrat is likely to win.

The answer, we think, lies in a return to and a strengthening of the control features of the pre-Benson price support program. If every possible effort had been made in the last 7 years to make this program work, farmers would be better off today than under the Benson program. It is no cureall; and successively more stringent controls may be needed. A decently enforced soil bank would be a part of such a program.

But a Democratic Congress, with Benson's unwitting support, has managed to make the

South a major competitor with the Midwest in the corn-hog field. This was done by paying supports for cotton and tobacco on restricted acreage while failing to control production on the diverted acres. This feed grain production is additional income for the South which drives down the price of Midwest corn.

Nixon could not win the farm vote with Benson's program. But he can win, we believe, with a sane price support plan and a soil bank that actually takes cropland out of production. The farmers don't want a hand-out and they know that the alternative to stiff production controls is a farm depression. If Nixon will give them some alternative to Benson on the one hand and southern Democratic control of Congress on the other, we believe Midwest farmers will go Republican this year.

Resolution of Connecticut State Labor
Council, AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I request the unanimous consent of the House to enter in the Record the text of a resolution adopted last fall at the annual convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

The resolution sets forth the position on international trade policy endorsed by the convention. It represents a fair and enlightened stand on an increasingly difficult subject. We have seen, in recent years, the comeback of major industrial nations that had been seriously damaged by the war. Meanwhile, benefiting from a high standard of living, this country has experienced favorable travel and import programs which have increased the national taste for goods made in all parts of the world.

More recently, it has come to be recognized that this competition has had an adverse effect on specific industries. Some have sought relief through new tariff and trade barriers. The State Labor Council recognized that this approach has aspects which could be undesirable for world stability.

Its policy calls for fair labor standards on an international basis. Without seeking to equalize world wage levels, it points out that workers in some nations have not benefited fully from rising income in those areas. It believes, however, that wages and working conditions in exporting industries should fully reflect the productivity and technological advance of the industry and the national economy.

The statement also recognizes that there are specific industries, such as typewriters, stainless steel, and other products which have been sharply affected in employment through foreign competition. I believe these matters deserve consideration and I would urge that any negotiators on multilateral tariff pacts take these facts into account.

Again, I would say that this seems to

me an eminently fair position, typical of the mature and reasoned thought given public issues by Connecticut labor. I hope all Members of the House will find time to weigh its message.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 20

INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY

The past several years have seen the economic recovery of many industrial nations of the non-Communist world, in many cases greatly aided by U.S. help in the form of Marshall plan aid, and other forms of economic assistance. As these countries reentered the world market, they have sent more and more products to the U.S. market in direct competition with manufactured goods produced by domestic industries.

In Connecticut the competition offered by many of these products has had an adverse effect on the total business of Connecticut firms, because of the lower prices of the imported products; and some manufacturers have urged unions representing their employees to seek the imposition of higher tariffs or import quotas to limit the amount of competing goods which could be sold in U.S. markets. Among the Connecticut industries which have felt the effects of this import competition are the textile, hat, apparel, flatware, typewriter, sewing machine, brass fabricating, and rubber footwear.

The policy of high protective tariffs has previously been tried and found ineffectual, as late as the 1930's, when the Smoot-Hawley tariff measure succeeded in reducing the volume of imports but also resulted in reciprocal high tariffs in foreign countries. This cut down our substantial export trade to a fraction of its previous volume, thus eliminating additional industry and jobs in this country. The high protective tariff policy was abandoned after the great depression and was followed by the reciprocal trade agreements program.

1. AFL-CIO policy: The American labor movement has vigorously supported the reciprocal trade agreements program from its very inception more than two decades ago. This traditional support was reemphasized in the resolution unanimously adopted at the 1957 convention of the AFL-CIO. The resolution urged extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of at least 5 years with reinforcement of the basic goal of the reciprocal trade program, the gradual reduction of barriers to trade without undue hardship to American industries or American workers. The achievement of this goal must be sought, however, in the light of present-day conditions in our own Nation and in the nations allied with us in the common struggle for the preservation of freedom and democracy.

2. Fair labor standards: The labor movement has also long advocated the principle that fair competition in international trade requires fair labor standards in exporting industries. This principle has been given at least some official recognition in recent years.

In its January 1954 report, the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (Randall Commission) stated: "The clearest case of unfair competition is one in which the workers on a particular commodity are paid wages well below accepted standards in the exporting country. In such cases, our negotiators should simply make clear that no tariff concessions will be granted on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country."

If this is the objective we are seeking, then our course should be to determine tariff policy in accordance with a liberal trade policy, but for those items made in industries where there are unfair labor standards in the exporting countries, existing concessions should be conditional upon sincere efforts in

the exporting country to eliminate unfair labor standards. Failure of the exporting country to take steps to eliminate unfair labor standards should be grounds for withdrawal of the concession.

As a first step, U.S. representatives to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Agency (GATT) should urge acceptance of a clause on fair labor standards in international trade similar to the one proposed in 1953. Toward this end, and in preparation for the multilateral tariff negotiations to take place in 1960, U.S. representatives should ascertain the facts regarding wage levels and working conditions in industries in exporting countries. In such negotiations, specific recognition should be given to the level of labor standards in such industries in any tariff concessions the United States may be prepared to offer.

In making these recommendations, we are fully aware that it is neither desirable nor feasible that wage levels be equalized in all countries. We recognize that the stage of development of a country's economy and the productivity of its industries may limit the level of wages that can be paid. Therefore, it is to be expected that wage differentials will continue to exist, and such disparities should not impede international trade. But we insist that wages and working conditions in exporting industries fully reflect the productivity and technological advance of the industry and the national economy. Substandard wage levels or working conditions are clear evidence of the existence of unfair competition in international trade and should be eliminated as rapidly as possible.

Development of a fair labor standard in international trade will benefit workers and employers in the United States, because it will assure them that they will not be faced by unfair competition from foreign imports based on unduly low wages and labor standards in the exporting country. In the exporting countries themselves, promotion of fair labor standards will contribute significantly to advancement of living standards and economic growth. The people of those countries will find, as we have found in America, that decent wages and decent working conditions promote domestic purchasing power, industrial productivity, and sound economic growth.

We also urge that where it is clearly demonstrated that jobs are being lost by American workers as a result of such imports, consideration be given to the placing of adequate protective tariffs and quotas on typewriters and other products that are affected by foreign imports which now enter this country free and clear of any import duties.

This third constitutional convention of the Connecticut State labor council, AFL-CIO, therefore, goes on record as urging our Representatives in Congress to support most actively the adoption of the policy set forth in this resolution.

The Honor Is Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Committee on Armed Services legislation which proposes that the Congress recognize the outstanding humanitarian service in Laos of Dr. Tom Dooley by presenting to him a Congressional Medal of Honor. I think this recognition has been earned a thousand

times over by Dr. Dooley. So do many others.

An excellent editorial supporting this bill, first introduced by my good friend and colleague from Oregon, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, has been written by Publisher Ralph P. Stuller of the Coquille, Oreg., Valley Sentinel. Ralph Stuller wastes no words. He calls Dr. Dooley "a one-man ambassador of America to Asia."

Our country has the capability to lead the world toward peace, freedom and understanding and away from poverty, disease and war. Dr. Dooley has carried our torch to the citizens of a newer nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include Ralph Stuller's fine editorial on this subject:

MRS. GREEN'S LEGISLATION

A Congressional Medal of Honor for Dr. Tom Dooley, the most famous young doctor in America, is the purpose of recently introduced legislation by Representative EDITH GREEN of Portland.

Dr. Dooley, a U.S. Navy doctor, who single handedly has done more for the people of Laos than all the State Department bigwigs have done for the rest of the world, is truly a great American.

Operating private hospitals in Laos, Dr. Dooley who also suffers from cancer, has been a one-man ambassador of America to Asia.

Such Americans as Dr. Dooley can stop wars more surely than the scientists who make atom bombs or guided missiles.

Top Seaway Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ashtabula Star Beacon for Monday, February 22, 1960. Ashtabula Harbor is in the 11th District of Ohio which I have the honor to represent. I am proud to report the Port of Ashtabula is leading all the Great Lakes ports in use of the St. Lawrence Seaway. This achievement certainly speaks well of Ashtabula Port's efforts to make full use of the new "Inland Sea." The results of the port of Ashtabula truly present an aggressive and successful record of the efforts of many people to sell the area's many advantages to the world. The article follows:

ASHTABULA HARBOR TOP SEAWAY PORT

Ashtabula has been spotlighted as the No. 1 St. Lawrence Seaway port in the entire United States.

The 1959 traffic report of the seaway corporation lists 3,876,665 tons of seaway cargo handled at the harbor here during the 1959 navigation season.

Closest competitor to Ashtabula was Chicago, which recorded 2,208,681 tons of seaway traffic during the past year.

Cleveland was fourth in the rating list. The report, prepared by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and St. Lawrence Development Corp., said 1,712,329 tons were handled there.

The third-ranking port was Toledo with 1,851,680 tons of seaway traffic during the year.

Seaway tonnage at the Conneaut port during 1959 amounted to only 36,752 tons.

ASHTABULA'S TOTAL TONNAGE

A breakdown of Ashtabula's total tonnage shows 2,236,022 tons of cargo came into the harbor from the seaway. A total of 1,640,643 tons of cargo was exported via the seaway to other American ports and foreign destinations.

In both instances, bulk cargoes made up the majority of each total. This bulk cargo was in the form of coal and iron ore.

An aggregate of 21,131,835 tons of seaway cargo was handled by U.S. ports during the past year. Seaway traffic recorded at Canadian ports during 1959 was 37,815,984 tons.

Canadian leader was the port of Hamilton, Ont. with 6,676,509 tons of seaway traffic. Number two position was occupied by Montreal with 5,581,120 tons.

Seven Islands, recording a total of 4,857,073 tons of seaway traffic, was ranked No. 3.

True Leaders of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the expression "labor leader" unfortunately has taken on a bad connotation. To many people it has become synonymous with racketeer or crook. I have never felt it fair to condemn a whole group for the sins of a few. Truly there are many fine men in the labor movement.

I take pride in the fact that I have several friends among the labor leaders in the district. Today I received a letter from a good friend of mine, the head of the Clinton, Iowa, Labor Congress, whose name is Joe Rajceovich. I believe that the spirit in this letter is representative of the spirit held by the men who are the true leaders of labor.

I want to congratulate him and commend to you his excellent letter which shows that the things that are important to working people are the problems and fears of all Americans.

I would like to share his excellent letter with the Members of Congress:

Is it wrong to expect reasonable decency for people? Is it wrong to help our senior citizens who have helped to make this country what we now enjoy? Is it wrong to expect Federal legislation to protect those unfortunate enough to be unemployed by establishing legislation for fair, livable compensation? Is it wrong that we ask that fair Federal requirements be met to protect those unfortunate enough to become injured on the job and whose family suffer, too, because of the meager income? Are we being unreasonable in asking that the minimum wage be raised (union members don't need that). Extended coverages to millions who are not covered under the minimum wage certainly deserve consideration and, too, union members don't need. Is labor a selfish-interest group because we ask for decency for people in need? Is complacency displacing ambition and drive in America? Are we so cocksure that we are the best educated and most powerful country in the world? The defeat of the edu-

education and teachers salary bill is something we all should be ashamed of and I sincerely hope that some day we do not regret it. Time, in this day and age, is of the utmost importance. Time is slipping and slipping fast, lets hope we don't wait too long before we realize our mistakes. The chamber of commerce advocates that education is and should be a State and local problem. Perhaps they are right, I really don't know. I do know that people are so very conscious of any thought of any increased taxation for education or for any reason that any bond issue drives have very good chances of being defeated. The end result? Dedication to the teaching profession is becoming a thing of the past. The financial opportunities in business and industry are offering too much of an opportunity and inducement to continue that dedication and we are losing too many good teachers. Are we in labor being selfish in supporting education and decent salaries for teachers? Is it fair that many teachers earn less than the average factory worker? Are we of the labor movement the selfish-interest group to want America to be the most educated and the most powerful country in the world? Will we see the day when "pressure groups" will sincerely work together to make America the real envy of the world.

No, I have no political ambitions but it irks me no end the complacency of too many people in and out of the labor movement. What to do I wish I knew. Thinking back 4 years ago when I first entered the labor picture on a full-time basis I wonder if I would have done the same if I had known then what I know now? It has been a wonderful experience but I really can't help wondering if it is worth all the effort. There appears to be complacency in all walks of life, people just don't seem to care. Let the other guy do it attitude. Time today is so very, very important. We spend far too much time fighting among ourselves. Just think what a wonderful country we would have if all factions would sit down and reasonably, honestly, and sincerely make every effort to make this country the undisputed leader of the world. We all are dreamers of better things, life is so very short, why can't we strive to make it as pleasant as we can because we pass here but once. We can count our many blessings, it could be worse.

I have been a member of the chamber of commerce for approximately 6 years and I cannot fully understand why the chamber's and labor's views are so consistently contrary. Perhaps someday if the opportunity presents itself you may be able to give me the answer. I can in all sincerity state that I am proud to be in the labor movement even though the opposition has burned a lot of midnight oil to turn public opinion against us. The majority of us did not deserve that kind of treatment but nevertheless we have been subject to more than our share of criticism. Time heals all wounds and in time the public will realize that our sincere goals and ambitions are to help the working class of people. God must have loved us, He made so very many of us.

Symbols of Western Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an edi-

torial from the New York Times, of March 3, 1960, entitled "Symbols of Western Unity":

SYMBOLS OF WESTERN UNITY

Despite the difficulty of reaching policy agreements among the 15 democratic nations of the North Atlantic alliance, their basic unity in the face of a common menace reasserts itself whenever fundamentals are involved. This is demonstrated again by the latest developments on the political, military, and economic fronts.

Thus, after another hectic debate in the House of Commons, the British Government has been able to score a decisive victory for its expanded defense program based on the two pillars of (1) collective security that includes Germany as a "firm and equal partner," and (2) "massive and terrible retaliation" in case of attack. These are also two of the main pillars of the American defense program.

Somewhat along the same line, as a symbol of collective defense and integration of military forces, General Norstad announces in Paris the impending formation of an integrated multinational task force with both nuclear and conventional armament to act as a fire brigade in a military emergency. The task force will be formed around a nucleus of an American, a British, and a French battalion acting as a unit, but will be expanded to include battalions from other nations. This task force is regarded as the beginning of making NATO itself a nuclear power, with wider and more unified control of atomic weapons. General Norstad's confidence that a solution is being found for the integration of French air defenses within the alliance is another indication of which way the wind is blowing.

Finally, the United States announces that eight NATO countries, plus Japan and representatives of the European Economic Community, will meet in Washington next week to devise ways and means of sharing and increasing aid to the less developed countries. This is in line with the project of a new Atlantic economic organization.

The detailed Western program for the East-West summit meeting is still in the hands of diplomatic working groups. But these developments, to which might be added possible resumption of high-altitude flying to Berlin in preparation for a possible blockade, give promise that any remaining differences will be resolved.

What Paul Harvey Said About Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a portion of Mr. Paul Harvey's radio newscast of Thursday, February 4, 1960:

You're carrying a picture of Mississippi around in your mind. Tear it up—throw it away—it doesn't fit any more.

I know where you got that ugly old picture. Hernando de Soto took a walk through here 400 years ago and he was disappointed, too. Looking for gold and he didn't find any. Billions of dollars' worth of black gold just a few feet down under his feet, but he walked right on by.

In 1800 the invention of the cotton gin gave Mississippi a cash crop and the State started to burst into bloom. But before it could, the depression of the 1830's clobbered

this one-crop economy and the prosperity that might have been, wasn't. The State stagnated.

Then, just when the cotton market looked up again, the Un-Civil War broke out and smashed Mississippi again to her knees. And the carpetbagging governmental extravagance that followed kept her there.

Then, the first championship prize fight in history was fought at Mississippi City; John L. Sullivan whipped Paddy Ryan in eight rounds and a new word was added to the dictionary. The word "knockout." But no sooner did the century turn the corner than the boll weevil arrived in the cotton fields and again the whole State went down for the count.

No, it's not strange that you've carried around a distorted picture of Mississippi. A half-starved State with a black eye and a swollen nose and cut and bruised and battered. The stranger thing is that, in such a condition, the State survived at all. But she did.

In the 1920's favorable tax laws encouraged industry to take root and grow, but before it could mature, the 1930's and depression. And then about 20 years ago then-Gov. Hugh White saw the need to balance the State's agriculture and industry. And since then * * *

Well, now, wait a moment. I'm used to hearing from cities that have doubled their populations in the past 10 years. There's a lot of such growth, particularly in the awakening South. But I began to hear from here of expansion so explosive I couldn't believe it. Of the city of Jackson, for example, doubling its population almost every 10 years.

Well sir, I came, I saw, and it's still hard to believe. I was last night with Mayor Allen Thompson—I'll be lunching in a few minutes with Gov. Ross Barnett at the mansion—and between visits with them and with you I'm watching a flower unfold and reseed itself in the Mississippi sunshine. The roots are in oil and industry and agriculture, the petals are paper money. I have not seen this much excitement since I was a boy in the oil boom days in Oklahoma.

In 1900 this town was located on Highway 51 between two Burma Shave signs. Population, 7,000. Today—170,000. And a skyline that looks like something out of tomorrowland.

And hear this—for 9 consecutive months last year—Jackson, Miss., grew faster, economically and industrially, than any other city in the Nation. Some cities campaign for years to get a new industry to move to town. Jackson has been adding a new or expanding an old, industry every 2 weeks. Not one oil well here 20 years ago. Today there are thousands. Mississippi ranks No. 9 among all oil producing States.

And that distorted picture of Mississippi you carry around is deep-shadowed by the preoccupation of the northern press with the misbehavior of a handful of misanthropes, though man for man, there is less per capita crime in Mississippi, than in any of 47 other States. Mississippi is among the three States in our Nation which have the least crime. And this in spite of the phenomenal growth.

You come up fast when you come from behind. Mississippi used to be the poorest State in the Union; it's on its way to being one of the richest. And its bank balance was up another 16 percent last year.

Now then; What's all this zoom going to do to the traditional character of the Southland? I don't know. Already along the once lazy banks of the Pearl River I see feverish construction harnessing her gentle flow, storing it for speedboats, diverting it to industry, converting it to what the world calls progress. And in the haste of the people to keep pace, I think I sense already some less "marshmallow softness" to the so-charming native dialect.

There is yet a "casserole informality" to Mississippi's hospitality. But its southern border already has become an American Riviera. The longest man-made beach in the world lines the gulf, and tourists flocking to this playground may litter the beach with beer cans, bikinis and railroad time-tables.

Yet you can still say, "Let's go fishin'," and most any Mississippian will drop whatever he's doing and go. And the hoopskirts and the steamboats are still here, if only for show. And the mockingbird and magnolia and the magnificent forests that carpet more than half the State. There's still room for growin' and still time for fishin'. So even if we could, nobody would, hold back the dawn.

But that old picture of young Mississippi you've carried for too long now. I thought you should know, that the awkward adolescent, retarded by malnutrition and misfortune, turned out tall and strong after all. And healthy and handsome and wearin' a hair shirt.

Paul Harvey. Good day.

Young People Deny Patriotism Is Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent survey made of 687 American teenagers, more than 450 answered "No" when they were asked, "Is patriotism an important part of your life?" Eighty-two percent of the same group polled said that sports are more important than patriotism and 88 percent said that dating outranks the importance of patriotism. Ninety percent said clothing is more important.

Those of us who sit in the Congress of the United States are constantly bombarded with requests for voting huge sums of money for everything from "soups to nuts" with the now fashionable justification that we must "maintain pace with Russia" or by some distortion in some cases, "essential to the strength of our national defense." I personally believe that this country and its young people could stand a little shot in the arm of good old fashioned patriotism with its proper evaluation of the blessings of Democracy. I include herewith part of an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times in this regard by Eugene Gilbert, president of the Gilbert Research Co. Reading and rereading it, I find it a bit frightening:

YOUNG PEOPLE DENY PATRIOTISM IS VITAL
(By Eugene Gilbert, president of Gilbert Youth Research Co.)

Something has happened to patriotism among teenagers.

Either the love of country in America's young people has withered in the atmosphere of disillusionment following two wars, or it lies dormant, awaiting some crisis to awaken it.

It seems strange, however, that it could sleep through the recurring jangle of cold war crises. Yet this fact is irrefutable:

More than two-thirds of 687 American teenagers answered "No" when we asked, "Is patriotism an important part of your life?" Ninety-six percent put family before patriotism.

These reactions may be understandable. But 82 percent said patriotism is less important than sports; 88 percent said dating outranks it, and 90 percent said clothing is more important. This attitude is perhaps partially explained by a 13-year-old St. Louis girl, who said: "I just never think about it."

Rose Michael, a 17-year-old Chicago girl who took a stab at explaining it, said: "Patriotism is less important in the average person's life because the United States is so well established." Another Chicago teenager, 19-year-old Norman Lewison, said patriotism is at low ebb among teenagers because they "have little contact with politics and government."

But to John Angus Campbell, 17, of Portland, one of the minority to whom patriotism is important, "democracy is worth preserving."

Unfortunately, few seemed to agree.

We asked this admittedly tough question: "If you could do a great benefit to your country by sacrificing the well-being of a loved one, would you do it?" Only 9 percent said, "Yes."

"Something as artificial as one's nation is never worth that much," said a 19-year-old St. Louis youth.

"I'm selfish," was the candid reply of a 17-year-old Salt Lake City girl. And a 16-year-old Philadelphia girl answered, "I'm a coward."

While they admit they are short on love for their country, the teenagers acknowledge that they are fond of the good life they have here.

Only 17 percent said they would ever consider settling permanently in another country.

Here are some of the reasons given by those who would:

Mary La Willett, 15, Chicago—"If I found a good position." A 19-year-old Hartford (Conn.) boy—"If I found that country more desirable than the United States." Ralph Helft, 16, of Hoosick Falls, N.Y.—"In case of world war III."

Fifty-five percent of the youngsters—more girls than boys—said flag ceremonies and the national anthem stir feelings of respect in them.

"They make you feel you are a part of something," said 17-year-old Sandra Vinyard, of Mount Pleasant, Tex.

Sixty-nine percent of the young people—again more girls than boys—said they are embarrassed if someone with them ridicules patriotic ceremonies.

She is embarrassed, said 13-year-old Sureen Hawkins, of Portland, "because they are criticizing our country."

On the other hand, Paul Girard, 13, of Hartford, Conn., said: "Let them think for themselves."

We also asked: "Do you think patriotism detracts in any way from agreement between different nations?"

Thirty-one percent said yes, 57 percent no, and 12 percent didn't answer.

"National pride is bound to conflict a little," said a 17-year-old Chicago girl. And a 16-year-old Portland girl said patriotism "creates some prejudices."

In retrospect, there is evidence that a 17-year-old Chicago girl knew what she was talking about when she summed up the feeling of American young people toward their country. She said: "People have become too complacent about all the good in the United States."

Comments by Congressman John H. Dent, Dickinson Law School, Carlisle, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to present a speech to be made at Dickinson Law School, Carlisle, Pa., on March 5:

In this day and age the question of the why, the wherefore, and the future of the union movement is the subject of daily discussion and debate.

I believe the first thing to attempt here is to give a logical reason for the existence of unions.

The reasons for trade unionism are threefold. Morally, a free society must allow freedom to all its members. This freedom should only be restricted by the common good of society as a whole. Unions are the means through which workers are able to express their needs as wage earners.

The transgressions of union officials do not detract from the moral necessity and right of unionism. Internal union reform and the force of public opinion will bring desirable changes.

Economically, unions are necessary to enable workers to determine to a reasonable extent the terms and conditions under which they work. Collective action is necessary, for individual effort is often ineffective in a highly industrialized society.

The psychological need for unions is in some respects the most important. Unless workers feel they have an assured means of expressing themselves, harmony in industry and a high level of performance becomes difficult to maintain. Workers readily become frustrated and resentful and a prey to harmful rumors.

Among the most important reasons why workers unionize are to achieve greater security, equal justice and a voice in determining their economic conditions.

However, sound trade unionism benefits management also. When workers' aspirations are reasonably satisfied, a more contented work force normally results. Through unionism, a channel of communication is established between workers and management, and practical cooperation can be developed in connection with such important matters as production and safety.

Is labor justified in promoting interest in unionism among workers? Sometimes management complains that nonunionized workers are satisfied until they are approached by unions during organizing campaigns.

Labor replies that in a free society it has every right to promote its viewpoint. Employers are free to encourage the formation of new companies. Organized labor feels that all workers should share in the benefits of unionism.

It is not fair to charge that wage increases cause inflation. Economic expansion can be inflationary. Arbitrary pricing policies and anticipation of economic developments, as during the Korean war, can cause higher prices.

Furthermore, management always has the right to resist excessive wage demands.

If a wage-inflation problem exists, there is not too much the average local union can do about it. Its wage demands will be governed largely by area or industry standards,

and it has a primary duty to make economic gains for its members.

Effective action, if required, must come at the top, through a "meeting of minds" among the top leaders of industry and labor.

A spirit of mutual understanding will result in good industrial relations. Management must accept unionism and unions must accept management's right to manage. The threat of strikes is definitely lessened through proper understanding.

In a company, definite responsibility for labor relations dealings should be assigned. That does not mean that a person need do nothing else but deal with the union. However, it is only natural for a union to expect to receive proper attention and consideration.

Where it does not appear that definite responsibility for this important matter has been assigned, a union may feel that the problems of its members are being disregarded.

If the demands of the union are really outrageous, it may mean that it has not been given full access to the facts. Both sides must face the facts in their dealings, especially in connection with bargaining and grievances.

If both sides practice real understanding, the union-management relationship can be highly beneficial.

In sequence, then the next question to be answered is: Should Government regulation of unions be increased? The American trade-union movement is the organized conscience of the American people.

No other substantial segment of the population of this country accepts as readily, as conscientiously, as seriously, and with the dedication and determination to discharge its obligations to itself, to its fellow citizens, and to the country as do the American labor unions. Unions blazed trail in the United States for more than a century, every good law, every step of social progress, every equitable economic advance, and every movement toward strengthening and improving the democratic processes of government in the United States has been inspired and brought to fruition because organized workers helped to initiate or fully supported it.

Some specific examples are:

1. The 8-hour day.
2. The free public school system.
3. Woman suffrage.
4. The U.S. Department of Labor.
5. The Pure Food and Drug Act.
6. The elimination of child labor.
7. Elimination of discrimination against women workers, including equal pay for equal work.
8. Premium pay for overtime work.
9. The 5-day workweek.
10. Paid holidays and vacations.
11. Progress in civil rights and in the elimination of employment discrimination.
12. The Wage-Hour Act (including minimum-wage law and 40-hour week).
13. National and State laws protecting women and juvenile workers.
14. Apprenticeship system for training skilled workers.
15. Public power and rural electrification.
16. Social security program and unemployment insurance.
17. Public housing.
18. School construction, increased salaries, and improved working conditions for educators.
19. Improved highways and roads.
20. Safety codes for transportation, construction, mining, and in the home.

These are but a few of organized labor's magnificent contributions to the welfare and security of the workers and to the social and economic progress of the United States. To name them all would require many volumes of many pages of fine print.

At the State and community levels, trade unionists are always found in positions of leadership in movements which are based upon civic, humanitarian, and fair economic motives. Organized labor plays a dominant role in such community projects as community chests and united fund drives, and hospital, school, housing, and library construction planning. Charitable and eleemosynary institutions draw heavily on organized labor for contributions, financial, and otherwise.

In times of war—hot and cold—it is organized labor, with its massive forces of workers who provide the leadership, the manpower, the brains and the skills which furnish the essential logistics so necessary to victory.

This leads into the subject of congressional action such as the Landrum-Griffin bill.

This legislation was the result of the most intensive drive for labor reform ever witnessed in the U.S. Congress.

Sparked by the dramatic, well publicized McClellan committee revelations over a period of months, the demand for so-called reform legislation reached the proportions of an avalanche. Like an avalanche it swept all before it, logic, reasoning, rights, wrongs, facts and justice.

In almost every case when questioned, one of two answers was given to the question, "Why this law?" First and foremost was the statement, "This will get Hoffa and that's what has to be done." Second, the answer was, "I can't win at home unless I vote for a labor bill. I prefer a better bill but I'll take any bill in preference to no bill."

In this atmosphere anything was possible and Congress in the main failed to give the kind of consideration this situation demanded.

One question never answered was asked many times: "If this bill gets rid of Hoffa, do we then repeal the law?"

Let's see what has happened to the labor bill since it passed.

First, the National Labor Relations Board charged with its administration has been issuing rules and regulations some of which are contrary to the letter of the law according to experts in the field. This, of course, is due to the need for political expediency in an election year.

One example is the section dealing with the bond requirements. Much ballyhoo and capital was made out of this section by the promoters of the reform legislation. It was supposed to put a straitjacket on union officers who handled money belonging to union members. The vast majority of Americans, I am sure, had a mental picture of union treasuries being looted by union officials systematically without any protection for the poor dues payer.

What's happened, however, is that the Secretary of Labor has taken a realistic view of the situation and although Congress wrote a bill that would have cost the unions millions of extra dollars under a drastic bonding provision, the Secretary has issued regulations that left the bonding practices practically in tact.

This is true in other features of the new law. Even Congress made some changes in the so-called Bill of Rights for union members embodied in the Kennedy bill when it passed the Senate.

Under the high-sounding title of "Bill of Rights" for union members Congress set out to take away from the majority of the union members all of their rights and to give to the minority rights never intended under our Federal Constitution.

Let's look at a rundown of just what the Landrum-Griffin bill does for or against labor.

Title I: "Bill of Rights of Members of Labor Organizations." This title contains provisions designed to secure reasonable equality among members, freedom of speech, as-

sembly, and the right to sue the organization, as well as protections from arbitrary discipline and arbitrary financial exactions. Union members may enforce these rights by civil suit in Federal court. This title also requires unions to forward a copy of any collective bargaining agreement at request of any member whose rights are affected thereby. This requirement is enforceable by Secretary of Labor in same manner as reporting requirements.

Title II: "Reporting and Disclosure." This title requires labor organizations to adopt a constitution and bylaws and file a copy with the Secretary of Labor, along with specific details as to their procedures for the conduct of internal affairs, and to file annual financial reports containing certain specified information "in such detail as may be necessary accurately to disclose its financial condition and operations."

The act also requires union officers, principal employees, certain employers, and persons providing labor relations consultant services to file reports with respect to certain financial transactions, to reveal conflict of interest dealings of union officers as well as expenditures of employers for the purpose of influencing employees in the exercise of their protected rights with respect to representation. Basic records must be kept for 5 years. Willful violation of title II is made a misdemeanor subject to \$10,000 fine and up to 1 year imprisonment.

Title III: "Trusteeships." This title requires every labor organization which assumes supervisory control over a subordinate body to file a report with the Secretary of Labor within 30 days after assuming such control, and semiannually thereafter. Such report must include, among other things, the reasons for the trusteeship and a complete account of the financial conditions of the subordinate union. The provisions for disclosure, regulations, and compliance of title II are applicable to the reporting provisions of title III, and similar criminal penalties are imposed for willful violations.

Title IV: "Elections and Removal of Officers." The bill requires union elections to be held periodically by secret ballot, that reasonable opportunity be given for the nomination of candidates, for the protection of freedom of choice in voting, for due notice of elections, publication of the results of votes cast by local members, conduct of elections in accordance with the constitution of the union, and preservation of election records. Expenditures of dues money of labor organizations, or of employer contributions to promote the candidacy of any individual is prohibited.

Officers of local unions guilty of serious misconduct may be removed by the members if the Secretary of Labor finds upon application of a member and after a hearing that adequate procedures for removal are not provided in the union's constitution and bylaws, or may be removed in a hearing and vote at the direction of the Federal district court in a suit brought by the Secretary as indicated below.

An election may be challenged by a member who has exhausted internal remedies, or invoked them and received no decision in 3 months.

Title V: "Safeguards for Labor Organizations"—Bonding. The act requires every officer or other official of labor organizations whose property and annual receipts exceeds \$5,000 to be bonded for faithful performance of duty. It prescribes standards for acceptable security companies and prohibits bonding through an agent or with a company in which the union has an interest. Criminal sanctions are imposed for violations. Labor organizations are also prohibited from making loans to their officers or employees in excess of \$2,000.

Barring Communists and criminals from office, the act prohibits Communists and per-

sons convicted of enumerated crimes from serving as union officers, agents, or employees, labor consultants, or officers or employees of employer associations dealing with unions, for five years after (1) termination of membership in the Communist Party, (2) conviction, or (3) imprisonment, unless citizenship rights which may have been lost are restored or unless the Federal Parole Board determines suitability of an ex-convict to serve. Persons convicted of violating reporting provisions of act are banned also from serving in such offices or paid positions.

Title VI: "Miscellaneous—Investigatory Power of Secretary." The act provides the Secretary of Labor with authority to investigate violations of any provision of the act, except title I or amendments made to other statutes, whenever he deems it necessary in order to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any such provision.

Extortionate picketing: The act prohibits extortionate picketing for the purposes of extracting money from an employer against his will for the personal enrichment of an individual and makes such conduct a felony under Federal law.

Discipline of union members: The act gives to members a civil right of action against labor organizations for disciplining any such member for exercising rights to which he is entitled and makes it a Federal crime to use force or violence, or the threat thereof, to interfere with the exercise of such rights by union members.

Title VII: "Taft-Hartley Amendments—No Man's Land." The States are permitted to assume jurisdiction over cases involving a labor dispute in which the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert jurisdiction. The Board is prohibited from further narrowing its present jurisdictional standards. Provision is made for delegation of representation matters by the Board to its regional directors.

Voting by economic strikers: The existing prohibition on voting by economic strikers in representation elections is eliminated in any election conducted within 12 months after the commencement of the strike.

Secondary boycotts: Hot cargo; the secondary boycott provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, are extended to cover direct coercion of employers to cease or agree to cease doing business with another, inducement of individual employees not to work, and the secondary boycott protection of employers is broadened to include railroads, municipalities, and farmers. The amendments permit publicity, other than picketing, for the purpose of advising consumers of disputes, so long as other employees are not induced to refuse services by such conduct.

Hot cargo agreements are prohibited by the bill. However, subcontracting agreements between unions and construction employers relating to work to be done at the site of the construction are excepted from the prohibition, and the prohibitions on the certain secondary boycotts and the hot cargo clause do not apply where jobbers and subcontractors in the apparel and clothing industry are involved.

Organizational and recognition picketing—Organizational and recognition picketing are made an unfair labor practice under certain circumstances, i.e. picketing where another union is lawfully recognized, where an election has been held within the preceding 12 months, or where conducted without a petition being filed within 30 days. Whenever a petition is filed the Board is directed to conduct an election forthwith without regard to other election provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Publicity picketing which does not induce refusals to perform services by other employees is preserved. The provisions for injunctive relief

in the existing law are extended to violations of the picketing provisions, but employer unfair labor practices of domination or interference with the formation of a union are made defenses against the issuance of injunctions in such picketing cases.

The act permits unions and employers in the building and construction industry to conclude prehire agreements with 7-day union shop provisions. It further permits contractual requirements that employers notify unions of vacancies, unions may refer applicants, and that priority in employment may be given on basis of length of service with employer or in the industry or area. Minimum training or experience qualifications may also be prescribed in such agreements.

Discrimination—Provisions are made in the act for priority of case handling where unfair labor practices involving discrimination in employment because of membership or nonmembership in a union are involved (whether by the employer or union).

Let's look at action now taking place in Congress.

There are three bills occupying the attention of the Labor Committee right now—one dealing with safety, one with wages and hours, and one with picketing.

Without getting into the details, I just want to make this one observation. The more union-management regulation becomes the law of the land, the more Congress will be asked to pass legislation that once was considered the proper sphere of labor-management negotiations.

If unions were as powerful and absolute as some would have us believe, there would be no need for Congress to pass laws prescribing working conditions in a specified industry or a law establishing a minimum wage and maximum hours. The union-management negotiations would establish these standards on a local and industry basis.

Because of the national scope of legislation passed by Congress, many inequities are created when a law has to disregard the basic concept of labor-management relations, that takes into consideration facts peculiar to the issue being negotiated.

However, one of these bills being discussed at this time by our committee deserves more than passing attention because it is the first amendment to the Landrum-Griffin concept of labor-management legislation. This deals with the right of building trades unions to picket a construction project.

This bill would set aside the Denver Building Trades decision. This decision later clarified by the Moore drydock decision restricts pickets on a building project to establishing a picket line under severe restrictions. There are strong arguments made by both sides—the unions and the contractors. When the Landrum-Griffin bill restricted picketing and made employment of strikebreakers common practice in labor disputes, the ability to successfully carry on a strike by an individual craft union at a multiple-employer construction job impossible under the law.

Congress is again being misled by the use of slogans and half truths. Instead of dealing with facts and the provisions of the proposed bill, the whole attack is being made against the term "Secondary Boycott." It is alleged that the right given to a striking union to picket a construction by use of a picket line would be in effect a secondary boycott on nonstriking subcontractors.

The unions argue that if they can't advertise their disagreement with one employer by using a projectwide picket line it gives the employer being struck every avenue to use strikebreakers or workers from other employers on the same job, thereby making the dispute one sided in favor of the employer.

This again shows the difficulties encountered when the National Government

tries to write rules that can't possibly cover all situations that arise in labor disputes.

Simply put this is what the law now allows. Every union other than the building trades can picket every gate, every place of production in any plant or industry, can strike and advertise to all workers that a strike is in progress.

The building trades unions can only picket a certain gate or place of work where the union members were last working before the strike although the construction is one individual project. With the provisions of Landrum-Griffin affecting hot cargo, picket line restrictions and free admission of strikebreakers, the unions argue that their constitutional right to strike in a labor dispute has been ineffective and for all practical purposes, useless.

Whether the right to strike is good or bad has nothing to do with the present proposal. The question to be resolved is whether or not Congress will pass a law reestablishing this right as an effective weapon in a labor-management dispute in the construction field the same as it is in other fields.

Industry contends that projectwide picketing by one or more trades is, indeed, a secondary boycott in that it stops workers not involved in the dispute from going to work across a union picket line.

The practical situation, of course, is that if the struck employer could not employ strikebreakers or workers of other employers to do the jobs of the striking employees the other subcontractors would soon have to stop work anyway because construction jobs are in reality dependent upon each craft or trade doing its work individually, yet jointly.

In closing, let's listen to some words spoken in farewell by a man whose experience covered over half a century in the most turbulent of all labor-management disputes in our lifetime:

"Not only in the coal industry has our organization been strong. The strength of this union has ever been an example for workers wherever situated in our Nation who are struggling to improve their lot. The establishment of widespread collective bargaining in our modern industries has been responsible to a great degree for the high standard of living and culture achieved by all Americans under our flag during the past few decades.

"Too many of our professional and business leaders failed to realize for many years that as the workers in their communities prospered and increased their buying power and their standards of living were raised, so inevitably that progress and that improvement would be shared by the business and professional and clerical interests in that community.

"So, America has finally achieved the highest standard of living that as far as we know has hitherto not existed in any country at any time in known history. There must be a reason that goes beyond what our political representatives may have done, or what our employers have done gratuitously, and that reason, of course, is the collective strength of the great masses of productive workers in our Nation making their influence felt through representatives of their own choosing and through the medium of collective bargaining.

"Can we keep America this way? Are we sure that progress will continue to be made in the face of the existent world problems and world trends and world confusion and expanding world population? That, my friends, is the task that lies ahead for the coming generations in our land, and that is the task that will face the organized labor movement of this country. But the organized labor movement cannot exercise its mass strength or fulfill its own destiny in the face of divided councils and caving and warfare in the ranks of organized labor down

to the lowest bobtail and ragtag local union in any particular craft.

"Private enterprise, as we know it in our country, is more or less on trial in all of the countries in the world except our own. Private enterprise, investment for profit, reward for incentive, doesn't exist in many countries. In countries where it does exist, it is in modified form as compared to our own economic scheme and our own economic arrangements.

"Our economy is not expanding. This is recognized by those who are students of such things. It is not expanding at a rate sufficiently rapid to protect this standard of living here in the face of the rapid expansion of other economies. American goods are increasingly and progressively being undersold in the world market—undersold by goods produced by economies that have been erected in these countries at the expense of the American taxpayer.

"How far do we go with it? Do we impoverish ourselves so that, with all vainglory, we can keep on contributing half of our national income to countries that will drive our goods from the world markets? Do we impoverish ourselves for countries that are only resisting Communist infiltration as long as we hire them in dollars? In reverse English that means that when these countries get to the place where they stand on their own feet they won't take our money, and then they will do as they please.

"The flight of American capital, for instance, is a problem that will attract the attention of this Nation in the years to come. Many of our manufacturers have items suitable for trade in the world markets but are finding it impossible to manufacture their goods in the United States under our standards of wages and living and collateral costs. So they are going abroad and are erecting production plants in foreign countries. One thousand American concerns already have plants that they erected in foreign countries. There they produce articles of trade which they had produced in their own American plants. There they produce articles with money earned under the American flag, under the free enterprise system. They are falling to reinvest under that same flag and under that same system. Many additional American concerns of magnitude in the commercial world are even now considering whether they are going to be forced to withdraw from the world markets or build production plants abroad, where there are low wages and standards of living conditions. There they can manufacture the same articles at less than they can do at home.

"You know, I used to know a baker in a fairly large town. His name was Heine, and he only had one ad. He had it on the highway a mile out of town, a highway that meets the four roads, and all it said was, 'Heine eats his own bread.' But apparently American capital, in part, does not want to eat its own bread. If one carries the arrangement or idea to its logical conclusion, the result will be the reduction of all our volume of trade in foreign countries and the abandonment of manufacturing enterprise here at home. This will augment the unemployment situation, add to the distress of our economy, dry up the source of taxation, until, perhaps, in the end we will not be able to sustain our foreign friends under the standards to which they have been accustomed, because we are destitute ourselves.

"These things are of great concern because they run to the question of whether the coal industry can continue as a vital part of the American economy—as its basic fuel. The coal industry, during the past decade, has made great strides in establishing national leadership, in modernizing its methods of operation and production, in lowering the unit cost of a vital necessity for American commercial purposes. There is a fair chance

that this stupendous effort will bring great economic reward to the investors in the coal industry, to the labor in the coal industry, and to the public at large—which gets a lower unit cost in purchasing this commodity.

"We must, however, maintain this economy of ours in that state of progression necessary to sustain our increasing population. The increase in population is a phenomenon not only in the United States, where 85 percent of our citizens now live in urban communities, increasingly dependent on their day-to-day income and their ability to meet their day-to-day expenses, but also in other countries. The teeming millions of the increased population in those countries are going to continue to overflow the political boundaries and strive with other peoples for the right to continue their existence in the only way they see possible at the time.

"Unless we keep our own Nation strong America cannot contribute for long to the maintenance of world peace against these menacing portents unless we keep our own house in order and unless we keep our own Nation strong. The business of keeping alive, keeping one's family in good health so the children can grow to be men and women is the primary obligation of every citizen. It begins at home. It is even more important than which candidate will get the nomination or be elected next fall. Far more.

"It is time for America to think. Our public debt is beyond all comprehension. Nine billion dollars a year in taxes are collected and paid to the bondholders as interest before a dollar becomes available for the ordinary operation of the Government and our public agencies. Perhaps we can continue expanding the national debt but it is very doubtful that we can do it successfully.

"I merely mention these things as indicative of my thoughts: that the members of labor organizations, as well as all other citizens, have a great obligation upon them in the future; that the work of labor is not finished; that America as a whole cannot grow soft and let the politicians do it all because pages of history are replete with incidents that indicate that the politicians rarely succeed after the confidence of the people has been removed through the lack of efficiency of their public representatives."

These are the words of John L. Lewis, miner, philosopher, American. His union shows what can be done by union-management cooperation without the interference of Congress.

Good Citizenship Needs Vision and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs sponsored a citizenship essay contest for high school juniors. The seventh district of the federated clubs consists of 32 counties in western Kansas, and Paul Taylor, of Sterling, won the contest with his essay entitled "Good Citizenship Needs Vision and Courage." Under unanimous consent I would like to bring this essay to the attention of this esteemed body:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP NEEDS VISION AND COURAGE

Collier's Encyclopedia defines citizenship as "the most perfect form of membership in a political community." What does this mean? Membership is the state of being a member and a member is defined as a person belonging to an organized body or society. To be a good member of society one must take an active interest in the welfare of the community. A citizen has certain duties to his town or community. He votes intelligently, helps create public opinion, serves on juries, performs military service, keeps well informed, pays taxes, serves in public offices, and helps in work of political parties.

Courage is defined as confidence to act in accordance with one's convictions. Certainly an individual needs courage to serve on a jury. How can we expect justice when jury members are timid souls who let their opinions be influenced by individuals of importance or by other outside sources? How can a timid person vote intelligently when he lets his vote be controlled by labor or other organizations? A person with sound and intelligent convictions can and should be helpful to more poorly informed citizens; however, this must not extend to the point of domination of those individuals. Military service also requires courage, for the battlefield is no place for the meek individual. Service to one's political party again requires courage in one's convictions. In my opinion political parties are fine, but a person's devotion to one to the point of worship is bad for the country and so is bad for the individual. Service in a public office is a job for an individual who will strive to do his best at all times to serve his fellow citizens in his community. He must have courage to resist the influence of certain corrupt individuals of whom there are frightfully many in our Government.

Vision can be defined as the ability of an individual to look ahead to new horizons, new problems, and to set new goals. Vision of the future as well as a thorough knowledge of the candidate's record is an essential factor in determining the best candidate for a public office. With this knowledge an individual will be able to use his vote to the best advantage. Vision of things to come enables an individual to help less informed people form an intelligent opinion of public affairs. Some people don't realize it, but when a person pays his taxes, he is showing faith in and vision for the future welfare of his community and country. Vision is an invaluable characteristic for a servant of the public. Should public servants lack the ability to look forward to things to come, the results could be disastrous. Going on the assumption that a well-informed citizen is a good citizen, a well-informed citizen can use his vision of things to come to determine whether they will be better or worse. If they should appear to be getting worse he should take advantage of every opportunity which may arise to improve the condition of his community.

The evidence seems to bear out the conclusion that vision and courage are two of the basic factors of good citizenship.

Resolutions of Indiana Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of informing my colleagues of

the views of the Indiana Council of Churches, I am inserting in the RECORD, the resolutions adopted by the assembly of the Indiana Council of Churches on January 15, 1960. Although we may or may not agree with every expression of view, we certainly can appreciate this sincere expression of convictions and can say without reservation that we join them when they say—

That we uphold the right and duty of the churches to study and comment upon the issues of human concern.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY,
INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, JANUARY 15,
1960

SECTION I

Whereas freedom of speech is being challenged in some circles; and

Whereas we believe that it is a vital part of our American way of life: Be it

Resolved, That we resist all efforts to discourage full freedom of discussion, that we uphold the right and duty of the churches to study and comment upon issues of human concern, and that we invite full candor on the part of governmental officials and other leaders of opinion in the public exposition of problems and dilemmas affecting the citizens of our State and Nation. In the light of this conviction: Be it further

Resolved—

1. That we urge our churches to help remove all barriers based on racial differences and to eliminate through study, negotiation and legislation discrimination in education, employment, housing, and public accommodations; and that we commend all who are using peaceful means to bring about the end of un-Christian practices in relationships with people whose racial, religious, or national origins differ from those of the majority;

2. That we use every means available to us as Christians to maintain clearly the separation of church and state, especially in cases where groups or individuals are tempted to try to use public tax funds for private schools (this would include the use of public school buildings and the time of public school teachers for released time religious education);

3. That we reaffirm our concerted opposition to all forms of gambling within our State including parimutuel betting and the use of pinball machines and similar devices recently condemned by the prosecutors of Marion and Lake counties;

4. That we call upon our State to join with other States and nations in the elimination of the barbarian practice of capital punishment;

5. That we intend to work unitedly for legislation, including an "implied consent" law, which will help to remove from our highways those who drive while under the influence of alcohol;

6. That we urge the Congress of the United States to outlaw the dangerous and disagreeable practice of serving alcoholic beverages on airlines, and that the airlines be instructed to refuse transportation to persons so clearly under the influence of alcohol as to become a hazard to the safety and comfort of other passengers;

7. That we use our influence as Christians to secure the abolition of the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce whether in newspapers, magazines, or on the air waves;

8. That we urge members of our churches to respect Sunday as a day of rest and worship.

SECTION II

Whereas the present development of weapons of destruction makes war hazardous to the very existence of mankind upon the earth; Be it

Resolved—

1. That we commend the President of the United States, other heads of state, and those individuals and organizations who have undertaken international visits and exchange of views as a means to resolve tensions;

2. That we commend those who out of concern for human values are striving to bring about an end to the suicidal arms race and to initiate a program of universal disarmament;

3. That we urge our Government to abstain from further nuclear tests and to renew its efforts to secure the universal abolition of such tests within a framework of international inspection;

4. That we reaffirm our support of the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to promote peace and understanding in the world and that we encourage our Government to give strong financial and moral backing to this organization and to utilize its good offices in all areas of discord affecting this country;

5. That we commend our U.N. delegation for negotiating treaties to insure the demilitarization of the Antarctic Continent and the peaceful exploration of outer space and urge upon the Congress their ratification forthwith;

6. That we commend and urge support for all religious, governmental, and private agencies and organizations working to bring about the sharing of our agricultural abundance with the needy of the world and we join with others in striving for more adequate machinery to deal with farm surpluses on a world scale.

7. That we continue to urge our Government to separate the humanitarian and military aspects of our mutual assistance program, in order that out of abundance and in love we may minister to the needs of our fellowmen without demanding military concessions which violate the self-respect and sovereignty of other nations;

8. That the rapidly expanding world population makes necessary consideration of means to limit population growth and that both Christian morality and humanitarian sensitivity would lead our Government to share with other nations, when requested, modern technical information concerning conception control and family planning;

9. That, in view of the harmful effects of compulsory military training upon both the morals and morale of our younger citizens and in the light of the opinion of many military leaders that this system is unnecessary and unrealistic in a scientific military age, we urge Congress to reconsider and re-evaluate its position in regard to compulsory military training and service;

10. That we urge our representatives in the United Nations and in Congress to declare that it is a crime for any nation or group to attempt to exterminate another group or nation because of ideology, color or ethnic origin, and that we, therefore, ratify the Genocide Convention; and

11. That we encourage our Government and people to receive in our Nation and communities a fair share of refugees from oppression and war.

12. That we call upon the members of our churches to inform themselves concerning our preparations for chemical, biological, and radiological warfare (CBR); and that we urge all with awakened Christian consciences to protest all preparation by any nation, including our own, to wipe out masses of people by the use of chemical, biological, or radiological weapons.

SECTION III

1. Whereas labor-management disputes vitally affect the public; and

Whereas it is difficult to ascertain the truth in the face of opposed presentations of fact; Be it

Resolved, That we urge both management and labor to enter collective bargaining ne-

gotiations responsibly and with sincerity and that unbiased representatives of the public be included in such negotiations.

2. Whereas the needs of human beings within our State and communities are necessarily a matter of Christian concern: Be it

Resolved, That we urge study by our churches of the adequacy of present public welfare programs and grants including the possibility of cooperation by Indiana with the other States in establishing uniform residence requirements for public assistance.

3. Whereas the Juvenile Court Act provides wisely for emphasis upon rehabilitation rather than punishment of youthful offenders and whereas the law makes possible the waiving to criminal courts of youths over 16 years of age: Be it

Resolved, That we favor maintenance of age 18 as the upper limit for jurisdiction of juvenile courts.

4. Whereas the life of a child untouched by religious teaching is impoverished; and

Whereas legally acceptable programs of weekday religious instruction on released time from the public schools have reached many unchurched boys and girls, and made possible expanded periods of instruction for church related children: Be it

Resolved, That we support the retention of present enabling legislation for weekday religious education classes on released time, and that we seek to develop such classes in conformity with the highest standards of Christian education and in full compliance with State and Federal laws.

5. Whereas faith in God and personal fellowship with Him in prayer have been cornerstones of American life and public policy: Be it

Resolved, That we support the setting aside of a room in the statehouse for private prayer and meditation.

Hon. Matthew Gilroy Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma, in Recognition for His Extraordinary Distinguished Public, Private, Patriotic, Philanthropic Services to Mankind, and in Further Recognition of His Efforts Toward the Establishment of International Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, on the occasion of the reception and ceremony, at the Lotos Club, New York City, at which the award was made to Mr. Gilroy. This high honor was bestowed on him in the presence of a very distinguished group of friends of Mr. Gilroy, from all parts of Canada, United States, Ireland, England, and South America by Maj. Gen. Carlos A. Cabrera, chief of the delegation of the Republic of Ecuador to the Inter-American Defense Board in Washington, D.C., and its military attaché.

The invocation was delivered by the Right Reverend Dr. Benjamin C. Eckardt,

President of Philathea College, London, Ontario, and Canadian provost of the foundation.

Mr. Joseph Goldberg, Canadian deputy provost and general chairman, read a cable from the Honorable Olmedo Alfaro, secretary general of the foundation authorizing the ceremony at the Lotos Club and conveying his personal greetings to all the assembled guests. Chairman Goldberg then introduced Dr. John Maurice Keesing, international provost, and famous international barrister, who delivered one of the most balanced and thought-provocative addresses, as follows:

SPEECH OF DR. JOHN M. KEESING ON THE OCCASION OF THE AWARD OF THE CROSS OF THE ELOY ALFARO INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION AT THE LOTOS CLUB, FEBRUARY 10, 1960

Ever since Dr. Herman Bayern, the American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation informed me that I was to take part in the award to Mr. Gilroy, I have been giving thought to the opportunity this presented to me to, as we say in the Army, "sound off."

The basic aim of the United States must be the creation of a prosperous and stable family of nations in the Americas. A prosperous and stable Latin America will advance the security of the entire hemisphere, and contribute greatly to the strength and solidarity of the Western World.

In the early 19th century, the great liberator, Simon Bolivar, when speaking of the type of government that was then required for Latin America, stated, "As long as our fellow citizens do not acquire the talents and virtues which distinguish our brothers to the north, a radical democracy, far from being good for us, will bring ruin upon us." This philosophy as expressed by the liberator at that time was, I believe, and as many historians believe, completely true. Gen. Eloy Alfaro, whose memory this international foundation honors, was an avowed disciple of Bolivar; a military man of renown who has been called the Lincoln of Latin America.

The men who are involved in international governmental affairs and business affairs must remember that times are constantly changing, and the rapidity of change is accelerating every day. The countries which compose Latin America today are full partners with the United States. The people of these countries have shown, and are continuously showing, that they have acquired the talents and virtues that the liberator referred to. The gap between the philosophy of the people of North and South America is rapidly disappearing. The people of Latin America has expressed their antipathy to despotic dictatorships, inflation, have expressed a desire for greater industrialization, and wider and more stable markets.

The Americas are fortunate today in having at the heads of Government men who are attempting to lead the growing up of the countries of Latin America. The heads of government of the Argentine, of Brazil, of Colombia, of Chile, and of Venezuela have been recently called by Time magazine, the real builders of Latin America. These men basically are attempting the amelioration of the condition of their countries as rapidly as they believe these changes can be effectively put into practice in their respective countries. They and other Americans realize that countries, like people, must grow and mature, and in so doing suffer the pains of growing.

The statement of international policy when made by officials of governments must be most carefully worded. The time of the statement, the place at which it was made and the reason for the pronouncement must

be carefully considered. Not only must the speechmaker consider these things, but also the reader or listener must view the statement in the light of these three circumstances. When speaking of a sister country of the Americas, the language must be clear. The underlying philosophy of the full partnership of all the countries of the Americas must be one of the guide rules governing the choice of words. A statement of policy must not be so worded that a perusal of it would lead the peoples of Latin America to feel that they have nothing to gain and much to lose by being sucked into the conflicts of the great powers in which they only will be exploited. Only when Latin Americans feel that they have something worth fighting for will isolationism give way to a feeling of identity and equality with the United States in the struggle for a free world.

The entire Latin American area is in the throes of a painful process of social, economic, and political transformation. This movement is only beginning.

The people who make policy in the Government of our country must gear their decisions to the probably great future of Latin America. The Latin American economy is rapidly expanding. Its potential for development in view of its vast untapped resources is of relative importance to this world. The economic growth of this area should double in less than 20 years. We have many inter-American organizations in which the governments of the Americas are in constant consultation and collaboration. This must be continued. Latin Americans must be convinced that in this contest that is going on in the world today, they have a great stake; that the stake of all the Americas is the same, whether it be the United States of America, Ecuador, Canada, Brazil, or any other country in the Americas. All the nations of the Americas are full and equal partners.

Private enterprise of North America must assist in the Latin American development. This assistance must be in such a manner as to discourage the growing belief that the nationalization of resources is the panacea of all economic ills. There must be a close interchange of ideas and awareness of purpose between private business and the governments involved, in order to bring about the potential economic advances of the Latin American countries.

I have placed these remarks before this group because I believe that the men who are here today speak with voices that have the authority of achievement in industry and in public life.

I ask all of you to use your influence and persuasive powers on our governments, and on our industrialists to convince them to view the Latin American affairs with the same eyes that they look upon their affairs at home, in the United States, and in Canada.

I ask for a unanimous advocacy of the principle of full partnership of the American nations.

Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, was then introduced, and set forth at length the achievements and accomplishments of former President Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, as follows:

FUNDACION INTERNACIONAL ELOY ALFARO, PANAMA, REPUBLICA DE PANAMA, LOTOS CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10

(Speech of Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, representing the foundation, when Matthew Gilroy, Esq., of Canada and Ireland, received the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross)

Dr. Keesing, members of the clergy, Mr. Gilroy, distinguished guests, and gentlemen, we are gathered here to honor a great humanitarian and philanthropist, Mr. Gilroy,

in recognition of his extraordinary efforts to serve mankind and international peace throughout the civilized world.

This foundation was incorporated by the Legislature of the Republic of Panama in order to perpetuate the memory of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, who was President of Ecuador at the turn of the century. This foundation seeks to promote the political and moral values of the Americas. General Alfaro advanced the cause of his nation by setting up the judicial system, and expanded her schools and colleges and other institutions of learning.

General Alfaro was a soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. His personal integrity, his unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice, and friendship marked about one-quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellow men which extended way beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador. He is recognized as the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people.

How the world needs another Alfaro today. History records that 70 years ago, in 1890, there was convened in Washington, the Conference of American States, in which Eloy Alfaro actively participated as a dedicated leader. Subsequently, the Pan American Union developed. Starting that long ago, Eloy Alfaro firmly believed in hemisphere solidarity. One of his major social contributions was to initiate measures for improving the status of the Indians and the downtrodden in his country and freeing them from exploitation.

The record shows that in 1907 he again was the dedicated leader who played a leading part at this International Conference in Mexico City, where the United States and six other Pan-American nations assembled and did discuss and resolve questions relating to the well-being of the American States.

In view of what is taking place in Cuba today, it is important to recall that General Alfaro played a leading part in achieving the liberation of oppressed Latin American nations, and furthering cooperation among the countries of the hemisphere, and restoring peace between the warring nations of the hemisphere when war was threatened. As a matter of historical fact, he welded together the factions of the Cuban Freedom Party in December 1895, 3 years before the Spanish-American War, when he publicly petitioned the Queen of Spain, in a document, demanding Cuban independence.

In view of his achievements and accomplishments, there are monuments in the memory of General Alfaro in almost every capital of the Western Hemisphere. And so today we stand inspired by the immortal Eloy Alfaro. Were he here, some of us would have been associated with him, and if he were alive today he would cooperate with President Eisenhower in his announced visit to Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, between February 23 and March 3, accompanied by Secretary of State Herter, in order to strengthen hemisphere solidarity against the vicious Communist conspiracy.

The philosophy of General Alfaro was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause and promotion of international peace. The public and private activities of our distinguished guest of honor, Matthew Gilroy, Esq., comes within the framework of this kind of service to humanity. In recognition of this fact, and that he is a great humanitarian and philanthropist, the ruling body of the foundation grants you, Mr. Gilroy, its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

You now, my dear Mr. Gilroy, join a goodly company of internationalists, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include President Eisenhower, former

President Truman, General MacArthur, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Governor Rockefeller, General McAuliffe, along with Maj. Gen. Carlos A. Cabrera, who typify the caliber of men who hold this high honor.

It now gives me genuine pleasure to call upon Maj. Gen. Carlos A. Cabrera, who I believe has an important message to deliver to us concerning President Eisenhower's trip to South America this month, to exercise what I know to be a pleasant duty imposed upon him by the board of dignitaries of this foundation to carry out its determination to honor Matthew Gilroy, Esq. General Cabrera.

Dr. Bayern then called upon Maj. Gen. Carlos A. Cabrera to bestow the high honor on the Honorable Matthew Gilroy in a dynamic speech as follows:

FUNDACION INTERNACIONAL ELOY ALFARO, PANAMA, REPUBLICA DE PANAMA, LOTOS CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10 (Presentation speech of Maj. Gen. Carlos A. Cabrera, Chief of the Delegation of the Republic of Ecuador to the Inter-American Defense Board in Washington, D.C., and Its Military Attaché, bestowing Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma (Titular de La Cruz de Eloy Alfaro) on Hon. Matthew Gilroy, of Canada and Ireland)

Hon. Matthew Gilroy, I consider it a great privilege to be with you today in this solemn ceremony of friendship, appreciation, and good will. Dr. Herman A. Bayern, whose clear understanding of human nature fomented and practices the virtues that dignify humanity: Liberty, Peace, and Justice. I consider it my pleasant duty to thank Dr. Bayern for having given me this privilege.

In the world today, we have before us an overwhelming task due to the fantastic progress of science. If we do not manage to maintain equal conditions based on true understanding and cooperation of all humanity, we will undoubtedly have to face the consequences of a major cataclysm.

The consequences of which would most certainly be disastrous. We do have rays of hope and optimism when we observe the existence of associations, like the one which has brought us here together, whose members dedicate their time and talent towards helping the needy, the unfortunate, and all those who are in need of spiritual and economical help so as to be able to continue living a life of honesty, hope, and self-respect.

Undoubtedly the "Fundacion Internacional Eloy Alfaro de Panama" has maintained alive the indomitable spirit of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, whose life was dedicated toward bringing about a mutual understanding and cooperation of the Americas, has decided to present to you, Mr. Gilroy, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma as a recognition of your multiple virtues and work dedicated to the service of international peace.

In this solemn hour, the memory of Eloy Alfaro is honored by the members of the Fundacion Internacional Eloy Alfaro. General Alfaro, the man of the Americas who never faltered in sacrificing his life and so became the standard of the unconquerable striver for the individual liberties of man and humanity. You will from now on, Mr. Gilroy, have with you the image of this illustrious Ecuadorian, a citizen of a small country if we measure greatness or smallness by land measures, but of tremendous size and fortitude when it comes to defending and upholding human liberties.

Today the world has the privilege of having another outstanding general, to whom I want to pay my respects and admiration, a citizen of whom the world is proud and in whom many have placed their hopes of liberty and freedom from fear. The President of the United States of America, General Eisenhower.

We of the Americas hold great hope and optimism in General Eisenhower's trip to South America. We all feel that with his personal encounter with us we will all be able to evaluate and understand each others problems. Understanding, I am sure, is the essential step in obtaining mutual cooperation.

I think, a solid feeling of liberty and democracy will greet him on his trip to the countries of Latin America, that are all willing to cooperate on a basis of integrity and mutual respect, but never by imperialistic or bellicose imposition.

Let us follow the example of Mr. Matthew Gilroy. He who has proved to be a dynamic leader whose intelligence and economical well-being he has dedicated toward helping human beings. Let us all strive toward re-assuring the most noble qualities of a human being: Honesty, morality, and justice. Let us all remember that certain qualities must exist to be able to live in a world in which man may enjoy the liberties so many times quoted. Where neither the fear of tomorrow, nor the imposition of tyrants, who feel they can destroy the lives of children, the aged, the adults, merely because of their whims, will never again cast its dark shadow over our heads. Let us always remember a few words left to us as a priceless heritage by Eloy Alfaro. "There is no redemption without sacrifices; these are the solid bases of progress."

General Cabrera, at the conclusion of his outstanding speech, then conferred the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross on Mr. Gilroy, assisted by American Provost Herman A. Bayern:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE MATTHEW GILROY

Thank you, General Cabrera, your Excellencies, members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am overwhelmed with the great honors you have bestowed upon me and at joining such distinguished company. I little thought when I followed the dictates of my conscience that I would one day be so honored amidst such outstanding company from all over the world. Besides Gen. Eloy Alfaro I feel humble but inspired by his example and with the opportunity to help further the aims and objectives of the great international foundation to be of greater service, to my fellow humans, and to international peace.

Among those who have honored me with their presence here today, are members of several faiths, several nations. In this great city there is a living testament to man's desire for harmony and brotherhood, in the shape of the United Nations.

We all here know that it can be achieved, and that it is even more vital at the grassroots level where the need is most important. There is so much need, so many places to start, and so little time. Like me, you are all blessed with much happiness and many true friends. Join me in helping to achieve Eloy Alfaro's aims of having everyone, everywhere, just as fortunate.

Again let me express my appreciation for the award of this signal honor. May God be with you all, always.

I am particularly happy to make note of this special occasion, since it gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to the spirit that made America great. Matthew Gilroy, like our own forefathers, came to North America, and starting from scratch, with little more than coffee money in his pocket, is creating a vigorous mining empire. Unlike most, Mr. Gilroy dedicates his substance, his life, and all his energies to all his fellow humans.

Furthermore, I am delighted to add my tribute because amongst the many distinguished guests from many nations were three of my own leading constituents, Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American Provost; Dr. B. Tully, a distinguished physician from Westchester County; and Mr. Hugh Baxter, a school friend of Mr. Gilroy, who also has made his mark as an American citizen and industrial leader. Unfortunately, urgent duties of State prevented me from participating in this award ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, the award made to the Honorable Matthew Gilroy includes the motto, "Thus one goes to the stars," a most appropriate one in this case. The award reads as follows:

Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—"thus one goes to the stars." Recognizing the special value of the services rendered by the Honorable Matthew Gilroy in support of the objectives of this institution he has been awarded the Cross of Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

Msgr. John J. Voight, secretary on education for His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, concluded the luncheon with the benediction.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Young America's Moral Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the preservation of high standards of morality and integrity among the youth of our country is absolutely essential, if we are to provide the kind of high quality leadership necessary for the future.

First of all, however, I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not believe the picture is as black as some would paint it—that the youth of America are “going to the dogs.”

To the contrary, the vast majority of our young folks are making a real, constructive, creative effort to live right, act right, and perform useful roles in home-and-community life; and to build themselves into adults capable of effectively bearing the responsibility of citizens and leadership in the future.

We realize, of course, that among the minority, there are serious problems to be dealt with, including, among other things, increases in delinquency, crime, and illegitimacy.

As adults, we have the responsibility of setting good examples within our human capabilities.

Secondly, we need to improve the moral climate in which the youth of today are accumulating ideas and knowledge upon which to conduct an adult life.

From time to time, there are analyses of the “whys and wherefores” of conditions in which there is disobedience to the social, legal, moral, and spiritual laws.

Regrettably, however, the analyses often do not go “that extra mile” necessary to find ways and means to provide the high standards of integrity and morality among the youth of our country.

Recently, however, an informative article in the *Eagles* magazine of March 1960, by Jim Collison, entitled “Young America's Moral Crisis,” did not just point an accusing finger at youth and adults for the existence of the difficulties facing young America; rather, the article also presented some constructive recommendations for improving the climate in which youth can grow educationally, spiritually, and morally.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOUNG AMERICA'S MORAL CRISIS

(By Jim Collison)

Adult Americans are corrupting young America. An alarming percentage of American teenagers—not alone the delinquent thugs among them—are maturing without an adequate sense of right and wrong. They seem to be developing morally void characters.

Luckily young people who have learned character discipline and whose parents have matured them are already pointing toward their own solutions to the youth problem.

These young people are digesting the unpleasant truth daily newspapers across the Nation report in increasing tempo—stories America's adults too quickly forget:

“DALLAS, TEX.—Alarmed over an increase in teenage marriages and pregnancies among school children, the Dallas Parent-Teacher Association council voted to ask that a separate school be set up for married students. A survey turned up one 12-year-old and two 13-year-old married students; marriages are up 41 percent since 1957—2 percent of the total school enrollment—and 144 girls dropped from school because of pregnancy.”

“STREATER, N. DAK.—Authorities have broken up a juvenile crime wave here, nabbing six boys aged 10 to 13 who had been looting business places over a 6-month period. Told they had hit every place in town except the bank one of the boys answered, ‘We got that, too,’ and produced two rolls of coins to prove it.”

“WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, Georgia, called Sunday for an investigation to determine whether Federal welfare payments encourage an increase in illegitimate births. The rate of illegitimate children born to teenage mothers has increased 5.2 percent from 1956 to 1957.

“DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.—The fire chief here said he would ask the village council to close a youth center as a result of a scuffle between hundreds of teenagers and 20 of his firemen. Several firemen suffered cuts and bruises in the melee. The fire chief lost several teeth. * * * He said many of the youth were drunk.”

The moral breakdown among American youth is so alarming that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has called it a crisis which threatens the very future of our Nation.

These are the facts that the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth will consider at meetings in Washington, D.C., from March 27 to April 2:

Almost one-third of all mothers work outside the home.

Juvenile delinquency is increasing five times faster than the child population of juvenile court age.

Although young people today are marrying younger, 1 out of every 7 girls between 15 and 19 who has a baby is not married.

Teenagers have 40 percent of all the illegitimate children born in the United States.

There are other statistics just as shocking: Juveniles represent one-half the venereal disease caseload in America. Health officials believe that 200,000 teenagers are infected with VD each year.

Unwed motherhood among adolescents is on the rise and will continue, Mrs. Katherine Brownell Oettinger, chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau, has stated.

Within 2 years, 110,000 to 120,000 illegitimate children will be born annually to teenage mothers.

The 1958 FBI crime report (last full-year report available) shows that in America there was a 9.3 percent overall increase in crime. During the last 5 years there was a 1 percent increase each year in crime among persons 18 and over; there was a 10 percent increase each year in crime for teenagers and youngsters under 18 years of age.

Juveniles under 18 represented 12 percent of all persons arrested in 1958. They accounted for: 64.1 percent of auto thefts; 49.9 percent of burglaries; 48.5 percent of larceny cases; 30.9 percent of receiving-and-possession-stolen-property charges, and 22.8 percent of robbery charges.

The National Safety Council notes a growing notion that children must not walk anywhere—they must not even walk two blocks to school. As a result nearly 6 million motorists are teenagers.

School officials are fast realizing the threat. One widely publicized study in an Idaho school showed that no straight-A senior student drove to school; 15 percent of the B seniors drove to school; 41 percent of the C seniors drove to school; 71 percent of the D seniors drove to school, and 83 percent of the failing seniors drove to school.

Now consider the average teenager's attitude toward previously accepted American political principles:

Dr. H. H. Remmers, director of Purdue University's Division of Educational Reference and originator of the Purdue Opinion Panel, in his book “The American Teenager” reveals that: 44 percent of American students believe that if a person is uncertain how to vote it is better if he does not vote; 57 percent agree that the average citizen is justified in remaining aloof from dirty politics that may exist in his community; 34 percent believe that the Government should prohibit some people from making public speeches; 53 percent say that history is the story of the fight for power between different economic classes (the Communist theory).

These tragic results seem to confirm beyond much doubt that our traditional freedom is already in danger. Certainly when nearly half of our teenagers feel that the people are incapable of making their own decisions, we have a massive and frightening rejection of the basic theory of democratic government. Dr. Remmers concluded: “If our interpretation of the findings of the Purdue Opinion Polls is correct, Americans should be much more concerned about the 97 percent of our teenagers who are not delinquent than about the 3 percent who are.”

Whatever the percentage of good youngsters in America—3 or 53—they themselves are beginning to see the moral decline in young America, and they are putting the blame squarely where it belongs.

A resolution adopted late last year at a 2-day convention of the New England Congress of Catholic Youth Councils in Manchester, N.H., noted that the conduct of teenagers is the responsibility of parents:

“Inasmuch as teenagers have been the target for criticism regarding driving and drinking, it is felt that parents should exercise their parental prerogative in these matters; that they should constantly alert youth to responsibilities to the public; that they should take a firm stand when the occasion demands; that if firm guidance is exercised,

much of the trouble caused by teenage driving and drinking could be averted."

The cause of juvenile delinquency and moral breakdown goes deeper, though.

Some authorities on the subject, like Judge Samuel Leibowitz of Kings County Criminal Court, New York, describes the cause as the "philosophy of permissiveness."

Judge Warren Hill, presiding justice of the domestic relations court in New York, best summarized the basic cause of juvenile moral breakdown when he told me that "you can readily infer that I deplore this policy of no restraint and no discipline, for our youngsters."

Before the U.S. Senate's Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee Judge Leibowitz put his finger on the American juvenile cancer: "Our family life has gone to flinders."

Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, told me that "testimony before this subcommittee and general research in sociology and criminology indicate that * * * parental roles are changing and thus confusing the frames of reference and goals on the basis of which parents are able to exert effective control over their children."

Senator HENNING went on to explain that "especially in delinquency areas, parents do not know what roles they are to play in society, and much less do they know what direction to give their children. This causes a lack of control."

What is the solution?

First, adults should recognize the problem and begin to organize and support youth councils throughout the Nation like those in the Cincinnati area.

Here are excerpts from a report which young people—500 strong from 40 high schools, 16 youth-serving agencies, and 5 youth councils participating in the first (1959) Greater Cincinnati Conference on Youth—prepared for the White House Conference on Children and Youth:

"The family is the basis of society, but it is falling apart because each member is going his own way. * * * The father is the head of the house. Mothers are needed in the home and should not work outside unless it is absolutely necessary.

"Stronger parental authority is needed. * * *

"Many adults don't have values for themselves; how can they set values for their children? * * *

"The youth of today have not developed sufficiently high moral qualities. The churches could help but youth will not give them a chance. * * *

"Youth have too easy access to beer and liquor in stores. They are seldom questioned about age. * * *

"Classroom discipline is too lax. Teachers need to be more strict. * * *

That report reflects the growing concern of young people about the vacuum they are reared in. For information on how to organize a Youth Council, write to The Citizens' Committee on Youth, 305 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio.

Second, adults must support medical and scientific investigations into the juvenile delinquency problem.

For example, Dr. Sam I. Stein, former director of the psychiatric department, Family Court of Cook County, Illinois, is dedicating his talents to neuropsychiatric research. His is a complicated theory but is backed up by years of experience in working with delinquents in Chicago. Dr. Stein believes that love is a basic need for every human, and his research is directed at proving this theory of his scientifically.

Third, adults must combine understanding love with intelligent forms of discipline.

Discipline is needed at home and at school.

District Judge S. E. Prall last November ruled in Nevada, Iowa, that teachers have the

same right as a parent when it comes to disciplining an unruly youngster.

"I think it is time that we settle down and recognize that we as adults must have discipline, we must discipline ourselves, and these kids must be taught some means of discipline," he said.

The judge pointed out that judges are given authority to maintain order in their courtrooms. "I maintain we are going to have to get back to a little more discipline in order to run our schools properly and give our kids the education they are entitled to."

Fourth, adults must start leading young people to church and showing by example the practice of morality.

Chief Justice Irving Ben Cooper of the New York Court of Special Sessions has made the following remarks concerning delinquents:

"They have seen justification for the attitude: 'Make a fast buck.' They have seen it on all sides. No one has talked about integrity, honor, forthrightness. And so it is in the home where the mother is going to meetings. It is in the home where the mother is overworked. It is in the home where there is never any attendance at church, or the equivalent."

Fifth, adults must challenge young people with opportunities to do constructive work—at home, in school, in community affairs, and at work.

Dr. Ted W. Engstrom, president of Youth for Christ International, at the recent national convention in Washington, D.C., called for a "spiritual revolution."

"The only antidote to our present moral collapse," he said, "is a spiritual counter-attack. * * * I have little hope for the adults to save the world. The great hope lies with the teenagers. * * * The purpose of the entire (Youth for Christ) program is to challenge today's teens with the great spiritual values that have made our Nation great."

Will our young people accept the challenge?

Capital Punishment in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, much interest is presently being taken in my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment.

In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Victor Wilson as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1960:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE UNITED STATES (By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—When Gov. Edmund G. Brown asks a special session of his California Legislature to abolish the death penalty, he could do no better than to call upon the U.S. Navy if he needs some expert witnesses.

For the Navy, a bit of research reveals, hasn't executed a man for any crime, including desertion in the face of the enemy in wartime, and murder, since 1842. This is a remarkable record, considering that the country has fought five wars since then.

The last Navy men to be executed were Philip Spencer and two coconspirators, who were strung up to the yardarm of the brig *Somers*, after conviction of mutiny. Spencer

was a son of the man who was Secretary of War in 1842.

A Navy spokesman, discussing this incident, explained with a perfectly straight face that the absence of executions since that date might well be attributed to the simple fact that the Navy knew enough to quit when it was ahead. There was a frightful uproar over the Spencer execution, but the captain of the brig *Somers* was held to be within his rights.

No overall figures are available on Army executions since 1842. But the Federal Bureau of Prisons recently released data showing that in the 30-year period, 1930-59, the Army—and Air Force—carried out 159 executions.

That included World War II and the Korean war. But only one death penalty was carried out for desertion. Of the others, 106 were for murder and 52 for rape. The Air Force and Army carried out the death penalty three times each in 1954, 1955, and 1957, and once each in 1958 and 1959.

The Navy spokesman pointed out that its courts-martial use the same military code for crimes as the Army and Air Force. There is no policy against death sentences; indeed, they are frequently voted by Navy general courts.

But, the spokesman said, the practice "just grew up" since 1842 that no Navy man is executed. On a few occasions, however, it took intervention by the Secretary of the Navy, or the President himself, to keep the record intact, with commutation of a death sentence to life imprisonment.

Governor Brown, who is against capital punishment as a matter of conscience, has the politically explosive Caryl Chessman case on his hands. Chessman, recently reprieved for 60 days from the California gas chamber pending legislative review of the State's death penalty statute, had been spared seven times previously since 1948. He was convicted at Los Angeles on two counts of kidnapping involving bodily harm.

On past form, the Governor's plea to the legislature looks forlorn. For in the last 27 years, eight similar appeals to drop the death penalty have been disregarded by the State's legislators, the last rejection occurring just last year.

Only 9 of the Nation's 50 States bar capital punishment—Michigan, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Maine, Minnesota, North Dakota, Delaware, Hawaii, and Alaska. (There is no death penalty either, in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.)

However, another nine States which once voted to abolish the death sentence, have reinstated it. They are Kansas, Colorado, Washington, Oregon, South Dakota, Arizona, Missouri, Tennessee, and Iowa. (Methods of execution include electrocution, lethal gas, and hanging. In Utah, however, one may choose between hanging or shooting.)

The Bureau of Prisons' data show that in 1959, 49 executions were carried out in 16 States. Florida led the way with 10. Arkansas and California had six each, and Georgia four. All were men, 41 convicted of murder, and 8 for rape. Last year's 49 figure was 1 above the alltime low set in 1958.

In view of Chessman's long, successful battle against death, it is noteworthy that the elapsed time between sentence and execution in 1959 for capital crimes ranged from 65 days in a Nebraska murder case, to 9 years 1 month and 21 days in the case of a Pennsylvania murderer. The Bureau's data remarks that "appeals, new trials, and judicial and executive orders granting stays * * * accounted for the wide range in elapsed periods."

Only one bill concerning capital punishment is now before the Congress. This is by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Brooklyn Democrat, introduced in January 1959, which would substitute life imprisonment

for the death penalty in all Federal cases except military crimes and atomic espionage.

Like Governor Brown, Representative MULLER is opposed to capital punishment as a matter of conscience. He says he doubts the death penalty is a deterrent to capital crimes and that man is not infallible in judging guilt. The Department of Justice is opposed to this bill.

A check shows that since 1930, 31 Federal prisoners (excluding military, of course) have been executed—15 for murder; 2 for rape; 1 for armed robbery; 5 for kidnapping, and 8 for espionage. None were executed in 1958 or 1959.

Death of Red Cloud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record some remarks of my own, and an editorial from the Daily Republic of Mitchell, S. Dak., on Tuesday, March 1, 1960, in connection with the death of Red Cloud, one of our great Sioux Indians.

There being no objection, the remarks and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

RED CLOUD—A GREAT INDIAN PASSES ON

There has passed from the South Dakota scene a truly remarkable man. Death has taken James Red Cloud of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

The Daily Republic, of Mitchell, S. Dak., published a story about this well-known Indian leader in the March 1, 1960, edition.

Those of us in public life knew Red Cloud well. He was a spokesman for his people. He devoted his life to their problems and he attempted at all times to seek means of raising the standard of living for the Indians of South Dakota.

Red Cloud was a modest man. He was not self-seeking nor did he attempt to promote his own welfare at the expense of those whom he represented. He was a man from whom an honest answer could be expected. He was honorable, tolerant, religious, and solicitous of others.

I am sure that many South Dakotans will appreciate the fact that the Mitchell Republic printed this story about the life of Red Cloud. Too many of our great Indians pass away without any record being printed of their contributions to the welfare of their people and to their country.

The name of James Red Cloud will always remain on the great tribal honor rolls as a distinguished American Indian. He should serve as a model to his own people as well as to all of us.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Mar. 1, 1960]

OGLALA SIOUX CHIEF, CHAMPION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS, WELFARE, DIES

PINE RIDGE.—On February 16, there passed from the American scene a great and romantic figure one of the few remaining links of the time with the old West, James Red Cloud, hereditary chief of the Oglala Sioux and grandson of the famous old warrior leader Red Cloud, died at the age of 83.

Chief James Red Cloud was born at Fort Laramie, Wyo., in 1877, the year another

famous chief Crazy Horse was killed and the year following the Custer battle. He was a boy during the time of the last sad struggles of his heroic people for their freedom and their homeland. He was 13 years old in 1890, when during Christmas week the Wounded Knee Massacre occurred, in which totally unarmed Indian men, woman, and children, even babies, were shot down or sabered to death by American cavalry troops, and his distinguished grandfather finally prevailed upon the Sioux to surrender and make a lasting peace.

After a childhood spent near Oglala on White Clay Creek among what were called the "Sore Back" clan (today no one seems to know the meaning of this description) his family moved to Pine Ridge in 1887, where the Government had built a house for the old chief out on the edge of the prairie just west of the present Indian boarding school. It was at this school that James Red Cloud made his first contact with the white man's learning. Later he attended Holy Rosary Mission which his grandfather had repeatedly invited the Jesuit Black Robes to found.

In 1911, he was a member of Buffalo Bill's 101 show and traveled all over the country, though never to Europe. It was while he was helping to load some show stock on a train that the accident occurred in which he fell and a switch engine ran over his left leg, making amputation necessary.

Like his grandfather, Chief James Red Cloud believed strongly in education and preached its value nearly all his life. Shortly before he died, at a feast to honor a grandson who had just graduated from high school at Holy Rosary Mission, the old chief, in full ceremonial costume and wearing his great headdress of eagle feathers, spoke long and eloquently from his wheelchair in behalf of education. He said that the Sioux people had lost to the white man; but that, even so, there was no need the Sioux should forever remain a defeated people; that through education they would rise again and learn to live in the white man's world and become honorable—and honored—citizens of America.

He was a great fighter all his life for the rights and welfare of his afflicted people and made 11 trips to Washington during his life to speak for them. He was also a great Christian, with a simple, living faith. Whenever he came to Pine Ridge, he never failed to visit Sacred Heart Church, where he would pray aloud in Indian and chant the praises of the Lord, whom his grandfather had first helped his people to know and honor.

In his old age, despite his many physical afflictions, the chief kept something of the striking handsomeness and fine bearing of his younger days. He was a tall, dignified man, and in his headdress presented an imposing figure. He kept his hair in two braids all his life.

He was buried at Holy Rosary Mission, the Rev. Lawrence Edwards, S.J., officiating at the grave. His grandfather also lies at rest in the same cemetery.

He is survived by two sons: Edgar, of Pine Ridge, and Louis of Pueblo, Colo., and one daughter, Agnes, of Pine Ridge.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 the President vetoed H.R.

3610, the bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment facilities. On February 25 the House failed by a few votes to override the President's veto with 234 Democrats and 15 Republicans voting to override and 131 Republicans and 26 Democrats voting to sustain the veto. In vetoing H.R. 3610, the President disregarded the advice of his own Water Pollution Control Advisory Board which was established by law to advise him on such matters. The record shows that this legislation has greatly expanded local cooperation in this important health field with a relatively small proportion of the expense carried by the Federal Government. Most of the help is in planning and encouraging local cooperation and participation. As the President said, local communities should not need encouragement, but the plain fact is that they do need encouragement and a vital health problem is involved.

Mr. Speaker, the Pella Chronicle, published in Pella, Iowa, recently published a worthy editorial in this matter and under unanimous consent I insert this thought-provoking editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET SAVINGS VERSUS PUBLIC HEALTH

U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials are showing a good deal of concern over serious water pollution in many sections of this country. They have warned if the situation prevails it could jeopardize the further growth and development of many areas of the country and even the health of millions of people.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower is so engrossed in looking for budget savings he slashed next year's water pollution budget nearly in half. This was done in the face of reputable reports from a leading sanitary engineering center in Ohio which revealed that more than 3,000 communities still discharge raw waste into the Nation's waterways. A number of cities are pumping microscopic, unseen worms in their water. Some drinking water has been found to contain radioactive waste, cancer-causing chemicals, raw sewage, such diseases as typhoid fever, paralytic polio, yellow jaundice, and dysentery.

A \$90 million antipollution bill is on the President's desk, but he wants the Health, Education, and Welfare Department to prepare a veto message telling why the money is not needed. It is reported that all leading presidential contenders except Vice President Nixon have endorsed the pollution control program.

We believe in wise saving and in wise spending. But the President's action in this matter is disturbing. The Nation's health is more important than budget balancing.

Pollution Setback Temporary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal discussed the problems that would face the Nation if Congress failed to override the Presidential

veto of H.R. 3610, a bill which would have increased Federal grants for construction of facilities to deal with our national water pollution problem. The veto has not been overridden, and the problems persist.

Although the editorial was written before the vote on the veto it expresses a rapidly growing concern about the basic question of water pollution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal,
Mar. 1, 1960]

POLLUTION SETBACK TEMPORARY

If Congress fails to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 3610, the Federal water antipollution bill, such action can be viewed as only a temporary setback. Proponents of Federal financial aid to municipalities, with a maximum of 30 percent of construction costs, are disappointed, not discouraged. The battle to clean up our rivers which too often are running cesspools will go on despite the opposition of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

President Eisenhower's objection was predicated on assumption that pollution control is a job for State and local governments. Yet, when Federal aid first was made available, municipal sewerage construction almost doubled. A Federal grant often has decided whether a sewerage system would be built or improved when a municipality was hard pressed by demands for schools, roads, or other local improvement.

Industries—and in New Jersey it is no exception—often have been embarrassed when attention has been called to the noxious wastes they pass into our streams. In their opposition they do not realize that clean water often is as essential to manufacturing processes as it is to health and recreation.

The \$50 million a year under the original law to help municipalities construct sewage-treatment plants is unaffected by the Presidential veto. But that sum—which H.R. 3610 almost would have doubled—is far from adequate to accelerate the present rate of progress. If it makes possible keeping even with the gain in pollution the Nation will be fortunate.

Under the existing Federal law 160 sewage-treatment projects were built by Ohio River Valley towns at a cost of \$111 million. They received a total of \$20 million in Federal grants. The Ohio River long has been held up to national scorn as one of the most polluted streams in the land. Apparently, with a modicum of Federal aid, Ohio Valley towns are willing to do something about it.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce repeatedly has singled out the antipollution control bill for attack along the lines used by the President in attempting to justify his veto. There are countless other channels into which Federal funds are being poured with far less to recommend them than clean waters.

The people of the United States, who are the taxpayers and foot the bill as well as reap the benefits, repeatedly have expressed themselves on the subject of pollution control. Clean streams are important to health, recreation, and American morale; in the past they have been and should continue to be an important factor in our American way of life.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join with our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], in paying tribute to the courageous nation of Lithuania on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of its proclamation of independence.

That independence is a state of mind, as well as a condition under which all peoples of the world have a right to live, is demonstrated by the indomitable people of Lithuania. For though ruthlessly overrun and totally deprived by force of communism of all human rights and freedom, there remains in the hearts of Lithuanians a spirit of resistance to such Godlessness that no amount of oppression can extinguish. The Communists have, since June 15, 1940, enslaved the Lithuanian people. However, they have not been able to hold in bondage the minds of their captives who live for the day they will be liberated.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, inherently are dedicated to the cause of freedom for everyone everywhere. It thus becomes our solemn duty as their chosen representatives in Congress to exert every wise effort toward achieving universal freedom.

On July 17, 1959, the President signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 111, providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. On that date the President issued a proclamation so designating the week beginning July 19, 1959. As we join in this observance of Lithuanian independence, the message of President Eisenhower in his proclamation takes on special significance:

It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence.

And to the American people:

I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of those captive nations.

One well might become so used to the familiar language of proclamations that he could become insensitive to their import. But consider for a moment the depth of meaning to us of these words that appear over the signature of the President:

Done at the city of Washington, this 17th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

Mr. Speaker, in saluting our friends in Lithuania we in Congress must rededicate ourselves to achieving the goal of individual liberty for all mankind.

We must keep this goal ever in our sights and never relax our efforts to secure and maintain this objective.

Lamar, Colo.—All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the courageous Great Plains city of Lamar has become the second Colorado community in 2 years to receive designation as an All America City by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Last year, similar honers went to Leadville, 2 miles above sea level in the Rockies. The people of Colorado are pleased, but not surprised.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject from the Denver Post for February 25 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a copy of a letter of congratulations which I wrote to Mayor C. O. Bowman, of Lamar.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAMAR'S EXAMPLE

Twelve years ago, Lamar, Colo., was an uneasy town, uncertain of its future. It was drought time; not as bad as the Dust Bowl days, but it brought back fears and memories.

Today, Lamar is thriving and confident.

It has a new community building, new schools, new sewage disposal facilities, a thriving airport, a big recreation program, a bigger hospital, an adequate water supply and many more new public facilities.

How did this happen?

First, through strong leadership by the chamber of commerce, the city council, the civil planning commission, and by the press.

Second, and perhaps more important, by the involvement of all the people, so that every Lamar citizen took a proprietary interest in what was going on, and so that the idea of "I got mine—let George do it" could not sidetrack the city's bootstrap project.

In a nutshell, that's why this week Lamar received from the National Municipal League and Look magazine the designation of "All America City." The honor is well deserved.

Lamar's community effort can serve as an excellent object lesson to many other Great Plains cities—some of them considerably bigger.

There's nothing so satisfying as achievement—especially community achievement—but it's like ice cream: You've got to taste it to know how good it is.

Trouble is, there are lots of skeptics who don't believe it's worth while to go to the trouble of picking up the spoon.

FEBRUARY 17, 1960.

Hon. C. O. BOWMAN,
Lamar, Colo.

DEAR MAYOR BOWMAN: Mrs. Carroll and I regret that the increasing pace of Senate business of historic significance during this session prevents us from attending the presentation ceremonies on February 22, when

Lamar will join the proud ranks of All America Cities. I wish I could be with you all that evening, but I trust that you will understand.

Let me say, however, that while the award is gratifying to all Coloradans, it comes as no surprise to the people of our State. Lamar's progress has been the talk of Colorado for years.

A plainsman named Lincoln once said that government should do for the people only what they could not do as well for themselves. Lamar citizens have shown the kind of healthy community independence that proves the wisdom of those words.

They saw a problem, studied it carefully, and went to work. They recognized that it would mean sacrifice of hard-earned money and perspiration and time, but they were willing to make the sacrifice. And they did it in a period of drought, uncertain farm economies, and a general flight of population toward metropolitan centers.

This marks the second year in a row that a Colorado city has been singled out for All America honors. As you may recall, Leadville was one of the 1959 winners. Both on the plains and in the mountains, Coloradans are showing the rest of the Nation how to turn a tough situation into an asset. This is appropriate, for ours has not been an easy kind of country to settle and make prosperous. It has required a special breed of people.

It is equally stimulating to note that you are not content to rest on your laurels—that another 10-year program is being developed under the same strong leadership mentioned by Look magazine—yourself, Fred Betz, Sr., Mrs. J. B. Spencer, Bob Scarffe, the members of the civic planning commission, and others.

In an age of self-doubt, when some thoughtful people express the fear that Americans have become physically and morally flabby—interested only in their own personal luxury and leisure—the Lamar story makes big news everywhere. It demonstrates that the individual's feeling of personal responsibility for the well-being of his neighbors, his friends, his hometown, is still a vital part of life in Colorado and our Nation. May it always be thus.

My warmest congratulations to you all.
Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARROLL.

The Problem of Equitable Treatment of Competitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association recently heard a number of important addresses on various phases of our antimonopoly statutes and their application. Commissioner Edward T. Tait, of the Federal Trade Commission, presented an interesting discussion of the problem of equal treatment of competitors whose practices may come under the scrutiny of the Commission.

This is a subject of importance to both industry and the bar, yet it is a field which is not so well known as many other activities of the FTC. Because of this situation, I ask unanimous consent

that Mr. Tait's address on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF COMPETITORS

(By Edward T. Tait, Federal Trade Commissioner)

"Why pick on me?" is a common query heard at the Federal Trade Commission. As you listen you try to place this person and his remark in the proper setting. A businessman has just been caught violating the law. Sometimes you feel he must have known that he was doing so. Is he a seller or buyer caught in the intricate web of the Robinson-Patman Act or is he an advertiser squeezing more sales from an alluring but cleverly deceptive innuendo? Putting aside sympathy, or lack of it, you remember a pigeonholing phrase of our profession, "competition not competitors."

Respondents frequently say that their competitors are engaged in the same alleged illegal practices. They further claim that if the Commission issues a cease and desist order against themselves alone, they will be at a serious competitive disadvantage. Recently the Commission issued simultaneous complaints against one large company and several small ones. The large company was heard to complain at the very outset, "Why were we the only large company to be sued?"

I know you and your clients are very much interested in the competitive effects of the Commission's law enforcement. I shall not discuss the trade practice conference procedure. It is well understood as an effort to gain industry-wide voluntary compliance with the law through what one might call the educational process. I shall refer only briefly to the stipulation and guides procedures.

My remarks this afternoon are directed primarily to those situations wherein the Commission determines that it is necessary to issue formal complaints. This brings us to the heart of my topic—the equitable treatment of competitors in formal proceedings. Francis Bacon once said that the best armor is to keep out of gunshot. I could heed that advice by presenting a paper condemning the sale of lottery devices. Such a paper would be safe and probably of no interest to you. Bear in mind, however, that I am discussing the equitable treatment problem in general terms and advancing a general theme for purposes of information and illustration. I am not attempting to promulgate rules of procedure.

As a practical matter the Commission has neither sufficient funds nor manpower to investigate all competitors alleged engaged in identical malpractices, issue complaints, try the various cases separately and issue orders to cease and desist simultaneously. This raises the first question: Does the Commission have discretion in the selection and prosecution of cases? Or, can the Commission issue an order to cease and desist against only a few of the competing firms who allegedly are committing the same illegal offenses?

In the *Niehoff* (*C. E. Niehoff & Co. v. F.T.C.* (241 F. 2d 37 [1957])) and the *Moog* (*F.T.C. v. Moog Industries, Inc.* (238 F. 2d 43 [1956])) cases, the courts of appeal in the seventh and eighth circuits were urged to stay the enforcement of the Commission's orders to cease and desist until similar complaints and orders were issued against their competitors. In *Niehoff*, the seventh circuit did stay the enforcement of the order to cease and desist "in the light of equitable principles" and depending upon "the future course of the Commission's proceedings against *Niehoff's* competitors." In *Moog*, the eighth circuit affirmed the Commission's order without granting a stay.

These cases thus directly presented the issue. On certiorari, the Supreme Court clearly answered this question in the affirmative as follows (*Moog Industries, Inc. v. F.T.C.* (355 U.S. 411 [1958])):

"Thus, the decision as to whether or not an order against one firm to cease and desist from engaging in illegal price discrimination should go into effect before others are similarly prohibited depends on a variety of factors peculiarly within the expert understanding of the Commission. Only the Commission, for example, is competent to make an initial determination as to whether and to what extent there is a relevant industry within which the particular respondent competes and whether or not the nature of that competition is such as to indicate identical treatment of the entire industry by an enforcement agency. Moreover, although an allegedly illegal practice may appear to be operative throughout an industry, whether such appearances reflect fact, and whether all firms in the industry should be dealt with in a single proceeding or should receive individualized treatment are questions that call for discretionary determination by the administrative agency. It is clearly within the special competence of the Commission to appraise the adverse effect on competition that might result from postponing a particular order prohibiting continued violations of the law. Furthermore, the Commission alone is empowered to develop that enforcement policy best calculated to achieve the ends contemplated by Congress and to allocate its available funds and personnel in such a way as to execute its policy efficiently and economically."

It is therefore clearly established that the Commission can issue an order against one of several competitors, all of whom allegedly are violating the law. It logically follows that the selection of cases is also, within the discretion of the Commission.

In the exercise of this discretion is the Commission alert to reality, i.e., to the competitive disadvantage which may at times exist should an order issue against but one or few of many offenders? I assure you we are keenly aware of it. Indeed, you constantly remind us. Further, on our part, and on the part of some respondents who exhibit initiative, there is and has been a continued effort to provide workable solutions within the statutory framework. This is demonstrated by some specific cases to which I shall refer later.

In our processing of cases one factor—public interest—is at all times paramount. Although it is highly desirable that competitors be treated alike, the lodestar is the protection of the public interest. Where one dovetails with the other we can use shortened, flexible procedures to avoid competitive advantage or disadvantage.

Several procedures have been used and used successfully. And I should add that the cases include both antimonopoly and antideceptive practices. Therefore, I am not confronted with a situation similar to that faced by Rufus Choate who, when asked by the court to cite a precedent, replied, "I will look, Your Honor, for a precedent, although it would be a pity that the court should lose the honor of being the first to establish so just a rule."

Where all respondents desire to terminate the challenged practice at the same time, they can accept orders to cease and desist simultaneously. The orders may or may not vary in some detail, depending upon the particular facts. The Commission issued complaints against the Bulova Watch Co., Inc. (D. 5830), the Gruen Watch Co. (D. 5836), and the Elgin National Watch Co. (D. 5837), charging each of them with granting advertising allowances to customers on disproportional terms in violation of section 2(d) of the amended Clayton Act. It is a probability of business life that if sellers are competing for the business of preferred buyers by granting them dispro-

portional advertising allowances and that if one of the sellers is required to discontinue the practice first, then he will lose business.

Counsel for one of the respondents in the watch cases readily agreed that a cease and desist order could be issued against his client provided that such an order was simultaneously issued against the other two respondents. Subsequently, counsel for the two remaining respondents made similar proposals. The result was that orders were issued at the same time against the three competitors.

In effect, the Commission determined in the above cases that the public interest would be well protected by such agreements. Most certainly there was no delay in obtaining ultimate compliance with the law. In fact, compliance in all three cases was hastened. In addition, competitive advantage, or disadvantage, was eliminated. And it is readily apparent that the taxpayers' and the respondents' money was conserved.

In another series of cases the Commission issued complaints against Sperry Rand Corp. (D. 6701), Schick, Inc. (D. 6892), North American Philips Co., Inc. (D. 6900), and Ronson Corp. (D. 7066). The several complaints contained various charges of price discrimination in violation of section 2(a) of the amended Clayton Act, the use of disproportional advertising allowances in violation of section 2(d), the furnishing of services and facilities on disproportional terms in violation of section 2(e), and illegal resale price maintenance in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The various respondents separately filed consent agreements providing that the effective date of the orders would be stayed until the Commission issued orders against the other respondents. Respondents' counsel, in submitting their separate proposals, insisted that the orders be issued simultaneously. The consent agreements were accepted.

These razor cases again illustrate that compliance with the law and equality of treatment for competitors can go hand in hand. It is noteworthy that the procedure was used successfully notwithstanding the multiplicity of charges in the various complaints. It was not necessary to litigate questions of law. The respondents, apparently, were primarily interested in obtaining equality of treatment both in substance and in the timing of the orders.

Another procedure has been used where all respondents wish to terminate the practice if it is found to be illegal. Under these circumstances, where there is a bona fide desire to litigate the issues, respondents may agree with the Commission that one case will be selected by the Commission for trial, all respondents to abide by the final determination in the selected test case. Respondents would further agree that should a cease and desist order issue in the test case, then such an order is to issue against each of them without further proceedings.

In the reprocessed oil cases it was necessary to litigate the illegality of the challenged practice. The Commission had issued a complaint against the Mohawk Refining Corp. (D. 6588), charging it with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act through failure to disclose the prior use of certain oil products. While hearings were in progress, five respondents similarly charged in other complaints (Dockets 6581, 6682, 6717, 6709, and 6579) filed separate agreements that cease and desist orders could be issued against them provided that the orders be stayed until final decision in the Mohawk case. The Commission accepted these five agreements.

In the reprocessed oil cases, all of the sellers did not compete with each other but all of them competed with another. Counsel for five respondents agreed to abide by the decision in a case other than the case

against their clients. The Commission had reason to believe that the failure to label the oil as used oil was illegal, but there was no direct court precedent in Commission cases. Since litigation to determine the question of legality was apparently necessary, it was obvious that it was more efficient for the Commission to determine this point in the trial of one case. Compliance with the law by all respondents was thus obtained and the procedure saved the expense of extended litigation, including several appeals to the courts. At the same time, no respondent was placed at a competitive disadvantage.

A somewhat different procedure was used in two other groups of anticompetitive practice cases. The first proceeding was in May 1957 and involved six manufacturers of wool interliners (dockets 6796, 6797, 6798, 6799, 6800, and 6801); the second was in June 1958 and involved eight manufacturers of woolen waste (dockets 7227, 7228, 7229, 7230, 7231, 7232, 7233, and 7234).

Both groups were handled in the same way. After it was ascertained that the several proposed respondents were willing to consider agreements for consent orders, drafts of complaints were prepared for each case by the Bureau of Litigation and submitted to the proposed respondents informally, with explanation that this was the form of complaint which would be presented to the Commission with recommendation for issuance. At the same time an agreement containing a consent order was also submitted to each proposed respondent for signature. The agreement contained a provision that they waived service of the complaint. This agreement was signed, the date and docket number being left blank so that they could be filled in after issuance of complaint. Accompanying the agreement was a separate waiver for their signatures, whereby they waived service of the hearing examiner's initial decision and the 30-day period within which the initial decision may become the decision of the Commission under its rules. These negotiations were carried on with each proposed respondent with the understanding that the same procedure would be used as to all other proposed respondents involved, and that such action as would be taken would be simultaneous.

After the agreements and the waivers were signed by proposed respondents, the complaint drafts were then submitted to the Commission. Upon issuance of the complaints by the Commission (minus the usual notice form), the consent order agreements were transmitted to the hearing examiner. Upon issuance of his initial decisions based on the consent agreements, the initial decisions and the waivers mentioned above were filed with the Commission. The initial decisions as to all respondents were forthwith adopted as the decisions of the Commission and the attending cease and desist orders were issued simultaneously.

The novelty of the procedure used in the interliner and woolen waste cases was that the discussion and agreement among counsel occurred prior to the issuance of the complaints. Usually, of course, the discussions among counsel occur after the issuance of complaints. These cases were also unusual in that the two groups comprise practically the entire industries. Each group was highly competitive and anxious to avoid any competitive disadvantages.

With variations to accord with the particular circumstances, procedures substantially similar to those used in the reprocessed oil cases were quite recently used in the so-called cigarette vending machine cases which involved alleged violations of section 2(d) of the amended Clayton Act: Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (D. 6908), R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (D. 6848), Philip Morris, Inc. (D. 6750), American Tobacco Co. (D. 6830), and Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., Inc. (D. 6842). The foregoing cases demon-

strate what can be accomplished to dovetail the public interest and competitive equality.

A factor common to each group of cases was that no respondent claimed that his particular situation deserved treatment different from his competitors. All wanted only to be treated alike. Insofar as it is possible we, too, desire to treat all who are alike, alike. In each of the cases, compliance with the law was obtained more quickly, efficiently, and economically than would otherwise be possible.

Generally speaking, what are some of the more basic considerations as to the availability of conditional consent agreements to alleviate competitive disadvantage? What atmosphere must prevail if their use is to be contemplated? Are subjective as well as objective factors involved?

The goal itself suggests one of the basic questions, namely, must a competitive situation exist among the various alleged offenders? Or, leaving aside the question of competitive disadvantage for a moment, assume the Commission files complaints against three fur retailers, none of whom competes with the others. If all three fur retailers want to litigate common, bona fide questions of law, is there any reason for the Commission to resist use of the test case procedure? Obviously, more reasons exist for the use of conditional consent agreements where competitive disadvantage is a factor. But competitive disadvantage should not be our only consideration. In a larger sense, as administrators we are striving in every instance to achieve greater degrees of flexibility in law enforcement through approaches geared to reasonableness, to practicality, and to the dictates of experience.¹

What is the effect of the existence of an enforceable order against a competitor of the respondent who seeks equitable treatment? If a respondent's competitor is already subject to such an order, respondent may have no valid claim to equitable relief. All the more, perhaps, is an enforceable order against him justified. Some equity lies with his restricted competitor. Recently the Commission rejected a respondent's conditional consent agreement for this and other reasons. But this reason, too, should not be the only consideration. For example, assume that the Commission issues similar complaints against 12 competitors. Further assume that one immediately accepts a consent order while the other 11 assert an intention to litigate a common, bona fide question of law. It might well be that the 11 should be permitted to use the test case procedure, as in the Reprocessed Oil cases. Depending upon the impact of the particular practice on the public, the compliance of the one restricted competitor might be stayed to await the outcome of the test case.

An atmosphere conducive to use of these procedures is present only if there is a full measure of cooperation, good faith, and understanding among the attorneys on the Commission's staff and counsel for the various respondents. I emphasize the good faith element because, in its absence, any attempt to use equitable procedures may but serve to delay final action. In short, equitable procedures are not available to sell the public interest down the river.

Subjectively, there must sometimes be the willingness by attorneys for the various competing respondents to risk the outcome of a case tried by another lawyer representing a respondent who is not their client. This not only involves the relative abilities of lawyers to try cases but also, perhaps, other more mundane considerations. The clients, no doubt, will also have definite views on this strategy.

Objectively, there is the question whether the facts and the law of various cases are suitable and appropriate for group handling. This decision is within the discretion of the

¹ See Groveton Paper Co., et al., D. 6592-6600.

Commission. As stated by the Supreme Court in the *Moog* case, supra, among a variety of factors for consideration is the extent of the relevant industry. Especially pertinent, of course, is the area of competitive impact. What is the nature of the offense? What is the nature of the competition? Another factor, and a very practical one, is whether the resources of the Commission will permit the investigation of a large number of concerns within a reasonable time. The Commission is not authorized under existing law to issue complaints unless there is reason to believe that the particular respondent has violated a law administered by the Commission.

Counsel for respondents can be of substantial assistance in developing the facts and the background data for the particular industry. Counsel may be able to obtain data from their clients as to the extent of the use of an illegal practice in the industry and the identity of the offenders. If the Commission receives this data early in the investigation, a tentative decision can then be made as to whether the practice might be appropriate for group handling. No respondent should complain of being singled out and not accorded equitable treatment unless he has exerted himself to the best of his ability to assist the Commission in bringing about the cessation of the same practices on the part of his competitors.

There are many situations where this group procedure may not be appropriate. For example, sellers of medicinal preparations containing different ingredients may recommend their products for the same general purpose. The alleged false advertisements may vary in considerable detail. Obviously, any orders to cease and desist might well vary with the facts in each case. Again, for example, if a number of sellers were charged with price discrimination in violation of section 2(a) of the amended Clayton Act, and if the defense to such charge were cost justification or the meeting of competition in good faith, then the several matters might have to be considered separately. These defenses, too, would vary with the facts in each case.

These same basic considerations with respect to the handling of formal complaint proceedings are applicable as well to those matters which initially are determined by the Commission to be the proper subject of stipulations to cease and desist under section 1.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice. Assuming that the various requisites are all present, competing members in an industry can have assurance of equality of treatment by entering into separate voluntary stipulations with the Commission to cease and desist their practices at one and the same time.

In the context of today's discussion a brief reference to the Commission's guides program is equally fitting. Thus far the Commission has issued guides in carefully selected fields dealing, e.g., with tire and cigarette advertising, with fictitious pricing practices, and with bait advertising in general. These guides constitute another step taken by the Commission to place competitors upon a more even basis at the very outset insofar as knowledge of malpractices is concerned. For those in business and industry who sincerely wish to travel the straight and narrow, the guides serve as pathways. General voluntary compliance with the guides will tend to eliminate competitive disadvantages resulting at times from case-by-case enforcement of the law. Along with the trade practice rules, the guides therefore are another of the first lines of approach to the problem of equal impact of law enforcement upon competing members of an industry.

Litigation before both the courts and the administrative agencies is steadily increasing. We must be ever alert to improve legal procedures. At this time we are considering possible revision of the Commission's rules

to clarify the complaint and consent order procedure so it will be known to all. If adopted, one press release would cover the complaint and the order.

We have also referred to a staff group the problem of recommending new procedures for enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act. It is desirable that the Commission find better and more equitable enforcement procedures in this area without lessening the vigorous enforcement of the act. Some of the ideas considered to date are ingenious and even revolutionary; for example, can the Commission make greater use of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to detect violations of the law? It is too early, however, to predict what the Commission will adopt.

In preparing for our meeting today I failed to find any prior extensive discussion of what I call equitable treatment of competitors. One who does not hold public office could, perhaps, rephrase some of my questions as answers. Personally, in the light of the relevant factors mentioned, I prefer to handle these problems on a case-by-case or an industry-by-industry basis. Through time and experience we may be able to adopt more definite criteria.

Some legal procedures can be misapplied and misused to the detriment of public or private rights or both. The wise law enforcement official, I believe, is one who has the courage to be prudently flexible and the wisdom to realize that precedent is the guidepost of the law.

Today I have concentrated upon procedures at the Commission which perhaps are not sufficiently well known to the bar. There will be, of course, differences of opinion as to whether or not these procedures should be used in particular situations. However, such procedures in appropriate cases can be quite effective in giving flexibility and reasonableness to law enforcement.

Rochester Provides an Example for the World To Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my home city of Rochester, N.Y., has long been proud of the manner in which foreign-born newcomers have been welcomed there and have become parts of the community. Leaders in all fields of endeavor in the city and county have been drawn from almost every conceivable nation in the world. We are proud of our new citizens and of their important contributions to the culture, the progress, and the vitality of the Rochester community.

In a recent editorial published in the *Rochester Democrat & Chronicle*, the heartwarming manner in which refugees who recently have moved to the Rochester area have joined the community is set forth. The Rochester Association for the United Nations and other interested civic groups have played a vital role in this work.

The editorial also points out that Rochester's example might well be followed by the Arab Nations, which have persistently failed to live up to their obligations to the refugees of the Middle East. I hope the suggestions contained in the editorial and in the R.A.U.N. report will

be headed in the not too distant future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Rochester Democrat & Chronicle*, Feb. 18, 1960]

REFUGEES REPORT

A heartwarming report on how 3,500 refugees in Rochester are faring is an object lesson that should be read with profit by Arab politicians in the Middle East.

Most of the refugees moving here since World War II, a Rochester Association for United Nations survey reveals, have made friends, become self-supporting and are a part of the community. Nearly all have become American citizens; many more will do so.

Since the Jewish-Arab war of 1948, Arab refugees now totaling more than a million have lived on U.N. resources in camps in or near Palestine. Repeatedly it has been suggested that these people be integrated in the Arab Nations. Substantial offers of help in doing this have been made. Arab leaders have persistently refused to do so. The R.A.U.N. report suggests that if our own community and scores of others in the United States can so warmly accept alien refugees from abroad, surely the politicians should permit the Arab Nations to absorb their own people.

Latin Nations Study Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published by the Associated Press entitled "Latin Nations Study Meeting."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN NATIONS STUDY MEETING

A conference of the 10 South American nations on arms reduction was reported under active consideration today.

Uruguay, a nation which already is practically demilitarized, has been suggested as the site for the conference, and June or July have been proposed as dates.

President Eisenhower endorsed the idea of arms reduction yesterday. Speaking in Santiago, Chile, he pledged U.S. cooperation in any such meeting.

Chile's President Jorge Alessandri has been an outspoken advocate of arms reduction, saying such expenditures could better be spent on economic development and social progress.

United States officials here stressed that the initiative for such a conference has to come from South America, but that this Government will be glad to help out in any way it can. Latin American diplomats said the conference has been under discussion for some weeks and now appears to be taking form.

A conference of South American nations only was proposed because of unsettled conditions in the Caribbean area, notably Cuba and the Dominican Republic. But some diplomats said Central American countries, notably Mexico and Panama, might feel slighted if they were omitted and that consideration could be given to including them if they desired.

Diplomats here said the interest in an arms conference appeared to have been stimulated by President Eisenhower's interviews with the chief executives of Brazil, Argentina and Chile—all of whom are reported favorable to the plan. It has also had the endorsement of Peruvian and Colombian officials.

Inflation and International Gold Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there is growing concern in this country over our unfavorable balance of payments. In the January issue of the Mining Congress Journal there appeared an editorial written by Robert W. Van Evera, editor, which had some pertinent comments on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION AND INTERNATIONAL GOLD PAYMENTS

(By Robert W. Van Evera, editor)

Increasing attention in recent months has been given by the business press to the problem of the balance of payments. R. Buford Brandis, chief economist of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, at the First National Conference of the Trade Relations Council last October, described the trend in the U.S. international payments position as "clearly an economic development of the first importance," and in a recent address, Ray L. Reiersen, vice president and chief economist of Bankers Trust Co., New York, said that "though no crisis is at hand, the balance of payments problem is indeed too serious to be ignored any longer."

This is a many-sided problem, and it is particularly related to the serious matter of inflation which has puzzled economic planners off and on throughout history—and more notably since 1934 when exchange for gold, the universal international monetary standard, was denied to our citizens as backing for U.S. paper currency. It is, of course, still unlawful, with minor exceptions, for Americans to own gold, and those few who can produce it at present-day high costs are required to turn it over to the U.S. Government at the same exchange rate, \$35 per ounce, that was set back in 1934.

According to Brandis and others participating in the recent Trade Relations Council Conference—including Franz Pick, an international monetary authority who spoke to the mining industry at the 1957 AMC convention in Salt Lake City—the U.S. gold reserve now has a balance of \$19.4 billion, \$5.2 billion less than 10 years ago. About \$12 billion of this is mortgaged to foreign governments holding convertible dollar assets. In addition \$6 billion of private foreign short-term investments exist and can be exchanged for gold in our reserves after transferring them to one of the foreign central banks. That totals about \$18 billion in obligations, leaving us a cushion of about \$1.4 billion—internationally.

Our monetary laws call for the Treasury to maintain gold backing for our currency at

25 percent of the outstanding banknote circulation—estimated by Pick to be an additional \$8 billion required in reserve. Thus our obligations exceed our total reserves by some \$6 to \$7 billion.

It is fortunate that the matter isn't so direct or simple as to leave only the recourse of declaring national bankruptcy, but nevertheless corrective action is imperative.

Reiersen, in the same address quoted above, said, "whereas the net balance of payments deficit averaged around \$2 billion a year in the early and middle 1950's and almost disappeared in 1957, it increased to almost \$3.5 billion in 1958 and is likely to be in the \$4 billion range in the current year (1959); in fact it may be above \$5 billion if our contribution to the International Monetary Fund is included." This deficit is, in turn, made up of several factors, among which are our total imports from foreign countries, foreign aid, capital investment abroad, and U.S. military and defense spending abroad—to the extent that they overbalance our exports. In final summation, we are spending, giving away, or investing far more money in foreign countries than we are selling or otherwise earning in those countries. Such a trend cannot be allowed to continue much longer.

So it is more than a question of gold economics—though the importance of pure monetary policy is paramount. Also involved are such critical considerations as our domestic wage-price spiral, which is still going on and is now pricing American goods out of international markets; our tariff policies, and the foreign-aid program. Domestically our Government has lived beyond its means in most of the past 30 years, and internationally we have been doing the same for nearly 20. How are we going to reverse this trend?

Wise and reasonable guideposts to corrective action are pointed out in the American Mining Congress Declaration of Policy—published in full in the October 1959 issue of Mining Congress Journal—which covers tariffs; other matters relating to inflation such as taxation, Government expenditures, Government reorganization and labor relations; and gold, silver, and monetary policy.

In the case of gold, the Mining Congress policy declaration recommends that:

"1. The restrictions on the purchase, ownership, and sale of gold by U.S. citizens be abolished.

"2. The administration recognize the historical and traditional confidence in gold and silver as monetary metals throughout the world, and as part of its foreign policy aid to other governments in restoring gold and silver coinage—and currencies convertible into gold—as a standard of value and as a circulating medium.

"3. Congress fix the ratio at which the dollar and gold are to be made fully convertible and take all steps necessary to provide for the orderly restoration of the gold standard.

"4. The Treasury, prior to restoration of full convertibility, cease sales of gold for industrial uses."

Johan Ludvig Runeberg (1804-77)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 Finland will celebrate the an-

niversary of the birth of Johan Ludvig Runeberg.

Runeberg was a distinguished man of letters of the last century, though little known in this country. At the peak of his fame, in mid-19th century, he had become the national poet of Finland, and at the time of his death he was esteemed most highly as a great poet both in Finland and in Sweden.

This highly talented son of a Swedish sea captain was born in Finland, but really belonged to two nations. He showed unusual interest from the very first in popular poetry and folklore. Breaking off his college studies at the University of Abo, he traveled various parts of the country and learned many popular songs by heart. Later when he began to compose his own verses, he showed the influence of classical Greek poetry. In 1848 he achieved great popular success with the publication of his series of poems on the war of independence of 1808. It was this series of poems that made him Finland's national poet, her poet laureate. All his verses show great originality and immense power, and his poems form the firmest link between the Finnish and Swedish people. He remains the idol of both peoples.

All honor to the memory of Johan Ludvig Runeberg, the national poet of Finland.

Seizure Excuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States-Item:

SEIZURE EXCUSES

The arguments of have-not nations, when they grab foreign assets in the name of "nationalization" of natural resources, have always taken the same channel: foreign capitalists have robbed the people of their natural wealth.

That channel is fast becoming a rut. Dr. Castro in Cuba, for example, in the instance of nickel ore, is making moves like he would expropriate all foreign holdings in that field in the interest of the Cuban people.

There is a happy medium between latent ownership and equitable development. Natural resources are seldom productive without proper development which often requires capital and engineering know-how. The day of the late 19th and early 20th century industrial barons who looted resources with little return to the sources of material or manpower is gone. If nothing else, international public opinion is against it.

The enlightened countries of the world realize that underdeveloped countries with marketable natural resources and an honest determination to derive the most from those resources are entitled to certain considerations. Such considerations extend to reasonable and legitimate taxation which finds its way into national coffers, not private hands. Modern developers cooperate in construction and maintenance of schools, hospitals, sanitation, and other improvements.

partly for their own protection. Dictators, however, gain more from ranting against foreign investors than from such gains as these for their people, even though it be a short-lived gain for themselves.

The Four Chaplains Died for God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Americans will long remember the four chaplains who went down with the SS *Dorchester* in the early years of World War II. Their devotion and courage gave us a memory which persisted during that long war, and we remember their example with equal clarity today.

Recently in New Jersey several observances were conducted to pay tribute to the four chaplains. An editorial in the February 27 issue of the *Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call* tells about one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUR CHAPLAINS DIED FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

On Sunday afternoon at 3:30 at the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, the Passaic County American Legion will pay a commemorative tribute to the four heroic chaplains who went down with the USS *Dorchester* off Greenland on February 3, 1943.

They died for God and country. Together with them, more than 600 lives were lost when the troopship was sunk by enemy action. To the men who served this Nation aboard the *Dorchester*, these four chaplains were their spiritual leaders, bringing to them God's words, His teachings of love, of faith, of brotherhood. While of different faiths, all men were to them made in the image of their God, entitled to the liberties and freedoms for which they on that sad day gave their very all that other Americans might live in peace and dignity.

Each of these heroic chaplains—George L. Fox and Clark V. Poling, Protestants; John P. Washington, Catholic; and Alexander D. Goode, Jewish—was awarded the Purple Heart and Distinguished Service Cross posthumously.

It is fitting that at the close of Brotherhood Week—an observance which should be continued throughout the year—that the Legion is paying tribute to the memory of these noble chaplains, who while amongst us, served mankind.

The citation accompanying the Distinguished Service Cross to the four chaplains bears eloquent tribute to their heroic deed:

"For extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States. On the night of the 3d of February 1943, a loaded troop transport was torpedoed, without warning, by an enemy submarine in the North Atlantic and began to sink rapidly. In the resulting confusion and darkness some men found themselves without the life jackets and others became helpless through fear and the dread of plunging into the freezing water. These

four chaplains heroically and calmly moved about the deck, encouraging the men and assisting them to abandon ship. After the available supply of life jackets was exhausted, they gave up their own. They remained aboard ship and went down with it offering words of encouragement and prayer to the last."

Would that the spirit of the four chaplains reside in the hearts and minds of all peoples throughout this war-weary world. Would that the enslavers of free nations were to learn the great lesson the lives and death of the chaplains teach.

Then would there be peace, freedom, and self-determination among peoples in all countries, some of whom are now oppressed, living in constant fear of imprisonment and death for expressing a yearning for liberty.

The four chaplains freely gave their life jackets to others; they didn't ask, nor did they consider the religion, race, or color of those whom they so nobly assisted in a time of peril. To them each man aboard was equal.

They died that others might live, in the service of God and humanity. Their memory will ever live and the inspiration of their sacrifice should move those who live not by the Golden Rule that we are all brethren, deserving the dignity all should be accorded.

Their physical beings are no longer here, but the spirit of the four chaplains must never die.

The Honorable Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently it was the privilege of the State of Louisiana to have within our midst a distinguished Pennsylvanian, a Member of the House of Representatives and chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. FRANCIS E. WALTER, at the invitation of the Americanism Commission, First District of Louisiana, the American Legion, received in appropriate ceremony the George Washington Great American Award. I was not permitted the opportunity to attend this occasion because of official duties in Washington, but my State was proud of the fact that Chairman WALTER came down to receive this important Legion award.

The speech which Chairman WALTER delivered on that occasion is outstanding. Backing up a long period of active service as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, the speech presents graphically some of the outstanding achievements of this committee in its fight against communism. This is an enemy which never sleeps, and the House of Representatives, in the interest of supporting democracy in the New World, certainly is to be commended for having set up a special committee for this purpose.

Chairman WALTER and his committee have a great deal of work ahead of them in the future. It is going to require his time and energy, but Mr. WALTER has exhibited real leadership in this respect and I am happy my State had the sig-

nal honor of making this award to a great Pennsylvanian and a great American.

Needed: Early Action on Special Milk Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, H.R. 9331, now on the Senate Calendar, would provide for expansion of the special school milk program.

The proposal would provide additional funds for the program, increasing the amount from \$81 million to \$85 million for the current fiscal year and additional funds for the next fiscal year.

As a sponsor of legislation with similar objectives, I am naturally hopeful that this bill can be considered and approved as early as possible.

Unless it is done, this excellent program providing first, for a useful outlet for surplus milk, and second, improving the health of our schoolchildren will suffer serious curtailment.

Fortunately, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has found it possible to set back its date for cutbacks—necessary because of shortages of funds—from March 1 to April 1.

Recognizing the parliamentary situation that exists, I nevertheless sincerely hope that the Senate will find it possible to act on this legislation soon, to avoid a serious disruption of the program.

Recently, the Green Bay Press-Gazette published an article by George Armour, reflecting the splendid way in which this program is moving forward in Wisconsin, as it is doing in other States throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "Hike in School Milk Funds Foreseen," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Mar. 1, 1960]

HIKE IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM FUND FORESEEN—DIRECTOR OF STATE UNIT CONFIDENT OF BACKING IN CONGRESS

(By George Armour)

MADISON.—"It's a sure thing" that Congress will appropriate an additional \$4 million for the 1959-60 extra milk program, Director Gordon Gunderson of the Wisconsin school lunch program said Monday.

Gunderson said the increase from \$81 million for the year to \$85 million would save Wisconsin school districts or children about \$194,000 in the remaining months of the fiscal year.

If the appropriation had not been raised, the Federal Government would have reduced the amount it reimburses schools per half pint of milk from 4 cents to 3½ cents for schools under the lunch program and from 3 cents to 2½ cents for schools under the extra milk program alone.

The Federal Government had set Tuesday as the date for cutting the reimbursement, but Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson extended this to April 1. Gunderson said Ben-

son has recommended the increase in the appropriation and House and Senate Agriculture Committees have approved it.

URGED BY GOVERNOR

Gov. Gaylord Nelson urged an increase in the appropriation in letters to congressional committees in January and his dairy farm policy committee urged that the program be continued and expanded at its meeting Friday. Nelson also asked that the appropriation be set at \$90 million for 1960-61.

Wisconsin schools bought 85,306,000 half pints of milk in 1958-59 from local dairies and about 57 million half pints of that total were under the extra milk program for which Federal reimbursement funds are available. The rest of the milk was bought for the type A lunches provided by the schools.

AVERAGES \$1.25 WEEKLY

The Federal Government reimburses schools 5 cents per type A lunch served. The lunches must include one-half pint of milk, 2 ounces of protein, bread and butter, fruit, and vegetables. The schools are able to obtain food bought by the Federal Government for these lunches and other surplus removal and price support foodstuffs.

George Boerke, supervisor, and John Homberger, administrative assistant, for the school lunch program said that the State received more than 300 freight carloads of food from the Federal Government in the last fiscal year for use by schools.

The State stores the food at eight warehouses and trucks it to county distribution centers where the schools pick it up. Madison and Milwaukee each have two warehouses, and there is one each at Green Bay, Shawano, Eau Claire, and La Crosse.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR THOUSAND SERVED DAILY

Homberger said 184,000 lunches are being served daily in the current school year, compared with 59,120 a day when the program began in 1946-47. A total of 7,186,173 lunches were served in that first year and last year the total was 27,299,103.

Boerke reported a trend toward use of central kitchens in certain areas of the State. The food is prepared at the central kitchen and then distributed at noon to smaller schools in the vicinity. He said this is being done at Eau Claire, Milwaukee, Black River Falls, and other cities.

Both employees of the department of public instruction agreed the program had benefited children greatly from a nutritional standpoint. They said that in some cases, the school lunch was the best meal the children received each day.

Juvenile Successes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press made an important point in a February 26 editorial, when it noted that young people of the United States have a persistent and enthusiastic way of achieving new goals.

I was particularly delighted at the mention of accomplishments of Miss Cornelia Harrington, of Wayne, N.J.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE SUCCESSES

In these days when a delinquent minority among our young people too often command headlines there is a refreshing contrast in the headlines being written at the winter Olympics at Squaw Valley. The prowess of Miss Carol Heiss, of Ozone Park, N.Y., in winning the first gold medal for this country in the women's figure skating contest; of Miss Jeanne Ashworth, of Wilmington, Mass., as a speed skater; and of Miss Cornelia Harrington, of Wayne, N.J., a runner-up to Miss Ashworth, indicates enthusiasm for achievement and a willingness to sacrifice toward that end.

They can't all be champions, but it is our belief that these young women who capture Olympic medals are typical of the great majority of our youthful citizens. For every juvenile criminal there are thousands who devote themselves to high attainment and take their recreation in wholesome pursuits. They seldom make headlines, because their conduct is normal and it is usually the abnormal that attract attention. Thus when young hoodlums are ignored and the headlines relate an outbreak of good behavior among young people the situation will be far more disturbing than it is today.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today we are celebrating Bulgarian Liberation Day. A banquet will be held in New York tonight in honor of this event. In view of the fact that it will not be possible for me to be there myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared to be read at the banquet.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL, OF MARYLAND

To Those in Attendance at the Annual Banquet Commemorating Bulgarian Liberation Day, New Yorker Hotel, New York, N.Y.:

I regret that it is impossible for me to be with you this evening. It would be a distinct pleasure to join with my Bulgarian-American friends and other friends of Bulgaria on this occasion commemorating Bulgarian Liberation Day.

On March 3, 1878, after 500 years of foreign rule, Bulgaria gained her freedom. Many brave Bulgarians gave their lives in the struggle for liberation. It is that victory which you are celebrating—and it is one the Bulgarian people will always remember with gladness.

Unfortunately, your country has fallen under Communist oppression. Bulgaria is held under satellite status by the Soviets. However, the spirit of freedom lives in the hearts of all Bulgarians everywhere, and I am confident that your country will again enjoy freedom—in the not too distant future.

I extend my best wishes to you all on this occasion.

Recognition of Outstanding Accomplishments of Three Oregon Orchardists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a singular pleasure for me, upon occasion, to be able to pay tribute to deserved accomplishments which have been recognized by various Oregon communities.

The Hood River County Chamber of Commerce, through my good friend, Mr. George D. Bartch, its able manager, has written to me concerning the awards won by three farmers of the area.

Bill Hazeltine, a Parkdale orchardist, who owns and manages a 60-acre ranch, of which 50 acres is in orchard, received the "Orchardist of the Year" award. The following public services are connected with Bill Hazeltine's name: Charter member of Parkdale Fire Department 9 years, past member of board of directors of Parkdale Fire District, member and past president of Upper Valley Booster Club, member of Wy'east Booster Club, member of Parkdale and Wy'east PTA, charter member of Hood River Soil Conservation District, past vice president of board of supervisors of Hood River Soil Conservation District, vice president Hood River County Unit School Board, member of Wy'east Vo-Agr Advisory Council, member of several extension service committees, alternate member of Hood River County School District Reorganization Committee, member Hood River Elks Lodge 14 years, second vice president of Oregon State Horticultural Society, past council member of Boy Scouts and Job's Daughters, and president, 1959-60, Oregon State Horticultural Society.

A second young farmer is Ross Hukari, who was awarded the "Young Farmer of 1959" recognition. He operates a 70-acre orchard in the Pine Grove district. He is past president of Oregon Horticulture Society and past president of the Apple Growers Association. Of particular interest is the fact that he participates annually in the foreign student exchange program which employs foreign students in his orchard operation.

The third Hood River County resident who took top honors in the annual award banquet is Odell rancher Jan Kurahara, who received the "Senior Citizen" award. Mr. Kurahara operates a 30-acre orchard, and has taken an active role in community affairs. Not only is he a successful valley rancher, but he also is a member of the Hood River County Farm Bureau, member of chamber of commerce agricultural committee, past director of Hood River County Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the Hood River County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, district commissioner, Explorer Training Committee, Columbia Gorge District Boy Scouts, chairman, county unit school board; and he served 3 years on the Hood River County Budget Committee.

George Barch tells me that the awards dinner featured our great Hood River apples in many ways, including casseroles of apple and onion, sweet potatoes and apples, three apple salads, a number of relishes, five apple desserts, and apple breads, and apple candy, all of which were prepared by the Pine Grove Home Economics Club.

Mr. President, the awards dinner is, as I have indicated, an annual one, at which the community gives deserved recognition to those who serve as models and inspiration to their colleagues. It was fitting and appropriate that at the celebration the Governor of the State presented the banquet address. I join with him in extending congratulations not only to the winners, but also to all others who participated in making it an outstanding community function.

ORT 80 Years After Getting There First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when we help others we prove that we believe in more than ourselves. Our mutual security program is based on that principle; so are the great campaigns we stage when we help others who have been stricken by disaster.

An editorial in the Bergen Evening Record (Hackensack, N.J.) of February 29 tells how the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training has worked for 80 years to develop potential skills and to spread understanding. Mr. President, the editorial speaks for itself, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATION FOR REHABILITATION THROUGH TRAINING 80 YEARS AFTER GETTING THERE
FIRST

When necessary resources and technological skills are lacking people must be assisted, or all the world will suffer. This is not a matter of charity or of easing our own conscience through doles. . . . The help we give to our friends is help and strength for the cause of American freedom as well as freedom throughout the world.

Thus reporting on his return from his trip through Europe, Africa, and Asia, President Eisenhower set before us alternatives. Either the underdeveloped countries will acquire somehow the skills and techniques they need to join us in the living standards of the 20th century, or (these are his words) they could well become so desperate as to create a world catastrophe.

For 80 years now ORT, the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training, has been saying something like that and doing something about it. In its vocational schools for the unskilled and uprooted and impoverished it now has 36,000 students across 19 countries—teenagers acquiring a technical education, young people and adults who will

never be scientists or engineers but who get a training that equips them within swift months to turn their back forever on begging and squalor and to take decent work in industry. To refugees from persecution ORT has given the intellectual equipment for adjusted and productive citizenship in their new homeland.

Women's American ORT will celebrate ORT Day Wednesday. The observance, especially in Teaneck, will be well worth the respectful and grateful attention of anyone who agrees that in skills and knowledge, as much as in philosophy and political commitment, may be found strength for the cause of American freedom as well as freedom throughout the world.

Padre Island National Seashore: A Beach for Our Grandchildren, From the Lone Star Catholic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the proposal to establish a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island has evoked widespread comment in the press nationally. But of all the stories, articles and columns written on this subject none have been more persuasive or factual than one written by Mr. Dale Francis, editor of the Lone Star Catholic.

Mr. Francis entitled his column, "A Beach for Grandchildren," and then told in strong and colorful language of the need for preserving for public use "Padre Island, one of the most beautiful beaches in the world."

His comments in the Lone Star Catholic, which is the official weekly newspaper of the Austin Diocese, brought letters from readers all over the Nation expressing support of the Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area proposal. His support and that of his readers will prove of great assistance to the project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column from the Lone Star Catholic of January 10, 1960, entitled "A Beach for Grandchildren," by Dale Francis.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wonder if you'd give me a helping hand so I can get my grandchildren out to the beach.

Of course, I don't have any grandchildren and, while my 8-year-old daughter has talked about having 10 or 12 children when she gets married, I don't know whether I'm going to have any grandchildren.

But if not my grandchildren then your grandchildren or your grandchildren's grandchildren. Help them to get to the beach.

Not long ago I gave a talk at a hotel on one of the most famous beaches in the United States—Miami Beach. I was amazed to see the growth of the hotels and motels in the last couple of years—beautiful, luxurious

hotels. They twinkle a million different color combinations at night.

But while I give talks there, I don't stay in the hotels. I don't have the money to put out to stay overnight, let alone a week. I mentioned to someone who was driving me down this luxury lane of hotels that it seemed a shame there hadn't been provision made for people who couldn't afford luxury hotels. He said provisions had been made and he showed me two or three blocks of public beach. But then this is public beach used primarily by people who stay at luxury hotels that aren't on the waterfront. It wasn't what I meant at all.

What I meant was a beach like the one that was discovered on an island by Padre Nicolas Balli, 156 years ago. He called it the Dead Desert when he built the mission of Santa Cruz there. There was the white shifting sand, the brightly colored seashells, the blue of the sky, and not much else.

Ever since then this long island, off the southeastern coast of Texas, has been called Padre's Island. It has taken the people a long time to find it, but in the last dozen years more and more people have come to recognize it as one of the most beautiful beaches in the world.

It has perpetual sunshine and on the southern end the climate is as mild as the climate of Miami Beach. The island stretches 120 miles and every bit of it beautiful beach.

But as the people discovered it, so did the promoters. This beautiful island is on the way to becoming like Miami Beach, a long row of luxury hotels with private beaches.

That's why I want it saved for my grandchildren and yours. That's why something has to be done right now. And you are the one who can do it.

The junior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH, has sponsored a bill to make Padre Island a national park. The response in Texas has been tremendous. The senior Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON, joined in backing the project. Conservative newspapers were as enthusiastic as the more liberal newspapers. When the National Park Commissioner asked for the opinions of citizens there were more than 15,000 who wrote to urge Padre Island be made a national park, only two who wrote dissenting.

But a thing like this deserves backing from all over the country and for it really to go over, it needs the backing of your Senators and your Congressmen.

The proposal leaves 17 miles of beach for commercial development. That means that private hotel owners can build 17 miles of hotels and motels. So they aren't being cut out of a chance to develop the area commercially—this isn't an attack on free enterprise. But close on to 100 miles is to be kept free of all commercialization, saved as natural beachland for all the people to enjoy.

There is no national park in the Nation that offers a beach like this—as a matter of fact, there is no other beach like this in the Nation. It is a beach located near the center of the Nation—even now it can be reached by plane, train, or car quickly from all over the country but in the future as travel speeds up and new superhighways are built, this will truly be at the center of the Southland.

This can be a national park for everyone in the Nation. It offers a vacation area for the whole Nation if it can be made into a national park. But if it is not made into a national park right now—before the building of private interests begin—it will be too late.

So please write to your Congressmen, your Senators. Let there not be a Congressman or Senator in the Nation who isn't informed of your wish for this great national park.

Then when the bill is passed, when Padre Island is made a national park, you'll be able

to sit back and say, "Well, I made a reservation on the beach for my grandchildren's grandchildren, a hundred years from now."

Estonia's Independence Must Be Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call expressed editorially on February 26 the feelings that many of us share when we consider the misfortune of those peoples who fought for independence and then lost it to Soviet aggression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTONIA'S INDEPENDENCE MUST BE RESTORED

Americans of Estonian ancestry here and throughout the land are observing the 42d anniversary of the Estonian Republic. It was in 1918 that Estonia was proclaimed an independent, democratic republic.

Today, Estonia is no longer independent, its liberties and freedoms having become victim of cruel Soviet invasion and oppression.

As the observance is being held, there is sadness that a once free land is under the complete domination of murderous Reds whose enslavement of free peoples in many European nations is notorious for its atrociousness.

In violation of treaties—which to the Reds are mere scraps of paper—Soviet Russia overran Estonia in 1940, murdering thousands and transporting other thousands of innocent peoples to Siberia. It would take pages to recount the crimes perpetrated against Estonians by their enslavers.

Many Estonians were fortunate in escaping and more fortunate in finding a haven in this land of the free, where they became citizens, hundreds residing in this area. To their adopted country they have displayed deep loyalty and an intense love for freedom. It is only natural that they fervently hope and pray that their brethren overseas who were unable to escape Red tyranny will be freed of oppression and once more become independent.

Mayor William H. Dillistin has issued a proclamation calling on the citizenry to join with neighbors of Lithuanian ancestry in prayers for the overthrow of Communist domination of Estonia.

Estonia must again become a member of the free nations of the world. Its peoples should have the liberty and freedom which we hold so dear restored, for Estonia of right should be a sovereign nation. The United States and all countries that cherish democracy recognized Estonia, which was admitted to the U.N. as a sovereign republic.

We of the Call called the turn when many here and across this Nation welcomed Khrushchev to our shores and treated him as a friend instead of the foe to democracy that he is. We wrote that his words masked

cruelty of thought and action, that his treaties are worthless. We warned that no good could come of his visit. The passage of months has shown the rightness of our stand.

The enslavement of Estonia and all the once-free nations of Europe which the commies now occupy—the loss of freedom which came in the wake of Red invasion—the murder of thousands and shipment of innocents to Siberia—all prove conclusively that communism is a menacing influence in the world.

With our many friends of Lithuanian ancestry we hope and pray that the shackles of communism will be lifted and Estonia once again restored as a free nation.

The Democratic Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which was published in the January 1960 issue of the Oregon-Washington Farmer Union. The editorial was written by a great liberal in Oregon. In fact, Arthur Bone, the writer of the editorial, is one of the most dedicated liberal Democrats in my State of Oregon. Therefore I offer for the RECORD the editorial, entitled "The Democratic Goal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC GOAL

The Democratic Party of Oregon will hold a State convention at Salem January 29-30 to draw up a platform on which its candidates will seek election in November. Of equal importance, it will be a guide to voters in evaluating the records of Democrats seeking nomination in the May primaries. There were a lot of so-called Democrats in the last legislature who might better have been left at home.

We hope the Republicans decide to hold a similar convention. Voters are entitled to know what the parties stand for.

What does the Democratic Party stand for? This is a hard one to answer. Judged by its recent congressional record, it doesn't stand for much. Judged by its candidates—from MORSE, HUMPHREY, and STEVENSON on the liberal left to KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON on the conservative right—it embraces all colors of the spectrum. Its loudest voices seem to call for a bigger and better defense program, despite the \$7½ billion already being wasted on "defense" by the Pentagon. At a recent press conference, Senator KENNEDY emphasized that national defense should come at the very top of the 1960 issues because the proposed budget figure for defense was "too low by a substantial percentage," and SYMINGTON and JOHNSON would go right along with the boyish Senator from Massachusetts.

If the Democratic Party goes to the people this year with that kind of a program, it will be defeated. The people are weary and tired of letting the Pentagon call the shots.

They are interested in peace, not as a slogan, not as a far-off goal, but as a major cornerstone of a national policy. Peace—not more billions for defense—should be the major emphasis in foreign policy. What progressive steps would a Democratic administration take toward disarmament? What is the stand of the party on abolition of nuclear tests? What about abolition of the draft? These are some of the questions for which they would like answers.

On the domestic front, the party should boldly proclaim its wider support of governmental intervention in the economy to make certain that things are done that are already badly overdue. As someone has well said, the opposition party, to be successful, must have a "categorical imperative." It must have a great simple, central theme. That theme should be to do for people the things that need doing, the things they want done and are unable to do for themselves. The party should not be afraid of Government, providing that Government is by and for the people.

On the farm front, that means rejection of any policy that would turn farmers back to the free market as a means of solving their price problems. One constructive solution of the farm problem which would find widespread support among farmers would be Government loans to build integrated co-ops on a nationwide scale as one means of giving farmers greater bargaining power in the marketplace.

Cooperative enterprises should be used on a much wider scale than they are now being used to "police" the whole private sector of the economy. Yardstick plants, financed by Government loans, in such areas as steel manufacturer, automobile manufacturer, food processing and distribution, and aluminum manufacture and fabrication, should be used to establish standards of cost and quality. The "yardstick" principle has worked well in the TVA and the Bonneville Administration in lowering power rates and increasing enormously power consumption. And it has not injured private utilities. It should be extended to other areas in the economy. It would be the cheapest and most effective way to provide competition to administered prices in an economy tending ever more strongly toward greater concentration and monopoly.

We need government expansion—both State and Federal—in other fields. In the field of health and hospital protection, the immediate goal should be adoption of the Forand-Morse bill which will assure medical care to our retired citizens. We need Federal aid in rebuilding our cities and unscrambling the traffic chaos which threatens to engulf them. We need Federal aid to education. We need cheap Federal credit to bring down interest rates. We need greater development of our natural resources, and especially full development of the power potential of our rivers.

To finance such a program, we need an increasingly progressive tax system based on ability to pay. To an ever increasing extent, we must rely on the taxing power of the Federal Government which alone is able to tap wealth where wealth is. Federal taxation, also, eliminates the penalizing of liberal and progressive States by backward States with no social welfare program—and low taxes.

With imagination and courage, Democrats in Oregon and over the Nation should face these problems and respond to their challenge. A craving for "respectability" and conformity will get the party no place. The Republicans can do that much better. A program looking forward to tomorrow and answering the problems of today should be the Democratic goal.

All Eyes on Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Cyrus Eaton, chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., has spelled out the position of the United States in world consideration of weapons testing and disarmament. He makes it clear that the United States is lagging in affirming a clear opposition to future testing and that the responsibility belongs to one man, the President of the United States.

Under a previous consent I am including hereunder a letter from Mr. Eaton to the Cleveland Plain Dealer which appeared in the February 28, 1960, issue of that paper:

CYRUS EATON CONTENTS ENDING OF NUCLEAR TESTS IS UP TO EISENHOWER

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR: At the time of the first Pugwash Conference of nuclear scientists, the United States, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom were the sole possessors of the dread secret of the bomb. Over a 4-year period, 5 Pugwash scientific conferences have brought together 112 eminent specialists from 23 major nations, east and west, all of the unanimous opinion that weapons of mass annihilation must be universally banned, and that delay can only lead to the eventual possession of the worst forms of weaponry by every country of consequence around the globe.

With the recent French explosion in the Sahara, membership in the nuclear club has increased to four. Unless international agreement is reached soon to prohibit tests and ban nuclear weapons, each of the other 19 nations on the Pugwash list, along with others, will in all likelihood be equipping itself with nuclear weapons. All of these countries now have the requisite scientific manpower and industrial capacity in the key fields of electric power, steel, chemicals, engineering, and large-scale construction.

These grave considerations dictate the urgency for the early conclusion of a clear-cut test ban agreement at Geneva, where negotiations have been dragging along for 15 months. There can be no hope whatever of agreement at Geneva as long as pressure for further testing, however limited, continues to be successfully exerted on the White House and the Congress by the U.S. Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the small handful of official scientific advisers with a vested interest in urging the United States to run the risk of more tests.

America's closest western allies have restrained themselves from open criticism of the U.S. position with the greatest forbearance, but now seem determined to convince world opinion that they, for their part, favor a different course. The Canadian Government has just announced a straightforward new foreign policy calling for the end of all nuclear testing and the complete prohibition of nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare. At the same time, Great Britain is giving every evidence of intending to follow the Canadian example promptly.

The rivalries that now seem to loom large between the United States and the U.S.S.R. will be overshadowed by the terrible hazards that will confront mankind if 23 or

more nations become manufacturers of their own nuclear arms. The eyes of the world are focused on the President of the United States, the one man who can make the fateful decision. Let us hope that his concern for humanity and respect for world sentiment, coupled with his profound knowledge of weaponry and broad experience in warfare, will tip the scales toward the immediate end of nuclear testing as the first step in disarmament.

CYRUS EATON.

THE TERMINAL TOWER.

Education in the Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., the distinguished research director of the American Federation of Teachers, a national organization of large stature affiliated with CIO-AFL and dedicated to democracy in education; education for democracy. Mary J. Herrick, whom I am proud to number among my outstanding constituents, is 1 of the 16 vice presidents of the American Federation of Teachers, representative of every section of our Nation. Dr. Reuter's illuminating article follows:

WHICH WAY AMERICA?

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers)

The people of America are entering 1960 with some apparent confusion but with much zeal. A better world is expected, but the plans are still abstract. Much attention will be given to the past and the present, but greater goals will need to be established. It is our duty to help in this worthy cause.

Many citizens of all ages have been born, lived their lives, and died without purpose. Some of the trouble can be traced to what Dr. Joy Elmer Morgan was talking about when he said: "It is not possible for society to guarantee to every child a devoted mother and a wise provident father, but society can guarantee to every child a competent, well-prepared, and adequately paid teacher." But, even here there is danger in our age, as called to our attention recently by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. He noted: "Hannah Arendt has suggested, we appear to be entering an era in which men will no longer act; they will simply behave," and this will affect the teacher too.

The day of questioning the place of a lady on a program was true in 1853 but not in 1960, yet ladies can't solve all the troubles. In 1853, a man said: "Behold the beautiful pillar of this superb hall; contemplate its pedestal, its shafts, its rich entablature, the crowning glory of the whole. Each and all the parts in their appropriate places contribute to its strength, symmetry, and beauty. Could I aid in talking down that entablature from its proud elevation and placing it in the dust and dirt of the pedestal?" In 1960, it is the interesting book by a lady educator and traveler that stands forth. Yes, it is Charlotte Boren's "South America in 30 Days."

Events will not always be sweet or right. A sad note happened some months ago when

Debbie Reynolds, one of the great Christians of Hollywood, was divorced through no fault of her own. She recently remarked: "I was never happier in my marriage than when I didn't know it was ending. It's very hard to find the person you love doesn't love you. A divorced woman shouldn't think about it or talk about it. I don't look at myself as a divorced woman. I accept that I am but I try not to think about it. I haven't reached the stage yet of looking around for something else."

Dr. Daniel R. Davies of Columbia University has developed many challenging points that we should briefly consider. These are:

1. "The human race is multiplying at a dizzying pace. And the rate appears to be still going up. The consequences if not terrifying, are at least sobering. The direct effect upon schools is, of course, the number of beings to provide for."

2. "It took 16 centuries—the time between the birth of Christ and the death of Queen Elizabeth—for the world population to double. It is now expected to double in less than one-half century."

3. "The rate of population increase of the U.S.A. is greater than that of India. Our national population almost doubled in the first half of the 20th century, and is still increasing" (from 76 to 151.7 million from 1900 to 1950).

4. "In the elementary age group, 5 to 13 years, we can expect an annual increase of about 1 million kindergarteners for the next several years, and then a tapering off. The high school group will increase more steadily at the rate of about one-half million annually."

5. "Not only do people grow up, but they live longer. The death rate from natural causes in our country between 1 month and 40 years in approaching zero. In 1900 the average life expectancy of the American male was 48.2 years. In 1950 it was 65.5 years. Today it is approximately 70. Some responsible observers predict that it will be 100 years by the end of the century."

6. "If we add up the estimated population for 1965 in the elementary, secondary, and higher education age groups we get a total of 92.6 million. The Census Bureau arrive at their estimates by assuming that the same proportion of the group's total population will be in school than as was the case in 1958, namely 54.7 percent. The trouble with that assumption is that the proportion of school enrollment to total population has been increasing through the past decade."

7. "Two effects then will be at work in expanding the school enrollments. First, there is the sheer increase in numbers, as pointed out by the census figures. Second, there is the trend toward a greater proportion of school attendance in all age groups."

8. "It is rapidly becoming old fashioned to speak of the public school system as including grades 1 through 12. Look at the junior college statistics. In 1958, Dr. Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, gave the following statistics: there were 625 junior and community colleges enrolling 765,000 students in 1958-59. This means we have witnessed a growth of 250 percent in a decade in the junior college. On June 1, 1959, Dr. Bethel said that the current figures are 667 junior and community colleges with an enrollment of 892,000. He continued by saying that by 1970 about 50 percent of all college freshmen will be enrolled in junior colleges. In California, the proportion is already far higher than this estimate: 65 percent. Florida figures are almost unbelievable. In the 26 counties having junior colleges, 75 percent of the students enrolling in college for the first time chose the junior college. Florida now has 16 public junior colleges compared to 7 in 1957. Between the fall of 1957 and

the fall of 1958, there was an enrollment increase of 57 percent."

9. "The 4-year colleges, too, are in for their boom period according to the book, 'Manpower and Education,' which says 'taking many factors into consideration, some specialists estimate that college enrollments in 1965 may exceed 5 million students and even approach 6 million.'"

10. "Public school adult education is becoming big business. In 1946-47 there were 2,662,786 public school enrollees in the 48 States and the District of Columbia. The comparable figure in 1956-57 according to the U.S. Office of Education statistics is 4,373,054. In the same period State financial aid increased from \$5.3 million to \$15.8 million."

Dr. Walter D. Cocking wrote of a past failure but a future prediction. He noted: "Comprehensive Federal support legislation will not be enacted by the Congress at the 1959 session. However, within 10 years such legislation will be passed and people (present opponents and supporters alike) will wonder what all the shooting was about."

Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago, provides further challenges to education and America. Below are a few of these key gems:

1. "It is the professor and his family who are currently subsidizing higher education, and, if labor can talk about a day's work for a day's pay, why cannot the academic world?"

2. "At whatever level, education is not a commodity to be bought and sold. It is a natural right and should be as free to all as the air we breathe. This country, with one of the highest literacy rates in the world, was built upon this Jeffersonian principle. It is immoral to treat learning as anything but a gift which each State owes to all its sons and daughters."

3. "We live in a divided world and higher education is probably the key to the survival of Western civilization."

4. "My father was a poor farm boy from Kansas, and my name is not by accident 'Lawrence.' The University of Kansas meant for him a whole new way of life that otherwise would have been beyond his and his family's wildest dreams. The public university as it meets the needs, both individual and regional, of its area is the symbol and the actuality of the democracy that is America."

5. "All of us here would agree that we must have more money for all higher education, public and private."

Toynbee gives us hope too: "The 20th century will be remembered as the 1st age in history in which people thought it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race." Yet, at about the same time these remarks were being uttered, George Meany wrote to Mrs. Povl Bang-Jensen: "The courage and honor of your husband in his refusal to compromise his high principles will everlastingly provide inspiration to men everywhere who defend the ideals of freedom against the forces of tyranny. Sincere condolences to you and your children." The idea of Toynbee is a beautiful dream, but the condition of the latter represents black reality to the dead man's family.

Bishop Vincent S. Waters, of Raleigh, N.C., recently suggested that all people should possess: "the right to physical integrity, the right to moral integrity, the right to intellectual integrity, the right to social integrity, and the right to economic integrity." These principles would do much toward building a positive program.

A better nation and world will come only through dreams and positive programs, however, and the then Secretary of State George C. Marshall gave a lofty statement at Harvard in June of 1947, when he said: "Our policy

is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." Later, the words of Dr. Harold Benjamin provided additional direction: "Free men cannot be taught properly by slaves; courageous citizens cannot be well educated by scared hired men."

If we will accept some of the goals of Dr. Cocking, we will be looking in the direction of progress. Among these are:

1. Reduction of operating school districts from about 49,000 to 40,000 by 1969.

2. Greater experimental research in education.

3. Increased and broadened programs of education in business and industry.

4. The use of automation in business offices of schools and colleges.

5. Greater student housing for all types of students.

6. The centralized kitchen should become more common in school systems and colleges. Efficiency and economy will thus be served.

7. Greater growth and development of junior or community colleges.

8. Citizen committee activities should be expanded.

9. State departments of education should devote more attention to service and research activities.

On the one side Americans face the reality of Robert Mauer's comment concerning the patterns of education, and on the other the status that Dr. Hutchins sees. The Antioch professor noted: "At one academic pole, represented by St. John's College in Maryland, every instructor is required sooner or later to teach everything—languages, music, sciences, literature—the whole liberal arts curriculum. At the opposite extreme are professors in large universities whose principal duties are research and publication in a narrowly specialized field and whose teaching assignments, if any, are kept to an absolute minimum so as not to interfere with their scholarly work."

Then, Dr. Hutchins sees the other: "Industrialization has introduced a new element into the aims of the state: a primary object must now be to keep the industrial machine going. The production of goods therefore becomes an end in itself, without regard to their utility. That popular statistic, the gross national product, makes no distinction among products in terms of their desirability or quality: quantity is all. Full employment, to which all countries are committed, does not ask whether the worker is producing cosmetics or tractors."

Which way America? All of us must work for a complete and worthy answer.

Endorsement of Establishment of Forest Work Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter, dated February 27, 1960, which I have received from Miss Bibiana M. Maher, secretary of the Oregon Juvenile Council, of Portland, Ore. The letter sets

forth a resolution adopted by the council at its last meeting.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OREGON JUVENILE COUNCIL,
Portland, Ore., February 27, 1960.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At our latest conference, among our resolutions was the following:

"Whereas there is pending in Congress legislation for the establishment of forest work camps similar to the former CCC camps; and

"Whereas there is a great need to provide training and work for youth in this country and for the conservation of our national resources: Be it

"Resolved, That the Oregon Juvenile Council, in convention assembled, approves such legislation."

We are confident, Senator Morse, that you are interested in this action of our organization.

Yours very truly,

MISS BIBIANA M. MAHER,
Secretary.

Serving the General Housing Demand and Protecting the Homebuilder's Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard Barrett of Barrett Homes and the Barrett Construction Co., San Francisco, Calif., made a speech before the Urban League Housing Conference in December on the subject of building houses for interracial occupancy.

Barrett Homes is not new to the building industry. Mr. Barrett's distinguished father was long engaged in the construction industry in California and the company has inherited a remarkable record of success.

One of the officers of this company is Mr. John H. Tolan, Jr., son of the late Representative from the Seventh Congressional District. He, like his father, has done an outstanding job in his chosen field.

The experiences of Dick Barrett should be of great interest to all, particularly at this time, and I am happy to make his speech a part of my remarks:

SERVING THE GENERAL HOUSING DEMAND AND PROTECTING THE HOMEBUILDERS' INVESTMENT

(By R. H. Barrett, partner, Barrett Construction Co., San Francisco, Calif.)

The subject of building housing for interracial occupancy requires a general contractor to step out of his working clothes. This is a field afar from our customary labor and management problems, from the procurement and assembly of materials and construction components, from the business of compiling estimates, and the submission of competitive bids.

Few general contractors operate as we do; that is, with a division of the company devoted to production housing. When you build housing you must face the general retail market rather than a single customer for one large building. Thus we are forced by the new laws to take another look at the social structure of our home sales and rentals.

Our experience in interracial housing has been confined to the Plaza, Richmond, Calif. Two years ago we sold 91 buildings in this development. There were 20 single family detached homes, 62 attached or semiautonomous row houses (called patio town houses), and 9 duplex buildings. The 100 living units were sold and occupied by 74 Caucasian, 11 Negro, 8 Filipino, 4 Japanese, and 3 Chinese families. This is a total of 26 percent minority.

As of last week we have had seven resales. The percentage of minority families has held constant, although one oriental family sold to a Negro family and, to that extent, changed the pattern within the minority group by 1 percent. Another oriental family sold to a Caucasian family, and that resale has accounted for a 1 percent increase in white occupancy.

There have also been five family moves due to the rental or rental of homes or duplex apartments. Here we gained one oriental family and one Negro family as against the original racial distribution.

The net change in the entire project so far as minority families are concerned is one additional Negro family. The resale picture indicates that this new neighborhood is more stable than any other local new subdivision. Everyone is making money when they resell. The last family to move out due to a job change paid a full 6 percent real estate commission and had a new cash balance of \$1,600 to take with them after their loan was assumed by the new buyer.

We are proud of this achievement. We liked doing this sort of a job. It was something that needed doing. We didn't talk about it or explain it—we simply did it.

Builders believe the new law will increase social and racial justice—but not economic justice. It puts a discriminatory burden of compliance on the merchant builders who use FHA and VA financing, or those involved in urban redevelopment and renewal. The statute must be broadened if it seeks to do economic justice to the new house builders as well as social justice to home-seeking minority families.

It appears highly probable that many a seller of older homes or single custom-built new homes will say to sales prospects:

"Don't buy in that new subdivision. They are building over five houses and have to accept colored buyers by law. Buy from me instead. We don't have that problem here."

As long as merchant builders of new homes remain the focal pressure point they will be apprehensive that their subdivisions may be overwhelmed by minority buyers. There is no way to release that pressure except by making this law apply to all home sales. It may be years before the right to purchase anywhere can be exercised by everyone. The number of these years will be shortened, in our opinion by meetings like this one. This gathering, with its spirit of cooperation, is of vital importance to builders.

After all, the deed to real property, especially a new home, is filled with many personal overtones. Ultimately there is just a buyer and a seller—one, or the other, or both, full of faith and hope over the transaction—or full of doubt and uncertainty.

"Who are my neighbors?" our buyers always ask.

Will it ever be satisfactory to answer: "According to law your neighbors are Mr. and Mrs. So and So."

You are saying by this meeting, "No, our horizons are broader than that."

But I just want to point out—as a builder of new homes—that the sound leadership in finding a new high standard of housing for minorities must work with continuing controls over new neighborhoods. Intergroup relations agencies must and will help stem the tide of unreasonable and unreasoning pressure in any one locale. Enduring property value is an economic must for any family, regardless of race, creed, or color.

To the builders here assembled may I suggest that we must continue to make substantial progress in the planning, architectural design, and construction quality particularly when we must carry the psychological market handicap of interracial sales. These are the plus values that will make our product so attractive that the unreasonable elements of uncertainty and doubt are readily overcome.

Your chairman has asked me to delineate our position and function.

Our position is simply to develop land, to build and sell shelter. Our function is to perform this service for value at a profit.

Secondly, I have been asked to discuss our problems and limitations. Well, our problems have to do with steadily increasing costs and the competition we face in the market from other goods, other services—and especially for an adequate supply of mortgage money at reasonable interest rates and loan fees. As to the limitations—I will take these up when I show you a series of colored slides.

Finally, your chairman would like our suggestions as to positive steps which can be taken for cooperation. I would suggest:

1. The public must be educated to expect integrated neighborhoods when they purchase new homes. There is no advantage to anyone in a surprised buyer, a forfeited deposit, a panic resale, or a disgruntled neighbor.

2. The responsibility for total integration cannot be shifted by law from the community to the individual builder. We are carrying organization and financing burdens now that are overwhelming many good firms. Don't try to overload a mechanic with a social and philosophical problem. By urban league activity and leadership give the builder his chance for modest cooperation and back him with reciprocal support.

3. Don't rely entirely on the penalties available under this new law. This inherent threat could hurt as well as help. The builder who complies will face increased marketing costs. Are you ready to share these expenses by paying higher prices?

4. This is not a ghost problem. You have to work with it—come to grips with it in the field—in order to do something about it. Are we all willing to sacrifice the time and pay the costs involved in giving proper attention to this subject on the local community level? You have called this group together today. Please call more of these meetings. I compliment you on your leadership, and thank you for your courtesy in inviting me to attend.

The Case for Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the chancellor emeritus of higher education in

Oregon, Dr. Frederick M. Hunter, is a man of great wisdom and wide experience. His views are received with respect in and out of Oregon. A dedicated educator, he has devoted his life to improving and enlarging education for our people.

I am including here, under a previous consent, a telegram which I have received from Chancellor Hunter:

EUGENE, OREG., February 29, 1960.

HON. CHARLES PORTER,

House of Representatives:

Sincerely and earnestly I urge you do all in your power to bring about the enactment of a law providing assistance to the States adequate to enable them to pay teacher salaries and construct buildings to meet the present critical situation and the continually increasing deficiency resulting from explosive population increases. No other issue is so important. How except for the public school have 41 million foreigners become good American citizens? How except for the public schools have 2 million young Americans coming to maturity each year, been given a common loyalty to our national objectives sufficient to meet the crises of two great World Wars? How from now on, can we hope to meet the colossal task of giving the sense of oneness of a free people to more than 4 million youths maturing each year in a divided world except for greatly expanded and improved educational institutions? The issue is: Shall we continue to do this or shall we surrender to the Russian dictators' verdict "We shall bury you"? That's the stake when Congress votes on the bill for Federal support to the States for public education.

FREDERICK M. HUNTER.

Operation Catalyst in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1960 issue of Audiovisual Instruction carried a story of how Oregon is making use of title III in the National Defense Education Act. Author Henry C. Ruark, Jr., is an audiovisual instructor.

In his words:

One of the most interesting title III developments in the State is the cooperative program for televised Spanish instruction taking place in Bethel-Eugene-Springfield, a three-community area centered around Eugene which is the home of the University of Oregon. In these three districts, a large percentage of foreign language teachers in Oregon get their practice-teaching experience. The TV instruction, at sixth-grade level, is supplemented with classroom work by both the classroom teacher and the special TV instructor.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the full text of Mr. Ruark's article:

TITLE III IN OREGON—OPERATION CATALYST

(By Henry C. Ruark, Jr.)

(Hank Ruark will be a stranger to few readers in this field, having taught AV in two Oregon colleges, worked in the center at Indiana University, and served as director of information for NAVA. He is consultant on instructional materials and coordinator of acquisitions for title III in Oregon.)

The title III program for the improvement and strengthening of instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages has brought significant stimulation to the audiovisual field in Oregon. Although it is too early to attempt any thorough analysis or evaluation of its impact, a catalytic trigger effect is clearly discernible, reaching beyond the NDEA subjects into other educational areas.

There is also a growing interest in cooperative establishment or expansion of county or regional film libraries; a greater awareness among school administrators, teachers, and principals of the need for assistance from a competent audiovisual person, and a broadened acceptance of AV teaching tools as an integral part of any plan to improve instruction.

It has been less than a year since Oregon's plan for title III was accepted by the U.S. Office of Education on February 16, 1959. Since then, Oregon has:

Organized a new instructional services section in the State department of education to administer title III's dual program—acquisition of special equipment and materials, and improvement of supervision in NDEA subject areas; guidance and counseling under title V, section A. The new section will also be responsible for other special-service programs of the Department, including school library consultant services and a program to improve curriculum and instruction for the educationally able and gifted. The latter program was in part an outgrowth of section A of title V.

Completed two application periods for title III (one covering 1958-59 allocations and a second covering 1959-60 grants) totaling more than \$1 million and including 410 applications from 139 school districts in 31 of the State's 36 counties. About 20 percent of expenditures were in the audiovisual field, and indications are that this proportion will increase.

Set up a second, supplementary, application period for 1959-60 funds, with an estimated 175 applications due for processing after December 10, 1959. (At deadline for this article nearly 300 applications had been requested.) Nearly \$500,000 in Federal matching funds is available for this supplementary period.

Completed reimbursement in many school districts for 1958-59 projects, and begun processing of claims for reimbursement on 1959-60 projects for which acquisitions have been fully or partially completed.

Planned an application period for 1960-61 funds to take place early in 1960 in order to time NDEA procedures with school budgeting.

Begun special programs of consultation and inservice work by new subject-area specialists under the improvement of supervision phase. The demand for the services of title III consultants in the three NDEA subject areas and in instructional materials is already heavy although these programs did not get underway until after school started last fall.

There is probably no such thing as a typical title III project, at least not in Oregon. The emphasis on curriculum change and development in the State during the past 5 years has brought about an understanding of the need for general improvement in instruction and has had a great deal to do with the acceptance of NDEA in Oregon. Most project applications submitted were pretty well tailored to meet local needs, with emphasis differing markedly from project to project and with the inventory of requested equipment differing just as markedly.

As in many States, the science area with its special needs for equipment drew much attention. Out of total allocations of \$1,009,000, science activities were granted \$631,000. Science appears 305 times in Oregon projects.

Mathematics appears 162 times during

the first 2 application periods (1958-59 and 1959-60) with \$194,000 allocated. Foreign language grants totaled \$184,000 with 92 activities underway in the same 2 periods. About 40 of these deal only with materials.

Many projects in science, especially for elementary schools, were confined to so-called minimum list items in 1958-59 and expanded to acquire other and more specialized or complex equipment in 1959-60. The minimum list items are considered the basic types which should be readily available before additional equipment is acquired. In mathematics there has been a fairly heavy demand for manipulative materials in the elementary grades with some emphasis on models and more specialized equipment at the secondary level.

In Oregon the approach to language teaching equipment has tended to be conservative, slow, and rather carefully planned; many districts are still working out the details for language laboratory installations, making sure that the facilities they install will fill their needs and provide for reasonable expansion and change. Thus many of the early projects requested building-block equipment, which can be integrated into functional use with more complex equipment later, and which provides better opportunity than in former years for teachers and students to familiarize themselves with equipment before making the transition.

One of the most interesting title III developments in the State is the cooperative program for televised Spanish instruction taking place in Bethel-Eugene-Springfield, a three-community area centered around Eugene which is the home of the University of Oregon. In these three districts a large percentage of foreign language teachers in Oregon get their practice-teaching experience. The TV instruction, at sixth-grade level, is supplemented with classroom work by both the classroom teacher and the special TV instructor.

VARYING STAGES OF LANGUAGE EQUIPMENT

In addition, all three school systems are making varying installations of electronic equipment for use at secondary and elementary levels. At Bethel the State's first level III language lab (listen-speak-record) is in daily use at the Willamette High School. In Eugene and Springfield, listening-corner equipment and materials are employed on an expanding scale, and recording and playback devices are also used. Depending on needs and experience, other levels of language labs may be installed in each community. There are, in fact, 12 level III installations, or modifications thereof, in various phases of acquisition or installation in the State.

It has been considered policy throughout the Oregon effort under title III to stress the interrelatedness of all types of materials for every subject. As a result of this policy in part, most title III projects have included requests for many types of supplementary printed materials, and in general it appears that these resources have also been strengthened in many projects.

Oregon policy regarding audiovisual materials and equipment has specifically been kept as flexible as possible. No "basic list" or suggested set of equipment or materials has been set up, and the official Guide for Oregon Projects Under Title III, NDEA carries this statement:

"Because the provision of audiovisual equipment at the local level is so closely connected with other factors of importance in good utilization of such equipment (i.e., supply and distribution of materials, teacher experience, interest and readiness for equipment application, light control facilities * * * etc.) quantitative standards for specific pieces of equipment have not been established. Each item of audiovisual equipment may be individually justified in what-

ever quantity can be shown to be essential to the individual project."

In addition, each subject-area section of the Guide carries a statement pointing out that the NDEA specifically recognizes and emphasizes the use of the audiovisual media; still further, separate standards for basic types of audiovisual equipment are contained in the Guide, and light control specifications are also written into the standards for remodeling. Facilities for light control are considered as "special equipment" in some cases where remodeling is not necessary, and where it would not serve the purpose of the act to consider these essential means for audiovisual instruction as "remodeling."

Another area in which there is increasing interest and activity in Oregon is that of local preparation of materials. One particular project will serve as an example; the high school mathematics instructors in the Beaverton school system are working together to produce visualized units for the overhead projector, making use of its unique qualities to bring new insight into special areas of this subject. The materials for the project are being supplied by the school district; the projection equipment has been acquired under a title III grant. The school system has also allowed worktime for the math instructors under a special summer program. Although the project is still in the beginning phases, it appears that some significant and interesting materials may result. The materials and experience gained will be made available to other Oregon schools when ready.

Some of the larger school systems have made an interesting use of title III by proposing projects for the acquisition of one or several items of special equipment for each school. For instance, one project stipulates a considerable number of micro-projectors, portable laboratory tables, and similar equipment for each elementary and junior high school. Another similar project in the field of audiovisual materials provides solely for a large number of new films and filmstrips in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages. Title III has also served as impetus for a growing number of joint projects, involving from 2 to 30 individual school districts, sometimes in more than one county. Most of these projects are centered on specialized materials, often films, filmstrips, recordings, and printed supplementary materials.

One of the most important phases of the title III program in Oregon is just getting underway; that is the work of special consultants in the NDEA subject areas and in instructional materials. Oregon has long practiced general supervision, and has an interesting history of effective action in this area. Now the title III program has made available a well-trained and skilled specialist in each NDEA subject area—math, science, and foreign languages. The primary responsibility of each specialist is simply the statewide improvement of instruction in his subject area. Each of the consultants is available to school systems for work with administrators, principals, teachers, and others. Each is maintaining close liaison with professional subject groups, with administrators at all levels, with institutions of higher education (especially teacher-training centers) and with groups at the national level. Each devotes full time to his particular subject area, and is also the chief resource person for the Department of Education. Each will be involved in curriculum development and planning, preparation of publications, and the wide variety of committee and group work on which these types of activities are based in Oregon.

In the instructional materials area, the Oregon Audio-Visual Association is working closely with the title III administration. One

phase of association activity undergoing expansion is the basic one of providing information and services; plans are underway for an action group which will carry out a continuing program to make sure that school administrators, school board members, the public generally, and others concerned with Oregon education have at their disposal full knowledge of the function and importance of audiovisual instruction.

A basic step to bring into reality the great potential of audiovisual instruction in every State is participation by the local audiovisual person in the planning steps for title III projects. In Oregon this fact is becoming more widely recognized not only as it pertains to NDEA but any kind of planning for improvement of instruction. The great danger is that the AV person will not get this opportunity to participate, unless he has proven himself by previous work with subject-area administrators, teachers, principals, curriculum people, and through his own audiovisual activities. Undoubtedly, what happens at this crucial local level can do more to determine audiovisual progress through title III than nearly any other factor in the program.

What has happened in less than 1 year in Oregon may well set the pattern for many future years to come, within or without NDEA. The most important developments can be summed up thus:

Title III has brought about significant new activities of great promise, both at the State and the local level.

Large sums of money have been expended on special equipment and materials, with a growing proportion going to audiovisual tools and media specifically.

The attention of administrators and teachers has been caught and directed specifically to audiovisual media as integral parts of key plans for improving instruction.

Growing interest in cooperative development of larger supplies and a broader range of audiovisual materials closer to the point of classroom use is now in evidence and will probably result in expanded cooperative activities.

State level and OAVA activities in the audiovisual field are sure of continued expansion during the next few years to meet the increasing demands for information, consultation, and in planning for increased audiovisual programming in Oregon schools.

Successful Decade Sees Growth of Port of Portland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest assets of the city of Portland, Ore., is its complex of port facilities. The Commission of Public Docks is an important part of the management of those facilities, and a very important part of the reason for Portland's growth in recent years. In a recent issue of Title Tips, a publication of the Title & Trust Co. of Portland, there appeared an excellent article about the work of the commission. Under unanimous consent I include the story in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SUCCESSFUL DECADE SEES GROWTH OF PORT OF PORTLAND

"Leading West Coast Dry Cargo Tonnage Port"; "West Coast's Leading Grain Export Port"; "Terminal No. 4 Site of Northwest's Largest Maritime Construction Project in 1959"; "1959 Ushers Out Decade of Unparalleled Progress for Portland Harbor."

Such headlines were commonplace during 1959. For Portland Harbor has just ended what was by far its most successful decade for new construction starts and handling of recordbreaking tonnages. The modern facilities located along Portland's 25 miles of waterfront and the port's large trading area—more than 300,000 square miles—are strong attractions to the world's leading shipping lines and to importers and exporters.

Cargo tonnages rose approximately 6 percent during 1959 over the previous year. Waterfront payrolls in Portland amounted to more than \$8.1 million, making the maritime industry one of Portland's largest single economic factors. In addition, studies made by the Library of Congress in cooperation with the Oregon State System of Higher Education and the State Planning and Development Department, revealed that 57 percent of Oregon's manufacturing, agriculture, fishing, and port industries have a positive foreign trade interest, while 33 percent have a net import competitive interest—evidence of the fact that international trade is the backbone of Oregon's economy.

The Portland Commission of Public Docks, entering its 50th year of service in 1960, was founded under city charter amendment to provide for and maintain the port's public marine terminals and to promote trade and traffic through Portland's harbor. Today, the commission maintains three of the finest general and bulk-cargo terminals along the west coast—owned and operated under single management and representing an investment of more than \$20 million of public moneys. The commission, operating from only a one-tenth of 1 mill tax levy for the general fund (approximately \$70,000 in 1959), maintains these facilities through the reinvestment of operating revenues, wharfage charges, etc. Privately operated docks in the harbor represent additional investment in Portland's future as a leading port.

FOUR SHIPS EACH DAY

Portland handles more than 1,500 vessels per year—an average arrival of one every 6 hours. Among primary imports are ores and concentrates, steel and iron products, foreign autos, and burlap. Leading exports are grains, lumber, paper products, and scrap metal.

Portland is linked to the world's seaports by more than 50 steamship lines. The port is serviced by more than 30 tug and barge lines, 5 major transcontinental railroads, and several of the world's leading airlines. There are more than 100 interstate truck lines operating in Portland to expedite the transshipment of imports to their final destination. The downtown banking firms with foreign trade departments, the city's customs house brokers, freight forwarders, and services of 19 foreign consuls round out the picture of a completely integrated world trade center.

Traffic and solicitation for the port of Portland is carried on extensively throughout Portland's trade area by personal calls of the dock commission's traffic department representatives. The commission also maintains a New York traffic representative.

A modern, newly installed IBM machine records unit at the commission office keeps complete, up-to-date tabulation of all commodities passing through the public terminals. This information, compiled by origination and destination, tonnage, and commodity, is useful in tonnage surveys and

planning sales solicitations. This department also maintains the commission's operating and payroll systems.

LABOR RELATIONS GOOD

All aspects of a modern port are found in Portland and are reflected in the harbor's record of progress and prosperity. Excellent labor-management relations exist in the harbor—evidenced by not a single major work stoppage in the past decade.

During mid-1959, the U.S. Department of Commerce officially announced that Portland was, for the third consecutive year, the leading west coast dry cargo tonnage port. More than 2,444,000 tons of foreign cargo passed through the port. In second place, with nearly three-quarters of a million tons less dry cargo, was Los Angeles. Seattle, Long Beach, and San Francisco followed, in that order.

Nearly 54 million bushels of grain were exported via Portland during 1959—strengthening Portland's position as No. 1 grain port of the U.S. Pacific Coast. Grains of all types, originating throughout eastern Oregon and the Inland Empire, move down the Columbia River aboard barges, and by truck and rail, to be unloaded and processed prior to export at the commission's 8-million-bushel elevator (largest tidewater elevator in the Western United States) or at one of the harbor's privately owned elevators.

The commission, noting the growing demand for imports of ores and concentrates by western U.S. industry, began construction of a \$3,700,000 bulk cargo pier at its Terminal No. 4. Due for completion in mid-1960, the pier will be the most modern bulk facility on the coast with its giant 900-ton-per-hour traveling bulk unloading tower and holding area for more than 100 rail cars. Ores and concentrates presently are the port's leading import commodity and prospects for increasing amounts are strongly evident.

DECADE OF GROWTH

The years 1950-60 marked highlights in practically every phase of Portland's waterfront industry. More than \$9 million was invested in new and modernized public facilities with funds derived from the commission's earnings and a \$6,500,000 bond issue granted the commission by Portland voters in 1954. New general cargo berths, modernization of bulk cargo handling facilities, and reconditioning of terminals gave a completely new look to the harbor and were instrumental in Portland's attaining the rank of leading dry cargo port.

Private industry spent several million more in new terminal operations and facilities. A 12-acre warehouse, reputedly the largest in the Nation, was erected in the central harbor area for handling paper products. Harvey Aluminum Co. put into service a new, completely mechanized dock, for receipt of waterborne imports of alumina ore. Union Pacific Railroad appropriated more than \$2 million in improving and enlarging its waterside freightyards and increasing its Portland base operations.

The coming decade promises more progress and even better records of achievement. A survey by a nationally recognized firm of engineering consultants predicted a constant rise in Portland's cargo handling operations and pointed out the need for added facilities in the not too distant future. A trade tour, made by dock commission members, resulted in promise of more trade with Japan, already Portland's leading harbor customer—more than two dozen personal calls were made on leading Japanese shipping company and import-export company executives throughout Japan. Portland's International Trade Fair awakened strong interest in Portland's trade area and harbor in the minds of many foreign exhibitors and national trade officials. Sev-

eral foreign government representatives expressed strong sentiments for increasing trade with Portland, even to the extent of opening trade offices here to complement the east coast offices.

Portland is seeing prosperity and an increased tempo in development of international trade and marine commerce. This development is actually just beginning along Portland's modern waterfront. The commission of public docks and the harbor's private interests are working together to maintain Portland's strong position as an international seaport and the world port of the Pacific.

U.S. Navy Band Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy Band comes home next week after its good will tour of several South American cities. It will return home, too, to pay its last respects to several of its members who lost their lives in the tragic air collision with a Brazilian airliner near Rio de Janeiro's Sugar Loaf Mountain February 25.

The Navy informs me that the special collective commitment service for the band members is open to the public. It will be held Tuesday, March 8, at 2 p.m. in Arlington National Cemetery. Full military honors will be accorded the men at that time.

Reports of the success of the band's trip will be coming back to us for a long time. One report on the band's March 2 visit in Santiago, Chile, has come from Ambassador Howe. The Ambassador told of the crowds who came to hear the band concerts.

In the Municipal Stadium in Santiago there were 40,000 persons present. In Constitution Plaza there were 15,000 in the audience. In Park Forrestal the number was 10,000.

As Ambassador Howe wired:

The U.S. Navy Band has endeared itself to Chile and has won the United States many friends.

I understand that the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and other ranking Navy personnel will be present to honor those talented and devoted musicians who gave their lives in the line of duty. I join in paying my respects. The spirit of the band and Commander Brendler in completing the tour is commendable. The results can never be estimated. The band had a job to do. It did it.

The fields of battle are varied. It may not be the particular duty of the hero to carry the torch or brandish the sword—sometimes he may play his part on a violin or flute.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a list of those Navy men who lost their lives February 25, a copy of my weekly report about the U.S. Navy Band, and two news stories which appeared in the February 26, 1960, New York Times:

U.S. NAVY BAND MEMBERS

Lt. J. H. Fultz: Wife, Mrs. Luna J. Fultz, care of I. Jerome Jackson, Middelbert, N.C.; parents: Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Fultz, Arlington, Va.

E. L. Armiger, MUC: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Armiger, Baltimore, Md.

Milton G. Bergy, MU2: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Milton Bergy, Huntington, N.Y.

G. F. Meier, MU1: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold J. Meier, Lockport, N.Y.

R. R. Mickellaf, MUC: Wife, Norene Mickellaf, Cheverly, Md.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis J. Mickellaf, Brooklyn, N.Y.

J. A. Mohs, MUC: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford H. Mohs, Cincinnati, Ohio.

R. B. Wilklow, MU1: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Clement Mattoon Wilklow, Perry, N.Y.

A. J. Desiderio, MUSA: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Desiderio, Springfield, Pa.

V. P. Tramontana, MU1: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Tramontana, Bronx, N.Y.

J. Rosenthal, MUC: Brother, Mr. Alfred Rosenthal, Pikesville, Md.

E. W. Richey, MUC: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bradford S. Richey, Eureka, Calif.

W. M. Penland, MUC: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Clark Penland, Iowa City, Iowa.

R. S. Gaglio, MU1: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Gaglio, Compton, Calif.

R. D. Harl, MU1: Father, Ben Hur Harl, St. Petersburg, Fla.

Henry Bein, MUC: Father, Mr. John Bein, Philadelphia, Pa.; mother, Mrs. Gertrude Bein, Philadelphia, Pa.

W. F. Albrecht, MU2: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Albrecht, San Francisco, Calif.

R. L. Clark, MU1: Sister, Mrs. Dexter Lake, Lockport, N.Y.

J. B. Young, MUC: Father, Zebulon V. Young, Greensboro, N.C.

A. M. D'Amico, MU1: Wife, Mrs. Judith D'Amico, Adelphi, Md.

AIRPLANE CREW MEMBERS

Lt. (j.g.) Carle Lorenz Jackson: Wife, Mrs. Laura Virginia Jackson, Hollywood, Md.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Jackson, Pryor, Okla.

Eugene Nevitte Torrance: Wife, Mrs. Marjorie Torrance, Norfolk, Va.; mother, Mrs. Annie Harvey Torrance, Arlington, Va.

James Aublin Cordell: Mother, Mrs. Letia Moore Cordell, Sylacauga, Ala.; wife, Mrs. Marjorie C. Cordell, NAS Patuxent River, Md.

Russell Edward Martin: Wife, Mrs. Hulda M. Martin, Lexington Park, Md.; father, Mr. Seward Martin, Virgle, Ky.; mother, Mrs. Clara Isaacs Jones, Devinsville, Ky.

Lt. (j.g.) Owen Proctor Hartshorn: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Hartshorn, Essex, Iowa; wife, Mrs. Betty J. Hartshorn, Lexington Park, Md.

Victor Dale Fugate: Wife, Mrs. Edythe Fugate, Lexington Park, Md.; father, Mr. Calvin W. Fugate, Canton, Tex.; mother, Mrs. Ruth D. Fugate, San Leandro, Calif.

Leonard Ray Maynard: Wife, Mrs. Nanetta Allen Maynard, Lexington Park, Md.

PASSENGERS

Lt. Robert S. Brown, staff consultant, liaison with band: Wife, Ruth Doris Brown, Naval Station, Trinidad, B.W.I.; mother, Dorothy T. McBride, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. B. Erickson, ATC: Wife, Doris Mildred Erickson, Norfolk, Va.

Lt. (j.g.) Burdett Van Otterloo: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herman L. Van Otterloo, Hall, Iowa.

Lt. (j.g.) V. A. Schoen: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Schoen, Columbus, Nebr.

J. T. Mathenia, TM1: Sister, Mrs. Liddle Lowery, Barnhart, Miss.

C. L. Wagner, TM2: Father, Mr. Cecil Wagner, Quincy, Ill.; mother, Mrs. Erma Colbert, La Grange, Ill.; wife, Mrs. Phyllis Wagner, Quincy, Ill.

R. F. Osborne, TMC: Wife, Mrs. Evelyn L. Osborne, Key West, Fla.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. M. F. Osborne, Gallen, Mich.

W. P. Glass, TM2: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Parker A. Glass, Kingston, Mass.; wife, Mrs. Ruth A. Glass, Norfolk, Va.

C. B. Ashby, TM3: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. L. Ashby, Norwalk, Calif.

SURVIVORS

Lt. George Paul Fitzgibbons: Mother, Mary E. Fitzgibbons, Worcester, Mass.

F. E. Wilson: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl L. Wilson, Dallas, Tex.

H. R. Halenza: Wife, Mrs. Grace L. Halenza, Oakdale Farms, Norfolk, Va.; parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gottlieb F. Halenza, Wheaton, Ill.

PORTER'S WEEKLY REPORT

(By Representative CHARLES O. PORTER)

U.S. NAVY BAND

The tragic air collision of a U.S. Navy plane and a Brazilian airliner near Rio de Janeiro's Sugar Loaf Mountain February 25, 1960, snuffed out the lives of 36 men who had been hard at work improving our person-to-person relations in South America.

Nineteen of those killed were members of the U.S. Navy Band, which has often played in Oregon. One of the dead, Lt. J. Harold Fultz, was the assistant band leader. I mention him particularly because Lieutenant Fultz conducted the band and its chorus, the Sea Chanters, in a special version of the Oregon State song in 1958.

I had asked the Navy band if "Oregon, My Oregon" was a part of its musical repertoire. Commander Brendler and Lieutenant Fultz told me it was not but they volunteered to make it a part if I could find the music. With the assistance of friends in Oregon I was able to provide the band with the music. The result was a stirring version, musical and choral, of our fine State song.

This February when the Oregon State Society met in Washington, D.C., the recorded Navy arrangement was played for the displaced Oregonians attending the annual society dinner. There were many favorable comments which I had hoped to tell Lieutenant Fultz about when the band returned from its South American good will tour.

Seven of the Navy men lost in the crash had been sent to Argentina to help that country hunt for a mystery submarine. Like the band members they were specially trained technicians. They will be hard to replace.

It was a terrible tragedy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1960]
SIXTY-ONE LOST AS PLANES COLLIDE AT RIO: 19 WERE U.S. NAVY BAND MEMBERS GOING TO EISENHOWER FETE THERE—ONLY 3 SURVIVORS—DISASTER CASTS PALL ON PRESIDENT'S TRIP—HE VISITS HOSPITAL

RIO DE JANEIRO, February 25.—A U.S. Navy plane and a Brazilian airliner with a total of 64 persons aboard them collided over Rio de Janeiro's bay in an overcast today.

Both planes broke into pieces and sank within view of horrified spectators.

The disaster wiped out a section of the U.S. Navy Band-Orchestra that was to have played here for President Eisenhower. When rescue operations were halted at nightfall only three survivors had been found.

The disaster cast a pall of tragedy over President Eisenhower's visit to Brazil.

ANTISUBMARINE MEN VICTIMS

With some of the top talent from the Navy Band and Orchestra the plane carried a group of U.S. antisubmarine men who had been in Argentina trying to help the Argentine Navy investigate the rumored presence of an alien submarine.

The bandmen who formed an orchestral group, were to have played at a dinner President Eisenhower was giving tonight for President Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil. (Other reports said that the dinner was canceled because of the tragedy.)

Many members of the band are known personally to President Eisenhower and he and President Kubitschek hurried to a hospital to comfort the survivors.

James C. Hagerty, Presidential press secretary, said the President "feels terrible about this tragic accident," but would go ahead with his South American tour.

The Navy plane, a four-engine R-6D, was flying to Rio de Janeiro from Buenos Aires. (The Defense Department in Washington said it carried 38 persons. The U.S. Embassy in Rio de Janeiro said earlier there were 44 persons aboard—the bandsmen, crewmen, and members of the anti-submarine team.)

The commercial airliner was a two-engine plane belonging to REAL Airlines. The company said it carried 22 passengers, including an infant, and a crew of 4.

The three survivors, taken to Miguel Conto Hospital, were listed as: Lt. G. P. Fitzgibbons, Worcester, Mass.; F. E. Wilson, sonar man, son of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Wilson of Dallas, Tex., and Aviation Ordnance Man H. R. Halenza, husband of Mrs. Grace Halenza, Norfolk, Va.

(The Navy in Washington listed these 19 bandsmen as missing: Lt. Johann H. Fultz, assistant band leader; Milton G. Bergey, Walter M. Penland, Robert L. Clark, William F. Albrecht, Richard D. Harl, James A. Mohs, Elmer L. Armiger, Earl W. Richey, Roger B. Wilkowi, Jefferson B. Young, Jerome Rosenthal, Vincent Tramontana, Raymond H. Micallef, Gerald R. Meier, Henry Bein, Reyes S. Gaglio, Anthony M. D'Amico, and Albert J. Desiderio.)

The Navy musicians were members of a 92-man band group that came to South America February 16 for appearances at several cities. Its headquarters was on the cruiser *Macon*, now at Buenos Aires.

WITNESS DESCRIBES DISASTER

One witness to the disaster was David B. Richardson, former war correspondent and South American regional editor for the magazine *U.S. News & World Report*. He was in a taxicab near Guanabara Bay.

"I happened to glance up at Sugar Loaf Mountain and noticed it was shrouded in thick fog," Mr. Richardson said. "Just at that moment a big four-engine plane—or what was left of it—came tumbling out of the fog."

"It spiraled crazily. The tail and rear section were missing. From the chopped-off fuselage a whole array of objects came spilling out as if it were a sort of ghastly cornucopia. I thought I saw a human figure in the falling debris."

"The plane hit the water with a splash that shot a sheet of white spray into the air. Then came the bizarre sight of the plane's tail section gliding slowly downward in a slow spiral until it fell gently into the bay. Other objects fell at the same time."

"Then the scene was as placid as it was just before that horrible moment."

As darkness fell, the search for bodies was halted. Buoys were put in place to mark the spot until work can be resumed tomorrow. Rain fell through most of the day.

PRESIDENTS SEE CRASH SCENE

As the two Presidents left the hospital ward, Mr. Halenza, one of the survivors, looked in President Eisenhower's direction and said: "Goodbye and thank you, sir."

Driving from the hospital to the Embassy residence, General Eisenhower and Dr. Kubitschek passed the bay area where the planes collided. They saw a long line of people standing in the rain watching rescue operations.

Dr. Kubitschek later issued a statement from the presidential palace saying:

"The news of the disaster that robbed the lives of Americans and Brazilians fills me with profound sadness."

"I speak in this moment certain of interpreting the sentiments of the Brazilian nation. Pain and sorrow cover all of Brazil."

"I turn my thoughts to God in moving prayer for the souls of those who died. And I hope that this sacrifice will unite even more the two American nations that live in these days moments of the purest joy and solidarity."

Robert Hartman, chief of the Washington bureau of the *Los Angeles Times*, accompanied the Presidents to the hospital as representative of all newsmen traveling with the American Chief Executive.

President Eisenhower, Mr. Hartman reported, stopped at the bedside of each of the three Americans, gave each a sympathetic pat and expressed wishes for their speedy recovery. All three survivors were in shock and under heavy sedation, but they obviously recognized the President.

President Eisenhower remarked to the men that "this surely is a tragic thing" and added that he was confident the doctors and nurses "will take good care of you."

The Embassy said the Navy plane, similar to a DC-6, was scheduled to fly at 6,000 feet and was headed for a landing at Galeao Airport.

The Real airliner was scheduled to fly at 5,000 feet and was coming in from Vitoria, north of Rio de Janeiro, for a landing at Santos Dumont Airport.

Rear Adm. John Quinn, chief of the U.S. Navy, mission to Brazil, appointed his deputy, Capt. John G. Hilton, to head a board to investigate the crash.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, who remained here while President Eisenhower was in Sao Paulo, issued a statement saying:

"Words cannot express my shock on hearing of the tragic accident. I can only express my profound distress that such an accident should have taken place and my deepest sympathy to the families of those who unhappily lost their lives."

[From the *New York Times*, Feb. 26, 1960]
NAVY BAND HEARD ALL OVER WORLD—COLORFUL OUTFIT, WHICH CAN PLAY SYMPHONY OR DANCE MUSIC, SET UP IN 1924

WASHINGTON, February 25.—Music lovers in many parts of the world have heard the famous Navy Band, some of whose members perished today in a plane collision over Rio de Janeiro.

The colorful outfit has played in more than a thousand cities at home and abroad since it was organized in 1924.

The band grew out of a unit of musicians stationed at the navy yard here prior to 1924. Recognized as the outstanding of a number of small musical units of the Navy, the organization was designated as the official band by Congress. This enabled it to play in the inaugural ceremony for Calvin Coolidge on March 4, 1924.

Navy ships had their small bands for almost a hundred years before the official band was formed. The log of a frigate, written in 1825, refers to the signing of a musician, with a salary of \$10 a month.

One of the famous units was the Great Lakes Band, led by John Philip Sousa, who was commissioned in the Naval Reserve to lead it.

Within the present Navy Band is a complete symphony orchestra, a section to provide light opera music and a dance band.

The band is a traditional part of Washington's parades and inaugural ceremonies, and sections play at funerals for Navy men at Arlington National Cemetery.

It has a library of more than 20,000 pieces. It operates its own school of music, to which musically inclined men are eligible after 3 months' basic training.

Lt. Comdr. Charles R. Brendler, present commander of the band, joined the Navy more than three decades ago, became chief musician for the old Navy Yard band and eventually advanced to leader of the official band.

The present size of the band is 128 men. Of those, 93 were on the South American tour, but only a minority were aboard the plane that crashed.

In remarks inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* Monday, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, said that efforts had been under way since 1957 to get the band to Latin America but that a lack of funds had prevented a trip.

Early this year, he said, the Navy authorized the cruiser *Macon* to "make a series of official state visits to certain coastal ports along the eastern shore of South America." The Navy Band was a logical choice to go along, he added.

Referring to plans for the band to play at the U.S. Embassy in Buenos Aires at a reception honoring the President, Mr. PORTER called this one of the most important assignments in the band's historic career.

"The assignment was not prearranged, I am told," he said. "It was a happy coincidence, a most opportune crossing of schedules for the President, the citizens of Argentina and the U.S. Navy Band members."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed, before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], recently delivered a splendid address at the 100th anniversary of the Cooper Union, in New York City. It is appropriate that Senator DIRKSEN should choose as his topic "The Man From Illinois," for he probably knows more about Abraham Lincoln than does any other Member of Congress.

The Senator's topic was doubly appropriate because in so many ways he exemplifies the virtues and abilities of The Great Emancipator. I hazard the guess that every Member of this body holds the distinguished Senator from Illinois in the highest regard, and that he is well liked by every Member of the U.S. Senate. There is also great respect for his activities as a leader of his political party and as a spokesman for American ideals.

Mr. President, in order that a wider audience can benefit from the eloquence of the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that his address at the Cooper Union be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN FROM ILLINOIS

(Address by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN at the Cooper Union, New York, N.Y.)

One hundred years ago today the man from Illinois came here to speak. He sought to make clear that the men who brought forth this new Nation were familiar with the problem of the extension of slavery. He came to prove that in all their later actions and conduct they did not directly or otherwise take the position that the Federal Government had the power to deal with this institution and its control in the territories. He came to accent the moral issue involved by pointing out that the fact that the South thought slavery right and the North thought it wrong was the precise fact at the bottom of the controversy. To all of his countrymen he addressed the appeal that we not lightly set aside what the Founding Fathers had wrought and that he and his associates were not unreasonable or sectional in their position. To those of his own political faith he urged that nothing be done in passion or ill temper. And, finally, he uttered his own supreme conviction that right makes might, and to that end he asked all that they do their duty.

How cruel and mistaken contemporary judgments can be. When he left Springfield, Ill., to come to New York for this address, the Springfield Register made this cryptic

comment: "Subject not known, consideration \$200 and expenses; object, presidential capital; effect, disappointment." Thus are men blinded to the inexorable sweeps of destiny. Ninety days after he spoke here he was nominated for the Presidency on the Republican ticket. Eight months after his appearance here, he was catapulted into the Presidency even as the fevers of the Nation quickened, and the ominous rumble of the irresistible conflict grew louder and louder. The man from Illinois was to become the grand captain in a vast and bloody conflict.

We must go back beyond the address delivered here 100 years ago tonight to note the emergence of the man from Illinois as the incomparable crusader in a moral cause, the magnificent missionary whose real armor in a day of fiery ordeal was his incandescent conviction, his unflinching zeal, his invincible logic, and his unflinching sense of right and wrong. We must indeed go back to the very prairies of Illinois, which he hallowed and where his brooding spirit still lives.

It was in May of 1856 that one might have noted the emergence of the inner spirit which was to be his shield and buckler.

Two years before that date, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and also the new and hateful doctrine of popular sovereignty was beginning to breed a strong revulsion in the land.

Before that, the issue of slavery was regarded in many quarters as a matter of policy rather than a transcendent moral issue. Among many of that day, it seemed to be little more than an intellectual exercise.

At the meeting in Bloomington, Ill., on May 29, 1856, the man from Illinois was summoned to speak at the party convention. This was the occasion when he uttered the celebrated "Lost Speech." The form and text may have in large measure been lost, but the spirit and effect were imperishable.

His law partner, Mr. Herndon, was present on that occasion. He referred to that speech as the greatest in the life of the man from Illinois. Until then, according to Herndon, the slavery issue had, in fact, been argued and discussed on grounds of policy and not from the eternal standpoint of what was right and wrong. But on that day, the man from Illinois was baptized in a new and unshakable cause. "From that day," wrote Herndon, "to the day of his death, he stood firm in the right."

The smothered flame had broken forth. A new and almost savage sense of justice fired his energies. The soul of the crusader was now seasoned. A new sense of mission was lighting the way. The man from Illinois had found his cross. There on the rolling prairies of Illinois where he had been a storekeeper and postmaster, lawyer and surveyor, State legislator and Congressman, the magnificent missionary had suddenly emerged to become mankind's greatest crusader in a human cause.

In that day and time there were many other events which aided destiny in making the man from Illinois ready for the role he was to play. In the year 1856, James Buchanan was elected President. In the territory of Kansas the recurring clashes over the slavery issue were being referred to as war. The unrestrained spirit of John Brown burst forth in murderous action like that of some horseman out of the Apocalypse, crying for death and vengeance. In that time also came the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court under the leadership of Chief

Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case, a decision which was to make history and to shake history as well.

Came also in that day a most extraordinary document, then known as the LeCompton Constitution, under which one group believed and expected that the Territory of Kansas might come into the Union.

There came in the year 1858, a campaign for the U.S. Senate between the man from Illinois and a distinguished and able opponent, a campaign marked by sharp allusions and pointed personalities, as each sought victory. And in the late summer of that year, as a part of the campaign, came that celebrated series of debates which have so greatly enriched the political literature of that day and left a revealing insight for those who were to come after.

In this great continuing discussion beginning at Ottawa, Ill., and ending in Alton, few things were left undiscussed.

The debate embraced the Missouri Compromise of 1850, which sought to limit the extension of slavery. It included the effort to repeal that compromise through the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which was piloted through a committee of the U.S. Senate by Senator Stephen A. Douglas, who was the opponent of the man from Illinois.

It involved the Dred Scott decision. It covered the personal life of the candidates.

But the moral issue became the overriding light and it came in the very first discussion in the first debate at Ottawa.

"I hold," said the man from Illinois, "there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, * * * and the right to eat the bread without the leave of anybody else which his own hand earns. He is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Here was the beginning of the moral thunder which was to roll down through conflict, through emancipation, and through victory.

On they went—these two gladiators—from Ottawa to Freeport, from Freeport to Jonesboro, from Jonesboro to Charleston, from Charleston to Galesburg, from Galesburg to Quincy, and from Quincy to Alton.

By that time it was mid-October in the year 1858. It was at Alton where the final discussion took place. Slavery is wrong. It is wrong. It is wrong. The very word "wrong" came tumbling from the lips of the man from Illinois over and over again.

And in that final discussion, the man from Illinois said, "That is the real issue. That is the issue which will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world."

In that day, even as in this day, editors and politicians, scholars and historians could interpret the debates as they saw and felt them against the backdrop of their own generation.

It may be difficult to evaluate this great event by orienting oneself into that period and then looking backward into the past and forward into the present.

Two years before the debates the great moral missionary had emerged. Character and conviction had emerged. A notion of the ultimate course which the country was to take and the moral concepts which must

be asserted had emerged. The missioner had found himself, and so on and on he went. The issue of principle was drawn. It was the age-old struggle of right and wrong.

At first it had to be tempered to reality, and the man from Illinois was indeed a realist. He knew that he was dealing with an entrenched institution. He knew that he was dealing with a Supreme Court, with a Congress, and with a Constitution. He knew that he was dealing with a divided land and with people who were sharply divided. He was dealing with friends and party associates who were deeply interested in a political victory. He was dealing with his own senatorial candidacy. All these were realities and he kept constantly in mind the necessities of the occasion.

Moreover, he knew that the people must be conditioned for this whole dose of basic moral principle and the struggle between right and wrong.

This was not a case for a thimbleful of gospel, and as the very conditioning process went on, so the conditioning of the spirit of the man from Illinois went on. With it all there was the slow but inevitable contagion which developed. The thousands upon thousands of people who attended the debates or who read the accounts were caught up in the fervor of the occasion. They were given a sustained chance to think and to meditate on the moral issue and to gradually separate the superficial from the genuine. They had a chance to get a sharpened sense of the real issue and to reflect week after week upon the basic principle of human equality.

And so at long last as the great issue of that day began to incubate, the man from Illinois was invited to address a meeting here in Cooper Union. He arrived on February 25, 1860.

He had accepted the invitation extended to him, together with the promised fee of \$200, partly because he wanted to come and see his son, Robert, who was then at Phillips Academy in New Hampshire and was expected to enter Harvard but had done very poorly in his entrance examination.

The weather as contemporary reports indicate was unseasonable and a heavy snow blanketed the city. This might have discouraged attendance at the meeting, and yet it is said that 1,500 people came to the huge basement hall to hear him. In that audience were great men of that period who helped to fashion public opinion. It included Horace Greeley and George Palmer Putnam, William Cullen Bryant and David Dudley Field; and it was William Cullen Bryant who introduced the man from Illinois to that audience 100 years ago tonight.

Here in Cooper Union the man from Illinois, in his ill-fitting wrinkled clothes, answered the South; here he answered those who charged his party with resorting to sectionalism; here he answered those who charged his party with inciting John Brown's insurrection; here he established beyond all doubt that the Pounding Fathers not only understood the slavery issue but that a majority of those framers of our basic law pursued a constant and consistent course in not limiting the Federal power to deal with this institution in the territories; and here it was that he set his foot on the first rung of the political ladder which took him to the Presidency, for it was but a few days more than a year after his appearance at Cooper Union that he took the oath as President of the United States of America.

How often in the century which has elapsed have his fellow countrymen expressed the prayerful wish and hope that he might be alive in days when we were confronted by a crisis. This human frailty is not strange. It is in the nature of mankind to wish their heroes back from their pedestals when the way seems dark and the future uncertain. Once in an hour of crisis

and despair in England's history a celebrated Englishman was moved to say, "John Milton, thou shouldst be living at this hour."

But the man from Illinois lives on because he speaks constantly to all the generations who have come after him. The Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, comments on the sacrifices made by Abel to gain righteousness, and then said, "Being dead, yet speaketh". The man from Illinois, being dead yet speaketh to his countrymen time after time. And what does he say?

He speaks of liberty not merely in its relation to the slave issue of his own day, but because of its promise to all and its importance to the unfolding of the Republic. In a fragment which he set down on paper in 1861 in the very turmoil of conflict, he paid testimony to the Constitution and to the Union and their impact upon our national well-being, and then he added, "but even these are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something else, and that something is the principle of liberty to all—the principle that clears the path to all—gives hope to all—and by consequence, enterprise, and industry to all." That sentiment might well have been uttered in every home, at every fireside, at every workbench, in every citadel of commerce this very night 100 years after the man from Illinois stood here.

He spoke of unshakable purpose in the pursuit of fundamental principles. To a friend, Henry Asbury, he wrote in 1858 that the "cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of 1 or even 100 defeats." To Secretary Seward he wrote in 1862, "I expect to maintain this contest until successful, or until I die, or am conquered, or my term expires, or the Congress, or the country forsakes me." In this hour, a century later, what a nourishing sentiment this is, as the Congress, having before it a vivid recollection of the incidents at Clinton, Tenn., and Little Rock, Ark., wrestles with the great issue of civil rights, civil liberty, and the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution.

The man from Illinois spoke of the steady course as the true course in preserving a great cause. Then as now there were those who would move faster. Then as now there were those who urged a course of action that might well have jeopardized the very cause for which so much blood had been shed. Heavy as were his burdens, he could still say to Senator Chandler in 1863, "I hope to stand firm enough not to go backward and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause." What a lesson for those who in this tumultuous period would recreate America over night and spurn all the lessons of the past.

The man from Illinois even now speaks of courage and devotion to a great issue and a great cause regardless of the political consequences. Even as a young man while addressing a church group in the city of Springfield, Ill., he could say, "Let not the probability of defeat deter us from asserting a cause which is just." In this day and time the lure of political victory is great. The lure of public office is even greater. The desire to appease sectional and economic groups is difficult to restrain. The impulse to yield to pressure is not unknown. Well might we listen to the man from Illinois, as he placed causes and principles above all other considerations.

Above all else, he speaks to us of the future. How preoccupied each generation becomes with its own affairs and concerns, and how often the future is forgotten.

The man from Illinois was thinking not merely of his own time but of the future of the Republic, knowing that unnumbered generations would live in this fair land. What then was to be their legacy?

In his message to Congress in 1861, he said, "The struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for a vast future also."

But it was at Gettysburg that the grand sweep of the past, the present, and the future was in his mind and in his heart. First came the deathless question whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality could long endure. It is a deathless question for it continues to roll down the corridors of time as an ever recurring challenge.

Then came the haunting present, as he noted the sacrifices which had already been made on the altar of that cause. And then came the future expressed in terms of the unfinished work, the great task that remained, and finally the flaming hope "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The man from Illinois still speaks to his countrymen. So long as Providence endows his countrymen with the capacity to remember, he shall continue to speak to them, even as he spoke to them here 100 years ago this night. The man from Illinois—his name was Abraham Lincoln.

Urban Decay Is the Forerunner of National Decay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of wonderment to me that so many of my distinguished colleagues know so little about our big cities of the North. It concerns me that because of unfamiliarity with urban changes, problems, and needs there is so little awareness of the danger to our country in urban neglect.

Julian Levi, director of the Southeast Chicago Commission, recently wrote: "Budget allocations for urban renewal are, of course, political questions, but the future of American civilization and democracy had better also be debated."

Stanley Pargellis, director of the famed Newberry Library, of Chicago, participated in the "know your Chicago" program sponsored by the Women's College Board and the Downtown Center of the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago magazine publishes his contribution in its issue of March 1960. Reading it will give to my colleagues from other areas something of the feel of the big city. It will leave them with a greater sense that our big cities in a world of transportation and other changes and shifting populations, do have serious problems and unless those problems are resolved all our country will be adversely affected. History makes it crystal clear that urban decay is the forerunner of national decay. Mr. Pargellis' article follows:

THE SPIRIT OF A CITY—CHICAGO

(By Stanley Pargellis, director, Newberry Library, Chicago)

Can we compare the spirit of Chicago with that of any of the great cities of the past? I doubt it.

A German prince who has lost his heart to America thought the comparison unfair

to the old cities. They all live on their past, he said in America you look ahead. And yet the report from those who know Europe well is that Rome is again the first city there, because it is looking ahead, and that London is second, and Paris a poor third. And where would Moscow rank, if judged by that standard?

Nor can Chicago today be compared to these cities at the moment of their greatest glory; with Athens, a city-state, its citizens poverty stricken in comparison with ours today, almost continually at war with its neighbors, and yet rising for a generation to a height of architectural, cultural, literary, and philosophic achievement that has been the despair and the inspiration for the world ever since; Rome in the time of Augustus, a city of brick become a city of marble, a city-state grown into an empire, its Romans proud to have been born to rule the world; or Florence under the Medici, or Paris in the time of Louis XIV; or Victorian London, capital of a world empire when Chicago was a muddy, stinking village. Comparison of Chicago with these cities in their great moments would be unreal, or, if you want to press it, unfair to Chicago.

And yet, from the experience of these and other cities, one can set down some, at least, of the marks which distinguish a great city. Mind you, there is no agreement on this. To some poets a city consists of the little people who live there, and not of its buildings and bridges, its towers and palaces and churches. To others it is a place where famous men have lived, dined, talked with their friends, or have written books and painted pictures and composed music. To others, and I think I would agree, a city, any city, is so complex that it cannot be understood. It is mankind's greatest work of art, because it represents the collective effort of all of its citizens. Without cities there would be no civilization—the terms are synonymous.

What are some of the marks which, generalized, make a city great?

First of all, I would place freedom. Traditionally, the medieval city gave freedom to a serf from the country if he had lived a year and a day within its walls. The city has always given privacy to the individual, from penthouse to garret—curious that both should be on the same top floor—privacy not found in a small town or in the country. What a man does in a city is his own affair, and no one else's, save in a police state, which, if it continues for long, ruins the city and its culture. And the city provides a stimulus, if he wants it, not found elsewhere. The queen comes to the city, the citizens assemble in the forum, they flock to hear the sermons of Savonarola, they throng into the Crystal Palace. Suburbanites, even in this day, have little concept of the life of a city. They may draw their sustenance from it; they may occasionally honor it with their presence, they may make a contribution of one sort or another now and then to it, but they have removed themselves from its lifeblood. Their freedom, if they have it in the suburbs, is secondhand, derived from the city they have abandoned. Freedom, I repeat, is only to be found and nourished in the city; only there does one's next door neighbor neither know nor care what you are doing; the city, the mysterious city, swallows us, and leaves us free.

Second, I would put in my category of the things that make a city great—civic pride. This is so enormous a subject that I cannot begin to do it justice. Listen to Pericles: "Our public opinion welcomes and honors talent in every branch of achievement, not for any sectional reason but on grounds of excellence alone." Athens, had it had a daily newspaper, would have headlined the Olympic games as we did the White Sox

winning the pennant; and it would have given equal, if not more space in the press to the first performance of a play by Euripides.

What creates a sense of civic pride? Let's start with the very small things. In the days when Britain was conquering India, and Canada, and ruling the Seven Seas, Dr. Johnson, walking the streets of London, had to keep to the wall, nearest in from the curb, lest garbage and slops be dumped on his head. Maybe cleanliness, so important to us today, is not necessary if the city has other merits. And yet, in default of other merits, we now judge a city by its degree of cleanliness; I was in such-and-such a city in Africa, filthy; such-and-such a city is clean. England in the late 18th century had Goldsmith for its novelist, Burke for its politician and philosopher, Garrick for its actor, Sheridan for its dramatist, Reynolds for its painter, and Johnson for its Great Cham.

Take a bus sightseeing through Chicago. What do you see? Loyola, Mundelein, Northwestern, the Art Institute, the Chicago Historical Society, the Elks Memorial, the University of Chicago, Bughouse Square and the Newberry Library, the Stock Yards, the parks, and the tall buildings. These, perhaps 90 percent of them, are, as Walter Lippmann said the other day, "the institutions which are essential to a good society, yet cannot be operated for profit." They are the sights which a profitmaking organization singles out as a source of pride for Chicago.

Civic pride—you can tell from the way a man leaves his money where his heart is. I have a friend who has gone through all the wills of the 16th century England, in order to discover what the people in every city and county in England believed in then, as worth continuing and worth their money after they had met the requirements of their families. What will a similar survey of wills made in Chicago show when a scholar, a century hence, works upon them? It looks as though, now, many men believed much more in Eastern institutions like Harvard and Yale than those in their own city. They are, and their wills show it, halfhearted Chicagoans.

We have institutions here which, if this city develops as it should and will, will match anything the world has to offer. But the men who are putting their money on Chicago's future seem not to be putting it in Chicago's cultural institutions. There is in this city a Library of International Relations with 50,000 volumes, the result of one woman's devoted efforts over a number of years. She cannot find the sources from which to support it. She is negotiating for the transfer of this library, in a city which is going to become, with the opening of the St. Lawrence Waterway, one of the world's great ports and therefore presumably concerned with the world's problems, to the library of Michigan State University, at East Lansing. As far as I can see, Chicago is accepting this loss without a tremor.

Civic pride—a city should, as the Germans say, schön liegen; lie beautifully. And yet, I wonder about this. Rome has hills, and a rather miserable dirty river. Most of the European cities have not much in the way of natural scenery; none of them has a river like the St. Lawrence, with the citadel of Quebec above it, or bays like San Francisco and New York; or a lake front as carefully and well guarded as Chicago's. The spirit of a city in the past has not depended very much upon its natural beauties.

There is another word which enters into this concept of a city's spirit. Listen again to Pericles: "We are lovers of beauty without extravagance, and lovers of wisdom without unmanliness. Let us draw strength from the busy spectacle of our great city's life as we have it before us day by day, falling in love with her as we see her." Love for a

city—this is a different thing from civic pride. A real Londoner, when the bombs began to fall, supposing he were 40 miles away and safe, had got to get back into the city. It was his; he'd got to be there. It's no question of the safety of his own place, it was simply the city. To be there through that misery with his own, to suffer with them, and if it comes to it, to die with them. Back to London, at whatever cost. Back to the tower, St. Paul's, Fleet Street, Trafalgar Square, Piccadilly Circus, Hyde Park.

I asked a taxicab driver the other day "What do you think of Chicago?" "I like it." "Why?" "I can make money here." "Do you love it?" "No, I am a Greek, I am making money to return home." "Where are you from?" "Athens." "Do you love Athens?" "Oh-oh-hohoh."

Some people love Chicago as Londoners do London, or Greeks Athens. I don't know how many.

Love for a city is one of those intangibles about which it is difficult to talk. I have known New Yorkers, little New Yorkers, for whom the universe rises and sets on Third Avenue; we all know Bostonians for whom still that universe's hub stretches west to the Mississippi; Philadelphians there are who must live and die within the potential peal of the Liberty Bell.

Ruined cities in Germany were asked, after the war, what they first wanted restored. In Stuttgart they wanted a department store; in Frankfurt, because it was on the border between the Catholic and Protestant belts, they wanted a Catholic church, and so voted; in Mainz there was to be the annual carnival the following February, and they wanted a hall for it. They traded wine for steel beams to build the hall. If Chicago were bombed, and we were asked to vote what should be restored first, what would we choose? Marshall Field's, the Art Institute, Comiskey Park? Or would we say, let us alone to build what we can manage, each of us by ourselves?

Love for a city—maybe the easy way out is to follow the novelists. Wherever love is—and that means for the particular girl—there is the beautiful city. There the towers stand enchanted, there the street lights fold and shield, only two among the millions, all alone, in love. That is the beautiful city, whichever one it be.

Let us get at this question of Ethos another way. Cities today in this country have almost insoluble problems. They are being drained away to the suburbs, which are not under their jurisdiction. Within another decade 80 percent of the population of the United States will live in metropolitan areas, but the main city itself cannot get financial support from all those millions. It is left with the problem of supporting the abandoned multitudes who must stay within its limits, the slum dwellers, the helpless, the poor, the juvenile delinquents, the aged. The modern city simply hasn't money enough to keep up with the normal increasing costs of fire protection, police protection, and of teachers for its schools. It has, under our outmoded State constitutions, no means of raising the money it needs. It has only sales and property taxes to depend upon, which are not enough. It is easy to say that, if the city were cleaner politically, if we didn't have aldermen manipulating matters in their own wards to their political advantage, if we didn't have an unacknowledged but apparently still existing connection between organized crime and politics, if we had—in short—an ideal city government—seldom obtainable in a democracy—then our city problems would be solved. That is not true. The mischief of the tremendous disintegrating city would still remain. Chicago has done as much as any city can to solve this question by focusing attention upon the Loop. It has built expressways and garages, it has not had

the power to continue cheap suburban means of transportation.

Intelligent city planning—and city planning is essential—becomes impossible under these conditions. At the moment the city needs Federal aid more than do the farmers. Perhaps the only solution in the long run is that every metropolitan community become a State of the Federal Union. The State of Chicago, running from Lake Forest to Gary, and as far inland as future population growth would appear to warrant, would carry a weight in Congress it does not carry today. There would then be possibilities of intelligent consideration of the entire metropolitan city problem.

In the meantime the swollen, sullen multitudes continue to descend upon the city. It is obvious why they come. A good living, or a better living than they have had, can be made here. "Oh, sure, I like Chicago. I do all right here."

There are, says Sir. George Clark, three attitudes of mind to be found in a city. First are those who are active in the city's behalf. They feel responsibility for it; consciously they serve its administrative, business, and cultural life. They are the decision makers and the artists, writers, thinkers, and educators who strive to make their wares available to all. Next come the people who participate much less actively but still feel a pride and joy in their citizenship. The fortunes of the city depend upon the relationship of these two groups to a third; those who merely live in, but not for or by, the city and who turn to their own private gain or loss whatever the city proffers to them. The test of city planning in the future is whether it can convert the third group to the convictions of the other two. And such city planning somehow means an ease of transportation, airports, shops, theaters, hotels, law enforcement, city administration—all these things, so well built and arranged and planned and carried out that the city comes to be something stable in the modern whirlpool. The mayor's committee is making great strides towards the accomplishment of this ideal, but the ideal is still far and away in the future.

The spirit of Chicago. What is it? Native Chicagoans are not as trustworthy on this judgment as foreigners. We have in the Newberry the travel account of almost every foreigner who ever visited Chicago and wrote a book about it. I'll give you a few. Sienkiewicz, the Polish author of "Quo Vadis," came here a few years after the fire. It's a port, he says, in the middle of the continent. It unites New York, with the West. It's a city built by giants for giants. It's a fantastic premonition of what 20th century cities are to be. Its got innovations unknown elsewhere, like telegraph poles. The vitality and incredible energy of its inhabitants, who all look to tomorrow. And here is a German in 1931 prophesying that in 1960 Chicago will have 9 million people, will be the center of the world for certain industries and the business center of the United States. It will have 20 acres of park for every 1,000 people, and since civilization has moved from Athens to Rome to Paris to London to New York to Chicago, it will be the center—"mittelpunkt"—of the migration of peoples. "Bevolkerung."

I have been asking foreign visitors in Chicago, who know something of the city, what they think its spirit is. Says one: "Three American cities are known on the Continent: Chicago, Hollywood, and San Francisco. They say in London that Chicago is known for only two things: Poetry magazine and gangsters." And another defines "ethos" as what its people do after the business of earning a livelihood is over for the day. I don't know what they do; neither do you. I know only that we are not producing so very much creatively. We were the natural center in

the country for TV; we missed out on it. Most young writers of merit succumb to the lure of the East, to its money and its opportunities. What do people do in their spare time? How many are doing creative things, which in the old American dream was what the individual would be doing after he was released from the tiresome drudgery of barely making enough to keep his head above water?

And finally here is a visitor who says, "Don't be modest in this business of Ethos. Where is there anywhere in the world, or anywhere in past of the world, a second city which can compare with Chicago? New York is first, we must admit. But you have a university, he says, which has probably more intellectual ferment in it than any university in the world. In the university rankings, he says, it is fourth or fifth; I would put it after Harvard, which is far and away the greatest university in the country. But who comes really second? Chicago stands there with Yale and Columbia and California. Where can you find a second city anywhere with an art gallery like yours? Or your museums, opera. You have everything a great city should have—the things that you proudly show visitors—and you must hang on to them all at whatever cost."

Old time Chicagoans may disagree with this enthusiastic judgment. They will say that Chicago moves in spurts, and that that is one of the characteristics of our spirit. We are slow to move, so slow that sometimes we miss the opportunity and the need. It must be drummed into our heads that this year, say, it is Roosevelt University, a fine institution deserving of support, which needs money. And meanwhile the University of Illinois, supported in large measure by funds from the Chicago area, plans to move into an area where it is not really needed. Our city universities have sufficient potential growth to take care of an increasing number of students. The building and maintenance of a new university will be a heavy drain on State resources. Nobody, as far as I know, has raised this basic objection to the University of Illinois plans.

My effort has now come to an end. I have given you many opinions about the spirit of cities, and of Chicago in particular. We are young, so bold and yet so cautious, less sophisticated than New York, rougher but not as hard (Chicago has few libel suits in comparison with New York), an appealing city, a friendly city (all my foreign friends say that), and a city which, somehow representing more of America's diversities than any other metropolis, has an unbounded future. We are now in direct touch with salt water, which has always broadened men's horizons, but, like Paris and Rome, not too closely in touch. The spirit of a city is an unspoken compact between the dead, the living and the yet unborn. If we can keep and build on what we have and are going to have, our children's children will yield to no city in pride of place.

Annual George Washington Dinner of American Good Government Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement of the annual George

Washington dinner of the American Good Government Society, which this year is going to be held on April 30. All the details of the dinner are included in the release which I have asked to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANS TO BE DINNER SPEAKER

The Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, will deliver the address of the evening on April 30 at the annual George Washington Dinner of the American Good Government Society to be held in the Sheraton Park Hotel. This was announced yesterday (Sunday) by A. Burks Summers, president of the society.

At the dinner the society's George Washington awards will be given to Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, North Carolina Democrat, and to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona Republican. The awards are made annually by the society for contributions to the cause of good government. April 30, the date of the dinner, will be the 171st anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States. The award to Mr. BARDEN will be presented on behalf of the society by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana Republican, who is minority leader of the House of Representatives, and that to Senator GOLDWATER will be presented by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Members of the society's dinner committee are: Rudolph F. Bannow, Bridgeport, Conn.; Hyman L. Battle, Rocky Mount, N.C.; Walter R. Bimston, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mrs. Katherine C. Blow, Yorktown, Va.; Hon. and Mrs. John W. Bricker, Columbus, Ohio; Frank C. Brophy, Phoenix, Ariz.; J. Edgar Brophy, Lenoir, N.C.; Raymond A. Bryan, Goldsboro, N.C.; R. T. Burney, Wilmington, N.C.; Hon. and Mrs. Edward R. Burke, Kensington, Md.; Harold F. Coffey, Lenoir, N.C.; Hon. and Mrs. William M. Colmer, Pascagoula, Miss.; Hon. and Mrs. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Norfolk, Va.; Colonel and Mrs. J. Hunter Drum, Washington, D.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Stephen F. Dunn, Bethesda, Md.; Hon. and Mrs. Paul Fannin, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. Henry A. Foscoe, High Point, N.C.; Daniel C. Gaine, Owatonna, Minn.; Miss Louise Gore, Potomac, Md.; Hon. and Mrs. Laurens Morgan Hamilton, Warrenton, Va.

Also, Walter Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wis.; Sherman Hazeltine, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. and Mrs. Lewis R. Holding, Smithfield, N.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Bert W. Holloway, Burbank, Calif.; Mr. and Mrs. Clifford F. Hood, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Hon. Herbert Hoover, New York, N.Y.; Hon. and Mrs. George M. Humphrey, Mentor, Ohio; G. Allen Ives, New Bern, N.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Ray Prescott Johnson, Chicago, Ill.; Halbert M. Jones, Lenoir, N.C.; Hon. James S. Kemper, Chicago, Ill.; Denison Kitchel, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hon. William F. Knowland, Oakland, Calif.; Hon. and Mrs. John L. McClellan, Camden, Ark.; J. Muse McCotter, New Bern, N.C.; Mr. Phillip M. McKenna, Latrobe, Pa.; Jeremiah Milbank, New York, N.Y.

Others are J. Clifford Miller, Jr., Richmond, Va.; Thomas O. Moore, Winston-Salem, N.C.; Felix Morley, Gibson Island, Md.; Hon. and Mrs. Karl E. Mundt, Madison, S. Dak.; G. Harold Myrick, Lincolnton, N.C.; Dr. Louis M. Orr, Orlando, Fla.; Mr. and Mrs. Jack Overall, New York, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. H. Bruce Palmer, Newark, N.J.; Robert H. Pinix, Gastonia, N.C.; Frank O. Prior, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Howard Pyle, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. and Mrs. Harry Rosenzweig, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. and Mrs. William H. Ruffin, Durham, N.C.; Hon. Richard B. Russell, Winier, Ga.; Hon. and Mrs. Allan Shivers, Austin, Tex.; Hon. and Mrs. George A. Shuford, Asheville, N.C.; R. Arthur Spauld, Winston-Salem, N.C.; Hon. Howard W. Smith, Broad Run, Va.; Mr.

and Mrs. Louis V. Sutton, Raleigh, N.C.; E. W. Weant, Greensboro, N.C.; and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Boyds, Md.

Previous recipients of the George Washington awards have been: 1953, Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia and the late Senator Robert A. Taft; 1954, former President Herbert Hoover and Hon. Allan Shivers, then Governor of Texas; 1955, Gen. Robert E. Wood of Chicago and Representative Howard W. Smith, of Virginia; 1956, then Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey and the late Senator Walter F. George, of Georgia; 1957, Representative William M. Colmer, of Mississippi and Senator Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; 1958, then Senator William F. Knowland, of California and Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; and 1959, Senator John L. McClellan, of Arkansas and then Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss.

William A. Noell, Jr., Wins West Virginia Title in the "I Speak for Democracy" Contest; Splendid Speech Is Worth Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a few days ago I was thrilled to listen to the final speeches—four of them—at the National Awards luncheon in Washington, D.C., of the "I Speak for Democracy" contest.

Members of the Senate were in attendance and sat with their State winners. The West Virginia youth from Bluefield told me of his plan to study law or business administration when he attends college. He realizes his personal responsibility to contribute a well-lived and productive life. In his speech, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, he sets forth in stimulating words, his belief in our country and its future.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By William A. Noell, Jr., Bluefield, W. Va.)

I speak for democracy, but what if democracy could speak? If democracy could speak, what would it say to you? You know, in praying there are two essentials: talking to God, and letting God talk to you. Now, it is fine to speak of democracy and to sing its praises, but I wonder how many people have ever sat down to let democracy speak to them.

By now, I imagine that some of you have realized that the use of the term "if" in the phrase, if democracy could speak, is somewhat in error, for democracy does speak in loud, clear tones to all who will listen.

Surely, democracy has something to say to the peoples of foreign lands who hunger for its advantages, and live in the dream of coming to our shores for the gold which paves our streets or for the equality which we preach and cannot always find room in our hearts to practice. Oh yes, the greatness of our way of life based on democracy is well known. Others wait in eager anticipation of the day when they, too, can see

for themselves the fulfilled promises of that new way of life.

Then democracy speaks a various language to those who must live without its benefits; yet it speaks in the universal language of freedom—something which only those who must live without it can fully appreciate.

It is easy, then, to understand the appeal of democracy to those abroad and the hopefulness they find in the words of Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free * * *

Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tost,
to me."

But to Americans upon whom the face of good fortune has shone, and to whom a gift more priceless than the finest silver has been given, there can be but one cry of democracy, one question: "How big am I? How big am I to you?"

"Democracy," to quote H. E. Fosdick, "is the form of government based on the assumption that there are some extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." Yet these same ordinary people may believe in the very narrowest type of democracy; it is my democracy; it is my way of life; it is big enough for me and maybe my neighbor, but minute enough to still have a small sphere of influence and personal involvement.

To these people democracy can only say that their conception are as large as their hearts and their souls. It is a small man who has a small democracy.

Edna St. Vincent Millay has some interesting thoughts along this line:

"The world stands out on either side,
No wider than the heart is wide;
And above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the soul is high."

The desire for democracy is worldwide. Its concepts are fully understood only by those who possess the heart and the mind to grasp them. Democracy is big enough for the universe; man's mind is the only thing small enough to confine it.

Walt Whitman's mind was big enough to get a true picture of American and, indeed, of universal democracy. He knew how to hear his country, his America speaking to him. When he wrote "I Hear America Singing," he was hearing democracy speak. He realized with Plato that the only thing any democracy need fear is too much freedom and the complacency of this condition brings.

Understanding that democracy can destroy itself, that as Paine said, "What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly," and that democracy pleads with all of us to—know me; love me; preserve me; strengthen me; expand me.

We as Americans are faced with a great responsibility. We live in a country that can and does speak with a booming voice to the rest of the world. If we will allow democracy to speak to us, our appreciation of it will be greatly advanced. Since America is democracy's spokesman to the world, our actions determine the tone of our voices. Act Americans—our actions speak for us, and America, and democracy.

Tribute to Paul Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a deserved tribute to the long and faithful

service to the Senate of Paul C. Johnson, head waiter of the Senate restaurant, is contained in an article written for the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution on February 19, 1960, by Mrs. Jerry Duggan of Dublin, Ga. The article is entitled, "Top Seniority on Capitol Hill Held by Negro Headwaiter." Mrs. Duggan is a beloved and respected Georgia educator, and I had the privilege of studying history and political science as one of her pupils at McRae-Helena High School. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of her article about Paul Johnson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOP SENIORITY ON CAPITOL HILL HELD BY NEGRO HEADWAITER

(By Mrs. Jerry Duggan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mrs. Jerry Duggan is the former Miss Enda Ballard, well-known south Georgia high school teacher of history and political science. It was she who kindled Senator TALMADGE's interest in these subjects while he was a student at McRae-Helena High School. At her insistence he went out for the debating team, which she coached, and he became its most outstanding member. Through the years they have remained close friends.)

DUBLIN.—This fall the President and Vice President, all 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 32 of the 100 Members of the Senate will be elected. These elections in all probability will send many new faces to the Capitol when the 87th Congress convenes next January. However, no matter what the election results are, if providence is willing, there will be one there whose face will not be new for he has served in that building longer than any other living person. He is Paul C. Johnson, a dignified, elderly Negro.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, went to Washington in 1911, serving 16 years in the House before being elected to the Senate in 1927. Thus he has a record of 48 years in the Capitol and ranks first in seniority in the Senate. Our own senior Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, went to the Senate in 1933 and has thus served 26 years. He ranks second in seniority in the Senate.

Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has served in the House 46 years, while Georgia's CARL VINSON has been there 45 years to be second in seniority.

TOP SENIORITY

We think of these four distinguished and able Members of Congress as having unusually long and enviable records of service in our Capitol, and they have. But, when the fact shows that Paul Johnson has been serving there since the year 1900, we can see that his 60 years on Capitol Hill gives him top seniority.

In 1900 when Paul was 17 years old, he went to Washington from his home in Virginia to visit his aunt Ada Lacey, who was the cook for the family of Virginia's Senator Barber. Aunt Ada's son, Willie, was a coachman and butler for the Barber family. While on this visit, Paul was told by Senator Barber that he could go to the Senate dining room and fall in for a boy who was out because of sickness. His services proved so satisfactory that Senator Barber's colleague, Senator Josephus Daniels of Virginia (not the North Carolina Josephus Daniels), caused Paul to be hired permanently. He had very little schooling but being ambitious Paul went to night school and today he would certainly be classed as "an educated person." His environment and associations

have, of course, had their part in achieving this.

This writer first became acquainted with Paul while on a visit to Washington as the guest of Senator and Mrs. Talmadge. Shortly after arriving, I was told that reservations had been made in the Senate restaurant for lunch. Senator TALMADGE immediately said that, because of my interest and love for all history and especially for events connected with the Capitol, he wanted me to know Paul Johnson—that, Paul had been there longer than anybody and could tell me much history that has never been put in books. When he entered the restaurant, we were met by this tall, polite and dignified man, who led us to a table in the exact center of the room. As soon as we were seated, the Senator made us acquainted.

RESPONSIBLE POSITION

Paul Johnson holds the responsible position of head waiter in the Senate restaurant, a beautifully appointed luncheon rendezvous, that caters exclusively to Senators and their guests. He became head waiter in 1935. His position is one that required much tact and diplomacy for the Senate restaurant has a limited seating capacity. However, once a reservation is entered in this head waiter's memorandum book, it immediately assumes the status of top priority. Paul handles all this with the assurance that comes only from long experience. When asked how he manages to find room for everyone in the restaurant and know which place is whose, he explained that it is simply a matter of keeping an accurate record of the request of Senators for luncheon accommodations. Too, the fact that the Senators lunch irregularly and all are never there at the same time with their guests, prevents what could be serious problems for this head waiter.

Added to Paul's remarkable physical appearance is a remarkable memory. This man of nearly 77 years—looks as if he were in his early 60's—talked with great clarity about Senators who have served Georgia in Congress since he has been in the Capitol. He recalls Senators Clay of Marietta, Bacon of Macon, Hoke Smith of Atlanta, Wm. J. Harris of Cedartown, Thomas E. Watson of Thomson and Walter F. George of Vienna.

At our first meeting on being told that I was from Georgia, he immediately asked, "How is Miss Lucy?" He expresses great admiration for Senators RUSSELL and TALMADGE. It is assumed that this man has known and seen more people famous in these United States than any other living person and can tell you something about most of them. He says, "I've met and served some of the most prominent figures on the political scene for nearly six decades and I've found each and every one of them to be gentlemen in every sense of the word."

During this writer's last interview with Paul in the fall of 1959, I asked him if he has any special wish or desire and his answer was: "Yes, when the Capitol's additions and renovations are completed and the Senate restaurant has much larger and even more beautiful quarters, I hope I will still be living and able to carry on there."

May this man, Paul Johnson, who has served so many, so well and for so long, live many more years and thus retain his seniority on Capitol Hill—that is the sincere wish not only of the Members of the U.S. Senate but of all his friends whom he numbers by the hundreds.

The Railsplitter—Tribute to Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on February 12, we celebrated the 152d birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln. It was an occasion for many outstanding addresses by individuals and splendid articles written by writers all over the Nation.

I was particularly impressed by a tribute to the Great Emancipator written by Frank Madson, a press photographer for the Wichita Beacon, of Wichita, Kans. His tribute, entitled "The Railsplitter" was printed in the February 12 issue of the Wichita Beacon.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAILSPLITTER

(By Frank Madson)

Americans. Wait up. Yankee Doodle Dandies. Time out.

You there, with your eyes toward the stars. You fast moving, restless, ambitious, crazy-mixed-up bunch of wonderful guys and dolls. Poised on the edge of infinity for your greatest adventure. You pioneers of the new age, nearing the countdown for blastoff into that new frontier of illimitable mystery—outer space.

Can you spare a minute, to pause and reflect to total up our priceless heritage, on this remembering day? I implore you. Take just a moment to recall, the birthday of the tall man from Kentucky and Illinois—and America. They called him Abraham Lincoln, to his friends and neighbors just Honest Abe: cabin born, prairie grown, frontiersman, yarn spinner, railsplitter.

But we haven't time, you say. What of this railsplitter? This is the age of the atom splitter. This is the 20th century, and it's such a long time since Mr. Lincoln was around. What can he possibly mean for our day? What answers can he have for our pushbutton world of automation? How can his plodding horse-drawn day, with its squirrel rifle and cannonball have any significance for our era of the H-bomb and intercontinental ballistic missile?

All right, Mr. and Mrs. America, racing through your ultra-modern, chrome-plated 20th century. Now hear this. Here are your answers. Don't look down your jet-age nose at Abe Lincoln. His shining spirit will always be, and is, as timeless as tomorrow, as new as the next satellite in orbit. Listen to his words. Words to live by. They are a beacon for all men of all time. He said of democracy: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. Any difference to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

And those deathless words at Gettysburg: "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated

to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"... Now we are testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure.

"The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work... that from these honored dead we take increased devotion... that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Space-age Americans, there is your answer, you fortunate young moderns with your glass skyscrapers, backyard swimming pools, bulging colleges, portable TV, wide screen movies, and that tiger-by-the-tail nuclear energy. Consider your hard-bought inheritance of liberty and democracy.

I give you Abe Lincoln—thank your lucky stars he came along and kept the stars united. He picked up the pieces of a disintegrating dream. When the hour was dark for the Nation and democracy. He kept the flickering candle flame of liberty shining through blood, tears, and a million heartbreaks. He preserved a dissolving Union. He believed it worth the saving for his countrymen and the endless generations to come. We must be ever grateful. Ours is the responsibility to sustain it and maintain it.

So happy birthday, Mr. Lincoln. Happy birthday, "Honest Abe." And, incidentally, thank you very much.

Water Pollution Control Must Be Pushed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the recent water pollution control bill, which was passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President, is one that faced up to the problem of the evergrowing pollution in our streams, lakes, and rivers. The pollution is growing faster than we are dealing with it. The decision of the President to veto this bill, to me seems incredible. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the Salt Lake Tribune for Monday, February 28.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL MUST BE PUSHED

The House of Representatives failure to override the Presidential veto of the pollution control bill should stimulate all possible other efforts to clean up the Nation's water supplies.

The veto did not kill the national control program, in effect since 1956. It holds total Federal aid at \$50 million a year instead of raising it to \$90 million and it blocks cooperative metropolitan programs under the act. (Mr. Eisenhower has asked that the U.S. contribution be cut to \$20 million for the next fiscal year.)

As alternatives to upping U.S. matching funds, the President proposed a national conference on water pollution to focus attention on the problem. He also suggested Federal control measures where the problem involves several States or is beyond State power to deal with it, financial aid in the administration of State and interstate pollution control programs and more U.S. research and technical assistance.

If effectively carried out, these proposals could help alleviate what is becoming one of America's most critical problems. Stronger Federal action may be necessary, however, to cut appreciably the amount of untreated industrial poisons being dumped into waterways by more than 3,000 communities.

Several rivers which are veritable open sewers of human and industrial wastes, flow through a number of States.

Most Utah streams terminate in the Great Salt Lake Basin. But from a starkly selfish attitude, it must be remembered that Utahans, like other Americans, are highly mobile and on occasion may drink or wash in water from a dozen sources in a single day.

The U.S. Public Health Service laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, last year examined thousands of samples from water plants of 22 major American cities. Fifteen of the cities studied draw water from rivers. Fourteen supplies from 13 rivers were found to contain microscopic worms which can carry disease-causing bacteria and viruses, says U.S. News & World Report. The wriggling micro-organisms are able to withstand chlorination, the standard treatment for impurities in drinking water. These worms also were found in water from Lake Michigan and in a man-made reservoir serving a city in Colorado. None of the cities involved are specifically named in the report.

Asked if the organisms, called nematodes, are dangerous to humans, Dr. Sih Lu Chang, microbiologist at the laboratory, replied: "No, not by themselves." He pointed out, however, that since some of the worms originate in sewage-treatment plants there is a possibility that they will ingest disease-causing bacteria and viruses. Hence they could serve as carriers of disease.

In addition to their possible threat to health, Dr. Chang said, the nematodes produce a musty flavor which gives an odor to the water.

Another new problem is that of detergents, used in washing machines and dishwashers. These pass through the most efficient treatment plants essentially unchanged because they are soluble in water. In some cases so much detergent gets into the supply that a sudsy "head" appears when a glass of water is drawn from the tap. This problem is prevalent not only in water supplies from rivers but also in suburban areas which use well water for drinking and septic systems for waste disposal.

In the same category as detergents are chemical wastes, particularly those from petrochemical industries which produce such things as plastics, says U.S. News & World Report. Health authorities are unable to say at present what the effects of these substances are on human health. More information is needed.

New methods of water treatment are needed, warn Public Health Service researchers.

With the U.S. population exploding and the water supply remaining constant, waste, sewage and filth are pouring into the Nation's streams faster than they are being dealt with. The problem is serious locally, statewide, regionally and nationally. It calls for strong, heroic measures all along the line.

Tribute to Ozaukee County, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of small in size but big in importance, closely knit communities on the landscape of America represents one of the great strengths of this country.

Today these communities are making an ever-greater contribution to providing the products, services, and, above all, the study, creative, patriotic, productive citizens which provide the foundation of progress, now and in the future.

In a fast-advancing age, however, the scientific, technological, sociological, economic, and other kinds of revolutions pose at times serious, complex problems.

Competition with the larger urban areas—toward which, incidentally, more and more people from both farms and small towns are migrating—also represents a tremendous challenge.

Despite these factors, however, these communities, through forward-looking leadership and staunch, constructive citizen support, are continuing to make their tremendously significant contribution to the growth and progress in this country.

Today I would like to pay tribute to one such area, the smallest county in Wisconsin, but big in importance, Ozaukee County.

By farsighted, creative utilization of its human and natural resources, this community is making a commendable contribution in manufactured products, farm commodities and, above all, in outstanding citizens, to progress in Wisconsin and the country.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal carried an informative article by Loren H. Osman reflecting the historic progress by Ozaukee County. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 3, 1960]
SMALLEST IN SIZE, OZAUKEE COUNTY IS BIG IN IMPORTANCE—IT HAS WILD BEAUTY, AND INDUSTRIES, TOO

(By Loren H. Osman)

PORT WASHINGTON, WIS.—Little Ozaukee County has importance out of proportion to its size. Smallest in the State, Ozaukee County's 232 square miles form a dull wedge along Lake Michigan. The point of the wedge is blunted on thickly settled Milwaukee County. The west boundary lies against Washington County. The boundary, which contains a noticeable jog, was drawn after a bitter squabble separated the two. The north end is capped by big, friendly Sheboygan County.

Within the area are an estimated 30,000 persons and nearly a quarter billion dollars' worth of property. Its industries turn out plastic products, ceramics, castings, engines,

woolen clothing, pumps, garden machinery, electrical components and a host of other products. It is home for thousands of commuters.

MEANS "YELLOW EARTH"

Alternately lashed and caressed by Lake Michigan's waves, threaded by the lazy Milwaukee River and a half dozen smaller streams, pocked with swamps, ravines and bogs, Ozaukee County has a wild beauty that appeals to the professional naturalist and family picnickers alike.

Ozaukee is an Indian name meaning "yellow earth." The description applies to its undulating hills, but they are far more productive—through good husbandry—than their pale tops would indicate.

This was the peaceful home of the Menominee, Potawatomi, Sac and Fox tribes of the Algonquin Indian Nation, according to H. H. Peters, county highway commissioner who has written a history of the county.

FRENCH, ENGLISH HELD IT

Dense forests of hardwoods and evergreens covered the hills. Clear streams ran through the valleys. French traders came to establish fur posts and the Jesuits to bring Christianity. The land passed from the French to the English who held it until the Revolution.

The Indians moved out under the treaty of 1835, the same year the first sale of Ozaukee County land was recorded, to Wooster Harrison & Associates. They platted lands at the mouth of Sauk Creek and called it Washington City, now Port Washington.

Originally a part of Milwaukee County, the area was cut off by the first legislature to form Washington County in 1830.

DISSENSION CAUSED COUNTY TO BE SPLIT

Port Washington was the county seat, a fact which rankled residents on the west side of the county. Dissension reached such a peak that in 1853 the legislature set off the seven eastern towns to form Ozaukee County. Somewhere along the line, the western faction made off with the early election files, so Ozaukee County has no records of elections prior to 1852.

Not all the early visitors stayed. Among those who moved on were Leland Stanford, a lawyer who practiced here from 1848 to 1852, then went to California and fame as that State's Governor, Senator and railroad magnate. Abraham Lincoln visited the city while looking for a place to practice law.

PLEADINGS FOUND

Municipal Judge Charles Larson, one of Ozaukee County's amateur historians, has delved into old files to find Stanford's original pleadings, written in longhand. "Stanford," said the judge, "had an intense practice, and had great depth and weight in his profession."

The early settlers brought industry as well as agriculture to the county. Mills sprang up along the Milwaukee River. The stream also was used to scow supplies into the developing area. In 1856, the Milwaukee & Lake Superior Railroad was built from funds raised in a stock issue among farmers.

Fourteen miles of road were built to Mequon. The president then absconded with the funds, leaving bitterness and losses throughout the county. More railroads were to come, of course—the Milwaukee road, the North Western and an electric interurban which streaked through the county for many years, but now has been abandoned.

CLAY WAS USEFUL

The county's yellow clay and sand were the basis for brick and tile factories. Remnants of old kilns still can be seen in hillsides. The building materials, including native limestone, went into the homes and

public buildings, including the first courthouse.

Timber was cleared and cut in the water-powered sawmills. It made building lumber, barrel staves, and railroad ties.

The Germans who had come to escape the militarism of their own country were puzzled to find the United States embroiled in civil war. Misunderstanding of the issues brought a draft riot in 1862. It was easily put down and the community responded with many enlistments, once the citizens understood the cause.

TOLL ROADS HELPED RAISE PUBLIC FUNDS

With Government funds short, several toll roads were built. Among them were the Cedarburg Plank Road, the Fond du Lac Road, and Saukville-Grafton Road. Today the county is laced with 93 miles of State and Federal highways, 107 miles of county trunk roads, and 412 miles of town, city, and village roads and streets.

Two important north-south arteries, Highways 57 and 141, speed traffic through the county. The latter is expected to someday be four lanes wide, meeting a similar facility in Milwaukee County.

Ozaukee County's proximity to Milwaukee, plus its natural beauty, has given it a role of part-time chef. City residents pour into the county on weekends and summer evenings to dine in well-appointed restaurants along the lake, river, and in the villages.

URBANIZATION GAINING

Urbanization is very much recognized in the conduct of the county's business, according to Ray F. Blank, chairman of the county board for the last 16 years and a board member for 26. He noted that Ozaukee was one of the first counties to petition the Governor for regional planning for southeastern Wisconsin.

"We want to have beautiful communities without going broke doing it," said Blank, also chairman of the town of Grafton.

A farmer, Blank has seen vast changes in the last few decades. The Lakefield 4-H club of his community, for instance, had 15 boys and girls, all from farm families, 30 years ago. Now it has 82 members, but only four are from farms.

Blank pointed, from his living room window, to several ranch houses, set on parcels cut out of his and neighbor's farms. The owners, he said, worked in the city, with the wonderful arrangement of country living. Even a cluster of high-rent apartments has been built in the town.

SHUTTILING POINTED OUT

A two-way commuting system has developed in Ozaukee County. Although workers drive into Milwaukee jobs daily, others come out from Milwaukee to work in plants which have settled in the suburbs. There is considerable shuttling between communities.

Even city and village officials make their living in next door municipalities. Mayor Paul T. Schmit of Port Washington is sales manager for an automobile agency at Grafton. Mayor Merlin G. Rostad of Cedarburg runs an aluminum casting company at Grafton. Belgium's president, Roman Schmitz, and its clerk, Bert Wester, make their living outside the village.

Booming Grafton is an example of the attraction the suburbs have for industry. Its edges are dotted with small, low plants, brought in by low-priced land and favorable taxes.

The village clerk, Emory Sacho, estimated that more than 1,000 jobs had been added. The population, at 1,487 in the 1950 census, now probably has reached 3,300.

Cedarburg's Mayor Rostad reported a near doubling of his community's population in the last decade to an estimated 5,000. It too has had an influx of new industry—a box company, structural steel firm, casting

specialties company among others. He estimated that half of the employed citizens commute.

Among new civic improvements is a high school and gymnasium, with an enrollment of 525.

QUAINT BEAUTY REMAINS

Cedarburg, still holding some of the quaint beauty of its past, has a peculiar problem. How can its old landmarks be preserved, without financial loss to owners?

Cedar Creek, one of the most charming streams in the State, winds through the county, spanned near Cedarburg by the only remaining covered bridge in the State. It joins the Milwaukee River south of Grafton.

CEDEBURG SWAMP PICTURESQUE SPOT

In the western part of the county is Cedarburg swamp, two sections of preserves which seem to have gotten lost in nature's timetable. Vegetation still is decaying into soil. Songbirds and wildflowers abound. Close by is one of the biggest stands of beech trees found in the State.

Half way up the length of the county is Saukville, crossroads of highways and with the Milwaukee River skimming peacefully along its park and under a handsome bridge. The diligent sightseer will find an older bridge downstream, with a dam that served a long abandoned mill.

From there northward, Ozaukee County rapidly becomes rural. The roads roller coaster over valleys and hills. Stone farmhouses probably crowding a century, still stand squarely against the winter winds. Lake Michigan's brilliant blue sparkles through the birches and spruce, and farmers show a willingness to share the magnificent view by signs which read "wooded frontage for sale."

VENERABLE PORT WASHINGTON PLANS VENETIAN NIGHT CELEBRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in addition, I would like to pay tribute to the venerable, 125-year-old city that serves as a county seat for Ozaukee County, Port Washington, Wis.

Known as "The City of the Seven Hills," Port Washington offers a unique environment for business, industry, commerce, trade and residence.

To celebrate its 125th birthday, this fine city is planning a special "Venetian Night" later in the year.

Representing a spirited community effort aimed at helping to provide an ever-better place in which to live. I ask unanimous consent to have an additional article from the Milwaukee Journal, on Port Washington, printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 3, 1960]

VENERABLE PORT WASHINGTON PLANS VENETIAN NIGHT PARTY

PORT WASHINGTON, Wis.—At the venerable age of 125, this city plans to celebrate its birthday next summer with a sprightly party, Venetian night, on Lake Michigan.

There will be gaily decorated pleasure craft, water skiing, and other stunts. In addition to the thousands of persons who will watch, the gulls that dot the lake front undoubtedly will be there.

Port Washington has lived through some lively times, now is old enough to have rehabilitation problems. Older by a quarter century than the county of which it is the governmental seat, Port Washington is known as the City of the Seven Hills. No one can visit here without being impressed

by the grand peaks on which the city was built.

CHURCH IS PROMINENT

Towering on one hilltop is St. Mary's, the Catholic church that looks down like a benign mother on the community. A steep stairway rises from Franklin Street, but there is an easier way up, along curving Catalpa Street.

The first mass was said at St. Mary's in 1847, when only three Catholic families lived here. By 1849, the parish had grown to 20 families. A small frame church was built on two lots donated by Hiram Johnson, an early settler.

So amiable was the relationship with the rest of the community that H. W. Schwin, then public school clerk, wrote of the early days: "No other town as yet has ever been known to consent to paying out of public school money (\$800 a year) for the support of a Catholic school. The whole affair is contrary to law, but as it seems to be a sort of family agreement all around, no one feels disposed to make objections."

STONE LAID IN 1882

The cornerstone for the present church was laid in 1882, and the \$70,000 edifice was dedicated 2 years later. Among its features were a clock with a 7-foot dial which has marked time ever since, and three great bells. The school has been a part of the parish from its beginnings, and now teaches 825 elementary pupils. The parish has more than 1,300 families.

Another hilltop landmark is the Coast Guard station, built in 1860. Other hills form a park with a spectacular view of the lake and surrounding countryside.

Remnants of a once bustling commercial fishing business remain at Port Washington. Smith Bros., which also operates a restaurant here and others in California, puts out one boat, daily netting about 800 pounds of good fish, mostly chubs, a member of the whitefish family, which are smoked.

Another half ton of trash fish also is taken each day. Those go to mink ranchers. Another fisherman, Joseph Cayner, also puts out a boat, a trawler dragging a big purse-shaped seine on which he takes anything, as a volume operation.

CAN'T JUST SIT

Port Washington got a jolt, a few years ago, when the Wisconsin Chair Co. shut up shop, leaving 300 persons jobless. The city bought the old plant, then sold it to A. C. Krueger of Mold Craft Co., who in turn has put paper box and broom factories in parts of the building. Portions were razed for municipal parking and a proposed shopping center.

Looking back, Mayor Paul T. Schmit thinks the demise of the chair factory may have been a blessing in disguise, for it forced the community into taking a good look at itself. The reflection indicated that the city was a mite lethargic.

"In the last 6 or 7 years, a lot of people have decided they can't just sit and watch the smoke from the electric company plant," the mayor said.

In 1935, the utility bought the city's power plant and erected what was then the most modern and efficient generating unit anywhere. Smoke from the four tall stacks has been a part of the Port Washington scene ever since. And the \$400,000 in utility taxes received annually, represents about a third of the city's budget.

Port Washington's drive for new industry is being led by a committee of citizens, the Association of Commerce and the Jaycees. The best news so far was that the Koehring Co.'s Kwik Mix division here was to be expanded to include the Ka-Mo Corp. which Koehring acquired and moved from Cicero, Ill. That brought 45 new jobs.

MAAS PRAISED

E. W. Maas, president and general manager of Kwik Mix, is considered something of a local hero to have turned the trick in favor of Port Washington.

The city calls itself the power garden equipment manufacturing center of the world. Although the title might be hard to prove, two of the giants of the industry are located here, the Bolens division of Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., with a payroll of 340 and Simplicity, with about 200.

Rumors are current that an 8-million-gallon storage tank area for petroleum products will be built along the harbor. With its mile of pipeline to a dispersal point, the project might involve an investment of \$750,000.

And \$250,000 is expected to be spent on a new private rest home for the aged.

CITY BUILDING NOW

The city government not long ago moved into a \$277,000 municipal building, which replaced the old frame "opera house" that went back to the 1890's. A new \$400,000 grade school was completed, and improvements made to other schools. A library may be one of the next projects, taking that function out of the aging vocational school.

The vocational school itself hums with day and night activity. Adults as well as youngsters learn upholstery, baking, sewing, and other crafts in its shops.

A Frontline Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN E. LONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Dr. Yoshio Yamashiro of Honolulu is one of those unsung heroes fighting a courageous battle for freedom on the frontlines of our foreign aid program. Because the mistakes—some of which are perhaps inevitable in such a program—receive so much publicity, it is refreshing when the story is told of some of our successes, particularly when the story portrays the human elements involved in this vast struggle against ignorance, poverty, disease, and communism. Mr. Jack Teehan of the Honolulu Advertiser recently wrote such a story about Dr. Yamashiro's inspiring efforts in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Teehan's article from the Advertiser of March 1 be printed in the Appendix of the Record so that it can be read by all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NO MEDALS—BUT HE'S HERO IN OUR FOREIGN AID FIGHT

(By Jack Teehan)

We don't pin medals on all our heroes. Meet Dr. Yoshio Yamashiro, a veterinarian of 2206 Wilder Avenue, Honolulu, just back from 5 years in Vietnam.

This footslogger in America's foreign aid army certainly doesn't look like a hero. Slight of build and graying, Dr. Yamashiro is the guy next door, the fellow at the next table in the downtown restaurant.

But Dr. Yamashiro is just back from the front in Asia, that vast theater of operations where the U.S. is desperately clinging to its

tiny beachheads in Vietnam, South Korea, and Taiwan.

He was a livestock adviser, one of the key men in the agricultural end of our aid program in Vietnam, a country of 12 million people.

In all those years in Vietnam he never talked to an American reporter, but only because one never called.

Yamashiro arrived in Saigon April 1, 1955. The revolution toppling the French colonial government was 3 days old. The nation was in the throes of poverty without even work animals to till its fields.

"My first job was to negotiate for the purchase of work animals," Yamashiro said. He found the necessary buffaloes and oxen in Thailand and Cambodia.

But the owners didn't want to sell the animals. They had them earmarked for slaughter. Yamashiro persuaded Cabinet ministers to help and he got the animals.

On this little deal he saved the United States about \$85,000 because he showed the owners how to make portable pens which could be used over and over again. Before he tossed this idea into their laps they charged \$5 per head for ship pens which were junked after shipment.

On one trip Yamashiro spent 3 days below decks with 258 seaskick animals while his Panamanian freighter wallowed through the typhoon-lashed South China Sea. He didn't lose an animal.

The ship was machinegunned and shelled going upriver to Saigon. "We had to turn back and land them at the mouth," Yamashiro said.

But the program was underway. Yamashiro brought in 23,000 buffaloes and oxen, 480,000 day-old chicks, 7,300 Yorkshire and Berkshire pigs, 6,000 pullets, and 2,300 rabbits for distribution throughout Vietnam.

"Each recipient had to return two in kind," Yamashiro explained. "If you got one large pig you had to return two after she farrowed—so everybody benefited."

Yamashiro started a vaccine laboratory, producing vaccine for 5 percent of previous animal vaccine costs.

Next came a hatchery large enough to incubate 100,000 eggs.

He organized seven mobile vaccination teams to eradicate rinderpest.

"It never made the New York Times, but the grateful Vietnamese gave torchlight parades to honor the teams," Yamashiro said proudly.

And while all this was going on, Yamashiro helped rehabilitate 2,300 families, part of the 1 million refugees from Red-controlled North Vietnam. "After 3 or 4 years, everybody seems to be gainfully employed and they have a roof over their heads," he told me.

It wasn't easy. The Communist underground doesn't like American aid programs. So when Yamashiro would pick out a likely village leader to win cooperation, the Communists knew what to do—they killed him.

"There are many killings," Yamashiro said simply. And he explained that these murderous acts made it doubly difficult to find replacements.

Even U.S. allies can be troublesome. Once Yamashiro's forces were shipping some 500 pigs into the country by boat.

Hours before the boat docked the French—at great expense—air freighted 100 pigs into the country in a Constellation.

"They got most of the publicity," Yamashiro said. But he said the people are very much aware of America's contributions.

Yamashiro makes sure of that by silk-screening the U.S. foreign aid symbol (two clasped hands) appears on every animal. He found that navy blue looks best on a white pig, yellow on a black one.

Other than that he's had to fight Communist infiltration of his own work force,

disease (he came down with typhus), and keep an eye out for man-eating tigers (hundreds of people are killed every year) and cobras that run up to 26 feet long and 14 inches in diameter.

Well, the eggs are bigger in Vietnam now. Everybody has some meat to eat. Tuberculosis isn't a major problem now. The people are healthier and an edict forbidding Vietnamese males to have more than one wife is cancelling out much of the population explosion.

Vietnamese have learned how to care for and feed poultry and livestock and how to improve the breeds. Their living standards have been raised to the point where only technical aid will be offered after 1961.

So Dr. Yamashiro is taking on a new job in Taiwan.

And by the way—he made one other contribution to his country. Two Yamashiro boys gave their lives under the 442d Regimental Combat Team's banner in World War II.

A Goal for Nuclear Test Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to an interview with Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee regarding the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Atomic Weapons Tests.

This is indeed a complicated and difficult problem. Senator GORE long has offered logical and farsighted advice in this field. As early as 1958 he suggested a limited ban on atmospheric testing pending an agreement on a foolproof inspection system for all other testing.

Because of the clarity of his position and the forthright position he is taking today, as well as his leadership in this field in the past, I commend it to all Senators for their information. We can all be grateful for his understanding of this subject and his determination for U.S. leadership in countering the Communist peace propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Goal for Nuclear Test Conference," published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A GOAL FOR NUCLEAR TEST CONFERENCE—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR GORE

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, selected as a Senate adviser, and thus a member of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva conference on discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, and one of the darkhorse possibilities for the Democratic presidential nomination in event of a convention deadlock:

Believes that "unless there is some success achieved in the Geneva conference on nuclear weapons, then there can be no real optimism for success of the general disarmament conference."

Says "France, of course, must be brought into" a nuclear weapons test-ban control

system and Red China, too, "else underground tests could proceed undetected in Red China."

Question. "Do you feel, Senator GORE, that there is a fair chance the Russians will come around to a limited ban on nuclear weapons testing?"

Answer. "I am apprehensive that they will now flatly turn anything down. They think they are winning the propaganda battle and I am not sure that they are not."

Question. "Did we wait too long before we officially made the proposal for a limited ban (cessation of atmospheric tests pending an agreement on an inspection system for other testing)? I believe you first suggested it 2 weeks after the Geneva talks began in 1958."

Answer. "World opinion has changed, but Russian intransigence has changed but little. The so-called concessions that the Soviets have made amount to very little. Actually, if you boil them down, they have conceded more in form than in substance."

Question. "Where does this leave us? What if we resume testing? Would world opinion censure us?"

Answer. "Well, much would depend on the manner of resumption. I cannot give a certain answer. From the standpoint of disarmament, there is little difference in the perfection of an intercontinental ballistic missile and in the perfection of the nuclear warhead. They are both part of the same missile. Yet a psychological and political element has attached itself to nuclear tests, even though that testing is done in a manner that does not contaminate the world's atmosphere."

"Let me turn to one unusual occurrence. Though we have been at the conference table with the Russians for 16 months, we have not yet asked them whether they have conducted underground tests. I suggested to the Secretary of State that we do so. I had a letter recently saying that the delegation in Geneva had been asked to ascertain the answer to that question."

Question. "In your judgment is there a necessity for the United States to conduct further nuclear weapons tests for reasons of security?"

Answer. "I am a layman and there are many persons more qualified to speak on this subject. I have not reached a conclusion myself whether, if empowered with the decision, I would resume underground testing. But until we are sure that the Russians are not doing so, then at the very least we should keep ourselves free to make the decision as to whether we do."

"To begin with, I think the President made a serious strategic error in August 1958, by his unilateral stoppage of all tests. This has operated now for 18 months to give to the Soviets that which they desired—the complete stoppage of nuclear weapons development by testing in this country without any system of inspection in the Soviet Union to give us assurance that the Russians are not proceeding with weapons development through underground tests, without any real progress being made to bring the Russians into the family of nations under a system of obedience to law and order."

"I think the President recouped his position somewhat by declining on December 29, 1959, to extend this ban on all tests."

Question. "What could further testing do for the U.S. military program?"

Answer. "Maybe I could boil it down to a basic problem. The area in which the Russians appear to be furthest ahead of us is in rocket thrust, the ability to hoist into intercontinental space a heavier payload. Our missiles are much smaller. The smaller the missile, the greater the need for increasing the explosive power of the warhead."

Question. "Are there any types of inspection systems that you feel have possibilities that perhaps we should now begin to push or explore? I am thinking mainly of the idea that recently came into the open that unmanned, underground detection systems could overcome some of the Soviet objections to an inspection system."

Answer. "Of course, improvements will be made in scientific instruments. The basic problem, however, is the freedom of a scientific team to inspect not according to a political quota but any time and place where scientific requirements would dictate. Now the Soviets have steadfastly given political direction to their scientists. Our scientists have gone to Geneva in two conferences free from political dictation."

Question. "What about the problem of bringing other nations into the control system?"

Answer. "France, of course, must now be brought into it. Red China must be brought into the agreement, else underground tests could proceed undetected in Red China. Whether they should be brought into the negotiations at this particular stage, I am not prepared to say for the moment."

Question. "How does the nuclear test ban negotiation relate to the broader question of disarmament, in your opinion?"

Answer. "Unless there is some success achieved in the Geneva Conference on Nuclear Weapons, then there can be no real optimism for success of the general disarmament conference in which the problems are far more complicated and difficult—a nuclear explosion, for instance, being so much easier to detect than a stored or concealed weapon."

"This is one reason why I had suggested early that the United States stake for itself an achievable goal in a field where we could detect a Russian violation if they did not follow our example. Because of this probability of detection, we could likely force the Soviet Union into either actual or tacit agreement with us. Their respect for international agreement could be demonstrated or their perfidy detected."

"The achievement of this kind of arrangement, it seems to me, is the real goal of the nuclear test conference. It is very important that success, even very limited, be achieved."

New York Egg Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the poultry business in New York State constitutes one of the most vital and flourishing aspects of the agricultural life of the State. In official recognition of this fact, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has proclaimed the month of March as "New York Egg Month."

In view of the significance of this action to the health and prosperity of New York State, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

Our poultry farms are a highly important factor in the economy of the Empire State. In cash income produced, the egg business ranks second only to dairying in our State. Nutritionally speaking, eggs are a perfect food, completely uncontaminated since they come in their own, germproof containers the shell. The content includes vitamins, proteins, minerals and amino acids.

The production of eggs is an essential industry. The men and women engaged in it render an absolutely vital service and should be encouraged.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of March 1960 as "New York Egg Month," and I urge that full recognition be given to the role of poultrymen in our economy.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 24th day of February in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN.

Secretary to the Governor.

Two Red Telephones and One Atlas Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, articles in the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Examiner, both dated February 29, 1960, correctly assert that the total strength of the United States in ready-to-launch intercontinental ballistic missiles is one. I know this to be a fact, but I hadn't said so on the floor of the Senate because I was afraid it might be regarded as security information.

The articles are written by Mr. Julian Hartt for the Los Angeles Examiner and by Mr. Marvin Miles of the Los Angeles Times. After a visit to Vandenberg Air Force Base, Mr. Hartt observes that, "The bones of our skeleton of defense rattled loudly." Mr. Miles makes an excellent analysis of our defense weakness. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner, Feb. 29, 1960]

ONE ICBM MOUNTED IN ALL UNITED STATES— SOLE ATLAS POISED AT VANDENBERG

(By Julian Hartt)

SANTA MARIA, February 28.—The total strength of the United States in ready-to-launch ICBM's—intercontinental ballistic missiles—is one.

Just one missile—an Atlas.

This one fact stood out among all others when Vandenberg Air Force Base—America's only "operational" ICBM launcher—was opened today for a "look in any closet."

The bones of our skeleton of defense rattled loudly during that inspection. There are two red telephones to order a firing. But there is only one Atlas ready to launch.

Of course, this Convair-built Atlas has the capability of dropping right into the Kremlin, blasting the heart out of Moscow, if an attack upon us dictated instant retaliation.

But:

1. No missile is 100 percent reliable. It might not get off the ground. It might go as far away as Discoverer IX earlier this month, and be blown up on command no farther away than the nearby farming town of Guadalupe.

2. Any such situation presumes an attack, and it would be sheer folly to assume further that the Soviets would not make Vandenberg a primary target in a space-age "Pearl Harbor." Exposed like a telephone pole in the desert, our lonely Atlas could be crippled or killed by a "near miss" atomic warhead dropping miles away.

3. And even if this Atlas's thermonuclear warhead were dropped inside the Kremlin walls—our guidance is that good, even better than President Eisenhower announced some weeks ago—there probably wouldn't be anyone home anyhow. After all, the Russians would be the only ones to know in advance what they meant to do.

This is not to say the Air Force, and the equally-dedicated civilians working under the Army's Corps of Engineers, are not doing their utmost at Vandenberg AFB to hurry America's readiness at top speed.

The holes are being dug for the follow-on Titan ICBM, and for the underground Atlas housings yet to be tested. Elsewhere the Atlas and Titan launch bases are being rushed.

We also have the Thor (300 to 1,750 miles range) missiles on duty in England, ready to go with nuclear warheads whenever the two ignition keys—labeled "war" and "peace"—and held by British and American officers—are slipped into the launch locks and turned.

There also has been much publicity about Atlas becoming operational 5 months ago, tempered by the admission there are but three launch pads available at Vandenberg AFB for combat firings.

It is quite impressive and dramatic, too, that a young officer in the Atlas blockhouse wears a pistol to protect himself—presumably against other Americans—and the encapsulated code word he wears about his neck on a chain. That is to verify the "fire" order he might one day receive over the red phones, one linked to First Missile Division, the other to Strategic Air Command headquarters in Omaha, Nebr.

But the fact remains:

As of this writing, one of the three Atlases is ready to go in a less-than-20-minute countdown.

The second is still in a gantry, and the console has as many red lights—indicating "not ready"—as green.

And the third is lying down under maintenance.

The young officer has a more terrible responsibility than even he may know—two telephones; one missile.

VANDENBERG'S THREE ATLAS PADS FORM TOTAL MISSILE RETALIATION POWER

(By Marvin Miles)

VANDENBERG AFB, February 28.—Three Atlas launching pads on this vast Strategic Air Command base represent—as of today—this Nation's sole ICBM retaliation capability within the required 15-minute reaction time.

And they are "soft" pads, vulnerable, unprotected against incoming missile warheads.

Furthermore, it is virtually impossible to keep three missiles in full combat readiness every minute of every day, considering maintenance, checkout procedures, etc.

Hence there are short periods from time to time when America's immediate retaliatory strength is limited to two missiles—or even one—that could be launched in a quarter-hour countdown.

If Russia attacked the United States with missiles today, a flight of three Atlases would be the biggest ICBM counterassault the Nation could expect to launch—"in time."

True, there might be time to haul up other missiles and launch them, but this cannot be assured.

No one can doubt that any missile assault launched against the United States today would pinpoint Vandenberg as a primary target to prevent, if possible, immediate ICBM retaliation.

Such an intercontinental nuclear attack would be delivered in a half hour at 15,000 m.p.h., hence the insistence on a 15-minute reaction (launch) time for U.S. retaliation missiles.

The chance of launching a second flight of Atlases would depend on the accuracy of enemy missiles.

But there is little doubt about that accuracy at this sprawling base 140 miles northwest of Los Angeles that would become an instant "frontline" in any major war of the future.

This is the situation in an uneasy world and amidst Washington arguments on the missile gap.

OTHER BASES PLANNED

Other Atlas bases are planned, of course. A dozen more have been announced, with Warren AFB, Cheyenne, Wyo., scheduled to become operational "sometime soon" as the second American ICBM stronghold.

Meanwhile crews of SAC's 1st Missile Division here work constantly to keep three of the big birds on the pads, ready for flight—missiles armed with thermonuclear warheads, already programmed to fly fixed trajectories to secret, predetermined targets.

The basic mission of the 1st Missile Division, commanded by tall, heavy-set Maj. Gen. David Wade, is the training of missile crews, although the three unprotected Atlas pads—resulting from a crash program to achieve ICBM operational status soonest—are primarily combat-ready units.

NEARING READINESS

Three horizontal Atlas launchers are nearing readiness, systems that maintain the missiles horizontally, but shielded to some degree by concrete walls and roll-away roofs.

In action, the roof is hauled clear to expose the bird which is then erected for launching within the walled shelter.

Two other horizontal launchers are also being developed, but these will offer more protection, for they will be bunker types, housing a missile just underground, with a protective roof at surface level.

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

In addition, a silo Atlas facility is under construction, a vast underground pit 174 feet deep, 52 feet in diameter, in which the missile will be stored vertically beneath massive steel-and-concrete doors.

This system provides for subsurface fueling after which the missile would be raised to ground level by an elevator and fired from the surface.

Together with the Atlas complexes, Vandenberg will have underground silo systems for Titan, the ICBM (now under flight test) that will follow Atlas into operational status.

COMPLEX OF TUNNELS

The first Titan silo with an elevator to surface the missile for launching is now nearing completion with its complex of tunnels and underground facilities, and probably four more such silos will be constructed here. The Army's Corps of Engi-

neers supervises all such construction projects.

And in the future, the base no doubt will have Minuteman, the smaller, solid-propellant ICBM, a third-generation missile that will be maintained in silos like a cartridge in a rifle chamber and actually fired from underground. (Minuteman also will be launched from railroads cars to provide the protection of mobility.)

These various installations, with the exception of Minuteman for which a site is now being considered, were shown to newsmen for the first time today when this secret missile base was really opened to the press.

(Vandenberg officers declined to comment on reports that hush-hush developments on the base include at least one new silo system designed to permit a Titan launch from underground. This Titan will feature cryogenic (supercooled) propellants, informed sources say. Another report indicates an even newer Titan for underground launch will have storable fuel.)

PRIMARILY FOR TRAINING

Most if these missile complexes, with the exception of designated operational launchers and a special Discoverer polar orbit satellite pad, serve (or will serve) a training function primarily.

In a war emergency, they would, of course, be available for combat launch—provided there is sufficient warning.

The systems also serve as test beds for various types of missile launch installations and point up changes or modifications that should be incorporated in future operational facilities.

Newsmen were impressed with the huge and complex system making up the Titan silo launcher and reached the pit after walking 820 feet through a tunnel that connects it with the underground control center.

In reality an underground gantry, the silo is awesome in size and looking into its 165-foot depth develops the same dizzy feeling as peering down the side of a high building. Concrete lined, air conditioned, and filled with a maze of steel and cables and piping to provide for its intricate systems, the 40-foot-wide silo is topped at the surface with two incredible steel and concrete doors almost 4 feet thick and weighing 283 tons each—protection against a nuclear blast.

Newsmen also were shown the operation of the horizontal launchers, given details of the intricate launch procedures and permitted close-up inspection of Thor IRBM training pads, the Discoverer launch pad where an Agena second stage was being mated to a Thor booster for the forthcoming launch of the Discoverer XI satellite.

They were invited into control centers, taken on an inspection tour of the missile assembly area, shown the amazing pit that will eventually be the Atlas silo and allowed to study the Atlas both in maintenance and gantry phase.

Despite the brooding menace of the big missiles, however, the most intriguing area visited was the launch control center for the combat Atlas complex—the heart of the operation.

Here the wall panel light systems showed the standby condition of each of the three missiles. Twin consoles faced each wall panel, one for the launch operator, one for the launch analyst. Behind them a third console summarized conditions for the launch control officer, hence a panel and three consoles for each missile.

FLASH INFORMATION

On the consoles themselves, red, green, yellow, and white lights flashed information on the operation of the maze of systems in each Atlas—green indicating ready or "go," red for not ready or "no go"—perhaps a malfunction; yellow for "in process," white for proper valve status.

The chains of colored lights on the consoles gave the green-colored control center somewhat the aspect of a recreation room with a series of complex pinball machines in operation.

But the false atmosphere of relaxation was dispelled immediately by the automatic pistol worn by the officer in charge, by the sealed capsule he wore around his neck.

The sealed capsule worn by the officer in charge contains coded secret instructions for the quick verification of any SAC firing order so the command system cannot be gimmicked by unauthorized persons.

Reporters came away with high respect for the job being done at Vandenberg, for the command system and the crews responsible for maintaining and launching the huge birds.

They saw eight Atlases on the base—three on the ready pads, four in missile assembly (two operational, two training), one in a horizontal launcher. Then they saw two more being delivered from Convair as they departed.

Reaction was unanimous:
"Wish we had more."

Primitive People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a modern age—in which discoveries in the technological, scientific, industrial, agricultural, and other fields, are creating ever-new conditions, we find that, as a people, we need to constantly attempt to obtain a perspective of the values and influences affecting our lives, as well as the directions in which we are traveling.

The challenge is particularly great, in an era in which the survival of our system is threatened by an opposing system that adheres to none of the principles, precepts, and ideals which we feel are fundamental to progress or a happy life.

In relation to the fast-advancing conditions, it has been said that "we are a primitive people" in a new world.

Recently, the National Grange Monthly published an editorial by Herschel D. Newsom, master of the Grange, entitled "Primitive People."

Reflecting on the need for maintaining a kind of mountaintop perspective, to assure the course of our journey through this modern age, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRIMITIVE PEOPLE

(By Merschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange)

"We are primitive people in a new world."

Dr. Arthur Schuck, chief Scout executive, speaking on a 50th anniversary program of the Boy Scouts, made this thought-provoking statement, one that is a little deflating. Perhaps we had better look at it seriously.

The "new world" may be a development we have but partially understood. A statement by the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury,

announcing the completion of negotiations of the articles of agreement of the International Development Association (now being transmitted by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to each of its 68-member governments), is perhaps just another chapter in the unfolding of this "new world." Whether or not the United States will subscribe the \$320 million, and whether or not subscriptions, totaling some \$440-odd millions, will be immediately forthcoming from other member countries, will provide a measure of the significance of this new world, and of our responsibilities internationally in such a world.

TWO SYSTEMS

It is apparent that the struggle between two systems of economics and political philosophies will go on for a long time. To meet the challenge successfully we must thoroughly understand that people of the world will make decisions on the basis of their own estimates or understanding of the effectiveness of the competing systems, economically, politically, and philosophically to serve their interests and needs. We must also understand that our ability to continue to help the peoples of the rest of the world to meet those needs, is determined by the degree to which we keep our own house—our economic structure—in proper order.

The IDA is being proposed by the administration. In fact, a resolution by the Congress directs the preparation of the articles of agreement for the purpose of providing extra credit, over and above normal credit facilities, for economic development in several countries.

Even here in America we find that extraordinary measures are necessary to meet the capital requirements in agriculture and other segments of the economy. The tremendous demand for capital indicates the extent to which we are substituting improved equipment and methods for man-hours. We have done a great deal of this, within agriculture especially. Agricultural output per man-hour has increased by 83 percent in less than 20 years while industrial output in America has increased by only 30 percent in the same period.

Despite the fact that farm marketing last year set a new all-time record, however, net farm income from all sources was down some 12-15 percent.

We have serious challenges in the world and within our own country. The contribution that our progress makes to our standard of living, to our well-being in America—both rural and urban—depends upon our ability to translate the improved man-hour efficiency into a sound division of benefits to the three parties concerned:

1. Unless the producers, from the standpoint of management and ownership, realize a reasonable profit from such substitution, the proper amount of capital for continuing the process will not be long available.

2. Unless the worker, be he farm owner, operator, manager, or employee, receives compensation in reasonable proportion to the production resulting from his work, the substitution of equipment for labor may well be a threat to his living standard, and indeed to that of all American workers.

3. Unless society as a whole (consumers and users of products of industry where such substitution is made) receives reasonable benefit from the increased efficiency, the rising living standard necessary to generate both purchasing power and capital will be diminished or absent. In this event, bids for capital required inevitably will raise the cost of such capital. (This is the real reason that interest rates go up.)

The rising level of indebtedness in agriculture, in spite of the phenomenal increase in productivity indicates that the producer does not realize a reasonable profit from his capital investment.

This, in turn, coupled with indications that we are not attaining the objective in No. 3 above, shows that we must examine carefully the question of whether we are primitive people—whether we are mature enough as a people to keep our own house in order that we may meet successfully the challenges in the New World.

Appointment of Dr. Jerry C. McCall, of Oxford, Miss., as Assistant to Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of Development Operations, Division of Army Ballistic Agency, Huntsville, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have just learned of the appointment of Dr. Jerry C. McCall, of Oxford, Miss., as assistant to Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville. Dr. McCall is a resident of Oxford, Miss., and has been trained in the field of mathematics with specialty in the computation field. I am particularly proud that Dr. von Braun chose Dr. McCall from available scientific talent and know that Dr. McCall's contribution to the successful space team located at Huntsville will be most constructive.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release from Huntsville, Ala., announcing the appointment of Dr. McCall be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.—Dr. Jerry C. McCall, 32, of Oxford, Miss., has been named assistant to Dr. Wernher von Braun, director of the Development Operations Division, Army Ballistic Missile Agency.

Dr. McCall's duties will include carrying out special projects and conducting program studies for the director, and maintaining liaison with Dr. von Braun's laboratories, other Government agencies, and industry.

The organization which Dr. von Braun heads is proposed for transfer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration July 1 under terms of a presidential recommendations to Congress.

Dr. McCall joined the Missile Agency late last year as a member of the scientific staff in the computation laboratory. He assumed the new position effective March 1.

Dr. McCall holds B.A. and M.A. degrees in mathematics from the University of Mississippi, and B.S. and Ph. D. degrees in mathematics from the University of Illinois. In the field of pure mathematics he specialized in theoretical aspects of the design of electrical systems.

Formerly he taught mathematics at both Illinois and Mississippi. At Illinois, his work included the application of digital computers to Navy fleet defense systems. After leaving the university, he joined the International Business Machines Corp., at Springfield, Ill., where he worked in the industrial application of digital computers. Later, he was

executive vice president of the Midwest Computer Service, Inc., of Decatur, Ill.

Dr. McCall has been initiated in the following honorary organizations: Phi Kappa Pi, scholastic fraternity; Omicron Delta Kappa; Chi Epsilon, engineering fraternity; Pi Mu Epsilon, mathematics fraternity; and Sigma Xi, research fraternity. He also holds membership in the American Mathematics Society; the American Rocket Society, and the Association for Computing Machinery.

A Navy veteran, Dr. McCall, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. F. McCall, of Oxford, Miss. He is married to the former Marget Denton, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Denton, of Tupelo, Miss. The McCalls and their two daughters, Betsy, 3 years, and Lynn, 6 months, reside at 525 Trousdale Drive, Huntsville.

**Joyce Anne Thompson, a Talented
Science Student of Charleston, W. Va.,
Wins National Honors**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, our younger generation are often characterized as "scattered-brained"—not using their brains—but there is much evidence to prove that the lads and lassies in our high schools very often possess well organized mental powers.

Joyce Anne Thompson, of Charleston, W. Va., is in the National Capital as one of the 40 finalists during a busy week of activity for the young men and young women who have merited the honors of a select group. The other youth from our State who were among the list of 448 to receive awards, are Elizabeth Brock and Andrew McCormick, also of Charleston; Suzanne Saliga, of Clarksburg; and George Harper and Vaude Linde, both of St. Albans.

Mr. President, it was pleasant to be visited by Joyce Anne, who told me of her project report. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEASURING THE HALF LIFE OF FREE RADICALS

Polymerization by free radicals is the most important process employed by the billion-dollar plastics industry, as well as the rubber and acrylic fiber industries. Through reading and talking with polymer chemists I became interested in discovering just how free radicals behave. These very unstable molecules can exist for only a very short time under ordinary conditions before combining either with other free radicals or with other molecules.

My first step in developing a project on free radicals was to find out their structure and what causes them to form. The most common source of free radicals is an organic peroxide. When ultraviolet light passes through certain peroxides the molecules split at the oxygen double bonds and free radicals are formed. Using ultraviolet light to produce radicals seemed the best way for me to carry out my initial experi-

ments. Therefore I had to set up an apparatus that would produce a large enough concentration of radicals to be measured.

I chose dibenzoyl peroxide as my radical-former since ultraviolet light was supposed to break it up comparatively easily and because this peroxide was relatively safe and easy to handle. Then I decided to use acrylonitrile as the monomer because it would react readily with the peroxide radical to form a polymer which was insoluble in the monomer and, therefore, easily seen and recovered. A special 100-watt mercury arc was used as the source of the ultraviolet light.

The first apparatus tried was not successful because when I tried to form the free radicals in a separate solution they combined too rapidly to build up a high enough concentration for effective polymerization. Evidently the only way polymer could be produced would be to dissolve the radical-former in the monomer and then form the radicals right in the monomer with the ultraviolet light.

My second apparatus was more successful. At least radicals were obviously produced because polymer was formed. However, this time the problem was that the polymer was formed so rapidly that the polymerization temperature went out of control and the polymer virtually exploded from the volumetric flask. This problem was easily remedied by placing the flask in a water bath of ice water. A magnetic stirrer was used to keep the water circulating and the temperature constant.

Now that I had a means of producing free radicals, I had to find a method of determining their half-life. It appeared that this problem could be solved by using a method developed by Dr. H. W. Melville in England. With this method the steady flow of ultraviolet light is broken up into light flickers. When the duration of the dark period approaches the half-life of the free radical the rate of polymerization will begin to decrease. By plotting the flickering rate against the rate of polymerization I could determine the half-life of the radical.

To obtain this flickering light I placed a motor-driven sector wheel directly in front of the mercury arc. The mercury arc was placed in a shield which not only directed the light only toward the sector wheel, but also protected the eyes from this powerful and damaging light. The wheel was arranged so that it completely blocked the light when a sector was in front of the lamp but allowed the full flow of light to penetrate the flask when an open section was in front of the lamp. For convenience the light and dark flashes were made exactly equal. A wide range of flickering rates was obtained by varying the speed of the motor driving the sector wheel and by using wheels with different sized sectors.

The polymerization rate was determined by measuring the amount of polymer formed as the polymerization proceeded. Since the density of the polymer is greater than the density of the monomer there is a decrease in the volume of the polymerization mixture as the polymer is formed. This decrease in volume is directly proportional to the amount of polymer formed and, thus, may be used to calculate the degree of conversion of monomer to polymer. The decrease in volume during polymerization can be determined from the decrease in the height of the liquid in the narrow neck of the flask. A small cathetometer was used to follow this change in height. Since the volume change due to polymerization is quite small, careful control of the polymerization temperature is necessary to avoid error from this source.

So far I have not made enough trials to enable me to make a graph which could be used to compute the half-life of the benzoyl

radical. However, I have solved many of the problems which have arisen. After making more runs at different flickering rates I should be able to calculate this value.

I believe that knowledge of the half-life of various free radicals will enable the polymer chemist to choose the most suitable peroxide for his needs—one which will produce the desired polymer, has the appropriate reaction time, and is least expensive to use. I hope my efforts will be of value in acquiring this knowledge.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----The Towers Apts.,
4201 Cathedral
Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----The Washington
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.-----
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer E., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt
(Mrs.), Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----1440 Rock Creek
Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington,
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----Apt. 201, 2418
Menokin Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alme J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr.,
Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr.,
N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.

Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Inouye, Daniel K., Hawaii-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Kerth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenneler, Robert W.,
Wis.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.-----Albemarle House,
4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Kyl, John, Iowa-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

What's Right With West Virginia; There Are Health and Hope in Its Two Greatest Resources—the People and the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently the Saturday Evening Post published an article entitled "The Strange Case of West Virginia." Both Senators from West Virginia have heretofore discussed the Post story in this body. Subsequently, I wrote to the executive editor of that periodical and suggested that the Post should consider exposing its vast circulation to another article about West Virginia with a different approach than that employed by the author of the one published in the magazine's February 6, 1960, issue. In response, the executive editor replied that he was "sorry to say that the Post cannot grant space for an article of rebuttal."

When this exchange of correspondence was made available to the newspaper editors of West Virginia by me, the editor of the Charleston Gazette, Harry G. Hoffmann, telegraphed an invitation that I prepare the article for publication in that newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "What's Right With West Virginia," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH WEST VIRGINIA

(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

Is West Virginia a dying State—is it chronically and critically ill—or are its problems those of localized infection which will respond to specific as well as general courses of treatment?

As with an individual, so with the body politic, there must be a diagnosis of the ailment, consideration for its causes, evaluation of the patient's resources, and then a prescription of treatment to bring renewed health.

There is indeed a sickness in our State. My responsibilities as a Senator from West Virginia have made necessary a focusing of attention upon many aspects of this fact, a consequence of which has been that I have received rather intemperate criticism from some quarters. But a fact is a condition which must be faced, and it is a fact that there are some extraordinary circumstances in our State which demand attention. It is axiomatic that a problem is not solved by according it nothing more than neglect. A public official must expect to be subject to censure as well as commendation, but to be

censured for inaction and inattention to conditions which require vital action and to fail to consider adequately all sides of a question are matters against which alert, patriotic citizens must and will arise and take appropriate action.

HEALTH AND HOPE IN WEST VIRGINIA

When I point out that there are health and hope in West Virginia, as well as sickness, and when I declare that ours is not a dying State, I cannot, with fairness, be accused of having assumed a Pollyanna attitude.

BEAUTIFUL SCENERY OF WEST VIRGINIA

On one of my recent trips from Washington back to West Virginia, I was a passenger on Eastern Airlines Flight 463, with Charleston as the destination. It was a clear day. There were only a few scattered cumulus clouds below as we crossed the Blue Ridge Mountains and approached the Appalachians at an altitude of 8,000 feet. Our pilot, Capt. George H. Miller, announced that we were flying over West Virginia—"a State with magnificent scenery," he commented. The pilot did not refer to our unemployment rate, to abandoned and worked out coal mines, nor to the habits of some of our mountain people. He spoke of the beauty of West Virginia.

Later, at Kanawha Airport, on the outskirts of Charleston, Captain Miller added to his earlier comments on the scenery of West Virginia and told us of the kindness and hospitality of the men and women whom he encounters on his frequent fishing trips to the South Branch Valley of the Potomac in our State.

This occurrence is related because, in his remarks to the plane's passengers, Captain Miller touched upon the two greatest resources of our State—the people and the land.

This is the substance from which we will fashion our future, and the new frontier of our State will be what you, the people, make it—what you demand will be. This is a belief which I have maintained throughout my adult life since first having expressed it in an article for the West Virginia Review magazine in the mid-1920's, at the time my friend, Phil Conley, was its publisher. We need more men and women who constructively chronicle and build West Virginia on the foundation of its finest assets—the people and the land.

SPIRIT OF THE PEOPLE OF WEST VIRGINIA

As West Virginians, we are familiar with the spirit which once moved among our people and is reputed to have inspired George Washington to remark, "Leave me but a banner to plant upon the mountains of West Augusta, and I will gather around me the men who will lift our bleeding country from the dust and set her free."

And who has not heard quoted the vivid description of Thomas Jefferson when he first viewed the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers and said: "In the moment of their junction they rush together against the mountain, rend it as under they pass off to the sea. The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

True, these stories belong to a realm of history. And perhaps they are merely apocryphal. But if so, yet they illuminate a kind of truth which lives even in the fictions of history, for they refer to the time-

less spirit of our people and the enduring strength and beauty of our land.

And certainly the resources of our citizens, and the natural, industrial, economic, and scenic resources of our earth are equal to the challenges posed by our present economic difficulties. But first we must have a clear understanding of the nature of our problems.

IMPORTANCE OF COAL MINING

Probably the most widely accepted explanation of our condition is that it is due to the mechanization of the coal mines. While this is certainly a major factor, it is a gross oversimplification to reduce our complex circumstances to such a single set of terms.

Competition with other fuels and technological developments within our national industrial and transportation systems are equally important factors in our coal mining economy. Coal is basic to the economy of our State, but any consideration which treats of coal alone is inadequate.

FARMING AND INDUSTRY

We have, in effect, at least five distinctive patterns of geographic and economic specialization.

In the eastern panhandle, the economy is based largely upon fruit, vegetable, and poultry farming; in the northern panhandle the base is principally the iron and steel industry; in the central area, coal, timber, and livestock raising predominate; in the southern section of the State, coal is the foundation; and in the Kanawha Valley and mid-Ohio Valley, economic life turns predominantly about the immense chemical development. Nor should we fail to acknowledge the significance of the new aluminum industry concentrated in the Ohio Valley, as well as our pottery, glass, and hardwood industries in West Virginia.

Even the briefest summary reveals an amazingly varied and rich economy, and one which is certainly unmatched in its profusion and contribution to our national wealth, except by the larger States of the Union.

Yet, despite the variety and productivity of the State's economy, and despite the development of new industries and the expansion of established ones, we continue to be confronted with the stubborn problem of an unemployment rate almost twice that of the national average. The main reason for this seeming paradox is that the areas of industrial expansion have been those in which there is already a high degree of mechanization and, therefore, a high rate of capital investment per worker. We have not maintained an equivalent rate of expansion in peripheral and subsidiary economic activities and in those areas where the slack in employment must be overcome.

A later article will deal with this problem in more detail, but it might be revealing to note at this point a comparison between the percentage of our labor force in certain employment categories in West Virginia and in the Nation as a whole.

These are some examples which need amplification:

In West Virginia 14.5 percent of our labor force is employed in wholesale and retail trade, but for the United States as a whole the figure is 20 percent.

In the fields of finance, insurance, and real estate, only 2.1 percent of West Vir-

ginians find employment in their home State, compared with 4.5 percent for the entire country.

And, in contract construction our employment rate is only slightly more than one-half that of the national average—3.3 percent for West Virginia compared with 6 percent for the United States.

Although these figures indicate certain limitations as we face our present problems, they also signify the range of opportunities for the inventiveness and initiative of our people. And I am confident that the men and women of West Virginia will be equal to the tasks of the present—as they have been in the past.

Voting Is Not Main Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial entitled "Voting Is Not Main Issue" from the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, the South's oldest newspaper:

VOTING IS NOT MAIN ISSUE

The big lie has been given to the argument that the principal aim of the pending civil rights legislation in the Senate is to insure voting rights for all people.

That sanctimonious bleat, the cry of such newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post, has been refuted by the very men whom they support in the Halls of Congress, the liberals on both sides of the aisle who would impale the South on the thorn of political convenience.

With calculated fervor, the Post declared editorially that the "voting provisions are the heart of the bill" and that the "vast majority of the sponsors of the bill so regard them." The Times, with exaggerated piety as to intent and complete distortion as to treatment, terms "the first and most immediate barrier to equality of rights is the effective denial of the franchise to millions of Americans because of their color."

The Chronicle offers no opposition to the argument that all qualified persons should be entitled to vote. We simply say that rules governing those qualifications belong not to the Federal Government but to the individual States.

But we take issue with those who cry that voting rights is the predominant point in question, gaining support for that contention by the actions of the liberal Democrats and Republicans in the Senate who have refused to accept a strong voting rights measure in exchange for an end to the time and energy consuming filibuster now in progress.

If, as the Times says, the administration bill against which the filibuster is directed is nothing more than a "mild antisegregation" measure, why should not those sponsoring it be willing to compromise—as would those opposing it—and turn their deliberations to more pressing problems? Could it be that sponsors will settle for nothing less than section 4 of the proposed bill that provides congressional recognition of the Supreme Court decision as being basic law? The Washington Post calls it innocuous recognition. Should not a newspaper being published in the Capital of the United States know, as most southerners know, that

the Constitution, not an on-again-off-again ruling of a Supreme Court, is the "law of the land" and that a recognition to the contrary would be catastrophic—not innocuous?

Voting is not, nor should it be, the major issue. It is charged that only about 25 percent of Negroes of voting age in the South are registered. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL effectively pointed out on the floor of the Senate Wednesday that only 26 percent of voting age Negroes in Cleveland, Ohio, are registered—and only 26 percent of those registered actually vote. He also cited a Civil Rights Commission report praising the freedom with which Negroes may register in Atlanta, though only 29 percent there do so. There may be instances in the South where the Negro is denied his voting privilege. But that is the exception, not the rule. Right here in Augusta, the Weekly Review, a Negro newspaper, places the blame for failure of Negroes to vote just where it should be placed—on the Negro himself, for failing to register. Thus, when the New York Times charges that "millions" are disfranchised because of their color, it must either be aware of a flock of disfranchised Negroes in the North, or it is guilty of distorting facts.

No, voting is not the dominant issue. To the contrary. It must be the least important issue. Why else would the liberals in the Senate be unwilling to go along with just a voting bill?

It is because the entire movement is itself an integrated package deal, a bald-faced, politically motivated grab for Negro votes en bloc.

Russia's Giant Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 6 issue of Parade magazine appears an article entitled "Russia's Giant Rocket." The article was written by the able correspondent, Jack Anderson.

In the article Mr. Anderson points out:

When a Soviet missile plunged into the Pacific recently within 800 miles of Pearl Harbor, the splash was heard around the world.

He further states:

From its launching site near the Aral Sea, the Russian rocket hurtled 7,767 miles in 36.5 minutes. It soared to a 765-mile altitude, streaked back into the atmosphere at 16,156 miles an hour, and plopped into the ocean only 1.2 miles from the bull's-eye. The warhead was huge enough to hold an 8-megaton bomb (equivalent to 8 million tons of TNT).

In the article, he further states:

Yet the biggest shock for the experts was the way the Russian warhead ejected an instrument package before plunging into the ocean. This capsule, once it was thrown free of the warhead, apparently used retro-rockets to slow its speed. Then a parachute blossomed, and it floated gently down upon a Pacific swell. A Soviet ship was waiting nearby to fish it out. The feat required split-second timing that left our experts with their mouths agape.

Later in the article he points out that—

The new Russian ICBM first showed up on U.S. radarscopes last summer when two were fired from the northeastern shore of the Caspian Sea into the Pacific halfway between the Kamchatka Peninsula and Hawaii. Two Red ships were waiting in the target area to register the impact.

Mr. President, in view of the impact of the article on the debate now in process, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Jack Anderson be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEWS REPORT ON RUSSIA'S GIANT ROCKET (By Jack Anderson)

When a Soviet missile plunged into the Pacific recently within 800 miles of Pearl Harbor, the splash was heard around the world. It caused military men here to break into a sweat as if from the ocean spray.

From its launching site near the Aral Sea, the Russian rocket hurtled 7,767 miles in 36.5 minutes. It soared to a 765-mile altitude, streaked back into the atmosphere at 16,156 miles an hour, and plopped into the ocean only 1.2 miles from the bull's-eye. The warhead was huge enough to hold an 8-megaton bomb (equivalent to 8 million tons of TNT). These frightening figures add up to one answer: our cities are now only minutes away from possible total destruction.

Yet the biggest shock for the experts was the way the Russian warhead ejected an instrument package before plunging into the ocean. This capsule, once it was thrown free of the warhead, apparently used retro-rockets to slow its speed. Then a parachute blossomed, and it floated gently down upon a Pacific swell. A Soviet ship was waiting nearby to fish it out. The feat required split-second timing that left our experts with their mouths agape.

One Air Force general suggested to Parade that it demonstrates Russia's ability to fire a double-barreled missile.

"Two hydrogen bombs could be loaded into a single warhead," he speculated. "The first bomb might be ejected, say, over Detroit while the warhead sped on to Chicago." Not two birds with one stone, but two cities with one "bird."

What is known of this monster missile, which has now become the No. 1 threat to America's security?

As yet our trackers and observers have been unable to fit together enough jigsaw pieces to form a full profile of the new missile. But from intelligence sources Parade can provide its readers with at least a silhouette. (See photo and comparative details, right.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

What we have may be only a nuclear pop compared to the Russian bang. Yet the Atlas can strike as far and accurately as the Soviet rocket.

OUT TO SEA

The new Russian ICBM first showed up on U.S. radarscopes last summer when two were fired from the northeastern shore of the Caspian Sea into the Pacific half way between the Kamchatka Peninsula and Hawaii. Two Red ships were waiting in the target area to register the impact.

These shots were never announced by Moscow or Washington. But Premier Khrushchev mischievously brought them up during his private talk in the Kremlin with Vice President NIXON. With a straight face, Khrushchev said the missiles had taken on too much fuel and has overshot into the Pacific. He added with a wry smile: "I suppose you tracked them, since we track all your missiles."

Of course, missiles don't overshoot because someone accidentally pours in too much fuel.

It is even less likely the two observation ships would make a navigational error that would put them conveniently at the right spot.

The next series of Pacific tests, proclaimed in advance by the Kremlin, began in January. Unknown to the public, however, the fanfare that greeted the first successful test was hastily shut off after the second launching. The second missile blew up; it was the Russians' first ICBM failure in 10 months. The world was told later that the third shot was really the second in the series.

How could Russia, just emerging from a wheelbarrow technology, manage to build a missile superior to our own? One answer is that the Soviets plunged into missile development before the echoes of World War II had died away. While we were leisurely patching together our first copy of the German V-2 rocket, the Russians had already produced 1,000 V-2's in the underground rocket plant they seized in East Germany.

From the V-2's the Russians developed an improved version, now known as the T-1. This was followed by the intermediate-range T-2, with a span of 1,200 miles. The big bruisers followed: First the T-3A, then its ballistic brother, the T-3B. Both were three-stage missiles and packed 1,200-pound warheads that could carry 2½-megaton bombs.

ONWARD AND UPWARD

The latest ICBM, which has been splashing in the Pacific, is a modification of the T-3B. But the genealogy of all Soviet missiles can be traced to the V-2.

Perhaps another reason the Russians got ahead of us is that we concentrated on shrinking the H-bomb. We built a smaller H-bomb while they worked on a bigger missile.

While the Atlas packs a nuclear wallop that can destroy any military target, the super-sized missiles have given Russia a headstart in the race to pioneer outer space.

But just as the British a few centuries ago pulled ahead of the Spaniards in pioneering the New World, the Americans are now rushing to catch up in space.

Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy and Congressman Burke Write Bethlehem Shipbuilding Management and Union Urging Early Settlement of Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SENATORS SALTONSTALL AND KENNEDY AND
CONGRESSMAN BURKE WRITE BETHLEHEM
SHIPBUILDING MANAGEMENT AND UNION
URGING EARLY SETTLEMENT OF STRIKE

MARCH 4, 1960.

Mr. DANIEL D. STROHMEIER,
Vice President, Shipbuilding Division, Bethlehem Steel Co., New York, N.Y.

Mr. JOHN GROCAN,
International President, Industrial Union of
Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of
America, New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Division strike has now been in progress for more than a month. During this time we have been in frequent contact with officials of the Navy Department, including the Secretary, the Under Secretary and responsible officials in the Quincy area. At our request, our staffs have discussed this most serious

problem with local and national representatives of the union and with representatives of Bethlehem Steel Co. Needless to say, we are vitally interested in an early and equitable settlement of the dispute.

Our concern in this matter stems not only from the serious situation in which workers and their families find themselves as a result of the prolonged worked stoppage, but also because of the most critical delays in defense production which the strike has entailed. In addition, trades people and service industries in Quincy and the entire South Shore are feeling the indirect effects of the strike.

We and the people of Quincy are apprehensive that this strike may have serious long-term consequences for the economy of the area. The people of Quincy are now concerned over both their immediate and their long-range interests. We have urged the Navy to leave the Springfield in Quincy pending an early settlement of the strike. This the Navy informs us it is planning to do, but of course national interest, if the strike is prolonged, may require the Navy to change its plans.

While in the early stages of the dispute it appeared that most of the issues were susceptible to negotiation and we were hopeful that a settlement could be reached quickly, we are now informed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that negotiations have slowed down considerably. We recognize that there are serious issues involved between labor and management but none of these appear to us to be insurmountable and we believe that with serious good-faith bargaining on the part of both parties to the dispute, a quick agreement can be reached. We are greatly disturbed that since negotiations have become centered in New York progress has been halting and the parties have not been meeting as frequently as the serious situation seems to demand. We are informed that locally both union and management are most anxious to bring these protracted negotiations to a close and arrive at an equitable settlement for all concerned. Consequently, we most strongly urge that the union and management take every practical step to intensify their bargaining efforts so that a settlement may be reached promptly.

Above all, we are concerned that the interests of Massachusetts people, who have for years assisted the Nation and made their living through responsible hard work on the ships being constructed in Quincy, are given full consideration in this controversy. Our sailors fought World War II in ships constructed in Quincy. Though we hope the cold war will never become a hot war, we all hope that America's deterrent capability on the sea will remain strong with the assistance of the people of Quincy. We look forward to a speedy and amicable settlement of the strike.

Sincerely yours,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
U.S. Senate.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate.

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

Conditions in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasion there has appeared before the Senate, to deliver the invocation, a very

distinguished Catholic prelate who is a longtime friend of mine. I refer to Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. He has had a long tour of duty in Latin America, and served in many charges there.

Recently he delivered an address in regard to certain situations in Latin America—in particular, in Brazil. I believe his address is of much value, for it deals, in part, with the possible attitude of the United States in regard to the making of loans to the Brazilian Government oil monopoly for the development of the petroleum interests there.

I believe his address is of sufficient value to have excerpts from it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I so request.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREDERICK, MD.—Addressing the faculty and students of the Visitation Academy, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and a specialist on inter-American history, declared that, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower meets President Juscelino Kubitschek, of Brazil, next week, "a decision will have to be made about U.S. loans to Petrobras, the Brazilian Government oil monopoly, a decision that will determine the future of private enterprise in large areas of Latin America."

The Maryland author, educator, and diplomat added:

"Up to the present, the Eisenhower administration has been adamant against official aid to Petrobras on the grounds that millions advanced to a government-owned and operated industry would mean encouragement to socialistic tendencies, thus favoring collectivism rather than private business. Since the seizure of oil properties in Mexico in 1938 and the establishment of Pemex, the Mexican Government oil monopoly, the White House and State Department have rejected all requests that any U.S. agency should provide Pemex with loans for exploration and development of petroleum resources. If President Eisenhower, yielding to the pleas of his Brazilian counterpart in Rio de Janeiro, should reverse this stand, it may be taken for granted that the Governments of Mexico, Bolivia, Cuba, Panama, Guatemala, Ecuador, Chile, and Peru would demand help in the discovery and exploitation of new oil wells.

"On the other hand, when President Arturo Frondizi, of Argentina, talks with the North American Chief Executive in Buenos Aires, he will report that private enterprise, within 14 months, has brought oil production up to a level where the Argentine economy will no longer have to depend upon foreign suppliers. In the case of Argentina, the U.S. Government encouraged President Frondizi, from the outset of his administration, to enlist the aid of private corporations. Although this was a policy highly unpopular with the Argentine masses, who had been led to believe by Juan Domingo Perón that the state was the fountainhead of all blessings, Dr. Frondizi risked his political life by bringing in North American companies whose technicians opened up new oilfields and greatly increased production. Now Argentina is almost self-sufficient with regard to crude oil, while the dollar drain upon the national treasury has been reduced to manageable proportions.

"Government monopoly a la Fidel Castro versus private enterprise is the issue that will have to be faced by President Eisenhower, not only in Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, but throughout all Latin

America. If the principle is surrendered on oil, the clamor will arise for huge subventions for many other types of official monopolies."

The Philippine Sugar Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from an article entitled "The Philippine Sugar Industry in 1959" by Manuel Elizalde, President of the Philippine Sugar Association, which appeared in the 1959 Yearbook of the Fookien Times.

Since the present Sugar Act expires in December of this year, new legislation must be considered at this session of Congress.

Under the revised Philippine-American Trade Agreement of 1955, Congress may increase the Philippine sugar quota to the United States. We did not implement this provision of the agreement when we amended and extended the present Sugar Act of 1948 in 1956. Consequently, the Philippines has been the only major area supplying sugar to the United States which has not participated in increases in sugar consumption in continental United States by reason of the population growth.

The President noted this discrimination against the Philippines, in signing the amendments to the Sugar Act on May 29, 1956, when he said:

It was not considered feasible to recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. I believe, therefore, that when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption, as is now provided for other foreign countries by this bill.

In considering quotas to be awarded to foreign nations in the new legislation, we should bear in mind that the Philippines are a friendly and important ally in an area of the world where we need friends. We should demonstrate that we appreciate their friendship.

Mr. Elizalde's article follows:

THE PHILIPPINE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN 1959

(By Manuel Elizalde, president, Philippine Sugar Association)

CROP, 1958-59

The Sugar Quota Administration has reported sugar production as of June 7, 1959, at 1,379,409 short tons, constituting 93.06 percent of the total estimated crops of 1,482,664 short tons for 1958-59. This leaves but 103,255 tons to produce, making it the record postwar crop, exceeding by 49,383 tons the 1953-54 production of 1,434,281 tons, which had stood unchallenged for 5 years. This season also has maintained for the second year, a bumper crop exceeding the previous year's by 104,817 short tons.

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The sugar shipments to the United States chargeable against the 1959 quota of the Philippines as of May 31, 1959, totaled 643,-

464 short tons, equivalent to 67.59 percent of the total quota, while the quantity cleared for shipment up to mid-June totaled 778,626 tons, equivalent to 81.79 percent of the quota, as compared to 80.13 percent for the corresponding period last year.

EXPORTS TO THE WORLD FREE MARKET

The Philippines has complied with its commitments to export its 1958 quota of 45,000 metric tons for the world free market.

Our quota in effect as of June 17, 1959, would be 45,000 metric tons less 10 percent, or 40,500 metric tons (44,642.85 short tons), from which would be deducted our excess exports of 1,265 metric tons in 1958, thus placing our effective quota for 1959 at 39,235 metric tons, or 43,248.44 short tons.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Withdrawals for local consumption during the past year totaled 319,386 short tons. The quota for 1959 has been fixed at 320,000 short tons. These compare with the withdrawals of 302,015 tons for 1957, 293,400 tons for 1956, 280,517 tons for 1955, and 295,457 tons for 1954.

MARKETS FOR PHILIPPINE SUGAR

Besides the domestic market which will absorb about 320,000 tons this year, the Philippines has a guaranteed minimum share of 952,000 tons, commercial weight, or 980,000 short tons, raw value, of the consumption of sugar in the United States, under the U.S. Sugar Act of 1948, as amended in 1956, and the Revised Philippine-American Trade Agreement of 1955 and lastly, a quota of 45,000 metric tons (49,800 short tons), in the world free market.

U.S. SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED AND EXTENDED

President Eisenhower on May 29, 1956, signed legislation extending the Sugar Act of 1948 to December 31, 1960—4 years from the expiration date of December 31, 1956—made retroactive to January 1, 1956.

The new law restores to the domestic areas their historic right to share in increased consumption of sugar in the United States. Commencing on January 1, 1956, 55 percent of any excess of the estimate of consumption over the base figure of 8,350,000 tons of sugar shall be allotted to the domestic areas as follows: the first 165,000 tons of such excess shall be divided, 51.5 percent to the beet area and 48.5 percent to the mainland cane area; the next 20,000 tons shall be allotted to Puerto Rico; next 3,000 tons to the Virgin Islands; and after the first 188,000 tons of such excess shall have thus been allotted, the domestic share be divided pro rata among all of the domestic areas, including Hawaii, in proportion to the quotas as adjusted by adding the initial distribution of amounts as stated above.

Forty-five percent of the excess of consumption beyond the basic figure of 8,350,000 tons would go to Cuba and the full-duty countries. In 1956 this went to 96 percent to Cuba and 4 percent to full-duty countries. From 1957 through 1960, the 45 percent would be apportioned as follows: Cuba, 29.59 percent; Mexico, 5.10 percent; Dominican Republic, 4.95 percent; Peru, 4.33 percent, and other full-duty suppliers, 1.03 percent.

Since the sugar quota system has been in effect, the tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced progressively from the rate of 2 cents per pound provided under the Tariff Act of 1930 to current level of 0.50 cent per pound and the full-duty rate has been reduced from 2.50 cents per pound to 0.625 cent per pound. The present effective rate of 0.50 cent per pound on Cuban sugar has been in effect since January 1948.

PHILIPPINES ONLY FOREIGN SUPPLIER EXCLUDED FROM GROWTH

Unlike the domestic areas and other foreign suppliers, the Philippines is excluded from participating in any increase in sugar consumption in the United States, as pro-

vided for in the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. However, President Eisenhower, upon signing this legislation extending the effectivity of the act for 4 years to December 31, 1960, made a statement to the effect that he believes consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in the consumption increase as is now provided for other foreign countries by that bill, when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act.

Also the Philippine-American Trade Agreement signed in Washington on September 6, 1955, provided for elasticity and possible increases in the sugar quota of the Philippines at the discretion of Congress, and article II paragraph 1, of the agreement accordingly provides:

"The establishment herein of the limitations of the amounts of Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouses in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future."

The Philippine quota of 980,000 tons being inflexible year after year, as the consumption in the United States rises, is becoming an ever-diminishing percentage of the annual U.S. domestic consumption needs. Calculated to be 15.41 percent of the total U.S. consumption in 1934 when the U.S. quota system was established, it is today 11.74 percent of the basic 8,350,000 short tons and only 10.65 percent of the current 1959 consumption quota of 9,200,000 tons. As the Philippines sells about 75 percent of its annual output to the U.S. market, it can improve upon its production methods with a view to reducing costs only if it will participate in the increased consumption of its principal market. If it fails to move forward with the market, it will have to doubly intensify efforts toward a substantial improvement of production and marketing methods.

Notwithstanding the handicap of an inflexible quota in the U.S. markets, the Philippine sugar industry has increased its yield per hectare, both as a result of heavier cane tonnage and larger rendement. The performance of the previous and the current crops attests to this significant progress of the industry.

Our Government with the help of the Philippine Sugar Association has been doing everything within its power all this time to secure reconsideration of the Philippine request for participation in the increased sugar consumption in the United States. Only thus can it hope to be able to adjust its production and marketing costs and thereby offset even gradually the loss of its preferential status in the American market.

Philippine participation in the U.S. increased consumption annually is vital to the industry for growth and development. Moreover, especially at this time, we need to increase our exports not only for the dollars we need but for employment opportunities to our labor force that such increased exports will generate. We particularly need dollars from larger exports to enable us to continue buying our essential needs from the United States.

PHILIPPINES MADE GREATEST SACRIFICE ON ADOPTION OF QUOTA SYSTEM

It is a fact that the Philippines sustained a greater reduction in production than any other supplier to the U.S. market when the U.S. sugar quota system became effective retroactively in 1934 (from 1,565,455 tons in 1933-34 down to 695,134 tons in 1934-35, or a reduction of almost 56 percent.)

During the latter part of 1941, the Philippines had run short of bottoms for its sugar exports to the United States, so that a sizable volume of the quota could not be shipped during that year, when the war broke out in December.

PHILIPPINES, FRIEND AND ALLY

The sacrifices of the Philippine sugar industry became more pronounced during and after the war when sugar lands and sugar centrals were abandoned and destroyed. The industry was dormant for 3 years and with liberation came the destruction of most of the centrals. After 10 years of feverish efforts at reconstruction and rehabilitation, the industry at last was able to fill its quota of 952,000 tons in 1954. In the period from 1941 to 1953, the Philippines shipped to the United States only 4,433,501 short tons out of its share of 12,376,000 short tons or barely 36 percent of the total. Other foreign sources supplied the deficiencies of almost 8 million tons lost by the Philippine sugar producers due to the war, principally Cuba.

PHILIPPINES PLACED IN STRAITJACKET BY 1956 AMENDMENTS

Following the 1956 amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948 in which an increase in U.S. consumption above the basic supply of 8,350,000 was contemplated, the sugar needs of the mounting population of the United States have in fact been augmented but the Philippines has enjoyed no part of the excess supply. Taking the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1959 of 9,200,000 short tons, raw value, the actual proportion of the Philippine share in U.S. sugar consumption is only 10.65 percent.

The Philippines should be entitled to a share of at least 11.74 percent of the increase in annual U.S. consumption representing the same proportion as their static quota of 980,000 short tons bears to the agreed basic quota of 8,350,000 short tons.

In attaining the desired result for the Philippines of sharing in the supply of annual excess U.S. sugar consumption demand to the extent of 11.74 percent, it is not contemplated that there be any decrease in the proportion of 55 percent of the excess U.S. sugar consumption above the basic amount of 8,350,000 short tons allotted to U.S. domestic suppliers. The position of the Philippine sugar suppliers can be restored by allotting to them a portion of the remaining 45 percent of the excess U.S. sugar consumption as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture from year to year above the basic supply of 8,350,000 short tons which is reserved for foreign suppliers.

SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR SUGAR INDUSTRY

As in prewar years, our sugar industry has continued to occupy in the postwar years a very important and significant position in our economy, not only because it is one of the most stable and largest earners of dollars but also because it is one of the largest providers of employment and among the heaviest taxpayers in the country. Then, too, various banking, insurance, shipping, machinery, fertilizer, oil, and other commercial enterprises depend on the sugar industry for their profitable operation.

The United States Should Remain Firm in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Indianapolis News of March 2, 1960, in an editorial entitled "Where We Came In," discussed the importance of the United States remaining firm in Berlin.

The editorial suggests that President Eisenhower should announce once again that the United States will not give an inch in Berlin—come what may.

I believe that this is an excellent editorial, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WE CAME IN

A year ago today the free world faced a threat by Khrushchev to seize West Berlin. The target date was May 27—a deadline set 6 months earlier by the Russian dictator.

As it turned out, an uneasy summer passed by and nothing happened. This was partly due to Western firmness. But it was due more to such disgraceful acts of appeasement as letting Khrushchev strut around America as though he already owned the place.

All of this was climaxed by the spirit of Camp David and an agreement to a May summit meeting.

Now, one year later, we are right back where we came in. The spirit of Camp David is a poltergeist, to say the best for it.

Khrushchev, heady with self-confidence, has just issued a new warning that the Reds will seize West Berlin unless the May summit meeting goes to suit them.

Coincident with this, the Western Powers have shown a measure of backbone by announcing they will fly their planes at high altitudes through the three assigned air corridors into West Berlin. In the last year they have tried to appease the Russians by flying below 10,000 feet.

Let us hope this small gesture of defiance presages Western determination to keep West Berlin free at all costs. Any retreat from the island city deep inside communism's European empire would be the beginning of a general retreat from all Germany and all Europe.

The News has said time and again that Berlin is the key to all of Khrushchev's complex diplomatic maneuverings. He recognizes that, if he can bluff us into a surrender there, he will be able to proceed from that victory to a series of triumphs which will, in short order, leave the United States a besieged bastion in a communized world.

It is time for President Eisenhower to announce once again that "we will not give an inch" in Berlin—come what may.

George Huddleston, Sr.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, last week Alabama lost one of its outstanding citizens in the death of Hon. George Huddleston, Sr., of Birmingham. For 22 years prior to 1936 he served Alabama with great distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 2, 1960, edition of the Birmingham News. The editorial is a neighborly expression about Mr. Huddleston which I commend to the House. It follows:

GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Sr.

For 22 years George Huddleston, Sr., with intense devotion and attention to details served the citizens of Jefferson County in the U.S. House of Representatives. His death at 90 brings to a close an active life, one filled with the pleasures of a fine and closely knit family, and with the immense satisfactions of public service and knowledge over the years that it was publicly appreciated.

Mr. Huddleston had what clearly was one of his greatest rewards for a life so well-spent—seeing his son win, and win well, election to the same seat in the House which he had himself filled for 11 terms. And he had the satisfaction, too, of knowing that his son, George, Jr., fitted himself into that body with skill and carried on service to Jefferson on the same basis as had the elder Huddleston. Mr. Huddleston's death at 90 is occasion for sorrow. But it also is an occasion on which we all might ponder the values in living a life of concern about public affairs and of interest in the welfare of fellow citizens.

High Interest Rates Hit Small Businessmen Who Are School Building Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a friend of mine who is a building contractor in Hancock, Wis., has provided a fine example of the direct impact of high interest rates, not only on the construction of schools, but on the welfare of the small businessmen who do the building.

Mr. Bushman, who is a general contractor with experience in constructing schools in central Wisconsin, writes me that his firm has more than doubled its gross in the past year without increasing its net one iota. On the basis of my recent analysis, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the vast increase in school construction costs caused by high interest rates, I feel very strongly that his complaint is thoroughly justified, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his letter be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, a copy of the letter was ordered placed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

JOHN J. BUSHMAN,
Hancock, Wis.WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator—Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Many thanks for your informative bulletin on the tight money situation relative to school construction—since school construction in the State of Wisconsin accounts for approximately 80 percent of my own business, I was especially interested in what you had to say—and am grateful to you for saying it where it counts, on the Senate floor. The last paragraph of your address hit the nail squarely on the head with respect to my own situation—our firm more than doubled its gross in the preceding calendar year, but our net profit remained the same as the previous calendar year. Over the past few years, we have been

forced to put out money for heavy machinery and adopt mechanization practices in order to be successful bidders—the construction industry is becoming a highly competitive field, and all the contractors have the same gripe—we have to go out for more and more work just to maintain our present net.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. BUSHMAN,
General Contractor.

What Is the Communist Position on Capitalism and Armaments?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Communist line on the economics of armaments is certainly a puzzling one.

On February 29, Thomas P. Whitney in his Washington Post article, "Capitalism Can Disarm Without Crisis, United States Now Told: Red Propaganda Rejects One of Its Own Myths," pointed out that Soviet propaganda is now trying to refute the myth which they helped start that disarmament is impossible for America because it must lead to economic crisis.

Recent efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which have aimed at showing that the United States could indeed demobilize without risking economic collapse, have seemed peculiar in light of classical Communist doctrine. Early Marxist-Lenin-Stalin doctrine maintained that without an economy based upon, and bolstered by armaments, capitalism would collapse. The United States and other capitalist countries, the Communists argued, were driven by the nature of their economic systems, to resist major disarmament.

The falsity of this argument is so well known that it hardly needs rebuttal. I have long contended that the United States could reconvert its economy without fear of collapse. I have taken this position before the public in answer to the classical Communist charge that a capitalist nation dares not disarm. A recent article of mine, "If Peace Were To Break Out," which appeared in the December 9, 1959, issue of the *Christian Century* and which was inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* by Congressman LEONARD WOLF, demonstrated that our economy is resilient enough to absorb huge cuts in the Government spending sector. Such was the case after the Second World War and the same, I confidently predict, will happen in the event of future disarmament and reconversion.

COMMUNIST RECORD

Premier Khrushchev, in a speech before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in 1956 disagreed with my long-held contention and stated that:

The capitalists and the learned defenders of their interests are circulating a 'theory'

that the uninterrupted expansion of arms manufacture brings salvation from economic crises.

In a speech in July 1958, the Soviet leader went even further in attacking the American economy and likened its condition to that of a dying man. Stated Khrushchev:

As one seriously ill is prepared to use any remedy to prolong his life, so capitalism whose organism is affected by an incurable disease, holds to such remedies as the arms race, preparation for war, hydrogen bombs, military blocs, so as to put a brake on the development of socialism and to prolong its own existence.

This was and still is pure nonsense.

According to a brief study done by the Library of Congress, recently Mr. Khrushchev reversed his field. Now, the Soviet leadership anxious to reach some disarmament accord with the West, Mr. Khrushchev has made several statements which imply that he no longer deeply believes the economies of the capitalist nations will collapse if the arms race is halted.

Adlai Stevenson, immediately after the Premier's visit to this country, wrote in the *New York Times*:

I have been interrogated during the past year by several important Russian visitors about the economic effect of reduced defense spending, and Khrushchev's conclusion that our 'economy is so large' that our industry could be converted without major trouble represents a sharp reversal of Soviet attitude.

However, Mr. Stevenson qualified his remarks by adding that "Mr. K. concluded that subject with a twinkle in his darting eyes, 'at least that's what your industrialists all tell me; and what else could they say?'"

It is likely that the Soviet Premier is unwilling to publicly admit that he now realizes that our economy need not maintain armaments production to survive. But this line is now being repeated in Soviet speeches and press releases.

Everyone acquainted with the basic principles of economics knows that white is white, that adequate income can be generated without arms spending. I am pleased to see that the Soviets are now abandoning their policy of depicting white as the darkest shade of black.

We are all coming to agree that our economy's strength does not rely on defense production. Just because the Communists, whether sincerely or because of strategy or tactics, now recognize that capitalism will not expire with a relaxation of tensions and disarmament, I see no reason to argue the issue with them. There remain many other, and more important points which we still need to discuss and debate, while holding fast to the truth as we see it.

Whatever the party line happens to be at the moment, facts have demonstrated that our economy can be adapted and used to serve our purposes, whether for purposes of military defense, purposes of meeting our public needs, purposes of domestic consumption, or purposes of helping other nations of the world realize their full potentialities.

Let us pursue our hopes for the resolution of tensions and international disarmament with greater vigor now that

the Soviets have finally given some indication that they believe we can afford to make that choice. The change in their line should spur our actions, not stop them.

The article follows:

CAPITALISM CAN DISARM WITHOUT CRISIS, UNITED STATES NOW TOLD—RED PROPAGANDA REJECTS ONE OF ITS OWN MYTHS

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

Soviet propaganda is now trying to refute one of its most assiduously cultivated myths—that disarmament is impossible for America because its must lead to economic crisis.

The standard Soviet argument, repeated to the point of nausea in the postwar period, has been that since high current levels of production in the United States are solely the result of "militarization of the economy" American "ruling circles" must inevitably prevent and frustrate all disarmament efforts.

"Wall Street monopolists," ran this line, can only continue to pump out their fabulous profits from the pockets of American workers through keeping the arms race going. Capitalism, declared Soviet propaganda day in and day out, is incapable of forging swords into ploughshares.

This whole line of Communist logic was then elevated to the status of proof that it is the U.S. Government that is responsible for the cold war and the arms race and the threat of nuclear destruction of mankind.

But now, with a summit meeting scheduled for May and the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings in Russia due in June, there's a new theme in the air.

"Some Western press organs assert that the discontinuation of the arms race will result in a destructive economic crisis," declared a recent official press release of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. It went on to say that "the truth is that . . . general disarmament does not present a threat to the capitalist economy."

The Soviet Embassy presents this interesting assertion as the conclusion of Erik Pletnyov, an assistant professor of the Institute of International Relations in Moscow.

Somewhat similar views were expressed, though not nearly so categorically, by Premier Nikita Khrushchev in his speech on disarmament to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in January. And the most authoritative Soviet journal in the area of international economics, *World Economics and International Relations*, in its latest issue describes as a myth the idea that armament orders are irreplaceable in the American economy.

Pletnyov, however, develops the new Soviet propaganda concept much further than have other Soviet sources. To prove his point about the possibilities of successful reconversion of arms industries to consumer and capital goods he cites American experience in the immediate postwar period of 1945-47 and again in the period after the Korean war in 1953-54.

Pletnyov points out that in both these periods the United States successfully reduced arms expenditures by very large amounts without severe shock to the national economy. This is an extremely interesting Soviet admission—and one which American propagandists would do well to note for future use—for it has always been a key Soviet stand in discussion of the origins of the cold war that the United States did not convert its wartime economy to peaceful pursuits after World War II.

Declaring that Marxists are still convinced that capitalism cannot get rid of economic crises, Pletnyov at the same time makes the rather curious statement that: "Actually it is absolutely contrary to Marxism to

assert that capitalism can increase production and employment only in the conditions of an arms race."

The amusing aspect of this new Soviet line is that apparently it represents a case in which Soviet propagandists, faced with changing needs in a year in which international agreement and sweetness and light are in the atmosphere, are fearful that people in the West may actually have come to believe a previous propaganda line and are now rushing to reassure that it really wasn't so.

Forty-second Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached resolution which was presented, adopted, and unanimously passed at a mass meeting sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council of Lake and Laporte Counties, Ind., commemorating the 42d anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the peace loving and progressive Lithuanian nation, notwithstanding its loyalty to international treaties and agreements, fell victim to unprovoked aggression and military invasion of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had rightly and deservedly enjoyed for many centuries in the past; and

Whereas because of their manifest and unmistakable anti-Communist attitude, the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, backed by their kinsmen in the free world, represent an active and reliable outpost in the present defense front of the free nations against international communism; and

Whereas the Soviet dictatorship constantly strives to extend its rule over the new territories in Europe, Asia, and Africa and seeks to dominate the whole world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this gathering appeal to the Government of the United States to respond to the demands of our times by giving wise and coordinated leadership to the troubled world aspiring to peace, justice and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our consensus that American leadership in the fight for freedom and peace will be best exerted by inaugurating strong and dynamic policy aimed not only at preventing further expansion of Communist imperialism but also at abolishing the fruits of all past Kremlin aggressions; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights of self determination to the Lithuanian people and to other enslaved Eastern European nations.

ALBERT G. VINICK,

President, Lithuanian American Council,

REV. PETER CELESIVUE,

Secretary, Lithuanian American Council.

Air Force Reports Smog Device Which Pays for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Subcommittee on Health and Safety held hearings on the problems of air pollution emanating from the discharge of unburned hydrocarbon from automobiles.

The automobile manufacturers report they have a device which will be installed on cars sold in California, which can effectively reduce these fumes.

My own reaction to this as I have expressed here previously is: Why cannot this device, if it is effective and inexpensive, be installed on all automobiles? Air pollution does not stop at the California State line.

Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared before the subcommittee during the hearings and testified in a similar vein.

I was very interested to learn that another device has been developed, and approved by the Air Force, which not only would reduce smog-producing pollutants, but would assist in the operation of the vehicle in which it is installed.

Testing authorities believe it could pay for itself within 6 months.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Washington Post on March 1, 1960, on this subject.

The article follows:

AIR FORCE VEHICLE DEVICE CUTS SMOG

(By Morton Mintz)

A cost-cutting device approved by the Air Force for its 185,000 ground motor vehicles offers a surprise bonus—it reduces air pollution.

A spokesman said that within 3 years it will be standard equipment on most of the vehicles and on thousands of stationary units powered by internal combustion engines.

The spokesman, Lt. Col. Walter A. Miller, said the device was tested for 8 months and then approved by both the Research and Development and Materiel Commands. He is chief maintenance engineer for motor vehicles.

The device adds an eat-your-cake-and-have-it-too angle to the fight against air pollution, holding out hope that even private car owners will be able to save money by fighting smog.

The report on the testing project, conducted by special shops at Schilling Air Force Base, Kans., said installation costs should be amortized within 6 months.

The Public Health Service, a spokesman said, is satisfied that the device removes the smog-forming hydrocarbons normally vented into the atmosphere by the crankcase "breather" pipe. The Army and Navy are among other Federal agencies that have the report under study.

The report was completed in July, 4 months before the auto industry's announcement that the crankcase had been found to be a significant source of hydrocarbons. The exhaust pipe remains the major source.

The crankcase fumes, called "blowby," are chiefly raw gasoline that slips past the piston rings. Various devices, including one approved by the auto industry, feed blowby back into the engine to be burned.

The Air Force-approved unit, made by the Oildex Corp., of Tulsa, traps impurities in the "blowby." Powered by engine vacuum, it atomizes the remaining fuel, oil and moisture and sends the cleansed mixture into the engine for burning via the intake manifold.

The Schilling report says tests on 45 Oildex-equipped vehicles—checked against the same number and type of vehicles operated for the same purposes—showed that a list of claims made by the manufacturer are true.

The report said the units "conclusively reduced our maintenance workload approximately 70 percent as far as engines are concerned * * * inspection may be ultimately beyond the 6-month cycles now established."

Colonel Miller said the average cost of a factory installation for the Air Force—because of mass purchasing and tax exemptions would be \$20. An Oildex spokesman put the usual range for an existing privately owned used car at \$35 to \$50.

The Schilling report—fully endorsed by Miller—said the device generally effects a "restoration" in older vehicles and protects new ones against those conditions which make them old.

It said that with proper installation—which can require repair of certain faulty engine parts—the device removes and prevents formation of carbon and sludge and reduces the frequency of needed oil changes and spark-plug and oil-filter replacement.

The device, easily serviced and about the size and shape of a quart jar, is said to increase compression and horsepower, reduce gasoline consumption slightly and reveal coolant leaks.

Why I Am a Democrat, by Senator Jennings Randolph and the Tulia Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us realize the importance of a strong two-party system in order for our form of government to work best. All of us could list many reasons as to why we chose our particular party whether we be Democrats or Republicans.

Recently the Tulia (Tex.) Herald, one of the Nation's finest weekly newspapers, whose editor H. M. Baggerly is a National Editorial Association prizewinner, published an outstanding editorial on the subject, "Why I Am a Democrat." This editorial was based on a very excellent speech by my friend and colleague the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, one of the best speakers for democracy in America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the January 21, 1960, issue of the Tulia Herald, headed, "Why I Am a Democrat."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM A DEMOCRAT

Despite our widespread learning and media for the dissemination of information, we Americans, in many instances, are grossly ignorant. How many of us, for example, understand the difference between Democrats and Republicans?

It isn't enough to say glibly that "They're all just alike" or make some other flippant observation such as "It isn't the party, it's the man." It would be more logical to say that "It isn't the church, it's the personality of the pastor."

When Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia was invited to speak at the Bethany College convocation, Bethany, W. Va., recently, he chose the subject, "Why I Am a Democrat."

Said Senator RANDOLPH, "First, I am a Democrat because I am young. Even though the years are magnified, I will be young with the Democratic Party."

"The Democratic Party, though the oldest political party in existence, is still the youngest in this country measured by vitality. Ours is the party of youth, for it sees the world in terms of its tomorrows while not relying entirely upon its yesterdays. Ours is the party with eyes in its forehead—not in its hindhead."

"In this respect I have sometimes thought that, rather than the elephant, a more appropriate symbol for the other party would be the vain and strutting peacock with a thousand eyes in its tail—all looking backward. However, the elephant, with much memory but little imagination, will do."

"The valid concepts of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—and most of them were valid—have become an enduring part of our national, political, and economic life, and have prevented the recurrence of the tragedies of the era of the thirties. Just as the great depression tested the assumptions of the philosophy of Let nature take its course—and found those assumptions insufficient, so has the period since World War II tested the basic principles of the New Deal—and found them valid."

Space prevents other comments of Senator RANDOLPH on his first point.

"There is a second reason why I am a Democrat," continued the Senator. "The Democratic Party is not afraid to dare. Our party, since its founding by Thomas Jefferson in 1794, has been willing to experiment in the public interest. And it is no accident of history that throughout our national life the significant surges of growth toward the realization of the American dream have been associated with the Democratic Party. It was Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party which routed the narrow mercantile philosophy of the Federalists. (I might add, parenthetically, that although Jefferson's party dropped the Republican suffix in 1828, one still finds a Democrat here and there who has not heard of that simplification.)"

"Before continuing with a discussion of the present challenge to the creativity of the Democratic Party, there is a third reason why I am Democrat. It is the party which embraces the broadest interests of the American people. And I say, with all respect—and some sympathy for members of the minority party—ours is the only really national party. During the dynamic 19th century industrial expansion, the concept of private property became identified with the ownership of factories, mines, and railroads. Thus, after the Civil War it was the powerful industrial and railroad barons who captured the Republican Party and defeated the hopes of Abraham Lincoln. Finally, during the 20th century, the concept of private property has again shifted under the development of the corporation as the major economic institution. And in this century we have found that the representatives of the major corporations have gained ascendancy in the councils of the Repub-

lican Party. The farmer, the small businessman, the worker, the aged and the unemployed may advance their claims only if the budget is balanced to the satisfaction of the dominant business executives.

"The property interests of the corporation are only a segment of the total area of the meaning of property rights. Without a fair price for his commodities, the farmer's property rights become an ironic jest—and a poor one."

"In thus recognizing a broader definition of property rights the Democratic Party has sought to extend the fruits of democracy to an ever-widening number of people. For this reason the Democratic Party continues to attract, in ever-increasing numbers, the farmer, laborer, the small businessman, the intellectual—and all those who look to the future, rather than to the past."

This is one man's reason for being a Democrat.

Radioactive Fallout on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made before the 15th Annual Convention of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., in Washington, D.C., on January 19, 1960, by Dr. Frank A. Todd, Assistant to the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture:

REDUCING THE EFFECTS OF RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT ON AGRICULTURE IN TIME OF EMERGENCY

In an age when nuclear weapons are a reality, we as a Nation should be prepared with as much knowledge as possible about protection and survival from an attack with these weapons. The primary responsibilities of agricultural leaders and farmers in such a catastrophe would be the protection of the farm people and the ability to produce the food and other crops necessary for existence.

Research is developing knowledge that would help to provide this protection. The study of nuclear weapons and their effects is a relatively new science, and it is understandable that not all of our information is definite at this time. However, research studies are extensive and our fund of dependable knowledge is growing rapidly.

One of the problems that is being widely studied to help agriculture survive a nuclear attack is the effect of radioactive fallout. And in approaching this problem we can start with the nuclear explosion itself.

NUCLEAR EXPLOSION

A nuclear explosion is accompanied by four destructive phenomena—blast, heat, initial radiation, and residual radiation. The first three are almost instantaneous while the fourth—residual radiation—produces its effects later and over a much longer period.

The area of destruction resulting from the blast, heat, and initial radiation will vary with the size of the bomb, the height of the explosion, and—to some extent—the terrain and atmospheric conditions. The size of the large bombs developed since World War II are expressed in terms of megatons. A megaton has the energy equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT.

When a nuclear explosion occurs close to

the ground, particles of earth, debris, and radioactive portions of the bomb—amounting to thousands of tons of material—are taken up into the familiar fireball and rise in the mushroom cloud. The maximum temperature of the fireball approaches that of the center of the sun—millions of degrees Fahrenheit. In the fireball, the particles of material are converted to gases and liquids. As these condense and solidify during cooling, they entrap radioisotopes formed from the bomb materials, and the resulting particles are thereby made radioactive. Other particles will not fuse, and may collect radioisotopes on their surfaces.

The heavier bits of debris begin falling in the immediate area shortly after the detonation and may continue for several hours depending on the meteorological conditions.

According to estimates, about one-half the fallout from an atomic explosion will return to the earth's surface in about 12 hours. The remainder may go high into the atmosphere—some may go even above the troposphere into the stratosphere—and gradually descend as fallout over a period of days or years. The size of the fallout particles, together with the wind, rain, and other atmospheric conditions, will determine largely when and where they will fall to the earth's surface. The fallout is a source of radiation that can be damaging to an area when it falls in large quantities.

In very general terms the region of severe local fallout contamination can be described as an elongated, cigar-shaped area extending downwind from the point of burst. The pattern will be extremely irregular in outline and contamination within the area is usually not uniform. There may be local areas of extreme danger, others with very little contamination, and all gradations in between. We can speculate on the causes for these variations—air currents, rain, and other weather conditions—but the exact cause is not certain.

NUCLEAR RADIATION

The danger of radioactive fallout is from the nuclear radiation emitted by radioisotopes produced by the explosion of the bomb. This radiation can pass into and through matter. When it does, it can change, damage, or destroy living cells through ionization—the production of electrically charged particles from cell constituents. Ionization resulting from radioactive fallout damages and destroys some of the constituents essential to the normal functioning of body cells. It forms products that may act as poisons to these cells. Furthermore, cells may lose their ability to divide and grow, thus inhibiting normal cell replacement in the body.

Thus nuclear radiation can damage or affect both living and inanimate matter, but it does not transmit the radioactivity to the affected matter. In our problem, the radioactive contamination is in the fallout itself. Once it has been removed, the irradiated materials are not contaminated thereafter, but the radiation damage to the living matter may persist or may not appear until later.

We are most concerned, of course, about the harmful effects of ionizing radiation produced in the cells of living tissue and biological systems. There are two types of hazards to animal tissue created by radioactive fallout materials: (1) External radiation and (2) internal radiation.

External radiation is the acute problem that would be faced at the time fallout first drops on an area. The major concern is with the shorter life isotopes that produce gamma rays, capable of traveling long distances. Internal radiation is the chronic problem created largely by the consumption of contaminated food and water. It is caused chiefly by longer life isotopes that produce beta rays which are capable of traveling only short distances. Once inside the body, they

can continue to damage the cells with which they come in contact. This radiation hazard is of major concern to agriculture since it can affect most food commodities.

Protection against both types of hazard are available.

PROTECTION FROM EXTERNAL RADIATION

There are three basic principles of radiation protection against external sources: Distance, time, and shielding.

Distance

The first natural protection is distance. As would be expected, the radiation exposure from a nuclear explosion or from fallout is less the farther away you are from the point of the burst or the source of radiation. This is true because the radiation is spread over larger and larger areas and diluted in strength as it travels away from the original point. The general formula applied is that the dose of radiation decreases through distance according to the inverse square law.

Time

The lapse of time is a natural protection against radioactive fallout. The total radiation hazard of the fallout begins to decrease immediately after its deposition. The various radioactive elements included in the fallout cloud decay at different rates, usually expressed in terms of their half-lives. Some isotopes lose half their radiation strength within seconds, hours, or days. Others decay at a much slower rate. For example, iodine 131 has a half-life of 8 days, while strontium 90 has a half-life of 28 years. In other words, iodine 131 has decayed to half its strength in 8 days while it takes 28 years for strontium 90 to lose half its original radioactivity. Therefore, the total radioactivity of fresh fallout decreases rapidly at first, but the rate of decay slows to a very low level after the shorter life elements have lost their radioactivity.

An approximate rule has been developed to estimate the decay rate of the mixture of all isotopes developed from a nuclear explosion. This rule follows that for every sevenfold increase in time following the detonation the radiation activity decreases by a factor of 10. Using this assumption a dose rate of 1,000 roentgens per hour at H/1 hour will decay to 100/hr at H/7 hours, to 10/hr at H/49 hours, to 1/hr at H/343 hours (approximately 2 weeks) and to 0.1/hr at H/14 weeks. The 0.1/hr exposure can be accepted in an emergency as relatively safe for work which must be carried on out-of-doors. This would result in about 1r/day exposure since part of the 24 hours would be spent indoors.

Shielding

The third protection is shielding. Farmers should be prepared to provide shelter from fallout for their families and livestock, as well as for their food, feed, and water. The most critical period of danger from radioactive fallout is the first 48 hours after detonation. However, in areas affected by heavy radioactive fallout, farmers should be in a position to provide shelter and uncontaminated food and water for their family and animals for longer periods. It might be advisable to stay within shelter—at least most of the time—for as much as a week or two.

Research experience indicates that a person on the first floor of an ordinary frame house in a fallout area would acquire about one-half the radiation dose received out-of-doors without any protection. Adequate protection would be found in an underground shelter with a covering of earth at least 3 feet thick.

DECONTAMINATION

Since radioactive materials cannot be destroyed, decontamination involves the transport of the source of radiation or contami-

nation. The fallout should be removed from a location where it is a hazard to a place where it can do little or no harm. Thus, there are two procedures: (1) removal and (2) disposal.

FARMERS' PROBLEMS

The farmer has two major responsibilities in the event of a nuclear attack.

First, to provide protection for himself and his family from radiation and fallout. He must provide adequate shelter, food, and water (at least 2 weeks' supply), sanitary facilities, and battery radio or some other means of receiving emergency information.

Second, he should provide protection for his livestock and poultry from radiation and fallout. This protection would include shelter, uncontaminated food and water, and buildings and other facilities for confinement until the radioactivity outdoors decays to a level that would be relatively safe for the livestock to be turned out.

For livestock, a good tight barn would reduce radiation dosage about one-half. But any kind of shelter provides some degree of protection. Proper use of shelter for animals can reduce the number of deaths from radiation by 75 percent or more.

Field experiments have indicated that total body radiation exposure of animals to from 300 to 600 roentgens provides a midlethal dose—or the dose level which you could expect to kill 50 percent of the animals within 30 days. However, there is a variation of tolerance among species of animals.

Table I gives the percent mortality of various species of unsheltered animals affected by exposure to different intensities of radiation. Table II shows the effects of shielding, using a two-story basement type barn with a loft filled with hay.

TABLE I.—Percent mortality of various species of unsheltered animals following exposure to a 24-hour radiation dose

Species	Percent mortality				
	100	80	50	20	0
Exposure dose in roentgens ¹					
Cattle.....	700	600	600	510	400
Sheep.....	600	600	520	440	350
Swine.....	610	530	460	390	310
Poultry.....	1,000	920	800	680	540

¹ Exposure dose in area where livestock and building are located.

TABLE II.—Percent mortality of various species of sheltered animals following exposure to a 24-hour radiation dose

Species	Percent mortality				
	100	80	50	20	0
Exposure dose in roentgens ¹					
Cattle.....	3,900	3,400	3,000	2,500	2,000
Sheep.....	3,400	3,000	2,600	2,200	1,700
Swine.....	3,000	2,600	2,300	1,900	1,500
Poultry.....	5,000	4,600	4,000	3,400	2,700

¹ Exposure dose in area where livestock and building are located.

In protecting feed and water, the objective is to prevent the fallout, which is the source of radiation, from becoming incorporated into the materials. This can be done by placing a cover over the feedstuffs or water. Grain stored in a permanent bin or ensilage in a silo are provided with adequate protection against fallout and the contents can be safely used when the farmer is able to get into the area to use them. The haystack in an open field can be protected with a covering such as a tarpaulin. The fallout will lodge on the tarpaulin, irradiate the

hay—just as it does the contents of the feed bin and silo—but by carefully removing the tarpaulin, the radioactive fallout will be removed. Although the hay would be irradiated, it would not be radioactive and could be used as a safe source of feed for livestock.

The use of standing crops such as grain, fruits, and vegetables subjected to fallout will depend upon the stage of growth—that is, whether they can be allowed to stand until radioactivity has decayed enough to make it relatively safe to get to them to harvest. If fallout is heavy, ripe, thin-skinned fruits may be lost because of the personal hazard involved in harvesting them. Thick-skinned fruits that do not have to be picked immediately and that can be peeled before eating, can probably be saved. They can be decontaminated with washing agents before marketing. Orchard trees should be maintained and the fruits examined for radioactivity before and after harvest. Leafy vegetables such as lettuce should not be eaten unless they are thoroughly washed and are known to be free of hazardous amounts of radioactivity. Growths of alfalfa and other feed crops standing in the fields at the time of the fallout might not be usable. Subsequent growths would be less radioactive.

Meat animals subjected to fallout may be thoroughly washed off to remove the external radioactive particles. If they are needed for food, they may be slaughtered immediately and the hides carefully discarded to prevent contamination of the edible parts. Because of the ingested and inhaled fallout, it will be necessary to discard the respiratory organs and the entire alimentary tract, along with the contaminated hide. The disposition of these contaminated parts should be determined after a more thorough radiological examination. If the area has been subjected to sublethal amounts of fallout, animals may develop signs of radiation sickness. In this case, they might be placed on clean, uncontaminated pasture and treated symptomatically.

HAZARDS OF INTERNAL RADIATION

The second phase of radiation hazard from fallout is internal radiation or the chronic exposure to the long-life radioactive isotopes, especially those that find their way into the food chain. These radioactive elements generally enter the bodies of animals and human beings with food and water.

At first, the principal sources of internal radiation is edible plants contaminated externally when the fallout first drops on the affected area. For livestock this would involve primarily forage grasses and legumes. For man it would involve fruits and vegetables. As time passes, and the contaminated food and feed are discarded, the principal source of internal radiation for animals and man is from the contamination in the soil which is absorbed through plant roots.

The radioactive isotopes of most significance as internal radiation hazards are iodine 131, cesium 137, and strontium 90. Many others produced by nuclear explosions are of minor concern because of the small amounts available, their extremely short half-life, and the fact that they are not incorporated into the food chain and hence do not affect animals and man.

Radioactive iodine is very similar to ordinary iodine. When it is consumed with contaminated plants it gets into the biological system. It collects in the thyroid gland. Children are more susceptible than adults to thyroid damage by radioactive iodine. In mammals it can be transferred to milk. Fortunately, this isotope has a relatively short half life of 8 days. Its radiation hazard has virtually disappeared in about 60 days. While the early acute hazards may be serious, there is general agreement among research scientists that iodine 131

will not be an important long-term fallout hazard.

Cesium 137 has a long half life of 30 years and is somewhat similar to the essential nutrient element potassium. When it is consumed and absorbed, it is found primarily in muscle tissue. But this radioisotope is not retained long in the body. It continually enters and leaves the system just as potassium.

Strontium 90, however, with a half-life of 28 years, is of primary importance. It behaves much like calcium in soils, plants, and animals. Atomic explosions produce large amounts of strontium 90. It is taken up in biological systems, secreted in milk, and collects in bones, where it remains for a number of years.

Just as other radioactive isotopes of fallout, strontium 90 falls on the surface of plants and can be consumed with contaminated foods and forage. Some of it enters the soil, remaining for considerable periods in the top several inches of uncultivated land. From here it is taken up by plants along with calcium, and when the plants are eaten by animals the radioactive strontium enters the bone and milk.

Fortunately, there is a protective factor termed the "discrimination factor." As the strontium and calcium move together through the food chain from the soil to the plant, through the body of animals to the meat and milk, and then through the body of man to its resting place in the bones, relatively more calcium than strontium is left. This is the natural discrimination between calcium and strontium. The findings of Comar show that if there are 100 units of strontium to each 100 units of calcium in plants, only 8 to 16 units of strontium for each 100 units of calcium would enter the bones of the human population.

Nutrition experts estimate that within the United States, from 70 to 80 percent of the calcium intake in our average diet comes from milk and dairy products. As the biological systems of both the cow and man discriminate between calcium and strontium, human bones accumulate only 34 percent of its hazardous strontium while it is getting 80 percent of its calcium from milk. From plants, the human bones get 15 percent of the necessary calcium while it is collecting 63 percent of the strontium content. In addition, we get about 5 percent of our calcium and 3 percent of the strontium 90 from meat.

Therefore, because milk is the outstanding food for building healthy bones and teeth, it would not be wise to recommend the substitution of another source of calcium in our diets, except under conditions of extreme emergency. In fact, the evidence available at this time would indicate that it is better to continue getting more of our dietary calcium from milk and less from plants.

(To digress for a moment—radioactive iodine is seriously damaging to young children and would be contained in milk produced in fallout areas. Therefore, milk from contaminated areas should not be consumed by children for about 60 days after the nuclear explosion to allow time for the decay of radioactive iodine. Such milk, under emergency conditions, need not be destroyed but can be converted into dairy products and stored for at least 60 days or until the radioiodine has decayed.)

Radioactive isotopes of strontium deposited in the bone probably can produce serious consequences, including bone cancer and leukemia. But since radiostrontium is assimilated in the bones, it constitutes essentially no genetic hazard for its radiations do not reach the reproductive organs in any quantity.

The question of whether there is a level of ionizing radiations under which there are no harmful effects to man has received considerable attention by many investigators.

The results as of today are generally inconclusive because measurements at low radiation levels are difficult to make. In general, the maximum concentration of strontium 90 in the bones recommended by the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement for atomic industry workers is one microcurie (very small measure of radiation) for a man whose body is estimated to contain 1,000 grams of calcium. Experiments with the reaction of animals to radiation indicate that appreciable increases in the number of bone tumors should not be expected to appear at less than 10 times this level. The average daily maximum permissible concentration (MPC) for peacetime consumption of food and water has been 80 strontium units. A strontium unit (s.u.) is one micromicrocurie of strontium 90 (Sr^{90}) per gram of calcium, or a millionth of a millionth of a curie of Sr^{90} per gram of calcium. The MPC is based on continuous intake. It was set by the International Commission on Radiation Protection.

Human beings under normal conditions constantly receive radiation from many sources. Cosmic rays, X-rays, potassium, and radium present in earth, bones, and wrist watches are a few of these sources. This background radiation contributes about 2 percent of the maximum level adopted by the International Commission on Radiation Protection as acceptable for large segments of the general population.

The exact long-term results of chronic exposure to internal radiation created by multibursts of modern nuclear weapons, under emergency conditions of an attack on populated areas, are not known.

RESEARCH

Reclaiming contaminated soil

Decontamination of soils is necessary only for the removal of strontium 90. Other biologically significant fission products either are taken up from soils by plants in much smaller amounts or have such short lives that decontamination is not necessary. In zones of heavy fallout, the most stringent decontamination measures available will be necessary in order to reduce the strontium 90 content of the soil to a level acceptable for production of vegetables and milk. (These products absorb a greater percentage of the available strontium 90 than others.) For production of other crops, or in zones of lighter fallout, it may be sufficient to use less effective practices which reduce the uptake of strontium 90 to a lesser degree. Obviously, heavily contaminated lands (over 1,000r/hr at H/1) should be placed in cultivation only when their use is absolutely necessary.

DECONTAMINATION BY REMOVAL OF GROUND COVER

Decontamination by the removal of ground cover is effective when the existing cover is thick enough. The cover provided by a sod or by a mulch consisting of two tons of oat straw per acre is practically complete. More than 90 percent of the fallout on sod or mulch may be removed by removing the sod or raking off the straw. Standing crops usually provide less complete ground cover, especially when young, and their harvest may remove only a small fraction of the fallout.

Contaminated crops could be disposed of by harvesting and baling to reduce their bulk. The bales must be stored where they will not contaminate other foods. The workers should avoid breathing the dust created by these operations by wearing respirators. Clothing should be kept as clean as possible. Thorough washing of the hands and face are necessary before eating.

The cover by the mulch illustrates the effectiveness of the level of two tons of oat

straw per acre. Less dense cover, of course, would provide less effective removal.

DECONTAMINATION BY REMOVAL OF SOIL SURFACE

The removal of soil surface is one of the most effective methods of decontamination, but it would be expensive and—with the procedures developed at this time—not suitable for large acreages. It might be useful if small clean areas are needed to produce food for survival.

The effectiveness of decontaminating surface soil by scraping ranges from partially successful for rough land to highly successful for smooth land. Rough, freshly plowed surfaces are difficult to decontaminate. Scraping off two inches of soil with a road grader may remove over 99 percent of the fallout from smooth soil, and only 60 percent from rough soil. Rough soil surfaces may be decontaminated more completely by scraping off more soil. Just as in harvesting, precautions against breathing dust and for cleanliness will be necessary.

The safe disposal of contaminated surface soil after removal is a serious problem. For the large volumes of soil involved, the only practical places for disposal appear to be pits in the center of small fields or regularly spaced ditches across fields. The pits or ditches would have to be protected from erosion and not used for crop production.

OTHER METHODS OF DECONTAMINATING SOIL

Several additional methods of decontaminating soils do not appear to be practical on a field scale. Among these are leaching and cropping soils to remove strontium 90. Leaching would require extremely large amounts of water and calcium salts or acids. In addition to removing strontium 90, plant nutrients would be leached out of the root zones and would have to be replaced. Cropping, even with those crops known to take up large amounts of calcium and strontium, would require more than 40 successive crops to achieve 90 percent decontamination.

REDUCING STRONTIUM 90 UPTAKE WITH SOIL AMENDMENTS

Additions of lime, gypsum, fertilizers, or organic matter in practical amounts usually reduce uptake of strontium 90 by less than half. Combinations of soil amendments and tillage practices may reduce uptake more than any single amendment would. The best use of soil amendments for maximum crop production is often the same as their best use for reducing strontium 90 uptake.

DILUTING CONTAMINATION BY LIMING

Another method of making contaminated soil more useful to agriculture may be by the addition of lime (or gypsum). The plant's need for calcium leads to the absorption of the similar element strontium. In soils low in exchangeable calcium, more strontium 90 will be taken up by the plant. By liming acid soils, more calcium is made available to the plant and less strontium 90 will be absorbed. It is useful on highly acid soils on which liming would be normally beneficial for other reasons. (Gypsum would be most useful on soils containing large quantities of exchangeable sodium, which would normally need lime or gypsum regardless of the strontium 90 hazard.) However, at best the strontium uptake can be reduced by the application of lime to about one-third the uptake if the soil were not treated.

Potassium fertilization at the rate of several hundred pounds per acre can also reduce the uptake of strontium 90. However, the calcium uptake by the plants is also reduced by this practice. Crop residues and manure applied at the rate of 20 tons per acre has reduced the uptake of strontium 90 by one-third.

RECLAIMING SOIL BY DEEP PLOWING

Decontamination by deep plowing would be aimed at turning the contaminated surface soil under to a depth of 18 inches or more—or below the root zone of the plants that are to be grown. Deep plowing might reduce the uptake of strontium 90 by about one-third compared to that without treatment in shallow-rooted crops such as grasses and many vegetables. It will be most effective when the freshly exposed surface soil has a high supply of calcium either naturally or by addition of lime or gypsum. However, before the method is used, careful evaluation should be made of the situation in the area and of the alternatives. Once strontium 90 has been plowed under, future removal is extremely difficult. Also, the productivity of some soils may have been drastically reduced.

Under field conditions, the uptake of strontium 90 may be greatly affected by its placement and that of calcium relative to the plant root system. Experiments are being initiated in which the strontium 90 will be plowed down as deeply as possible. The growth of the plant roots will be kept as shallow as possible by use of lime, fertilizer, and irrigation. The immediate goal of these experiments is to reduce strontium 90 uptake by a factor of 10.

SUMMARY

In short, we find that in the event of attack with nuclear weapons, the hazards of radioactive fallout to agriculture would be serious. But there are practical methods of protection. Even in areas of heavy radioactive fallout contamination, proper shelters for sufficient periods of time can significantly reduce the damages of external radiation to man and his animals. The long-term hazard of internal radiation is less acute but does present a chronic problem of major concern. Through the knowledge being gained by research, we could expect to reduce this hazard by the proper use of the land and its products that provide the Nation's food supply.

Controversy Between Matson Navigation Co. and Pacific Far East Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Pacific Shipper, entitled "Basic Matson-PFEL Issue Is Subsidy and Not Monopoly."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pacific Shipper, Feb. 22, 1960]
BASIC MATSON-PFEL ISSUE IS SUBSIDY AND NOT MONOPOLY

Our venerable policy has always been to take no sides in intramural shipping disputes, and we have no intention of revising it, now or in the future. This applies, of course, to the controversy between Matson Navigation Co. and Pacific Far East Line, which has gathered a lot of attention, in and out of the press, and has reached the U.S. circuit court of appeals, last stop before the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue is moot, and still before the courts, so that it would be improper for us to pass on it, even

if this were not contrary to policy as stated above. It also is dramatized by the sudden curtailment of the Hawaiian Marine Freightways Service, the third recent casualty of this route.

However, it is our duty, as we see it, to inform and interpret. We imagine there is confusion in the minds of the shipping public over the true nature of the Matson-PFEL controversy, and this confusion ought to be cleared up.

There is, as far as we are aware, no dispute whatever about anybody's right to compete with Matson in the Hawaiian trade under what we will call, for want of a better term, "ordinary circumstances." As a matter of fact, steamship companies have been bucking Matson on this route as far back as we can remember, which is too far for any pleasantries. Besides sporadic competition, the Los Angeles Steamship Co. for many years gave Matson a stirring, even if possibly losing, battle before LASCOR was absorbed by the older firm. Since the war, Hawaiian Marine Freightways and its two predecessors have been operated in direct rivalry, and while there has been heavy firing over rates and traffic, nobody has tried to exclude the newcomers. In short, whether Matson has or has not a monopoly may be for the courts to decide, but it is a simple statement of fact to say that it has not had a monopoly in the sense that any carrier, not otherwise obligated, was somehow disbarred. We pointedly refrain from identifying the right to compete with the ability to make a go of it. Legally, the distinction is important.

So, as may not be clear to the lay reader, the issue in the PFEL case is not monopoly as commonly understood; it is whether a subsidized operator in foreign commerce has the right to compete with an unsubsidized domestic operator. All domestic operators are unsubsidized. The Hawaiian case is not the first instance in which vessels subsidized on other segments of their routes have vied with domestic operators; the oldest familiar example that comes to mind is the incidental competition of transpacific or round-the-world vessels with intercoastal services.

It is to be noted that while the question of monopolistic transportation may have been introduced in the Matson-PFEL case, and while some of the news reports read as though this were the basic issue, what is really being debated is the right of a subsidized carrier to compete with a domestic shipping service. That is what we leave to the courts to determine; as it stands at this writing, the answer is in the affirmative.

On Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 870 to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States except the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and to authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof.

In that connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by C. Gordon Post, professor of political science. Professor Post is a member of the New York Committee to

Abolish Capital Punishment. His article appeared in the December 1959 Vassar Alumnae magazine:

ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By C. Gordon Post, professor of political science)

Master Barnardine, what ho! your friend the hangman! you must be so good, sir, to rise, and be put to death: Pray, Master Barnardine, awake, till you are executed, and sleep afterwards.—Measure for Measure.

Of the death penalty I find it difficult to speak with restraint. This obscene ritual of our society is no more than murder—premeditated, deliberated, and intended; "official" murder, to be sure, and done in theory by a vague abstraction called the United States or the State of New York or the State of California. The ritual involves a whole cast of characters: the legislators who provide for the death penalty, the jury which convicts, the judge who sentences, the prison officials who guard the victim and strap him in the chair, the priest, the executioner who throws the switch; they are all part of the ritual and they are all accessories. As long as we countenance this dismal and barbaric performance, we are all accessories.

So the deed is done. The guests depart, the executioner gets his fee, the body, if unclaimed, is consigned to quicklime, everything is tidied up. All can go to their rest with the feeling of a job well done and with assurance that society has been safeguarded.

And yet—and yet, in a poor and shabby section of the city, and while the pillars of society sleep, a woman who has been "two-timing" her sweetheart is slain with a bread-knife.

Thus, I express my feeling about capital punishment and thus I suggest its futility.

THE DETERRENCE ARGUMENT

The chief prop of those who favor retention of capital punishment is that it is a unique deterrent.¹ Sir James Fitzjames Stephen stated this view very clearly in 1864: "No other punishment deters men so effectually from committing crimes as the punishment of death. This is one of those propositions which it is difficult to prove, simply because they are in themselves more obvious than any proof can make them. It is possible to display ingenuity in arguing against it, but that is all. The whole experience of mankind is in the other direction. The threat of instant death is the one to which resort has always been made when there was an absolute necessity for producing some result. . . . No one goes to certain inevitable death except by compulsion. Put the matter the other way. Was there ever yet a criminal who, when sentenced to death and brought out to die, would refuse the offer of a commutation of his sentence for the severest secondary punishment? Surely not? Why is this? It can only be because 'All that a man has will he give for his life.' In any secondary punishment, however terrible, there is hope; but death is death; its terrors can not be described more forcibly."

The argument of deterrence is centuries-old. In the 18th century, Blackstone asserted that the death penalty set "a dreadful example to deter others." William Paley, author of a profoundly influential book, Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, declared that the object of punishment was not the satisfaction of justice, but "the prevention of crimes." "Sheep-stealing, horse-stealing, stealing of cloth from tenters or bleaching grounds, by our laws," he said, "subject the offenders to sentence of death: not that these crimes are in their nature

¹ In this paper I am concerned with capital punishment for civil offenses, not for treason or other political offenses.

more heinous than many simple felonies which are punished by imprisonment or transportation, but because the property, being more exposed, requires the terror of capital punishment to protect it."

In the 19th century, the Chief Justice of England, Lord Ellenborough, held that capital punishment "ceases not to hold out that terror which alone will be sufficient to prevent the frequent commission of the offense." To the same effect, Lord Chancellor Eldon declared that he was "rather of opinion that it is not from the circumstances of the severity of the law being put into execution to the fullest extent, so much as the imaginary terrors of it on the mind, that produces the abhorrence of crime."

The same argument is frequently voiced in our own century. In the Canadian report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Capital Punishment (1956) it is said that the committee was impressed by the support given the death penalty by law enforcement officers who felt that "it was an effective deterrent to murder." At a hearing of the New Jersey Assembly Judiciary Committee on bills to abolish capital punishment (1958) a police chief stated emphatically that "capital punishment is a deterrent."²

At this point there are two important questions to ask. The first is: Is capital punishment in fact a deterrent? Obviously, it is not. When a murder is committed, and many are committed in the United States every year, capital punishment has failed as a deterrent; and its failures can be numbered.

The second and more important question is: Is the great mass of law-abiding people in the United States deterred from committing murder by the death penalty? Its successes cannot be numbered. To this second question there is no conclusive answer. There are, however, certain trends, certain facts, certain observations which cast serious doubt upon the claim that the death penalty is a general deterrent.

TREND AWAY FROM THE DEATH PENALTY

There has been a trend toward abolition of the death penalty for civil murder. The States which have either abolished capital punishment by law or have allowed it to fall into disuse by a policy of reprieve are as follows: Austria (1950), Belgium (1863), Denmark (1930), Finland (1949), West Germany (1949), Holland (1870), Iceland (1944), Israel (1954), Italy (1948), Luxembourg (1822), Nepal (1931), Norway (1905), Portugal (1867), Rumania (1864), Sweden (1921), Switzerland (1942), U.S.S.R. (1947), the Argentine (1922), Brazil (1891), Colombia (1910), Costa Rica (1980), Dominican Republic (1924), Ecuador (1897), Honduras (1894), Mexico (1928), Panama (1903), Uruguay (1907), Venezuela (1863), and Queensland (1922).

Of the 49 States of the Union, there are 8 in which the maximum penalty for murder is life imprisonment: Michigan (1846), Rhode Island (1852), Wisconsin (1853), Maine (1887), Minnesota (1911), North Da-

kota (1915), Alaska (1957), and Delaware (1958).³

In western Europe, it will be observed, only Spain, France, and the United Kingdom continue to make use of the death penalty for civil murder, and in the last named State, its application has been curtailed by the Homicide Act of 1957.

This movement or trend, if such it may be called, must indicate that in the minds of many peoples there has been, and is, great doubt as to the general deterrent effects of the death penalty. Many of the States aforementioned have known no executions for civil murder for decades; if there had been a considerable and continued increase in the murder rates at any time following abolition, the death penalty would no doubt have been restored. But with the abolition of the death penalty there has been no general and

continued rise in the murder rates. In the words of Prof. Thorsten Sellin, of the University of Pennsylvania, "whether the death penalty is used or not, both death penalty States and abolition States show rates which suggest that their rates are conditioned by other factors than the death penalty." After extensive study of the evidence from foreign countries, the recent British Royal Commission concluded "That there is no clear evidence in any of the figures we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has led to an increase in the homicide rate, or that its reintroduction has led to a fall."

The following table, the work of Professor Sellin and taken from the Report of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment (1949-53), is illuminating:

Homicide death rates (1920-48) per 100,000, in selected American States

Year	Michigan, abolished	Ohio	Indiana	Minnesota, abolished	Iowa	Wisconsin, abolished	North Dakota, abolished	South Dakota ¹	Nebraska
1920	5.5	6.9	4.7	3.1	1.7	1.7			4.2
1921	4.7	7.9	6.4	4.4	2.2	2.2			4.9
1922	4.3	7.3	5.7	3.6	1.8	1.8			4.5
1923	6.1	7.8	6.1	2.9	2.1	2.2			4.1
1924	7.1	6.9	7.3	3.2	2.7	1.8	2.1		4.4
1925	7.4	8.1	6.6	3.8	2.7	2.3	2.0		4.0
1926	10.4	8.6	5.8	2.2	2.3	2.6	1.8		2.7
1927	8.2	8.6	6.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	1.6		3.5
1928	7.0	8.2	7.0	2.8	2.3	2.1	1.0		3.7
1929	8.2	8.3	7.0	2.2	2.6	2.3	1.2	(1)	3.0
1930	6.7	9.3	6.4	3.8	3.2	3.1	3.5	1.9	3.5
1931	6.2	9.0	6.5	2.9	2.5	3.6	2.0	2.3	3.6
1932	5.7	8.1	6.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	1.2	1.6	3.7
1933	5.1	8.2	5.6	3.5	2.9	1.9	1.2	1.7	3.2
1934	4.2	7.7	7.1	3.4	2.3	2.4	1.6	3.0	4.4
1935	4.2	7.1	4.4	2.6	2.0	1.4	2.3	2.0	3.4
1936	4.0	6.6	5.2	2.3	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.2	2.5
1937	4.6	5.7	4.7	1.6	2.2	2.2	1.6	.1	2.0
1938	3.4	5.1	4.4	1.6	1.4	2.0	2.4	.9	1.6
1939	3.1	4.8	3.8	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.2	2.8	2.1
1940	3.0	4.6	3.3	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	2.2	1.0
1941	3.2	4.2	3.1	1.7	1.3	1.4	2.3	1.0	2.1
1942	3.2	4.6	3.2	1.7	1.2	1.6	1.4	.9	1.8
1943	3.3	4.4	2.8	1.2	1.0	1.1	.6	1.4	2.4
1944	3.3	3.9	2.8	1.4	1.7	.9	.9	1.6	1.3
1945	3.7	4.9	4.0	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.0	2.0	1.2
1946	3.2	5.2	3.9	1.6	1.8	.9	1.5	1.1	2.1
1947	3.8	4.9	3.8	1.2	1.9	1.4	.4	1.0	2.2
1948	3.4	4.5	4.2	1.9	1.4	.9	.9	2.0	2.5

¹ Capital punishment restored, 1939.

THE NATURE OF THE MURDERER

A third observation has to do with the nature of the murderer. Most homicides are committed without any consideration of the death penalty. Most murderers do not premeditate, deliberate, and intend the death of another; in most cases, murder is the unhappy end product of anger, frustration, jealousy, despair, alcohol, pity, or sex. In the report of the California subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on Capital Punishment, it is said that "From data from the State bureau of criminal statistics it appears that, of the 93 men executed between 1945 and 1955, 52 or 55.9 percent had no known prior criminal record other than misdemeanors. Twenty-five of them had no record even of misdemeanors. The point is that, in the

majority of cases, these executed men were not of the habitual criminal class. Their homicides were in the nature of explosive incidents."

Beyond the "explosive incident," Dr. Bernard Glueck, Jr., psychiatrist at Sing Sing, holds that "no person in our society is in a normal state of mind when he commits a murder." Another psychiatrist, Dr. Isadore Zifferstein, of Los Angeles, has declared: "Psychological studies have shown that the vast majority of those who have been executed for capital crimes were very sick people mentally." Similar testimony is to be found in all reports of legislative committees concerned with the problem of capital punishment.

If what the psychiatrists tell us is true (and there is no reason to doubt their findings), how can the death penalty be a deterrent? If the murderer's action is compulsive, if what he does is in the heat of passion or dissension, in explosive rage or torment, if he is the product of a broken home and broken spirits, if he is a psychoneurotic or a schizophrenic or a mental defective, how, then, can be restrained by capital punishment?⁴

⁴ No consideration has been given here to the legal definition of insanity, which is antiquated and not in accord with medical knowledge.

² The police chief thought, that the lives of policemen in line of duty would be greatly endangered if the death penalty were abolished. Mr. Herbert L. Cobin, president of the the Prisoners Aid Society of Delaware, has very kindly sent me a statement summarizing the findings of Thorsten Sellin and Donald Campion, S.J., on this question. "It is obvious," said Professor Sellin, "from an inspection of the data that it is impossible to conclude that the States which have abolished the death penalty have thereby made the policemen's lot more hazardous."

³ Several States have abolished capital punishment and then restored it: Iowa, Kansas, Colorado, Washington, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Arizona and Missouri. Maine abolished in 1876, restored in 1883, and reabolished in 1887. Professor Sellin is of the opinion that "the main reason for the restoration of capital punishment was always the same; something happened which aroused popular feeling, probably quite irrationally, and the Legislature rushed into imposing the death penalty." See Report of the Royal Commission, pp. 374-375.

THE MAD DOG DOCTRINE

There are those, however, who believe that insane or not, the murderer, like a mad dog, should be quietly eliminated. Sir Ernest Gowers, chairman of the recent Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, in his book, "A Life for a Life?" quotes an army colonel and two doctors to this effect. The colonel declared, "When the further existence of any person is clearly against the public interest, and still more when it is a positive menace to the community, as in the case, for example, of a murderer who is held to be insane, it is folly to keep him alive. He should be dealt with as humanely as we deal with unwanted domestic animals now. * * * To one doctor, capital punishment "is a practical decision to remove permanently from the community a person who has made himself unsuitable to continue in it"; to another doctor, "When the criminal has no moral sense and is a true psychopath, he should be regarded as a human refuse, dangerous to society, and quietly and humanely dispatched." No good to themselves, no good to the community, a burden at least, possibly a threat to others, let us rid ourselves of them.

"Such doctrines," it is declared in the Report of the Royal Commission, "have been preached and practiced in National Socialist Germany, but they are repugnant to the moral traditions of Western civilization and we are confident that they would be unhesitatingly rejected by the great majority of the population of this country. We assume the continuance of the ancient and humane principle that has long formed part of our common law," namely, that if at the time of his unlawful act, a person is so mentally disordered that it seems unreasonable to impute guilt to his act, he ought not to be held responsible under the criminal law.

There appear to be three functions of punishment: Retribution, deterrence, and reformation. Obviously, if a man is executed there is no opportunity for reformation. There is serious and sound doubt as to the validity of the death penalty as a deterrent. Thus, we are left with the one function which modern penology has discarded, namely, retribution—the lex talionis, an eye for an eye, retaliation, revenge, call it what you will.

"We have," declared Sir John Anderson, "over the years, fortunately succeeded to a very large extent, if not entirely, in relegating the purely punitive aspects of our criminal law to the background." Buried but not dead, retribution is covered with the mythical flowers of deterrence whose color of plausibility blinds men to the fact that capital punishment is society's vengeance.

THE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE

Edwin M. Borchard in "Convicting the Innocent," quotes a district attorney as saying, "Innocent men are never convicted. Don't worry about it, it never happens in the world. It is a physical impossibility." A comforting thought, were it true.

Late in 1949, Mrs. Beryl Evans and her baby daughter, Geraldine, were murdered in their flat, located in a London slum. In January 1950, the husband, Timothy John Evans, was tried at the Old Bailey for the murder of his child, and a large part of the evidence presented in court was directed to show that the accused had strangled his wife, the prosecution contending that whoever murdered the mother must necessarily have murdered the child. Evans, an illiterate, mentally subnormal lorry driver, at first had confessed and later retracted his confession, at the same time accusing John Christie, the chief witness for the Crown, of the murders. Christie's testimony was crucial; Evans was found guilty, and on March 9 he was hanged.

In 1953, the Crown's chief witness in the Evans case was arrested and tried for the

murder of his wife. An investigation of Christie's flat and outbuildings brought to light the bodies of six women, including Mrs. Christie's, all of whom Christie admitted having strangled. He confessed to the murder of Beryl Evans but denied killing the baby; whether he did or not must be placed in the category of "not proven." At any rate, Dr. J. A. Hobson, who examined Christie and to whom Christie originally confessed several murders, has had this to say: "It is unfortunate that I did not question Christie more fully about his killing of Mrs. Evans, but at that time my primary interest was to establish Christie's insanity. It is even more unfortunate that I was refused access to him after his sentence. * * * I feel that it is more than likely that he would * * * have told me how he had murdered baby Geraldine."

The home secretary who wrote on Evans' papers, "The law must take its course," has voiced a hope "that no future home secretary, while in office or after he has left office, will ever have to feel that although he did his best and no one would wish to accuse him of being either careless or inefficient, he sent a man to the gallows who was not guilty as charged," all of which is no consolation to Timothy Evans.

With all of our procedural safeguards, there is still the possibility of error. This may be due to improper identification; a witness may lie or he may be the victim of defective observational powers. It may be due to an overzealous prosecutor or police. Expert testimony can be unreliable, and an inflamed public opinion may insist upon a conviction.

Borchard discusses eight trials for murder in which no crime whatever had been committed.

There is much room for error in our criminal trials; and where the accused is put to death, error discovered later cannot be remedied nor amends made. The literature is replete with cases of men who were found guilty of murder, sentenced to die, and then reprieved; and who later were found to have been innocent. The opportunity of establishing one's innocence is gone with the springing of the trap or the throwing of the switch.

On March 15, 1957, at 10 a.m., Burton Abbott was scheduled to enter California's gas chamber. A reprieve was granted at 9:10 to permit the defense to present an appeal. The appeal was denied at 11 o'clock and at 11:15 Abbott was placed in the chamber. At 11:20 the secretary of the reprieve board notified the prison that the board had changed its decision. But Abbott was dead.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The alternative to capital punishment is life imprisonment which in England means from 8 to 12 years, and in the United States, an indefinite sentence, the prisoner being released on parole when this move is considered appropriate.

The argument is sometimes put forth that life imprisonment is a punishment worse than death. This is a specious argument. Decades ago, prison conditions were bad, horrible, but I daresay that, even then, imprisonment was preferable to death.

It is also argued that murderers would make the problems of prison administration more difficult and constitute a source of danger to prison personnel and prisoners. The evidence gathered from far and wide by the Royal Commission refutes this contention: "murderers are no more likely than any other prisoners to commit acts of violence against officers or fellow prisoners or to attempt escape; on the contrary, it would appear that in all countries murderers are, on the whole, better behaved than most prisoners."

Of course, a man who is incapable of reform or who is criminally insane or dangerously psychopathic ought never to be turned back to society; but with all other murderers

the object of punishment should not be annihilation but reformation. Even the murderer deserves his chance and society should accord him this chance; for it is not too clear that the rest of us are without responsibility, without guilt.

CONCLUSION

My story ends. It is not a complete story; that would be impossible in a space so brief. It does, I hope, suggest a few of the reasons why I oppose capital punishment.

For those who wish to pursue the matter more broadly and more deeply, there is appended a list of books which may be helpful.

One last word. Capital punishment, however you look at it, is brutal, sordid, and savage; it is unworthy of a civilized people.

In our time, we have witnessed an almost unprecedented savagery in Europe and elsewhere; in our own country, we see and hear brutality, brutality, brutality, over television and radio; in motion pictures and so-called comic books, brutality is common fare. Without being a pessimist or a Cassandra, I lament and resent this pernicious influence.

We resent the "third degree" because it is brutal; we resent a lynching, not only because a man has been denied a fair trial, but because it is brutal; we resent a bully because he is brutal.

Let us make clear to our own people, and to the world, that we detest brutality by the abolition of a sentence which cannot reform and which does not, on the evidence available, deter.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration From 1750" (Vol. I, The Movement for Reform), Leon Radzinowicz, London, Stevens & Sons (1948). For a knowledge of the background of capital punishment, no work surpasses this volume.

"Report, Royal Commission on Capital Punishment," 1949-1953, London, H.M.S.O. (1953). This is a solid, factual, balanced, and comprehensive consideration of capital punishment. It is a "must" for those who would be informed on the subject.

"Murder and the Penalty of Death," edited by Thorsten Sellin, in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia (1952). This issue consists of a series of factual articles on murder and the death penalty and edited by America's first authority on criminal statistics.

"Reports on Capital Punishment, Corporal Punishment, and Lotteries," the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons, Ottawa, the Queen's Printer (1956). An excellent factual report but not as comprehensive as the British report.

"Problems of the Death Penalty and Its Administration in California," report of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on Capital Punishment, the assembly of the State of California (1957). A brief report consisting of statistical evidence, the social and psychiatric status of men executed in California, and an account of the testimony presented at the hearings of the committee.

"First and Second Public Hearings on Assembly Bills Nos. 33 and 34" (Abolition of Capital Punishment), Assembly Judiciary Committee, Trenton (1958). This mimeographed material consists solely of the verbatim testimony of 24 witnesses who appeared before the committee. Most of these witnesses were opposed to capital punishment.

"Capital Punishment in the 20th Century," E. Roy Calvert, London and New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1927). This book, which very forcefully presents the case against capital punishment, has become a classic.

"Convicting the Innocent," Edwin M. Borchard in collaboration with E. Russell Lutz, New Haven, Yale University Press (1932). A most interesting account of the miscarriage of justice in 65 cases.

"Not Guilty," Jerome Frank and Barbara Frank, New York, Doubleday & Co. (1957). More cases of the miscarriage of justice.

"Reflections on Hanging," Arthur Koestler, New York, The Macmillan Co., (1957). This book, in a sense, is a popularization of the report of the Royal Commission, but it is an extremely superior popularization, and highly readable. It is an excellent piece of work, well-documented and balanced, and reveals, quite rightly, the indignation of a man who feels strongly against capital punishment.

"A Life for a Life?" Sir Ernest Gowers, London, Chatto & Windus (1956). A brief statement of the case against the death penalty by the Chairman of the Royal Commission, 1949-53.

"Capital Punishment as a Deterrent: and the Alternative," Gerald Gardiner, London, Victor Gollancz (1956). This work of less than a hundred pages may be useful to those who wish a rapid review of the problems.

"Reflections on the Guillotine," Albert Camus, Michigan City, Ind., Fridtjok-Karla Publications (1959). "To assert, in any case, that a man must be absolutely cut off from society because he is absolutely wicked is the same as saying that society is absolutely good, which no sensible person will believe today." An essay on capital punishment by the 1957 Nobel Prize winner.

"The Offenders," Giles Playfair and Derrick Singleton, New York, Simon & Schuster (1957). The authors relate the stories of six crimes which serve as a basis to present the case against legal vengeance.

"Star Wormwood," Curtis Bok, New York, Alfred A. Knopf (1959). Part novel, part tract, this is the story of a young man charged with murder, a story interspersed with essays on such subjects as legal insanity and medical insanity and the futility of capital punishment.

"The Man on Your Conscience," Michael Eddowes, London, Cassell & Co. (1955). A study of the Evans murder trial.

"Hanged—and Innocent?" R. T. Paget and S. S. Silverman, London, Victor Gollancz, London (1953). A study of the Rowland, Bentley, and Evans cases.

"Report and Recommendations of the Special Commission Established for the Purpose of Investigating and Studying the Abolition of the Death Penalty in Capital Cases," the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, House Document No. 2575, Boston (1959).

A Thing of Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, poetry is the language of the soul. Too seldom do we commit it to memory, read it, and rejoice in it as a source of strength. In the lines of a poem we touch hands with the great.

I sometimes fear that we are losing our appreciation and love for poetry and prose, and perhaps, if this be true, it is a symptom of the weakening of the moral and spiritual fiber which is becoming so apparent in our national life. I have always been a lover of verse. I cannot write it, but I can cherish it and learn from it. Poetry serves to strengthen my ideals, my pride in American's past, my hope in her future. It gives me a closer tie with my Maker and

my fellow man. I believe that it can have the same effect upon others.

Mr. President, today and from time to time in the days and years ahead I shall supply for the record bits of verse and prose which, having given me strength for the day and courage for the trials, may do the same for others. Today, I think it best to reflect, if we might for a moment, upon the beauty of some well-known lines by John Keats; which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the lines were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A thing of beauty is a joy forever:
Its loveliness increases; it will never
Pass into nothingness; but still will keep
A bower quiet for us, and a sleep
Full of sweet dreams, and health, and quiet
breathing.

Therefore, on every morning, are we wreathing
A flower band to bind us to the earth,
Spite of despondence, of the inhuman dearth
Of noble natures, of the gloomy days,
Of all the unhealthy and o'er-darkened ways
Made for our searching: Yes, in spite of all,
Some shape of beauty moves away the pall
From our dark spirits. Such the sun, the
moon,

Trees old and young, sprouting a shady boon
For simple sheep; and such are daffodils
With the green world they live in; and clear
rills

That for themselves a cooling cover make
'Gainst the hot season; the midforest brake,
Rich with a sprinkling of fair musk-rose
blooms:

And such too is the grandeur of the dooms
We have imagined for the mighty dead;
All lovely tales that we have heard or read:
An endless fountain of immortal drink,
Pouring unto us from the heaven's brink.

An Adequate Little Red Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read an excellent editorial in the March issue of the Air Force magazine relating to the current debate on the adequacy of our national defense. Mr. John F. Loosbrock, editor of the magazine, does a fine job of assessing the situation. He opens his statement with the astute observation that "perhaps the one encouraging aspect of the current debate over the national defense program is that it is occurring at all." The editorial concludes on the warning note that "adequacy is synonymous with mediocrity."

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Air Force magazine, March 1960]

AN ADEQUATE LITTLE RED DETERRENT

(By John F. Loosbrock, editor)

Perhaps the one encouraging aspect of the current debate over the national defense pro-

gram is that it is occurring at all. Only a few months ago it appeared that the subject, as a matter of political debate, would be lost in the fog of peace and prosperity. Indeed, only an incurable optimist would conclude that the defense issue will rate very high in the political ledger for very long. But a useful purpose is being served by the current discussion. No one wants defense to become a political football, but it is a matter of the public interest and therefore deserves and demands full and complete public airing.

Quite apart from the exigencies of partisan politics, which are obvious and comparatively easy to sift out, three major factors tend to hide or confuse the central issues:

The President's personal assumption of the role of the Nation's most highly qualified military expert.

The separation into neat boxes, marked respectively "war and military" and "peace and civilian," of vital problems which cannot be solved satisfactorily so long as they are thus separated.

The obvious conviction of the administration that private prosperity is synonymous with national power and, further, that achievement of private prosperity should rank No. 1 on the list of national goals, with peace and security following as natural afterthoughts.

No analysis of the welter of conflicting facts and opinions that are being offered as evidence in support of, or attack on, current defense policies can be useful unless these factors are given full weight in assessing the arguments in the debate.

In the first instance, the President has defended his program by pointing to his personal expertise in military matters and has attacked the views of responsible military leaders who disagree with him as "parochial." Both positions are open to question in the context of the situation to which they were addressed. Military experience must be added up in terms of when it was acquired and under what conditions. Experience gained during and before World War II does not necessarily contribute significantly to solving strategic problems of today. It cannot be dismissed out of hand, but it is manifestly unfair to draw upon it to criticize today's military experts as parochial whippersnappers. Today's generals are not necessarily right. Indeed, they do not agree completely among themselves. But neither should they be dismissed with the cavalier implication that they are necessarily wrong. If it is to be a matter of an ex-general's military judgment against that of the current crop, the very least the public is entitled to is an assessment of what might happen to it should the President prove to be wrong.

As to the second factor, the artificial and arbitrary dichotomy established between military and civilian requirements in certain important areas is serving only to compromise both requirements and needlessly confuse the American people. There are many examples, the one that first leaps to mind being the uneasy and unprofitable cleavage between the exploitation of space as necessary means to military ends and its exploration for peaceful, civilian purposes. The cleavage exists in other areas, such as the battle of well-meaning but shortsighted groups to preserve the freedom of the airways for the Piper Cub, with small regard to the defense needs of the Nation. It exists in the relegation of the problems of arms control to those who have only a hazy understanding of the nature of modern arms. It erodes our overall deterrent posture by placing shelter against radioactive fallout in a neat pigeonhole labeled "civil" defense, as if it had nothing to do with the avoidance of, as well as the survival after, a future war.

Perhaps the foregoing are but symptoms of a more insidious disease which is ravaging our national fiber—the idea that we can somehow reap the fruits of private compe-

tion and personal freedom while neglecting the will to win in the public and international arenas. We are told about the "adequacy" of our defenses. We are told not to worry about being second best in missiles and space—that "you can't win 'em all." We are told that the steps needed to maintain this Nation in first place militarily, educationally, economically, and technologically are too expensive, that they will encroach on our personal liberty and turn the Nation into an armed camp.

Well intentioned as this position may be, it is dangerous and misleading. Worse, it evidences a lack of understanding as to where the true roots of national power lie. One does not assess the true strength of a nation by the wealth of its inhabitants, by the numbers of chickens in the pot, cars in the garage, or even by the prospect, as a recent magazine advertisement put it, that "every family should have a second home."

We should be proud of a system that has produced so much good for so many people. But in our pride we cannot balk at whatever sacrifices might be required to protect our system. We cannot become so obsessed with picking the fruit that we neglect to fertilize the roots. We cannot give the same weight in the national power equation to the plastic franistan that we give to an equivalent dollar's worth of missiles, or classrooms, or digital computers.

Regardless of what the various indexes of wealth indicate, a nation that looks on them as guides to greatness has taken the first step downward. In Greek mythology, the maiden Atalanta challenged would-be suitors to a footrace—the prize to be Atalanta herself or death. She bested all comers until shrewd Hippomenes distracted her with the three golden apples of Venus. Right now we are so busy picking up the apples that we forget there's a race to be won, with death the loser's prize.

Wine connoisseurs call a worthy vintage great or noble. Adequacy is synonymous with mediocrity. Let's not rest easy then when we're told not to worry, when we're told that, after all, we still have an adequate little Red deterrent.

Solutions to Farm Issue Numerous but Elusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Mr. John Knight, the very distinguished former publisher of the Chicago Daily News, who still is the publisher of a very distinguished number of newspapers in Michigan, Ohio, and Florida, on Saturday of each week writes what is known as "John S. Knight's Notebook," for the editorial columns. One of his recent "Notebooks" bears the heading "Solutions to Farm Issue Numerous but Elusive." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN S. KNIGHT'S NOTEBOOK—SOLUTIONS TO FARM ISSUE NUMEROUS BUT ELUSIVE

A charming city lady who knows a thing or two about public affairs said to me the other evening:

"I read your editorial on the farm question and didn't understand a word of it."

The remark was understandable, since few people, including most urbanites, politicians, and editors, have the faintest comprehension of this much belabored subject.

But since the editorial appeared, we have been deluged (in a newspaper office that means 25 to 30 letters) with communications from farmers and others who have positive, if not always clear, views on every aspect of the farm problem.

Last week, Editor Bob Myers of the Lapeer (Mich.) County Press cited Michigan State University statistics to show that better-than-average farmers in his State made only about \$2,400 in labor income during the good year of 1958.

Bob resents attacks on farm subsidies, since "little is said about the much greater subsidies we pay to labor in the form of minimum wages, unemployment pay, tariffs on competing foreign manufactured products and featherbedding."

TWENTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LIMIT ON SUBSIDIES

In asking Bob Myers and other interested reader to offer possible solutions for abuses of the farm subsidy system, it seems we started something.

Most of the letters are too long for printing in their entirety, but here are excerpts which reflect the thinking of these readers.

C. D. Jones of Lauderdale says that subsidies should be limited—possibly to \$25,000. He concedes this would require close policing of dummy corporations but says wryly that the bureaucrats would like it, since more workers could be put on the Government payroll.

Speaking of the "ridiculous uses" of the soil bank plan, Mr. Jones thinks land should have a previous record of cultivation to qualify for payments. He would encourage marginal farmers, through education, to move into other occupations.

FERTILIZER LOBBY HAS AN ACCUSER

R. A. Hill, of Detroit, attributes the "farm subsidy scandal" to the lobbyists, "a brand of microbe" operating with money supplied by the chemical fertilizer companies.

Mr. Hill says they talked the "spineless politicians" into making the farm laws read acres * * * when it should have read bushels, tons, or bales. He accuses these same lobbyists of promoting poison sprays which he says are killing off all our wildlife.

Another view comes from Urban Meyer, of Lombard, Ill. Mr. Meyer says his biggest complaint is that "farm subsidies do not consider individual needs as do unemployment compensation, minimum wages, and tariffs. The farm subsidy is like paying a corporation president unemployment relief because his company shows low profits."

Mr. Meyer, who is in the coal and fuel oil business, thinks the law of supply and demand should apply to farmers. If they can't make it, let them close up. "Why," he continues, "should they have more help than the coal man?"

CANADIAN FOOD EXPORTS BLAMED

Now 68-year-old Arthur Simmons, of Kingston, Ill., has his say.

Mr. Simmons discusses inflated land values, and says it is impossible today for a young man to buy a farm as they did in his time with the help of a friendly banker.

"Your Michigan friend was right," adds Mr. Simmons, "your Sylvia Porters and all the rest sit idly by and condone higher steel costs and every other cost while the farm population is dropping into the serf class."

Mr. Simmons' suggestion is that every farmer should cut production of corn by 10 percent, but thinks the Government should pay taxes on land taken out of production.

G. L. Weber, a farm appraiser from Flint, Mich., deplors the way "both political parties

have bartered and traded millions of dollars to gain the farmers' vote over the years."

He is critical, too, of importing agricultural commodities from Canada "when we have such staggering surpluses in this country."

Note: It costs \$1,500,000 a day to stabilize wheat prices.

Mr. Weber believes a farmer must have at least 177 to 209 tillable acres * * * "to make a decent profit from his operations." He says the farmer should have more protection from the Michigan Highway Department which takes over farming land for road development and pays unfair and inadequate damages.

Harry Dibell, contemptuous of Government procedures, offers "my most sincere contribution" for the farm mess. "Buy a good 18-inch scoop," he says, "and give it to a man of courage and strength to use on the Agriculture Department even though the building collapses."

"If you think," he continues, "that the mess isn't in the Department, and hasn't accumulated over the last 7 years, I will be glad to have you interview some bankers, agricultural agents, farmers, and grainmen."

Mr. Dibell is from Wolcott, Ind.

Then we have Howard Reich, of Unionville, Mich., who says he is "a small, full-time dirt farmer." Mr. Reich says: "I don't have an answer for the farm problem either, but I think the farmer gets blamed for a lot he cannot help."

Mr. Reich recalls an article in the Readers Digest showing how, as he remembers it, "the six largest payments to farmers were over \$300,000 each while the average for the entire United States was less than \$100."

CORPORATE FARMS HOG THE SUBSIDIES

Enclosed with Mr. Reich's letter is an article by Arthur Mauch of Michigan State, analyzing the \$6.8 billion budget for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Mauch claims that less than a third of this budget "can be charged directly to the farm program," although he concedes that another \$1.4 billion goes into farm research, loans to farmers and conservation programs.

The rest of the budget, Mr. Mauch contends, should be charged to the Departments of State or Welfare, since nearly \$3.3 billion is spent in foreign disposal, storage costs, and interest, donations to needy people at home and abroad and for school lunch programs.

Mr. Mauch concludes his article with this admission: "These facts do not answer the questions of whether we are spending too much or whether we are getting our money's worth—but they do throw some light on who gets the benefit."

FARMER FAVORS LICENSE SYSTEM

A final contributor to our forum on the farm problem is Kenneth Geiger, of Clinton, Mich.

Mr. Geiger, like the rest, sees the farm question as a prime example of political bungling.

He considers the farmer to be unfairly taxed, and the victim of unfair competition from hobby farms which need not show a profit to stay in business.

Without pretending to have the answer, Mr. Geiger suggests three things:

1. Government licensing of all full-time farmers. He says this would eliminate most of the unfair competition and is no more un-American than the closed shop in industry.

2. An overhaul of the tax system to put farmers on an equal basis with urban neighbors.

3. Make farmers immune from antitrust laws which prohibit him from protecting himself through organization.

Then oddly enough, Mr. Geiger says these suggestions are "a place to start the long

process of getting the Government out of agriculture."

ONE THING CLEAR: THE PAY IS POOR

So there you have it from the grass roots. After reading these contributions, I share the confusion of the city lady who "didn't understand" last week's farm editorial.

Still, it is fair to conclude that the average full-time farmer isn't getting rich at the taxpayers' expense. For all his labors, he earns less than school teachers or factory workers.

Secondly, the subsidies paid to big farmers constitute a national scandal, as do the Federal income tax exemptions granted to huge farm cooperatives such as the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul.

According to Time, this group began with only \$30,000 in capital and now has a net worth of \$40 million. It has bought out privately owned, taxpaying businesses unable to compete and FUGTA annual reports reveal \$29 million in profits since 1950.

STOP BLAMING THE LITTLE GUY

I suspect the people of this country will still be discussing the farm problem years after this administration and a long line of succeeding administrations have departed.

At this moment, there appear to be some solutions in sight for the more flagrant abuses of the farm subsidy system.

But which party, or which politician other than the President, has the guts to apply the drastic corrective measures which are needed?

Until reasonable limits are placed upon the size of Government subsidies received by the big landowners, often not in residence, let's stop carping at the little guy whose full-time farm operation enables him to make a living, and not much else.

The Ninth Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's trip to Latin America, ending today, has surely created a better climate of understanding between the countries of South America and ourselves.

Vast responsibilities lay ahead for him, but the kind of service that he is rendering is of incalculable aid in strengthening our ties of friendship throughout the world.

These sentiments are ably spelled out in the accompanying editorial, which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, March 6, 1960, and I believe we should all read the well written words of the editorial writer:

THE NINTH GREEN

When President Eisenhower got out of his helicopter at the ninth green of the Dorado Beach Club on Friday he was, as he said, "bushed." He was also, as he showed when he addressed the Caribbean Assembly after lunch, somewhat hoarse. The fatigue and the hoarseness came from his exacting trip to four Latin-American countries. If his voice was poor it was, as he explained, because he had "left it all in South America."

He had left other things in South America. He had left a new kind of friendship which everybody, except a few hundred or a few dozen youthful fanatics, fully understood. He had made no startling new proposals. There is nothing new, for example, in the wording of the so-called Declaration of Montevideo which says that "both countries will endeavor to increase their economic, social, and cultural cooperation directly and through international organizations."

Yet the feeling persisted that there was something fresh in the Eisenhower message, as explained during the preceding 10 or 11 days. Ambassador German Arciniegas, who represents Colombia in Italy, told the Caribbean Assembly that the President's recent statements "give hope of a radical change in policy toward Latin America."

As far as the President's speeches went, there may have been a change in attitude rather than in policy. We are no longer the indulgent but domineering elder brother, if ever we were such. At Dorado Beach the President emphatically rejected "any thought of the United States alone developing a so-called master plan for raising living standards throughout the hemisphere." He did not deny that "the countries of Latin America desperately need long-term financing of their development projects, technical assistance in their planning and execution, escape from dependence on one crop or one mineral . . . and an end to inflation." But what he seemed to have in mind was that they wouldn't have to sell pencils to get these things. As in other parts of the democratic world any aid we may give to Latin America should be, as one reads the President's speeches, cooperative and for our mutual good.

The ninth green at the Dorado Club is approximately a halfway point in the President's final rounds of diplomatic golf. He still has to attend a summit conference in Paris. He still has to go to Moscow and return Premier Khrushchev's visit. He hopes to go to Tokyo. There is much journeying ahead for him, much fatigue and no doubt some hoarseness as he breathes the dust of half a dozen new countries.

But he is rendering in his last year in office a kind of service for which he is temperamentally fitted and for which he seems now to have the necessary physical strength. Others will work out the details of policy. In his arduous journeyings he has created a better climate for the diplomatic tasks that still lie ahead.

Creation of State Orchestra in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in recent months the University of Wisconsin has been formulating plans for a praiseworthy cultural adventure, the creation of a symphony orchestra for the State of Wisconsin. Such an ensemble would bring the pleasures of high quality orchestra music to cities all over the State while providing the benefits of a resident orchestra to population centers like Madison and Milwaukee. The orchestra would be attached to the University of Wisconsin, which has earned a

national reputation for its hospitality to the arts through its artists-in-residence program which in recent years has included the Pro Arte String Quartet, concert pianist Gunnar Johansen, and painter Aaron Bohrod, who have won international acclaim for their accomplishments. This new concept of a State orchestra would bring further benefits to the State.

In the New York Times for March 6, 1960, their chief music critic, Howard Taubman, describes and praises what he terms this "bold plan for the creation of a State orchestra." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for Mr. Taubman's article to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORCHESTRA FOR A STATE—UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN HAS BOLD PLAN FOR CREATING BIG ENSEMBLE TO SERVE COMMUNITIES IN WISCONSIN

(By Howard Taubman)

A bold plan for the creation of a State orchestra has been formulated at the University of Wisconsin. It has not yet been implemented because it requires substantial sums of money. But its merits are so great that it would be a pity if the scheme were not translated into reality.

Wisconsin looks like a promising testing ground of an ensemble formed to serve a State instead of a single city. It has, despite its producing a shabby, reactionary adventurer like Joseph McCarthy, a tradition of openmindedness. Its university has for years maintained a pianist, a string quartet, and a painter in residence. In various communities there are 22 civic orchestras, which, though almost entirely amateur, offer proof that music has numerous practitioners and admirers.

The position of Milwaukee, the largest city, is a key consideration. For a long time it has relied on the visits of the Chicago Orchestra for symphonic performances of professional caliber. Although a Milwaukee ensemble has been formed recently, it is a modest affair. When you consider that the city prides itself on being the home of the Braves, you wonder that it has lacked the vigor to build its own major-league orchestra. Indeed, if you run down the names of cities that will maintain major-league baseball this year, you find that only Milwaukee is without a professional orchestra of similar pretensions.

Aware of its backward situation, Milwaukee apparently has endorsed the notion of a State orchestra. The city, which could organize its own professional ensemble if it chose, evidently is willing to integrate its needs with those of the State. If this is true, it should be a decided impetus to the plan. Milwaukee has invaluable resources to contribute.

The principal inspiration, however, has come from the University of Wisconsin. Its faculty has done most of the planning. Its president and regents have voted their approval. Its facilities would be at the orchestra's disposal.

The proposal grew out of the Peninsula Musical Festival held in Fish Creek each August. For 3 weeks Thor Johnson and a professional orchestra present a series of programs that has won the support of summer residents in Door County as well as visitors who come specially for the concerts. The festival draws its financial sustenance from local business and individuals. Why could not many Wisconsin communities join to support a statewide orchestra that would serve them all?

The idea of centering the effort in the university is well conceived. The university has functioned on the principle that "the limits of the campus are the boundaries of the State." In many fields such as agriculture, conservation, business, and government, this theory has been realized in practice.

AVAILABLE TO STATE

Thanks to its recent expansion, the university is prepared to help make an orchestra available to the State. Besides its chief base in Madison, the university has a second campus in Milwaukee, an active extension division, 8 branches where regular courses are given, a noncommercial network of 10 AM and FM radio stations and an experimental television station serving the Madison area at present but likely to offer State coverage eventually.

The plan calls for turning over the responsibility of operating the orchestra to the university, which would act as sponsor and guarantor, would receive and spend all funds, would define general policies, and would administer all activities. Conductor and instrumentalists would be employees of the university. They would be engaged on a year-round basis, integrated into its table of organization, and teach as well as perform.

In cities like Milwaukee and Madison there would be extended series of concerts each year. In medium-size towns there would be modest series. Small places would have occasional visits for children's concerts or events designed for adults or possibly both. College towns would certainly be on the orchestra's annual itinerary either for single concerts or series. The peninsula festival would be among the ensemble's assignments.

In the original draft of the plan, a membership of about 40 to 45 players was envisaged. With such a unit the baroque, classic, and early romantic repertoires could be encompassed, as could a good deal of the modern. Big works requiring a large instrumental apparatus would be bypassed except on special occasions when additional players could be hired.

It is easy to sympathize with the planners who foresaw that such an ensemble could be of notable service in "extending and raising the level of music culture" and "giving instructional service of high caliber."

In the latter category the orchestra, it has been predicted, would open up the following possibilities that cannot be pursued sufficiently, if at all, with student groups: accompanying oratorios by campus choral groups; supplying orchestral accompaniments to student and adult opera presentations; playing concertos with advanced student performers and serving as a laboratory group for advanced instruction in conducting; trial of new works, and experimentation in orchestration.

PROBLEM OF FINANCING

Like so many noble plans, this one has not yet solved the problem of financing. Its assumption has been that the money, something like \$370,000 for a year's budget, could be raised from receipts at the box office, donations from industry and individuals and grants from National and Wisconsin foundations.

It is one thing to list sources of income; it is a graver challenge to tap them. For the moment the plan remains on paper because its drafters have not found the funds with which to start activities. Because they have not been insured a large initial sum, they now are thinking of starting more modestly with an ensemble of 20 to 25. They believe that the reduced budget, about half of the original estimate, could be met in Wisconsin.

A less ambitious beginning would be better than none. But one regrets that a brave idea must be diminished at the outset. There ought to be money for this plan. It ought to be forthcoming from State and

municipal treasuries in Wisconsin as well as private sources in the State. The national foundations should also welcome a chance to back a scheme that might become a model for other States without professional ensembles.

An orchestra built to serve an entire State could become as proud a possession as a major-league ball club. And making it part of the State university is in accord with the growing trend to have these institutions become sturdy guardians of the arts as well as propagators of mighty football aggregations.

Rumanian Enslavement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1945, 15 years ago yesterday, the Communist tyrants seized control of Rumania. As a member of the special congressional committee investigating Communist aggression in 1954 I heard the testimony of hundreds of witnesses at our hearing in this country and Europe all exposing the Soviet aggressions.

The coming meeting at the summit the No. 1 question on the agenda should be "freedom for the captive nations."

On August 9, 1954, our committee submitted 12 major findings based on the testimony. These facts are as true today as they were 6 years ago.

I hereby submit seven of those findings:

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Based upon the testimony and other evidence thus far presented to the committee, at hearings held in Chicago, New York, London, Munich, and Berlin, the committee makes the following preliminary findings:

1. Communism never has come to power by legal or by democratic processes in any of the areas now under its ruthless domination. It uses the tactics of penetration, subversion, threat of military invasion, and finally occupation by military and political elements under the direction and control of the Kremlin.

2. Once communism seizes control it immediately seeks to clothe itself with respectability and legality by conducting so-called elections which are in no sense of the word free elections guaranteed by the secret ballot. Moreover, the results are predetermined long in advance of the first vote cast.

3. Communism is able to maintain control over the peoples it enslaves only by the exercise of the most brutal and inhuman methods known to mankind, such as wholesale arrests and deportations, forced famines, mass killings, and the crime of genocide against entire nations. The former Crimean Autonomous Republic (Crimean-Tatar Republic) and the former autonomous Republic of Chechen-Ingush and Kalmuk are specific examples of the crime of genocide.

4. Life under communism is one of ruthless and absolute tyranny. The state is god. The dignity and inherent rights of man have no place under communism. The free world is losing the battle for the minds and allegiance of youth in the countries and areas under Communist domination.

5. As far as the Communists are concerned, treaties, mutual-assistance pacts, nonaggression

pacts, or solemn covenants are mere scraps of paper. Agreements or pledges made at the conference table are broken any time such action serves the Communist table for world conquest.

6. Communism is a conspiracy which utilizes an extensive and complex international criminal mechanism. It seeks to destroy all free nations and to replace them with a system of Red colonialism.

7. The peoples of the captive nations and other areas under Communist control are by tradition overwhelmingly anti-Communist. They desire their national independence and are still friendly to the free world. However, witness after witness testified that time is working against us and that in many important respects anti-Communist-sponsored programs and activities were not producing the desired results.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to learn the thoughts of Ana Pauker, the Communist leader of Rumania, at that time. The following is verbatim from our committee report:

This being the plan the Communists are working to prepare the new generations in the subjugated countries for the fight against the West. At the same hearings, Princess Helena added the following:

"Ana Pauker explained to me that you looked at a country as at a field which you wanted to plant with new seed, and therefore you had to work it all over and burn everything on it and then plant new seed. And she said, 'Of course this takes a long time. Therefore we have to terrorize the older generations into silence, so that they do not dare to speak to the young ones and to remember, so that the young ones would not have any memory whatsoever of times past; that their minds should be absolutely empty of anything but what the Communist regime wanted to plant in it. And that is why,' she explained to me, 'they had to use torture, imprisonment,' because I asked her whether she thought she was convincing anybody. She said she was not interested in convincing anybody, that that was a waste of time, and that they did not try to convince. That was a thing they used only in the so-called free countries but in the country which they occupied, they were not going to be bothered with convincing."

Mr. Speaker, I also submit for the RECORD a letter I received last week from Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,

New York, N.Y., March 2, 1960.

The Honorable RAY J. MADDEN,
U.S. Representative From Indiana.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We will be deeply grateful to you if you could, as you have always so kindly and understandingly done in the past, call to the attention of the House the plight of the enslaved Romanian people.

This 6th of March 15 years will have elapsed since the Soviets installed through fraud and violence the Communist puppet government which still tyrannizes the country. The absence of any firm stand on the part of the Western allies against Russian aggressive encroachments in Europe, led to the consolidation and international acceptance of this subjugation. Churchill's memoirs even state that in the case of Romania an agreement took place between London and Moscow by which the Russian domination of the country was assured. Let us hope that in the future memoirs of Mr. Macmillan there will not be found the same sort of deal with Moscow regarding Germany, which could legitimately be feared by what the columnist Joseph Alsop (Washington Post, Feb. 29, 1960) has defined as the British permanent pleading "for a do-nothing policy at turn after turn of the unfolding Berlin crisis."

The strengthening through recognition of the Communist government in Romania has been followed by one of the most cruel pages of Communist oppression in a formerly free nation. To give merely two examples: the Catholic Church was abolished wholesale and its hierarchy doomed through the process of imprisonment and other Soviet liquidation methods; the democratic leaders of Romanian political and civic life were also the victims of the same extermination tactics, of which deportation and forced-labor camps were among the principal means.

The Congress of the United States reacted to those horrors and the underlying political issues by its investigations and recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, of which you, Mr. MADDEN, have been an outstanding member. The recommendations of your committee have never been acted on in any way. But strangely enough the administration's policy in this matter was finally expressed as a liberation through peaceful means. What those peaceful means were and are is, as in Churchill's words, an enigma wrapped in a mystery.

Instead of the peaceful means recommended by your committee as a road to liberation from communism, the administration took the opposite, that of consolidating communism in the subjugated countries.

Has continued recognition of nonrepresentative Soviet stooge governments been a peaceful means of liberating the enslaved peoples? Has the acceptance of these same puppet governments in the United Nations after their constant violation of the U.N. charter, been another peaceful means of liberation? Have trade, cultural relations or other exchanges with the Communist oppressors, helped the liberation of the oppressed people? Will the further enhancement of the international status of the Soviet stooge governments by their equation at the conference table with the Western powers in Geneva, March 15, be a new peaceful means of liberation?

Unfortunately the whole policy of the West toward the former free nations has had nothing to do with their liberation, but have served to peacefully strengthen the Russian dominion over a large part of Europe.

At this sad anniversary, we Rumanians, as well as the other East Europeans, fervently hope that the political recommendations of the Committee on Communist Aggression will at least be taken into consideration at this crucial moment of an approaching Summit Conference. This would be the wise course you have so strongly advocated during the last 5 years.

We warmly thank you for your unfailing sympathy and understanding.

I remain yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

"Reaffirmation of Our Faith in the Nation": Creed Adopted by National Baptist Convention, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on September 12, 1959, the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., which comprises

a constituency of 5 million American citizens, or about a third of the Negro population of our country, adopted a "Reaffirmation of Our Faith in the Nation." Because of its deep rootage in our finest religious precepts and its clear expression of their hope and determination to work for freedom, the dignity of man and equality of opportunity for all, I ask unanimous consent that this creed be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAFFIRMATION OF OUR FAITH IN THE NATION

(By J. H. Jackson, president, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., pastor, Olivet Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., Sept. 3, 1959)

THE CREED

1. We believe in the United States of America: land of opportunity, a country dedicated to freedom and democracy.

2. We believe in its Constitution: the supreme law of the land.

3. We believe in the right of all citizens to participate equally according to their several abilities in all the cultural privileges, in all the political and economic affairs of this great Republic.

4. We believe that all citizens should take their full share of the responsibility in building a greater, stronger, and better America for the weal of man and to the glory of God.

5. We believe that segregation and discrimination based upon race, national origins, or religion are not only sins against the fundamental laws of the land, but also against the Supreme Law Giver. We must continue to fight the sins against human freedom without apology, without compromise.

6. We are convinced that every State has far more to gain by applying the principles and the ideals of the Federal Constitution at the local level.

7. We believe that no race or group should be discouraged for seeking to improve their mental, economic, political, and moral status but rather should be encouraged and guided since the development of a part contributes to the enrichment of the whole. To neglect a minority greatly weakens the Nation as a whole handicapping the majority and penalizing those in places of power and influence.

8. We believe that a voluntary togetherness of the race based upon constructive and creative ventures is desired and should be encouraged in the interest of the preservation of racial values and the growth of the group as a whole within the democratic framework of the Nation.

9. We believe that our leaders, our organizations, and our press should more and more recognize the presence and the positions of a vast number of white people who are dedicated to the laws of this land, who are ashamed of the sins being committed against the soul of the Nation, who are working for the growth of democracy and who are suffering for the fulfillment of America's dream of freedom.

10. We also believe that all minority groups should be willing to cooperate with other people of good will whenever and wherever they are committed to the task of upholding the laws of the land, defending the country's cause, working for complete democracy, and a full victory for freedom.

11. We believe that the battle for freedom is not only America's battle but also the battle of all humanity supported by the moral laws of the universe and by the God who made out of one blood all races of men to dwell in peace on the face of the earth.

And the struggle must move forward to victory since right is right and God is God.

12. We believe that first-class citizenship is essential for the realization of a first-class democracy and that a first-class democracy will give first-class freedom in which will be developed first-class personalities, first-class people, first-class thinkers, and first-class statesmen; all of these working together will build a first-class social order of good will, justice, understanding, and peace.

13. While we believe in the separation of Church and State, we believe in the Christian Church not only as a community of believers held together by a common loyalty to Jesus Christ but also a redemptive influence and a vital part of the soul of the Nation.

14. We believe in God, the Creator of heaven and earth; we believe in the dignity of man, in the triumph of justice, and in the victory of truth.

Sewage-Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, editorial support is expressed by the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier for the action of this body in sustaining the President's veto of H.R. 3610, the so-called water pollution control bill. As one who voted to sustain the veto, I am glad to include as part of my remarks the following editorial, which appeared in the February 28 edition of the Courier:

THIN LINE HOLDS TO SELF-RELIANCE

The only possible justification for a Federal sewage control program would be Washington's responsibility for the coordinated improvement of watercourses which cross State boundaries.

Yet during debate on the Democratic bill to raise to \$900 million the amount of Federal funds to be spent for this program, critics proved that most of the money in the past had merely been used to help cities build treatment plants which they should have built without Federal help.

Minority Leader HALLECK, for example, showed that 571 projects previously approved for Federal grants, only 12 involved interstate, coastal and Great Lakes waters.

"I challenge anybody to get up here and deny that project after project has been approved over the country that involved the construction of sewage plants that had absolutely no connection with any sort of stream on which you could catch a fish or run a boat," HALLECK declared.

Nobody challenged his statement. And apparently the economy bloc which functioned last year is again in operation (although somewhat weakened by election-year fears). For the House failed by 22 votes to override President Eisenhower's veto of the extravagant and unnecessary sewage-aid bill.

We would rather have Federal aid for sewage treatment plants (where Federal control would be no issue) than Federal aid for schools. But the constant attempt to pass local problems to Washington represents a breakdown in the character of the people. Self-reliance was formerly an American trait. Now it can be promoted only with a Presidential veto.

Drug Probers Hunt Headlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Drug Probers Hunt Headlines." The article was written by Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune, and was published on February 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUG PROBES HUNT HEADLINES

(By Donald I. Rogers)

A few weeks ago this column revealed the tactics of press agency employed by the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department in dropping a 7-year-old charge of conspiracy against the Socony Mobil Oil Co. and we moralized to the effect that the Government seems to feel privileged to cast doubts on the integrity of any American industry, but never obliged to omit its error when proved wrong. In the case of Socony, after the Government lost its case, it revealed the court decision over the 4-day New Year's weekend, thus insuring that the story would be played down in most newspapers and missed by most readers.

Industry, which keeps most of us employed, pays most of our taxes, has contributed mightily to our freedom and is directly responsible for the high standard of living in this country, is at a distinct disadvantage any time it deals with many branches of the American Government, a phenomenon which must not only astound but please the enemies of the enterprise system.

The latest incident is clearly demonstrated by the recent conduct of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, that experienced adversary of capitalism who, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, has been "probing" prices set by the drug industry. His tactics leave the lingering suspicion that he is less interested in learning the truth about drug prices than he is about garnering headlines which, while discrediting the drug industry, portray KEFAUVER as the shining hero.

RESPONSIVE DUPES

As in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, the newspapers of America are responsive if not willing dupes in the conspiracy to mislead the public. And this, too, is strange for Time magazine in its current issue, reveals that there are 1,361 working reporters in Washington, the largest number assembled at any point in the world. Time also suggests that many, if not most, of them lean to the political left, which may account for some of the great gaps in coverage.

Like all other congressional committees, the Kefauver group selects its witnesses carefully to assure getting articulate people with strong leanings. The public expects this. What the public may not suspect, however, is that the appearance of the witnesses is timed to coincide with newspaper deadlines, thus assuring coverage for those who espouse the favorite point of view, and effectively silencing those who do not.

A case in point was the calling before the Kefauver subcommittee of one Mike Gorman, a former newspaperman who now

serves as executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness. Gorman was called to talk about tranquilizers, a misnomer for these drug items are anything but a placid subject in this political year.

Urged by KEFAUVER, Gorman immediately soared off his launching pad, slashing into the high cost of drugs and the general deterioration of the pharmaceutical manufacturers.

WINS HIS HEADLINES

For the record, Gorman is a layman. He knows no more about tranquilizers than you do. He has no background to entitle him to speak as an authority.

His charges were covered widely and indeed wildly in the afternoon newspapers and were picked up by the morning papers the following day. KEFAUVER had won his headlines.

Late in the afternoon of the same day that Gorman testified, the subcommittee listened to Dr. Henry Brill, Deputy Commissioner of Hygiene of New York State. Dr. Brill, a national medical authority, wasn't at all critical of the drug industry and had some nice things to say about it.

But his appearance was late and his testimony failed to make most of the morning newspapers the following day. Since his was a "second-day story," it appeared in only a smaller number of afternoon newspapers.

This seems strange when Gorman himself described Brill as "one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on drugs, without dispute."

The contrast between the views of the layman, which were widely reported, and those of the expert, which were not, are something for you, the voter and the consumer, to contemplate. After having done so, you may judge whether Senator KEFAUVER, who is being paid with your tax money, is acting sincerely in your behalf. Certainly, you may feel that because of the "timing" of witnesses, something that is controlled by KEFAUVER, you are not getting both sides of the story.

CHARGES VERSUS REBUTTAL

Gorman charged, among other things, that the "high price of tranquilizing drugs at the corner drugstore has a disastrous effect upon thousands of mental patients." He added: "Mr. Chairman, with a full realization of the seriousness of this charge, I accuse the pharmaceutical industry of America of contributing to the return of thousands of mental patients to mental hospitals, because of the high price of tranquilizing drugs."

Late in the day, after the subcommittee had won its publicity and scored its point in the gullible press, Dr. Brill gave the other side of the story—the one that the American public didn't get to read.

In New York State, Dr. Brill said, the traditional annual increase in numbers of mental patients was "suddenly reversed" after the start of large-scale treatment with tranquilizers several years ago. "The favorable change has continued," he said, "and has advanced during the next 4 years, and we find now that both for inpatient and outpatient work, tranquilizing drugs are indispensable to the operation of a mental hospital system."

PRICES GOING DOWN

About the prices of tranquilizers, Dr. Brill said, "there has been a definite tendency for the cost of each medication to fall at least somewhat during the passage of time."

It costs, at State prices, about \$50 a year to treat the average out-patient with tranquilizing drugs, compared with about \$1,500 to keep him hospitalized, Dr. Brill said. Patients who are dismissed from State hospitals can obtain needed tranquilizers at a retail price averaging \$3 to \$5 a week. When

this cost is too high, he said, the State is willing to supply the drug to the patient without charge.

He added that many discharged patients, who give the cost of drugs as a partial reason for being readmitted to mental hospitals, are, as mental patients, engaging in what he called "rationalization."

In other words, they're nuts.

The Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a speech written and made by Miss Judith Kester, a senior student in the Oshkosh (Wis.) High School, entitled "The Voice of Democracy."

Miss Kester represented the State of Wisconsin at a dinner given in Washington recently for the 50 State winners who participated in the 13th annual voice of democracy broadcasting script-writing contest.

The speech follows:

Democracy is a mighty word,
A strong and powerful word;
Its nine letters capture the basic elements
Which are America,
Forming them into Democracy,
Creating the life-blood of our existence,
The pulse of our American way of life.
I am an American;
I speak for Democracy;
D is the beginning of Democracy—
D means, to me, Decision,
An unwavering determination to work for
Democracy—
To stand our ground;
Seeing a Khrushchev swagger and pout and
proselytize
Makes us thank God for freedom, and
strength to resist, and a free press.
We guard against inner decay and outward
aggression,
Because sincerely and surely, my heart says
Democracy does the most, cares the most,
means the most.
D is Decision.
E means Enthusiasm,
The pride we show in our Democracy;
"My country, 'tis of thee"—
Yes, I sing of Democracy.
In schoolrooms all over the land, children
sing enthusiastically of Democracy,
Only half-comprehending, yet feeling the
wonder, the power of it—
Not mere flag-waving and parade-watching,
But a creative, constructive enthusiasm.
M is for Maintenance,
What I must do to maintain the priceless
gifts
Earned by the
Battles and bloodshed,
Fortitude and fearlessness,
Sweat and toil,
Tears and love of our forefathers.
"Vigilance is the price of survival"—
This thought must dwell with me every day;
I must remain steadfast
In the midst of hot words, cold wars, and
international strife.

O stands for Opportunity,
The chance we, as Americans, have
To grow, to learn, to think, and to earn for
ourselves,
Baby-sit, wait on tables, earn a million
dollars;
But we conform only when personal princi-
ple is not sacrificed;
Our talents find release:
We can become artists, teachers, farmers,
ministers, doctors,
On the basis of personal qualification;
Ambition and skill are all-important,
Not the arbitrary dictates of a self-appointed
power.

C is for the Constitution,
A written guarantee,
Like an insurance policy,
Entitling each of us to rights and privileges;
But the strength of a Constitution
Depends upon the willingness of the people
to support it;

And we are the people.
What must it have cost
Those courageous ones who framed it
That we might speak freely, write without
unreasonable censorship, worship as
we choose.

Because—
We are Americans.

R is for Responsibility;
The obligations each of us has
To pull the voting lever after intelligent
thought,
To support our schools,
To take part in government;
Realization of our responsibility animates
Democracy.

A is for Abundance—
Material abundance, seen in
Sun-kissed fields of swaying grain,
Milk bottles at the back door,
Crowded dime store windows,
Fresh laundry,
Hamburgers and ice cream,
TV sets and golf clubs.
Spiritual abundance, felt and heard in
Prayers and smiles,
Songs and sympathy,
Charity and friendship,
Church bells and weddings,
Handclaps and security.

C is for Citizenship,
The realization that all good things require
effort;

Not only making rules, but living by them;
Taking an active interest in the community;
Being flexible, but not radical,
Being openminded,
Shattering prejudice,
Choking corruption,
Voicing opinions.

Y is for youth.
Let Youth be thinkers and doers,
Not branded and classified
Beatnik, defeatist, delinquent—
Let youth learn to know and to love the
great land that we live in;
For soon we shall stand in the high places,
holding the reins;
Today but a whisper, tomorrow youth's
voice shall be heard as Democracy's
shout.

"Champions of Liberty"—Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today,
Monday, March 7 marks the 110th anni-

versary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder-first President of Czechoslovakia. Our Government, in recognition of Masaryk's fight for Czechoslovak democracy, authorized that the sixth of the "champions of liberty" postage stamp series honor this great patriot, and it is very fitting that these stamps be first placed on sale here in Washington today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I gave to the Masaryk Champion of Liberty Commemorative Committee and to the Czechoslovak National Council of America be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

I am happy to join with all of the members of the Czechoslovak Societies of the United States on the occasion of the 110th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder—first President of Czechoslovakia.

Today, Czechoslovaks and friends of the Czechoslovak democratic spirit recall the dramatic rise of Thomas G. Masaryk from a humble Czech and Slovak parentage to respected professor of philosophy at Charles University in Prague, and his meteoric career as representative of his people in the Austrian Parliament while the Czech and Slovak lands were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

His leadership during World War I, along with the assistance of Eduard Benes, a Czech, and Milan Stefanik, a Slovak, and other fighters for freedom, led to the uniting of efforts to secure an independent Czechoslovakia.

On October 28, 1918, diplomatic support and world public opinion crowned with success his efforts when the Czechoslovak National Committee in Prague made effective a declaration of Czechoslovak independence. We recall that under his presidency, 1918-35, the Czechoslovak Republic, although beset by many internal and external difficulties, became a notable example of a modern state pursuing social progress through democratic methods and playing an important part as a small nation in international affairs.

Today, we revere his memory as the father of the Czechoslovak Republic, and although the Czech and Slovak peoples do not now enjoy the internal democratic freedoms they once had, I feel certain that his aspirations and his love of liberty are part of the national heritage of all Czechoslovaks and will never be forgotten by those who love freedom.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of Czechoslovakia on the occasion of his 110th birthday, March 7, 1960:

It is a privilege for me to join with the large number of my colleagues who are today, March 7, paying tribute to the

life of service and to the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of Czechoslovakia on the 110th anniversary of his birth.

No man in modern European history has made a greater contribution to the cause of freedom than did President Masaryk. His sacrifice and his work in behalf of democracy and human liberty should not only be an inspiration to his enslaved fellow countrymen in Czechoslovakia, but to all of us in the Western World, as well.

It is my hope that his spirit shall continue to live in the hearts and in the minds of all Czechoslovaks, as well as all other freedom-loving people everywhere in the world.

What Kind of Farm Program Do Farmers Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that over the years the task of finding a solution to the farm problem has become increasingly difficult.

As we well know, there have been efforts to solve it by legislation; too, there have been—and still are—attempts to make it a political football.

Fundamentally, however, I believe the job can be done only by applying sound economic principles to the farm situation.

The laws of supply and demand must again be allowed to find their way to the top of the heap, if there is to be a real lasting solution.

We realize, of course, that the stimulus to production created by Federal programs during the national crisis contributes to our current condition. However, the crisis has been over for almost 15 years. Yet, we have not succeeded in finding our way back to a sound agricultural program.

Because of the significance of a healthy agriculture, not only to our farmers, but to the whole economy, we cannot afford to pull the rug out from under our farm people. However, it is high time we found a realistic solution to the farm problem, based on sound economic principles.

In attempting to meet the challenge, it is of course important that we seek from the farmers themselves their ideas on what should be done.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist—a 110-year-old "voice of agriculture," with a long history of farm opinion polls—published the results of a poll among farmers on the question: "What kind of farm program do farmers want?" Recognizing the need for closely staying attuned to the farmer himself on these matters, I ask unanimous consent to have the poll printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF FARM PROGRAM DO FARMERS WANT?

What do farm folks think about farm programs? What kind of farm programs would they like to have? To find out the Wisconsin Agricultural Poll asked a cross section of Wisconsin farmers the following questions about farm programs.

Here are the questions and their answers:

Question: "Farmers hear a lot of talk about new farm legislation and about other efforts to help farm product prices. Which one of the following statements comes closest to what you think ought to be done?"

Answers:	Men	Women
(percent)		
"Nothing needs to be done, except to get the Government out of farming. Let supply and demand take care of things....."	21	12
Farmers should advertise farm products, at home and abroad, as business does and so avoid need for Government help.....	15	16
Government should stop trying to support farm prices and instead give farmers themselves the power to bargain and run their own programs.....	17	12
While farmers need more bargaining power they will also need some Government help such as buying up some surpluses.....	17	16
Federal farm programs of many kinds are needed if farm incomes are to be kept at a satisfactory level.....	15	15
Undecided.....	15	29

Women were more hesitant than men to say that everything would be all right if Government got out of farming. Seventy-nine percent of the men and 88 percent of the women thought some kind of action was needed.

Forty-nine percent of the men and 43 percent of the women felt that some form of Government program or a self-help program was needed for agriculture.

In general more men over 50 years of age thought that agriculture would be all right if Government got out.

More of the younger group said that "while farmers need more bargaining power they will also need some Government help, such as buying up surpluses." This question got about 20 percent of the vote of those under 50 but only 10 percent for those over 50.

The gross income farm folks make seemed to have very little influence on their preferences in what should be done.

Those who voted Republican in the last senatorial election had a larger percentage who thought Government should get out of farming. Fewer who voted Democratic felt this way.

Many folks expressed their own ideas about farm programs. "If the Government could fix the price of what the farmer sells to equal the price of what he buys, it would keep farmer and laborer on an equal basis," said a Dunn County woman.

"Farmers would buy more and this in turn would help labor. As it now stands I wouldn't want my boy to be a farmer when he finishes school. Farmers today just have to work too hard."

"I feel that we need to control the output rather than to support the price," said a Dunn County man.

"If we don't get support and control production, farmers will have to quit farming," said a man from Taylor County.

A woman in Wood County told the poll taker, "If the Government had never started this subsidy business in the first place, farming wouldn't be in the mess it is now."

A Dodge County man told the poll taker, "It will be rough going for a while, but the Government must step out. The transitional period will be hard. But eventually things will be all right. Farmers should have their own distribution system and produce by contract."

Several people had a good deal to say about advertising. A Polk County man thought if the dairy farmer advertised his products "like the big tobacco companies do, we wouldn't have any surplus to worry about."

Several folks said they thought advertising was important but wasn't the whole answer. "The farmer should advertise more," said a young Buffalo county farmer, "but the Government is in the best position to really handle the farm problem."

"I don't like Government programs. They seem to help the big farmers to get bigger and they hurt the medium-sized farmer," said a farm owner in Shawano County.

HELP TO LEAVE THE FARM?

Some farm economists have recommended a Federal program that would help farm people get out of agriculture. If we had fewer farmers, they say, then it would mean that each farm family left would get a larger share of the total farm income.

Here's what Wisconsin farm people said when the poll takers asked them the question:

Question: "Do you think the Federal Government should help farm folks who want to leave the farm and move to jobs in town? This could be loans, job training, and the like."

Answers:	Percent
"Yes, should be done....."	22
No, isn't needed.....	48
Undecided.....	30

"They should help farmers who need to move off submarginal land to a job in town where they can make a living. It would be just a drop in the bucket compared to all the other farm subsidies they are handing out to keep the people there," said a Wood County man.

But a Jackson County woman didn't agree. "The Government would go broke if they did that," she said.

Some of the folks said "yes" with qualifications.

"I feel that if they just want to leave the farm, no help. But if they have to for some good reason, yes, give them help in the form of a loan," said a Dunn County woman.

Apparently a majority of those asked felt such a program isn't needed.

"Too many are leaving the farm now going to town," said a Jefferson County man. "There should be more family-sized farms, not more and more big ones."

DO WE NEED A DAIRY PROGRAM?

What do Wisconsin farm folks think of dairy programs?

To find out the Wisconsin agriculturist poll asked:

Question: "Do you feel dairy farmers need some kind of Government program for dairy products?"

Answers:	Men	Women
(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
"Yes, need it....."	47	43
No, do not.....	38	29
Undecided.....	15	28

Among both men and women, more of the younger group felt that some kind of dairy program was needed. And more farm folks milking larger herds favored some kind of Government program.

Considerably more farm people who voted Democratic in the last election thought a dairy farm program was needed than those who voted Republican.

"I tried farming with a fair sized herd of cows," said a Taylor County farmer. "I just couldn't come out. So I sold all but two cows and got a job off the farm. We definitely need some kind of Government support in order to make a go at farming."

"As long as they support grain they've got to support the rest," said a farmer in Vilas County.

Of the farm folks who think we need some kind of dairy program, what kind would they prefer?

Here are the questions poll takers asked and how farm folks answered:

The Government should continue to buy up milk products to maintain prices (even though you may not agree as to the present support level)—agree, 76 percent; disagree, 6 percent; undecided, 18 percent.

Strict Government quotas on the amount of milk each producer can sell—agree, 24 percent; disagree, 57 percent; undecided, 19 percent.

Government should make production payments directly to farmers to make up the difference between the support price and the market price—agree, 54 percent; disagree, 21 percent; undecided, 25 percent.

What we need is the right kind of feed grain programs. With supply of feed grain cut down, we wouldn't have to worry much about overproduction of milk—agree, 17 percent; disagree, 45 percent; undecided, 38 percent.

In spite of much criticism of the present milk program, it would apparently get an overwhelming majority of the votes from those who favor some government action.

Since the purpose of asking the question was to determine what kind of program farm folks wanted, the poll made no attempt to find out at what levels Wisconsin farm folks thought milk should be supported.

FOOD FOR THE POOR?

Frequently it is argued that we could get rid of more dairy surpluses in our own country by expanding our present domestic disposal programs and inaugurating a food stamp plan. Here's how Wisconsin farm people felt about this question:

Question: "Some folks say we need to speed up government surplus disposal by such programs as a food stamp plan for the needy, expanded school lunch and State institution food programs. What do you think?"

Answers:	Percent
"Yes, need to expand them....."	75
No, wouldn't help much.....	6
Don't believe in such programs.....	4
Undecided.....	14

Apparently a majority of Wisconsin farm folks agree with the young Brown County woman who said, "If they buy up all those surpluses why not give them to schools, institutions, and the needy. At least it wouldn't be going to waste and we'd save the storage costs."

SHOULD WE SHIP FOOD OVERSEAS

A majority of farm folks asked favored a food-for-peace plan. At present large amounts of surplus food are moved overseas under Public Law 480. Here's how Wisconsin farm people answered the following question:

Question: "Do you think we should sell farm surpluses to underdeveloped, friendly, foreign countries at reduced prices, as loans, or in some cases as gifts—providing this does not replace regular sales by ourselves or other friendly nations?"

Answers:	Percent
"Yes, good idea....."	61
No, don't approve.....	17
Undecided.....	22

While only 17 percent said they disapproved of the program, many of them were quite emphatic about it.

"I know two families who have a large milk bill every month and their children could drink a lot more if they had it. Let the 'brains behind the desk' figure out a way so large families in cities can get more milk. Let's feed our own poor first," said a woman in Sauk County.

"We're making fools of ourselves," said a man in Wood County.

"Why should we give away all the time like a Santa Claus. That's what they think we are now—Santa Claus," said a man in Vilas County.

But apparently most Wisconsin farm folks would come near to agreeing with the Langlade County woman who told the poll taker, "If we give part of the surplus to the needy in Europe and Asia regardless of whether they are allies, it will build friendship. And they will know we haven't any desire for war. Maybe they will be convinced that our way of life is best."

HOW CAN THE GOVERNMENT HELP FARMERS?

Kind of action:	Percent
1. Get Government out of farming. Let supply and demand set the prices.....	16
2. Let farmers advertise their own products and Government help won't be needed.....	16
3. Stop supports. Give farmers power to do their own bargaining.....	15
4. Let farmers bargain, but have Government buy up some surpluses.....	16
5. Have many kinds of programs to keep farm incomes up.....	15
6. Undecided.....	22
Total.....	100

Pony Express Centennial

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the pony express. I am proud to state that the portion of the pony express which goes through the State of Kansas is located entirely within my congressional district.

This year's centennial celebrations of the famous pony express will be largely a tribute to American youth.

Most of the daring riders of the famous mail-carrying service which began April 3, 1860, between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif., were very young men—many of them in their teens.

An advertisement of the times in San Francisco, seeking pony express riders, stated: "Wanted—Young, skinny, wiry fellows not over 18. Must be expert riders, willing to risk death daily. Orphans preferred. Wages \$25 a week."

Young men entering Pony Express service, operated by the famous transportation firm of Russell, Majors & Waddell, were given a Bible. These are very rare today.

Riders were required also to take this oath upon entering service:

I hereby swear, before the great and living God, that, during my engagement, and while I am an employee of Russell, Majors & Waddell, I will, under no circumstances, use

profane language; that I will drink no intoxicating liquors; that I will not quarrel or fight with any other employee of the firm, and that in every respect I will conduct myself honestly, be faithful to my duties, and so direct all my acts as to win the confidence of my employers. So help me God.

The youthful pony express riders consistently outran Indian pursuers while carrying the mails through the wilderness, often through blinding snows and howling storms, and in extremes of heat and cold. Only one pony express rider was lost to the Indians.

Johnnie Fry—or "Frey" according to some writers—is credited by some accounts with being the first pony express rider to leave St. Joseph on April 3, 1860. He was little more than a boy when he entered the express service. He was a native Missourian, weighing less than 125 pounds. An early account states:

Though small in stature, he was every inch a man. His run was from St. Joseph to Seneca, Kans., about 80 miles, which he covered in an average of 12½ miles an hour, including all stops.

He later entered the Union Army, and was killed in 1863 in a hand-to-hand fight in which he was credited with killing five assailants before he was killed himself.

William "Bill" James, a native Virginian, was credited at 18 with being one of the best of the pony express riders over a route in Nevada through some of the most savage Indian country.

According to Alexander Majors of the Russell, Majors & Waddell firm, in a book published in 1893—"Seventy Years on the Frontier"—William F. "Bill" Cody was a pony express rider, in his early teens, when he entered the famous mail service. Cody is credited with many notable feats, including a ride aggregating 384 miles without any real rest period, which is referred to by some authorities as probably the longest continuous performance of its kind not only in the annals of the pony express but in any other courier service in history.

None of the pony express young men had an opportunity to grow old in the service. In October 1861 the cross-country telegraph was completed and the pony express was terminated. Despite its short life, it was credited with many important contributions, including the fact that it helped to keep East and West joined during the early crucial days of the Civil War.

Although the pony express was short lived, it will be very much alive this year.

Many pageants, celebrations, and other activities memorializing the pony express are planned for this 1960 centennial year.

As a part of centennial year celebrations, the Post Office Department will issue a new pony express commemorative postage stamp next July 19 at Sacramento, together with a new commemorative stamped envelope to be issued at St. Joseph.

On the same date, as one of the major memorial events scheduled during the vacation season this year, the National Pony Express Centennial Association plans to reenact the Pony Express runs, starting out—just as the pony express

did approximately 100 years ago—from both St. Joseph and Sacramento.

The reenactments are expected to require about 9 days each for both the eastward and westward runs. The original pony express runs, across the 1,966-mile original route, required an average of about 10 days, although it frequently took less time. Lincoln's inaugural address in 1861, for example, was carried by the pony express in less than 8 days.

The eight States through which the pony express ran are Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, and California.

Ike's Latin American Trip an Outstanding Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, President Eisenhower today returns from his Latin American trip. The good will mission—although not without its drawbacks—was, I believe, according to realistic standards—a great success.

As we recall, the original purposes of the tour were: First, to reflect the deep interest of the United States promoting better relations with our Latin American neighbors, and second, to encourage further development of an inter-American system for meeting the aspirations of the people of the Americas and demonstrating peaceful cooperation.

The questions now confronting the Nation include: What kind of follow-up action is essential to further cement relations with Latin America?—and: What is the proper U.S. role in stimulating economic progress among these southern countries—now striving diligently to move ahead economically, socially, and nationally.

We recognize that it is relatively simple to voice adherence to general principles of cooperation and efforts toward mutual development.

However, the real challenge now is to turn the microscope on our inter-American policies to find specific ways and means by which to improve trade; open new channels of social, educational, political and economic interchanges between our countries; give encouragement to these people striving to improve themselves economically, as well as to solidify political systems in which the people themselves have a real voice. Specific actions may well include: First, further improving sources of loans to Latin American countries for necessary development projects; second, improving the climate for further private investment in those countries; third, a more effective effort to obtain the understanding of U.S. policies among the Latin Americas, particularly in the light of the anti-U.S. propaganda by the Communists, and fourth, a greater effort

to give merited recognition to these nations for their individual significance to the collective security of the Western Hemisphere.

Yesterday the Washington Post published an article by Murrey Marder entitled "Ike Aides Appraise Latin Trip a Success." The article reviews some of the significant factors, not only relating to the trip, but also pertaining to important decisions that must now be made in further improving our Latin American relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE AIDES APPRAISE LATIN TRIP A SUCCESS
(By Murrey Marder)

RAMEY AIR FORCE BASE, P.R., March 5.—President Eisenhower returns to Washington Monday with the immediate impact of his American trip scored as a major personal success. But a heavy question mark hangs over its long-term significance.

If the President's own image of good faith and sincerity leaves the Latins with a warm glow of affection for the United States, the physically grueling trip will have accomplished its purpose.

But it will be months before that can be known in any positive form. The only quick test of the trip can come in a negative way: If the impatient-for-progress Latin Republics he visited should flare up in disappointment at unfulfilled expectations.

Members of the President's party are optimistic about the end result. They are using their own measuring rod.

Before the President left for Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, they point out, he set very generalized goals.

TWO ANNOUNCED PURPOSES

The trip, the White House announced, would have two purposes. It would "publicly reflect his deep interest in all the countries of the new world." Secondly, it would seek to "encourage further development of the inter-American system" for meeting the aspirations of the peoples of the Americas and demonstrating peaceful cooperation.

Anyone who participated in the over-packed, over-rushed 10-day schedule in South America can testify that the President worked hard to accomplish purpose No. 1.

He saw several million welcoming people in those 10 days. Most of them cheered him warmly, some were only curious, but numerically, in the few counter-demonstrations, only a tiny percentage were hostile.

What is less certain at this point is the President's success in the second part of his announced goal—encouraging inter-American cooperation.

From the U.S. standpoint, officials along on the trip are understood to regard it as a tremendous, unqualified success on these grounds as well. But American newsmen who got a chance during the trip to speak to the Latins themselves generally received this response: "The real result of the trip depends on your government's follow through."

NO NEW PLAN INTENDED

Ever since the trip began the official participants have tended to blink in surprise when questioned about any new program which might emerge from it.

The announced purpose of the trip, they note, did not contemplate any new approach to Latin-American problems. They are literally correct in this. The question is, did the Latins understand that?

There are strong reasons to believe that many did not. In Chile, for example, Presi-

dent Jorge Alessandri was happy to hear President Eisenhower say the United States does not contemplate liquidating its huge stockpiles of copper—which would knock the bottom out of the world market price. When Alessandri then asked if the United States could remove its duty on Chilean copper imports, Mr. Eisenhower sidestepped the question by saying he was unfamiliar with the details and would have to study them. Nevertheless Chilean newspapers the next morning leaped to the conclusion that the United States was contemplating removal of the copper duties.

Similarly in Chile President Eisenhower praised Alessandri's statesmanship in proposing a moratorium on arms levels in Latin America, with the money saved to be used for economic development. This, too, was hailed as an American endorsement. But Mr. Eisenhower went on to say each sovereign nation obviously would insist on the right to determine its own arms levels. President Eisenhower's main emphasis in this discussion with Alessandri, according to official sources, was reassurance of "the U.S. commitment in the Rio Treaty of 1947. It pledges each American republic to assist any sister republic subjected to armed attack.

Equally, in Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay the visiting U.S. officials avoided specific commitments, according to a reliable source here.

NO GO-IT-ALONE PLAN

There are no big new loans or credits dependent on the outcome of the President's trip, informed sources said. President Eisenhower, in a speech here yesterday, specifically ruled out "any thought of the United States alone developing a so-called master plan for the raising of living standards throughout the hemisphere." He said the Latin American leaders he consulted agreed.

They did, but the manner in which the President posed the question ducked the point. There is no serious talk in Latin America of the United States "alone" planning its economic future.

AID CONCEPT HELD ADEQUATE

In substance, the U.S. position at the end of this trip is that the present concept of U.S. multiple loan and credit aids to Latin America is adequate. This does not necessarily mean, an informed source said, that any increase is ruled out.

The new billion dollar Inter-American Development Bank is due to start operations in April. With this fund and continuing aid from such sources as the Export-Import Bank and International Monetary Fund, plus technical and agricultural assistance, the Eisenhower administration is disposed to leave the bulk of Latin American development to private investment.

PACE OF AID QUESTION

The overriding question which remains is whether this pace of assistance is adequate.

Time is pressing in Latin America, said the Caribbean group of the American Assembly in a report issued here yesterday. The group has a membership of public and private experts of varied political orientation.

Right now, said the Assembly—and reports by other bodies echo the same theme—with Latin America emerging from an era of dictatorships "nationalism is exceptionally strong" everywhere.

Communism "is making headway in parts of Latin America," said the report, and "there is a tendency in Latin America to underestimate the danger."

A prime example of the Latin problem in the Assembly's report was Cuba. President Eisenhower, in each country he visited, was urged to exercise patience and restraint toward the Cuban revolution, and was commended for doing so.

"Communists are working hard in Cuba and appear to be gaining influence," said

the report, "but a final judgment on the prospects of Communist control therein would be premature." The report commended the restraint of U.S. policy in Cuba.

Inside Policy: The Harlem Story

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 3, 1960]

INSIDE POLICY: THE HARLEM STORY
(By Ted Poston with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman, and Richard Montague)
Times do change.

In the old days you couldn't pay the average policeman to work voluntarily in Harlem. Today, for those of the vice squad boys who operate the pad—the multimillion-dollar protection racket for the numbers game—Harlem is the happy hunting ground.

Why? Well, say you are on the take. And say, for instance, that you are transferred from some other assignment to a vice squad in Harlem.

Then you know that on your first tour of duty there will be \$250 waiting you—a welcome-to-our-neighborhood gift of \$50 each from five major East Harlem banks which dominate the numbers racket throughout the city, but especially in Harlem.

And, of course, as soon as the OK is given by your immediate superior, you go on the pad, cut in for your monthly share of the phenomenal tribute which crooked vice squad cops levy on policy operators who must maintain public spots where the bettors can buck the numbers without police molestation.

But whereas the division pad for a regular spot in the rest of the city is usually \$350 a month, the take in a Harlem division is now \$615. And whereas "full pad coverage" (from the cop on the beat all the way up to the special squads in headquarters) usually averages around \$2,500 per month per spot for the rest of the city, a full open spot in Harlem may be down for as much as \$4,500, depending on the play it handles.

The Post looked closely into the Harlem operation because of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's charge that white racketeers, mainly Italian, were taking over the game from Negro bankers there—with police connivance.

In his original press conference—attended by ranking police brass—Powell named Louis (Louie the Gimp) Avitabile, owner of a supermarket at 539 Lenox Avenue, as "top man of the Harlem operation."

The Post found that Louis the Gimp was indeed a big man in the Harlem policy racket, but he is by no means the "top man" in the syndicate, which has muscled into the community.

The most powerful figure in Harlem, in the matter both of influence and the most protected spots, is Anthony (Punchy) Salerno, an East Harlem hoodlum whom the newspapers nicknamed "Fat Tony" when he was exposed as the "Mr. X" who bankrolled the Patterson-Johansson title fight.

Salerno, who managed a phenomenal rise from punk to dope peddler to Dutchess County squire in less than a decade, operates 37 "full open spots" in Harlem—from which grafting cops receive an estimated rakeoff of nearly \$100,000 a month.

A former Negro numbers banker, reduced to controller for a white policy bank when he could no longer meet The Pad, explained the importance of Salerno's position.

"Because Tony's operation is so tightly organized," he said, "the cops don't need a lot of pickup men like that Joe Luberda to go around to individual spots. Tony's bank, for instance, can assemble about \$45,000 a month for four special squads above the Division level and turn it over to just one bagman. That way, there's less chance of a slip-up."

THE "OK" BOYS

"Salerno is so big that he has the right to give the 'OK' for any new spot to be placed on the pad. There used to be a half dozen Negro bagmen or bankers who could give the 'OK,' but today there aren't more than two Negroes in all Harlem who can 'OK' you to the cops for a place on the pad, and I doubt that any Negro now can 'OK' a full pad."

Next to Salerno in power in this respect, the Post investigation indicated, is Louis the Gimp Avitabile, who started out with his three brothers as pushcart peddlers in Harlem around 1938, rose so rapidly in the numbers business that by 1951 the Bureau of Internal Revenue had him down for \$807,000 in unpaid taxes.

Until the heat went on, following Powell's charges, Avitabile had 14 full open spots, for which he was assessed a monthly police take of about \$2,470 each.

Assistant Chief Inspector Burns, who attended Powell's press conference, quickly pointed out to reporters that the Gimp was officially listed as a "known gambler" and that two of the four addresses listed by the clergyman had been raided and were at that moment "suspected premises."

Burns could have gone further by noting that Avitabile's main headquarters, his Lenox Avenue supermarket, had been officially made a "raided premises," with a patrolman stationed there since last July 2 to prevent any policy operations.

Actually, the Gimp's main business had moved into a basement right around the corner and his 13 other spots were even at that moment in full operation. The main one was still in action when the Post team went around Harlem. Avitabile's partner, Solly Appuzzo, was running it in his absence.

Close behind Avitabile in the East Side hierarchy are the Villigante brothers, Louis, Tony, and Charlie. The Villigantes, who have their headquarters at 95th Street and Second Avenue, plus extensive policy interests elsewhere, pay for 11 full open spots in Harlem.

Louis Villigante, the boss of the outfit, has three policy convictions. Like Avitabile, he was listed on the pad carried by retired cop Joseph Luberda, the Harlem bagman now serving time for refusing to name his police department associates in the protection operation.

There are other Italian operators who have sizable slices of the Harlem numbers game such as Felice and James Falca, both known gamblers with more than 30 arrests for policy between them. Luberda had them listed as Phil and Jim Black.

A nice tribute to the lushness of the Harlem policy play came in the Post's discovery that Sammy Schlitz, the most powerful non-Italian policy figure in the East Harlem syndicate and boss of policy in the Bronx, pays for seven protected spots in Harlem.

Schlitz, born Sam Schlitten on January 14, 1910, son of a respectable trucker, was only 18 when he started a long police and prison record which included arrests for robbery, bootlegging tax-free liquor, consorting with known criminals, and felonious assault.

At the time of his bootlegging arrest in 1938, Schlitz boasted that he was a member in good standing of the Bronx Pigeon Fanciers' Association. The police paid no attention to that item at the time but in 1953

they discovered that the congenial little racketeer was making ingenious use of the hundreds of pigeons who roosted in elaborate coops atop his Bronx home.

Schlitz had pigeons delivered each morning to the scores of controllers in his Bronx policy operation, and each homing pigeon would carry the day's business slips back to him before the third race was run at the designated numbers racetrack.

The ingeniousness of this plan evidently brought Schlitz to the East Harlem syndicate's attention, and when that mob decided to supervise the major policy operations for the whole city (for a percentage of the gross take) he was left to continue to run the Bronx operation in the new combine.

"Unless Sammy gives the OK," non-syndicate operators told the Post, "nobody can get the pad anywhere in the Bronx (today)."

But Schlitz is still subordinate to Punchy Salerno in the overall operations of the syndicate's policy game, as he is to Salerno in the number of protected spots in Harlem, for Salerno stands secure among the current policy kings. His story is pure rags-to-riches.

Born and reared in the East Harlem neighborhood where he still operates his bank (in absentia) on East 116th Street between First and Pleasant Avenues, he earned his nickname Punchy as an amateur club fighter.

Punchy's fistic career was cut short in October of 1932 when he was sent to Elmira Reformatory, at 18, for armed robbery. Released on probation, he worked as a rouser around the fruit markets. When World War II came, he was classified 4-F because he had two deformed fingers on each hand and webbed feet.

It was around this period that the Narcotics Bureau first took note of Salerno. For when wartime restrictions created a short of cocaine, the word was out in East Harlem that Punchy could get it for you at a price.

Salerno was picked up on a charge of extortion, later dismissed, in 1951, but had no other trouble with the law despite the narcotics agents' suspicions.

In 1953, however, the Narcotic Bureau finally assembled evidence which resulted in Salerno's indictment for unlawful sale of heroin and conspiracy to violate Narcotic laws. Salerno thereupon vanished. He was not arrested until a year later and maintained a not-guilty plea as his case dragged through the courts. Finally, 4 years and 10 days after his indictment, he pleaded guilty to two of the three narcotics counts in the case.

In the intervening year, the once small-time hood had risen fast in the east Harlem hierarchy.

As a close pal now of Trigger Mike Coppola and Joseph (Joe Stretch) Stracci, he was the unchallenged director of the east Harlem operations of the syndicate, then steadily gulping up the policy game in west Harlem, and also operated the mob's lending bank which financed jukebox and other rackets.

And although he paid less than \$600 income tax in 1957, Salerno was able to buy a plush home in Miami Beach—later sold to Capone gangster, Paul (the Waiter) Ricca for \$75,000—and a \$100,000 estate called Spruce Bar Ranch in Rhinebeck, N.Y.

"IT'S A LIVING"

Salerno's rapid rise in the numbers game in east and west Harlem coincided with the collapse of most of the Negro banks which had dominated the game in the latter community for decades.

But it did not result, as POWELL charged, in the complete elimination of "every Negro banker in the community." The Post found at least a half dozen Negro banks still in full operation, although one or two are believed to be under syndicate direction.

The largest of these is a Negro-Puerto Rican operation run by Henry Lawrence and Spanish Raymond Marquez, whose bank pays for 10 spots. Lawrence, last arrested a year ago for policy and listed as "Henry" on the Luberda pad, operates daily in the area of 148th Street and 8th Avenue. He fronts as a tailor shop owner and is regarded as one of the two Negroes who can OK a new spot for the pad.

Marquez, ostensibly a theatrical producer, handles the bank's spots and business in the lower 8th Avenue area embracing 112th and 113th Streets.

A somewhat smaller operation is located in the Lenox Avenue area around 140th Street. This bank is operated by the big five—Boo Marshall, Sid Thompson, Fritz Devinish, Pat Hogan, and Crappy Hale.

And still smaller is the action of the big three—Walter Smith, Carlyle Williams, and Crip Martin at 127th Street and Lenox Avenue.

There are also several Negro combinations, including one organized by one of the original Harlem policy barons. In these, the partners establish a bank on prorated shares and accept a weekly salary from its earnings.

In most cases, the combinations operate no spots, but handle their business through runners and controllers. These banks establish private pads with police and pay off on a precinct level when possible.

"It's a living," one such operator told the Post, "and the headaches are sometimes a few less. But still it is better than being on the full pad. Only the east Harlem boys have got enough money to keep these greedy cops at bay."

Tribute to Parliamentary Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join in endorsing all the complimentary statements which were made by the majority leader and others, and which referred to the outstanding ability of our Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

Longtime familiarity with our rules, profound knowledge, not only of parliamentary procedure but of the common law itself, has equipped our Parliamentarian to, on almost all occasions—the exceptions are very, very few—come up with an accurate decision without consulting either the rule book or the precedents.

Moreover, as one who has served here for 25 years, and has, during that time, probably caused the Parliamentarian more justified perplexity than any other Member, it is a pleasure to say that even though his decisions on occasion are adverse to views entertained by the seeker of knowledge, they are always rendered in such a way as to be convincing—convincing without question or resentment.

My almost lifelong experience with judges, Justices, and Parliamentarians

prompts the statement that I have met and listened to none who could ruin my convictions and make me like it with less resentment than Lewis Deschler. Very, very few in this world have the ability to, while clearly pointing out your error, send you away satisfied and sometimes delighted with the new knowledge as does our Parliamentarian.

He has sometimes pointed out my lack of information on some parliamentary issue so convincingly and so eloquently that I really enjoyed his adverse decision—an ability which surely is exceptional and one greatly to be desired, but possessed by few.

Let's Not Bury American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, recently I presented a statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission on the problems besetting the American textile industry.

Because there are many here who are interested in this matter, I wish to include in the RECORD this statement.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, MARCH 3, 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing with my colleagues in support of appropriate safeguards to alleviate the unfair and, in some instances, intolerable situation under which many segments of the domestic cotton industry now are laboring.

I will not belabor the points which have been clearly and cogently presented by the National Cotton Council and the other friends of domestic industry in pointing out the seriousness of the problem.

I wish to be associated with the remarks of these gentlemen.

Coming from a State which has some 45,000 textile workers and representing a district where textiles constitute the largest industry, I am personally very much aware of the pressure being exerted by imports of cotton products.

During the past decade, the textile industry has lost some 325,000 jobs. This was not during a time of depression; rather, this occurred during a period of economic development in most industries and a tremendous growth in gross national product. During this period, the United States lost 717 textile mills.

I believe a great part of this is directly traceable to the continuing and increasing inequity in the trade policies of this country with other countries. While the figures for imports of cotton yarn and cloth have steadily climbed during the past decade and are now more than seven times the total imports for 1948, the exports of cotton in the form of yarn and cloth have been in steep decline.

Further inequity has developed by the increase in the subsidy on exported raw cotton from 6 to 8 cents per pound. Now, raw cotton produced in this country is available to the foreign textile mills which

are putting our mills out of business at a substantial discount under U.S. domestic mill prices.

Last August, I joined my colleagues in the Alabama delegation in urging the Secretary of Agriculture to approve a petition seeking relief for the domestic industry under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. Of course, I was delighted when the Secretary recommended action and the President requested the Tariff Commission to make an investigation.

I was, however, disturbed very greatly by the implications of limitation in the President's order to this Commission. I cannot interpret the order any other way but that he wishes to restrict the Commission to no more than an 8-cents-a-pound fee imposition on the cotton content of imported articles.

Now this, in my estimation, is a flagrant misuse of section 22 as enacted by Congress.

The section Congress approved contemplated that the Commission would recommend the relief it deemed necessary when it was determined that imports materially interfered with the domestic cotton program.

Certainly it was not the intent of Congress to limit the considerations involved in one of these cases, or to do anything prejudicial to full and complete relief where it is indicated.

In the past, in every instance section 22 has been interpreted, properly I believe, in the broad and complete sense, and I can see no justification for limiting its application in this instance.

I want to commend the Tariff Commission for the cooperative and conscientious manner in which it has approached these hearings, for receiving all the testimony, and for covering the wide range of this complex problem.

I urge the Commission now to recommend relief appropriate to the problem, unfettered by any administration decrees. Certainly the Commission should not feel bound by any means by such decrees.

My parting remarks will be to implore you not to bury the American textile industry. It needs help desperately.

Thank you.

A Report on Voters' Attitudes Toward the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this office conducts a special, nonpartisan educational project for college juniors entitled "A Week in Washington." The students are selected by four colleges and universities in Kansas. The students come to Washington for a week to see Government in action first hand. The major portion of their expenses are defrayed by funds received from this office in consideration for projects done for this office in the public interest.

One of the students, Ray L. Nichols, Lawrence, Kans., student at the University of Kansas, conducted a survey in the State on the mutual security program. The following is the report verbatim as Mr. Nichols prepared such:

A REPORT ON VOTERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM, JULY 1959: BASED ON A SURVEY CONDUCTED IN ATCHISON, DOUGLAS, AND LEAVENWORTH COUNTIES OF EASTERN KANSAS.

(By Ray L. Nichols, the University of Kansas)

The interviews on which this summary report is based were compiled in a survey taken in the counties of Atchison and Leavenworth (First Congressional District) and Douglas (Second Congressional District), in the eastern portion of the State of Kansas, during the summer of 1959. The purpose was to determine the general attitudes of Kansas voters toward the mutual security program (foreign-aid program) of the U.S. Government, currently a mainstay of American foreign policy. It was hoped that the survey would thus reveal public concepts of the nature, accomplishments, weaknesses, and other aspects of the MSP.

METHODS

Because of the limited time in which the survey was to be completed, it was impossible to establish a rigorously scientific method of picking a random sample. However, the investigator did attempt to interview an equal number of people of voting age above and below the age of 45 (the approximate breaking line in terms of votes actually cast by the electorate), and to gain a roughly proportional representation of different income-occupational groups. These groups were "labor," "farmers," "professional" (lawyers, administrators, local government officials, etc.), "students" (university—graduate and undergraduate, of voting age), "white-collar employees" (secretaries, clerks, etc.), "business" (shopkeepers, bankers, executives, managers), and "housewives." Each of these groups was tabulated, and a separate tabulation was then compiled in addition, comparing men with women. An attempt was also made to make a proportional selection of urban and rural (including towns with less than 5,000 population) voters.

The survey covered 200 eastern Kansas voters in the above-mentioned counties. Those interviewed were chosen in part by going to the local newspaper editor, where available, and asking him for the names of local citizens in the various occupational divisions and subdivisions listed above. These in turn were asked to suggest other individuals. Otherwise, a random sampling technique was used: every third store in business sections, and two-block sections in residential areas were surveyed, insofar as possible.

The original questionnaire discussed the mutual security program of the United States, using that official title with reference to the program. When it was found, however, that continued use of that term alone would produce only confusion in the minds of those interviewed—since the official title was not equated by the vast majority with the foreign aid program—the phrase "foreign aid" was substituted for MSP in all questions following No. 5. Question No. 3 was then given as the first one, followed later by question No. 1. (For an explanation in detail, see the attached sample questionnaire form.) In tabulating, percentages were rounded off to tenths.

RESULTS

For purposes of tabulation, the 10 most indicative questions were exactly computed, answers on the others being of too diverse a nature or too nearly unanimous to warrant such calculations. (Where questions are referred to by number in the following passages, the number used is that found on the original printed questionnaire—the questions are referred to in the sequence in which they appear, without alterations.)

To the first question ("What is your position on the foreign aid program of the U.S. Government?"), the majority of every group interviewed answered that it was in favor. The housewives group led, with 100 percent in favor, while the business sample was last (73.8 percent); 80 percent of the women interviewed answered in favor of foreign aid, compared to almost 83 percent of the men; overall, 82 percent supported foreign aid, with only 12.5 percent actually against the program.

To the question (3), "What do you understand as the intent of the mutual security program?", only 10.5 percent of all those interviewed identified MSP as the foreign aid program, while over 41 percent did not know. To the next question (4), however, which asked if MSP and foreign aid were the same, the percentage of those correctly answering (in the affirmative) rose to 16.3, while that of those answering negatively also rose, to 65. No farmer correctly related the two programs, while labor led with over 39 percent identifying MSP and foreign aid as the same.

Of those who believed the two programs to be different, the nearly unanimous answer (5) was that MSP was related to defense pacts such as NATO and was mutual insofar as defense obligations were reciprocal; while foreign aid was aimed at economic development, without benefits to the United States in return. A few individuals made a broader distinction, asserting that both programs helped the United States, MSP in a military way, and foreign aid in an economic way (through defeating communism and expanding U.S. export markets).

When asked from what source(s) they obtained most of their information on matters such as the foreign aid program, well over 60 percent of those interviewed cited newspapers first, followed by television (especially the Sunday panel-discussion programs). The rest mentioned television, magazines, and radio, in descending order.

To questions (8) and (9), dealing with economic benefits to local communities and to the State of Kansas in general as a result of aid given to foreign countries, the vast majority of those surveyed knew of no such gains. Others (perhaps 20 percent) thought that increased trade and production relative to aid materials might have helped indirectly. A few in Leavenworth mentioned foreign army officers brought to the United States for training at the Army Command and General Staff College, and some in Lawrence (Douglas County) referred to foreign students attending the University of Kansas. Such latter answers, however, showed hesitancy about the relevancy of the subjects mentioned.

On question (10), however, dealing with possible benefits to farmers as a result of U.S. foreign aid, about 60 percent mentioned the giving of surplus agricultural commodities as an example—although one farmer added that he "doubted we've been helped—we've only just about held even as a result of that [the surplus export program]."

Despite the answers to questions (8-10) nearly half of those interviewed responded in the affirmative to question (7): "Have you heard of any examples of benefit or good the United States has received as a result of our foreign aid program?" Forty-four percent answered "no", however, while 9 percent were uncertain.

Question (12) asked: "Do you think the average person understands the program and its intent?" To this, an overwhelming 87.7 percent answered in the negative. When (13) suggestions were elicited as to how the program could be explained better to people, most of those answering mentioned television, with newspapers placing second. The emphasis was upon clear, concise explanation, presented in an interesting and non-

technical form. A significant minority, however (approximately 20 percent) suggested that little could perhaps be done: the public was in general apathetic and uninterested in such matters unless—in the words of one businessman—"it hits them where it hurts, in the pocketbook."

In the next two questions (14-15), people were asked if they believed that the majority of people in their community, and in the State, agreed with their general thinking on the matter of the foreign aid program. In each case, 60 percent made no comment and 30 percent answered "no". There were, however, a few more individuals who believed opinion in their community agreed with them than there were those who felt the same about the state in general.

When suggestions for improvements in the foreign aid program were solicited (17), the great majority had no comment to offer, the general feeling being expressed by one lady who stated that "I simply don't know enough about the thing to tell them [the Government] how to make it better." Of those who did make suggestions, nearly all proposed more efficient administration and selection of better trained officials. Some mentioned shifting away from grants to loans and use of more surpluses.

On a more specific query, however, answers were more readily forthcoming. The next question asked if waste and inefficiency in the foreign aid program was typical of the general pattern of the program, or rather unusual. Only 72.6 percent of the total thought that the problems were typical—but most of those (42.6 percent of the total) blamed the situation on the nature of big organizations, particularly American Government. Several of these (perhaps 5 percent of the total) specifically added that, in the words of one man, "this really doesn't hurt the successfulness of the program much. We still need it." In response to the next question, which called for ideas on how to alleviate such problems of waste and inefficiency, most people (17) replied as they had to, that better administrators and perhaps more centralized control was needed. Two people specifically commented in favor of proposals which they had read in newspapers, for a central board to oversee all U.S. aid programs.

Question (20) asked those interviewed how much importance they would give foreign aid compared to our national defense programs. While only 10.4 percent believed that aid was more important as compared to 35.5 percent who favored national defense, 43.6 percent thought that the two programs were of approximately equal importance. One professional man commented that "You really can't separate the two. Aid is long range and national defense is more short range. We need both of them."

The following question drew responses similar to those of (17): Most offered no suggestions. However, 2 percent of the total did suggest greater relaxation of trade barriers to at least greatly supplant foreign aid. An even smaller number called for greater private investment in foreign countries as a substitute.

To (22)—"Do you believe this Nation can promote peace and freedom without the necessity of having the foreign aid program?"—only 21 percent said, "Yes," and 9 percent were uncertain. The weight in favor of foreign aid was even greater on the next question (23), which asked if anything in the nature of foreign aid was necessary: 87 percent said, "Yes," while only 8 percent answered "No."

Question (25) solicited comments on any other subject pertaining to the Federal Government. By far the most commented-upon issue was Federal spending, with such emphasis upon waste of money in the military services—and the frequent desire that they

be unified—and the farm program. Most farmers were clearly dissatisfied with their situation, but suggestions ranged from "Get rid of Benson and establish 100 percent of parity," to "Just abolish price supports and supply and demand will work again—give me a free market." Businessmen frequently complained about redtape in forms which they were required to fill out for different purposes: They charged that so much time was required for such tasks that their businesses themselves were in fact neglected. Another general comment was a desire for Washington to clean up labor. Others individually called for increasing wages of postal employees and Army personnel, forestalling cuts in allocations of funds to the Veterans' Administration, and other such personal matters. One person spoke out sharply against the proposed new GI bill, although he himself would benefit from it. Among university people, sentiment was almost unanimous in favor of Federal aid to education. A few individuals supported the administration's "tough" policy (re: Little Rock) on segregation in the schools.

The last question (26), asking whether or not those interviewed would be interested in a brief synopsis of the findings of the survey, brought widely varying responses. Overall, however, 73 percent indicated that they would like such a synopsis sent to them.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In general, the voting population of eastern Kansas represented by the sample taken by means of the survey is in favor of the U.S. foreign aid program. This favorable attitude was prompted in most cases by a belief that the program will promote world peace—and of the people holding this attitude, most of them spoke specifically of averting the spread of communism to underdeveloped lands. Motives of the rest of those interviewed (and in favor of the program) were vaguely humanitarian: three individuals mentioned the need for "neighborliness" to other nations, just as to people. Some, however, saw foreign aid as a means for expanding U.S. export markets.

On the other side, most of those opposed to the program felt that "You can't buy friends," and added that foreign aid was "money poured down a rathole." A few mentioned their fear that the development of industries in other countries with the help of U.S. aid was merely increasing unfavorable competition for our own industries. This view was expressed almost entirely by businessmen.

Interestingly, while 21 percent felt that the United States could promote peace and freedom without giving foreign aid (although four individuals argued that this was not our "mission"), an overwhelming 87 percent felt that something along the line of foreign aid was necessary for some reason or other. The fact that this figure was larger than that of those favoring foreign aid itself (82 percent), when coupled with other figures, indicates some disenchantment with the present foreign aid program. Indeed, even those favoring the program expressed reservations: many qualified their support with phrases such as "if it's administered well," "if it goes only to those who need it," "so long as we don't plan to help them forever—they've got to learn to help themselves." As large a portion favoring aid as 10 percent of the total number interviewed believed that we should substantially reduce the amounts of aid given, although some help was necessary, both to protect the United States and out of humanitarian instincts.

Women appeared to favor the aid program substantially more than did men, and they also more generally desired to receive summaries of the report based on the interviews than did men.

Laborers were the least interested in obtaining summary reports—a lack of interest perhaps reflected in their uncertainty as to the answers to several of the major questions of the interview. In addition, their support of foreign aid seemed to be least influenced by considerations of U.S. foreign policy goals, and most by vague feelings of sympathy for the underprivileged of other countries.

Farmers also were somewhat uninformed on certain points, but all the farm sample requested summary reports. Professional people, while failing to identify MSP as foreign aid seemed well informed and interested. Students' responses were quite similar to those of people in the professions. White-collar employees showed the highest percentage score on identifying the purpose of MSP—and scored rather highly on recognizing the identity of MSP and foreign aid. Business people had the highest percentage opposed to foreign aid and the highest believing that nothing along the line of foreign aid was necessary at all. Housewives were 100 percent in favor of aid, and scored highest overall both in ranking aid more important than defense and in ranking it equally important as defense.

Data at this time appear to be too incomplete for any conclusions to be definitely drawn in explanation of the results of this survey. Several questions can be raised at

this time however, as subjects for further study. First among these is that of refusals (people who preferred not to be interviewed at all). Fully 60 percent of all women declined, as did 9 percent of all men. The researcher's tentative conclusion, based upon the comments of those who refused, would be that women feared showing their lack of information more than did men. Another reason, apparent to some degree in both groups (at least from the appearance of some refusal answers), would be a general aversion to politics. Sample: "No * * * My business * * * well, I run a store so I can't meddle in politics at all."

Another question concerns the reason for women's extreme favoritism toward the foreign aid program. A third relates to the surprising correlation between the answers of the two diverse groups, labor and business, which ranked first and second in opposition to foreign aid, as well as in having heard of no benefits coming to the United States from foreign aid, and in the belief that nothing of the nature of foreign aid was at all necessary. It is this researcher's suspicion, thus far unproven, that this correlation is traceable to the preoccupation of both groups (labor and business) with daily affairs relative to wage earning, concentrating the attention upon local economics, and not upon broader national issues. This might, indeed, explain the relatively better

informed position of students, and of professionals. It leaves unanswered the problem of the position of the farmers, housewives, and white-collar employees, however.

From the above it should be obvious that the problem of what shapes public attitudes is an extremely complex one. This report has not attempted to provide any lasting solution to that problem, but merely to present the attitudes as they are toward a particular governmental policy and to indicate opportunities for further research toward explaining the situation.

One final comment relative to the formation of public attitudes might, however, be in order. The researcher spent some time reviewing recent newspapers circulated in the area, and in speaking with newspaper editors. Only in two editorials (in the Kansas City Star) did he find mention of the mutual security program under its official title—and in both instances the editorial's caption included the words "foreign aid." This is doubtless one factor leading to the public misunderstanding of the relationship of the two programs, which are in fact one and the same.

This writer hopes that this report, including the tables immediately following, will be of use in the examination of the U.S. mutual security program by the Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

RAY L. NICHOLS.

Report on voters' attitudes toward the mutual security program, July 1959

[Percentages of the total number interviewed and in each division]

	(1) What is your position on the foreign aid program of the U.S. Government?			(3) What do you understand as the intent of the mutual security program of the U.S. Government?			(4) Do you believe the mutual security program and foreign aid are the same?			(7) Have you heard of any benefits or good that the United States has received from the foreign aid program?			(12) Do you believe the average person understands the foreign aid program and its intent?		
	For	Against	?	Right	Wrong	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?
Labor	87.0	13.0	-----	4.2	43.5	52.3	39.2	30.4	30.4	39.2	60.8	-----	84.8	15.2	-----
Farm	90.0	10.0	-----	-----	40.0	60.0	-----	60.0	40.0	40.5	59.5	-----	90.0	10.0	-----
Professional	92.8	7.2	-----	4.8	71.2	24.0	12.0	73.6	14.4	71.2	24.0	4.8	7.2	83.2	9.6
Student	90.0	10.0	-----	10.0	70.0	20.0	-----	90.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	-----	100.0	-----
White collar employees	76.4	11.8	11.8	18.2	39.0	42.8	31.2	60.6	18.2	36.4	51.5	12.1	-----	90.9	9.1
Business	73.8	15.0	11.2	12.3	41.5	46.2	9.1	71.2	19.7	42.3	48.3	9.4	3.5	86.5	3.5
Housewives	100.0	-----	-----	12.5	68.8	18.7	31.3	68.7	-----	43.8	43.8	12.4	6.3	93.7	-----
Men	82.9	14.3	-----	10.9	49.3	39.8	15.5	63.6	20.9	50.7	41.1	8.2	5.8	89.0	5.2
Women	80.0	4.1	14.3	9.4	45.3	45.3	19.0	66.7	14.3	41.7	47.9	10.4	10.0	84.0	6.0
Total	82.0	12.5	5.5	10.5	48.5	41.0	16.3	65.0	18.7	47.0	44.0	-----	7.0	87.7	5.3

	(18) No doubt you have heard comments about waste and inefficiency in the foreign aid program. Do you believe this is the general pattern (typical) of the program or is it unusual?				(20) What importance do you give the foreign aid program in comparing it with our national defense program?				(22) Do you think the United States can promote peace and freedom without the necessity of having the foreign aid program?			(23) Is anything of the nature of the U.S. foreign aid program necessary at all?			(26) Would you like to receive a brief synopsis of the findings of this survey?	
	Typical	Un-usual	General	?	Aid	De-fense	Equal	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	No
Labor	39.2	21.7	13.0	26.1	4.2	52.3	21.7	21.7	30.4	39.2	30.4	87.0	8.8	4.2	34.8	65.2
Farm	30.0	-----	50.0	20.0	-----	60.0	20.0	10.0	9.5	80.0	9.5	100.0	-----	-----	-----	-----
Professional	6.3	34.8	53.9	5.0	16.8	35.2	38.4	9.6	16.8	78.4	4.8	95.2	4.8	-----	90.2	9.8
Student	10.0	10.0	80.0	-----	-----	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0	60.0	-----	100.0	-----	-----	100.0	-----
White-collar employees	30.3	36.4	33.3	-----	9.1	30.3	57.6	3.0	15.2	81.4	3.4	93.9	6.1	-----	84.8	15.2
Business	30.5	23.7	45.8	-----	6.9	36.1	50.2	17.2	26.7	63.8	9.5	82.8	10.9	6.3	90.5	9.5
Housewives	12.5	31.3	56.2	-----	18.7	18.7	62.6	-----	12.5	75.0	12.5	87.4	6.3	6.3	81.3	18.7
Men	22.7	28.2	49.1	-----	10.4	40.7	35.6	13.3	24.7	65.7	9.6	86.8	9.8	3.4	69.7	30.3
Women	22.2	35.6	42.2	-----	10.4	23.1	60.2	6.3	14.2	79.5	8.3	93.7	2.1	4.2	83.3	16.7
Total	22.4	30.0	42.6	-----	10.4	35.5	43.6	10.5	21.5	69.5	9.0	87.5	8.5	4.0	73.0	27.0

Inside the Policy Racket: How the Mobs Moved In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

INSIDE THE POLICY RACKET: HOW THE MOBS MOVED IN

(By Ted Poston (with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman, and Richard Montague))

One inevitable result of the operation of the pad—the multimillion-dollar police protection set-up in the numbers game—has been to give major control of the policy racket to the underworld here.

Call them what you like—the east Harlem mob—the syndicate, the Mafia—the Post's investigation of policy showed that these are the people who now control what once was a comparatively harmless, penny-ante lottery and is now a major racket.

Today, for the first time in the 150 years that it has existed here in one form or another, the numbers game is now a means as well as an end.

The end is obvious—the once fabulous profits reaped by numbers bankers from suckers who take a 1,000 to 1 chance on picking a number in the hope of getting a 600 to 1 payoff if they're lucky enough to win.

The profits are still there but the rigidly organized graft of dishonest vice squad policemen has made a heavy dent in the take enjoyed by the policy banks.

The means became equally obvious when Post reporters began a 2-month investigation of the numbers game here in the wake of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's charges that Negro numbers bankers were being forced out of the game by the police so that whites—mainly Italians—could take over.

For the numbers industry—with its thousands of collectors, hundreds of controllers and other thousands of full and part-time employees—provides an already established apparatus for other uses by unscrupulous racket bosses.

Here is what the Brooklyn grand jury reported last year after its investigation of gambling and police corruption:

"If you scratch the professional operator of gambling ventures you will find the narcotics peddler, the loan shark, the dice game operator, the murderer.

"Brooklyn has been the scene of a number of unsolved gangland homicides over the past few years. Almost every one of those killings is involved with gambling ventures in one form or another.

"In one case where seven leading narcotics dealers were convicted in Kings County last year, six were actively engaged in gambling activities, including bookmaking and policy, which they used as the source of funds for their deadly trade in narcotics."

A veteran numbers banker who insisted on using an obviously fictitious name told the Post a story which vividly illustrated the grand jury's findings.

"It happened around Christmas a year or so ago," this man said "I was paid up on the pad (the list of police-protected policy spots) and would've been in good shape if all the cops on the pad, past and present, hadn't doubled back for a 'Christmas taste.' I had to shell out.

"And then, just before New Year's, I get hit heavy by some of my biggest players. I was out about \$18,000 and I just couldn't

raise that kind of money. Then the bagman for one of the special squads set up a meet for me with the East Harlem boys. He said they'd let me have the money until I got back on my feet.

"But when we finally had our meet, I found they wanted something in return. They said that if I would use my setup to handle about \$18,000 worth of hoes (heroin) that I wouldn't even have to pay any interest on the \$18,000 they were lending me.

"Well, I wasn't going to get mixed up in that kind of rap this late in life. So I just walked out. They didn't like it a bit, and the bagman told me later I was a fool. Of course, they took over my bank anyhow—and they've still got it."

Unfortunately, other bankers, pressed to the wall by limited capital and mounting vice squad graft demands, evidently have taken the other road. During its investigation, the Post found strong indications that at least one major "independent" bank in Manhattan is closely allied with the narcotics trade, as is another in Brooklyn and at least two in the Bronx.

The connection is becoming increasingly evident as narcotic agents more frequently find themselves tracking down dope-peddling suspects only to find them also employed in numbers operations.

The syndicate, or Mafia, has long been active in the numbers game on the waterfront, but policy then was only an adjunct to such other activities as loan sharking and other waterfront rackets.

It was not until 1949 or so that the late Albert Anastasia, chief assassin of Murder, Inc., decided to expand from the waterfront and take over the policy game in other profitable areas.

A KING LOSES HIS CROWN

First to feel the weight of the new decision was Louis Weber, Brooklyn's then admitted policy king and a pal of James Moran, Mayor O'Dwyer's right-hand man and a political power in his own right in Kings County.

One night in 1949, Weber received a visit in a South Brooklyn tavern from Anastasia and Frank (Frankie Shots) Abbatemarco, who had handled the policy operation for Anastasia's syndicate on the Brooklyn and Staten Island waterfronts.

The conversation was short and to the point. Weber was out; Frankie Shots was taking over.

Weber was a man of standing. He had a vice squad payroll nearing that of Harry Gross' still-to-be-exposed bookmaking empire. He had defied a long list of district attorneys (when defiance was necessary) and could depend on the immense political power of Moran in the O'Dwyer administration.

But Weber knew this was all to no avail when the syndicate decided to move in. So he gave up a lifelong policy empire in Brooklyn without an argument and fled to West Harlem to try to reestablish himself. He never attained his former eminence.

For the next decade Frankie Shots, a boastful, high-living thug, became Brooklyn's biggest policy operator, although the real power for the borough's operation was held by Carmine Lombardozi, a representative of the East Harlem mob which even then was consolidating its spreading policy power.

Lombardozi, soft spoken and unobtrusive, was only faintly known to the public until his participation in the 1957 underworld conclave at Apalachin put him on the front pages.

Brooklyn underworld sources said that Lombardozi was demoted after Apalachin, presumably for not being diligent in pushing the syndicate to take over all the major policy banks in Brooklyn, and Mike Miranda, still a major policy figure in Brooklyn, took over his behind-the-scenes role.

(Frankie Shots, loud-mouthed to the end, wasn't as lucky as Lombardozi. Suspected

of holding out on the syndicate, he was mowed down in Brooklyn by two gunmen on November 4, 1959, in the very same tavern where Louis Weber had been handed his walking papers.)

The syndicate's plan, duplicated in other boroughs, was quite simple. The major banks were swept up by the mob, with all direction coming from the East Harlem empire of Vito Genovese, Anthony (Fat Tony) Salerno, Trigger Mike Coppola, and Joseph (Joe Stretch) Stracci.

The remaining "independent" banks, run mainly by veteran Negro and Puerto Rican bankers, were to be supervised by the syndicate at a flat fee of 1 percent of the gross take.

Each "independent" bank had to permit a syndicate representative to check its "ribbon" (the daily adding-machine tabulation of the total play) so that the syndicate could be assured of its 1 percent "off the top."

At the same time, the mob undertook to put all policy spots and locations on "the pad"—the vice squad's list of police-protected places.

POLICY: THE MOBS MOVE IN

The conquest of Brooklyn by the syndicate was almost complete by early 1958 when District Attorney Edward Silver began a secret 2-month investigation which in April of that year led to the smashing of the \$5 million bank of Angel F. Calder, the city's largest Puerto Rican policy banker. The raid also revealed an open connection between Calder's bank and what Silver called the Manhattan Syndicate.

Working so quietly that even the clerical staff in his office didn't know when he planned to act, Silver assembled 82 detectives and picked plainclothesmen on April 1, 1958, and made a series of simultaneous mass raids which netted Calder and 67 of his associates, along with policy paraphernalia, the day's play, and several thousand dollars in cash.

The prize catch of the raid proved to be an obscure East Side mobster, Emmanuel (Nappy) Frazetta, 40, of 160 Mott Street. Frazetta was seized in the basement of a three-story brownstone at 693 Lafayette Street in Bedford-Stuyvesant, which Silver said was the temporary headquarters of Calder's main bank. The raiders found Frazetta holding the "ribbon" for the day's policy play and surmised that he was checking for the syndicate to guarantee its 1 percent take.

Frazetta would only admit that he was a messenger sent over from Manhattan to pick up something to turn over to somebody in a subway.

Urbano (Benny) DeMucci, 41, seized while checking the take there at a Calder annex, also was suspected to be a syndicate representative.

Calder himself, along with his son, Angelo, and his brother, Julio (One-Eyed Red) Calder, was charged with contriving a lottery—a felony—and released in \$25,000 bail each.

Forty-four other persons seized among the 68 with the Calderes were also booked and released in bail. Most of them went directly back into business.

On April 9, just 8 days after the big April Fool's Day raid, Silver's rackets bureau detectives struck again—in the absence of any action by the police who regularly covered the area.

The DA's men seized Otis Spain, Jr., of 110 Cambridge Place, and charged him with possession of 22 numbers slips containing 1,800 plays. One of the 45 booked in the big Brooklyn raid, Spain had been plying his trade industriously since his release on bail.

With Spain in custody, the rackets bureau detectives struck again that night at 924 Lafayette Street, just three blocks from the basement at 693 Lafayette where Calder's main bank had been smashed.

The raiders acted on information that 20 of Calder's controllers and runners were assembled there to set up a new operation, but apparently the policy boys had been tipped by their own sources, for the DA's squad found just 2 men there.

But the raid was not in vain. One of the two men turned out to be the aforementioned Angel Calder himself, a durable veteran of 22 years in the business and the other was Fitz Sealy, 70, another old-time policy operator.

The 45 men seized in the Calder ring are still awaiting trial after 2 years.

Silver and Assistant District Attorney Koota told the Post this week that the trial was being held up awaiting clarification of a 1957 U.S. Supreme Court decision which indicated that evidence obtained by wiretapping might not be admissible in local courts.

BUSINESS AS USUAL

One year after the raid, the State Court of Appeals upheld the use of wiretap evidence in State courts, but Koota pointed out that the Court of Appeals did not rule on the legality of wiretapping under section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, on which the Supreme Court based its ruling.

"We are still concerned," Koota said, "about the possibility of having a policeman admit to an act which the U.S. Supreme Court has held to be illegal. Such testimony by a policeman might expose him to possible indictment by a Federal Grand Jury."

Meanwhile, it can be assumed that the Calder bank is back in business as usual—probably trying to lay up a reserve for the day when the court showdown finally comes and Silver—as he expects—sends most of the 45 to jail.

But a Brooklyn Negro policy banker, whose operation was once closely associated with that of Calder, predicted that there wouldn't be much reserve left.

"The only boys who made anything out of the Calder business," he said, "are the vice squad boys on the pad. They were around the day after the first raid to say that everybody's payments had to go up because 'We're taking more chances now.' And I'll be damned if they didn't try to get a second hike just 8 days later when Calder was picked up again."

"So the old man will be lucky if he can keep his head above water until the trial comes up. I doubt if they'll leave him much more than that."

The Nature of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech on our Constitution by Mrs. Merritt R. Hosmer, president of the California Federation of Republican Women, Northern Division:

THE NATURE OF OUR CONSTITUTION (By Lucille Hosmer)

"The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: That it connected with one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity."

This quotation from John Quincy Adams is found in the preface to "The Pulpit of the American Revolution" by J. Wingate Thornton (1860).

In a later paragraph he says, "It is the duty of all Christian people to inform themselves what it is their religion teaches concerning that subjection which they owe to the higher power."

This our ancestors did most carefully. Their knowledge of the Scripture and their adherence to its teachings was reflected in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. Their understanding and comprehension of history and government far surpassed the knowledge that we have today on those same subjects.

In other words they were keenly aware of the various forces which had combined to result in the establishment of our Constitutional Republic here in America.

Three times in the history of mankind outstanding attempts have been made to establish the freedom of the individual:

First, in the days of Abraham when he recognized that there was only one God of all things and that man was free and self-controlling; and responsible for his own actions. His people prospered for a time under this concept; but once they permitted others to make their decisions for them and denied their rights of self-government and took subsidies from the Pharaohs for work that they did not do and once they refused to stand firm for their convictions as free men, they returned to serfdom and slavery.

Moses came, centuries later, and took them out of the bondage and slavery into which they had placed themselves. Most of them had forgotten what it meant to be free. They abused and heckled Moses continually. He endured it because he knew the truth about God and man. Finally, he gave them the Ten Commandments, hoping that it would serve as a moral code until such time as they became capable of understanding its deeper spiritual meaning.

It took many centuries of living with and under the Ten Commandments before mankind was ready for the advent of Jesus and His teachings of Christianity. Even then there was only a fragment of the people who understood His message.

Jesus never taught "mass salvation" nor "group salvation." His very explicit rule was "work out your own salvation" * * * as an individual. He did not feel that it was the job of the state or Caesar to do it for the individual. For 300 years after His coming there was great growth in the freedom of the individual and the recognition of his worth and dignity. Once again, however, men refused to accept their responsibilities as free individuals: they accepted patronage and protection from the pagan Emperor Constantine instead of relying on God. Through their refusal to stand firm for their Christian principles, they helped to plunge the world into an era known as the Dark Ages.

The only glimmer of light relative to the rights of man in the centuries that followed was in the year 1215 when the Magna Carta was wrung from King John and some of the rights were for the first time in history put into writing.

When the Republic of the United States was established and its Constitution adopted, some centuries later, the third outstanding attempt to establish the freedom of the individual was made.

Today and in the days ahead we face the menace of dictatorship as our forefathers faced and feared the menace of monarchies. We recognize that life has become more complex and involved but we also recognize that it is worth living so long as we preserve and protect our rights and freedoms as individuals. New dangers to liberty are appearing every day from many new avenues.

Our Constitution, in the days ahead as in the past, will be our bulwark of defense only if it is understood and adhered to. We then will find that it is indispensable to our rights and freedoms. It must be understood and appreciated and protected with increased energy and vigilance.

The very basis of our Constitution is our Ten Commandments and its fundamental structure is derived from Christian principles. It is readily apparent to those who have made a study of the historic origin of our Constitution that here in America, as nowhere else on earth, the higher law from our Divine Lawgiver has been written into our Constitution. Everywhere else in the world manmade law is accepted as supreme.

Our forefathers were disciples of John Locke, the 17th century philosopher, who first declared in his treatise on Civil Government (1714) that "no law could be held valid unless it was in harmony with the laws of nature or Divine Law." Locke was the authority to whom our leaders of the American Revolution looked for guidance. Nearly every writer of that period quoted his words and arguments. Many of the phrases in the Declaration of Independence may be found in Locke's Treatise.

In spite of the manner in which many modern writers have interpreted John Locke and his writings; Locke was a sincere and devout Christian. How else could he have written on the "Reasonableness of Christianity" or the "Epistles of St. Paul"? Locke's works were considered the "Political Bible" of the American Revolution and the Founding Fathers.

Divine Law or the Laws of God were, in the eyes of Locke and our Founding Fathers, the Ten Commandments and the teachings of the Master Christian. The Ten Commandments have always been considered the basis of all law in America.

The First Commandment, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me", was clearly understood by Locke and his students to mean that no individual must allow the love of power, of money, of self, or ambition, to come between him and his recognition of the all-power of God. This love and loyalty and recognition of God's supreme power broke the fear of tyranny and oppression. It gave man his first inkling into his right of self-government 'under God.' They knew that the other nine Commandments were what the individual should not do in order to obey the First Commandment. They recognized that all law came from the Bible.

Jesus said that He had come "to fulfill the law." Christianity includes the Ten Commandments plus the grace and truth and compassion of the teachings of Christ. His command "Love thy neighbor as thyself" as well as the Beatitudes were all accepted by our Founding Fathers as the moral law upon which should be established our Constitutional Republic.

The First Commandment was accepted as the truth of the sanctity of the individual "under God"; and that no man or State had the right to enslave or rule him in any way which would force him to deny the supremacy of God. The very first article of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Because the Founding Fathers were Christians, they were determined that the power of government (the State or Caesar) should never be used to force the individual to "bow down" to any supreme State or power other than God. As Christians, these architects of our Constitution believed in the principle that every man shall be permitted to worship God in his own way, according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Many of the colonists had suffered cruel persecution at the hands of bigots because

of their religious beliefs. That had been the history of religion for hundreds of years. Our Founding Fathers wrote into our Constitution this provision so that all Americans, always, would have their freedom of worship. The command of Jesus "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's," is enforced by this article of the Bill of Rights. The government (Caesar) has no power to suppress, control, or to act upon religion in any way.

Chief Justice Joseph Story in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States" (1833) stated:

"It was under a solemn consciousness of the dangers from ecclesiastical ambition, the bigotry of spiritual pride, and the intolerance of sects, thus exemplified in our domestic as well as in foreign annals, that it was deemed advisable to exclude from the National Government all powers to act upon the subject of religion and the 'things that are God's.'"

Jesus taught the principle that "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." In order to be free in either this world or the next, the individual must know the truth. Unless we have access to the experiences of our forebears and knowledge which they accumulated and unless we can know and understand the results of those experiences, both past and present, we could not "know the truth." Denial of freedom of speech or freedom of the press, the denial of the right of every individual to be free to study and research where he will on any subject, prohibits the right of man to search for the knowledge which may lead him to truth. We appreciate the protection of this article more when we recognize that all attempts to crush Christianity or man's rights and freedoms as an individual have always depended upon the ability of government to suppress freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

When our Founding Fathers wrote this article into our Bill of Rights, to insure our religious liberty, they included in this same article the tenets of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. They knew that the freedom to communicate one's belief is as sacred as the freedom to have one's belief according to the dictates of one's own conscience. They are our inherent rights, or as our Declaration of Independence states: inalienable rights given to us by our Creator.

Justice Story, in discussing the first article of the Bill of Rights, quotes John Locke as saying "No man or society of men have any authority to impose their opinions or interpretation on any other, even the meanest of Christians: since in the matters of religion every man must know and believe and give an account for himself."

Justice Story continues: "The rights of conscience are, indeed, beyond the just reach of human power. They are given by God and cannot be encroached upon by human authority."

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." (Art. V, Bill of Rights.) This "due process of law" clause in our Constitution is considered one of its most vital clauses.

Chief Justice Story said "It is founded on natural equity and is laid down by jurists as a principle of universal law."

This article is in keeping with the commandments, "Thou shalt not kill" and "Thou shalt not steal."

Obviously, our Founding Fathers felt that murder and theft were still wrong, even if committed by government. This clause was written to protect the rights of the minorities and individuals against the power of the majority as well as against the public officials who went beyond their lawful authority in the name of government. In providing that no man shall be unjustly de-

prived of life, liberty, or property, our Constitution recognized that there is a higher law than that which may be set up from time to time by human lawmakers. Even under the guise of the general welfare, Congress may not confiscate wealth for the purpose of redistributing it. That would be taking property without "due process of law" and that is in violation of the divine law, "Thou shalt not steal." In many cases, tried under this clause, the Supreme Court has upheld the divine command, given to Moses, that not only must the law be righteous, but that no "unrighteousness in judgment" must be done under the law. (Lev. 19:15.) They recognized that the law must be administered equally by public authority to all.

The command, "Thou shalt not steal" applies to everyone, in every class, under every condition. It does not say, "Thou shalt not steal, except to promote the general welfare or keep the peace"; or "Thou shalt not steal, except to take money from a rich man and give it to someone who is poorer." Nothing can be found, either in the commandment or the Constitution which provides a way by which robbery or stealing can be legalized.

Man cannot be deprived of life "without due process of law," "Thou shalt not kill."

Our Constitution stipulates that Congress, itself, cannot declare an exception; cannot make life cheap in the name of an emergency; cannot authorize the taking of life arbitrarily.

However, life can be taken from us by depriving us of liberty. Jefferson said "The God that gave us life gave us liberty at the same time." When we are deprived of our rights and freedoms as individuals, the right to choose when and where and how we work, the right to direct our own affairs and make our own decisions, and handle our own money; our life activity is lessened and we are being limited in our right to material, mental, and spiritual advancement which are our inherent rights.

James Wilson, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and a student of John Locke, was the foremost lawyer at the Constitutional Convention. He said in one of his speeches, "The laws of God and so-called natural law are to be regarded as true law and all temporal legislation is considered to be binding only so far as it is the expression of this law."

For the first time in history a nation, our Republic, was established which considered all human laws null and void which transgressed the divine law. Europe was shocked. To them manmade law and the divine right of kings was supreme. To our newly developed sense of government, no legislature had the power to pass any laws which were not in harmony with the divine law.

Our Constitution laid down the fundamental and immutable laws for our Government and provided that if any act of Government shall violate these fundamental laws of justice, it shall be set aside.

The principle that any and all laws which deny or destroy our "inalienable rights" given us by God are null and void is exclusively Christian. It is, also, exclusively American. It is an application of the Christian principle that man should not "render unto Caesar" the things "that are God's." This principle was their reason for providing for a government of "limited powers." Caesar (government) must have no supremacy over the souls of men.

James Otis, another founder of our constitutional Republic, believed that "thus far and no farther" could manmade law go. He, too, was a follower of John Locke. The Founding Fathers intended that our Constitution should control or limit government. They believe that it should be kept within its legitimate area to secure or protect the rights and the freedoms of the individual.

George Mason, another of our great revolutionary statesmen echoed the teachings of

John Locke when he said that "both people and judges were, in conscience bound to disobey all enactments which contradict the laws of nature and the laws of God." Continuing with Locke's thesis, Mason said "The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to Him from whose punishment they cannot protect us."

Even before communism and socialism and their totalitarian forms of government, European nations were ruled by the pagan philosophy that there is no higher moral law than the state. Today, we are told that there is no higher moral law than the whim or will of the majority. This is a denial of the Christian principle that all lawmakers must follow the pattern of the divine law or else their law is null and void.

The Constitution of the United States embodies and expresses the eternal moral principles which require obedience from all individual citizens and lawmakers alike.

Justice Davis of the U.S. Supreme Court (1862-1877) once said "The Constitution is a statement of eternal moral principles as changeless as their Author." In one sense our Revolution and the writing of our Constitution was an effort to prove the right of the authority of the divine law over all man-made law.

The authors of our Constitution believed that neither men nor government (Caesar) had the right to take away from man what God had given him—his inalienable rights. Justice McReynolds of the U.S. Supreme Court (1914-1941) once said that the guarantee of liberty embraced the right of the individual to "engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home, to bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and generally to enjoy those privileges recognized as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by freemen."

James Otis said that "Liberty is the gift of God and cannot be annihilated."

John Adams said that "Liberty is a moral right derived from the great Legislator of the universe. Liberty, as the gift of God is for all men, at all times, under all circumstances." One of the main purposes of our Constitution was to secure its blessings to every American and his posterity.

Christ taught that the Ten Commandments are a statement of moral law as eternal as His Father who gave them. He did not believe that more complex and complicated ways of living would require the revision of the Ten Commandments or the principles which he taught.

The architects of our Constitution believed that the moral laws laid down in the Bible and taught by Jesus were fixed and eternal.

Their purpose was to incorporate those principles in our Constitution so that its spirit would be forever in keeping with the "Spirit of the Lord", where, they knew, "is liberty". The underlying moral principles which sustain our Constitution and maintain our liberty and freedom as individuals is under constant attack today.

The belief that the government or the majority can deny divine law or the moral code of the Ten Commandments is assailing us on all sides. We are being told that moral truth does not apply to this age and that the teachings of the Christ, which are endorsed and upheld by our Constitution, are outmoded and old fashioned.

The pseudointellectuals tell us that what is right in one age is wrong in the next. They tell us that all morals are manmade and as men change their morals must change with them. In other words, the morals demanded by the Ten Commandments and the rules of conduct given to us by Jesus were all right for our fathers but we have outgrown them.

These same pseudointellectuals will tell us that our Constitution deserves no respect or obedience and that it must be made to conform to the new concept of government, where man becomes a dependent on the state, loses his rights and freedoms as an individual, and man-made law is once more supreme.

The present attack upon our Constitution is the outcome of the effort of many pseudointellectuals started decades ago to destroy faith and confidence in the Bible, the Ten Commandments, and the teachings of Jesus. The founders of our constitutional Republic believed that in those sources they had found the absolute and eternal moral principles upon which all good government is based.

Our Constitution recognized the truths stated in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," including "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Jesus taught that the will of His Father in Heaven was a higher law than any man made law or even that of a majority.

In either case, if it was not in harmony with the Ten Commandments or the moral principles which He taught, the law of man must be set aside. Our Constitution upholds this teaching that the individual has "inalienable rights" and it denies the present day philosophy that right or wrong the majority has a "right" to do anything it wants to do.

The laws of most governments are man-made and they recognize no law higher than that which they make themselves. They believe only in force, that might makes right whether that force is embodied as a dictator, a legislative body or a mob (majority rule).

Jedidiah Morse, in 1824 wrote "The Annals of the American Revolution or a Record of the Causes and Events Which Produced and Terminated in the Establishment and Independence of the American Republic." In his chapter on the "View of the Principles of the Constitution and Government of the United States," he asks "what is government?"

He answers: "It is power or force applied to a certain object; and the administration of government is the exercise of this power. This power is of different kinds and exists in different forms or modifications; but in all cases it must be essentially of one or two kinds, either moral or physical; and hence governments are most properly and naturally divided into two classes, those in which power is essentially physical and those in which it is essentially moral; the latter is a government of reason in which the just powers of the government are derived from the consent of the governed and are exercised in conformity to their will, constitutionally expressed."

"The definition of free government is that it is the substitution of moral for physical force." This frame of government, in modern language is called a constitution—it constitutes the supreme authority—and is above the reach of the ordinary legislature and as much binding thereon as upon individuals. This may truly be said to be the authority of law in contradistinction to that of man.

He continues "The world owes a debt of gratitude to the American Republic for the establishment of this system." Our constitutional Republic was established on this different, this revolutionary principle. This principle of moral force crystallized in the Declaration of Independence and formalized and endorsed in our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers believed that by incorporating into the Constitution these principles that "all law must be in harmony with

the divine law to be valid" and that the law-maker as well as the individual citizen must be subject to the law—these standards would incur the rights and freedoms of the individual for all times.

Unless we accept our responsibility to develop and encourage and cultivate a deeper understanding and appreciation of the true nature of our Constitution, we face the danger of destroying the very fortress that protects our rights and freedoms. Our Constitution, by its very nature places these rights and freedoms beyond the reach of either the will of the majority or government. Its basis is the fundamental principle of moral law which reflects the divine law.

Let us go forward into the new decade with the inspiring words from the Battle Hymn of the Republic ringing in our ears:

"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat:
He is sifting out the souls of men before His judgment seat
Be swift my soul to answer Him. Be jubilant my feet
Our God is marching on."

Nobody Pays Taxes but the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, ABC Commentator Paul Harvey made a most enlightening statement in a radio broadcast which I request be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. His subject concerns, and should be of interest to, every person—even those who think they do not pay taxes. It should certainly interest every Member of Congress who has any sense of fiscal responsibility. Mr. Harvey will open their eyes. Direct taxes are oppressively high; but when compared to hidden taxes, direct taxes are the lesser evil.

When I was elected to Congress, I promised the people of my district that I would vote on each issue as would be best for our district, State, and Nation. I promised that my vote would not be controlled by party "bosses," nor by any other vested interest. I promised that I would not compromise principle for either party or politics.

I represent the people, and have kept myself independent of entanglements so there could be conflict of interest. As a result, I am criticized for not blindly following the dictates of the radical northern branch of the Democratic Party. I am a lifelong member of the Democratic Party; I will not betray the trust of my people by following the demands of the radical wing of our great party. The radical "bosses" are wrong. I will not follow anybody who is wrong. The people of the district I represent still subscribe to true Democratic principles, and so long as I am here, I will live up to those principles. They know I will not let them down.

The radicals criticize me for voting contrary to dictation when I oppose the foreign aid program. I oppose it not only because the money could be put to better use in our own country, but because it costs each family in our districts a minimum of \$200 per year in hidden taxes, as disclosed by Mr. Harvey in easily understood language. The radicals support it because it provides patronage jobs for them to fill. Another item I opposed was the appropriation to pay for the President's sending the troops to Little Rock. The radicals supported it because they thought it meant votes for them. There are numerous examples of these giant spending programs and proposals, but you know them as well as I do. For each billion dollars that is spent, each small family has to dig up an additional \$25 for hidden taxes, in addition to direct taxes. For larger families, the cost is more. To truly represent my people, I must oppose the northern radicals, and say "No" to those who demand that I submit to their dictation.

History discloses that when any nation taxes its people more than 25 percent of their income, that nation is eating its seed corn and is headed for ruin. We have already reached nearly 35 percent. When somebody complains that I have opposed the radicals—when somebody attacks me because I have tried to cut out useless and unnecessary spending—when somebody proposes a new spending program, just remember that if more money is spent, it will be your money—you will have to pay more taxes.

At this point, I ask to include Mr. Harvey's statement. Here is Paul Harvey, radio commentator, newspaperman, farmer, and author, who reveals that nobody pays taxes but the people, because all taxes are added to the price of the things that are sold:

WHO'S DOUBLING THE PRICE YOU PAY FOR YOUR DAILY BREAD? PAUL HARVEY NAMES THE CULPRIT IN "ONLY PEOPLE PAY TAXES"

Americans, 2 weeks ago, I, Paul Harvey, started out chasing a sneak thief and I ended up with the detection of public enemy No. 1. I have been 2 weeks on the trail.

I am very tired. But the job is done. No conviction yet. But I can name him now. And he is yours to prosecute as you see fit. Before I tell you his name. * * *

Here's what happened. Two weeks ago I got a letter from a farmer on the subject of the last election.

But he included this question, "Who is the middle man who is getting rich off the farmer?"

He said he sells a bushel of wheat for \$1.73.

By the time that bushel of wheat is made into 66 loaves of bread it costs housewives \$15.84. Whoa, there.

"Who's getting rich on me?" the farmer wanted to know.

Well, I've heard that question repeated so often that I had stopped listening to it.

But suddenly I decided the one way to silence that noisome question—nobody had tried—and that was to answer it.

Well, with my limited staff we started playing detective.

For the wheat in a loaf of bread the farmer gets 2½ cents.

But you pay 24 cents.

So you are both being robbed by somebody. Who?

I figured I'd backtrack on the culprit. So I went to the grocery store. "How much do you take out, Mr. Grocer, when you sell a loaf of bread?" I said. "There's more than 20 cents missing that somebody's getting. Is it you?"

Well the grocer showed me that his markup is confined by competition to only 3 cents.

In view of his salaries, overhead, that markup seemed fair enough, especially when he explained that he has to pay more than half of it back in corporate income taxes not covered in the sales tax.

And also he contributes to the social security and unemployment taxes of his employees.

He pays an electric bill every month plus a tax on it. And his delivery truck was taxed when he bought it and the gasoline it uses and the license plates it wears are all taxed.

So all this overhead, not to mention his own income taxes, made 3 cents seem a fair enough profit for the grocer to make on that loaf of bread.

Anyway, he was not the robber I was looking for.

I went to the wholesaler and rode on one of the trucks that delivers the bread.

Maybe this driver was the boy who's been picking the farmer's pocket.

After all, the teamsters union, you know.

But I divided the number of loaves of bread the man delivers by his wages per week and his take is less than one-twentieth of 1 cent a loaf. So he's doing all right. But he's not stealing anything.

There's too much spread between the price and the cost of a loaf of bread. The guy I was looking for doesn't have just a finger in the kitty.

He's in there with both fists.

I kept looking.

There were two tedious days of sleuthing for this sneak thief before I backtracked on that loaf of bread as far as the flour mill. But I made sure that I didn't miss any possible middlemen in the bakery or in the railroad that hauled the flour, or anywhere.

And not one was getting away with anything. I mean the profit slice which each took for his services was an infinitesimal fraction of one-tenth of 1 penny per loaf. Not even measurable.

Then I got a tip. Check the sugar source. If nobody in the wheat-flour ingredient was robbing us—maybe the sugar people. I backtracked to a New Orleans refiner and it was another deadend. The price you pay for the sugar and the salt and the yeast and the milk solids and the shortening in the loaf of bread—all put together—come to less than one-fourth of 1 cent per loaf.

So...

And here is where I stubbed my toe. By the time I added everybody's profit for handling the materials and the finished product plus the cost of the ingredients—I figured it all up—and it came to 12 cents for a loaf of bread. You should be paying 12 cents for a loaf of bread.

But I can't get my grocer to sell me a loaf for less than 24 cents.

Who's doubling the price of my loaf of bread?

Who's getting away with that other 12 cents?

I had figured every handler's wage down to the most minute fraction. My figures could not be wrong.

But a loaf of bread added up to 12 cents and it's still selling for 24 cents. I was getting as angry as the farmer who'd written me that letter. It's frustrating to have your wife go to the grocery store and—somewhere in there—get robbed by a ghost.

Well I went back to the farmer. I decided to start all over again, but working forward from the farmer. The research

went faster this time because I knew the direction.

And this time I caught him. Red handed. The guy who's picked your pocket every time you buy a loaf of bread. And he's been dealing himself in when you buy milk, too. There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your doorstep. And sure enough, I found the same guy doubling the price. The syndicate he operates is so smooth and so subtle that it's little wonder he's escaped the rap for this before.

But I'm going to name him tonight. Because he's gradually aiming to double the price of your loaf of bread again.

And again.

While the farmer fusses and fumes and shadowboxes with imaginary villains, the real one has been in hiding.

I took that farmer's bushel of wheat to market. The farmer got \$1.73 for it. Two and one-half cents per loaf of bread.

But when flour mill added its fraction for milling—wait a minute—the flour to make one loaf of bread has suddenly doubled. It comes out of the mill costing 5 cents. Not 2½. Still the mill is getting only a minute fraction of a penny for itself.

But the mill is required to pay. Now the trail gets warm.

The mill has to add on seven Federal taxes and eight separate State taxes.

The railroad which hauls the finished flour—now the trail gets hot—keeps only a tiny fraction of a penny for its services—but it adds on 2 pennies to pay five Federal taxes, plus State taxes in every State through which the shipment passed.

In this case there were three.

Jumping Jehoshaphat.

I thought taxes just soaked the rich.

This is soaking anybody who buys a loaf of bread.

And when I backtracked on those other ingredients, I found the sugar refiner paid eight Federal taxes and six Louisiana State taxes. The railroad that hauled the sugar paid taxes. The warehouse where the salt was stored in Chicago paid taxes. The shortening manufacturer and the yeast factory and the producer of the milk solids.

Each was keeping for himself such a minute profit that the total cost of the ingredients had added only 2 pennies. But the taxes had pyramided to more than twice that.

I am an amateur detective. But I did the best I could. And when I finally retracted the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf I understood why that price tag is more than 10 times what the wheat farmer gets.

Because here are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread.

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. While we were watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again and again and again. After all, we've consoled ourselves, the tax man gets only 20 percent of my income. It's worth that to live in America.

But that's a lie and a delusion. The tax man has been picking your pocket for 12 cents every time you buy one loaf of bread. But with such clever slight of hand—by such an involved and complicated multiplicity of hidden taxes—that his hand was quicker than our eye.

You think you pay a hundred dollars tax when you buy a new \$2,000 car. Listen: There have been \$288 in hidden taxes collected on that car before it ever leaves the factory.

And then there are all the taxes the dealer pays, taxes on income, property, taxes when you transfer the title, when you pay the State tax. So when you pay \$2,000 for a car—more than one-fourth of that price is just taxes.

You've been figuring the corporation tax would cost only the big corporations. But look what happened. They added it to the price of the car.

We pay it.

The grocer, the trucker, the baker, the miller, they don't pay their taxes. We do.

When we buy that loaf of bread.

Railroads don't pay taxes. Corporations don't pay taxes.

Just people pay taxes.

All the rest of those fellows add their taxes onto the stuff they sell us.

Only people pay taxes.

We can hear that our Federal Government is sending a billion dollars to Tito. * * *

And we figure "so what * * *."

But every time our Government spends a billion it taxes the average American family another \$25.

Only people pay. How much different it might have been if our Government had said it that other way. That "every American family is asked to chip in \$25 this year for Tito." Wow.

Conversely, every billion dollars which our Government saves—every billion dollars less that it spends—decreases the tax load for the American family of four by \$25. Wow.

I'm going to remember that. Every time the Washington or the State spenders speak of spending another billion for something or other, I'm going to remember it's 25 of my dollars they're spending. It'll make a difference.

There you have it. That is what takes your money—the reason for the high cost of living. The hidden tax is far more costly to the wage earner than is the income tax—and every new giveaway spending program makes it worse. You never hear one of the free spenders offer any idea about where the money is coming from—but you and I know we have to pay it—and the old folks on small pensions and others with small income are the hardest hit of all through the increasing hidden taxes.

A great majority of the people of my district would vote just as I do, in opposing the radical northern usurpers. How do you vote?

Kiwanis Clubs Are Spearheading Challenging New Individual Citizenship Program Called the C Q Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release of the public relations department of Kiwanis International. My good friend and constituent, Hon. Albert J. Tully of Mobile, Ala., is now president of this great organization, and I had the pleasure of introducing Albert at a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, honoring him, on February 23. We are proud of Albert Tully in Alabama; he is one of our outstanding citizens and is performing a fine job as president of Kiwanis International. Kiwanis is to be com-

mended on their new "C Q program." As President Tully states:

During the past few years it has become more and more evident to more people that the assumption of individual responsibility and concern for good government, strengthened moral fiber, and even North American freedom itself, has become a must if we are to continue as strong, healthy, free nations.

KIWANIS CLUBS ARE SPEARHEADING CHALLENGING NEW INDIVIDUAL CITIZENSHIP PROGRAM CALLED THE C Q PROGRAM

CHICAGO, ILL.—Kiwaniis Clubs on both sides of the United States-Canadian border are currently spearheading a dramatic new good-citizenship program for the individual called the C Q program. The name inspired by the international code signal identify yourself means, literally "Citizenship Quotient." The aim of the program is to challenge each individual of each community to appraise his personal C Q, and to determine through that appraisal his own acceptance of citizenship responsibilities. "It is hoped that, if he finds himself deficient, he will set about improving his C Q, and thus his community and his Nation," said Albert J. Tully, Mobile, Ala., attorney, and president of Kiwanis International.

Mr. Tully added that "the program is in no way an effort by Kiwanis, itself to rate either its members or its fellow citizens. Instead, it seeks to encourage them to rate themselves in keeping with the true concept of individual responsibility."

The C Q program is especially appropriate now because of the year—in the United States—devoted to selecting and electing new governmental leaders.

Kiwanis clubs in many communities have already established local C Q committees which are bringing the "C Q story" to their fellow citizens through publicity, and through gatherings of various types.

"The idea for the C Q program has been long in the making," said Tully. "During the past few years it has become more and more evident to more people that the assumption of individual responsibility and concern for good government, strengthened moral fiber, and even North American freedom, itself, has become a 'must' if we are to continue as strong, healthy free nations." President Eisenhower, himself, pinpointed the need for this assumption of responsibility when he said at a recent press conference in Washington, "I just want to say this—the Americans, the American's rights and privileges are going to be maintained only if he exhibits a commensurate responsibility of his own."

"For the past 2 years, Kiwanis' annual theme has pledged Kiwanians to assume greater personal responsibility in community affairs of every kind, so the C Q program was a 'natural,'" Tully continued.

That the program has wide appeal, and is badly needed is attested to by such comments as those of Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, Mr. Charles Dudley, Atlanta attorney and former executive secretary of the Associated Industries of Georgia, and Mr. John A. Labree, Pacific district manager, Extension Division, the Du Pont Co.

Senator MUNDT said "Increasingly, Kiwanis International is impressing upon the Members of Congress through such programs as CQ that it is an action organization, vigorously interested in the preservation of our American freedoms and determined to do its part to preserve those basic American institutions which have made us great and keep us strong."

Mr. Dudley said, "I appraise the CQ program as one of the most comprehensive and challenging programs ever presented by Kiwanis. It loads the 'action gun.' If put into action by Kiwanis Clubs and the communities in which they serve, this recognition of citizenship responsibility and the

individual discharge thereof would, indeed, bring us to a new day in America, and put an end to the alarming drift toward Statism."

Mr. Labree said "Your aim to develop the individual and his citizenship quotient is sound, dynamic and workable. May your efforts be rewarded with 100 percent success."

Perhaps the most powerful statement of the need for the assumption of individual responsibility comes in the words of Mr. Walter Wiesman, a former sergeant in the German Air Force (World War II) now a newly naturalized American citizen. Mr. Wiesman said:

"The newcomer realizes that as an individual he becomes part of the Government—a sensation never before experienced—the feeling that he can do his part to determine what should be done for the welfare of community, State, and Nation not just by enjoying the privilege to vote but by expressing his views in the proper form to the proper people. This is something millions in this world are dreaming about and hoping for. And we have it right here."

"But the newcomer also sees alarming signs which he just cannot understand. He finds that a great number of citizens in this country enjoy all the privileges without realizing the duties of a citizen in a democracy such as ours. He finds a complete apathy toward the affairs of our Government—a complacency which spells death to any free and self-governing system. He detects that many people do not appreciate the advantages offered to any member of this great family called the United States."

"It is precisely this trend, plus what is called 'the weakening of our moral fibre' that the CQ program is aimed at helping to stem, and to reverse," said President Tully.

Politics and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at one time or another, many of us have given serious thought to ways in which the base of participation in our two party system might be broadened—ways in which more of our people could be motivated to take an active interest in politics, which is the science of governmental operation.

We also have given serious thought to the consequences of having either one or both of our major political parties derive principle financial support from a small group, or groups, of contributors.

We have seen nonpartisan, civic organizations, such as the American Heritage Foundation, launch programs designed to stimulate general participation in and financial contribution to political parties.

With these facts in mind, I submit an editorial from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times commenting on a proposal of ESTES KEFAUVER, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, on this subject.

The editorial speaks for itself and I commend it to all my colleagues:

A DIFFERENCE IN POINT OF VIEW

When the clean elections bill, which so closely resembles Florida's who-gave-it-who-

got-it? law was being debated in the U.S. Senate, one important and little noticed amendment got sidetracked—only temporarily, we hope.

This was a proposal sponsored by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, with strong support from such others as Senators NEUBERGER, HENNING, CLARK, and JAVITS, to permit an income tax credit, or alternatively a deduction, for small campaign contributions.

Specifically, the Kefauver formula would have permitted a 50 percent tax credit on contributions up to \$20, or, if the taxpayer preferred, he could take a deduction up to \$100, just as he does on gifts to charity.

It is important to understand the distinction in these alternatives. The first—the 50 percent credit—would apply to every taxpayer, whatever his income. Thus it would encourage a great many small campaign contributions.

But in order for the taxpayer to get as good a break on the alternative of a deduction, he would have to be in the 50 percent tax bracket—which is to say, with a net taxable income about \$15,000.

From that level on up, the deduction would be preferable. The taxpayer with an income of \$50,000, for example, would save \$75 of his \$100 deduction. Anyone with \$200,000 or more would save \$91 of the \$100.

And here there was revealed a rather significant party difference. The opinions of the two national chairmen—Paul Butler for the Democrats and Sen. THURSTON MORTON for the Republicans—was solicited.

Both chairmen liked the idea of a tax incentive to encourage more campaign contributions. However, while Democratic Chairman Butler endorsed the Kefauver plan of either a credit or a deduction, so as to give an even shake to everyone, whatever his income, not so Republican Chairman MORTON.

The GOP chieftain was all in favor of the tax deduction, which means the bigger the income the bigger the break for the contributor. But he expressed powerful opposition to the tax credit for the small giver.

Our readers can draw their own moral from these two viewpoints.

As to the whole idea, the Senators dropped it because they feared the House would consider its constitutional rights of originating tax measures were being invaded.

If the House ever gets around to the Senate bill, we hope the tax incentive plan will be added there—and that it will include both the credit and the deduction.

Cardinal Cushing Airs Views on Christian and Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the Cardinal's first pastoral letter which reveals his views on a variety of topics:

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 6, 1960]
CARDINAL AIRS VIEWS ON CHRISTIAN AND COMMUNITY

Richard Cardinal Cushing has issued his first pastoral letter which will be announced to Catholics throughout the archdiocese today at all masses.

The pastoral letter, titled "The Christian and the Community," reveals the views of His Eminence on a variety of social topics,

including the family, marriage, children, public and parochial education, men in elective offices, labor and management, the use of leisure and interreligious cooperation.

While the pastoral letter is the first since Cardinal Cushing took over as shepherd of the archdiocese in 1944, such letters are common in other dioceses. They are considered the official views of the head of an archdiocese under his teaching authority as a bishop.

AMONG HIGHLIGHTS OF PASTORAL

Among the highlights of the pastoral are the following:

Referring to the "sad image of public morality," the cardinal noted that "widespread crime and deep corruption trouble the community in many places" and that "the slick and the doubledealing use the public confidence for their own purposes." He said that the breakdown of the moral demands of an earlier time in private life has brought about a situation wherein "the sacred values which the Christian Church has fostered are not merely challenged, they are ignored, as if ancient relics of a bygone era."

"I write this letter," an introduction to the pastoral says, "in the hope that my voice will encourage the persevering, recall the wandering, solace the suffering, and bring lost souls back to the love of God." The 32-page, 13,000-word letter, issued in booklet form for distribution in the churches of the archdiocese, is divided into five sections, each one reflecting on certain problems facing the believer in the area of his personal life, the life of the family, the area of civil action, and the international scene.

Under the heading of "human dignity," the pastoral refers to certain "techniques of degradation" which unconsciously repeat the "brainwashing" of the Reds by more subtle means when "the art of persuasion becomes the art of seduction. We do not present an alternate worthy of man, the pastoral points out, when we substitute for the 'socialized mass in service of the supreme state, . . . an arrogant individualism which denies to others the rights and privileges which it demands for itself."

The portion of the pastoral letter which deals with the Christian family speaks strongly of the holiness and permanence of marriage as well as the "devastating impact on society" called by the public acceptance of separations and divorce. In a strong passage on parental discipline, the cardinal urged a return to the traditional notion of punishment—"reasonably inflicted and charitably motivated—as a necessary and logical part of any system of character building which recognizes that corrections regarding moral matters must be developed side by side with the growth of intelligence."

Commenting on housing and the problems of mixed neighborhoods, the pastoral urges Catholics to "see Christ in every present and prospective neighbor" and pointed out that the "unity of the human family" has too long been outraged "in our present housing practices."

FOR BETTER USE OF LEISURE TIME

A strong call for a more creative use of leisure time was issued by the cardinal who warned against the "unhealthy climate of a society where those hours which are given to man as his own are thrown away in a dissipation of mind and body that cannot fail to lead to debility and degeneration." He urges the intelligent use of new-found leisure in a manner that "would bring to success the higher possibilities of our own personality."

An especially powerful part of the Lenten pastoral touched upon the political community and the responsibility of citizens and officeholders for producing a better society. It says: "the good society—free of organized crime and official corruption—reflects the serious will of good citizens to provide a

healthy framework for the advancement of virtue and the promotion of progress. Nothing less will satisfy the committed Christian, nothing less will be tolerated." The letter clearly acknowledged that public virtue, far from being realized, seems to be still an elusive ideal.

On the topic of religious pluralism and interreligious cooperation, the cardinal's letter dwelled in a special way on the historic kinship between the Orthodox and Catholic churches and urged prayers for religious unity. In a similar manner a continuation of the dialogue with Protestants was urged as a means of bridging the great gulf which either a great silence or a species of embittered argument placed between the two groups. Finally an expression of affection and sympathy was directed to the Jewish people who have been afflicted recently here and throughout the world.

An appeal to assist the peoples of other lands emphasized the religious reasons for international solidarity and urged all to accept the implications of a truly international community.

"Powerful and prosperous nations," the cardinal said, "cannot consider themselves in isolation or independence, but must bring the particular interests of their own nations into harmony with that wider good which is that of the great community of mankind itself."

In concluding, the letter the cardinal emphasized that the newest of problems often look to the oldest of principles for their understanding and solution. For this reason "you have seen in these pages an appeal to the spiritual dignity of man, the sacred character of marriage, the responsibilities of the citizen in national and international life, and the call to holiness which each of us has received from the revelation of Christ." Excerpts follow:

MORAL BREAKDOWN A CHALLENGE

Widespread crime and deep corruption trouble the community in many places; more often than we like to admit it evil goes unpunished and the wicked are permitted to prosper. Government and social institutions are no exception to all of this and the slick and the double-dealing use the public confidence for their own purposes and their private interests. Not a week passes but new scandals rock the community, until even the sensitive begin to believe that this is part of our way of life.

In the realm of personal ethics, the breakdown of the moral demands which our fathers respected has progressed so far as to make our current American ethic totally incompatible with that of an earlier time. The sacred values which the Christian church has fostered are not merely challenged, they are in large measure ignored, as if ancient relics of a bygone era. For many they simply no longer apply to the realities of life as we are living it. Instead of creativity men seek excitement; instead of accomplishment, satisfaction; instead of happiness, security; instead of virtue, ease; instead of sanctity, adjustment. For the Christian it is a topsyturvy world and someone must set it right.

I know that these are days of what is called religious revival, that everywhere the churches are crowded and works of piety seem to abound. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that much that passes for religion is no more than religiosity, and much that appears to be piety is only a routine religious practice. Indifference and materialism take their toll on every side and our best efforts fall short of what the times require of us; we fail to make the faith so decisive as to break down the obstacles that dam up the flow of divine grace among men, obstacles that so effectively keep God out of the world he has created.

Most painful to the church—and probably a serious source of disinterest and defec-

tion—is the divorce so often existing between the Christian faithful and the Liturgy. We need only repeat the strong insistence of Pius XI, of blessed memory, that the faithful should not assist at the sacred rites "as if they were outsiders or silent onlookers"; or we may recall the wise teaching of St. Pius X that the first and indispensable source of the Christian spirit is to be found in "active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the church."

Every effort must be made to break down any barrier that time and custom has placed between priest and people in the act of worship. We speak of "attending" mass, but we should actually speak of "offering" mass in order to emphasize our oneness with the priest in the eucharistic sacrifice. There are no silent observers, both priest and people offer a single sacrifice to God.

HUMAN DIGNITY, MARRIAGE, DIVORCE

The problems of society then cannot be faced as though they were difficulties which could be resolved solely through technical means. To a great degree they are problems of interpersonal relationships and their solution could be aided immeasurably if we were continually conscious of the worth of each individual as a child of God. This presents to us the task of creating communities in which the desires and purposes of the individual must be achieved in harmony with the similar legitimate desires of other individuals.

We know from the bitter experience of contemporary history, the debasement both of the body and spirit of man which results from those systems which dissolve individuals into a socialized mass in service of the supreme state. On the other hand, an arrogant individualism which denies to others the rights and the privileges which it demands for itself, sins equally against the dignity of man.

The purposes of marriage, which include the personal satisfaction of those who enter into it, must be regarded primarily from the point of view of the family, and of the community into which family life must be integrated. The church has adhered firmly to this teaching, against increasing opposition from those who would see in sexual pleasure a value which the individual may and should seek for his own benefit. Longstanding ideals of personal purity have been condemned as impossible of realization. The purpose of married life has been presented only from the point of view of the married partners themselves, in such a way as to justify any excess which caters to individual desire.

The Christian, however, must defend and stress the teachings of the church relating to the pleasure which accompanies sexual activity. This pleasure forms a part of a larger series of events by which the perpetuation of the human race is assured. Sexual pleasure has its only meaning in this context.

Recently a group of religious leaders of every denomination joined in a plea against mixed marriages. In these marriages so much is lost of the spirit of the community between husband and wife, that the risk of divorce is more than doubled, not to mention the tremendous loss to the faith of children brought up in an atmosphere of religious bickering and indifference. I raise my voice again to urge that Catholics marry Catholics, and hence avoid the many frictions which the best will in the world and a sincere love are often unable to overcome.

Separation and divorce are having a devastating impact on society. Here we must regret the absence today of that social sanction which a few generations ago forbade them under whatever guise. The more insecure the institution of marriage becomes,

the more insecure the emotional life of the children, the more ready the married couple to seize upon the least of excuses as a cause for separation or divorce.

I exhort you all sincerely to pray with increasing regularity for the needful gifts of patience, understanding, and mutual love that must support a couple throughout their married lives. The obligation of living together which arises from marriage cannot be set aside according to the whim or caprice of either or both parties, and it is unlawful for married Catholics to separate on their own initiative and without submitting the matter to proper ecclesiastical authority.

CONCERNING CHILDREN AND AGED

Each of us has a responsibility to the children over whom we exercise guidance or care. We must remember always, we of the adult generation, that tomorrow is living beside us, as well as ahead of us. Tomorrow lives in the youth of our land to whom it is our duty to give a Christian upbringing, a sense of personal worth, and a standard of values for time and eternity.

The external forces of social environment are not all-powerful and each child, as an individual person, must be assisted in achieving that independence which, in his adult life, is the indispensable condition for the exercise of his human rights. This personal freedom implies also personal responsibility; it means that a man must give an account of himself. Punishment, reasonably inflicted and charitably motivated, is a necessary and logical part of any system of character-building which recognizes that convictions regarding moral matters must be developed side by side with the growth of intelligence.

We do not punish children in order to repress them, or to frustrate their natural desires. We punish them in order that they may look for and find in their environment the influences which will move them toward the healthy maturity for which they are naturally destined. We punish them in order that they may better understand the dangers with which punishment is associated, and which dangers they are unable to discern.

We punish them that they may learn to do by their own effort the things which are necessary for their normal development as self-determining members of the community. "Spare the rod and spoil the child"—this axiom of commonsense, called into question by some, proves upon deeper reflection to be in conformity with the fundamental principles of human wisdom.

There can be a quite unconscious tyranny of youth toward the aging or the elderly, so that older people will often have a sense of intrusion even where they most have a right to be present. But please, do not neglect them. Give them the care, the attention, the love that they deserve, and that we ourselves will need in the sunset years of our own lives.

While the church lives in every society where its freedom is respected, nonetheless it can pass judgment on social realities. Not only atheistic communism and materialistic socialism have been condemned. "Where capitalism has based itself on false principles and laid claim to absolute authority on property, beyond its subordination to the common good, the church has always condemned it as contrary to the Natural Law." (Pius XII).

LEISURE, POLITICS, OTHER TOPICS

Certainly our leisure must be used in some measure for recreation and for relaxation; the human personality requires some lighter moments when the pressure of life is less strenuous and the happy company of friends dispels our cares. What we are experiencing is something quite different and something immensely dangerous for our own personal development.

The inferior quality of so much that passes as literature, the mediocrity of mass entertainment, the frivolous nature of so much socializing, the excessive seeking after excitement—all of these, and so many other factors as well, dull the truly creative powers of man, break down the disciplines of virtue, and give an example to the young that puts all spiritual values in jeopardy.

I cannot warn too strongly against the unhealthy climate of a society where those hours which are given to man as his own are thrown away in a dissipation of mind and body that cannot fail to lead to debility and degeneration.

Let no one say that I speak too strongly until he has surveyed with precision the mental and physical health of both man and society, until he has counted the vacant minds and nerve-shattered bodies, the broken families, and the mounting crime. It is not likely that anyone in our age will work himself to death, but how many hundreds of thousands have played themselves into madness.

The citizen, especially when he is also a believer, will be particularly concerned about the ability and integrity of those selected for public service. To elect an incompetent or dishonest candidate to office is a woeful reflection on the careful judgment of the citizenry, but to return such a one when his incapacities are exposed is surely inexcusable.

If a community—any community—is stricken with the infections of corruption, if law is ignored and enforcement is neglected, a dread judgment rests on the people whose lassitude and inaction amounts to a silent approval.

The good society—free of organized crime and official corruption—reflects the serious will of good citizens to provide a healthy framework for the advancement of virtue and the promotion of progress. Nothing less will satisfy the committed Christian, nothing less can be tolerated.

Within the community all men are accepted. There is no true concept of mere toleration within society. We know that there is an objective truth, one which is not susceptible to change with each generation. However, we must allow for freedom of consciences in the endeavor to reach this truth. We have the certainty within us that we possess it. Yet charity is the supreme commandment in our relations with those who do not share our faith.

The Christian must then pursue his supernatural objectives with the full knowledge that he lives in a society of differing beliefs, a pluralistic society. He will not be able to withdraw into an enclave all by himself, but must be prepared and ready for friendly discussion with those whose views of life and its meaning are different from his own.

It is in the spirit of friends and brothers that we must converse and live with those who are not in the fold of the Catholic Church. We are forbidden, by the very operation of conscience, to compromise in anything which touches upon the essence of faith. We extend equal respect to the consciences of those who find themselves in disagreement with us. Somehow the differences will become less acute, the climate someday will be more ready for friendly discussion. Then the personal relations of millions of Catholics with their friends will affect a difference in attitudes within which the spirit of God's truth may be able to work more effectively.

Since an enlightened citizenry is needful above all else for the Nation's welfare, we share a concern as loyal citizens in good educational facilities. We must show our interest then in all endeavors to improve the public schools for a better America. The public schools and their loyal administrators and teachers deserve well of the total com-

munity. This will be our conviction, even in those places where it may be that none of our Catholic children attend such schools. In point of fact, nearly half of our young people do attend the public schools and the percentage will in all likelihood increase in the years ahead.

I would be less than frank if I did not openly admit that, to me, one of the most disturbing factors in American life today is the series of attempts made by certain business enterprises to challenge or even to violate the laws regulating business on Sundays. It seems that an organized campaign is being waged to destroy the traditional American respect for the religious nature of the Lord's Day, out of a sordid desire for financial profit.

It is true that many sincere and religious people feel that the present laws do them an injustice. It is not against them that I direct my words, for I respect and honor them for their loyalty to their religious tradition. Rather it is against those who would make of the Sunday just another business day, that I beg you to be on your guard. "Business as usual" is not to be the slogan for Sunday, if America is to remain what it has been: a religiously God-fearing, and God-serving nation.

Should We Continue To Quarantine China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an issue which is receiving much attention in the United States, in the communities and increasingly in the Congress, is our China policy. If we are going to have world peace through world law and controlled disarmament, we have to communicate with China. Under unanimous consent I am including a thoughtful editorial by Paschal Wilson, editor of the Grants Pass Courier. It appeared February 20, 1960:

SHOULD WE CONTINUE TO QUARANTINE CHINA?

Recognition of China is one of the issues scheduled to be studied and discussed next week by an estimated 200 adults and 360 high school students in the current Josephine County "Great Decisions" series.

Mainland China, with a quarter of the world's people, has long been the most populous nation in the world. With its vast human and natural resources—and its relentless drive toward industrialization—China could conceivably become, in a generation or so, the most powerful nation in the communist bloc, if not in the world.

The rapid modernization of China may mean that, in less than 10 years and perhaps as soon as 3 years, China will produce its own nuclear weapons, thus joining the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union as an atom-age military power.

Many Allied leaders claim that the U.S. diplomatic and economic boycott of Peiping government is out of date now that China is acquiring the status of a major world power.

Yet there is also widespread support for continuing present U.S. policies—withholding of U.S. diplomatic recognition, total embargo on U.S. trade with Red China, and U.S. blocking of all maneuvers to turn over China's U.N. seat to Peiping government.

Even the most conservative outside observers agree on two generalizations: mainland China's economy is growing at an unprecedented rate; and the cost in individual freedom has been enormous. The economy is undoubtedly growing more rapidly than the Soviet Union did in its first 10 years.

The implications of these rates of growth, if accurate, are fairly clear. In time, China can catch up not only with Britain, but also with the Soviet Union. It has the potential and, apparently, the drive.

Nor has this lesson been lost on the leaders of many underdeveloped nations. Even though many of these leaders deplore China's communes, mass purges and total social regimentation, people in underdeveloped lands cannot help but be fascinated with the material success of Communist economic planning. It still remains to be proved whether, in the 20th century, a backward economy can progress as rapidly under free enterprise or free political institutions. Democratic India's economic growth, for example, lags well behind China's.

Participants in the "Great Decisions" radio panel on KAGI at 8:30 p.m. Sunday will include Rev. Raymond Brandt, Mr. Frank Lavsky, and Mrs. John R. Boe, moderator. The discussion topic will be "Red China on the March. What U.S. Action?"

Loyalty Oaths Under the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last week I referred on this floor to widespread dismay inside the academic community, and especially at my district's world-famed University of Wisconsin, over the imposition of certain loyalty statements upon persons receiving loans or other aid under the National Defense Education Act. I have recently received from a committee of the faculty of the university a full statement of the faculty position. Before I put this statement into the RECORD at this point, I should like to add that the regents of the university have adopted precisely the same position as the faculty. I call my colleague's attention to this statement as one of the clearest, most excellent explanations of what is wrong with the disloyalty disclaimer that I have ever seen in so few words:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

LAW SCHOOL,

Madison, Wis., February 17, 1960.

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KASTENMEIER: The undersigned are a committee of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, appointed to communicate to the Senators and Members of Congress from Wisconsin the views and hopes of that faculty on the disclaimer-of-belief affidavit under the National Defense Education Act.

As you know, that act requires that anyone (whether student or teacher or research worker) either receiving pay or borrowing money under any of the act's provisions execute two sworn statements: (1) an oath of allegiance in the form that all of us who have been in the military service know so

well, and (2) an affidavit that he does not believe in violent overthrow of the Government, etc. etc., nor support any organization that does so believe or teach.

Our faculty, after extended consideration and debate at two meetings a month apart voted on January 4 last to announce its unalterable opposition to the affidavit requirement of the NDEA, that is, to the second requirement above listed, the one that asks a man to swear that he does not believe in certain things. The faculty's reasons for this position are, as simply as possible, these:

(1) The conviction that belief is a private matter. Government, we say, has a legitimate interest in a man's actions, and sometimes in his words or his associations. But his beliefs are private: about them the government of a free country has no business asking questions.

(2) The difficulty of understanding the particular form of words that NDEA requires. Suppose a man believes, as we certainly do, that General Washington, although a revolutionary and no doubt a traitor by King George's law, was nevertheless a moral man and a great patriot. Or suppose he thinks, as many do, that the Government of the United States is in fact in danger of violent overthrow—namely by atomic attack from the Soviet Union. Can a man holding either of these beliefs honestly sign this affidavit?

(3) The conviction that the affidavit is useless. Its purpose, we suppose, is to exclude subversives from these programs. But who will be so quick as a subversive to sign anything whatever? A big lie in the cause is to them an act of duty.

(4) The feeling that the requirement discriminates against college people. No one else engaged in nonsecret work, if we understand the situation rightly, is asked by the Government to sign a document like this. (Labor union officers were asked to under the Taft-Hartley law, but the requirement was repealed in 1959). Are college people, faculty and students, really so much less reliable than all the other Americans who have dealings with the Government?

(5) The conviction, as President Eisenhower has put it, that the oath of allegiance ought to be enough. When a man has sworn to bear true faith and allegiance to his country and to defend its constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, it is merely insulting to ask him in the next breath whether he thinks that country and that constitution ought to be violently overthrown.

Whatever different men may think of the first four reasons stated, it seems to us that this last one ought to be conclusive. The oath of allegiance is an effective, comprehensive and clear statement of patriotic duty, hallowed by long use and by the lives of many men. No one can be asked to swear to it without an inner thrill. To follow it with complicated jargon about what a man believes cheapens the whole performance. The President is right: the oath of allegiance is enough.

A bill, S. 2929, to repeal the affidavit requirement (leaving the requirement for the oath of allegiance in the act) has been reported out by the Senate committee in charge. Similar House bills are in the hands of the Committee on Education and Labor. The matter, we believe, is strictly nonpartisan: at least leading members of both parties have supported the repeal. We hope that the repeal of the affidavit requirement may have your support and your vote.

Respectfully,

F. H. HARRINGTON.

J. O. HIRSCHFELDER.

R. K. HUITT.

F. I. OLSON.

EDWIN YOUNG,

CHARLES BUNN.

Chairman, Faculty Committee on the
Disclaimer Affidavit.

Pedalight—Safety for Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, through data recently collected I have learned that for the past 20 years, safety campaigns have been conducted continuously throughout the 50 States to reduce the tragic toll in bicycle and automobile accidents. Not only do literally dozens upon dozens of organizations, clubs, and companies participate in these campaigns with no monetary motive in mind, but almost without exception the Governors of all 50 States have, and are lending a hand.

Unbelievable as it may seem, the tragic toll in 17 years in the United States alone has been 641,750 youths crippled and injured and 9,286 youths killed outright in bicycle-car accidents.

Parade magazine published:

Bike-car accidents are now the leading cause of death in our children between the ages 1 and 14.

It has come to my attention that right here in the Nation's Capital a Mr. Paul H. MacMahon—who one night some years ago had the harrowing experience of almost hitting a child who fell from a bicycle directly in the path of his car—has done something about the situation.

His research has disclosed that approximately 68 percent of all the bike-car accidents occur after dusk, or at such times when both cars and bicycles should have on their head and tail lights, and that therefore the mere observance of all safety rules for bicycling would do little toward cutting down this tragic toll. MacMahon concluded that the only answer was a light that would show the unique motion of the legs in pedaling a bicycle, plus a blinker action for instantaneous recognition that such a light was on a bicycle in motion. The result was his invention of "Pedalight."

When Pedalight was demonstrated to Mr. William F. Stoeffhaas, vice president of Arnold, Schwinn & Co., of Chicago, one of the largest bicycle manufacturers in the world, Mr. Stoeffhaas stated:

I am of the opinion that this Pedalight should add considerably to the safety of cyclists riding at night.

The appalling, tragic implications of the accident totals leave no doubt that the combined efforts of the various safety campaigns have not been sufficient to reduce the gruesome figures. Otherwise, the deadly trend would not have increased in 12 short years from 21,790 youths crippled and injured in bicycle-car accidents in 1947 to the shocking and terrifying figure in 1959 of 59,300 youths crippled and injured and 480 killed outright.

Almost daily in many of the larger cities there are newspaper articles dealing with suggestions for curbing this toll or simply reporting the local catastrophes in bike-car accidents. Finally, and at last, three newspapers have just

recently published items that give the answer everyone has been looking for.

I recommend including these items in the RECORD not only for the good that can be derived here at home, where the bicycle is a mere drop in the bucket as compared to the numbers in use in European and other countries of the world, but because I believe that these articles appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be a humanitarian contribution on our part so that other countries may learn and benefit with us.

The invention of "Pedalight" marks a milestone in progress toward the safety of our youth, and its use should be implemented by appropriate legislation on the Government and State levels.

Before appropriate legislation is introduced on the subject, I invite comments from all sources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of these remarks, and articles from the Chicago Daily Tribune, February 22, 1960; Washington Daily News, February 9, 1960; and Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 23, 1960.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 22, 1960]

NEAR TRAGEDY PUTS LIGHT ON BIKE CRASHES— INVENTOR BUILDS LAMP FOR PEDALS (By George Bilas)

Ten years ago, an electronics engineer from Washington, D.C., received the scare of his life while driving through Cincinnati. A 10-year-old boy riding on an unlighted bicycle suddenly fell in front of his moving automobile.

"It was dark and all I could see was the boy's shadow," said Paul H. MacMahon. "I jumped out of the car and stood amazed as the boy crawled out from under my car. He wasn't hurt, but it was close."

The memory of that incident began to occupy MacMahon's leisure time. His hobby over the years has been inventing things.

He consulted records he received from insurance companies and other sources and found that during a 17-year period there were 641,750 youths crippled or injured and 9,286 killed in bike-auto accidents. Each year there has been a tremendous increase in this type of accident.

Of more importance, MacMahon's study revealed that more than 68 percent of the bike-auto accidents occurred after dark. Most bicycles were not equipped with lights and those with lights generally were far from adequate, he said.

After trying several ideas, MacMahon developed a light which would fit into the pedals of the bike and which would operate like the lights of railroad crossings protected by a combination of oscillating and flashing red lights. The invention, he said, is also similar to the oscillating and flashing red tail lights on airplanes.

MacMahon said the battery powered lights throw beams in three different directions. A white beam of attention-attracting light flashes on when the pedal is in the forward direction and a beam of red light cuts in automatically when the pedal begins its revolution in the other direction.

MacMahon hopes to get legislation to require all bicycles to be equipped with the moving light.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 9, 1960]

(By Gene Shumate)

The fruits of one inventor's labors could save thousands of lives at a minimum cost to the public.

District Traffic Director, George England, when he saw this at a preview, said he was "very impressed with the life-saving possibilities of this invention."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 23, 1960]

A BETTER LIGHT FOR BIKES

If you've ever had to swerve suddenly while driving along a dark street to miss a kid on a bicycle, you'll be interested in an invention described in the Chicago Tribune—a combination battery-powered, oscillating and flashing red-and-white light which is fitted into the pedals of bicycles, and which throws white and red beams in three different directions while the pedals are revolving.

The inventor, an electronics engineer from Washington, D.C., compiled records which showed that during a 17-year period 641,750 youngsters were crippled or injured, and 9,286 were killed in accidents involving bicycles and automobiles. He also learned that 68 percent of the bike-auto accidents occurred after dark.

In Cleveland last year 203 youngsters were involved in this type of accident, although they are required by law to have lights on their bikes if they ride after dusk. Three were killed.

However, there are lights and lights, and it is very difficult, when coming from behind in an automobile, to see a youngster who has just turned into the street on his bike, when the bike's headlight is about the same intensity as a birthday candle. In many instances better and brighter lights on bicycles would be a great safety factor—and flashing, oscillating red and white lights might be just the ticket.

Presidency Demands Trained Statecraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy at this time to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 3 issue of the Columbus Dispatch. This, I believe, is the first major newspaper in the United States to endorse RICHARD M. NIXON for President of the United States.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENCY DEMANDS TRAINED STATECRAFT

Now, of all times, the first requisite in choosing a President is that he be a man trained in statecraft. And America's statecraft today is both global and domestic in scope.

Statecraft calls for skill in the art of conducting the Nation's affairs, preferably the skill of experience and contact with contemporary problems. Possibly even more important is the skill of discerning the hard core of a problem as a preliminary to taking effective, well-considered, concrete action.

Speaking at Notre Dame University recently, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON declared that the nonmilitary struggle between the United States and world communism poses a greater problem than any threat of armed attack, though he does not, of course, minimize the dangers of the latter.

He sees the present struggle between the West and the Communist East as determin-

ing the future of the "uncommitted one-third of the world" in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East where new nations are springing into being overnight or advancing in their ambitions and their stature. These are the nations of the future who could tip the balance of power on the earth. Most of these countries have been visited by the Vice President and their ferment noted.

Mr. Nixon enlists our confidence because we doubt if any American has greater firsthand knowledge of the Russians, much of it gained by personal contact.

Not only does Mr. Nixon have a vast understanding of the Russians, he has had some experience in dealing with them. He has forcefully demonstrated on numerous occasions that he can hold his own in verbal exchanges with Premier Khrushchev. He showed it in Moscow last summer and again in Washington when Mr. Khrushchev visited the United States. He was not afraid to stand up to communism's No. 1 man, yet he spoke diplomatically, smilingly, courteously.

On several occasions, Mr. Nixon has exhibited tough-mindedness in his dealings with various Communist leaders. He is able to meet with them without being taken in by their sweet talk of peace and good neighborliness. He can dispute them without yielding ground on the one hand or antagonizing them on the other. This is particularly important in an era when so much depends on personal diplomacy.

Mr. Nixon is fully aware of the insidious methods used by the Communists in their conspiracy to undermine democratic Governments. He knows the battle of ideologies is being fought on many fronts more subtle than the launching pads for satellites and missiles.

The Vice President's knowledge and understanding of world affairs is tremendous. He has traveled 55 countries as a personal representative of President Eisenhower. He has gained a personal acquaintanceship with the heads of most of the nations of the world, has entertained many of them as his guests and has been their guest.

In South America, without quailing, he and Mrs. Nixon stood up to the slings, slurs and spittle of naked Communist insults.

Vice President Nixon is almost as well informed and briefed as the President on our foreign policy and defense planning, since he regularly attends meetings of the National Security Council.

During the President's illnesses, Mr. Nixon has been called on to conduct cabinet meetings and to take part in the formulation of Government policy, both foreign and domestic, within the framework of the Constitution, but beyond all precedent, all the while maintaining the delicate niceties of the situation.

No vice president, indeed no man in all the history of the United States—has been so well prepared for any emergency which might arise pertaining to the Presidency. It would seem to follow, then, in the logic of things, that he is the best prepared man in the country to face the demands and assume the responsibility of the statecraft of our Nation in the time that lies immediately before us.

Let Them Pay 7 Cents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced H.R.

9488, a bill which would require that airmail postage rates be paid on mail sent by air. I am pleased to report to the many Members who have expressed an interest in this legislation or who have joined me in sponsoring similar legislation that Chairman MURRAY of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has asked the Postmaster General to expedite his report on this bill.

Mr. MURRAY has written me of his awareness of recent action by the House Appropriations Committee in recommending a legislative action in regard to the long-experimental program by the Post Office Department of airlifting first-class mail on which airmail postage has not been paid.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of March 1, 1960:

AIRMAIL AT AIR RATES

If you put a 7-cent airmail stamp on a letter an airplane will carry it.

If you use a 4-cent stamp the letter will go by train or truck—or possibly by airplane.

Postmaster General Summerfield has been experimenting with airhauling of regular first-class mail for several years. Now he is trying to make the arrangement permanent, and a bill, S. 2402, would authorize him to transport all classes of mail by air regardless of the postage paid.

The railroads are up in arms about this bill, and they have a good case. They say diversion of regular mail would not only take the mail cars out of passenger trains but would take the railroads out of the passenger business because the mail is a major source of revenue.

They argue that the airlines would be given a huge cut of the mail revenue without assuming the responsibility for regular service, which the railroads have discharged capably for more than a century. The railroads carry mail around the clock every day in the year. The terms of S. 2402 would permit the airlines to handle mail virtually at their own convenience. The mail could be kept waiting at the airport not only on account of weather but because the planes had higher paying traffic.

One factor that neither the railroads, the airlines, nor the Postmaster General seem to take into account is that the American people themselves should have a choice in how they want their mail transported.

If they want to pay more, and be certain their mail will go by air, that should be their right. Premium service at a premium price is a reasonable arrangement.

But why should a letter bearing a 4-cent stamp get the same service? And—most inexcusable—why should junk mail get the same treatment as airmail?

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican of Nebraska, who has introduced a bill to prohibit the flying of any mail except at the full air rate, said:

"If people want their mail to go by air they can put a 7-cent stamp on it."

That is a reasonable view, and we hope it prevails.

The Menace of the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, underlying all of our daily thoughts and ac-

tions is the sense of concern over the continuation of the cold war.

One of my constituents, Col. Robert M. Falkenau of Winter Park, Fla., recently made a speech before the Men's Club of the First Unitarian Church of Orlando, Fla., in which he discusses ably and thoughtfully "The Menace of the Soviets."

Col. Falkenau's address follows:

THE MENACE OF THE SOVIETS

(By Col. Robert M. Falkenau, U.S. Army, retired)

We are all more or less disturbed by the possibility of a thermo-nuclear war with Russia, but I believe that as long as we maintain a strong enough military position and continue with our missile development and allied activities there is little likelihood of such a war eventuating. What I propose to discuss is the "cold war" which should be regarded as just as important for us as a thermo-nuclear war would be.

I have used the title "The Menace of the Soviets" because it would naturally draw your interest, but perhaps a more suitable title would be "The Menace of Our Own Indifference." Robert Strausz-Hupe, who has spent several years in intensive study and research of the Communist conflict operations on a global scale, has said that the most formidable obstacle to purposeful action by the United States in the cold war has been the uncertainties of the American public mood. It would seem that these uncertainties are in a large measure due to a lack of knowledge and understanding by the great mass of our people of Communist methods and what the cold war really is.

Lenin once said that communism is a battle for men's minds. The cold war is that battle. In war it is essential for the commander to know as much as possible about the aims, the strategy, and the tactics of the enemy. While our time is too limited to discuss these at the length which they deserve let us see if we can briefly set down some facts regarding them as a basis for a better understanding of the problems which we face and the actions which we must take to combat communism and preserve our way of life.

The foundations of modern communism were laid by the socialism of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Some of their main tenets were:

1. The class struggle.
2. The inevitability of capitalistic disintegration and socialistic triumph.
3. Collective ownership and management of the means of production.
4. The conquest of the state for the furtherance of socialism.
5. The dictatorship of the proletariat.
6. The final obliteration of the state caused by the communization of the economy.

Upon this foundation the Bolsheviks under Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have built the structure of modern Communist Russia and its Communist Party, which controls the government and also leads and controls, or seeks to control, the Communist Parties throughout the world.

The official "History of the Communist Party in Soviet Russia" sets forth in its preamble the aim of the Party as "the great task of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of communism in the whole world."

Lenin wrote, "The replacement of the bourgeoisie by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution and also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power which was created by the ruling class." He stressed the necessity of creating a homogeneous group of professional revolutionaries, among whom no factionalism or dissent would be tolerated. Thus the dictatorship of the proletariat became the dictatorship of the party, leading the proletariat, as Stalin himself wrote. He in turn

said that the established revolutionary regime—meaning the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—must provide help to the rest of the world "acting when necessary even with military power against exploiting classes and their states."

It has taken four decades for the Communists to reach their present status but during that time they have never lost sight of their aims as set forth by Lenin and Stalin. They are conditioned for a protracted struggle in which the cold war is only a tactic of the larger strategy. We must bear in mind that the Communist ideology is atheistic and has no standard of moral values. Lenin and Stalin, whose writing may be said to constitute the Communist bible, taught that anything which contributed to the Communist aims was right. Lying, deceit, treachery and even wholesale murder have been exemplified in their teachings and their actions. Lenin wrote that in their struggle with the bourgeoisie they should zig and zag to confuse the enemy and take one step back in order to take two steps forward. Nor should we forget that of 52 agreements which the Communists have entered into with the Western nations they have unilaterally breached 50. When the U.S.S.R. believes that it can resort to military power with a probability of success and without too much loss to itself it will not hesitate to do so. Therefore it doubly behooves the Western Powers to win the cold war. So far we have been losing it, as we see the Communists expanding their power in Asia and the Middle East and they are at work in Africa and Latin America both openly and clandestinely.

The U.S.S.R. systematically trains the leaders for its apparatus, as it calls the party organization which in practically all Communist countries controls the established governments, and in the western countries leads the work of the Communist Parties.

Jan Valtin, one of the earliest officials of the apparatus to defect to the United States, wrote:

"Over 6,000 students attended the Communist University in the winter of 1925-26. The large majority were Russians who were trained for political and administrative work in the party machine, the economic councils, in the trade unions and cooperatives, in the Red army, the Red navy, and the G.P.U., and for functions in the great number of Communist auxiliary organizations.

"The foreign students were incorporated in the international division. * * * The courses of the international division dealt almost exclusively with the aspects of class war and the struggle for communism. They did not aim at educating academic scholars. Revolutionary theories were never treated apart from actual class war experiences. The battles of the past and present—armed uprisings, strikes, civil wars—were analyzed and dissected, the mistakes of strategy and methods were pointed out, and lessons were drawn to guide the students in the actions of the future. All courses led up to and culminated in the Leninist conception of the most important step on the road to a classless society—the seizure of power through revolution, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party. Every thought, every campaign, every action whatsoever had value only if it constituted a forward step in the seizure of power. Every omission, every scruple and laxity that could tend to retard the advance was an unpardonable crime. Revolution was not one way out—it was the only way out."

Today the Lenin Institute in Moscow is the top echelon for such training. In each of the other Communist countries there is a party academy at the top, and as in Russia, district and local party schools. Similar training schools are maintained in this country for leaders in the apparatus of the American Communist Party, which is actually controlled through this apparatus by the party

of the U.S.S.R. This control is not an assumption but a well-documented fact.

Angela Calomiris was for 7 years a "plant" of the FBI in the American Communist Party in New York City and became a minor official in the apparatus. She writes:

"There are leadership schools at all echelons, from the schools for New York county leaders which I attended on up to the Lenin school in Russia where national leaders are sent for further training.

National officers are watched more closely than the lower cadres because they are responsible to the authorities overseas or across, as the Communists refer to Russia. Visitors from abroad choose the national committee and the national board just as section and county officials designate the officers of branches under them. The national committee is the top governing body of the American Party. Its executive committee is the national board, which the Communists themselves nickname "the Politburo" after its Russian counterpart. * * * Although it is theoretically chosen by the national committee, it rules the national committee the way the executive board of a branch rules the branch, and everyone on the Politburo lives in deathly fear of the "C.I. reps" from abroad.

"C.I. reps" are usually Europeans Communists from the English, French, German, or Finnish parties. They often enter the United States illegally and take false, English-sounding names. They say very little, but they listen closely, attending meetings of the national committee, roam about headquarters at 12th Street, and travel all over the country to observe the party in action. Through the detailed personnel reports kept by the National Review Commission they are in a position to locate loyal comrades who can help Soviet espionage agents in search of specific information on industry or politics.

One of the important former officials of the American Communist Party was J. Peters, who wrote "The Communist Party: A Manual of Organization." I quote from it:

"The role and aim of the Communist Party.

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society."

Today the party is believed to have about 10,000 members, having declined from 70,000 or 80,000 some years ago. This decline is deceptive, for it represents the loss of the half-hearted membership which was of relatively little importance to the movement. What remains is the hard core of dedicated and disciplined Communists. William Z. Foster, for many years the leader of the party, wrote:

"The actual strength of the Communist movement in the United States is not something that can be accurately stated in just so many figures. * * * The influence of the party stretches far and wide beyond the limits of its actual membership."

How this influence is exercised through Communist fronts and the infiltration of other organizations may be interestingly shown by the description of a single instance. James A. Wechsler, the editor of the New York Post, was recruited into the Communist Party when a young student at Columbia University and remained a member for several years, until finally disillusioned.

He was a participant in the founding of the American Youth Congress which was subsequently described as "one of the major Communist coups of the decade, if not of

the century." The Congress was not originally inspired by the Communists but by a highly un-Marxian and idealistic young woman named Viola Ilma, with a yearning to do something constructive.

Wechsler writes: "Her Congress was a pushover for the Communists, who knew what they wanted to do and were organized to do it. The basis of selection of delegates to the assemblage wasn't too precise and, in advance of the 3-day session, the Communists had assured ample representation for themselves. All varieties of youth groups were invited to elect delegates: young men and women who displayed most eagerness about attending found it easy to get themselves elected and many of them conveniently turned out to be young Communists who had received advance notice of the conclave.

After the evening sessions * * * those of us who were Communists slipped off to a "fraction" meeting at which plans for the next day's developments were carefully rehearsed. All of the top brass of the Young Communist League was on hand for these left-wing skull sessions. By the time the Congress was formally opened Miss Ilma was no longer its leader. She and a number of her bewildered conservative adherents had fled the scene. From the tone of the convention, the machinery of the Youth Congress was securely in Communist hands, but that fact was disguised more skillfully than in many other front organizations.

A YMCA midwesterner was elected chairman for the first year. He was generally pictured as spokesman of the grassroots youth, as a moderate, and as a fitting spiritual leader for so true a cross-section of the younger generation. It was not generally announced, however, that he had been present at the Communist fraction meeting the night before at which it was decided that he would be spontaneously chosen chairman next day.

This indicates the importance, in our efforts to fight the cold war, of watching not only the open maneuvers of the Communists but also their insidious operations through other organizations with ostensibly other aims. John Strachey, War Minister in the Socialist Government of Great Britain, wrote:

"It is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is, accordingly, proposed to establish socialism as something which we can put in place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence, Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road of communism."

Again, in "Bending the Twig," Col. Augustin G. Rudd writes:

"One of the greatest boaxes of history is the Communist myth that it was they who overthrew imperialist Russia. They did nothing of the kind. With German aid they treacherously seized the unseasoned Krensky regime months after it was established, and then set up their Communist despotism. Alexander Krensky tells us:

"The Bolsheviks took no part in that crucial event. Lenin and Zinoviev were in Switzerland. Trotsky was in New York. Stalin (at that time a minor figure) was in Siberian exile. * * * Lenin, Zinoviev, and others arrived 1 month after the downfall of the Romanoffs—in the notorious sealed train provided by the German Kaiser for their journey. * * * "Russia is now the freest country in Europe, where there is no oppression of the masses," Lenin declared on reaching Petrograd. * * * The myth that the Bolsheviks overthrew czarism has been purposely spread to conceal their crime of having strangled the first Russian democracy. The Communists everywhere are today trying to seize power by the same cynical device which Lenin used in 1917, namely by posing as a "defender of people's freedom and democracy."

"This historical incident affords a classical example of the incapability of Socialists or Social Democrats to maintain their regimes against a determined Communist element in their midst. Inevitably the Communists use and exploit them until a favorable opening for treachery occurs."

Ivor Thomas, a Member of the British Parliament, said:

"The Social Democrats (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries) were trying to stand on an avalanche which they themselves had helped to start. * * * The October revolution could not have taken place but for the February revolution (of Kerensky); the Communists could not have come to power if the Social Democrats had not first paved the way."

Under the New Deal and the Fair Deal we have adopted some of the plans and tenets of the Socialists and we must be watchful that we do not go far enough in that direction to make ourselves vulnerable to Communist machinations. About 5 years ago ex-President Herbert Hoover, in an address at West Branch, Iowa, said:

"I have little fear that these Communist agents can destroy the Republic if we continue to ferret them out. Our greater concern should be with the other varieties of the Karl Marx virus. Foremost among them are the Socialists, who advocate constitutional methods. By so doing they may allay many fears of some socialistic threats to our institutions. * * * The Socialists prowl on many fronts. They promote the centralized Federal Government, with its huge bureaucracy. They drive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary Government spending and exorbitant taxes. They have pushed our Government deep into enterprises which compete with the rights of free men. * * * Every step of these programs somewhere, somehow, stultifies the freedom, the incentives, the courage and the creative impulses of our people.

"Beyond all this there is proof in the world that the end result of socialism can be bloody communism. In the Iron Curtain states it was the Socialist intellectuals who weakened the freedom of men by destroying free enterprise. Thus they furnished the boarding ladders by which the Communists captured the ship of state."

What are we, in the United States, doing to fight the cold war, both at home and elsewhere throughout the world? We instituted the Marshall plan and the point four program of economic aid to underdeveloped countries and we have the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. In addition to these, various individuals and groups are making studies of Communist policies and methods, publishing papers and books on the subject, but all of these activities, both governmental and private, are uncoordinated.

We have almost entirely left the initiative in the cold war to the Communists, meeting their various moves with defenses extemporized on the spur of the moment. We have no national strategy of offensive approach to exploit the weaknesses of the Communist ideology, history and organization. It has even been said that there is insufficient coordination between the State Department and the Department of Defense and suggested that political ends have been shaped to meet military means, rather than vice versa.

One of the first governmental moves to meet this situation was the creation last July of a subcommittee of the Senate, headed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, with Senators HUBERT E. HUMPHREY of Minnesota and KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota, to make a nonpartisan study of America's preparedness "to outthink, outplan and outperform the Soviets in the cold war." At the beginning of October this committee made a preliminary report outlining

the direction which its studies would take, which appears to be soundly conceived.

Our Representative from this district of Florida, Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR. of Leesburg, has introduced in the House a bill to establish a Freedom Academy. This would provide a governmental institution in which an intensive study of the cold war would be carried on with a view to the development of national strategy and where American diplomats, military men, foreign aid personnel, businessmen serving overseas and others concerned with the combating of the cold war, including keymen from other free nations, could receive a training in strategy and tactics. At the same time it would serve as a central point for the voluntary coordination of the efforts of other organizations and individuals engaged in this field. In a sense it would be the counterpart of the Lenin Institute in Moscow. It could encourage the institution of suitable courses in our schools and colleges which would serve a purpose comparable to the local and district party schools of the Communists.

Also, in the growth of our young people they usually go through a phase at late high-school or college age, in which a large proportion of them, at least, develop a trend toward radicalism, which most lose as they mature. In this phase they are particularly susceptible to the advances and teachings of the Communists. Therefore the institution of suitable courses in all of our schools and colleges is very important, not only for the preliminary training for leadership in the cold war but also to combat the insidious approach of the Communists to our youth.

Unless some steps of this or similar character are taken to rouse the people of America from their lack of understanding and apparent indifference to the struggles of the cold war we shall continue to lose the battle, as we have done in the past. Anything which can be done to awaken them to the seriousness of this situation is well worth the effort and the cost.

The Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R. and U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most formidable deterrents against Russian Communist aggression, whether political or military, is the reality of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself. Unfortunately, this fundamental truth has not sufficiently penetrated American thought and policy. Unfamiliar with the individual histories of these captive non-Russian nations, too many of us continue to equate the Soviet Union with Russia and thus distort our thinking with this basic fallacy. As a result, many opportunities in the cause of world freedom are blindly missed and Moscow-directed operations in our very midst are scarcely noticed.

The validity and striking pertinence of my remarks are well borne out by developments these past several months. The impact of the Captive Nations Week Resolution last summer, the visit of

Khrushchev to this country, and a recent advertisement in the New York Times sponsored by Communist-listed foreign language newspapers bear a significant relationship to the vital issue of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

One of the chief proponents in this country for the development of this non-Russian issue is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Dr. Dobriansky follows closely the relations between Russian Moscow and the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. He sees in them tremendous opportunities in behalf of our own national security and for the advance of world freedom.

Some of his ideas are indicated in the following communications to the President: First, a letter dated December 17, 1959, urging the President to capitalize politically, vis-a-vis Moscow, on the Captive Nations Week Resolution; second, a letter dated September 12, 1959, suggesting poignant questions that should have been raised publicly during Khrushchev's visit here; and third, a telegram revealing the Communist-inspired advertisement printed by the New York Times on February 16, 1960. A similar telegram was sent to the editor of the New York Times.

The contents of these communications disclose how vitally important the issue of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is to our own foreign policy. The aim of the advertisement which misrepresents American groups of Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Polish, and other east European backgrounds is to discredit these groups and lessen the influence of their thinking as concerns our policy in regard to all of the captive nations. Because of the prevailing importance of the captive nations issue, particularly in connection with the approaching summit, I request that all four communications sent by Dr. Dobriansky be printed in the RECORD.

The communications follow:

GROUP URGES PRESIDENT TO CAPITALIZE ON REVELATIONS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

In a communication sent to President Eisenhower in Paris and released today, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America urged, through its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, that the United States take the lead in developing the new policy dimension provided by the cause of freedom among the majority captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The full text follows:

"DECEMBER 17, 1959.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Along with countless other Americans the membership of this committee rejoices in the tremendous success of your mission for peace and friendship in freedom. We take this opportunity to heartily congratulate you on a vital job well done. The enthusiastic reception accorded you in the course of the entire trip attests to the faith that millions upon millions of people, perched in the very shadows of Russo-Chinese Communist imperialism, have in the leadership and power of our Nation. This deep human faith in us doubtlessly seeks enhanced sustenance and justification for the years ahead.

"With the convocation of the Western sum-

mit meeting, we earnestly hope that the moral and political principles, posture, and perspectives so eloquently enunciated by you will find their concrete translation in a position of strength and firmness among our allies for the world summit meeting next spring. Considering the political and psychological reverses we, as a Nation, have seriously suffered these past 2 years, it is imperative at this critical juncture to effect this translation of principle into concrete deeds in order to dynamically advance the cause of freedom. Quite realistically, this basic cause has been badly battered in these 2 years by the massive propaganda and psychological victories reaped by Moscow through its skillful employment of scientific, military, economic, and diplomatic means, much of it possessed of marginal rather than substantial strength and significance.

"In our considered judgment a positive translation of principle into deed toward the fixed end of advancing the cause of world freedom could only be realized on the following grounds of action in thought and practice:

"(1) Placing first things first, the logic of our thinking should be steadfastly girded to the theme 'Justice and Freedom for Peace and Friendship.' The position of the free world at the summit of summits should be heralded by this trademark of freemen and all that it implies;

"(2) Realistically facing the fact that, as a result of pressured developments these past 2 years, the eventuation of another general summit represents in itself a Russian diplomatic victory, we should not expose ourselves to the boggy prospect of a series of summits whose distractive value will only redound to Moscow's favor. With this leverage of diversion into endless baited talk, the Russian-directed world conspiracy against freedom would assume even greater relative proportions;

"(3) Recognizing forthrightly that the microissue of West Berlin is only a projection of the general issue of the captive nations, including those in the Soviet Union itself, it is sine qua non for the cause of world freedom to preserve our rights in West Berlin without fear of any threat of a hot global war. The multinational state of the U.S.S.R., not to mention other parts of the Russian Empire, is far from the reality of political cohesion to permit Moscow to risk any such war;

"(4) Capitalizing on Moscow's most fundamental weakness as so prominently revealed by the Captive Nations Week resolution last July, let us begin to develop and concentrate on the new dimension of policy provided by the cause of freedom among the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. In the propaganda mirror, not to say in every other respect, the qualitative image of Russia's power, a nation of only about 196 million, would be properly cast in full relief, thus relieving many of the illusions of costurivalism. So deeply has this prospect struck Moscow that in addition to last July's outbursts against the resolution, Khrushchev's article in Foreign Affairs, in August, a puppet's speech in the U.N. in September, Khrushchev's report to the Supreme Soviet in October, and several Soviet commentaries in November have continued the blast;

"(5) while underwriting the cause of freedom for all the captive nations and precluding even the faintest possibility of an 'accommodation' of Moscow's empire, it is equally necessary to insure and deepen the solidarity of NATO which likewise has been weakened by Moscow's artful propaganda these past 2 years; and

"(6) admitting the superiority of Moscow's propaganda warfare, which is the spearhead of its cold war action, it is long overdue for us to understand the totalistic nature of the traditional Russian cold war and to build

with our allies an apparatus to cope with it in any quarter of the globe. The attempted triadic role of Khrushchev must first be understood: to hold his empire, like Czar Nicholas I in his dealings with the West; to extend the empire, like Lenin in exporting ideas to Africa and Asia; and to perpetuate his regime, like Stalin in exercising the reins of totalitarian power. In addition to the evidence furnished in "the Crimes of Khrushchev" series of the House Un-American Activities Committee, it is significant that only this past October 15, Khrushchev's agents assassinated in Munich the Ukrainian leader Stefan Bandera. Moreover, the Stalinist method of weakening a captive populace by mass deportation is being exercised at this very moment in Western Ukraine under the guise of economic mobilization. It is strikingly noteworthy, too, that by recently comparing his methods in Budapest with those of Nicholas I over a century ago, Khrushchev has openly confirmed the basic thesis maintained by this committee for years on traditional Russian imperialism and colonialism.

"In the hope that the outcome of the present summit will reflect these perspectival views for realism in the permanent cold war and always by the test of advancing the cause of world freedom, we wish you every measure of personal strength and success.

"Sincerely yours,

"LEV E. DOBRIANSKY."

UCCA CHAIRMAN'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

The following letter was sent to President Eisenhower on September 12, 1959, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your address to the Nation last Thursday evening on the subject of Mr. Khrushchev's visit to this country was both reassuring and impressive. Although this committee regards the visit in itself as another Russian cold-war victory, it nevertheless expresses its complete support of your stand that no principles will be compromised and no deals will be made.

"Your quote from de Tocqueville was most appropriate. But, on this occasion, let us also not forget this passage from his *Democracy in America*: 'The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life, the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the plowshare, those of the other by the sword.' By deeds and thought, Mr. Khrushchev is the very epitome of what de Tocqueville had in mind.

"Because this visit is in every sense of the word another cold-war weapon for Khrushchev, we strongly feel that the misleading challenge he will offer must be met by our own challenge, if this moment is not to rebound to our complete disadvantage. We, therefore, offer for your consideration use the following questions which we feel should definitely be posed to Khrushchev:

"(1) In your article in *Foreign Affairs*, you mistakenly compare Texas, Arizona, and California with certain non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Would you be willing to stage, under U.N. auspices and control, free voting conditions to determine whether the natives of Lithuania, Ukraine, and the Caucasian nations want to remain in the U.S.S.R. or be independent states and whether the residents of comparable Arizona, Texas, and California want to remain in the United States of America or be completely independent States? Let's compete in ideas and action.

"(2) Your constitution and people speak of 'freedom of religion' in the U.S.S.R. Every group can establish its own place of worship in the United States. Why is it that

the Ukrainian Catholic church and also the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic church, which exist here, are not permitted to exist in Ukraine? Let's compete in ideas and peaceful action.

"(3) There is nothing more we want than a real and close understanding with all peoples and nations. The non-Russian peoples and nations in the Soviet Union are of interest to us just as your Russian people. Would you agree to the unrestricted circulation of our magazine *Amerika* in the languages of these non-Russians and to a marked expansion of cultural exchange with the non-Russian republics? Let's compete in ideas and peaceful action.

"(4) Ukraine and Byelorussia are original charter member nations of the U.N. How would you react to our proposing the exchange of diplomatic representatives with these two republics? This would be a step toward greater understanding between our people and theirs. Let's really begin to understand each other.

"(5) I know you were terribly upset by my Proclamation and Congress' Captive Nations Week Resolution. If we were wrong about the 20 captive nations mentioned in the resolution, let's put it to a test. You speak of slavery here; we speak of slavery from the Danube to the Pacific. Under U.N. auspices and control, would you be willing to stage free elections in every one of the mentioned nations as, indeed, we would be willing to go through another one here? With whom they want to be, whom they want to be represented by and so forth would be the questions asked. Let's compete in ideas and peaceful action.

"(6) You were allowed to tour whatever area you wished to in the United States. Our Vice President had only the opportunity to travel in parts of Russia within the U.S.S.R. When I return this visit, will I be able to travel in the non-Russian countries within the U.S.S.R.? Let's compete in ideas and peaceful action.

"Mr. President, I believe that if we ourselves are not afraid of challenging ideas and of the realities that face us, these questions are quite reasonable and worthy of being presented to one who poses as a great competitor.

"With God's many blessings upon you in this most delicate situation, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,

"Chairman, Georgetown University.

"The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, White House, Washington, D.C.

"Among signatories appealing to you in the New York Times ad of February 16 to ban testing of nuclear weapons and withhold nuclear warheads from our NATO allies is the Ukrainian News. As chairman of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America I wish to assure you that said newspaper does not in any way reflect opinion of Americans of Ukrainian descent who are all behind you in your disarmament and nuclear weapons policy. The Ukrainian Daily News was cited as Communist by House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on May 14, 1951.

"Dr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,

"Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

"EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES,

"New York City:

"Your advertisement of February 16 calling on President Eisenhower to ban testing of atomic weapons and withhold them from our NATO allies includes the Ukrainian News among other signatories. As chairman of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America I wish to assure you that said newspaper does not in any way reflect or represent thinking of 1½ million American citizens of

Ukrainian descent organized in our committee. As a matter of fact the Ukrainian Daily News was cited as Communist by House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on May 14, 1951, and as such is a mouthpiece of Moscow.

"Dr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
"Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America."

Another Reason for Establishing a Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. KASEM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article by Col. Richard L. Hayes that appeared in the March 1960, issue of *Trailer Life* magazine. The article effectively points out another valuable area where the proposed Youth Conservation Corps could serve. I would like to recommend the article as must reading for each of my colleagues:

CAN'T WE HAVE MORE CAMPGROUNDS?

(By Col. Richard L. Hayes)

If you are looking for an early increase in the number of campgrounds on our great public recreation areas, you are probably doomed to disappointment. If you believe, as I do, that vastly more trailer parking facilities are urgently needed around our most popular natural attractions—in order that trawling continue to expand and the trailer club movement to grow—you will be aghast at the dim prospects.

Our previously best hope, the highly publicized and most promising programs of the National Park Service and the National Forest Service, called, respectively, "Mission 66" and "Operation Outdoors," have bogged down. The National Park Service recently announced that a time extension is needed to fulfill the aims of Mission 66, originally a 10-year program to be completed by 1966, when the Service celebrates its 50th anniversary. Now, they say it will take many years beyond that date, and, unfortunately, new campgrounds come late in the planning.

I have learned from an official in the National Forest Service that current appropriations are barely sufficient to maintain and rehabilitate old campgrounds, with no funds available for building new facilities.

The reason given by the National Park Service for extending the completion date of Mission 66 so indefinitely, is that rising costs of labor and material have made appropriation estimates and requests completely inadequate. Ominously missing from the announcement was any reference to an exposed abuse in the employment of funds heretofore allotted. This alleged misuse of construction money came to light in 1959 during hearings before a Senate committee considering the current appropriation request, when it was discovered that mansion type residences were being built for park employees, far out of line with their civil service ratings. Angered by this damaging evidence of bureaucratic selfishness, it is small wonder that the Congress refused to appropriate sufficient funds to overcome rising costs. But, as happens too often, we trailerists are numbered among those who really suffer the penalty.

Admittedly, rehabilitating old and building new campgrounds is expensive. Rising

costs make these projects appear discouraging to an administration dedicated to the noble effort of balancing the national budget. So, to win the administration's favor, a way must be found to accomplish the desired objectives without greatly increasing the cost to taxpayers. I believe a way has been found.

The fact that we have any campgrounds today must be credited to the great Civilian Conservation Corps program of the 1930's. Most of our present-day recreation facilities were built by young men who came, in many instances, from underprivileged homes, who traded tenement living for the great outdoors, much to their advantage at that time, and for our benefit today. The CCC has been acclaimed the best, and certainly the least controversial, of the early New Deal ventures, and I have long hoped for the restoration of such a program.

I can speak with some authority on this subject. For more than 4 years I was Army inspector of CCC camps in New England. On my inspection trips, I lived in those camps, became well acquainted with the Army officers who administered them, with the civilian superintendents and their foremen who conducted the work programs. I watched those boys mature into men under an efficient but not too restrictive type of discipline, and I marveled at the beneficial change of attitude in those youths which could be accomplished within a few short weeks. I marveled as well at the high quality of the work accomplished under the strict, but benign, supervision of the Forestry personnel.

Now we have a chance to restore that program. A bill has been introduced into the House by Representative GEORGE A. KASEM of California (Baldwin Park), to establish a youth conservation corps patterned after the CCC. This bill is H.R. 9334, and is identical to a bill introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY which passed the Senate during the last session of Congress.

Let us take a look at this bill. Under the supervision of the Department of Labor, the corps would be composed of young men between the ages of 16 and 21. The program would start with an enrollment of 50,000 the first year, 100,000 the second year, and a maximum thereafter of 150,000 yearly. Enrollments would be for 6 months, with maximum service limited to 2 years.

The enrollees would be paid \$60 a month for the first enrollment, with an additional \$5 a month each time they reenroll. The bill also provides that "up to an additional \$10 per month" may be paid to those assigned leadership responsibilities and for special skills. The enrollee would also be allowed to allot part of his pay to his parent, dependent, guardian or any fund established for his benefit. In addition to his pay, the enrollee would be furnished quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, medical services, and hospital services as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary or appropriate for his needs.

Estimates place the cost of the corps to the Federal Government at \$125 million the first year, \$250 million for the second, and \$375 million annually thereafter. The States may participate in the program to develop their own parks and natural resources, but they would be required to match Federal funds. So you can see that relative cost is small indeed, when compared to the good that can result.

It should be emphasized here that the Youth Conservation Corps, though being stressed as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency, is not intended as a penal institution, any more than was the CCC. As stated in the bill, enrollees must be "citizens of the United States of good character and health." Fifty percent of the authorized enrollment would be allocated to the States on the basis of population, the other 50 percent would be allocated throughout the United States at

the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, "taking into account areas of substantial unemployment."

The purpose of the corps as stated in the bill, "to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men," is implemented by this allocation of the enrollees. It is important to note this basic purpose in view of the statement made earlier in this article that a way has been found to increase the number of our campgrounds, and still stay reasonably within the appropriations presently being made by the Congress to the Park and Forest Services. The work of these youths should reduce proportionately the present labor costs within our recreation areas and result in a much greater and faster expansion of facilities.

Where do we stand right now? The breakdown in the Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors programs is denying us the new campgrounds so badly needed. Unless this Youth Conservation Corps is established quickly, no new campgrounds can be anticipated in the foreseeable future. But there is no assurance that the House will pass this bill soon, if at all. This threatens to be a short session of Congress, due to the conventions in July. The fact that the Senate has passed a similar bill gives no certainty that the corps will be established. Representative KASEM writes that he does not know when his bill will be acted upon by the House, but he hopes it will be this year. And he fears that a veto by the President is very possible.

He requests the action we must all take: "Letters are always helpful, especially when written to one's own Congressman, so you might spread the word along this line." I am spreading the word, and I do not believe I have ever written a more important message to trailerists. We must have more campgrounds if we are to continue to enjoy our rigs in our popular recreation areas. So, every trailerist must write his Congressman, every trailer club must authorize its secretary to write a letter, and our trailer club associations must bring the weight of their numbers and their prestige to bear upon the Congress to pass this bill.

Apathy can be a dreadful thing. You have been turned away from overfilled campgrounds. You have already seen your privileges in our national parks and national forests greatly curtailed. It used to be that you could occupy a space in a public campground indefinitely. Then, because of increased demand and a shortage of spaces, you were limited to 30 days; soon this was reduced to 15 days, now to 10 days in many places. If no new campgrounds are built you may soon be permitted to stay only one night.

Don't let this happen. A Youth Conservation Corps is the only hope we have that it will not happen. So, make sure your club sends off a letter as soon as possible, and urge your trailer club association to take immediate action. But, above all, please send your own letter to your own Congressman. All you need write is a few lines asking him to vote for H.R. 9334, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. And—please—do it today. Time is fleeting.

Alvin Bentley: A Real Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, a fitting tribute was recently paid our col-

league, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] in a news-feature article by the well-known writer, Esther Van Wagoner Tufty. His activities on the Foreign Affairs Committee as well as his position on a number of major issues confronting the country today are clearly enunciated in the article. The feature appeared in the Owosso Argus-Press published in the gentleman's hometown.

Because it so ably describes the work of our colleague, under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Owosso Argus-Press, Feb. 23, 1960]

ALVIN BENTLEY: A REAL REPUBLICAN (By Esther Van Wagoner Tufty)

WASHINGTON.—What manner of man is the only Michigan Republican to announce his candidacy for the U.S. Senate?

Politically, Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY is what's known as a "real Republican." Not exactly what's meant when the phrase "Old Guard" is used, and even more definitely not a liberal. Such catch phrases get fuzzy in meaning from too much use and misuse. Yet the application of one or the other helps to place a candidate for type and in a sharper relation to his opponent, who in this case is certain to be the incumbent senior Senator, FAY McNAMARA. No other label but out-and-out liberal would fit the towering Democrat who will have Labor, the "left," and even the "far left," as they have no other place to go.

The contrast is neat. When so many national presidential contests make it difficult for the average voter to say he "can't see the difference in the two major political parties," this Senate race defines the difference, assuming of course both men survive the primaries. The closing date for filing is June 17.

In a leisurely interview, the Owosso Republican talked about his philosophy, his record, and his forthcoming campaign to represent Michigan in the upper Chamber.

His political philosophy is twofold. Briefly and in oversimplified terms he believes in decentralized government, "letting the local government do the job if it can"; and in "careful" spending the taxpayers' money.

The word "careful" is a favorite of ALVIN BENTLEY especially when someone dubs him the richest man in the Congress.

He says "doesn't it follow that if a man is careful of his own money he will be careful of the taxpayers' money?"

A little sensitive about being called a multimillionaire, he's quick to rebut that wealth is not seen as a political handicap to Rockefeller, Kennedy, Williams, or Hart.

As so BENTLEY's record in the House, he describes it as a mixture of conservatism and liberalism.

As a Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—and the only Michigander in the delegation on it—he is best known for his opinions on things international.

In principle, he favors foreign aid but has been "a constant critic of the size and administration of our foreign aid program." For some years he has been trying to stop the annual heaping of amendment upon amendment to the original 1954 foreign aid bill by proposing a general overhaul to fit today's conditions.

He championed Michigan farmer Stanley Yankus, who moved to Australia in protest against the Government restriction which prevented him from growing all the wheat he could use on his land.

On civil rights issues, his opponent Senator McNAMARA will not be able to taunt him for not signing the discharge petition to blast the bill out of the Rules Committee. BENTLEY did add his name although he didn't

rush in to do so and probably will be accused of political expediency. However, he recently introduced legislation "to outlaw discrimination in all fields of Federal-financed housing." Also, he has a good voting record on civil rights legislation.

On Labor, BENTLEY said he expects the union leaders to be in McNAMARA's corner but hopes to attract the votes of many workers. This optimism is based largely on his opposition to right-to-work legislation on a national scale and equally strong opposition to compulsory arbitration procedure to settle strike disputes.

That word "careful" pops up again in considering his position on taxes. He stands for using at least half of any budget surplus to reduce the national debt and, if possible, the other half to relieve the tax burden on the individual, if possible.

He is 41. As a campaigner, he will be indefatigable. Into every corner of the 82 counties he will go to tell his story. One can expect his campaign to be well organized, well financed, and widespread. His dogged determination to win demands it. He'll not put on a vicious, name-calling campaign unless provoked. However he has collected some ammunition come the day.

For type, this is a very serious young man, not easily understood in the rough and tumble world of politics. One can't imagine him hilariously slapping a precinct chairman on the back or telling a bawdy campaign joke.

Many Republicans must like him and what he stands for judging by his securing 40 percent of the votes in a Michigan poll among four likely GOP candidates. That poll, incidentally, probably was a decisive factor in making him announce his candidacy. His hope is that if he does face a primary contest that it will not leave scars to hinder a Republican victory in November.

The Bentleys are friendly but not a part of Washington's society merry-go-round and don't want to be.

The Congressman has four children, three by a former marriage, Alvin M. has just entered the Coast Guard. Helen and Michael are attending school here. His son by his present marriage, Clark Henry, was born in the Capital shortly before the lawmaker was shot on the floor of the House by some Puerto Rican fanatics. Incidentally, he has visited Puerto Rico at the invitation of the Government and his efforts in behalf of Puerto Rico are well known.

He speaks Spanish fluently and that is always an asset. He also has some linguistic ability in French, and German and a word-vocabulary in Hungarian which he picked up when he was a foreign service officer. This will be a political asset in campaigning among the ethnic groups in Detroit, several of which have already honored him. Besides, he's kept currently informed on what's going on abroad. In 1957 he was the first Congressman to visit Poland after the 1956 revolutions.

A knowledgeable, educated man he will work hard to fulfill his ambition to seated in the U.S. Senate.

Harlem's Policy Racket: The Day the Heat Was On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following article from the New York Post, March 4, 1960:

INSIDE HARLEM'S POLICY RACKET: THE DAY THE HEAT WAS ON

(By Ted Poston With Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman, and Richard Montague)

What happens when somebody blows the whistle on a suspected numbers spot which just might be buying police protection under the multimillion dollar pad system?

Well, it depends.

If it is just an ordinary squawk lodged with the local precinct, or even at police headquarters, that's one thing.

But if the whistle is blown on the floor of Congress, that's another thing altogether.

So one Wednesday last month, the day for Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's weekly discourse on "Gambling in the City of New York," a Post reporter investigating the alliance between the policy barons and certain members of the police vice squads decided to check on the results.

On that particular day, POWELL asserted that Harry Felt, a former Internal Revenue man, had "become the numbers boss of lower Harlem."

"His headquarters are various houses on 115th Street between Lenox and St. Nicholas Avenues," POWELL told Congress. "He uses two places for his telephone communications. One is a restaurant called the Asia Currie place at 100 West 115th Street. The other is the drugstore on the corner of 115th Street and Lenox Avenue, on the West Side."

The Post man dropped by the drugstore and the Asia Famous Currie Shop around the corner. Here is his report:

"I spent over an hour in the restaurant—before the news of POWELL's speech reached Harlem. I noticed on the way in that the block, which is between Lenox and St. Nicholas Avenues was jammed with people on stoops and idlers on the street corners. I saw a man walk up and pass money to another man in the group on the corner. I assumed that the recipient (he was in his 20's and wore a gray overcoat and hat) was a single action banker."

"In the restaurant there were only a few people sitting around eating, but their talk revolved around numbers—what figure was leading today, what number they had almost hit yesterday, and things like that."

"Presently, a woman entered. She was short, brown-skinned, and spoke with that accent peculiar to Puerto Ricans born and raised in East Harlem. She was complaining that her customers were doing business with some rival policy operator in a nearby bar."

"She sat at a table near the window and every now and then she got up and went out into the street, returning a few minutes later. I did not see her transact business in the restaurant."

"Shortly before 5 p.m., the chap in the gray overcoat entered the restaurant and yelled: 'Did you hear it on the radio? I just heard that POWELL named Harry as one of the policy bosses today.'

"Everybody in the place, including the proprietor, an East Indian called Jimmy, seemed to recognize the name and a heated discussion followed. There was a lot of talk about POWELL 'stirring up trouble.'

"Then the woman, who had just come back from completing another sidewalk transaction, asked:

"Did POWELL mention Charlie Freeman?"

GETTING THE WORD

"Gray Overcoat said no. (The brief radio reports at that point hadn't mentioned either the restaurant or the drugstore, so no one seemed upset.)

"About 5:30 I dropped in to check the drugstore. It was jammed but I did not witness any open numbers activities. I did

notice though that the stocks on the store's shelves seemed small for such a large volume of possible business."

Later that day, the newspapers carried two addresses among POWELL's growing list of policy targets, so the Post reporter went back in the morning:

"Around 9:30, I paid another visit to 115th Street. Two radio cars were parked in the block, just sitting near the two establishments. There wasn't a single customer in either the drugstore or the restaurant."

"Only a few people were standing on the stoops and no one was on the street corners."

"About an hour later, there were three radio cars, two white plainclothesmen strolling through the block, and a uniformed cop standing on the corner by the drugstore."

"I asked a passing citizen what was going on. He laughed and said the radio cops had told the people they weren't going to allow any loafing on the stoops today because there had been a couple of small fires started in some cellars on the block the day before."

"I noticed that the radio cops were going in and out of a couple of buildings. I asked why and they said they were investigating yesterday's fires."

"I went away and came back a half hour later and now there was another radio car parked at the curb in mid-block. An unmarked car with four plainclothesmen was parked directly in front of the Asia Famous Currie Shop. There seemed little chance for any gambling activity there that day."

The report concluded:

"No doubt, police headquarters will say that POWELL's charges were investigated and that police found no sign of policy activity. Which, of course, will be quite true."

"The cops had telegraphed their punches beforehand by riding in slowly cruising cars, in pairs or trios, circling the same block several times. The plainclothesmen's cars were unmarked but they might just as well have had 'Police Department' painted on them in foot-high letters."

"But as far as the cops and their superiors were concerned, they had done their job. They could report back to their commander—quite truthfully—that they had checked the block and found no sign of gambling activities."

[It is only fair, of course, to add that POWELL's floor speeches also have the effect of forewarning the intended victims. There is nothing to prevent agents of policy people from listening in themselves from the congressional gallery.]

In the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, POWELL inserted a copy of a letter which a retired schoolteacher had written Police Commissioner Stephen Kennedy about a chain restaurant on Broadway above 140th Street.

"I have discovered that gambling has invaded this particular restaurant in the form of numbers," the exteacher wrote Kennedy, "and its presence is much to the annoyance of decent clientele."

"They have a booming business among the colored and white patrons. The manager of the restaurant has knowledge of the existence of gambling here, as I have seen him making wagers on the numbers with a Mr. Jenkins. He is in rapport with all the gamblers, and he is an avid devotee of that phase of the numbers known as single action."

POWELL charged that "nothing has been done concerning this letter," but the policy operators with whom Post reporters talked disagreed.

"Oh, no," they all agreed. "They can't afford to ignore something in writing like that. But if the place is on the Pad (the vice squad list of police-protected policy locations) they'll just get into S.O.P. (standing operating procedure)."

And one controller who once operated a Harlem store as a front for one of the big East Harlem banks, cited his own personal experience to illustrate S.O.P.

"It all started with a loud-mouthed chick who had been putting a buck on 699 for more than a year," he said. "She always insisted on having a slip although we told her that she could keep it in without one since she played the same number every day.

"But she insisted on a daily slip because sometimes she played a few other numbers too. Well, one day, out jumped 698 and to everybody's surprise this chick comes in and demands her \$600 [Editor's note: The chances of winning are 1,000 to 1].

"I pointed out that the winning number was 698 and that she had played 699. Well, she pulls out her slip and handed it to be. It looked like 698 all right, but I could tell that part of the last 9 had been carefully rubbed out to make it look like an 8.

"We are used to hustles like that but we didn't want a stink, so we told her we'd check with the bank and get her original copy back.

"Well, we had the copy sent up the next day and it was plain as hell that she had bet 699, as she had been doing right along. We showed it to her and also told her we had checked the bet on the ribbon (the adding machine tabulation of the day's bets)."

The operator said the woman refused to accept the evidence and returned with a boy friend.

"They raised so much hell that they scared off some of our legitimate customers, people who had been trading in the store for years without knowing numbers were played here also. And that's bad; if you don't have any legitimate business at all, even being on the Pad can't help you but so much.

"We finally got them out of here, but they threatened to come back next day and take the place apart. They didn't, though, because we passed the word along and some of the boys dropped by to talk to them and we thought that was the end of it."

MORE TO COME

The operator then came to the point of his story:

"Well, it was about a week later that a plainclothes guy from the local squad dropped in and asked for me. I come up front and he said:

"Look, fellow, I'm sorry, but Downtown is sending us up a letter of complaint that says you are writing numbers in here. So you've got to give me somebody right now so we can cover ourselves."

"Now that isn't the usual S.O.P. The guys usually telephone you when they got to make an arrest, but they usually give you until later that day or early to next morning to line somebody up.

"That will give you time to hire some local wino or junkie who hasn't had too many policy busts so that he can be picked up by the cop in front of the place or even inside, if necessary.

"It's better still if you can get some guy who has never been busted at all. For you got to give him \$50 to take the bust anyway. And if he's a first offender he'll get a suspended sentence, anyway. In that way, you don't have to slip his wife or family nothing while he's serving time. But you've still got to put out \$25 for his lawyer and another \$25 for his bond if the magistrate don't stand still.

"But this plainclothes guy wouldn't take that 'later' stuff. He said he had to have somebody right now. He said the letter had too many details about my spot—I figured it must have come from the chick who had tried to hustle us—and even hinted we might be on the Pad. So he had to have somebody right now."

SOMETHING HAD TO GIVE

"Well, there was nobody there then but me and my writer, and you know I couldn't afford to take no bust. I didn't want my writer (the \$85-a-week employee who accepts the bets and makes out the slips) to take one neither, for it don't do to have a writer with too much of a policy record.

"I told this to the local guy, but he said everything would be okay. 'I got to have him or somebody,' he told us, 'but don't worry. I'll keep him clean. He'll be back behind that counter by the time you open up tomorrow.'

"The cop was a man of his word. When he booked my boy, he made out the complaint to say that he didn't find any numbers on his person but that he did find a bunch of slips under the radiator near which my boy was standing.

"Naturally, the magistrate threw the case out."

The operator smiled in reminiscence.

"That was the last I heard of it personally," he recalled, "but I learned later that that chick's complaint was sent up from Downtown the next day, but it was already a dead squawk. The squad boys reported to Downtown that they had been keeping the place under surveillance, and that they had just made a policy arrest there the day before.

"They said they had trailed the guy (my writer) into the store just before making the pinch, and said that he usually operated on a street corner about a block away. They said their surveillance indicated that my store was clean and not a numbers drop at all."

He smiled broadly in conclusion.

"So that poor retired schoolteacher need not worry. Nobody's going to ignore any written complaint sent to Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy."

Address by Congressman Schwengel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address by Congressman SCHWENGEL, delivered at the 15th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute. Said convention was held January 21, 1960, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here in Washington, D.C. I recommend this address very highly. It is a wonderful review of the huge Federal road program.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL AT THE 15TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, JANUARY 21, 1960, WASHINGTON, D.C.

To you good people from all over this great land, welcome, first of all, to Washington, the site of the greatest Capitol on this earth, where what happens daily makes some difference somewhere in the world. The dome of the Capitol that you will see or have seen since you have been here represents, first of all, freedom and liberty as no other people in the world know. It represents wonderful things for our own people and it represents a longing hope for billions of people outside this land of ours. Since I have been here, I have made it my business to study some

of the things that happen in that Capitol, and I can say to you that I believe that more things of importance have happened to people there than any place else in the world. And, I could spend the whole hour talking about it. I want to call this to your attention because while you're here I want you to appreciate its importance, its grace, and invite you not only to see the Capitol but see the monuments that have been built to great men who represent big ideas and great ideals.

I have recently done a little research on the foreign people who were invited to this land to speak from the House podium, and I have found this to be one of the largest heritages that we have—a subway hidden that we don't even use or know about. Let me quote just one phrase from one of the 74 different speeches made from the podium of the U.S. House of Representatives. This one by a Mr. Mayhew when he was here in 1949, which is among the many fine speeches we have had.

"My good friends, I toured your Capitol and I visited many of your monuments, and it was a thrill to receive something of the spirit that was in the hearts and minds of those wonderful people you call your forefathers."

This is how they influenced him. Last summer we had a well-known world character come into this country. He is a character, and that is the best compliment I can give him. While he was here, our State Department had the idea of taking him on a little tour and they took him to the Lincoln Memorial. That is the place you ought to visit—if you haven't friends. He walked up those 58 steps with Mr. Lodge and Mr. Lodge took him first to the south wall and there talked to him briefly about that great public document, the Gettysburg Address; showed him this monument and explained why Lincoln was sitting and facing the east. He pointed out the east, it was from the east that we got all the ideas and ideals that were put together in this wonderful thing we call America. And, also, facing the east because this way he could be watching that great symbol of liberty and unity that he believed in so much. And, then, took him to the north wall and read to him, " * * * with malice toward none; with charity toward all; with kindness in the right as God gives us to see the right; let us finish the task we are in; bind up our Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, his widow and his orphan; and to do all to achieve and cherish just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." This was interpreted to Mr. Khrushchev.

He thought a moment; he said, "This is beautiful language; this is a noble thought, I bow to Mr. Lincoln." It occurs to me that this may be the first time that this Communist who represents anything but good in the government had ever bowed to anything that wasn't communism. And, somehow this experience might have proved—and showed him that there was more to America than our power. He might adhere with this experience and others, and come to realize what we ought to realize and that is the greatness of America is not our might and our power and our know-how; but the greatness of America is in the hearts and souls of America; the spirit of man. And then Mr. Lodge said to him, "In these 72 words, 59 of them one syllable words, 12 of them two syllable words, and 1 three syllable word, is found the heart and soul of America and the great objective for our people and for all the people. This is something we ought to think on often." I share this experience with you for whatever it may be worth, in hopes that you will think briefly on something of the meaning of that experience and from the experiences that you can have while you are here.

Now I come to you as a politician and I admit it. Lincoln once said, "You can't be a statesman unless you get elected . . ." and I have found in my brief experience that politically you can't get elected unless you are somewhat of a politician, and it isn't easy sometimes to be the kind of a politician you want to be. Someone has said if you believe it's easy to be a politician try sitting on the fence with your hands on the post, your ear to the ground and then when it comes time, throw your hat in the ring.

I've diverted some from the subject that I wanted to talk about. Let me begin by saying to you, Mr. Seitz, and good friends, that I am glad to have the opportunity to substitute for a colleague of mine on the subcommittee, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Roads and Highways of the House Committee on Public Works. And I appreciate the reference you've made to the "watch-dog" or study and investigation committee views. This is certainly going to be a part of what I am going to talk to you about. But, before I go too far, I feel that it is necessary to begin with the presentation of certain facts in a brief review of what has transpired in the field of highways and highway construction.

We all know that the Government, with the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956, created and began the greatest single internal public works project ever attempted by any nation in the history of mankind. Besides substantially enlarging the program for the construction and reconstruction of the primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions—those known as the ABC System—this act finalized a plan for a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, a plan that was desperately needed and is becoming more important than we realized when the act was passed. The initial concept of the Interstate System began with the studies by the Bureau of Roads and the appropriate committee in the Congress as far back as 1938 and the preliminary plan was presented to Congress in 1939. The records show that these studies finally resulted in making section 7 in the Federal Act of 1944. This officially created a plan called the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways which was limited then to 40,000 miles, or less than 40,000 miles actually. Little was done until extensive congressional hearings were held in 1955 and 1956. I sat through every one of those hearings, and there were 74 different sessions. So I can say to you that this had a pretty thorough going-over at that time. This legislation also established another very worthwhile feature—the highway trust fund as a depository for revenues from those who used the highways. It established a good principle, I think, hence, motor fuel taxes and the other highway user taxes, the receipts of which were to be used to finance this vastly expanded program. The legislation also established authorization of funds to be apportioned to the various States from fiscal 1957 through fiscal 1969—a period of 13 years—for construction of this System. These authorizations then totaled \$24,825 billion, which was then the estimated total cost of the Federal Government for completion of this 40,000 miles on a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State cost-sharing ratio.

Such a program carried a great message of hope and a challenge to the American people—a fond hope that the transportation problem, which was becoming more serious, would be solved and a challenge to those who would accept it. Highway contractors and those who furnish material for building highways especially saw the challenge. You of the National Limestone Institute, who represent a most important cross-section of this group, and the manufacturers of equipment and others of the great and almost matchless road-building team expanded

greatly to carry out this program. This was favorably impressed upon the Public Works Committee by your representative, Bob Koch, in his testimony before that committee, of which I am a member. And I want to say to you that you have, in this gentleman, a very, very capable public servant and a fine representative of your organization in whom everyone who knows him has confidence, and this part is important because this does not prove true of everyone who represents associations in this community.

And now, in less than 4 years, because we were not realistic—and when I say "we," I mean Congress and some people who appeared before our committees, because they made some recommendations that were unrealistic, too—we were unrealistic—too many demands have been placed on the fund for projects that could have waited; and because of some mistakes made by Congress, we see this expanded program for highways with its back to the wall and in very, very real financial trouble—trouble that we must contend with now and, I imagine, for the duration of the program. What caused the trouble? This is a good question that needs some forthright answers and needs to be appreciated and looked at by everyone. Testimony by administration officials during the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means last July on financing the Federal-aid highway program revealed that the latest estimate to complete this dynamic and necessary program is over \$10 billion more than the estimate in 1955. Let me say that again: Over \$10 billion more than the estimate in 1955.

Partly explained by that old word we call inflation—and I'd like to make a speech on that tonight, because I think everybody should have some very real concerns about that problem; because if we won't be concerned about it, this great and wonderful thing we call America could be lost just because we have ignored the problems that caused this. Well, \$8.9 billion of this at least will be paid by your Federal Government. When you break this down, there is a 5-percent increase due to traffic costs, increase due to traffic costs under estimated traffic, \$1.2 billion; a 15-percent increase due to local needs costing \$3.4 billion; a 3-percent increase due to utilities costing \$700 million; and a 12-percent increase in prices for \$3.6 billion; and then for the additional 1,452 miles added to the Interstate System it will cost at least \$1.5 billion over and above the figures just quoted, making a total \$11.5 billion of the original cost. Now this is something for us to think about.

What has brought this about? I've already mentioned inflation. As I began this talk, I mentioned that the 1956 act launched the greatest program for a system of highways which any nation has ever attempted, and that is an irrefutable statement. The Interstate—I'm going to include in this the Interstate and the ABC System—to make the record clear, is necessary for reasons of national defense and safety and for the far more compelling reason of handling the traffic coming with the economic growth of this country. It should be pointed out that the present program is not necessarily aiding this economic growth which it should. It is following it and, in my opinion, should be leading this growth. It should be pointed out and noted, too, that the Interstate and ABC Systems are not in conflict—and we in the committee appreciate this especially. In some areas this is looked at as a conflict of interests—actually, they complement each other. Right now we're further behind in the Interstate System, and, therefore, I think we should give further accent to that system.

This legislation gave green light to 50 separate and distinct sovereign governments. Each State expanded its highway department. I am sorry to say, and it is indeed unfortunate, that when a program of this

magnitude is inaugurated, men of influence with selfish interests are attracted and tempted to do those things that are not in the public interest even though they may be within the law and this is what forces Congress, often times, into passing laws that might not be in the public's interest. Costs for such things as right-of-way acquisition and engineering go up and all—innumerable ones, go up, and I think it is a shame. I think it should be halted and the answer is, of course, legislation, but the far clearer answer is, and this is something that every American should think about, and especially those people who are directly concerned with this, that we need to call upon statesmanship here as well as in the areas of Congress and the legislative halls of our various States. It is a shame, but how is it halted? Well, the answer to that question is simply that we need statesmanship in this area, too. Now, besides the mushrooming cost due to the increase in right-of-way acquisition, engineering, etc., there is, as many people who have a sincere interest in the highway building program have pointed out, a diversion of monies going on to pay utility companies for such things as relocating any utility line along Federal-aid highways. If the Federal act and the state highway commissions are allowing these companies, as some have said, to raid the Trust Fund of more than \$2 billion we may be forced, and here's something to think about, into reconsidering our policy toward filling stations, motels and other businesses who depend upon the highway who have just as much right to ask for relocating costs. If we do this we run into many billions more than we can't afford and I don't think we should be called upon to pay. I point these things out because we a lot of times can't stand the onrush that makes these things possible in legislation.

Now before I leave the subject of increased costs for completion of this system, it is worth noting, I think, for the record, that your industry along with those in the contracting field has, through price competition, brought bargain prices to the highway bid tables, and this is not the first time I've said this. I've said this in committee and Mr. Koch knows this. Your efficiency, giving rise to increased capacity, has made this one of the most competitive industries in business today. And, as I said in the House committee this is one of the finest endorsements of honest private enterprise system that I know. According to a report recently released by the Bureau of Public Roads, competition among highway contractors was so keen during the first half of 1959 that there was an average of 7.4 bidders per contract as compared with 6.8 and 6.5 in 1958 and 1957, respectively. Now listen to this, on the average bids ran 11.3 percent below engineer's estimates. Your industry has certainly assisted in making this saving possible and I want to commend you for this. And, if it had not been for this we would have been in a heck of a lot worse shape than we are now. Now I'm not suggesting here that you sharpen your pencils upward on these propositions at all—I'm suggesting that you continue doing what you are doing in the good old American way and then we'll have these highways sooner and I think in better condition.

And still another savings is one that can never be given a dollars-and-cents figure but one we must, if we're ever going to talk about it, refer to as one of saving lives. Quite a dissertation could be given on that but just let me say to you briefly what has been estimated. Estimates have been made that 4,000 lives will be saved annually upon completion of the Interstate System. Now, you try to transfer that to dollars and you come up with quite a tidy sum. On this system, which is expected to transport 20 percent of all U.S. traffic by 1975, accident costs will be reduced from one cent per

vehicle mile to 0.3 cents per vehicle mile—a saving estimated at \$750 million each and every year. That's at the present estimate and when this comes into being we all know that we're going to have increased traffic. Is it any wonder we should strive to complete our roads on schedule?

There has been much spoken and written about the world's populations explosion. In the United States, for example, a baby is born every 11 seconds. The area from Boston, Mass., to Norfolk, Va., will become one urban area before the end of our lifetime—think of that. Yet some officials say slow down a system which will comprise only a little over 1 percent of the highway mileage of the United States and yet will alleviate traffic congestion by carrying 20 percent of the traffic, partially eliminate a great accident and death hazard, and contribute—yes, contribute handsomely—to the economic growth of our Nation. I also mentioned the benefits our national defense will receive from this system. There are many officials in the Pentagon who rate completion of this system as important as matching Russia in the missile race. Most of you are ex-military men, or a good many of you are, and know the importance of logistics. It cannot, in my opinion, be underrated in our time.

I wish that what I say here today could stir people like Paul Revere's ride did in 1776. I feel there are two calls to action. One is directed straight at the Congress of the United States. We should revalue the entire highway program. The six special points that I made before the Ways and Means Committee and which I will comment further about in a few minutes are a good starting point for completion of the Interstate System, but we may have to find additional ways to finance this program. And may I say, parenthetically, when the report comes out of the national tests, I hope that all of you will take a second look before you start shaking your heads on any phase of that report and find out all the facts before you say too much. I think they are going to be very indicative.

Last June I advanced to the members of the Committee on Public Roads the proposition to create a study or investigation committee, or as many refer to it as the "watch-dog" committee. I thought that the problems that have been brought to light in connection with the Interstate Highway System needed some attention. I proposed to the committee that there was abundant evidence already and that we needed to investigate ways and means to expedite its completion, that maybe we needed to investigate ways and means to cut down some costs, we needed to do those things that will assure reason and understanding of the total problem by all of our people and that we needed to do those things that are necessary now that call for immediate solution of the problems of today as well as the problems of tomorrow.

I proposed that such a committee be established immediately on a non-partisan basis with an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. That is the only way, in my opinion, that we could show those most interested in the building of the highway and the general public that we are not just witch-hunting—that we intend to be objective and constructive and that politics should be taken completely out of the proposed study committee. If a thorough job is done on this question in this area I feel we can save hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars and at the same time hasten the completion date of the system.

At that time I suggested, and I reiterate today, that the committee would perform a fine public service by:

(1) Reevaluation of the program for extensions which have been granted over and above the 40,000 miles originally approved to determine first of all their justifi-

cation, and second study the possibilities of setting up some kind of a priority system for the building of extensions to the system.

(2) Explore the possibility and feasibility of building two lanes in certain areas of our country where four lanes are not now needed and may never be needed.

(3) That they put a priority on the number of interchanges and conduct a study to determine the advisability of modifying designs which may be too elaborate in some places and not necessary in many areas.

(4) Investigate the charge that not enough emphasis is being put on getting links of the Interstate System built between population centers.

(5) Review the possibilities of putting priority on those sections which studies show will carry the greatest amount of traffic when completed.

(6) Study the possibilities of saving money by adopting different but adequate standards for bridge construction under the Federal Bridge Act.

Not until early September did the Chairman and the Committee on Public Works act on my proposal to have a study and investigation committee formed to consider these questions. The committee was then appointed, composed of 12 Democrats and 6 Republicans. I immediately objected to this because the two to one majority of the committee indicated partisan politics, in my opinion, beyond question.

It should be pointed out and understood that from the beginning of our Federal and Interstate Highway Program in 1916 there has always been a bipartisan approach to our biennial highway bills. It has only been in recent years, particularly since the beginning of the current Congress, that partisan politics seems to have been injected into the consideration of this very important highway legislation.

Republicans on the Committee of Public Works, and Republicans I might add who are not above playing politics, but in this case those on the Subcommittee on Roads have been powerless to call a halt to the present program and the very apparent political domination of the study and investigating committee. As a result, there is a very noticeable diminishing confidence in the committee—in the subcommittee particularly, and the objectives that sincere and devoted members of the committee and the public had hoped for. Because of the vastness of this program and the importance of this program to the economy of our country, a unity of effort is more vital here than in any other phase of legislation that the Congress will deal with in this session.

At the present time the Committee on Public Works consists of 22 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The Subcommittee on Roads has 12 Democrats and 6 Republicans, and this Special Study and Investigating Committee on Roads has 12 Democrats and 6 Republicans. Everyone connected directly with and those most interested in the Interstate System assumed that when the time came to select the members of the Special Roads Study and Investigating Committee that the members of the committee would be selected from the members of the Subcommittee on Roads and that the very able, devoted, and dedicated chairman, Representative GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, would most certainly become its chairman—and I might add that he served in a very nonpolitical and in a most fair way throughout his entire term during the development of this system and yet he is not chairman of the committee and there are four very distinguished members of the Roads Committee that are not even on the investigating committee.

The fact that the committee has retained crime investigators from a crime investigating committee of the other House and the fact that we have been in session since Janu-

ary 6, and the Study and Investigating Committee has not yet met, has caused a lot of people interested in the highway program, the objectives of this committee and the problem that the building of the Interstate System has created, to wonder, become suspicious and lose confidence in what should be the committee's real objectives. They have begun to believe that this has become a witch-hunting committee rather than one designed to investigate the policies and all the other problems that have no real relation to crime and criminal intent. Now if there is anything wrong and criminal going on in the Interstate Highway building program it, of course, should be investigated and brought to the public's attention and I would be one of the first to join hands to do so. But I am not inclined, at this time, to put the 48 highway commissions under the kind of a cloud of suspicion that this implies.

Another point on which I want to dwell and focus attention is the fact that this committee is so much out of balance and inconsistent with the record of the House and Senate in setting up study and investigating committees in the past. Dating back to the 80th Congress, and this is the 86th, I find that in that Congress there were 6 investigating and study committees appointed and in every instance, except 1, there was a majority of only 1 for the majority party and in that exception the majority was 3 when there were 11 Republicans and 8 Democrats on the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and in this study and investigating committee there is a majority of 6. In the 81st Congress, controlled by the Democrat Party, we find that there were four committees appointed, all of which had a one-vote majority with the exception of one—that one had a three-vote majority. In the 82d Congress, controlled by the Democrats, we find that there were four committees appointed, each with a one-vote majority. In the 83d Congress, seven committees, all with a one-vote majority with one exception. I imagine our investigation, if we went back further, would confirm that this has been a precedent of policy of the Congress.

Here, in my opinion, is conclusive evidence based upon precedent, that the Public Works Committee of the House has entered into this without much thought or consideration and it could be charged as a deliberate attempt to make this a political committee rather than a true and honest investigating and study committee. Now, I call today for reconsideration by this committee of this problem—the problem of making this truly a nonpolitical committee and immediately get organized and adopt policies which are not yet known, but should be known and understood by the committee and the public and to do those things that will reinstate confidence in the original intent and purpose of such a committee. So much for that.

Let me close with the suggestion that highways are more important to the economy of our country than any other public works in which the Government participates directly or indirectly. They are the backbone of this great country. They should have the best unbiased, nonpolitical attention and direction that can be given to them and, of course, should not be subjected to graft of any kind. A concerted drive should be made to cut costs and make greater speed toward its early completion and to make it on schedule. You, the voter, are important in this. You can help. I urge each of you to contact your Congressman and get others who have a direct and indirect interest in this proposition to contact their Congressman. If he is not a member of the Public Works Committee, ask him to contact members of the committee and urge their immediate consideration of some of these problems that are confronting our Nation today in connection with the building of our Interstate System of Highways.

Have them stress that our highways will not be built on time to meet the growing need if something is not done now. Let us lay the groundwork now to do this job well, adequately and get it done on time.

The year 1961 will bring before the Congress and the American people two reports of outstanding significance. We should be prepared to receive them by laying the groundwork. I have already referred to one of them and made some suggestions about it. As individuals concerned with our highways you can easily visualize the importance of these studies—one will deal with the system's cost and one with the system's physical makeup and direction. Again, I urge you and ask you to urge your friends when you return home—contact your Congressman on the subject of highways. Do not wait until sometime in the future—when there is another crisis like the one in 1959—but do it now and let's have the crisis averted. Be sure to tell your Congressman to get this problem solved. Some of you know of my interest in Lincoln, this man I consider the greatest public-spirited patriot that ever lived. Once he said, and I quote, "But this Government must be preserved in spite of the acts of any man or set of men. It is worthy of your every effort. Nowhere in the world is presented a Government of so much liberty and equality. To the humblest and poorest amongst us are held out the highest privileges and positions."

I suggest to you again that nowhere, at no time, in the history has there been presented a proposition as great and as important as the Interstate System that has been presented to us. It is worthy of your every honorable effort—and, finally, good luck as together we tackle this great job and more importantly, the job of promoting the welfare of our country wherever we can. Thank you for this kind attention.

Khrushchev's Big Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Soviet Premier Khrushchev is a man of many moods and unpredictable temperament. He proved this beyond a shadow of a doubt during his travels in this great Nation. He also is a man who is not unwilling to be abusive of the truth if he believes there is some advantage in so doing.

I am thinking particularly of Khrushchev's recent remarks before the Indian Parliament in which he attempted to paint a picture of the Western nations as colonial powers, at the same time depicting the Soviet Union as the great sympathizer to those nations in the world who are emerging from colonization.

Of course, the fact the Premier neglected to mention is that the nations of the Western World, such as Great Britain, are those which are releasing the bonds of colonialism and allowing the people of parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America the national autonomy they desire. While this has been going on, it has been Soviet Russia that has

tightened the reins on its satellites in a form of domination far worse than any modern colonialism.

Khrushchev's remarks make it incumbent upon the United States and the rest of the free world to make a sincere effort to tell the entire story about imperialism in the world today. The truth will show that Communist Russia is the only great imperialistic power.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Key West (Fla.) Citizen, concerning Khrushchev and colonialism. I think it hits the nail right on the head.

KHRUSHCHEV'S BIG LIE

Soviet Premier Khrushchev is no stranger to the technique of the big lie. He showed himself to be a master of it in his address to the Indian Parliament. He beat the rapidly weakening, if not yet quite dead, horse of Western colonialism. He proclaimed the Soviet Union's friendly sympathy with the emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. He plausibly called upon Western Powers "to repay at least a portion of the looted wealth" of the colonies.

All this, the things Khrushchev actually said and the implications he sought to convey, was a part of the big lie. For the truth is that the only great imperialist power left in all the world is the Soviet Union.

In recent decades, and especially during the last few years, Great Britain and other colonial powers of the West have been cutting the ties of dominance over more backward nations. In many cases, patient, and sincere efforts have been made to help the newly freed peoples along the road to a better life. Contrast this with the Soviet Union's treatment of its satellite peoples, many of whom live under conditions of repression and exploitation as severe as anything in colonial history. Contrast it also with Moscow's ideological domination of some Far Eastern nations.

Khrushchev's trumpeting of the big lie in New Delhi was not unexpected. It does no harm to note again, for the record, that the truth is bigger than the biggest lie ever told.

Bridgeport Post Joins Supporters of Full Military Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation providing for full unification of the armed services, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House an editorial from the Bridgeport Post, one of Connecticut's most distinguished newspapers.

The Bridgeport Post editorial points out that recent disclosures of military training manuals which are stupid, nonsensical, and worse make it absolutely imperative that we have a single service.

My bill, H.R. 9874, would accomplish the objectives which the Bridgeport Post regards as necessary. It provides for a single armed service, under a civilian Secretary of Defense, and it calls for the reorganization of our Military Establishment along functional lines. It

would not only mean savings of billions of dollars a year by the elimination of duplicate operations, but would, in my opinion, give us a more effective, more flexible national defense.

Following is the editorial from the Bridgeport Post of February 20, 1960:

AIR FORCE BANS IDIOTIC BOOK

Further circulation or use of an Air Force manual linking the Nation's churches and educational institutions with communism has been banned on orders of Air Secretary Dudley Sharp.

It is good to know that such nonsensical, idiotic garbage has been taken out of use, but the big question, which will be investigated, is how the thing happened to be written, by whom, and who authorized its use among U.S. servicemen?

Whoever is responsible should be dealt with harshly, especially if the person or persons involved hold military rank.

Chaplain and other members of the clergy discovered the manual issued at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., after distribution of 3,290 out of 6,100 printed copies had been circulated, and protested to Defense Secretary Gates. Senator Prescott Bush referred to the situation as "outrageous and incredibly stupid." That is exactly what the manual amounts to.

In one place the thing says: "From a variety of authoritative sources, there appears to be overwhelming evidence of Communist antireligious activity in the United States through the infiltration of fellow travelers into churches and educational institutions."

The National Council of Churches is attacked by the allegation that 30 out of 95 persons who aided in the revision of the Standard Version of the Bible had been affiliated with Communist causes, and further, by the charge that "even the pastors of certain of our churches are card-carrying Communists."

It is bad enough to have manuals for servicemen on how to clean officers' shoes, mix martinis, prepare salads, care for infants, wash dogs, etc., but this antichurch textbook is the worst yet.

Evidence mounts almost daily that absolute unification of the services, under a tough boss or tough bosses, is what this country needs, to put an end to the nauseating nonsense.

Air Pollution No. 1 Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Washington Post on February 28, 1960.

The article follows:

FIGHT ON AUTO-CAUSED AIR POLLUTION TOPS GOVERNOR BROWN'S PLANS
(By Morton Mintz)

Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown of California has made enactment of far-reaching plan to control automobile-caused air pollution "the principal goal" of the State government in 1960.

His program is drastic. It would require installation on antismog devices on new and, later, used motor vehicles. Failure to

comply would be an offense punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Air pollution in which automobile gases are a prime factor have caused more hardship in California than in any other State. But it is widely considered a problem of all metropolises.

Only last week, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, asked Congress to broaden and make permanent the Federal Government's role in the fight against air pollution.

SEVENTY MILLION VEHICLES

The Nation has 70 million motor vehicles today. The Bureau of Roads estimated Friday that it will have 114 million in 1976.

The California Legislature meets in special session Monday. Brown has warned it that the State cannot stand idle while the air becomes further polluted by "the curse of smog."

A spokesman for the Governor said the program has an "excellent chance" of passage. Brown himself said that the "vast majority of Californians recognize that smog is a menace to public health."

Brown said there can be no magic cure-all for smog. He declared that California "must work with diligence and determination to keep from falling behind in the battle." The State's population and industry are increasing rapidly.

In 1959, California became the first State to set standards for the safety of the air and for auto-exhaust fumes. Brown's program would implement these standards.

The Department of Public Health would get a \$1.4 million motor vehicle testing laboratory and a motor vehicle pollution control board.

The laboratory would test every plausible exhaust-fume purifier and conduct a continuing study of the whole problem of motor vehicle pollutants.

On the basis of the laboratory's reports on purifiers—at least 20 are being developed—the board would certify those that meet State standards and are practical.

PURIFIER REQUIREMENT

Every new motor vehicle registered or principally used in an air pollution county would be required to have a purifier within a year after a device is certified for the particular make and model.

The Governor's spokesman said that 1962 models would be the first that could be effected. The auto industry has said the cost would be in the range of \$150 per car.

The deadline for used commercial vehicles would be 2 years after the first December 31 following certification of a purifier for the particular make and model. For used personal cars another year would be added. These installations presumably would cost more than those at the factory.

"At least until recent months," Brown declared, "the automobile industry has been shamefully laggard in the development of effective devices." The industry has repeatedly and emphatically denied charges in this vein.

The Governor said his program gives the industry an economic incentive to obtain certification of the devices being developed within its own ranks. He said that if devices developed by others are certified "the automobile makers will have to obtain the right to use these devices if their new cars are to be sold and registered in any 'air pollution counties' in the State."

The control provisions would apply in every county in which a majority of the board of supervisors invoked them. Brown said adoption of the program in the five most populous counties would control 60 percent of the motor vehicles in California. Half the State's vehicles are registered in Los Angeles County alone.

The Governor said that it may be necessary to tighten the law to prevent a motorist

from fraudulently registering his car outside of an "air pollution county."

Brown said that if a certified device must be periodically renewed or repaired, "some form of local inspection may have to be devised." At least one purifier now in the prototype stage requires no chemicals and is expected to last the life of the car.

In addition, Brown would require all cars equipped with exhaust-fume purifiers to have a means of destroying the smog-forming hydrocarbons now vented out the crankcase.

The industry has developed a "blowby" device that does this and intends to put it on 1961 models made for the California market. The cost would be "probably under \$10 per car," a spokesman has said.

Flemming urged the industry Wednesday to put the device on all new cars, not just those for one State. His testimony has brought no public reaction from Detroit.

VFW Old Guard Post No. 2100

Burning the Mortgage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars from my hometown of Everett, Wash., is going to do something March 12 that I wish our Nation could do—burn its mortgage.

The veterans who are members of Old Guard Post No. 2100 should be commended for their accomplishments since the post first organized at Lake Stevens, Wash., in April 1930, due in a great part to Elwin W. Spriestersbach. The post has been a leader in veterans' affairs, youth work, and community projects ever since it received its charter in April 1931.

When the post moved to Everett in June 1932, its members met in the Washington State National Guard Armory. These members wanted and needed a home for the post, so they worked toward and finally purchased a site nearby for construction of a modern concrete-and-brick building.

Construction began December 5, 1945. A year and 10 days later the building was formally opened. Now, a little more than 13 years later, because of an active and steadily increasing membership the Old Guard Post is out of debt.

Mr. Speaker, many of the accomplishments of the post are due to the able leadership of its past commanders. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the names of these veterans, beginning with the first, Clyde Pottruff, who took office in 1931. They include: Dr. C. L. Lauerman, Otto Beilfus, Mel Knudsen, Ernest Swaney, Ellsworth Johnson, Gordon Steele, Thomas Phillips, Robert Knight, Clayton Wilbur, John Campbell, Harry Hansen, Carl Olsen, Walter Callahan, Almon I. Spence, John Matson, Walfred Johnson, Harry Spence, Joseph M. Torrey, George F. Thompson, Wilbur E. Ryder, Blaine Wise, Earl Ray, Harold Hall,

Kurt Kallstrom, Leonard Luce, Morris Stevens, and A. C. "Jerry" Krekow.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I believe recognition is due the present commander, E. "Fuzzy" Forsgren, and the post manager, Warren L. Scheel, whose efforts are contributing to the continued success of Old Guard Post No. 2100.

Lincoln's Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln was one of the best educated men in the history of the United States. He had only a few months formal education. I only wish that parents today would realize that education is not necessarily something to be bought with money in some far off day when they send their children to college. Education is a knowledge of people and understanding of things regardless of how it is obtained. Education is a day-to-day process beginning long before we are born. I commend the following article to the attention of every American interested in education:

WHERE DID LINCOLN GET HIS EDUCATION?—
"THE AGGREGATE OF ALL HIS SCHOOLING DID NOT AMOUNT TO 1 YEAR"

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

A little over 150 years ago a boy was born who grew to feel and express, better than any other man, the deepest dreams of what the American people have wanted themselves to be. Who and what were his teachers?

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln had lost his race for the United States Senate to Stephen A. Douglas. But 2 years later Lincoln was a candidate for President. He was nominated and in November elected.

In June of that year, 1860, his friends asked him to prepare a short biographical sketch which could be used as a campaign document. Lincoln did so, writing of himself in the third person, and insisted that it be used without material change.

In the course of the document he said:
"The aggregate of all his schooling did not amount to 1 year."

"He regrets his want of education and does what he can to supply that want."

"After he was 23, he studied English grammar, imperfectly of course, but so as to speak and write as well as he now does."

"He was never in a college or academy as a student, never even inside a college or academy building until after he had a license to practice law."

Lincoln felt, as so many do, that education comes from schools and books, and having had little of either, he felt he had little education. Whence then came the power to put in pure and limpid English—as clear as a Vermont trout stream—his letter to Mrs. Bixby, who had lost five sons in the War; the closing paragraphs of his Second Inaugural, and the Gettysburg Address? Whence, also, came the power to make speeches and state papers that march to their conclusion with the precision of a proposition of Euclid?

Now, books are important teachers. One would not downgrade them in the least.

They open many doors and tell us many things, some of which we remember for years. A subject taught in school is like a whetstone on a scythe. It may leave a little of its substance on the scythe, but it leaves it sharper.

But books and schools are not as important as that from which they come, life itself, and then they are important only as long as they are true to life, or some facet of life.

An anecdote of the late Charles Kettering, the noted inventor and research scientist, illustrates this point. Kettering had thought up some new idea as to how a piston could work better in an engine. Describing his idea to a famous engineer, the man said "It won't work." Kettering asked "How do you know it won't work?" The man said, "Why, every engineer and all the books on engineering know it won't work."

Kettering said, "But does the piston know it won't work?"

So they asked the piston by putting it in an engine. The piston did not know it could not work. It did work. The books were wrong.

Life is the great teacher. Ralph Waldo Emerson expressed this in a sentence worth remembering: "The scholar loses no hour that the man lives." And he added: "The scholar recognizes his teacher in every man."

What we learn from contact with life, teamwork on the athletic field, competition in the classroom, loyalty to our country, how we sort out those we meet in life, those with honor, and those without honor—with what these teach us, we can go far with no more than one shelf of books, unless of course, one enters some specialty like law, medicine, or engineering.

So the question remains, Where did Lincoln get his education?

In "Prairie Years," Carl Sandburg says of Lincoln: "In wilderness loneliness he companioned with trees. . . . Silence claimed him as her own. In the making of him the element of silence was immense."

In describing the life of Lincoln's family and the pioneer people with whom he grew up, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

"Many, if not all, frontier women of the old days were dreamers. Their lives were hard their emotions mainly sealed up, but all around them was the mystery of the primeval forest; they treasured it in silence. . . ."

"How had he gathered into himself a subterranean sense of beauty in words, whether it had grown out of long reading of the Bible, Shakespeare, and Robert Burns—the favorite books of his maturity—whether it linked back to his mother's world, with its forests and empty spaces, its loneliness and its lampless nights of stars, who can say?"

Yes, who can say? A great book remains to be written on how the wilderness and the prairie influenced the American character.

Lincoln and all pioneer people learned to think for themselves. They had to. There was no one except an occasional preacher to tell them what to think. Families were often far apart and did not meet for days. There were no newspaper editorials, telephones, radios, or television sets by which pundits from afar could form their opinions and judgments for them.

And so, without all these modern advantages which we possess, the pioneers were free from the mass mind, the "group think," which is one of the curses of our time. They thought as individuals, groping for the truth and the right as God gave them to see it.

Lincoln wrote his own speeches. He did not have the benefit of a stable of ghost-writers like the statesmen of our time, who read a speech to a nationwide audience and

often stumble over the words as if they had never seen them in type before.

In his speeches and state papers Lincoln seldom quoted anyone as an authority for what he was saying. Occasionally he quoted Jefferson—his kindred spirit—and once or twice, Henry Clay. Few others. He was his own authority. He thought things through to conclusions that seemed right to him.

Self reliance was his teacher, as it was of all pioneer people. "Trust thyself, every heart responds to that iron string." Nobody ever taught Lincoln to use his vote so as to eat his bread in the sweat of other peoples' brows. Lincoln made his own way, and he traveled far.

The crude tools of the pioneers taught him their secrets. The ax was put in his hands when he was 8 years old and it was not far from his grasp until he was man grown. What we learn through our hands we seldom, if ever, forget.

These tools taught him many things. They taught him how other people had to struggle to make a living. He learned the trades of the farmer, the woodsman, carpenter, stonemason, surveyor, storekeeper, many others. And thus it was that he learned to understand people and talk to them in words they understood.

We speak somewhat scornfully of a "Jack of all trades and master of none," and of course, a man must be master of something to earn a living. Nevertheless the tools of all these trades taught Lincoln many things not found in books today.

Nature was his teacher. Think of Lincoln as a boy in the primeval forest of Little Pigeon Creek in southern Indiana where the sound of an ax had never before been heard, where century-old trees grew nearly as tall as the redwoods of California, where there was silence and mystery and peace. Think of him looking up through the foliage far overhead to the blue sky of noon, or the bright stars of night—do you think he did not hear voices in the air? Do you believe he ever thought that a divine hand was not behind it all?

Do you think he did not hear the same voices that the Psalmist heard?

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world."

The wilderness of southern Indiana echoed these words seven score years ago. We don't hear them so well in a city apartment filled with TV and radio jazz.

Poverty and privation were his teachers. They were close to him and all around him. From them he learned kindness, compassion, sympathy, understanding. He learned many things from living with poor people which rich men's sons often never learn at all. Because this was so, people liked him and trusted him and later voted for him.

It was thus that he could later write to a mother of five dead soldier sons in words no other man had ever put on paper. Only he could have made the Gettysburg Address.

Lincoln never lost the common touch and so it came about in the terrible years of war, that the plain people of the North spoke of him as "Father" Abraham. He trusted them, and most of them trusted him. A stranger to pride and vanity, high office never spoiled him.

Part of his knowledge came from books, but the mystery and the mastery of Lincoln came from life, the great teacher.

One of Our Number

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite a privilege for me to pay this slight tribute to one of our colleagues. His has been an interesting, highly patriotic and unselfishly service-rendering life. That life, replete with fine and friendly acts is capped, I believe, by his record in the Second World War. I know genuine heroes loath to have their praises sung or their heroics lauded and I would be the last to embarrass our colleague in this regard. I do want to mention that he was a civilian employee in the Philippines when the Japanese came. He volunteered as a civilian to participate in the defense of the Philippines. He was captured with the Army and spent 3½ years in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp. He has recorded this terrible story of Bataan in a book entitled "Horror Trek."

Recently there came to this man, Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING, a worthy honor bestowed when Maj. Gen. Russell L. Vittrup, acting in behalf of the Secretary of the Army, administered to him the oath of office as a major in the U.S. Army Reserve. I predict he will wear that honor well and continue to serve his country and his people effectively, patriotically unselfishly and most cheerfully.

And so Mr. Speaker under the permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am happy to offer the below clipping from a recent addition of the Mansfield, Ohio, newspaper:

LEVERING NOW MAJOR

Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING, Democrat, of Ohio's 17th District, was appointed a major in the U.S. Army Reserve in January, Department of the Army said yesterday.

Maj. Gen. Russell L. Vittrup, Chief of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Army, administered the oath of office to LEVERING in behalf of the Secretary of the Army.

Appointed in the Judge Advocate General Corps., Representative LEVERING said, "I am deeply honored and delighted to receive this appointment. This military experience will offer many opportunities to serve our country that I would not have otherwise and it will enhance my legal knowledge."

JAP PRISONER

The Ohio Congressman was serving as a civilian for the Government at the beginning of World War II and volunteered, as a civilian, to participate in the defense of the Philippines. He was captured with the Army in Bataan and spent 3½ years in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp.

His book, "Horror Trek," printed and published in 1948, is a graphic account of the defense of Bataan and Corregidor.

He is the first survivor of the Bataan death march elected to Congress.

Political Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 24, 1960.

To the Editor of the New York Times

DEAR SIR: Your leading editorial in Tuesday's edition (February 23) on the status of Puerto Rico is so misleading and so far from the reality that I think in all fairness you should publish the following facts:

1. Puerto Rico was certainly a possession of the United States from the signing of the Treaty of Paris up till 1952 and during most of that time was governed by an act of Congress known as the Organic Act.

2. About 1948 Congress consented to a modification of the Organic Act of 1917, and permitted the Organic Act to be modified by a constitution drawn up and voted upon by the people of Puerto Rico.

3. However, a necessary condition for the acceptance of the new constitution by Congress was the retention of the Federal Relationship established by the old Organic Act of 1917. This is clear from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 30, 1950, wherein Mr. JAVITS of New York expressed his opposition to the bill for the reason that it did not give Puerto Rico the opportunity to vote for independence or statehood, but only the opportunity to vote for a new constitution within the structure of the old Organic Act.

4. It was this new constitution (which modified, but did not abolish, the Organic Act and therefore did not abolish or change the Territorial status of Puerto Rico) which was approved by Congress in 1952. At that time no one had any doubt about what was done by Congress.

5. However, in 1953, Mr. Sears, an official of the U.S. Government, declared before the U.N. Commission for nonautonomous territories, that the United States would no longer report to this Commission in regard to Puerto Rico, which by Public Law 600 of 1952 had ceased to be a nonautonomous territory.

Taking advantage of this declaration and presuming that a change from nonautonomous to autonomous was the same as a change from a territorial status to one of independence, Gov. Muñoz-Marín began to spread the idea and proclaim publicly that Public Law 600 of 1952, had somehow given independence to Puerto Rico, and then Puerto Rico in its turn and by the same law, freely united itself to the United States in a bond of permanent association. This is not what Public Law 600 has done as anyone may convince themselves by reading it. It maintained the organic act as the basic law for Puerto Rico and by the organic act, Puerto Rico is and remains a possession of the United States. In fact one of the necessary conditions for acceptance of the new constitution of Puerto Rico by the Congress was the retention of the Federal relations established by the Organic Act of 1917.

7. The result of the confusion being spread by Gov. Muñoz-Marín is that the New York Times and even the President of the United States are speaking as though Puerto Rico has been given its independence and is now independent but voluntarily associated with the United States. It is for the sake of continuing this thinking that Gov. Muñoz-Marín is now requesting the Congress of the United States (Fernós-Murray bill) to change the terminology of Public Law 600 of

1952 so that the words "Federal relations" will no longer appear and that they be substituted by the words "articles of permanent association." This may continue the confusion, but it will not change the reality which is that only Congress can give independence to Puerto Rico, and up to the present there is no evidence that that has been the intention of Congress, and the recent congressional investigation regarding the Fernós-Murray bill which was held in Puerto Rico last December, made that quite clear.

8. When the New York Times states that "Puerto Rico does not belong to the United States" and "Puerto Ricans themselves have chosen the commonwealth status and are equally free to choose independence or ask for statehood," and when Gov. Muñoz-Marín states: "We are happy to say that Puerto Rico is a proud, free, self-governing Commonwealth, joined to the United States by her own choice"—these are all statements which do not square with the legal realities, and which usurp the powers of Congress over territories or possessions of the United States. Puerto Rico up to 1952 had been a nonautonomous territory or possession of the United States. In 1952 Congress made it an autonomous territory, and that is where we stand at present and until Congress does something about it. It would seem that the people of Latin America have more reason for suspecting our statements than the Times is willing to admit.

If we are ashamed to have colonies, and we should be, then let us get rid of them in a legal way and in a way in which there will be no room for doubt by anyone. The people of our colonies should be given a fair opportunity to choose between independence or statehood. If independence is not wanted and statehood is not practical at the time, there is still the possibility of legislation by Congress that will make all our present territories that do not want independence a definite and integral part of the United States (District of Columbia is not a State, but is definitely and integrally a part of the United States) with the assurance of statehood if the conditions warrant it. But let this be done by act of Congress after consulting with the people concerned, since these are the only ones with authority to make the decision. The present condition in Puerto Rico is that Gov. Muñoz-Marín is, by his own will, imposing upon the people of Puerto Rico and on the Congress of the United States an independence which was never granted and a voluntary association which is absurd unless independence has first been granted.

JAMES McMANUS,

PONCE, P. R.

Top Level Advisory Group Proposed by McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I conclude the following:

[From the Steel Labor, March 1960]

TOP LEVEL ADVISORY GROUP PROPOSED BY McDONALD—PRESIDENT EISENHOWER URGED TO NAME PERMANENT LABOR, INDUSTRY TEAM TO ADVISE ON MAJOR PROBLEMS

David J. McDonald, international president of the United Steelworkers of America, has renewed his proposal for Presidential appointment of a permanent Labor and In-

dustry Advisory Committee to consider major labor problems.

"The Committee should be appointed by President Eisenhower to serve the dual purpose of keeping the Government advised of impending labor trouble and of keeping labor and management in constant communication between negotiations," President McDonald explained.

ORIGINATED PLAN IN 1957

A similar proposal was made originally by President McDonald in June 1957, when he proposed a special advisory group to keep the President informed of the wage-price spiral.

At the time, he said the group should include only those people directly involved in collective bargaining—thus eliminating such groups as the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

President McDonald's proposal won immediate support from Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell who reiterated his belief that top labor management meetings can help achieve industrial peace.

Addressing a west coast meeting, Mr. Mitchell said that "outside-the-bargaining-table relations must become a practice in America if we are to meet the needs of the future."

Mr. McDonald, who renewed his proposal recently at the annual civic achievement award dinner at Granite City, said that a "permanent advisory committee could make a significant contribution to harmonious labor-management relations in a period in which friction has continued to grow."

He suggested a committee of 10 or 12 leaders from both sides who would meet the President at least every other month to discuss pressing problems.

"We would need real 'decisionmakers' in the contract negotiation field including presidents or board chairmen of national industries such as steel, coal, automobile manufacturing, and the railroads," Mr. McDonald said.

DECISIONMAKERS

The USW chieftain obviously had in mind the recent negotiations with the basic steel industry which ended with a 116-day strike. During the months of futile talks with the industry's four-man team, Mr. McDonald charged that the real decisionmakers were not present at the bargaining table.

"To those who have engaged in major contract negotiations, two things are immediately apparent," Mr. McDonald asserted.

"The first is that only the really top (industry) men have the authority to make decisions. The second is that there are six or seven nationwide industries in which a labor dispute can vitally affect the Nation's economy."

"If both sides could be kept in touch with each other constantly, major mutual problems would not be left to build up to sometimes futile contract negotiations," he said.

INFORM WHITE HOUSE

Another function of the committee would be to keep the White House informed and advised on problems affecting labor and industry.

"It is my belief that President Eisenhower was poorly informed during periods of collective bargaining—often receiving his information late or thirdhand. Under the proposal, the President would have the facts of what is occurring and would not have to rely on thirdhand information."

Mr. McDonald said he was not criticizing U.S. Labor Secretary Mitchell.

President McDonald charged that a new group of steel leaders and their nonfraternization policy was a major factor in the recent strike and contrasted their actions with the steel leaders of other years "who grew up with us and understood us, even though we had our fights."

Speech by Carl Vinson Delivered at the
District of Columbia Council of the
Navy League Testimonial Dinner,
March 3, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit therewith a speech by CARL VINSON, distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, crowded into his 46 years of intense activity and service in the defense of his country, CARL VINSON has become the symbol in America of nation military preparedness. His towering stature has cast its protective shadow over every nook and cranny of the free world. No man before him has given more of his intelligent effort to making his Nation militarily capable to defend and protect the ideals of this Nation or the aspirations of other freedom-loving peoples. He gave to America the world's most powerful Navy. He has striven to do the same thing for the other branches of our mighty military machine. He believes in preparedness in every sense of the word. He believes in modern tools to defend his Nation. He knows that a strong America is the only bulwark between communism and enslavement.

Mr. Speaker, for a matchless contribution over almost a half a century of effort in the Congress of the United States, on last Thursday, March 3, at the dinner following the conclusion of the Navy-Marine Corps Symposium conducted by the District of Columbia Council of the Navy League, where CARL VINSON was the guest of honor, he received a scroll from the Service Secretaries signed by the Secretaries of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force.

He made the following address which I commend to every American:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Secretary Gates, distinguished Secretaries of the Department of Defense, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is not often, in one man's lifetime, that he is fortunate enough to hear so many laudatory things about himself as I have heard tonight.

I must be the first to deny them; but I can assure you that I will also be the last to forget these kind remarks.

I never dreamed that so many wonderful things could be said about me—as "crusty" as I have been diagnosed.

So with all humility, I cherish your gracious remarks.

Usually, a man in public life receives all earthly praise in his obituary—or perhaps when he retires from Congress.

An obituary is, in this instance, definitely premature; and if anyone is under the impression that I am about to voluntarily retire from Congress, I can only paraphrase the remarks of John Paul Jones and say "I have just begun to serve."

May I say to my distinguished friends who have spoken here tonight how very grateful I am for your generous statements.

Mr. Secretary Gates, I also deeply appreciate your very kind and flattering remarks concerning my endeavors in aid of national defense.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing to you, sir, my high regard and admiration for the manner in which you have fulfilled the exacting duties of your many public offices in which you have served.

You bring great credit upon the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

In you, the Nation has a true and tried public servant at the helm.

I especially wish to commend you for your recent directive with regard to your participation in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

With this one directive you have left an impressive mark on defense organization.

You have strengthened our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and at the same time have dealt a shattering blow to the advocates of a single chief of staff system.

And you have vitalized and reaffirmed the constitutional principle of civilian control.

I consider it a particular honor, Mr. Secretary, that you have presented this beautiful scroll to me upon which appears the names of the distinguished Service Secretaries and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and its great Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, for many years you played an ever-increasing role in the history of our Navy.

I, too, have watched our Navy grow. I have watched it grow from a second-rate power to the greatest naval power in the world, even though its primacy is now seriously challenged by the Soviet Union.

Likewise, Mr. Toastmaster, I've seen the Navy League grow in importance and influence and become a tower of strength in the effort to keep America in a constant state of preparedness.

My recollections of the Navy League carry me back to my early days on the Naval Affairs Committee in August of 1917, and Josephus Daniels. In those days the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy League did not always see eye to eye.

The naval gentlemen who are here tonight probably would have endangered their careers and possibly their personal liberty had they participated in a Navy League banquet during the Daniels' days.

Happily, that event was weathered by the Navy League and it emerged stronger and more influential than ever, just as it did when a former President appointed his own committee to inquire into the Navy League.

You weathered those storms—and if you can weather storms of that magnitude, then you are indestructible.

You weathered those days because your organization was founded upon a rock, and neither wind nor the seas could dislodge it.

From the first day of its organization, down to this hour, the Navy League has rendered great service to the Nation.

I congratulate its not only for the strong support it has always given to the Navy and the Marine Corps, but also to the entire defense program.

Such civilian groups as the Navy League, the Air Force Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, and others, play a vital role in America.

It is through patriotic organizations of this kind that the business interests of the country and the people, are made aware of the urgent necessity for continual progress in the technology of warfare.

The greatness of the Navy League and the other military associations is found in the fact that they are always in the fore-

front of a sound, strong, preparedness program.

This organization, and others of a similar nature, realizes that the expenditures involved in maintaining an adequate military preparedness are vastly less than the cost of total war; and incomparably less than the cost of defeat.

The security of our Nation demands that in our defense structure we attain and maintain a flexibility that will permit us to cope with any type of aggression.

In our defense thinking we must avoid the danger of over commitment to a single concept.

That is why I say to you that we must have a modern Army; and we can no longer delay the modernization of our Army. Each day of delay affects our security.

In addition, we must have an Air Force equipped with superior weapons.

While we do have superiority in manned aircraft today, nevertheless we are overlooking an opportunity for even greater manned aircraft supremacy for the years ahead.

Let me remind you that we must not be so anxious to discard the proved weapons systems of today for the intriguing and vastly complex systems of tomorrow, even before they have become an integral part of our arsenal.

And during this period of transition from the conventional to the ultramodern family of ballistic weapons, we must not forget that the nuclear weapons of the future, whose very usage implies world extermination, may make our conventional weapons even more important than they are today.

That is why I say to you that we must have a Marine Corps capable of fulfilling its mission of readiness.

This means a Marine Corps of three full combat divisions and three air wings.

We must give the Marine Corps the men and equipment to fulfill the mandate of the Congress.

We have a great Navy today, but I do have grave concern for it in the years ahead.

We are not rebuilding our fleet as rapidly as it is becoming obsolete.

And this failure to promptly modernize our Navy jeopardizes our security.

When I first came to the Congress the battleship was the hearthstone of our Navy.

Today, the battleship is but a memory of past glory.

In its place is the aircraft carrier, possessing, as it does, all of the vital attributes of a singularly powerful weapons system.

It is versatile, for it can be used for practically every type of challenge to our national interests.

It is mobile, and thus difficult to find, and its location is impossible to predetermine.

It is powerful in the weapons that it carries.

But a new and even greater future lies ahead for the aircraft carrier as the result of nuclear energy.

The Congress wisely recognized the tremendous significance of the nuclear carrier. Thirty-five million dollars was appropriated last year for long-range planning for this second nuclear carrier. Unfortunately, these funds are still withheld by the Bureau of the Budget.

The action in withholding these funds adversely affects our security and seapower.

By stupendous effort, with magnificent industry cooperation, brilliant planning, and outstanding leadership—the Navy gave birth to the Polaris submarine.

But, now, that this child prodigy is close to becoming operational, there are rumors that the child is to be taken away from its parents.

Let's not separate the child from its mother.

Let the judgment of Solomon prevail.

Naval seapower, coupled with the versatility of the Navy-Marine Corps team, is a priceless capability which we, and we alone, possess.

We must not let this unique and vital superiority wither on the vine, because seapower is entering a new and even greater age in the struggle for the preservation of the free world.

Mr. Toastmaster, there is not one person among us who does not want to see a strong America.

We perhaps differ only in the method by which we will attain this strength.

And in this respect, I want to say that the Nation is indeed fortunate in having a Secretary of Defense, a Secretary of the Army, a Secretary of the Navy, and a Secretary of the Air Force who are truly dedicated, patriotic Americans.

I have worked with many public servants in my years in the Congress, and I can say, here tonight, that the men who now occupy the important positions as the civilian heads of our military organizations have impressed the Nation with their competence, their integrity, their steadfastness, their service loyalty, and their outstanding leadership.

My committee assignments in the Congress have placed upon me the responsibility of dealing with matters involving the security of our country. This has given me the opportunity of working with outstanding civilian, military, and naval leaders.

As a result, I have known some of the finest men America has to offer.

My life has been enriched by these memories.

But tonight will be the brightest star in all my memory.

Women's American ORT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in many communities throughout the country, today, March 2, was celebrated by thousands of our most dedicated fellow citizens as ORT Day.

The ORT, as our colleagues know, is the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training which is devoted to the humanitarian work of rehabilitating Jewish people who are in need wherever they may be throughout the free world.

ORT Day this year marks the 80th anniversary of the World ORT Union and the 33d year of service of the Women's American ORT. In this period, several million of their fellow Jews have been helped in a way that merits the understanding and support of all our people.

ORT is based on the principle that people should be helped to develop their God-given talents and innate abilities and aided in becoming useful and productive citizens of the free world. Its program emphasizes vocational training and it has served displaced and underprivileged people whose potential contribution would otherwise have been lost to society and who themselves would otherwise have been denied the fruits and satisfaction of useful lives. Through its 631 vocational training installations in

19 countries, ORT has offered young people and adults the means of learning valuable industrial skills and thereby of participating in a productive way in the economic life of their countries.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we, the friends of the ORT program, salute the 55,000 members of the Women's American ORT and the 100,000 members of other American ORT Federation affiliates on this happy occasion, and wish them well as they prepare for years of ever greater and more beautiful service to humanity.

Alternative Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, labeled the farm bill recently introduced by 16 Democratic House Members as a "step toward collectivization."

Mr. Shuman has attacked as "rigged" the recent prognostications given the House Committee on Agriculture which foresee a sharp drop in farm income if controls were eliminated and price supports reduced or abandoned. He said such studies had been based on arbitrary and unrealistic assumptions.

If the existing surplus commodities owned by the Federal Government were not hanging over the domestic market, it would seem that an existing damper on prices of these commodities would be removed. Thus, my bill, H.R. 10350, to eliminate acreage and price controls has a cushion because the existing surpluses would be used only to feed starving and hungry people without disrupting domestic or foreign marketings.

No large organized pressure groups favor legislation such as mine, but individuals who hear about its provisions do support my bill.

Here are typical letters from scores of supporting communications which I have received from all over the country:

KIRKLAND, WASH., March 1, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS PELL,
Representative From Washington,
House Office
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for introducing a bill in the House to eliminate price supports of wheat. In my opinion price supports should have been either eliminated or modified long ago. Your bill seems to be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Benson has worked long and diligently to improve the farm program. Politically selfish interests have too long delayed any effective action to correct or curb the waste which has resulted. I urge Republicans and Democrats alike to support Mr. Benson.

To further express my interest in the bill and its passage I am sending a copy of this letter to the other Representatives from our State. I shall be interested to see what success the bill realizes.

Although I am a registered Democrat, it has been your positive action which has

prompted me to write my first letter to an elected Representative.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JERRY R. GEYER.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., March 3, 1960.

DEAR Mr. PELL: I read in the Indianapolis Star about your bill to free the farmers from Government regulations. I have long wondered why some lawmaker doesn't propose such a thing. It seems to me to be the only cure for the farmers' ills and the consumers' high prices; however, I'm fairly confident that such a drastic course would have to come gradually to prevent a large-scale depression among farmers. Does your bill have a provision for doing this a little at a time? I hope it also provides for doing away with the large farm surpluses.

I'm no economist but I lived on a farm for 16 years and have a lifelong interest in agricultural problems. I'm a college graduate and also hold a master's degree.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN B. IRWIN.

The Christian Science Monitor Is Right: Rejecting Dictators Isn't Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the March 3, 1960, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The editorial notes the value of the President's South American trip, then adds:

But further action is needed in this field. Presidents Lleras Camargo of Colombia and Betancourt of Venezuela deserve recognition and praise from Mr. Eisenhower for the sacrificial devotion they have shown in restoring freedom to their nations. For reasons of timing, their countries have not been included on the President's tour. But some means of public recognition can, and should, be found to give support to them and their peoples.

The editorial follows:

REJECTING DICTATORS ISN'T ENOUGH

"I have heard it said that the United States supports dictators. This is ridiculous. . . . We repudiate dictatorship in any form, right or left." (President Eisenhower, speaking in Chile.)

The blunt words of repudiation have long been needed. Indeed, what is "ridiculous" is not that some Latin Americans thought Washington supported dictators but that Washington sometimes carelessly did lend support to dictators.

Mr. Eisenhower's four-nation tour has done much to make it clear that the American conscience has not lost its vigor in wishing other peoples free to be governed by their own consent.

But the direct and unequivocal denunciation of dictatorships is only half of what the United States needs to mend its political friendship with its southern neighbors.

More should be done to encourage the democratic regimes that have replaced dictators—and had to struggle with inherited bankruptcy in treasuries and in political institutions.

In the past decade seven dictatorships have fallen in Latin America. Not all have been replaced by free systems. But dictatorship is on its last legs. So speaking out strongly against dictatorship, while welcome, is not so much an act of bravery as of overdue communication.

Mr. Eisenhower is superb at earnest communication. He can make ideals felt. He has done much to lend support to four important democratic leaders struggling with economic, political, and social problems.

But further action is needed in this field. Presidents Lleras Camargo of Colombia and Betancourt of Venezuela deserve recognition and praise from Mr. Eisenhower for the sacrificial devotion they have shown in restoring freedom to their nations. For reasons of timing, their countries have not been included on the President's tour. But some means of public recognition can, and should, be found to give support to them and their peoples.

The taste of irony still lingers there. It is remembered that Washington decorated Venezuela's malign General Pérez Jiménez, and let its arms help support tyrants under the banner of nonintervention—despite its swift action against a dictatorship of the left in Guatemala.

One potential liberator may have served as a spokesman for all when he said: "I didn't specially enjoy being carried to jail in a jeep with a sign on it, saying: 'Gift of the People of the United States to the People of Nicaragua.'"

Fortunately this era of blundering lies mostly in the past, struck down by stones hurled at Mr. Nixon 2 years ago.

But Mr. Eisenhower's excellent missionary work of the past 2 weeks should be extended, by word if not by visit, to other peoples emerging from tyranny and poverty. The clear (to Washington) change in Washington's official attitude is not clear to others until it is communicated in forthright words—and acts. No medals are needed. But encouragement is.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following Newsletter of March 5, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 5, 1960.

Civil rights legislation dominates the Washington scene, snow and ice notwithstanding. The round-the-clock Senate filibuster is now an entertainment to see, and many through the Senate galleries. Southern Senators, working in shifts, show no visible tiring. Most Senators do not want to vote to invoke cloture, the shutting off of debate, because of their high valuation of their unlimited freedom to speak. Most would not want to be shut off on other issues. Curtailing debate on civil rights would set the precedent for curtailing debate on other issues. Unfortunately, the Southern effort now results mainly in crystallizing the opposition to the Southern viewpoint. True, these speeches for and against are for "home consumption" of the respective Senators. Meanwhile, other

legislation is backlogged and delayed. To many of us, this in itself is not an unfortunate development. The truth is, as I see it, we pass too much legislation anyway, and any reduction of our legislative output could be in the national interest.

Just what does the Senate civil rights bill involve? Is it a voting rights matter alone? Absolutely not. Behind the voting rights' masquerade is much more—including forced integration and massive Federal aid to education. Briefly, here is an analysis of the bill: Section 1, \$10,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment for interfering with or obstructing school integration. (So your letter or chance remarks could land you in jail.) Section 2, creates a new Federal crime for bombing religious or educational properties and fleeing across State lines. Section 3, local election officials must keep voting records 3 years and turn them over to the Federal Justice Department. Section 4, Federal grants and aid for local schools that desegregate. Section 5, Federal Government provides schools for children in areas where public schools are closed to avoid integration. Section 6, a commission would be set up to seek to eliminate racial discrimination in jobs. (Where now is the right to hire and fire?) Section 7, Federal referees would oversee local election. Here finally the bill is related to voting rights—which now is a State matter.

The truth is, as I've testified before, we are not even defining what civil rights are, besides the right to vote. The solution proposed by this bill could easily create more civil wrongs. What happens to our other civil rights and freedoms—freedom to speak, write, assemble, to hire and fire and not the least, the freedom from Federal persecution, bureaucracy, and increased taxation to pay for it all. Forgotten is the fact that there are 175 million Americans, only 19 million of whom are Negroes. Must rights of the majority be trampled by overzealous efforts to protect a minority? Under all this lies the mistaken judgment of politicians seeking votes by any method. Should increased riots develop in the South, the more serious tinder boxes of racial tension in the North could erupt. * * * Philadelphia, New York, Detroit, and others. The politicians pushing civil rights for political gain will then suffer—but so will all the people in their areas. Meanwhile, in the Senate southern supporters of this exaggerated civil rights bill could become heroes by toning down the bill and controversy they enflamed.

"A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to provide for certain payments for the relief of rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution, and for other purposes" provoked my opposition in floor debate. Whether good or bad, I know the measure was too little understood by Members of the House. Everyone is in favor of assisting victims of persecution, but when it comes to authorizing the expenditure of a half million dollars, I insist that the purposes, and especially the "for other purposes" provision of the bill, be clearly understood. No adequate explanation was given the House as to why the United States should give \$500,000 to a private organization to settle claims when those who were persecuted, their property taken (now held by the United States), left no heirs. (This bill treats only with heirless property.) By what curious logic do we transfer the property of people now dead and which we acquired during the war, to present percutees, wholly unrelated to the original property owners, through the agency of a private organization? Like the iceberg, there could be more here than meets the eye. Regardless of the merit of the bill's ultimate aim, it struck me as a good example of a slipshod way to legislate.

AFL-CIO Opposes Interest Rate Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, opposition is growing to H.R. 10590, the so-called compromise bill to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

Opponents of the bill have little confidence in the Eisenhower administration's fiscal and monetary policies. Its shortcomings in this area have been well-documented by the majority views of the Joint Economic Committee in its report on "Employment, Growth, and Price Levels" and its "1960 Joint Economic Report."

Administration debt-management failures have increased the interest rates paid on Government securities by 63 percent in just 7 years, to their highest level in 30 years. This has raised the annual cost of interest on the national debt by 60 percent, to a staggering total of \$9.6 billion for the coming fiscal year. Next to defense expenditures, this is the largest single item of Federal spending in the President's budget. During this same period the national debt has risen from \$266 billion to \$290 billion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and statement of the AFL-CIO opposing the interest rate hike and an extract from my radio address of February 27-28 on this important subject:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since World War I—through booms, depressions, and military crises—the United States has successfully met its money needs without breaching the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term bonds.

Despite urgings of the President, the AFL-CIO continues to believe that no change by the Congress is justified nor should decision-making authority on this vital matter be transferred to the President. The enclosed brief statement summarizes the reason for our view.

It shows that since 1953 hard money has been a persistent objective of the administration and that higher interest rates have been justified on one pretext after another even when more effective and equitable ways of achieving monetary objectives have been available.

It further documents the tremendous costs that ever higher interest rates have heaped upon millions of wage earners and other private borrowers as well as on governments, while lenders reap handsome profits without providing any added service.

Finally, it points to several alternatives the Government can now pursue, rather than initiate still another round of higher interest rates which hurt so many while retarding economic growth.

Because the issue is so vital, we hope you will read our short statement before your own decision is finally made.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

AFL-CIO STATEMENT OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO BREACH THE 4 1/4 PERCENT INTEREST RATE CEILING ON LONG-TERM BONDS

The AFL-CIO continues to hold that Congress need not, and should not, lift the interest rate ceiling on long-term bonds (of 5 years duration or more) nor should it give the President authority to raise it, for many reasons:

(1) The scarcity of loanable funds over the last year has been due essentially to temporary factors related to the recovery from the 1957-58 recession. For example, the rapid inventory buildup of last year and the large Federal deficit in 1959 contributed to a rapid increase in the demand for loans. But inventory growth has now begun to subside, the current budget is expected to be in balance, and the fiscal 1961 budget will show a sizable surplus. These events and other factors have reduced pressure in the money market and interest rates have recently tended down.

It is reasonable to assume, as a consequence, that U.S. long-term bonds may soon attract buyers without the enticement of rates above the current ceiling.

(2) The record of the administration doesn't support the sense of urgency to sell long-term bonds and "stretch out" the debt which it alleges exists.

During the years from 1953 to 1959 when interest rates were much lower, the Treasury showed no comparable rush to sell long-term bonds in order to stretch out the debt. Because of its action or inaction, the maturity of the Federal debt actually declined substantially during those 6 years.

It should be further noted that the use of long-term marketable obligations by the Treasury is not and has not been a major source of Federal financing. For example, a year ago—before the clamor to raise the interest rate ceiling was heard—the total interest bearing debt was \$283 billion. However, about \$147 billion of this total—or, roughly 50 percent—represented marketable Treasury obligations. Of these, only \$39 billion were obligations maturing in 5 years or more. By way of contrast, over \$48 billion of a smaller debt was in long-term bonds exceeding 5-year duration at the beginning of 1953 when the administration took over.

(3) Although the Consumer Price Index rose less than 1 percent in 1959 over 1958, Government spokesmen, from the President on down, have been helping to drive buyers out of the bond market by their own incessant and irresponsible scare-talk about inflation. No wonder savers preferred to hedge against the alleged inflation by buying stocks (and to enjoy the special—and unjustified—tax bonanza for dividend recipients put into effect at the request of the administration back in 1954).

(4) The sale of long-term bonds at highly inflated costs at a time when interest rates have been at a 35-year high would unnecessarily add billions to taxpayer burdens and further inflate all other interest rates as well.

There are surely more prudent ways to manage our monetary system:

The Treasury can continue to meet current needs through short-term borrowings on which no interest ceiling has been imposed and on which the rates recently in fact have been going down. This is far wiser—since these commitments are quickly self-terminating—than to sell bonds of 20 and 30 years duration which lock into the debt structure high interest rate obligations over a long term of years.

The Federal Reserve Board could, and should, aid the Treasury by purchasing some long-term bonds itself. This would help stabilize bond prices and benefit both the Treasury and all bondholders.

In the main, the sale of long-term Federal bonds should only occur when interest rates are low or at least, not abnormally high.

The administration, on the other hand, seems willing to add billions more to the crushing interest burden the public already pays to no advantage to anyone but banks and other lenders.

Already the debt burden under this administration has increased staggeringly. Although the debt itself has risen less than 6 percent since fiscal 1946, interest payments have skyrocketed almost 100 percent. These payments totaled \$6.4 billion in fiscal 1954, the first year after the new administration took over. By the end of fiscal 1960, they will have reached \$9.4 billion.

Today, 12 cents out of every \$1 collected in Federal revenue is being paid out as interest to those who own the Federal debt.

It is instructive to recall some additional recent monetary history.

From the time Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey boosted interest rates on long-term U.S. bonds back in 1953, tight money apparently has been a major administration objective. Except during the depths of the recessions of 1954-55 and 1957-58, interest rates have been continuously pushed up by a combination of Treasury-Federal Reserve actions—all avowedly to stop inflation and assure adequate economic growth.

Since 1952, as a consequence, the overall interest rate rise—including the costs of both Government and private borrowing—has been nearly 100 percent.

Theoretically, high interest rates are supposed to reduce inflationary pressures by curtailing spending. However, tight money has not deterred spending by wealthy corporations and individuals who do not need to borrow to meet their investment or consumption needs.

Furthermore, high interest rates have transferred billions from the incomes of working people and other borrowers to the lenders who provide not one cent of additional service for the higher price they receive for their loans.

Millions of average American families have been grievously hurt by tight money. For example, over the last 2 years alone higher interest charges on a 25-year \$10,000 FHA mortgage loan have added over a thousand dollars to the cost of buying a home and installment purchases of all kinds have become similarly more costly. As taxpayers, American families not only must bear billions more in Federal interest charges but the cost of carrying State and local debt has soared as well. For example, recent high interest rates will ultimately make the real cost of a classroom almost double the construction cost of the room.

Is there any wonder that the net profits of member banks of the Federal Reserve System shot up 75 percent between 1952 and 1958 while personal income from interest payments skyrocketed from \$12.1 billion in 1952 to \$22.5 billion in 1959, a 90-percent rise?

What is more, it is evident that many factors besides interest rates influence consumer and business demand and that tight money surely has not immunized America from rising prices. This is particularly true in the case of enterprises that can administer their own prices upward—like steel, auto, oil, drugs, etc.—without any regard at all for the actual level of demand or of interest rates.

Moreover, higher interest rates themselves increase all prices: they inflate the cost of raising a family, of financing Government services, of operating a farm, and of running any other business—and particularly a small or moderately sized one. Thus, higher interest costs are themselves a major price factor in the rising price level.

Finally, ever-higher interest rates have not brought the growth and stability the American economy needs. On the contrary, during the postwar years from 1947 to 1953 our average annual rate of real economic growth was 4.7 percent, but after 1953 it dwindled to 2.3 percent. Moreover, we have

already suffered two sharp recessions since tight money has been sanctified by this administration. Another recession is widely predicted by 1961 because, among other reasons, high interest rates and credit scarcity are already reducing new housing starts and threaten to slow down the growth of personal consumption and business and Government investment.

The AFL-CIO recognizes that periods arise when abnormal demands upon an economy require temporary credit restraints. We believe, however, that the efforts of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board not only have been ill timed but have also employed wrong methods.

For example, acting as though the raising of profits for lenders was its major objective, the Federal Reserve Board has raised interest rates again and again when inflation has been the assumed problem and, therefore, credit restraint has been prescribed. But at no time since the Eisenhower administration came into power have bank reserve requirements been raised—an action that would have restricted credit by reducing the funds available to the banks for loans. On the contrary, since 1953, the maximum reserve requirement of member banks actually has been cut from 24 percent to 18 percent.

Moreover, at precisely the same time Congress was first being asked to breach the 4 1/4-percent interest ceiling to help fight the alleged inflation, the administration also was asking it to pass the "cash vault" bill which sanctions raising the money supply and thus, presumably, increasing the inflationary danger.

It is our view that the President's request for a higher interest rate ceiling does not reflect good economic judgment. It reflects concern for the gains of bankers and other lenders far more than the welfare of the entire Nation.

Today, the American economy depends more than ever upon the wisdom of those who direct monetary and fiscal policies. Above all, old concepts must be constantly reexamined to make sure that they are responsive to realities in our fast changing times.

Clearly, neither the Treasury nor the Federal Reserve Board have been fulfilling their functions in this manner. While ignoring vitally important monetary and fiscal reforms such as those proposed by the majority of the Joint Economic Committee, they continue to adhere to outmoded classical and class-biased practices.

It is high time that the monetary policies of the United States be geared to the needs of the Nation instead of the profits of the national banks. Until this happens, it would be irresponsible to give the President and the Treasury additional power to misuse.

RADIO ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE M. RHODES, WEEU, WRAW, WHUM, FEBRUARY 27-28, 1960

This is Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, reporting by transcription from Washington.

The House Ways and Means Committee has voted approval of a "compromise" bill backed by the administration which would raise the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. A bill to accomplish the same purpose was rejected by the House last year.

The interest rate bill is one of the most important measures to come before the House. It affects every American in his daily life. It would give power to the President to set the interest rate on the sale of up to \$5.8 billion worth of bonds each year—power which no other President in our history has ever had. Heretofore, Congress has maintained control over the maximum rate of interest which the Government could pay on bonds issued for longer than 5 years.

Just last month, a majority of the Joint Economic Committee recommended that the

present interest rate ceiling be retained, after conducting a series of hearings and studies on this issue. The bill to take off the interest rate ceiling would repudiate the recommendation of these economic experts.

The administration contends that the interest rate ceiling makes it impossible for the Treasury to market long-term bonds and forces it to issue short-term notes at higher rates of interest, thus costing the taxpayers more for the money borrowed.

Experts on the Joint Economic Committee and other opponents of the interest rate increase contend that there is no crisis in public debt financing which could not be corrected by administrative reforms recommended by the committee.

It has been pointed out that a private business would be foolhardy to undertake long-term borrowing when interest rates are at their highest levels in 30 years. Yet this is exactly what the administration is proposing to do. Long-term borrowing at present abnormally high rates of interest would burden the next generation with many billions of dollars of additional payments of interest on the national debt.

The administration's high-interest, hard-money policies have already increased the interest payment on the debt to a staggering total of nine and a half billion dollars a year. Such fiscal and economic policies have also curtailed our rate of economic growth at a time when the Soviet Union is forging ahead economically as well as militarily. The serious unemployment problem, particularly in chronically depressed areas, continues to worsen. We now have almost as many persons unemployed in this so-called prosperity year as were unemployed in the recession year of 1954. This is at least partially caused by the failure of our economy to expand fast enough to absorb the millions of young people entering the labor market each year.

Opponents of the so-called compromise bill to raise interest rates contend that once the ceiling is lifted, interest rates would be boosted in every other sector of the economy. Directly or indirectly, this would affect every citizen. It would, for example, make it even more costly to buy a home because of the increased interest on home mortgages. This would have the effect of curtailing the building industry and the thousands of related industries. Higher interest rates on Government bonds would affect the rate of private borrowing, making it more costly for businessmen to finance inventory purchases, expansion, and other activities. It would add to the cost of all goods purchased on time—from cars to household appliances. It would add to the cost of borrowing to finance new schools, streets, and other public improvements at the local governmental level, thus bringing about higher local taxes.

Liberal Democrats in the House are convinced that an increase in the ceiling on Government bonds would be harmful to the vast majority of Americans and only benefit a handful of large banks and insurance companies which grab up bond issues at the present inflated rates of interest. The so-called compromise bill, while it does not go as far as the administration originally requested, would nevertheless break the interest ceiling and transfer legitimate authority of Congress to the President.

A bitter fight over this issue is expected to develop in the House. Liberal Democrats are pledged to fight this giveaway of more billions of dollars of taxpayers' money to the big financial interests which now are calling the tune—not only on Wall Street but at the White House and here on Capitol Hill.

The Real Castro—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News is currently publishing a series of articles by two of its ace reporters, Joseph Martin and Phil Santora, about Cuba's newest dictator Fidel Castro. They bring to light many interesting facts about him which depict the real Castro. The first installment in the series appeared on Sunday, March 6, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article in the RECORD:

CASTRO: PHONY PROPHET—JUST ONE MORE IN THE LONG SERIES OF CUBAN TRAGEDIES

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

Fidel Castro, who just 15 months ago was hailed as the Ethan Allen of the Sierra Maestra Mountains—a colorful, magnetic, swashbuckling combination of a canebrake Quantrell and Simon Bolivar—represents the latest in a long series of tragedies to be inflicted on a long-suffering Cuban people.

It is doubtful that most Cubans are yet aware that their idol, before whose picture religious peasant women burn vigil lights as they would before the Christ, is dedicated to communism.

Only the more perceptive realize that Fidel Castro is a consummate actor, that far from the brave revolutionary battling against evil, he is in truth a physical coward, a double-crosser who has sent friends and followers to their deaths, a dictator whose only interest in his people is a selfish one, utter personal power.

LITERALLY, HE IS STRICTLY FROM HUNGER

Castro is the product of a generation of unrest and tyranny in Cuba. He was created out of the hunger of the Cuban people for a true liberator who would free them from the oppressions of the Batistas, the Prios, the Grau San Martins, the Machados and all the others who have systematically plundered the island and deprived them of democratic rights.

But the Cubans have again been short-changed. Even those who have been able to set aside their emotions long enough to realize that their beloved Fidel is just a carbon copy of his bloody predecessors after all, hesitate to say so. They hesitate because they don't want to believe they are in for another era of dictatorship. Of because they can be sent to "the wall" before a firing squad as enemies of the revolution if they are overheard.

The freedom of speech, freedom of the press promised by Castro while he was beating his breast in the mountains before the fall of Batista have not materialized. Nor are they likely to. Free elections have been put off indefinitely. Agrarian reform has become synonymous with confiscation.

Almost every popular figure, outside the tight little circle that includes Fidel, his brother, Raul; the Argentine Communist, Dr. Ernesto (Che) Guevara and close friends in the Red-dominated cabinet, has been "eliminated."

Some have been thrown into jail for long terms. Others have suffered fatal "accidents." Still others have been executed outright or exiled.

Castro doesn't like competition. Neither does he like to have men around him who knew him when he was an embryo hoodlum in Havana University, when he was a bearded revolutionary potting farm animals with a high-powered rifle in the mountains, when he fled from the attack on the Moncado garrison and left others to do his fighting.

CIRCUS TRIALS AND EXECUTIONS

To cover up his many deficiencies, Castro has adopted a familiar theme among Latin-American and South American revolutionists—vilification of the Colossus to the North—the United States. He has kept the Cuban hunger for excitement appeased by circus trials and executions.

He has jailed political prisoners in such numbers that he has been forced to free hundreds of thieves, dope peddlers, rapists and gangsters to make room for the enemies of the revolution.

He has adopted Soviet-style brainwashing methods in dealing with these prisoners. His torturing of these unfortunates rivals that of Batista, the butcher who preceded him.

This series of articles will describe Castro as seen by those who know him best—men who have known him since he was an egotistical student leader at the university, who served with him in the mountains, the priests who gave the last rites to prisoners condemned to death by the Castro tribunals.

There will be first-person accounts by men who knew him in prison, when he taught Marx and Lenin to a literally captive audience.

There will be a report by the investigating officer of the real story behind the disappearance of Camillo Cienfuegos, popular head of the revolutionary army.

WELL-FED LEADER, HUNGRY FOLLOWERS

The exiled former chief of Castro's air force, who flew munitions to Castro and his brother while they were in the mountains, gives his impressions of a man who sat around eating caviar and smoking big cigars while his followers went hungry.

There are profiles on Rolando Masferrer and Gen. Jose E. Pedraza, the two men Castro fears most.

Former chiefs of police, of intelligence, of the anti-Communist division of the national police cooperated in giving The News team an insight into the several faces of Castro. Each of the dozens of interviews was carefully double-checked. In no case was information on Castro accepted without confirmation by sources unknown to the men originally interviewed.

What emerges rips the mask of pseudo-patriotism from the bearded face of Fidel Castro Ruz.

It portrays him as a schemer who always knew what he wanted—complete, absolute control of Cuba. It also shows that he was always a willing tool of the Reds, that he was carefully schooled in Communist tactics by Reds who had gained experience during the civil war in Spain.

This communistic education has molded Castro into a catatonic agent that may, if not checked, crystallize the Red cells in Latin and South America, placing Soviet satellites squarely on the doorstep of the United States.

To understand what makes Castro tick, however, it is necessary to describe the conditions under which he was spawned.

Communism is not new in Cuba. The first signs of the Red ideology go back to the late twenties, to Havana University, which has always been a fertile spot for revolutionary political doctrines.

The first disciples of Cuban communism were Julio Antonio Mella (killed in Mexico

and whose ashes were enshrined on Reina y Escobar Street in Havana; Pablo de la Torriente (killed in the civil war in Spain); Aureliano Sanchez Arango (who deserted the Communist Party and became associated with President Carlos Prío Socarras); Juan Marinello Vidsurreta and others, including Raul Roa, currently Minister of State.

From 1930 to 1933, Fabio Grobart, known as "El Ruso" (the Russian) was assigned to organize the Communist Party. On September 4, 1933, communism erupted throughout the country, infiltrating even the armed forces. Soldiers wore Red armbands.

The party lost some of its momentum, however, and during the next two decades was not a vital force in Cuban politics. It received another jolt when, in April 1952, President Fulgencio Batista, severed diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Embassy's 126 employees went to Mexico where they began to apply outside pressure against the regime.

They instigated a plot to kill Batista. Among those who met with the Russians at Havana University were Francisco Calderio (Blas Roca Calderio); Lionel Soto, Alfredo Guevara, Antonio Nunez Jimenez, Vicentina Antuna de Carone, Dr. Raul Roa, and others.

CORRUPT BATISTA WAS FAIR GAME

There was no quarrel with the original objectives. Batista was corrupt and fair game for anyone who wanted to free Cuba from his grasp. But all were accepted as members of the Communist Party, and that was important.

It is significant that the group agreed to name Fidel Castro, who had won notoriety as a gangster at Havana University, as its leader.

Look at some of the names thus far mentioned:

Dr. Raul Roa is currently Castro's Minister of State. He has been a staunch leftist for 30 years. He is famous for his fight against Machado in 1932, a very close friend of Jose Antonio Mella, the slain Communist leader, as well as other Reds.

He is aggressively anti-United States, boasts of his huge library on Communist doctrine and has contributed articles to *Fundamentos* and *Neustro Tiempo*, both well known Red publications.

Roa is one of the men to watch in the Castro regime. He is powerful, ruthless, and has Communist connections throughout the world.

REVISED TEXTBOOKS LEAN TOWARD REDS

Dr. Vicentina Antuna de Carone has risen to a post as general director of culture. She is an avowed Communist and fanatically anti-United States. She and other Reds in the revolutionary government have undertaken teaching reforms in which Communist doctrines have been insinuated into revised textbooks. In the new Cuban history books, U.S. intervention in the fight for Cuban independence has been deleted.

Trivial though it may seem, not the least of Dr. Antuna's campaign has been the abolition of Santa Claus.

Last Christmas, she arbitrarily prohibited the showing of images of Kris Kringle in all schools and department stores and forbade the importation of American Christmas trees into the country.

She also prohibited the selling of U.S. Christmas cards depicting Christ, New England scenes, carolers, and such. Cubans enjoy the U.S. version of Christmas and American relatives of Cubans here were appalled to receive cards showing a bearded rebel holding a rifle instead of a bearded Santa holding a bagful of gifts. On the card was the legend: "Merry Christmas in the Year of Liberation."

Cuban children, whose parents desperately tried to decorate mango shrubs with tinsel and ornaments, burst into tears when they sighted the fraudulent Christmas trees.

REPORTED PLANNING RUSSIAN SUB BASE

Antonio Nunez Jimenez, director of the INRA—the National Institute of Agrarian Reform—was a leader of the Young Communist League at Havana University. He organized the Cuban group that attended the Berlin Youth Festival and is an influential member of the propaganda and cultural section of the Communist Party in Cuba.

Reports are that Jimenez is one of a group working with Russians toward the establishment of a secret Soviet submarine base in Cuba.

He is the author of a geography textbook that aims at the indoctrination of young readers. It praises Russia and violently attacks the United States for the part it played in the Cuban War of Independence. The Batista government banned sale of the book, but it is in use in Cuban schools today.

Along with others, including Dr. Antuna, he is responsible for the elimination of English from school programs; English was a compulsory subject before Castro took over.

In addition, Jimenez is the strong man behind the confiscation of U.S. properties and investments in Cuba.

Lionel Soto studied in Moscow. He was secretary of the International Union of Students, a Red group created in Prague on August 27, 1946, to indoctrinate teenagers. His wife, Geisha Borroto de Soto, was in on the Russian plot to kill Batista. Both have places in the new government.

Soto also helped put out the *Carta Semestral*, a Red publication outlawed by the Batista regime.

Fidel Castro was eminently qualified for the job of putting into practice the Communist "Security Cordon" discussed at the 20th Communist Congress and which had as its main objectives the occupation of the Panama Canal, the assassinations of Carlos Castillo Armas, of Guatemala; Somoza, of Nicaragua; Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, and Batista.

FIGURED IN SLAYING OF STUDENT LEADER

Castro had been involved in violence long before this. He was one of the principals in the slaying of a student leader, Manolo Castro (no relation), who was shot to death on San Rafael St. in Havana. He was also accused of being one of the group that shot to death Fernandez Caral, a sergeant of the university police. Fidel has a long record as a terrorist.

What was Castro like in his student days, when he was earning the right to become a revolutionary leader? The News team talked to a classmate as well as to police officers who knew him at the time. None can be identified for fear of reprisals against members of their families still in Cuba.

"Even in those days," said one classmate, "Fidel was a complex person. He was not particularly popular because he was a troublemaker, a swaggering individual who carried a .45 and who was habitually hatching plots against his rivals for honors in the political groups at Havana University."

"The FEU (the Federation of University Students that later became a potent force in Castro's successful overthrow of Batista), had rejected Fidel's bid for its presidency. Fidel was angry and he became associated with an underground campus group—the UIR, the Union of Insurrectional Revolutionists."

REGARDED BY FIDEL AS A MORTAL ENEMY

"Manolo Castro had been president of the FEU. He had a police record. On one occasion, he was accused of the murder of Fernandez Fiallo, a professor in the school of architecture. On another occasion, he fired shots at another teacher."

"Fidel regarded him as a mortal political enemy; for Manolo had achieved a stature that Fidel aspired to as FEU president. At a meeting of UIR members, Fidel boldly in-

sisted that Manolo must be killed. There was opposition, but Fidel, still smarting because he hadn't made the team, insisted.

"A group of students finally caught up with Manolo and shot him. Fidel is said to have been with them and he was placed under arrest. However, he was clever. The gang had gone to the home of a friend and put paraffin on their hands to remove any evidences of nitrate."

A police officer said: "Manolo Castro died en route to the hospital. A friend of mine on the force saw a member of the Fidel Castro group—Gustavo Ortiz Faez—come running past Mario's Restaurant near Neptune Street. He fired a couple of shots in the air and Faez stopped."

HE HAD INFLUENCE EVEN IN THE EARLY DAYS

"Faez was a nephew of Grau San Martin, then president of Cuba, and pressure was put on to release him. The business of the paraffin took place in the home of Miguel Suarez Fernandez, an influential senator who was the patron of the UIR for the political help he could get from this illegal group."

"Naturally, when Castro and the others were picked up and subjected to the test no trace of gunpowder remained. Then a judge came to the precinct and they were released. No trial was held. In other words, instead of his going to court, the court came to him. He had influence even in those early days."

Castro hungered for recognition—any kind of recognition. He sought power and popularity on an almost compulsive basis and was an insatiable publicity hound. When a strike was called at the university—and there were many—Fidel would always be up in front, talking to newsmen, posing for photographers.

When he received a small scratch on his forehead during a skirmish, he bandaged his entire head and posed joyfully for the photographers.

He was impatient for success, burning with ambition. He passed a 4-year college course in three by cramming on the eve of examinations. And he was willing to do anything to erase those who stood in his way.

His attempt on the life of Leonel Gomez, a student leader, is typical. Castro didn't know Gomez. He merely knew that Gomez had influence, that he was an obstacle in his path. He told a close friend he was going to kill Gomez.

"He didn't even know where Gomez lived or what he looked like," said a former classmate, "but killing Gomez—who was only 17 at the time—was too big a job for Fidel to handle alone."

ASKED CLASSMATE TO HELP IN KILLING

"He asked me to help and I refused, telling him it was a crazy idea. He tried to enlist the aid of Rolando Masferrer and I believe that two of Masferrer's men went with him 2 weeks later when Gomez was shot, though they didn't help Fidel."

"Fidel ambushed Gomez from the top of a stone wall outside the baseball stadium. He shot him in the back—putting a slug in his lung."

"Gomez was walking down a crowded street when it happened. One of Castro's friends, who happened to be in the area, was accidentally shot in the leg when Fidel opened fire. He was Fernando Freyre de Andrade, a lawyer now living in Havana. Fidel never worried about where his bullets were going."

"Gen. Juan Rodriguez, a Dominican exile living at the San Luis Hotel—he later took Castro on an expedition against Trujillo—hid him, gave him money and even switched guns in the event Castro was captured and they ran a ballistics test."

"He came to me first, however. He was very excited and he told me he had just shot Gomez. He cried: 'I need your help, I need your help.' He almost wept—a great actor

this man. When he wants something, he can turn on the tears." Gomez lived and Castro never came to trial.

During those university days, Castro was somewhat less than a Frank Merriwell. He was a forerunner of today's beatnik. His clothes were always rumpled, his fingernails needed cleaning and he avoided bathing with something akin to fervor.

He seldom relaxed. One night, he started out with the boys for a night on the town. He had his .45 with him, as usual. He spotted a street light on Virtudes Street, near the office of El Mundo in busy, downtown Havana, and decided then and there to brush up on his shooting. He didn't hit the light, but police swarmed to the scene and Castro and his buddies never did get to the bordello.

He had an enormous appetite, something which stuck with him later in the Sierra Maestra. He liked hot, spicy Spanish food rather than the milder Cuban variety and could handle a terrific amount of wine—two or three bottles at a session.

He ate so much that he frequently ran out of money and this sometimes got him in trouble.

"One day," relates a friend, "we went to lunch at Santa Fe, a beach near Havana. We pooled our money and found we had about 6 pesos and we were studying the menu pretty carefully. Not Fidel. He ordered a chicken and a bottle of expensive wine. We were worried but not Fidel. He said: 'Let's eat first and worry about it later.'"

GENTLE GIRL FALLS IN LOVE WITH HIM

"The bill came to more than 25 pesos (\$25). The owner came. Then a corporal and two soldiers came. They were going to arrest us but Alberto Perez Nodarse, whose father owned a large home at the beach, was finally allowed to sign the tab.

"The next week, the incident was almost repeated. We went to Varadero Beach, registered at a hotel, ate the best and Fidel even wine and dined the owner.

"He really made a hit with that man. When the time came to pay the bill, we all walked out of the hotel leaving our empty suitcases behind. Some of us were wearing two suits of clothes."

Castro was devoid of "any civilized manners and was extremely rude to women," in those days. He never brushed his teeth, his table manners were terrible and the sleeve of his jacket served as a handkerchief.

But curiously, Myrta Diaz-Balart fell in love with him. Myrta was a gentle girl who had lost her mother when she was 3. They were married in 1948, while he was still a student.

During what might loosely be described as the "courtship," Fidel's sisters, particularly Lydia, used to give him money to buy small gifts for Myrta. She bore him a son—and then, a few years later, the marriage went on the rocks.

Even then Fidel was drinking rather heavily.

"You hear about his drinking on TV and radio during those long harangues," said a classmate, "or about his drinking in the Sierra Maestra, but he was drinking cognac and taking benzedrine when he was a student, too. He said the combination kept him alert for his studies."

CASTRO COCKTAIL: BENZEDRINE, COGNAC

Benzedrine and cognac—that's the Castro cocktail that keeps him going on those talkathons. The cognac is kept in a teacup so that Cubans will think it's the rum that Fidel is always pushing as an export.

This, through the eyes of those who knew him intimately, is the portrait of the young hoodlum the Reds selected to launch what was to become the symbol of the new revolu-

tion. Castro was to give the caper some individualist touches.

In previous incidents, including an attempt on the life of Batista and Rolando Masferrer, he had always prudently left a door open for retreat in the event something went wrong.

The incident at the Moncada barracks in Santiago was no different. Castro knew the attack would fail—he also felt it would give him the recognition he sought.

We Can No Longer Afford To Waste Water

SPEECH
OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, effective control of water pollution is essential if our Nation is to grow and prosper. Once a plentiful resource, water has now become more precious than any other single resource we have. By 1980, the demand for water will equal the available supply of 600 billion gallons a day.

Obviously, we will be unable to waste a single drop of water. Since polluted water is wasted water, we must begin now to provide the necessary facilities and programs to prevent this waste.

At the present time, it is estimated that less than \$5 million a year is being spent on safe water research by all sources, public and private. I have introduced a bill which would improve this situation by authorizing the U.S. Public Health Service to establish five regional research laboratories in five different areas of the Nation. In these laboratories, research would be conducted with an eye toward developing practical, low-cost ways of making waste-polluted water safe for use.

An editorial in the February 22, 1960, St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., commented on the need for this legislation. I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD:

WATER PURIFICATION RESEARCH IS LACKING

One long-neglected phase of the fight to control water pollution is research for improved methods of removing impurities. Present systems of treating municipal and industrial wastes do not remove or break down numerous chemical substances which are increasingly finding their way into public water systems.

Congressman LESTER JOHNSON of Black River Falls, Wis., recognizes this problem in a bill he introduced to establish five regional research laboratories in different areas, to be operated by the U.S. Public Health Service.

A water pollution article in Good Housekeeping magazine estimates that less than \$5 million a year is currently being spent on safe water research by all sources, public and private. It says that billions have been invested by industry in developing new synthetics and other products which now help pollute rivers, lakes, and wells. No one has accepted the responsibility for discovering how to counteract the effects of this type of pollution.

Doing the Week in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Edward J. Reardon, the Washington news correspondent of the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, on March 5, 1960, wrote a fine column pointing to the serious undermining of our country's moral fiber presently taking place in publications and the movies. The article deserves attention and should command serious thought:

DOING THE WEEK IN WASHINGTON, WITH ED REARDON

(By Edward J. Reardon)

WASHINGTON.—When immorality enveloped the Roman Empire like a plague, it rotted and crumbled.

This has been the fate of other great nations, before and since. Postwar America, with its soft living, its leisure time, and its headlong pursuit of questionable pleasures, is coming close to the crossroads.

It took Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to emphasize how far we have strayed when, during his visit to Los Angeles, he demonstrated in his crude way his dislike for the type of entertainment Hollywood is supplying the American masses. Khrushchev gave an imitation of the dancing girls in "Can Can" and angrily declared he would never permit the film to be shown in Russia.

The movie producers laughed at Khrushchev's antics. But they should have felt a sense of shame, instead.

For the past few years the moving picture industry's most successful films have been those emphasizing sex. Its advertising of these pictures in newspapers and magazines has been of the variety which in former days would have looked out of place even in the old Police Gazette.

The publishing industry has been following suit, flooding the bookstands with trash. Bestsellers today feature immorality and perversion.

In the Post Office Department Building in Washington is a room which Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield calls the "Chamber of Horrors." It contains samples of smutty magazines and other items taken from the mails.

A House subcommittee on postal operations held hearings last session in an effort to fashion legislation to strengthen Summerfield's hand in prosecuting the peddlers of this filth.

Its members—Representative GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, of New Jersey, among them—heard testimony from law enforcement officials that this filthy literature was often responsible for much of our juvenile delinquency, for sex crimes, and in some instances for narcotics addiction.

The subcommittee is doing its best to fight this insidious campaign to weaken and eventually destroy the Nation's moral fiber. Right now it is seeking to induce the motion picture and publishing industries to do their own policing.

But it realizes that if the crusade is to be successful it must have help and that the most effective aid would be action at the community level.

"Only when an aroused and persistent community conscience has been established," it states in a recent report, "can we be certain that the dealers in printed filth will be

thwarted in their devious design of getting their wares into the hands and minds of our youth."

As an example of what can be done at the community level, the subcommittee cites the suburban community of Arlington, Va. Here it was that the Northern Virginia Citizens for Decent Literature was organized about 2 years ago in a small Presbyterian church circle of people dissatisfied with the quality of magazines on local newsstands.

The first goal was simply to ask the newsstand owners to look more carefully at what they were selling.

It was their conviction that an informed druggist would be as unwilling to sell magazines which might be harmful to the mind as he would be to sell drugs which would poison the body.

Today, the group has the active support and cooperation of over 125 organizations, large and small, including civic groups, service clubs, parent-teachers associations and Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious groups.

The first step was to ask other organizations to join in an effort to canvass the entire county. Letters were sent to all church, service, civic, and school groups explaining the purpose of the organization. As the membership grew, research into the nature and extent of the community's problem showed that the originators had been completely unaware of how much of this filth was on the newsstands.

A large committee on standards was then established, composed of a cross-section of the member organizations, to develop criteria representing the average citizen applying contemporary community standards. These criteria were then approved by the entire organization. Using this measuring rod, a list of some 50 magazines which should be removed from newsstands was prepared.

A few stands, where the majority of objectionable magazines were found, refused to cooperate on the ground their business would simply move across the State line. So a legislative committee was created by the organization. It went to work to obtain stronger antiobscenity laws at the local level. Result—the Arlington County Board appointed a committee to study the problem. It recommended the State law be clarified and strengthened, with increased penalties.

Meanwhile the committee on standards continues to check and keep the list of objectionable magazines up to date.

This is what one community has done to protect its youngsters against the merchants of filth who would destroy them morally.

It can be done in every community where people are sufficiently interested in the future of their children and the Nation.

Timely Portrait on Trujillo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item which appeared in Dave Reque's column on TV in the March 5, 1960, edition of the Washington Daily News:

TIMELY

CBS has moved up "Trujillo, Portrait of a Dictator" to March 17 from May, apparently sensing that the benefactor's subjects are about to show forcefully their unappreciation of him.

Statement by Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which deserves the very serious consideration of every person who depends on America's deterrent power for survival:

STATEMENT BY THOMAS G. LANPHIER, JR., BEFORE THE HOUSE SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE, MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1960

I would like to thank the chairman and this committee for the honor of the invitation to present my views, as an American citizen, on our national space program and on what I consider to be the perilous state of our national defense over the next 3 years.

As background for my remarks, I would observe that for the past 20 years, I have, like many others, been associated in one way or another with the defense effort of the United States.

For more than the past decade, I have been directly associated, in the Pentagon, in the White House, and in industry, with the development of weapon systems of the hydrogen bomb and ballistic missile era. Throughout this period, I have held a top secret clearance with the Pentagon and a "Q" clearance with the Atomic Energy Commission.

For the past 9 years, I have worked with Convair, one of the Nation's largest and most versatile defense contractors. Convair is a division of General Dynamics Corp. which in its electric boat division, also builds nuclear submarines for the Polaris weapon system.

As Convair's long-range planner, I have over the years, participated in the conception, development, and production of supersonic manned interceptors and antiaircraft missiles for our aid and fleet defense, and have been similarly employed on our nuclear bomber, supersonic manned bomber and Atlas ICBM programs for this country's retaliatory forces. Also, during the past several years, with the advent of the Atlas as the bulwark of the national space program, considerable participation in the long-range planning for some systems in this field.

Throughout this past decade, and particularly over the past 5 years, I have watched with growing concern the perennial development of defense budgets more and more out of joint with the technological times and less and less sufficient to meet the growing threat in the significant areas of ICBM's, antisubmarine warfare and limited war deterrent.

Three years ago, Gen. Curtis LeMay testified before Congress to the effect that unless our defense program changed from what was then planned, the winter of 1959-60 could find us inferior to Soviet Russia in modern military power.

In the intervening 3 years, the only changes in our own defense effort have been to diminish it from what it was then planned to be. The Soviets, meanwhile, have led mankind into space with their sputniks.

Last spring, along with the rest of the world, I heard President Eisenhower admit by implication that we could not meet the Berlin crisis, if force were required, with any alternative but national suicide.

This winter, in the defense budget he has proposed to the Congress, I note with disappointment that the President has proposed no significant step toward arming us with a limited war deterrent for use in the

continuing crisis over Berlin and other, as yet unforeseen, but certainly potentially limited war situations.

I note he has again asked for insufficient ballistic missile and manned aircraft to close the growing gap relative to Soviet Russia in the area of massive weapon systems.

And he has once again read the United States out of the space race while failing to take the simple steps currently possible to better organize the space programs the United States does have underway.

Altogether, I believe my country's defense forces and policies have been allowed to drift to the paradoxical point in time when the President can rightly say our armed force is incalculable and could today destroy any aggressor: and at the same time, I can validly say my country may this winter be in the process of losing world war III.

I believe we are losing world war III for, among other reasons, lack of a sufficient and timely ICBM program, lack of a defense against a submarine attack, lack of a weapons program and policy to deter limited aggression, lack of a sufficient and timely space program and, above all, lack of recognition that we are, and have been for a long time, actually engaged in world war III.

We are engaged, in fact, in the only military phase of world war III we have a chance to win: the deterrent phase. And we are losing it. Losing it to the extent that I believe we could now logically assume ourselves to be in jeopardy of physical destruction and likely to remain so for the next 3 years.

This because modern weaponry, in the hands of the Soviet Union, can be assumed to have reached a qualitative and quantitative point at which our incalculable power to destroy an aggressor can now be itself destroyed, in the main, in a matter of moments.

A revolution in arms has occurred on both sides of the Iron Curtain over this past decade. A revolution not yet thoroughly recognized or acknowledged at the policy levels of the executive branch of our own Government but disturbingly recognized and exercised in the Kremlin.

In the course of this technological revolution in arms, it is worth noting that the scientists, the engineers, and the producers of ICBM's and other ultramodern weapons have moved alongside the uniformed men of the armed services as combatants in the conflict against communism.

Those in science and industry who are responsible for the continuing invention of weapon and space systems timely enough and effective enough to add to the deterrent can and do take pride in their contribution to the defense effort.

Men of science and industry deserve better recognition than they generally get for the major role they play in maintaining the quality of the deterrent force in being. They also should be afforded readier access to such information as our intelligence sources may have developed regarding experience in similar technological fields on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

In regard to the momentary effect of the arms revolution which is occurring, General Power, commander of the strategic air arm, has recently said:

"According to released data on nuclear effects, it would take an average of three missiles, in their current state of development, to give an aggressor a mathematically probability of 95 percent that he can destroy one given soft target some 5,000 miles away. This means that, with only some 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes. To further heighten this threat, only about half of these missiles would have to be ICBM's. The rest could be the smaller IRBM's which are considerably less expensive and easier to produce."

There are those, including myself, who believe General Power is conservative when he estimates it would take as many as three ICBM's to destroy a SAC base and all the retaliatory bombers on it. There are others who argue it would take more. But it is difficult to understand how anyone can argue when he says:

"We must anticipate that the Soviets may have accumulated a sufficient number of operational ICBM's and IRBM's for an all-out missile attack before we have in operation warning systems which could provide reliable and adequate warning of such an attack. We have such systems now under development designed to give some 15-minutes warning which would suffice to get most or all of SAC's ground-alert forces airborne. But until our ballistic missile warning system becomes fully operational SAC's capability to survive a missile attack with little or no warning will be the crux of the free world's deterrent posture."

Yet this winter's budget for our defense does not ask for enough money to keep a significant number of SAC bombers and bombs off the ground and out of the pouncing reach of Soviet ICBM's. An ICBM force which could well be, by this time, more than the 150 Soviet ICBM's General Power opines would be required to wipe out our retaliatory forces.

There is no great mystery about the point General Power is trying to make. Including our carriers at sea and our advanced SAC bases overseas, there are less than 100 points at which the Soviets must aim their ICBM's or submarines in order to destroy our retaliatory power. And in a technological era when we ourselves have nuclear submarines which can outrun our current carriers and have an ICBM which can be delivered halfway across the world, and by the President's own admission, strike within 2 miles of its target, it is certainly within the realm of logic to assume the Soviets may have submarines and ballistic missile forces of equal quality and considerably greater quantity than do we.

Any less assumption as the basis of our defense planning in this age of final weapons is unwarranted.

In World War II, Pearl Harbor came upon us at a speed of about 200 miles per hour from an altitude of about 10,000 feet and we had, in effect, 2 to 3 years warning time with which to retaliate.

The Pearl Harbor of world war III may well be quietly occurring this winter as we drift past that moment in our national planning when we could have maintained a defense force impressive enough to continue to deter the Kremlin from overt physical aggression or unanswerable political ultimatum.

Again, borrowing from General Power, about 30 years ago at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, a member of the committee of the Communist Party told the students:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course (that is, in 1931), we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

All things concerned, our guard is now down. We are, as predicted, cooperating in our own destruction. We are being put to sleep.

To the extent I can cry alarm, with my own individual voice, I propose to do so. And in order to unclutter my opinions from charges of bias, I am regretfully leaving the great company of which I have been a part for almost a decade. This in order that its important programs and my own opinions not encumber one another.

Thank you again for your gracious invitation to hear my point of view.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following testimony of Donal E. J. MacNamara, dean of the New York Institute of Criminology and national president of the American League To Abolish Capital Punishment, before the Legislature of the State of Virginia in support of a bill to abolish the death penalty.

Mr. MacNamara testified on February 29, 1960, as follows:

Senators and delegates of the Virginia Legislature, I urge favorable consideration for the legislation before you outlawing the death penalty from Virginia's penal code for the following reasons.

1. Capital punishment is criminologically unsound. It violates the basic tenet of 20th century penology, i.e., the rehabilitation of offenders.

2. Capital punishment is morally wrong and violative of the ethical foundations of modern democratic states. Opponents of the death penalty readily admit the right of the State to defend itself against aggressors and through its police to protect the lives of its populace even if in so doing the killing of a criminal is necessary. But once the criminal has been disarmed and is in custody, his capacity to injure the State or its citizens has been effectively curtailed and the right of the State to take his life ceases. To execute him at this point is vengeance and retribution, not protection.

3. Capital punishment is unnecessary. It provides no more deterrence to the commission of capital crimes than do alternative, more acceptable penalties. It is a truism of penology that it is not the quantum of punishment but the certainty of punishment which deters the offender. Improving our police and investigative machinery to insure the apprehension of a larger percentage of wrongdoers and of our prosecuting apparatus to insure the conviction of the guilty would, even with much less severe penalties, reduce the incidence of crimes, capital and noncapital, more effectively.

4. That capital punishment has demonstrably failed to achieve its objectives, i.e.: the reduction or elimination of capital crimes, is evidenced by comparing the crimes history of the nine American States which have abolished the death penalty (three for more than 100 years) with the capital crimes rates in those States, with the same social and population patterns, which retain capital punishment. In every instance the capital crimes rate in the States which have abolished the death penalty is lower, often-times significantly so, than in those States

in which the death penalty is on the statute books and is supposedly deterring capital crimes. Most recently, Delaware abolished capital punishment. Short term results are now available. In the 12 months prior to abolition, there were 11 homicides in Wilmington; in the 12 months after abolition, there were but 2. Abolishing capital punishment will not start blood flowing in the streets of Richmond—nor will it make the people of the Old Dominion in any way less secure in their persons or property.

5. Capital punishment has been differentially and inconsistently applied. The statistics of executions since 1930 show that more than half of those executed have been persons of minority groups. Studies in other States have indicated that a disproportionately high percentage of those executed had been defended by court-appointed lawyers whose funds for legal and investigative services were severely limited. There is no showing, for example, that the 48 persons executed in the United States during 1958 were the 48 most dangerous criminals. Indeed analysis of the serious crimes during 1958 shows that the professional gangster murderer, the cold-blooded killer for hire, is unrepresented in that group—and in instance after instance was neither apprehended nor convicted of any degree of homicide.

6. Miscarriages of justice: The American system of criminal justice has many built-in protections for the innocent person accused of crime. The Chessman case is a monument to the desire of our people and our judges to take heroic measures to prevent an execution where there is the slightest doubt of guilt or of the legality of the criminal proceedings involved in determining guilt. Nonetheless there have been cases, in the United States and in other countries, in which human fallibility, coincidence, and occasionally culpable negligence on the part of the police and prosecution or public pressures on the jury and court have resulted in a miscarriage of justice and an innocent man has been sentenced to death. Fortunately for our consciences in most cases the error has been caught and corrected prior to execution; but innocent men have been executed. If we make a mistake and give an innocent man a life sentence and if even after 20 years we realize our error, we can in some way, inadequate as it may be, recompense him for his sufferings; if we execute an innocent man, society can neither make good its error to him nor can it ever wipe the stain of guilt from its escutcheon.

7. Capital punishment increases the cost of administering justice. It makes for long, drawn-out trials, many appeals, and in States with the mandatory death penalty provision, often leads to a guilty man going "unwhipped of justice" due to the reluctance of the jury to be responsible for his execution. The charge is made that substituting life imprisonment for the death penalty will saddle the public with extra costs and increase taxes. I am reluctant to discuss human life in dollar-and-cents terms but a good cost accountant can right here in the State of Virginia demonstrate clearly that it would be cheaper for Virginia in the long run to maintain its murderer in a luxurious suite of the Hotel Richmond across the street than it is to execute them.

8. Capital punishment provides no special protection to police officers. Father Donald Campion, a noted Jesuit priest and editor of America, has studied the incidence of assaults on and killings of police officers in death penalty as opposed to non-capital-punishment States. He finds that the incidence of police deaths in the line of their police duties is lower in those States which do not have the death penalty.

9. The purported deterrent effect of the death penalty is based on the mistaken assumption that the criminal at the time of committing murder or another capital crime is necessarily a rational being, weighing the pleasure or profit to be derived from his crime against the pain or loss to be suffered should he be caught and convicted. This is a popular restatement of the classic, but rejected, "pleasure-pain" theory of penology. But the murderer is seldom a rational man at the time he commits a murder—he is at that time in the words of Dr. Post "the unhappy end product of anger, frustration, jealousy, despair, alcohol, pity, or sex * * *." Most homicides are committed without any consideration of the death penalty. Most murderers do not premeditate, deliberate, and intend the death of their victims. Recent studies at Vacaville (California Correctional Research Institute) and at Ralston (Florida State Penitentiary) give indisputable evidence that at least convicted murderers thought nothing of and were certainly not deterred by the prospect of the death penalty.

10. Capital punishment is then: unsound criminologically and penologically, unnecessary to protect the State and its people, demonstrably no greater a deterrent to crime than lesser, alternative penalties; it is costly to the State; it makes final and irredeemable miscarriages of justice; it has in the past been inconsistently and prejudicially applied; it is retributive rather than rehabilitative and imposes the barbaric "lex talionis" on a civilized, modern democracy; it brutalizes our penal system and makes impossible the reform of criminal justice administration; it provides no special protection to our police officers; again quoting Dr. Post: " * * * however you look at it, capital punishment is brutal, sordid and savage; it is unworthy of a civilized people."

Virginia is a great State. It has contributed not only Presidents and political leaders to America but has given much in the way of cultural and progress not only in science but in morals and ethics. Enact, gentlemen, this legislation and join Virginia to the roll of honor of those nations and States which by abolishing capital punishment have contributed to the march of civilization and respect for God-given human life which only the God who gave it has the power and the right and the wisdom to take away.

DONALD E. J. MACNAMARA,
Dean, New York Institute of Criminology, National President, American League to Abolish Capital Punishment

The 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 110th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, and it is most fitting that the Post Office Department of the United States has issued a commemorative stamp honoring him in the "champion of liberty" series.

Thomas G. Masaryk was born March 7, 1850, in Moravia. He was the son of a

Slovakian coachman. He studied and lectured at the University of Vienna—doctor of philosophy, 1876. From 1882 to 1911 he was a professor at the University of Prague.

Elected to the Austrian Parliament in 1891, he fought for independence for Czechoslovakia. After the outbreak of World War I, he fled to Paris to avoid arrest, and with the aid of Eduard Benes formed the Czechoslovakian National Council, which was recognized during the war as the de facto Government of Czechoslovakia.

Masaryk traveled extensively during the war to gain support for the Czechoslovak cause. When the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed he was chosen—November 14, 1918—as President of the newly formed Czechoslovak Government. He was reelected in 1920, 1927, and 1934, and resigned in 1935 because of his advanced age. He died in 1937.

No one has been more patriotic, more persevering, or more devoted to the Czechoslovak cause than this great leader. It is easy to understand why the celebration of his birth had become a national event in the Czechoslovak Republic before the advent of the Communist regime.

It is tragic that today, because of the treachery of the Communists, this Republic is far from enjoying the freedom and abundance of good things for which Masaryk devoted his life. We in the free world pay tribute to his memory on this day, and devoutly hope that soon the yoke will be removed from the people of Czechoslovakia and that they will regain the liberties they enjoyed under Masaryk's leadership.

Higher Interest Rates—Some Alternatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enter into the RECORD an editorial from the Dalles Optimist of February 18, which deals with the important issue of higher interest rates. While I am convinced, as you know, that raising interest rates has not proved to be an effective way of putting the brakes on inflation, and while I would also argue that administered prices are a more important causative factor than wages, I feel that this editorial does reflect a growing concern across the country in the administration's reliance on high interest rates alone as our major tool of monetary policy. As this editorial points out, there are alternatives and we should be utilizing them:

HIGHER INTEREST RATES—SOME ALTERNATIVES

No doubt raising interest rates is one way to put the brakes on inflation, but there are other good ways. One method that has

become unpopular during the past couple of decades is spending less money.

Higher and yet higher wages, followed by higher and yet higher prices, is a vicious circle and at the end of that road lies disaster.

This the Optimist emphasizes from time to time; for the most part, nobody listens. Most are too busy trying to keep their balance on the old Ferris wheel.

Not only are interest rates higher than they have been; money is tight, and will get tighter.

It does appear that a strong wave of resistance to lifting the lid on the interest rate ceiling on the Federal level is becoming evident in Congress.

A good many Congressmen are showing concern over business reports. Republicans have been boasting of prosperity, but some of the indexes for the immediate future are not exactly rosy.

Despite recent glowing forecasts for the economy in 1960, the bounce back that was supposed to take place with the inflationary settlement of the steel strike has not been encouraging, to judge by recent stock market declines.

Even for good credit risks, money is not generally available in much of the country for home loans. Good credit risks also are reluctant to involve themselves in long-term higher interest rate buying.

More sensible on the Federal level than higher interest rates might be such obvious alternatives as work for budget surpluses and a reduction in the national debt; better control of consumer credit, and other measures to keep interest rates down.

Narcotics Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in California, and particularly southern California, problems from the illegal trafficking in narcotics is of serious proportions. Col. C. S. Smith has long been in the vanguard of the forces fighting to clean the situation up. Recently, in his column as publisher of the Herald American newspapers of southeastern Los Angeles County, he has these important words to say on the subject:

THE NARCOTICS PROBLEM

(By Cliff Smith)

Shortly after our new attorney general, Stanley Mosk, took office, I was called to a meeting in the State Building, presided over by him.

Present were approximately 30 men representing law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and judges.

I remember a number of the men who were present, Sheriff Peter Pitchess, Chief of Police William Parker of Los Angeles, the Treasury agent in charge of narcotics law enforcement for the Federal Government in California, District Attorney William B. McKesson, U.S. Attorney Laughlin Waters, Louis H. Burke, presiding judge of the superior court.

After a considerable amount of discussion, I suggested the following program. This was based upon my own observations and the observations of the various editors of the Herald American newspapers.

Separate the narcotics addicts from the nonaddicts who are engaged in the narcotics traffic. And have a separate set of laws for each class.

As far as the narcotics addicts are concerned, there is no problem determining whether or not they are addicts. Have them arrested whenever located and tried in the Superior Court. If found to be addicts, have them committed to a hospital for treatment. After a certain course of treatment parole them from the hospital. Do not discharge them, but keep them as wards of the Court. A monthly checkup will determine whether or not they are cured or have become addicts again. If at any time they become addicts again, immediately recommit them.

As to the pushers, any pusher engaging in the illegal production, sale, or distribution of harmful narcotics, such as heroin and morphine, should be given a sentence of from 20 to 30 years, without hope of parole.

This simple outline was approved in principle by the majority of the peace officers present. However, the judges, District Attorney and United States Attorney felt there would be grave difficulty in securing convictions.

It is the thought of this writer that the putting away of one pusher for a considerable length of time is of much more benefit to society than the conviction of 50 pushers who are given a 6-month to 1-year jail sentence.

The above plan has a double-edged purpose. Retire the users so that the pushers have no customers.

Make the punishment so great that the prospective profits will not outweigh the danger of being sent up practically for life.

Many countries have no narcotics problem because they use the above system.

Some countries attack the problem directly by making narcotics available at a very cheap price to addicts. This in itself would take the profit out of the narcotics traffic, and without the profit, very few new addicts would be developed.

More than 1 million voters signed a petition under the auspices of the Elks Clubs, asking the legislature to enact laws making the mandatory, minimum sentence 30 years, for convicted narcotics pushers.

The State Assembly passed this measure but it was lost without a hearing in the Senate. Perhaps it is time for a reapportionment of the State, so that the balance of power in the Senate does not lie with a few small counties, with practically no population, in the northern part of the State.

The Real Castro—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the second in a series of articles currently appearing in the New York Daily News on Fidel Castro. This one was published in the issue of March 7, 1960:

HE WON LAURELS FLEEING A FIGHT

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

The attack by fledgling revolutionary Fidel Castro's bewildered forces on the Moncada garrison in Santiago de Cuba is one of the most incredible "military" undertakings of all time. It is important, however, for sev-

eral reasons, because it proved that Castro could talk men into doing practically anything and because it gave him the notoriety for which he thirsted and furnished the symbol for the revolution to come.

It happened July 26, 1953—and it baptized in blood the 26th of July movement that eventually overthrew dictator Fulgencio Batista.

Fast-talking Fidel's sheer magnetism induced 120 men—some of them presumably intelligent—to drive off to a "shooting practice" session in Oriente and it was not until half an hour before the attack that some of the horrified group realized that they were engaged in a military expedition.

BORN TO BE LEADER, RIGHT OR WRONG

One of the survivors of that fiasco, a man who later was sentenced to prison along with Castro, gave the News team his version of the expedition.

"I guess it's a tribute to his magnetism that we followed him," he said.

"You have to understand this Castro. He's a magician. He has boundless energy and personality, a sort of inner fire that creates enthusiasm. The man was born to be a leader—right or wrong, but a leader.

"There is no doubt in my mind now that Castro knew the attack could not possibly succeed—but we didn't realize it then. We couldn't have known that Castro was using us as pawns to build himself a reputation.

"We arrived at a farm, the Finca Siboney, about three miles outside Santiago. We were somewhat surprised to find guards posted at the doors to the house and some of the men asked what in hell was going on.

"Seven of the men backed out then and there. They smelled trouble. I smelled it, too, but I figured that was why we were supposed to be training, if you can call it that. Castro was affable—he told the dissidents they could leave the place after the main body had taken off. He didn't say where.

"TWO WOMEN THERE IRONING UNIFORMS

"There were two women in the place, ironing uniforms. One was Melba Hernandez, until recently in charge of the women's prison in Havana.

"The other was Haidee Santamaria, now married to Armando Hart, who is Castro's minister of education.

"It wasn't until dawn that Fidel gave us an inkling of what we were going to do. He told us then that we were going to take Moncada, that the members of the garrison were waiting to join us—a lie.

"Juan Almeida, now head of the Cuban Army but then a sergeant, gave us instructions on how to load the few .22 rifles and pistols that we were issued. We didn't even know how to work them half an hour before we went into Santiago."

It was 5:30 a.m. when Castro finally got off a speech, possibly the shortest of his career.

Our informant, who now works in a Midwestern university but has relatives in Cuba, said: "The words he uttered are burned in my memory. He told us: 'We are going to take Moncada. Because of the surprise element, the job should be easy.

"The other groups fighting Batista are merely playing at revolution. They have no standing. We are the only ones who can do anything. Once we capture the garrison, the rest of the province (Oriente) will be easy. We are going to be even greater than Maceo and Marti (the two greatest Cuban patriots)."

"The two women donned nurses' uniforms. With them was a man dressed as an intern. They were to gain entrance to the Saturnino Lora, the hospital across the street from the garrison.

"Raul Castro and a small force were to take the Hall of Justice and use its tower as a sniper post."

The attack was a complete fizzle. Only 80 out of the original 120 men ever got near the garrison. Others piled into the cars and thoughtfully lost their way.

"The soldiers weren't surprised; we were," said our informant wryly. "They began chopping us down systematically. When Fidel saw the attack was failing, he shouted, 'Every man for himself' and ran.

RUNS TO PRIEST FOR SANCTUARY

"Boris Santa Coloma was Haidee's sweetheart. He yelled, 'What about the girls?' Castro yelled back, 'We haven't time for that. I've given orders. We can't risk our lives.'

"Santa Coloma covered Castro while he fled. Then he went back to rescue the girls. He was shot to death."

Castro had once told friends that if he ever got into trouble, he could seek sanctuary in a church. Now, along with his brother Raul, he ran to the office of Msgr. Enrique Perez Serrantes, the archbishop of Santiago, two blocks away.

The entire mess had taken less than an hour. It was now 6:55 a.m., July 26, 1953. The 26th of July Movement, which was to sweep Cuba a few years later and catapult Fidel Castro to the power he wanted, was born during that brief, utterly fantastic foray.

It was born—and perpetuated—in the midst of lies, deceit, and violence.

Castro doesn't like to talk about the details of the incident. Neither does he like to talk about the next year or so of his life, when he was arrested and sent to Isle of Pines Prison.

PLEAD TO CARDINAL FOR INTERCESSION

"Most of us were also arrested," said the News' informant, "and imprisoned along with Fidel. It was during that time that I had time to reflect. My conclusions were that Castro had betrayed us out of personal ambition.

"No matter how long he talked, I could remember only that Coloma had covered his retreat and then gone to his death in an effort to save his girl friend."

The refuge Castro had so carefully selected didn't prevent his arrest 4 days later. In November 1953 Fidel, Raul, and 62 other political prisoners were taken to the Isle of Pines.

At that, Castro was lucky he wasn't shot. While he hid in the cathedral, his wife, and his sister, Lydia, pleaded with Manuel Cardinal Arteaga to intercede with Batista. The cardinal based his plea on the fact that Castro was the son-in-law of Rafael J. Diaz-Balart, minister of transportation.

Batista agreed to save Fidel from a firing squad and Fidel was so overcome with gratitude that, since he took power, he has exonerated the cardinal for his friendship with Batista.

"Fidel seldom had visitors," said a man who was in jail at the same time. "His mother visited him only once. He was in a dormitory with 30 or so friends—most of them rowdies who went along with him when he wanted to create trouble.

"Since he was somewhat of a scholar, he started giving history lessons to the less educated among the prisoners. When he was refused books on Marx, Lenin and Engels, he threatened a hunger strike. They gave him the books and he used them as texts, along with books on Cuban history. I know Cuban history and he distorted statements by Marti and others.

REJECTS CLASSES IN CATECHISM

"When a priest and nuns came to the prison to conduct catechism classes, Fidel rejected the idea. He jeered at the men who accepted religious medals.

"On one occasion, Batista and some aids visited the place and Fidel defiantly sang the 26th of July anthem from a window.

He and Raul were placed in a room by themselves. He later smuggled out a letter stating he had been beaten and starved. In reality, he was very well fed and he and Raul had a fine room.

"That religious medal he wore when he was in the Sierra Maestra—many of us laughed when we saw pictures of him with it. He wore it for the effect it would have on a people mostly Catholic."

He bragged constantly. He told of his exploits in Bogota, Colombia, in 1948.

"We knew that story by heart," said a former prison mate. "He told us how he lunched with Jorge Gaitan, a member of the Liberal Party in Bogota, an idol of the working class of Colombia."

"Two days later, Gaitan was shot to death in the street and Bogota erupted into a series of riots that claimed more than 300 lives. The Communists had planned the 'incident' to cast reflection on the Pan-American Conference and Castro helped them."

(Hundreds were injured in the riots and property damage from fire and looting rose to millions of dollars. Sections of the city were reduced to rubble and hundreds of Americans and other foreigners were forced to flee Bogota.)

(Secretary of State George C. Marshall, the then Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman and other Americans attending the conference were unharmed—although Red mobs swept through the streets looking for foreigners.)

(So great was the carnage that bodies lay in the streets for days following the riots and U.S. Marines were ordered to Bogota to protect Americans.)

Fidel escaped by cargo plane. He never told us who paid his expenses to Bogota.

"Those of us who knew him were cognizant of the fact he had first been introduced to communism in 1946. He was never a card-carrying member of the party—he still isn't—but you don't have to carry a card to be a Red."

(After the Bogota incident Fidel was in hot water in Cuba. He and his bride were in Banas and Rolando Masferrer sent some of his hoods there to kill him. Lt. Felipe Mirabel risked his life and army career by taking Castro and his wife to the Camaguey Airport and putting them on a plane for Miami.)

(Mirabel became a major under Batista and is now in Cabana Fortress awaiting execution at Castro's orders.)

(Recently, relatives of the condemned man waited for Castro outside one of the many homes he uses in Havana and pleaded for leniency. Castro seemed to be weakening, but Celia Sanchez the mannish "secretary" who has been with him since his days in the mountains, snapped: "The revolution doesn't have to be concerned with humanity." That ended the interview.)

(Castro, it seems, never forgives a friend.)

THEIR BEAUTIFUL FRIENDSHIP BEGINS

In May 1955, Batista signed a general amnesty for political prisoners and the two Castros, along with their buddies, were freed. They left Cuba immediately. Raul could not obtain a visa to the United States and ended up in Mexico. Fidel made a grand tour—New York, Miami, Tampa, and Mexico City.

There are several versions of when Fidel actually met Dr. Ernesto (Che) Guevara, the Argentine Communist who now heads the National Bank of Cuba and who is crowding Castro for political honors. The truth is they first met in Mexico and that Raul was the man who performed the social amenities.

Fidel was living in the swank house of Orquidia del Pino in the Pedregal de San Angel. Senora Del Pino was the wife of a friend of Castro's and Fidel wallowed there in luxury while his ragged followers scrounged for ordinary accommodations.

Castro never met his contacts at the house. He used a cheap apartment belonging to Senator Del Pino's sister. It was there he met El Che in late 1956. It was the beginning of a beautiful friendship.

El Che had a long record as a Communist agitator and he had contacts. Within days, Castro and his followers began training under the supervision of Alberto Bayo, a Red who had fought as a captain in the Spanish civil war.

Training grounds were at the Rancho La Rosa, on the outskirts of Mexico City. Castro had little in the way of arms and was trying to enlist the aid of Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, and of ex-Cuban President Carlos Prío Socarras—who had left Cuba with \$40 million and wanted to go back for a second helping.

TRUJILLO BALKS AT COST OF BOAT

Prío had the money and the arms—cached in Miami, Mexico, Key West, and other spots. He had the organization to move the stuff. He needed a leader to pull his chestnuts out of the fire.

Actually, it was mere accident that Prío rather than Trujillo financed Castro. An aid of Trujillo's tried to make a few bucks on the side by asking the boss for \$100,000 for the *Gramma*, the boat to be used in the invasion. Trujillo found out the boat was worth \$40,000 and he balked.

While Trujillo was still giving his aid a going over, Prío stepped in and bought the *Gramma*. Weeks later, the converted yacht sailed for Cuba where most of the boys died trying to establish an Oriente Province beachhead. Fidel, Raul and a handful of followers miraculously escaped and went on to the mountains. There they were to stay for a long time before they could overthrow Batista.

Prío? He had hoped that Castro and Batista might eliminate each other. He was wrong and today he's a virtual prisoner in Havana, being milked of the money he looted from the Cuban treasury.

The Boys' Club—An Effective Guide Through the Corridor of Adolescence to Manhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in our city, our State, and our Nation, there are many dedicated people seeking to direct young boys' activities into proper and useful channels. One of these men that I know is Peter Capra, executive director of the Boys' Club of New York located at 287 East 10th Street, New York, N.Y.

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." An occupied young man has no time for activity leading to juvenile delinquency or crime. The Boys' Club of New York is one of the outstanding organizations which is rendering service to the youth of our community and providing them with facilities to develop their growing talents and to occupy their spare hours. This organization should be commended for its outstanding and continuing work with the boys of the community in New York and throughout the United States.

A short history of its origin, its activities, its policies, and its technique will prove interesting reading to those who have an interest in the youth of our country. I am setting forth a short history of the Boys' Club of New York which has come to my attention and which I believe that the readers will enjoy perusing. The history follows:

A young boy scaled a rock through a second-story window on Avenue A one afternoon in the 1870's. Accompanied by splinters of shattering glass it landed at the feet of Mr. E. H. Harriman who was visiting Mrs. Clark, superintendent of the Wilson Mission School for Girls. Mr. Harriman asked:

"Does this happen often?"

"Oh, yes, and it's the lawless street boys who tease the girls in this school and create all of this mischievous activity," Mrs. Clark replied.

His first thought was to agree with her, but he didn't. He looked at the rock again as he tossed it from hand to hand. Without further hesitation he turned to Mrs. Clark and said:

"I can't blame the boy any more than I can blame this rock. The boy was there, the rock was there. But for the want of a little excitement and something to do he wouldn't have thrown it."

"But it happens all the time," Mrs. Clark complained.

"Then let's do something about it," Mr. Harriman replied.

What was done about it is the history of the Boys' Club of New York. The rock an East Side kid heaved through the window around 1870 figuratively became its cornerstone.

With dedicated zeal Mr. Harriman, with friends whom he enlisted, went to work to get the boys off the street and give them something with which to work off their normal energies in a clubhouse of their own.

Harriman's initial try was such a great success that it soon called for larger quarters and a professional staff to assist the volunteers to meet the demands of increased boy membership. In 1887 the organization was incorporated and in 1901 a permanent five-story building, especially designed for its purpose was opened at Avenue A and 10th Street—the Tompkins Square Clubhouse.

Summer camping was developed during the late 1890's under the leadership of one of the trustees, William Carey, and in 1902 a campsite was purchased at Jamesport, L.I. Health services were added to the boys' club program in 1918—with complete dental clinics in 1922. Each successive year added some new milestone in the progress of the boys' club. Only a volume could recount the accomplishments of the Boys' Club of New York in its service to the boys from the tenement areas of our city.

The Boys' Club of New York now operates four clubhouses: The Tompkins Square Clubhouse, 287 East 10th Street; the Jefferson Park Clubhouse, 321 East 11th Street; the Central Park Clubhouse, Fifth Avenue at 110th Street; and the new Pitt Street Clubhouse—opened Monday, November 16, 1959—135 Pitt Street; although serving over 8,000 boys. The club operates two summer camps; Camp Carey, Jamesport, L.I., which provides 1,400 boys a 2-week vacation in the country, and Camp Tabor, Fishers Island, New York, a caddy camp where the older boys can be useful, earn some money and enjoy a healthy summer recreation program at the same time.

Each boys' club center is staffed with professionally trained men and women and some 150 volunteers. These volunteers and staff tangle daily with the ideas of the young and set them an example that comes only through leadership. And because of this genuine interest in their affairs, these youths soon learn

that both individuals and groups of boys have a fuller, more rewarding life when they respect property, the rights and opinions of others—and have fun at the same time.

A sampling of the popular recreational, health, and educational activities offered to the members includes: Swimming, basketball, boxing, body conditioning (weight lifting), tumbling, group clubs, recreation rooms with pool, ping-pong, chess, and checkers, arts, crafts, photography, band, drama, glee club, lounge rooms, trips to points of interest, socials, dances, medical and dental services.

Then, too, there is the educational program which counsels and financially assists boys who are endowed with exceptional industry, motivation, leadership qualities and sterling character, to matriculate in schools and colleges.

Since 1876 the Boys' Club of New York has followed two basic policies:

"The open door policy": Any boy from the age of 7 to 17 may become a member, regardless of differences in attitudes, cultural patterns or spiritual beliefs. Thus each boy has a chance to respect the ideas, customs and beliefs of others, thereby developing his own self-respect and self-confidence.

"The man behind the boy" policy is the day-to-day contact with the men and women who guide the youngsters in worthwhile pursuits, be it the boxing instructor, volunteer leader, art director or the receptionist doorman and hundreds of other dedicated men and women who greet the boy daily.

The contributions of the Boys' Club of New York in the city and the country is history. Its best testimonial is the alumni, numbering hundreds of thousands, all former Boys' Club members who are finer citizens today because of their early association with the Boys' Club of New York: Col. George Kojac, U.S. Air Force; Admiral Berger, retired; the Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general for the State of New York; the Kriender Brothers, of Club "21"; Dr. William M. Hitzig, medical observer for the atom bomb tests at Bikini; J. Rankin O'Rourke and Martin King, prominent brokers on Wall Street; Ralph J. Liberti, teacher-coach in the public school system; Col. Paul Akst, New York City directory, Selective Service System; John A. Byrnes, chief justice of New York City courts; Red Buttons and Senator Ford of the entertainment field; to mention just a few.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----The Towers Apts.,
4201 Cathedral
Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----Tulip Lane and
Glen Mill Rd.,
Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----3019 Norman-
stone Drive
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Biatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3723 N. Oakland
St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chilperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----1440 Rock Creek
Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington,
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah-----1817 N. Quinn St.,
Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----Apt. 201, 2418
Menokin Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Ewins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstien, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr.,
Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr.,
N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.

Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., N. Y.-----3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hebert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----5211 Flanders
Ave., Garrett Pk.,
Kensington, Md.
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Inouye, Daniel K., Hawaii-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastemeler, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), Albemarle House,
W. Va.-----4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Kyl, John, Iowa-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

West Virginians Have Enriched American Life Materially, Intellectually, and Spiritually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today an article I prepared on the invitation of the editor of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette on the subject of prominent West Virginians was published in that newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE RICH HERITAGE OF WEST VIRGINIA
(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

A passenger train of the Baltimore & Ohio snaked its way westward through the rolling countryside of Harrison County, W. Va. It was a leaden day in the dead of winter. The steep hillsides and gently sloping meadows, stripped of vegetation, were covered with snow. I was a passenger, enroute from Washington to my native Salem to attend a meeting of the board of directors of Salem College.

On much of the trip I had been engaged in casual conversation with the man who sat next to me. It developed that he was a blase and somewhat cynical New Yorker making his first journey through West Virginia. He was not impressed by the bleak scene.

"This," he said, waving his hand toward a barren hillside, "is the most God-forsaken country I have ever seen. What on earth could this land produce?"

My response was that beneath the hills through which we were passing lay vast stores of bituminous coal, oil, and natural gas, and, furthermore, during the spring and summer the meadows would be dotted with cattle grazing on the finest bluegrass in America, while in the urban centers there would be found much production in the glass, pottery, chemical, and other industries. And speaking of bluegrass, I acquainted the gentleman with the fact that West Virginia has more of its acreage in bluegrass pastureland than does neighboring Kentucky, which is called the Bluegrass State.

"But," I further declared, "the most valuable product of these hills lies in the character and stature of its men and women, and in the contributions they have made in commerce, public affairs, education, and in the arts and the sciences."

The easterner beside me remained unimpressed.

"Don't remember that I ever heard of any famous West Virginians," he said, and then asked: "Who of importance ever came out of these hills?"

It was pleasing to have the opportunity to tell him that the one county (Harrison) through which we were then passing, had given us the greatest military strategist of

the Civil War (Stonewall Jackson); three members of Presidential Cabinets (Nathan Goff, Secretary of the Navy—Howard M. Gore, Secretary of Agriculture—and Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense); the Solicitor General under President Woodrow Wilson, and later Ambassador to Great Britain, and Democratic nominee for President of the United States (John W. Davis); the man who discovered more oil than any other individual in history (Michael L. Benedum); two national commanders of the American Legion (Louis A. Johnson and Donald R. Wilson); two presidents of the National Education Association (Dr. Joseph Rosier and Dr. Corma Mowrey); the author who was one of the highest paid fiction writers in the first three decades of this century (Melville Davidson Post); and the president of Swift & Co., one of the Nation's largest meatpacking concerns (Porter Jarvis).

My travel companion was astonished. Practically every name I had mentioned was familiar to him—and he recognized these people as being outstanding Americans. He seemed amazed to learn that they were all from West Virginia, but I gave him little time to regain his composure.

"All those outstanding citizens I have named are products of this one county—Harrison," I continued. "Within the next few minutes this train will roll into Doddridge County, birthplace of U.S. Senator Matthew M. Neely, whose home for many years has been in neighboring Marion County, and who served West Virginia in the U.S. Congress as both Senator and Member of the House of Representatives, and also was one of our State's Governors.

"Then, too, within another hour you will be passing through Wood County, home of Adm. Felix Stump, now retired commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific and of the U.S. Pacific Fleet. And there are M. J. Rathbone, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and Holmes Alexander, nationally syndicated Washington newspaper columnist, both of whom are Wood County natives.

"And," I added, "to mention a few other West Virginians who have distinguished themselves, to the south of us is Braxton County, home of the late Dewey Fleming, another well known journalist who was chief of the Washington bureau of the Baltimore Sun; still further to the south is Lincoln County, the birthplace of Maj. Charles Yeager, the first pilot to break the sound barrier and introduce a new age in the exploration of the air; and the tier of counties from Randolph through Pocahontas, Greenbrier, and Monroe also furnished notables, from Randolph having come two U.S. Senators, Henry Gassaway Davis, who also was a Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States, and Stephen B. Elkins, who also served as Secretary of War; from Pocahontas came the world-famous novelist—the only woman writer to have won the Nobel Prize for literature—Pearl S. Buck, and that county also was the home of Gen. Mason Patrick, the first head of the Army Air Service during and after World War I; from Greenbrier came Gen. John L. Hines, who succeeded Gen. John J. Pershing as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

"To consider the humane art of medicine," I continued, giving my listener no time to rally his forces, "I can readily think

of two contemporary West Virginians who have achieved national eminence, though by divergent routes. Dr. William R. Laird of Fayette County, for his pioneering in the establishment of rural area clinics and other significant contributions, received justified recognition from the American College of Surgeons. And in a very different way, a native of Cabell County, Maj. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton, Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, achieved fame. As the commanding general of Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C., General Heaton headed the team of surgeons who operated successfully upon President Eisenhower.

"And being a New Yorker, you doubtless know about Eleanor Steber, world renowned Metropolitan Opera star, whose native city is Wheeling, Ohio County. A West Virginian, Dudley L. Simms of Charleston, Kanawha County, is the immediate past-president of the world's largest organization of service clubs, Lions International.

"Then there—"

The train was slowing down for the stop at Clarksburg, from where I was to go by automobile to Salem. Thus, it was necessary that I interrupt my story, but not until my companion had asked a question—a pertinent and challenging one:

"Why haven't you West Virginians told the Nation of these sons and daughters of your State? I am a merchant, but no one would know that I had quality merchandise if I did not put it on display in my store windows and advertise it in the newspapers and through other media of communications. You West Virginians need to do a sales job, not only as relates to your people, but on your other resources as well."

His question still troubles me. Why haven't we told our story? Perhaps it is because we take it for granted that others know as much as we do about our State and its people. It is even possible that many of our own citizens do not know the remarkable story of West Virginia's material and human resources. If so, our first task is to awaken our own people to their rich heritage, for the West Virginians mentioned in the train travel episode are but a few of those who have enriched American life materially, intellectually, and spiritually. And they are but representatives of the capabilities and potentialities which are present among the men and women of our State.

Payola at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sunday, March 6, 1960, issue of the Washington Post:

PAYOLA AT THE SUMMIT

Chairman Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission made an unimpressed

sive exploration before the Harris subcommittee of his most recent impropriety. His account of the Commission's performance and plans regarding the purification television was rambling and indecisive. His explanation of his personal conduct in accepting the hospitality of a major broadcast licensee was confused and, indeed, pitiful—the more inexcusable in wake of the disclosures of the last few months.

Mr. Doerfer was roundly censured 2 years ago for allowing persons with business before the FCC to be his hosts and pay his expenses. Now it develops that he has done the same thing again. He was entertained last month on the yacht of G. B. Storer, owner of a dozen radio and television stations—all of them, of course, subject to licensee renewal by the FCC. In addition, the FCC chairman accepted a lift to Florida in Mr. Storer's private plane—explaining to the committee that he intends to refund to Mr. Storer the amount of the plane fare.

Mr. Doerfer's justification of all this is the plaintive cry that he "can't be expected to live like a hermit," that there has been "a high morality" among FCC chairmen in the past, that he feels free to associate in a friendly way with persons who have no business of a judicatory nature immediately before the Commission. But the very manner and matter of this justification are an acknowledgment of impropriety. One may sympathize with Mr. Doerfer's good intentions, but the best that can be said of his acumen is that if he doesn't know any better he doesn't belong in the chairmanship of a commission which has the responsibility of regulating an industry which has shown altogether too many ethical lapses.

National Portrait Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my proposal for a National Portrait Gallery to be housed together with the National Collection of Fine Arts in the historic Patent Office Building was the subject of a fine article by George W. Oakes in the Sunday Star, of March 6, 1960. Mr. Oakes described the present portrait collection now being held by various national galleries until a home is available and pointed out the special appropriateness of the Patent Office Building as a home for the two collections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VARIETY OF HEROES FOR NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

(By George W. Oakes)

The long-discussed National Portrait Gallery—a historical museum of portraits and sculpture of America's most distinguished citizens—will become an important addition to Washington's cultural attractions if present plans materialize.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, last month introduced legislation to establish such a gallery "to foster patriotism and educate the coming generation in what our country stands for." Under legis-

lation enacted in 1958 the National Portrait Gallery would be appropriately placed in the historic Patent Office Building, Seventh and Ninth and F and G Streets NW. This building, constructed between 1837 and 1867, is one of Washington's finest works of architecture.

The portrait gallery, as a separate bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, would be more a historical museum than an art gallery. It would become a national archive for the display and preservation of paintings and sculpture depicting the personalities of prominent Americans who have made significant contributions to the development and growth of our civilization and culture.

THE ORIGINAL IDEA

The concept of a National Portrait Gallery has been current in the Smithsonian for more than 35 years. Since the Civil War many paintings of American civilian and military leaders have been presented to the institution. After World War I many historical portraits, like the one of General Pershing now hanging in the Natural History Museum, were acquired by the Smithsonian's National Collection of Fine Arts.

The idea of a specific museum for such historical paintings perhaps first took concrete form when Andrew W. Mellon, in gathering works of art for the National Gallery, bought in the middle thirties the famous Clark portrait collection of famous Americans. At that time David E. Finley, first director of the National Gallery and now chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, planned with Mr. Mellon that the Clark collection should become one of the nuclei of a national portrait gallery.

Most of the Clark collection, consisting mainly of paintings of 18th and 19th century historical figures by prominent American artists, is being held in storage in the National Gallery of Art, which displays only paintings that are primarily of artistic, rather than historical interest.

To some extent the concept of a national portrait gallery in Washington was suggested by the famous National Portrait Gallery of London. It is the most important one of its kind in existence.

THE LONDON GALLERY

The London gallery began to take shape in 1836 and was moved in 1896 to its present building immediately behind the National Gallery off Trafalgar Square. The British regard it as a national pantheon of historical figures and it has helped to focus the public mind on the nation's past leaders. Although a large part of the more than 4,000 paintings are of deceased British statesmen and public figures, the collection gives special prominence to individuals outstanding in the arts.

In contrast to the House of Commons, where no statue can be erected until the subject has been dead 10 years, the portrait gallery occasionally acquires pictures of individuals within a year of their death. Only reigning sovereigns may be represented during their lifetime.

The gallery has considerable public appeal. Although not as popular as London's National Gallery which averages about 900,000 visitors a year, the Portrait Gallery attracts approximately 150,000 annually.

A special committee of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents under the chairmanship of John Nicholas Brown of Rhode Island is now making plans for our National Portrait Gallery and consulting with its proponents in Congress. Senator Humphrey's bill provides for a director and an advisory board including seven leading private citizens as well as the directors of such Government organizations as the National Gallery of Art, the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Library of Congress.

Leading art museum officials agree that an outstanding director and a strong independ-

ent advisory board, comparable to the board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art, whose chairman is the Chief Justice, is absolutely essential to set and maintain high standards in gathering and presenting the collection.

MIGHT INCLUDE FURNITURE

The gallery would include mainly paintings and sculpture. It has also been suggested that furniture of the period be on display both to relieve the monotony of the portraits and to create a more realistic impression of living conditions current during the various eras of our country's history. Portraits would be selected on the basis of the subject and not the artist. Despite this policy art critics are convinced that the level of artistic quality can be suitable.

The basis of the portrait collection would be those painting now held for a National Portrait Gallery by the National Gallery of Art and the National Collection of Fine Arts. The National Gallery's collection includes important paintings of Washington by Peale, Lincoln by Healy, John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, John Calhoun, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Stephen Foster. One of the most interesting portraits earmarked from the Mellon collection for the National Portrait Gallery is that of Pocahontas painted on her visit to England in the 17th century.

But a National Portrait Gallery would reach into wider areas of American life. Outstanding scientists like Edison would be represented as would educators, artists, and poets as well as industrial and labor leaders. The problem of who is to be included will undoubtedly be formidable. In order to withstand the anticipated pressure of those urging a particular candidate, many feel that an acquisitions committee composed of respected authorities should be appointed. Such a group, acting as a buffer for the director and the trustees, might initially prepare a list of subjects whose portraits should be exhibited.

Although it is likely that some art museums and many private collections will donate paintings to expand the present nucleus of the collection, considerable difficulty can be anticipated in obtaining certain desirable portraits from art galleries now possessing them. In this event, consideration might be given to the use of substitutes for the original portrait. Funds for the acquisition of portraits would be provided by the Government.

CONTEMPORARY FIGURES

The question of whether portraits of contemporary figures should be commissioned is one that the director and trustees will determine at a later date. Some distinguished art museum directors would oppose this on the basis that the collection should be composed of those whose place in American history has been clearly established by the passage of time. For this reason it might be decided that except for Presidents of the United States, no individual should be eligible for consideration until 10 or 20 years after his death.

The National Portrait Gallery might also include extensive archives of photographs of famous Americans, for the use of scholars and students.

The Patent Office Building, one of Washington's architectural landmarks, is considered a particularly appropriate setting for such a gallery. The site was marked on the L'Enfant Plan of 1791 for the construction of an American Pantheon. President Andrew Jackson commissioned the distinguished American Architect Robert Mills of South Carolina to design the building. He did so in 1837 using the Greek Revival style which he also selected for the Treasury Department. After the building's completion in 1867 it was used to house 200,000 models of American inventions until they were moved to the

Smithsonian's National Museum at the end of the century.

THE SITE IS HISTORIC

As the Patent Office Building is naturally suited for museum purposes, the cost of renovation would be minor. Present plans provide for the inclusion there of both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts although each collection would be completely separate with its own entrance. Despite the fact that this building has been authorized by law for such use, it will not become available until the present occupant, the Civil Service Commission, is moved. As no funds are yet available for its new building, this shift will probably not take place for another 4 years.

Legislation for the National Portrait Gallery was first introduced in 1950 by Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, when Mr. Finley was Director of the National Gallery. At that time, although President Truman endorsed the plan, Congress failed to pass the bill. Now Senator GREEN has become a cosponsor of Senator HUMPHREY's bill. A companion measure has been introduced in the House by Representative RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. Whether legislation will be required to supplement the 1958 act authorizing the Patent Office for such use will be determined by the Smithsonian's Board of Regents.

The Fight Against Smut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective means of combatting the ever-increasing threat which obscene literature poses to our society is through informed, intelligent, and responsible but aggressive civic action.

The Portland, Maine, area is fortunate to have a dedicated man, Rev. Vincent A. Tatarczuk, to spearhead this crusade. Father Tatarczuk has devoted considerable time and effort to speaking before civic, fraternal, and religious groups, alerting them to the serious effects of obscene literature, not only on our youth, but on our entire society as well. He has been personally instrumental in the formation of local civic committees dedicated to the objective of keeping this objectionable material off our newsstands and out of our mails.

It is, with pleasure, that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech and an editorial prepared by Father Tatarczuk. The first deals with the overall problem of obscene literature in our society; while the editorial, which originally appeared in the July 10, 1959 edition of *The Church World*, a weekly newspaper, published in Portland, Maine, comments on the Supreme Court decision relating to the New York State ban against the movie, "Lady Chatterly's Lover."

(The speech and editorial follow:)

THE FIGHT AGAINST SMUT

Until recent years, whenever any group of citizens made a concerted effort to halt the indiscriminate sale of lurid and obscene books, pocketbooks and magazines in their

communities, they were generally labeled as bluenosed reformers, self-appointed censors, or prudish busybodies. Today, in every part of the Nation, whole communities have been aroused by the deluge of pornographic literature which has flooded our newsstands and drugstore counters, and is even disseminated through the mails, despite the valiant efforts of the Post Office Department. Now more than 200 cities have organized committees of Citizens for Decent Literature to work with law enforcement officers and agencies in stopping the distribution and sale of smut.

Why the change of attitude?

I believe there are three basic reasons:

The first is that within the past decade the printing, distribution, and retail sale of indecent literature has developed into a multimillion dollar business, with new pornographic books and magazines issued every month, vividly depicting every form of moral depravity and perversion. It is no longer a question of an occasional risqué picture magazine or book which is procured by a behind-the-counter sale. They are flaunted all over the newsstands and counters, in the most conspicuous places, and consequently they can no longer be ignored.

The second reason for the public rage is that a great percentage of the new releases are aimed directly at the teenagers, whom the industry has discovered to be the most avid readers of this filth, and therefore the most important customers.

The third reason for the change of public attitude is the proven effect that these publications have had upon those who constantly feed their minds with this trash.

The purveyors of obscenity challenge the alleged connection between the reading of lurid material and the commission of crime and the increase of delinquency, but we hazard to guess that not one of them would introduce into their own homes the books and magazines that exploit sensational sex, crime, and perversion, for fear of the effect this literature would have upon their own offspring.

There have been many painstaking studies made of the case histories of young people taken into custody for immoral behavior or for various other crimes and delinquencies. The results of these investigations have frightened even those who were already convinced of the direct connection between pornographic literature and immoral or delinquent behavior. These surveys have been extended by different agencies to all phases of the juvenile problem, and the end result has been the undeniable conclusion that the minds and consciences of countless American youths have been warped by the violent and lurid content of their reading materials.

The New York State Joint Legislative Committee Studying the Publication and Dissemination of Obscene and Offensive Materials concludes its current report with the conviction that "children are attracted to lurid and sexy publications; they depict actions the teenagers might not have otherwise known about; they often make such activities seem socially acceptable or even glamorous and subtly challenge the young to imitate them."

This committee has only confirmed what parents, through their intimate observations, have always known. In 1957, the Trendex News Service conducted a nationwide poll of parents—only parents of children from 6 to 20 years of age. The question proposed was this: "Do you think that some of the lurid magazines and books on many newsstands contribute to juvenile delinquency?" In answer 70 percent said yes; 15.4 percent said no; and 14.6 percent had no opinion.

Courtney Ryley Cooper, in his book "Designs in Scarlet," draws a shocking picture relating to this problem which is not born in his imagination, but of the surveys he has

taken over a long period of time with the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the U.S. Post Office Inspection Department, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and other national and local agencies having to do with the detection of crime. He attributes the increase of crime to the decay of moral codes, and the decay, in turn, to the destruction of the moral sense of youth through its contacts with sex perversion produced by a sex-mindedness resulting from the reading of lewd literature. His studies have convinced him that the filthy magazine is not a chimera of prudish minds. Its menace is real, its influence potentially crime-inciting.

It has been many years since Mr. Cooper concluded his investigations, but the subsequent development of our juvenile history has offered no rebuttal to his conclusions.

Of course, as the New York State Legislative Committee has recently observed, the purported defenders of freedom of speech will still steadfastly contend that there is only an imaginary or, at most, a coincidental relationship between the reading of obscene material and delinquency, despite the contrary opinion of qualified psychiatrists, social workers, and police officials, and despite the numerous cases where defendants in criminal actions have themselves attributed to lurid reading the inspiration for their crimes.

Now we do not contend that all our American teenagers read these materials, but we do contend that they are all exposed to it. It is available to anyone of them provided they have a quarter, or 15 cents, or even just a dime for a purchase. We do not contend that every youngster who may pick up an indecent piece of literature will be permanently tainted by it, but we do contend that it is, for young and old alike, a very proximate occasion of sin, and for those who do make it a habit, it is a very real corrupting influence.

As Mr. John Brennan, assistant executive secretary of the NODL (National Office for Decent Literature) has recently noted: "Once an individual has been initiated, his predilection becomes progressive. He develops a tolerance for pornographic stimuli, and like the drug addict finds himself needing stronger and stronger doses to get the thrill he is looking for."

Surely our publishers, distributors, and retail salesmen are not going to contend that such a person is going to be satisfied with the vicarious thrills derived from his reading and that, even though his habitual patterns of thought have been changed, he is not going to seek a new outlet for his prurient tastes.

It is for all these reasons that so much publicity has been given to this problem in recent years. Yet, despite these facts which I have just related, and despite the publicity in the secular and religious press and from speakers' platforms, there are still three distinct reactions to this problem of smut.

There are those who have recognized the problem, who have come to realize the depraving influence of printed filth and the danger it presents to their own young people, and they have conscientiously concluded that they must act, not as guides to the public conscience, not as bluenosed reformers or censors of the reading habits of the community at large, but as dutiful parents, as good teachers, and as responsible civil officials. In many communities they have banded together in committees of Citizens for Decent Literature, and have attempted, through the normal processes of law, to give some measure of protection to those youngsters whom God has placed in their charge. They have, but this past February, coordinated their efforts on a national level in order that they might work more effectively to roll back the tide of obscenity which, as U.S. Postmaster General Summer-

field has said, "is poisoning the very marrow of our national life."

In opposition, there are those who fight even more vehemently to protect what they hypocritically call the freedom of artistic expression, the freedom of thought and the freedom of the American press. The publishers, distributors, and even some of the retailers of obscene publications have resorted to every legal trick and maneuver, and with considerable success, to protect their selfish interests, despite the moral cancer they know they are spreading throughout the Nation.

Whenever they are indicted and brought before the courts, they raise a hue and cry against what they call a medieval censorship, and then they solicit the aid or at least the moral support of the various liberty groups, pleading that they are not after the American dollar, but are only trying to fight for the freedom of expression and individual liberties against reactionary bluenoses and overzealous prudes. But they are, in fact, little disturbed that their publications have turned the thoughts of their readers to the lurid and obscene, making their minds cesspools of salacious and lustful phantasmas, and that these thoughts have too often erupted in external antisocial actions. They print and peddle their filth and corruption in order to fill their own pockets, and then, like Pilate, they attempt to wash their hands of the consequences.

They have too often succeeded because of the apathy of the third group. This group is made up of those who cannot believe that there is a problem in their own community, either because they are unaware of all that passes through the malls and are blind to the displays on their newstands, and in the drugstores, supermarkets and neighborhood grocery stores, or because they naively believe that we and our dependents are immune to the cheap publications.

Some months ago, in preparing a feature story for the Sunday Telegram, a staff writer for the Gannett Publishing Co., made a survey in the Portland area. He discovered that this problem is not restricted, as we would like to believe, to the great metropolises of our country. Here, on almost all newstands, and in most drugstores, there were displayed an unbelievable number and variety of slick magazines which cater to the prurient taste. We have discovered that the situation is no different in the other cities and towns of Maine. The magazines and other cheap-paper publications of similar theme are available, and they can be bought by any teenager.

Because of the action of various national organizations and many citizen committees, the material of most of the romance and confession magazines has changed for the better. Now most of them—not all—are trashy rather than obscene. The dominant theme, however, is still unmitigated sex. Here, for example, are titles of stories found in these milder publications which appeared on our newstands in recent months. They were taken from a random selection. "I Elope With My Mother's Lover," "A Woman's Nightmare," "I Had a Baby at Twelve," also "Sex Problems of a Divorce" and "Why Some Teenagers Have To Be Bad."

Among the real offenders, however, are the men's magazines and the growing number of "pin-up-boy" publications obviously intended for homosexuals.

Even these heavily illustrated magazines are outdone, in lurid content and in volume, by the pocket-size books whose characters, as aptly described in the latest report of the NODL, "move in a miasma of rape, incest, lesbianism, homosexuality, sadism and masochism."

Why do they continue to be printed and distributed, and allowed to contaminate our society? Because of our apathy, and because too often, we do not have adequate legal sanctions.

At the present time the U.S. Supreme Court holds that obscene speech and writings are not protected by the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the press. There are many, however, and perhaps some of the Justices of the Nation's highest Court are to be included among them, who believe that almost any restriction of the expression of ideas is a violation of constitutional rights. They confuse liberty with license, and should they succeed in their present purpose, which is to void all existing laws dealing with this problem and to prevent the enactment of more precise and adequate legislation, then they will be responsible in great measure for the breakdown of the moral fiber of our people.

We must admit that here in Maine our laws are not adequate to cope with the problem with which we are faced.

The 1954 Revised Statutes of the State of Maine contained the following enactment: "Whoever imports, prints, publishes, sells or distributes any book, pamphlet, ballad, printed paper or other thing containing obscene, indecent or impure language, or manifestly tending to the corruption of the morals of youth, or an obscene, indecent or impure print, picture, figure or description, manifestly tending to the corruption of the morals of youth, or introduces into a family, school or place of education, or buys, procures, receives or has in his possession any such book, pamphlet, ballad, printed paper or other thing, either for the purpose of sale, exhibition, loan or circulation, or with the intent to introduce the same into a family, school or place of education, shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, and by imprisonment for not more than 5 years."

This statute was by no means perfect. In the light of recent court cases, for proper enforcement there would be a need for a clarification or definition of terms. A revision was in order.

But in 1957, the following statute was substituted for it. "Whoever sells, rents, displays for sale, loans, gives or distributes to a child under 18 years of age or offers for sale to such a child any pamphlet, magazine, comic book, picture, picture book which contains fictional illustrations of sadism, sexual perversion, bestiality or lust, or of the physical torture of human beings, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or by fine of not more than \$50. Under this section it shall be necessary to prove that the defendant knows of the offensive picture contained in the literature involved." In 1959 this last sentence was revised to read "it shall be necessary to prove that the defendant by the exercise of reasonable diligence should know of the offensive picture contained in the literature involved."

Under the existing statute, only fictional illustrations come within the scope of a penal sanction. It matters not how much of the obscene and indecent may be described or related in any publication, providing it contains no pornographic picture or an illustration of physical torture.

This revision of statute, no matter what was its motivation, represents a tremendous victory for the smut industry.

There is, of course, no good prospect of new and stronger legislation, on a national or State level, unless there is an end to the gross indifference of the general public.

At the present time efforts are being made in our Nation's Capital to strengthen the arm of the Postmaster General in his fight to rid the mails of every form of obscene material. We will have greater assurance of success if our representatives in Washington know that they have your moral support. Let them know that you expect the enactment and enforcement of laws pertaining to obscene and pornographic literature.

On the local level no more effective program has been realized than the Citizens' Committee for Decent Literature. Its modus operandi is quite simple. The first step is an objective evaluation of the problem in the community or State. When this is accomplished, a program of information is carried out, usually through the various civic and religious groups working in cooperation with the proper municipal or State authorities. If there are no adequate State laws or local ordinances to deal with the problem, the machinery is set in motion to cure this defect. If the laws are adequate, then the committee, representative of the community at large, works for their enforcement.

We believe this program is vital.

Rev. VINCENT A. TATARCZUK, J.C.D.
PORTLAND, MAINE.

[From the Church World, July 10, 1959]

NEW CONCEPT OF FREEDOM

We read with great interest several of the opinions of the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court who unanimously agreed to set aside the New York State ban on the movie "Lady Chatterley's Lover."

The decision was handed down on the ground that the ban "struck at the very heart of constitutionally protected liberty" by forbidding the advocacy of ideas. The film depicts an adulterous relationship in an attractive light, and attempts to convey the idea that it is, in some circumstances, permissible.

Some 4 or 5 years ago, New York censored and banned a notorious foreign film on the ground that it was immoral. The U.S. Supreme Court decided that the term "immoral" was too vague, and that it afforded those responsible for the censorship of films too wide a discretion in determining when an exhibition license should be denied. Accordingly, after much deliberation and debate, the New York statute was amended, and the words "sexual immorality" substituted for "immoral." Then, in 1956, "Lady Chatterley's Lover" was banned on the ground that it taught that adultery could be a proper or at least a tolerable relationship. Again the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the ban was out of order.

There is much food for thought in the various opinions of the Justices, all of whom concurred in the speedy reversal of the New York Court of Appeals which had upheld the ban.

In the main opinion, Associate Justice Potter Stewart wrote that "Its (i.e. the first amendment's) guarantee is not confined to the expression of ideas that are conventional or shared by a majority. It protects advocacy of the opinion that adultery sometimes may be proper, no less than advocacy of socialism or the single tax."

Justice Stewart must realize, however, that adultery, which is forbidden by the natural law, by the positive law of God as expressed in the sixth commandment, and by the civil statutes of all the American States, can never be tolerated in any healthy, God-fearing society. He may fear, with Justice Felix Frankfurter, that vague censorship laws may "lead to timidity and inertia and thereby discourage the boldness of expression indispensable for a progressive society," but he must admit that freedom of expression does not include the right to disseminate ideas calculated to weaken the moral fiber of the Nation or to destroy our reverential concepts of marriage, family, and the home.

He might note, too, that socialism and the single tax, unlike adultery, cannot be described as inherently wrong; 'twas a most unhappy analogy that he used.

Our laws provide for many restraints calculated to protect the legitimate interests, the health, and the well-being of the citizen. These restraints are rarely challenged

as attacks on our "constitutionally protected liberty," because we realize that freedom does not imply the license to jeopardize the strength of the Nation of the welfare of its people. The advocacy of adultery or the advocacy of any form of immoral behavior is not less a threat to our national well-being than the physical dangers from which we are protected by the countless ordinances and statutes of the cities and States in which we live.

Justice William O. Douglas also gives evidence of the haste with which the U.S. Supreme Court moved in reversing the New York Court of Appeals. We quote: "I can find in the first amendment no room for any censor whether he is scanning an editorial, reading a news broadcast, editing a novel or a play, or previewing a movie."

Would the Justice claim that those who would make irresponsible use of the various media of communication and entertainment, and threaten social and moral harm, cannot be restrained by any human authority?

Soon after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that States may not interfere with the advocating of antisocial ideas, a constitutional amendment was introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, of Mississippi. It reads: "The right of each State to decide on the basis of its own public policy questions of decency and morality, and to enact legislation with respect thereto (e.g. the film censorship laws of New York), shall not be abridged."

Supporting the amendment, Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, declared on the Senate floor: "I cannot accept as sound the declaration that under the right of free speech the showing of moving pictures in public encouraging and implicitly approving an adulterous life is lawful, and that the Government is helpless to do anything about it."

Evidently, with proper respect for the opinions of our Supreme Court Justices, there are responsible public leaders who agree with the late Pope Pius' declaration that "the watchful care of the State's officials (over the press and motion pictures) is not an unfair limitation on the liberty of individual citizens, for it is concerned not with the private citizens as such but rather with the whole of human society with whom these arts are being shared."

He answers with broad assurances. The country's defenses are adequate, he says, although there are many well-informed men who say differently. America is not in any space race with the Russians, he assures, although a high-ranking official of his own administration says otherwise.

The President's statements are probably reassuring to most people. Yet the suspicion grows that America is not giving its best in this struggle with a militant, determined, well-organized foreign ideology that seeks to impose itself upon all the world. And the suspicion grows that the country is not rendering its best because no one demands its best.

In recent days several prominent individuals have appeared before a Senate subcommittee that is inquiring into the adequacy of Government policymaking procedures. None of them was a partisan politician with an eye on November's votes. None of them was a general or an admiral with a "parochial" military viewpoint. Several were Republicans.

Yet what they had to say added up to a serious questioning of American effort, American priorities and American leadership.

Said Robert C. Sprague, who was cochairman of the Galther Committee on National Security in 1957:

"We have not done a great deal that urgently needs to be done * * *. It's just utter nonsense to believe that we can't do the things that we need to do to survive, to win this contest. * * * The danger is more serious than the President has expressed."

The United States must be awakened to the seriousness of the overall Russian threat, he continued. "There is only one man in the United States who can do this effectively, and that is the President."

Said Robert A. Lovett, former Under Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense:

"National security depends on many things. Some of them, to be sure, are material things. But the most important ones are matters of national spirit."

"It depends on our belief in the future; it depends greatly on our willingness to give up a little of today in order to have a tomorrow. While the challenges of the moment are most serious in a policymaking sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts."

"We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: we must be willing to do our best."

Said Thomas Watson, Jr., president of International Business Machines:

"We cannot just go along with 'business as usual' and hope to win. * * * If we do not impose the strains necessary to win, it is obvious that at best we will live in a Soviet-dominated world and, at worst, in a Soviet province."

"* * * Our national goal should be clear superiority over the Soviet Union in all possible areas, and we should believe enough in our democracy so that we will not be reluctant to enter fully into the contest."

And said Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College and a member of the Galther committee:

"It is really tough business for a nation to sustain the prolonged effort that cold war demands. But I think we are right up against it, and we are going to have to do it."

These men are saying that a nation with $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the resources of Russia can meet any Communist challenge, provided only that its resources are summoned and used.

It can mount whatever defense program is necessary. It can regain the lead in space exploration, whose propaganda importance is tremendous even if its military importance is not.

It can strengthen its educational program, and it can summon itself and its allies to a greater effort in behalf of the underdeveloped nations.

It may require a sacrifice in the frills and fancies of consumer goods, and a sacrifice in taxes. But that would hardly wreck the Republic, while the Communists well might.

The High Price of Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Kefauver committee's investigation continues to reveal case after case in which the prescription drug industry has abused its public trust. Last week the Senate hearings revealed that some companies may not only be charging unreasonable prices but may also be pushing incompletely tested drugs onto the market—drugs that could be worthless or even dangerous.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 26, 1960, edition of the Washington Post:

THE HIGH PRICE OF DRUGS

The Kefauver committee investigation of the prescription drug industry is getting onto distinctly firmer ground. An alarming, and certainly disgusting, picture of some industry practices is emerging, and Minority Leader DIRKSEN would do the Senate and the public a favor by dropping his ill-considered objections to the orderly continuation of the hearings at normal hours even though they may conflict with Senate sessions.

The early Kefauver disclosures of fantastic markups in individual drug items made more headlines than they did sense; many essential steps in the development, manufacturing and marketing process were simply not taken into account in the calculations. The committee acknowledged this, but the resulting publicity was nonetheless unfair. As the broader picture has emerged, however, it has become apparent that profits of many larger pharmaceutical houses are outrageously high—twice the average for all industry. The way in which this stunning financial success has been achieved makes the really dismal reading, however.

As the hearings have shown, the enormous growth of the drug business in the past decade has been brought about in part by the development of an infinite variety of similar drugs which have been patented, labeled with brand names and peddled with massive promotion and advertising campaigns among doctors. The cost of all this has added considerably to prices, but it now appears that this may be the least of the evils of widespread hucksterism.

As yesterday's hearings, Dr. Haskell J. Weinstein, a former research director for Charles Pfizer & Co., charged that incompletely evaluated drugs have been brought on the market "which not infrequently are hazardous." Doctors, he said, are virtually "brainwashed into prescribing new medicines, under their costly brand names, even without adequate information about their efficacy. Dr. Weinstein's predecessor at the Pfizer Co., Dr. Martin A. Seidell, said he had quit because of such "perverted

Americans Fight a War From a Peacetime Stance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 7, there was published in the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer a significant editorial entitled "Americans Fight a War From a Peacetime Stance." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS FIGHT A WAR FROM A PEACETIME STANCE

President Eisenhower seldom holds a news conference now in which he is not asked about charges that the country is not doing all that it must do to meet the Communist challenge.

marketing attitudes" which he found "incompatible with both the ethics of my profession and my sense of morality." If drug promotion, in addition to burdening patients with inordinate costs, is also resulting in the distribution of dangerous (or even merely useless) pharmaceuticals, the Kefauver committee has at last struck legislative "pay dirt."

Obviously, the companies' answers to these latest charges must be awaited before any conclusions are reached, and it would be wrong to indict all drug manufacturers for the practice of some. But if there is doubt about what the Government could or should do to end profiteering, there is no doubt whatever about its powers—and its obligation—to protect the public from the premature dissemination of drugs that may be of dubious value or even dangerous.

It is also beginning to appear that physicians themselves must bear a considerable part of the blame for their patients' increasingly burdensome drug bills. By relying so heavily upon brand-name promotions, they may be denying their patients considerable savings possible through the prescription of medicines by their generic names. Indeed, if the Kefauver hearings do no more than educate the public to demand more economical drugs whenever possible, they will have performed a genuine service.

Milwaukee Journal Calls for All-Out Effort for Peace Through Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal in a remarkably constructive fashion recently called editorial attention to the warnings by distinguished American businessmen that we are not doing enough to keep America defensively strong. The Journal agreed we should do much more to assure our strength, and then went on to call for sober reflection on where the missile race and the construction of weapons of infinite destruction is taking us. The Journal eloquently concludes:

While making sure that we are adequately armed, must we not make more intensive, imaginative, consistent efforts to find ways to peace—disarmament, nuclear controls, guarantees of existence? Should not the basic concern be over our leaders thinking in outmoded terms—and the fact that the voices which must show the way to a livable future are seldom heard, almost always ignored?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICES THAT SHOW THE WAY TO LIVABLE FUTURE SELDOM HEARD

President Eisenhower has heatedly defended our defense and missile programs. He sees no threat to our national prestige in

Russia's sputniks. He calls inflation the greatest danger to our Nation. He says that his administration has fully informed the Nation on the international situation.

Recently three leading Republicans and an independent who has strongly supported Eisenhower and has been the President's frequent guest appeared before the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington. The committee is studying how, in JACKSON's words, "can a free society organize to outthink, outplan, and outperform totalitarianism—and achieve security in freedom?"

Said Robert C. Sprague, Boston businessman and cochairman of the Gaither committee which Eisenhower named to make a confidential study of national security problems:

"The Nation faces a clear and imminent threat to its survival but we have not yet fully awakened to this unpleasant fact." Only one man can do anything about this—"the President; I don't think there is anybody else."

Then he added: "I believe the danger is more serious than the President has expressed himself to the American public." Sprague said that it was silly to argue that increased spending for survival would bankrupt America. And he criticized the budget approach to defense.

Sprague's final criticism was that it wasn't enough for a President to have briefings on important subjects—"Even the best briefing is no substitute for homework. The man who does not have time to do his own reading of really basic studies and policy papers and reflecting on them has not assigned proper priorities to the demands on his time."

Robert A. Lovett, investment banker with long experience in government, said many of the same sort of things. He said, in relation to competition with the Soviet system, "We are doing something short of our best." The Government underestimates the Communist threat and this Nation has been losing prestige.

James Phinney Baxter III, Gaither committee member and president of Williams College, was also critical of the budget approach to real national needs for security and said: "I am willing to pay more taxes if it is necessary to do the things we need to do, and I believe that our entire people would feel the same if they realized all that is at stake."

And, finally, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the International Business Machines Corp., who says he's an independent, said that "we cannot go on with business as usual" and expect to compete with the Russians. He did not mention the President, but he said: "I do not agree with people who suggest that we must not push our economy to any point necessary to win in competing with the Soviet because we might lose what has made this country great."

This testimony shows deep concern over whether this country is on the proper course, is doing enough and even understands where it is headed. Part of that concern must include the question of where, in this age when complete destruction can be a matter of seconds, the whole weapons and missile race is taking us.

While making sure that we are adequately armed, must we not make more intensive, imaginative, consistent efforts to find ways to peace—disarmament, nuclear controls, guarantees of existence? Should not the basic concern be over our leaders thinking in outmoded terms—and the fact that the voices which must show the way to a livable future are seldom heard and, when heard, almost always ignored?

Backward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, when Congress enacted the Landrum-Griffin law last year, it very carefully considered the matter of picketing on construction sites and included certain fair but specific limitations.

Certain union leaders would like to have all restrictions on picketing removed. That would, in the opinion of many, create a secondary boycott situation strictly forbidden by the Taft-Hartley law.

A very able editorial in the Washington Evening Star, March 3, 1960, comments on the situation and is produced herewith:

A quietly bitter fight over a 1949 ruling by the National Labor Relations Board, later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, is going on before a House Labor Subcommittee.

The ruling, issued in what is known as the Denver Building Trades case, establishes four conditions under which picketing may be carried on legally against a primary employer (the one involved directly in a valid labor dispute) at a construction site. Since construction normally involves multiple employers—subcontractors hiring workers in different crafts—the board set up these conditions in an effort to prevent interference with the operations of "unoffending employers" . . . in controversies not their own. Picketing in violation of the conditions was classified as an illegal secondary boycott.

The Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO has fought this limitation on so-called common site picketing on grounds that it is unduly restrictive in the peculiar circumstances of the construction industry. President Eisenhower and Secretary of Labor Mitchell have recommended legislative clarification to make it explicit that concerted action against . . . an employer who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott. A belated effort to accomplish this through amendment of the Landrum-Griffin bill while in House-Senate conference last year was dropped when the threat was raised of a point of order against including new legislation in conference.

At this point, strong opposition is being voiced by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on grounds that it is special-interest legislation that would tend to break down safeguards against secondary boycotts in many areas, that it would be the first wedge to weaken the protection offered workers and employers by the labor reform law and that it would be in direct conflict with national labor policy as already determined by the Congress.

Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, the pressures of election year are apt to play a part in consideration of legislation of this sort. The evils of secondary boycotts have been well demonstrated. A legislative redefinition should be undertaken with the greatest caution, and without political motivation.

Time To Stand Up for World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in Life magazine of March 7, 1960, entitled "Time To Stand Up for World Law."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STAND UP FOR WORLD LAW

Those who believe the rule of law must be superior to the rule of force in the world won a tough, hard battle in Chicago last week at the meeting of the American Bar Association's House of Delegates. The issue whether the ABA would continue, as it has done for 13 years, to support repeal of the notorious 1946 Connally amendment. This amendment hampers extension of the rule of law by a reservation that only the United States can decide whether the World Court may take jurisdiction in any case involving our Nation. The repeal proponents won, 100 to 93 on one vote and 127 to 68 on a second.

But the size of the opposition shows how many people there are—even among lawyers, who should be the most vigorous advocates of the rule of law—who have been misled by the argument of unreconstructed isolationists (or pure demagogues) that repeal would undermine U.S. sovereignty. And some also fear that foreign judges may decide cases on ideological, political, or nationalistic lines.

Actually, both these fears have little basis in reality, as any reasonable examination of the facts proves. The Court's decisions have been generally excellent in legal reasoning, scholarship, and judicial integrity—and furthermore those who take cases to the Court usually obey its decisions. Among the 15 judges, chosen by the U.N.'s General Assembly and Security Council for 9-year terms, some have rendered decisions against their own nations. For example, a Peruvian, appointed as an ad hoc judge, decided against Peru in one case, and in another, won by the United States, a Soviet judge strongly defended the U.S. position.

As Arthur Larson's World Rule of Law Center at Duke University points out, the United States, with its billions invested in so many lands, needs the protection of law and the Court's jurisdiction more than any other country. But so long as the Connally reservation exists, any other nation can use it against us, as Norway did against France (which had a similar reservation) to keep the Court from ruling on Norway's repudiation of some gold bonds sold to French citizens. Last year even President de Gaulle, with all his touchiness about French sovereignty, saw his way clear to abolish France's reservation.

Some enthusiasts for extending the rule of law go so far as to claim that strengthening the World Court could establish world peace and order right away. That's too much to expect. But what it can and would do would be to build an accretion of precedents—of peaceful settlements of disputes accepted and obeyed by all the parties—which would help the world grow more orderly and less violent. As these precedents accumulate, smaller regional courts might well be established—for example in

the Organization of American States—to judge such issues as the sort of expropriation which Cuba is now undertaking.

The next chapter in the fight for repeal of the Connally Act is now opening. It hinges on whether Senator FULBRIGHT, the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, brings out upon the floor the repeal resolution already introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. FULBRIGHT himself supports repeal, as do the President, Vice President NIXON and Attorney General Rogers.

What worries FULBRIGHT is whether this support is merely lip service or whether Eisenhower and Nixon are willing to make a vigorous, emphatic fight for repeal and force Republican leaders to go along. If such a fight is not waged, FULBRIGHT fears the possible defeat of repeal could be a damaging propaganda blow to the United States before the world. And so it could.

NIXON, especially, can wield great influence in this fight because he is very popular among the admirers of former Senator John Bricker—who are the principal opponents of repeal. But only last week Clarence Manion, the former dean of Notre Dame law school, who has always opposed repeal, accused NIXON of "ambiguity" in his support and urged him to make an "unequivocal statement" of how he stands.

NIXON's past statements have been clear enough in support of repeal (Life, April 27). But Senator FULBRIGHT is fully entitled to demand that the administration back its words by drumming up maximum support from Republicans in the Senate.

Three Views on the Need for New, Clean Elections Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the press throughout much of the country has displayed a gratifying, sustained interest in the current drive for clean elections legislation.

Recent editorials from three papers representing widely separated areas are typical of the many written about the need for modernizing election laws. These three, from the Springfield (Ohio) News, the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, and the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, read as follows:

[From the Springfield (Ohio) News, Feb. 5, 1960]

SOMETHING GAINED

After 6 uphill years, a crew of conscientious legislators has bulldozed a really good elections reform bill through the Senate. The Senate itself couldn't be more surprised. The majority was amazing—59 to 22. So is the bill.

In addition to more realistic ceilings on campaign expenditures, it would open the books on spending in primaries, State conventions, and by local and State committees on behalf of Federal candidates. The power of individual contributors to bid for political favor with wide-open checkbooks would be curbed at last.

The end of this beautiful dream of honest election legislation will come, of course, in the House. Southern Congressmen don't want disclosure of primaries bookkeeping.

Others, mindful of the cost of standing for election every 2 years, will be glad to join them in presiding at quiet last rites.

So the old Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 will stay on the books—for now. As a control on modern campaigning it's like trying to tame tigers with catnip.

Yet something important has been ventured and won. Modern Republicans joined northern Democrats to carry a Senate victory blocked by conservative coalition since 1954. Good ground has been gained for the day when lavish campaign spending produces another scandal and a strong public clamor for reform.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, Jan. 28, 1960]

MORE GIVERS, LESS MONEY

In the debate on the "clean elections" bill just passed by the Senate, a principal theme was the desirability of minimizing the "fat cats" in a political campaign and relying on many small contributors.

The Senators even considered a proposal to permit small tax deductions as an encouragement to small donors in election campaigns. This properly was turned down, but not because of disagreement over the objective.

As passed, the bill takes a step toward curbing oversize contributions. It fixes a flat ceiling of \$10,000 on the total any one person may give to all political committees in one year. (Present limit is \$5,000 per committee, but a well-heeled contributor can make us many \$5,000 gifts, as there are committees.) No effort was made to curb the spending of labor organizations, other than the flat overall ceiling applied to all interstate committees.

The top on presidential election spending by national committees would work out to \$12.5 million on the basis of the 1956 election—the ceiling is fixed by a formula tied to the number of voters. (The two major parties are estimated to have spent \$33 million between them in 1956.) The proposed new ceiling was said to be "realistic" in view of today's high cost of television and travel.

But there is massive waste and extravagance in every campaign. If candidates and parties had to depend on far lesser totals, they could manage quite reasonably. And if individual contributions were limited to sums most people could afford—say up to \$100 at the most—the politicians would not be tempted by slush funds contributed by those seeking favors from Government, or even by the rackets.

The Gallup Poll once reported 17 million American families were willing to give small sums, at least \$5 each, if they were asked by the parties they favored. This would amass a sum sufficient to run all political organizations and campaigns, if they operated prudently.

When a relative few of the wealthy donate a high percentage of a campaign's expenses, they automatically assume an influence all out of proportion either to their wisdom or their benevolence. A public official elected with the help of 2,000 donors of \$5 is indebted to practically no one—but a man who gets \$10,000 from a single contributor obviously is in hock to his benefactor. That's the nub of it.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, Jan. 27, 1960]

THE SENATE BUYS A BROOM

The U.S. Senate passed its first major bill of the 1960 session Monday night: a bill aimed at providing effective control over political campaign expenditures. It is a sweeping reform—so sweeping, in fact, that plans are already underway to ambush and kill it in the House.

If this happens it will be an unhappy ending indeed, because the Senate bill is

both excellent and long overdue. The truth is that present legislation governing campaign spending and financial reporting by political candidates is an almost unqualified farce. Existing restrictions are inadequate, unrealistic, unenforced and, for all practical purposes, unenforceable.

The new Senate bill, largely the handiwork of Democratic Senator HENNING, of Missouri, beefs up the ineffective Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 in four vitally important ways:

It deals with party primaries as well as with final elections. This would make restrictions on campaign contributions and expenditures applicable for the first time in the South, where victory in the Democratic primaries is normally tantamount to election.

It establishes for the first time a fixed ceiling (\$10,000) on the amount that any individual may contribute for political purposes in any election. Present law provides that no one may contribute more than \$5,000 to any individual candidate—but this is meaningless in practice because there is no limit whatever to the number of \$5,000 contributions a person may make to different candidates or to the various separate campaign committees of a particular candidate.

It raises the present law's ceilings on campaign spending by candidates to more realistic levels—for example, from \$10,000 to \$50,000 in the case of U.S. Senate campaigns, and from \$3 million to \$12,500,000 for presidential campaigns. The proposed new limits are still far below what is normally spent in campaigns for Federal office, but they at least represent a step in the right direction.

Finally, the Senate bill extends the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act to the activities of purely State and local committees when they spend money in behalf of candidates for Federal office. This closes a loophole through which many candidates have received enormous campaign contributions without bothering to report them.

It would be naive to suppose that enactment of these reforms would automatically end such longstanding evils as concealed political contributions and dummy campaign committees. This, after all, is a field in which enforcement is peculiarly difficult, if only because those charged with enforcement are often themselves the beneficiaries of loose financial practices in their own political campaigns.

But at the very least the Senate bill would establish a sound standard to which the proponents of reform can repair. It would deter many otherwise law-abiding candidates and campaign contributors from illegal practices which they now rationalize on the grounds that the laws make no sense. And it would at least provide a realistic basis for crackdowns in the case of the most flagrant violations.

Ike for Tykes—Journey at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ike for Tykes—Journey at Home Proposed," published in the Delaware County Daily Times of Chester, Pa., which was written by Mr. Bob Finucane, city editor, which contains an extremely interesting suggestion to the

general effect that President Eisenhower, either during his term of office or perhaps after the conclusion of his term, should make a tour of the United States, so that our younger generation may have a chance to see and to become acquainted with the President and to view and to observe him before he becomes a historical figure, which may inspire them to a greater recognition of the accomplishments of this great and good man, both as General of the Armies and as President of the United States, in the hope it will give them an opportunity to cherish in their recollections through all the years the memory of having seen in person the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE FOR TYKES—JOURNEY AT HOME PROPOSED
Mr. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Welcome home.

All of us hope your journey to South America will not, in the long run, rob you of time in that rocking chair to which you aspire.

The months ahead, we realize, are to be full ones for you. But we cannot contain the urge to suggest to you still another trip. This one would be called "Ike for Tykes."

Watching films of your tremendous receptions in many foreign lands, it occurred to us these people of many distant nations have enjoyed a thrill youngsters in this country rarely experience—a closeup of the President of the United States.

We are suggesting, then, you make a relaxed tour of this country—perhaps even after you leave the White House—to give our youngsters a chance to cheer a living American hero at close range.

If touring by train, allow on the platforms only children of high school age or below.

If by plane, rope off the landing area for these same young people.

If street parades could be arranged, reserve for just boys and girls the best curbstone locations.

A man we know still tingles at the mention of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inauguration. He was there, you see, and agrees it should be "Ike for Tykes" above all else.

It's time, we think, our sophisticated American youth be given the opportunity to see, hear, and cheer a genuine red, white, and blue legend in the Lincoln, Lee, Grant tradition.

While you were away, Mr. President, the U.S. hockey team whipped the Russians in the Olympics.

The telecast of that Squaw Valley classic—and its dramatic finish—gave Americans a rare opportunity to holler for our team on what might be termed "the homeland level."

Most youngsters take a certain pride in their community, their school—even their State. But how often, except for the brief Olympics thrill, are they given the chance to stand up and cheer for their country?

Cheering you, our youngsters would be cheering their country as well. Who was it, Mr. President, who led their fathers on another U.S. team to that big win in Europe in 1945? Who is it, Mr. President, who still leads the U.S. team in what may be a contest for survival?

Do our boys and girls the same favor you've done for millions abroad and at the same time do yourself a favor: see the affection in which you are held by our young.

It's been said, Mr. President, you personify the "father image."

A Mount Vernon farmer—first man to hold your office—is in the history books with a

similar label. Our children can only read about him.

Before becoming just another fat chapter in a future publication about the past, Mr. President, show yourself in the flesh to our young.

Sincerely,

DELAWARE COUNTY DAILY TIMES.

The First Thing First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting editorial on the narcotics traffic on the U.S.-Mexican border, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on March 1, 1960.

THE FIRST THING FIRST

"Any perceptive person roving the border towns knows; he may not have direct information about the organization behind the traffic, but he sees it going on all around him."

The experienced commentator was speaking of the narcotics traffic on the U.S.-Mexican border.

TERRIBLE IMPACT

This is an international business which can be dealt with only by sovereign national governments. The dope traffic has a terrible impact on California, but this State does not have the authority to negotiate with Mexican governments, national or state. Only the Government in Washington, dealing directly with the Government in Mexico City, can find a formula to control the smuggling from Mexico into the United States, most particularly into southern California, where the degrading effects of the narcotics traffic are far more serious than in any other border States. Two-thirds of the narcotic most widely used in California—the opium derivative called heroin—is smuggled across the border from Mexico, where it is produced.

This is why the Times, which tries never to ring three alarms for small fires, has so strongly urged the Government in Washington to do something decisive about the border traffic. Under pressure, Washington has made some gentle gestures, and the Mexican Government, with hardly a demur, has offered to receive U.S. narcotics agents in Mexico to cooperate with its own.

UNITED STATES DRAGS ITS FEET

The U.S. Government has not been eager to accept this invitation, nor to press for further negotiations with Mexico: for example, for an agreement to suppress heroin production at its source by destroying Mexican poppy fields.

The reluctance in some Federal quarters to act in this matter prompted the proposal for a White House Conference on Narcotics. Such a Conference would focus national attention on dope problems, particularly—it is hoped—on California's helplessness without Federal support. And it might goad the executive departments to give their wholehearted support.

Senators and Representatives have endorsed this proposal, and a resolution calling for a White House Conference will be heard by a House judiciary subcommittee tomorrow. There is much sympathy in the Senate and the House for California in its helplessness and for the other border States which suffer impotently, and only in a lesser

degree, from the smuggling activity. For that matter, there have been sympathy and cooperation, within limits, at some elevated levels in the State and Treasury Departments; the unwillingness of the bureaus to exercise their full authority is probably institutional rather than personal in most cases.

The stock objections to our urgent plea for Federal assistance are (a) that the narcotics plight of California has been overstated, (b) that the bulk of California heroin is not smuggled from Mexico, and (c) that California can do its own policing without Federal help.

CONFIRMED RESEARCH

The answers are that the frightening magnitude of narcotics addiction in southern California is self-evident. Reporter Gene Sherman spent months on his grisly researches and his findings, published in the Times last summer, were confirmed by the hearings of a visiting committee of U.S. Senators. Moreover, Mr. Sherman established, with only some bureaucrats in Washington dissenting, that most of the miserable stuff came over the border, the processed product of the Mexican poppy fields. As for California policing and punishing, that is not pertinent to the border problem, which is the central problem.

Unquestionably, there is some slack to be taken up in narcotics suppression within the State, and there have been many proposals for reform. It seems probable that State penalties against peddlers are too light or that judges are too lenient with offenders. Some proposals would suspend constitutional guarantees to make police work easier in narcotics cases, and these proposals should have very cautious examination.

But none of the proposals for State enforcement and punishment should distract anxious citizens' attention from the main issue, which is that the U.S. and Mexican Governments must act together to close the border to narcotics. The first thing must come first.

Every Traveler Is an Ambassador for His Native Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at this time of the year many thousands of Americans are beginning to examine travel folders, consult airlines and steamship schedules, and make plans for a summer in Europe or other lands abroad.

The thousands and hundreds of thousands of Americans who go abroad each year may do much for good or ill for the United States, depending upon how they conduct themselves in other lands. While our diplomats conduct our relations with other governments, they are not our only ambassadors. For the attitudes of the people of other countries, as distinguished from their governments, are often responses to the quality of behavior which they encounter in Americans who travel abroad. Thus, every American traveler may be an ambassador of good will, especially if he takes with him a sense of courtesy, a genuine desire to understand other cultures than

his own, and a respect for the traditions of other people.

This perspective is well expressed in a letter to the New York Times which comes to me from my good friend, W. H. M. Stover, a business and civic leader here in Washington, and president of the Leadership Training Institute of District of Columbia, an institution where I have often lectured. The writer of the letter, the journalist and broadcaster, Oliver K. Whiting, has also taught for Mr. Stover, and is well qualified to speak on this subject. As a faculty member of the Dale Carnegie & Associates of New York, and sponsor of the Dale Carnegie Courses in the British Isles, his work places him in frequent contact with Americans abroad and Europeans in this country. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EVERY TRAVELER IS AN AMBASSADOR FOR HIS NATIVE LAND

MARCH 1, 1960.

CORRESPONDENCE EDITOR,
New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: No traveler ever set out with better equipment than that which is available to him today. Before he closes his front door he has been thoroughly advised where to go, what to see, how long it will take, how much it will cost, what clothes he will require, what food to eat, and what luggage to carry. Every conceivable piece of information has been offered by his travel agent or the appropriation section of the press. Everything is made clear to him except the most vital fact of all, and that is, that the moment he sets foot on a foreign shore, he will cease to be a private individual responsible only to himself. He has become a public figure. In the eyes of those he visits he is a representative of the country from which he hails.

We all know how this works but it cannot be too clearly understood. Suppose you meet an Italian, or Frenchman, or any foreigner, in New York, and he should treat you with discourtesy, one's instant reaction is not how unpleasant Mr. X made himself, but rather, "What an objectionable fellow that Frenchman was." And, similarly, should he be kindly, gay, and attractive, we think (though for some reason too often we refrain from saying), "What a charming gentleman that Frenchman was." In both cases, his country has been credited with what he may have fondly felt was his own particular idiosyncrasy and of little outside concern.

Last week in Grand Central Station, an Englishman waited in line at the information counter to find the platform for his train. By the time he got attention, his train had left. In annoyance, he shouted, "Why don't you people go over to Europe and learn how a railroad should be run," to which the clerk replied, "If you feel like that about it, why don't you stay on the other side."

It is important for us to remember in a foreign land, our smallest action, as traveling Americans, even our momentary moods will add a touch of color to our host's mental picture of Uncle Sam, and throw a kindly or a hostile light on our native soil.

It is said a million Americans will go abroad this year. What a fantastic opportunity they have to win friends all over the world for the United States of America. It will not be done if we fill the air with invective comparisons, criticisms, and complaints. Let us remember we are guests; in

many cases, in countries whose civilization was established a thousand years before the first white man set foot on the continent of America.

We are rightly proud of our fine cities, our skyscrapers, our hygiene and sanitary equipment, and they, too, have their pride, not counted perhaps in weights and measures, or dollars and cents, but in an ancient tradition seasoned by the centuries and which, incidentally, cradled the very democracy from which we spring.

So fellow Americans, as we travel on, let each determine to seek those things we can praise and admire, and to carry in our very bearing the things which we would like others to see in us, and in the America we represent.

The responsibility of those who travel is truly great, but so, too, is their opportunity. For if we are so determined, we can each become an ambassador of good will to every land we visit.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER K. WHITING.

Jet Progress—Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of March, Pan American World Airways, in keeping with its history as a pioneer airline, began jet airplane service between Seattle and Fairbanks, Alaska. The jet flights, which will operate on Mondays, Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, will require 3 hours 15 minutes of flying time, cutting approximately 2½ hours off current piston-engined flight times. This saving in time will, I hope, enable many of my colleagues who have never been in Alaska to visit the 49th State and thereby better comprehend its problems, great potential, and significance to the Union in regard to national defense and otherwise.

These flights are on a round-trip basis, Mr. Speaker, and will bring to Alaska a service it richly deserves, covering a distance between Seattle and Fairbanks in excess of 1,500 miles.

Those of us who have long lived with the transportation problem in and out of Alaska have a great appreciation for this latest innovation by Pan American. Pan American was the first scheduled carrier to operate between Seattle and Alaska about 20 years before Alaska became a State, so it is not a mere coincidence that Pan American became the first carrier to commence scheduled jet operations between Seattle and Fairbanks. In fact it took considerable initiative, as permission had to be obtained from the Air Force to temporarily land and take off at Ladd Air Force Base, pending extension of the runway at the Fairbanks International Airport, which job will be completed about a year from now.

For this achievement, I salute both Pan American and the Air Force for recognizing the need of this very valuable public service between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington.

Letters to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters to the editor which have appeared in recent weeks in the Appleton Post-Crescent newspaper by Henry Flanagan, Sr., in support of my food-for-peace proposal and my bill to assist middle age workers in obtaining employment be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters to the editor were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKES HUMPHREY'S PROPOSAL TO AID MIDDLE-AGED WORKER

EDITOR, POST-CRESCENT:

I read with interest your editorial dated January 2, 1960, "Looking Ahead for the Aged." I agree that there is a problem in regard to the plight of the older worker. However, the immediate problem seems to be that of the middle-aged worker and his inability to be considered for work because of his age, which was mentioned in the editorial. One of the main reasons that the employer gives is that the added costs of hiring older workers proves to be too great a burden and, consequently, younger persons are hired instead—even though the younger worker has a minimum of training and experience.

A step in the right direction seems to have been taken by a bill that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has introduced in the last session of Congress. The bill provides that employers could compute the additional costs of fringe benefits involved in the employment of older workers, as compared to younger persons doing the same work. Such costs could be treated as a tax credit against the income tax for the employer.

If Senator HUMPHREY's bill is accepted by Congress I am sure that it would result in a two-fold benefit. First, experienced and trained workers would find a market for their talents and second, employers could use the tax credit as an incentive when considering the possible employment of an older person. For these reasons it would benefit both the employer and employee to support this bill in the present session of Congress.

HENRY FLANAGAN, Sr.

BEAR CREEK.

NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE WOULD SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS, AID FRIENDS

EDITOR, POST-CRESCENT:

Recently the Post-Crescent published two articles in reference to the farm problem. The first was under the date of January 6 entitled "Agriculture Still Has Problems of Production and Income" which covered a statement by Robert L. Clodius. The other article appeared January 22, "Farm Problem Looks Worse for 1960 Despite General Prosperity," which was accredited to the New York Herald.

Because the two articles were so different in approach and conclusion I think that the Post-Crescent should be congratulated for being objective. However, the basic premise of each view appears to be so different that I think they should be restated. Clodius does not hold that the solution to the farm problem is answered by driving the farmers off of the land. On the other hand, the New York Herald flatly states "that the only solution is the retirement

of whole farms—and whole families—from agricultural activity."

Now I want to make it clear that I am on the side of the family farmer—I am for family size farms. To be sure the Fox valley must recognize the importance of the family farm to the economy. If we were to liquidate these farmers by forcing them from the land, the only place left for them would be the cities and towns competing in the mills and factories for jobs.

The New York Herald calls this problem an albatross hung from our national neck. I agree that if it is an albatross at all it should be hung from the national neck and not from the farmer's neck. Why should we belittle our farmers for being the most efficient producers in the world.

It is true that production and marketing controls would help somewhat to curtail the problem. But the national policy must not stop there, Congress must find a plan that will take advantage of our God-given abundance. The farmer can be induced to reduce production but is that really necessary? I don't think that our farm production must be cut back as far as the Department of Agriculture says. If as much effort were put into formulating a national food and fiber program as in the energies expended attempting to cut production, I am inclined to believe that our present farm output would not be producing a surplus.

America's farm policies need to be examined and clarified in terms of objectives sought in the Nation's interest and not in the light of political slogans designed to turn city consumers against the producing farmer.

We need a program that really does something about surpluses. A program that will make better use of what we have and adjust production to meet all possible needs. A national food policy is needed that will be closely aligned with a farm policy so the Nation can gear its productive resources to the needs of humanity at home and abroad. This should be the plan instead of merely producing to fill Government storage bins.

We must realize that the country will have to pay one way or the other. It seems that it would be cheaper and far wiser to mobilize our agricultural abundance in a fight for peace than mobilize our sons and economy for war. Wouldn't it be logical if a National Food Reserve was created? The country spends billions of dollars for missiles and weapons that never get off of the drawing board—all in the name of good national defense. Why would it be so unusual to have a national food reserve on hand to meet any unforeseen calamity, when as in war, a tremendous demand is created overnight? Finally it seems that it would be cheaper and more humane to use our abundance to raise the standard of living for the low income groups, rather than turn to a philosophy of scarcity that would force up food costs for all society.

As mentioned before, a new dimension has been added to the use of agricultural surpluses—surpluses as an implement of peace—which was worked out by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY: It is called the Food for Peace Act and is essentially an extension and revision of Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, which was perfected by the Senator from Minnesota. We have all seen the benefits that have resulted from this law, but, in the long run, it has proven to be inadequate to deal with and effectively use our disposable surpluses.

The primary function of the Food for Peace plan would be getting our surpluses in the hands of underdeveloped countries. The proceeds from these sales then would be loaned back to the recipient country who would carry out programs designed to be mutually beneficial to both countries. A second objective enables the President to furnish emergency assistance on the behalf of the American people to friendly peoples in

meeting famine and other unusual relief requirements. This would be done through an agency of the Government or distributed to various voluntary relief agencies as CARE or church organizations. In addition the plan calls for the President to barter for strategic materials necessary for our national defense and to establish in friendly countries nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health and public welfare.

The proposal of course directs the Government to act in such a manner so the disposal of the agricultural commodities will not disrupt the world market. For example Food for Peace would not be sold in our normal dollar or pound sterling market. It would operate where there are no dollars or British pounds.

It must be remembered that food is security and it will win more friends than weapons. A few tons of powdered milk in Africa or Asia will do us more good than a ton of uranium or a case of rifles in the same area.

HENRY FLANAGAN, Sr.

BEAR CREEK.

The Wrongs of Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, civil rights is a compact and disarming label for a legislative package of explosive danger to constitutional guarantees.

Although frankly aimed at the South, this bill of the Eisenhower administration, as devised by Attorney General Mitchell with the President's approval and the strong endorsement of Vice President Nixon, could suspend free elections in other sections of the Nation as well.

The bill contains additional provisions of sweeping effect, notably that which would make it a felony to oppose the Supreme Court's school integration fiat. Too few citizens are aware of this provision which could have ticketed for prison every member of the Virginia General Assembly who voted recently for a resolution stating the sense of that free elective body that the Court's decree was illegal.

To return to the election controls in the bill, however, Mr. Speaker, it is important that citizens familiarize themselves with the Federal voting referee scheme. In this connection, I take the liberty of directing the attention of this House to a straightforward and perceptive analysis of the provision by our learned colleague from Louisiana, the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, whose reputation for dispassionate and conscientious legal scholarship is known to all here. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include Mr. WILLIS' comments, as printed in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of March 7, 1960:

THE RIGGED CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(By EDWIN E. WILLIS, Congressman from Louisiana)

(Congressman WILLIS is a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary which handles civil rights legislation. His ability as a constitutional lawyer is said to be highly respected and recognized by both the Democratic and Republican Members of the

House of Representatives. Here he discusses the Federal voting referee proposal.)

Very few people have had the opportunity to read and study the voting referee provision of the pending civil rights bill rigged up by the U.S. Attorney General and so-called liberal groups. It is one of a series of punitive political measures designed to penalize the Southern States in order to appeal in the coming presidential election to the organized minorities in the large cities of the North and West. This effort to make the Southern States the political whipping boy is participated in with equal vigor by leaders of both the National Democratic and Republican Parties.

Fundamentally, it restores the old force bills of the chaotic Reconstruction days following the Civil War, when the people of the South lived under a government by carpetbaggers. The pending bill was conceived by the same minds and the same U.S. Department of Justice that induced the President to commit the tragic error of sending the Army into Little Rock. The bill was cleverly drafted and hastily introduced, and is sought to be grafted, without hearings, on a comparatively moderate bill reported out of the House Judiciary Committee.

The desperate filibuster now being conducted in the Senate hinges around this new bill, proposed, devised, and written by people outside of the legislative bodies. It takes from the States and vests in Federal authorities the supervision and control of elections, Federal and State, from the justice of the peace to the Governor of the State. It is important for the people to know and understand from the language of the bill itself how cunningly it is devised to deprive the States of their constitutional and inherent right to determine which of its citizens possess the necessary qualifications to vote under State law.

Here is how the bill will work if enacted into law:

Upon complaint, the first step will be, upon request of the Attorney General, for the Federal court to make a finding whether discrimination exists against Negro voters pursuant to a pattern or practice. The bill does not define what constitutes a pattern or practice and the decision on this question is left entirely to the discretion, whims, or prejudices of a Federal judge.

It does not require that the Federal judge shall be a local one. A judge from any other State in the Union may be designated to preside and supervise the local elections. It will be remembered that a Federal judge from North Dakota was designated to preside over the hearings that led to the Little Rock incident.

There is a total lack in the bill of any provision of how this finding shall be made, or the rules, procedures, or evidence under which it is to be done. After the Federal judge, under the guidance of the Attorney General and without any specific provision for a hearing on the part of the State involved, makes a finding that a pattern of discrimination exists, the decree would establish a conclusive presumption that all Negroes, who were not even parties to the initial proceeding, have in fact been discriminated against. It would make it totally unnecessary for them to prove any alleged discrimination on account of race or color. That is the nub, the crux, and the very heart of the bill.

In the next step, the referee appointed by the Federal judge takes the statement of the applicant and the specific language of the bill requires that the applicant shall be ex parte, which means that the other parties, the State and the authorities in the locality, are denied the opportunity to be heard. The first bill introduced on the subject specifically required that these referees be selected from persons outside of the State. This was such an obvious carpetbagger requirement

that in the revised bill that provision is omitted. But there is no provision in the present bill that the referee shall be a local person with knowledge of local people and it still permits, although it does not require, the court to appoint carpetbagger referees from out of the State.

The next step in this cunning scheme compels the referee to presume that the applicant has been denied the right to vote on account of race or color and to accept as true his representation or misrepresentation as to his age, residence, etc. The referee really does not referee anything. He hears only one side of the issue. The bill, in violation of all standards of due process, denies local registrars of voters or State officials, who are presumed to have denied the right of an applicant to vote on account of race or color, the right to be present with counsel at the so-called hearing, and the right to confront and cross-examine their accusers.

In the next step, the referee reports the result of his phony hearing to the court. At this point only, the attorney general of the State is invited to file exceptions to the report, but since the report contains only the self-serving declaration of the applicant, without the right of confrontation and cross-examination, this invitation is practically meaningless.

When all of this unprecedented procedure has been carried out according to plan, the court gives to the Negro a certificate that he is a qualified voter and then authorizes the referee or such other person or persons as he may designate to attend the election at all polling places, look over the shoulders of the State authorities and see that the person is voted, and that the vote is counted. State law requires election officials to keep people a stated distance from polling places and voting booths, so that under the bill, if they admit the Federal agents, they go to State jails, and if they exclude them, they go to Federal jails.

Likewise, in all other respects, if complaint is made by a Negro voter that the judge's orders have not been carried out to the letter, the State election officials may be hauled into court on a contempt citation and sentenced to jail, or fined, or both, and deprived of the right to trial by jury. It is a frightening prospect that in the United States our Federal jails could be filled with political prisoners consisting of State officials.

Such is the devil's brew that is cooked up for consumption for the Southern States alone. It is utterly unconstitutional. It is devastating. It is the sure breeder of racial troubles of untold proportions.

Rural Envoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey is proud of the many achievements of its young people. They have been among those who rank high in the fields of science, general scholarship, and understanding of citizenship.

The 4-H Clubs of New Jersey are among those groups which have helped our young students to extend their range of interests. An editorial in the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News of March 6, tells about the well-earned honor which

has been given to one club member. His story is one which should be of great interest to other students he will meet in Nepal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RURAL ENVOY

Farm organizations of the future will have their sights set higher than lobbying for subsidies, if 4-H Clubs are any indication. For several years now, the clubs' youth exchange program has sent Americans to Europe and South America while arranging for foreign youths to sample rural life in the United States.

One of the 4-H members chosen to go abroad this summer is Dennis Dalton, of Mendham, a Rutgers senior who has majored in political science with emphasis on Far Eastern culture. He has selected Nepal, that landlocked little country wedged between India and Tibet.

Aside from his long interest in the area, Dennis has other qualifications that should make him an effective ambassador to a people who scorn extravagant materialism. Starting at the age of 11 with a 25-cent weekly allowance, he built up his own egg business and succeeded in winning national poultry awards.

The world would have a more accurate impression of American values if it saw more youths like Dennis Dalton and fewer Hollywood movies.

Senseless Textile Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to insert in the Appendix an editorial entitled, "Senseless Textile Policy," which appeared in the Stanley News and Press, Albemarle, N.C., on Friday, February 26, 1960.

I heartily concur in the views expressed in this editorial, which follows:

SENSELESS TEXTILE POLICY

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the Eisenhower administration and the man most closely associated with the international aspects of the textile situation, startled members of the Charlotte Textile Club before whom he spoke Monday.

Mr. Kearns, who apparently expresses the policies of the present administration, appears very cool toward any move for protection of the American textile industry against foreign imports and contends that other factors besides foreign competition are mostly to blame for the feeling of insecurity among textile leaders.

He even went so far as to say, "Survival for the South's mills lies in 2 billion 'under-clothed' potential customers in the world. They offer the long-range solution to your problems."

The textile industry is now seeking some Government protection from mounting imports from countries where the textile industry is just now developing. They have openly expressed the feeling that mills in this country cannot compete against foreign

manufacturers who not only have the latest in textile machinery, but have labor which works for a fraction of the American wage and can purchase American cotton for 8 cents per pound less than our own mills have to pay.

To be sure, much of the world's textile market lies in the 2 billion underclothed people in all parts of the world.

The principal reason why they are underclothed is because they haven't the money with which to buy.

Since foreign manufacturers can produce textiles much more cheaply than we can, it does not make sense to expect these people who lack money to provide the field for markets for our high-priced articles while we give away the market right here in our own country which could support our mills.

It would be much more reasonable to expect the people of the underdeveloped areas to purchase the low-priced foreign textiles than to ask them to pay our high prices. They would achieve a much better standard of clothing by spending their meager income for items of non-American manufacture than by spending for similar items which come from American mills and cost them more.

Stanly County has a definite stake in this problem. Several local plants make quality textile products. If Mr. Kearns' philosophy is allowed to operate, this Nation will apparently throw its markets open to clothing and textiles from Japan, Hong Kong, or any other place which happens to want to ship to us. Our stores will sell these goods to our people at prices below what they would have to charge for similar American goods.

When our own mills seek to market their products they will have to send traveling salesmen around the world, trying to interest the tribesmen of Africa or the laborers of India in purchasing the items we have caused to be crowded out of our own stores. That sort of selling will be hard and unprofitable, for those tribesmen and laborers know they, too, can get goods from Japan or Hong Kong cheaper than they can get American goods. So, Uncle Sam will have to dig into his "foreign aid" and give them dollars with which to buy his goods.

If Mr. Kearns' thinking represents the thinking of the Washington policymakers, and we have every reason to believe it does, then there needs to be a complete rethinking of the problem.

It must be a sadistic government, indeed, which penalizes our textile mills 8 cents a pound for cotton and then deliberately gives away the markets in our own country to foreigners, telling our textile men to go and look elsewhere, among the "underclothed" people of the world, to find a long-range solution to their problems.

Article on Capital Punishment by Senator Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the subject of capital punishment, containing his views thereon, with particular reference to the capital punishment provisions under the laws pertaining to the District of Co-

lumbia. It is a very learned article by a very well known lawyer, a Member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which I commend to the attention of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD BE GIVEN CONSIDERATION

(By Kenneth B. Keating)

(Senator KEATING, Republican, New York, is also well known as a lawyer and is a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.)

Discussions of capital punishment are rarely dispassionate. Those who favor its retention are accused of being sadistic, warped people full of hate and vengeance. Those who plead for its abolition are typed as weak-minded sentimentalists, more concerned with saving the criminal than protecting society.

Such highly emotional reactions to the imposition of the death penalty are not hard to understand. Cases which present the possibility of a death sentence are sensational and sordid. They draw a tremendous amount of attention. They almost assume the character of a dramatic production and the same deep feelings of sorrow and hate are stirred as by a play. This is not the setting in which reason flourishes.

Another quite different but increasingly common tendency in discussing this subject is to reduce the argument to a bunch of statistical tables. Some tables I have seen would force a statistical logician to conclude that murder increases in places where the death penalty is present and decreases where the death penalty does not exist.

Corollary: Removal of the death penalty is a deterrent to murder. While this may be logical, I do not believe it will strike too many people as being correct.

This subject cannot be considered adequately in either an electrically charged or a coldly calculated context. Neither passions nor collections of figures will lead us to a solution of the problem appropriate to our conception of justice.

This does not mean that studies by penologists and others are useless in our inquiry; nor does it mean that we can ignore the emotional impact of whatever policy is pursued. It just means that we are likely to fall into error if we rely too heavily on either frame of reference.

In my opinion, we must retain capital punishment for those cases in which the reflective moral judgment of the community would be shocked by any lesser penalty and for those cases in which no other sanction is possible. Such cases, thank goodness, are rare. There are some who say that they are nonexistent, but this, unfortunately, is not so.

On one issue in this discussion, there should be universal agreement, and that is that the supreme penalty should never be exacted as the automatic punishment for any predefined crime. It is incredible at this late date, with all the liberal advances which have been made in this field in the last century, that right here in the District of Columbia it is still the law that "death by electrocution" must be imposed in all first-degree murder convictions.

It is this kind of unremedied anachronism in the law that sometimes leads to gross injustice either because it will induce a jury to acquit a guilty felon entirely rather than send him to his death, or because it will require execution of a defendant regardless of the circumstances which may mitigate his offense. There must be room for the exercise of judgment and discretion in any case before the supreme penalty is imposed.

A number of aggravating as well as mitigating circumstances are appropriate for

consideration by the judge and jury in passing sentence. The aggravating circumstances include the fact that the murder was committed by a convict under sentence of imprisonment (think of the situation in which a convict under life sentence kills a prison guard trying to escape); that the murder was committed for hire, or that the murder was especially heinous, atrocious, or cruel, manifesting exceptional depravity.

Certainly, such cases are to be distinguished from killings by a defendant with no previous record, in which the victim may have been an accomplice in some crime, or in which the defendant may have been impaired mentally or under some form of duress. These aggravating and mitigating circumstances are obviously pertinent, and justice in the District of Columbia will be impaired as long as such factors cannot be considered in passing sentence.

Because I have introduced a bill to abolish mandatory capital punishment in the District of Columbia, many people have assumed that I am opposed to capital punishment as such. What I am opposed to is arbitrary punishment, particularly in cases where the death penalty is invoked.

I have in fact introduced another bill in this session of Congress to allow a discretionary death penalty in lynching cases, but here again it will be up to the judge and jury to weigh the circumstances in each case in assessing punishment.

It seems to me that this approach answers the capital punishment problem better than provisions for automatic death penalties or absolute death bars. Where discretion is allowed, the death penalty must be unanimously recommended by the jury and the recommendation must be accepted by the judge.

I have tremendous respect for our jury system and for the judges who serve us. I believe that they better reflect the community conscience in such situations than do either defense lawyers or prosecutors, both of whom are naturally imbued with a passion for their cause.

Let each side have an opportunity to present its arguments. Surround the defendant with every necessary protection. Admit all the evidence pertinent to the issue. Maintain the requirement that the jury be unanimous and that the judge and jury must concur. Do all these things and you will meet the ends and requirements of justice in these cases.

Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the opportunity to pay my respects and heartfelt appreciation for the long and useful life given to the service of mankind by my dear friend, Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson, who recently celebrated her 88th birthday.

While Mrs. Thompson has been active for many years in Republican politics in the State of New Jersey, she has continued always to devote a great portion of her time to the relief of sickness and distress in one form or another to afflicted humanity. She has thousands of friends who rise up and call her blessed and wherever she goes she brings a per-

sonality which is priceless and which gives encouragement to everyone she comes in contact with. I am greatly honored to have her as a friend and the inspiration of her thoughts, her deeds and her wonderful outlook on life have brought me much courage and comfort in the days gone by. I know this to be the testimony of a host of people who glory in wishing her good health and happiness for many days to come.

I include in my remarks an editorial about Mrs. Thompson which appeared in the Asbury Park Press on Sunday, March 6, together with a news article appearing on the same day in the same newspaper.

OUR LEADING CITIZEN

When Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson of Lincroft celebrated her birthday last week the traditional cake carried only 16 candles although the guest of honor has passed the four-score mark. Mrs. Thompson dismissed the incident by saying that it would be rather foolish to crowd 80-odd candles on one cake. That is one explanation; we have a better one. It is this:

No one ever thinks of Mrs. Thompson as a person who is living in her eighth decade. Her interest in public affairs and her driving ambition to see the world a better place in which to live have kept her young. Her usefulness belies her years and, symbolically, 16 candles represent her more accurately than five times that number.

Mrs. Thompson may well be regarded as Monmouth County's foremost citizen. Her efforts to improve her county and State would require pages to recount. She has led a full and fruitful life and no young person can do better than to strive to follow in her footsteps. Everyone is grateful for the years of service that have been allotted Mrs. Thompson. May she have many more ahead of her.

MRS. THOMPSON REMEMBERED BY SCORES ON 88TH BIRTHDAY

MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP.—Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson waded through scores of birthday cards and messages yesterday at her Brookdale Farm, Lincroft, home, and finally found the one she was looking for. It was from Governor Robert B. Meyner.

"After I read this one," she quipped, "I was almost persuaded there is a Democrat one could vote for."

Mrs. Thompson, an outstanding leader in social work in New Jersey for more than 50 years, observed her 88th birthday Wednesday.

Governor Meyner's message read in part: "I speak for all the informed people of New Jersey in saying this State owes a special debt to you for a lifetime of vigorous, fruitful, and generous service on behalf of those who are unequipped to speak for themselves."

Mrs. Thompson was appointed in 1925 as the first Republican State committeewoman from New Jersey and held the post for many years.

MRS. ROOSEVELT SENDS GIFT

Mrs. Thompson received gifts from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, former State Senator H. Alexander Smith; a phone call from Dr. Anna Cross, New York City Health Commissioner; flowers and cards from many other people.

Mrs. Thompson quickly shifted the conversation from herself to her first love, children.

"When one gets into second childhood," she said, "one's chief interest is in the children of today."

"Isn't it remarkable what has happened to the youth since World War II," she said. "Look at what you get on television. You've got to have the fastest gun, a good horse, and all that."

WANTS SOMETHING FOR YOUTH

"I'd love it if we could set up something for our youth in Monmouth County," she said.

"We're going to start a new center for delinquent girls at Allaire," she said. "If we can do the right thing for the girls, perhaps we can get people to understand what delinquency really is and what problems young people face today."

Mrs. Thompson, although technically retired, still attends the juvenile court at Freehold once a week to "rescue delinquents."

She said jokingly, "perhaps they'll be putting some parents in jail instead of the children."

POOL CHANGED BOY

She relates the incident of the boy from the State Home for Boys at Jamestown, whom she allowed to swim in her pool last summer. "It brought a miraculous change in that boy," she said, "almost overnight."

Mrs. Thompson served on the board of control of the State Department of Institutions and Agencies from its inception in 1918 until her retirement in 1957.

MATCHED STATE FUND

She has matched a State appropriation to make up \$75,000 for one psychiatrist, one psychologist, one social case worker, and one remedial reading teacher to treat disturbed children.

She thinks the institutions have got to come closer together if we are to achieve the best effect.

"An example of a fine institution is the one at Glen Gardner," she said.

Russian Language Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Sunday Star of February 21 by George W. Oakes reporting on the increasing interest in this country of the study of the Russian language be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is encouraging to note from Mr. Oakes' article that, whereas only 4 years ago only 5,000 Americans were studying Russian at all educational levels, today 36,000 students are learning the Russian language. I have maintained for many years that we should encourage the study of this language so that we may have as great a knowledge as possible of that country, its people and its institutions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S TAKING THE LANGUAGE?—EVEN HIGH SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS STUDY RUSSIAN NOW

(By George W. Oakes)

About 36,000 students are now learning Russian in regular credit courses in public and private schools, colleges and universities in this country. Thousands more are taking Russian at home on TV, in adult education courses, commercial language schools, and university extension courses but the exact number is impossible to ascertain.

Since Sputnik I dramatized Soviet scientific prowess in 1957, there has been a phe-

nomenal rise in the public urge to study Russian. Perhaps never before have so many Americans suddenly tackled for the first time such a difficult foreign language.

Four years ago, it is estimated, only 5,000 Americans of all ages studied Russian at all educational levels.

Now approximately 15,000 college students alone are taking Russian courses in 415 institutions. Only 165 colleges gave Russian courses 2 years ago. There has been an increase of 700 percent in some colleges even in the last year. A college professor of Russian who had 10 students in 1958, now is likely to have 100. Four years ago a college student who took Russian often was regarded with suspicion—now he's considered patriotic.

FIGURES IN RUSSIA

Latest U.S. Office of Education estimates show that, contrary to the general impression that 10 million Russians are studying English, about half that number, approximately 5 million, are probably enrolled in school and university courses in the Soviet Union.

Officials believe that 3.5 million schoolchildren in Russia were taking English courses in 1957. This figure has dropped slightly in the last 3 years. Another 800,000 university students and possibly the same number of technical school students are believed to be currently learning the English language in the Soviet Union. American education observers who have visited Soviet schools have not been greatly impressed by the quality of the English courses taught there.

Columbia University, one of the chief centers for Russian study, has some 750 students enrolled in the language. Its Russian Institute, started in 1946, has probably trained more than half of all college graduates in the United States who have taken advanced degrees in Russian studies since World War II.

Four hundred and fifty high schools are giving Russian language training, often outside of the regular curriculum, to some 13,500 students. In 1957 only 15 schools taught Russian. None offered it before World War II.

IN HIGH SCHOOLS HERE

Even in the elementary schools there are between 750 and 1,000 students taking Russian in 50 schools, mostly on a voluntary basis, outside of regular class hours.

The rise in the study of Russian in the schools and colleges has been so rapid that educational authorities have not had time to collect exact statistics.

In Washington, Russian was offered first in 1958 at Eastern and Woodrow Wilson High Schools, and later at Western High School. Ninety students, compared to 50 last year, are enrolled in these schools in a 2-year course. All who took the beginning course passed. One of the best classes is conducted at Eastern High School. The district school system allows only students who have shown competence in other foreign languages or in English to take Russian in their last two high school years. Also district school officials do not permit students to drop a foreign language that they have studied for only 2 years in order to learn Russian.

The largest number of elementary schoolchildren in this area studying Russian is in Montgomery County, Md., where 7 schools offer extracurricular courses sponsored by the local parent-teacher association. Next year Russian will be a regular school course.

In nearby Virginia there was such pressure from the teenage children themselves to learn Russian that 3 high schools, Fairfax, Annandale, and Falls Church, organized a Russian language program outside of school hours for a hundred students.

What's happening in the Washington area is typical of the rapidly increasing study of Russian in schools all over the country, ac-

cording to Prof. Helen B. Yakobson, executive officer of George Washington University Department of Slavic Languages and Literature and chairman of the national committee for the promotion of Slavic languages in secondary schools.

Russian-TV courses, given by colleges, and high schools throughout the Nation, have been one of the most significant developments in spreading public study of the Russian language.

LANGUAGE OVER THE TV

Just a year ago George Washington University started a half hour Russian TV program at 6:30 a.m., three times a week. Of the 3,304 officially registered students, all but 87 took the course on a noncredit basis. The entire listening audience for the 45 sessions was estimated at some 30,000. In the second semester of the 1-year course which has just been completed, the number of registered students has dropped, probably due to the early hour.

Professor Yakobson, who also directs the TV course, noted that most students who took it for college credit did better in their grades and knowledge of the basic material than her college students taking a similar Russian course on the campus. Seven members of one Herndon, Va., family—the parents and five children from 6 to 11 years old—all studied the beginners TV course together.

Other universities that have been giving TV courses are Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, University of Washington, University of Alabama, and Western Reserve. All are operated as university extension courses and two are sponsored by scientific organizations.

Last year Pittsburgh ran a 1-hour TV-Russian program three times a week, financed by the Ford Foundation, for 69 of the city's high schools.

In addition to TV courses in Russian now telecast in more than a dozen cities, community and fraternal organizations are helping to satisfy the public demand to study at least elementary Russian. In the Washington area there are about half a dozen of these study groups.

The study of Russian is being pushed in the Government—especially in the State and Defense Departments. Federal Government employees totaling 837, exclusive of those in the Central Intelligence and National Security Agencies, were receiving instruction in Russian as of September 30, 1958, either on a full- or part-time basis. At present, 9 Government officials are doing 30 hours of classroom work a week for 9 months to a year at the Foreign Service Institute and another 25 take a year's course at 7:30 a.m. each day for an hour and a quarter on their own time. Even wives of Foreign Service officers headed for a Russian-speaking post voluntarily join in the full-time course. Many Government employees who have learned beginning Russian either take correspondence courses or work at home on tape recordings.

THE FAVORITE METHOD

The trend in the teaching of Russian in schools, colleges, and on TV is by the audio-lingual method. This is the process of learning a modern foreign language by imitating and memorizing conversational patterns instead of using the grammar translation approach. The new procedure is first hearing, then speaking, reading, and writing the language. In this method major use is made of sound films, filmstrips, tape recordings, and phonograph records.

The extraordinarily rapid growth of the study of Russian plus the increasing use of the audio-lingual method has created a serious shortage of teachers and instruction materials. At present there is a need for several hundred college teachers of Russian. The lack of teachers also has limited the number of high schools that can offer Rus-

sian. As a result of the shortage many schools are forced to employ Russian teachers either with marginal qualifications or who utilize outmoded teaching methods.

Government programs under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are partially meeting the teacher problem. Sixty-nine fellowships for graduate work in Russian were awarded last year under the act and this year the number will be at least doubled in order to provide more college teachers.

SPONTANEOUS ENTHUSIASM

The situation will be somewhat improved by the summer of 1961 when more Russian-trained college students will graduate and, after a summer institute course, will be available for college teaching.

Perhaps the most significant aspect in the remarkable growth of Russian language study in the last few years is that it is spontaneous. Public, not Government, pressure has been responsible. As Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, whose Senate subcommittee made a special report on the Federal Government's foreign language program, has observed, "the stimulus has come from our young people. They understand the kind of world in which they will live."

Mrs. Marjorie Percy Bowen, supervising director of foreign language in the District public schools, points out that schoolchildren want to study Russian for the following reasons: For professional use, because some are language specialists, some on account of their Slavic background, and because many feel knowledge of the language will provide them with a means of understanding and communicating with the Soviet people.

George Washington University conducted a survey among those who took the Russian TV course and found that the largest group were housewives, the next largest scientists. Professor Yakobson feels that the housewives, mostly in the suburbs, found that taking Russian on TV satisfied their starvation for knowledge. Many said that professional advantage was their reason for enrolling and almost as many stated they were concerned about the growth of Russia as a world power of increasing importance.

Although there are some indications that the widespread urge to learn Russian may be a fad, many who have worked with students both in school and adult courses are inclined to doubt it. Actually, since the popularity of Russian is only a few years old, it's probably too early to tell.

How much Russian can a student learn in a high school course? After a 4-year program, a useful competency in the language can be achieved including the four basic skills: Listening comprehension, speaking ability, reading, and writing. A 2-year course of study gives a student a general understanding of the spoken language. And proponents of the TV course claim that a year's intensive study will achieve a working knowledge of Russian—enough at least to read newspapers and get the sense of the spoken and written language.

Philippine Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the time is ripe for the Philippine case for sharing in the U.S. sugar consumption increases either by an outright additional allocation or by allotting the Philip-

pine a percentage in U.S. consumption increases. As you may have read in the press, Russia and Cuba have just concluded a trade treaty in which Russia is buying 1 million tons of Cuban sugar per annum for 5 years. In view of the great restraint shown to Cuba by the United States in the face of provocation, Cuba's growing intimacy with the Communists must cause many of our colleagues to wonder whether Cuba should continue to be so heavily favored in the U.S. Sugar Bowl as hitherto.

The Philippines, on the other hand, for all its national sensibilities and pride, is a proved friend and ally of the United States. Unlike Cuba, the Philippines fought in the last war and suffered heavily.

President Eisenhower, when signing the Sugar Act of 1956, which is now due for renewal, wrote down his hope that special consideration—then denied to the Philippine case—would be extended to the Philippines in 1960.

There is much unemployment in the Philippines. The first impact of any increased sugar quota that may be allotted to the Philippines would be to the benefit of Philippine labor. In sugar production, unlike oil refining, cement manufacturing, and some other industries, labor is a high component of production cost. Philippine employment and Philippine contentment would be affected by an increase in the Philippine sugar quota long before any benefits of that extra quota come through to the sugar capitalists, the majority of whom are the Filipinos.

The U.S. domestic producers in the sugar beet and cane States—including Hawaii—should obviously receive the first consideration from the U.S. Government, but we sincerely believe that second only to them, consideration should be given to the Philippines, the only Christian country between Suez and San Francisco and the one in which the American conception of democracy is most indigenous.

Court Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 5, the Washington Evening Star published a penetrating editorial entitled "Court Under Fire." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT UNDER FIRE

The Supreme Court's decision this week in the Globe case has brought that tribunal under fire from journalistic guns which generally are trained upon anyone else who presumes to criticize the Court. One of the journalistic critics went so far as to say that the Globe decision "deprives the Supreme Court of the intellectual respect it needs

now more than it ever did." All of which brings to mind the adage concerning distinctions which arise, depending upon whose ox is being gored.

Arthur Globe, a temporary employee of Los Angeles County, was dismissed after he had refused to tell a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether he was a member of the Communist Party. Globe had been warned by his superiors that, under regulations and State law, a refusal to answer for any reason would result in his dismissal for insubordination. He refused on several grounds, including, in general terms, the first and fifth amendments.

The Court's problem was to distinguish this situation from its 1958 ruling in the case of *Harry Slochower*, a Brooklyn College professor, who was dismissed by the city of New York for refusing to answer a question concerning past Communist affiliations. He invoked the fifth amendment ground of possible self-incrimination. Slochower's dismissal, the Court said, was unconstitutional.

As we read the two opinions, the distinction drawn between the Globe case and the Slochower case is an exceedingly fine one. Nevertheless, there is a distinction. And certain facts should be considered before one concludes that the Court has forfeited its right to intellectual respect, or, as Justice Black put it, that the Globe decision "does not bode well for individual liberty in America."

The Court divided 5 to 4 in the Slochower case, with Justice Reed writing what we thought was a persuasive dissent. The division in the Globe case was 5 to 3. In a companion case this week, involving a permanent fellow employee of Globe's, the division was 4 to 4. (The Court did not discuss this case, but the even division had the effect of also upholding the permanent employee's dismissal on the same grounds as those in the Globe case.)

An interesting point is that Chief Justice Warren, who joined the majority in the Slochower case, did not participate in either of this week's decisions—presumably because he will still Governor of California when the statute involved in the Globe case was under consideration. In some future case he might well join this week's minority. Another interesting point is that Justice Clark wrote the majority opinions in both Globe and Slochower. Finally, the 5-to-3 majority in the Globe case resulted from the fact that Justice Frankfurter, also in the majority in Slochower, agreed with Justice Clark that a valid distinction could be drawn between the two decisions.

To us, this suggests honest differences of opinion on fine points of law. We do not think the Court, as a result of Globe, should be refused intellectual respect, nor do we believe that the Globe ruling raises a threat to individual liberty in America. It is possible, of course, that the Globe decision amounts in practical effect to a modification of Slochower. If so, we are not alarmed. For our sympathies were with the four dissenters in the Slochower case, and we would welcome a tendency on the part of the Court, if such a tendency exists, to move away from the decision.

Alberto Gualano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, a true idealist died the other day. He had

spent a lifetime fighting in righteous causes for the welfare and protection of the rights of the immigrant Italian. He was born at San Vincenzo al Volturno, Province of Campobasso, Italy, on the 31st of March 1868. Upon his emigration to the United States—having received a law degree at Naples—he further completed his law study at the Illinois College of Law in Chicago, Ill. He became a famous and influential member of the bar association and served as judge of the Municipal Court of the City of Chicago. The greatest part of his brilliant professional career was spent in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois. He sparkled with fervor in defense of his countrymen. His popularity was acclaimed by all the citizens of the community. No one had greater success in lifting the enslavement of his people. The second-class citizenship label of the bigoted disappeared.

During his retirement he established residence in the city of San Gabriel in the San Gabriel Valley, Calif., and again the urge to put into play his great literary and oratorical talents sought an outlet in the establishment of a cultural newspaper publication, titled "L'Italo-Americano di Los Angeles." He also was the author of many illustrious articles on various public subjects; some controversial and others informative. He had truly a great mind. His writings in book or pamphlet form were given the highest acclaim in most noted Academy of Scholars in Italy. He was invited to many memberships in these societies and in one he was elected president. His favorite writings—two periodicals—The Story of Rome and Italy and his *Numi Tutelari* were published exclusively in the great daily, *L'Italia*—The Italian News of Chicago—edited by the distinguished editor, *Aria Lo Franco*.

The Congressmen of Illinois, cognizant of his great service to the community for a long period of years, mourn his passing. A telegram, as follows, was sent to his dear widow, Tina, and daughters Ida, Virginia, Amelia, and his son Alberto, Jr., presently a lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force. Also, his brother Ettore Gualano, master of music.

MARCH 7, 1960.

Mrs. Tina Gualano and Family,
San Fernando, Calif.:

It is with a deep feeling of sadness that I learned of Judge Alberto's death. He spent his life fighting for the Italian cause in America and his career was typical of the great leaders before him—a series of political sacrifices. He was energetic in his courageous political activity and, as an honest man, fought against great odds.

He had the confidence of the Italo-Americans and spent his time, energy, and money in the advancement of the Italo-American immigrant. He was a loyal friend and an earnest, outspoken adversary. His success as an editor, and author, and attorney, carried him to brilliant accomplishments throughout his career. As a man of letters in his fiery editorials and persuasive oratory, he merited the distinguished recognition that the Italo-American public gave to him.

He lived and died a great American. Your loss is the community's loss. I know that you, his family, contributed so much to his happiness in life and you must be proud to enjoy such a distinguished heritage.

In the death of this great leader the people of California and Illinois have lost an outstanding citizen and public servant. We mourn his passing with you.

May I offer you my deepest sympathy and sincere condolences.

Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

In appreciation, the widow's reply, herewith:

MARCH 7, 1960.

Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The eulogy that so many tried to express, came to me this morning in the form of a telegram from Washington, D.C., signed ROLAND V. LIBONATI. Who else, but the one so highly esteemed by him could put into words what the grey-haired idealist really was? I feel so completely relaxed now, that now through you a voice that has been stilled will echo and reecho in the halls of the Congress of these United States. His guiding hand will be with you and I pray that in the years to come, his son, Lt. Alberto N. Gualano, Jr., USAF, will justify the heritage you painted so beautifully in words. This family will always pray for the successful fulfillment of your duty and your freedom from care. God bless you.

Mrs. Tina Gualano and Family.

The Voice of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this week's Time magazine contains an interesting article about my good friend A. H. Kirchhofer, who is editor of the Buffalo Evening News. Mr. Kirchhofer is one of America's great newspapermen, and a legend among the people of western New York.

He has worked long, hard, and successfully for the welfare of Buffalo, New York State, and the Nation. His is the voice of Buffalo, and it is a voice that is strong for the good. I ask unanimous consent that the article about this fine man be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time, Mar. 7, 1960]

THE VOICE OF BUFFALO

The city room, tidy and peaceful as any library, is free of the crumpled balls of copy paper and other litter usually found around working newsmen. No smoke hangs blue above the desks; by executive order in the interest of "increased efficiency," smoking is prohibited. To make phone calls, most reporters retire to soundproofed glass booths along the wall; when they want a copy boy, they do not shout, but press a buzzer button. The big room has an almost palpable serenity, helped along by the sight of the old-fashioned dust jackets worn by some of the copyreaders.

Upon this scene, every midmorning, arrives the Buffalo Evening News' editor, Alfred Henry Kirchhofer—an austere, bony-cheeked man of 67 in rimless glasses and a dark blue suit. He looks much like Woodrow Wilson, a resemblance not fancied by Kirchhofer, who, like his paper, is a lifelong, root-stock Republican. Two feet six inches away from Kirchhofer's desk a visitor's chair is bolted

to the floor; that is as close as Kirchhofer wants anyone to approach. Before long a flurry of blue memos pours from his desk to every department. Sensing the news possibilities in some current local development, Kirchhofer hands out the assignment. "I can't put my hands on the fish," he says, "but the smell is there." By 2 o'clock, with the help of 190 respectful and sometimes awe-struck editorial staffers, Editor Kirchhofer has produced another issue of the newspaper that is as much a part of Buffalo as its 400,000 city-owned trees.

LOCAL IN FLAVOR

The Buffalo News is a big (circulation 285,206), powerful and prosperous example of the U.S. provincial daily, whose voice rings commandingly at home but is rarely heard outside. The News' province embraces eight upstate New York counties, of which Buffalo (population 607,000), Erie County seat, is the industrial core. To the 1,642,500 inhabitants of its territory, the News speaks loudly of things they want to hear.

The paper is intensely local in flavor; it devotes nearly as much space to domestic news as it does to national news. One of its most popular features is a three- to four-column chronicle of Buffalo items, headed "Daily News Summary" and set in eye-straining agate type. Here the News reports birth, traffic mishap, burglary, blaze, marriage license, missing person, court judgment, bankruptcy and stolen car. Deaths, society notices, club meetings, and high school athletic contests get more generous shares of space.

The city's brawling political affairs, in which dozens of factions spiritedly divide along party, ethnic, and religious lines, are covered with the thoroughness of a paper whose editor believes that "politics and Government turn out to be our job." The News' republicanism, usually confined to the editorial page, gives local Democrats the conceptions. Just last month Mayor Frank A. Sedita, a Democrat, went on television to bewail what he considered lopsided News coverage of his office. But between swipes at the paper, the mayor reads it attentively, takes all but two of the seven daily editions, and in cooler moments has been heard to say that "the News' pages have been fair to my administration."

The News has been Republican ever since its establishment, 79 years ago, by Edward H. Butler, a Scranton, Pa., newsman. Butler did help one Democratic mayor of Buffalo, Grover Cleveland, become President of the United States, but this was hardly more than a burst of local pride. After Cleveland took office, in 1885, the News picked a quarrel with him, and has not since supported a Democrat for either Governor or President.

By sensibly concentrating on homegrown news, Butler handily survived the killing competitions of early 20th-century journalism. Buffalo has put as many as 12 dailies in the field, including 3 in German and 2 in Polish. The only survivors are the News, in the afternoon, and the morning Courier-Express, which publishes the city's only Sunday paper, but has only about half the daily circulation of the News.

LIKE A TOOTHBRUSH

The News has remained in the hands of Butler's heirs, but Alfred Henry Kirchhofer runs it. Buffalo-born, a trained-on-the-job newsman who did not go to college, Kirchhofer started on the News in 1915 as church reporter, worked 12 to 18 hours a day in his course to the top. When Founder Butler's son, Edward, Jr., died in 1956, Kirchhofer, then managing editor, took full charge. On the News' masthead his name stands above that of Publisher James H. Righter, a Butler son-in-law.

Unbending and unflamboyant, Kirchhofer keeps his staff loyal and happy by paying handsome salaries: 25 News men make more than \$10,000 a year. The News stylebook, largely drafted by Kirchhofer and cast in his own stern image, warns staffers that "motherhood is treated as an institution, not as a situation comedy"; advises them to "avoid mention of hideous creatures or gruesome circumstances." For years the paper fastidiously designated rats as "rodents." Says Kirchhofer stiffly: "We don't use 'rat' on page 1 unless it bit Eisenhower or he bit it."

Kirchhofer is as much a municipal fixture as his newspaper. He lives quietly with his wife in a modest two-story home on Hallam Road, bordering on the city's most fashionable neighborhood. By nature aloof, he likes to putter around his garden, has been seen standing moodily alone, in topcoat and straw hat, on a summer beach. But Kirchhofer is a vigorous swimmer in the main currents of city life—he is a trustee of the Community Chest, a board member of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and the University of Buffalo, and belongs to both the Buffalo Country Club and the Cult of the White Buffalo, an order dedicated to making Buffalo "a better place to live in."

In fulfilling its mission, the News has become an ingrained Buffalo habit that grew with the city and faithfully reflects its image—solid, conservative, industrious, and, at first glance, colorless. "It looks like a dull sheet," says a former city editor under Kirchhofer, now in Manhattan. "But after you've been in Buffalo a few weeks, you find you can't do without it. You miss it like a toothbrush if you don't see it every day."

United States Unprepared on Pacific Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Mr. Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 27, 1960:

UNITED STATES UNPREPARED ON PACIFIC FRONT
(By Keyes Beech)

TOKYO.—In the midst of the great debate on the state of America's military preparedness, there are a few things worth noting about the Pacific:

1. U.S. defenses in the Pacific are more vulnerable than at any time since the end of World War II. The vulnerability is so great, in fact, that it could lead the Communist bloc into the kind of major miscalculation that brought on the Korean war.

2. Soviet Russia has the nuclear capability to knock out every major U.S. base in the Pacific from Japan to Hawaii.

3. The United States is not prepared to fight a conventional limited war, which is precisely the kind of war it is most likely to have to fight in this part of the world.

4. Regardless of whether the United States is a second-rate military power, a great many Asians think it is. And in this part of the world what counts is not necessarily the way things are but the way people think things are.

By far the most significant military event in this part of the world in years was the recent highly successful firing of two Soviet ICBM rockets into the central Pacific.

The Soviet tests served several useful purposes. They served notice that the central Pacific is no longer an American lake, a great psychological jolt to many Americans and a sobering thought to anti-Communist Asians who have cast their lot with the United States. They demonstrated they could hit any target of their choice with an accuracy of 1.5 miles from a distance of 8,000 miles.

The rockets that fell 1,000 miles southwest of Hawaii could just as easily have fallen on Pearl Harbor—with a nuclear warhead. They could have hit Guam and eliminated the retaliatory power of the U.S. Strategic Air Command base there. They could have done the same thing to U.S. missile bases on Okinawa.

In addition, the Russians managed to leave the impression with impressionable Asians that U.S. defenses in the Pacific are weaker than they actually are.

Perhaps the most ominous fact—and it is a fact—about these long-range Soviet shots is that the United States has no warning system that would tell when an ICBM was on its way. The United States and its allies have a network of nearly 400 early warning radar stations scattered from the Philippines to northern Japan. The network includes 100 smaller ground control intercept stations. But none of these stations is capable of tracking space rockets or ICBMs.

U.S. airbases in Japan also live under a nuclear gun—from a complex of intermediate range ballistic missile launching sites in the vicinity of Vladivostok.

Here again the United States is at a distinct disadvantage, for it has no missile bases in Japan. The United States-Japan security treaty specifically forbids the United States from bringing nuclear weapons into Japan, which tends to minimize the effectiveness of Japan-based U.S. airpower. The U.S. 7th Fleet, our most powerful striking force in the Pacific, packs an enormous nuclear punch. Also, it is not a fixed target. It could retaliate swiftly.

But where ships of the 7th Fleet would go for supplies and replenishments after getting off their missiles is another matter. Every U.S. naval base in the Pacific from Japan to Pearl Harbor is within range of Soviet missiles.

There may be some comfort in the assumption that the Russians won't use their missile arsenal because any attack in the Pacific or elsewhere would mean a general nuclear war. But this is cold comfort to military men who must reckon not with Communist intent but with Communist capability.

However, the possibility of a surprise nuclear attack is not what worries U.S. commanders most. U.S. Pacific bases would, after all, be backwater targets in a nuclear war.

But what does—or should—worry them is the possibility that the United States will have to fight the kind of war that was supposed to end with Korea—a limited or brush-fire war with conventional weapons.

This the United States is not prepared to do. Yet such a war could come at one of several places where southeast Asia's soft, tempting underbelly is exposed to Red China's hungry gaze. Laos and Vietnam are two places where it could happen.

The United States has two Army divisions in Korea. But these are only 65 percent of strength and the rifle companies are manned largely by Koreans. What's more, they are in fixed positions for duty in Korea and not available for other assignments.

These seem to be reasons for concern if not alarm.

Problems of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Aging recently made a far-reaching report on the problems faced by those Americans who find their way of life changed after they reach what others describe as advanced age. The report was one expression of national concern about a national issue. It emphasized that we must have an all-out mobilization of interest on the part of Government agencies, private groups, and all citizens. The need for such a response is, I think, obvious. Americans must realize that we must plan adequately and act effectively to deal with the looming crises tied to the overall problem of the aging and the aged.

Mr. President, a five-article series in the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal recently discussed the question.

I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the last article in the series in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Mar. 4, 1960]

THE SENIOR CITIZENS—PLANS TO AID AGED
SIFTED BY FEDERAL, STATE GOVERNMENTS
(By S. Walter deLazaro)

Society and government from the municipal to Federal level are poised to tackle the problems confronting the Nation's 16 million senior citizens, including 37,000 in Union County.

A solution to the acute crisis facing persons 65 and older will depend on the efforts put forth by various groups.

Several recommendations to cope with the plight of the elderly have been made by the Senate Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and Aging, following hearings in Washington and seven other cities.

As stated before, the Senate group has suggested that Congress provide more financial aid for low-rent housing and for nursing homes which meet designated standards.

In addition, the subcommittee, headed by Sen. PATRICK V. McNAMARA, Michigan Democrat, recommends a substantial increase in old-age benefits from a minimum of \$33 a month to at least \$50, expansion of the system of old-age, survivors, and disability benefits to include health service and action by the States to outlaw discrimination against employment of the aged.

"A major need of America's aged and aging," a subcommittee report asserts, "is a central agency in the Federal establishment to represent them and their problems."

FEDERAL OFFICE SUGGESTED

Therefore, the Senate body suggests a U.S. Office of the Aging should be created to cope with the full range of problems of America's citizens.

"The creation of such an agency," the subcommittee admits, "will not automatically solve the problems of senior citizens."

"It will, however," according to the subcommittee, "establish on a permanent basis an agency with authority to take positive action nationally and develop cooperative re-

lations with States and local communities in programs for the aging."

U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of Westfield said he has reserved judgment on some of the subcommittee's proposals until they reach final legislative form.

But, he added, he considers the subcommittee's program "a thoughtful and much-needed one."

"The subcommittee majority is not disputing the devotion of today's children and middle-aged adults," Senator WILLIAMS stated. "Its proposals are intended to help State and hometown agencies do even a better job," he continued.

LOCAL AGENCIES ASSISTED

Senator WILLIAMS asserted that the New Jersey State Division of Aging is helping private and public agencies and groups in getting results where they count most—at the neighborhood and hometown level.

"Administrators in charge of the State division don't try to do the job alone," he added. "And certainly Federal Government can't do it alone, either."

"We shall need total mobilization of interest by all Americans," the Senator emphasized. "If the subcommittee helps accomplish that much, it shall have accomplished a great deal."

Some 3,000 delegates from throughout the Nation will meet in Washington next January to discuss some of the problems of the aged.

The White House conclave will probe into such problems as housing, medical care, recreation, religion, job opportunities, and retraining programs.

REPLACEMENT SERVICE

Some officials hope that a huge replacement service for the older person who wants to launch a new career will result from the national meeting.

Prior to the Washington session, various States will hold their own conferences in preparation for the White House session.

In New Jersey, various segments of the population, including labor, business, and welfare workers met in Trenton last year to discuss the needs of the senior citizen. Many carried home ideas for helping the aged in their communities.

No concrete programs resulted, but the awareness of the crisis was there, and with it a promise of things to come.

In Princeton this week the problems of providing long-term care for the aged and chronically ill were explored during a day-long institute held by the New Jersey Hospital Association.

While it has been emphasized that assistance must be given to the elderly, Elizabeth Welfare Director Theodore Rathjen pointed out that many senior citizens must learn to help themselves.

GUARDIANSHIP PROBLEM

The welfare official noted that his agency finds itself with a problem involving guardianship of aged persons who are not as mentally alert as formerly.

"There should be some action to expedite guardianship procedures for people in this situation and I'd like to see more interest in this problem," he asserted.

"A real, acute problem is that many need help," Mr. Rathjen stated, "and they won't ask for it."

He suggested that the Senior Citizens Center in Elizabeth consider a program under which one of its members would attempt to convince an elderly person in need to seek help from the agency.

The center is among several old-age clubs established in this area to promote recreation for the elderly and give senior citizens a chance to make new friends as they reach the lonely years.

As ideas and suggestions are offered by all segments of society, the groundwork is laid

for aid to the Nation's growing number of senior citizens.

But an increase in public interest is vital to support the foundation on which programs will be built to solve the problems facing the aged.

The Keating-Van Zandt Bills (S. 2882-H.R. 9841) Will Adjust Conditions of Competition Between Certain Domestic and Foreign Industries With Respect to the Level of Wages and Working Conditions in the Production of Articles Imported Into the United States

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1960, Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, introduced S. 2882 and on the same date, I introduced H.R. 9841 as a companion measure. This legislation is designed to adjust conditions of competition between certain domestic and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States. In plain language, if the legislation is enacted into law it would eliminate the existence of a condition that has long plagued American industry and which has produced much of the unemployment the Nation is faced with today.

The cause of unemployment in various industries of the United States has long been recognized as being due in great measure to the unfair competition American industry has been forced to contend with from cheaply manufactured foreign goods that flood the American marketplace.

It is a matter of simple arithmetic to determine the true picture. When you consider that a manufacturer in a foreign country pays a wage equivalent in dollars to 10, 15, or 25 cents per hour, naturally he enjoys a competitive advantage over an American manufacturer who pays the traditional wage standards of industry in the United States. This is further emphasized when you realize that wages represent a large portion of the cost of production.

Americans are proud of the fact that sweatshop conditions in the United States were outlawed at the turn of the century and that today there is no denial of the fact that American wage earners are worthy of their hire. Every right-thinking American favors the wage earner being given the opportunity to enjoy the high standards of living in the United States. To make certain that such an opportunity is constantly safeguarded we need and must maintain a strong industrial economy. To do otherwise is to encourage unemployment and with it the misery that follows in its wake.

As an example of the serious inroads made against American industry by cheaply manufactured foreign goods, one needs only to cite the chaos and the uncertainty of the future that are the lot of the following industries: china and glassware, textiles, clothing, hand-tools, kitchen utensils, small appliances, umbrellas, rugs, toys, bicycles, light-machinery, footwear, athletic equipment, plumbing fixtures, tile and ceramic fixtures, etc.

According to the February 1960 issue of *Steel Facts* a steel executive recently stated:

With imports of steel up and exports of steel declining, American mills and American workers have had a combined loss of 6.6 million tons of steel output in the past 2 years.

He estimated:

Had this steel been made here at home it would have provided employment for nearly 52,000 people in the steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, what is the answer to such a distressing situation where the jobs of American wage earners are threatened or destroyed through the uncontrolled importation of foreign goods manufactured at slave labor wage rates?

It is now a thoroughly documented fact that the swift, accelerating course of events taking place in American foreign trade and competition has rapidly outdistanced both our legislative and commercial ability to keep apace.

Two years ago when the trade agreements program was extended for 4 years a number of my colleagues in the House rose to caution and protest in the name of prudence that such a lengthy extension was clearly out of key with the tell-tale signs of rapidly rising imports and diminishing exports so clearly evident even in 1958.

Be that as it may, this House cannot now escape the responsibility for the fact that when we slammed shut the doors of this body to the pleas of import-injured industry and labor for 4 long years we have heard a great many echoes of other closing doors; namely, those leading into our mills and mines and factories. Once open to all who sought gainful and honest employment, many of those passageways are now locked and barred by the deluge of excess imports from foreign factories financed by funds which we so generously provided and continue to provide in large volume.

The distressing situation prompts me to ask this question in all sincerity. Which distinguished Member here will step forward today and meet face to face the chairman of a New England shoe manufacturing concern who recently said, "Sure all this free trade may be great for international relations, but how do I explain that to several hundred of my employees who were waiting for a midyear bonus and got termination notices instead?"

Or perhaps some of our distinguished Members would prefer to meet the group of industrialists, or the labor union which stands with them on this issue, whose industry has been whittled from 184 firms to 56. Referring to imports, they said:

Sharing a market is one consideration; but to dominate it completely is not justified.

In my opinion, this statement offers one of the most accurate descriptions of the so-called reciprocal trade program that has yet been made.

I now ask: What are you going to tell employers and employees such as these? Will you say,

Don't worry fellow, the trade agreements program has only 2 years left to run and we will deliberate over it then?

You can easily guess the retort, which would be short and to the point:

Congressman, you explain that to my wife and kids.

Despite the apathy and the anxieties of our Department of State and the fact that this is an election year, the time for legislative action is now—not 1962. Members in gratifying numbers from both sides of the aisle are voicing their concern almost daily on the issue of crippling competition. They realize there is a time and place for everything, including politics, but now is the time for straight talk on a problem so serious that few political districts remain untouched.

Let us consider two facts: One, that the foreign trade tail is wagging the dog of our domestic economy. Do not misunderstand me. I stand fully in favor of developing our foreign markets to their maximum capacity and if there are untapped foreign markets available, let's go after them. What I am saying, however, is that the real bread and butter market is and will remain the domestic market. Even our big exporting corporations understand this. Our foreign exports represent but 5 percent or so of the domestic giant's trading capacity. For this reason, the home base must not continue to be subjected to competition from low-cost imports, often encouraged by our diplomats who piously plead that they never interfere in domestic matters.

And the second point: Our State Department reflects the wishes of peoples, friendly and otherwise, all over the globe. But we of the House speak for the will of the American people, a known but sometimes overlooked truism. The State Department's interest is international while our first concern is the welfare of our Nation. The State Department alleges no jurisdiction on the domestic front while claiming a high priest's privilege as sole custodian over all our international activities.

However, in practice the Department of State couches one and all of its programs including that of free trade in the name of the national interest. Whether State Department officials realize it or not, the phrase contains convenient words to make more palatable their theories to the Congress.

Mark you, it is Congress through which the pulse of the people beats. It is the Congressman, not the diplomat, who is reminded of this fact each morning as he sits down to a desk stacked high with letters from home. It is in this daily ritual that we search for the interests of the people, not in the pages of scholarly books on the philosophical foundations of international commerce. It is these letters with a misspelled word here or a

grammatical error there that speak to us with a humble but deafening eloquence that reveals the emptiness of State Department slogans designed to promote free trade.

In addition to the direct and intolerable interference in the economic stability of this country brought about by international-minded administrators of our trade agreements, there remains the question of jurisdiction in America's foreign commerce.

We all know that the Constitution under article I, section 8, provides that responsibility over foreign commerce rests squarely with the Congress. We know on the other hand that it is the task of the executive branch to carry out the duties accorded that body in the political, cultural, and similar areas. In 1934, the Congress delegated certain management activities in the theater of foreign commerce to the executive branch of Government. It is necessary to acquaint the Members of the House with the subsequent operations and conduct of our foreign trade policies since that time and especially since World War II.

The Department of State has not only picked up the ball and run with it, it has changed the rules of the game and by so doing has distorted the game beyond all recognition. It has construed our delegation of a simple managerial function to be a complete, final, and outright grant of basic congressional rights. And now we see to the Representative in Congress who dares to question the so-called prerogatives of the Department of State.

To those who say the executive free trader should not have it both ways, let me reply that they already have it. Because of the distressing situation I am speaking in the name of the people of Pennsylvania who resent the loss of markets and jobs through uncontrolled imports of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

The reason for insisting on fair trade and not free trade is based on the desire to protect and preserve the jobs of American wage earners. Let us look at the situation as it is, not as we might like it to be. We have high priced products which cannot compete because everything that goes into that product is high priced: the wages, the salaries, the material, the taxes, the overhead, the advertising, and so forth. Would you quarrel with this? Would you be the one to take the first cut?

If you are in utilities, would you be the first one to cut your water or light bill in half to a given steel company so that its bids against foreign companies on ships or structural jobs would not be double that of its competitors abroad? If you are its supplier would you be the first to reduce your prices on ingots a similar amount? And taxes—are you and I prepared to unburden our hypothetical firm in domestic steel or other industries from the crushing load which it carries?

Who among the workers, the businessmen—any of us—stands ready to step forward to take the first reduction on payday? Were such a question truly put to the test, the silence I dare say

would be profound. We are priced out of world markets by our high-priced products because we are a high priced Nation so to speak. Is this to be considered a felony? Are we to live with this horrible crime on our collective consciences like some unforgiven sin of the past? Must American industry now be battered and penalized by imports created by the force of circumstances which elevated our Nation's economy and its standard of living to the industrial mountain top, relatively out of reach of the foreign economies in the valleys below? For these achievements, surely we should not be asked to hang our heads.

By some peculiar emotional twist the free traders seemingly look upon our economy as some unclean spirit through whose veins flow the dirty, degrading dollars of life. Our relative economic abundance seems to prey on their minds. They have reached the conclusion that the quicker we can spend ourselves down to the economic level of other countries, the sooner hastens the day of our rebirth as a socially conscious Nation with a new image and a pure industrial soul.

Realizing that the voices of protest grew louder against unfair competition and the State Department's grants and gifts to competitive trading nations abroad, another way had to be devised which would hasten our acceptability into the free-trade academy. Such a way was recently discovered through a market give-away program.

As the foreign manufacturer wedged his competitive offense deeper into the fabric of our markets, not a word, not a murmur was heard from the free traders. It would be somewhat inconsistent, to say the least, were they to take sides when one considers the fact that the International Cooperation Administration, the handmaiden of the State Department, had led hand in hand approximately 25,000 of our foreign friends since 1950 into the very vitals of our industries and to study and learn the essence of our economy. In addition, Americans are now being sent abroad officially to teach the men who run the marketing operations of foreign producers the latest methods of merchandising. In this connection, we have shipped abroad tens of billions of dollars of the most up-to-date machinery and equipment.

American style techniques will soon move their wares into the United States as well as third countries where we are in even more serious competitive difficulties than at home, if that is possible.

The question which immediately faces us is: How are we going to legislate ourselves out of the corner into which the executive branch has painted us? And bear in mind that preparations are now underway here in Washington for the forthcoming Geneva meeting in October of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. A new list containing many hundreds of domestically made products is being readied for the sacrificial altar of free trade. All, of course, in the national interest you understand. Tariffs already too low are to be cut another 20 percent.

It is my belief that many of my colleagues share the view that this House is ready to act.

A noted author once said in chiding his opposition:

If you have 10 boys but only 5 hats you solve the problem by simply lopping off 5 heads.

Are we to lop off and dissect the highly industrial, integrated organism of the American economy in order to make it artificially conform to the "hats" of other nations? Or do we select the prudent and reasonable course, by passing the measures, long overdue, which insure our domestic producers a fair share of commerce in the marketplace?

If we are to come to grips with the issue of foreign imports this body must provide our people with equitable conditions of competition. Feasibly, such conditions might take the form of an escalating duty or quota on incoming products, flexibly administrable to all classes or commodities according to their port of entry price irrespective of countries of origin. Thus the wage gap would be automatically reduced.

Regardless of the final form which remedial measures may take, the following principle should be the foundation for our actions: foreign producers should not be enabled to enjoy commercial advantages within the American market not obtainable or available to the American producer in competition with the same or similar product.

If this precept were adhered to, the products of American industry could have a fighting chance to compete with foreign imports which, in comparison, are priced at ridiculously low levels. Conversely, were this principle to be applied by foreign countries to our own exported products affording us no greater nor less an advantage in their markets than their producers enjoy there, we would fare considerably more favorably than at present. Our industry would not then find it necessary to send its capital abroad in order to compete.

For example, an American car which retails for about \$3,000 here is now selling for \$4,000 to \$6,000 and higher in European countries. In other words, our exporting manufacturers not only do not enjoy the commercial conditions of the automakers abroad in the European theater of competition, but are also needlessly tarried out of contending in a market where low prices provide their own built-in protection. It was because of this that our automobile manufacturers began producing in England, Germany, and France and then sending some of their output overseas back to this country.

Whether foreign producers pay their employees high wages or low wages, charge high prices or low prices, organize common markets or not, pass voluntary-quota resolutions or not, let me say that it is their right to do so as it is surely our right to do that which serves our interests.

Parenthetically, I might add that it becomes both irksome and tiresome to read and hear the meddlesome musings of the disciples of free trade who having

helped create our problem now intend to right things by foisting their socioeconomic theories upon others abroad.

"In due time," say our free traders in their efforts to make all countries alike in this age of conformity, "foreign wages, productivity, and so forth, will increase everywhere and then all the nations will come to us and buy our machines and goods." On the contrary, the facts show that our customers, for example in Latin America, are turning away in droves from the United States and now do their shopping in Europe, and so forth, where other trading nations are moving to higher levels of industrial productivity. In addition, they want to make for themselves the goods which we formerly sold them. This kind of outcome was not contemplated by Adam Smith.

I feel it my duty to suggest to the exponents of free trade that they explain their theories to the workers of Pennsylvania who like to work and eat even as you and I.

Meanwhile, here in the House we have a job to do. We may have our personal views on various aspects of international affairs but at hand is our professional duty which must concern itself with the problem as it affects us and in those areas where we can effect the honest regulation of excessive imports.

In short, let us stop theorizing about what Europe may or may not do, or what Japan has or has not done, and do here what must be done. If the foreign producer wants to sell his product in his country at his prices, that is his business. But if he sells his products at his prices in my country, then it becomes my business, and I will continue to consider it my business as long as his low-priced goods lay waste the markets and destroy the jobs and industries of the State of Pennsylvania.

Twin jeopardy faces both sales and jobs every time foreign products capture a larger slice of our markets. Our working people face on the wage level what the producer meets on the price level in competition with imports. If employer and employee are to unite on this issue both must clearly understand this. Debates about the low-waged foreign workers who make the low-priced foreign goods that abundantly stock our shelves and warehouses being over or underpaid become rather academic at this stage of the game. They have legislators and labor unions to provide them recourse.

Similarly whether we have high prices because of high wages or high wages because of high prices does not nullify the demand for immediate action before we arrive at the point where we will lose both by default.

In the market of wage competition we are sadly outpriced, too, as the following approximations indicate.—Basic average hourly wage before benefits, in U.S. equivalents:

The Japanese textile worker receives a wage of about 16 cents; the Italian, 27 cents; the French, 51 cents; the German, 46 cents; the English, 68 cents; and the American, \$1.58 per hour.

The Japanese wood worker receives about 18 cents; the Italian, 24 cents; the

French, 54 cents; the German, 48 cents; the English, 50 cents; and the American, \$1.98 per hour.

The Japanese chemical worker receives about 37 cents; the Italian, 37 cents; the French, 49 cents; the German, 57 cents; the English, 68 cents; and the American, \$2.44 per hour.

The Japanese leather worker receives about 23 cents; the Italian, 30 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 40 cents; the English, 47 cents; and the American, \$1.59 per hour.

The Japanese glass worker receives about 26 cents; the Italian, 36 cents; the French, 47 cents; the German, 55 cents; the English, 70 cents; and the American, \$2.22 per hour.

The Japanese steel worker receives about 41 cents; the Italian, 46 cents; the French, 53 cents; the German, 59 cents; the English, 83 cents; and the American, \$3.10 per hour.

The Japanese machinery worker receives about 28 cents; the Italian, 36 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 59 cents; the English, 74 cents; and the American, \$2.50 per hour.

The Japanese auto worker receives about 26 cents; the Italian, 46 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 64 cents; the English, 94 cents; and the American, \$2.69 per hour.

The addition of employer and government benefits to the foreign worker's wage would increase the overall take-home pay from about 20 percent in the case of Germany to as high as 60 or 70 percent in the case of some Italian workers, with other countries falling somewhere within this wage spread. The fringe benefits accruing to the American worker are not as high as those abroad in proportion to the basic wage, although in some categories such as overtime, they may be. Yet 10 percent of \$2.69—average U.S. auto wage—would be higher than 50 percent of 36 cents—average Japanese auto wage. In the United States, overtime generally takes effect above the 40-hour point whereas some foreign workers may not receive such benefits until they have worked 44 hours or more.

While it is difficult to obtain accurate statistical data of comparative hourly income in different countries and industries for the same period of time because of the complexity and variation of conditions under which such benefits apply, it can be conservatively stated that one inescapable fact stands forth: Benefits notwithstanding, in his relation to foreign workers the American worker is waged out of the market. Current benefits received by foreign workers could well double, triple or more the amount of his basic wage and foreign products would still outprice American-made products.

While certain Government officials continue to insist that we are not priced out of the market, our competition readily concedes that we are.

"From the cost point of view," said one British steel industry official, "we had an advantage over America in that our wage rate was only about one-third of theirs and even though their pro-

ductivity was twice ours, this enabled us to sell at lower prices."

Nor must the phenomenal increase in productivity enjoyed by many foreign industries as a result of advanced mechanizations be overlooked.

Recent reports disclose that some ultramodern automobile plants in Europe can now produce 3,000 cars a day in one-half the time required for us to make 1,500 cars.

Continuing on the subject of productivity, Dr. Karl Fetter, vice president of research and development of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., who recently returned from Europe where he studied new steelmaking processes had this to say:

Many European mills were partially or completely destroyed during World War II. These mills have been rebuilt and expanded, partly with our foreign aid money, and we find more of their steel being produced in new and modern mills than in our own country. It was interesting to note that in every new mill the very latest automatic production, material handling, recording and control equipment has been installed to increase productivity per man-hour. Every possible new mechanical, chemical and electronic device is being used to produce high quality products at low cost. We saw one completely new steel plant in Liege, Belgium, that for practices and equipment is the finest we have ever seen.

In order to minimize the effects of the vast disparity in wages and in prices there and here and to provide an opportunity for our people to compete in an honest market, further legislative delay must be avoided.

Needless debate simply perpetuates the disruptive elements which have caused chaos to orderly and sound industrial planning and which are even now affecting our future growth and expansion by curtailing research and siphoning off investments from domestic facilities to ready havens abroad.

As stated previously, it is for this reason and the reasons outlined that I introduced the following bill, H.R. 9841 on January 21, 1960, as a companion measure to S. 2882, introduced on that date by Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York:

H.R. 9841

A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1960".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.—Sweatshop labor conditions are prohibited by law in the United States. The rapid expansion of American foreign trade in recent years, in effect, permits foreign industries in which wages and working conditions are below American standards to compete with domestic industries in which wages are significantly higher and in which minimum wages and working conditions are set by the laws of the United States and the several States. Many American industries, especially those in which labor costs constitute a high proportion of the total production cost, have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a

result of such competition. The following procedures are established to provide relief for such American industries.

SEC. 3. PROCEDURES.—(a) Upon the request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress, or upon application of the representative of any domestic industry or employee organization in a domestic industry, or upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") or his designee shall make an investigation of any situation in which it is alleged that the differential in costs, due to the existence of wage rates and working conditions significantly below United States standards, gives foreign manufacturers or producers a competitive advantage over United States manufacturers or producers.

(b) In carrying out an investigation and hearings under the foregoing procedure, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable consider (among other factors): wages and all other forms of remuneration for work performed, labor productivity, production costs and the components thereof, levels of automation, working conditions, legislation or regulations pertaining to working conditions, and living standards in the United States and in the country or countries of origin of the imported article or articles under investigation.

(c) The Secretary shall request the views of the Tariff Commission in writing on relevant trade and international factors in all cases in which he deems such information necessary to the investigatory process under this Act. He may in addition request the views of any other interested agency or agencies.

(d) Should the Secretary find that a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured by imports of goods which are produced in foreign countries under wages and working conditions below United States standards, he shall recommend to the President such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies, as he shall deem necessary or proper in each case, but in no event shall such new or additional duties exceed existing rates of duty by 100 per centum or by the amount of 50 per centum ad valorem, whichever is higher, or shall such new or additional quotas exceed existing quotas by 50 per centum.

(e) Upon receipt of the Secretary's report and recommendations, the President may by order impose such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies (1) as recommended by the Secretary to be necessary to afford relief to the domestic industry, or (2) as are determined by the President to be necessary for such purpose.

(f) The Secretary shall make and publish, with dispatch and in no event more than six months after the request, application, or resolution is made, a report on each request, application, or resolution under this Act.

(g) Any order issued pursuant to this Act may be modified, suspended, or terminated under the procedures herein established.

(h) The new or additional duties or import quotas imposed by the President or other action taken by him under this Act and any modification, suspension, or termination thereof, shall become effective on such date as he shall specify in his order and shall be treated for administrative purposes as a part of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) The Secretary shall within ninety days after the enactment of this Act promulgate procedural regulations to give effect to the authority conferred upon him hereunder.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, but in any event not later than ninety days after the date of enactment.

Importance of Saving Family Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the family farm has always been one of the great bulwarks of our democracy.

From the ranks of family farmers have come some of America's most outstanding leaders.

Recently, the Ohio Farmers Union sponsored a statewide essay contest on the importance of the family farm to American life.

The winners were 16-year-old Diana Oliver of Mount Orab, Ohio, and 11-year-old John W. Simmermon of South Solon, Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the essays by these fine young people be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Diana Oliver)

I want to save the family farm because I want to save the best place to rear a family. The family farm is a family operation, with all members sharing in the responsibilities, enjoyments, and rewards. The family farm furnishes the ideal partnership for man and wife. It is the best place to prepare young people to be honest, wholesome, and conscientious. It brings to one the responsibility and satisfaction of home ownership.

The family farm is important to the community because of the wholesome association with genuine neighbors. There is a pattern of helpfulness in a farm community—a certain way of life, certain traditions, certain standards of education. Those things help make up the culture of the community.

The welfare of our Nation is dependent on the family farm. A Nation built on a wide diffusion of private home and farm ownership will remain essentially a democracy, as Jefferson viewed American—a land of independent farmers and artisans rooted deeply in a democratic tradition, with all the blessings and freedoms of a democracy.

Japan and the Philippines were once countries in which land was held by a few people. In order to prevent communism from taking over in these countries, we encouraged the breakup of the large holdings into small family units. This brought a new prosperity not known under the old system and a greater respect for democracy. In our own country we are drifting in the opposite direction, and too few people seem to realize the danger. If someone else owns the land on which the farmer works it might as well be the government. When the private ownership is gone, democracy is gone. The family farm is democracy.

The family farm is best for the family, the community, the Nation, and the world. Let's keep the family farm.

(By John W. Simmermon)

I want to save the family farm in the United States for it is the foundation of our democracy. The family farm stands for more and better interested citizens. The family is more concerned with the work of the farm.

In different countries there are men called barons. They own hundreds of acres of

land. The people are peasants and not much more than slaves. The baron works the soil to death by planting one crop year after year, cheating future generations of its fertility.

Farms in the United States should be small farms uniting together to support everyone, not just one big farm run by one man. The family farm can help the community in different ways. It is a landmark for some people. The family farm can be a good farm if worked correctly. The family gets more interested and does much better work. The hired hands sometimes do not care about the crops. The big farmer does not care what help he gets. He works them hard for a few days and then lets them go.

We must have proper legislation to support the family farm and proper understanding to keep our way of life—America's way which is the best way in all the world.

Girl Scout Week in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the week of March 6-12 has been designated as National Girl Scout Week. This is a richly deserved recognition of an organization which has won a place in the life of our Nation and in the hearts of all Americans. Founded on March 12, 1912, the Girl Scout movement has played a vital role in the cultural pattern of the United States. Through its spirit of service, through the manifold activities of its enlightened program, the Girl Scout organization has contributed importantly to the moral, physical, and spiritual development of the citizenry of the United States.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has proclaimed the week of March 6-12 Girl Scout Week in New York State. In view of the significance of this observance, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We cannot emphasize too often the fact that 97 percent of our young people are admirably worthy of the love and respect that we give them. In the face of many difficulties they are making adjustments to a fast-moving world with intelligence and sensibility that command our admiration.

This gives us powerful reason to appreciate an institution such as the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, now about to celebrate the 48th anniversary of its founding.

As a people, we have millions of reasons to be thankful for the existence of this truly great and beneficent organization. They are to be found in the women of varying ages and walks of life who have been Girl Scouts, and who proudly acknowledge the many happy days they enjoyed in their scouting years, and the immeasurable benefits they had and still have from their experience.

It is reassuring and inspiring to know that membership in the Girl Scouts is increasing

with rapidity. I have every confidence that this growth will continue.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim March 6-12, 1960, as Girl Scout Week in New York State, and I urge our citizens to give this admirable organization full cooperation.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 15th day of February in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Military Translingua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an unusual article by Capt. E. E. Waller, U.S. Army, which appeared in the February 1960 issue of Signal, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Captain Waller and his brother served on active duty throughout World War II and the Korean war, and his father in addition to serving on active duty throughout World War II and the Korean war served throughout the Mexican campaign and World War I. They are a highly patriotic family. I am proud indeed to present for the RECORD Captain Waller's excellent article so that the Members of the Senate may have the opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY TRANSLINGUA

(By Capt. E. E. Waller, AS/SigC)

(The author is stationed at the U.S. Army Security Agency, School and Training Center, Headquarters Co., 1st Battalion, Fort Devens, Mass.)

One of the fascinating recent developments in linguistics has emerged after several years of research at the University of Iowa. Seven years ago Dr. Erich Funke, head of foreign studies at the State University of Iowa, began work on a method for interlinguistic communication. A practical application of Dr. Funke's method is Military Translingua, which is designed for multilingual military commands and international commercial correspondence.

Since the dawn of history, the military leader has been faced with the problem of precise communication with allies and elements of his command who use different tongues and dialects. The clarity of modern warfare and the need for all the allies that the free world can muster in these challenging times impinges heavily on the efforts of the soldier to explore every new vehicle that may help him find a meaningful, simple, precise, unclassified method of interlinguistic communication.

The translingua script offers interesting possibilities to alleviate this age-old military problem. It recognizes the validity of the sage advice of Sun Tzu: "He who has a thorough knowledge of his own conditions as the condition of the enemy is sure to win in all battles."

Translingua divides all human knowledge into some 35 numerical categories (for example, 15 denotes "medicine and health," and 26 refers to the "Armed Forces"), which are, in turn, broken into subconcepts to make up a basic vocabulary of 25,000 words of a numerical language.

How is this used?

Take the title of this article. Its teletype equivalent would be 18.201-1.778:5-19.500:4-1.432:18-121-5.628. Assume that the originator is a West German commander, Gen. Karl von Rhein. Without needing a knowledge of English or any other language used in a NATO command, he has been able, by the use of his German-translingua dictionary, to prepare this translingua numerical sentence from the following German: "Der Feind griff die Stadt überraschend von Süden an." The English-speaking recipient, just the same as a Portuguese, Dutch, Italian, or other language group, without leaving the domain of his own language, can simply obtain his own tongue by the use of his translingua-English dictionary (or translingua-Portuguese, translingua-Dutch, etc.) to obtain: "The enemy attacked the city surprisingly from the south."

When dealing with the more exotic languages of the East and the concomitant problems of translation, the use of translingua comes into closer focus, especially in preventing the tyro linguist from making serious mistakes stemming from a lack of precise knowledge of idioms or technical military terminology. Anyone who has heard a story repeated several times readily understands the possibility of distortion when many people are involved. It may seem humorous that "jack up" in Spanish could be literally translated as "to raise with the cat," but the exigencies of the military situation in modern conflict may not give us the luxury of enough well-trained language personnel to prevent a modern version of the Tower of Babel. The following passages may point up the ease of using translingua if a dictionary is available:

You, as an English-speaking recipient, may receive the following sentence from an Arab originator, General Abdullah: 7.1805-6.1000:2-5.400:17-5.625-5.626-5.429:4-6.103:2. The Arabic original of "Algutru 'Imisriyu yuk-sueinu 'zzswiyata 'shahamôyaya 'shihar-giata min afrigiyatin" may be rendered into: "The land of Egypt forms the northeast angle of Africa," by learning the simple translingua grammar and by quickly looking up each number, as separated by dashes. Other examples could be given in languages ranging from Spanish to Indonesian and Swedish to Chinese.

Translingua, by itself, is no more safe than ordinary English. Its vocabulary needs more revision for military use. It is no more difficult to use than a telephone directory and its vocabulary numerical equivalents do not change, though they may be added to at any time by new words or new concepts. The following exercise evinces the preciseness of translingua grammar in action:

8.1-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks water."

8.1-1.162-5-7.312:4 for, "The man drank the water."

8.1-1.162-8-7.312:4 for, "The man will drink the water."

8.1-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The men drink the water."

8.1-1.162-2.35-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks cold water."

8.1-5.770-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks the water today."

8.1-4-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man does not drink water."

8.1-29-1.11:5-119-31.1-1.162:5-7.312:4 for, "The man who came into the house drank water."

11-41-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You can drink this water."

11-44-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You cannot drink this water."

11-35-41-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You can drink this water now."

Note the simple sequence of words and the use of "1" for the plural concept and "4" for the direct object.

Research into the nuances of translingua usage and practical applications thereof is continuing at the State University of Iowa (Iowa City) under direction of Dr. Funke. In a day when our free world allies speak languages ranging from Norwegian to Turkish and Portuguese to Siamese, any meaningful multilingual concept becomes useful for considered study. As Bacon has noted, "Knowledge is power."

The U.S. Balance of Payments and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the brief statement developed by the Princeton Conference on the Balance of Payments of the United States, dated November 16, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT DEVELOPED BY THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, PRINCETON, N.J., NOVEMBER 16, 1959

THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

The large deficit in the American balance of payments since early 1958 has raised the question whether the United States must make a fundamental adjustment in its economic, financial, and military relations with the outside world.

We believe that corrective measures are in order. But those measures must be chosen with care, lest they prove destructive of our basic national objectives.

Our foreign payments situation does not require the United States—a rich country with growing riches—to run from the commitments it has imposed on itself. It should not withdraw from its postwar role of leading most of the world back to a liberal system of trade and payments precisely at the point when this leadership has reaped amazing success. It should not cut back its aid—now at a modest level—to the poor and underdeveloped countries of the world. Nor should it, on economic grounds, reduce its military strength at home and abroad. To react with haste to the deficit in our balance of payments would entail a major setback in the security and welfare of the non-Communist world.

Balance-of-payments analysis

The major items in the U.S. balance of payments since 1950 are set forth in the summary table in the appendix. In 1958, the combined gold sales and increase in foreign short-term liabilities of the United States—commonly regarded as its balance-of-payments "deficit"—amounted to \$3.4 billions; in 1957 we had recorded a surplus of \$500 millions. In the second quarter of 1959 (excluding the effect of increases in the U.S. subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund), the deficit ran at an annual rate

of \$4.4 billions. For the entire year 1959, the deficit is generally forecast at \$4 billions.

The position indicated in the table is a serious one, and merits governmental and public attention. It is, however, important to view it in perspective. There are transitory elements in the position, apart from the once-and-for-all payments to the Fund excluded from the table, which may be listed as follows:

1. The 6-month lag behind the United States in Europe's recovery from the 1958 recession, which has made our income and imports rise more sharply than Europe's in the current phase of the cycle. This influence is now at an end.

2. The collapse in U.S. exports of cotton in 1958-59 from the 1957 peak. These exports are now recovering part of the lost markets.

3. The steel strike, which has produced a slight decline in exports but a large increase in imports.

4. A series of special situations in particular commodities of considerable magnitude: in airplanes, where exports are down while production shifts from propeller to jet-driven types; in meat, where substantial imports were required owing to a temporary decline in domestic supply; in small cars, where the shift in public taste led to a rapid rise in imports from Europe which may now be checked by the introduction of American models; and in coal exports to Europe.

We recognize that some part of these changes may be structural, and that there are other temporary factors which have operated in the opposite direction to expand exports and curb imports. Nonetheless we suspect that the cumulation of unfavorable factors in the first half of 1959 made this a peculiarly unrepresentative period. Even after these short-term influences have been taken into account, however, there remains a basic change in the structure of the U.S. balance of payments. In particular there have been:

1. A step-up in the rate of private investment abroad.

2. A pronounced expansion in the U.S. demand for foreign manufactures, both capital equipment and consumers' durable goods, and for foreign travel, as a consequence of rising incomes and changing tastes.

3. A substantial increase in the competitive supply facing U.S. markets abroad, in Europe, Japan, and in third markets, as a result of the expanding industrial capacity of especially Germany and Japan, but also of the United Kingdom, France, and the rest of Western Europe.

4. A rising trend, especially between 1950 and 1955, in U.S. military expenditures abroad. This has been partially offset by the elimination of recovery aid to Europe, which was larger than the current flow of economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

We have discussed the widely held view that the United States is "pricing itself out of the market," and we find that the evidence is inconclusive. Greater price rises here than in Europe and Japan have doubtless occurred in some lines, notably certain steel products, and perhaps heavy machinery. But American prices generally have not risen more than elsewhere. For the most part, however, the gains of Europe and Japan stem from a pronounced expansion of supplies at existing prices—prices in many cases already lower than ours; and especially from a faster rate of technological innovation and imitation.

A number of factors are already at work to bring about some correction:

1. Higher interest rates here than abroad, which will discourage part of the outflow of capital as has already happened in the case of foreign sales of dollar bonds.

2. Action taken by foreign countries to remove quotas on imports from the United States.

3. Rising wage rates in industrial countries enjoying lower levels of unemployment than this country, with a consequent increase in imports, loss of competitive edge in exports, and some discouragement to U.S. direct investment.

4. The maturing of credits previously extended by this country to assist recovery in Europe and elsewhere, and in some cases, repayment prior to maturity.

5. Prospective returns on the new investments and licensing agreements of the last few years, which are now coming to fruition.

In our view, the hard core of the projected deficit, when temporary factors have been eliminated and the built-in adjustment mechanism has gone some distance, is still substantial, and if continued, will pose a serious problem.

Short-term foreign claims on the United States are now more than \$16 billion. On the other side of the ledger there is the \$19.6 billion of gold, more than \$37 billion worth of private foreign long-term assets, and our capacity to produce and export, but it is well to bear in mind that other countries have been getting along with much smaller backing. The redistribution of gold and the gain in foreign dollar reserves which have taken place, as far as they have gone, are testimony to the success of past policy. And a continued small deficit, accompanied by a greater accumulation of long-term assets, would not be unhealthy for this country and at the same time would provide growing reserves for the rest of the world.

A deficit in our balance of payments represents a decrease in our net foreign liquid assets, not necessarily in our total net foreign assets. We can remedy the deficit either by cutting our long-term lending and grants to match our net exports, or by raising our net exports to match our net long-term lending and grants, or by some combination of the two adjustments.

We place main emphasis on measures to raise our net exports of goods and services for two reasons. The United States, as the most prosperous country in the world, continues to have a substantial share of the burden for providing real goods and services to those countries which still need additions to their own real resources. Recently, despite our financial aid, we have not been translating such aid into its full real economic counterpart: goods and services. Further, we are in a better position than any other country to increase our net exports of goods and services without further reducing the volume available for our own use.

To deal with the problem of the remaining deficit, there is no need to take measures which would defeat other national objectives. Before turning to constructive alternatives, it is worthwhile to point out the objections to the measures which we regard as destructive. We agree that there is a great variety in the magnitude of undesirability among the policy alternatives listed. We did not undertake to evaluate their relative importance but did agree that they had the factor of undesirability in common.

Undesirable policy alternatives

1. Reduction of military expenditures abroad: The size of our forces abroad should not be determined on balance-of-payments grounds. There may exist today, or arise tomorrow, excellent reasons either to increase or reduce these forces. In either case, the decision should be based on political, military and diplomatic considerations, with which this meeting is not concerned, rather than on balance-of-payments grounds. Any other policy could gravely weaken the position of the Western World in forthcoming East-West negotiations and might endanger seriously our security and the survival of the free world.

2. Reduction in foreign aid: To reduce American economic aid to underdeveloped countries would be both unwise and futile.

Gold and foreign exchange reserves of underdeveloped areas are altogether insufficient, and foreign-exchange shortages are as critical a limitation as ever on their economic progress. Moreover, the great bulk of our aid expenditures now results in American exports, so that only a small fraction of any reduction in aid would go to improve our balance-of-payments position.

As indicated below, we welcome the opportunity created by Europe's economic recovery for greater aid contributions on their part, both bilaterally and through such international bodies as the proposed International Development Association. But with the present aid levels far short of needs, these new efforts should be net additions to, not substitutes for, continued U.S. action to promote development abroad. With our national output increasing at an annual rate of 15 to 20 billion, it hardly seems necessary to refute the argument that the American economy cannot afford the present—or substantially increased—levels of economic aid. It would be especially untimely to curtail aid to, say, India, at the very moment she is facing serious problems of domestic and foreign policy.

3. Tied loans: One other palliative—"tying" our loans and grants by requiring recipient countries to spend our assistance primarily in the United States—has already been applied to credits extended by the Development Loan Fund.

In our judgment, such measures are not a constructive remedy. If extended to all our aid funds, it would admittedly assure the spending here of the small proportion of these funds not now resulting in American exports. But the effect would be to hamper the best use of limited assistance resources and thereby reduce the extent of world economic development that could be achieved. At the same time, it will probably encourage other aiding countries to extend ties on their now increasing foreign aid and, over time, thereby deprive American exporters of substantial potential markets.

Much more constructive would be a vigorous effort to secure agreement among all assisting countries to eliminate the various tying practices that now exist, to the end that the countries receiving government-to-government loans and grants may make the maximum use of their aid.

4. Reducing private foreign investment: Private investment can play an important part in promoting foreign economic development. It would be an error to reverse the national policy trend of recent years toward encouraging such investment in the underdeveloped countries. Moreover, foreign investment affects both sides of the balance of payments, the initial outflow of capital (which is itself often matched by exports of machinery) soon being followed by a reverse flow of royalties, dividends, and interest payments. Special incentives to increase foreign investment in Europe seem to us no longer justified.

5. Devaluation of the dollar: While exchange rate alterations are often a sound means of correcting balance-of-payments disequilibria, this remedy is out of the question for the United States under present circumstances. It would be of doubtful effectiveness, since other countries might also devalue their currencies. Any doubt regarding the dollar price of gold would undermine the use of the dollar as a major international reserve currency, a use essential to expanding world trade. We fully agree with the administration on the wisdom of maintaining the value of the dollar in terms of gold; and we have no doubt that it can and will be done.

6. Import restrictions: Another retrograde line of policy which may be pressed upon the U.S. Government in the months ahead is the reduction of imports, either by applying import quotas, by raising tariffs or other direct controls. Today, after 25 years

of patient negotiation, the principal trading nations of the world are removing the bulk of their quantitative restrictions on private trade. American business can sell its goods abroad with fewer restrictions now than at any time in recent decades. To turn our back on the bipartisan policy of lowering trade barriers would reverse this trend and might lead to a retaliatory increase in restrictions on U.S. goods.

Desirable policy alternatives

There remain a series of constructive measures for improving the U.S. balance-of-payments position. Among them are the following:

1. Removing restrictions against American exports: Since the war, American exporters have faced extensive discriminatory barriers against dollar goods as well as some nondiscriminatory restrictions which bear particularly on American goods. The redistribution of international reserves now makes it feasible progressively to remove such restrictions. The United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Japan, and other important trading countries have recently taken significant steps in this direction. We endorse the efforts of the administration to promote and hasten the elimination of discrimination and the continued reduction of trade barriers in general. Such liberalization should also, of course, extend to travel and other service transactions and to capital movements to the United States. In addition to steps already taken, such action, if vigorously pursued, could contribute significantly to correcting the present imbalance in U.S. payments.

2. Harder selling abroad: With the other major industrial countries back in production and with import restrictions being lifted, the question remains whether American business will take the measures to meet the hard competition it faces in export markets. While we have no wish to see a competitive race in the area, the U.S. Government might assist in this process by insuring that credit facilities for U.S. exporters are no less favorable than those of competing countries.

3. Enlarged foreign participation in economic assistance and joint military burdens: The improved economic position of Europe and Japan makes possible greater contributions on their part to economic aid for underdeveloped countries. They should be encouraged to expand the amount and broaden the coverage of such aid. We must reiterate, however, that more aid from other countries should be a net addition to present efforts, not a replacement of ours by theirs.

A number of our allies are now also in a position to assume a larger share of the burdens of collective defense.

Any action in the direction of redistributing the burden of development aid or military expenditure must take into account that the main criterion for international burden sharing remains productive capacity rather than the balance-of-payments position. Given the improvement in both incomes and balance of payments, however, Europe in particular should expect to carry a substantially increased burden.

4. Policies for economic stability and growth: There is, further, the policy, to which we subscribe, of avoiding inflation while promoting economic growth. We do not advocate deflation, which is of dubious effectiveness in correcting a structural maladjustment and is harmful to growth; neither are we suggesting that the United States should abdicate its position of leadership in the international economic community. But much more than in the past, our domestic, monetary, credit, fiscal, and wage policies must be influenced by the serious long-run position in our balance of payments. We must avoid waste, and, if primary objectives of domestic or foreign policy

require expenditures above expected tax income, we should impose taxes to meet them. Our \$500 billion economy can sustain additional charges which we may have to impose on it, but we must manage it effectively.

5. Transitional measures: There is a good chance that the constructive measures above will eliminate or reduce to manageable proportions our payments deficit. But they may take time. In the meantime we have access to a number of temporary measures of international cooperation, such as arrangements for prepayment of debts due us on past assistance and other measures which we did not discuss in detail.

CONCLUSIONS

We are aware that restrictive methods of coping with the payments deficit are more immediately under the control of our Government than are the constructive steps which require cooperation by our friends and allies. But the evidence is that our friends are disposed to provide such cooperation. Restrictive policies are largely self-defeating and threaten to undermine the economic strength, the military security, and the political cohesion of the free world.

In emerging from its 19th century isolationism, the United States has had to make a series of fateful economic choices. Some were made well, some badly. Among the

mistakes are the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, and the premature termination of lend-lease aid. On the other side, among the successes are Bretton Woods, the Marshall plan, and the continuously evolving scheme of international and national assistance to defense and economic development of the past decade.

We think that the United States is now faced with another fateful choice. This country is in no danger of collapsing under its responsibilities. Though a payments problem exists, there is no need to switch to a short-run and parochial view of our interests, which subverts the international order which we have helped to bring about.

Balance of payments of the United States and selected items, 1950 to June 30, 1959

[In billions of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959 ¹ 1st quarter	1959 ¹ 2d quarter
1. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transfers under grants).....	13.9	18.9	18.1	17.1	17.9	20.0	23.5	26.5	23.1	21.7	23.2
2. Imports of goods and services.....	-12.1	-15.1	-15.8	-15.6	-16.1	-17.9	-19.8	-20.7	-20.7	-21.8	-23.9
3. Unilateral transfers (excluding military).....	-4.0	-3.5	-2.5	-2.5	-2.3	-2.5	-2.3	-2.3	-2.3	-2.4	-2.1
4. Net exports and imports, including transfers (1, 2, and 3).....	-2.2	.2	-.2	-.2	-.4	-.4	1.4	3.5	.1	-.3	-.8
5. Private U.S. capital, net, direct investment.....	-.6	-.5	-.9	-.7	-.7	-.8	-1.8	-2.1	-1.1	-1.0	-1.5
6. Private U.S. capital, net, other.....	-.6	-.5	-.3	-.4	-1.0	-.4	-1.1	-1.1	-1.8	-.6	-1.0
7. Government capital, net.....	-.2	-.2	-.4	-.2	.1	-.3	-.6	-1.0	-1.0	-.4	2-1.3
8. Foreign capital, net.....	1.9	.6	1.6	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.8	.6	1.1	3.3	3.5
9. Gold.....	1.7	-.1	-.4	1.2	.3	-.3	-.8	2.3	.4	3.0
10. Gold plus short term foreign capital (8 plus part of 9).....	2.7	1.0	.8	2.2	1.5	.6	1.1	-.5	3.4	2.9	4.4
11. Military transfers resulting in exports (excluded from 1 and 3).....	.5	1.5	2.6	4.3	3.2	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.7	(?)
12. Other Government grants (included in 3).....	3.5	3.0	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6
13. Military expenditure abroad (included in 2).....	.6	1.3	2.0	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.2

¹ Preliminary; at annual rate.² Excluding effect of addition of subscription to the International Monetary Fund.³ Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

The undersigned are in general agreement with this resolution and sign in our individual capacities: Frank Altschul, Robert Asher, Henry G. Aubrey, Guy Benveniste, Theodore Beza, Robert R. Bowie, William Breswick, Lester Chandler, Paul C. Cohen, Alvin J. Cottrell, William B. Dale, Francis Deak, John Deaver, Frank W. Fetter, William C. Foster, Richard N. Gardner, Robert Gardner, Lincoln Gordon, Robert Herber, Randall Hinshaw, Albert Hirschman, Charles Kindeberger, Klaus E. Knorr, Sperry Lea, Harold F. Linder, Franklin A. Lindsay, Edward S. Mason, Stacy May, Max F. Millikan, Gardner Patterson, Edward S. Prentice, Richard Richardson, Walt W. Rostow, Walter Salant, William Salant, Thomas C. Schelling, Ralph I. Straus, Robert Triffin, Raymond Vernon.

The conference was sponsored by the following organizations: Princeton University Center of International Studies; Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C., with the cooperation of the Stanford Research Institute.

Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I prepared a statement for the American College Public Relations Association on some of the problems of financing higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement, which appeared in the February 1960 issue of the American College Public Relations Development Section Newsletter, be printed in the Appendix in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUMPHREY FAVORS FOUR-POINT FEDERAL PROGRAM

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

We cannot—and we should not—consider the financial problems of our institutions of higher learning on only one level. To achieve our goal of adequate financial support, we must keep in mind the fruitful diversity of these institutions and we must direct our efforts so as to enlist the rich variety of private and public action.

The pressures of rising enrollments and rising costs already put tremendous burdens on many colleges and universities. Although a few operate at less than full capacity, the rising tide of the college age population in the 1960's threatens to engulf even those institutions which are not already popping at the seams.

How can we deal with these problems? Where will the money come from?

A few points are already familiar to ACPRA members. Individual alumni and alumni groups must be educated to their responsibilities. We must make it clear to them that their education was subsidized by underpaid professors and depreciating classrooms and dormitories. College graduates have greater income earning capacity. They must realize that they have incurred obligations to the institutions which gave them this capacity at less than full cost.

You know also that American private enterprise has a responsibility to support the hard-pressed institutions which supply highly trained scientific and administrative

manpower. Fortunately, more and more of our leading business firms recognize their obligations to provide financial support for these institutions. I hope we will see a more rapid trend toward unrestricted gifts for higher education. Gifts with strings attached can result in lopsided, unnatural development. A college may need a dining room or better library facilities far more urgently than it needs an endowed chair of chemistry or business administration. Unrestricted gifts—without emphasis on quick, visible results—allow college administrators to put available money where it is most needed. This makes sense, but it does not happen often enough.

What kind of help should Congress provide?

There are four specific measures which I believe will help provide vitally needed financial assistance for our institutions of higher learning—a college construction loan program, tuition tax credits, grants to institutions enrolling scholarship and fellowship winners, and Federal insurance for loans to students.

Last year, Congress tried to put a long-term, low-interest college loan program into the housing bill. That effort was supported by the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the Association for Higher Education, and other organizations. We were not successful then, but we are trying again. I am supporting a \$125 million loan program to colleges and universities for construction, alteration or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities of public and private institutions of higher learning.

Under my tuition tax credit proposal, any student or parent or friend could charge off against his net income tax 30 percent of the cost of tuition and fees for higher education up to \$450 a year. At first glance, this may appear to benefit the student's pocket-

book more than the institution he attends, but I am convinced that this proposal would encourage our colleges and universities to put their tuition charges at more realistic levels by removing the fear of penalizing the talented young people from low or middle income families.

My third proposal is for grants to colleges which bear added costs as the result of accepting students with scholarships. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 recognizes the problem by authorizing payments of up to \$2,500 a year to institutions of higher education for each student studying there under an NDEA fellowship. This is a sound idea—and college administrators should call it to the attention of private scholarship donors. I have proposed a Federal scholarship program, but I know that colleges and universities cannot expand enrollments without putting terrific strains on existing facilities. My bill would authorize payments up to \$500 to the college which accepts a scholarship winner. We must be prepared to consider the indirect costs of any scholarship program and to compensate the institutions which incur expansion costs because they accept scholarship winners.

I believe we must also give very serious attention to legislation providing Federal insurance on loans to students by institutions of higher education. I have joined in sponsoring a bill for this purpose. This proposal could insure up to 100,000 new college students a year for \$1,000 loans. The maximum insured loan to any student under this program would be \$4,000, and would be repayable within 6 years. I do not want to see this loan program take the place of a Federal scholarship program, but I think the loan program should be a part of the overall attack on the financial problems of higher education.

As we try to solve financial problems, let us not forget our purpose. H. G. Wells put it succinctly: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." Let us do our part to make sure education wins the race.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1960, the University of Notre Dame Law School sponsored a conference on civil rights. Discussion at the conference centered on three aspects of civil rights legislation: voting rights, school desegregation and equal opportunity in housing.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, February 29, 1960, on pages A1706 through A1734, a number of my colleagues joined with me to include the proceedings of this conference on the subject of voting rights.

I am pleased once again to join with several of my colleagues at this time to include in the Appendix the remaining part of the proceedings of this conference on school desegregation and equal housing opportunity:

II. ASSISTING SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Dean O'MEARA. I shall call on Professor Ward of the Notre Dame faculty for a brief

preliminary statement on the problem of assisting school desegregation. Professor Ward.

Professor WARD (Notre Dame Law School). The recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission with respect to desegregation problems were quite mild. The Commission recommended that it be authorized to serve as a clearinghouse of information to communities effecting desegregation, and to establish a conciliation and mediation service to assist local school officials in developing plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions.

Three of the Commissioners, Hannah, Heshburgh and Johnson, recommended that Federal agencies entrusted with some \$2 billion annually for various educational institutions, be authorized and directed to withhold funds from institutions of higher learning which refused admission of qualified students on racial grounds. Commissioner Johnson was alone in his proposal that Federal funds be withheld from all segregated schools, primary and secondary.

BILLS BEFORE CONGRESS

These recommendations triggered no such legislative explosion as those about voting rights. Most of the bills now pending were put in during the last session before the appearance of the Commission's report. They fall, generally speaking, into three categories. First, a whole slew of bills providing criminal penalties for obstruction of integration orders and destruction of school facilities. Second, bills authorizing the Attorney General to bring suits to compel integration and to prevent intimidation of those exercising rights under or charged with execution of integration plans. Third, bills authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to extend technical assistance to communities in the form of advice and money, and, when and if these latter prove unavailing, to formulate a plan for integration and proceed to enforce it with the help of the Attorney General if necessary.

In appraising proposed legislation in the school desegregation area I think we must move much more cautiously than in the voting rights area. I agree with Professor Wofford and others that there's an enormous symbolic value in any congressional action in the civil rights field. And I think it's true enough that whatever voting bill Congress passes this year, the public can be counted on to insist that ultimately a workable, practical bill be produced. I'm afraid it's otherwise with school segregation. I'm afraid that a large number of Americans can be persuaded that there are insuperable problems in the way of integrating schools. And a series of aborted bills, all seemingly aimed at the problem of implementing desegregation, would in my judgment be a disaster. Indeed every bill which simply pays lip service to the school problem is a strategic triumph for the segregationists.

INADEQUACY OF H.R. 8601

Applying this philosophy to the three bills upon which most discussion is centered, I must conclude that two of them—H.R. 8601, the Celler bill, and Senate 499, the Johnson bill—should be disavowed. The Celler bill, which is the most famous, for it is the center now of a petition to pull it out of the committee, barely squints at school desegregation. It penalizes obstruction of integration orders and flight to avoid prosecution in property destruction cases, and it provides for education of children in the Armed Forces in areas where schools have been closed by State or local authorities.

This latter provision may contain the germ of a bigger and better idea, but standing as it does, in the context of the Celler bill, it seems to be what Father Kenealy would refer to as a sort of camel's-head bit of legislation. As to the criminal provisions, criminal provisions are rather clearly not the answer to

the school problem. Only last week Attorney General Rogers admitted their general ineffectiveness. To my mind they're the best examples of the kind of legislation which ought not to be allowed to pass under the guise of being civil rights legislation.

The general understanding about this is—and I take this simply from my political advisers in the New York Times—that the supporters of H.R. 8601 are just waiting to get the bill to the floor where it can be toughened up by amendments. If so, well and good. In my judgment the bill as it stands would be a positive disservice to the problem of desegregation.

JOHNSON'S CONCILIATION SERVICE PROPOSES

The contribution of the Johnson bill, which properly speaking is not a school bill, is the establishment of a community relations service as an independent agency of the Federal Government. Now there's a revised form of this bill that does allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on call from the States to offer certain advice and provide information, but basically the heart of it is this establishment of a community relations service. The rather obvious but nonexplicit function of the service is to arrange for and perhaps preside over discussions of problems arising out of the necessity of compliance with desegregation order.

I have very great doubt that there's any need for such a service. Conciliation is of value where both sides have an interest in settling the controversy. I doubt whether such an interest exists in some areas of the South. And in those areas where there is a real interest, Federal machinery is unnecessary.

THE DOUGLAS OMNIBUS BILL

The third bill is the Douglas bill. This is an omnibus bill specifically aimed at this problem of implementing desegregation. Its chief contribution is that it gets the Attorney General directly into the business of initiating and following up the litigation made necessary by the decision in the Brown case. Furthermore, it contains an elaborate statement of the role to be assigned to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary is to provide a conciliation service like that recommended by the Commission. And the recommendation of the Commission, by the way, ought not be confused with the recommendation of the Johnson bill. What the Commission recommends is a perfectly sound business, that is, conciliation with a direct view toward integration—talks between school groups in a given community. The Secretary is given this role under the Douglas bill. Furthermore the Secretary is to encourage formulation of a plan. Finally, to go through it quite quickly, if all else fails the Secretary is to come up with a plan and if necessary the Attorney General is to take the plan into court for enforcement.

I think the great virtue of this bill is that it can form the basis of an acceptable compromise bill. It seems to me that any civil rights bill affecting school desegregation ought to contain an authorization to the Attorney General to initiate court action leading to desegregation, and ought to protect local officials and Negro citizens in the execution of court orders. If this much can be gained in the present session, we can afford to wait another day for the provisions involving the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I simply do not have time in the 5 minutes assigned, which I've already exceeded, to discuss the rather interesting provisions of the bill proposed by Governor Collins which may be of general interest. I neglect to do so simply because I think of all the bills currently mentioned it probably has the least chance of serious consideration in this Congress.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Professor Ward. Congressman BRADEMAs will open the discussion.

Congressman BRADEMAs. Following Professor Ward's analysis I have a number of questions that seem to me we might use as a basis for our discussion. In the first place we have the suggestion of the Commission that there should be established by Congress a clearinghouse of information on the matter of desegregation of schools across the country. I think it might be fruitful if we had a little more discussion of the difference between this particular proposal and the community relations service suggested by Senator JOHNSON. I for one am not yet clear on the distinction.

A second subject that I think we might talk about has to do with a point made by Father Hesburgh in his speech at lunch, in which he suggested—a suggestion in which he was joined by two of the other Commissioners—that we should have a Federal policy whereby the Government would withhold funds from any institutions of higher learning that failed to promise that they would not discriminate. Being sympathetic with Father's suggestion, I'm also aware of the logic of Commissioner Johnson's suggestion that this policy ought to be applied at the elementary and secondary level as well. And I am a little curious as to how Father Hesburgh can defend the one and not go along with the other.

I hasten to add that I'm among those Members of Congress who voted against Commissioner Johnson's proposal and voted with Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Congressman Dawson, Congressman Nix and Congressman Diggs when this proposal was applied to the housing bill last year, because we felt we would have been mousetrapped by the enemy into helping to defeat the bill. So I raise two questions here: one, of the logic of the position, and two, of the politics of the problem.

Now we come to the Celler bill. I'd like to hear more discussion of the specific objections to the two proposals in the Celler bill that concern the field of education. One, the criminal penalties for obstructing court orders in enforcing school integration. And two—what's the matter with Mr. CELLER's proposal to give assistance to the education of children of members of the armed services in trouble spots?

Then we come to the Douglas bill. I believe Professor Ward endorses Senator DOUGLAS' proposal that the Attorney General should be authorized to help in desegregation cases. I would like to have some clarification as to how he can, on the one hand, object to Mr. CELLER's proposal for criminal penalties for obstructing court orders in these cases while, on the other hand, he would be sympathetic to an authorization of action by the Attorney General.

Now, if I haven't confused everybody suitably, I'll stop and hope that we can have some discussion about these questions.

Mr. FOLEY. For the enlightenment of those participating here I wish to point out a little legislative history, pertinent to Professor Ward's statement. What is known as the Celler bill today, H.R. 8601, having been reported by the Judiciary Committee and now before the Rules Committee, is not the original Celler bill. The original Celler bill is identical with the Douglas proposal. That bill was considered by the Judiciary Committee, both in subcommittee and then again in full committee. Literally and figuratively it was gutted in subcommittee. They struck out all after the enacting clause, and that position was overwhelmingly supported in the full committee. So from the House standpoint the Douglas proposal I'm afraid is dead, completely.

Now the provision you have today, so far as protecting court orders is concerned, is a recommendation by the President himself,

and submitted as an executive communication by the Attorney General. The same thing applies to the relief to the children of members of the Armed Forces. And here I think you should also consider that there was an additional proposal by the President—somewhat of a midway version between the Douglas proposal and nothing at all—namely some kind of technical aid and assistance, and financial assistance as well, through the Commissioner of Education. That particular proposal was rejected by an overwhelming vote in the full Judiciary Committee.

So from the standpoint of House legislation now those proposals have been rejected and little hope is held out that they will even be considered on the floor of the House. There is one strong possibility of implementing the Celler bill insofar as school desegregation is concerned, and that is the restoration by floor amendment of the old title III of the 1957 act, in a rather modernized version let me put it. But that is subject to a serious parliamentary question, namely the question of germaneness to the bill.

Mr. EDELSBERG. I want to begin again by looking at the problem as I see it. I think the great problem in school desegregation today is no longer the matter of resistance along the lines of violence that we found in Little Rock. Resistance to school desegregation takes the form of legal evasion of legal compulsion—takes the form of pupil placement laws—and it also takes the form of the threat of closing down the public schools altogether. Now within the past year only a handful of school districts in this country desegregated. The process of desegregation seems to be grinding to a halt.

And the question is who should bear the burden of bringing the legal suits which today seem to be necessary to speed the process of desegregation in the school systems. Up to now the burden has been borne by the NAACP, and I for one think they've acted with exemplary discretion in picking the areas in which to institute their suits. We cannot be sure that the business of picking the site for another court test will be wisely chosen, and we certainly cannot expect the NAACP to shoulder the financial burden of doing this job. In this area, unlike the area of voting rights, the voluntary civil rights organizations are agreed—they are agreed that the Attorney General should have the power to enforce general civil rights including school desegregation in particular, as he has the power to do in the case of voting violations.

The only issue is: Since suits will be necessary, who should bear the burden of vindicating these basic constitutional rights? In our judgment the answer is clear that the Attorney General should do it.

Now I depart from my colleagues in the voluntary civil rights organizations when I suggest that this so-called part III legislation is not as important today as it was last year, and certainly not as important as it was two years ago. If it is true that southern legal evasion will be the response to legal compulsion, we ought to be seeking new approaches toward getting genuine compliance with the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision in Brown against Topeka.

POSSIBILITIES OF CONCILIATION

The administration's proposal to offer technical and financial assistance is one such way to bring better compliance. And another way, I think, may be found somewhere in the confines of the Lyndon Johnson proposal, which has been fairly cavalierly dealt with this afternoon.

I argue like this: Any conciliator sent into a southern school situation is a representative of a national political position, and that national political position cannot afford to permit the South to continue to evade.

Just as the Attorney General and the Department of Justice were put on the spot under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, because people said, "How many new Negroes have been added to the voting list," so a conciliation service federally administered would be on the spot if at the end of a year or two of service it couldn't point to genuine desegregation accomplished as a result of its efforts.

I think a conciliation service might move into the softer periphery areas of the South—certainly not in the Deep South tomorrow—and begin to conciliate and offer technical and financial assistance to those communities that are closer to doing the decent thing. For one thing they can persuade southern communities that desegregation is not quite a fate worse than death. I think it would be a useful starting point to have Federal educators and other officials coming into a school superintendent's office, where there is reason to believe he is well disposed, and help him become the leader of a movement with the school board, looking toward the adoption of a school desegregation program that certainly couldn't be any worse than the kind of pupil placement we're getting today, as a response to compulsory legal process.

Professor WARD. I would like to answer a couple of questions, some of them implied I think. First of all, Mr. Foley, I'm well aware of the background of the present House bill. My point is that I think Mr. CELLER is making a real mistake in associating himself with that bill. It seems to me that what has happened is that what started off as a splendid bill has been completely emasculated and it's not even recognizable—it isn't a bill—and yet the southerners have maneuvered advocates of civil rights into the position where now they are with a great deal of clamor getting up a petition to pull that bill out.

This looks to me like what the national football people call the mousetrap play. When that bill finally comes out, if it gets to the floor and if it gets a favorable vote, we're going to be told then, "You got the bill you wanted. You beat us down. Over our resistance you got it. What good has it done you."

Now, Congressman, you asked what's wrong with the first section of that bill making it a crime to interfere with the carrying out of integration orders. I say nothing is wrong with it. It's another criminal statute that goes on the books. I think it's perfectly obvious that those criminal statutes are not likely to get us anywhere. You have to bring those people before southern juries. I have the word of the Attorney General of the United States that this is not a very fruitful procedure.

But the heart of my position simply is: Better no bill, no bill at all, than a bill that isn't going to do the job. Because what I fear is that the moral indignation of the American people, which I think still exists—although apparently it took the bombshell of the Commission to activate it last September—I think that moral indignation will not be still until and unless it becomes clear that what we're trying to do simply isn't doable. And I am afraid that here, unlike in the voting area, there are a number of perfectly well-meaning, decent, peaceful citizens who have serious fears that integration in the schools in the South is simply not possible. I think it would be a disaster if a whole series of ineffective bills cemented that conviction.

Congressman DINGELL. I thoroughly agree with Professor Ward as to the effect of H.R. 8601. I think it's necessary, however, to maintain a certain perspective. I would first like to criticize the bill then I'd like to explain some of the background. I agree that the provision for making it a criminal offense to interfere with the court orders for

enforcement of integration is now within the contempt power of court, and people have been sent to jail for precisely this very act. I agree that flight to avoid prosecution is now a Federal offense. I agree, as a matter of fact, that flight to avoid giving testimony across State lines is now a Federal offense. The Civil Rights Commission, we all know, was extended for an additional 2 years, and furthermore the education of children of military personnel is traditionally a power which the President has had and which he's carried out, at least during my lifetime that I know of and for sometime previous.

But you have to understand the nature of the Congress and to look at it in perspective. Now MANNY CELLER, as author of this bill, is not such a fool that he would say that it is a strong bill or that it is a worthwhile bill. However, as chairman of the committee, he was authorized by resolution to introduce a clean bill, I believe, or at least he has a bill which was badly emasculated. Either one of those two things happened in the committee, and I think Mr. FOLEY could explain precisely what happened there.

Now, with regard to the discharge petition, I thoroughly agree that we are fighting very hard to bring out a nothing. But we are fighting very hard to bring out a nothing which can be amended and strengthened very much on the House floor, if we are able to get a sufficient number of votes. One of the problems we have is that within congressional committees very frequently things can be and are done behind closed doors which cannot bear the scrutiny of the daylight on the House floor or the Senate floor—the same thing being true in the case of the Senate. So you have to understand the reason and the motivation for this thing.

I think that having come to an understanding of the need, let's say, for either referees or voting registrars or a Congressional Election Commission, we can understand that there is a distinct possibility that this can be added on the House floor if this matter gets to the House floor. Our real problem is this: As a matter of parliamentary procedure there is virtually no way that we can shake this bill loose and bring it on the floor—because it's been effectively pigeonholed in the Rules Committee for a long time—without the discharge petition.

I would point out this discharge petition now has, or did have on Friday last, 206 signatures. It needs 13 signatures. This discharge petition has in it a very interesting provision, which would be interesting to students of parliamentary law. It waives points of order—any amendment at all will be germane and will not be subject to points of order. Now this is in effect a self-defeating discharge petition, because certainly the chairman of the Rules Committee is not going to permit a piece of legislation of this sort to be brought to the floor under, in effect, a rule waiving points of order. So I think you have to understand this whole parliamentary system and to understand why we do what we do to bring out a piece of legislation of such apparent and obvious and such real worthlessness.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the

RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

Mr. BERNHARD. I'd just like to go back for a moment behind some of the legislation to the factual situation which the Commission has had an obligation to keep current. You may recall that in our report—I was just looking at it—it is stated that voluntary desegregation reached its peak in 1956. Since then a growing proportion of starts have been under court order and the trend seems likely to continue. Well, we've gone back and attempted to see what actually has happened in the last year, and really right within the last few months, and as predicted in the Commission's 1959 report, initial desegregation, voluntarily originated or initiated, has all but stopped.

I think this is a simple fact and I think in turn it relates to the type of legislation which may be needed. The only optimistic point is in the area where there are so-called military personnel. We found that in North Carolina, in Dade County, Fla., and in Pulaski County, Ark., where there has been some token desegregation, this has resulted predominantly in military districts.

We realize that in six States—Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma—the official State policy is one of compliance. But in the 11 so-called compulsory segregation States nothing is presently being done except through the pupil placement laws. This relates to what Herman Edelsberg stated previously. Take the comparison between North Carolina and Virginia. North Carolina used the so-called pupil placement system, and in total some 53 Negro pupils in seven schools have been integrated. In Virginia, where they tried massive resistance, since February 1959 there have already been 106 Negro children integrated.

What this points to is that some of the recommendations of the Commission and some of the bills which have been introduced, relate to the demand for information as to voluntary desegregation plans. Now if what we seem to find is true, then I think that conciliation and mediation and the exchange of information are essentially outdated. It could be that court decisions because of class suits will change the situation, but if they do not, I think that the entire approach may have to be shifted somewhat. There may not be the desire to communicate. There may be more falling back on the legal paraphernalia and court orders and pupil placement laws. I think this is true to some extent of Senator JOHNSON's conciliation bill—and I think the same is true of Senator DOUGLAS' technical and financial assistance, because this is based upon the local communities who are planning voluntarily to set up plans for desegregation and to implement desegregation.

Overall I think that there just has to be a shift of emphasis to recognize that the successful thing today, in terms of overcoming the opposition, is the law; that voluntary desegregation seems to be ceasing; and that the one great hope and the one point of optimism for voluntary desegregation—occurring more rapidly is in only one place and that's where military—either on-base or off-base—schooling is involved.

Dr. MORSELL. I had two comments to make, the first of which Congressman DINGELL has more than adequately covered; namely, in answer to Professor Ward as to the minuscule elements in the bill now known as the Celler bill, that the whole strategy is based on getting something on the floor under conditions which will permit it to be amended. And this of course was the vehicle whereby the voting provisions also are expected to be made effective.

I'd like to put a question, once again, to the legally trained. This is in connection

with the pupil placement and assignment laws. As at least two speakers have noted, this constitutes the real 100-percent down-to-earth roadblock to desegregation in the predictable future. As you know, the Supreme Court has, by declining to review adverse decisions in lower courts, in effect upheld pupil placement and assignment laws as not unconstitutional on their face. The implication of this language obviously is that if the laws are administered unfairly, in a discriminatory manner, then the court will find against them.

Now the question is, since class actions are not possible against assignment laws, each individual child's case must be handled in and of itself, on its own merits. What is the likelihood that, within the next 3 or 4 years, to use perhaps a minimal time, a pattern of discrimination in application sufficiently clear can be demonstrated, so as to result in decisions which will strike down the assignment laws on constitutional grounds? Is this indeed a probability or only a matter of fancy?

Mr. SLARD. I think, John, that in response to your and to Herman Edelsberg's points, it certainly seems correct that the problem of the moment is not the totally intransigent States, but continued movement in the States where movement has begun, and in that connection something like conciliation might make sense in certain areas. On the other hand, it doesn't in itself solve pupil placement.

Now there's a suggestion which I think could cut through pupil placement, and that's simply to have the courts do what the Supreme Court obviously contemplated they would do and they have never yet done, which is to demand that a plan which at least starts toward desegregation be put into effect or be put up for discussion and one or another kind adopted.

In this connection I think Professor Foster had an idea 9 months ago that should be put out on the table again. Oddly enough, he proposed referees long before anyone mentioned referees in the voting area. He proposed that referees in the school area might very well provide the mechanism by which the courts, not in themselves willing to take the burden of promulgating or demanding the promulgation of a plan of compliance, might nevertheless choose such persons in the community as masters who could, if for no other reason, at least by their community status, move things along toward the possibility of a plan. And I really would like to have Professor Foster outline that idea.

Dean O'MEARA. Professor Foster has made a study of the role of southern district judges in school desegregation. I understand he talked to a lot of judges and that he discussed with them the possibility of something like referees. Would you be willing to tell us about that, Professor Foster?

Professor FOSTER. Well, only by disclaiming just about everything at the outset. I am a great fool if I were to presume that I really know anything much about this. Indeed every time that I have acquired any more information I've found that my uncertainty about next steps only increases rather than diminishes. I hadn't really expected to be called on to speak in any detailed way about this, and my thoughts are not really going to be connected especially. I'd rather like to come back to that master's thing in a few minutes, if I may, John Slard.

In a fair balance I am quite discouraged about the immediate prospects for school desegregation in the South. At the point of the decision in *Brown v. The Board of Education* in 1954, there was somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000 biracial school districts which were segregated. Three-quarters of those today have so far taken no step whatever toward desegregation. In the quarter in which the step toward desegregation has

been taken, that step has more often than not been only the most minimal token step. And the truth of the matter is that even in those places where beginnings have been made, with a few exceptions, there are very few real instances of intermixing of races in the educational process.

By and large, if I could write a ticket for a single piece of congressional legislation at the moment, it would be a very simple piece of legislation. It would simply declare that we, the Congress of the United States, endorse the principle of *Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka*.

Everywhere I went in the South, in talking with judges, newspapermen, educators—everyone—the point insistently was made that the Supreme Court has usurped constitutional power—done something beyond the permissible limits of what the Constitution allows. And the strongest proof of this usurpation came out of the fact that neither the Congress, nor the President, had ever indicated any agreement whatever that the decision was a correct decision. And if, therefore, we could get at least out of the Congress that simple declarative statement, "We agree with *Brown v. The Board of Education*," this alone I think would have incredible side effects in an enormously complicated area.

THREAT TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

For at the moment this whole usurpation argument gives strength to the arm of the segregationist who urges the South to turn down public school bonds, not to worry about increasing salaries of teachers, in short, to disregard what is happening to your public schools—because, as the argument goes, you perfectly well know we're all going over to private schools as soon as the courts come in anyway, so there's no point in increasing any expenditures with respect to our public schools. Thoughtful people I talked to in several States of the Deep South said that they are gravely concerned about the future of their public school systems, simply as a consequence of the fact that the segregationists have made such an attack upon the very existence of public education. And I do feel that if we could get at least the Congress—and perhaps hopefully some day the President—to put full support behind that decision, this will be a great help.

Now another thing with respect to school desegregation. As a question of constitutional inequality I would assume that it is entirely consistent with everything that has been decided in *Brown v. The Board of Education*, that a school district violates nothing in the Constitution, if it assigns children to the school nearest each child's home. In short it is relying on residential segregation, something that is a major fact of life in the urban areas of the country. It simply assigns the child to the school closest to his home. You have a completely nonracial criterion, the net effect of which is that Negro children largely will be in Negro schools and white children largely in white schools.

GAP IN ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Now what occasionally shows, as the top of the iceberg, in talking to the southern educators about this problem, is the sinking realization—or it was a sinking realization to me—that the academic standards of the white schools compared with the academic standards of the Negro schools in the same community were so woefully different.

One example will illustrate the general problem. The smartest young Negro fellow in a North Carolina high school—Negro high school—was permitted to transfer to the 11th grade of a white high school in that community as one of the first students to transfer. This was 3 years ago. The principal of the white high school told me that that child who stood at the very top in

achievement in his group ready to enter the 11th grade was more than 2 academic years behind the median white 11th grade student in the school to which he was being assigned. The boy flunked some courses that first semester. To his credit, he graduated with his class 2 years later.

Every Negro child in that community today knows how tough it is to transfer to the white schools at a high school level. And this, if you had nothing more, I submit, is an enormous deterrent to a Negro community socially inert in a great many aspects so far as this problem is concerned. And indeed one of the real evils, it seems to me, of the pupil placement system is the fact that it shifts to this fearful, hesitant, and inert Negro the responsibility of having to step forward and go through a perfectly horrid process as an individual—of cross-examination, interrogation of the most embarrassing kind, in order even to apply to a school that is white. And if on top of this we add to it all the fact that he is going to be so deficient academically at the high school level that he can't keep up, then I think we've got a system which is pretty close to what we do have, in these places in the South where these transfers have occurred at the high school level.

THE NASHVILLE PLAN

The Atlanta school board, as you know, has recommended a plan of a grade a year from the top down, and this has been agreed to tentatively by the district judge there. It was at the high school level that this breaking down process began in Little Rock, Ark. To me it makes a great deal more sense to look to what was done at Nashville as a pattern for the future.

It is perfectly clear, statistically at least, that the 6-year-olds who approach the first grade, black and white, both share equally their literacy. But it is equally true statistically that the Negro of the South is far less ready to go to school at 6 than the white is at 6. The teachers ascribed this to the fact that a Negro child perhaps has never held a book, nor has ever been read to. Now this is not to say that there are not whites of whom the same way be said, for obviously there are whites in the same condition. The simple point is that there are far more Negroes in that condition. Such a child has to be taught to want to read before you can even teach him to read. So that the readiness of these children to start at the first grade level is far less.

Nevertheless, the Nashville plan has about it two characteristics it seemed to me were the real consideration here. They are first that the initiative is not on the child to be assigned. The child is assigned to the school by the school board on the basis of the geographic location of his home in relation to the school. In short, the school board makes the initial assignment on a nonracial standard.

Now in the second year of the Nashville plan—they had at this point desegregated the first two grades at Nashville—by this system of geographic assignment about 150 Negro children were assigned to schools previously white, and about 70 white children were assigned to schools previously Negro. Then what happened? Into operation came the second aspect of the Nashville decree. This provided that any child, having been assigned to a school, might thereafter apply for a transfer to any other school, provided that the applicant could show that he was a member of a racial minority in the school to which he had been assigned.

VOLUNTARY TRANSFER SYSTEM

Now let me unwind that and explain what it means. It meant that every one of the 70 white children assigned to the Negro schools was of course a member of a racial minority and was permitted to ask for and did get a transfer out of the Negro school.

On the other hand, so far as the Negroes in the white schools were concerned, the white children had to stay put. They couldn't ask for a transfer and run away from the Negro. In other words you did not set up a game of musical chairs of the sort that took place at Miami where all the white children transferred out of the school after the Negro children went in. The whites had to stand pat at Nashville. But the unhappy fact was that of those 150 Negroes assigned in the second year, 122 asked for and got transfers back to the Negro schools. This is in the first and second grade levels, mind you.

Now, so far as pupil assignment is concerned, it seems to me that we are going to be able in the next few years to approach the day that we can demonstrate that plans of the Nashville type—and the entire State of Delaware is under a decree of comparable kind—that those court plans that shift to the school board and away from the Negro the initiative of getting placed in a school in the first instance, that these are in point of fact bringing about desegregation and that those systems such as pupil placement which require the Negro individually to take the initiative and are not producing this kind of result. But at the point that we can then compare the two systems in operation in enough cases, we have the foundation for overturning cases like *Shuttlesworth* which have refused at the outset to say that the placement laws are invalid.

NEED FOR SUITS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

To this end it seems to me of urgent importance that we get going as many lawsuits as we can find Negro plaintiffs to bring them, provided we can get skilled counsel to man the operation. To this end I feel very keenly that the old title III provision rejected from the 1957 act is of real need at this point. For if we had vigilant activity in the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department—if they really moved in, to Birmingham, into Knoxville, into the urban communities of the South—remember there hasn't been a school suit—I haven't checked this within the last 2 weeks—there hasn't been a school suit even started in Memphis, mind you. And Memphis will do—you won't have any trouble in Memphis if this thing is adequately handled. But if the Attorney General were permitted, in the name of the United States, to bring these actions so that we could test in a whole wide variety of circumstances and get this comparative data that we need to demonstrate the inefficacy and unfairness of these pupil placement plans as compared with those systems in which we get the board taking the initiative, as at Nashville, then and there I think we have the foundation for rather quickly peeling back what is at present a very unhappy setup with respect to pupil placement.

But even this doesn't do very much of the trick for reasons of residential segregation and some of the other problems of Negro hesitation. For there will be those Negroes who will withdraw from the white school if they're given a chance to do so. And it seems to me that something more than simply worrying about what someone here called the political—or the legal—chess game is in order. I would give anything, frankly, if we could have a really first-class Federal aid-to-education program—I mean this—that would go into the secondary schools with far greater contribution in the form of salaries, in those States that simply have not come up with adequate salaries for their teachers. For the inequality that faces the Negro, it seems to me, in the southern school systems, is not merely something that comes out of the fact that he's been kept separate, but the fact that in that separation the academic standards have been permitted to lag so far behind the levels in the corresponding white schools of the system.

COURT MASTERS OR REFEREES

Now, finally, where might a master come into the operation? It seems to me that there are going to be, in the course of the kinds of evasive tactics that can be anticipated here, resignations of school boards right at that crucial instant that the court orders the board to come up with a plan, or some other kind of recalcitrance on the part of the board that calls for skillful and imaginative use of inherent equity powers.

There is a magnificent paragraph in the second Brown decision of Justice Warren that suggests that the lower courts make liberal use of their traditional equitable remedies to handle this kind of thing. It is here that I see real hope if we can have joining that heroic handful of people that represent the attorneys working with the legal defense fund of the NAACP on this—if we can have joined with them a cadre of Government lawyers who can give to these Federal judges opportunities imaginatively to use equitable powers in the form of masters, referees, what have you, to meet any kind of contingency as it opens up.

One thing that rather bothers me about the possibility of spelling out, as the Attorney General's proposal now suggests that we do, the use of these equity powers in the voting cases, is that perhaps this might suggest to conservative southern judges that they ought not use the same equitable powers in the school cases. Indeed an amendment that I would very much prefer see going into any legislation this year that might use the Attorney General's suggestion would be an amendment that would make it clear that nothing was to be implied from any Federal legislation now setting up referees and the like that comparable equitable remedies ought not be available in the enforcement in Federal courts of any other kinds of Federal rights.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

EXPERIMENTATION REQUIRED

But mind you this—I'm no expert on this thing—I have spent an awful lot of time worrying about it. I don't know what the answers are or should be. But nevertheless, I feel that no great harm can come from trying as many combinations—permutations—as we conceivably can try, to get the answers as fast as we can on the things that work and don't work and pragmatically to push forward every time we find a system like Nashville that works—try to get a somewhat better version of Nashville somewhere else—and let's really get about the job as a national responsibility—something I think we can do only if we succeed in getting comparable power given the Attorney General in this area to those that in 1957 were given him in the voting area.

Dean O'Meara. Thank you, Professor Foster. Mr. Yarmolinsky.

Mr. YARMOLINSKY. Bill Foster has said almost everything that I wanted to bring to

your attention as we went along here, but I would like to add just a word or two, bringing in a couple of facts from outside this chess-game area entirely—facts from work that I happen to have been doing in the area of education and educational psychology. The more the psychologists look into the nature of human intelligence, and particularly of the intelligence of children, the more apparent it is that ability is to a tremendous extent a function of motivation, and the capacity of an individual child to improve his IQ—which we used to think was something that was fixed and immutable—is quite extraordinary. Variations have been measured—and over short periods of time as much as one standard deviation in the IQ of a schoolchild, the same child.

At the same time I think we have to take note of the fact that the educational process—the process of secondary education particularly, and education even through the 14th grade, the first 2 years of junior college—is very rapidly becoming not only a right, but indeed an actual possession of all, or of substantially all the Americans who are growing up in our country today.

Now, given these two facts we find ourselves in a situation where education is available to everybody, but unless we take some giant steps to improve the quality of education that is available generally, we are going to have a system of education which is more and more segregated, not by levels of actual ability, but by levels of opportunity, so that we'll not only have a perpetuation, even in the North, of de facto racial segregation, but we will have segregation of every disadvantaged group in our society, and that segregation will grow greater and greater and not less and less as the quality of education and the distribution of education is increased.

NEED FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Therefore, it seems to me that an essential ingredient of any legislative program that we talk about here today is really a massive infusion of Federal funds—because I think only Federal funds can do this job—to make it possible to offer the kind of education that the abilities of all the young people in our country can absorb, and to do this with all the ingenuity and using all the techniques that are now available—that in a small way have been tried out with the limited resources of foundations and private organizations, colleges, and universities.

Just to give you an example, I mention the so-called junior high school 43 plan in New York, where a very substantial increase in facilities is available to boys and girls in a single junior high school—which was, I believe, 40-percent Negro and 30-percent Puerto Rican. This resulted in overcoming these 2- and 3-year deficiencies in reading skills, arithmetic skills, and other abilities over a period of months, so that the kids were brought up to a level where they could go on to compete with other not-disadvantaged students in the New York City high schools of fairly high educational standards, and go on as they are now doing to college and professional preparations.

So that I would say that discussion of strategy, tactics such as Bill Foster proposed here, is, of course, essential, but it will be to no avail unless it is coupled with a very substantial—and I use the word "massive" intentionally and advisably—a massive program of financial assistance to American primary and secondary education.

Representative PAUL SIMON (Illinois General Assembly). This is just a very minor point that hasn't been covered that we found important in the State of Illinois. Technically segregation has been illegal for more than three-quarters of a century in Illinois, but two terms ago in our State legislature we passed a bill which possibly could be an amendment to either Father Hesburgh's suggestion of Dean Johnson's. The bill prohibited State aid to any school dis-

trict which practiced discrimination in the employment of teachers. They had to sign an affidavit to this intent.

Now this has been important, particularly in smaller communities where the teachers frequently are those who can provide—sometimes are the only ones who can provide—the real leadership, but have been very reluctant to do it because of economic reasons. It has been a very helpful thing in the State of Illinois in getting more leadership, in providing a little more employment opportunity, and in helping to solve this paradox of a shortage of teachers and a surplus of teachers at the same time.

Dean O'Meara. We're approaching the limit of the time that we can devote to this aspect of civil rights, but I do think we ought to hear from Mr. Fleming before we go on to anything else.

Mr. HAROLD FLEMING (Southern Regional Council, Atlanta). Much of what I might have said has been said, and very ably here, in the last few minutes—a mighty fine diagnosis and prescription. I'd like to emphasize very briefly a few of the points inherent in what's been said that I think are tremendously important for any legislative approach to the problem of school desegregation.

First, in amplification of what Herman Edelsberg said, while true that the nature of the problem is shifting a good deal, let's not forget that the basement States are just now being reached, and I think it would be a little premature to hope, or to be sure, that the Little Rock type of resistance is at an end. And I think this should be kept in mind in any legislative planning about sanctions against interference. That's certainly still a part of the package.

The two things it seems to me most important to bring home—and these points, as I say, have been certainly inherent in what's been said—are first that there is a vacuum, there has been a vacuum, not so much in the collection of information on school desegregation—though that hasn't been as much as might be desired—but in the dissemination of information. There's really been nothing of comparable power and financial backing and vocalism generally to match the calculated campaigns of misinformation on the subject, and nowhere could it come with greater authority and with greater resources behind it than from the executive branch of the Government. And for my money this should be a sine qua non of any prescription in this field. This job simply cannot be done alone by voluntary agencies and by the courts.

UNDUE RELIANCE ON JUDICIARY

And on that subject, which goes back to what we were talking about earlier, the disposition in some quarters to rely on the judiciary for the total remedy here I think has reached just about a saturation point. I'm not worrying about the overworked Federal judges. That's more in the line of the lawyers here, but I am worried about public images and the effect on public opinion that this exclusive reliance on the judiciary it seems to me is producing. Someone spoke of the disrepute in which the executive branch of the executive department of the Government may have fallen. Believe me, in my part of the country it's nothing compared with the disrepute in which the judiciary has fallen—labeling the courts the superschool boards, which I can see very rapidly is going to be supplemented by labeling the courts superregistration boards. All of that, it seems to me, has got to the point that it is essential that the other branches of the Government become involved, and I heartily endorse Bill Foster's suggestion about the one-sentence resolution that Congress should pass.

The practical choices? Voluntary segregation? It's true it's just about died out, but I don't think this is an argument against the conciliation approach if it embodies very

strongly the mandate to carry on public education or to disseminate information—not just to specialists but to the public at large, to inform the whole Nation on this important question. Because the practical choices that are afflicting people—as in my home town of Atlanta now on whether to have some desegregation in the schools—are producing a receptivity to information on this subject. I agree that the movement is slow and grudging, but the receptivity among rank-and-file citizens to information and reassurance that desegregation is not synonymous with catastrophe—this receptivity has increased enormously.

TIME FOR NEW EFFORTS

It's at the political level that the lack of movement and the lack of change is most perceptible. Down below that there is tremendous ferment, and I think that this is an ideal time for more of this kind of information, new information of the sort Adam Yarmolinsky suggested as well as what we now know, and new imaginative approaches such as Bill Foster suggests couldn't be better time than now in the South, as I see the situation.

Of course I share fully the idea of taking the burden of litigation, some of the burden anyway, off the plaintiffs in these cases, or off the Negroes generally and the NAACP. Everything that has been said on that subject seems to me to be right on the point.

Finally, I wonder if in this discussion—I know we've reached the end, and I've helped to push it over beyond the end, but I think it would be very helpful, if it were possible, to at least make a beginning toward the kind of consensus that Mr. Silard offered us on the voting legislation. I realize this one is much bigger and looser, but certainly if we could make a beginning toward agreeing on some of the principles that ought to be achieved through legislation and otherwise in this field of school desegregation, this might help to lessen some of the flailing around on this subject, which I think fairly characterizes much of the public debate in and out of Congress.

DEAN O'MEARA. Thank you, Mr. Fleming. We have reached the seventh inning, and we're entitled to a stretch; but we're so pressed for time that I'm going to suggest that you take the stretch in this room and that you limit it to 5 minutes.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

III. ACHIEVING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

Dean O'MEARA. We've reached the last of the three specified subjects that we wanted to consider here today—achieving equal opportunity in housing. Professor Broden of the Notre Dame law faculty will introduce this last subject.

Professor BRODEN. In the housing field no civil rights bills are now being pushed and the Commission recommends none. How-

ever the Commission urges the executive branch of the Federal Government to modify its present administrative policies to promote equality of opportunity in all federally supported housing programs. Specifically the Commission calls for an Executive order requiring equality of opportunity in Public Housing, Urban Renewal, FHA and VA housing programs and for a more vigilant policing of all these programs to insure equality of opportunity. Finally the Commission recommends the creation of city and State housing commissions to combat discrimination in housing.

ALTERNATIVES TO COMMISSION APPROACH

These recommendations are more meaningful when we consider alternatives to the approach of the Commission. On the one hand is the approach that the government—Federal, State, or local—has no business in the housing field. Builders, owners, investors, lessors, rental agents, and others should be free to deal with whom they wish on whatever terms they find profitable. If some discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin (or as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON likes to add "section of the country") this is a purely private matter. For the most part the Commission rejects this approach and adopts the position that racial discrimination in housing is a proper governmental concern.

Another approach is that represented by the Powell amendment, named for Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York. By it Congress would expressly require all recipients of Federal insurance or other aid to give assurance in writing that the property involved would be available for sale, lease, or occupancy without regard to race, creed, or color. Furthermore it would empower Federal officials to withhold, suspend, or terminate insurance of other aid if the recipient, beneficiary, or any successor in title failed to conform to such written assurance. The Commission rejects this approach in recommending no Federal legislation.

This approach raises basic legislative policy issues which warrant some consideration. The advantage of this approach is that it would firmly establish a sound nondiscriminatory Federal policy. The disadvantage is that it might dry up any Federal aid for housing in the places needing it most. This raises the ultimate issue of whether we should sacrifice Federal aid for segregated housing today in the hope of achieving non-segregated housing tomorrow.

EXISTING LAW

The Commission recommendations do not write upon a clean legal slate. There is a large body of existing law, legislative and judicial, Federal, State, and local, dealing with racial discrimination in housing. The law is generally that a private person acting on his own is free to discriminate as he pleases. On the other hand generally when the Government acts on its own, the Constitution prohibits racial discrimination. Some examples of the latter are as follows: The 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States has in validated racially discriminatory zoning laws. *Buchanan v. Warley* (245 U.S. 60 (1917)). Likewise it has invalidated the judicial enforcement of racially restrictive covenants whether of the obvious kind, *Shelly v. Kraemer* (334 U.S. 1 (1948)) and *Barrows v. Jackson* (346 U.S. 249 (1953)) or of the more sophisticated kind, *Harris v. Sunset Islands Prop. Owners* (4 Race Rel. L. Rep. 716 (Fla. 1959)). (In the *Harris* case the Florida Supreme Court invalidated a restrictive covenant limiting land ownership to members of a private corporation where the effect was to exclude Jews and non-whites.)

Although the pressure of local prejudice maintains racial segregation in many low rent public housing units, such discrimination by local governmental authorities clearly

violates the 14th amendment. State governmental action is obviously present. Although some might suggest that the separate but equal doctrine is still alive in the housing field, I'm certain it is not. I'm sure the Supreme Court of the United States, if called upon to decide the question, would reach the same result as that of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in *City of Detroit v. Lewis* (226 F. 2d 180 (1955)), that is, that separate but equal public housing accommodations violate the 14th amendment.

COMBINED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ACTION

The question becomes more complicated when the Government and private persons combine to act and the private person seeks to discriminate. We have this in the urban renewal and FHA and VA loan guarantee programs. In these programs private developers act with Government aid and the question is whether there is sufficient public involvement to constitute governmental action covered by the 5th and 14th amendments of the U.S. Constitution. In the urban renewal programs, after the local governmental authority has cleared the site, private builders take over and develop it according to the plan of the local authority. Judge Rives of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals said that under these circumstances the developer is not merely engaged in private action but rather is a vital participant in the governmental plan and that discrimination by him constitute State action within the 14th amendment. *Barnes v. City of Gasden* (268 F. 2d 593 (1959), cert. denied 28 Law Week 3181 (1959)). The district court had concluded that the private developer was engaged in purely private action.

An even more difficult question is presented in the FHA and VA loan guarantee programs. Courts have disagreed as to whether the loan guarantee programs render the action of the builder or seller sufficiently nonprivate to bring it under the 5th and 14th amendments. Judge Oakley of the Sacramento, Calif. County Superior Court held that "the mortgage insurance guaranty, inspection services and the various other administrative accompaniments incident to establishment of the system" constitute sufficient governmental action to come within the protection of the Constitution. *Ming v. Horgan* (3 Race Rel. Law Rep. 693 (1958)). He said "When one dips one's hand into the Federal Treasury, a little democracy necessarily clings to whatever is withdrawn." A contrary result was reached by U.S. District Judge Kirkpatrick in an earlier case involving Levittown in Bucks County, Pa. He rejected the notion that the loan guarantee program with its inevitable governmental regulations sufficiently clothed Levitt's action with a governmental character. *Johnson v. Levitt & Sons* (131 F. Supp. 114 (1955)).

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY POLICY

A few observations concerning the legal policies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are in order. In general that agency has attempted to attune its programs to the racial policies of the local communities. This has resulted in segregated low rent Public Housing projects in some parts of the country and integrated projects in other parts of the country. Similarly in the urban renewal program and the FHA and VA loan programs developers are relatively free to abide local policies. In some of the States and cities having antidiscrimination laws the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration have agreed affirmatively to advise the developers that they are expected to obey these laws and to refuse to deal with violators. Administrator Mason has announced that developers convicted of violating State antidiscrimination laws would not be eligible for urban renewal programs. In the mortgage loan guarantee programs the agency has also prohibited the

inclusion of racially restrictive covenants in deeds.

STATE AND LOCAL LAWS

The most vigorous antidiscrimination action in housing has been taking place recently on the State and local level. At least 13 States and 34 local communities have enacted provisions against racial discrimination in housing. The reach of these statutes and ordinances varies. For example in Oregon any person engaged in the business of selling or leasing real property is prohibited from engaging in discriminatory practices. The Civil Rights Commission reports that in Colorado discrimination is prohibited in transactions involving all dwellings other than owner-occupied units. The New Jersey, New York, and Washington statutes not only cover public housing but also prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of private multiple dwelling houses built with Government loan insurance. The New York City ordinance prohibits discrimination in multiple dwellings of three or more units and in housing developments of 10 or more units, as well as in all public housing. Many of these laws are administered by housing commissions which first seek voluntary compliance but have authority to hold hearings, issue cease and desist orders, and seek court sanctions.

SELECTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY

There is a parallel in the Commission's recommendations concerning voting and those concerning housing. The Commission does not leave these problems to the courts alone. It recommends administrative remedies as well. And I would suggest there are good reasons for this.

At present the scope of judicial protection in the Urban Renewal, FHA and VA loan guarantee programs is uncertain. As far as housing cases are concerned there are complex legal problems concerning the jurisdiction of Federal courts. And in any judicial remedy, State or Federal, there is the problem of expense and delay which is significant for the usual victims of racial discrimination.

By invoking the administrative remedy, discrimination would be prevented in FHA and VA housing without forcing victims to court litigation in States and cities having antidiscrimination laws. The advantageous flexibility of the administrative process would be employed in the selection of sites for public housing to avoid racial concentration and to assure that spokesmen for minority groups participate in urban renewal planning. Presumably these are some of the reasons the Commission turned to the administrative remedy. The Commission urges that the power of governmental agencies, Federal, State, and local, be affirmatively exercised to combat racial discrimination in housing.

CONCLUSION

I close with two points the Commission stressed. First, the national housing crisis, involving a general shortage of low-cost decent housing, is a potent factor imposing substandard housing on racial minorities. Therefore no real solution to actual discrimination in housing can come until there is a vast increase in the availability of decent low-cost housing. The Commission did not address itself to the general housing problem. However, Father Hesburgh and Dean Johnson recommended legislation for specific assistance to persons displaced by urban renewal and the Federal highway programs and special mortgage and loan programs for low income persons in general. Second, the Commission stressed that discrimination in housing is a national not a regional phenomenon. It is just as ugly and pervasive in the North and West as it is in the South.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Professor Broden. Congressman BRADEMAs will open the discussion.

Congressman BRADEMAs. There seemed to me to have been several questions raised by Professor Broden. The first point that he mentioned had to do with the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission that there should be established biracial committees or commissions on housing in the cities and States with substantial nonwhite populations. I think it might be interesting to get some observations on the effectiveness of past commissions of this sort.

Another question that he brought up had to do with two other recommendations of the Commission—recommendations for an Executive order by the President stating that equal opportunity in housing was a constitutional objective and directing all Federal agencies to shape their policies and practices to that end. I wonder what objections might be raised to this particular recommendation of the Commission.

But the last questions that I have I think are perhaps better for us to focus our attention on because here are areas which are perhaps more controversial in nature. One of the recommendations of the Commission was that the FHA and the Veterans' Administration should strengthen their present agreements with States and cities that have laws opposing discrimination in housing in a way spelled out by the recommendation—I won't go ahead to read it here. And then Professor Broden said that we had 13 States and 34 local communities which now have such laws. It seemed to me, to give a lay reaction, that we are in effect, if we are to follow this kind of recommendation, requiring a higher standard of performance of these particular areas than we require of those States and communities that do not have such statutes. And I wonder if there's not some sort of problem of fairness involved there.

Then two other questions briefly, which are both related to this last point. One has to do with the Urban Renewal program and one has to do with the VA and FHA loan programs, and I would raise the same questions in both areas. Should the Federal Government enforce a policy of non-discrimination on the developer of an urban renewal site and, comparably, should the Federal Government enforce a policy of non-discrimination with respect to VA and FHA loan programs, or to put it more specifically, should there be congressional action that would stipulate the recommendation set forth by the Civil Rights Commission—on the theory that, if such discrimination is found, the people who are dipping into the Treasury and have democracy touching their hands should not be permitted to keep their hands in anymore?

These are some of the questions that occurred to me that we might discuss.

Professor NATHANSON. I was a little more anxious than usual to get in early on the discussion, because I wanted to link it with the previous discussion about education. Since I didn't get a chance to say a word on that, I'm going to fudge a little, you see, and put them both together.

It seems to me that there is a common general problem with respect to the field of education and with respect to housing that we have to get the courage to face up to and make up our minds about—really the fundamental question that Father Hesburgh was putting to us at lunch: whether the Federal grants-in-aid are going to be conditioned by requirements of nondiscrimination.

It seemed to me that it was obvious from the last comments in the education field that most of us anticipate that in the not-too-distant future Federal grants will be playing a tremendous part in the education field—that the great sanction, really, is going to be the withholding of funds, if we're ready to take that step. That same thing is true in the housing field. I wonder

whether it isn't important that we should have a general policy which affects the whole country on this—which doesn't seem directed simply at the South. It's so easy to be virtuous at a distance—and I know that there's also on the other hand a tendency to make the problem bigger by asking for a bigger remedy. But sometimes the broadest approach has value. I think that perhaps the northern liberal, so-called, will be in a stronger position and will be more influential if what he's asking for really has a bite at home as well as somewhat further away.

So, I wanted to finally tie this down in the form of a question. I didn't quite see why—I didn't understand why—the Civil Rights Commission, although apparently asking for executive action, did not recommend legislative action, at least in the sense of determining policy. It seems to me it's asking too much of the executive or administrative agency to determine that its funds will not be available except on certain conditions so fundamental as this, conditions which may to some extent hamper the carrying out of the program—I think we have to realize that—hamper some of its objectives. It seems to me that kind of a determination—that weighing of ultimate goals here—has to be made by the Congress and that it has to be faced up to by the Congress.

Mr. EDELBERG. What could Congress do, Nat?

Professor NATHANSON. Well, I was about to say. For my own part I think I would be prepared to make the decision. I would say that I would sacrifice the immediate gains, perhaps to some extent, both in education and housing by asking for these conditions. I have great confidence in the persuasiveness of money, and that in the long run there will be enough people who want that money and that this will be really the most effective sanction, the carrot in a sense, both in housing and in the field of education.

Mr. VERNON EAGLE (the New World Foundation). I just want to supplement what Professor Nathanson has said on the power of money and the use of sanctions, and throw out a suggestion. I do it with a little bit of fear and trepidation when they are so many lawyers about, but I agree first of all with his suggestion and with the suggestion that Father Hesburgh made, that it's certainly perfectly right for the Federal Government to attach such strings to public funds, both for schools and for housing. But it occurred to me that there's another field, that of philanthropy. People may not realize the sums that are being spent in philanthropy today, but I think last year it was something like \$7 billion. Not all of this, I can assure you, has been on a basis of discrimination, but a good deal of it certainly has.

Speaking for my own foundation, and there I can speak officially, we've written right into our rules of operation that no money would be given to institutions which discriminate on the basis of race, creed or color. I think we're the only foundation that I know of that states this specifically in public.

I realize that the Congress has been very hesitant to interpret the sections of the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 that relate to tax exempt institutions, and even though the Internal Revenue Department has tried to put a lot of pressure on them they refuse to do it. But it seems to me that it would be perfectly possible and right for them to do so if it requires an act of Congress. Perhaps it can be done on an administrative basis—I don't know.

But if you can put pressure on the expenditure of \$7 billion in a year to see to it that none of these funds are spent on institutions or organizations that discriminate on the basis of race, creed or color, you've got a fairly hard pinch where it

hurts—in the pocketbook. This covers a large area.

Foundations are one part—but you've also got the vast organizations of the churches. And even in this sacred place, I would suggest that the churches are not at all free from criticism in this respect. Also private schools—it seems to me that this possibly may be a way of putting a pinch on the programs that are being suggested and are in existence in the South, where they're going to try to set up private foundations to run the schools. If they had their tax exemption taken away from them it would be a good deal more difficult. I'd love to have some comment from the legal minds here as to how this could be done.

Mr. YARMOLINSKY. I'm not speaking as a legal mind. I'm a little concerned about Vernon Eagle's suggestion and also somewhat about Nat Nathanson's. It seems to me that while obviously money has a good deal of power, the effect of forcing people to act against their principles in order to obtain money—the effect of this, I would be awfully afraid, would be that in the situations where the money was most needed it would be turned down, and the result of turning it down would make the situation that much worse.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

Again, this is one of these situations where the choice is a terrible one. But I would be distressed if this were done with Federal funds—well, Federal funds for education certainly—I'm less concerned about the housing issue, because that is a matter more of material comfort. But if you deny people the education they need to overcome the prejudices that they have because they have the prejudices, I don't think this makes a great deal of sense.

Also, on the matter of amending the tax laws or the tax regulations—anything that is done—to tighten up the tax situation on ideological grounds, I am scared of that. I would not want to see it done for any reason. I think this is too dangerous, and also very difficult to enforce. And I don't know where Vernon's 7 billion figure comes from—I take it this is all philanthropy, including foundations. Foundations are 3 percent of all philanthropy.

Dr. MORSELL. I don't have any compunction at all about the desirability or the merit of withholding Federal funds from either housing or education if they are to be used by bodies which are in violation of the Constitution. With regard to Mr. Yarmolinsky's fear that we narrow the areas in which education along liberal lines can take place, I can assure him of two things. If he were to look at the plans already drawn up in city after city in the South for new school construction, he would find that this has been done with the express and explicit and very obvious purpose of making it next to impossible to achieve desegregation no matter what happens. So that from that point of view certainly the loss or the lack of the

funds to construct those schools I would not regard as a hazard.

At the same time it seems to me our discussion has already indicated that different areas call for different kinds of solutions and different means. We had a great deal of debate on voting as to whether we ought not to add something of an executive character to these sanctions and these enforcements. And we all agreed that it was highly desirable. Here in the case of housing the Commission has recommended principally that kind of action—the tightening up of the administration of Federal housing aids, by administrative action, by Executive order. I think this entirely desirable and likely to be extremely effective.

I have in mind one recent order which was not handed down by the President, but by the Federal Housing Administrator, and which can, over a period of time, have quite far-reaching results. This has to do with the disposal of foreclosed FHA properties, which upon foreclosure revert to Government ownership and are then sold to the general public through brokers and are obtainable with nominal or almost no down-payments and on very liberal terms. Now it has been the universal practice that these sales are made through white brokers, who channel them solely to white prospective purchasers. The recent order reaffirms the no-discrimination policy and then provides that all such property must be very plainly labeled, must be a matter of record, and that if Negro purchasers cannot get these homes through white brokers they may consummate their purchases in the regional offices of the FHA itself. And it provides for suitable dissemination of this information in the communities where it's important. Now in a place like Levittown, Pa., I can assure you that this is a matter of some moment, because the number of houses available from day-to-day on this basis is quite large, and it's simply a matter of removing this artificially-imposed barrier to access by Negroes.

I think that it is much more probable that you will get some effective relief here through Executive orders and administrative means than you will through legislation. I don't believe, for example, that Congress will actually affix either to housing or to education bills genuine safeguards against the use of Federal funds in discriminatory ways.

Dean O'MEARA. There have been three hands up. I'll call on the owners in the order in which they put them up. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. DOUGLAS ANDERSON (assistant to Senator DOUGLAS). I would go for this denial of Federal funds to groups that discriminate, but when we do that we must recognize the truth, as one gentleman said over here, that some of those funds are not going to be used. In Chicago in public housing we have a situation like that. Any public housing in Chicago must be nondiscriminatory. And so the only public housing we get is in the Negro areas.

We had one situation out in an integrated area—Trumbull Park—and the battle resounds still about our attempt to keep that an integrated housing project. The white wards will not accept public housing because they know it will be integrated. And so we have a large number of units of public housing allocated to Chicago that go unused.

There's another situation in connection with restricted covenants. A Federal judge is now pondering a situation which has arisen in Deerfield, where a private housing project is being erected with the idea that it will be integrated. From a legal viewpoint the opposition to this group has said in court the other day that there's discrimination on both sides, because the housing project was based on limiting the number of Negroes who could live there to 10 or 11 out of about 45 or 60. And so they were discriminating, too, and therefore how

could the group that was fighting them in Deerfield be accused of a conspiracy to violate the 14th amendment when the other group was violating it also?

QUOTA TO MAINTAIN INTEGRATION?

That's a real problem in the community in which I live, Hyde Park, which is an integrated community. How do you keep it integrated? If you tie FHA's hands and say that FHA money can only go to groups that do not discriminate—any discrimination based on any quota system of course is discrimination. And yet in our area, without some form of a quota system, as disliked as that may be, it's not going to continue integrated.

A Negro friend of mine in our area came to me about a year ago and said, "We're buying a cooperative housing project—six flats—and we'd like to have it integrated." So he said, "We want three white families and three Negro. I'm going to take one of them," he said, "and we've got plenty of Negro applicants, but not enough white. Will you join us?" Well, we were satisfied with our housing so we didn't join him. But eventually it filled up—all Negroes. He was trying to keep it integrated. No FHA was involved, particularly, but here just on a private basis he was trying to keep it like that.

Now there's a group of housing in the near southside, Prairie Shores, Lake Meadows, which is attempting—by a selective process, they call it—to keep it integrated. The one, Prairie Shores, is on the basis of about 60 percent white and 40 percent Negro. The other group didn't start out with any kind of an allotment, but filled up rapidly with Negroes. Now as the Negro families leave they're trying to put whites in there to keep that an integrated project, but they're willing to accept a reverse ratio—60 percent Negro and 40 percent white.

PROBLEMS OF OPEN OCCUPANCY

All of these problems are tied up with the whole question of open occupancy, which all of us are for. Our alderman is for open occupancy in the city council of Chicago, but it hasn't passed. If we get open occupancy, that means first come, first served. The people who need housing most are Negroes. They will flock into our area wherever there are vacancies, and you'll not be able to select with an open-occupancy rule. You'll have to take first come, first served. And so you lose the whole progress of integration.

Now, another thing. If you say open occupancy, that means that Negroes can move anywhere in the city, but where will they go? They will go to the friendliest community—the community that has not fought them—and so they'll come to Hyde Park. They won't move out into areas where they know they're going to be discriminated against in terms of buying and where people next door to them may move out or where they won't have friendly neighbors. They'll come into Hyde Park, because we welcome them. So they'll flood in there, even with an open-occupancy amendment.

These, to me, are some of the real problems that we face in connection with any overall attempt to relate Federal funds only to housing projects that are nondiscriminatory. We get ourselves into some real problems—and this comes from one who isn't a lawyer or the son of a lawyer, but just a practical politician.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Mr. Anderson. We have time to hear only from those who have already raised their hands, and of the three—there are three of them—Professor Dukeminier is first.

Professor DUKEMINIER. It seems to me that we are basically faced with two problems here, and one is the problem of giving adequate housing to all persons, and the other is the problem of discrimination. And, even

If you accept Professor Nathanson's idea that Federal money would not be given unless it was given on a nondiscriminatory basis, I'm not sure that this would help the Negro to the extent that you might think it would, because it's not Federal money that's given. It's private money which the Federal Government insures in the case of FHA and VA guaranteed mortgages. So that you have to get a private banker to make the loan, and then the Federal Government will insure it. Well a subdivider can easily agree that his houses in his subdivision are available to colored and white alike, but the colored person cannot get a private loan from a local banker to buy into the subdivision, and so it remains all white.

So it seems to me that one of the critical problems that the Negro faces is getting mortgage money. And presently the Federal Government does not make any mortgage money directly available to Negroes unless they're veterans and come under the VA direct loan program. And one of the things that it might do—to do more than it's presently doing under the voluntary home mortgage credit program, which is a program that assists Negroes in getting their applications into bankers' hands—is to make direct loans to Negroes who are refused direct loans by private bankers in their community. In this way the property in which they live, which in most cities is in the older areas of the city and badly needs improvement, could be improved, and also they could perhaps get money this way to buy subdivision property.

But I don't think by simply saying that Federal money, or Federal insurance, rather, wouldn't be available to a discriminatory builder, you're going to insure that you're going to get integration of any type, unless you face up to the problem of getting mortgage money into the Negroes' hands.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think the most perplexing problem of legislative morality in this context is the problem of that which John Morrell felt no compunction. He thought the answer was quite obvious. It's the problem of whether or not to tuck on an antidiscrimination provision in Federal aid for social welfare purposes. I've been exposed to this approach since it began with the Bricker amendment. I've seen this device of the antidiscrimination amendment used as the most cynical, amoral parliamentary maneuver of any in the last 10 or 12 years in the American Congress. When Bricker offered his antidiscrimination amendment his purpose was brazen. It was designed to defeat the housing bill to which it was attached, because liberal southerners like HILL and SPARKMAN and some others would not be able to vote for a housing bill to which was appended an antidiscrimination condition.

Thereafter the history of the various attempts to tack on such bills, both in the Senate and the House, is something to behold. In the House I've seen southern Democrats lined up on a nonrecord vote and pulled off the floor, so that they let the antidiscrimination amendment pass, so that thereafter no southerner who wanted the substantive housing legislation would be able to vote for it. They did it as cynically as that. And only in the last session, this last year, Congressman POWELL voted against the Powell amendment. He voted against it, but it was tacked on to the housing bill he wanted. He voted for it when it was tacked on to the housing bill he didn't care about—the Republican version. So that's the kind of history these antidiscrimination amendments have.

PROBLEM OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION AMENDMENTS

Now, what do you do in such cases? Is there any guide? For myself I'm guided by an ancient saying which is attributed to the rabbis—though some rabbis have told me they can't find it. It sounds more like

Adlai Stevenson than anybody else. It says that the obligation to be just cannot be divorced from the obligation to be practical and effective. And I would say, translated to the problem of antidiscrimination amendments, it goes something like this. It begins with a counting of noses on a practical basis. Certainly in any Congress in which you can pass both the substantive legislation and the antidiscrimination rider, you should vote for both. It should become a condition of the legislation.

I'm not so sure what you do when after counting noses you know that if you tack on the antidiscrimination amendment you will kill the principal legislation so that you will have neither nondiscrimination or schools or housing. In such a case I would suggest that if a Congressman feels that by passing the housing or education legislation without the rider—and let's not call it a rider because it isn't really a rider, it's really related to the purposes of the bill itself, and so conventionally and classically it bears the more honorable semantic name of an amendment or a condition. It isn't an irrelevant provision. Where you feel that the substantive legislation enacted can thereafter be subject to antidiscrimination executive action, then you haven't postponed or hurt the possibility of being able to desegregate, to impose nondiscrimination when you have the votes or the executive will to do it.

Then I see no harm, I see no ethical wrong, in voting for the basic substantive legislation. I say this, still believing that this is one of the most difficult problems of legislative ethics to come before a Congressman.

Senator DICKINSON (Indiana State Senate). I think in this matter there are two considerations—well maybe just one: What do we hope to accomplish? And then we have to decide or determine the instruments or the mechanisms most available to us to get a certain job done.

Now I don't have—as a legislator, long ago I stopped having a lot of faith in that which could be accomplished by statutory provisions. I've participated in and followed many laws through. They get on the books in different ways. For example, I can recall when we were working on our FEPC proposition back in 1945. We finally got it through, but it wasn't really the wish of the group that was running the State government. But there were political repercussions and so forth that had to be considered, so they let the law get on the books. But what did the Governor do? He immediately put a person in to administer the law who was absolutely opposed to it all the way along, you see. But he still had a record of getting the law on the books.

Now, actually we should just face it: there's no difference in our difficulties in education and our difficulties in housing. The germ that creates the toxic condition, the poison that causes one to be a problem does the other. I mean if you kill it in one place, you'll find that both of these things will disappear. Certainly laws have a contribution to make, but it seems to me that we can't—we must view other areas in which there has to be honest consideration and effort.

UNWORKABILITY OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION CONDITIONS

On the matter of attaching certain requirements—that is that a subdivision of government, a State or locality, will not be able to participate unless they have clauses prohibiting discrimination—this is very good. I wish it was workable. But I may tell you this could serve, certainly in the beginning, to do nothing much beyond lessening our taxes. And I say that for this reason: right in my own State of Indiana I can recall when the State of Indiana refused a grant of \$400,000 that we could have had without matching funds because this was for a program of rehabilitation for handi-

capped, and it would involve some of our educational processes. Indiana has taken a position against any Federal aid to education. They said therefore we cannot accept the \$400,000. This certainly is not as strong as the matter that we're after. So I'm not so certain that, depending upon what you want to accomplish, there is much to be gained by the concept that "Either you will follow this or you won't get funds."

In our own city of South Bend we are now in the process of building a low-rent housing project. This is going to be, or this is open occupancy. In all of the publicity we have stated that race, national origin, etc., will have no bearing upon the application. Now I don't know what is going to happen. Most people think this is going to be a project solely for Negroes.

Also, we have set up the machinery to have another low-rent housing project. We're having great difficulty in getting the site, and I know the reason why: because the best areas, in the places where the project should be, with the South Bend policy of open occupancy it would mean that it's going to take some of the people of my group into areas where we do not now exist. This isn't written, this hasn't been stated, but this I'm pretty certain is one of the causes of our difficulty. There is much pressure for more low-rent housing in South Bend because of our urban renewal program. It's possible—unless the conscience of this community rises up and gives us some support, it's very likely—we're going to have to put our additional units in an area that's considered more or less Negro.

MORE THAN LAWS REQUIRED

Now certainly it is not my intention to throw any cold water on it. I still—and this is my approach always in the legislature—try to observe that which has to be done and how can I best accomplish it. In this kind of a consideration we must determine what is wanted, and how much of it we're going to be reasonably satisfied with accomplishing over a period of time. But certainly we're going to have to go much beyond the power and the forces of the legislative process and, I may even say, the governmental processes, to accomplish this thing that is causing us so much distress, not only on the local, State, and the national level, but is causing us so much distress on the international level. Legislation—governmental processes—are not going to do it.

However, if we want to stand up and support and do or die with the concepts and philosophies that have tended to promote our situation over the world, then of course we can afford to say, "We'll have it right and we'll go up or down with it." If you want to take what is available and what can be had and what may contribute to alleviating the pressure of the situation, then some of these very strenuous measures are going to have to have a lot of consideration, as I see it, before you decide that you are going to institute them.

Dean O'MEARA. At this point, ladies and gentlemen, the agenda calls for a summary or a summation of the conference, and Congressman BRADEMAS has agreed to undertake that.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the

RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

SUMMARY

Congressman BRADEMAS. At times today, during some of the technical legal discussion, I have been reminded of Carl Sandburg's line, "Why does the hearse horse snicker when they carry a lawyer away?"

But on the whole this has been for me, as a nonlawyer and legislator, a most valuable discussion. I do hope that this law school and other law schools throughout the country will carry on this experiment in collaboration between lawmakers and law teachers.

I have learned a lot and I trust that the record of this conference will also be useful to other Members of Congress who will read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to see other conferences like this held on other important legislative problems.

In summarizing today's discussion I'm only going to try to make some of the major points that seem to me to have been made in each of these three areas.

HOUSING

In the area of housing, it seems to me that most of our discussion has been focused around the following issue, and we've not yet come to any resolution of it: Are Federal grants to be conditioned on the existence or nonexistence of discrimination in a particular area?

Mr. Anderson has given us a good example of the type of problem one gets into when he tells about the effort in Chicago to keep public housing both integrated and operating under a policy of open occupancy. His point I think was underscored by what Senator Dickinson has just told us.

If we were to assume, however, to come to another point in the discussion on housing, that Federal grants are to be conditioned on the nonexistence of discrimination, we have the following problem: Should this condition be set forth by action of Congress, or should it be carried out by Executive order?

I think Mr. Edelsberg summed up very well the problem as it confronts any Member of Congress. I might say, Mr. Edelsberg, I remember very vividly last year when we had the housing bill up and the opponents of the housing bill thought they had us in a box because they had one of their side all ready to get up—and I'm trying to be, Dean, as nonpartisan as I can here—Mr. BALDWIN, of California, a Republican Member and a very able one, rose and offered a Powell-type amendment. Then the rabbi's problem confronts you.

I'd already made up my own mind what I was going to do on this and, as a matter of fact, I think it's a decreasing problem, because I think more and more Members of Congress who believe in civil rights and who believe in the substantive legislation are now not going to let themselves be mousetrapped on this issue. And I remember the look on CHARLIE HALLECK's face when the time came for those opposed to the Powell-type amendment to go down the aisle, and who should be leading the troops down but ADAM POWELL and the other three Negro Members of the House. That was the only time in my experience when every single Democrat voted the same way on any issue. There was a shout of laughter and a wave of applause. I think, as I say, it is a decreasing issue.

Finally with respect to housing I think one thing we've all agreed on—though we've not settled these other issues—is that we have to give greater attention to more of it.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Now in the field of education, it seems to me that we made several points and that there was some consensus here. We most of us agree that there is a rather discourag-

ing picture with respect to voluntary desegregation, and that we will have to give greater reliance to the law itself.

The suggestion was made by Professor Foster and supported strongly that Congress should itself pass a resolution of some sort in which explicitly the House and Senate would endorse the principle of the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision.

Another point on which I think most of us were agreed was that in the field of education we should lift some of the burden from the plaintiffs, for example the NAACP, and place more of the burden for instituting these desegregation suits on the Federal Government.

We also heard a call for more imaginative and more widespread use of equitable procedures on the part of the courts in resolving this problem.

We were agreed that we needed a great deal more information on the ways in which desegregation of school districts has been carried out in the past, and we agreed that the Federal Government should itself establish an agency for the collection and dissemination of such information.

And, finally, it was suggested and generally agreed that we needed the use of Federal funds for public education generally in far greater measure than is today the case.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

In the field of voting rights we were agreed, I think, first that there should be established some process of Federal registration for disfranchised Negroes and that this process ought to be no more burdensome for Negroes than for whites who register to vote under State procedures.

Second, we were, I think, with an exception or two, of the mind that the Federal registration process should be used for both State and Federal elections.

Third, we were still not in complete agreement as to whether or not the judicial or the administrative approach was the appropriate remedy here.

Fourth, we were most of us agreed that there should be available Federal-court equitable enforcement to assure that whoever was federally registered had a chance to vote.

And fifth, I think we were agreed—and we spent a good deal of time on this subject—that there should be some assurance that the States, although given an opportunity to challenge the Federal registration procedure, should not be able by delay of any sort to defeat the right of those who were registered to cast their votes in the election.

The suggestion was made—a constructive suggestion that seemed to most of us to advance a solution of many of the problems—and I think agreed upon, that the time for the State to challenge the qualifications of a person thus federally registered should come when the person appears to vote, so that, pending decision on the challenge by the Federal courts, his vote can be cast and his ballot impounded and held for subsequent inclusion in the count.

I'm sure that I've missed some of the major points that were made here today, but I've tried to suggest what seemed to one lay observer to have been the most significant points.

And once again, speaking for myself, I want to express to all of you our great appreciation for your having come to the university to take part in this conference, and to express for all of you our great appreciation to Father Hesburgh, to Dean O'Meara, and to the University of Notre Dame for acting as our host.

DEAN O'MEARA. I have only this to add, ladies and gentlemen, the hope that this conference has contributed a little bit toward the realization of that kind of society described by Prime Minister Macmillan as one in which "individual merit alone is the criterion for man's advancement, whether po-

litical or economic." Thank you all very much. The conference is adjourned.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(Page references to Commission's abridged report "With Liberty and Justice for All.")

VOTING

The history of voting in the United States shows, and the experience of this Commission has confirmed, that where there is will and opportunity to discriminate against certain potential voters, ways to discriminate will be found. The burden of litigation involved in acting against each new evasion of the Constitution, county by county, and registrar by registrar, would be immense. Nor is there any presently available effective remedy for a situation where the registrars simply resign.

If any State were to pass a law forthrightly declaring colored citizens ineligible to vote, the Supreme Court would strike it down forthwith as in flagrant violation of the 15th amendment. The trouble, however, comes not from discriminatory laws, but from the discriminatory application and administration of apparently nondiscriminatory laws.

Against the prejudice of registrars and jurors, the U.S. Government appears under present law, to be helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution (p. 88).

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem (unanimous)

"To secure these rights," declared the great charter of American liberty, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The instrument by which consent is given or withheld is the ballot.

Few Americans would deny, at least in theory, the right of all qualified citizens to vote. A significant number, however, differ as to which citizens are qualified. None in good conscience can state that the goal of universal adult suffrage has been achieved. Many Americans, even today, are denied the franchise because of race. This is accomplished through the creation of legal impediments, administrative obstacles, and positive discouragement engendered by fears of economic reprisal and physical harm. With those Americans who of their own volition are too apathetic either to register or, once registered, too apathetic to vote, this report does not concern itself. But with denials of the right to vote because of race, color, religion, or national origin, this Commission and the Congress of the United States are urgently concerned.

The Commission's studies reveal that many Negroes are eager to exercise their political rights as free Americans and that they have made some progress. Our investigations have revealed further that many Negro American citizens find it difficult, and often impossible, to vote. An attempt has been made to gather and assess statistics and facts regarding denial of the right to vote. This task has required careful analysis and understanding of the legal impediments.

The Commission has sought to evaluate the extent to which there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to prevent denial of the right to vote because of discrimination by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin. This is what Congress asked. The scope of Federal power to protect the suffrage depends on whether interference comes from State and local officers or from private persons; on whether improper voting procedure alone is involved, or whether the interference is based on race or color, and on the nature of the election itself, whether State or National.

Article I, section 2, of the U.S. Constitution has long stood for the proposition that while the qualifications of electors of Members of Congress are governed by State law, the right to vote for such representatives is derived from the U.S. Constitution. Article

I, section 4, authorizes Federal protection of voting in Federal elections against interference from any source. The 14th amendment affords protection against State interference with the equality of opportunity to vote in any election. The 15th amendment prohibits any action by the United States or a State, in any election, which interferes with the right to vote because of race or color or previous condition of servitude. The 17th amendment provides that a person possessing State qualifications has a right to vote which is derived not merely from the constitution or the laws of the State from which the Senator is chosen, but has its foundation in the Constitution of the United States.

Without attempting to evaluate specific changes other than those reflected in the body of our report on voting, it has become apparent that legislation presently on the books is inadequate to assure that all our qualified citizens shall enjoy the right to vote. There exists here a striking gap between our principles and our everyday practices. This is a moral gap. It spills over into and vitiates other areas of our society. It runs counter to our traditional concepts of fair play. It is a partial repudiation of our faith in the democratic system. It undermines the moral suasion of our national stand in international affairs. It reduces the productivity of our Nation. In the belief that new legislation is needed, we submit for consideration of the President and the Congress the following recommendations which we believe will help Americans to make good our declarations of national purpose (pp. 89-90).

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

The Commission recommends that the Congress require that all State and territorial registration and voting records shall be public records and must be preserved for a period of 5 years, during which time they shall be subject to public inspection, provided that all care be taken to preserve the secrecy of the ballot (p. 92).

PLAN FOR TEMPORARY FEDERAL REGISTRARS

The Commission has investigated sworn complaints of denials of the right to vote by reason of color or race in seven States. In two States where it determined to hold formal hearings, Alabama and Louisiana, its efforts to secure all relevant facts were met with open resistance by State officials. Nevertheless, on the basis of the testimony of witnesses and the examination of the registration records that were made available in Alabama, and through field investigation in other States, the Commission found that a substantial number of Negroes are being denied their right to vote. The infringement of this right is usually accomplished through discriminatory application and administration of State registration laws.

But discriminatory registration is not the only problem. The Commission also found instances in which there was no registration board in existence, or none capable of functioning lawfully. In all such cases, the majority of the electorate already registered were white persons.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 26

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in

the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

For one example, the members of the Macon County, Ala., Board of Registrars resigned after this Commission's Alabama hearing. At the hearing, 25 Macon County Negroes had testified that the board had unlawfully refused to register them. Invited to answer these charges, the Macon County registrars had refused to testify. But an injunction suit against the board to compel registration of 17 of the hearing witnesses and other apparently qualified Negroes, brought by the U.S. Attorney General under the new provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, was dismissed for lack of anyone to sue. Subsequently, new appointees to the Macon County board were named in July 1959. They refused to serve. Their reason, according to a United Press International report, was "the pressure for Negro registration" and "fear of being 'hounded' by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission."

The two other suits brought by the Attorney General under the same act had not at this writing resulted in a single registration. The suit in Georgia had been dismissed and was on appeal; the one in Louisiana was pending.

In short, no one had yet been registered through the civil remedies of the 1957 act.

Class suits on behalf of a number of Negroes to obtain registration have rarely been successful. The courts have inclined to the view that these suits are an individual nature, with the result that a vast number of suits may be necessary.

The delays inherent in litigation, and the real possibility that in the end litigation will prove fruitless because the registrars have resigned, make necessary further remedial action by Congress if many qualified citizens are not to be denied their constitutional right to vote in the 1960 elections.

FINDINGS

The Commission finds that substantial numbers of citizens qualified to vote under State registration and election laws are being denied the right to register, and thus the right to vote, by reason of their race or color. It finds that the existing remedies under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 are insufficient to secure and protect the right to vote of such citizens. It further finds that some direct procedure for temporary Federal registration for Federal elections is required if these citizens are not to be denied their right to register and vote in the forthcoming national elections. Some method must be found by which a Federal officer is empowered to register voters for Federal elections who are qualified under State registration laws but are otherwise unable to register.

Such a temporary Federal registrar should serve only until local officials are prepared to register voters without discrimination. The temporary Federal registrar should be an individual located in the area involved, such as the postmaster, U.S. attorney, or clerk of the Federal district court. The factfinding responsibilities to determine whether reasonable grounds exist to believe that the right to vote is being denied could be discharged by the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended. Because of the importance of the matter, such a temporary Federal registrar should be appointed directly by the President of the United States.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

Therefore, the Commission recommends that, upon receipt by the President of the United States of sworn affidavits by nine or more individuals from any district, county, parish, or other political subdivision of a State, alleging that the affiants have unsuccessfully attempted to register with the duly constituted State registration office, and that the affiants believe themselves qualified un-

der State law to be electors, but have been denied the right to register because of race, color, religion, or national origin, the President shall refer such affidavits to the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended.

A. The Commission shall:

1. Investigate the validity of the allegations.

2. Dismiss such affidavits as prove, on investigation, to be unfounded.

3. Certify any and all well-founded affidavits to the President and to such temporary registrar as he may designate.

B. The President upon such certification shall designate an existing Federal officer or employee in the area from which complaints are received, to act as a temporary registrar.

C. Such registrar-designate shall administer the State qualification laws and issue to all individuals found qualified, registration certificates which shall entitle them to vote for any candidate for the Federal offices of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Members of the Senate or Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners for the Territories or possessions, in any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate.

D. The registrar-designate shall certify to the responsible State registration officials the names and fact of registration of all persons registered to him. Such certification shall permit all such registrants to participate in Federal elections previously enumerated.

E. Jurisdiction shall be retained until such time as the President determines that the presence of the appointed registrar is no longer necessary.

DISSENT BY COMMISSIONER BATTLE

I concur in the proposition that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote but I believe the present laws are sufficient to protect that right and I disagree with the proposal for the appointment of a Federal registrar which would place in the hands of the Federal Government a vital part of the election process so jealously guarded and carefully reserved to the States by the Founding Fathers (p. 94-96).

PROPOSAL FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

By Chairman Hannah and Commissioners Hesburgh and Johnson: "The Commission's recommendation for temporary Federal registration should, if enacted by Congress, secure the right to vote in the forthcoming national elections for many qualified citizens who would otherwise, because of their race or color, be denied this most fundamental of American civil rights. But the proposed measure is clearly a stopgap."

"In its investigations, hearings and studies the Commission has seen that complex voter qualification laws, including tests of literacy, education and 'interpretation,' have been used and may readily be used arbitrarily to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States."

"Most denials of the right to vote are in fact accomplished through the discriminatory application and administration of such State laws. The difficulty of proving discrimination in any particular case is considerable. It appears to be impossible to enforce an impartial administration of the literacy tests now in force in some States, for where there is a will to discriminate, these tests provide the way."

"Therefore, as the best ultimate solution of the problem of securing and protecting the right to vote, we propose a constitutional amendment to establish a free and universal franchise throughout the United States."

"An important aim of this amendment would be to remove the occasion for further direct Federal intervention in the States' administration and conduct of elections, by

prohibiting complex voting requirements and providing clear, simple, and easily enforceable standards.

"The proposed constitutional amendment would give the right to vote to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not legally confined at the time of registration or election.

"Age and residence are objective and simple standards. With only such readily ascertainable standards to be met, the present civil remedies of the Civil Rights Act should prove more effective in any future cases of discriminatory application. A court injunction could require the immediate registration of any person who meets these clear-cut State qualifications.

"The proposed amendment is in harmony with the American tradition and with the trend in the whole democratic world. As noted in the beginning of this section of the Commission's report, the growth of American democracy has been marked by a steady expansion of the franchise; first by the abandonment of property qualifications and then by conferral of suffrage upon the two great disfranchised groups, Negroes and women. Only 19 States now require that voters demonstrate their literacy. Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Vermont have suffered no apparent harm from absence of the common provisions disqualifying mental incompetents. With minor exceptions, mostly involving election offenses, Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia have no provisions barring certain ex-convicts from the vote, and of the States which do have such provisions, all but eight also provide for restoration of the former felon's civil rights. In only five States is the payment of a poll tax still a condition upon the suffrage.

"The number of Americans disqualified under each of these categories is very small compared with the approximately 90 million now normally qualified to vote. It is also small in relation to the numbers of qualified nonwhite citizens presently being disfranchised by the discriminatory application of these complex laws. The march of education has almost eliminated illiteracy. In a nation dedicated to the full development of every citizen's human potential, there is no excuse for whatever illiteracy that may remain. Ratification of the proposed amendment would, we believe, provide an additional incentive for its total elimination. Meanwhile, abundant information about political candidates and issues is available to all by way of television and radio.

"We believe that the time has come for the United States to take the last of its many steps toward free and universal suffrage. The ratification of this amendment would be a reaffirmation of our faith in the principles upon which this Nation was founded. It would reassure lovers of freedom throughout a world in which hundreds of millions of people, most of them colored, are becoming free and are hesitating between alternative paths of national development.

"For all these reasons we propose the following 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE XXIII

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State or by any person for any cause except inability to meet State age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within the State, or legal confinement at the time of registration or election. This right to vote shall include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

SEPARATE STATEMENTS REGARDING PROPOSED XXIII AMENDMENT

1. By Vice Chairman Storey and Commissioner Carlton: "We strongly believe in the right of every qualified citizen of the United States, irrespective of his color, race, religion, or national origin, to register, vote, and have his vote counted. We regard full protection of these rights of suffrage by both State and Federal Governments necessary and proper. Therefore, we have supported and voted for all recommendations of the Commission (except the proposed XXIII amendment) to strengthen the laws and improve the administration of registration and voting procedures. However, we cannot join our distinguished colleagues in the recommendation of the proposed constitutional amendment. These are our several reasons:

"1. We believe that our Commission recommendations, if enacted into law and properly enforced, will eliminate most if not all of the restrictions on registration and voting by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin.

"A recommendation proposing a constitutional amendment granting additional power to the Federal Government would be in order only if we had found a lack of power under existing constitutional provisions. Such is not the case.

"2. On principle, proposals for constitutional amendments which would alter longstanding Federal-State relationships, such as the constitutional provision that matters pertaining to the qualifications of electors shall be left to the several States, should not be proposed in the absence of clear proof that no other action will correct an existing evil. No such proof is apparent.

"3. The Constitution of the United States of America presently includes sufficient authority to the Federal Government to enable it effectively to deal with denials of the right to vote by reason of race, color, religion, and national origin.

"4. The information and findings cited in support of the proposed 23d amendment disclose that some illiteracy still exists, that authoritative State statistics and studies are wholly lacking to support such an important proposal, and that our staff has not had the opportunity to make a thorough study of such a far-reaching proposal."

2. By Commissioner John Battle:

"I heartily agree with the objections of Commissioners Storey and Carlton to the proposed constitutional amendment" (p. 97-99).

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference— Part 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

PUBLIC EDUCATION

The problems (unanimous)

The Commission based its study of legal developments constituting a denial of the equal protection of the laws in the field of public education upon two fundamental premises:

(1) The American system of public education must be preserved without impairment because an educated citizenry is the

mainstay of the Republic and full educational opportunity for each and every citizen is America's major defense against the world threat to freedom.

(2) The constitutional right to be free from compulsory segregation in public education can be and must be realized, for this is a government of law, and the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land.

The problem, therefore, is how to comply with the Supreme Court decision while preserving and even improving public education. The ultimate choice of each State is between finding reasonable ways of ending compulsory segregation in its schools or abandoning its system of free public education (p. 131).

INFORMATION, ADVISORY, AND CONCILIATION SERVICES

Background

The Commission's studies, and particularly its conference with school officials from districts in border States and a few in the South that have in some measure desegregated since 1954, demonstrate that when local school officials are permitted to act responsibly in adopting plans that fit local conditions the difficulties of desegregation can be minimized. A variety of plans have proved to be successful, ranging from the merger of the former Negro and white school systems into one integrated system (particularly in communities where the Negro population was small and the cost of maintaining separate systems considerable) to the gradual Nashville plan that began in the first grade and is proceeding at the rate of one grade a year, with voluntary transfer permitted to any child assigned to a school where his race is in the minority.

In *Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham Board of Education* (358 U.S. 101 (1958)) the U.S. Supreme Court upheld as valid on its face the Alabama pupil placement law on the assumption that the law would be administered in a constitutional manner. Eight southern States have adopted pupil placement laws as a means of meeting the test of nondiscrimination. This is another possible method by which compliance may be achieved.

In many instances desegregation has been used by the local community as the occasion to raise its educational standards. In many instances remedial programs have been adopted for the handicapped, and advanced programs established for gifted students. Such programs were described to the Commission at its Nashville conference by the superintendents from Wilmington, Del.; Washington, D.C.; and San Angelo, Tex. St. Louis, Mo., has adopted a similar program. It is important that any transition should not result in the lowering of educational standards for either the white or Negro student. If possible, it should result in an improvement of educational standards for both; a number of school officials report that this has already happened in their communities.

In the transition to a nondiscriminatory school system, a carefully developed State or local plan is better than a plan imposed by a court for the immediate admission of certain litigants, or a plan imposed by any outside agency. The Supreme Court and the Federal lower courts have made it clear that they will consider sympathetically any reasonable plan proposed in good faith. This seems to be an area in which the principle of States rights can most effectively express itself through local option in meeting this problem. If State governments do not permit local school officials to develop such plans for good faith compliance, the effectiveness of the school system in the State as a whole will be impaired. By permitting such local option a variety of methods of transition can be developed that take into account the varying circumstances in different areas of the State.

FINDINGS

1. The ease of adjustment of a school system to desegregation is influenced by many factors including the relative size and location of the white and Negro population, the extent to which the Negro children are culturally handicapped, segregation practices in other areas of community life, the presence or absence of democratic participation in the planning of the program used or preparation of the community for its acceptance, and the character of the leadership in the community and State.

2. Many factors must be considered and weighed in determining what constitutes a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance and the means by which and the rate at which desegregation should be accomplished.

3. Desegregation by court order has been notably more difficult than desegregation by voluntary action wherein the method and timing have been locally determined.

4. Many school districts in attempting to evolve a desegregation plan have had no established and qualified source to which to turn for information and advice. Furthermore, many of these districts have been confused and frustrated by apparent inconsistencies in decisions of lower Federal courts.

RECOMMENDATIONS NO. 1 (a) AND 1 (b) (UNANIMOUS)

Therefore, the Commission recommends: 1(a) That the President propose and the Congress enact legislation to authorize the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended, to serve as a clearinghouse to collect and make available to States and to local communities information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts to comply with the Supreme Court mandate either voluntarily or by court order, including data as to the known effects of the programs on the quality of education and the cost thereof.

1(b) That the Commission on Civil Rights be authorized to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions; and to mediate and conciliate, upon request, disputes as to proposed plans and their implementation (pp. 131-133).

PROPOSAL TO REQUIRE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AS A CONDITION OF FEDERAL GRANTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

By Chairman Hannah and Commissioners Hesburgh and Johnson: "More than \$2 billion a year of Federal funds go for educational purposes and to educational institutions. The principal recipients of these funds are the Nation's colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education. Whether tax-supported or privately financed, they receive Federal grants and loans both for their general support and capital improvements as well as for research projects, special programs, and institutes.

"Discriminatory admission policies and other practices are known to exist in a number of such institutions. None of the Federal agencies administering these educational assistance programs require proof or an attestation of nondiscrimination by the institutions as a condition for the receipt of Federal funds.

"With its duty to 'appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution,' the Commission was compelled to ask whether it is consistent for the Federal Government to aid and support educational programs and activities in institutions of higher education which are not open to all citizens on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis.

"While Congress has not required such conditions for these grants, the operations of the Federal Government are subject to the

constitutional principle of equal protection or equal treatment.

"The Supreme Court has held racial discrimination in public education to be a denial of equal protection. In regard to public institutions of higher education the courts have required the immediate admission of qualified students without discrimination. The reasons for the gradual elimination of racial discrimination in elementary and secondary schools do not obtain in the field of higher education. There, immediate equality of opportunity for qualified students of all races is possible and necessary.

"Although the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment applies only to State action, 'it would be unthinkable,' the Supreme Court has held, 'that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.'

"We believe that it is inconsistent with the Constitution and public policy of the United States for the Federal Government to grant financial assistance to institutions of higher education that practice racial discrimination.

"We recommend that Federal agencies act in accordance with the fundamental constitutional principle of equal protection and equal treatment, and that these agencies be authorized and directed to withhold funds in any form to institutions of higher learning, both publicly supported and privately supported, with refuse, on racial grounds, to admit students otherwise qualified for admission."

Additional proposal by Commissioner Johnson: "While joining in the above proposal, I recommend that the policy set forth apply to all educational institutions that receive Federal funds, including public elementary and secondary schools. My reasons are set forth in my closing statement at the end of this report."

SEPARATE STATEMENT ON CONDITIONAL FEDERAL GRANTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

By Vice Chairman Storey and Commissioners Battle and Carlton: "We oppose the recommendation that Federal agencies be authorized to withhold all public funds from institutions of higher learning (public and private) which refuse, on racial grounds, to admit students otherwise qualified for admission for the following reasons:

"1. The Commission has agreed that the preservation and improvement of education is a matter of great national interest, and is a fundamental principle within which the problems of equal protection must be evaluated. Therefore, we cannot conscientiously endorse a program which might well undermine that principle.

"2. Present problems of equal protection pertaining to education fall within the sweep of the 14th amendment, an area long since preempted by the courts. We cannot endorse a program of economic coercion as either a substitute for or a supplement to the direct enforcement of the law through the orderly processes of justice, as administered by the courts.

"3. Such a proposal by this Commission—as an agency of the Federal Government—would drastically affect the administration of privately owned institutions of higher education. Such action goes beyond the scope of the Commission's duties.

"4. Our staff studies were directed toward understanding and evaluation of equal protection problems in public and secondary schools, not private schools upon any level, and not institutions of higher education, whether public or private" (pp. 135-137).

HOUSING

Findings and recommendations

The Problem (Unanimous)

It is the public policy of the United States, declared by the Congress and the President

and in accord with the declared purposes of the Constitution, that every American family shall have equal opportunity to secure a decent home in a good neighborhood. Since the home is the heart of a good society it is essential that this aspect of the promise of equal protection of the laws be fulfilled forthwith.

From the Commission's study of housing two basic facts were found to constitute the central problem.

First, a considerable number of Americans, by reason of their color or race, are being denied equal opportunity in housing. A large proportion of colored Americans are living in overcrowded slums or blighted areas in restricted sections of our cities, with little or no access to new housing or to suburban areas. Most of these Americans, regardless of their educational, economic, or professional accomplishments, have no alternative but to live in used dwellings originally occupied by white Americans who have a free choice of housing, new or old. Housing thus seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay. It would be an affront to human dignity for any one group of Americans to be restricted to wearing only hand-me-down clothing or to eating the leftovers of others' food. Like food and clothing, housing is an essential of life, yet many nonwhite American families have no choice but secondhand homes. The results can be seen in high rates of disease, fire, juvenile delinquency, crime and social demoralization among those forced to live in such conditions. A nation dedicated to respect for the human dignity of every individual should not permit such conditions to continue.

Second, the housing disabilities of colored Americans are part of a national housing crisis involving a general shortage of low-cost housing. Americans of lower income, both colored and white, have few opportunities for decent homes in good neighborhoods. Since most suburban housing is beyond their means, they remain crowded in the central city, creating new slums. Since colored people comprise a rising proportion of the city dwellers with lowest income, these slums are becoming increasingly colored. The population of metropolitan areas, already comprising over 60 percent of the American people, is growing rapidly not merely by births but by migration. These migrants, many of them colored, most of them unadapted to urban life, form the cutting edge of the housing crisis.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—
Part 28EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on Sunday, February 14, 1960:

CITY AND STATE LAWS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

In New York City, as in Pittsburgh and in four States—Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Oregon—there are far-reaching laws against discrimination in the sale or rental of multiunit private housing.

and all publicly assisted housing. In New York State, as in 10 other States, there are laws against discrimination in publicly-assisted or urban renewal housing. Officials and community leaders in New York testified that these laws are having a valuable educational effect and that their enforcement, principally through mediation by the city Commission on Intergroup Relations and the State Commission Against Discrimination, is helping to promote equal opportunity in housing.

In Atlanta, the work of the Mayor's West Side Mutual Development Committee, representing equally the Negro and white people in the area of the city undergoing the greatest racial transition, has served to replace blockbusting and reduce racial tension and violence by means of expanding Negro residential areas through negotiation and consent. This has enabled Negroes in Atlanta, unlike those in most American cities, to gain access to good outlying land and to build new suburban neighborhoods.

In Chicago, which has neither New York's laws against discrimination nor Atlanta's policy of negotiating agreements for Negro expansion, the Commission found that the Negroes' primary method of securing better housing was through the mutually unsatisfactory system of blockbusting, with the consequent uprooting of adjacent white neighborhoods and with inevitable racial tension and occasional violence.

On the basis of its hearings in these three cities the Commission finds that, whatever the particular approach adopted, some official city and State program and agency concerned with promoting equal opportunity to decent housing is needed. Such programs and agencies can bring about better public understanding of the problems and better communication between citizens. Whether or not cities or States are prepared to adopt antidiscrimination laws, and even in areas where racial separation is the prevailing public policy, it is possible that through interracial negotiation practical agreements for progress in housing can be reached. Where public opinion makes possible the adoption of laws against discrimination in housing, this might contribute significantly to the work of the agency promoting equal opportunity in housing. Then the agency would have legal support in its efforts at mediation and conciliation.

Recommendation No. 1 (unanimous)

The Commission recommends that an appropriate biracial committee or commission on housing be established in every city and State with a substantial nonwhite population. Such agencies should be empowered to study racial problems in housing, receive and investigate complaints alleging discrimination, attempt to solve problems through mediation and conciliation, and consider whether these agencies should be strengthened by the enactment of legislation for equal opportunity in areas of housing deemed advisable.

OVERALL FEDERAL LAWS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

The Federal Government now plays a major role in housing. Its participation in slum clearance, urban redevelopment, public housing and mortgage loan insurance amounts to billions of dollars. The Constitution prohibits any governmental discrimination by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin. The operation of Federal housing agencies and programs is subject to this principle. In addition, there is in effect an act of Congress adopted in 1866 and reenacted in 1870 that recognizes the equal right of all citizens, regardless of color, to purchase, rent, sell, or use real property.

While the fundamental legal principle is clear, Federal housing policies need to be better directed toward fulfilling the con-

stitutional and congressional objective of equal opportunity. Norman Mason, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who is responsible for coordinating the various housing programs of the constituents of HHFA, testified before this Commission that he intends to develop policies that will further promote the principle of equal opportunity in all these housing programs. The Commission finds that there is much that the Administrator of the HHFA can do, through careful and determined administration, to assure that the principle of equal opportunity in Federal housing programs is applied not only in the top policies but at the operating levels in each constituent agency.

Because of the paramount national importance of this problem the Commission finds that direct action by the President in the form of an Executive order on equality of opportunity in housing is needed. The order should apply to all federally assisted housing, including housing constructed with the assistance of Federal mortgage insurance or loan guarantees as well as federally aided public housing and urban renewal projects.

There have been such Executive orders calling for the application of the principles of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the fields of Government contracts and Government employment, and in the armed services. Instead of establishing a new presidential committee, as was done in these other Executive orders, the President could request the Commission on Civil Rights, if its life is extended, to conduct the necessary continuing studies and investigations and make further recommendations.

Recommendations Nos. 2 and 3 (unanimous)

Therefore, the Commission recommends 2. That the President issue an Executive order stating the constitutional objective of equal opportunity in housing, directing all Federal agencies to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution to the achievement of this goal, and requesting the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended, to continue to study and appraise plans to bring about the end of discrimination in all federally assisted housing, and to make appropriate recommendations.

3. That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency give high priority to the problem of gearing the policies and the operations of his constituent housing agencies to the attainment of equal opportunity in housing.

FHA AND VA

The present policy of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration is not to do further business with a builder who has been found in violation of a State or city law prohibiting discrimination. However, waiting upon the appropriate State or city agency to make a finding of violation of State or city law may result in Federal assistance to a builder who is openly or manifestly evading such law. By the time any State or city action against such a builder has been completed the projects may well have been built and sold or rented on a discriminatory basis.

Recommendation No. 4 (unanimous)

Therefore, the Commission recommends that, in support of State and city laws the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration should strengthen their present agreements with States and cities having laws against discrimination in housing by requiring that builders subject to these laws who desire the benefits of Federal mortgage insurance and loan guarantee programs agree in writing that they will abide by such laws. FHA and VA should establish their own factfinding machinery to determine whether such builders are violating State and city laws, and, if it is found that they are, immediate steps should be

taken to withdraw Federal benefits from them, pending final action by the appropriate State agency or court.

Public housing

The location of sites for public housing projects and the kind of housing provided play an important part in determining whether public housing becomes almost entirely nonwhite housing, whether it accentuates or decreases the present patterns of racial concentration, and whether it contributes to a rise in housing standards generally. A policy of "scattering" of smaller projects throughout the whole metropolitan area may remedy some of the present defects of public housing.

Public housing projects can serve as schools for better housing and homekeeping. A large number of the tenants are recent migrants from rural areas, unprepared for urban life. Placing them in decent housing units and requiring that decent standards be maintained will help them make a successful adjustment to city life. Locating these projects in better neighborhoods and making them less institutional in appearance will add to this educational process.

As a result of the large number of nonwhites in need of low-cost housing and the tendency of whites to avoid living in the midst of nonwhite majority, many projects are all or predominantly nonwhite. This may result in a proportion of nonwhite occupancy higher than that actually required under the Public Housing Administration's "racial equity" formula based on the estimated needs of the two racial groups. In one city the Commission found that the location of public housing sites within areas of Negro concentration resulted in de facto discrimination against low-income white citizens.

Recommendation No. 5 (unanimous)

Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Public Housing Administration take affirmative action to encourage the selection of sites on open land in good areas outside the present centers of racial concentration. PHA should put the local housing authorities on notice that their proposals will be evaluated in this light. PHA should further encourage the construction of smaller projects that fit better into residential neighborhoods, rather than large developments of tall "high rise" apartments that set a special group apart in a community of its own (pp. 180-185).

THE PROBLEM AS A WHOLE

Through its studies of three particular aspects of civil rights—voting, education, and housing—the Commission has come to see the organic nature of the problem as a whole. The problem is one of securing the full rights of citizenship to those Americans who are being denied in any degree the vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws.

To a large extent this is now a racial problem. In the past there was widespread denial of equal opportunity and equal justice by reason of religion or national origin. Some discrimination against Jews remains, particularly in housing, and some recent immigrants undoubtedly still have to overcome prejudice. But with a single exception the only denials of the right to vote that have come to the attention of the Commission are by reason of race or color. This is also clearly the issue in public education. In housing, too, it is primarily nonwhites who lack opportunity. Therefore, the Commission has concentrated its studies on the status of the 18 million Negro American citizens, who constitute this country's largest racial minority. If a way can be found to secure and protect the civil rights of this minority group, if a way can be opened for them to finish moving up from slavery to the full human dignity of first-class citizenship, the America will be

well on its way toward fulfilling the great promises of the Constitution.

In part this is the old problem of the vicious circle. Slavery, discrimination and second-class citizenship have demoralized a considerable portion of those suffering these injustices, and the consequent demoralization is then seen by others as a reason for continuing the very conditions that caused the demoralization.

The fundamental interrelationships among the subjects of voting, education, and housing make it impossible for the problem to be solved by the improvement of any one factor alone. If the right to vote is secured, but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing, the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance. If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums.

In this complex picture there are, of course, other major factors that the Commission has not studied directly, particularly questions of discrimination in employment, in the administration of justice, and in public accommodations.

Equal opportunity and equal justice under law must be achieved in all sections of American public life with all deliberate speed. It is not a court of law alone that tells us this, but also the needs of the Nation in the light of the clear and present dangers and opportunities facing us, and in the light of our restive national conscience. Time is essential in resolving any great and difficult problem, and more time will be required to solve this one. However, it is not time alone that helps, but the constructive use of time.

The whole problem will not be solved without high vision, serious purpose, and imaginative leadership. Prohibiting discrimination in voting, education, housing, or other parts of our public life will not suffice. The demoralization of a part of the non-white population resulting from generations of discrimination can ultimately be overcome only by positive measures. The law is not merely a command, and government is not just a policeman. Law must be inventive, creative, and educational.

To eliminate discrimination and demoralization, some dramatic and creative intervention by the leaders of our national life is necessary. In the American system much of the action needed should come from private enterprise and voluntary citizens' groups and from local and State governments. If they fail in their responsibilities the burden falls unduly on the Federal Government.

This Commission would add only one further suggestion. The fundamental cause of prejudice is hidden in the minds and hearts of men. That prejudice will not be cured by concentrating constantly on the discrimination. It may be cured, or reduced, or at least forgotten if sights can be raised to new and challenging targets. Thus a curriculum designed to educate young Americans for this unfolding 20th-century world, with better teachers and better schools, will go a long way to facilitate the transition in public education. Equal opportunity in housing will come easier as part of a great program of urban reconstruction and regeneration. The right to vote will more easily be secured throughout the whole South if there are great issues on which people want to vote.

What is involved is the ancient warning against the division of society into Two Cities. The Constitution of the United

States, which was ordained to establish one society with equal justice under law, stands against such a division. America, which already has come closer to equality of opportunity than probably any other country, must succeed where other have failed. It can do this not only by resolving to end discrimination but also by creating through works of faith in freedom a clear and present vision of the City of Man, the one city free and equal man envisioned by the Constitution (pp. 191-194).

Tribute to Henrietta Szold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very excellent lecture given by Dr. Miriam Freund, president of Hadassah, before the American Jewish Historical Society in Baltimore on February 21.

Maryland has given many great and distinguished persons to our country and to the world—but none is really greater than the remarkable Henrietta Szold.

In calling attention to the centennial of Miss Szold's birth, Dr. Freund has reminded us of the great contributions Miss Szold has made to the betterment of our country. She was a distinguished educator, the organizer of a unique and dedicated society of women devoted to philanthropy, known as the Hadassah. She was also a great welfare worker and an even greater humanitarian. Thousands of people live today, well and happy, because of the deeds of this extraordinary woman.

In carrying on as president of the Hadassah, Dr. Freund has earned an enviable reputation in her own right and I am pleased to have her thought-provoking lecture inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

In every generation, in every land, among every people, unique personalities have been born who are destiny marked, leaving an imprint on time and on history. Henrietta Szold was of this noble community.

We shall mark the centennial of her birth in December 1960. As the years march on, the magnitude of her vision becomes ever more apparent. She was a woman who, by the force of her character and creative gifts, impressed both her personality and her purpose on all who came into contact with her, thus shaping time and events beyond her own mortal span of years. There are many ways to tell her many faceted life story—all true, all requiring volumes; she was the forerunner of the night school program in America; she was designated one of the 100 great American women of the century; she was the founder of the magnificent volunteer group of women, Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America; she was mother to countless generations although without child of her own flesh; she was originator of the education, child guidance, and social welfare concepts now practiced in the modern democratic State of Israel.

One phrase, her own, illumines all these achievements: "Make my eyes look toward

the future," a phrase which she uttered in her 84th year as she sat for a bust by Madame Batya Leshinska of Jerusalem. Always aware of today's immediacy, yet always conscious of the future, such was Henrietta Szold—daughter of Israel and the American dream, possessing both the riches of Judaism and of the American heritage, born in the city of Baltimore on December 21, 1860.

Her life was permeated by an insatiable search for knowledge and an equally burning need to take action on behalf of her people. Her great gifts of mind and heart helped create a rare personality. She was self-disciplined, yet she left thousands of letters full of fire and temper. There was no boundary or frontier to her pioneer spirit. What was her preparation for the fulfillment of her destiny? She was the daughter of a rabbi, rooted in the tradition of her people and in the land of her birth, personifying the noblest traditions of two cultures—American and Jewish. In her life and work were blended the Jewish ideals of freedom and justice—the ancient Jewish ethical and religious teachings—with the principles of democracy enunciated by the Founding Fathers. She worked unceasingly to help boys and girls to become whole human beings, physically, emotionally, and psychologically secure.

Daughter of Benjamin Szold and his wife, Sophia Schaar, who arrived in Baltimore from Hungary a year before Henrietta's birth, Henrietta, the eldest of eight sisters, was given the training and education usually reserved for boys. She learned Hebrew, and indeed sat at the right hand of her father. She was privileged to attend the Western Female High School of Baltimore and was chosen, at the age of 16, out of the 48 graduates, to give the honorary address entitled "Our Public Schools" at the 25th annual commencement. The newspaper of that day states, "She was applauded to an echo . . . only another evidence of the talent and studiousness which has placed Miss Szold at the head of her schoolmates."

For the next 15 years she earned her living teaching French, German, algebra, botany, and other subjects—preparing for that path which she would tread during a long and illustrious life. Her teaching philosophy, similar to that of John Dewey, is magnificently illustrated in a paper delivered at a conference of the Maryland State Teachers' Association in July 1887. Its title is "Elementary Schools—Training Schools," and gives a remarkably prophetic statement of our modern ideas of education. In this paper she questions the popular method of teaching which tested the facts acquired by young people. "Not knowledge, but the capacity to acquire knowledge, is power," she states. With her genius for projecting herself into the future, she says: "We are, in fact, drafting toward the solution of problems unique in the history of mankind, so far as the attitude of the masses of the people will have to assume towards them is concerned. These problems can be met through public training—training, not a mass of undigested and indigestible information." And she concludes, "Everywhere can be discerned prognostics of the fact that life in the 20th century will not be easy to live, that it will call for high courage to face the truth, steadiness in action, steadfast opinions, and unflinching purposes." Indeed, she found life in the 20th century not easy, but applying truth, steadfastness, and unflinching purpose, Henrietta Szold taught men and women by the very force of her example, where and how to find that high courage.

During these years of teaching, a number of external factors influenced her life. It was in these years that thousands upon thousands of immigrant Jews found their way to the shores of America as a result of the promulgation of the Russian anti-

Semitic May laws of 1882. Many of them came to Baltimore, encountering great difficulties because of their lack of language and "strange ways of living." Rabbi Szold, upright and compassionate, opened his home as a welcoming center to these Jewish refugees from czarist Russia. He, too, had fought at the age of 19 behind the barricades in Vienna. Henrietta, who believed that faith must be translated into reality, had faith in the potential of these men and women. She took the first step to help them "Americanize." With the support of the members of the Hebrew Literary Society, she took a room above a shop in Gay Street and opened a night school in November 1889.

On the first evening 30 men and women enrolled. As the word spread, each succeeding night more came, and very shortly after, with the aid of the Baron de Hirsch Fund, the school occupied a whole house on Front Street. By 1892 she moved to a still larger house on East Baltimore Street and when, 6 years later (in 1898) the Baltimore Education Authority took over this Russian school, there were 5,000 students who had attended classes. Christians, Slovak and Czech immigrants attended it as well as Jews.

Long years later in New York City (on Thursday, January 9, 1936), when Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia handed Miss Szold the certificate citing her for distinguished and exceptional public service, he hailed her as "A distinguished citizen of the world . . . who needs no key in the city of New York" and said, "You were the pioneer in this movement, which resulted first in educating the parents to avail themselves of the schools for their children. Through that pioneer effort, that inspiration, that group of immigrants who came at that time, many, many are holding today places of responsibility in the commercial, industrial, financial, scientific, professional, and governmental world. I would not be here, perhaps, in 1936 if you had not started your work in 1880."

In the doing, the doer was enriched. Contact with these minorities and with the history of persecution and degradation of the Jew throughout the centuries, quickened her mind and spirit to the need for a homeland wherein the Jew would be free and able to live a life of dignity and creativity. And thus she states, "I became converted to Zionism at the very moment that I realized that it alone supplied my bruised, torn, and bloody Nation, my distracted Nation with an ideal—an ideal that can be embraced by all, no matter what their attitude may be to other Jewish questions." She followed through by organizing in 1893 together with a group of her immigrant friends, the first Zionist Society in Baltimore (the Hebras Zion). Little did she know on what far path and to what great toll this conversion would lead her and how it would become the central and dominating motive of her life.

Overlapping her career as a teacher, confidant and literary secretary for her father, was a literary career of her own. At 18, she became the Baltimore correspondent of the New York Jewish Messenger using the pen name of Sulamith. Delving through the back numbers of this newspaper and of the columns as saved in her diaries and papers, one is astonished at the depth of understanding, at the pungent force and at the magnificent literary style in so young a girl. The range of topics upon which she wrote was amazing, and her deep Jewish roots were apparent in all her writings.

In pursuit of her firm belief that Jews must be rooted in Jewish history and tradition, she was one of that small company of far-seeing men and women who founded the Jewish Publication Society of America in 1888, serving as a volunteer on the publications committee. The Jewish Publication Society, acting on the principle that an in-

digenous, creative, cultural Jewish life must be devised for this country, sought to foster this end by publishing Jewish classics in English and by becoming the lodestone for contemporary writers. Miss Henrietta was fascinated by what she foresaw as the future of this organization and what it could mean for the unfolding Jewish life in this country. Thus, in 1893, she resigned from teaching and from the Russian School, said farewell to the religious classes and to her private students and became the professional literary secretary of the society and held this post for 23 years. She served as editor, translator, writer of articles for the Jewish encyclopedia and many learned journals, adviser to young people of talent. All the early volumes of the American Jewish Yearbook bear testimony to her editorial skill, to her knowledge of languages, and to her competence as a translator.

One of the most magnificent pieces of work during this period was the revised translation of the "History of the Jews" by Heinrich Graetz, in five volumes, with an index volume prepared entirely by Henrietta Szold. In 1898, volume VI, the index volume, made of the whole work not simply a history but a Jewish encyclopedia, for it is a compilation of events in chronological order. Miss Henrietta devoted herself for over a year to this tremendous labor. During this period too, there was fruitful collaboration with Prof. Louis Ginzberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary and she was extremely helpful in the translating and editing of volumes of his "Legends of the Jews."

"The Hebrew Journal" commenting on one of her lectures entitled, "A Century of Jewish Thought" (January 1896) says, "She demonstrates that the formation of a visible center as the acknowledged home of the Jewish people is required for the religion of Israel to assert its power and mission in the world."

The Journal continues, "With rare knowledge of the subject (almost too profound for an American woman) Miss Szold exhibits the beauties of the modern Hebrew literature. . . . (To our knowledge, the most learned Jewess in the United States . . . perfectly objective in her reasoning.)"

Rabbi Szold died in 1902 and Henrietta and her mother moved to New York in 1903. She became a student—a lady studying Talmud—at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City. She was extremely eager to publish her father's unfinished work and thus set about preparing herself to become his literary executor.

While attending the seminary as its first woman student, she commuted to Philadelphia to continue her work with the Publication Society. Reveling in the intellectual stimulation of the great minds at the seminary, her own horizons widened and she took on additional areas of work, which stemmed from her manifold interests. Her passion for Zion and for Jewish tradition and Hebrew as a living language was quickened at this time.

In New York she came into intimate contact with the Zionist masses as well as with its leadership and was impelled to positive action. Thus, in 1907, at the request of Dr. Judah Leon Magnes, then honorary secretary of the Federation of American Zionists, she and a group of young girls organized a study circle named the Hadassah Study Circle. For the next 2 years they studied under her guidance and became familiar with the ideas of the forerunners of the Zionist movement.

Toward the end of 1908 Miss Szold suffered from ill health and, therefore, she and her mother set out in 1909 for a leisurely trip to Europe and Palestine. In Palestine she saw the living reality of that which she had believed in and understood—namely, that Zionism was a movement of self-

emancipation, "a movement which epitomizes the finest Jewish impulses of the day." Her life took on new meaning and purpose.

When she returned from her visit abroad, she shared with the members of the Hadassah Study Group her concern for the mothers and children in the Holy Land, where the maternal death rate, as well as the death rate of the newborn, was shocking. And, thus, it came about that on Purim, February 24, 1912, this study group, meeting in the vestry rooms of Temple Emmanuel, declared itself "Hadassah," the New York Chapter of the Daughters of Zion, with the motto "Aruchat Bat Ami—The Healing of the Daughter of My People" (Jeremiah 8: 22), and elected Henrietta Szold as its president. Hadassah thus started with some 40 members with a twofold purpose—to establish and maintain a visiting nursing service in Palestine and to foster Jewish and Zionist education in the United States.

The concept of volunteer service which was incorporated in the constitution of this new group has been a major source of strength as the years marched on and the organization marched with it. Today Hadassah, more than 300,000 strong, has become a great movement in Jewish life, securely rooted in the American tradition, committed to a program of healing, teaching, and research and youth rehabilitation in a new democratic nation in the Middle East, Israel; respected and revered wherever men and women of good will live.

Justice Brandeis has said, "My life has been an analysis of organizations of all kinds. From that point of view, I have studied Hadassah and I am ready to say that there is no organization, political, economic, industrial, that I would put in the class of Hadassah."

The twofold purpose shines forth from its twin names, "Hadassah Medical Relief Association" and "Hadassah—The Women's Zionist Organization of America"—ministry of healing and service as well as educator of a large sector of American Jewry. Today, Hadassah represents a magnificent network of preventive and curative medicine encircling a nation and a state, crowned by a City of Healing—the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center, paralleled by an equally magnificent women's group in the United States dedicated not only to its practical work in Israel but also to Jewish survival. Yesterday, the name "Hadassah" meant two nurses to give prenatal and postnatal care in a one-room hut in the Old City of Jerusalem and a small study circle in New York City. Indeed, her hands and her heart and her eyes looked to the future that day. Purim 1912, may be counted not only as the birthday of Hadassah, but also of Miss Szold's life work, for all else was "commentary."

In 1916, Miss Szold's friends, under the direction of Judge Julian W. Mack, made it financially possible for her to devote all her time and talents in the field of volunteer service. Therefore, Miss Szold tendered her resignation to the Jewish Publication Society and turned her energies and talent to the field of Zionist work. During World War I, as the magnitude of the problem facing Jewish life became ever more apparent, a Provisional Committee for Zionist Affairs, under the chairmanship of Louis D. Brandeis, to aid Jews abroad, was set up in America. Henrietta Szold became a member of the executive committee. When the pleas came from Europe for medical relief as well as other aid, and as the appalling situation of the Jews in Palestine became apparent, the provisional committee turned to Henrietta Szold and Hadassah to organize such assistance for the Jewish community of Palestine. Hadassah, then an organization of 47 chapters and 4,000 members, accepted the responsibility of organizing, financing and dispatching a medical unit to Palestine. Thus, on June 11, 1918, the first American Zionist

medical unit to Palestine set out from New York harbor in a British ship. This mission was composed of 45 doctors, nurses, sanitarians and administrative personnel, and arrived in Jaffa on August 17, 1918.

While Miss Szold labored to set up this mission, the Balfour Declaration was issued. Thus, "The medical unit was an advance guard of the builders * * * and became the advance and seminal instrument for a modern State with model health facilities and achievements."

In this first planning, her concern for tomorrow and her understanding that tomorrow must be built on the work of today, was evident. She believed in discipline, work and building, and communicated this to all who came into her orbit. "I see no sense in any movement which is not built up slowly, bit by bit."

Hadassah built slowly, bit by bit, under her guidance and direction, accepting the challenge of today, planning for the tomorrow that inevitably becomes today. From its very beginnings, Miss Szold taught that there are no frontiers to medicine and that all creeds and groups should be served. This has remained Hadassah's credo.

In 1920, in her 60th year, Henrietta Szold started her life anew. She went to Palestine to take her part in the medical program which Hadassah had taken on as its obligation in the building of a new nation. She remained in that land for a quarter of a century of unremitting work and awe-inspiring achievement. On May 10, 1944, she wrote to a cherished friend, "I have a great longing to visit America once more * * * I long for the Maryland woods. I long for an American autumn. I long—but dare I hope, with a war that must be won, no matter how long it lasts." She died in Jerusalem the following February 1945, without seeing the Maryland woods again.

The breadth of vision, the capacity for seeing the one step ahead, gave her the understanding that a healthy baby, a normal child, must be given proper education and training and so her interest angled out to include all the needs of the Yishuv (Jewish community of Palestine) in the fields of education, social welfare, vocational education, as well as in health. In 1927, the Zionist Congress elected her to the Palestine Zionist Executive and she became the director of education and health. In 1931, she was elected a member of the Vaad Leumi (the Jewish National Council in Palestine) and was appointed director of social welfare and she set out to organize the central bureau for social work for the whole country. She wrote, "When I came to Palestine I acted as though I were an expert on medical affairs. Fate made me pretend to be an expert in educational affairs in 1927 and now in 1931, having passed the Psalmist's turn of year, I dare go into another field in which to expertise is imperative."

The circle of her life had almost come full round, but not yet, not until that day in 1933 when she unpacked her trunks and knew that she would not return to live out her last days in the city of her birth, her beloved Baltimore. For in 1933 she had said her goodbyes, had packed her few belongings, and had set her feet on a path to fulfill her heart's desire of ending her life amid the fields of her birthplace and in the bosom of her beloved family. But in that year came the accession of Hitler to power and once again her life took on new dimensions. She who had started as a teacher and as the

friend of the newcomer into America, found herself again in the field of youth education and integration of immigrants.

German Jewry, in its anguish and effort to save its youth, had organized a movement called Judische Jugendhilfe and they and the Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews under the Jewish Agency, turned to Miss Szold to direct the work of receiving the young people, of integrating them in Palestine, and of giving them the opportunity for training and citizenship. In October 1933 Miss Szold went to London, as Palestine's representative, to attend a conference discussing ways of meeting the crisis facing Jewish life. En route she wrote to a friend, "Last spring I determined to cut loose from Palestine and return to America for my remaining years, to be coddled by my sisters. Hitler disposed otherwise. I should have felt like a renegade if I had not remained to do my bit." From London she went to Berlin to make her plans.

On February 19, 1934, the first group of Youth Aliyah boys and girls arrived in Haifa Harbor aboard the *Martha Washington*. Henrietta Szold was there to welcome each one, to talk of their home and their parents, to bid them Shalom, and to take them to their new home at Ein Harod, a kibbutz in Palestine. Slowly they came, and then faster and faster, the children and youth, as each year brought its own story of increased Jewish suffering. Each year brought new groups from various lands; from the concentration camps when they were opened up; from the partisan ranks; from the homes of foster parents who had taken them in; from the Orient and Arab countries; from lands numbering more than 70.

Now as plans are being made to mark the centennial of her birth in December 1960, the figures of World Youth Aliyah show that 100,000 children and youth should have come into Israel by that date. One million Jewish children cruelly done to death in the years of the Hitler massacre; 100,000 children—untold generations—to balance that awful score. The sages have said, "He who saves one life saves the generations."

One of the beacons of Jerusalem in the 1940's was the light that burned in her room at the Eden Hotel—a source of comfort and hope for all who passed that way during the dark days of the Hitler holocaust. In her own words, she described her workday to a friend, "My day extends from 4:30 in the morning until 12 at night and I am kept busy all the hours." Once when asked by a dear friend how was it possible to work this way, she answered: "There are two reasons: one, I keep the Sabbath; and two, my cast-iron stomach." A spiritual and physical blending. She went on to explain that Friday, when she lit her candles, she put aside all business and turned toward the delight of the Sabbath, renewing her forces for the work of the coming week.

Through all these years of service for the Yishuv, a vision was born in her mind and heart, germinating slowly, but one which developed towards a logical conclusion; namely, that there must be established in this new land a children's bureau comparable to that of the United States or of Switzerland. It must be an organization with the authority, the technical knowledge and the purpose of delving into various social problems attendant on the care, training, and future of the child as he grew into a mature and conscientious citizen.

She wished that a national fund similar to the great instruments of Israel's redemp-

tion—another national Keren, this time a Keren Haya'el, be set up. Thus, on her 81st birthday, December 21, 1941, the Mosad Szold, Keren Leman Haya'el v'Hanoar, or the Henrietta Szold Foundation for Child and Youth, was formally established through the initiative of Hadassah with the aid of the Vaad Leumi. The Mosad functions today as a research and coordinating body in the fields of social work, social welfare and youth work. It is indeed "Miss Szold's legacy and conscience, a project for this and future generations."

Today, we who love and revere her may not visit her last resting place on the Mount of Olives, for it is in Jordan territory. But we meet her in every corner of the Holy City and the Holy Land, on the docks of Haifa where she greeted the first group of Youth Aliyah boys and girls; in the City of Beer-sheba, which the genius of Hadassah helped to grow from a primitive market point in the desert to a city of 40,000 people; in Safad, in Tel Aviv, in Tiberias, where the former Hadassah Hospitals tell something of the story of its beginnings in the land; in the medical center which dominates the skyline of Jerusalem. She is seen too in the happy laughing children in the playgrounds; in the pink-cheeked schoolchildren having their midmorning snack and milk; in the Oriental girls studying sewing and homemaking. The ideas of education, social welfare and child guidance, which are now an integral part of an orderly democratic state, were born in the mind and heart of Henrietta Szold and became reality through her stubborn will, matchless integrity, and ceaseless activity.

How does one conclude this paper? For her who spanned centuries and crossed continents in her life and her work, there is no such word as conclusion. May I therefore quote from an essay written by Henrietta in October 1917, in memory of a beloved friend, (Hortense Guggenheimer Moses):

"To such as she was we say no farewell. The harmony of their being has stolen into the fiber of our consciousness. In part we are what we are because they have lived. In part we do what we do and as we do it, because they have done as they did. Remembering what they were and what they did, what she was and what she did, we consecrate our lives to life—life—full, complete, harmonious."

The Challenge of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, while all of us are concerned—and rightly so—with the quantity and quality of secondary education in this country, we must also pay increasing attention to the onrushing problems involved in providing college training for our young people. According to reliable statistics, enrollment in institutions of higher learning will more than double within the next 10 years.

A principal dilemma posed by this avalanche of college students is how to prevent a diminution in the quality of the education provided. This problem and many others involved in the forthcoming crisis in our colleges was ably discussed recently by Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Assistant Commissioner of Education.

In a speech at Sidwell Friends School here in Washington, Dr. Babbidge voiced an eloquent plea for greater public interest in the challenge of higher education, and pointed out the need for insuring that more and more of our young people receive college training. He said, "Society as a whole needs more people with education beyond high school," and I thoroughly agree, Mr. President.

Dr. Babbidge dealt with the need to take steps now to meet the coming tidal wave in higher education. While it is, of course, true that much of the financial backing needed for this great effort must come from private individuals and organizations, some help must be provided by governmental units at the Federal and State level. I am convinced that the Federal Government must more thoroughly explore means to assist in meeting the crisis in higher education.

There are a number of proposals now before Congress, several of which I have sponsored, to provide Federal help in this great cause. I am hopeful action will be forthcoming before long on these means to stimulate and encourage America's response to the need for improved quality and quantity in our institutions of higher learning.

Mr. President, the sooner we respond to the challenge outlined in Dr. Babbidge's address, the easier it will be to answer it. As he notes—

We are either going to do what needs doing, or we will relegate education to a lesser place in our national way of life.

And I might add, Mr. President, that if we do demote education in our national scale of values, we will be dooming America to a secondary place in the family of nations.

So that all my colleagues and a wider readership can benefit from Dr. Babbidge's cogent remarks, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts appearing in the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1960]

THE COMING CRISIS IN OUR COLLEGES

(By Mr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.)

(Excerpted from an address delivered recently by the U.S. Assistant Commissioner of Education at Sidwell Friends School.)

The most widely and confidently forecast tidal wave in all history is not a meteorological but an educational one. Based on accurate population data—the young people are already in school—it is estimated that demand for college enrollment will double within the next decade. This is a forecast fraught with significance for the Nation.

It seems to me that there are three possible basic courses of action that we can, as a Nation, contemplate:

1. We can turn away a larger number of applicant students at the college doors, making it relatively more difficult for an individual to get a college education.

2. We can increase educational resources to accommodate the numbers.

3. We can accommodate the numbers without a commensurate increase in resources, with a consequent decline in the quality.

This last course of action impresses me, I am afraid, as the course most likely to be followed by the American people, and at the same time the most frightening course. I regret to say that there is a worrisome amount of evidence that through lack of concern and lack of action, we are in danger of paying for growth in higher education by cheapening the product.

Parents are, individually, much concerned about the quality of the education their own children are likely to receive. But there is always the danger that parents will be concerned only for the fate of their own children, and that they will be lured into believing that they may be able to shoe-horn their children into an institution that is miraculously able to maintain the quality of its instruction in the face of enrollment demands.

That is dangerous thinking in the case of individual families, but it is even more so for society at large.

Let me enter a plea that you make common cause with other parents in this matter; that you be as concerned with the dilution of higher education in the large as I know you are concerned about it in the case of your own sons and daughters. Frankly, the kind of diminution of quality that I fear will be epidemic in nature; no institution and no family will be immune. I believe that only through concerted community effort can we have any protection, singly or as a society.

There is a specious appeal to the idea that we can keep the educational standard high by practicing higher education on a narrower segment of society. I think that it would be a false economy. In the first place, it may be your son or daughter who gets selected out. But more importantly, we must realize that a college education is increasingly a standard component of self-fulfillment in our society, and that self-fulfillment is an ideal too important in our way of life to be cast off for reasons of economy. And then, too, we need more people with college training—society as a whole needs them.

In my view the only honest and socially constructive response we can make to the so-called tidal wave is to prepare for it; prepare for it by building the facilities and training the faculties that are required to accommodate increased numbers of students. That preparation will come high. Our physical plant needs alone in the next decade may run to \$20 billion—and our present rate of construction would provide only about half that. In the area of faculty needs we face a troubling production problem: with needs for new staff rising, during the next decade, to 40,000 or 50,000 a year we are currently producing less than 5,000 Ph.D.'s a year who go into college work.

The decision to put much more effort and much more money into higher education is a hard one. The alternatives are easier, and unless I am mistaken, you will be hearing an increasing number of elaborate rationalizations designed to make the easy solutions seem sound. I believe there are economies that can be effected in our higher educational enterprise, and I think we can do a better job of seeing to it that those who go to college are those who will most benefit from the experience; but neither is going to let us off the hook of decision. We are either going to do what needs doing, or we will relegate education to a lesser place in our national way of life.

Address by Philip McCallum, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Before the National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 20, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the best summaries of the active role which the Small Business Administration is playing in today's economy was given by Mr. Philip McCallum before the National Limestone Institute at its annual meeting in Washington earlier this year.

Because I have a great deal of confidence in the value of the Small Business Administration in bolstering the backbone of every community—the small businessman—under unanimous consent I insert Mr. McCallum's remarks in the Appendix of the Record. His address follows:

I am happy to have the opportunity to meet today with you members of the National Limestone Institute, and your guests, to explain the services of the Small Business Administration.

Your president, Robert Koch, has assured me that most of the members of this institute are small, independent operators. In addition, I am well aware of the value of the products and services you have to offer. You are playing a vital part in the improving of our highway system, and equally as important is your production of agricultural limestone which does much to maintain the fertility of our farms.

Yours is an essential industry, and I have no doubt that in the years ahead you will continue to play an important role in our national economy.

Newspapers and magazines recently had a good deal to say about the "fabulous sixties" which we have just entered. The marvelous advances of the past few years are well known to all of us—atomic energy, space exploration, new products, new machines, new methods of doing just about everything under the sun.

But marvelous as these recent advances have been we are told that they are as nothing when compared to the promise of the next decade. And, indeed, it is not difficult to envision that this will be so.

Already, as a result of rocket and space research, industry is offered a wide range of new materials, light in weight, durable, and highly resistant to friction.

We have no sooner become used to the marvels of electronic computers, when we are told that in a few years we may well have available machines, perhaps no larger than a cigar box, that will approach human thinking processes.

Today, as every businessman knows, time and space are of increasing importance. To our forebearers, time moved slowly, sedately, leaving plenty of time for reflection, for decisionmaking, for correcting mistakes before the mistakes became important.

Now, time is packed full of action. More people have more things to do than they can find time in which to accomplish them. We are even more aware of the telescoping of space. Experimental airplanes have been flown at speeds of 1,400 miles an hour—but that was a few months ago. Perhaps that

speed has been exceeded by now, I do not know. I do know that there has been speculation of aircraft speeds in the near future of perhaps 4,000 miles per hour. We can move today between continents in less time than it took our fathers to travel from one county to the next.

Within this shrinking world of time and space, is it any wonder that the businessman has increasing problems of administration and operation, affecting not only himself, his employees, his sources of supply, but his customers as well?

Today, more than at any time in the past, the owner or manager of a business must keep up with changes in technology. Lacking that kind of knowledge, he will soon fall behind in the competitive race. To run and win that race in a time of rapid sociological changes, he must know about, or himself introduce, new and improved products, and new and up-to-date methods of production and distribution. With the consumer ready, and often eager to spend his money on a large variety of goods, the businessman cannot stand still. If he does, he will surely do himself irreparable harm.

One would hardly recognize the machinery used today in manufacturing as compared to even 20 years ago. Continued investment of capital has brought automatic control of looms, lathes, drill presses, cutting tools, oil refining processes, and countless other operations. The flow of materials, the testing of materials and components, the storage of parts, and even the whole operation of assembly lines can now be controlled by magnetic tapes or by one or two skilled operators.

Change is the order of the day; radical change, often swift and unexpected. And change appears certain to dominate our lives in the years ahead.

The businessman who is going to succeed in the fabulous sixties will be the businessman who anticipates the changes that lie ahead and prepares for them.

Certainly these are prosperous times now, and all the predictions for 1960 that I have seen forecast a further expansion in our economy, with the gross national product surging past the \$500 billion mark for the first time in history.

We in the Small Business Administration are concerned with the welfare of the Nation's 4 million small firms. We have developed a number of programs to help the small firms with their various problems, so they can keep up in the parade of progress and help strengthen the Nation's economy.

One of the common problems of small firms, particularly of small firms that are expanding or trying to expand, is the shortage of term financing. To help meet this need, the Small Business Administration has developed a program of financial assistance. We think this is a very effective program. Since the start of the program in September 1953 we have approved more than 18,000 individual loans totaling more than \$850 million to aid small firms.

Perhaps the best way to explain this program to you is to give you in some detail the story of one such loan we recently approved to a small firm engaged in crushing, hauling, and placing limestone rock on highways, and crushing and spreading agricultural lime for farmers.

The proprietor of this small firm visited one of our branch offices and told this story: He and his brother had organized the firm about 15 years before and they had done very well. They had about 35 employees and their net sales were about \$300,000 a year.

In order to keep up with technological progress, the firm has been obliged to go rather heavily into debt to purchase crushers, pulverizers, shovels, trucks, and other equipment.

Profits were also reduced by the necessity to make large set-asides for depreciation of equipment.

The proprietor's basic problem was this: In order to improve the efficiency of operations and handle an increased volume of business, he would have to spend an additional \$55,000 for new equipment. The equipment needed consisted of a link-belt shovel costing \$10,000; a jaw crusher costing \$20,000; and a roll crusher costing \$25,000.

He had been to his bank to discuss the problem with his banker. The banker explained that he was already helping the firm finance its past purchases of equipment and was helping with the firm's short-term financing and that was about as much as he could do at this time.

However, he suggested that the proprietor visit the Small Business Administration. He said his bank would be glad to consider a participation loan in cooperation with the SBA.

Accordingly, the proprietor of this firm had prepared the necessary financial records and he was now asking what help the Small Business Administration would be able to provide.

The financial specialist was impressed with the operation of this business. He noted that the management was experienced, competent, and well regarded in the community; he noted that the equipment the firm owned was maintained in very good condition and was checked regularly; the firm maintained a complete set of books and its future prospects appeared very good.

Accordingly, in a short while the SBA was able to approve a loan of \$87,000 to this small firm—\$55,000 to purchase the needed new equipment, and the remaining \$32,000 to pay off chattel mortgages on machinery and equipment previously purchased.

The loan was to be repaid in monthly installments over a period of 7 years. The bank agreed to take a 25-percent share of the loan, and to service the loan for the SBA. The interest was set at 5 percent.

I have given you details of this loan, because it is typical of the way the Small Business Administration operates. When we are convinced that the management is capable, the collateral adequate, and there is a good prospect for future earnings from which the loan can be repaid, the applicant stands a good chance of receiving financial help from this Agency.

In this case, the firm purchased the new equipment, expanded its operations, hired 15 additional employees, and at last report it was getting along very well.

Small businesses are eligible for SBA loans for these purposes: Business construction, conversion or expansion; the purchase of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies or materials, or for working capital.

There are two types of Small Business Administration business loans—participation and direct. In a participation loan, the agency joins with a bank or other private lending institution in a loan to a small business concern. In a direct loan, there is no participation by a private lender—the loan is made entirely and directly by the SBA to the borrower.

By law the agency cannot make a direct loan if a bank or other private lending institution will join with it in a loan. The amount which may be borrowed from the Small Business Administration depends upon how much is needed for the intended purposes of the loan. The maximum amount which the agency may have outstanding to any one borrower is \$350,000. This maximum applies to the agency's share of a participation loan and to a direct SBA loan.

So much for our financial assistance program. Let us now turn to another program we have for helping small firms obtain

needed equity capital through the establishment of privately owned small business investment companies.

Under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Small Business Administration licenses, regulates and may provide financial assistance to privately owned small business investment companies. These companies in turn make equity-type and long-term financing available to small business concerns.

Before it can begin operations under the act, a company must be licensed by the SBA and must have paid-in capital and surplus of at least \$300,000. However, in order to enable a company to get started, the SBA is authorized to purchase subordinated debentures from the company up to a maximum amount of \$150,000.

As a further step to encourage the formation and growth of these new sources of equity-type and long-term funds for small business, the Small Business Administration may also make loans to an investment company, up to 50 percent of the company's paid-in capital and surplus. The investment company also may borrow from private sources, subject to conditions prescribed by the SBA.

The Small Business Investment Act also authorized the Small Business Administration to make loans to State and local development companies to help them assist small businesses of their areas.

So far the Small Business Administration has licensed 67 small business investment companies. We expect that before long there will be at least one such investment company organized in each of the larger cities throughout the country and that these investment companies will become an important source of financing for small business concerns.

Let us turn now to another service of the Small Business Administration—disaster loans:

Loans are made in storm, flood and other major disaster areas to help repair or rebuild homes, businesses and nonprofit institutions, and to help replace lost furnishings or business machinery, equipment and inventory.

Loans are made in drought or excessive rainfall disaster areas to help small business concerns suffering substantial economic injury to overcome this injury and to continue in business until the disaster conditions end.

A small business concern may be considered for an SBA disaster loan provided it has suffered substantial economic injury because of a drought or excessive rainfall in its area, and provided the President or the Secretary of Agriculture has declared the area a major disaster area because of the drought or excessive rainfall.

The Small Business Administration has approved nearly 9,000 disaster loans for approximately \$95 million.

Another of our services is helping small firms who wish to sell their products or services to the Government. This is an important program because, as you know, the U.S. Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world.

In the Small Business Act, Congress stated its intention that "a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government (including, but not limited to, contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small business enterprises," and that "a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises."

The agency's regional offices maintain inventories or listings of the productive facilities of small firms in their areas, and use them to refer prime contract and subcontract opportunities to firms which can furnish the needed products or services.

The SBA's field offices serve as a meeting point for Government prime contractors and other business concerns in need of subcon-

tractors and small firms which have the required facilities.

The SBA helps small business concerns to undertake research and development work, including work for the Government, and to obtain the benefits of research and development.

The Small Business Administration has developed programs with major Government purchasing agencies under which purchases are set aside to be made from small business, and bidding for the contracts is limited to small business concerns.

The SBA has arranged cooperative small business set-aside programs with the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Post Office Department.

Small Business Administration representatives are assigned to the larger purchasing offices of these agencies to review proposed purchases with their purchasing officials and to reserve suitable ones for award to small business. The decision to set aside for small business all or part of a purchase, or class of purchase, is made jointly by the SBA and the purchasing agency.

Under this program, nearly 80,000 prime Government contracts have been awarded to small firms, and these contract awards amount to more than \$3 billion.

The Small Business Administration also assists small business concerns with their management problems; helps small business owners and managers strengthen their management skills and learn of new and improved business practices; and finances research into the problems of small businesses.

As part of this program, the Small Business Administration arranges with colleges, universities and State agencies for research and studies concerning the financing and operation of small business enterprises. So far we have made individual grants to educational institutions in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

The grants range from \$7,000 to the maximum permitted by law, \$40,000. These studies, when they are completed, will be widely distributed and we believe they will be of great value to small business enterprises.

As part of its educational program among the small business concerns of the Nation, the SBA cosponsors with educational institutions administrative management courses designed to help businessmen fill the gaps in their knowledge and experience by acquiring a better grasp of overall business administration.

Since 1954, the SBA has cosponsored 653 management courses at 255 educational institutions, and the courses have been attended by more than 20,000 business owners and managers. They pay the cost through their tuitions.

We also publish several series of management and technical publications of value to established or prospective operators of small business concerns. These are:

Management Aids for Small Manufacturers, a series designed to supply needed information on sound business administration in small plants.

Small Marketers Aids, which are leaflets intended for owners and operators of small retail, wholesale and service enterprises.

Technical Aids for Small Manufacturers, a series designed for use by operators of small plants, discuss significant developments in such fields as materials, processes, equipment and maintenance.

The Small Business Management Series consists of booklets which cover important management subjects, and normally are prepared on a contract basis by recognized authorities in the fields covered.

The Starting and Managing Series, a new type of publication, will provide information

on starting and managing different types of small business concerns.

From this brief outline, it is apparent I believe, the Small Business Administration has developed a wide and effective program for aiding small firms.

In these prosperous times businesses of all kinds, small or large, have an unprecedented opportunity to expand their products and services and help provide new jobs and new opportunities.

Business is on the upsurge. The National Industrial Conference Board says that the Nation is going to continue to have a rapid rise in the standard of living, due to technological progress, a growing population, a very high rate of income, and large capital investments by industry.

Thus we have in our great Nation assurance of further economic growth and a solid foundation upon which we can build our future. All the signs indicate to me that alert, farseeing companies will find exciting opportunities for growth and prosperity.

The Last Days of J. Ernest Wilkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an article appearing in a recent issue of Ebony magazine, written by Simeon Booker, entitled "The Last Days of J. Ernest Wilkins."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST DAYS OF J. ERNEST WILKINS—A
VICTIM OF POLITICAL BICKERING, UNBENDING
FIGHTER DIES A LONELY MAN

(By Simeon Booker)

On a balmy spring day 2 years ago in the Nation's Capital, the son of a poor Methodist minister who rose to become Assistant Secretary of Labor, the highest Government post ever held by a Negro, grimly set out to write a letter of resignation to President Eisenhower. For J. Ernest Wilkins, the administration's most celebrated Negro appointee and internationally known because of his position, the decision was heart rending. He had failed in the one job he wanted so badly, in which he had worked so hard to succeed.

Somehow, he did not write the letter—at that time. Perhaps, because of his objections to the methods used to oust him or because he felt he still could perform in a manner satisfactory to his superiors, he delayed the ordeal. The postponement, according to intimates, exposed the soft-voiced, gentle "prince of a man" to a hectic, bitter campaign against him and probably hastened the end of his life—only 10 months later.

In those months, however, the 64-year-old Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Illinois and a pacesetter for a brilliant family demonstrated a courage and perseverance seldom seen in U.S. politics. The man whom some Negroes described earlier as "ultra-conservative," launched a one-man battle that reached the White House level and ended in the pitiable death of "a broken-hearted Christian." Little has been written about the stormy episodes that capped his

spectacular career. Only in recent months have intimates started to discuss the fateful disaster of the man dubbed "The Puritan of Mahogany Row" and worshiped as the administration's headline race figure. The talk is reviving the memory of the former Chicago lawyer and could well give him the rightful and lasting place he deserves in civil rights.

When he was appointed to the subcabinet post in 1954 by President Eisenhower, Wilkins became the ranking Negro in a torrid, fast-moving, protocol-conscious Nation's Capital. He calmly accepted the honor, courteously rejected the frills and trimmings. A staunch Methodist churchman, he steered away from drinking, smoking, cursing, even turned social invitations down by the score. He made it clear from the start that his goal was carrying out his duties. Without press conferences or interviews, he regularly (though unwillingly) made news, becoming the first Negro to sit in on a cabinet session, head a U.S. delegation to International Labor Office meetings in Europe and Cuba.

But the buildup became a nightmare 4 years later that worried the architects of administration policy: How could they fire a Negro VIP whom they publicized so much? Especially since the country had been told that he had done a tremendous job.

What are the factors that provoked Wilkins to consider resignation? There was apprehension from the beginning in labor circles as to his qualifications for a post that dealt with international labor relations. Wilkins had no previous experience in labor, didn't talk the language, and, as one labor leader said: "He didn't know the difference between the AFL and CIO and just couldn't get on the level with working people." A man dedicated to what he believed was right, Wilkins was firm once he adopted a course. He took little advice, had few friends in labor areas and worked almost independently. Said one Negro laborite: "There were a lot of us who wanted to see him make good, but he never picked up the phone and called. And he never stopped by." Yet, despite this criticism, department officials admitted that Wilkins learned the ropes and within months was making a record on the job. He was acclaimed for his speeches to worldwide delegations of labor leaders, instituted exchange programs, developed a labor program in Africa. Said one: "When he made up his mind, he went all of the way."

Even though racism was not a factor in his predicament, it lurked in the shadows. Deep down, Wilkins was an uncompromising crusader. Here is an incident one labor leader related: When Wilkins led the delegation to Switzerland in 1957, a Russian took the floor at the ILO confab and in a rousing speech attacked the United States as a country spawning people such as Mississippi Senator JAMES EASTLAND. An American delegate turned to Wilkins, their leader, and urged him to object on the grounds that what the speaker was saying wasn't germane to the labor issue. Retorted Wilkins: "He's telling the truth, isn't he?" Wilkins refused to step in and another American did, finally getting the chairman to silence the speaker. Said the labor leader: "Wilkins just was too honest, too sincere to realize his role as a diplomat."

During the fall of 1957, Labor Department Secretary James P. Mitchell, according to reliable sources, indicated that he was displeased with Wilkins' role as head of the 80-person staff which handled relations with labor leaders in 79 countries. He told some aids that he "realized he made a mistake" in appointing Wilkins, but wanted to help him find another unique job. To gradually ease Wilkins out, he had the White House appoint him as the only race member of the newly formed Civil Rights Commission. But

Wilkins refused to quit, delayed his resignation and fell victim to a humiliating incident—and a heart attack.

Scheduled to lead his fourth ILO delegation to Europe in May of 1958, he packed his bags and canceled speaking engagements. Then, he got word he would be left home. The decision unnerved him and 3 days later, after the delegation departed, a secretary rushed into his office to find him groping at his desk, gasping that he could not see. He had suffered a heart attack. Rushed to Walter Reed Hospital, he was confined 3 months, losing his sight for a while. It was first feared that the heart attack had blinded Wilkins permanently.

For weeks, his life hung in the balance. His faithful wife, Lucille, stayed at his side but, like her husband, refused to summon outside help. Said a Negro Republican: "If we'd just known what was going on, we could have helped. But Wilkins was a self-reliant man."

Still ailing, Wilkins returned to his office where he found the pressures for his ouster at an all-time high. Newspapers hinted correctly that his successor would be 31-year-old George C. Lodge, son of the U.N. Ambassador. There was little work for Wilkins: he was stripped of responsibility and according to office help, he "merely shuffled papers all day." The man whom the GOP formerly headlined was a "forgotten man" without services of a full-time secretary. Crippled somewhat by the heart attack, he fought on, trying to retain his post. A year or so before, when he broke his leg in a fall in Flint, Mich., he astonished employees by hobbling to work in a cast—so enthusiastic was he about the job. This never-say-die spirit flourished and won the admiration and silent help of numerous white and Negro employees.

As the first Negro subcabinet member, Wilkins endeared himself early to staffers. He was responsible for the first Negro secretaries to accompany overseas Labor Department delegations and the appointment of top race aides in his section. It is said that even while walking down halls, he noticed all-white sections and complained to personnel. Yet, his own secretary was white and he made no effort to replace her. With use of a limousine, Wilkins often drove his own car and even ate in the public cafeteria in his building in preference to the exclusive executive dining room.

As resignation rumors persisted, prominent Methodist Church men offered their services to the defense of their first Negro president of the judicial council (the church's supreme court). But Wilkins turned them down. When it came to services, Wilkins' creed was "Believe in yourself and march forward." Said a friend: "He would charge into a lion's den and not know how to get out." Said another: "He knew church politics but he was lost when they hit from behind in national politics."

During the next weeks, Wilkins was the loneliest person in the building. No longer did he have communication with Labor Secretary Mitchell who wrapped his arm about him at the initial press confab. No more was he considered a man on the team. Aids said Wilkins prayed, read the Bible in his office, but that there was little relief. Aids for White House Chief Sherman Adams and Vice President Nixon tried to arrange meetings with their bosses to discuss the matter, but Wilkins spurned them. Said he: "The President appointed me and I want him to hear my case."

This attitude surprised the professional politicians. Never before had a colored man refused to talk to the Vice President or chief White House aid and stood his ground so firm, refusing to compromise on principle. When the conference, with President Eisenhower was arranged, Wilkins ducked in a side door of the White House and talked

face to face with the man who had uprooted him from his successful 35-year law practice. But the President was firm; Wilkins had to go because Labor Secretary James Mitchell had the right to appoint his top aids. Still, the President would find another job of equal importance. Wilkins replied that he would think it over.

When he left the White House, reporters said the soft-spoken, humble man had tears in his eyes. He did. But he wasn't crying. Since the heart attack, his eyes watered and he constantly had to wipe them. Friends said, however, that he was distressed and disillusioned.

At a White House press conference in mid-August, President Eisenhower denied reports that he was forcing Wilkins from the post. He admitted that he had "a congenial talk" and that Wilkins was considering resigning. The reporters were led to believe the reason was Wilkins' failing health.

The President's public pronouncement was the last straw. Wilkins, according to friends, realized that he had lost the battle. Daily for weeks he carted books and other belongings from his office in such amounts as not to cause comment. His resignation "for personal considerations" was announced during the first week of November and Wilkins, on his last workday, went home without saying goodbye to any of his superiors and turning down a proposal that he be honored at a testimonial dinner. He was through. Period. He wanted to forget.

A leading Republican said: "His leaving was the low water mark for us as far as Negroes were concerned. We feel embarrassed."

There was no uproar from the Negro community—just as Wilkins desired. But shortly after suffering perhaps his biggest setback—to be forced out of a history-making job, Wilkins, to his credit, refused to quit public life. As a member of the Civil Rights Commission, he concentrated his energies. His early accomplishments: appointments of Howard Law School Dean George Johnson as the Commission's legal director and Thomas Young on the publicity staff.

The stage was set for his debut in early November in Montgomery, Ala., former Confederacy capital. The Commission was launching its first probe of Alabama vote denial cases and there were some 45 Negroes, some white judges and members of registrar boards, slated as witnesses. The Commission members stayed at the Maxwell Air Force Base after downtown hotels rejected the entire group because Wilkins was a Negro.

Before a tense and crowded hearing in the Federal courthouse, Wilkins, alert and quick, tossed caution to the wind—and exploded. His questioning of witnesses, including the judges, brought gasps. A registrar refused to answer him. There was no argument that his questioning of witnesses laid the Commission's groundwork.

Said a Negro newspaperman: "There is not an ounce of fear in Wilkins. He is sharp. Where has he been all this time?" A white colleague remarked: "He plunged right in and hit the heart of the matter. Being a Negro, he upset the tradition in that area for years to come." But, said a Washington politician: "This was the turning point in Wilkins' life. Before, he'd been a quiet but powerful crusader. After he lost the job, he just started talking what he believed. He'll never get another U.S. post."

Meanwhile, there was little use in speculating whether Wilkins would have been named a Federal judge or a U.S. ambassador. In speeches throughout the country, he mentioned that there was a brooding look on the face of Abraham Lincoln in the Washington memorial. Then he always added, "In a few years we'll have to change that statue. With segregation on the way out, the Emancipator will be happy."

On January 19, 1959 (10 days after he appeared at the second Montgomery, Ala., hearing), J. Ernest Wilkins died alone in his Washington home. Friends immediately noticed the grimace on his face as he lay sprawled on the bedroom floor and were reminded of his remarks about Lincoln. Said one: "Now he belongs to the ages—the forgotten man." He lay in state at downtown Washington's Foundry Methodist Church, the first time a Negro has been so honored, and was funeralized from his beloved Chicago.

A year after his death, little has been written about the man who taught Washington VIP's the value of devotion to duty and integrity. It's understandable. They want to forget the way Wilkins was treated and how he died.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during these days of uncertainty it is well to pause and consider the importance and the impact of social security on our economy and our way of life.

When social security was born it was heralded as a major prop in our economy against the devastating effects of unemployment, automation, and national business recessions.

Social security was held up as the answer to our need for security in old age, opportunity for youth and as proof positive that a democracy could meet the challenge of socialism and communism.

Recently much has been written but little has been said about the need for drastic changes and an updating of this law passed in 1934 becoming effective in 1935.

From the earliest dawn of history, advancing age has been one of man's greatest problems. Primitive tribes regarded age with superstition and fear. Often, the older men and women were driven from the tribes into the forest in the belief that their infirmities made them unfit to associate with others. Gradually, as family units were established, the elderly gained a better place in society. In the beginnings of most civilizations that remain today, the very old were the responsibility of the younger members of the families. In some societies, the aged were highly revered and the conduct of government rested in their venerable hands. But the family remained the basic foundation of their support.

Not until recent times has society as a whole accepted responsibility for the care of the old. Homes for the aged were established in Holland in the 16th century. Other nations neglected the elderly to a woeful extent until the beginning of this century. But gradually, as industrialization drove families into teeming cities and destroyed the last vestiges of tribal life in the Western World, it became clear that the people as

a whole would be forced to protect the old, or let them starve in lonely misery.

This gave birth to national pension systems in some European countries. Many had already established generous programs for the elderly long before the United States at last recognized its obligations to its senior citizens.

Not until the great depression did America act. But when it did, its action was aimed more at unemployment than the economic protection of the old. The Social Security Act first went into effect in 1935, when millions were jobless. With its rigid restrictions against earnings by beneficiaries the act was largely designed to drive older workers out of the labor market. That if offered some retirement benefits was an incidental feature. Thus, we see that social security came too late, with too little.

All efforts to broaden its provisions and enlarge its benefits have lagged far behind the exploding economy of this Nation. On every hand, we see evidence of the greatest prosperity in history. America has more factories, bigger cities, finer highways, and more devastating weapons of destruction than any other nation ever had. Most of our people are the richest, the best-fed, and most adequately clothed, the best educated in the world.

But millions dwell on the edge of economic slavery in the midst of fantastic wealth. These are the more than 14 million Americans of age 65 or older. Many receive a small social security benefit, pitifully insufficient to meet their monthly needs. Most augment this with State old-age assistance, if they are desperate enough and lucky enough to meet the restrictive requirements of State and local welfare regulations. Others, who do not qualify for social security, must depend entirely on State assistance.

Who pays for State old age assistance? The taxpayers of the State and the Nation. The Federal Government contributes matching grants to the States. The States are encouraged to add their funds. From these two sources, States establish their old age assistance grants, hardly enough to keep the elderly alive. The programs are makeshift in character, cumbersome in administration, and the constant target of attacks by so-called "taxpayer groups" and other special interests. Their narrow concern is the level of taxes, which they fight to reduce with total disregard of the people's welfare—especially the aged.

So America forges ahead toward a millennium of materialism, while clinging to an old age security system as outmoded as the buggy whip. With a social security program crippled in its infancy, and State old age payments that are only a slight improvement over the poorhouse system of a generation ago, this Nation has virtually abandoned its deserving aged.

PROGRAM RETIREMENT BENEFITS

First. Social security must be brought up to date. It must be reshaped to fit our atomic times, available to all who apply for it in an amount geared to the Federal minimum wage law. This now

stands at \$1 per hour for a 40-hour week, or \$173 per month.

If this Nation accepts the fact that a working man cannot live on less than \$173.33 per month, does it not follow that an aged person deserves the same amount?

Under present law, millions of oldsters are denied any social security benefits, or receive minimum payments. The Social Security Act must be amended to include all these aged men and women. They must be rescued from their plight as second-class oldsters and freed of the harassment and persecution they suffer under threadbare State old age assistance programs. Many of these unfortunate oldsters are widows who devoted their lifetimes to their families only to reach their later years with no provision for economic security.

Second. America's oldsters must be protected from the financial ravages of inflation. Too often, retirees have seen their hard-earned savings swallowed up years ahead of their retirement timetable as the value of the dollar drops with dizzy speed. After a realistic payment has been set by Congress, a cost-of-living amendment should be written into the Social Security Act, to increase benefits automatically in inflationary periods.

Third. To protect the sensitive economy of the Nation, social security eligibility ages should be made fluid. Benefits should be available at a lower age in times of widespread unemployment. The eligibility age for those able to work could be raised but not past 65, in periods of great labor demand, such as a war or other national emergency.

Fourth. Under existing law, several million Americans are totally neglected by the Nation they have helped to develop. These are men and women of 60 years and older. Once jobless at this age, these people find it well-nigh impossible to find new employment. There is no State old age assistance available. At age 62 women can obtain partial social security old age benefits but no State old age assistance. Men are not eligible for either form of benefits until they are 65. The Social Security Act must be broadened to include both men and women in the 60-and-over group, if they apply for benefits.

Fifth. The present, unrealistic limitation on earnings by old age beneficiaries under the Federal Social Security Act should be junked. Instead of prohibiting the elderly from making more than \$1,200 per year, the law should permit them to earn at least twice that amount, or \$2,400. All limits should be removed at age 70, instead of the present age of 72.

Sixth. The Nation's disabled should receive full benefits at whatever age they become physically unable to work.

Seventh. Adequate annuities must be provided for widows with families, enabling them to raise their children in dignity and decency.

Revolutionary changes? They may be, to some. But drastic action is necessary now to establish a real national retirement program. The Social Security Act provides a practical vehicle for this ob-

jective. Even Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, admits the urgency of this program. He recently stated publicly that social security benefits should be offered to everyone at 72, whether or not they had ever worked in covered employment.

Tremendous savings would be possible under a "social security for all" system. Hundreds of thousands of State, county, and municipal social welfare workers could be dropped from the tax-supported payrolls. With a single check coming every month from the Federal Government, recipients would no longer be subjected to the humiliation of embarrassing investigations, quizzes and surprise visits by snooping welfare workers. The labyrinthine tangle of State and local welfare departments could be cleared and the taxpayers relieved of millions of dollars in annual administrative and other costs.

The present outdated system of requiring the employer and the employee to bear the full expense of social security payments should be abandoned and America should follow the example of many foreign nations. The Federal Government could participate in the program as a third-party contributor. This practice has proved successful in many other countries, some of which receive millions in foreign aid from the United States. Paradoxically, they use part of these funds to establish social security programs far more advanced than our own. Can America risk losing her position of world leadership by permitting less wealthy countries to widen their lead in this important area of social progress?

MEDICAL CARE

The elderly have more frequent and serious health problems than any other population group. They spend more time in hospitals and their chances of recovery diminish with every passing year.

In modern America, they find themselves in a hopeless squeeze, caught between steadily rising medical and hospital costs, and greatly curtailed income. No realistic private health or hospitalization insurance is available to the aged at a cost they can afford.

Congress must provide health protection to the aged to fill the medical vacuum left by private medicine and private insurance companies. Every person receiving social security benefits should receive medical care and hospitalization at no cost to him with the doctors and hospitals paid out of the social security fund. This is the only practical solution to the problem of protecting the health of our elderly. Payments could follow established rates and customs set up under Blue Cross, Blue Shield and other programs.

A bill by Representative AIME FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island, now before Congress, provides for this protection to social security recipients.

HOUSING

Social scientists and public agencies throughout the Nation have repeatedly described housing as one of the most urgent needs of our aging population.

Severely limited financially, older Americans cannot compete with highly paid workers for rental dwellings. As a result, they concentrate in the slums, endangering their health and safety and perpetuating areas of civic blight.

Although Congress in 1956 established section 207—Housing for the elderly—as part of the Federal Housing Act, very little has been accomplished in the field. Nonprofit organizations can qualify under section 207 for federally insured loans to build housing for the elderly developments. But the financial hurdles are so high that no truly nonprofit corporations can surmount them. Consequently, housing for the elderly remains almost at a standstill while millions of worthy, elderly citizens stagnate in unhealthy—often dangerous—living quarters.

Congress in 1959 passed new legislation affecting housing for the elderly. Unfortunately, the provisions are so far largely meaningless. Congress did not appropriate the necessary \$50 million to activate the new legislation. And although the payback period for federally insured mortgage loans was extended from 40 to 50 years, high interest rates and large FNMA discounts virtually cancel this feature. The advantages of 100 percent mortgage insurance offered in the new law is illusory for the same reason.

Congress must further revise housing for the elderly provisions of the Federal Housing Act. One hundred percent financing must be made available on realistic terms to nonprofit organizations interested in building low-rent, high-quality facilities for the aged. The terms should be similar to those now available for military and other special assistance programs. Interest rates, paid directly to the Federal Government, should be pegged at a level no higher than necessary to process and service the mortgage.

Eight billion dollars of surplus foods lie sealed in warehouses across this great land of ours. The harvest of fertile farms in every section of the country, this precious food is denied to our elderly men and women, even though they desperately need it. Occasionally, large shipments are sent to foreign lands, to be distributed wholesale on a "no questions asked" basis. Meanwhile, private corporations fatten on the huge rentals charged to our Government for the use of the food storehouses.

Congress in 1959 passed an amendment to a foreign aid food bill, to permit distribution of surplus foods to hungry Americans, using a food stamp system. But Agriculture Secretary Benson arrogantly announced he would not put the system into effect, even after President Eisenhower signed it. This is an example of how far some of the President's appointees will go to prevent help from reaching those who need it the most.

The 1960 Congress should adopt a mandatory provision in a new, stronger food stamp bill, including a provision compelling the administration to put it into effect without delay.

These food stamps should be negotiable at any store or market, so that individuals could go to the store of his choice

and exchange the food stamps for any kind of food commodity.

In the interest of showing the inadequacy of the present law, I present a summary of the benefits obtainable under the present law.

BENEFIT AMOUNTS

Average monthly wage: In general, an individual's average monthly wage for computing his monthly old-age insurance benefit amount is determined by dividing the total of his creditable earnings after the applicable starting date and up to the applicable closing date, by the number of months involved. Excluded from this computation are all months and all earnings in any year, any part of which was included in a period of disability under the disability "freeze" (except that the months and earnings in the year in which the period of disability begins may be included if the resulting benefit would be higher). Also excluded from the computation are all months in any year prior to the year the individual attained age 22 if less than two quarters of such year were quarters of coverage. Starting dates may be the year of attainment of age 21. The closing date may be either (1) the first day of the year the individual died or became entitled to benefits or (2) the first day of the year in which he was fully insured and attained retirement age, whichever results in a higher benefit.

Applicable starting and closing dates are those which yield the highest benefit amount. The minimum divisor is 18 months.

Individuals can drop out up to 5 years of lowest or no earnings in computing average monthly wage.

The minimum primary insurance amount is \$33.

MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS

Family maximum benefits are set by the new table and range from \$53 to \$254 (subject to rounding of individual benefits to next higher 10 cents). Though not specifically stated in the law, the table provides that the maximum amount payable on a single wage record is the lesser of \$254—twice the maximum possible primary insurance amount—or 80 percent of the individual's average monthly wage. The 80-percent limitation, however, cannot reduce family benefits below the larger of \$53 or 1½ times the primary amount.

DEPENDENTS' AND SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

First. Wife or husband of insured worker: One-half of primary insurance amount.

Second. Child of insured worker: One-half of primary insurance amount.

Third. Widow, widower, former wife divorced, or parent of deceased insured worker: Three-quarters of primary insurance amount except minimum benefit is \$33 if individual is sole beneficiary entitled.

Fourth. Child of deceased insured worker: If only one child is entitled, three-quarters of primary insurance amount, except minimum is \$33 if the child is the sole beneficiary entitled.

If more than one child entitled, each child gets one-half of primary insurance amount plus an equal share in an additional one-quarter of primary insurance amount.

Fifth. Lump-sum death payment: Three times the primary insurance amount with a statutory maximum of \$255.

Benefit chart

Average monthly earnings	Old-age benefits			Survivors benefits ¹	
	Worker	Worker and wife at age 62	Worker and wife at age 65	Widow, widower, child or parent	Widow and 2 children
\$50	\$33	\$45.40	\$49.50	\$33.00	\$53.10
\$60	59	81.20	88.50	44.30	88.60
\$70	65	89.40	97.50	48.80	97.60
\$80	67	92.20	100.50	50.30	100.70
\$90	69	94.90	103.50	51.80	105.60
\$100	71	97.70	106.50	53.30	112.90
\$110	73	100.40	109.50	54.80	120.00
\$120	75	103.20	112.50	56.30	128.00
\$130	77	107.30	117.00	58.50	139.20
\$140	80	110.00	120.00	60.00	146.50
\$150	82	112.80	123.00	61.50	154.50
\$160	84	115.50	126.00	63.00	161.60
\$170	86	118.30	129.00	64.50	168.90
\$180	88	121.00	132.00	66.00	176.00
\$190	90	123.80	135.00	67.50	180.10
\$200	93	127.90	139.50	69.80	186.20
\$210	95	130.70	142.50	71.30	190.10
\$220	97	133.40	145.50	72.80	194.20
\$230	99	136.20	148.50	74.30	198.10
\$240	101	138.90	151.50	75.80	202.20
\$250	103	141.70	154.50	77.30	206.10
\$260	105	144.40	157.50	78.80	210.20
\$270	108	148.50	162.00	81.00	216.00
\$280	110	151.30	165.00	82.50	220.10
\$290	112	154.00	168.00	84.00	224.00
\$300	114	156.80	171.00	85.50	228.10
\$310	116	159.50	174.00	87.00	232.00
\$320	118	162.30	177.00	88.50	236.10
\$330	120	165.00	180.00	90.00	240.00
\$340	123	169.20	184.50	92.30	246.10
\$350	125	171.90	187.50	93.80	250.20
\$400	127	174.70	190.50	95.30	254.10

¹ Survivor benefit amounts for a widow and 1 child or for 2 parents would be the same as for a man and wife.

INSURED STATUS

Fully insured: one quarter of coverage—acquired at any time after 1936—

for every two calendar quarters elapsing after 1950—or after quarter in which age 21 was attained, if later—and before

quarter of death or attainment of retirement age whichever first occurs.

No person can be fully insured unless he has at least six quarters of coverage.

Currently insured: six quarters of coverage within thirteen quarters ending with quarter of death or entitlement to old-age insurance benefits.

Also includes in the definition of "currently insured individual" an individual who meets the present coverage requirement in the quarter in which he becomes entitled to disability insurance benefits.

Quarter of coverage defined: quarter in which individual received at least \$50 in wages (other than for agricultural work) or was credited with at least \$100 in self-employment income.

Every quarter in any calendar year in which wages are \$4,800 or more, and every quarter in a taxable year in which combined wages and self-employment income equal at least \$4,800.

In the case of wages computed on an annual basis for agricultural workers, four quarters of coverage are credited for a minimum of \$400; three quarters for income of \$300 to \$399.99; two quarters for income of \$200 to \$299.99, and one quarter for \$100 to \$199.99 for a year.

A review of the law shows that the Congress has failed to keep the Social Security Act abreast of the needs and the times. Approximately 2 million young workers enter the labor market every year while automation increases production per man-day beyond consumption levels creating unemployment at both ends of the age scale.

Every statistic proves that unemployment is becoming greater amongst production workers while production is increasing. This means we are increasing surpluses of both goods and labor.

Consumption of goods produced and creation of non-production jobs is the obvious answer. Charity is not the answer. Social security and retirement pension systems paid for while working and earning income are the answers, at least until something better comes along.

Although the demands of political expediency in a presidential election year may well stall all but minor revisions and amendments this year, the demand for changes will increase and in the not too distant future a major overhaul of the Social Security Act will be the order of the day.

Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, upon my request the League of Women Voters of Anchorage has submitted a statement of policy regarding technical cooperation and economic assistance under the mutual security program. The statement is signed by Mrs. Paul B. Crews, president of the League of Women Voters of Anchorage. Because the statement

demonstrates that the people of Alaska are concerned not only with the vital issues which affect the 49th State, but also with the worldwide situation of the United States, and because the statement reflects study and wisdom, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from Mrs. Paul B. Crews, dated March 3, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,

Anchorage, Alaska, March 3, 1960.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: We are most pleased to send our views on the technical cooperation and economic aid portions of the mutual security program because we hold the firm conviction that the security and economic health of the United States and the rest of the world are inseparable. Being convinced of this we recognize that the means of achieving and maintaining our own security and economic health are of increasing importance and will require perhaps decades of effort and discipline by our people before the goal is achieved. The arguments of the opponents of foreign aid reflect very real domestic problems which we must solve; however, if the narrower, isolated interests should prevail rather than the overall welfare of the United States, the problems we would have to face would be overwhelming.

The League of Women Voters believes that an effective overall plan for economic aid should embody long-range plans, involve joint participation by the United States, the other industrialized countries, and the developing countries; provide enough money at the right time to insure real progress; be well coordinated and efficiently staffed and administered.

Under these characteristics of a good mutual security program many phases of U.S. participation will need constant reappraisal, a few of which are: The ratio of United States to other participating countries' contributions to multilateral loan programs; the balance of payments deficit; how we allocate our aid for the development of those we aid as well as in our own self-interest; and measures to increase the efficiency and accountability of the foreign-aid programs. Decisions to these peacetime challenges are possible within the broader framework of our total commitment to world economic stability and reconstruction. While the interim answer lies in foreign aid and technical assistance and loan programs, we think that the ultimate answer to healthy economics is mutually beneficial trade. Toward this end the League of Women Voters for many years has supported reciprocal trade agreements and urged that the United States participate in GATT. We have opposed higher tariffs, quotas, escape clauses, and buy American provisions.

We see no particular merit in arguing the case for or against foreign aid on whether or not our domestic programs of schools, natural resources development and highways need public attention which they are not now getting inasmuch as the survival of our form of society depends upon how we meet our international challenges.

We do recognize the urgency of readjustment in some sectors of our American economy due to our own technological progress as well as highly competitive foreign markets. Toward this end we believe the American public would support congressional efforts aimed toward studies and pilot programs relative to conversion of industries and research into new uses of basic products. We have no position as the League of Women

Voters on any of the Federal aid to education programs, but we note that the administration has made recommendations for enlarging the National Defense Education Act to increase appropriations for grants to States for science, mathematics, and foreign language teaching equipment, and for vocational training in occupations requiring scientific skills. The present farm surpluses as they affect our domestic economy and their effect on the world commodity markets are crying for solution. In these three mentioned areas of domestic problems the critics cannot place the blame on our foreign aid programs—they are products of our own development.

The League of Women Voters of Anchorage does not think that foreign aid is an either/or proposition. And we do not think that political expediency has any place in the vital decisions affecting the international position of the United States. We would rather urge the individual solutions to our domestic problems and the statesmanlike approach to international relations. This includes the various phases of our foreign economic policy.

Thank you for the opportunity of expressing our thinking on this subject.

Very sincerely yours,

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF

ANCHORAGE,

Mrs. PAUL B. CREWS,

President.

Presidential Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1960:

PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—How can we bring about a more meaty and exciting debate of the great issues at stake in a presidential election?

Political campaigning has been in a rut for a long time. The torchlight parade has given way to the whistlestop and the whistlestop has pretty much given way to the jet-prop stop. But this has affected mostly the mechanics of political discussion. There is not enough serious debate of the most vital matters. Too much of it is conducted under circumstances which repel, rather than attract, the at-home audience.

Admittedly new approaches to campaigning are uncertain and venturesome. Most politicians will shrink from them unless the reasons are compelling.

Perhaps the most compelling reason to develop something new and better in presidential campaigning is the need for the candidates to have regular, nationwide exposure on radio, and television which is becoming prohibitively expensive.

This may prove to be a blessing in disguise if it brings about these two consequences:

1. A change in the law which would permit the networks to give prime radio and television time to the nominees of the two principal parties without being compelled to give equal facilities to a host of lesser candidates who are obviously not in the contest.

2. An improvement in the substance and quality of presidential campaign speeches so that the networks could reasonably give the time as an act of public service.

One reason campaign speeches in the past have rarely made good radio and television is that they were delivered in the most hysterically partisan settings and with a kind of pep rally hoopla which appeal to none but the convinced and which demand a superheated oratory repelling most people.

We can hardly blame the networks for not wanting to give away their time for that kind of stuff.

Both the Republican and Democratic national chairmen have shown some interest, though rather skittishly, in the idea which Adlai Stevenson now develops further in an article in *This Week* magazine. Mr. Stevenson puts it this way:

"More than a hundred years ago my great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, an Illinois editor and friend of Abraham Lincoln, proposed the Lincoln-Douglas debates on a great issue—slavery. Imagine a debate, or, at least, a discussion, on the great issues of our time with the whole country watching.

"Suppose that every Monday evening, at peak viewing time, for an hour and a half, from Labor Day to election eve, the two candidates aired their views. They might on each evening take up a single issue. Each, in turn, might discuss it for half an hour, followed by 15-minute rebuttals of one another for the third half hour.

"There are other possibilities, including face-to-face debate. But the central idea is that in some manner the candidates for President appear together at the same prime time each week for a serious presentation of views on public questions."

The first step is for Congress to alter the law so that the networks could provide the facilities without running afoul of the equal-time provision which now prevents them from doing so. The equal-time provision is like stipulating that any newspaper which prints the full texts of the principal nominees must simultaneously publish the full texts of all the lesser candidates.

Senator A. S. MIKE MONROE, of Oklahoma, has written to me that he is ready to introduce the needed legislation at an appropriate moment. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has said that CBS will provide ample prime viewing time when Congress permits. The other networks would undoubtedly do the same.

Mr. Stevenson suggests that the time is at hand to establish a "new national institution, a great debate for the Presidency." I think he's right.

Vice President Richard M. Nixon Addresses the President's Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the recent conference, held here in Washington on the subject of occupational safety, Vice President Nixon made an address which I am sure will be of interest.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE OPENING SESSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, CONSTITUTIONAL HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1960

I appreciate the opportunity to be here personally in my capacity as the Vice Presi-

dent representing the President. As you have probably already been told by the Secretary, only the fact that the President is in South America has made it impossible for him to be with you; and I am most honored and delighted to express, on his behalf, his greetings to this group.

We know that you are unusual so far as groups of people who come to Washington on business affecting the Government even indirectly. We realize that this is an unsubsidized conference, that you come either paying your own way, or your various organizations are taking care of this matter. This certainly indicates your interest and the vital concern which the direct organizations which you represent have in this whole problem of industrial safety.

And so, may I express the appreciation of the Government of the American people for the contribution you are making to that tremendously important cause.

Now, in coming before this group, may I say that I did what I usually do before appearing before an important group of this type: I read over your agenda. One thing I decided right at the outset, was that I wasn't going to talk about the technical aspects of the work that you are going to discuss in the next few days. When I notice such people, not only as the Secretary of Labor, but Dr. Kaplan from my own State of California, who not only knows a lot about safety but about outer space and other things connected with the geophysical year, I am not going to get into the position of an amateur talking about matters in which experts behind me are much more proficient.

But it did occur to me that it might be worth while, and perhaps constructive, to relate what you are doing and the contributions which you are making to the whole posture of the U.S. economy and to this problem that we have heard so much about in recent months—particularly since Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States—of how we maintain our competitive position in the world economically with the totalitarian countries.

I don't need to tell you that the threat with which we are confronted is a real one. Any of you who saw Mr. Khrushchev on his visit here will remember how confident he seemed to be in the superiority of his own system; how he laid down the challenge to us in every city that he visited. He said that while we were ahead now, they were moving faster than we were economically, and that they were going to catch us and pass us. He even went so far as to say that their system was so far superior that, once they had passed us, we would have to turn their way, in fact, in order to avoid staying in the second position.

Now, I am sure that very few Americans, if any, were convinced by what he said. I am certain, on the other hand, that all of us recognized that he and the people over whom he has domination have one advantage that anyone running behind in a race has; he has the stimulus of trying to catch the front runner. And I can say, from having visited the Soviet Union, that one thing that does impress you is the determination not only of the hierarchy, but in some way it has been infused even among great segments of the working force as well, the competitive spirit which is theirs. And so we must not underestimate that challenge.

But, by the same token, in pointing out the strengths that they have and in examining, to be sure, in a free country, the weaknesses that we have, we must never lose confidence in our own system and our own principles.

Now, what does all of this have to do with industrial safety? Let me put it just exactly this way.

Today, economically, the United States out produces the Soviet Union, taking the gross national product figures as one standard, by

over 2 to 1, and we are ahead of them in every major area of production, and we can stay ahead. We can stay ahead, however, provided we avoid what I would describe as any unnecessary inefficiency or negligence in our economy, and this means efficiency on the part of management, of labor, of Government, where Government has any relationship to the economy, and it means all aspects of the economy. And, of course, I don't need to tell you that in this whole area of industrial safety this is an extremely important aspect of the total problem of productivity and efficiency of an economy.

For example, I was tremendously impressed and somewhat surprised by some statistics I read, that last year—perhaps partly because of an increase in the work force, the youngsters in the work force, and the like—the rate, as far as accidents were concerned, was the highest since 1953. I noted that we lost, in effect, through accidents, the work of over half a million men and women workers for the whole year. What they could have contributed, that much we lost through accidents alone. And so everything that we can do to reduce this loss, which has resulted from practices which could perhaps be corrected through improved safety programs, we realize has an effect which is necessary in keeping the American economy as productive as possible and keeping us on a competitive basis with those who challenge us abroad.

So much for that aspect of the problem. There is also another aspect. I think too often, when we examine these problems like safety on a national basis, we think in terms of half a million workers working for a year, or so many million man-hours, and the like, and oftentimes we overlook the very important individual involved, the human problem.

Let me illustrate. I recall when I visited Poland we went through one of their newest steel plants, which was still under construction. It was a very impressive plant. And the young Communist commissars who managed the plant very proudly escorted me through, showing me the machinery, and the like, not paying attention, however, to the workers themselves; very little, as a matter of fact. After we completed our tour, we were riding back to Warsaw—and in Poland there is a great deal more of freedom to speak, or at least the Poles do exercise more freedom to speak than in the Soviet Union—and a Polish foreign service officer, a career foreign service man, not one who apparently had been thoroughly indoctrinated in the Communist cause, made a very interesting comment. He said: "You know, one thing about these plant managers is that they know everything about factories and nothing about people." And I can think of no single anecdote that better illustrates the difference in approach of a totalitarian society to the problems of progress and of productivity than that statement: Everything about factories, nothing about people.

And so we are not only concerned about the work of 540,000 men and women working for a year, or a million or so of man-hours, we are concerned about the fact that every day, last year, over 300 men and women died or were permanently disabled as a result of accidents in plants throughout the country. We are concerned about the individual problem, the human loss individually, and we do not say that progress is something that we worship without regard to what the cost is. Our totalitarian competitors say, "We offer progress, but the cost will be freedom," and our answer is, "We offer progress, but with freedom and because of freedom." They say, "We offer progress whatever the cost may be in human terms," and we say, "It is possible to have progress but still to have a concern for the individual," and this, of course, is certainly directly related to the dedication of the people in this room, because everyone here is concerned about the

individual, the human cost involved, in a modern industrial society. Otherwise, you would, of course, forget the fact that a life here, an injury there, might be one of the costs of greater productivity which a totalitarian society would be willing to pay for. And I might say that when we compare the Soviet Union and the United States there are differences, but there is one area in which we are far, far ahead of them—a gap which I am sure they will never close—that is in this very area of safety. I trust that this is one that we will continue to maintain at a substantial advantage.

And finally, may I just leave this one thought with you. In the world today I think that sometimes we have a tendency, because of the challenge that has been laid down before us, because of the very understandable and constructive American attitude of examining our deficiencies, of advertising them, and doing so because we want to correct them, we perhaps sometimes have a tendency to overlook some of the very good things about America. And certainly, as I greet you at this conference, one of the things all of us in America can be proud of is that we have the most efficient economy in the world, the most productive economy in the world, and yet it is one that is always concerned, above everything else, with the problems of the individual, with human dignity. May it ever be that way, and may we thank you for your dedication to this fundamental principle.

Thank you.

Feminine Touch in Passports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, Mar. 1, 1960]

FEMININE TOUCH IN PASSPORTS

If you're tired of looking at your eternally green passport, if you think it's too big to fit into a woman's pocketbook, and that there aren't enough pages in it—you're in for good news.

Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Federal Passport Office, is considering fundamental changes.

She is planning to reduce the passport's size but increase the number of pages from its present 20 to about 50.

Also, she wants to replace the cloth cover, which often frays and becomes unstuck from its backing in damp weather, with plastic material in blue, maroon, and gray, as well as the standard green. More women, she reasons, are traveling abroad than men and they should have a choice of color in their identification papers.

We're inclined to like the idea. Even more, we like the principle behind it. Here, for once, is a Government office that isn't content with having things stay in the same old groove. It wonders. It questions. It is willing to experiment with something new. It is trying to find a better way of doing things.

If this kind of spirit were to spread around don't-rock-the-boat, bureaucratic Washington it would be tremendous progress. It would also be something of a miracle.

Chessman's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson as it appeared in the New Republic magazine of March 7, 1960:

CHESSMAN'S CHALLENGE

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

The latest American cause celebre, that of the man Chessman, in California, is acquiring an oddly satirical relation to that of Sir Walter Raleigh. Chessman has been in the death house for nearly 12 years. Raleigh lay under sentence of death for 15. Chessman's life was saved by the intervention of a foreign nation, Uruguay. Raleigh finally went to the scaffold by the intervention of Spain. Chessman has never been able to convince any court, or any pardoning power, of his innocence. Few people believed at the time, and almost nobody believes now, that Raleigh was guilty as charged.

But the reputation of American justice is suffering almost as much from the Chessman case as that of England did from the Raleigh case.

Perhaps the oddest circumstance in the Chessman case is that the question *cul bono*? does not arise. Ordinarily in such cases the sacrifice of the victim inures to the profit, or at least sates the bloodlust of some identifiable person or group. James I executed Raleigh to appease the King of Spain. Many people believe that Sacco and Vanzetti were offered up to placate the Massachusetts Red-baiters; and that Leo Frank fell to Georgia anti-Semitism; and that Tom Mooney almost died, and, indeed, did serve 20 years, to satisfy the enemies of organized labor.

But the crime of which Chessman was convicted was so revolting as to raise grave suspicion of the sanity of the perpetrator. One of its effects was to consign a young woman to the living death of a madhouse—a deed by comparison with which murder is almost benevolent. Nor was the criminal representative of any idea, or creed, or class. It was plain bestiality.

The successful efforts to prevent his execution therefore cannot be attributed to any organized fanaticism, unless hatred of capital punishment be accounted fanaticism. No person or cause stands to gain, regardless of the final disposition of the case. The movement in his behalf was an attack by certain determined persons on what they regard as a miscarriage of justice.

But to oppose what one believes to be a miscarriage of justice is wholly admirable. Thus we have the ironical situation that an effort to which it is impossible to attribute a sinister motive has nevertheless prejudiced American justice in the eyes of the world—prejudiced it to such an extent that foreign governments feel that they are justified in intervening in the name of humanity.

The trouble was the method. Time after time Chessman's appeals have been dismissed by the higher courts as being based on mere technicalities, without substantial merit. Nevertheless, for more than 11 years the man's life has been preserved solely by his ingenuity and that of his counsel in discovering loopholes in the law. Thus the alien observer may logically infer either that the man, for some unknown reason, is being persecuted with a ruthless ferocity that

passes all civilized bounds, or that the American system of justice is impotent to protect itself against pettifoggery. In neither case does our system of justice present itself in an admirable light.

The final touch was added by the bungling fashion in which Washington handled the message from Uruguay. A nation uncertain of its ability to protect a visitor from insult or injury is a nation that ought not to be visited. But instead of saying so promptly and firmly, Washington undertook to pass the buck to Gov. Edmund Brown, of California, giving rise to the suspicion that someone was trying to make political capital out of the case.

Was there ever another nation with such a fatal proclivity for doing what is basically the right thing in a way so wrong as to make it look downright criminal? The atrocity of the crime of which he was convicted does not affect Chessman's right to a rigorously fair trial; but every court that has reviewed the case agrees that his trial was fair. Perhaps capital punishment ought to be abolished, but if so it ought to be abolished for everyone, not merely for those lucky enough to have counsel so ingenious that they can tie up the courts for a span of more than 11 years.

Insistence on a fair trial for every man, no matter how dreadful the crime of which he is accused, is civilized. Opposition to capital punishment is also civilized. Yet on the basis of two admirable motives we have made such a mess of this case that it will stand as a reproach to us for many a year.

As a Nation we seem incapable of paying sufficient attention to how things look. We blithely disregard old William of Wykeham's motto, "Manners maketh man," and the repudiation is costing us money, reputation, and friends at a rate we can ill afford.

Good Citizenship—Mr. Edward Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the best speeches of its kind that I have read in a long while is one delivered to the Prelaw Society of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex., on February 17, 1960, by a distinguished alumnus of that university, Mr. Edward Clark, of Austin, Tex.

I found his discussion of the qualities of good citizenship helpful and stimulating, and I went to share it with the Members of Congress. I ask that it be included with my remarks. It is as follows:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(Address by Mr. Edward Clark of Austin, Tex., before the Prelaw Society, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.)

My good friend Grogan Lord aroused me early last Sunday morning and told me that another good friend, to wit: Dr. Hester, would like for me to come up here and make a talk. I asked him on what subject, and he said he didn't know, but since it was a prelaw group he thought something on citizenship would be in order.

Now, if we are going first class, we must give more thought and study to citizenship—basically, I state something that you

should know or learn here at Southwestern, and that is that our quality of citizenship is indicative of our quality as people. So, I find myself with an important subject but one without much glamour or compelling interest. I think I may know the reason for this situation. I have heard quite a few too many speakers say that we all ought to be good citizens because being a good citizen is good. Well, such statement ends right where it starts and gives me no help on my effort here in Georgetown tonight.

Why should I waste your time and my time in saying we ought to be good because we just simply ought to be good. It is not only dull, but it is not my place to tell you what you ought to do. Dullness does not go well with goodness or citizenship either. I'll guarantee you I am not promoting dullness and I hope you never do. It is a lot easier to do things exciting in this wonderful world—so many wonderful places to go, nice people to know, stimulating thoughts that we just don't have to be dull.

I have been trying hard for the last 36 years since I left the Southwestern campus to get all the fun and excitement out of life possible. Now believe me when I say I want the same thing for you; so I am going to try to talk for a few minutes about how we get the best out of life for ourselves. Perhaps it may be a little selfish to ask ourselves such a question. We must try hard to get the right answer. Surely some people sometimes do not understand just what is best for ourselves. We are going to be honest and not fool ourselves. We know there are many things we do not know. Will Rogers said, "We ought to admit that we are all ignorant—some men in different things and some in different degrees, but all men are still ignorant."

One human step further, we all make mistakes in judgment. Some are tragic.

Take the squirt who plays Russian roulette with a pistol, twirling one cartridge in the revolver and then snapping the hammer with the barrel pointed at his head. Does he get a kick out of it and impress his girl friend with his daring? But even so, if he shoots his head off, then I submit that he mistook his best interests. Who thinks he was brave? Was the act really exciting? No; only foolish.

Now, you take the college fellow who races his car 100 miles an hour down the highway on his way home to change his tie. This may be exciting as long as the boy is dumb enough to forget about the other considerations. Either he is ignorant about car wrecks and the resulting human agony, death, and sorrow, or else his mind is so shallow that he fails to comprehend.

Or what about the fellow who finds it convenient to take some kind of a goof ball or narcotic? That guy is really chopping off his own head. Surely we are not that silly.

I came across a fellow that had gotten in trouble with the law. I asked him why, and he told me that he just felt like he had not been counting for anything, that he wanted to be somebody and felt like he would become important and be somebody if he got a gun and went out and did a stickup.

To me that was a funny sort of wisdom. It takes a lot of know-how and a lot of personality to be a thief or a murderer or sneak around in the dark committing vandalism. The dumbest cluck who ever lived could pull the trigger on a gun. Now, what is there for a criminal to be proud and happy about? Perhaps someday people will have to cage him up somewhere in prison like an animal. The bully and the destroyer get the same thing out of life that they put into it—nothing. Soon they are out of the way because someone has to shoot them or lock them up, or maybe, after a lot of dull and

lonely days, they die. And when they are gone, it is just good riddance. Nobody misses them, nobody weeps for them, and nobody wants to remember them.

Another thing I will say right here. It has to do with sex. I will let you in on this: Nothing is so overrated as sex. You may not believe me, but the movies, magazines, and newspapers, or some of them, would cause you to think sex is the supreme element in all the world. That is overexaggeration. If you culture and nurture the sexual capacity of your body, it will bloom and bear fruit. But some, before they know anything about it, before they understand it—like morons out to prove that they have heard something about the birds and the bees—they tear up the flower and crush from it all the fragrance and beauty. All they have left then is bitterness and ashes and a mind hung with ugly pictures—when they could have had something fine and exciting and lovely and enduring.

How easy it is for one to be wrong, very wrong, about the things that mean the most to us.

So, we see that as all that glitters is not gold, so all that looks like fun does not always turn out to be fun. The wise man said that most of the cynicism of the world is the aftermath of counterfeit joys. There are many counterfeit joys.

Jump off of a building and you fly through the air with ease—and perhaps excitement—and very soon you arrive at the ground and you bust something. You did not get away from the law of gravity. It is a factor that exists and you cannot escape it. What you did not know about this law did not make you feel any better after you hit the ground.

So, we have learned, I hope, that if we stick our hand in the fire, it will be burned; if we don't eat, we will starve; if we are careless in the street, we will get run over; if we swallow too much poison, a funeral is in order, and so on and on.

The mind and spirit of man work on a system too. You have laws there too—causes and effects, just as dependable and predictable and just as inescapable. The things you think and the things you do, all bring about certain results in your personality—in your happiness and unhappiness. Every time you cheat, every time you steal, every time you lie or pretend to be something you are not—regardless of whether or not other people find out about it or catch you or take you to court—within you something happens. Something changes in your mind, in your spirit, in your soul—just as sure as that old law of gravity will work again and again.

You must go by the rule, by the law, if you please, if you want to be happy and get the most out of life. I have three rules or laws for you tonight. I know them to be important laws of life.

Point No. 1: Work is good for us. I will say that again: Work is good for us. I mean that, and I assure you that I have not been adjudged insane by a court of competent jurisdiction nor do I have a case presently pending.

This is my basic rule of life. When I am upset because things have gone against me, or dissatisfied with myself or others, and find that idle talk and wasted time only aggravate my great unhappiness in the depths of despair; whereas, plowing headlong and directly into my work and life ahead always very soon dispels the clouds, lifts my soul from where I have sunk, restores my interest and enthusiasm, and I find that I can again have a healthy and happy attitude toward life.

I regret to tell you that far too many people seem to think happiness comes primarily from fun, idleness, and play. It does not. I venture on the basis of experience and observation to say that happiness depends

promarily on achievement. Our thinking is limited to our own ideas and understanding of life. You have to know before you can be interested. If you never hear of them, you will never realize how many fascinating facts, inquiries, and contests exist all the time right at our elbows. The sheer joy in life is in being a part of these contests and adventures and in the use of some capacity of our own to think and act—in the use of our own hands and tongue and mind and personality in such a way as to be a part of this fascinating life.

Work can be like medicine. It may look and taste bad at first, but it may be the only thing that can make you feel good.

Point No. 2: Look up. It makes a big difference where you look. If it is your honest desire to be a fine person, you must look at the fine scenes of life.

It is like your diet. You pay attention to what you eat because you know that will determine something of your health and strength, the energy and tenor of your body. The selfsame thing is true of our minds. If we feed our minds with nothing but cheap movies and magazines and the lurid and sensational stories of the yellow press, if we watch nothing but drivel and shocking murder and violence on the television, if we have no hobby except collecting smutty stories—then pray tell me what kind of a mind for thinking purposes could you expect to have? You would have a completely perverted picture of life. You would be ignorant in the whole realm of the spiritual—you would have a mind incapable of having the ingenuity and power capable to think yourself out of a paper sack.

Quite a few people these days are going around shouting about and reveling in our freedom, and they boast about being free to know all about sex and all about the realities of life. I pause right here to comment that their emphasis has been on the freedom to look down. Why not look up?

You all know in truth, we live in a tremendous time. If we could but tune our vision and listening ear, we could not help but see and know the presence of forces of eternity, the hand of the Almighty God, all around us. We, all of us, can become a part of the continental movements. These forces can dwell in us and make us great.

Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote a little poem in which she said:

"Earth's crammed with Heaven,
And every common bush afire with God;
But only he who sees takes off his shoes;
The rest sit around it and pluck blackberries."

For our own happiness and well-being, let us get our eyes up from the dirt and look up to see the burning bush—the kingdom and the power and the glory.

Point No. 3: We all need to make a very definite decision to do something constructive with our lives.

There are decisions which we cannot yet make about what we are going to be and what we are going to do. It interests me very much to so often hear college students complain about how they cannot decide what career they will follow. Some of you doubtless are worried about it. Some students seem to think there is something wrong with them in their inability to decide exactly what sort of profession or business they would go into. Well, all of that is nonsense. We need people looking for ways to render more service and not just stay in that old dull rut. I sure don't know what I am going to be or do before I hang up my derby for the last time.

I am a lawyer, but I am trying hard as I can to get out of the practice at the earliest possible moment consistent with my commitments. I want to have some time left to devote to my Government in honest, loving public service free of greed, vaulting

ambition, or political preferment. If I can't do this, I want to go into a business where I can find an opportunity for larger service than I have found in law. In addition to all the above, I have done just a little preaching and, like the others, I like this too and I want to do more in this field as well as law, government, and business.

The cold fact is, none of us is likely to know exactly what the circumstances will be next year or 10 or 20 years from now. I think I would like to be bold enough to advise you to do what I am doing myself, answer the questions you can answer; do not bother with the others. Just "bust" right on across the bridges as you get to them, and use 3 hours that are passing to the fullest advantage.

All of us need to learn something, and I suggest we start by realizing that we can accomplish nothing by worrying about the unanswerable questions of life. Surely there are uncertainties which are beyond our power to resolve. Time and space are beyond my mortal perception, they are endless. The plans of the Almighty just do not fit our minds. Now, until we get the facts on the situations of life, both present and future, we are in no position to exercise our judgment. Some questions we have to leave to a higher court or to the future.

There are other questions that we have to answer as the days go by. I submit one of these is this: Will it be your role in life to debunk and spoil and tear down—or will you be a helper, a lifter and a builder?

There is a lot of darkness in the world. There are heartaches, emptiness, loneliness, bitter disappointments, hate, misery, and sickness. I believe that we have people here tonight who will learn where the lights are and will turn them on. Don't you really want to be one who can find lights—isn't that what we are all about, here and everywhere?

Perhaps we cannot look at each other and see greatness. Everybody cannot always be popular, some seem a bit timid and shy, not willing to go along and get along, so to speak. But, if you have dreams in your heart and visions in your minds, then I know that someday your hands will light the candles and turn the switches.

What I am trying hard to say to you, my young friend, is this: Without any exception, there are important jobs for you—exciting and satisfying. As you grow older, one of the things about the world that will surprise you the most is how much it needs the work and friendliness and helpfulness of every little person. The world is not nearly so simple and even as routine as it seems. Everywhere there are problems. There are patent and boundary disputes between neighbors. There are machines that will not work. There are systems in government, private enterprise, hospitals, drawing boards, and laboratories that are cumbersome, messy, inefficient, and just waiting for your ideas and your touch. And if you could only know as I know, there are words of assurance and encouragement that need to be spoken.

Work is good for us; look up; decide upon the life of a builder.

So why be a good citizen? Because the world is full of hungry and desperate people. People cry out in the darkness for someone who knows where the lights are. There are mountains to be climbed, tunnels to be dug, seas to be harnessed, planets to be flown to, diseases to be cured, hates to be quenched, kingdoms to be won. Now, I am not trying in my own feeble way to be good in order to be called good, but rather to be a part of all of this. If at the end I make the grade and someone says so, well good enough, but the reasons that motivate us are what are important.

You people read Shakespeare. Things seem to me to come down to a bitter end in his plays. His characters moan about life

as being a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

I don't like that, I prefer the platform of Pilgrim in John Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" when he walked up to the keeper of the Book of Life and said in no uncertain terms: "Set down my name, sir."

This should be me and you, the only me and you there will ever be. Our name and being is our responsibility. Can we countenance the awful thought of our becoming nothing and leaving nothing when we are gone? For me I want to do and find that which was made for me. I want to join that company of great believers, thinkers, builders and doers, the real honest folks who have mended all the wounds, lighted all the candles, sung the songs, built the roads and bridges, and borne the crosses.

So I say, there, please God, set down my name.

Policy: The Harlem Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post, March 7, 1960:

POLICY: THE HARLEM STORY

(By Ted Poston, with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman and Richard Montague)

The voices came from many places, but they blended together in a medley of common concern.

A Manhattan mother of four: "How can you expect them to have any respect for him [the cop on the beat]? They're not blind. There's hardly a day they don't see him taking money from that numbers runner. More often than not right here in this hallway."

A Brooklyn rackets grand jury investigating gambling: "Corruption produces disrespect for law and order and disrespect for those charged with law enforcement. This poisons the minds of many of our young people. It produces a contempt on their part for the law and those charged with enforcing it. It leads them to deride decency and good conduct and thus promotes juvenile delinquency."

A Bronx father of a boy in trouble: "I know he had no business sassing that cop, but the cop didn't have no cause to hit him either. All he asked that cop was: 'Why you always give us a hard time—even when we ain't doing nothing? Why don't you lock up that single action man that you so buddy-buddy with every morning?'"

A respected Harlem leader: "... so these two cops drove their patrol car right up to the curb on 125th Street and started badgering this white banker openly. He treated them like dirt under his feet and snapped: 'Let me alone. You got yours Monday, didn't you?'"

"And one of the cops whined, as if joking: 'Sure, boss, but that was Monday. We need a little taste now.' And the banker pulled two dirty \$1 bills out of his pocket and flung them contemptuously on the squad car floor. They reached down and divided up the money—a lousy two bucks—and then drove up the street laughing."

"But nobody else was laughing. Least of all three teenage kids who watched the whole incident."

The Brooklyn Grand Jury presentment on police corruption was made early last year at the end of a lengthy investigation of the

Brooklyn morals squad, which was finally dissolved as a result of the jury's recommendation.

The random comments quoted above were made by ordinary citizens in various parts of the city who discussed the subject with Post reporters investigating Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's charges of collaboration between the police and police barons.

A young Negro lawyer in Harlem went a step further than mere talk. "Come along with me," he told a reporter, "I want to show you something."

Together they went to a bar on upper Eighth Avenue and ordered a couple of beers. The lawyer called attention to about eight other men assembled near the other end of the bar.

"The heat is supposed to be on," the lawyer said, "as a result of POWELL's revelations. But look what those guys are doing."

THE TUMBLE

The men were sorting out slips and small bits of paper, or copying other figures from the backs of envelopes, or counting money and shifting it to various pockets.

The Post man reported later:

"From their conversation, I gathered they were discussing the 'heat' and how it operates."

"It seemed that just a few days before the cops had hit a numbers drop several blocks up the street from the bar just when all the collectors or runners were arriving to turn in their action."

"One of the guys, describing the raid, chor-tled: 'Man, I mean they caught everybody on the scene.'"

"From what they said, it appeared that there was a long discussion between the cops and the controller and the runners in the drop. And the upshot was that the cops finally left, making only one arrest and letting everybody else go—including the man who had 'the works' for that day's business."

"One loud-mouthed guy, who was recalling the whole incident, concluded: 'And wouldn't you know who they picked out to arrest? The one cat that wasn't even in the joint when they hit it.' He was the lookout man who had been down on the corner. But you know how it is; somebody's got to take the tumble and he was it for the day."

The conversation drifted on to other subjects—like the make and colors of the cars the plainclothesmen were using that day. The word had been passed up from downtown early so everybody could be on the lookout.

Near the center of the bar, a woman was taking action on the Brooklyn number (which differs from the one for the rest of the city) and another woman kept coming in and out accepting single action bets.

But the young lawyer told the reporter:

"This isn't what I really brought you here for. Keep your eye on the guy sitting alone at the other end of the bar."

This man was also shuffling bits of paper and counting money, but periodically he conferred with several adolescent boys who would come in, hand him small envelopes or bits of paper, and go right out.

"Now that is what worries me about this whole thing," the lawyer said. "That guy is a numbers collector—not a controller—just like the rest of these fellows. But he doesn't even go out and do his collecting himself."

"He just sits here and hires these kids to do his running and collecting for him. And when he turns in his controller's book later today, he will get his regular 25 cents commission on every dollar he turns in. And then he'll slip a few bucks to the kids who do all the work and take all the chances."

The lawyer pushed his beer aside.

"My main concern is not about the economic exploitation of these kids," he said, "for exploitation is a built-in part of the whole policy racket. What particularly up-

sets me is this: these kids will start getting arrested when they are about 17 and 18 years old, and their policy records will later prevent them from ever getting any kind of decent job.

AND NEXT: NARCOTICS

"Worse still, many of these kids are going to wind up selling and using narcotics, for the dope racket has become very much a part of the policy game."

Although the fact had been glossed over during the airing of his charge that the police were helping Italian "and some Jewish" mobsters to run Negro bankers out of the Harlem policy business, Representative POWELL had also raised the question of the effect of mass numbers arrests on the community's future.

Citing Deputy Chief Inspector Burns' estimate that Negroes comprised roughly 82 percent of the 4,500 persons arrested for numbers violations in Harlem last year, POWELL told his congregation:

"This means that this community is being criminalized. Once a person is arrested for numbers, it is impossible to receive private employment any more.

"There have been many, many tragic incidents of those who have civil service jobs who were forced to resign because somewhere in the early years they had been arrested for the misdemeanor of being connected with the numbers."

It is an old problem, but it casts a longer shadow into the future. For, as policy has expanded, so has the number of arrests, and Negroes and Puerto Ricans, because of their lowly operating status as runners, writers, controllers, or lookouts for the game, constitute the vast majority of those arrested.

In 1954, the police listed 6,453 policy arrests for the whole city. Last year, the number had more than doubled, with 14,103 arrests listed. Manhattan arrests, mainly all in Harlem, rose from 6,391 in 1957 to 8,468 in 1959.

The police got 1960 off to a good start by throwing reinforcements into Harlem and arresting hundreds of minor Negro policy figures in the wake of POWELL's charges that the department was in cahoots with the white bankers.

A former Negro banker, who has spent 44 of his 61 years in the business, echoed part of POWELL's charges, saying:

"How can a man get a legitimate job if he has policy arrests on his record? Many Negroes who got these arrests were acting as 'stand-ins' for the real numbers operators. A lot of that started during the depression days when a Negro couldn't make money to feed his family any other way. Now, these men have become pawns of the policy game because they are no good for anything else.

LOOKING FOR WORK

"Besides, even if you don't have a long arrest record, how can you get a decent job when you are asked for references and you can't show any work record for 5, 10, or 15 years?"

This veteran, now a lowly employee of a policy bank he once dominated, predicted, on the basis of his long experience, that crime rates would skyrocket in most slum areas—not only Harlem—if the policy game was really suppressed.

In this, he was supported by the young Negro lawyer who had taken the Post man to the bar.

"I am willing to bet," he said, "that when the January and February crime statistics become available, you will find a rise in crimes other than those connected with gambling.

"Not that this supposed crackdown on the heels of POWELL's charges has really been effective. But any police activity is bound to affect certain peripheral employees of the racket—muscle-men, winos, junkies, ex-cons, and others who make a buck in the

numbers business one way or the other to keep going.

"Deprived of this, they've got to resort to other illegal activities—burglary, robbery, muggings—anything to turn a dollar until the heat (no matter how light) is off. For these men are the unemployables who can only make a 'legitimate' living through the policy racket."

Garland Marshall Appointed Executive Secretary to the Committee for Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, a personal friend and constituent, Mr. Garland Marshall, was recently appointed executive secretary to the Committee for Rural Development Program.

Mr. Marshall has been working in this program in the Seventh Congressional district of Texas for several years, and is well qualified for his new duties.

Under unanimous consent, I include the news release on Mr. Marshall's appointment in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY APPOINTED TO SERVE COMMITTEE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced the appointment of Garland Marshall, former Texas Extension Service official, as executive secretary to the committee for rural development program.

As a member of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Mr. Marshall has been working in the rural development program at the county and area level in east Texas for the past 4 years.

Mr. Marshall takes over the duties of Dr. Kenneth L. Bachman, Agricultural Research Service economist, who has been serving as interim executive secretary to the committee. Mr. Marshall's appointment was effective February 1.

One of the first rural development agents in Texas, Mr. Marshall helped develop the Cherokee County program from 1956 to 1958. Later he moved up to coordinator of the newly established area program covering 22 counties in east Texas, with headquarters at Nacogdoches. This was the position he held before his appointment as executive secretary to the Federal committee.

Mr. Marshall's work in the Texas program included assistance to local farm, business, and other groups in setting up rural development committees, supervision of resource studies in program areas, planning agricultural and other programs especially suitable for small farms, and liaison with State agencies taking part in rural development activities.

Before joining the Texas Extension Service, Mr. Marshall had broad experience as a farm manager and operator of small businesses in the State. During World War II he served as an Army Air Force liaison pilot in the United States and Japan.

He is 42 years old and holds a degree in agricultural economics from Texas A. and M. He was born near Snyder in Scurry County, Tex.

Secretary Benson also pointed out that Dr. Harry J. Reed, former Purdue dean of

agriculture, who has been serving as coordinator for the rural development program, will continue in this position. Dr. Reed's primary responsibility is to assist State leaders where the program is going forward, Secretary Benson said. He also frequently meets with private groups and leaders at the State and local level to explain the program and advise on contributions they can make.

Mr. Marshall will also be meeting with rural development program leaders and committees of the various States in cooperation with Dr. Reed.

Under Executive Order 10847 issued by President Eisenhower October 1959, six departments and agencies of the Federal Government were directed to "make the fullest possible contribution to the objectives of rural development."

The following Federal departments and agencies are contributing to the program: Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare; the Small Business Administration, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Each of these departments and agencies has assigned responsibility for the program to a senior official who reports to his Under Secretary or Administrator. The latter in turn is a member of the Committee for Rural Development Program, chaired by Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse.

The President's 1961 budget, now before Congress, includes increased funds for the rural development program. In addition, participating agencies are redirecting some of their programs to be of greater assistance to low-income families in rural areas.

Started in 1956-57, the rural development program has as its aim improvement of incomes in rural areas through farm, industrial, community, and educational development.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson and Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall News Messenger, Mr. Millard Cope, editor and publisher, Marshall, Tex., in its issue of March 4, 1960, contained an editorial on "Johnson and Rights." It is as follows:

JOHNSON AND RIGHTS

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON took the lid off a boiling kettle on February 15. He did so in his announcement to the Senate that so-called civil rights amendments could be appended to a minor bill exempting a Missouri school district from paying for use of a Government building.

The announcement served to erupt the long-expected battle. The first salvos, however, were fired at the majority leader himself, an unexpected target. Extremists on both sides of the political ranks brought cries of "treason" from some segments of the South and shouts of "trickery" from some southern Senators.

There is reason to suspect the protests of Senator JOHNSON's colleagues from the South were strictly for public consumption back home.

Despite the cries of his colleagues, it was a highly known and publicized fact that an agreement had been made between the Senators on both sides to bring the civil rights question before the Senate on February 15. It has been known as far back as September 14 last year. The agreement was announced to the full Senate on September 14 and

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The announcement made headlines in the press. There was repeated discussion in the newspapers.

It would have been a surprise had Senator JOHNSON not acted as he did on February 15. Had he not done so he would have broken an honorable pledge and would have opened the floodgates of chaos in the Senate.

Those familiar with Senate procedure know that had he not brought up a minor bill, any other Senate Member could have done so. What kind of a bill would have been brought up by one of the liberal Democrats from the North? What would the Republicans have offered? Critics of the Texan's action might ponder the type of measure the liberals might have brought up on the day to which all had agreed last September 14. The bill to which their amendments would have been offered likely would have been the tobacco measure, which preceded Senate consideration of the Missouri school district bill. The South wouldn't have liked that, either.

From his vantage point Senator JOHNSON obviously saw the inevitable—that a majority of Senators intend to pass a "civil rights" bill.

They have the numerical strength to do just that.

They have the votes to force through the Senate a harsh measure that would bring irreparable damage to the South.

Facing this reality, the News Messenger is grateful to the Texan for his continued efforts and achievements to prevent punitive legislation. His record is proof of his opposition to efforts to punish Southern traditions. Remember, that during the 1957 "civil rights" debate, he voted against the infamous title III, which would have revived the worst of the Reconstruction laws.

Furthermore, his current action against punitive legislation also is a determined effort to assure that State laws will be applied equally to all persons within that State. The State's Righters have a right to be appreciative of such leadership.

When all the sound and fury have subsided, and Lyndon Johnson's efforts are understood, we firmly believe his leadership will have calmed the shouting extremists who want to hurt the South and that he will have steered through the storm a reasonable voting rights bill that can be supported by reasonable men.

Why Not a Day for American Dream?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in a March 5, 1960, editorial, the editors of the Salt Lake Tribune have suggested that our Nation should make the traditional Washington's Birthday observance something more than just another holiday for the schoolchildren. And I heartily agree. I strongly feel, as does the Tribune, that more of our holidays, particularly the February 22 holiday, should be devoted to special programs on the meaning of Americanism. Such programs would give not only the schoolchildren, but the American citizens generally, the chance to reflect upon the lessons of history, to renew their spir-

itual appreciation of the priceless liberties which they enjoy and to appreciate the great sacrifices which made our freedoms possible.

Under unanimous consent, I commend the Tribune editorial entitled "Why Not a Day for American Dreams?" to the attention of all my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT A DAY FOR AMERICAN DREAM?

Boards of education in many American communities will set school calendars for the 1960-61 academic year at routine meetings this spring. Following recent precedent, most of them will make February 22, Washington's birthday, a school holiday. But we hope some thoughtful school boards will substitute for the usual day off a special program during February devoted to the meaning of Americanism.

The need for a real patriotic holiday in the United States should be apparent. Most of such holidays have lost much of their original meanings. The old-fashioned Independence Day parade, for instance, is now a procession of cars chalking up mileage on the highways. And the patriotic orations have been replaced in a tragic number of instances by funeral sermons.

Coming as it does at the low point of winter, Washington's birthday finds many families unable or disinclined to answer the call of the open road. It, therefore, would be a good time to unite in pondering America's heritage, to retell the American story and to commemorate the ideals to which Washington, Lincoln, and the other great patriots of American history devoted their lives and pledged their honor. This commemoration could take many forms, with student participation in panels and pageants, showing of special films and stimulating talks by qualified adults.

Last February 22 roving groups of school boys were observed in downtown Salt Lake City.

Most of them clearly were at loose ends. Because the weather was cold and stormy, some of them took refuge in lobbies of business buildings, where they created disturbances or otherwise were a nuisance. Many children doubtless spent the day watching television. Few heard or thought about the reason for the holiday or their heritage from Bunker Hill and Valley Forge.

Modern information media bring us many worthwhile things but there is a troublesome void in the meaning of the American Revolution. We do not doubt that American history is being taught conscientiously but many Americans have forgotten—or never learned—the historical roots of their liberties.

Edward R. Murrow has pointed out that in times of crisis nations customarily go back to their folklore, to their history, even to mythology, for comfort and inspiration. Even the Russians did this in the darkest days of World War II. They shelved orthodox Marxist doctrine momentarily and went back to their old time heroes.

We are in crisis today. Our public schools well could take the leadership in setting aside Washington Day or some other day during the birthday month of many American heroes to turn the spotlight on our old, but young Republic. Thus a day of idleness could be turned into a day of pride and understanding.

If we are to compete successfully with the dedicated, often intelligent and hard-working Communists—bent on plowing new ground—we must do more than continue our defeatist retrospection and condemnation.

This is not a call for patriotic demonstrations of the flag-waving, see-how-wonderful-we-are type, but for a higher patriotism, a regeneration of the arsenal of ideas

and institutions, for an honest examination of history. And history need not be dull and repetitious. It is as new as this morning's newspaper. Fresh and important information is constantly being brought to light and evaluated.

We realize that schools must devote all possible effort to the education fundamentals and that academic time is already infringed upon for the Christmas programs and the annual spring music festivals. It is also vitally important, however, that we recapture the spirit of '76, that we learn what makes America tick.

The Policy Racket: The Cops Had a Share in the Old Days, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post, March 6, 1960:

INSIDE THE POLICY RACKET: THE COPS HAD A SHARE IN THE OLD DAYS, TOO

(By Ted Poston, with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman and Richard Montague)

Violence is no stranger to the numbers racket—neither to the ruthless operators who have fattened on the swindle for more than a century here, nor even to the outraged citizens who have tried in vain to suppress it.

For it was just 61 years ago this month that the Anti-Policy Society sent roving bands in horsedrawn hacks and streetcars around the city, armed with sledgehammers, axes and crowbars, to demolish several hundred number drops operated by Al Adams, New York's first policy king and the first man to become a multimillionaire out of a game which had existed here as early as 1832.

Why did the citizens take the law in their own hands? They acted because the police wouldn't.

"In 11 precincts," said a contemporary article in the old Metropolitan magazine, "Al Adams spent an average of \$1,500 monthly for police protection—and got what he paid for. . . . He had more than 400 policy shops below 59th Street, yielding a total gross revenue of \$10,000 to \$12,000 a day."

"There the man stood in the midst of millions made, and daily added to, in spite of the criminal laws; a public spectacle, yet no one touched him."

The citizens' raids on Adams establishments continued for more than a year before the police themselves moved against Adams.

On December 14, 1901, just 2 days after he had made his monthly payments to his 11 precincts, rumor had it, the police broke into Adams' elaborate office on East 33d Street, and hauled him off. (He eventually served 21 months in jail.) Today's policy racket, of course, has a much bloodier history. The late Dutch Schultz beat and blooded a dozen Negro policy barons into submission when he muscled himself into control of the game in Harlem. Some men died, too.

No one can recall that period more vividly than a slender, fashionably dressed woman in her 60's who discussed it at length with Post reporters investigating the current policy game and its attendant police protection.

Mme. Stephanie St. Clair, once Harlem's most flamboyant "policy queen," is a property owner and prosperous businesswoman now, but around 1930 she was the scourge of Schultz and the police.

"I fought Schultz from 1931 to 1935," she recalled the other day, her eyes flashing behind bejeweled harlequin eyeglasses, her long earrings jangling. "It cost me a total of 820 days in jail and three-quarters of a million dollars. And not one bit of help did I get from my own people."

The "policy queen" was the first Negro operator of that period to blow the whistle on grafting cops. A lieutenant and 13 men were suspended in December 1930, after she testified that she had paid them \$7,100 protection money.

Sitting in the living room of her expensively furnished Sugar Hill Apartment (she owns the four-story building), Mme. St. Clair recalled how other Negro numbers bankers refused to join her in her fight on Schultz because "they said Schultz had police and the politicians, too."

"To my knowledge," she said, "Schultz killed about seven Negroes in taking over the Harlem policy business. By 1935, I was running for my life. One time when the Dutchman's killers were chasing me, I had to hide in a cellar while the super, a friend of mine, covered me with coal." As it happened, she had the last word in her war with the gangster, for as Schultz lay dying in a Newark hospital on October 23, 1935—victim of gangland bullets—a telegram was delivered to his ward. It read:

"As ye sow, so shall ye reap." It was signed "Madame, Queen of Policy."

THE NEW KINGS

It is a long cry from old Adams to Dutch Schultz, and, in some respects, a longer cry from Schultz to the East Harlem mob which now controls the numbers game over most of the city, and especially in Harlem.

But, as the Post investigation has revealed, the police have been with it all the way.

The operation is smoother now. The multimillion-dollar extortion device known as the pad has made it possible for the new policy kings to accomplish with graft what Schultz had to do with strong-arm stuff.

"Nobody got beat up like in the old days," a recently retired Negro numbers banker told the Post. "The East Harlem boys just got together with the cops, raised the price for protection, and then got the right to say who could get on the Pad and who couldn't."

"There were at least 30-odd Negro banks doing a good business when the mob moved in. I doubt there are a half dozen left now—if you don't count the boys trying to make a living with single action."

Other Negro operators observed that the take-over had not been wholly without violence. They cited the case of Roy McGregor, 27, who had been fined \$750 on five policy arrests and had served 4 years in prison for assault.

McGregor opened up a numbers spot in the 143d Street sector of Lenox Avenue, in a territory controlled by one of the more powerful Italian bankers. When the cops knocked him out, he went to the white banker to get an OK for the pad (the official list of police-protected spots). The banker refused, and McGregor, angry, floored him.

Older heads, hearing of the incident, urged McGregor to leave town for a while and he went to Florida for 2 weeks. Then, back in Harlem, and still unable to operate, he planned a daring revenge. Hearing that one of the white banker's spots, operated by two men called Butch and Tony on West 144th Street, had been hit by a lucky player for \$6,000, he moved into action.

Trailing the "payoff man" to the spot, McGregor walked in and seized the \$6,000

for himself. "And this isn't the end," he reportedly told his victims.

It was the end for Roy McGregor, however. Two days later—on March 9, 1955—the young hoodlum was found dead in his brandnew 1955 convertible, parked in front of 7 West 129th Street. He had been shot twice through the back of the head.

The police questioned the white banker who had all that trouble with McGregor, but the case is still marked unsolved.

A similar murder, also unsolved, was the more recent slaying of Bernard Bratton, another young tough, in Jack Carter's Bar & Grill just off 116th Street on 7th Avenue.

Bratton was standing at the crowded bar talking to a girl when the killers walked in and riddled him. His sudden end came as no surprise to the more knowledgeable people in Harlem.

For several months, Bratton had been suspected as the leader and "finger man" of a bunch of young Negro holdup men who had been "knocking over" a series of Lenox Avenue policy spots from 110th to 125th Streets.

"The holdups stopped immediately after Bratton got done in," one observer said. "I guess everybody got the message."

But the message came too late for Charlie Copeland, righthand man of one of the biggest white bankers in the Bronx, and an operator of some ingenuity in his own right.

Bronx sources told the Post that Copeland decided to "run a game" (swindle) on his boss, and he worked for months to set it up.

On the day of the big deal, Copeland waited near the last stop the bank's pickup man would make before returning to the bank with the day's "works"—policy slips collected from the various spots.

He "fingered" the pickup man to two pals. While they trailed him and took the "works," Copeland sped back to the bank to be with the boss when the pickup man reported the holdup.

After hearing a description of the hijackers, both Negroes, he said he thought he knew them and offered to get the "works" back before the seventh race, on which the last of the three digits is computed. He already knew that the "lead"—first figure for the day—was 6.

Being on the inside, Copeland also knew before the hijacking the slips had been divided into 10 envelopes. The numbers 000 to 999 were in one, from 100 to 199 in another, and so on up the line.

The boss was elated when Copeland returned an hour later with the envelopes, but his approval lasted only until the envelopes containing numbers from 600 to 699 was opened.

It contained several big bets on every possible combination of numbers starting with a 6. Immediately suspicious, the boss accused Copeland of "trying to run a game." Copeland slapped him in the face and demanded an apology.

None was forthcoming, and Copeland stormed angrily from the bank.

The story spread swiftly through The Bronx and Harlem, but no one could check it with Copeland. He was missing from his usual haunts.

A couple of kids solved part of the mystery 3 days later. They pecked into a car parked on a deserted section of Bruckner Boulevard and found a man with three bullet holes in the back of his head.

Charlie Copeland had "run his last game." There have been other murders, of course, including six unsolved homicides in Brooklyn which a rackets grand jury there last year attributed to policy and bookmaking.

One of the most spectacular killings occurred on August 17, 1958, when "Spanish Raymond" Marquez (co-owner with Henry

Lawrence of a Negro-Puerto Rican bank in Harlem's 8th Avenue sector, shot to death David Peters, 28, hoodlum son of a Negro minister, at 113th Street and 8th Avenue.

Marquez fled after the shooting, which insiders said grew out of a feud over Peters' numbers-writing activities in an area where Marquez and Lawrence maintain about 10 "protected" policy spots, but surrendered the next afternoon and claimed self-defense.

Police, meanwhile, had rounded up Marquez' brother, John, 27, and 12 companions and stripped them of 4 revolvers and 2 dismantled rifles to head off suspected gang warfare in the wake of the killing.

ONE MORE BODY

A grand jury failed to indict "Spanish Raymond."

Still another slaying took place last January 16, on the eve of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's second pulpit blast alleging police cooperation with white policy barons to drive Negro operators out of the business.

The body of Erby Turpen, 55, a longtime single-action banker, was found in the basement of 152 W. 118th Street between Lenox and 7th Avenues, numbers territory controlled by the East Harlem mobs. He had been garroted with his own belt.

Turpen normally operated in the area around his home at 371 W. 126th Street and insiders said he had been warned to stay out of the 118th Street territory.

Old Al Adams could hardly have envisioned all this as he raked in an estimated \$10 million from policy, bought extensive real estate, got himself elected a director of a half dozen legitimate banking institutions, and departed the numbers game for the more refined atmosphere of Wall Street.

Adams came to a sorry end, however. Contemporary newspaper accounts recorded it this way on October 2, 1906:

"Hated by the general public, separated from his family, lonely and despondent—Al Adams took what he regarded as the only step yesterday.

"He shot himself through the head."

And one headline read:
"Every Dollar That He Made Was Wrung From the Mites of the Ignorant and the Lowly Poor."

The 110th Birthday of Thomas G. Masaryk, Founder and First President of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, national heroes are men who at one and the same time embody the national character of a country and are individuals who contribute in a concrete way to the life of their country.

George Washington is an example of the national hero in our Nation.

Thomas G. Masaryk embodies all that is Czechoslovakia. He was the "Father of his Country." He served as its first president. He was a man who felt deeply for democracy and the dignity of his people. He made his nation one of the world's true democracies.

Today, his memory lives still as the embodiment of the free spirit that still

lives in Czechoslovakia. This is the 110th anniversary of his birth. The United States is issuing a postage stamp honoring him as the first in a series of "Champions of Liberty."

This is entirely fitting, that our great country, a stronghold of liberty and democracy, should honor a man who dedicated his life to these ideals. By doing so, we are showing again that we honor and believe in these ideals and the national heroes who have sought to make them come true for their people throughout the world.

It is especially significant and salutary that we honor Thomas G. Masaryk because we will be paying tribute to the free spirit of democracy which still exists in Czechoslovakia. The homage we pay to Masaryk will surely hearten the people of that country as they live under the tyranny of a Communist dictatorship, and give encouragement to the Americans of Czechoslovakian descent who are trying to keep the flame of Masaryk's spirit alive.

The Challenge of Safety in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Labor Secretary Mitchell's address at the President's Conference on Occupational Safety is of real interest. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the address, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SAFETY IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the President's Conference on Occupational Safety, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1960)

Ladies and gentlemen of the President's Conference on Occupational Safety, I would like to welcome each of you to the President's Conference and thank you for giving so generously of your time, your talent and your resources for improving the safety of American working people.

The figures that are before you—an 8 percent rise in the number of disabling work injuries, a 4 percent rise in the number of work deaths—are indeed sobering.

They result, in part, from the evolutionary changes taking place in American industries and occupations, changes that involve the assimilation of untrained workers, and the shifting of trained workers, in an atmosphere of experimentation, exploration and competition.

This Conference, occurring as it does at the beginning of a decade in which the world will see more change than ever before, can be a milestone. Our industrial system, if the job done here by you is done well, may look back to this Conference as the decisive event in shaping change to suit the safety of the individual.

The theme, "The Challenge of Safety in a Changing World," could not be more well chosen.

You will hear, before this Conference ends, from a number of distinguished experts who will discuss with you the facts and the im-

plications of the three challenges set before you.

I would like to take these few minutes this morning to survey these challenges in a broad context.

The first, the changing nature of work, brings us directly to what has been called "the industry of discovery," so radically different in method and technique than the production processes of a few years ago that it constitutes a kind of revolution.

At the heart of it is man's increasing knowledge of the true nature of nature, and the application of that knowledge to practical, productive enterprises. From the quiet research laboratory, from the experimentation of the scientist, come the ideas and discoveries that emerge as new materials, new machines, new methods.

Our investment in basic research has grown from \$2.5 billion a year in 1950 to over \$10 billion today. Some of its fruits are dramatic—they reach into space and into the depths of the oceans, communication by satellite, chemical products emerging at the rate of one new one a day that wash our dishes, grow our vegetables, kill our germs, electronic systems that remember and solve problems for us, and so on.

Ironically, there is danger in change.

The more rapid and fundamental the change, the greater the danger to those men and women who must control and utilize it. Industrial change has always increased occupational injuries, and while the "industry of discovery" may relieve the labor force of many hazardous manual and physical jobs, it does not remove the danger element from work; it merely moves it to a different plane where it assumes different forms.

For those of us here this morning, I think the lesson is plain: We must better anticipate where the danger will be.

The safety engineer of today and tomorrow must be able to judge every new scientific advance destined for practical use in the light of its potential danger to human life and limb. That means he must acquaint himself with the work of the research labs and be familiar with the concepts and practices it involves.

We can no longer wait until an accident occurs to discover that a new machine, a new practice, a new element may contain a danger element.

Nor can we comfort ourselves that exposure to new hazards may be small. If there are only seven astronauts preparing for their incredible adventure in space, there are hundreds of thousands of engineers, technicians, and skilled craftsmen designing, making, testing, and using the equipment, fuels, construction facilities, and test sites that contribute to such an adventure—and this kind of activity will increase in great measure.

We cannot shift work injuries from one place to another and pride ourselves that they have been eliminated from the first place.

I would like to pose a series of questions regarding the changing nature of work:

Have you taken a hard, objective look at the hazard element in new equipment you have introduced or plan to introduce?

Are the present safety standards keeping pace with the changes made possible by the researchers?

Are your operations as safe and safer than they were 10 years ago, or have you only shifted the danger zone to a different level?

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, have you compared the training of your new workers with the experience of your older ones, and made sure that training gives the same protection that experience teaches?

This last question poses, in part, the second challenge of this conference—the changing nature of the work force.

Recent studies, released by the Department of Labor only a few weeks ago, leave

no room for doubt about the manpower challenge that confronts this Nation.

For this Conference, one aspect of that challenge is especially compelling. In the decade ahead there will be a surging increase in the number of young and inexperienced workers, just as we experience a shortage of men in their working prime, the group between 35 and 44 years of age, to which we ordinarily look for the highest experienced skill, supervision, and leadership. The proportion of older workers and working women will also rise sharply.

Measured against this trend in the labor force toward a volume of younger workers is the occupational trend toward job growth in occupations requiring the highest skills and the greatest amount of education and training.

The evolutionary changes explicit in the first challenge to this Conference illuminate the nature of the second challenge:

New discoveries will increase the demand for scientists to teach and research in fields like electronics, nuclear energy, medical research, and space exploration. Mathematicians, physicists, biologists, and chemists will be in demand. So will technicians, programmers for computers, medical personnel, skilled building craftsmen, skilled maintenance men, teachers, tool and die makers, and clerical personnel adept at handling automatic instruments.

The dilemma, then, is how to meet the increasing demands—indicated by the sketch of demand occupations I just gave—for highly skilled personnel from a growing supply of less experienced workers.

Certainly we must improve educational facilities and opportunities. We must increase individual competence across the board. We must make a wise and just use of our manpower without regard to race, sex, age, or physical handicap.

And we must make certain that the waste of accident and work death is eliminated.

The only formal safety instruction that millions of our new young workers will receive before they go on the job is that given to them as a part of their education.

Safety should be a conscious effort in education from the earliest years.

This evening you will hear a report of progress made in this area under the leadership of the U.S. Commissioner of Education—one that we can all applaud.

For our society in general, the changing nature of our work force calls for greatly increased attention to the teaching of safety. The investment by the worker, by his employer, and by the Nation in the acquisition of competence and skill by an individual is far too great to afford to lose it by a preventable work injury.

And because of the configuration of the labor force in the next decade, the heaviest burden will fall to the educational system to prevent that loss and guarantee the full use of a talent for its full period of service.

Our educators should be aware that safety in terms of "working safely on the job" is a concept becoming obsolete rapidly. When split-second decisions are required to protect life and limb, when hazards become so subtle they can be detected only by special skill and instruments, then safety becomes a part of general instruction.

One of the things this Conference might explore is how to integrate safety education at every level of schooling.

The third challenge posed for us by the planners of this Conference is the unchanging nature of man.

I believe that this is a simple challenge for us to understand better the psychological factors that can sometimes be hazardous to a man working at a job.

Mr. Ben Fairless, in an address to the National Safety Council, recently indicated the kind of problem we face in this area. In an industry in which machine operators

may increasingly be replaced by machine watchers, maintenance experts standing at the ready, how is one to prevent boredom from becoming dangerous? How is one to assure the constant alertness that is a part of a working habit?

It is possible that one of the products of a crowded, urbanized, industrial society may well be increasing danger at the work place, danger due not so much to exterior factors as to the stability and awareness of the worker himself.

Man goads himself. He makes changes and then finds he must adapt to them in order to survive. Progress and danger often go together—progress more profound and danger more subtle as science develops.

I am sure that Dr. Carmichael of the Smithsonian Institution will have some illuminating remarks on this specific challenge.

These three challenges, skillfully chosen by the planners of the Conference, should elicit positive and creative responses. From what I know of the imagination and ability of the people gathered here, I am certain they will.

We can read the new figures, the sobering figures of increasing accidents and deaths, and see that the changing nature of work and the work force is already resulting in higher rates.

This belief is supported by the analysis of the injury statistics made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which relates the upswing in part, and I quote, to "increasing employment, with untrained workers entering employment and the shifting of regular workers to changed procedures and activities."

The challenge of change before us this morning has already been faced in the Nation's work places—and the first reports of that confrontation are not encouraging.

This should certainly add urgency to the work of this Conference, and make all of us fully aware that what we see as titles on a program are, in fact, the very real situations of men and women today.

The President has called upon us to "devise a program of voluntary action to bring about a better safety record in all places where Americans are at work."

I am confident that such a program will emerge from your meetings and discussions, and that the "Challenge of Safety in a Changing World" will be remembered as the theme that awakened our Nation to the problem, so that we might fully fulfill the promise of life in a world of new adventure and new hope.

Resolution Commending the People of the United States Upon Granting Statehood to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Hawaii chapter, World Brotherhood on February 24, 1960, commending the people of the United States upon granting statehood to Hawaii:

Whereas on March 12, 1959, the people of the United States of America, acting through their Representatives in Congress, did invite the people of Hawaii to become a member of their Union; and

Whereas on August 21, 1959, pursuant to the enabling act, the President of the United States of America proclaimed Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union; and

Whereas as a result of this action, the people of Hawaii have become joined to those of the mainland as "one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"; and

Whereas such union magnificently demonstrates to the world America's fundamental belief in the brotherhood of man with its attendant hope for a peaceful world based upon love and understanding; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hawaii Chapter of World Brotherhood extends to the people of the United States, through their Representative in the 86th Congress, its most sincere appreciation and aloha for their magnificent expression of brotherhood; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Done in the annual meeting of the executive board, this 24th day of February 1960.

HAWAII CHAPTER, WORLD BROTHERHOOD,

J. RALPH BROWN, Chairman.

DOROTHY B. SHIMER, Director.

Jobs for the Handicapped: A Passport to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following prize-winning essay by Mamie Richardson, a student of Ringling High School:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED: A PASSPORT TO DIGNITY

(By Mamie Richardson)

(English literature, Irene E. Mitchell, Ringling High School, Nov. 20, 1959)

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. Who are the handicapped?
- B. Progress that has been made toward helping the handicapped.

II. BODY

- A. Reason employers do not hire the handicapped.
- B. What we can do for the handicapped.

III. CONCLUSION

- A. Organizations for the handicapped.
- A man sits in his wheelchair at home. From his window he watches the world walk by. His strong, skilled hands rest folded in his lap.

He does not sit there by choice. Time after time he has made the rounds of employment offices. Time after time he has heard the polite murmur, seen the lowered eyes afraid to meet his: "Sorry, nothing at all right now." "We have a high physical standards. Can't risk accidents, you know." "No. No openings."

This man is not a statistic in a labor force report. He is a human being who dreams and aspires. He doesn't wish for the moon. He asks merely for his birthright: to hold his head high in independence; to support his family; to know that he is part of the living, thriving land that is America.

It is this man we talk about when we tell employers, "Hire the handicapped; it's good business."

It is impossible to tell exactly how many handicapped men and women are today seeking jobs. Experts agree the number is not small; it must run into the hundreds of thousands.

Over the years much progress has been made. There are approximately 30 million handicapped in our population. Some 10 million of them are severely disabled; yet more than half of these now hold jobs. But the silken curtain of prejudice still stretches between the handicapped and employment. With what strands is it woven? A recent President's Committee survey revealed many:

One is the fact that many larger industries maintain such high physical standards for employment that few handicapped applicants can make the grade.

Another is the excuse that the handicapped lack flexibility to be transferred from job to job.

Another is the belief that the handicapped cannot produce as well as the able bodied.

Another is the feeling by employers that handicapped workers might seem unsightly to squeamish fellow employees or to the general public.

And so it goes. Myths and misconceptions, all of them. Out of these are woven the fabric of the curtain of prejudice—a fabric that can be ripped asunder by truth, by light, and by constant educational and promotional efforts.

"The truth can set you free." The truth, proclaimed to the far corners of our land, can free the handicapped from the shackles of unfounded prejudice.

A man sits in his wheelchair—but not at home. Every day from 9 to 5 he can be found—surrounded by blueprints, sheafs of computations, and reams of wiring diagrams—in the busy plant of an electronics manufacturer in New York State.

He develops electronics brains that control guided missiles. Without the massive computers which this man masterminds, no missile could get off the ground.

Paralyzed from the waist down; yes. Physically handicapped; yes. But his employers say they could use more like him.

In this case, and in the case of all the handicapped, it's ability that counts. Opportunity to display ability; that's all the handicapped ask.

The records show we are making tremendous progress, but until every American is given full opportunity to display and utilize all the capacities he has, considering his physical conditions, we still have more work to do.¹

Our goal is for full and equal job opportunity for the handicapped. How do we achieve it? It can't come by wishing for it. It can't come from Washington or from the State capital alone. It must come by a surge of activity throughout the country and in each community. It can come through intensified never-ending promotional activities to create the proper climate of opinion. It can come through intensified effort to form active local public relations subcommittees throughout the land, to spread the word to the grassroots, where men and women are hired—or are not hired.

The first step for us in helping the handicapped is to help him face his problem squarely. Every day, someone can be seen helping a handicapped person. Along the roads, in store windows, or almost any place one looks, there is a sign saying, "Help the Handicapped." Do help them, to a certain extent, but don't over do it.

One of the biggest dreams of the handicapped is to be accepted by society as a normal person, which he really is. Often,

¹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Program Guide," 1958-59, p. 2.

not being accepted will turn him into a hard, bitter person. Part of being accepted is to have the feeling that people aren't staring at him as he attempts to do something. That is why it is best not to overhelp them.

When a person with a defect goes out into public, one should never go too far beyond the limit of courtesy they would use when with a normal person. Special treatment of any kind will make the handicapped self-conscious and cause him to retire more and more, eventually never going out. By waiting on himself, the handicapped will have a greater feeling of security and independence.

In order to help the handicapped obtain this feeling, there are centers established around the country where trained personnel work with these people, teaching them to do things any normal person could, or should do. Their methods will be slightly different, maybe a little awkward, but in the end, the same thing is accomplished. The fact that they can do it is the most important thing.

One of these rehabilitation centers is located in Okmulgee. The center is designed so that the handicapped have almost everything placed at their convenience. One of the first things they learn is to care for themselves. The center is also adjacent to the Oklahoma State Technical College. This gives the people an opportunity to choose and train for a vocation. The ones that do take advantage of this opportunity are usually a success in their chosen fields.²

There are many organizations to help the physically handicapped. They may have various names in different cities, but their function is the same everywhere. In Fort Worth, Tex., there are two such organizations. One is known as Goodwill Industries. People all over Fort Worth and surrounding areas donate articles, such as clothes, shoes, furniture and electrical appliances, which are in some way used or damaged. The men and women of Goodwill Industries take these articles and make whatever repairs are necessary. They are then sold in Goodwill Industries stores throughout the city. In this way the physically handicapped are encouraged to use their talents, not only for their own benefit but to help the community also.

The Lighthouse for the Blind is another such organization. As the name implies, this is an organization designed specifically to help those who have lost their sight, the blind. These handicapped people are taught to use their hands to create household articles, such as brooms, mops, etc., for sale. They sell these from door to door to housewives.

This is using only one city as an example. There are other similar organizations in cities throughout the United States, that help the physically handicapped face his problem—and overcome that problem.³

² Ann Benham, "The OCW Trend," vol. 41, No. 2, Thursday, Oct. 8, 1959, p. 2.

³ Pamphlet from Goodwill Industries and Lighthouse for the Blind, Oct. 12, 1959, p. 5.

Maj. Gen. John S. Mills, USAF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1960, Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, USAF, commander of the Air Materiel Command, presented Maj. Gen. John S. Mills, USAF, with the second

award of the Distinguished Service Medal on the occasion of General Mills' retirement after 32 years of active duty.

I have come to know of his outstanding work in the development of special requirements for nuclear air weapons, through my service on the Appropriations Committee. It is indeed a grievous loss to the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and to the Nation that General Mills elected to retire at 54 from active military duty. His knowledgeability, his compassion for individuals, but most importantly, his integrity, will long be remembered in the annals of American defense. The following is a short account of General Mills' biography and achievements.

Maj. Gen. John S. Mills, recipient of two Distinguished Service Medals, was born in Appleton, Wis., July 17, 1906. He was graduated from the Appleton High School and after attending Lawrence College for 1 year, entered the U.S. Military Academy in July of 1924. He was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery, June 9, 1928.

In the fall of the same year, General Mills entered primary flying school at Brooks Field, Tex., completed this course, and was transferred to the advanced flying school at Kelly Field, Tex., where he was rated pilot in October 1929. The following month he was transferred to the Air Corps with duty assignment at Rockwell Field—now the North Island Naval Air Station—San Diego, Calif., as a pilot of the 11th Bomb Squadron. In September of 1930 he entered the Air Corps Technical School at Chanute Field, Ill., graduating the following April. He then rejoined his organization at Rockwell Field, transferring with the squadron to March Field, Calif., in October of 1931.

In the early months of 1931, General Mills participated in the Air Force project of flying the U.S. airmail subsequent to the cancellation of civil contracts for the operation. During this period he flew from the Salt Lake City, Utah, airport over some of the most rugged terrain of the country. In November, he received orders transferring him to Nichols Field, Philippine Islands, as adjutant of the 28th Bomb Squadron. In January 1937, he returned to the United States with assignment at Langley Field, Va., where he served initially as flight commander in the 29th Bomb Squadron and later as navigation officer of the 2d Bomb Group, the first organization equipped with the B-17 bomber.

In July 1939, General Mills was reassigned to Wright Field, Ohio, as Chief, Instrument and Navigation Unit, Air Materiel Command. He also attended the 3-month course at the Air Corps Tactical School, Maxwell Field, Ala., that year, returning to his permanent station in Ohio after graduation.

In June 1943, General Mills was selected to organize, train, and lead the 450th Bombardment Group in combat. He flew 25 combat missions in the Mediterranean theater in B-24 aircraft including the first high-altitude mission against the heavily defended Ploesti oilfields. He was awarded the Silver Star medal for this action.

In mid-1944, General Mills was appointed Chief of Operations for the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces, leaving this assignment in December to become Chief Technical Assistant in the Materiel Division at Army Air Force Headquarters. He subsequently became Deputy Director of the New Development Division of the War Department General Staff in April 1945.

The general's next assignment, in July 1946, was at Quarry Heights, Panama Canal Zone, with duty as Deputy Chief of Staff of the Caribbean Defense Command. He returned to the United States in mid-1948 and, in August of that year, entered the National War College, graduating in June 1949. He was then assigned as Deputy Assistant for Atomic Energy at U.S. Air Force Headquarters.

In October 1959, General Mills was transferred to Albuquerque, N. Mex., as Commanding General, Special Weapons Command. It was during this tour of duty that he devised methods for dropping the hydrogen bomb from bombardment aircraft, developing the USAF capability for use of this weapon and thus augmenting the deterrent strength of the USAF. His accomplishment in this project was recognized by the award of the Distinguished Service Medal on July 15, 1954. The citation reads:

Maj. Gen. John S. Mills distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the United States of America in a duty of great responsibility during the period January 1951 to January 1954 as Commander, Air Force Special Weapons Center. His efforts have contributed materially toward the successful development of the nuclear weapons program which has greatly enhanced the Nation's security and is of international significance. General Mills' successful execution of major military operations of this magnitude reflects great credit upon the U.S. Air Force and upon his ability, outstanding leadership and mature judgment.

In mid-1954, General Mills returned to Headquarters, United States Air Force, as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, a position he held until the summer of 1956 when he became the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, USAF. In 1958 he was named as Commander, San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, where he assumed command on November 1958.

The second citation, the Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal, reads as follows:

Maj. Gen. John S. Mills distinguished himself by exceptional meritorious service to the United States in a position of great responsibility as Commander of the San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, Norton Air Force Base, California, from 1 November 1958 to 31 January 1960. In this important and challenging capacity the technical leadership and extensive executive ability of General Mills were instrumental factors in furthering the important role of Air Logistics in the Space Age. The singularly exceptional accomplishment of General Mills culminates a distinguished career of more than 31 years in the service of his country, and his dedicated efforts reflect the highest credit upon himself and the U.S. Air Force.

General Mills has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Silver Star, Legion

of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, with two Oak Leaf Clusters, French Croix de Guerre with Palm and the Army Commendation Medal. He is rated Command Pilot, Combat Observer and Aircraft Observer.

General Mills married the former Alice Gilbert of Los Angeles on December 23, 1933, and has two children. He is a member of the Congregational Church.

How Pennsylvania Is Working To Increase Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Pennsylvania Secretary of Labor and Industry, which appeared in the Catholic Charities Review of February 1960:

HOW PENNSYLVANIA IS WORKING TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT

(By William L. Batt, Jr.)

Unfortunately, we are experts on unemployment in Pennsylvania. Unemployment is our No. 1 problem. We consistently have one of the highest rates of unemployment of any State in the Nation. We have more areas of substantial labor surplus within the State. With about 6 percent of the total population, we have about 10 percent of the total unemployed.

But we are not depressed. There is no such thing as a depressed area in Pennsylvania. We have been hit hard by forces which were largely out of our control. But we have hit back with intelligence, with persistence and with strength. We are realistically optimistic. We are gaining important new industry. Our cities are being redeveloped. Our highway system ranks with the best. Our natural resources are magnificent. And our people are skilled and industrious.

Pennsylvania's troubles stem from the fact that in the past its economy relied on several basic industries. All of these industries are employing fewer people now than they did before, but for different reasons. Thirty years ago, 150,000 men were at work in the anthracite mines. This year, the count is less than 20,000. Consumers have turned to oil and gas for heating. Bituminous mines employed 85,000 in 1950. In 1959, the figure was about 38,000, largely because of mechanization, but also because of competition from other fuels. Employment in railroads dropped from 132,000 in 1950 to 84,000 in 1959, partly because of competition from other forms of transportation and partly because of the change to diesel engines. As recently as 1950, about 145,000 were on textile payrolls in the State. The average in 1959 was about 80,000, largely due to the movement of plants away from the area. And automation is making it possible to produce more and more steel with fewer and fewer employees.

As a result of all this, recessions in Pennsylvania are worse than they are in the Nation as a whole, and booms are not quite as good. Unemployment in Pennsylvania was 2 percent higher than the national average at the height of the 1950 recession, 3 percent higher at the height of the 1954

recession, and 3½ percent higher at the height of the 1958 recession.

One result of all this unemployment is that our unemployment compensation fund was slowly depleted, year after year since 1950, and the severe recession of 1958 put such a strain on the fund that we were forced to borrow money from the Federal Government to insure our solvency for 1959. Fortunately, the economy recovered in time so that we did not have to use this borrowed money, but we have had to revise our law to provide for higher payments by employers in order to build up the fund to a point where it can withstand another recession.

This will be used as an argument in some quarters to bolster a claim that adequate unemployment compensation benefits in Pennsylvania will discourage industry from locating in the Commonwealth. Our experience does not bear this out but we do think it is shameful for States to compete against each other on the basis of which State has the cheapest system of unemployment compensation benefits. Therefore, we are strongly in favor of a uniform system of unemployment compensation benefits for all 50 States under prescribed Federal standards.

Pennsylvania has fought back to lick its unemployment problem, principally through an imaginative and aggressive program to bring new industry into the State and to help industry which is already in the State expand and prosper. Pennsylvania communities have raised more money than those of any other State to help finance the construction of new plants for industry. In 11 years from the end of World War II to 1956, 52 communities financed 51 plants in this way, creating approximately 31,000 job opportunities.

This program took on a statewide aspect with the advent of the administration of Governor George M. Leader when the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority was created. In the 3 years since then, 53 communities have financed 104 new plants employing over 20,000 workers, at least 70 percent of whom were men.

Of course, many additional businesses have expanded or come into Pennsylvania without such assistance. One of the reasons for this is that the Pennsylvania tax climate for industry has improved considerably in the past 3 years so that it now compares favorably with the climate in other States.

The core of the Pennsylvania program is the fact that it is possible for an industry to move into a modern factory building without the expenditure of its own funds for the building. One hundred percent low interest, long-term mortgages are made available to the industry, with the local community, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, and private sources sharing in the mortgage. In some cases plant shells are constructed before a prospective tenant has been located. These plants become available to industry without undue delay.

While these efforts have been productive, they have fallen considerably short of the goal of providing enough new jobs to replace those which have been lost. This is one reason why Pennsylvanians are so anxious for a Federal area redevelopment bill, which would provide additional Federal assistance in the form of loans to the States to help finance additional construction for new industries. It also should make provision for community facilities essential to industrial development and for vocational training of the unemployed.

We believe that expanded training programs are another essential aspect to economic recovery. During the height of the recent recession we estimated that there were many thousands of jobs unfilled be-

cause qualified people could not be found to fill them.

Pennsylvania has a unique program of training for the unemployed. It enables the State to reimburse local school districts for the full cost of training unemployed persons to accept employment. This is valuable for prospective new industries, because Pennsylvania is in a position to offer not only a plant, but also a trained labor force without capital investment by the new industry. In some cases we have trained new employees for industry in the employer's plant on the machines which will be used for regular production, and at no cost to the employer. (There is relatively little cost to the State for such programs in some cases, because the items produced in the training program, such as shoes or clothing, can be used in State institutions.)

Many other unemployed persons have received training under such programs to accept employment in already-established businesses or institutions. We have trained unemployed persons to become self-supporting as truckdrivers, practical nurses, food service supervisors, welders, painters and paperhangers, power sewing machine operators and stenographers. The only fault we find with this program is that we are not doing enough. We have about 30 courses throughout the State, turning out graduates at the rate of about 2,000 a year, and we find jobs for about 85 percent of them. We believe that if we had enough money, we could put 10,000 people a year back on the employment rolls.

It should be kept in mind that all of the persons trained under these programs are unemployed. Many of them are taken off unemployment compensation or public assistance rolls, and all of them pay taxes on their earnings. Consequently, the cost of training is repaid in less than 2 years.

Industrial peace is another important aspect of our approach to solving unemployment problems in Pennsylvania. To promote industrial peace we have reorganized our State Mediation Service so that it can move promptly and intelligently to help bring industrial disputes to a satisfactory solution. Qualified professional mediators are available virtually on a 7-day-a-week, 24-hour basis, on call from either side to an industrial dispute. This service has proved very valuable, because we have been able to prevent quite a few disputes from reaching the stage where the employer would decide to shut down and move away.

But settlement of disputes is only one aspect of industrial peace. We are trying at all times to create the kind of industrial climate that makes intelligent collective bargaining possible without serious conflict. To that end, we promote labor-management cooperation on a wide range of matters, including industrial safety, training, and retraining, a good business climate, productivity, legislation, etc. As labor and management continue to work together on other matters outside the sphere of work contracts, we feel that they will be able to work together more cooperatively when they turn to collective bargaining. This does not mean that either side gives up any of its rights, but rather that both sides deal with each other in good faith and in full realization of the other's point of view.

These programs are the core of our approach to the problems of chronic unemployment in Pennsylvania. They include a fair tax climate for business, vigorous industrial promotion, low-cost full financing for new industrial plants, training programs for workers for new industry, training of the unemployed for unfilled jobs, and the promotion of industrial peace.

We feel we are doing everything within our power to help ourselves in our communities and in our State as a whole. We are hope-

ful that Federal help for areas of chronic unemployment will be forthcoming in 1960. With such aid, we are confident that Pennsylvania will once more make its full contribution to the prosperity of the Nation.

Men of Maine: Herbert W. Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Herbert W. Kitchen exemplifies the tradition of the farmer in northern Maine who by combining personal initiative with good business judgment not only builds a career as a businessman but also seriously assumes his obligations as a citizen by serving his State and community in elective offices.

It is my privilege to claim Mr. Kitchen as a friend, and this is a rich treasure. This friendship and the counsel he has given are, for me, highly prized possessions.

As a tribute to this first-class citizen and my good friend, I insert into the RECORD an article from the March 5-6 issue of the Bangor Daily News:

MEN OF MAINE: POLITICS HIS AVOCATION FOR 50 YEARS, HERB KITCHEN STILL ACTIVE ON HIS FARM

(By Dean Rhodes)

PRESQUE ISLE, March 4.—For more than half a century, politics has been a driving force in the active life of Herbert W. Kitchen of this city.

He ranks it next to potato farming, his first love. But he says with a wry smile:

"If I had kept out of politics I would be a rich man today. It costs a lot of money to be in politics, but I've always been interested in community affairs."

It is difficult, however, to detect any real regret on the part of this tall, angular farmer who played a major political role in county and State politics for more than 50 years.

In fact, only a quirk in the State constitution prevented him from becoming his party's candidate for governor.

Kitchen was born in Canada and the State of Maine constitution requires U.S. birth as a qualification for office.

STILL ACTIVE

Although in his seventies, Kitchen is still active on his 175-acre potato farm.

He says it isn't the biggest potato farm in Aroostook, but he boasts, with a smile, "I haven't missed a potato crop on it since 1903."

This Aroostook County farmer has also taken the time to serve in the Maine Legislature six times—four times in the house and twice in the senate. He has served a 6-year term as Aroostook County commissioner and was chairman of the county's first potato tax committee.

But he pointed out: "I've led a pretty simple life. My highest ambition when I started was to have a bathroom and a fireplace. I worked hard until I was 60."

Kitchen continued, "I raised Aberdeen Angus cattle for 30 years here. Also I used to raise hogs. Farming and hogs go together. You feed cull potatoes to the hogs and it's meat. About 10 years ago the price of labor became too high and I went out of the meat business."

"I started in here as a pretty young man and began to farm, in 1903, the year I was married."

Kitchen explained that in 1912 he remodeled the family homestead, adding a piazza "around the whole of it"—100 feet. "It's quite a job just keeping the snow off it in the winter," he stated. Then he told of how the roof of the old house was raised and of how a story-and-a-half farmhouse was made into a two-story home. Elm trees were planted along the drive and along both sides of U.S. Route 1, he said.

The Kitchen farm is composed of land on both sides of U.S. 1, about 4 miles north of Presque Isle.

LOT OF WORK

"I did a lot of work when I was a young man and spent a lot of money," said Kitchen. "That windmill out there was built to let folks know where the Kitchen farm is."

He confided that he and a colleague, the late A. T. C. Wilson of Presque Isle, inspired legislation which changed Presque Isle from a town into a city, in 1940. "It got to a point where you couldn't handle a town meeting here," he explained.

He mentioned the years in which he served as a member of the Maine House of Representatives—1923, 1925, 1927, and 1929. And he spoke of being a State senator in 1931 and 1933, and of later becoming county commissioner.

"You should have heard the first speech I made in the Legislature," he went on. "I was green and I thought I represented quite a community. I got up and looked around and saw that large gathering of lawmakers and became stage-struck. I couldn't say a thing."

"Well, they used to say: 'Put Kitchen in; put Kitchen in.' A Lewiston paper approached me on the subject of being Governor after I retired from the Legislature, about 1936. They had quite a campaign on to get a man from up here as Governor. They thought I was a great fellow."

"But I was Canadian born. I was born in Jacksontown, N.B., near Woodstock, and according to the Maine constitution you have to be a U.S.-born citizen to run for Governor."

He concluded: "I'm interested in everything yet. I'm not as active as before."

FAMILY AND FARMING

The talk was now about his family and farming. Kitchen said: "In 1839 my father brought a large family—4 sons and 5 daughters—to this place from Canada. He began a farm. The original farm was about the size of today's farm, but only 70 acres were cleared. Back over the hill were stumps and cutover land. It is a very convenient farm to work. It's easy to get about walking."

He said that in 1901 his father died on the day President McKinley was shot. Kitchen soon began farming for his mother. In 1903 he bought the farm from his mother and married the former Annie Greenlaw of Presque Isle. After obtaining ownership of the farm he paid off two mortgages. His mother died in 1924.

When he was 21 he became a naturalized citizen of the United States and began to vote Republican. He attended a Portland business college for two terms.

Kitchen's daughter, Alice, is married to Charles A. Towle, who helps run the farm. A grandson, Herbert W. Towle, has completed 2 years' service with the Army and is home. Kitchen hopes to form a farm corporation with his son-in-law and grandson.

"I've grown up in the potato business," said Kitchen. "The farther I go in it the less I know about it."

"We've lost the spirit of speculation," he said, "partly due to the operation of hedging. But it's been an interesting game."

The Real Castro—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the third in a series of articles by Joseph Martin and Phil Santora currently appearing in the New York Daily News. This installment is in today's issue, March 8, 1960.

The more I read this series about Fidel Castro, the more I am puzzled as to our whole attitude in these matters. For example, I should like to know why this Communist stooge was allowed to take over Cuba? Where was our intelligence? Why did we not have someone join Castro's forces in the Sierra Maestra so that we could learn of his Communist background and affiliation? Why can we not try to prevent things? Why do we always wait for something to happen before we act? If such questions had been raised before, we could have saved ourselves many headaches today.

The article from today's issue is as follows:

THE REDS' BOY LOLLED IN LUXURY

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

The traditional portrait of Castro the revolutionary is that of a bearded hero with a rifle tucked underneath his arm, silhouetted against the blue sky of his native Oriente and peering keenly at the next mountain top for evidence of Batista patrols.

It's a nice, dramatic picture beloved by photographers and picture editors. But the picture painted of Castro by the men who lived with him in the Sierra Maestra, who knew him better than anyone else, is somewhat less flattering.

The News team interviewed four men who knew Fidel in the mountains. They were questioned at different places, at different times, and only two of them were acquainted with each other. However, each gave practically the same story of the real Castro, the Latin fuhrer who inspired other to do his fighting for him while he lolled around exercising his massive intellect.

HE FOUND CASTRO WORSE THAN BATISTA

"I joined his forces," said an ex-revolutionary, "because I was against Batista. Now I see that Castro is worse than Batista. I thought Castro was going to be good for our people. Even after I knew he was a physical coward, a glutton and a tool of the Reds, I stuck with him in the hope he would be content to sit back and allow a man with character to run the government."

"I was wrong—as were so many others who fought for him and died in the mountains."

"He had a high-powered rifle with a telescopic sight and he would aim it down a mountainside, fire it a couple of times and shout—like a child, 'I got him. I got him.' We never found the body of the so-called victim."

"He sent us to fight, but he rarely fought himself. He acted like a scared man underneath the bravado. He used men as carelessly as he used bullets for his rifle. He was a pitiless, two-faced man who cursed his followers, and took away any dignity they might have had, and even sacrificed them for propaganda purposes."

"I remember vividly one man who was Castro's personal professional killer. He obeyed orders without question. At the time, Castro's popularity was waning with the local farmers, whose support he needed. He had to do something spectacular to show them he was a friend.

"A mountain girl became pregnant and Castro accused his pet assassin of having a romance with her. We all knew it was someone else, but that made no difference. He had the man tried and executed. In this way, he showed the farmers he would kill his boys if they got out of line."

There were few men in the mountains in the early days of the revolt. Newspapermen came to see Castro and, to impress them with the size of his forces, he would order a troop of his bearded followers to march by a half dozen times or so.

A CURIOUS CAMP AND LOTS OF MONEY

It was a curious camp. Castro was accompanied everywhere he went by Celia Sanchez, a cold-faced woman who resembled a Rasputin in skirts. She kept tabs on the money. And there was plenty of money.

"Once," said a man who was close to Fidel, "Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, an active member of the Communist Party in Cuba, arrived with a dozen men loaded with money. It came to \$800,000 and Fidel hugged him and shouted: 'Now we're ready to win the war.'"

Rodriguez also brought him books—"Mein Kampf"; the life of Maceo, a great Cuban patriot; a manuscript on Chinese guerrilla warfare written by Mao Tse-tung, and a history of the Russian Revolution. These he read avidly.

Castro read other things too. The News team uncovered a letter to Fidel by his old Red mentor, Alberto Bayo, the highly professional Spanish Communist who had trained Castro and his men in Mexico. It is one of several sent to Fidel by Bayo. It is dated March 8, 1958.

A BLUEPRINT FOR AGITATION

It states: "Start activating a program of agitation on a large scale to encompass the most important cities (in Cuba). Begin with your active groups to terrorize the population, using bombs, petards (stink bombs), Molotov cocktails, lighted matches in public vehicles, etc.

If this fails, or if you see that the people don't respond, begin a wave of sabotage aimed in particular against the sugar centers of the interior. If this also fails, then start with personal attempts on the lives of individuals belonging to the armed forces and the police.

"Endeavor to use for this task minors, because the police are scared of being tough with them for fear of public criticism. When this happens, use the written propaganda. Have the women in your group wear black dresses to impress the people further—this always gives a good result."

The effect of this last was felt when the chief of the women's groups, Dr. Martha Prada Barraque, organized such a demonstration to convince U.S. Ambassador Earl Smith that Batista's men had butchered Castro followers in Oriente Province. Most of the weeping widows were phonies.

Microfilmed copies of the letter, as well as others, were delivered to Castro in the mountains by a newspaperman close to the revolutionary forces.

HOW TO IMPRESS THE MULTITUDES

Another letter from Bayo advises Castro that, if he should win, he should wait until all his men occupied key positions in the capital's civil and military command and then tour the backward and impoverished areas of the country so that the multitudes would acclaim him.

Castro, as any student of recent history knows, carried out these instructions to the letter.

Castro mistrusted his men. The money he received from outside sources was always kept near his bed. As usual, he was drinking a great deal—the inevitable Castro cocktail—benzedrine washed down by cognac.

"When we moved," said an ex-aid, "he would remind us not to forget the bottle. He had an insatiable appetite—eating enormous amounts of food with his hands and wiping his mouth on his sleeve. Occasionally, he received a shipment of caviar and would gorge himself. Cigars were flown in by helicopter.

"He flew into terrible rages at the least provocation. In April, 1958, a general strike was to be called. It fell through. Faustino Perez was the chief of the 26th of July group in Havana and it was his responsibility.

"Castro said things to him that would make your flesh crawl. He called him names no man could possibly take in front of others. He even wanted to execute Perez, as well as Vilma Espin, who later was to marry Raul Castro. She was at that time a chief of the 26th of July movement in Santiago."

WAR—WITH WHISKY FROM A HELICOPTER

It was a strange war, Maj. Gen. Eulogio Cantillo, a Batista aid, was currying favor with Castro by sending cigars, whisky and American cigarettes in a helicopter.

Cantillo apparently was playing both sides. He and Fidel reputedly made a deal under which Cantillo would surrender after the revolution took place and be freed. He's in jail now, serving a 10-year sentence.

Raul Castro was with his own troops on a parallel mountain range during these months—on the Sierra Cristal. He often made deals to get munitions earmarked for his brother.

"Castro and his rifle were a joke," said an ex-Fidelista. "He would get a new shipment of rifles and insist on testing them personally. On such occasions pigs, sheep, cattle—anything that moved and didn't wear a Batista uniform—were in great danger.

"He would pot them from easy distances. Once, he shot a dog belonging to a little farm girl. The peasants in Oriente don't have much in the way of personal possessions and the child's heart was broken. Castro airily waved at one of his aids and told him to give the girl \$20—as if that could pay for the loss of her pet."

SOME MONEY CAME FROM THE SUGAR MEN

Some of the money Castro was getting for the munitions his agents were purchasing in Mexico, the Miami area, New York and Belgium came from a "squeeze" on sugar mill owners. It was the old protection racket—you pay 25 cents a bag to the boys and they'll see you don't have fires and other accidents.

Another source was the shopkeepers throughout the island, who had cups underneath the counters for "extra change."

And there were the Red groups headed by Dr. Ernesto (Che) Guevara, today the top brain truster of the Castro government.

The communism with which Fidel had been flirting now became the seducer. The affair began to bear fruit. Months later it was to involve an unsuspecting Catholic clergyman, Father Maximiliano Perez, a Don Camillo sort of Cuban priest, who had real cause of anger against Dictator Fulgencio Batista.

The priest's father, Catalino, was leader of the Authentic Party in the town of Guirade Melena in Havana Province. During an argument at election time, he was beaten to death by two Batista men at a polling place.

THE PRIEST BELIEVED IN CASTRO THEN

Father Perez contributed \$100 a month to the Castro cause which he cajoled from his poor parishioners. He hid and transported arms for the revolutionists in the mountains. He harbored Castro agents in the rectory. He believed in Castro without reservations.

Father Perez recalled:

"After Batista fell, I became temporary mayor of Managua, at the request of the townspeople. I was there only 15 days. During that time I became disillusioned. I saw Castro soldiers rape girls in the street. I witnessed all kinds of brutality."

But his disillusionment was only beginning.

Last August, Father Perez drove to the town of Trinidad on church business. He was stopped at a roadblock set up by soldiers called to quell a threatening rebellion. The stocky, 41-year-old priest showed his 26th of July identification card, assuring the men he was a Castro follower.

"The guards were Spanish, not Cubans," he said. "There were also Chinese, French, and Americans in the groups I saw in the town. I completed my mission and was on my way out of town when I was stopped. I again showed my card, but they took me to headquarters set up in a police station.

"Celia Sanchez, Fidel Castro, and Camillo Cienfuegos (chief of the army, whose later strange disappearance has never been officially solved) were in the headquarters. I pointed out that for years I had been helping the movement."

Several days later, Father Perez said, Castro insisted that he accompany him in his private plane to Havana.

"In the plane" said Father Perez, "he finally came to the point he wanted had to make. He's a devious man and he thought I was off guard. He said to me: 'How would you like to head a national church?' Nationalization of the church is the most common of totalitarian tactics.

"I told him, 'Fidel, you build the Cuban Catholic Church, I won't.' He changed the subject but came back to the original topic many times during the short trip. He told me that the church should have certain changes, that there was a great deal of corruption, that the church was decadent.

"He was disgusted when I flatly refused to have anything to do with his plan. At the airport, I was permitted to walk away."

Father Perez finally got back to his parish in Punta Brava, but it was under different conditions. He was constantly under guard, his telephone was tapped.

On December 12, 1959, he left Cuba. The last mass he celebrated was before a small group. Two bearded rebel soldiers stood guard.

"Several years of my life were gone," he says sadly. "I had committed the grave error of disagreeing with Castro. I should like to appeal to the Catholics of the United States to meditate on the great danger of this madman—my former idol—establishing a Communist government in the Americas."

Another supporter of the Castro revolution had bitten the acid dust.

Religion in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the remarks of Rev. Jay M. Logan, of the First Presbyterian Church of Decatur, Ill., to the Decatur public school administrators with respect to sectarian religious observances in the public schools, with special reference to the 1959 all-city high school vespers of Sunday evening, December 13, 1959.

Reverend Logan's remarks were as follows:

I apologize for interrupting your busy lives. It could be said that I should adjust to the situation as I find it in and around the Christmas season, especially wherein I find conflicts with the public school in programing and personnel.

It was not my intention to be stumping again about the popular observances of Christmas in Decatur. Very few will feel that I am pursuing a fruitful effort. It is possible that it would be hard to find ministers who agree with me. I have no assurance of any support for these views.

Feeling that I must accept the inevitable and keep off the stump, I projected fall vespers for the six Sunday nights prior to Christmas. That was exactly the wrong thing to do. The community's (and our church's) mind was elsewhere. The climax came last Sunday night when I tried a presentation of "The Search for Meaning" over against the annual high school vespers. We got whipped to death. Even my own family was caught by the school program and not one of them could be at his own church on a Sunday evening.

Following our service, I drove around Decatur to see if the other churches which cooperate actively and philosophically with the public schools were alive. Each, as far as I could observe, was as dark as a tomb. I assume that there was not one youth meeting held among these churches last Sunday evening. Very likely, most all regular observances were canceled.

Consequently, chaffing under the situation, I wrote and destroyed two letters to Miss Charlotte Meyer and finally called by phone. This meeting is a result of that phone call.

It would seem to me wise to look at this matter from three directions—the church, the school, and most of all, the youth with his family.

I. THE CHURCH

Decatur's church Christmas is a sad one. The association of commerce, the junior chamber of commerce, the downtown merchants' association, and the public schools all assume the office of theologian at this season. Each, with his own reasons, does so at an early date.

When the church's turn comes the spirit of the season has been sapped, the songs have been sung out, the youth have already been to Bethlehem; an anticlimax is insured.

No church can begin to do what the school, with the truant officer and tax funds, has already done. The church's effort at pageantry seems meager and inadequate—even when it does its very best. The church turns to ludicrous outside displays, frantically searches for newness, and enters the new year defeated at its own business. Some churches get on the bandwagon and point to the State-supported pageant as their own. But, deep in their hearts, they wish for a truly significant chance at their own bias within their own sphere.

I doubt if there will be a significant expression of Christmas among high school youth in any Decatur church this year. For them the occasion is now done. The annual Christmas Eve vesper under the youth council will be weak and poorly attended. At First Presbyterian, as the vesper at Decatur High drew nigh, all our youth dropped out of choir work. When Westminster Presbyterian together with Millikin, put on its Christmas vesper service, there was not one high school student involved.

These two churches have full-time ministers of music, trained in the music of the church. Both have their youth volunteers absorbed by a sister institution which has a huge number of captive participants, extensive hours of practice, and tax funds for both leadership and supplies. The competi-

tion is simply unfair and, in my opinion, disastrous for the church.

The Christian church has two possible festival seasons: Christmas and Easter. They are of life and death dimensions to us. In many respects Christmas is our most colorful time for pageantry. It is a witness to our basic doctrine—the incarnation. Our future depends upon a serious and joyful witness to this belief. If we fail here, our future is truly problematical.

Our treasury from the past is the scriptures, the carols, the wise men, the stable, etc. We have nothing else if this is taken from us. It has shocked me to observe other institutions walking right over to take this treasury away; and, unbelievable, often with the approval of the appointed treasure-keeper—the church.

Undoubtedly, it can be charged, and the charge supported, that the churches do a poor job. Certainly, we do not do a perfect job. We need the help of the public school to undergird our use of language, music, reading, group experience, etc. But, it has been our understanding that the public school would not attempt to replace our unique area of service to the community. We believe we are better trained to do it and that we have the responsibility for the total religious requirements of the individual; the sacraments, marriage, a regular worship throughout life, and the final burden of taking the person to the gates of death.

It seems inconsistent and inconsiderate that you should dip into our material at its most colorful point to make a public presentation and then turn your back on the much more demanding tasks involved in the total religious experience of the person. I shudder at the results achieved in other countries where the state has taken over responsibility for religion. Our church health depends upon a struggle to win people. But we need a fighting chance without the kind of competition the public school represents.

II. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Religious affairs in the public school inevitably create tension. The school's function is not in the direction of sectarian faith. The public school serves people of every religious persuasion. To choose one and intimate that this is the position of the school is to embarrass the constituents of the school.

It is unlikely that the public school is ready to support the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ. It might rightly teach that some Christians believe this to be true, but no school, dealing objectively with a mixture of pupils from all kinds of families, can be the spokesman for even the Christians at this point. The presentation of the Nativity scenes throws the school right into the middle of theological controversy on which the churches themselves are not agreed.

Further, having done this much, it must be clear that Christmas should not be held in suspension by itself. It is part and parcel of a total theological involvement which no public institution in America is in a position to handle.

If the school wishes a winter festival, there are many places to get material which will not create community tensions. The choice of a month other than December for a production would also seem better. It would take some of the clutter out of the Christmas season. Certainly the school would not then choose a Sunday evening to present its program. The fact that high school vespers are held Sunday night is further evidence that the school is mixed up on its true function in society.

During December, I have had occasion to inquire into the college work of three youths who graduated from Decatur public school

this past spring. Each is an above-average person. Each is finding college over his head and is embarrassed over college class results. Could it be that while working on public productions the basic job of the school has been neglected?

Each of these three is an inadequate reader. Each is stumped by the amount of material required to be read by the college professors. Would we not all be happier and better equipped for life if the public school stuck more closely to its basic educational job?

There is always the question of the legality of sectarian programing in an American public institution. There is a place in our philosophy of public education for courses about religion. The history of the world would be strange and untrue if religion were left out. However, it is not the history of one religion. We are a nation of religious pluralism and this is one of our national glories. To program as though this were a Christian nation with a state church is to run counter to our best tradition and to step over the line of the Constitution.

III. THE CHILD AND HIS FAMILY

This is probably the most important side of the matter. A child comes to school to get the basic tools for intelligent living. During his limited time he must be prepared to the fullest of his capacity to meet the crises of his future. Regardless of the religion of his home, he does not come to school for indoctrination.

If he is a Christian, he will get the religious nurture he needs at his church. This will include whatever his church believes is a well-rounded religious diet. He may refuse to follow his parents' religion. He may not care for the majority religion. His Nation insures him freedom at this point. This freedom is one of his most precious possessions.

If he comes from a family with no religion and the school involves him in Christmas and Easter festival occasions, he gets a fragmented view of Christianity under involuntary circumstances. His religion must be in the permissive realm. He must choose it. He will be weakened whenever faith is imposed upon him by an agency he cannot escape.

Further, he is not thereby prepared for full church life. When the public school puts him into Christmas and Easter functions, it prepares him to be a Christmas-Easter churchman. The church has an overabundance of these. If the school is to help this young person, it should hold the many choices before him in comparative fashion so he may see the full scope of any one faith, the many differences, and the costs of full participation. He may then choose where to put his lot if he wishes to be involved at all.

If he is of a minority faith, it is unkind to produce a setting in which, as a young person, he must choose between his religious loyalty and the school function. The social and educational pressures imposed on a minority people by our present school religious observance are both unnecessary and harmful.

The family which goes along with the program as now administered assumes that sectarian religion is the business of the State-supported institution. This cannot possibly prepare such persons for the best kind of church stewardship. The church prepares, at heavy expense, a well-rounded program of regular worship, sacraments, church school, missions, group participation, stewardship, etc. When anyone feels that the school has done an adequate job, the church must, sooner or later, give him a complete reeducation.

What is needed is some vital and objective information about the program of the church in relationship to the community, the Nation, and the world.

In closing, the Nation needs each of us at our own posts doing the best we know how. We should encourage and supplement each other. We will each see weaknesses in the other's program. But, we should both resist with all our beings the temptation to take over the field of service for which the other is best qualified and for which society has called the other institution into existence.

The community has a right to expect that those of us who administer these areas of life will be far out head of the people in understanding what is needed for the welfare of society as a whole. It also has a right to expect that we will stake our lives, at least our positions, on the truth as we see it. If the people cannot count on our sincere leadership, even when we run counter to their wishes, we have no right to our leadership.

Again, I regret absorbing your time. I value your friendship and think highly of the Decatur Public Schools. I have no intention of withdrawing my support from your overall excellent program. If, in your sincere judgment, these thoughts are in error, we at First Presbyterian are prepared to adjust ourselves away from the conflicts we have experienced this year.

I cannot promise to forget my dream of what seems to me to be right. Nor can I promise to feel good when I see the "wise men" of today riding away from Bethlehem with our treasure.

The Juvenile Court: Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a copy of the talk given by Judge Oram Ketcham, Judge of the juvenile court, at a dinner of the Federation of Citizens Associations, which I attended at the Mayflower Hotel, Saturday, March 5, 1960. I enjoyed it so much that I thought it should be called to the attention of others not privileged to attend. His remarks follow:

THE JUVENILE COURT: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Mr. Norwood, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is truly a pleasure for me to be asked to speak to such a large and representative group of citizens about the juvenile court. And I am especially glad to participate in this 50th anniversary celebration of the Federation of Citizens Associations. You are, I'm sure, justly proud of the record of civic endeavor and community achievement which you have compiled in the half century just passed.

A 50th anniversary is always a propitious moment. It reminds us of many accomplishments already achieved, of obstacles met and surmounted. But its significance should not be limited to the past. There is also a need to look to the future. And with an organization like the Federation of Citizens Associations it is reasonable to look to the future with the confidence and hope derived from prior success. Such an anniversary is, in short, an appropriate vantage point from which to scan both backward and forward. By way of contribution to

this celebration I should like to share with you not only the satisfaction of accomplishment which another agency of civic action is experiencing as it plunges into its second half century of operation, but also the fervor of its promise for the future. The juvenile court of the District of Columbia was 50 years old on July 2, 1956. I would like to illustrate to you how the current operations of the juvenile court differ from those in the past, and what you may reasonably expect it to contribute to the improved Washington of tomorrow toward which we all look.

My story begins less than 4 years prior to the founding of the Federation of Citizens' Associations. According to the first annual report of the court, it was on Monday, July 2, 1906 that the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia was put into operation. No. 1816 F. Street, NW. was the location of the court. The report recites the names of a number of the Washington dignitaries attending the festivities of the first day. In addition to the details of the inauguration ceremonies, the report includes the announcement of appointments to the court, as made by Judge DeLacy, the first juvenile court judge. There were appointed a clerk, a chief probation officer, an assistant probation officer and, as those of you with a practical turn of mind will have already guessed, a janitor. Since then, two world wars, enormous technological advance and substantial change in patterns of schooling, church and family life have intervened. And, as you will presently see, the jurisdiction and the responsibilities of the juvenile court have been steadily growing ever since it first opened its doors.

Even with its sole judge and small staff, the newly created juvenile court represented (in 1906) a significant step forward in the public's procedures for dealing with juveniles. As all of you will recall from the novels of Charles Dickens in past centuries, the treatment of children and adults charged with criminal offenses was substantially identical. Whether prankster or hoodlum, the child was subject to the same laws, held to the same level of responsibility, and could be committed to the very same jail or prison. The conditions of filth, drudgery, brutality, vice and other forms of criminal contamination to which children were subjected in those days shocked the conscience of the community. It was largely for the purpose of correcting such things by providing a separate method of handling children who violated the law that the juvenile court was established.

The first juvenile court in this city was given jurisdiction over two categories of children—those who, prior to their 17th birthday, committed misdemeanors, and those who were neglected, abused or dependent. As a logical corollary, the court was also given jurisdiction over adults who mistreated children, refused to provide for them or contributed to their unlawful behavior. Thus, the earliest statute made it clear that the court had a dual purpose—to correct the illegal activities of children and to protect children from paternal and adult abuses. To effect these purposes, Judge DeLacy was authorized to commit a child to one of the available houses of correction, to transfer custody to the Board of Children's Guardians for placement in a foster home, or to place the child on probation.

Although quite commonplace even in adult courts today, probation was a novelty in 1906. Judge DeLacy, in his annual reports, laid great stress on the value of probation as a method of strengthening the child's family tie, which in his opinion was the most important influence in a child's life. Commitment to a house of correction necessarily severed that important tie, sometimes forever. Moreover, probation was then and is now an economical procedure. In those days of harder currency, it only cost \$150 a year

to keep a child in a reform school. Today it costs about \$2,700 per year. Nowadays it costs about \$250 a year to supervise a juvenile while on probation—less than one-tenth of the cost of maintaining him in an institution at public expense.

We do recognize, however, that probation has its limitations. Some months ago I placed a boy on probation for auto theft. One day he was late for his probation appointment. So he stole another car in order to drive to the court in time. For him probation was not a success. It was revoked and he was committed to the National Training School for Boys.

To summarize the situation in 1906, the juvenile court represented a true innovation in traditional legal methods of dealing with children. It was a court physically and jurisdictionally separate from adult criminal tribunals; it possessed the functions of protection and care as well as that of coercive regulation; and it provided the judge with flexibility and discretion in disposition which was the beginning of "individualized justice" as we now practice it.

During the three decades following the establishment of the court in 1906, not only did the city of Washington grow but so did the court's jurisdiction and responsibilities. The growing awareness of the profound influence exerted by adults, particularly parents, upon the actions of children resulted in Congress giving to the juvenile court the duty of administering a variety of laws regulating adult-child relationships.

Bringing my story up to date, the court in 1938 was overhauled and the original organic law replaced by a statute based on the model Juvenile Court Act recommended by the National Probation and Parole Association and the U.S. Children's Bureau. Experience has shown this law to have been drawn with both wisdom and imagination. The significant innovations made when the juvenile court was first established were further implemented in the new, noncriminal act of 1938. The court's jurisdiction was expanded to include all types of law violations committed by children prior to their 18th birthday as well as truancy, incorrigibility, and other dangerous or disruptive activities. The court was made a court of record, instead of a police court, and was given the authority to transfer felonies committed by older juveniles to the U.S. district court. Its probationary powers and staff were increased. And the new act gave the court added criminal powers for dealing with adults whose actions affected the lives of children. In summary, the 1938 Juvenile Court Act provided all the jurisdiction necessary to permit individualized justice for children.

Later, in 1951, the Congress further added to the court's adult jurisdiction by enacting the Child Born Out of Wedlock Act, which gives at least economic protection to the illegitimate child. This legislation requires the court to establish the paternity of children born out of wedlock and, thereafter, to insure their economic support and education until the age of 16. As the result of this statute nearly 5,000 fathers are currently on probation to the juvenile court.

Many of these cases provide us with pathetic problems. But, as I'm sure you are aware, pathos is one of the chief ingredients of humor. So I am reminded of one of my occasional additional duties—the performance of marriage ceremonies. Frequently the request comes from two of our clients who already have several illegitimate children. In one of my most carefully reasoned decisions I have ruled that children shall not be invited to the wedding of their parents.

So today—54 years after its creation—the juvenile court has grown in many ways. From a police court for children with jurisdiction over misdemeanors committed by those under 17, it has become a plenary

court of record with jurisdiction over all offenses committed by children under 18—from mischief to murder. It has also acquired a wide range of jurisdiction over adults whose acts affect the lives of children; so much so that today more than 40 percent of the court's time is devoted to such adult cases. And the court, like the Federation of Citizens' Associations, has watched Washington grow from a quiet town of 300,000 people to its present urban population of 830,000, and the population of the total metropolitan area population has increased from about 350,000 in 1906 to over 2 million persons today (a sixfold increase). To meet the increasing demands on its services, the court's staff has grown from the original 5 to the present 97.

But one feature of the juvenile court remains the same as when it was first organized. The juvenile court was created in 1906, with one judge. It was revamped and reorganized in 1938, with one judge. And in 1960, there is still only one judge. During the same period of time, the judicial manpower of the municipal court has gone from 7 to 16 judges, plus the addition of a 3-judge municipal court of appeals. The district court of the United States has increased from 5 to 15 judges, and the U.S. court of appeals has tripled in size, from 3 to 9 judges. As a final measure of comparison, the strength of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District has risen from 731 men in 1910 to 2,508 in 1958.

Therefore, it is with regret, but candor, that I must report to you tonight that the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is no doing all that it should or could do to assist this community in its fight against delinquency, dependency and neglect. In the last few years we have resorted to a variety of devices in an effort to reduce the number of court hearings before the judge. But there is an absolute limit to what one judge can do to stem this tide; and that limit was reached long ago. The sad fact is that the absence of additional judges has created a bottleneck which seriously hinders the progress of the juvenile court as well as the many other agencies and organizations which are trying to make our city a safe and wholesome place for adults and children alike.

What has this bottleneck meant? It has meant a substantial failure of justice and law enforcement where it is most needed—in training the youth of the community to be the law abiding citizens of the future. In at least five ways is this evident.

First, juvenile court justice, under present circumstances, is not swift. The court has a large and growing backlog of cases awaiting adjudication. On January 1, 1960, there were 1,390 cases (401 juvenile cases and 989 adult cases) awaiting hearing. In juvenile cases this means a delay of 2 to 3 months before their cases are heard; and with adult cases, the delay is in the neighborhood of 7 to 9 months.

Secondly, because of the backlog and its accompanying delay, the court's justice is sometimes uncertain. The recollection of witnesses grows dim as the months pass and in many instances complainants cannot be located by the time of the trial.

The third point is that the court's justice is often unequal as between different juveniles who are awaiting a court hearing. Since the trial will be months away, the court must choose between detaining the child in the receiving home for a long period (at substantial public expense) even before it is determined whether he is delinquent or not—or releasing the child to the custody of his parents while waiting for the hearing. If the first course is taken, there is always the possibility of unjust confinement. If the latter course is taken I am always aware that the juvenile may again

violate the law before his trial can be reached.

Fourthly, a single judge cannot give enough time to each court hearing to allow for normal judicial reflection or analysis. When you must adjudicate and dispose of over 100 cases a week the process is similar to that of an assembly line in proceedings which, more than in any other court, warrant individual treatment and compassionate understanding. With such hasty determinations there is always the possibility of ill-considered justice.

And finally, the present situation means costly justice for you as citizens and taxpayers. If, on the one hand, the court commits to a public institution a youth who might have been corrected while still at home, you citizens foot the bill of \$2,700 per year for his care while at the institution. While I fervently hope that none of them is unjustly committed, the fact that there are now over 1,400 children in our public juvenile institutions bears tribute to the fact that the court is not unmindful of its responsibility for protecting the law-abiding citizens of Washington. I estimate that the maintenance of these 1,400 children is costing the District of Columbia over \$3½ million each year. On the other hand, if the court mistakenly permits a child to remain in the community who should be in an institution, one or another of you may be yoked on a dark street or have your car stolen and wrecked. I sincerely believe that there will be a great saving for all if such decisions are made with greater deliberation and more certainty than is now possible.

Thus, it can be said that, as a result of the present judicial bottleneck, the juvenile court does not afford the type of swift, sure, equal, and positive justice which sets a good example to the youth of this city. This seriously handicaps the administration of justice, hinders the court in its efforts to inculcate in children and their parents a proper respect for the law, and often denies the citizens of the community the protection to which they are entitled.

Turning then to the future, we find that the basic tools are at hand. But their cutting edge awaits the honing of an enlightened Congress. A noble and vastly promising concept has been embodied in the law. Community agencies, both public and private, designed to rehabilitate and wisely correct children have been created. Among these much credit goes to the youth aid division of the Metropolitan Police Department which was established in 1954 and to the child welfare division of the Department of Public Welfare which provides for most of the children committed by the court. But, to a large degree, the juvenile court is—and of necessity must be—at the hub of this wheel. I have the highest praise for the wise and devoted work which is being performed daily by the dedicated staff of my court. However, a judicial bottleneck exists and until the juvenile court is, by legislation, made adequate to the task assigned to it the community will never fully reap the benefits of this concept.

It is a pleasure to know that this powerful organization of Washingtonians is in the forefront of a host of civic groups who have endorsed the legislation passed by the U.S. Senate and now pending before the House District Committee to add additional judges to the juvenile court. Let us all fervently hope that this legislation will become law during this session of Congress.

In conclusion, the half century since the founding of the juvenile court in the District of Columbia has been a period of experimentation and progress. We are, I think, substantially closer to the goal of achieving a judicial tribunal which will adequately provide for children and protect the community.

The appellate courts have clearly established the fact that, however compassionate its approach, the juvenile court must operate as a court and not as a social welfare agency. Its function is to adjudicate legal issues which concern the rights and liberty of children and their parents. At the same time the court is also responsible, as a court of law and justice, for protecting the rights of citizens of the community to live in peace and safety. We at the court welcome the dual responsibility which these interpretations of our statute place upon us. Much has been learned, facilities have been expanded and improved, and more and better trained staff members have been obtained. Though much remains to be accomplished, given sufficient judicial personnel, I believe that the prospects are good.

Thank you for listening to me. It has been a pleasure for Mrs. Ketcham and me to share this celebration with you. I wish you and your fine organization even greater success during the next 50 years.

Six-Star Rank for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.—Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat as follows: which I believe deserves everyone's thoughtful consideration.

SIX-STAR RANK FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has received virtually all the honors which a grateful Nation can bestow—with one exception.

He holds the five star rank of a general of the Army, the highest, along with three others of similar rank and four fleet admirals, ever bestowed to an officer during his active career.

He has been awarded the Congressional Medal and all of the Nation's other decorations. He has received the thanks of the Congress and innumerable decorations from other governments, as well as honorary degrees and citations by the score throughout the world.

He should, however, receive an even higher though honorary rank by having bestowed upon him the title of General of the Armies.

There is ample precedent for this in that this title was conferred upon General Pershing some years after the conclusion of World War I in recognition of his great services as our military leader in that conflict, and a similar rank of admiral of the fleets was bestowed on Admiral George Dewey following the Spanish-American War, although Admiral Dewey's services, without disparagement to that great naval commander, were completely trifling compared to later wars.

General MacArthur is, by common consent, the greatest general produced by America in this century and perhaps in all our history.

While he unquestionably has many years of life ahead of him, the Nation should not wait for his monuments in the future, but should bestow its recognition on him while the general can take satisfaction in this climax to a brilliant career unparalleled in our military annals.

The six-star rank for General MacArthur would in no way be a derogation of the

superb careers of Fleet Admiral Nimitz or of General Eisenhower whose places in history are entirely secure, nor could it be interpreted as a rebuke to President Truman who relieved General MacArthur of his command.

It is simply a past-due and merited recognition of the services of this great man who was the youngest general officer in World War I and cited for conspicuous gallantry, the Chief of Staff of the Army during the difficult days of the depression, the redeemer of the Philippines, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces which fought back to final victory against overwhelming odds in World War II, and culminating in Japan following the surrender, when he, by the force of his personality and the wisdom of his acts converted, in an administration entirely without parallel in the world's history, a fallen and embittered foe into a strong ally and devotee of democracy and a partner in the continuing battle for a free world.

We hope that the Congress will enact a bill giving General MacArthur the title of General of the Armies before it adjourns in the current session. This recognition will meet with universal acclaim.

Eisenhower Reassures the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two articles from the Bangor Daily News of February 24, 1960:

EISENHOWER REASSURES THE NATION

President and Commander in Chief Eisenhower has relieved the uneasiness of the American people by declaring that U.S. defenses are a strong and trustworthy shield of peace. He assured his fellow countrymen that the nuclear-armed planes and ships and the missiles of United States are a solid deterrent against attack.

Surely none could speak with greater authority. He is a military man in his own right. And, as Chief Executive of the Nation, is in a position to appraise better than anyone the overall military picture.

Much of the criticism leveled at the administration's defense program comes from the Democrats in an election year. Thus it should be heavily discounted.

The Democratic Party is poorly qualified to pose as a preparedness party. Woodrow Wilson was going to keep United States out of war in 1916. He failed to do so and, moreover, the country was not ready to fight when war came.

The Roosevelt administration was caught with its guard down when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor in 1941. And, again, our military forces were not in shape to strike back. United States took a drubbing before it could muster strength and reverse the tide of battle.

Then there was 1950, when the Truman administration fell asleep and Red North Korea invaded South Korea. Much American blood flowed in regaining the lost ground.

Some able and sincere military men feel that the Nation's defense program is not all it should be. It seems to us that the President has answered them as far as missiles and other defenses for large-scaled war are concerned. But what about preparations for deterring and extinguishing brush fire wars?

The Communists may not dare start a global holocaust but they have been successful with small piecemeal aggressions in the past and we assume they will try more in the future, whenever they see the opportunity. We'd like to hear the Commander in Chief's views on this phase of free world defense.

WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES STAND BY? EDITOR, BANGOR DAILY NEWS:

Communism, only now, is actively seeking to penetrate this hemisphere with an initial foothold in Cuba. At present, American and Cuban relations are steadily deteriorating to a point where it would have been better had Fidel Castro never come to life or power. Premier Castro is trying, and apparently with great success, to make a "people's republic" out of his country. He has rejected our friendship over and over again by doing such things as siding with the Communist bloc countries in the United Nations, by confiscating nearly \$1 billion worth of American capital by American investors. Those persons losing their property will get nothing more than a mere token from Castro.

What is Castro doing to us, the country that liberated Cuba in 1898? He has just recently made an agreement with the Soviet Union to sell her something like 345,000 tons of sugar at \$2.98 per hundred pounds which is much less than the world's market price for sugar. The United States buys nearly 3 million tons yearly of Cuban sugar at \$5.50 per hundred pounds, which is almost double what the world's market price (\$3.62) is and also what Russia will pay Castro for her sugar.

President Eisenhower has outlined a policy of "nonintervention" which is good to a certain extent but which is a poor example of how to answer the threat of a Communist complete takeover on our back doorsteps. Why should the United States stand by and treat Castro with smooth, polite diplomatic talk while he continues to work in the Communist cause which is to destroy the United States and all other democracies? This country doesn't have to buy sugar from Cuba and continue to pour millions into the Communist coffers. There are several other countries like the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Peru from which we can buy our sweet stuff.

The United States has lost much prestige around the world, especially in Latin America, since Castro began lying, cheating, and stealing from us. But still our policy continues to be of nonintervention. At present there is much difference of opinion in Congress as to how to handle this situation. But some legislators are in favor of cutting all trade with the Cuban island. We must write our Congressmen urging immediate steps to halt any further trade with the Cuban Government. This is exactly what Congress needs to know: What the people back home are thinking, and if the people don't take more interest in what is happening in Cuba and elsewhere, then Cuba shall be wholly red.

LAWRENCE DOUGHTY II.

The Size of the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following

article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Size of the Problem," which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

The article follows, and I would certainly commend it to my colleagues:

THE SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

(By Walter Lippmann)

Here at home the overriding question is how to pay for the public needs of our growing population in an era when our social order is relentlessly challenged. These public needs include not only the rising costs of the race of armaments and the competition among the underdeveloped nations. They include also the rising costs of scientific research, of better public schools, of more adequate hospitals and public health services, public works, roads, water supply and sewage disposal, slum clearance and urban renewal.

There are some who will say that we cannot meet all our public needs without abandoning the freedom of our society. There are others of us who say that we must meet these needs, that we can meet them without sacrificing our liberty, and indeed that by meeting them we shall strengthen our liberty. This is the central issue of our time, and no one who is interested in public life can ignore it.

An excellent newspaper, which I read regularly and greatly respect, "The Wall Street Journal," said recently in an editorial that to argue, as I have done, that our public needs have to be met is to invite us to start surrendering our liberties in panic. For to meet the needs will cost a lot of money, and this will put us on the dreary road of statism and when the individual must face the faceless state, he has only as much free choice as the state chooses to grant.

This would indeed be monstrous if it were allowed to happen. How are we to make up our minds whether it will happen if we decide to devote to defense and to other public needs enough of our wealth to pay for them? One way to go about deciding it is to look at the problem quantitatively and concretely, and not abstractly and in generalities. Let us then look at some figures.

I am taking my figures from the Fourth Report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund which was issued in 1958. It covers all Government expenditures, Federal, State and local, which are for the purchase of goods and services. It omits transfer payments which, like the interest on public debts, "do not make a direct claim on our production of goods and services." The report contains figures for the year 1957 and estimates for the year 1967. The report is, by common consent, I believe, expert, disinterested, and obviously it is not partisan.

In 1957 all Government purchases of goods and services came to \$86.4 billion. In 1967, if we meet the public needs for defense and other things which the authors of the report are agreed upon, the cost will be \$153 billion (in 1957 dollars). This gives us an idea of the dimensions of the problem. The question then is whether the expenditure for public purposes of \$153 billion in 1967 would revolutionize our society.

In 1957, when we spent \$86.4 billion publicly, we were taking 20 percent of our national production, leaving 80 percent in private hands. What would be the situation in 1967 if we carry out the programs to meet public needs which are recommended in the Rockefeller Report? The answer to that question will depend on our rate of growth in the next 10 years.

The Rockefeller estimates show that on the feasible assumption that our gross national product can grow at a rate of 4 percent per year, the share taken for public purposes in 1967, if their recommendations as to what is desirable are followed, would be only 24 percent, and the share left in private hands would be 76 percent. This would mean that

the rise in private consumption, which on the average has been 2 percent per year, would drop to 1.4 percent. We would not be raising our private standard of life quite so fast as we are now. But we would be raising our public standard and we would be doing it with three-quarters of our product still in private hands. No one can say that on these fairly conservative assumptions we would not still be a free society.

These figures make the assumption that we can grow only at a rate of 4 percent. If, however, we could raise the rate of growth to 5 percent, the position would be changed substantially. We would then be spending for public purposes 22 percent, which is not much more than the present share of our spending, and there would still be left in private hands 78 percent. At the same time consumption would be rising at 2.8 percent, which is above the average.

It is evident then, that the argument of the Wall Street Journal is based on an assumption which is not stated. The assumption is that the U.S. economy, in this age of automation, cannot increase its productivity fast enough to support our growing public needs. The figures I have cited indicate that if we can now achieve a growth rate equal to that of the years 1947 to 1953, that is to say, an annual rate of growth of 4.7 percent, instead of the 2.3 percent rate of the years since then, we shall be able to provide the needed public services while maintaining approximately the same ratio of public to private spending as we have today.

I am sorry to use so many figures. But they are necessary in order to put in its true perspective the size of the great problem of our era. When we look at this problem quantitatively, comparing our growing needs with what can be our economic growth, we may conclude that our tasks are big, which makes them interesting, but that they are quite within our capacity.

Thomas G. Masaryk

SPEECH
OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the 110th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk be commemorated by the issuance of a new postage stamp in the "Champion of Liberty" series issued in tribute to leaders in the cause of freedom everywhere.

The name of Thomas Masaryk will ever stir the emotions of those who love liberty, democracy, and learning. The emotions of inspiration, joy and sadness are mixed when the name of this statesman and philosopher bring to mind the struggle and the triumph which were inextricably his own and those of his beloved Czechoslovakia, but which for his country were to succumb to tragedy so soon after his death.

For the name of Thomas Masaryk and Czechoslovakia are in a sense synonymous. Not only was the Czechoslovakia which rose from the ruins of World War I almost wholly the result of his efforts. His writings had been the inspiration for the incipient movement for independence. His persistence at home and abroad brought about its very creation. Not only was his presidency simultaneous

with the beginning, the rise, and the peak of achievement of this new and truly democratic country. But the democracy which he had almost literally himself created, and which flourished under his leadership—the democratic era of the young republic Czechoslovakia—was to come to an untimely and tragic end just a year and a half after his death.

Was there ever before in all history a country so completely forged at the anvil of one man, so closely identified with his life, his thoughts, and his ideals? It was he, Thomas Masaryk, whose ideas gave birth to the movement which became the independent country Czechoslovakia. It was he whose efforts at home and abroad were responsible for the genesis of the new freedom loving country which was to become a model of democracy during its all too short span of independence.

This one human being who in the span of a single life accomplished so stupendous a feat, in his own origins and his life typified the rise of the democratic spirit at its finest. The son of a coachman, he rose through his own love of independence, his own diligence and learning to the presidency of his country. From a paucity of background he became renowned not only as a statesman, but as a sociologist and a political philosopher. It was the originality of his ideas, the independence in his written word, and his defiance of domination that were actually responsible for the origin and growth of the democracy he was chosen to lead until his resignation at the ripe old age of 85.

As he is remembered and revered today, so is cherished and honored that memory of what Czechoslovakia was, what it potentially is, and what it may be again. Not only Czechs the world over, but all who love freedom and true democracy find in the memory of Masaryk an inspiration and a hope for the future of his beloved country.

National Defense Student Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter received from Mr. Irvin E. Youngberg, executive secretary, the Kansas University Endowment Association, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., concerning a report of the national defense student loan fund account at the University of Kansas.

I feel this letter merits the attention of every Member of Congress. The letter follows:

THE KANSAS UNIVERSITY
ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION,
Lawrence, Kans., March 1, 1960.
The Honorable WILLIAM H. AVERY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AVERY: We have just completed a cumulative report of the na-

tional defense student loan fund account at the University of Kansas for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I thought that some figures from our report would be of interest to you, especially since I understand that a supplemental appropriation of \$9.7 million has been requested for the current fiscal year by the President.

We have received a total of \$286,044 as a Federal contribution to the program. This has been matched, on a 1-to-9 basis, by \$31,789 contributed by alumni and friends for student loans.

Of the total of \$317,833 available to date in this way for the national defense student loan program at KU, loans totaling \$300,454 have been made to 518 of our students. The average is approximately \$585 per student.

We have \$17,479 on hand for the remainder of the current school year, the summer session, and commitments to new freshmen for next fall. Our request for the current year was reduced by \$63,687, an amount which I believe would take care of our needs quite satisfactorily for the rest of this year, summer school and for freshmen students entering next fall, and also the amount which we will receive if the requested supplemental appropriation is approved.

Representatives of the big eight schools meet at the time of the conference indoor track meet in Kansas City each year to discuss matters of mutual interest related to alumni and educational fund raising work. I was pleased to learn at such a meeting last week that our enthusiasm about the Federal student loan fund program seems to be shared by all of our sister institutions. Translating the dollars that we have received into terms of assisting Kansas boys and girls with a higher education makes the program, in my opinion, a most worthwhile one.

I might add that we feel that the program is being well administered by the Department. The people concerned with the program seem to understand and appreciate the problems involved from our point of view, and reporting and redtape have been kept at a minimum.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

IRVIN E. YOUNGBERG,
Executive Secretary.

The Economic Impact of Tight Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of the Members are aware of my strong feelings on the matter of tight money. We are all soon to be faced with an important measure which relates directly to this issue. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to enter into the Record an excellent address on this subject, made before the recent annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, by Dr. Horace M. Gray, of the University of Illinois. Professor Gray is a nationally known and respected economist who is a coauthor of the book, "Monopoly in America." I commend his remarks to all in the confidence that increased awareness of the facts relative to this

issue will assist this House in making the decision which is required by the best interests of our Nation and its people.

The address follows:

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF TIGHT MONEY

(By Horace M. Gray, professor of economics, University of Illinois, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 22, 1960)

Tight money, as rationalized by its defenders, is a natural phenomenon, which arises from an excess demand for money operating against a limited supply. Under such circumstances the interest rate, or price of money, naturally increases. This being a natural development, nothing can be done about it, except to conform and wait patiently for natural corrective forces to redress the imbalance. Moreover, if properly understood, this natural tightness of money is actually beneficial and salutary. It will restrain excessive spending, investment and speculation; stimulate increased saving; force people to be more prudent and efficient; stop inflation; preserve the integrity of the dollar; and improve the public credit. By submitting to the stern discipline of tight money, the Nation will be purged of its economic sins and emerge from the ordeal cleansed and strengthened.

Those who expound this doctrine of economic salvation conveniently overlook certain important facts:

1. There is nothing natural about tight money. It is the direct consequence of human folly and mismanagement of our monetary, fiscal, and economic policies.

2. Tight money, whatever its other results, yields large and unjustifiable profits for bankers and money lenders.

3. Monetary policy is merely one of many control devices by which the economy can be regulated and stabilized. Those who place sole reliance on monetary policy, because it is profitable to them, generally reject all other pertinent controls on the specious ground that they would interfere with private business.

4. The alleged benefits of tight money are largely spurious.

5. The argument omits all reference to the evil effects of tight money.

Let us examine briefly some of the deleterious effects of the tight-money policy on various sectors of the national economy.

A. THE IMPACT OF TIGHT MONEY ON SMALL BUSINESS AND AGRICULTURE

Certainly, no one would argue that small-scale, competitive business or the independent family farm are guilty of promoting inflation and, therefore, need to be restrained. Their spending and investing have not been excessive; they have not raised prices; they have not made extravagant demands upon the credit system nor wasted resources in wild speculative ventures. Because they labor under the restraint and discipline of competition, they could not promote inflation even if they were so minded.

Nevertheless, the anti-inflationary tight-money policy hits them with special severity. Small business and farmers must borrow in order to operate; hence, they cannot avoid the impact of restricted credit and high interest rates. Interest is a large and unavoidable cost to them; it increases their cost of production, reduces their margin of profit, jeopardizes their financial security, limits their opportunity to expand and to improve their efficiency, and places them at a disadvantage competitively. Restriction of credit and high interest rates are a sure way to destroy thousands of small businessmen and independent farmers. Their liquidation can scarcely be regarded as a public benefaction. Yet, it is the bitter fruit of a tight-money policy.

B. LARGE-SCALE, MONOPOLISTIC BUSINESS

In sharp contrast, the giant corporations which dominate our basic industries are al-

most completely immune from the adverse effects of tight money. They escape largely because they don't have to patronize the banks or the money market.

Consider their alternative sources of funds:

1. Monopoly power over prices.
2. Government procurement contracts on a negotiated, noncompetitive, cost-plus basis.
3. Direct subsidies.
4. Indirect subsidies in the form of Government-fixed prices.
5. Indirect subsidies in the form of tax writeoffs and immunities.
6. Tax deduction for interest charges on debt.
7. Accumulated reserves of short-term securities.
8. Retained profits.

As a result, their command over funds is so ample that they are relatively independent of the banks. Tight money and high interest rates are to them little more than minor irritants—about as effective in controlling their conduct as a mosquito on an elephant. Even in those cases where borrowing from banks, or in the open market, is necessary, the tax writeoff of interest charges reduces the effective cost of borrowing by roughly one-half. Thus, a very high interest rate—say of 8 percent—would not deter them from any undertaking that promises to be profitable.

The Federal Government is in the ridiculous position of trying to stop inflation by a restrictive monetary policy which falls almost completely to deter inflationary decisions by big business. By sheer market power, based on privilege and monopoly, big business is independent of monetary control. Its decisions about spending, investment, output, prices, and expansion, whether inflationary or deflationary, are taken without regard to the feeble and ineffective actions of the central monetary authority. If big business is to be compelled to behave responsibly, it will require stronger controls than monetary policy.

C. IMPACT ON CONSUMERS

Durable-consumption goods, such as houses, autos, furniture, and appliances, are sold largely on credit. The volume of such credit is very large—some \$50 billion of installment credit and some \$120 billion of home mortgage credit, or a total of \$170 billion. Obviously, the interest charge on a debt of this magnitude is a significant item in personal and family budgets. An increase of 1 percent would impose an additional burden of \$1.7 billion per year on consumers.

Some restraint in this volatile area is probably desirable, both to prevent inflation and to protect people against imprudent involvement in excessive indebtedness. High interest rates, however, are the worst possible way to do this. They fail to restrain unwise and imprudent expansion of consumer debt, while imposing an added burden on consumer purchasing power, especially among the poorest and most insecure members of the community. Control of downpayments and amortization periods would be far more effective and yield more socially beneficial results.

D. IMPACT OF THE PUBLIC ECONOMY

Perhaps the most calamitous effect of tight money is on the public economy. If the public economy were in good condition, and the finances of government stronger, this would not be the case. It so happens, however, that the tight money policy emerges at a time when the public economy is in most distressful circumstances. The impact, therefore, is abnormally severe.

For some 20 years, roughly since 1940, we have failed to allocate sufficient resources to the development of the public economy. As a result of this protracted malnutrition, appalling deficiencies have accumulated in almost every area of our public economy. In the meantime, rapid increases in population, urbanization, and industrialization

have aggravated the shortages. As a rough measure of present needs, it has been estimated that over the next 25 years, and in anticipation of a population well over 200 million, we should spend some \$40 billion per year for public capital and social services. This is a large order but well within our national capability if we put our minds and ingenuity to the task.

Unfortunately, however, we have allowed our fiscal and monetary institutions to fall into such disarray and confusion that sufficient funds cannot, under prevailing conditions, be had to build up the depleted and inadequate public economy. The public debt, in all categories, amounts to some \$350 billion, excluding publicly guaranteed private debt of some \$50 billion. The interest charge on this public debt amounts to about \$12 billion annually and is increasing rapidly; each 1 percent increase in the overall interest charge imposes an additional \$3½ billion annual burden on taxpayers. Clearly, the limits of debt financing at ever increasing interest rates are near at hand; some other way must be found to finance the urgent needs of the public economy.

Three alternatives are available, if we would only use them:

1. Increase the revenue of the Federal Government by closing the scandalous tax loopholes now operative.

2. Reduce Federal expenditures in areas of conspicuous waste, such as: Foreign aid, defense, subsidies to big business and big agriculture, and excessive stock piling.

3. Restrict private credit for nonessential purposes, such as speculation in capital values, inventory accumulation, building of excess plant capacity and financing of trivial, low-value personal consumption.

The combined effects of these measures would be to divert resources from the inflated and wasteful private economy into the impoverished public economy. The resources so diverted would yield far greater social utility than they now do. A collateral effect would be to restrain private demands for money and thus to reduce interest rates. This would permit public debt—Federal, State, and local—to be refunded on favorable terms, thereby substantially reducing the tax burden on account of interest charges.

It is preposterous for the public economy to be forced into the private money market and to be compelled to compete against private traders and speculators for funds with which to maintain essential public service. These public services have a first claim on the resources of the Nation, and Government should take, through the tax power, whatever is needed to sustain the public economy. The progressive income tax is the key institution in this operation; borrowing in the private money market is justifiable only in limited instances of revenue-producing, self-liquidating public enterprises. Tight money is now strangling the public economy only because we refuse to learn this elementary lesson of political economy, and foolishly persist in subordinating public needs to the vagaries of the private money market.

President's Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, Dr. Joseph Kaplan, from the University of California, made a

provocative talk at the President's Conference on Occupational Safety.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address as follows:

THE CHANGING NATURE OF WORK

(By Dr. Joseph Kaplan, department of physics, University of California at Los Angeles, March 1, 1960)

When Mr. Hunt wrote me last November to invite me to participate in this plenary session, one sentence in his letter struck me and has stayed in my mind ever since. It is the theme of this conference: "The Challenge of Safety in a Changing World." Now it must be clear to you that I don't intend to pose as an expert on the problem of safety for the American worker, even though I could somewhat immodestly recall that after World War II I received the War Department's Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service, in part, for my work in decreasing aircraft accidents in the heavy bombers of that day, particularly the new B-29's that played such a significant part in the war in the Pacific.

Also, taking a line from one of the excellent fact sheets that have been issued in preparation for this conference—I don't even want to pose as an expert on the interaction of man and his environment in a period of explosive technological change. In contrast, I would rather approach this very challenging assignment as a scientist, who has had the good fortune to play some part in one of the areas of science which promises technological changes hard to overstate even if one lets his imagination run riot. I refer, of course, to the International Geophysical Year and to the scientific discoveries that led to it.

Now I am quite certain that most of you in this audience have heard much about the International Geophysical Year or the IGY as it is more conveniently called. Here I cannot resist telling you of the outstanding work that the Astrophysical Observatory of the Smithsonian Institution has done in the observation of satellites, since I am sharing this platform with my distinguished friend, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. In fact, I could spend the afternoon on that topic alone to demonstrate how science works in order to understand and to extend man's environment.

Instead, in spite of the temptation to talk to you about some special and exciting aspect of the recently concluded IGY, or to tell you about the many programs of great practical and scientific significance growing out of the IGY, I want to talk to you about this changing world from the point of view of a scientist and then let you, during this conference and afterward, draw your own conclusions regarding the possible effects of these changes on occupational safety.

Because of the recent widespread recognition of the importance of science in determining the future status of our Nation, I'd like first to talk about some of the ways in which science and its technological impacts operate. As I develop this theme, I believe that you will recognize how relatively recent are the discoveries that have led to such profound changes in man's way of life. Recognizing this, you will then certainly become aware of the difficulties that face all of us, scientists, engineers, and others, in understanding and reacting to the discoveries that lie ahead.

I have had many opportunities during the past 5 years to think and to talk about this relative recency of scientific discoveries and to try to predict some of the future impacts of science. To illustrate how difficult and dangerous such predictions can be, let me quote from "The Nature of the Universe," a most remarkable book written by my good friend, Prof. Fred Hoyle, of Cambridge Uni-

versity, in 1950, who said that "It is now important that we should leave the earth, and I say this in some sense literally, for I think that within 100 years it may indeed be possible to leave the earth, or at any rate for rockets containing radio-operated cameras to do so. When this does happen, astronomy is certain, I believe, to make marked changes in our whole outlook on life; changes that are likely to be as far reaching as those that followed the Copernican theory of the planetary motions."

I am quite certain that all of you will recognize a note of conservatism in Professor Hoyle's remarks. To show you how conservative he really was, I quote from the proposed agenda of the 10th International Astrophysical Symposium organized by the Liege Astrophysical Institute, to take place this summer in Liege. Prof. Fred Whipple, Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and the leader of the IGY satellite optical tracking program will be the chairman. Three of the items relate to U.S. plans for space telescopes for planets, stars and nebulae; U.S. plans for space solar telescopes; U.S. plans for space radio telescopes—in other words, U.S. plans to leave the surface of the earth—and this only 10 years after Hoyle's prophecy.

Here I will go back only 140 years to 1820 when the Danish Physicist Oersted discovered that when a wire connecting the terminals of a battery of cells, such as you have in your automobiles, is placed in the magnetic meridian directly over or under a magnetic needle mounted on a vertical axis, the needle is deflected from its north-south orientation and tries to place itself at right angles to the wire. This was the discovery of a magnetic field which is associated with a current-carrying wire.

It was only natural to inquire whether, since it is possible to produce a magnetic field by means of a current, it is not possible to create a current by means of a magnetic field. This is a question which led to much scientific investigation during the years after Oersted's fundamental discovery. It was not answered, however, until the epoch-making experiments of Faraday in London in 1831 and the more or less simultaneous experiments of Henry in the United States. The experiments of Faraday and Henry were so simple that any child can perform them today without spending more than a fraction of his or her allowance.

One simply brings a bar magnet and thrusts it into a coil of wire the ends of which are connected to an instrument capable of measuring an electric current. So long as the magnet is moving, the needle of the instrument shows a deflection and therefore a current of electricity. Out of these discoveries of the relationship between magnetism and electricity have come scientific and technological advances that have changed man's way of life and work. The development of physics and its applications in the 130 years that followed Faraday's discovery depended profoundly on the results of this simple experiment—one that I could perform for you even with our present-day prices for less than \$25. Without Oersted and Faraday's discoveries there would have been no electrical industry to speak of, no radio or television, no cyclotrons and other accelerators that led to the age of atomic power. It is hard to overstate the impact of these discoveries on the history of the last century and the effects they had in changing man's way of life and work. And let me remind you that all of this took place a little over a century ago, when relatively few people did scientific research and long before such things as electrons, protons and neutrons were part of the everyday conversation of young people.

At this point I can't resist making the remark that some high-level English governmental official—possibly the Prime Minister

himself—might have visited Faraday's laboratory in 1831 and asked him to predict the practical significance of his experiments on electromagnetic induction. Since even Faraday could hardly have predicted the fantastic future developments growing out of his experiments—he might have been forced to satisfy the Prime Minister by telling him that someday England would be taxing his discoveries. As a matter of fact, something like this did happen to Faraday and has been happening to pure scientists ever since. Quite a few of them might have added that someday this discovery will save the nation. Faraday and his successors could hardly have dreamed of a day when aeronautical scientists would be studying the properties of electrically charged gases, moving in magnetic fields, in an effort to achieve faster flight, higher in the atmosphere or to understand some of the current problems of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Scientists who were experts in ordinary fluid dynamics have been forced by recent events to study electromagnetic theory and to develop the new science of magnetofluidynamics.

Let us turn now briefly to the International Geophysical Year in order to illustrate the character and recency of other basic scientific discoveries and the unexpected origins of technological advances and the changing nature of work. But before doing so, let me go back to 1882 when the conference of directors of weather services which was one of the first groups ever formed to promote international scientific cooperation—organized the enterprise known as the International Polar Year. Eleven nations joined to send expeditions to different parts of the Arctic region, to observe the weather, the northern lights and a phenomenon long known to be associated with the northern lights, the disturbances of the earth's magnetism.

These nations had worked out a common plan for the 13-month period of the IPY—from August 1882 to August 1883 inclusive. Two nations sent expeditions to high southern latitudes.

Now the meteorological directors had a very practical motive for organizing the first IPY. Most of their regions surrounded the almost unknown Arctic region and thus it was only natural to believe that this region might seriously influence weather changes in the surrounding countries. But I am quite certain that none of those who organized the IPY realized even to a small extent the ultimate effects of the coordinated observations of aurora and geomagnetism. They did know that magnetic disturbances disturbed the working of the newly invented electric telegraphs, but not much more than that.

Let us recall that in 1882 no one had any knowledge concerning the composition of even the simplest and most abundant element in the universe—hydrogen. They could not have known that an atom of hydrogen consists of a negatively charged electron and a positively charged proton, held together by some strange forces—since neither the electron nor the proton had as yet been discovered. The positively charged proton came along a few years later and not until 1932 did the discovery of the positively charged electron occur—by C. D. Anderson of the California Institute of Technology in cosmic rays. To complete this family of discoveries, this year's Nobel Prize in Physics went to two of my University of California colleagues, Professors Segre and Chamberlain for their recent discovery of the negatively charged proton.

Where today when we study the northern lights or aurora borealis, or the southern counterpart, the aurora australs, we use the latest tools of spectroscopy and photography, combined with radar, these tools either did not exist in 1882 or were in their infancy. Furthermore, the vast knowledge of matter that is now at our command did not

exist in 1882 as illustrated by the fact I pointed out earlier—that we did not even know the true nature of an atom of hydrogen. You may wonder then what the scientists of 80 years ago could find out from observations made on the ground of a phenomenon now known to occur from 60 to 1,000 miles above the surface—high in the thin atmosphere that slowly blends into space.

Remember too that no high altitude meteorological balloons existed, capable of ascending to more than 100,000 feet and sending back by radio their messages regarding the physical conditions of pressure, temperature and humidity that they encounter. Yet observations were made; observations of the distribution of auroral displays, the discovery that there was a zone in which they occurred most frequently—a zone that had a striking relationship to the magnetic forces surrounding the earth. A strange fact indeed; a puzzling fact—but one that was destined to guide man again and again into the high atmosphere; first with better observations from the ground, backed up by increasing knowledge of the nature of matter and of the characteristics of the atmosphere. Later, with the invention of radio and the discovery that radio signals can be reflected back to earth by the electrically charged regions above us—these signals were used to probe the auroral regions.

Then came rockets, with their exquisite instrumentation, fired during the IGY from shipboard and from rocket launching facilities on land, one in the far north and others in more temperate regions. These were used during the IGY and they performed well by taking instruments into the aurora itself, reporting back by radio the results of a chemical analysis of these strange, thin regions of our atmosphere.

You may ask why I tell you this story, as fascinating as it may be, or what has all of this to do with the changing nature of work. There are many answers to these questions. Out of our knowledge of the thin regions of our atmosphere, in all of which only a microscopic fraction of the air resides, have come many of the facts needed to maintain our long distance radio communications; also the knowledge that will enable us to protect a nation against an otherwise unforeseen attack by ICBM's. There are real indications that some of this knowledge might someday help us to understand the relationships that exist between the sun and the earth and possibly to understand and control some important aspects of our physical environment.

Continued curiosity about the aurora, the earth's magnetism and the upper atmosphere; the need to know more and more about the weather as man flew faster and higher, led to a second International Polar Year, which took place in 1932-33, for the same 13 months as 50 years previously. By this time the well-organized group of meteorological directors were helped by the relatively new international associations that brought together experts in geomagnetism, aurora and in the scientific study of radio. It is tempting to digress even more than I already have, and to tell you about the development of international scientific co-operation; but this is a long story. I do want to say the geophysicists, astronomers, and the students of scientific radio have been the most active scientists involved in international programs, because only by co-operation on a regional, planetary and now even on an interplanetary scale can these studies make real progress.

Following the second polar year came the IGY. Because it was very much broader in scientific and geographical scope than its two predecessors, the 2 polar years of 1882 and 1932, the IGY has brought out many new facts about our planet and has inspired much future work on it and in space. It is interesting to none, too, that the aurora and

the earth's magnetism again played important roles, with the IGY leading us ever closer to a complete understanding of these two phenomena—no longer esoteric, but increasingly connected with matters of great national and international importance.

I make these statements because out of the IGY—inspired from its very beginning by students of the aurora, the earth's magnetism and scientific radio—have come many of the forces which have already changed man's relationship to his environment. Among these are the notable advances in our knowledge of polar regions, particularly of the Antarctic; the advances in the studies of the oceans, with ambitious plans for the future; new meteorological data and future plans that might literally create a new science of meteorology and finally the realization of research in space.

No modern scientific development can quite compare with space research in the suddenness and scope of its impact on mankind. Although it is true that rockets had been used both for military and scientific purposes 10 years before the U.S. National Committee for the IGY asked for the support of a scientific satellite program, it was the IGY program that brought the word "space" and the phrase "space research" into the daily language and thought of all of us. What Fred Hoyle predicted for 2050 has already happened—and even more. Only the most conservative among us now talks about things that will happen 100 years from now. Even the pioneers in space research expect to see man's landing on the moon and the nearby planets.

It is less than 3 years since the launching of the first scientific satellite during the IGY by the U.S.S.R., and a little more than 2 years since we launched our first satellite, yet the amount of direct and related scientific activity that goes under the heading of space research is bewildering even to those of us who helped start these developments. In universities all over the world, departments of aeronautical engineering are now called departments of aeronautical and space engineering. I've already mentioned the pioneering work of Dr. Whipple and his Smithsonian colleagues on platforms in space. Whipple and I talked about these things 10 years ago when with several others, we wrote a book called "Across the Space Frontier." We were visionaries then—we are the old men of the business now.

Scientific and engineering societies, international scientific groups, industries of all kinds—all associate themselves with the word "space." The distinguished organization known since its start as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is now the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—and so it goes—rapidly. Yet it's only the beginning; and only in one general area of science and engineering.

Were I an expert in nuclear physics, I could tell a similar story there, one that many of you are familiar with. One of the newest fields of modern physics is the one generally referred to as the physics of the solid state. Here too are the beginnings of a major revolution, one aspect of which is already known to most of us—the discoveries leading to the development of the transistor. It is not long ago that my good friend, Dr. William Shockley, and his colleagues, Dr. John Bardeen and Walter H. Brattain, were awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for the invention and development of the transistor.

I have said nothing about the life sciences and medicine. These are fields in which explosive possibilities exist, in great part due to the remarkable advances in physics and chemistry, in high-speed computing and in technology in general. In all of these areas and in others, the story will be repeated. At the focus of all of these great efforts stands the American worker, the builder of this changing world.

One fact stands out above all others as we examine the position of the American worker in this changing world. It is that as time goes on, he will be outnumbered by the skilled workers in other parts of the world, notably in the U.S.S.R. and in Red China. In fact, as far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, this time may already be here and if that is not so, then it is not far in the future.

The American worker, like the rest of us, scientists, engineers, managers and bankers, students and teachers, must all realize that to overcome this advantage in numbers, we must develop our skills and our effectiveness. When we are outnumbered two to one, each American must be the equal of at least two in other countries. This challenge places a burden on all of us—but a particularly important one on this conference. We can no longer afford millions of disabling injuries and thousands of occupational fatalities. The safety and future of this Nation, the maintenance and improvement of our way of life, depends on the decisions that we make during these 3 days.

The Futile Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include the following editorial which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "The Futile Filibuster":

THE FUTILE FILIBUSTER

How long can the 18 southern Senators carry on their filibuster?

Well, unless they choose to yield on their own, which no one expects, the only immediately clear alternative is for the majority to insist by two-thirds vote on stopping the so-called debate and getting down to business on civil-rights legislation.

But it is equally clear that as of now the votes are lacking for cloture. So for the moment the Senate has no choice but to persist in round-the-clock sessions. This is what LYNDON JOHNSON calls clearing the air. And doubtless all parties concerned are also interested in seeing how goes the impending debate in the House on civil rights.

If, however, cloture isn't attainable just now, it certainly does not follow that the filibusterers can interminably prolong their spectacle. Why? Because the overwhelming majority is determined, in greater or lesser degree, on strengthening civil rights. The more the Southerners huff and puff, just so does their windy exhibition inspire increasing public disgust and fortify the necessity of meaningful legislation.

While Senator JOHNSON talks of getting a "reasonable" bill and rejects cloture at this time, the danger is that this will make the filibusterers think they can somehow drive through a compromise. But that for which the Southerners might settle, which probably means a circumscribed version of voting rights, can be assuredly described as so much dishwater.

The problem of the Senate majority, the 82 nonfilibusterers, is to see to it that the final bill is in fact strong. The heart of the argument, of course, is to insure the Negro's right to vote. That, surely, is not a matter for days and weeks of gumbeating.

There can't be any compromise here; indeed it ought to be, ideally, a nonpartisan

matter. On this the Senate majority must stand. And if the only way to act forcibly in the right is to stop the present parody of debate, it is high time for action. Because even the filibusterers know they are contesting an irresistible force.

I would like to admonish my southern friends that in the House, too, they will be "contesting an irresistible force." As inevitable as it is that night follows day, so it is with this issue. There can be no compromise on civil rights, and the majority of the Members of the House will stand firm on a strong and adequate bill.

May I call to mind at this point the old political maxim—"If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." That might be most appropriate at this time.

**Editorial Quoting Maurice H. Stans,
Director of the Budget Bureau**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 4 edition of the Tinley Park Times, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought provoking commentary on a topic of grave concern to us all:

Officials, candidates, writers, and John P. Public lose thousands of words from time to time on Government spending. The subject has been the theme of countless editorials about the country and probably will continue to serve as such for many years to come.

We have written on it on various occasions and wish to refer to it again now. However, we will not use our own words. Instead we give you the words of an expert—quotes from Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Federal Budget:

"WHAT WE DO

"We spend great sums on interest charges on our national debt, but we do not reduce the principal.

"We carry on massive Federal programs which State and local governments could do better.

"We devote large amounts of money to farm price supports to reduce surpluses, with the opposite results.

"We lend money to benefit special groups at rates below those which the Government must pay to its own creditors, when private sources could do the job.

"We perpetuate Federal programs which have long since met the objectives for which they were created.

"FUTURE CASH ON DELIVERY OBLIGATIONS

"It will cost between \$25 and \$35 billion to complete the Interstate Highway System after this fiscal year.

"Federal civil public works projects already started will require expenditures of about \$8 billion before they are completed.

"The Federal Government is committed to contribute \$6 billion in the future for public housing.

"Merchant marine subsidies and ship replacement constitute a Federal liability of \$4.4 billion."

These and a variety of other obligations, when added to huge unexpended balances in the defense program, total \$98 billion of commitments for future Federal spending.

Geographical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, since Alaska and Hawaii have been added to the Union, there has been some controversy as to where the new geographical center of our Nation is located. I will, if pressed, admit to a slight bias in this matter though I have no desire to reflect unfavorably upon Kansas, South Dakota, or the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey. I merely wish to enter the following news release in the RECORD and let the facts speak for themselves. I would also add a personal invitation to all to come and visit eastern Oregon. It has much to recommend it in addition to its unique geographical status as described below:

NORTHEAST OREGON VACATIONLAND,

Portland, Oreg., February 1960.

If all residents of the 50 United States were evenly distributed over the Nation's surface, and if they all started walking in a straight line toward its center, they would meet in northeast Oregon vacationland.

That's what the "fellas" say, and "vacationland" boosters certainly won't argue with them.

The fellas in question are W. O. and B. J. Holmes of Research Publications, Inc., San Carlos, Calif. A pair of professionals in geography, astronomy, and navigation, they became intrigued with the center of America problem after Alaska and Hawaii were added to the Union.

Addition of the two new States probably wasn't popular with folks in Lebanon, Kans., the mythical geographical center of our country for 46 years. When the 48 States became 50, a new center was obvious.

But how was it to be determined? These new United States aren't even in one piece. Much of Canada and much of the Pacific Ocean lie between our new States and the old, one-chunk 48.

If you should weigh the new 50 States on the same scale as the old 48—and this would include the intervening ocean and Canadian territory—the center isn't even in the United States. Lines drawn from the extreme corners of the new 50 show the center either in Canada or far out in the Pacific Ocean.

The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey cut out a cardboard map of the 50 new States, left out great gaps for the Pacific Ocean and Canada, and came up with a new center near Castle Rock, S. Dak. But this spot is not equidistant from anywhere, and isn't accepted, at least not in Northeast Oregon Vacationland. Holmes & Holmes found the answer which is accepted in these parts.

They mathematically constructed a box of the 50 States. For the north line they used 71 degrees, 23 minutes north latitude, the parallel which passes through Point Barrow, Alaska, the northern tip of the 50 United States.

At the south they chose 18 degrees, 54 minutes, 45 seconds north latitude—the

parallel at Cape Lae, southern tip of the main island of Hawaii. On the east, they used the parallel of longitude that passes through Quoddy Head, Maine, and on the west the line through Attu Island.

However, this didn't work. It placed the geographic center out in the Pacific Ocean.

As a compromise, they sliced off the Aleutian chain of almost uninhabited islands which straggles out toward Russia's Siberia, and accepted the line running through Cape Prince of Wales, Alaska, the westernmost point of the continental United States.

The center of this box turned out to be a point among the pines on China Cap Mountain, 11 miles northeast of little Pondosa, Oreg. It's at 117 degrees, 32 minutes, 10 seconds west longitude; 45 degrees, 8 minutes, 53 seconds north latitude.

This isolated pinpoint is 2,478 miles, 2,463 feet, 2 inches from the western boundary, and exactly the same distance from the eastern edge. It is 1,813 miles from the northern boundary, and the same distance from the southern line.

Fame thus hit Pondosa at an unlikely time. The little lumber town at the foot of the Wallowa Mountains is a ghost town—what is left of it after a public sale of its buildings last spring and a disastrous fire last summer.

But the Northeast Oregon Vacationland organization aims to bring Pondosa its due fame as the center of America. Signs are up in the area to this effect. The spot on Highway 203 from where the Catherine Creek forest road leads to Pondosa has been marked. A 3-mile hike from the end of the road and an old trail over China Cap Mountain leads to the center of America.

A spire marking the spot is planned, and action has been taken toward getting congressional action to make it official.

Resolution Commemorating the 42d Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Detroit Americans of Lithuanian descent on February 14, 1960, commemorating the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

These loyal citizens of America of Lithuanian descent express their belief in freedom and their hope that the United States will not trust the dangerous doctrine of "peaceful coexistence" with Russia. I join them in their hope that the United States will continue working for the freedom of the people of Lithuania.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas Lithuania formally declared herself a free and independent nation on February 16, 1918; and

Whereas in violation of international law, and unlawful, forcible occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against the will of the Lithuanian people, the Kremlin rulers annexed her to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania were and still are suppressed by tyrannical Communist dictatorship, her culture distorted, and thousands of her people were deported yearly into prison camps; and

Whereas our Government has never recognized the fraudulent and violent annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of Detroit and vicinity calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism in the free world; be it further

Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States not to trust the Soviet "peaceful coexistence"; and finally be it

Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom, sovereign rights, and independence to Lithuania and other enslaved Eastern European nations.

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS

CENTER,

IGNAS SKIRGAUDAS, *President*.

STASYS GARLIAUSKAS, *Secretary*.

FEBRUARY 14, 1960.

A Bill Needed To Increase Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the following letter a schoolteacher in Michigan, much more eloquently than I can, expresses the need for passage of a bill providing not only for Federal support of school construction but also for teachers' salaries:

DEAR SIR: I am an elementary school-teacher in Michigan. I have 4½ years of college training and 3 years of teaching experience. My salary is \$4,700 a year. My fiancé has the same amount of college education and no years of experience. His salary is \$5,700. He is a senior clerk who accepts applications for work. I am responsible for the training of 36 young minds and the keeping of their academic and health records; he is responsible only for pieces of paper. He has coffee breaks. I have none. His workday finishes at 4:45 and he takes no work home with him. I am required to go to meetings after my regular workday ends at 4 o'clock. My time after 4 o'clock is used in preparing lesson plans and attending college classes for additional training which is required to keep my job. It costs \$13.50 for each credit hour I take each semester. The lowest number of hours allowed is 2 which amounts to \$27. The two books for this class totaled \$8.25 or a total of \$35.25. I am required to pay this total cost. He is taking a class in which General Motors pays two-thirds of the cost and furnishes all the books. I am not complaining about the time and effort I spend over my regular workday, but I do think this should be considered as well as the cost of additional training when teachers' salaries are being considered or reviewed.

My principal and supervisor rated me as a superior teacher. People say that if I am

not satisfied with my present salary that I can always go into industry. Children need superior teachers, not just average teachers. I enjoy my job, but I do more work and work more hours than I am paid for. All I ask is that I am paid for the responsibility I feel I assume in helping to develop young minds. I have only taught 3 years, but perhaps in another 3, I, too, will realize the little importance the general public and those in a position of power and influence such as in government, attach to what I consider an important job. I do a job which requires a great deal more human understanding, professional know-how, ingenuity, creativity, and knowledge of human relation techniques than a senior clerk, yet I am paid \$1,000 less a year. I teach ballet 3 days a week after school and on Saturday to make enough money to live in a decent manner. Should I have to hold two jobs to make as much as a factoryworker or senior clerk? Is a senior clerk's job \$1,000 more important than that of a teacher?

Why am I paid \$1,000 less a year than a factoryworker with no experience?

Please express my positive vote for the Federal school aid bill providing funds for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

Thank you for taking time to read my letter.

Yours truly,

Address of Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson at the National University, Bogotá, Colombia, February 23, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to draw to the attention of Members of Congress an address delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson at the National University in Bogotá, Colombia, on February 23, 1960.

I believe it is fair to say that there have been few speeches on Latin America this year which can match the splendid address of Governor Stevenson.

The award to Adlai Stevenson of an honorary degree by this great Latin American university is an indication of the high esteem in which this distinguished American is held by our neighbors to the south.

Governor Stevenson's address follows:

ADDRESS OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AMERICA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1960

I am grateful for the honor this ancient and famous university has done me. I have been honored far beyond my merits by many great universities in my own country and abroad, but I doubt if I have been more flattered and pleased than I am today. And I am sure I have never had a warmer welcome in any country than I have had here in Colombia and from all manner of people. The demonstration in the Plaza de Toros, the friendly greetings in the streets, the messages and visitors have moved me deeply. If I had always been welcomed with the same enthusiasm at home—especially during

recent political campaigns—I think I might be a less carefree tourist this winter.

One of the messages from Colombians which awaited me here in Bogotá said:

"I hope that when you touch Colombian soil you will feel that it is your own country."

Well, I do.

My journey to Latin America is one of a learner, for I have never had the opportunity to travel widely among our Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking neighbors. North Americans know too little about Latin Americans. We must know more, because we are dependent on one another and because by history and deep commitment we Americans, North and South, are bound together by the strongest ties in the great contest of our century. For we are on the side of the democratic forces—of individual freedom, of national independence, of government by consent of the governed, of honest elections, of integrity in public life; and our solidarity and common purpose to defend these convictions is the mightiest weapon of the free world.

So, I hope to return to my country from this long journey around your continent a better citizen of our hemisphere with a better understanding of your problems.

The amazing progress Colombia has made since its exhausting troubles in the direction of these goals of free, democratic and responsible society is one of the great achievements of our time. It is due, I know, in no small measure to President Alberto Lleras Camargo, and I am proud to have this opportunity to pay my public homage to a great leader and an old friend.

In my few days in Medellín and Bogotá, I have come to understand some of the awesome problems that confront modern Colombia. And I have also developed a great admiration for the realism and courage of your leadership in the struggle to narrow the gap between rich and poor, and to win the race between your resources and the explosive growth of your population.

These encouraging developments add to the gratification of this honor in the land of the first permanent European settlement on the American mainland. The early emigrants wrote that even the heavens were different; here in the words of your own Juan de Castellanos: "Our standard sees other stars and our flag a new sky."

For a while it was thought that the seat of utopia lay across the Atlantic and in those days one heard the refrain: "Oh My America! My New Found Land"—a phrase which signified a new hope for mankind.

In contrast to utopia was a burning desire to find El Dorado. I have read of the religious festival held near this spot, in which a Cacique covered himself with gold dust, and of the expedition from Bogotá of Jimenez de Quesada which started out to see the fabled kingdom in 1596. And, of course, the dualism in our nature of idealism and materialism still persists.

Fortunately, even as the conquest was going on, some of those who came to the New World began to ask themselves whether the Indians could justly be enslaved. Mankind is indebted to those great representatives of your culture, Bartolome de las Casas, Francisco de Victoria, and Domingo de Soto, the champions of liberty for the native inhabitants. And let me pay tribute here to an early Colombian, the Apostle of New Granada, San Pedro Claver, who protested so violently against the enslavement of defenseless Africans.

While it is not for me to remind the cultured audience of its past, yet as an expatriate I cannot overlook the extraordinary relationship between letters and government in this country—the eloquent political verse of some of your writers and the literary abilities of many of your Presidents. No other country in the hemisphere

can compete with Colombia's record, and I say that a little wistfully in view of the anti-intellectualism which so often afflicts public attitudes in my country.

But, speaking of the United States, let me turn to a happier, more constructive theme that is even more true of my countrymen, and is also the first concern of all mankind.

The people of the United States want peace—everywhere and with everybody. There can be no security or real safety in this world as long as mankind is threatened with nuclear destruction. You can't make peace with the hydrogen bomb.

"The world," someone said, "is now too dangerous for anything but the truth, too small for anything but brotherhood." In that sense we have a desperate physical solidarity. But, alas, moral and social solidarity in the family of man is still to be found.

Not so long ago I visited Dr. Albert Schweitzer in his primitive jungle hospital in Equatorial Africa, and he told me he considered this the most dangerous period in history, not just modern history, but all human history. Why? Because, he said, heretofore nature has controlled man, but now man has learned to control elemental forces of nature—before he has learned to control himself.

We are all part of a human experiment that may founder. We have set our hands to a science we cannot control. We stand on the edge of the mysteries of outer space. We live under judgment before an infinite godhead. It behooves us, therefore, to express in all our dealings with other peoples our sense of belonging to one endangered family and sharing with it our part of hope and aspiration.

I think Latin America can help us. I think Latin America has an opportunity and a duty to take the lead in arms limitations. I would like to see all the Latin American Republics declare as one their intent and determination to avoid an arms race, and to progressively reduce the arms burden in this continent.

It would be a moral and practical example of what wise, bold statesmanship can do to restore sanity to the world.

I believe the Americas can and should lead us out of this nightmare. And the resources that disarmament would release would go a long way toward the economic improvement which is so imperative in Latin America, as it is in Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

In some ways we can congratulate ourselves. The system of organized friendship and cooperation between the American nations is an achievement in a torn and unhappy world. There has been criticism of our inter-American system, and some of it is justified. But we must not forget that it has, by international action, given peace to more people, over larger territory, and extending for a longer time, than any system of peace in modern history. This peace has not been imposed by any empire. It has been maintained by a community of peoples like your own, like my own, working with fellow peoples from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Cape Horn to Canada. And, with my country's defensive military potential, I see our hemisphere's greater peril not from lethal arms but from lethal ideas taking root in soil cultivated by frustration and misery.

In 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt said to the United States that all of it must prosper together, and that his country could not continue half boom and half bust. In 1960, I say that the hemisphere cannot long continue if half of it is rich and the other half poor. In the United States, since President Roosevelt's time, we have made steady progress toward abolishing poverty. With intelligence, courage, and social vision, we should be able in the next generation to

go forward toward eliminating poverty in the entire hemisphere.

Fortunately, political conditions are more favorable to a great hemispheric advance than they have been for many years. In most of the American countries, the governments are now democratic. This permits a higher degree of confidence between peoples than prevailed a few years ago. In my own country, we have confidence only in those governments which represent the expressed will of their people, and which can be changed to correspond with that will, peacefully, and without force.

To me it is clear that we shall not solve the problems of poverty by separate, nationalist approach. My country tried that, and without success. The United States perhaps could, for a time, preserve her prosperity at the expense of her neighbors—but not for long. Unless a way can be worked out to share the prosperity, and to share the burdens, no one's position can be safe. This will require economic agreements, covering all of the American nations, more detailed and more widespread than has been the habit of most of us up to this time. Happily, the American nations are coming to recognize this need.

Western Europe has been moving toward economic union for the past 10 years, with the result that her industrialization has grown, and her prosperity has increased. There is no reason why a common market should not be organized here, as has been done in other parts of the world. A beginning has been made toward a continent-wide capital banking system, though it needs to be developed with courage and speed. It is entirely practicable to assure that the capital built as each of the American countries develop, shall be directed towards the development of these countries.

No program of economic development will be sufficient unless the social policies of each country in credit, taxation and welfare legislation assure that the income in each country is equitably distributed to substantially all of the inhabitants in it. In final account, men and women and their welfare as individuals are the important consideration. This is true in all situations. Businessmen seeking a market must find it among men and women able to buy. Statesmen and politicians seeking the welfare of their people, must find it in the growing comfort and education of the peoples. Teachers and intellectuals, seeking a higher level of intellectual achievement, must find it in the increasing capacity of the public to read, to learn, to think, and to contribute to the civilization of their time.

All these tasks, however, must be accomplished for each people by their own thinkers and leaders. The form of social organization they choose in each case must and will be their own. Some lessons, I think, are the same in all social systems. There must be schools; and they must be supported by the whole of society, and available to everyone. There must be reasonable wages, so that industrial life is worthwhile. There must be reasonable access to the land, so that its products are available first to the men and women who work on it, and second, that the food the land produces shall be available to the cities. Credit must be available on reasonable terms. There must be skills available, so that the worker can know how to achieve the largest return for his toil.

We have learned, too, that capital does not come chiefly from outside, but is made by and from the enterprises which serve each country. Part, but only a small part, of such capital can be borrowed from abroad or can be provided by foreign aid. And when capital is built, it must not be locked up, or spent in luxury for a few, but must be devoted to the further development of the country. Businessmen who handle

enterprises, great and small, cannot regard themselves as private money makers. They are economic servants of their people. That is their task, and those who do not perform it, must give place to others who will. And if native capital seeks greater security in foreign countries then why should foreigners bring their capital here?

By honest, competent government, by organized international action, by good economic planning, by careful investment, and by technical assistance, the stronger countries in the American hemisphere can help the less-developed countries. I have steadily advocated that my country, the United States, should do more than it has yet done. And one of the things we can do is to encourage, by scholarships and loans, more young Colombians, for example, to study abroad to acquire better work habits as well as technical proficiency.

But I know, and you do too, that in most of these things each country must act for itself, in its own ways, with its own men, seeking to make its own particular contribution. In cooperative union there is economic strength. In cultural differences there is great richness. Each of us, learning from the other, can move towards the next era with unlimited hope for beauty as well as for well-being.

The nations of the American community which we are building will all be different. But to work together in friendship and trust, we must agree on, and make effective certain basic human rights. Our peoples agree that they must struggle to make effective the equality of human beings of whatever race or color, religion or inheritance. Our peoples agree upon the right of every individual to an opportunity to learn, to work, to develop. And freedom of information is a powerful means to that end.

All this was said, years ago, by President Franklin Roosevelt in his declaration of the four freedoms. Like all ideals, such freedoms are not realized at once. But they are, and must continue to be, the guidelines of all policy and action, public and private. Men devoted to them will serve well the American community of nations. In the words of the Charter of Bogota, under which the American community of nations is bound to act:

"Social justice and social security are bases of lasting peace.

"Economic cooperation is essential to the common welfare and prosperity of peoples of the continent.

"The American States proclaim the fundamental rights of the individual without distinction as to race, nationality, creed or sex."

Twelve years ago, representatives of all our 21 Republics signed that charter. Now it is for us to make of it, not merely a treaty, but a reality, on the mountain sides, the plains and the coasts of our hemisphere.

Kiss Those Shores Again for Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Congress of the United States, we are ever mindful of the contribution that the men of our Armed Forces played in various international conflicts in which our Nation has been forced to participate. We have great

respect and always try to cooperate with the veteran organizations who represent Americans who served our country in time of war.

A friend, neighbor, and constituent, John Summers, a member of VFW Post No. 8774, Calumet Park, Ill., is the author of a song, "Kiss Those Shores Again for Me," which has been adopted as the State song of the VFW, State of Illinois. The VFW Department of Illinois will submit this song to their national organization, asking for its adoption as the national song of this great veterans' organization.

KISS THOSE SHORES AGAIN FOR ME

Said this lonely young teen
On a far distant scene
To his buddy sailing cross the sea:
So I'm telling you, Mac,
When you ever get back,
Please kiss those shores again for me.
There's a lassie back there
Who's so tender and fair,
My only true girl in the world.
It's been many the day
Since we sailed far away,
And it's changed our plans for happiness.
So I'm telling you, Mac,
When you ever get back,
Please kiss those shores again for me.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Alken, George D., *Vt.*-----Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*-----Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.

Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*-----
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*-----
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*-----
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*-----
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*-----
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*-----
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*-----
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*-----
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*-----The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *N. J.*-----
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*-----

Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*-----The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*-----Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*-----
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*-----
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*-----4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*-----2525 P St.

Church, Frank, *Idaho*-----
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*-----
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*-----
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*-----
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*-----
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*-----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*-----
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*-----
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*-----

Eastland, James O., *Miss.*-----5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*-----
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*-----
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*-----
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*-----5519 Uppingham
St., Chevy Chase,
Md.

Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*-----
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*-----
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*-----
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*-----
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club
R. I.

Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*-----
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*-----
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*-----
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*-----
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.

Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
way, Chevy Chase,
Md.

Hill, Lister, *Ala.*-----
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*-----Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*-----
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.

Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*-----
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*-----
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*-----
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*-----
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*-----
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*-----3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*-----4929 Hillbrook
Lane

Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*-----
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*-----
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*-----
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*-----
Long, Cren E., *Hawaii*-----
Long, Russell B., *La.*-----
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*-----2930 Chesapeake
St.

McClellan, John L., *Ark.*-----
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*-----
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*-----
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.

Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*-----
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*-----4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okl.

Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*-----4300 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*-----
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*-----
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*-----122 Schotts
Court NE.

Murray, James E., *Mont.*-----The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*-----
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.

O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*-----
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*-----
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*-----
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*-----
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*-----
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*-----
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*-----2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoepfel, Andrew F.,
Kans.

Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*-----
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*-----
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine.*

Sparkman, John, *Ala.*-----4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*-----
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*-----
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*-----
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*-----
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N. J.

Williams, John J., *Del.*-----
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*-----
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*-----Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*-----

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman),
Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington,
Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon,
Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin,
and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of
South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Hum-
phrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jord-
an, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of
North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoep-
fel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell,
Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson,
Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of
Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible,
Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges,
Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt,
Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel,
Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Vir-
ginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington,
Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett,
Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith,
Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and
Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright,
Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire,
Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey,
Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and
Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear,
Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and
Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr,
Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Ander-
son, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy,
Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Ben-
nett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green,
Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse,
Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche,
Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Cape-
hart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson,
Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt,
Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson,
Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Car-

roll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii,
Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin,
and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore,
Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche,
Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee,
Schoepfel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey,
Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver,
Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, Mc-
Clellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd,
Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and
Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy,
McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Ran-
dolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater,
Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty,
and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chair-
man), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough,
Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNa-
mara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy,
Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of
Hawaii, Case of South Dakota, Martin,
Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden,
Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis,
Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel
Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts,
3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852
Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut
Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037
Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van
Ness St.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT
Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey
Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823
Reservoir Rd.

Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St.
Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-
furter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hamp-
shire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan.
Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan.
Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin
Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black.
Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia,
Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart.
Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark.
Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri,
Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas.
Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana,
Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Okla-
homa, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Military Translingua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an unusual article by Capt. E. E. Waller, U.S. Army, which appeared in the February 1960 issue of Signal, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Captain Waller and his brother served on active duty throughout World War II and the Korean war, and his father in addition to serving on active duty throughout World War II and the Korean war served throughout the Mexican campaign and World War I. They are a highly patriotic family. I am proud indeed to present for the Record Captain Waller's excellent article so that the Members of the Senate may have the opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

18.201-1.778 | 19.500 - A 1.432-121-5.628:

MILITARY TRANSLINGUA

(By Capt. E. E. Waller, AS/SigC)

(The author is stationed at the U.S. Army Security Agency, School and Training Center, Headquarters Co., 1st Battalion, Fort Devens, Mass.)

One of the fascinating recent developments in linguistics has emerged after several years of research at the University of Iowa. Seven years ago Dr. Erich Funke, head of foreign studies at the State University of Iowa, began work on a method for interlinguistic communication. A practical application of Dr. Funke's method is Military Translingua, which is designed for multilingual military commands and international commercial correspondence.

Since the dawn of history, the military leader has been faced with the problem of precise communication with allies and elements of his command who use different tongues and dialects. The clarity of modern warfare and the need for all the allies that the free world can muster in these challenging times impinges heavily on the efforts of the soldier to explore every new vehicle that may help him find a meaningful, simple, precise, unclassified method of interlinguistic communication.

The translingua script offers interesting possibilities to alleviate this age-old military problem. It recognizes the validity of the sage advice of Sun Tzu: "He who has a thorough knowledge of his own conditions as the condition of the enemy is sure to win in all battles."

Translingua divides all human knowledge into some 35 numerical categories (for example, 15 denotes "medicine and health," and 26 refers to the "Armed Forces"), which are, in turn, broken into subconcepts to make up a basic vocabulary of 25,000 words of a numerical language.

How is this used?

Take the title of this article. Its teletype equivalent would be 18.201-1.778:5-19.500:4-1.432:18-121-5.628. Assume that the originator is a West German commander, Gen. Karl von Rhein. Without needing a knowledge of English or any other language used in a NATO command, he has been able, by the use of his German-translingua dictionary, to prepare this translingua numerical sentence from the following German: "Der Feind griff die Stadt überraschend von Süden an." The English-speaking recipient, just the same as a Portuguese, Dutch, Italian, or other language group, without leaving the domain of his own language, can simply obtain his own tongue by the use of his translingua-English dictionary (or translingua-Portuguese, translingua-Dutch, etc.) to obtain: "The enemy attacked the city surprisingly from the south."

When dealing with the more exotic languages of the East and the concomitant problems of translation, the use of translingua comes into closer focus, especially in preventing the tyro linguist from making serious mistakes stemming from a lack of precise knowledge of idioms or technical military terminology. Anyone who has heard a story repeated several times readily understands the possibility of distortion when many people are involved. It may seem humorous that "jack up" in Spanish could be literally translated as "to raise with the cat," but the exigencies of the military situation in modern conflict may not give us the luxury of enough well-trained language personnel to prevent a modern version of the Tower of Babel. The following passages may point up the ease of using translingua if a dictionary is available:

You, as an English-speaking recipient, may receive the following sentence from an Arab originator, General Abdullah: 7.1805-6.1000:2-5.400:17-5.625-5.626-5.429:4-6.103:2. The Arabic original of "Algutru 'lmisriyu yuksueinu 'zzswiyata 'shshamōāyata 'shihargiata min afrigiyyatin" may be rendered into: "The land of Egypt forms the northeast angle of Africa," by learning the simple translingua grammar and by quickly looking up each number, as separated by dashes. Other examples could be given in languages ranging from Spanish to Indonesian and Swedish to Chinese.

Translingua, by itself, is no more safe than ordinary English. Its vocabulary needs more revision for military use. It is no more difficult to use than a telephone directory and its vocabulary numerical equivalents do not change, though they may be added to at any time by new words or new concepts. The following exercise evinces the preciseness of translingua grammar in action:

8.1-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks water."

8.1-1.162:5-7.312:4 for, "The man drank the water."

8.1-1.162:8-7.312:4 for, "The man will drink the water."

8.1-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The men drink the water."

8.1-1.162-2.35-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks cold water."

8.1-5.770-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man drinks the water today."

8.1-4-1.162-7.312:4 for, "The man does not drink water."

8.1-29-1.11:5-119-31.1-1.162:5-7.312:4 for, "The man who came into the house drank water."

11-41-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You can drink this water."

11-4-41-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You cannot drink this water."

11-35-41-1.162-30-7.312:4 for, "You can drink this water now."

Note the simple sequence of words and the use of "1" for the plural concept and "4" for the direct object.

Research into the nuances of translingua usage and practical applications thereof is continuing at the State University of Iowa (Iowa City) under direction of Dr. Funke. In a day when our free world allies speak languages ranging from Norwegian to Turkish and Portuguese to Siamese, any meaningful multilingual concept becomes useful for considered study. As Bacon has noted, "Knowledge is power."

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birth of the man whose name was given to the two great continents of the Western Hemisphere—Amerigo Vespucci.

We owe a great deal to this courageous Italian navigator, as well as to those other early explorers who accepted the challenge of the high seas and who ventured out into the unknown to make their great discovery. Their fearless spirit can well serve as an inspiration to us as we chart other unknown seas in the turbulent world of the 20th century.

Amerigo Vespucci was born in Florence in 1451. He spent his early years as a clerk; subsequently he outfitted several expeditions to the New World; and, finally, determined to see for himself, he set forth on several voyages of his own.

On his third voyage—in 1501-2—he is reported to have reached the Canaries and Cape Canaveral, Fla.; then he sailed south and reached the coast of Brazil, which he called "The New World." The terms "The New World" and "America" came to signify the two continents along whose coasts Vespucci courageously sailed.

It is particularly timely that we note the strong historical tie which binds together the two Americas. In a very real sense both we and the Southern Hemisphere have common ancestors. And, as the President has stressed on his tour, we have reinforced those bonds by cen-

turies of mutual good will and friendship. It is certainly of vital importance that people of both hemispheres work toward a still firmer relationship of trust and understanding.

Retirement Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a Washington Post editorial of February 20, 1960, so well supports my bill H.R. 4700, providing health insurance for the aged, that I am including it in my remarks so that it will be available to any Member of Congress who may have missed reading it.

Here is the editorial:

RETIREMENT NIGHTMARE

Everywhere in its travels around the country, Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging heard anxiety expressed by older citizens as to how they would pay for medical care in their retirement. How can anyone with foresight, old or young, fail to be anxious about this problem? While a man is employed, he can enjoy the protection of some sort of group or private insurance program to cover medical and hospital bills if he becomes ill. The chances are, however, that when he retires he will no longer enjoy such protection; yet this is the time, obviously, when he will need it most—when, indeed, he is certain to need it sooner or later, which is what makes the cost of such private insurance prohibitively high for the aged.

The McNAMARA subcommittee came to the conclusion that this problem "should have top priority for legislative consideration in 1960" and recommended in its report an expansion of the system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include health service benefits for all persons eligible for OASDI. We think this conclusion is inescapable. The essence of it is embodied in the Forand bill which would cost about \$1 billion a year to be financed with one-fourth of 1 percent increase in social security taxes. Like other old-age benefits, this would be paid for by a citizen throughout his wage-earning years, with a matching contribution by his employer. It would relieve retirement of one of the worst of its nightmares.

That the American Medical Association would offer its usual doctrinaire opposition to this proposal was as much to be expected as a bill from a doctor after a visit to his office. Senator McNAMARA has observed that the AMA had nothing to offer but tired abuse. This is not, by the wildest flight of the most neurotic fancy, socialized medicine or political medicine. It is simply a system, if the AMA could but calm its nerves enough to realize it, which, like Blue Cross or Group Hospitalization or any other insurance program, would enable a patient to go to the doctor and the hospital of his choice and pay the bills resulting from the care he needs in old age. It would help doctors, hospitals, and medicine in general. And it would enable American men and women to retire in their old age with more security and self-respect.

Good Cooks Everywhere Serve Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was pleasing to read in the March 8 issue of the Christian Science Monitor the splendid article written by Mrs. Eleanor Richey Johnston from Bangkok, Thailand, about the widespread use of rice in the diet of our Far East friends and neighbors. Mrs. Johnston's interesting article also presents some intriguing rice recipes that gourmets and fine cooks will desire to add to their menu.

This article comes most appropriately on the eve of National Rice Week, which will be celebrated throughout the Nation during the week of March 13 through 19. At that time it will be my privilege to issue additional rice recipes which the ambassadors of foreign nations now stationed here in Washington have secured for our use as indicative of their favorite national recipes using wholesome and nutritious rice.

May I point out that the consumption of rice by American citizens falls far short of the world average, and if the people of the United States would double their consumption of this fine food it would create the need to increase our national rice acreage allotment by some 300,000 acres.

It is my hope that our citizens everywhere in the Nation who enjoy tasty and delectable foods will try these rice recipes. It will benefit their diet and their health and strengthen the economy of our Nation.

The article follows:

GOOD COOKS EVERYWHERE SERVE RICE

(By Eleanor Richey Johnston)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Everywhere in the world women are interested in foods and ways to prepare them. Their interest goes far beyond their own native dishes in many cases. Thailand—which is Siam—is no exception, as I learned before I had been in Bangkok many hours.

Upon arriving about noon, I learned that there was to be a colorful pageant on the Chao Phya River that very afternoon, a pageant that was held only every 30 years. I was invited to go. Seats were arranged in certain places along the river bank, and the section where I sat was canopied to keep off the too warm sun. When there was a lull in the activities on the river, the woman seated next to me asked about some typical American foods and, in return for my information, told me about some Siamese favorites.

"The most typical local dish that I know about is *kai pot*," she said. "It is made with shrimp or crabmeat usually, with bits of chicken and pork added. The foundation of *kai pot* is fried rice—and it must be fried in oil. Add onion and a little garlic (some Thai cooks add tomato sauce), eggs, and saffron.

"When *kai pot* is served, it is often decorated with sliced cucumbers all around it, and with green onion tops stuck in it, for a sort of climax to the decoration of the dish."

In my hotel here, the dining room is run by Chinese and I learned by talking to several that much of the Thailand food is similar to that of the Chinese. The people eat a great deal of rice, of course, and raise what is considered the best in the world. They like such exotic dishes as bird's-nest soup and those made with shark's-fins as well as dishes using many other kinds of fish.

"If we speak of meatballs in Bangkok, we usually mean balls made of pork and fish—about twice as much pork as crab or other fish is used. Then we add some water chestnuts and mushrooms. We chop all this very fine and season with salt and pepper.

"Add a tiny bit of sugar, too. Make little balls of this mixture, roll in flour and then in egg and then cook in deep boiling oil," a woman instructed me.

OYAKO DONBURI

Six chicken breasts (frozen, if you like).
Two cups water.

One and one-half teaspoons salt.
One-half teaspoon monosodium glutamate.

Three mushrooms, sliced.
Two small bamboo shoots, sliced.
One small carrot, sliced.
Three green onions, sliced.
Six eggs, lightly beaten.
Six cups cooked rice.

Remove skin and bones from chicken breasts. Simmer skin and bones in the two cups water for 30 minutes and strain. Season broth with salt and monosodium glutamate. Cut chicken into thin slivers. Add chicken, mushrooms, bamboo shoots and carrots to broth. Simmer 15 minutes. Add green onions. Pour eggs gradually into vegetable mixture, stirring constantly. Cook over low heat until eggs begin to set. Serve over hot rice.

In this country, curry is used often to season various dishes. Here is a baked dish of curried rice that is good to serve with roast lamb, chicken, or pork.

CURRIED RICE

Two and one-half cups boiling water.
One teaspoon salt.
One and one-fourth cups uncooked rice.
One-fourth cup butter or margarine.
One and one-half teaspoons curry powder.
One box frozen peas.

One pimiento, cut into strips.
Mix first 5 ingredients in casserole (or in a Dutch oven). Cover. Bake at 400° F. about 45 minutes. Cook and drain peas; mix peas lightly into rice with a fork. Top with pimiento strips. Serves 6.

I have often been asked for the recipe for yellow rice, and here is a simple way to cook this dish.

YELLOW RICE

One cup uncooked rice.
Two cups boiling water.
One teaspoon each salt and turmeric.
Two tablespoons butter or margarine.
Put all ingredients in a 1½-quart casserole. Cover and bake at 350° F. about 1½ hours. Serves 4.

Have you ever eaten chicken served in a rice ring with cheese in it? Here is a recipe for chicken supreme in this rice ring.

RICE RING

One-half cup grated cheese.
Two tablespoons butter or margarine.
Seven cups hot cooked rice.

Add cheese and butter to rice; toss lightly with fork until cheese and butter are melted. Pack rice in buttered 8 or 8½-inch ring mold. Cover with waxed paper. Set in pan of hot water. Keep warm until ready to serve. Loosen edges with spatula, invert onto platter and fill with cream chicken or chicken supreme. Garnish with parsley, pimiento, and egg slices.

CHICKEN SUPREME

Two small onions, sliced.
Two small carrots, diced.
One-fourth bay leaf.
Eight peppercorns.
Two sprigs parsley.
Two cups chicken broth.
One-fourth cup butter or margarine.
One-fourth cup flour.
One-half cup heavy cream.
Two cups cooked dice chicken.
Two cups hard-cooked eggs.
Salt and pepper to taste.
Add onions, carrots, bay leaf, peppercorns, and parsley to broth; simmer 10 minutes; strain. Melt butter in saucepan; stir in flour. Add broth all at once, stirring constantly until smooth. Add cream; cook until thickened, stirring frequently. Fold in chicken and eggs. Heat thoroughly. Add salt and pepper to taste. Pour into center of above rice ring.

United States-U.S.S.R. Trade—Plus Trickery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body, the following article by Mr. George Todt from the March 4, 1960, Valley Times, North Hollywood, Calif., wherein reference is made to remarks of my good friend and colleague, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB:

UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. TRADE—PLUS TRICKERY

"Commerce is the equalizer of the wealth of nations."—Gladstone.

What's the score on commerce and trade with the Soviet Union? Would it relieve international tension? Bonanza—or boon-doggle?

Much has been said pro and con, on both sides. Few things are either all black or all white in any case. There is usually something to be said in favor of any position which is seriously advocated by intelligent men and women.

However, life is made up of a series of choices. I see the matter in much the same light as recently advocated by GLEN LIPSCOMB, a serious-minded young Congressman from Los Angeles. He said:

"The U.S.S.R. is not interested in trade as we know it. What buying the Soviets are interested in is whole factories, production machines, technical data and skills, and other items in this general category. The trading they wish to do is for the purpose of building up Soviet production facilities.

"After they obtain the factories, the skills, the machines, or copy our production machines and goods, the goods produced can go to build up Soviet armament—and to dump goods around the world for political and economic purposes. These dumping activities could be in direct competition with our firms from whom they bought the factories, machines and skills in the first place. There is no mutually beneficial intention behind their trade proposals."

LIPSCOMB thinks the efforts to engage in trade with the United States along such lines ought to be viewed with alarm. He says we

must never lose sight of the grim purpose behind the Soviet negotiators in their trade talks.

One item not making friends here and influencing people for Ivan is his obtuse handling of the correct settlement of World War II lend-lease agreements with the United States. This is largely a matter of principle.

Despite our offering the Soviets terms which would amount to less than a nickel on a dollar, the Kremlin's trade diplomats repeatedly have been coming close to agreement in principle—only to renege as soon as it came time to sign up. This is a friendly game?

Following the discussions at Camp David in 1959 between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, it was the understanding of the United States that negotiations on lend-lease would be resumed thereafter, as a separate and independent problem.

Negotiations, scheduled for January this year, turned out a complete dud. For, lo and behold, the wily Soviets came to the conference bearing unacceptable gifts: Now they said they could not treat the lend-lease question separately and independently unless it was simultaneously accompanied by a new trade agreement. The gimmick, of course, was that we should make the Soviet Union favorable trade concessions and extend long-term credits.

This is comparable to having one's cake and eating it too. It's always nice work if you can get it, but this time we turned the U.S.S.R. down flat. It's enough that we are financing most of our allies, but to ask the American taxpayer also to support our chief enemy in the cold war is really asking a little too much.

The President Should Proclaim Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, all Hungarians will celebrate the 112th anniversary of the victorious Hungarian Revolution of 1848, which was then crushed by the czarist army just as the Soviet Union crushed the 1956 Hungarian revolt against Russian domination and control.

It would be highly regrettable if the United States failed to keep firmly in mind at the forthcoming summit conference the plight of the heroic Hungarian people who have so often sacrificed their lives for freedom and national independence.

Consideration should be given at this time by the Congress to the matter of authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 23 of each year Hungarian Independence Day. It was on that day, in 1956, that the Hungarian people rose as one man against their Soviet and local Communist oppressors, and this step would give hope to the heroic Hungarian people that the freedom-loving American people will not forget their suffering under foreign colonial domination.

I include as part of my remarks a letter and a proposal sent me by distin-

guished officials of the Hungarian committee for the information of my colleagues:

HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE,
New York, N.Y., March 1, 1960.

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. McDOWELL: On March 15, all Hungarians will celebrate the 112th anniversary of the victorious Hungarian revolution in 1848, which was then crushed by the czarist army just as the 1956 revolution was crushed by the tanks of the Soviet Union.

This year the celebration of this national holiday will precede the East-West summit meeting which might be as fateful for the future of the Hungarian people as were the Teheran and Yalta Conferences.

Knowing that your honor has consistently raised your voice in favor of the Hungarian people who had sacrificed their lives for freedom and national independence so often in their thousand-year history, we would be very grateful if you would have the kindness to say a few words of remembrance on the heroic struggles of the Hungarian people and in expressing your hope that the Hungarian question may be discussed at the summit meeting.

It would be highly regrettable if the West would fail to raise this question at the very first East-West summit conference following the adoption of not less than 12 U.N. resolutions on Hungary which have been consistently defied by the Soviet Union.

Thus, apart from other considerations the prestige of the U.N. also calls for the placing of the Hungarian question on the agenda of the summit meeting.

Finally, we would be extremely appreciative for any initiative in the U.S. Congress aimed at authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 23 of each year as Hungarian independence day. It was on that day in 1956, that the Hungarian people rose as one man against their Soviet and local Communist oppressors, and we think that this would be the most dignified way to pay tribute to the world-shaking Hungarian freedom fight and to give hope to the heroic Hungarian people that the freedom-loving American people will not forget their immense suffering under foreign colonial domination.

For your kind information I am attaching to this letter a memorandum dealing with various aspects of the Hungarian problem. We would be deeply thankful for its eventual inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Being convinced that your honor will do what is the best to commemorate in this sense the Hungarian independence day, we convey to you the expression of our warmest thanks.

Sincerely yours,

MR. FERENC NAGY,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
former Minister of Hungary.

MSGT. BELA VARGA,
Chairman of the Hungarian Committee,
former President of the Hungarian
Parliament.

MEMORANDUM ON THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM TO BE PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

After World War II, the democratic political leaders did their utmost to establish a truly democratic system of government in Hungary in accordance with the will of the people as manifested in the free elections of November 4, 1945, when the Communists were not able to muster more than 17 percent of the votes, despite Soviet occupation and Communist terror.

However, unfortunately, the Hungarian people were not duly sustained by the Western allies in their efforts of developing and

preserving the democratic institutions of the Hungarian Republic. The sad fact that the Western Powers had tolerated that there be no rotation in the chairmanship of the Allied Control Commission in Hungary, had enabled the permanent Soviet chairman to intensify gradually the direct Soviet interference in all domestic matters of the country.

Despite this direct Soviet interference which was virtually sanctioned by the mere presence of the two Western members in this Control Commission and following the elimination of the leading democratic politicians in the Hungarian Republic, the Hungarian people made another desperate demonstration of their unshakable will to reestablish a democratic system of government. In the elections of August 31, 1947, ordered to be held by the Communist Party chief, Matyas Rakosi, the Communist Party polled only 20 percent of the votes. It was Rakosi's aim to erase the non-Communist majority by fraud and terror, exploiting the psychological effect of the presence of Soviet troops.

Transformed in 1949 into a so-called People's Republic whose institutions were set up on the Soviet pattern, Hungary's entire public life, economy and territory was placed under the Kremlin's control in striking defiance of the agreement on liberated Europe and the Hungarian Peace Treaty, both signed by the Allied Powers and the Soviet Union.

The nationwide Hungarian revolution of October 23, 1956, left no doubt that the Hungarian people, even the youth and the working class, in spite of 10 years of indoctrination, rejected the Communist system and foreign domination. However, while they were ready to sacrifice their lives for freedom and democracy, they very realistically stressed in their political manifestations the necessity of good-neighborly relations with the powerful Soviet Union. The authentic spokesmen of the revolution had many times declared that they were not intent on converting Hungary into an anti-Soviet state. On the contrary, they emphatically advocated the idea of an internationally recognized neutrality as this was officially proclaimed by Premier Imre Nagy's Government.

All these facts have been established by the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, and accepted by the United Nations General Assembly as trustworthy evidence of the bad faith of the Soviet Union which did not shrink from the assertion that the spontaneous Hungarian revolution was the result of a plot of Hungarian Fascists and foreign secret services.

This Soviet version was completely reversed by Khrushchev himself when he bluntly declared in an off-the-cuff speech delivered in the Ganz factory in Budapest on December 2, 1959, that the revolution was crushed because the Soviets wanted to preserve by force the Communist regime in Hungary. He also openly admitted that the revolution was due to the extreme despair of the Hungarian people as a reaction to Rakosi's terror regime. His third sensational revelation was that even his colleagues in the party presidium had misgivings that the Soviet military intervention in Hungary might be "misconstrued" abroad.

Thus, these revelations have strikingly confirmed, even on the part of the Soviet Union, the facts established by the United Nations factfinding organ on the real causes of the revolution and the brutal crushing of the uprising by the Soviet tank divisions.

The United Nations General Assembly has, since 1956, successively adopted 12 political resolutions on Hungary, demanding the with-

drawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the Soviet Union for the brutal crushing of the victorious Hungarian revolution. The Soviet defiance of these resolutions has gravely affected the prestige of the world organization by creating a dangerous precedent for the impunity of members who do not comply with the General Assembly resolutions.

Although the political actions of the United Nations could not be enforced, the mere discussion of the Hungarian situation during the periodical debates of the General Assembly on Hungary kept alive the Hungarian people's spirit of resistance under a seemingly quiet surface. However, it was shocking for Hungarians at home and abroad that 3 days after the adoption of the latest U.N. General Assembly resolution on Hungary (December 9, 1959), the very same high U.N. body accepted Hungary as a member of the committee for the peaceful exploration of outer space (December 12, 1959).

By this totally unexpected and inconsistent move the General Assembly accepted the Kádár regime as an equal international partner, although the Hungarian delegation's credentials were not approved, with the motivation that it was issued by a regime which was placed in power by the Soviet armed forces in 1956. This move, which was supported by the Western Powers, virtually amounts to the rehabilitation of the Kádár regime and thus means a complete Western capitulation in the Hungarian case, which is now noisily exploited by the Communist propaganda in Hungary and abroad.

It is the most revolting injustice in the 20th century that the Hungarian people with a record of a thousand years of independence is languishing in the most ruthless colonial bondage of the Soviet Union, while even backward peoples are attaining nationhood and independence, one after another, thanks to the help of the Western Powers.

The present situation in Hungary may be briefly illustrated as follows: Increasing persecution of the patriots, secret trials and executions, a ruthless drive for the collectivization of agriculture, institutional violation of the basic human rights, psychological exploitation of the presence of Soviet troops, overcrowding of the forced labor camps, control and persecution of the clergy.

Speeches of Communist Party leaders delivered at the party congress in December 1959, clearly indicate that Moscow wants to tighten the regime in Hungary despite the period of thaw in East-West relations. This mirrors the Soviet determination to present Hungary as a completely socialized state as soon as possible in order to eliminate one of the most outstanding problems in Eastern Europe, and to make it, thus, disappear from the United Nations General Assembly agenda, also.

For all these reasons the Hungarian people who had not received any Western diplomatic or political assistance in the victorious days of their life-and-death struggle for freedom, now rightly expect that the Western Powers seize the very first East-West summit meeting to be held after the adoption of 12 United Nations resolutions on Hungary, to pose the grave problem of non-compliance with the United Nations resolutions to the Soviet Union.

Both the juridical and moral obligations of the Western Powers and the preservation of the prestige of the United Nations equally demand that the Western Powers bring up forcefully the Hungarian question at the forthcoming summit meeting.

New York, N.Y., March 1, 1960.

Problems Facing the Livestock and Food Distribution Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to your attention, and ask permission to insert following my brief observations a speech given by Mr. H. R. Davidson, president of the American Meat Institute, at a dinner last evening where the board of directors of the institute and some Members of Congress from agricultural States were present. Mr. Davidson's speech, it seems to me, points up realistically the problems facing the livestock industry, and the food distribution industry in the years ahead. We hear a great deal of the spread between prices received by the producer and prices paid by the consumer. As Mr. Davidson points out in his remarks, additional costs came about as the housewife asks for more service, such as trimming, packaging, freezing, and preparation for the table. The producer perhaps should be giving more attention to providing part of the service asked for by the housewife in order that he might have a greater share in the dollar spent by the consumer.

Of even greater importance to the livestock industry, as Mr. Davidson points out, is the problem of proper control by Government of the use of some of the chemical additives in food and feed. The livestock industry and the processing and distribution industry, I am pleased to report, are aware of the threat posed by improper use of additives and have been working quietly, but strenuously to devise ways and means to completely assure the consumer of the continued reliability of our meat supply. A wonderful job has been done in the past by producers and processors of providing the consumer with clean, wholesome, healthful, completely dependable meat products, regardless of grade or price. The industry dedicates itself now, and in the future, to carry out this responsibility. Our existence, Mr. Speaker, depends upon our continuing to do a good job.

The speech follows:

This is the third year that we have had the opportunity of visiting with many of you. We are beginning to feel that we know you better and that you are perhaps more familiar with us and some of our business problems than you may have been formerly. In addition to its social values, this meeting is basically an effort to improve our communications. In the next few minutes, I hope I can make a contribution along this line by talking briefly about where meat packing fits in this complicated economy of ours.

We are an old industry. We deal with a perishable product. We take all the livestock raw material that is offered, make it edible and useful by many complicated processes, and move it to the retail dis-

tributor. While this sounds pretty basic, this is a big job. Millions and millions of livestock broken up into billions of small pieces and transported all over the land under the watchful eye of management, aided by hundreds of necessary technical controls, prove the point. It is axiomatic in our industry that the average beefsteak travels at least a thousand miles from where it is produced to where it is consumed.

The very nature of agriculture in America is such that there is a tremendous variation in the quality and kind of raw material. It is a technical fact that no two head of livestock are identical. We work with young livestock and old livestock, fat livestock and thin livestock, livestock of such quality that it produces cuts suitable for the broiler or the roasting pan, or livestock producing products that must be processed extensively to gain palatability. Fortunately for agriculture, the so-called less tender meats are even more nutritious, from a protein standpoint, than the products of broiling quality, such as we have enjoyed this evening. In fact, there is no such thing as a really undesirable piece of meat in this country, provided it is handled properly. A pot roast from the chuck of a Low Grade steer or Good cow becomes a delectable dish when properly braised. Many of us were raised on this kind of good solid food.

It is said that the trick of tenderizing the more flavorful but less fat meat products of American farms is a lost art. I do not share this view. A check I made the other day indicates that 21 million American homes—more than half—are equipped with pressure cookers and thus have the facilities to prepare properly these lower cost cuts. Nevertheless, steaks and chops, which don't require moist cooking, remain in brisk demand in relation to other cuts. A large part of this demand comes from the working housewife who represents nearly two-thirds of the 22 million women in the labor force. The working housewife usually wants a meat cut that she can slap in a skillet and serve a few minutes later. She not only doesn't have the time to prepare other cuts—too often she doesn't know how to do it properly.

Practically all of the studies we have made indicate that there are two things which the housewife wants most in return for the 25 percent of her food budget that she spends for meat: One is tenderness, and the second is a minimum of fat. This presents agriculture with a sharp dilemma.

To provide the eating quality the consumer wants, we must have young animals for tenderness, plus some fat for flavor. Now, I am sure many people have wondered why we take a dim view of Government grading and of most other grading systems now in use. The reason is, of course, that grading is based on a 100-year-old, now outmoded, concept that the fattest animal is the best. From the consumer standpoint, the fattest animal is not the best, but the Government graders still tell her that it is.

Our grading systems also set up a target for the producer which doesn't really reflect the consumer's desires. The retailer complains about fat, but he still tends to use the magic words "Choice" or "Prime" to describe his product because they are terms that are firmly rooted with the image of quality among consumers.

In some areas of the country, particularly the Far West, where the fattening of cattle is a new business and where most packers are also feeders, this same vested interest is apparent. However, most meat packers realize that except for some addition to flavor and some contribution to tenderness, excessive fat production is an economic waste. Being in the middle between the producer and the consumer, the packer finds it difficult to do too much about it except to "raise the flag" and try to get better thinking

and better interpretation of consumer preferences to filter through the entire industry. I am sure that most of you this evening left the fat from your steak on your plates.

This problem is complicated still further by the fact that American agriculture grows great quantities of feed grains which, when fed heavily to animals, are efficient producers of fat. The meatpacking industry, extremely conscious as it is of the responsibility of merchandising products which constitute approximately one-third of the farmer's income, has sought to meet this problem in the case of pork by trimming pork cuts drastically before they reach the retail trade. This practice is now quite general throughout the country. In addition to making poor products more acceptable to the consumer, the fat trimmed off at the packinghouse can be more economically utilized there than elsewhere on the trip from farm to market.

In addition, we have in the past and presently are engaged in extensive research to try and find artificial methods of tenderization. Some methods, based on the application of enzymes, are already a commercial success. On a relatively small scale, many restaurants are now offering beef that has been tenderized by soaking in vegetable enzymes. These products are frozen to arrest the action of the enzymes and cooked before they are completely thawed. While not yet sufficiently practical to be offered on any scale to the general consumer, the chances of extensive use of enzyme tenderizers is probable in the future.

The meatpacking industry is in the midst of and has ahead of it many difficult problems. While this is true of industry generally, we are plagued by many special difficulties, all of which result from circumstances that are not easy to appraise. For example, to what extent will livestock production patterns change during the next decade? Will livestock be increasingly produced by fewer and large specialists in the effort to meet changing demands? Will livestock production, for example, approximate the course which the poultry industry has demonstrated? Poultry has, by virtue of a mass production sequence, standardized its product and increased its market. If so, where should one build a packing plant to take the place of obsolete equipment which he may now possess? Should a packer think in terms of a small packinghouse which runs around the clock and thus keep his machinery in constant operation, or should he favor a large operation? Should a packer set out to automate his operation, running it on a continuous line, and if so, can his buying and selling operation be synchronized with such a machine? Should the packer take a leaf from the book of the grocer and prepack and presell his products on a franchise basis through mass media?

I am sure the answers to some of these questions are gradually emerging. About 6 weeks ago I had the opportunity to sit in on the unveiling of an extensive study which had been completed by the Raymond Loewy Co. for the Super Market Institute. I was most interested in these findings and I would like to share some of them with you. This study was made for the purpose of trying to determine better methods for merchandising perishables. Included in the study were methods of presenting meat food products, fresh fruits and vegetables, dairy products and bakery goods to the public.

While this study resulted basically in recommendations for changes in store arrangement and more merchandising prominence for perishables, and included recommendations for increasing the space devoted to nonfood items, there was one point which ran all through the study that I believe is significant: That was the evidence of greatly increased demand on the part of consumers for more service and convenience. For ex-

ample, it was pointed out that fresh fruit and vegetables have lost from 25 to 35 percent of their acceptance during the past 10 years to the frozen food counter. They have lost ground to the convenience of the frozen package, despite the fact that operators have tried to package and present their fresh produce in more convenient form.

It was pointed out that meats, while offered in infinite variety, need to be sorted out for the consumer. In other words, the housewife should be in position to go to the stew section to get stewing meats; to the breakfast counter to buy breakfast meats; to the beef counter to buy beef; to the sausage counter to buy sausage; and to the variety meats' counter to buy variety meats. It was also recommended that the package should show the product; carry a picture of it as it should look when cooked, and list a recipe on how to do it. By way of emphasis, this study pointed out that a decade from now most housewives won't know how to shuck an ear of corn.

The study said that the use of anatomical terms for descriptions of meat cuts are confusing; that grading systems were complicated and meaningless to consumers; and that people relied on the store to provide quality. What was wanted was that the job of service and know-how should be laid out with the package. The institute's sales and merchandising committee is already at work in an effort to appraise this basic study. Like all studies, the Loewy study represents the gathering together at one point the known facts about a problem and then drawing conclusions from these assembled facts. I mention this by way of illustration of the changing role which our industry will be playing in servicing agriculture and its customers in the decade ahead.

For a moment let us come back to the present. There are other problems in communications which have political as well as economic and market undertones. We hear a great deal about the increasing spread between the producer and the consumer. This is true and very real. However, the impression sometimes given that the farmers' share is being squeezed because of some malfunctioning of the marketing system is decidedly unfair. In the first place, it is unfair to farmers in misleading them into the belief that there is a culprit somewhere that should be chastised. And secondly, it is unfair to food processing and distribution firms because it implies that the increased spread is largely bloated profits or unnecessary added costs or both.

In the case of meatpacking, our gross margin widened by 30 percent in the 10 years 1948-58. The margin between selling prices and cost of raw materials went from about 18 percent to about 24 percent of our total sales dollar. At the same time, our industry's average profit after taxes included in the gross margin actually declined—from 0.9 to 0.6 of 1 percent of the sales dollar—in this 10-year period.

Meatpacking, like most other industries, has very little control over its operating expenses such as labor, transportation, electricity, supplies and taxes, all of which have gone up significantly. I do not need to talk to this group about taxes. As a matter of fact, the present tax and other increasing costs has placed American industry and agriculture in a position similar to that described by the queen in "Alice Through the Looking-Glass":

"Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

And that's just about what we have to do to keep ahead of this cost problem today.

We certainly have every sympathy for the Presidents' concern and your concern over the built-in inflationary problems that have developed in our post-war economy.

The increased spread we hear so much about is a matter of simple arithmetic that harbors no great mystery and no evidence of skulduggery. The meatpacking industry has been doing what it can to offset these increasing costs by improved efficiency. A number of the older, outmoded plants have been replaced by new, modern operations. The result is that the industry has actually lowered its total operating expenses since 1956, despite continued advances in wage rates, freight rates, taxes and other costs of doing business.

While the increased spread between the producer and the consumer is a fact in our business, it is also a fact in practically every other business in the country.

Another problem and perhaps the most potentially explosive issue we all face is the use of chemical additives in food and feed. There is also the problem of insecticide residues—a byproduct of man's eternal struggle against the pests of nature.

We in this industry, of course, have been extremely sensitive to what has happened in this area recently. Without debating the right or wrong of methods used, the results of the cranberry and caponette situations have dramatically pointed out to us, and I'm sure to you, that this subject needs firm, intelligent, and constructive handling on the part of government, manufacturers of chemicals, and pesticides, the users of these products, the food industry, and the press and other communications media. We want you to know that we are fully aware of our responsibilities in this field and have been quietly, for a period of years, bending every effort we know how to find solutions. There is no need to dwell here on the tremendous and growing importance of chemicals in the production of both the quantity and the quality of our food supply. The American Meat Institute takes second place to none on the insistence that the most paramount issue is the preservation of the wholesomeness of the food supply and the confidence of the American people in the agencies of government and the food industry responsible for this wholesomeness.

The meat industry is very fortunate in this situation from the standpoint of public protection. The Federal Meat Inspection Division, in particular, and other meat-inspection services over the country have done and are doing a magnificent service in the public interest. For 50 years the Meat Inspection Division has not only inspected animals before slaughter and after slaughter but on a piece-by-piece basis. Approximately 100,000 pounds of meat are condemned every working day by the Federal service alone. This has been done quietly and without fanfare, and with a dedication that I think finds no counterpart anywhere else in the world. This service is necessary and needed to protect the health of the Nation. It is obviously a public function and it should be paid for by the public.

The meat and livestock industry absorbs the loss of the tonnage which is condemned as unfit for food. The public should absorb the small additional cost of meat-inspection services.

You know better than the rest of us that it is common, of course, for a citizen to complain about the tax bill and at the same time make the point that the tax which protects him is the exception, usually suggesting, as I have done, that the amount is very small. The actual cost of the Federal meat inspection service is something less than a penny a month—about a dime a year—per person. Nevertheless, we are talking about the public health and the food supply, which is as basic a Government responsibility as is defense or any other fundamental public need which helps all the people.

As I near the end of this report, I am proud to point out that the American Meat Institute is the only nationwide association of

meatpackers which represents and serves the interest of all classifications of meat processors—the smallest and the largest, slaughterers, processors, sausage manufacturers, canned meat manufacturers, jobbers, and others. Our members—who number about 700—do business in every State.

As I noted earlier, we are primarily concerned with communications. I don't need to belabor this point with you who are in the business of dealing with people that one of the biggest problems in our industry, as well as in others, is the problem of communications and of getting better public understanding.

In conclusion, let me say that we believe these meetings are good for us; we hope that they are informative and interesting to you. We firmly believe they are in the public interest. It is part of our responsibility as a trade association to keep the leaders of Government informed of the basic, everyday problems of this great industry which makes a real contribution to the national well-being and is of direct interest to the 250,000 men and women engaged in this business, the 5 million farmers who grow livestock, and the whole Nation that depends on it for its meat supply.

We welcome, as you do, the apparent maturity that is developing in Government and industry relations. We want to encourage this mature and sound development.

What the Aged Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article that appeared in the February 13, 1960, issue of *Business Week*. I believe that all who are interested in the health care of the aged will find that it represents sound thinking on a most pressing problem.

The article follows:

WHAT THE AGED NEED

It's obvious that the swift increase in the number of older people in our population poses new economic and social problems. These problems are now undergoing the most thorough and searching examination ever.

There was a time when providing a basic pension program was the great need—a need fulfilled in the main by establishment of social security in 1935 and by the widespread development of private plans in later years. Now the most pressing need of this population group is medical care, especially assistance in case of major, crippling illnesses.

Medical expenses of older people are at least three times those of younger citizens. While many can cope with the normal run of illness, few oldsters have the financial resources to meet the cost of catastrophic illnesses.

Many had hoped that the private health insurance companies and medical groups could meet this problem by coming up with some sort of health insurance plan at rates older people could afford. But they haven't, and even President Eisenhower and Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Flemming, who were so anxious for just such a solution, now feel there's no recourse but for the Government to step in to provide coverage against catastrophic illness.

The cost would probably be financed by a supplement to the social security payroll tax. At the same time, individuals would be encouraged to continue their basic health insurance policies on into retirement to defray normal medical costs.

If the Government steps in to provide insurance against catastrophic illnesses of the aged, it will not be moving in where private industry can do the job. It will be assuming responsibility in an area where industry has found it cannot offer the protection needed.

Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to insert into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Edwin J. Putzell, Jr., corporate secretary and director of the law department of Monsanto Chemical Co., made before the House Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of taxation of cooperatives.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to his statement for I feel they will find it to be a most intelligent approach to this matter.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWIN J. PUTZELL, JR., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON THE TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

My name is Edwin J. Putzell, Jr. I am corporate secretary and director of the law department of Monsanto Chemical Co. Today, I appear, with your kind permission, in support of the request from a growing number of quarters for some type of proper income taxation of the earnings of cooperatives.

For over 30 years Monsanto and its predecessor companies have manufactured fertilizer ingredients. Today, we are substantial producers of nitrogen and phosphorus, two of the three basic components of plant food. Along with others of the fertilizer industry, we are confronted with an ever-increasing kind of grinding competition against which no amount of cost cutting, increased operating efficiencies, accelerated sales effort, or better research is, or can possibly be, effective. It stems from the failure of basic tax concepts to keep up with developments and the resulting gap in our income tax system. It results in an inequitable and unfair situation where certain corporations whose earnings go largely untaxed compete for customers and sales with increasing effectiveness against other corporations which pay a 52 percent tax on their earnings.

At the outset, let me emphasize that we have no desire whatsoever to destroy cooperatives and certainly no quarrel with the present exemption from tax of income from traditional service activities. These traditional types of cooperative activities are important to our rural economy; they are desirable for the welfare of a large segment of our people. In addition, Monsanto has no desire to be free of competition; on the contrary, we welcome it and believe our society is the benefactor of keen, healthy competitive effort by all types of organizations, partnerships, corporations, proprietorships, and cooperatives. But at the same time, we believe in and want to perpetuate our free enterprise system in which, under our Con-

stitution and established rules of fair play, commercial endeavors which compete are subject to the same governmental and tax burdens. We, therefore, would like to direct special attention to those recently acquired activities of cooperatives which are competitive with tax-paying industry when engaged in business unrelated to the original concept of cooperative endeavor, namely, that of being service organizations for the joint marketing of farm produce and joint purchasing of farm supplies.

From many witnesses during the panel hearings in mid-December, as well as those appearing before you now, you have heard of the rapid growth of cooperative enterprise in this country. Such startling development is not just the result of increased activity in the purchasing of farm supplies and the selling of farm produce. A very large part of it is the product of the movement of cooperatives into areas of activity which widely depart from the concept of their traditional service function. Nowhere is this departure more noticeable than in their use of retained earnings for investment purposes and in manufacturing, mining, and processing. Some of the effects of cooperatives' tax-free competition with tax-paying industry in such unrelated activities are known, but other effects are less patent and not as well understood. Let me give an illustration. In 1952, a cooperative was formed to manufacture nitrogen fertilizers in competition with Monsanto and others. Now, 7 years later, it has built a net worth of \$12 million, with total assets of \$21 million. Manufacturing costs at plant capacity for it and for Monsanto in producing a similar fertilizer product of the same chemical constituents are within 2-3 percent. In selling the product to a customer equidistant from both plants, the cooperative sells its product at \$68 a ton which price becomes \$50 a ton after an \$18 per ton benefit differential is repaid as a patronage rebate. No corporate tax goes to the U.S. Treasury from the co-op. If Monsanto sells at the same market price and nets the same differential as the patronage dividend, one-half, or \$9, is paid in taxes to the Treasury Department and the other half constitutes funds for expansion and returns to Monsanto investors. Thus, ultimate benefit to the cooperative investor is obvious.

But, who gets the fertilizer business in such a situation? Certainly it is not Monsanto, and just as certainly, it is the cooperative. There isn't even a race for the customer. But, then what happens? Up to the capacity of its plant, the cooperative takes all of the business in its marketing area. Beyond that area, Monsanto vigorously competes in the usual way with other taxpaying companies, but with this major difference. From the differential of \$18 per ton, an average of as much as 45 percent must be deducted for extra freight costs to put the product beyond the marketing area of the cooperative. This cuts the differential to \$10. Now, instead of one-half of \$18, or \$9, in tax revenues for the Treasury, there is only one-half of \$10, or \$5, for the Treasury and the remainder, or \$5, for expansion and Monsanto investors.

The conclusions from this perhaps oversimplified illustration are clear: (a) A group organized as a cooperative and employing extensive amounts of capital in their business pay no corporate tax on the profits of their investment; (b) other taxpaying enterprises competing in the same field now earn less and, therefore, pay less in taxes; and (c) of equal importance, the inducement for new risk capital in taxpaying enterprises will become increasingly unattractive with the consequent drying up of Federal tax revenues from this type of business.

You have heard excellent reviews of the history of income taxation of cooperatives.

To me, that history is clear in two respects:

(a) The original tax exemption was intended for and expressly granted to associations organized and operated as purchasing agents and as sales agents for farmers, and (2) the economic impact of granting the exemption in 1916, when the income tax rate was 2 percent, was almost nil. Indeed, it was not even possible in 1921, when the first amendment to the cooperative exemption was adopted, to forecast the economic force which tax exemption, granted in an era of low tax rates, could have when continued into an era of the extremely high rates which exist today—and when used in connection with earnings from totally unrelated business activities. The mounting anticompetitive effect of the tax provisions resulted in repeated investigations and hearings by this committee. Then, in 1951, the Congress adopted legislation designed to tax all cooperative income either at the cooperative level or in the hands of its patrons. The subsequent frustration of congressional intent by a series of court decisions is well known. Equally clear are the two results of such court action: (a) The U.S. Treasury is being deprived of taxes not only at the patron level, but at the cooperative level as well, by the use of paper allocations, or so-called patronage rebates or dividends, and (b) there is the consequent accumulation of untaxed earnings by the cooperative enterprise. The importance of such paper allocations was apparent, for example, in 1954 when the Department of Agriculture's survey of 1,157 cooperatives showed that even then over 60 percent of those cooperatives' net margins had been retained tax-free by such means.

There is also a corollary effect resulting from the loophole in the present tax law. It is the acquisition of taxpaying businesses by co-ops which then pay for them over a period of time out of tax-free earnings. One of the more recent of an increasing number of such cases was the acquisition by the Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Association of the Embassy Dairy here in Washington. In this case, the Milk Producers Association, a cooperative, was able by loans to obtain the assets of the Embassy Dairy. Then, by paper allocations, it retained its earnings tax free and used such funds to retire its loans. Such a method of financing acquisitions enables any cooperative to pay a price which is in excess of that which could be paid by a competing business paying normal taxes, and then to retain earnings from the acquired enterprise tax free.

The effective reenactment of the principle sought to be established by the 1951 amendment would go part way toward correcting the situation by bringing some added revenue to the Government from taxes levied on cooperative earnings allocated to patron members and would tend to prevent the accumulation of tax-free funds in the cooperative Treasury. However, it is not in my opinion the answer to the basic problem. Likewise, the Simpson bill (H.R. 7875) is only partly corrective. While it, too, would provide some added tax receipts, it would not relieve today's increasingly serious subsidized competition with taxpaying industry.

An analysis of the elements of a patronage dividend or rebate helps to indicate an answer. It also shows clearly the part which unrelated business income now plays in cooperative earnings. From the origin of co-ops in this country, patronage dividends have consisted of price adjustments arising from the traditional purchase and subsequent sale of farmers' products in the case of a marketing cooperative and from savings resulting from large-scale joint buying on the part of farmers' purchasing co-ops. A part of the patronage dividend has also resulted from the natural and inevitable benefits of cooperation, such as profits generated

by a reduction in transportation, storage, and other costs or from the averaging of gains and of losses. Today, however, patronage dividends include an additional element: profit from the investment of capital and from the extensive use of it in the co-op's business. This is customary now with most large cooperatives and with almost all regional ones. For example, such cooperatives may own elaborate facilities to manufacture milking machinery, paper, and boxes and to process and can produce before marketing the farmers' products. They also own well-integrated nitrogen-manufacturing plants, phosphate mines and furnaces, oil wells, refiners, and distributing facilities.¹ Others have substantial investments in the securities of other cooperatives or of taxpaying corporations. In all such cases, patronage dividends contain the element of profit, either that attributable to the direct manufacturing, processing, or mining activities or to the return on one's investment in securities or other types of capital assets. Such extensive use of capital and the resulting tax-free earnings is a departure from the historical concept of exempt cooperative service activities. Such can also plainly be designated as unrelated business activity and income.

Congress dealt with a similar situation in 1950. Certain charitable and nonprofit organizations, exempt from Federal income taxes, had been actively engaged in businesses competitive with taxpaying corporations. In the Revenue Act of 1950, income from such business activities of charitable organizations was properly made the subject of income taxation. This committee's report on the bill states:

"The problem at which the tax on unrelated business income is directed here is primarily that of unfair competition. The tax-free status of these section 101 organizations enables them to use their profits tax free to expand operations, while their competitors can expand only with the profits remaining after taxes. Also, a number of examples have arisen where these organizations have, in effect, used their tax exemption to buy an ordinary business. That is, they have acquired the business with no investment on their own part and paid for it in installments out of subsequent earnings—a procedure which usually could not be followed if the business were taxable."²

Therefore, we would recommend taxation on a current basis and at corporate rates of all earnings of cooperatives which result from investment income, rents, and royalties, and earnings from manufacturing, processing, and mining activities. These are unrelated businesses as contrasted with the traditional service functions of cooperatives. It is in this unrelated business area where the effort ceases to be joint purchasing and selling and becomes the accumulation of capital, its joint investment, and the receipt of profits resulting therefrom. It is also in the manufacturing, processing, and mining areas that the competitive advantage of tax-free operation at the cooperative level is most marked.

This proposal is not in any sense a departure from existing law. Today, co-ops

¹ For example, with respect to regional cooperatives during 1956-57, of 2,582 employees on Southern States Cooperative, Inc.'s payroll, 1,188 were engaged in manufacturing and processing operations; of 2,047 employees on Consumers Cooperative Association's rolls, 837 were involved in oil production and refining and 404 in manufacturing plants; and 754 of Eastern States Farmers' Exchange's 1,834 employees were engaged in manufacturing and processing.

² H.R. Rept. No. 2319, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 36-37 (1950).

pay a tax on unrelated income, such as rentals, interest, etc., even though such earnings are distributed to patrons. In our thinking, the manufacture of fertilizer and of milking machinery and the operation of an oil refinery are as much unrelated to the basic service function of a cooperative as is the rental of income-producing properties.

A tax on profits from specified unrelated business activities necessarily requires a clear definition of such activities. Surely, income from investments, whether in securities, real estate, or other capital assets not used in the trade or business of the cooperative, should be included in any such definition. So should income from manufacturing, mining, and processing. To reach profits derived from the extractive industries, sections of the present Code can easily be utilized. A definition of "mining" could be based on the provisions under which a deduction for depletion is currently allowable. Defining "manufacturing and process activities" is not difficult either. The definition in the regulations under the manufacturer's excise tax can serve as a starting point.

The determination of earnings attributable to these categories will, under generally accepted accounting principles, be a relatively easy matter. The only factor that might significantly distort the accuracy of such determinations of earnings would be the cost of goods sold or gross sales price in transactions with members. A price policy could be established by a cooperative with respect to transactions with members which would leave the co-op with no taxable income; that is, to the extent that the cost of goods sold with respect to products purchased from members is overstated, the manufacturing profits of a cooperative would be understated.

In the case of manufacturing, mining, and processing cooperatives, the possibility of distorting income through unrealistic pricing does not constitute a serious problem. The existence of equity or outside creditor interests would compel realistic pricing policies. Additionally, cooperatives should be subject to statutory provisions similar to those of section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code which has for many years successfully prevented the distortion of income from transactions between related businesses through unrealistic intercompany pricing policies.

Our second proposal is the same as existing law. It deals with cooperatives' earnings which derive from their traditional services and related activities because we recognize that (a) certain elements of the patronage dividend should inure to the patron, free of tax at the co-op level, as they result from joint effort, and that (b) the use of some capital is necessary for the co-op to perform those services for all of its members which the farmers would normally perform themselves. Therefore, such earnings as are not distributed in cash or its equivalent would be taxable to the co-op in the year earned at the usual corporate rate. On the other hand, all such earnings should be excluded from taxable income at the cooperative level to the extent that distribution of them is made in cash or its equivalent. Distributions in the form of paper without a fixed maturity date or fixed obligation to pay should be taxable to the recipient if he has consented both to that type of distribution by the cooperative and to having its stated value treated as cash in his hands for tax purposes. Where the cash or paper is taxable to the patron, it would be deductible by the cooperative.

In addition, we would recommend an annual \$25,000 deduction from tax of income from the cooperative's traditional service operations. At panel hearings before this committee last December, reference was made to the Department of Agriculture's 1954 survey on cooperatives. The survey in-

cluded 1,157 cooperatives, or 12 percent of the total number then existing. Those 1,157 cooperatives had combined annual net margins, or earnings, of \$132 million which amounted to nearly one-half of the \$275 million total net margins of all cooperatives. Your committee was then told that analysis of the data showed that the average net margins per cooperative in the 12 percent group amounted to \$114,000 per year,¹ while the average net margins for all of the remaining 88 percent of the cooperatives surveyed amounted to \$16,600 per year. The very substantial number of small cooperatives, whose average earnings were \$16,600 per year, do not engage in unrelated business activities and, therefore, do not have income from such sources. The recommended \$25,000 deduction from the income of service activities would, therefore, leave untaxed the earnings of the smaller co-ops which represented 88 percent of all cooperatives in 1954, and would permit their accumulation of capital.

In summary, our proposal is, briefly, that co-op income from all sources be subject to the usual corporate tax. However, in computing taxable income, a cooperative would be allowed a deduction for all patronage dividends, including paper allocations, to the extent that they are taxable to the patron. The co-op would also receive an annual \$25,000 deduction. But in no event should the sum of these two deductions exceed the co-op's income from service activities.

With regard to the patron, his taxable income should include his pro rata share of amounts deducted by the cooperative as patronage dividends (except where such amounts are considered as a reduction in his personal expenditures). All other co-op distributions to the patron, as such, should be treated as dividends in his hands for tax purposes.

The foregoing proposals are fair. In our view, they would correct, in major part, the abuses and inequitable results which now flow from the present tax treatment of cooperatives. The traditional service concept of cooperative groups operating in the field of marketing and purchasing would remain undisturbed. Government revenues would be increased and competition waged on a fair basis by levying taxes on income from cooperative activity such as investment and manufacturing, processing, and mining, which are unrelated to the traditional service concept of such group enterprises. Likewise, Government revenues would be increased by preventing the accumulation of tax-free funds at the cooperative level and by closing the present tax loophole through requiring tax collection on allocations from either the cooperative or the patron.

In closing, let me express my sincere appreciation for this opportunity to express my company's views on this important subject. Thank you.

¹This average net margin figure would have been significantly greater had 898 local co-ops not been averaged with the 259 regional ones. In that same year, the assets of regional co-ops averaged \$4,050,000 and those of local co-ops averaged \$198,000.

Soviet Cars in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it was recently reported in the press that

an American importer has contracted with a Soviet Government-controlled trading agency for the importation and sale in the United States of 10,000 Russian built automobiles over the next 2 years. If the American people find these cars to be satisfactory, there is of course nothing to prevent them from buying them. This is in the American tradition of free enterprise, and freedom of choice for the individual.

However, the Soviet Union itself is not able to provide all the automobiles which its own citizens would like, and freedom of choice for the individual in the U.S.S.R. is limited to the choice the Soviet Government feels like giving.

Against this background, we see the difficult position of the United States in its present trade policy. We are not selling American automobiles in the Soviet Union today. American products are excluded from many markets of the world. And yet, we in the United States must leave our domestic market open to the goods of other nations in order to remain consistent in our liberal trade policy.

On February 15, Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, wrote a letter to Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Premier of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Danielian's association is comprised of American business corporations, including automobile manufacturers. In his letter to Mr. Mikoyan, Danielian suggests that the Soviet Union favorably consider granting permission to American auto manufacturers to open up American dealerships to sell American-made autos to Soviet citizens on the installment payment plan.

This would certainly benefit the Soviet people, in helping them to obtain the consumer goods its Government says they should have. With Russian cars being sold here, and American cars being sold in Russia, we would have reciprocal trade in consumer goods.

Directors of the IEPA are, in addition to president N. R. Danielian, Mr. H. Robert Diercks, Cargill, Inc.; Mr. E. V. Huggins, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Mr. Nicholas Kelley, Jr., Chrysler Corp.; Mr. George N. Monro III, National Bank of Detroit; Mr. Murray Preston, American Security & Trust Co. of Washington, D.C.; Mr. Walter C. Skuce, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.; Mr. Philip H. Watts, Alex. Brown & Sons, and Mr. F. Hugh Burns. Mr. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., manager of the Washington office of the Ford Motor Co., is adviser to the board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of the letter sent by Dr. Danielian to Mr. Mikoyan:

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY
ASSOCIATION.

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1960.

MR. ANASTAS I. MIKOYAN,
First Deputy Chairman, Council of Ministers,
the Kremlin, Moscow U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to our attention that a U.S. automobile dealer has signed a contract with Avtoeksport, a U.S.S.R. Government-controlled foreign trade corporation, to import 10,000 Moskvich cars, manufactured in your country, into the United States, during the next 2 years.

You are quite aware, of course, that under our free enterprise system and our national trade policies, there is nothing to prevent the sale of these Soviet manufactured cars in the U.S. market, except the taste preference and the free choice of the individual U.S. purchaser.

We are wondering whether, in the interest of expanding mutual trade in the area of consumer goods, your Government would entertain the establishment of agencies and dealerships by U.S. automobile manufacturers in key metropolitan centers in the U.S.S.R. for importation and sale direct to Soviet citizens of cars manufactured in the United States? We suggest specifically your giving favorable consideration to the following proposals:

1. Authorization for the establishment of dealerships, sales, and service organizations in market areas in the U.S.S.R. to be selected by U.S. automobile manufacturers, including, of course, the importation of assembled cars and parts.

2. The establishment of consumer credit or installment selling facilities to make these cars more widely available to a large group of U.S.S.R. citizenry.

3. Authority to transfer in gold, dollar exchange, or other convertible currencies, the earnings of the U.S. corporations from their sales of cars and service in the U.S.S.R.

We believe that permission to U.S. manufacturers to make available American-made cars to an ever increasing number of Soviet citizens, at reasonable prices and with easy payment arrangements, would immeasurably add to their standard of living, and establish reciprocity of trade in consumer products, an area in which U.S. industry has much to contribute to the improvement of living standards and happiness of the Soviet people. This, we take it, is consistent with the stated objective of your Government, to make consumer goods more widely available to your people.

Sincerely yours,

N. R. DANIELIAN,
President.

Growth of the Liberty Tree Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, last spring we were visited by members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Strasburg in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, who brought us pine seedlings planted in soil gathered from historic sites as a reminder of our heritage of Patriotism.

Previously, I have had the pleasure of reporting to the House that this project, developed and carried out by a relatively small unit of the Jaycees, won the highest national awards of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Now, the liberty tree program has been adopted as one of the 1960 State projects of Virginia Jaycees, and the Strasburg members have opened a special office to carry it forward.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article which appeared in the February 1960 issue of

Future, the official magazine of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce:

Last spring a comparative handful of Jaycees from Strasburg, a small community in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, launched a program that would ultimately bring them nationwide acclaim.

Their program was to be cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD four times, have members rubbing elbows with the top House and Senate leaders, put them on the White House lawn, and finally see Strasburg sweep the national awards competition by taking honors in Public Affairs Division I, the National Sweepstakes in Public Affairs, Project of the Year in Division I, and Grand Project of the Year in the 1958-59 Jaycee awards program.

This program, which has become one of the Virginia Jaycee State projects for 1960, is called Liberty Trees.

Strasburg Jaycee Jack Marsh, local attorney who was the project originator, first program director and now State chairman, describes Liberty Trees as being a tangible symbol of our heritage. Liberty Trees are small American white pine seedlings planted in red, white, and blue pots, containing soil from historic spots such as the Shenandoah Valley, Jamestown, Yorktown, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and the Alamo.

The project was designed as a countermeasure to the Communist celebration of May Day and encourages Americans to learn about America. The Strasburg Jaycees sold about 400 trees and the proceeds went to the Nathan Hale Fund, which will be used for scholarships and as a fund for financing patriotic endeavors.

In addition to selling the trees locally on May 1, the Strasburg Jaycees loaded nearly 600 in a truck, formed a Liberty Tree caravan to Washington, D.C., and gave each Congressman and Senator a tree. In addition to presenting them to members of the legislature, two were given to Homer Gunther, Presidential staff assistant, who accepted them on the White House lawn in behalf of President Eisenhower. Other notables receiving trees included Secretary of State Herter, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and Governor Almond of Virginia.

Charlie Adlis, a local industrial plant manager who worked out the scheme which enabled Jaycees to distribute the trees to every legislator in both the Senate and House Office Building in a little over an hour, said the response from official Washington was overwhelming. Over 200 Congressmen and Senators sent personal acknowledgments to the Jaycees.

When the program swept the USJCO awards program at the national convention in Buffalo this fact was carried on two different occasions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The program had been outlined twice previously in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and on the day the trees were presented Seventh District Congressman BURR P. HARRISON explained the project to the House while the Jaycees observed from the gallery.

The Strasburg Jaycees are now implementing the program on a statewide basis, and have a Liberty Tree office. The trees will be offered in packets of 100 which will include all materials necessary for a local club to conduct the program in their community. Of the money received for packets or trees a portion will be used for promotion and establishment of a scholarship fund. Chapters participating in the program must agree that their profits will be used for patriotic endeavor in their community. The recommended sale price of Liberty Trees at the local level is \$1 per tree.

Further information concerning this program can be obtained by writing "Liberty Trees," Box 252, Strasburg, Va.

Representative Curtis Proud To Be on Hoffa's Purge List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Globe-Democrat, March 6, 1960:

REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS PROUD TO BE ON HOFFA'S PURGE LIST—WARNS OF RUGGED FIGHT AHEAD

(The author, a Member of the House of Representatives for 10 years, is one of 56 Congressmen whom Jimmy Hoffa has pledged to defeat. His congressional district is one of the strongholds of the Teamsters Union.)

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

WASHINGTON.—Fifty-six Congressmen have been marked for political purge by James Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

I am one of those Congressmen, representing St. Louis County and South St. Louis, home of Harold Gibbons, teamster executive vice president, and Sidney Zagari, director of Hoffa's purge campaign.

Most of us on the Hoffa purge list will run in the November 8, 1960, elections. Forty of us have banded together in the Committee to Re-elect Hoffa-Threatened Congressmen to offer a solid front to the threats of Hoffa and to delineate a choice for our citizens:

Shall Hoffa or the American voters have the final voice in choosing a Congress?

To "qualify" for the Hoffa purge list a Congressman had to have voted for the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act and have won an election victory in 1958 by less than a 5 percent majority.

AYRES ON LIST

Fifty-three Republicans and two Democrats made the list in this way. The fifty-sixth, Representative WILLIAM AYRES, of Akron, Ohio, despite his convincing 36,000-vote victory in 1958, was marked for purge because of his membership on the House-Senate conference committee which drafted the final version of the law.

The purge campaign is based on the fallacy that the act is "union-busting" and that those who supported it are antilabor.

This is patently untrue. The 56 named, plus 173 other House Members who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, did so to curb abuses in the labor-management field, revealed to the Congress and to the public. As its name plainly states, the law aims at the unscrupulous employer as well as the unscrupulous labor leader.

Since most of the abuses exposed were perpetrated by Hoffa and his close associates, it is clear why they were angry at the Congress for protecting the public interest and the rights of workingmen and women.

Propaganda opposed to the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act characterizes those who voted for it as either blind in their disregard of labor or servile in yielding to the pressures of big business. I object to this attack on the motives and integrity of Congress.

VOTED OTHERWISE

Had I any reason to feel that this law was a vindictive assault on the labor movement, as it has been called by its opponents, I would have voted, worked and spoken against it, just as I have from 1954 to the present against the "right to work" proposals that

have been presented in Missouri during that time.

There is nothing in this law requiring the overwhelming majority of properly run unions to do anything which they were not previously doing nor to prevent them from doing anything that they were.

Response to the creation of the Committee to Reelect Hoffa-Threatened Congressmen has been spontaneous, widespread and encouraging. Civic leaders, editors and commentators have commended the committee's formation.

Many people throughout the Nation have responded. Letters are flowing into the House Office Building offices of the temporary committee cochairmen, Representatives AYRES and CARROLL KEARNS of Pennsylvania. These letters offer voluntary services and money to offset Hoffa's huge slush fund, his main weapon for waging political war.

The public response has highlighted the Hoffa purge list as an honor roll on which my colleagues and I are all proud to be named.

Surely no one wishes to deny Mr. Hoffa his right to engage in political activity. To flourish, our system of government requires a maximum of political activity and our committee would not strip anyone—an individual, union or corporation—of his legitimate right of political advocacy.

We do not condemn Hoffa for his exercise of this right; rather we commend him. We urge, however, that our citizens also exercise their rights in this field and prevent a special interest from usurping the powers of the public at large.

ONLY WAY

This is the only way to counter the Hoffa purge. The hundreds of thousands of interested, thinking citizens who refuse to let their rights be snatched away by a special interest group must act.

Those who cared enough to demand the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reform Act by an unprecedented deluge of mail, those who resent the threats of a bully can help. To show this interest they must support those Congressmen Hoffa would purge.

We honestly believe we are right. We were right to work for a law curbing a small but dangerous element in labor leadership that has perverted the movement for personal power. We are right in banding together against the purge of a well-heeled special interest. We are opening the way for popular participation in a drive that will show it is not Hoffa, but the voters, the American people, who will name their Members of Congress next November 8.

This is the crux: Do the voters indorse our action or do they not?

If those who agree with us do not register their convictions at the polls, then we are doomed to the purge Hoffa has decreed.

Have no doubts, Hoffa with his huge slush fund for this purge will succeed unless the people rise and prove that they are the true rulers under our form of government.

Why Move to Natick, Mass.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 8 and which pre-

sents so clearly an argument against moving the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. I should like to call attention particularly to that part of the editorial which emphasizes the fact that the Illinois Institute of Technology has offered to give the Army more than adequate facilities for its research installation on food and food packaging.

This editorial, I think, certainly calls the shots on the Army, and it would appear to me that in view of the offer made by the Illinois Institute of Technology to retain the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute in Chicago, it would be unconscionable on the part of the Army to persist in its efforts to remove this facility from Chicago, under the guise of economy.

The Chicago Sun-Times has performed a fine public service with this editorial, which follows:

WHY MOVE TO NATICK, MASS.?

The storms that battered the East last week canceled a trip to Chicago of two Congressmen assigned to investigate the Army plan to pull its Quartermaster Food and Container Institute out of this city.

For the taxpayers' sake and the Army's we hope that the Congressmen—Representatives VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and DOYLE, Democrat, of California—are still planning to come here. We are confident that they will be convinced that the Army is off base in proposing to move its food research agency from Chicago to Natick, Mass. The Congressmen were assigned to make the study by the House Armed Services Committee.

The Army has asked for \$3,628,000 to build new quarters for the research agency in Natick. It estimates it would cost \$687,000 to move. The Army's stated reason for the change is economy—the Army says it can save \$1 million a year by moving to Natick and reducing space and personnel.

We are happy to see the Army expressing concern about economy but we take its thrift talk with a grain of salt. It can make a considerable saving, obviously, by merely reducing space and personnel in Chicago. How much it would save by moving to Natick hasn't been mentioned by the Army. We suspect the Army's motive is not economy but is dictated by the Government's concern over unemployment in New England.

The purpose of the Food and Container Institute is to do research on food and food packaging for the Armed Forces and not to provide jobs. It should be located wherever it can best do its research. It was located here when it was organized after World War II because Chicago is the home of the military procurement agency, it is the heart of the food industry and excellent research facilities are available in Chicago's universities and food and packing industries.

If the Pentagon really is on the level about saving money on the research operation by moving into smaller quarters it should consider an offer by the Illinois Institute of Technology. The institute will finance a new building for the Army on its own campus and make it available on terms that will cover only the costs involved.

Such a location would give the Army access to the manpower of thousands of science and engineering students, excellent research and technical facilities, large computers, a nuclear reactor and the new John Crerar Library, largest technological library in the United States.

If the Army is interested in saving money and doing a proper job of food research it can hardly turn down this offer.

Collection Agencies for Medical and Dental Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I received my copy of the December 28, 1959, issue of the AMA News, official publication of the American Medical Association, which carried in their "Editorial Viewpoint" an article stating that, "no person with a legitimate need for a doctor's services needs to forgo that care because of inability to pay," I received a letter from a private citizen which literally explodes the myth of this type of propaganda. Enclosed in that letter were two letters from collection agencies.

The manner in which these collection letters are written is brutal and vicious. They state that notices will be sent to all businessmen in the area thereby "black-balling" that person for future credit.

The following letters speak for themselves, and for a true and fair evaluation I am inserting both the AMA article and the letters I received. They follow:

[From AMA News, Dec. 28, 1959]

EDITORIAL VIEWPOINT—MEDICAL CARE FOR ALL

A common argument used by forces pushing Forand-type legislation is that many elderly persons now are being denied a physician's care because they are unable to pay for it.

There may be isolated instances of such cases, but if there are the person involved has not explored the facilities available to him.

Actually, no person with a legitimate need for a doctor's services needs to forgo that care because of inability to pay.

The prime object of the medical profession is to serve humanity, regardless of reward or financial gain. And since time immemorial, doctors have given professional advice to the indigent without compensation.

Many county medical societies, however, hesitate to put advertisements in newspapers or publicize their program to guarantee medical services to those who are unable to pay. They feel it is not necessary since the medical profession traditionally takes care of those who cannot pay—modestly and quietly.

The question is not whether physicians actually will provide care to those who need it. According to the code of ethics, a doctor is honor bound to give free care in such instances. The important factor is that some people mistakenly believe that doctors' care is not available unless it is paid for. And apparently the only way to correct this dangerous misconception is to remind the public of the medical society's efforts to provide such care.

A number of county medical societies have publicized through paid advertisements in newspapers their programs "guaranteeing the services of a physician to all who need him, regardless of ability to pay." Thus, those counties have conclusively answered any loose talk about "all the poor folks in this county who are going without needed medical care."

There also is a concerted effort to follow through on the program. When the physicians hear an occasional remark of that kind,

the M.D.'s immediately get in touch with the individual or group who made the statement, and ask them to produce the name of at least one of those poor folks. The medical society keeps after them, even if it takes weeks, until they either confess that they had no one particular in mind or come up with someone who really does need help. "Either way it is a great satisfaction to us," one physician said.

Seven years ago AMA's house of delegates encouraged constituent State medical societies to make these programs known to the public through every effective medium of communication.

Today, medical public relations is better in those counties that have regularly publicized their guaranteed medical-care-for-all plans, the round-the-clock availability of physicians, emergency call systems, and grievance committees.

And where the public generally is aware of the extent to which the profession of medicine has responded to this public need, loose talk by do-gooders is labeled for what it is—loose talk.

CONGRESSMAN FORAND,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Following is a plea that we on social security may get some relief from the high cost of drugs, doctors, and medicine. Both I and my wife are on social security drawing a total of \$99 per month. My wife is a paralytic and has high blood pressure and other ailments. My wife needs special food which costs three times the price for a healthy person's food. I called a doctor 1½ years ago for my wife. The doctor gave her 1 month to live. I brought her home and I have taken care of her since. I cannot pay the doctor and the enclosed letters will show you that I cannot even get a doctor to do my wife any good. Sure the doctor will come but none of them will take the time to diagnose my wife's case. I owe one doctor \$40 which I cannot pay, so I am on the blacklist of the medical profession in Hot Springs. I need medical attention myself but can't get it. Local government won't help me so I am appealing to my National Government. My great grandparents fought the wilderness, disease, and Indians to build our Nation, into a country we call a democracy. It was meant that none of us would suffer, but some of us can't get the bare necessities of life. I wasn't in any war so I do not receive \$250 per month. I was rejected in the First World War. I have been a cripple all my life. Must I be punished for that?

ARKANSAS MUTUAL
CREDIT ASSOCIATION,

Hot Springs, Ark., November 28, 1958.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. —: An account against you has been turned over to us for collection.

We believe that this is a just account, but if an error has been made, please contact us at once. We would much rather protect a good name than to put a name in our monthly report of bad accounts. These monthly reports are used by Hot Springs businesses in granting credit.

The account to which we refer is with hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. Amount past due: \$15.65.

If this account is in dispute for any reason, we urge you to take it up at once with the firm named above.

If you pay or otherwise settle this account within 10 days, you will not be listed in our monthly report. Payments should be made to us, but if it is more convenient, they may be made direct to the folks with whom you had the account. If this matter becomes a law case, payment should be made to the court in which the case was heard.

If you are unable to pay your account at one time, we will be glad to discuss a regular payment plan with you.

Please let us hear from you right away.

Yours truly,

A. R. McCoy.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL BUREAU,
Hot Springs, Ark., April 18, 1959.

Re Dr. —. Amount \$40.

DEAR MR. —: The above delinquent account has been submitted to our office for handling and collection.

We do not know why you have allowed the matter to reach this degree of seriousness, but it is now necessary that immediate and satisfactory disposition be made of this account.

We can help you protect your credit for the future. Cooperation costs less than embarrassment and additional expense, and we are here to help you, rather than to inflict any undue hardship upon you.

In the event that you have made satisfactory disposition of this account within a 10-day period, your name will not be recorded in our master files.

We ask that you place your check or money order in the enclosed envelope, or come to the office and take care of this matter.

All payments must be made to this office.

Yours truly,

I. MITCHELL, Manager.

Family Housing Units at the Alameda, Calif., Naval Air Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

MR. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Navy has requested, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved, authorization to construct 900 family housing units at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.

Existing military-controlled housing was built during the war emergency as a temporary measure and has been declared substandard under section 407 of Public Law 84-241. It is to be eliminated from housing use by July 1, 1961.

I am personally familiar with existing housing and can attest to the fact that much of it is a health hazard and a fire hazard. It should have been eliminated long ago. It is so inadequate that outside studies show that rehabilitation to bring it up to required public standards would be completely infeasible.

The Navy reports that various investigations and surveys in the bay area have established that private support housing is simply not available. Joint factfinding surveys made by the Federal Housing Administration and postmasters of Alameda, Oakland, San Francisco, Berkeley, and Daly City, disclosed a family housing vacancy rate of only 1.3 percent, where as a 5-percent vacancy rate is considered normal.

The Naval Air Station in Alameda is one of the largest naval air stations in the country. It is the home port for

five aircraft carriers: the *Ranger*, in the *Forrestal* class; *Ticonderoga*, *Hancock*, *Bon Homme Richard*, and *Midway*.

Unless action is taken immediately to construct these family housing units a serious military personnel housing shortage will develop with its consequent effect on the morale of our servicemen as well as the economy of the area.

I urge my colleagues to support the authorization for these critically needed family housing units so that construction can begin at the earliest possible date.

South Dakota Editor Answers Secretary Benson's Claim That Price Supports Have Caused the Farm Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

MR. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has justified his lowering of farm price supports on the grounds that this was necessary to discourage farmers from producing surpluses. Actually the price support program prior to Mr. Benson's administration was used effectively to regulate production so that farmers could keep supply in line with market demands. Farmers have consistently shown their willingness to adjust production to demand when they were assured through the price support program that they would receive a fair price on their reduced crops.

By lowering price supports Mr. Benson has forced farmers to increase production to survive. Thousands of them have abandoned the crop control programs because they knew that they could not accept both lower prices and reduced volume. That is why the farm surpluses which Mr. Benson deplores have been built up under his unsound administration of the farm program.

There was no farm surplus when the present administration took over in 1952. We had a small food reserve of about \$1 billion in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory in 1953; today that inventory is seven times that amount. Likewise, the Department of Agriculture budget in 1952 was approximately \$1 billion; today after 7 years of maladministration by Mr. Benson the cost of running the Department of Agriculture is \$7 billion.

Yet, Secretary Benson persists in blaming his disastrous policies on the Congress. Fortunately there are clear-headed observers in the Farm Belt who know better and who are saying so. One such highly competent observer is the editor of the *Huron* (S. Dak.) Plainsman who has written an excellent editorial answering false statements made by Secretary Benson in a recent speech at Yankton, S. Dak. I urge my colleagues to read the following editorial from the

Huron Plainsman of Monday, March 7, 1960:

WHY DO WE HAVE SO MUCH WHEAT?

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson in his speech at Yankton last week told a farmer-businessman audience the trouble with wheat is that too many farmers are growing this grain under the 15-acre exemption from controls.

Since 1939, he said, South Dakota has lost 200,000 acres of wheat allotment and North Dakota has lost five times that much. At the same time, he added, other areas have increased wheat acreage with the total number of wheatgrowers rising from 538,000 to 690,000 in the last 3 years.

"Why did this happen?" Benson asked. "Because we lost large portions of our cotton and tobacco markets by pricing ourselves out of competition. . . . Those farmers who produced cotton and tobacco had no choice but to divert acres to corn, wheat, and livestock."

Secretary Benson's analysis of the wheat situation is open to some challenge, as a look at the figures of his own Department of Agriculture will show.

If there were 152,000 new wheatgrowers in 1959 and each of them grew an average of 10 more acres of wheat that would make a total of 1,520,000 acres in this crop. If we assume further that they had an average yield of 20 bushels per acre—slightly more than the actual 1959 yield—that would make a total of 30,400,000 bushels of wheat.

Now, if that total is subtracted from the total production of wheat in 1959—1,128,151,000 bushels—the remainder is 1,097,751,000 bushels. This, then, is the amount of wheat the Nation's farmers would have produced in 1959 if there had been no 15-acre exemption.

It should be noted that this 1,097,751,000 bushels is almost exactly equal to the 1,098,415,000 bushels produced in 1949—long before the exemption was in effect.

And it should be noted, too, that the number of acres seeded to wheat in 1959 was only 58,043,000—including the acres seeded under the exemption—whereas in 1959 wheatgrowers seeded 83,905,000 acres.

What then caused the great increase in wheat production? The 1,520,000 new acres under the exemption hardly can be blamed when it is realized that farmers in other areas had cut their plantings by almost 26 million acres.

The answer, it would appear, lies in the fact that the price of wheat last year was about 20 cents a bushel below what it was 10 years earlier and the yield per acre was up from 13.1 bushels per acre in 1949 to 19.4 bushels per acre in 1959. Had there not been serious drought in some of the wheat-growing areas, wheat yields might again have approached the record 26 bushels per acre achieved in 1948.

Thus, farmers were pushing their land harder to produce more wheat per acre just to keep even with where they were on income 10 years earlier—and their costs had risen tremendously during the same period.

Now, as to Secretary Benson's argument that it is the high price of tobacco and cotton that is causing southern farmers to shift to wheat production.

It is true, southern farmers have increased their production of grains. This has been due in part to increased livestock production in that area. But the southern agriculture has been shifting mainly from cotton to grass because of the invasion of that high-rainfall area by southwestern ranchers seeking new pastures for their breeding herds. The tremendous increase in feeder-calf sales in that area bears this out.

As for the tobacco belt, it hardly seems likely that farmers who had taken a half-acre or even an acre out in their tobacco

bases would hope to make up the difference by growing wheat. An acre of tobacco produces about 1,600 pounds of leaf worth about 50 cents a pound. Obviously, \$800 an acre is not the equivalent of \$40 per acre. Thus, reduced tobacco acreages have not been much of a "force" in the changeover to wheat.

There are problems in the tobacco belt, it is true, but high prices are not the major problems. The high prices on much of our tobacco result from the tremendous demand for lower grade tobacco which has developed from the filter-tip cigarettes and not from the price support program.

This has been called to Secretary Benson's attention many times in the past. It is significant that he doesn't use this argument when he speaks in the Tobacco Belt.

The Western Stake in the Spirit of Resistance of the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement by the Assembly of Captive European Nations dated February 19, 1960. As one who hopes that the fate of the captive peoples will be raised at the forthcoming summit meeting between the leaders of the free world and Mr. Khrushchev, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body the above-mentioned document:

THE WESTERN STAKE IN THE SPIRIT OF RESISTANCE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

There is a school of thought in the West which holds that the nuclear stalemate renders obsolete any active concern for Eastern Europe and that it would make little sense to raise at the summit a question which cannot be solved. The only practical result of such action, the supporters of this theory say, would be to poison the atmosphere and render impossible any agreement even on the limited issues under consideration, such as the Berlin question for instance.

Another school of thought—with which the Assembly of Captive European Nations finds itself in agreement—holds that whether or not Western ability to help captive nations recover freedom and independence has been adversely affected by the so-called nuclear stalemate the raising of the question by the Western Powers far from being dangerous would be a realistic move. It would present both short-range and long-range advantages for the West and the captive countries.

I

From the short-range point of view, the first and most evident advantage the West could derive from raising the issue of the freedom and independence of the captive nations at the coming summit meeting would be the positive impact of such official demonstration of Western concern and purpose on the morale of the people of central and Eastern Europe. The deterrence represented by the spirit of resistance of these nations would thus not only be preserved but further strengthened. Such result would be an undeniable contribution to the security of Western Europe in the period of nuclear stalemate, when the diminished effectiveness of the nuclear deterrent against superior Soviet ground forces confronts the West with

the problems of assuring the defense of Western Europe at a lesser cost than an all-out nuclear war.

Soviet statements and actions have clearly indicated that in the calculation of the Kremlin a nuclear stalemate would decisively tip the balance of power in Europe in their favor; will enable them to demonstrate to the nations of Western Europe that they can no longer depend on the NATO sword, that is the protective umbrella of American strategic nuclear power, and induce these nations to take the realistic course of seeking shelter in neutrality. All indications are to the effect that the Soviet rulers count that once their preliminary objective is achieved, they will be in a position gradually to take control over Western Europe by a combination of pressures and subversion.

It is safe to postulate that in order to cope successfully with such Soviet strategy, the Western Powers will place increasing stress on the NATO shield with a view of replacing the strategic nuclear deterrent and, in case such deterrent failed, to be able to repel a Soviet nonnuclear forward thrust without having to resort to the increasingly prohibitive strategic retaliation. Since the West is not contemplating a buildup of its non-nuclear defenses to a level commensurate to the opposing Soviet forces, it will have to find another way of mitigating the coming imbalance. It is precisely as a balancing factor that the aspirations of the captive nations to freedom and independence, their resolute hostility to Soviet domination, are meaningful to the West. For paradoxically enough, at the very time when the ability of the West to help these nations to recover their freedom has been greatly curtailed by the nuclear stalemate, their potential as deterrents and, in case of an actual Soviet onslaught, as allies, become vital factors in the security of Western Europe.

As long as the spirit of resistance in the captive countries remains alive, the Soviet Union must count not only with the forces the West can oppose to her in the field but also with the unreliability of the satellite armies and the insecurity of its westward lines of communications. And they consequently must allow in their planning for the possibility that a substantial segment of the Soviet armed forces will have to be assigned to security duties in the captive countries.

The point is, however, that the spirit of resistance of the captive peoples and its deterrent effect should not be taken for granted. It must be bolstered by a continuous effort on the part of the West. This entails not only the refusal to sanction, directly or by implication, the political status quo in Central and Eastern Europe and occasional friendly statements, but also positive steps indicating that the freedom and the independence of the captive nations are a political objective of the Western Powers which they are determined to pursue by all nonmilitary means. Raising the issue of the captive nations at all important international conferences, beginning with the coming summit meeting, and before the United Nations, is a minimum requirement to this end.

It hardly needs stressing that such action would have a very solid foundation in the inalienable right of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice, in the wartime and postwar agreements to which both the Western Powers and the Soviet Union are parties, not to speak of the moral principles of the free world and the right of self-determination which is now being recognized even to underdeveloped peoples with no record of nationhood.

II

In raising the issue of the captive nations at the coming summit meeting the West may reap further short-range advantages.

(1) It would enable it to counter Soviet efforts to confine negotiations to their demands on Berlin and on Germany with an overall plan of a European settlement based on the universally recognized principle of self-determination and designed to remove the major causes of the international tensions by the liquidation of all the dangerous consequences of the Second World War.

(2) It would give the West the moral benefits that should accrue to it from the emancipation of the colonial peoples. For as long as the West does not stand squarely and consistently on the principle of self-determination, the liquidation of the colonial empires will not be viewed as an unselfish course of action, founded on principle, but would be unjustly regarded as a necessity due to weakness and to the successful "liberation" struggle conducted by international communism.

III

In bringing up the issue of the captive nations at the summit meeting, the West would also serve the long-term mutual interests of the free and captive nations.

The captive nations have come to realize that as an effect of the nuclear stalemate their liberation has become a long-range aim. They are aware that the Western Powers are no longer prepared to negotiate from a position of strength. They have also learned by the tragic experience of Hungary that even in the event of a successful internal revolt they cannot depend on the West as a deterrent to armed Soviet intervention against victorious internal forces of freedom.

Still they have not given up hope. They know that materially the West is stronger than the Soviet Union and it also has the moral argument on its side. They are more familiar than the free nations with the internal weaknesses of the Soviet empire and of the forces that slowly but inexorably work for its disintegration. But they also know that all these advantages can be brought to nought if Soviet boldness and purposefulness are not matched by the Western Powers. They therefore trust that the Western Powers will remain strong, united and determined. They trust, in particular, that these powers will succeed in holding all their positions in Europe and that they will never abandon the vital objective of a Europe free and united in its natural confines—which in the long run is the only guarantee of a secure peace.

There can be little doubt that if the West will successfully prevent the Soviet Union from further expanding and if, at the same time, the ultimate purpose of a free Europe is kept alive and pursued by all peaceful means, opportunities will arise for the assertion of freedom throughout the Soviet empire.

The potential contribution of the captive nations to both these essential tasks in the struggle for the survival and ultimate victory of freedom can hardly be exaggerated. It is for the Western Powers to help make sure that this contribution will be forthcoming and the summit meeting affords a first opportunity for useful action to this end.

IV

It has now become perfectly clear that even if efforts to avert war in the coming years will be successful, the world will not enjoy for a long time peace but a precarious co-existence. The Soviet rulers have unambiguously declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic and ideological drive for the worldwide victory of communism. And their actions fully match their words.

To begin with they work tirelessly for the consolidation of their hold over the captive nations. Both the process of total economic integration of the captive area in the Soviet economy and the efforts to complete the structural changes—political, economic, so-

cial, cultural and administrative—which would transform each captive country into a replica of the Soviet Union have been greatly accelerated and expanded. More than ever before the Soviet rulers are set to break the spirit of the captive peoples. They proceed with their efforts to induce the Western Powers to admit, by their silence if not by a formal act, the finality of the status quo in central and Eastern Europe. And their propaganda misses no opportunity to persuade the captive peoples that the balance of power has so decisively been upset in their favor that the worldwide triumph of communism has only become a matter of time.

At the same time they are conducting an intense political offensive in every corner of the earth. In Western Europe the objective, undermining NATO, is being advanced both by missile-rattling and by subtler approaches. The recent announcement of a reduction in the Soviet ground forces which is designed to create a psychological obstacle to any attempt at stepping up the defense efforts—is a case in point.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America Communists work day and night to disrupt the existing order and prepare the ground for the eventual establishment of Communist regimes.

Confronted with this type of competitive coexistence the West can hardly hope to hold the ground if it confines its efforts to combatting Communist infiltration on its own territory while refraining from any action on territory controlled by the Soviet Union. In so doing the West would comply with the Soviet invitation that it cease conducting any kind of cold war operations and thereby help the Soviet Union consolidate its rule over the eastern half of Europe, while Moscow would remain entirely free to carry on what Premier Khrushchev calls the ideological struggle.

Such compliance is too replete with disastrous consequences to be even conceivable.

The West possesses in the peoples under Soviet captivity valuable allies. Because of its democratic structure it may not be able and prepared to wage political warfare with the same methods the Soviets are employing. But unlike the Soviets it has on its side the majorities, not mere minorities, like the Communist parties in the West. There is, therefore, a wide scope for a Western political offensive by methods available and acceptable to the Western democracies. International negotiations and international forums provide fitting platforms for such offensive and the issue of the captive nations represents the best possible political battle issue. It certainly represents the most promising way to push the Soviets on the defensive.

The struggle for the preservation of freedom in the western half of Europe can no longer be separated from that for the recovery of freedom and independence in the eastern half of the old continent. The sooner this will be recognized, the more important will be the contribution of the captive peoples to the world-wide contest between tyranny and liberty, and the greater will be the chances of freedom to achieve victory.

The Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the years since the end of World War II,

American air transportation companies have rapidly been losing their position as leaders in the field of international airline operations. Companies which a dozen years ago transported some 75 percent of all transatlantic air passengers, for example, carry less than 40 percent today. A foreign airline, which calls itself the largest in the world, serves more American cities than one of our own international carriers. Another foreign airline is permitted to transport passengers across the United States while such authority is denied an American international carrier. This trend has resulted from concessions to foreign airlines at the expense of our own carriers.

Fortunately, the Department of State, upon recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has recently issued a decision reversing the pattern. KLM of the Netherlands, was denied permission for a route to our west coast. I commend the decision and hope it is indicative of the future direction of our decisions in similar cases in the future.

American carriers should certainly share in international air traffic generated by American business and travel abroad. While it may be necessary to make concessions to foreign airlines to maintain our international services by obtaining foreign operating rights, it appears that there have been too many concessions.

Correspondence with airline pilots who live in my district makes it fully clear that the detrimental effect of the current trend in international air travel is borne by American airline employees to an increasing degree. Let us hope that improvement is on the way.

Undertakers Oppose Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, since 1957 when I first introduced my bill, H.R. 4700, providing hospital and surgical services for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance, I have learned of opposition to my bill by such groups as the AMA, the chambers of commerce and the insurance companies. I expected this, but I was surprised to receive a few days ago a resolution opposing my bill from the Indiana Funeral Directors Association, Inc.

Could it be that undertakers are opposed to good health?

Here follows the resolution:

Whereas legislation has been proposed that would amend the Social Security Act to provide for the Federal purchase of certain health care services for social security beneficiaries; and

Whereas such legislation would further increase social security taxes—which are already scheduled to reach 9 percent of payroll—up to \$4,800 income; and

Whereas care for the older citizen calls for a flexibility of medical approach and tech-

nique; not the rigidity inherent in Government-controlled programs; and

Whereas the proposed legislation is a political approach to a health problem; and

Whereas a nationalized program of this sort would weaken the patient-physician relationship; and

Whereas a bureaucratic system for solving individual health problems of the aged would result in political abuses and administrative waste: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Indiana Funeral Directors Association, Inc., does hereby go on record against adoption of H.R. 4700 introduced in the 86th Congress by Representative A. J. FORAND, of Rhode Island.

Let's Terminate the "Temporary" Luxury Tax on Telephone Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in this month of March the people of this Nation paused to honor the memory of Alexander Graham Bell who was born March 3, 1847, and who, 29 years later on March 10, 1876, gave to the world that vitally essential and indispensable servant of mankind called the telephone.

Things were different then. To quote a contemporary writer of historical prose:

The old enemy of distance prowled everywhere. And people were separated by the bigness of this land.

That was what started young Alec Bell thinking. He knew well what it meant to be shut off from the sounds of familiar voices. You see, he was a teacher of the deaf.

It wasn't easy—explaining sound to those who knew only silence. He had to take hold of sound and pry loose her secrets. He had to find out what she looks like. What she's made of. And then he learned that sound was willing to learn from him.

So he taught sound to change herself into a new form—electricity that wiggled up and down along a wire and carried with it all the laughter and sadness and anger and love of men's everyday conversation. Wherever they strung Alec's wire, distance just shriveled away. The plain, friendly speech of the western farmer could be heard, clear and distinct, in Boston. A man in New York could find out how things were going in California without even raising his voice. Alexander Graham Bell's telephone was talking their language.

Some inventions change the way people live all over the world. If so many of them have happened in America, it's because in this country there's always a dream of doing things better. And part of that dream is that each of us can make it come true.

And so we have seen how the telephone, in a little more than half a century, has grown from a laboratory curiosity to a necessity numbered by the millions. The manifold uses it has today scarcely need be told. Electronic engineers tell us the time is coming when a person anywhere in the world will be able to dial anyone else on the face of the globe without the intervention of an operator and in a few seconds have his party on the line. A vast, new field is

opening up in communications. When the whole world can talk over telephones, the benefits will be multiplied. Perhaps, then, nations will understand each other a little better. Perhaps—and who can tell—the telephone may be one of the avenues which will help establish permanent peace in the bright new world we are still hoping and praying for.

We scarcely need be told that the people of this country and our own Government rely heavily on communications facilities and services not only in pursuance of our peacetime activities but in defense of our Nation. I point up all these things to remind us that the telephone is not a luxury but an everyday necessity. Yet, it is one of the most heavily taxed of any necessary service. Water, gas, electricity, heating fuel and other utilities are not taxed. Why then should we continue to single out and penalize the telephone user with a 10-percent levy every time he calls the corner grocery and every time he calls a sick relative in some far-distant State?

Actually, the Federal excise tax on communications services is unfair and discriminatory. It is a luxury sales tax on an essential service. The same kind of a tax that we assess against jewelry, furs, and liquor. Why should the telephone be put in the luxury class? When a housewife telephones for groceries or when she needs to call the family doctor about her baby's illness, she does not regard the telephone as a luxury. Nor does the businessman when he picks up the transmitter to order more merchandise for his customers. When farmers and others resident in rural areas need to summon a doctor or a veterinarian or to call the fire department, they do not feel that telephone service is a luxury. Yet, Congress has continued to impose this luxury tax upon one of the most essential services we have. I repeat, to continue this tax is unfair and discriminatory.

This tax was imposed as a temporary wartime measure to restrict civilian use of the telephone and to save materials in the interest of defense. Telephone users have been paying this temporary tax for more than 18 long and heavily burdened years.

Last year this Congress voted to drop the excise tax on local telephone service on June 30, 1960. We decided that the tax—the only such tax on a household utility—was an inequitable levy. The discontinuance of this tax would mean a 10 percent cut on local telephone bills for everybody. But now President Eisenhower has asked us to rescind the repeal action of last year and to continue the tax on both local and long distance service. In bringing these facts before the House I want my colleagues to understand I am as fully aware as they are of the problems involved in obtaining tax revenue for the country's needs. We know these needs must be met and that the money must come from somewhere. But telephone companies and their customers already are paying more than their fair share. I wonder how many of you realize that approximately one-third of every dollar spent for telephone usage goes for Federal, State, and

local taxes. I am reliably informed that this is the amount of the tax against telephone companies and telephone users in most localities.

The millions of people who depend upon the telephone and the telephone companies themselves are seriously concerned should there be a continuance of this Federal excise tax on telephone service. I share that concern. They fear that the longer this tax on communications service is continued the greater is the danger that it will become a permanent part of the tax structure. Telephone users long have complained, newspapers the country over have demanded repeal of this tax, and the entire communications industry long has urged elimination of the tax. Are we going to continue to ignore their pleas? Telephone users and telephone companies are not alone in seeking repeal of this tax. State and Federal agencies which regulate the rates and charges for telephone service are fully aware of the impact of these excise taxes on the cost of service. These regulatory authorities repeatedly have advocated repeal of taxes on telephone service. The regulatory commissions know that the cost of providing telephone service has been constantly increasing due to the inflationary trends that have raised the cost of nearly every product and service. Commissions have found it necessary to allow a net increase of \$2.08 in gross revenues to allow an increase of \$1 in the net income of a telephone company. This comes about as a result of the Federal income tax. But, in addition, the customer must pay another 21 cents to cover the 10 percent excise tax on the increased rate. Thus, in order to increase a telephone company's net income by \$1, the customer must bear a total increase of \$2.29. Regulatory commissions are opposed to this added cost because they regard it as unsound, unjust, and inequitable to the maintenance of a reasonably priced communications service.

In view of these things I ask the Congress when the proper time comes to allow the tax on local telephone service to terminate on June 30, 1960, as scheduled. The wish to keep Federal tax revenues at present high levels should not blind us to the need of eliminating this discriminatory and unfair assessment upon our vital communications services. It would be a practical way of providing a general tax reduction which would stimulate our economy and which would benefit everybody.

In the language of St. Paul, I urge you to think upon these things.

Thomas Masaryk

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have this week celebrated the birth of a great Czech patriot, Thomas Masaryk.

Much of the work for Czechoslovak independence was accomplished by Thomas Masaryk, the "father" of the Czechoslovak Republic. Much of his work, indeed, was accomplished in the United States, where, as an exile from tyranny and oppression, he not only persuaded the Allies of the righteousness of his cause, but he also learned the patterns and workings of democracy and determined to put them to work in his own republic.

The greatness of Masaryk's contribution is that he did succeed in establishing his nation as one of the foremost democracies in Europe.

One hundred and ten years have passed since Masaryk's birth, and 42 years have passed since his republic was established. Today, Czechoslovakia is no longer free. Soviet oppression has replaced the democracy which Masaryk struggled so valiantly to insure. But the memory of Thomas Masaryk lives on in the hearts of the people; they remember his teachings, and they remember the day when they lived in freedom. The people of Czechoslovakia are subjugated and oppressed, but they remain faithful to the heritage which Masaryk left them.

Yes, Peace and Friendship, but First Justice and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the peace and friendship campaign initiated and developed by Moscow has unfortunately caused too many of our fellow Americans to lose their bearings as concerns the nature, scope, and depth of the titanic world struggle. We are rapidly losing ground in the politico-psychological area of this struggle, which is the most essential and fundamental area. The concrete results of these losses are unquestionably in the making and in the future might well shock us even more than the Sputniks.

Those who rightly perceive and understand the present maneuvers of Moscow as instruments of the Russian cold war are now being slandered by Khrushchev as cold-war mongers. The simple fact is that the cold war is an established Russian institution and the deceptive peace and friendship campaign is only another phase of it.

This basic fact is well brought out in an address delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky at the recent 10th annual meeting of the All American Conference To Combat Communism, held in Columbus, Ohio. Dr. Dobriansky, who is a professor at Georgetown University and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, gives a background to this essential fact and presents some incisive cases of the empire-building methods employed by Khrushchev's czarist predecessors. Titled

"Yes, Peace and Friendship, But First Justice and Freedom," the address defines the cold war concept and shows the significance of the Captive Nations Week resolution passed by Congress in 1959.

Because of the lessons pointed out in this address and their striking pertinence to the forthcoming summit, I believe that every Member will find it of profitable reading, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD:

YES, PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP, BUT FIRST
JUSTICE AND FREEDOM

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Mr. Mayor, reverend clergy, and fellow cold war mongers. If you don't believe that, in a way, we are "cold war mongers," then I would urge that each of you read, if you haven't as yet, the speech that was given by Nikita the Sanguine to fellow Muscovites upon his return to Moscow after his trip to these United States. In that particular speech, there is a very illuminating paragraph. Mainly, it calls upon Muscovites, the Communists throughout the empire, and even upon many sources in the free world, including the United States, to detect the patriotic cold war mongers—the ones that, in behalf of the advance of freedom, would want to continue with the cold war, that show an avid interest in such real themes as protracted conflict—and to publicly expose them. And, not only that, but to publicly whip them. So, we are all exposed to them and we are all liable to be whipped.

It is a singular pleasure for me to be given this opportunity to speak before you on this occasion, the 10th annual meeting of the All American Conference to Combat Communism. Ten years, really, of sustained effort and work on the part of this conference have been due to the wonderful efforts of Dr. Dan Poling, Mr. "Tom" Sawyer, and numerous others in this audience. Their steadfast aim has been to keep the American public aware of the continued danger and threat that confronts these United States. And I think it is particularly significant, also, that we meet in, as the mayor has said, the great city of Columbus. The name itself indicates things that are associated with our interpretation and understanding of the protracted conflict: venturesomeness, courage, will, and the determination to see a thing through.

I hope that we won't ever see the day when recourse would have to be taken to methods that are being used in many parts of the Communist empire. I'm reminded of this incident that occurred at the American exhibit in Moscow this past summer. As you know, many Muscovites clamored to get in to see the numerous wares and goods at the American exhibit, and this elderly Russian who just managed to get through the crowd yelled out, "Thank God." At that moment a security captain came to her, nudged her and said, "Now, you don't say thank God. For this opportunity, if anything, you say, 'Thank Khrushchev.'" And she nodded meekly and went on. But apparently that disturbed her a bit. Later on, after having observed the exhibit, she met the same security officer, and said, "Well, all right, but what do I say when Khrushchev is dead?" And he looked about and said, "Well, then you say thank God."

RESURGENCE OF APPEASEMENT

Now, we fortunately don't have to use these methods. We have the blessed opportunity in this Nation of ours to examine this matter of protracted conflict. Dr. Poling, I think, has given an excellent review of the many contemporary events that have taken place. I would just like to add this, that about a year ago much of what he has related here had been confined pretty much to many a dark alley, and ever so often

would come to the surface. It can be said quite truthfully that since last January, especially since the Mikoyan visit to this country, many of these appeasement forces have been pressing on, and with increasing confidence. When one looks back over these months, one finds some openly stating that there are no slave labor camps today in the Soviet Union, others telling us that Khrushchev was simply appalled by the crimes committed by Stalin, as though Khrushchev had never committed a crime. As a matter of fact, it could be pointed out that only last month, a very reputable and famous Ukrainian patriotic leader, Stefan Bandera, was assassinated in Munich by Khrushchev's agents. And the pattern of his assassination conforms with the many examples under Stalin's rule.

At the same time we have numerous other Americans, in economics, in science, and in education, who are actually peddling, whether they are aware of it or not—advertently or inadvertently—the very things that Moscow would want them to peddle. Many of them are really doing Moscow's propaganda work at no cost to Khrushchev. And, in addition, when one looks at this period, the period of the spirit of Camp David which seems to mystify even our own press, Moscow is handsomely exploiting the occasion in the same way that it exploited, at the end of 1955 and into 1956, the spirit of Geneva. Indeed, when one looks at the record of events just in the past month, one finds, for example, that when we support an ally, a very trusted and faithful ally, such as Turkey, in the United Nations, we are condemned for violating the spirit of Camp David and blasted for attempting to protract this conflict, this cold war.

When we show concern for Laos, again representatives of the Soviet Union condemn us for continuing the cold war. And just the other day the free people of West Berlin were sternly warned not to establish a radio station of freedom because that, too, would be against the thawing of the cold war.

It is perfectly obvious that Moscow is manipulating and exploiting the so-called spirit of Camp David. Khrushchev has really so effectively administered tranquilizing cold war pills to major segments of our society that an increasing number of Americans aren't even aware of the great strides made by imperialist Moscow in this perilous phase of the permanent cold war. The singular victory of exacting an invitation to this country has in itself produced confusion and doubt in this country. It has entrenched the power of Khrushchev with new airs of respectability and legitimacy. It has depressed the freedom hopes of millions of patriots in Moscow's empire. It has impressed the newly independent nations with Moscow's inflated power, and it has also caused uneasiness among our most loyal allies situated about the periphery of the Communist empire.

DECEPTIVE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

This past summer we heard a great deal about peace and friendship. One of our officials used it at great length on a tour of the Soviet Union. However, before we uncritically accept this particular slogan we should look also at its significance, not only at this time but in the course of history. I would say: Yes, peace and friendship, but first, justice and freedom. The traditional Russian political slogan of "peace and friendship" has for centuries been used to seduce neighboring non-Russian nations into captivity. It is indicative of our lack of cold war insight and imagination that we fail to turn this slogan to our account in whatever sphere of human existence. Peace and friendship are and can only be the consequence of justice and freedom, not their cause. The harmony implied by peace and friendship is logically predicated on the dictates of justice and freedom. The Russians,

with typical deception, put the cart before the horse, and some of us are uncritically amenable to be taken for a ride in the cart. And this isn't the first time in the course of these past 40 years.

Now, it's not my purpose in this talk this morning to dwell on these transient events. Instead, what I would like to do is to develop three points. The first point is that the cold war is not new. It's not a new institution. It wasn't started in 1947, despite the fact that it first really began then to affect the United States. It wasn't even started in 1917. Historically and analytically, one could show Russia cold war techniques going as far back as the 16th century. The second point is that the development and refinement of these techniques have been linked with the expansion of an empire. These techniques have a tradition and, as I'll indicate with several cases, they have served to build an empire, with military power always kept in secondary reserve. And my third point is that unless we develop a perspective and an understanding of these techniques to see the whole background to what we now call protracted conflict or the cold war, we can only hope to make all sorts of transient shifts, makeshifts, executed in a haphazard and aimless manner, constantly reacting, if you will, to the perpetual initiative shown by the enemy. In such a case, we will find, I think, much to our surprise and also dismay, that military power will virtually be neutralized. Even superior military power, in such a case, could really prove to be of little avail. And in exposing ourselves in this way we truly risk an eventual hot war with greater probability of defeat.

FIVE U.S. ATTITUDES

In the United States at this time, there seem to be at least five dominant attitudes: (1) wishful cold war cessationism; (2) accommodation to Moscow's empire; (3) military hardware; (4) evolutionism; and (5) cold war realism.

The first, the wishful cessationists, erroneously believe that understanding and cultural exchange will secure peace. They argue as though the two did not prevail in far greater degree with regard to Nazi Germany prior to World War II. We had cultural exchange and a very close and intimate understanding with the German people prior to World War II and yet, these did not, or were not sufficient to avert the outbreak of a second world war. The plain fact is that the cold war is at Moscow's instigation and, contrary to what they now say, it certainly has never been at our instigation. Understanding and people-to-people programs are important, but if you begin to understand that the cultural exchange program in itself continues to be an instrument carefully manipulated and used by Moscow for its own benefits, then this could hardly produce that kind of understanding which presumably will pave the road to permanent peace.

The second group consists of the accommodationists. They never learn from historical experience that this form of appeasement only encourages the enemy to bolder ventures. We have many of them in this country, in official circles and outside. They'll say, "well, if we can only accommodate them. They've expanded far enough. We could make a deal with them. This is your sphere, and this is ours"—which is, curiously enough, the very thing that Khrushchev has been seeking and demanding. This certainly indicates a very deep naivete on the part of these individuals with regard to the cold war.

A third group is made up of the military hardwarists. These hardwarists obtusely ignore the forces of spirit, will, and ruse which, so often in the past, have undermined many a mighty fortress. In the armed forces there are those, of course, like Ad-

miral Burke, who recognize that actually the decision of tomorrow will not rest in the military, especially in the period of mutual deterrence, but, instead, in the area of the nonmilitary, the psychological, propaganda, or, what we properly call the cold war.

And then, fourthly, we have the evolutionists. Many, without declaring whether they are random or selective evolutionists, are equally wishfully that history will, for some inscrutable reason, be on our side. This position certainly stimulates a passivity, a wishful hoping that somehow there'll be a liberalizing process either through consumer goods, production, and the rest of it, followed eventually by an institutional blend. This, too, fails to recognize the nature of what we call the protracted conflict.

The fifth, the cold war realists, are guided by the evidence not only of today, of yesterday, or even of 40 years of Russian Communist conquests, but also of centuries of established Russian cold war techniques. The evidence precedes any act of hope.

THE COLD WAR CONCEPT

Now, in our government, and elsewhere, there is no firm general grasp of what a cold war means. Lacking a working concept, it is no wonder that there is scarcely any appreciation of its long background of methods and techniques. However, on the other hand, it is plainly comprehensible why we continue to operate in aimless, haphazard, makeshift and piecemeal fashion, incurring losses upon losses as we hobble along. The imposing irony of our current situation is that while Moscow carefully plans its cold war tactics and maneuvers in the broad context of its fixed cold war strategy and objectives—including even the lessening-of-tensions maneuver—we are engaged in no such cold war gaming and don't even possess the apparatus for it. In a hot war, we wouldn't think twice; we would instinctively create such an apparatus.

Yet, definitionally, a cold war is a twilight condition of neither peace nor hot war, where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. A cold war is really the very soul and spirit of a hot war, with the massive body of military conflict in secondary reserve. A cold war entails objectives. It entails all the techniques of ruse, of subversion, infiltration, cunning, treachery, plotting, fraud, bluster, blackmail, and indirect aggression. It includes every conceivable thing as an instrument—the psychological, the economic, the ideological, demographic, the political, scientific, educational. And it also allows for action on two levels: the level of official pretext, like Khrushchev coming here as head of State, and, second, the level of subofficial cold war operation, viz Khrushchev as the head of a world conspiracy.

Many of us rightly lean on the authority of Clausewitz to gain insight into the nature of the cold war. Lenin studied him closely and quoted him often. And Khrushchev, a professed Leninist, must see himself in the mirror of Clausewitz's words: "A conqueror is always a lover of peace; he would like to make his entry into our state unopposed." But few of us realize that Clausewitz gained his cold war knowledge in Russia's military service. With Russia's military position much weaker than Prussia's at the beginning of the 19th century and, yet, the Czar extending his domination over other nations, Clausewitz asked himself, "How could this be?" He entered Russia's military service to obtain the answers, in order to save his own Prussia. When he returned in 1814, he rejoined the Prussian Army and in 1818 was already Commandant of the General War School in Berlin. Lenin studied him and many of us turn to Clausewitz to gain insights into the nature of the cold war.

TRADITIONAL RUSSIAN COLD WAR

In essence, the cold war methods employed by Khrushchev today are no different than those developed by Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and other Russian tyrants. In looking at these techniques, one has to bear in mind a traditional and institutional nexus, the nexus between internal, totalitarian tyranny and external, imperialist expansionism. The two have always worked hand in hand, one feeding upon the other, in the past as well as in the present. Substantially, the techniques have not changed. In content, by virtue of technological changes over the centuries, and especially in the recent period, you've had changes, of course. But I'm speaking of methods in substance. After all, on the substantial basis of these methods a tremendous empire had been built and still continues in existence today.

The methods are in substance psychological, propagandistic, political, and of numerous other veins that I'll cite in a moment to make my point. The military, on the other hand, has always been kept in reserve, marching in, if you will, at the climax to a situation. There is a work by which many of us could profit immensely. A work written by a French cultural traveler in the czarist empire, the Marquis de Custine, "Journey for Our Time," published by Pellegrini & Cudahy, New York, 1951, provides the diary notes of de Custine in the Russian Empire of 1839. Their timeliness will amaze you. With changes for a few characters, you would believe that he is describing the present Russian situation. He says, for example, in one place: "I try to analyze the moral life of the inhabitants of Russia. The Russian thinks and lives as a soldier * * * a conquering soldier" (p. 150). In another passage, which is very appropriate to the Khrushchev exchange visits and the hospitality involved, he says, "Once again I say, everything is deception in Russia, and the gracious hospitality of the czar, gathering together in his palace his serfs and the serfs of his courtiers, is only one more mockery" (p. 149). In this work, you will find many precious observations concerning the period of that time, only to relate them to the present with little difficulty, to say the least.

The cold war methods we want to observe for every century, since the 16th—the methods of ruse, subversion, infiltration, indirect aggression, fraud, bluster, blackmail—were adroitly employed to build up an unprecedented empire. The tyrants of the past left a wealthy legacy of cold war techniques for the Russian Communists, including Nikita the Sanguine. By these methods, the contemporary tyrants of Moscow have extended the empire and are now threatening the independence of our own Nation. The spurious ideologies of the Third Rome and Pan-Slavism were used in the same deceptive way that the mythical ideology of communism is manipulated today. It would do well for our people to learn more of the growth of the Russian Empire, both past and present, than to learn the Russian language. Such learning would reveal the secrets of empire-building, which are the cold war techniques. Frontal military aggression was always secondary.

RUSSIAN COLD WAR CASES

Now, let me just quickly review this for you, taking one case in each century. In the case of Basil III and Ivan the Terrible, the groundwork for the swift expansion of Muscovy was laid in the 16th century. The starting point was 1519; the target and victim was Kazan, the citadel of the great Golden Horde. And for 33 years Moscow worked at it in peaceful coexistence, using infiltration, subversion, and intervening support, as it does now, for a contender (Shah Ali) against the possessor of the throne. Finally, in October 1552, the Mus-

covite forces simply walked in when Kazan itself was so weak that it couldn't even defend itself.

There's a definite similarity here between this technique and the one employed by Khrushchev in connection, let us say, with the Middle East. Khrushchev first builds up a man—Nasser—and hopes that through Nasser he would be able to neutralize the area and thus exclude the influences of the United States, Britain, and others. Then, later, he builds up a contender in the area in order to provide the contention and the clash that would lead to division and chaos. Ultimately, the area drops into the lap of Moscow.

In our first case, 4 years later in 1556, by the same techniques and support of the contender Derbish Ali, Moscow managed to take over Astrakhan. The entire area of Siberia and also the Middle East, at that time, was made open to further aggression.

Take a representative case in the 17th century. This case, I believe, is very appropriate. For 4 years ago—many of you might not have been aware of it—in the Soviet Union and throughout the Communist empire, a whole year of celebration was conducted in observance of the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654. Theses were produced, and these had to be taught and learned in Communist cells throughout the Soviet Union and also in the so-called satellite states. And what were they doing? They were glorifying the alleged union of two Slav nations, namely, Russia and Ukraine. One not knowing the history of the Pereyaslav Treaty would certainly not be in a position to evaluate the reason why, in 1954, a 300th anniversary of this event was put on. Of what significance, of what value to Moscow was there in putting on such a gala event throughout the empire?

Well, the fact is that Moscow twisted the meaning of the treaty to show today an indissoluble union between these two nations, in ostensible effect the basis for the present empire. Yet, historical facts show that when the treaty was consummated in 1654, it was only a military alliance, a mutual security pact, between Muscovy and Ukraine against hostile Polish or Turkish forces. In 4 years, that pact was violated by Moscow. We speak of treaties being violated by Moscow in our day. I could even add to the recent list of Russian violations issued by our own conference, going as far back as December, 1917, particularly in Russo-Ukrainian relations. When one looks at the history of the growth of this empire, he finds the same gross violations. Let me just cite this to you. In 1559, a war took place—an inevitable war—between Ukraine and Muscovy. Hetman Vyhovsky, who was the head of the Ukrainian forces, declared: "The treacherous action of Moscow was apparent in preparing for us a slavery primarily by means of instigating a civil war in Ukraine." How many instances do we know of instigated civil wars, many that are currently going on, indirectly if you will, in Laos and numerous other places. Again, a precedent, if you will, for the present.

Let's now look into the case of Poland in the 18th century. We know of the Polish partitions. But how many of us know, for example, the operation of the Russian "Smiling Mike" of that day. The Russian Ambassador Repnin, in Warsaw, employed the religious issue of Orthodoxy to divide the Catholics against the Orthodox in Poland until, finally, he managed successfully to bring about the first partition in 1772. Immediately thereafter, his successor, Ambassador Steckelberg, operated just as Vishinsky had in 1940 when he entered Latvia and by ultimatum "legalized" the situation. Steckelberg had the Polish Sejm "legalize" the first partition. Then, in 1793, with the second partition, a new issue was infused, 50 years before Marx even made his name.

Discord was sown between the social classes of the boyars and the peasants. Old techniques are these, no matter how you attempt to grace them and really change them.

Another interesting case, for example, was that preparatory to the conquest of Georgia. From 1768 on Russia was at war with Turkey and allied itself with Georgia. In this case, Catherine the Great placed the Russian forces in agreement with the Georgians to thwart the Turks. On the eve of battle, the Russian forces withdrew, leaving the Georgians exposed. A century or more later, an agreement between the Polish underground and Moscow's forces was consummated to destroy the Nazis in Warsaw. The agreement designated a certain time of uprising, to wage together a war against the common enemy, only to be deceitfully broken by Moscow.

As one goes through these cases, one cannot help but be impressed by the techniques that have been used to build up an empire, least of all that of frontal military assault. I could give numerous other examples. I am reminded of the case in Persia toward the close of the 19th century because of the operations of Moscow surrounding Iran today. Some of you might have noticed on the economic level where Moscow is offering Iran 85 percent of the oil profits. The highest is about 60-65 percent in mutual engagement for oil exploitation in the Middle East. Moscow is even willing to build dams and numerous other things, so long as Iran refuses to set up any missile bases.

In the 1880's, the Russian Ambassador in Persia played a very instrumental role that led to the bombing of the parliament, to the abdication of the Shah, and the withdrawal of the constitution. The division of the country between the Russians and the British soon followed.

A repetition of such division occurred in Iran in the 1940's. The old borderland's policy of using non-Russian peoples within the Russian Empire against adjoining territories is a standard one for Moscow. Just as it is attempting to use the Kurds in Iraq and elsewhere, so with the Azerbaijanis to divide Iran. Again, old techniques, and even in this century, many of us don't realize what transpired immediately prior to World War I, and then in that very fateful period of 1917-20. In this post-war period, many of the so-called republics in the Soviet Union today, were independent states. Georgia entered into a mutual security pact with Soviet Russia. Ukraine was promised that its sovereignty would be respected. One by one, through infiltration, subversion, and ideological deception, they were raped and have been kept in a submerged state within the Soviet Union.

KHRUSHCHEV AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

The passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution this past summer disclosed two indisputable facts: one, the sensitivity of Moscow about the weakest and yet most vital nerve in its empire and, two, the lack of understanding in many sections of our Nation with regard to the significance and content of this resolution. Khrushchev's rantings against the resolution last July and, again, in his Foreign Affairs article released last August, and once again, at the end of October before the Supreme Soviet, clearly demonstrated how deeply the resolution penetrated Moscow's cold war armour. Khrushchev fears this resolution more than anything else. And the reason for this is that the resolution is fraught with enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities.

For the first time, our Government has taken official cognizance of the majority of captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself. Without the captive Baltic nations, Ukraine, the Caucasian nations, Turkestan, and others mentioned in

the resolution, Russia, with its 100 million population and its own resources, could hardly be called—as the Moscow propaganda machine now does—"the greatest power in the world." It would be no more comparable in power to the United States than a reunited Germany would be. A cold war development of this crucial weakness in the synthetic state known as the Soviet Union would seriously deflate all the bluster, bluff and sham of Moscow's economic prowess, military might, scientific achievements and cultural attainments. Parasitic growth on the basis of captive resources is not exactly alluring in propaganda or otherwise. Khrushchev has the vision to see this and thus continues to bellow against this resolution. Unfortunately, the possibilities inherent in the resolution escape most of us.

The low level of our understanding about the Soviet Union and its ersatz political character was shown at the time of the resolution's passage. Many reporters and writers inquired to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia are located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. What can one expect when on the highest levels of our Government, the U.S.S.R. is referred to as "the Soviet Nation" and the different nations within the Soviet Union are arbitrarily and somewhat insultingly called "the Soviet people" or the "Soviets." Aside from the historical and demographic untruths of these usages, the suggestion of a united, integrated and monolithic power in the U.S.S.R. is not even intelligent from a cold war point of view. Our many economic, military, scientific and other comparisons between the U.S.S.R. and the United States are drawn on false premises. The U.S.S.R., in essence an empire within an empire, is not at all qualitatively comparable to the United States which is a nation-state.

In short, if you don't know the nature of your opponent, how could you expect to convert his weaknesses into real vulnerabilities? We are like the fighter entering the ring with an obscurantist disregard of the information given him that his opponent has several loosely patched-up broken ribs. More, like him, we even refuse to test it. Khrushchev fears such a test and virtually paralyzes some of us with his coexistence or coexistence propaganda, while at the same time his cold war activities continue undiminished in every quarter of the globe. And these activities include every conceivable instrument—political, diplomatic, psychological, demographic, economic, cultural, scientific, military.

If we are not to be cornered into a hot war, we must face up to the realities of the cold war. An unparalleled empire was built up over 500 years by cold war techniques. With modern technology and communications, it could expand in short time. A sound basis for necessary cold war gaming is provided in the Captive Nations Week resolution. With an indispensable apparatus, such as a Freedom Commission, the possibilities suggested by the resolution could be developed peaceably and victoriously in the name of justice and freedom first. The captive nations throughout the Communist empire, and particularly in the Soviet Union, constitute our most powerful weapon in this period of mutual deterrence.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY, 1960-76

In conclusion, I would just like to point out that we are really on the eve of an important decade and a half. Next year, 1960, we will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the presidency of the Great Emancipator. As he stated, no nation can be half slave and half free. With the global, international significance of our daily doings today, we can paraphrase that and say the world certainly can't be half free and half

slave. But we must also look to 1976, the period of the 200th anniversary of our own Declaration of Independence. It seems to me that in these 16 years, we face a period of moral and political rededication to show the tremendous will and the stubborn patriotism of the American people, not the old age that Khrushchev ascribes to us now. It is a period for us to prepare for the many challenges that will certainly present themselves.

In terms of our own moral and political principles, as enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights—not to speak of the importance of preserving our own national independence—we have a global field for the most successful endeavor, provided we are able to express these principles adroitly, skillfully, and in a peaceful manner. The entire Communist empire, including even the Russian people, is ripe for the spirited drive of independence. For the Russians, independence from centuries of tyranny, oppression, and slavery. For the non-Russian nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, national independence and freedom. These objectives constitute a tremendous opportunity for America, and with the proper kind of rededication, we can then begin to implement the means whereby we can seize this opportunity. No team, on any football field, has ever won a game playing on its own side of the 50-yard line. We've been doing that now for over a decade. It is not a winning proposition and there are many avenues—many feasible avenues—for this kind of pressure for freedom. As it was once said, *si vis pacem para bellum*—if you wish peace, prepare for war. And the war we have to prepare for in the case of Russia, is primarily a cold war.

Special Assistance Health Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF EUGENE P. CAMPBELL, M.D., DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PUBLIC HEALTH, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, ON SPECIAL ASSISTANCE HEALTH PROGRAMS, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

I. MALARIA ERADICATION

The proposal for the fiscal year 1961 worldwide malaria eradication program is shown in detail in the "Congressional Presentation Book" (nonregional program). It is proposed that \$38 million of special assistance funds be utilized for U.S. assistance during the fourth year of the malaria eradication program. This amount of U.S. assistance is necessary if the program is to proceed without unnecessary delays.

1. By the end of 1959, 414,404,000 people were being protected against malaria in the 25 countries which the United States was assisting bilaterally in the program. Of particular interest is the success of the program in Taiwan. No new case of malaria was discovered in that country in 1959. It appears that Taiwan will be the first country in Asia to complete eradication of the disease.

2. Certain problems have been encountered which tend to delay the development of the eradication campaign in some countries. For example, in countries such as

India, Indonesia, and Brazil, the magnitude of the operation coupled with political, administrative, and financial problems make it necessary to proceed by stages, progressively covering the malarious areas.

3. At the request of ICA an expert panel of internationally known American technical experts in the field of malariology is now studying the worldwide malaria eradication program, with particular reference to participation of the United States. Their preliminary findings definitely show that, even considering all the problems, malaria can and is being eradicated. Furthermore, real progress is being made, and momentum achieved, during these initial years of concentrated worldwide effort which began in fiscal year 1958. These results have come as a direct consequence of substantial assistance and participation by the United States. By fiscal year 1963 the goal of eradication will be much closer to realization.

4. Funding of the overall program for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 and estimated funding for fiscal years 1960-62 is shown in table 4 [not printed in RECORD]. It should be noted that governments having malaria are paying approximately one-half of the total cost of eradication.

The malaria eradication program is well underway, and there is every indication that the eradication of malaria can be achieved. Success, however, will depend upon continued U.S. support of the program at the requested funding level.

II. COMMUNITY WATER-SUPPLY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The community water-supply development program was authorized by the 1st session of the 86th Congress. It provides U.S. support and leadership in a coordinated effort directed toward the control of diarrheal diseases, the most destructive remaining communicable disease in most underdeveloped countries. This will be accomplished through the stimulation of nationwide water-supply programs. The United States is assisting cooperating countries to develop or strengthen business-type self-sustaining institutions which will plan and aid financing, construction, and management of water-supply systems at the community level.

This is a program which admirably meets mutual security criteria.

1. In terms of feasibility it ranks very high. Community water supplies are popular with cooperating country officials and with the people.

2. Water is not only the key factor in the control of diarrheal diseases but contributes substantially to the reduction of lice, scabies, and filth among population groups.

3. For economic progress safe, potable water is essential to the health and increased efficiency of the labor force and to the establishment and growth of industry.

4. The program is conceived on the basis of maximum utilization of community resources to supply potable water to their people, thus reducing the drain on state and national governments.

5. Perhaps most important of all, this is a positive program which is self-sustaining and self-generating. It has a cumulative and compounding effect on the health, social and economic development of the local community and the nation.

In the short time since the program was approved implementation has been going on at a rapid pace. As planned, the activity is concentrated in assisting the cooperating governments, including their local and community authorities, to develop the technical, professional and institutional means to supply potable water to their citizens on a businesslike basis. This is a coordinated program in which multilateral agencies, WHO and PAHO, and ICA are cooperating.

The development of water supply institutions in the cooperating countries will be one of the first and most important activi-

ties in the order of priorities. Well conceived and properly organized they will have a long and lasting effect. Many countries have already taken important initial steps in planning these institutions. Requests for assistance in furthering this effort have come from Ecuador, Peru, Costa Rica, Ceylon, and Korea. Several others including Yugoslavia, India, Jamaica, and Brazil have requested assistance in other closely related aspects of institution building. Modest grants of assistance have been made to Peru and Ecuador while several others are in preparation. A team of expert consultants is presently in India with others definitely planned for Ceylon and Yugoslavia.

Training and education to develop and upgrade personnel to staff the evolving institutions must progress simultaneously. During the past year both ICA and WHO/PAHO have sponsored special training courses and seminars. These will be expanded in all areas of the world. A special course in ground water development for public water supplies was given at the University of Minnesota for 45 students from 22 countries. This will be repeated again during the university summer session of 1960. Later on this year the course will be offered in Latin America and in one other area, possibly the Middle East. One special seminar for Mediterranean countries was held in Amalfi, Italy, in December under sponsorship of WHO and attended by ICA engineers. Others are planned for the Far East later this year with ICA collaboration.

A special course in waterworks management for engineers is scheduled for April 1960, and others tentatively scheduled for Central and South America and for the Far East later in the year. WHO and PAHO have played a leading role in promoting management training with close cooperation of ICA. The bilateral programs will become increasingly active as this type of training begins to be organized within countries.

The coming months and years will be marked by a growing volume of expert consultation assistance in all phases of community water supply development—planning, organization, financing, design, construction, operation, and management.

The matter of special investigation, research, and development is receiving increased attention. While a great deal of effort is placed on this phase of water supply in the United States, very little has been done on the problems in less developed countries.

Spot investigations in Puerto Rico and Costa Rica have given promise of important economic cause and effect relationships directly associated with water supplies. Negotiations are underway with Northwestern University to investigate this area more intensively.

Plans are in progress to study specific problems with cooperating countries in the field. In Brazil one of their institutions is being approached to investigate, under field conditions, various methods of assessing shallow ground water with simple, inexpensive equipment.

A survey is underway in about 55 countries to determine the amount and type of water supply equipment and materials being produced.

It is proposed that \$2.1 million be used in this program for fiscal year 1961, broken down according to the table in the presentation.

III. INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH

The purpose of this proposal is to assist the World Health Organization to develop a program of research in international health matters of interest to its 90 members.

The United States made a \$300,000 contribution in fiscal year 1959 to initiate a study, \$500,000 in 1960 to take the first step in this direction, and it is proposed to contribute \$500,000 in fiscal year 1961.

A partial list of elements in this program is: (1) Standardization of nomenclature, drugs, and techniques of examination; (2) epidemiologic studies of a variety of diseases of vital interest to all countries; (3) training of scientists; and (4) development of international reference centers for tumors. To date progress has been made in all four areas.

WHO has proposed a research program for 1961 which would cost \$2.7 million. Of these funds the Director General has requested the Assembly to appropriate \$750,000 from the regular budget, the remainder to be raised by voluntary contributions to the special account for research. The United States proposes that \$500,000 of mutual security funds be contributed to the special account.

The Director General of WHO proposes the following allocation of funds for research: 50 percent for communicable diseases research; 30 percent for cancer, heart disease, and nutrition research; 5 percent for human radiation studies; 8 percent for planning for additional research; 7 percent for central administration in WHO.

Soviet Rule in Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was sent to me by Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Rumanians, calling attention to the fact that this past March 6 marked the 15th anniversary of Soviet Russia's takeover of Rumania. I am sure all of us who love freedom hope and pray that the day will come when freedom will be restored to the courageous people of Rumania who have suffered such terrible oppression during the past 15 years.

The letter follows:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE RUMANIANS,

New York, N.Y., March 2, 1960.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
U.S. Representative from Michigan.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Fifteen years will have elapsed this March 6 since the imposing, through a military terroristic diktat, of the Soviet rule in Rumania. We believe that mention should be made in Congress of these years of terrible oppression and deprivation of liberty.

We appeal to you, as the enlightened and courageous defender of the cause of enslaved Eastern Europe. Anything you can say on this sad occasion will be deeply appreciated by Rumanians everywhere. According to our information, the personal expression of interest and sympathy from Members of Congress for the plight of the enslaved, is doing much to balance the demoralizing effect in the subjugated countries of the western policy of collaboration and amity with their Communist oppressors.

The seizure of power in Rumania by the Soviets, in defiance of an armistice convention and at a moment when the Rumanian armed forces were cooperating with the Allies on the front, is undoubtedly one of the high points of Soviet double crossing. This was done in the presence of American and British control commissions. The United States and Britain were obliged in the face of this flagrant treachery, to protest, the protests were ignored and a demand of President Truman for free elec-

tions cynically rejected. Unfortunately, the objections of the western allies were merely pro forma, they recognized the Soviet stooge government in Rumania and signed with it a peace treaty.

By this treaty, in which the Rumanian people had no part, the Russians dismembered the Rumanian national territory of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina, incorporating them, with Western approval, in the so-called U.S.S.R. Moldovan Republic. The Rumanian ethnic majority of this pseudo-Russian province has since been subjected to systematic persecutions, among which stands out deportations to Kazakhstan. Regarding the rest of Rumania this treaty was violated from its inception by the Soviet agents in charge of the stooge government in Bucharest.

The greatest forced-labor camp in occupied Europe—the Danube Black Sea Canal—together with tens of smaller ones, were organized, deportations and political liquidation were ruthlessly used as a means to break down national resistance; Rumania became, as a French reporter put it, “the most impenetrable and oppressed country behind the Iron Curtain.” But in spite of all this the people remained unalterably anti-Communist and, a worse crime, pro-American.

The country was economically bled white by the Russians, who used it also for military bases. It should be recalled in this respect that the military clauses of the peace treaty signed by the United States, were continuously violated by the Moscow stooges, who contemptuously made a mockery of the protests of the combined United States-United Nations and World Court mighty juridical forces. But strangely enough this mockery did not deter the Western tactics of appeasing communism at any price. The unrepresentative, treaty, and international law violating Soviet stooge government at Rumania was elected as a member of the United Nations in 1955.

Hardly had this government been accepted in the United Nations, when in 1956 they lied to the General Assembly by assuring it that they had given political asylum to Imre Nagy with full guarantees for his safety and well-being. This same stooge government then promptly delivered Nagy to be executed by their bosses, the Soviets.

At the present moment, besides the “cultural relations” with such a regime, the United States and her allies are engaged in discussions in Geneva (the conference will start on March 15) on disarmament, with the apparent intention of reaching bonafide agreements. It is obvious that this sequence of events has deeply demoralized friends of the United States in Rumania and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, if a harmonious and brotherly understanding, real cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States could be achieved, the sacrificing of the sacred rights to life and liberty of millions of people might have some meaning, but if, in view of all past and present experiences, this is merely an utopian pipedream of incurable appeasers, then the present actual disregard for the will of the people in these sacrificed nations will constitute not only a moral disgrace but a substantial political loss for the United States.

After the West's inaction in the Hungarian uprising, a committee of Congress said that this lack of action was “the lost opportunity of our generation.” This opportunity, although lost, can be redeemed at the summit meeting with Khrushchev if the West are not frightened or ashamed to take the defense of freedom.

Please accept again our warm gratitude for your constant sympathy and support.

I remain yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,

President.

Ionia Campaigns for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the publication the Great Lakelands which has to do with a fine city in my congressional district. The story this article tells of this community's efforts to better itself is truly inspiring.

The article follows:

IONIA CAMPAIGNS FOR PROGRESS

(By Carl Martens)

Looking ahead to the future, Ionia, Mich., is in the throes of a program, which is, it is believed, will insure that the community will not be left in the economic backwaters of tomorrow.

With an eye to recent predictions which indicate that the next decade will bring unprecedented growth to the Great Lakes region, the people of this small community are seeking real industrial and business development.

They are doing it by saying to industry, “Tell us your problems, and let us see if we can help you.” This helpful attitude has benefited existing industry. In the same manner, Ionia folks are willing to more than go out of their way to be helpful to a new industry, realizing that prosperous industry is a real benefit to the area.

Geographically, Ionia has much to offer, for it is in the heart of a rapidly developing industrial area. The county seat of Ionia county, the city is located about midway between Grand Rapids and Lansing in the scenic Grand River Valley.

Ionia has two very active railroads, the Grand Trunk and C. & O. Two State highway trunklines, M-21 and M-66, pass through the city, providing north-south and east-west access. The new Detroit-Muskegon expressway passes through the county only 6 miles south of Ionia, putting Ionia folks only minutes away from Grand Rapids and Lansing.

Ionia's excellent educational system was one of the first public school systems in the State. The first public school was founded in 1835 by W. B. Lincoln, a distant relative of Abraham Lincoln. The year of 1871 saw the first class graduate from Ionia High School. In the 1959-60 school year, the official enrollment of the Ionia public schools was 2,356 pupils. The district provides high school service to an area some 15 miles long and 6 to 9 miles wide. The district is currently in a building program which will add a new 400-pupil elementary school to the already existing high school, gymnasium, shop building, and two elementary schools.

Despite continually improving the school buildings, and adding several, the district has been able to operate on a total tax rate (including debt service for buildings) of less than 13 mills on the State equalized valuation of over \$21 million. Academically, the public school system is rated high, having accreditation from the University of Michigan and North Central Association.

Supplementing the public schools are three excellent parochial systems. The Catholic schools consist of both grade and high school, and a new \$200,000 addition is now in progress. The Lutheran church operates a new \$150,000 elementary school, while the Adventist church has a new modern building.

Ionia is the site of the Ionia State Hospital, the Michigan Reformatory, and the Medium Security Correctional Institution. Dr. Perry C. Robertson has been Medical superintendent of Ionia State Hospital since 1915. He has pioneered many of the treatments used for the sick over the years of administration. He has done a very commendable job for the institution and is a highly respected citizen of Ionia.

Michigan Reformatory has 1,500 inmates. Present Warden George Kropp has proven himself a very efficient man. Dr. Gerritt Heyns, the former warden was distinguished in the field of penology and is at the present time in charge of all corrective institutions in Washington State.

The Medium Security Correctional Institution has schools from elementary on through high school. Citizens of Ionia sincerely believe that this will help many a boy find his way back to becoming a respectable citizen again.

The three institutions employ a total of 850 people throughout the year, which is a valuable asset to the business stability of Ionia. Ionia is accustomed to the idea of helping the less fortunate find their way back to society. As a leading citizen put it, "There is not so much difference between those boys and you and me, only we had breaks in life which many of those boys did not have."

There are 13 well-attended churches of various denominations. Recent improvements and additions to existing facilities, place Ionia's churches among the finest to be found anywhere in a community of this size. Strong emphasis has been placed by many of the churches on religious education and training.

The Ionia Free Fair, with Allan M. Williams as secretary-manager, is Michigan's greatest annual outdoor event. The 6-day event attracts an estimated 450,000 spectators to the spacious grounds. Midway shows and rides, free agricultural and industrial exhibits, and an outstanding evening grandstand program delight the crowds. It is the largest fair in the world to feature a free gate. Many attractive, well cared for buildings house its various departments, and blend well into the beautiful, park-like setting on the banks of the Grand River. During its annual run, fair spectators thrill to auto racing, harness racing, tractor, and horsepulling contests. During its more than 45 years of existence, the Ionia Free Fair has risen to rank among the top fairs in the country.

The rich farming territory surrounding Ionia is recognized as an important asset to the overall prosperity of the community, balancing the existing business and industry. Long known as one of the richest agricultural counties in Michigan, Ionia County farmers plant and till over 55,000 acres of corn, 38,000 acres of hay, 30,000 acres of wheat, and 28,000 acres of oats. The dairy industry, however, actually proves to be the largest single source of farm income in Ionia County. In addition to this, beef cattle production on Ionia County farms has taken on new importance. Fruit production in the northern part of the county has steadily increased, and has led to the creation of some of the largest and most modern fruit storage facilities to be found. Farming in Ionia County is a \$12 million a year business.

Ionia's \$500,000 water project, which was completed this last year, gives it one of the best water systems for a city of this size. At present it has a productive capacity of about 5 million gallons daily. This can be readily increased simply through the addition of larger pumping facilities. The newly-improved municipal system includes automatic pumping stations, which are connected at all times with the 1,500,000 gallon storage system, thus assuring an adequate supply for all emergencies. The city's efficient, well-

trained, full-time fire department, plus the new water system, has led to an unusual distinction for the city. It is probably the only community of its size to have a class 6 rating for fire insurance purposes.

The Ionia County Airport, located 3 miles to the south, is well rated and permits private, and some commercial air service, operations throughout the year. A new improvement to the facility was the recent hard-surfacing of the main east-west runway. It is anticipated that additional improvements will be made as the need dictates.

Ionia's largest industry is the Ionia Manufacturing Co., a division of the Mitchell-Bentley Corp. This concern is the largest independent producer of station wagon bodies in the world. They custom produce special bodies, make automotive stampings and trim, produce specific items of metal office equipment, and have excellent engineering facilities working on many and varied products. About 2,000 people are employed by the company.

The Brown Corp. of Ionia, with some 100 employees, produces metal stampings and fabrications for automotive parts.

The Peschke Packing Co. produces and distributes an outstanding line of processed meat items, while the Runciman Milling Co., is noted for the fine quality of flour and other allied items it manufactures in its modern plant.

Other important names on the industrial roll of the community include Ionia Bottling Co., Specialty Block Co., Clore & Co., Grand Valley Chair Co., Ash, Inc., Ionia Concrete Products, Trojan Athletic Wear Co., Ionia Tool & Die, and American Venetian Blind Manufacturing Co.

Ionia is blessed with four beautiful parks suitable for reunions and family recreation. Allen Williams, former highway engineer was the originator of the idea of the natural park development of Bertha Brock Park, located 3 miles west of the city. The park consists of 237 acres of hills, valleys and beautiful scenery. It has 40 scenic areas for picnic tables which will seat 8 to 135 people to a location for a total seating capacity of 1,700.

An artificial lake is being developed in the park which will provide ice skating, swimming, and help enhance the natural recreational benefits.

Adjacent to the park, supervised and maintained by The Ionia County Hunting & Fishing Club, are several added attractions. A modern lodge located on a hill overlooking the park, is capable of accommodating upward of 200 people at a time. There is a target practice range in the basement of the lodge, an archery range on the grounds, and a long toboggan run.

Ionia has an excellent radio station, WION, a very good daily and a widely circulated weekly paper—which is rather unusual for a city of its size. The development of parking sites in the downtown area through property purchases has had the active interest and support of the city officials. Many new parking lots have been opened.

South Ionia, a suburban area developed in recent years, is an attractive little village with about 15 business places and scores of new homes. "Service With Satisfaction," seems to be the motto of the neighborly community.

Ionia has set aside hundreds of acres of choice sites for new industry and is ready to assist anyone seeking a new location. Contact may be made with the Ionia Economic Development Commission or the chamber of commerce, both of which are active organizations designed to help improve the economic growth and well-being of the community.

A very cooperative relationship exists between Ionia's management and labor, which

signifies that both parties have benefited from communications, industrial relations programs and a general understanding of the benefits of teamwork.

Ionia has a new 75-bed hospital, modern in every detail, which answers well, the needs of the county. The hospital also provides employment for about 130 people.

The civic-minded people of Ionia are dedicated to the constant improvement of the city. This is evidenced by the fact that well over 80 percent of Ionia homes are owner-occupied, and by the many building improvements which make Ionia's business and residential areas among the most attractive to be found.

Ionia is a friendly city, perhaps because of its 47 civic clubs and fraternal organizations, which function for the benefit of all.

Law of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have appeared in the well of this House on numerous occasions to point out the threat to American fishermen of a proposal to be discussed at the second United Nations-sponsored Conference on the Law of the Sea to be held March 17, 1960, in Geneva.

Here is an Associated Press dispatch from Canada which appeared recently in many newspapers in this country. It tells the story of what the Canadians have in mind.

The Pacific coast fishing industry has a right to expect that our American delegation will not support any international agreement which would deprive Americans of long-established rights.

This newspaper story appeared in the Seattle Times:

CANADA HOPES TO END U.S. FISHING RIGHTS—
SAYS CABINET MEMBER

OTTAWA, March 4.—Canada is pushing for a territorial-limit proposal which would deprive the United States of its historic fishing rights off the Canadian coasts, External Affairs Minister Howard Green said yesterday.

Green told the Commons External Affairs Committee he is hopeful the plan will be approved at the Conference on Law of the Sea, opening in Geneva about 2 weeks.

The Canadian proposal calls for a 6-mile territorial limit, plus another 6 miles for exclusive fishing rights for the coastal state.

Green said that if this proposal is adopted, historic fishing rights enjoyed by the United States and some other countries will be wiped out.

Green said the chances for success of the Canadian proposal depend on the willingness of the countries concerned to be flexible and move toward compromise.

If inflexible positions are taken, the prospects for success will be considerably reduced.

The minister added that, if agreement cannot be reached now, it probably will be a long time before another attempt can be made. This would mean chaos, he said.

Green said there has been no indication of support from Britain, which has been ignoring Iceland's unilateral claim to a 12-mile fishing limit.

Santa Fe Springs, Calif., All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, March 12, 1960, the city of Santa Fe Springs, Calif., will receive the All America City Award. I am extremely proud to be able to represent in the Congress of the United States such a progressive and modern community as Santa Fe Springs.

I wish to congratulate all of the officials and citizens of this fine city. It is very seldom such a young city is chosen to receive such a significant award. I believe the citizens of Santa Fe Springs richly deserve all of the praise and recognition they are receiving. I am sure the citizens of Santa Fe Springs feel the many hours of work and the many sacrifices that went into making this project a reality have now been justified.

The All America City Award is to be presented to the city of Santa Fe Springs, Calif., by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. The awards are given each year to 11 U.S. cities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on Government impaneled by the league. Santa Fe Springs is the youngest city to receive this coveted recognition in the 11 years the awards have been made. Santa Fe Springs is just 2½ years old.

Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, who served as jury foreman of the distinguished award jury, said:

Santa Fe Springs' award was based on its efficiency in government and progressive city administration accomplished through alert continuing citizen participation.

Four students from Santa Fe Springs high schools, accompanied by a local delegation, made the presentation of the city's history to the All America City jury in Springfield, Mass., last November. Taking part in the oral presentation to the judges were Steve Dickinson, Barney Martinez, and Kathleen Burton of Santa Fe High School, and Penny Yapelli of St. Paul High School. It was the first time in the history of the National Municipal League that youth had taken part in the All America City competition.

Just under 100 cities were considered. Their entries were screened by a committee of experts in community and government affairs. The field was narrowed to 22 finalists, who then presented their cases orally to the jury of experts, headed by Dr. Gallup. Santa Fe Springs, Calif., the youngest city ever to be selected, was chosen from the finalists to receive this outstanding honor.

I include herewith articles from the Santa Fe Springs Independent and the Los Angeles Examiner. Also an expert from the Look magazine story reporting on the award to this All America City—Santa Fe Springs, Calif.:

[From the Santa Fe Springs Independent]

CIVIC PARTICIPATION SEEN KEY TO VICTORY

Santa Fe Springs is an All America City. The announcement came this week from Dr. George Gallup, who was chairman of the All America Cities Award jury. Only other California city to win the award is Vallejo.

Other western cities honored as 1 of 11 All America Cities for 1960 are Lamar, Colo., and Seattle, Wash. About 100 cities competed in this year's contest, sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

According to Look magazine, the 11 cities were chosen on the basis of citizen action in pressing for needed improvements and backing major community programs.

FOUR STUDENTS

The winning cities will be described in the March 1 issue of Look, which will be on the newstands February 16. This 2½-year-old community is the youngest ever to be honored in the annual competition.

Four students from Santa Fe Springs high schools, accompanied by a local delegation, made the presentation of the city's history to the All America City jury in Springfield, Mass., last November.

Taking part in the 10-minute oral presentation to the judges were Steve Dickinson, Barney Martinez, and Kathleen Burton, of Santa Fe High School, and Penny Yapelli, of St. Paul High.

OTHER WINNERS

It was the first time in the history of the National Municipal League that youth had taken part in the All America City competition.

Announcement of Santa Fe Springs' achievement will also be published in the National Civic Review and Western Cities magazine. Other cities named "All America" were Alton, Ill., De Soto, Mo., East St. Louis, Ill., Fargo, N. Dak., Norfolk, Va., San Juan, Puerto Rico, and Winston-Salem, N.C.

Aside from the presentation by the youngsters, observers feel that the role played by Santa Fe Springs residents in community projects helped most to bring home the award. Highlighted in the presentation were the many citizen committees which have advised on important civic projects.

DEFRAY COSTS

The presentation, prepared by Santa Fe High journalism advisor Ted Snyder, administrative assistant Darrell Essex, and City Manager Meno Wilhelms, also pointed out the tireless efforts of citizens toward incorporation and the lessening of the tax burden by the creation of a municipal fire department.

Numerous citizens and youth groups participated in fund-raising events to help defray the costs of sending the youthful delegation to Springfield.

Special civic events to celebrate the accomplishment for Santa Fe Springs are expected to be announced later.

One of the first will be this Friday morning at 9 a.m., when the entire community is invited to attend the first official raising of the All America City flag at Santa Fe High School.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

SANTA FE SPRINGS "ALL-AMERICAN"

Santa Fe Springs, 15 miles southeast of Los Angeles, one of the youngest cities in the Nation, yesterday was one of the 11 cities in the United States chosen for the All America City Award.

The All America City Award, considered the highest honor that can be achieved by communities of the Nation, was established in 1949 by the National Municipal League.

The awards are conferred on the basis of outstanding civic achievements brought about by the concerted efforts of the citizens.

Yesterday, in the Detroit Room of the Statler, Santa Fe Springs Mayor William J. McCann and "Miss Santa Fe Springs," Miss Martha Phillips, 19, a city employee, proudly displayed the award pennant.

The flag will be flown at the city's community center and at the Santa Fe Springs High School, the mayor said.

"This national coveted honor is a tribute to every citizen of Santa Fe Springs, and accepting it on their behalf is the greatest honor I could ever expect," the mayor said.

Dr. George Gallup, chairman of the council of the National Municipal League and foreman of the award jury, said:

"Santa Fe Springs award was based on its efficiency in government and progressive city administration accomplished through alert continuing citizen participation."

Santa Fe Springs was incorporated in 1957, and has a population of more than 15,000.

The other 10 cities honored were Alton and East St. Louis, Ill.; De Soto, Mo.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Lamar, Colo.; Norfolk, Va.; Vallejo, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Winston-Salem, N.C., and San Juan, P.R.

Among the 11 cities receiving honorable mention were Baldwin Park and Burbank, Calif.

[From Look magazine]

Mayors, city managers and other local officials sometimes make the presentations, but the task is often performed by volunteers who know the story of their city. This year, a group of high school boys and girls made the presentation in behalf of Santa Fe Springs, Calif.

A variety of accomplishments accounted for this year's winning cities. Some reflected continued citizen revolt against local crime, vice, and political corruption. Contest officials note, however, that most new kinds of civic action stem from the country's explosive population growth.

The new trend in civic action appears to fall into five areas (combined in some communities into a single long-range program):

1. Modernization: The new programs involve ingenious plans for traffic, new housing, and new industrial parks. Many projects in older cities aim at revitalizing the downtown sections to protect valuable tax-producing properties threatened by population shifts to the suburbs.

2. Slum clearance: The cultural and economic boundaries of most of our sprawling cities have spread far beyond their old political boundaries. People are facing up to the fact that the slums left behind have health hazards that involve the entire region, rather than a small local area. As a result, decaying acres of blighted homes are being eliminated with the help of citizens in the suburbs, as well as with Federal support.

3. Efficiency: The redtape and needless, overlapping costs of the good old way of doing things are being seriously challenged. It is tough to change political traditions, but the case histories show citizens are learning that tax waste at city hall comes out of their own pockets.

4. Annexation: The number of cities annexing their neighboring areas indicates that residents have been sold on the idea that larger communities with better administrations can provide more public service for less money.

5. Outside guidance: Many small communities have learned they are not alone in their efforts. For most major and many minor civic improvements, they can look to outside private and Government agencies to help bring dramatic and exciting changes to their own doorsteps.

The stories of what this year's winning cities did to win their wards begin below.

SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIF.

Salesmen told prospective home buyers that the new tracts near the oil-rich fields

15 miles east of Los Angeles were part of communities nearby. But when the new owners moved in, they learned the sickening truth. The houses were on unincorporated land, without street lights, services, schools or identity. No one could help the homeowners but themselves. First, they organized a homeowners association. Then they spread word of what had to be done—over their fences and through their own newspaper. Soon the street lights went on, the streets were swept, and schools, parks and a post office all materialized. So intense was civic interest that 1 in 10 families helped in a study leading to a recommendation for council-manager government, then campaigned vigorously to put it over at election time, by a margin of 4 to 1.

MEMBERS OF THE JURY THAT SELECTED THE ALL AMERICA CITIES

Dr. George H. Gallup, Princeton, N.J., director, American Institute of Public Opinion, foreman.

Miss Grace B. Daniels, Kingston, Pa., president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Dr. Anna L. Rose Hawkes, Washington, D.C., president, American Association of University Women.

Harry J. Krusz, Lincoln, Nebr., president, Harry Krusz & Co.

Mark S. Matthews, Greenwich, Conn., former president, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Willard V. Merrihue, New York, manager, Community and Business Relations, General Electric Co.

Vernon C. Myers, New York, publisher, Look magazine.

James M. Osborn, New Haven, Conn., Yale University.

Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, Washington, D.C., president, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Henry Toy, Jr., New York, president, National Citizens Council for Better Schools.

Donald H. Webster, Seattle, Wash., director, Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington.

Arnold S. Zander, Washington, D.C., president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

Unfair Imports Ruin Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our farmers are being ruined by imports from slave labor, foreign countries. The following farm resolutions tell the tragic story:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO., JANUARY 27-30, 1960

RESOLUTION NO. 7—MEAT IMPORTS

Whereas we feel the unwarranted decline in the price of slaughter cattle has been caused by the increased importation of cheaply produced foreign meat, and that this low price of cattle has resulted in great numbers of breeding cows and heifers that would normally go to slaughter being held on ranches and farms, further increasing the surplus of cattle; and

Whereas owing to the increased cost of domestic processing and retailing, this price reduction has not materially reduced the price of beef to the consumer; and

Whereas beef producers have consistently opposed Government subsidies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association request the Congress and the administration to grant our industry relief by enacting equitable and realistic quotas on importation of all foreign livestock, meat, and meat products, and, specifically, by setting quotas that curtail the import of below-second-grade meats which at the present time are unrestricted as to volume.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., DECEMBER 1959

FOREIGN TRADE

A healthy exchange of goods and services between nations is highly desirable and is beneficial economically and politically to the nations involved. We believe that an active foreign trade, based on the principles of free enterprise, should be encouraged, but with due regard to the protection of our own national interests. We would look with concern on any legislative or administrative action which would tend to increase import competition with domestic perishables.

We look with suspicion on any transfer of authority over import regulations and tariffs, by membership in any supranational organization such as the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation. We object to the constant interference of the Department of State in foreign trade matters. We believe that regulation of our foreign commerce is the constitutional obligation of the legislative branch of the Government, and we, therefore, favor exclusion of any executive department, including the President, from regulatory authority in the field of foreign trade.

Specifically, we favor return from the President to Congress of the obligation to approve or disapprove all recommendations of the Tariff Commission made under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. We recommend that the Congress establish explicit guidelines to govern decisions of the Tariff Commission with respect to import quotas, and that such decisions of the Tariff Commission on import quotas shall be final and operative unless disapproved by Congress.

FROM 1960 PLATFORM OF THE NATIONAL WOOL-GROWERS ASSOCIATION AS ADOPTED BY THE 95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION JANUARY 24-27, 1960, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

TARIFFS

The National Woolgrowers Association believes that it is time for our Government to make a searching reexamination of its tariff policy. We urge Congress to reassert its constitutional right to set and control tariff policies.

The matter of adequate tariff protection on imports of raw wool and wool manufactures and of lamb and mutton has been of vital importance to the sheep raiser since the early years of this country. It is necessary for the very existence of our industry. For this reason we vigorously oppose any efforts to reduce or disrupt our tariff system.

This is the reason that we have always opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and still oppose it. We deplore its extension to June, 1962 and hope that it will be allowed to expire at the end of this period.

We advocate that the authority of the Tariff Commission be strengthened and that its recommendations for protection of domestic industries be transmitted directly to Congress for its consideration and action.

We urge that the escape clause procedure be clarified so that import quotas can be readily applied.

In this direction, we strongly urge continued implementation of the Geneva Reservation with greater utilization of its po-

tential to accord the protection so vitally needed by all segments of the American wool economy.

We are still opposed to U.S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the participation of the United States in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

We commend the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy and its chairman, Mr. O. R. Strackbein, and the Trade Relations Council of the United States for their vigorous opposition to the lowering of tariffs. We request their continued activity on our behalf in connection with our historic stand on tariff matters.

**Last Commanding Officer of the Scotia Naval Supply Depot, Scotia, N.Y.—
Capt. Harold E. Cole, Supply Corps,
U.S. Navy, a Great Sailor Dies in the
Service of His Country**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow high on a hill in Arlington Cemetery there will be laid to rest the last mortal remains of one of the finest naval officers I have ever had the privilege of knowing and one of my close and warm friends, Capt. Harold E. Cole, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy.

Captain Cole passed away suddenly last Saturday while attending classes at the Albany Teachers College in Albany, N.Y. At the time of his death he was site administrator of the Navy machine tool program being conducted at the General Services Administration Depot in Scotia, N.Y. Until last December 31, Captain Cole was the commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Supply Depot at Scotia, a post in which he had served with great distinction since July of 1956. Prior to coming to Scotia, Captain Cole had graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Naval and Finance Supply School at Philadelphia, and the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in Cambridge. He served with distinction with the Asiatic Fleet prior to World War II and occupied a number of major staff assignments both at sea and ashore during World War II. Immediately before coming to Scotia he was comptroller for the Military Sea Transportation Service in Washington.

To Captain Cole fell the difficult and unhappy assignment of presiding over the Navy's major installation in the Schenectady area during its disestablishment. During the time of his tenure the Navy gradually reduced its complement at Scotia, and from time to time rumors of even greater reductions circulated prominently throughout the area. During this whole trying period, Captain Cole not only represented the Navy in the Scotia-Schenectady area with great distinction and ability but was tireless in his efforts to see that those in charge of ar-

rangements in Washington were fully apprised of the situation in Schenectady before making their decisions involving base disestablishment. Like every good commander, he had the welfare of his subordinates close to his heart.

In spite of all his tireless efforts in defense of the interests of our area and of the hundreds of loyal civilian personnel who were privileged to serve under him in Scotia in one of the finest activities which it has been my privilege to see in any Government department, Captain Cole had to watch the Navy go ahead with its decision and in December of 1959 he officially brought the Scotia Navy Depot to a close.

This action was not only a tragedy for the community and a blow to Captain Cole in his professional capacity, it also represented a serious personal blow as well. His ship sunk from under him, Captain Cole was obliged to look forward at the end of the current fiscal year to retirement from active naval service at the age of 49, with two young children left to educate. However, the personal blow which Captain Cole sustained was something he never spoke about, even to his closest friends. Having fought hard and courageously in the highest traditions of the Navy to preserve the jobs of the men and women under him, he went to work quietly without complaint to prepare for the difficult adjustment to civilian life which faced him and his family. In fact, with characteristic vigor and determination, he was at school early on a Saturday working, taking a special course of training in preparation for the impending return to civilian life when he passed away. He hadn't given up the ship. He had only just begun to fight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay my deep respects to Capt. Harold E. Cole for the outstanding job which he did for the Navy and for our community. I have never known a naval officer who did more for a community or for the men and women under his command than was done by Captain Cole.

Our Navy exists to fight, of course, and this is her first responsibility. But no military force can ever be effective in a democracy unless it has the understanding and sympathetic support of men and women in villages and cities and communities all across our land. For this reason the individual who embodies the Navy or any of our armed services in a particular community bears a very heavy responsibility. I am frank to say that I believe Captain Cole discharged this responsibility with a distinction and with a spirit of dedication that were far above and beyond the call of duty.

His sudden and untimely passing from our local scene also raises in my mind, Mr. Speaker, another matter. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I find it increasingly difficult to understand why our military services cannot make the fullest possible use of the abilities of the able officers who have selected the Navy as their career while they are still vigorously capable of serving and still possess their full capabilities. Why should it be that our military

services can tell a man who has devoted the best years of his life to his country that his professional career is at an end and require that he should go out and start another one from scratch at an age when his family responsibilities are heaviest, as were Captain Cole's, and when men of his own age group are only just beginning to establish themselves in greater positions of leadership and responsibility in other professional fields instead of taking down their shingles. Surely this is one of the greatest challenges which our military services face today. I for one believe they must meet this challenge promptly if we are to continue to attract to the career military service, men of the ability and devotion of Harold E. Cole.

I know the people of Scotia and Schenectady and the whole 32d district will join with me in expressing to Mrs. Cole and to her two fine sons our deepest sympathy in the loss of a wonderful husband and a devoted father.

Home is the hunter
Home from the hill
And the sailor home from the sea.

New Farm Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a wheat farmer from Reardon, Wash., on a trip to Phoenix, Ariz., has taken the trouble to write me his views on price supports and to endorse my bill to repeal farm subsidies. I include his letter and excerpts from other communications to show the widespread opinion in favor of ending the present agricultural program:

Hon. Mr. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I farm a section of wheatland in Spokane and Lincoln Counties, Wash. I endorse the idea of repealing the entire farm support program as the morning Phoenix paper of February 11 states would be accomplished in a bill introduced by you. On February 19 the same paper stated that Secretary Benson submitted a farm bill that would greatly reduce price supports and free wheat farmers to produce as much wheat as they want.

I feel that accepting acreage control as the price of security price supports was like trading a birthright for a mess of pottage. If a farmer was entitled to a parity income, he certainly did not receive it when he was compelled to reduce his wheat acreage 36.2 percent (the Spokane County figure for the 1959 crop) even though he had received 90 percent of parity price support— $9 \times .638 = 57.42$ percent. If the support is at 75 percent of parity the figures are $.75 \times .638 = 47.85$ percent. I believe the farmers in the areas best adapted to wheat would have had a higher income if there had never been a farm program. In the absence of a high guaranteed price, wheat acreage would have been reduced in areas where a variety of

crops can be grown. Market price is a constantly acting production regulator like the governor on an engine. A farm program should not violate the principle of competitive marketing.

Although economists characterize the demand for wheat as inelastic, hungry, and malfed people would certainly eat wheat if they could get it. I believe they would get more if the price were set in a free market. To the underprivileged the fact that automobile output is curtailed when sales fall off may be an academic question, but no one can explain to a hungry man why the United States must reduce the acreage of food crops. Even though the economic problems are large, we would be headed in the right direction again.

More and more farmers are expressing the wish that the entire farm program be done away with. They realize that at a high cost to the Government, they have received no real benefit. It would be better to seek to reduce Government subsidies to other segments of the economy than to seek subsidies for farmers under a program that does not really help them.

I am sure there is strong underlying support among farmers throughout the Nation for plans that would abolish production controls.

Yours truly,

Other comments on the farm program are:

I suggest this solution to the farm support scandal. At this session of Congress a law be passed with the following points:

1. The Federal Government get out of the farming business completely and immediately. No price supports at all, no soil banks, no acreage allotments, and no buying of surpluses.

Would suggest that if the parity program cannot be reduced then that all forms of marketing should be put on a parity program. Such as coal mining, auto manufacturing, production of television sets, fisheries, shipbuilding, etc., and so on ad nauseum. Parity programs on manufactured products would be ridiculous and probably financially impossible, but deserves exactly the same consideration as the farm parity program.

The apportionment of 20 percent of the national budget to agricultural supports is indicative of the disproportionate political influence which agriculture is able to wield. The principle of parity embodied in price-support programs was designed as a short-term answer to a long-term problem to artificially stimulate production. These two elements reflect basic reasons for opposition to any continued price-support program.

It would seem to me if we ever plan to cure some of our farm problems we must begin to let them start operating on a supply and demand basis, not a subsidy.

I want to express approval of your stand and proposed bill for repeal of farm support prices as mentioned a few days ago in the local papers. I suppose it will encounter a lot of opposition in this election year from Members who are interested in votes rather than commonsense and economy, but I'm glad you are taking the initiative in an effort to undo what seems to me at this late present date to be a wholly unjustified and indefensible subsidy of inefficiency and waste.

Personally I think the price supports should be completely abolished. Twenty years ago when price supports were put into effect I thought that it was the only good thing that the Roosevelt administration sponsored in all of the years it was in power.

Is Political Leadership Inconsistent With Good Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in June 1959, a Pottsville, Pa., newspaper reporter issued a report to the fund for the Republic called "The Art of Government," which purports to cover reform and organization politics in the city of Philadelphia. The basic thesis of this report is that a political organization which becomes successful because of a good government program will eventually abandon or avoid the foundation upon which it was built and move into an area where it will operate in a corrupt or improper manner.

James Reichley, the reporter, attacks the successful Philadelphia Democratic organization and its leader, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR. He impugns the character of the Congressman and a number of leading ward leaders of the city. On Sunday, February 21, 1960, a panel discussion was held in Congressman GREEN's district in northeast Philadelphia on the topic "Will Reform Last in Philadelphia?"

The participants were James Reichley, the author, W. Thatcher Longstreth, a leading Philadelphia Republican and former candidate for mayor, and Congressman GREEN, the Philadelphia Democratic city chairman.

The author presented an argument in favor of his report. The Republican speaker supported the author's basic thesis that efficient and successful political organizations end up in politically corrupt activities and poor government. The city chairman of the Democratic Party denied that he was interviewed by the author, charged that the report had 79 misstatements and inaccuracies and that the work was mainly fictional and based upon pure fantasy.

The danger of such prejudiced attacks, which have been made and can be made again, against any Member of Congress who is a political leader, is that the publisher frequently gives permission to reprint to other publications. In Philadelphia, the Greater Philadelphia magazine announced that it would reprint the Reichley report in full and agreed to print at the same time Congressman GREEN's answer to the report, so that all people could read both accounts and form an independent judgment.

The Times newspapers cover the Greater Northeast Philadelphia. They are independent newspapers, serving the Fifth Congressional District, where Representative WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., is campaigning for Democratic nomination for an eighth term in the House.

The following Times newspaper editorial, which should be read by all Members, raises the question whether the history of some corrupt political organiza-

tions makes it inevitable that a successful city political organization in this day and age must follow in the same footsteps. Will a successful political organization, built on good government policies, eventually abandon them?

The editorial follows:

DOES GREEN FIT THE POLITICAL BOSS SYMBOL?

Too many people use symbols to simplify their thinking on every subject from little boys to political bosses.

If a symbolizer talks with Mr. B., and Mr. B. says he has a 6-year-old son, the stock image of a 6-year-old boy pops into the symbolizer's mind. He knows 6-year-old boys are always lively, mischievous, loud, hard to manage, and untidy.

When someone mentions political boss, the symbol pops instantly to mind. A political boss is always ruthless, unethical, grasping and undemocratic.

Such is the reaction in the minds of many Philadelphians when anyone mentions BILL GREEN.

GREEN is the boss of the Democratic Party. Right? Thus he is a political boss. Right?

ANYONE KNOWS

If he is a political boss, they figure he must be ruthless, unethical, grasping and undemocratic. Anyone knows, they say, that all political bosses always have been and always will be ruthless, unethical, grasping, and undemocratic.

We have heard many such descriptions of GREEN in recent years. We can honestly say that none of these critics who talked with us substantiated their comments beyond some vague reference to deals, the inevitable mention of Tobyhanna and the final weak defense: "I don't have anything solid to go on, but I know I'm right."

One of the sharpest recent attacks on political machines in general and GREEN's machine in particular is contained in a 125-page book, "The Art of Government," by James Reichley, a Pottsville reporter. Published by the Fund for the Republic, it covers the politico-governmental picture in Philadelphia.

The other night Reichley's book was the subject of discussion by a three-man panel at the Northeast Neighborhood Center. In addition to Reichley, the panel members included Congressman GREEN and W. Thatcher Longstreth, who was the unsuccessful Republican candidate for mayor in 1957.

Reichley said a few nice things about the local "machine," but was principally concerned with condemning it. Longstreth threw a few logs on Reichley's fire. And GREEN said the book is shot through with lies, inaccuracies, distortions.

CONDENSED VERSION

We at the Times haven't had the privilege of reading the entire report. We've only been able to get hold of a condensed version.

At this point, we are of the opinion that Reichley let a number of wise-sounding Philadelphians slip him symbol interpretations of local politics instead of hard facts. And after he had collected a number of such symbol-statements he weaved them together into one big symbol statement, upon which he set the lofty title "The Art of Government."

Unless Reichley can furnish us a lot more facts, we're going to have to disagree with his crier sweeping symbols about GREEN and his party.

We'll stick with these few conclusions for the time being: The Democratic machine is efficiently run by GREEN; it is likely to take over completely from the reformers when Dilworth steps out; its approach to government at that point is not likely to be idealistic, but is likely to provide good government.

HINTED COMPARISON

We will not accept even the hinted comparison of GREEN and his machine with Boston's late Curley and his machine or Louisiana's late Huey Long and his machine.

Maybe someday GREEN will slap the Times down in typical political boss style. But until some solid anti-Green facts are forthcoming, we'll stick with our conclusion that he's an intelligent politician who is proving that a political machine can be run efficiently without losing its ideals.

Though historians might look back on GREEN as just another machine boss, we think it's more likely they will credit him with finding the formula for combining political efficiency with sound city government.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads— No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have inserted a series of articles and other matter in the RECORD to familiarize the Congress with the serious deterioration of our Nation's rail commuter services and to point up the need for Federal help.

After investigation into a number of accidents on the New Haven Railroad, which serves the district I represent, I learned that failure or breakage of some parts of train running gear was responsible for some accidents. But I also discovered that the running gear, which includes axles, wheels, brakes, and other such apparatus, is not included among train equipment which must be inspected and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I introduced legislation to require extension of ICC responsibility to include the running gear.

Scrutiny of financial operations of the same railroad, as outlined in annual reports to the ICC, disclosed the need for financial assistance and I have introduced legislation to provide long-term, low-cost loans for purchase and maintenance of commuter and mass transit system facilities and equipment.

Incidents of the past weekend serve to emphasize the urgent need for legislation, such as I have introduced, to cope with the crisis on the New Haven Railroad and other commuter lines.

On Saturday, a derailment occurred on the railroad because of what a railroad official described as a broken axle caused by a burned out journal. The accident left only two tracks open and a bottleneck resulted because the accident had occurred along a portion of tracks used by the New York Central system as well as the New Haven Railroad.

How the failure of equipment not covered by ICC inspection can jeopardize public safety and enormously inconvenience the public is made clear in the following article published in the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour on Monday, March 7, 1960.

which I include under permission previously granted:

NINE HOURS TO NEW YORK; OR, LIFE ABOARD
No. 399

NEW YORK.—Here's the sad saga of ol' 399—the Connecticut Cannonball that came up a dud.

Old No. 399 is a New Haven Railroad train. On a clear day it makes the 56-mile run between Bridgeport, Conn., and Grand Central Terminal in Manhattan in an hour and 10 minutes.

Then came Black Saturday—old 399 took more than 9 slow and agonizing hours to make the 56-mile trip.

"A nightmare," cried one cold and weary passenger as he staggered into Grand Central early Sunday. Railroad officials were speechless.

The 8-car train carried 300 passengers. Many missed theater and dinner appointments, concerts, or reunions.

During the trip the heat failed on three of the eight cars. A dozen men "abandoned ship" in anger at the delay. There was no food.

The slow trip was blamed on a derailment of six New Haven Railroad cars in the Bronx. Despite that, the ride was a traveling—and sometimes stationary—comic opera. If a log had been kept, it might have read like this:

4:20 p.m.: Train leaves Bridgeport. Passengers carefree.

5:30 p.m.: Passes through New Rochelle, N.Y. Passengers enjoying scenery, reading.

WORSE AND MORE OF IT

5:35 p.m.: Train stops, backs up to New Rochelle to take on more passengers.

6 p.m.: Passes Mount Vernon, N.Y.; last of chocolate bars eaten.

6:20 p.m.: Somewhere between Mount Vernon and New York train stops. "It was horrible," said Mrs. Donald Street, of New York City. "The lights went out. There was no food, no heat."

6:50 p.m.: Passengers anxiously clutching theater tickets ask conductor if he could back train up so they could disembark and transfer to other transportation. He says, "No." Some take off anyway.

8 p.m.: Passengers tear up theater tickets.

9 p.m.: A dozen men try to leave train. They are pelted by boys with snowballs.

9:30 p.m.: Hungry passengers stare fixedly at a train passing on open track. Train has diner—and people eating in same.

Midnight: Passengers give up. Huddle together to stay warm.

1:30 a.m.: Train creeps into station. "It was terrible," said an executive from Stamford.

Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Italy has been the home of the arts in all ages, but in the 15th century she gave birth to two famous sons who became great explorers. One of them discovered the New World while the other, Amerigo Vespucci, baptized it with his name.

Little is known of this adventurous son of a notary public in Florence whose sole ambition seems to have been to sail away from home to places barely known, and explore new lands. In about 1500 we find him entering the services of Don Manuel, of Portugal, and organizing several expeditions. It is now known that

in about 1502, or 1503, he arrived at a Florida shore, and then sailed south to the shores of Brazil. Then the two continents of the New World were named after him, Amerigo, America. Glory to the memory of this great explorer.

Rubber Footwear Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mr. W. E. Brimer, president of the Tyer Rubber Co., Andover, Mass., concerning the enormous increase in the importation of rubber shoes, overshoes, and rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers, which will, of course, reduce substantially domestic production.

The letter follows:

TYER RUBBER CO.,
Andover, Mass., March 1, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Since you were apparently unable to visit with us at the Hotel Mayflower in Washington on February 18, I am taking the liberty of enclosing a photostatic copy of each of three placards which we displayed to our visitors that evening.

You will note that the first one shows that the total of imported rubber shoes, overshoes, and rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers in 1959, for the first 11 months, reached the alarming percentage of 34.18 of the total domestic market, and that this was nearly double the percentage imported in 1958 and more than five times the percentage of 1957. The second picture shows that nearly all of the imports were from Japan, and the third shows the difference between the wage costs in Japan and those in this country.

Since wage costs represent an unusually large percentage of total costs in our type of product, it seems obvious that we cannot maintain employment in our industry in competition with a country paying 20 cents per hour for workers against more than \$2 locally.

We are, as an industry, taking steps to see what can be done either through the executive department of the Government or through legislation to establish some limit on the total of imports, and hope that we can count on your support.

We were sorry to miss you at our open house and hope to see you on some other occasion within the near future.

Cordially yours,

TYER RUBBER CO.,
W. E. BRIMER, President.

Rubber footwear imports versus industry shipments since 1953—Rubber shoes, overshoes, boots, and rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers

(Thousands of pairs)

Calendar year	Industry shipments	Imports	Total shipments, industry and imports	Percent, imports to total shipments
1953	73,364	688	74,052	0.93
1954	73,835	717	74,552	.96
1955	81,850	1,086	82,936	1.31
1956	86,190	2,334	88,524	2.64
1957	89,389	6,045	95,434	6.33
1958	92,218	19,474	111,692	17.44
1959 11 months	91,945	47,742	139,687	34.18

11 months.

Rubber footwear imports by country of origin, 11 months, 1959

(Thousands of pairs)

Country	Rubber shoes, overshoes, and boots	Rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers	Total
Japan	33,941	9,867	43,808
Hong Kong	473	1,513	1,986
All others (17)	1,108	840	1,948
Total	35,522	12,220	47,742

Average hourly earnings, including fringe benefits, rubber footwear employees, domestic versus Japanese

	Per hour
Domestic rubber footwear industry (October 1959)	\$2.51
Japanese—all rubber products (March 1959)	.20

More About Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the following exchange of correspondence will prove of interest to our colleagues. Following is a letter I received from the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association and my answer thereto. If I receive any answers to my letter I will be happy to share the contents thereof with our colleagues.

The letters follow:

NORTHEASTERN RETAIL
LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

Rochester, N.Y., February 24, 1960.

Re interest rate on Treasury obligations.
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: On behalf of more than 1,200 retail lumber and building material dealers who are in New York and New England States, we wish to call your attention to action taken by these men on the important subject of interest rates on Treasury obligations.

This action has been taken after careful study and clearly reflects the attitude of these dealers on this matter which is of vital consequence to them and the home-buying public.

We feel that this is of particular interest to you because it reflects the considered judgment of a substantial number of your constituents.

We invite your attention to the enclosed statement of position pertaining to this resolution on interest rates.

We hope that you will give this subject your personal attention and careful consideration and that you will take such action as is warranted by further developments.

We shall be glad to have your reaction to our views on this subject.

Sincerely,

HORACE G. PIERCE,
Managing Director.

A STATEMENT OF POSITION—INTEREST RATES
ADOPTED AT THE 66TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE NORTHEASTERN RETAIL LUMBERMEN'S
ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK, JANUARY 26,
1960

Whereas Congress failed in the 1st session of the 86th Congress to remove the 4¼-per-

cent interest rate ceiling which was imposed many years ago and is long outdated because of worldwide financial trends on long-term Federal bonds. If the ceiling had been removed the Treasury's efforts to achieve non-inflationary debt management would have been strengthened; and

Whereas short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest level in several decades, and the ability of the Treasury to manage the debt in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustaining economic growth has been seriously undermined; and

Whereas the vital interest of all Americans is at stake because excessive reliance on short-term financing probably will have grave consequences by reducing the purchasing power of the dollar; and

Whereas this trend has affected the available mortgage funds for house construction because the consequent withdrawal of funds from traditional savings institutions such as the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations and channeled into short-term paper which has seriously threatened their liquidity, and thereby their ability to furnish the mortgage funds necessary to build the new homes America needs:

Resolved, That we the members of the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen Association commend the administration for its position in the management of the public debt; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling to give the administration more freedom in management of the public debt; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be brought to the attention of the congressional Members in the northeastern area urging their favorable action on President Eisenhower's proposal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1960.

Mr. HORACE G. PIERCE,
Managing Director, Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association, Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. PIERCE: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of February 24, 1960, with reference to interest rates on Treasury obligations.

I regret to advise that it is my opinion that you are merely mouthing the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, which statements are fallacious and have not yet been sustained by the facts. On the contrary, every fact of economic and banking life indicates that they are wrong.

It is almost silly for anyone to argue that you will lower the interest rate in the marketplace by increasing the maximum interest that may be paid. Every time that we have increased the interest rate on FHA and VA mortgages, the rate immediately went to the maximum and stayed there. Furthermore, the interest paid on Government bonds fixes the interest rate on everything.

It stands to reason that the interest charged on risk loans, whether they be mortgage loans or otherwise, should be higher and they always are higher than the interest rates paid by the U.S. Government on its riskless securities. Our Government has never defaulted on any of its obligations and never will.

The finest security is U.S. Government obligations, requiring no effort on the part of the saver or investor but to sit back and to either clip coupons or receive the interest checks.

The pretense that short-term securities are inflationary is utter nonsense. They are no more inflationary than the E and F bonds that are readily cashable at any bank by the owner thereof. The mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations of the country have upward of 25 percent of their resources invested in U.S. Government obli-

gations, most of them long-term. They are selling now way under par. If we increase the interest rate on new issues of long-term Government securities by as little as one-half percent the value of those outstanding bonds will fall another 5 points, and if we increase the interest rate on the new long-term issues by 1 percent those outstanding long-term bonds will drop 10 points. None of those institutions can stand it.

If you think that mortgage money is now tight, just try to imagine what will happen to it when the Government issues long-term bonds at 5 percent. Commercial banks are paying a maximum of 3 percent on their savings accounts, savings banks are paying 4 and 4½ percent, and some savings and loan associations are paying as high as 4½ percent.

You can be sure that the run which was experienced a short time ago when our citizens rushed to buy the last high interest rate Government bonds will look like a crawl if we give this administration its way and let them issue long-term bonds at more than 4½ percent interest.

There is no better way to dry up the mortgage market than to have the Government issue long-term bonds at an interest rate close to that being paid in the mortgage market. Why maintain and pay for the cost of real estate appraisers and employees to service mortgages when you can get better than the equivalent net return on riskless Government securities at the expense of employing a coupon clipper?

Can you think of anything more inflationary than increasing the cost of Government? The interest on Government obligations is the first charge on the cost of Government. The national debt now stands at \$290 billion. The President says he is going to reduce that by \$4 billion. I doubt whether he can but let us assume he does. That will bring the debt down to \$286 billion. An increase in the cost of carrying that debt of only 1 percent a year is \$2,860 million each and every year of the term of the debt. And you urge the Congress to let the President do that so he can issue long-term bonds that will run from 25 to 30 years? Multiply the \$2,860 million by the number of years he wants the debt to run and you will have the total increased cost of carrying that debt. What could possibly be more inflationary?

Do not overlook the fact that this is not new or additional money that the Federal Government must borrow in order to carry on. This is all refinancing or refunding of existing debt. The only new money that must be generated for this refinancing will be the increased interest, if any.

There isn't an economist or financier in the country worthy of the name who can justify advising a client to refinance with long-term obligations an outstanding debt during a high interest rate market. The only sensible, businesslike thing to do is to finance short-term in the high interest rate market and when the interest rate drops, finance long-term. That has been traditional with our Government as well as with business and no one can give any valid reason to do the contrary.

Incidentally, did you know that in the bill reported by the committee there is a provision permitting the Treasury Department to engage in what is known as "advance refunding." That means that a Government bond that has 12 years to run until maturity, bearing a 2½ percent interest rate, can be exchanged by the Treasury for a new 20-year bond with a 5 percent interest rate. Justify that if you can. I cannot.

I will appreciate your circulating a copy of this letter among your members with the suggestion that they send me their comments with reference thereto.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

An American's View of Conditions in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, February 25, 1960, I placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD lamenting the tragic death of Chough Pyong-ok, the Korean Democratic Party leader who had been battling Syngman Rhee for the presidency of his nation.

The Japan Times of Tokyo was among the papers reprinting my remarks. An American businessman noticed the story there while in Asia on a commercial trip. This person, who has made annual trips to the Far East for the last decade, possesses a broad knowledge of the area. The death of Chough, and indications of American interest in Korea's plight, inspired him to write me an extremely frank letter about conditions under the Rhee regime.

Urging my colleagues to take special notice of the passages that point to widespread misuse of American aid funds, I am placing the text of this letter in the RECORD. To protect the writer's business contacts in Korea, naturally I am withholding his name. The letter follows:

MARCH 1, 1960.

The Honorable STEWART UDALL,
Congressman, State of Arizona,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being in the Far East on a business trip I read with great interest your statement in the Japan Times of February 28, dealing with the coming presidential election in Korea.

I spent last week in Seoul where I was a witness to the funeral of the late Chough Pyong-ok and I was amazed at the spontaneous demonstrations of the people showing support of the Democratic Party. Thousands upon thousands of people lined the streets in a silent tribute to this great Korean patriot.

I have been coming to the Far East every year for the past 10 years, and for 6 years in a row I also have visited Korea in connection with my business. I have been able to follow the developments in Korea and I am appalled by the lack of progress and the completely hopeless economic situation under the present regime.

Businessmen (I am only talking of those I consider honest without doubt) and plain people today express openly their belief that general improvement can only come with a change in the Government.

Mr. Rhee's dictatorial state, with corrupt higher and lesser officials, and with a policy of hatred toward Japan, is blocking the development of Korea as a truly democratic state. This policy of no trade with Japan costs the American taxpayer a lot more money than if we would compel Mr. Rhee to permit free trade with Japan forthwith. Japan would be the cheapest supplier and also the best customer which Korea could have.

I would like to state here that I have no interest whatsoever in any trading between Korea and Japan; however, I do have an interest in the tremendous amount of money which we Americans are pouring into Korea without any chance to discontinue doing so in the foreseeable future. All this because

of a man, no doubt a great patriot, too old today to understand the changes in the world and surrounded by corrupt officials.

During a speech in Chile on his present tour, President Eisenhower stated that America would never support a dictatorial state. May I ask what is Korea?

I know of factories in my line of business, a tannery and a shoe factory, built in Taejon about 4 years ago with ICA funds (American taxpayers' money), and to this day neither factory has been used. Why? Because of corruption, graft, and diversion of funds.

Under the present Government I fear that the people of South Korea are moving closer to communism because of the tremendous differences between the new rich and the terribly poor masses. The present police state is a hotbed for breeding hatred and mistrust. Unfortunately we Americans are partly to blame because we are supporting men like Rhee and his friends.

I do not believe that conditions should be attached to any aid program, but in a case like Korea where our officials must see every day the evidence of graft and corruption and a policy of hatred against Japan, I feel then we either clean up the situation and insist on the establishment of a true democratic nation, or we withdraw our aid despite the terrible losses in American blood a few years back.

The true friends of America in Korea are losing faith in us. We should not let that happen.

I hope that you will forgive my frankness but, having followed the conditions over a number of years, I believe that I know what I am talking about.

Very truly yours,

(Signature withheld.)

Statement of Congressman Lane on Cotton Export Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission on March 9, 1960:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, MASSACHUSETTS, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION IN RE SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED, ON THE UNDUE INTERFERENCE WITH THE COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OF IMPORTED COTTON, TEXTILES, AND TEXTILE PRODUCTS, MARCH 9, 1960

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Tariff Commission, the cotton export subsidy program of the U.S. Government for the benefit of domestic growers, is indirectly hurting the domestic manufacturers who process this raw material into cloth and clothing. This contradiction may be described as a double-standard in textile economics.

We are paying out a subsidy rate of 8 cents a pound in cotton and the cotton content of cotton products in order to reduce the surplus of this commodity in the United States. Foreign manufacturers are buying and using this cotton to make textiles that are then exported to the United States where they undersell American-made textiles.

The same Government program which is helping the American cotton grower, is dam-

aging the American cotton manufacturer. Even though we produce more cotton than we can use, American textile manufacturers have to pay \$350 million more a year for cotton than they would at the world price.

We want to dispose of our surplus cotton abroad, but we don't want to see it come back to the United States in the form of cotton cloth or clothing that undersells American cotton textiles on the raw material differential.

This is only one competitive disadvantage that our manufacturers must contend with. The wages and other labor costs of foreign manufacturers are one-tenth of one-half of American costs. The surge of Japanese imports through 1955-56 has been held to that level by a voluntary quota arrangement with the Japanese Government.

But imports continue to pour in from other countries, and especially from India, Korea, Formosa, and Pakistan. In 1959, 170 million square yards of cotton goods were imported from Hong Kong; an increase of 170 percent over 1958.

New England textile mills have suffered from the constant erosion of unfair competition and Government indifference to their problems for many, many years.

Now that the problem of the textile industry has become national, affecting all mills irrespective of the States in which they are located, it is expected that the Federal Government will not only recognize the danger, but take effective action to protect our textile industry from the double-barreled attack of foreign competition.

The President has asked the Tariff Commission to determine if the establishment of an import fee equivalent to the export subsidy on raw cotton to foreign mills, is necessary to prevent interference with the Department of Agriculture's cotton export program. This is a 'round-about' and inadequate way to help American textile manufacturers in their predicament. A countervailing duty to offset 'two-price cotton' is a beginning. To be effective, it must be implemented by overall quotas broken down by categories of goods, and comprehensive quotas.

The whole problem will not be solved unless the Government also applies a formula that will protect our manufacturers from the low-wage competitive advantage of foreign producers who are undermining our domestic market.

The Tariff Commission must face up to the fact that the American textile industry needs protection from the destructive effects of mounting imports. As it considers the convincing testimony presented by management and labor working together in their appeal for a solution to the ruinous competition of imports, I am confident that it will make the necessary recommendations to save the American textile economy.

Dr. Thomas Garrigue Mazaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a tribute to an outstanding exponent of liberty, Dr. Thomas Garrigue Mazaryk.

March 7 was the 110th anniversary of Dr. Mazaryk's birth in Moravia. He

was the first President and founder of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, one of the greatest statesmen of this century, a great leader and patriot. Dr. Mazaryk's death in 1937, 2 years prior to the liquidation of the Republic of Czechoslovakia by Hitler, prevented his witnessing that tragic event and the present Communist control of his freedom-loving countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it most fitting that I add my tribute to that of my colleagues in the Congress in honoring Thomas Masaryk's memory on the occasion of his birth, which privilege is denied his own unfortunate people living presently under the oppression of Communist bondage.

Granting Atomic Weapons Information to France and Other Allies in Best U.S. Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to revise its policy of withholding atomic energy information from its own allies. This was recognized by the President in a recent press conference when he said:

When the Soviets have the information and the know-how to do things, it's pretty hard for me to understand why we don't do something with our allies.

Under the Atomic Energy Act, however, the President cannot transfer restricted material and data for use in atomic weapons unless a nation "has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons." Only Great Britain has achieved eligibility under this standard. Even the recent explosion by France of an atomic device in the Sahara has not qualified it to receive the American know-how and materials which would facilitate its attaining an atomic capability.

I believe that in view of the fact that the Soviet Union already has atomic weapons as powerful as those of the United States, it serves no useful purpose to continue this prohibition in effect. The law under which nuclear weapons and information are kept from our allies is out of date, especially since General de Gaulle exploded the French bomb in the Sahara.

Furthermore, the effect of withholding data and material on atomic weapons from allies such as France has become self-defeating. First, it requires our allies to spend millions and millions of dollars in duplicating work which we have already done—money better spent for raising their standard of living and for defense purposes.

Second, it makes it necessary for our allies to conduct nuclear tests explosions, either to develop their own weapons independently or to achieve the

substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons which is a prerequisite to American atomic weapons aid.

Third, either we pool weapons and expertise or nations will act independently. France will go on testing until it has the hydrogen bomb or we offer nuclear cooperation. We dare not stand pat any longer. Such action can result only in a considerable number of independent capabilities—a situation in which it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to impose effective weapons control.

To remedy this situation, on February 29, 1960, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10748, eliminating as a condition for obtaining atomic weapons assistance from the United States the current requirement that a nation already have achieved substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons. The President will thus be enabled to make atomic weapons assistance available whenever he determines that this will promote the defense and security of the United States. The proposed agreement for the exchange of information or material will, of course, still be subject to the provision of the Atomic Energy Act which retains in Congress the right to make any such agreement ineffective by a simple concurrent resolution.

I have also provided in my bill that in return for receiving aid from the United States in developing its own atomic weapons, any nation receiving such assistance must guarantee to refrain from conducting nuclear tests explosions to the same extent that the United States refrains from conducting her tests.

The passage of this legislation will not only assist such staunch and proven allies as General de Gaulle in his quest to restore France to her greatness, but it will also prevent the proliferation of nuclear tests by aspiring atomic powers which now appears inevitable.

We must help France in this manner for then France helps us in the defense of Europe. Remember also, France is our time-tested ally. We have since our beginnings been forced into conflict with every major nation in Western Europe, but France has always been with us.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 10748

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 91c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, or loan to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—

"(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons and nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving Restricted Data;

"(2) utilization facilities for military applications;

"(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications; and

"(4) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, or

use in atomic weapons: *Provided, however,* That the transfer of such material to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and each proposed transfer arrangement for the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons and atomic weapon system, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123: *And provided further,* That if an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to this subsection provides for transfer of utilization facilities for military applications the Commission, or the Department of Defense with respect to cooperation it has been authorized to undertake, may authorize any person to transfer such utilization facilities for military applications in accordance with the terms and conditions of this subsection and of the agreement for cooperation."

SEC. 2. Subsection 123a of the Atomic Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) A guaranty by the cooperating party that it will refrain from nuclear test explosions to the extent that the United States refrains from nuclear test explosions;"

SEC. 3. Subsection 144c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—

"(1) to exchange with that nation Restricted Data concerning atomic weapons: *Provided,* That communication of such Restricted Data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability; and

"(2) to communicate or exchange with that nation Restricted Data concerning research, development, or design, of military reactors, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed Restricted Data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

Statement on Cotton Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

MR. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Mr. Seabury Stanton, before the U.S. Tariff Commission regarding cotton products, section 22, on March 3, 1960:

My name is Seabury Stanton. I am chairman of the Northern Textile Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass., which represents New England textile manufacturers. I am also president of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., which operates seven mills in Massachusetts and Rhode Island and employs 6,000 people. Our headquarters are in New Bedford, Mass. We manufacture fine combed cotton fabrics.

I serve on the New England Governors' Textile Committee, having been appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts, and I also serve on the Textile Advisory Committee, established by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the recommendation of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, known as the Pastore committee.

The textile industry is still an important segment of the New England economy, employing approximately 130,000 persons. It ranks third among manufacturing industries in the area. Cotton spinning, weaving, dyeing, and finishing operations employ about one-third of this number, and the balance are engaged in processing other fibers. The area also employs 90,000 in the apparel trades.

The mills and employees in New England are, of course, an integral part of the U.S. cotton textile industry and cannot prosper unless the industry does.

It is from this point of view that we view these proceedings, and from this point of view that we wish to record the Northern Textile Association in support of the petition now before you. We also wish to endorse the statements made here by Mr. Halbert Jones, representing the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

I shall not attempt to review the statistical material which has been so ably presented here. I wish to emphasize, however, a few points.

1. The President's letter of November 10, 1959, to the Commission, requesting this investigation, seeks to narrow the scope of recommendations to the matter of a fee equivalent to the difference in cotton prices.

The imposition of such an equalization fee is, we believe, necessary, desirable, and equitable and we urge the Commission to make such a recommendation. Such a fee will restore us to a position of equality on cotton costs, but does nothing about the differences in other costs, such as labor, which (unlike cotton) vary greatly between countries.

Therefore, we urge the Commission to construe section 22 broadly and to make recommendations designed to remedy the total situation caused by rising cotton goods imports. Whether imports are induced by cotton cost differentials or by wage and other cost differentials, we believe they are proper subjects for this investigation.

We are hopeful that the Commission's findings and recommendations on the total situation will be persuasive with the President.

2. The welfare of the raw cotton industry and the success of Government policies designed to help the cotton farmer depend upon the maintenance of a healthy and prosperous cotton textile industry in this country. This country could not afford to maintain a large raw cotton industry if its customers were largely foreign mills.

3. Imports of cotton textiles and other cotton goods are substantial, are increasing at an alarming rate, and cause and threaten injury to the domestic industry.

As has been pointed out earlier, imports of cotton in the form of textiles have risen from about 33,000 bales in 1948 to approximately 318,000 bales in 1959, an increase of over 850 percent. The greatest increase has been between 1958 and 1959. Measured in terms of cloth, it has been estimated that imports of cloth, made-up goods and apparel have risen from the equivalent of 365 million

square yards in 1958 to 578 million square yards in 1959, an increase of 58 percent.

In addition, there have been substantial increase in imports of yarn, knit goods and miscellaneous manufacturers which, when converted to a square yard basis, show additional imports of almost 68 million square yards for a total of 646 million square yards in 1959.

	1958	1959	Change, from 1958 to 1959
Countable cotton cloth.....	141,539,538	240,769,514	70
Other cloths.....	7,446,788	10,327,873	39
Made-up goods.....	54,642,163	51,626,762	-6
Apparel.....	162,118,949	275,633,063	70
Total.....	365,747,438	578,357,212	58

There is no doubt that imported cottons replace domestic cottons. In an industry which has not shared in the growth and expansion of the past decade, and which is historically plagued with overproduction, imports depress prices, earnings, and wages and inhibit needed investment and progress.

4. Beginning in 1954 and carrying through 1955 our industry was threatened by the rapid growth in imports of Japanese cotton goods. The reasons for this growth were lower production costs based on lower labor and overhead costs in Japan. This threat was not induced by differences in cotton costs. We in the industry made every effort to meet this problem and were gratified by the action of the Japanese in establishing a comprehensive system of export quotas.

At that time our problem was almost exclusively one of Japanese imports. It was pointed out by us at the time the Japanese announced the present 5-year quota that "the arrangement deals with a particular situation of cotton goods imports from Japan. Similar problems in connection with other textile products and with other countries are not covered. These must likewise be solved if the industry as a whole is to prosper."

Since that time the Japanese quotas have limited shipments to the United States but imports from other sources have begun to rise at alarming rates. In 1956 cotton textile imports from Hong Kong were negligible. In 1959 we estimate that cotton goods imports from Hong Kong will reach the equivalent of 170 million square yards. The upward trend of imports from other countries is also marked.

	India	Korea	Formosa	Pakistan
1956.....	5,702,907			45,994
1957.....	1,098,280			13,455
1958.....	1,328,999	4,792,428	127,113	27,856
1959 ¹	21,816,000	6,411,000	8,078,000	7,557,000

¹ Estimated.

These developments have brought about a situation which did not exist in 1956 but which was foreseen. This investigation offers the means for dealing with the current and developing problem before more damage is inflicted.

5. The first quota limitations were announced by the Japanese before a two-price cotton system came into existence. The reasons for urging the quota arrangement were based on differences in wage costs, and were not dependent on the existence or absence of a two-price cotton system. We believe that the principle of quotas covering all types of cotton goods, from yarn to apparel, broken down by categories, and geared to a percentage of domestic production, is sound. We welcomed the acceptance by the Japanese and American Governments of this principle.

We urge the Tariff Commission to recommend quotas. The Japanese arrangement should serve as a pattern. Within any total quota the Japanese should retain the quotas and subquotas which they established in 1957.

6. When the Japanese quotas were developed in 1956 and 1957 we were aware that the threat of imports from other sources would undoubtedly grow, and we made it clear that our efforts to protect ourselves from this threat would continue. It would be inconsistent to urge limitations on Japanese imports and fail to make every effort to limit imports from other sources. This proceeding offers the means within the framework of our laws to accomplish this.

7. Imports of Japanese cotton goods rose from 84.6 million square yards in 1953 to 237.5 million square yards in 1955, at which time the Japanese first announced a voluntary quota. This increase of 180 percent should be contrasted with the growth of imports of Hong Kong cotton goods from 20.8 million square yards in 1957 to 170 million square yards in 1959, an increase of 700 percent. Japanese quotas were justified in 1955. Quotas on imports from other countries are justified now.

8. A fee equivalent to the per pound export subsidy rate on the cotton content of imported articles is necessary. Such an equalization fee does not solve the import problem caused by lower wage and overhead costs in foreign mills. It should, however, solve that part of the problem which is caused by the differential in cotton costs and, to that extent, is a step forward and desirable.

Such an equitable arrangement does not require extensive argument. American mills are forced, as a result of programs and legislation, to pay more for cotton than foreign mills. This being the case, tariffs on cotton goods imports should be adjusted accordingly, not only for the protection of the textile manufacturers and apparel makers, but for cotton growers as well. Failure to do this means a loss of customers for cotton growers and a loss of employment and investment in the textile and apparel industries.

9. A comprehensive system of quotas on cotton goods, including yarn, fabrics, made-up goods, apparel, and other miscellaneous cotton items should be recommended. The quota should be divided by categories, to avoid concentrations, and by countries. The total should be based on a representative period such as 1955 and divided by categories on the basis of relative production of each in the United States.

U.S. Cotton goods imports, 1958 and 1959

	1958	1959	Change, from 1958 to 1959
Countable cotton cloth.....	141,539,538	240,769,514	70
Other cloths.....	7,446,788	10,327,873	39
Made-up goods.....	54,642,163	51,626,762	-6
Apparel.....	162,118,949	275,633,063	70
Total.....	365,747,438	578,357,212	58
Cotton yarn.....	3,850,867	5,198,846	14
Knit goods.....	18,607,739	25,514,110	37
Miscellaneous cotton manufactures.....	32,366,348	37,195,408	15
Total.....	54,824,954	67,908,454	24
Total, all cotton goods imports.....	420,572,392	646,265,666	54

¹ Estimated on the basis of 10 months' actual.

² Converted to square yards by means of conversion factors used by the Business and Defense Services Administration.

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

Can Amphibious Warfare Survive in the Nuclear Age?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there has just concluded here in Washington the annual Seapower Symposium sponsored by the District of Columbia Council of the Navy League of the United States, held at the Sheraton Park Hotel. This year's symposium highlighted one of the most versatile and necessary capabilities of our balanced fleets—amphibious warfare.

The program for this significant event included a most informative article by Gen. David M. Shoup, U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps, entitled "Can Amphibious Warfare Survive in the Nuclear Age?"

At a time when our attention is so easily caught by the continuing discussions over missiles, and the constant controversy which seems to surround so many aspects of our defense preparations it is well to focus our attention upon a proven U.S. capability—amphibious warfare—in which we excel.

Again and again in the years of the cold war the free world's ability to respond to the recurrent crises which mark the East-West struggle has rested squarely upon the versatility, mobility, and instant readiness of American seapower, and in particular—the highly trained amphibious forces of the balanced fleet.

General Shoup's comments serve to remind us that what has been true in the past will remain true in the future. Whatever else we in the Congress may provide for in meeting the security requirements of the Nation, we must not neglect the very forces which time and again by their instant, impressive response have enabled the free world to stand fast in the face of Communist aggression.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the views of General Shoup, as they appeared in the program for the Amphibious Warfare Seapower Symposium 1960, in the RECORD:

CAN AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE SURVIVE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE?

(By Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps)

Amphibious warfare is a highly specialized art which has evolved over the centuries. Like more conventional forms of warfare, it has been employed at times by men of genius who fully understood it and at other times by men who lacked the vision and experience to employ the art successfully. In ancient times Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans launched successful ship-to-shore operations. Their success stemmed from recognizing the complicated and specialized nature of their task.

During the 13th century, Asia and parts of Eastern Europe fell prey to the swift cavalry of Mongol hordes from the roof of the world. Empires ceased to exist in face of their inexorable advance. They were

everywhere victorious. Yet even in their golden age and at the zenith of their success, the Mongols were unable to project themselves beyond the confines of the Eurasian landmass. Kublai Khan's attempted amphibious invasion of Japan failed partly because he lacked an understanding of seapower and amphibious warfare.

In the 18th century it was mastery of seapower and a sound national maritime philosophy which enabled England to reign supreme as mistress of the sea. But during that same century her record of success in almost a score of amphibious ventures was less than 50 percent. In the decade and a half preceding the Congress of Vienna, her landing forces were successful in only one-third of approximately a dozen operations. It was ironic that the world's greatest seapower failed to develop the techniques for projecting seapower ashore.

A century later England was responsible for one of the most disastrous of modern seaborne ventures. The abortive Anglo-French ship-to-shore assault to seize the Gallipoli Peninsula from the Turks early in World War I appeared to sound the death knell for amphibious operations. Although the ill-fated operation to seize the Golden Horn was in itself a failure, it was in many respects the guinea pig which made possible present day amphibious doctrine.

In the aftermath of World War I, U.S. marine officers, who predicted the nature of the coming amphibious war with Japan, set about to develop the techniques which would be needed to win such a war. Their work was conducted in the face of dissenting world military opinion.

When the United States was drawn into World War II we were the only Allied nation which was prepared to conduct amphibious operations on a major scale. The landing force techniques pioneered by the Marine Corps coupled with the amphibious techniques developed by the Navy enabled our country and our allies to conduct the greatest amphibious war the world has ever known. Never before in the history of the world has a coalition of allies marched or sailed farther or launched a greater number of successful amphibious operations of a major scale than the United States and her Allies in World War II.

WITH THE "MOSTEST"

Amphibious assaults in World War II were characterized by huge concentrations of men, ships, and aircraft which were launched against the enemy to exert the greatest shock possible. The attacker's combat power at the juncture of sea and land was brought from zero to the maximum attainable as rapidly as possible. Frequently the outcome was decided in favor of that belligerent who could achieve optimum mass soonest. Heavily populated battle areas were the order of the day.

World War II ended as the nuclear age was ushered in. Thus far the atomic weapons used at Nagasaki and Hiroshima constitute the only combat use of nuclear warfare, but their portent was unmistakable even in 1945. It would be sheer folly to expose great concentration of men, ships, or aircraft to possible nuclear attack by an enemy possessing the secret of the atom. A reappraisal of our methods was required.

I think it is significant to note, however, that nuclear weapons affected tacticians in all military walks of life. Accepted principles and techniques for air, naval and land warfare were subjected to just as close a scrutiny as the speciality of amphibious warfare which embraces all of the other forms of combat.

Two questions arose with respect to our speciality. Can amphibious warfare survive in the nuclear age; and, if so, does it deserve to survive?

Massing forces at the point of a main effort has been a standard combat tactic for centuries. The advent of nuclear weapons placed commanders on the horns of a dilemma. Massing forces, whether they be aircraft, ships, or men, creates a lucrative target for nuclear attack by an enemy. Conversely, if a commander disperses his forces over too great an area he subjects them to defeat in detail by an alert and mobile enemy. The secret of success in this age lies in the ability to remain dispersed except for brief periods when forces must be massed to accomplish a given mission, immediately after which they must again be dispersed before being subjected to nuclear attack.

USED IN INDOCHINA

Obviously if we are to fight a nuclear war of any proportion or even to fight a conventional war against an enemy who can, if he chooses, use nuclear weapons we must possess the means for accomplishing rapid massing and equally rapid dispersing of major forces. We found the answer in the helicopter. This highly versatile vehicle provides the means for keeping attack force ships dispersed at sea while retaining the capability to overfly enemy beach defenses and, by swift concentration of helicopter-borne troops, strike an inland objective in sufficient mass to force a decision. In place of the two-dimensional warfare of recent years—striking frontally or on a flank—we have introduced a third dimension, the vertical assault. What was merely a concept 15 years ago is now a tried and tested doctrine.

When vertical assault was first considered as a possible answer to the problem caused by the threat of a nuclear conflict, however limited, extremists were found on both sides of the scale. On one side could be found those who decried helicopters and claimed they were too vulnerable to serve a useful purpose in combat. On the other side were those who prophesied that soon all phases of an amphibious assault operation would be accomplished using helicopters. I subscribe to the middle of the road, not from any desire to compromise but because of the hard facts of reality. Helicopters were used successfully in combat in Korea by our marines and in Indochina by the French. As a means for lifting assault troops and for keeping them supplied they serve our purpose admirably.

BUDGET REALITIES

On the other side of the coin there are still some items of hardware in our inventory which do not lend themselves to being helicopter transported. Conventional means of landing must be employed if we desire these items brought ashore. In addition, the realities of the budget and competition with other programs of equal and greater importance leave no doubt that we may never have available to us all the helicopter amphibious assault ships (LPH's) we would like to have.

Amphibious assault operations for the foreseeable future will be a mixture of the old and the new. Assault elements will be lifted by helicopter; perhaps additional assault units will be lifted in amphibious vehicles, and necessary quantities of supplies, equipment, service and support troops and replacements will be landed over the beaches which must be secured by the assault troops. The mix of helicopters and surface craft contributes to dispersion, and in my view both have a proper role in modern warfare.

IN NUCLEAR ENVIRONMENT

There is no doubt in my mind that amphibious warfare is as valid in a nuclear environment as any other form of warfare. This brings me to the second part of the question I raised. Does amphibious warfare deserve to survive?

The continued existence of amphibious warfare as a practicing art can be justified

only if it meets the requirements of national strategy. It becomes necessary, therefore, to examine the objectives of our defense program. Simply stated, these objectives are: first, to deter general war; and second, to deter limited war or to win or contain limited wars without delay if they should once start.

It must be recognized that all of the armed services of the United States contribute to the overall defensive posture and therefore to the general deterrent capability of our Nation and of the free world. In the event a general war should occur the role of our retaliatory striking forces is clearly evident. The exact role of forces not having an instant retaliatory mission will depend to a great extent on the survivability inherent in the various elements which make up the opposing power blocs and the moral fiber of their people.

Our role in limited wars can be predicted accurately. There is a general consensus, with which I heartily agree, that limited wars are the most probable type of action we may have to fight. Although of less threat to national survival than general war, limited engagements merit our close attention. They must be met with the forces in being. Speed of response is a matter of primary importance.

REMINDER TO COMMUNISM

The Navy-Marine Corps response to limited war threats has been and will be the balanced fleets. Deployed in each of the great ocean areas, the fleets are maintained in a state of readiness for immediate combat employment. Our highly trained Fleet Marine Force units in close proximity to amphibious shipping stand as a constant reminder to the Communist world that we are ready and able to counter aggression in any quarter of the globe.

The deterrent potential inherent in an amphibious task force extends to all areas which can be reached or influenced from the broad expanse of the seas. Our existing capability in this regard is unique. It is unmatched anywhere else in the world and furnishes our country with a handsome return on its investment.

An amphibious task force enjoys a high degree of strategic mobility, and it can deliver its Fleet Marine Force units to a troubled area without delay. Arrival at a potential trouble spot does not signify an irrevocable commitment of a landing force, however, because the endurance of a fleet enables it to lie just over the horizon for days or weeks. It can land its landing force of marines in part or in whole should the situation deteriorate and their presence be required ashore.

The Navy-Marine Corps team stands ready at this very minute to conduct amphibious operations using the doctrine of vertical assault. However, the fire support that is available from seaward is diminishing.

DON'T BURN BRIDGES

The crashing broadsides and thunder of scores of fire support ships to which we became accustomed in the last war are now thinning out in favor of all-weather aircraft and missile support. I sound a caution here because the time has not yet arrived when we can turn our backs completely on conventional warfare techniques.

Amphibious assault transports or LPH's which were designed from the keel up for helicopter operations will be entering the fleet soon. And the CVS support carriers which have been converted for our use are doing a splendid job. Only two CVS are presently in use along with one old converted CVE escort carrier. Obviously our capability for launching an amphibious vertical assault must be increased. As I have previously indicated, marines will make their entry into enemy territory both by

helicopters and by surface craft for a long time to come.

Our organizational structure, our weapons and equipment, and our state of mind are geared for any kind of war in any environment. The necessity for amphibious readiness is still with us in full measure.

Our China Policy Must Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our China policy must change if we are to avoid war and attain peace. I wrote an article favoring recognition of Red China, after preliminary negotiations and exploration, in the March issue of the American Legion magazine. Most of the resultant mail has been very favorable to my stand. Under unanimous consent I am including a letter I received from State Representative Robert H. Barnes, Democrat, of Montville, Conn. Last year the Oregon Senate passed a resolution favoring trade with Red China in nonstrategic materials on the same basis which we use in trading with the Soviet Union.

Following is Mr. Barnes' letter, resolution, and statement to all members of the 1959 Connecticut General Assembly:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: I liked your pro stand in the March issue of the American Legion. How much longer are we to keep our head in the sand? As a veteran of five wars, including World Wars I and II, I say that it is about time we became realistic in our policy toward the China mainland. The following is what I have done about it.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

Resolution proposing a compromise with Red China Government

Whereas the situation in the Far East, notably in the Yellow Sea-Formosa Straits area, has kept the people of the United States in a state of apprehension, tension, and confusion, for a considerable length of time, which is exceedingly detrimental to the well-being of the world in general and the United States in particular, many believing that eventually the end result might well be world war III; and

Whereas since the Korean war, Korea has been divided into two hostile camps, the Communists of North Korea, with telling assistance by Red China, exerting constant political and military pressure on the Free Republic of South Korea; and

Whereas so long as the de facto government of Red China is not recognized by the United States as a de jure, sovereign nation, so long as the United States resists the efforts of Red China to join as a member of the United Nations, and so long as the controversy over the Quemoy-Matsu Islands remains unresolved, strained relations between the two countries, Red China and the United States, will continue unabated; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, well knowing the aims and desires of Red China, as heretofore indicated, should take full advantage of this favorable and promising opportunity, before it is too late, to resolve the differences between the two countries, by offering to compromise the aims and desires of both countries, Red China and the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That it is the consensus of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut that for the general welfare and tranquillity of the people of Connecticut and of the United States, the following proposal be made by the United States to Red China, viz, that:

(1) The Government of the United States will recognize Red China as a going, established, and sovereign nation, with the institution of diplomatic relations between the two countries, Red China and the United States;

(2) The United States will not oppose the entrance of Red China into membership of the United Nations; and

(3) The United States will endeavor to induce the Government of Formosa to give up the Quemoy and Matsu Islands to Red China, these three concessions in exchange for:

(a) Red China to withdraw its forces and influence from North Korea, aiding in the reunion of North Korea with the free Republic of South Korea;

(b) Red China to withdraw its forces and influence from the kingdom of Tibet and such other countries and territories not a part of China proper;

(c) Red China to recognize Formosa as a free, separate, and sovereign nation, and agreeing further not to covet, molest, or attack this island empire; and

(d) Red China will return to the United States all military and civilian prisoners now held by Red China, upon the confirmation of these bilateral concessions, by both Red China and the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate shall cause copies of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States and to the 86th Congress.

To All Members of the 1959 General Assembly:

I have submitted for approval and passage by this assembly a resolution dealing with the unconscionable and deplorable situation now prevailing in the Far East between the Governments of the United States and Red China which if passed by this assembly will be forwarded to the President and the 86th Congress of the United States.

The benefits derived from this resolution to the State of Connecticut, if the suggestions set forth in the resolution are carried out to a successful conclusion, are many, but most importantly (not mentioned in the resolution for obvious reasons) would be the boost to the economy; Connecticut, a manufacturing State, selling its goods once again to China, directly or indirectly.

The writer of this explanation of the subject resolution once lived in China, during which time, learned a great deal about the Chinese people, their customs, habits, and thinking. I also learned of a considerable degree of friendship for Americans, better than that for the peoples of other occidental countries, stemming from the time Yankee Clippers went around the Horn and commenced trading with Chinese merchants, and the action of the American Government at the turn of the century (1900) when the United States declared for an open door policy in dealing with the Chinese, opposing the greediness of the other major powers who desired to divide a then very weak China into spheres of influence. However, today, that reservoir of friendship is rapidly being dissipated, as a result of a stubborn U.S. policy that has long since become bankrupt.

Not only are we losing this friendship but let's not forget that we have already lost almost all of our once substantial commerce with China, there remaining but a trickle through such places of entry like that at the port of Hong Kong. I have lived and visited in the seaports along the coast of China—Canton, Hong Kong, Swatow, Amoy, Shanghai, Weihaiwei, Chefoo, Tientsin, and Chin-

wangtao—and have seen our huge ocean liners, tankers, and freighters at the docks, but today that good, inspiring sight has ceased to exist. I have been inland and have seen American goods in abundance but that also has disappeared from view. We are currently not selling to China by reason of our nonrecognition, while all other principal powers have access to this market, resulting from their acceptance of Red China as an organized, going nation.

As a result of our nonrecognition, the Communists of Red China are taking advantage of the situation—to our disadvantage. They are not telling the people that our opposition is due to our disapproval and distrust of their communistic government, but rather that we dislike them, the Chinese personally, the color of their skin, their inferiority, their low position in the scheme of things. They are conducting a hate campaign that will continue until the entire population of 650 million will look upon the United States as their mortal enemy. The only solution is to get back into China as quickly as possible to let them know us once again.

Let us not forget that our posture of opposition and the hatred being generated is aiding the Reds where they need aid the most. It is helping them to solidify their position and firm up their control over the Chinese people, selling communism to them, and getting their complete, all-out cooperation for the aims and goals of the Communist movement.

The provisions of my resolution, if carried out, would not only benefit both sides, the United States and China, but would be face-saving for both countries. Let's not forget that face saving is more important to the Chinese than life itself.

A final point. What happens if we become involved in a war with Soviet Russia? As matters now stand, Red China would be on Russia's side. But if we were on friendly terms with Red China, it is quite possible that Red China would come in on our side, because the Chinese have never forgotten or forgiven the Russians for invading and possessing, at one time or another, large chunks of China, like Manchuria, Inner and Outer Mongolia. China would like nothing better than to revenge herself on the Russians. Why don't we take advantage of this situation as a part of our national defense, strategical and tactical planning?

For a better feeling of security and economic well-being for the people of Connecticut, I earnestly and respectfully solicit the support of every member of the Senate and House in this 1959 general assembly. Thank you.

ROBERT H. BARNES,
Representative From Montville.

Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans owe many things to many peoples, for we are indebted to innumerable countries and peoples for what they have contributed to our civilization. We are especially indebted to Italy for giving birth to two great Italians whose deeds and names are indissolubly connected with America. Christopher Columbus, one of the great explorers in his days,

discovered the New World, and his contemporary, Amerigo Vespucci, gave his name to the New World.

This enterprising son of a notary public in Florence was born on March 9, 1451. From his early youth he was an adventurer, anxious to go far and away from home. His parents placed him in the great commercial and banking house of the Medici, and that connection offered him opportunities to travel and sail to all parts of the then known world. In about 1500 he entered the service of Don Manuel, of Portugal, and made several expeditions to the New World. It is believed that some time in 1504 he came here and gave his name America to our continent. Today, on the 509th anniversary of his birthday, let us remember this great explorer, this great son of Florence.

The Vision of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate this week the 110th anniversary of the birth of one of Europe's greatest statesmen of our modern era.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the George Washington of Czechoslovakia, was a man of vision, of action, and of profound humanity. As one scholar has written, "Masaryk's life and work remain an inspiration for all free peoples, and his name stands out in the company of the immortal creators of our civilization."

When the infant Czech Republic emerged from the chaos of World War I, Thomas Masaryk became that Nation's first President. For 17 years he guided the destinies of a remarkable experiment in applied democracy. Under his leadership, Czechoslovakia became a model of political liberty and economic progress for all of Europe.

In no area was Masaryk's achievement more brilliant than in the area of land reform. Land tenure was one of the greatest problems facing his Nation. A state largely agricultural, Czechoslovakia had to break with its feudal legacy if it was to survive as a stable, well-ordered democracy.

To a great extent, Czechoslovakia had been a land of the dispossessed. The peasant toiled on land that was not his own and accrued little from the fruits of his labor that went to the landlord.

Under Masaryk's guidance a remarkably just 1919 Land Reform Act was put into operation. By the end of 1937, over 4½ million acres of land had been distributed to about 650,000 applicants. The total distribution would have increased to 5 million acres and 700,000 applicants by 1940 had not the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia intervened.

The significance of this extensive land reform program cannot be overestimated. Here was an agrarian revolution on a grand scale, a demonstration of a

democratic revolution in depth carried on peacefully, efficiently, and with justice. The old social and economic order had been transformed, and a genuine democratic system was erected on a new base.

Masaryk's land reform assured the success of the Czechoslovak democratic Republic because it consolidated the support of the people, Czech and Slovak alike, for the Republic. Vital to this success was the President's intense faith in his own people.

But Masaryk's Czech patriotism was grounded in a wider vision as well: a vision of the interdependence of all nations. He became a tireless and eloquent spokesman for the idea of self-determination within federation—the federation of the nations of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Aegean, and ultimately the federation of all free nations everywhere.

Fortunately, Thomas Masaryk did not live to see the betrayal of his nation at Munich and the later tragedies which wrote a temporary end to Czech democracy. Nor did he live to see the postwar world fall sadly short of the aspirations he cherished for all mankind.

In the winter of 1948, I had dinner in Prague with his son, Jan Masaryk, then serving as Czechoslovakia's Foreign Minister. It was the eve of the Communist coup d'etat and Jan Masaryk was caught in the struggle against Soviet encroachment which had already engulfed most of Eastern Europe.

In the noble tradition of his father, Jan Masaryk told me of his fervent hope somehow to build a bridge between the Soviet world and the Western democracies.

Yet the construction of such a bridge was clearly no longer possible. When Czechoslovakia attempted to join the Marshall plan some months later, the Soviet Union forced the Government to reverse its decision. The Czechs fell under the dark shadow of Communist tyranny, and with their fall the subjugation of Eastern Europe was complete.

This week we can recall both the life and the vision of the elder Masaryk with a purpose. For, more than any other man, he embodied the ideals and aspirations of all the nationalities of Eastern Europe. And until the battle which he waged so long is at last won—until the peoples of Eastern Europe can practice the self-determination he preached—we can never accept as final the political arrangements of Eastern Europe that have been imposed by armed might.

A Different Look at Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Journal, Atlanta, Tex., in its issue

of March 3, 1960, contained an article on "A Different Look at Democracy." This article, which won first place in the Americanism contest, sponsored by the Athenaeum Club, of Atlanta, Tex., was written by John Hudspeth, a senior in Atlanta:

A DIFFERENT LOOK AT DEMOCRACY

(By John Hudspeth)

The world we live in today is very small and complex. America seems to be the pacesetter and each year it paces its people and the rest of the world even more rapidly. Here in America, we have adopted the scheduled life, with as much as possible crowded into it. So much goes on at such a terrific pace in this life that we are often apt to be confused and a little bit frightened. Hardly a day passes now that we don't hear of a new scandal being discovered, especially in big business. The American is not sure he can trust even his neighborhood butcher anymore. Recently he has found that he has been defrauded in his own living room by none other than his television set. He is also shocked by the price he has been paying for commodities, such as drugs; and how his fellow American is making such a tremendous profit at his expense.

Besides these things, we daily hear of steel strikes, space programs, presidential candidates, foreign aid, national surplus, balancing the budget, and new communist activities. Is it not only natural for the American to be a little confused and frightened?

But just a moment, is this our idea of an American? One too busy and confused to enjoy and appreciate life? Is this the impression we are giving other people? Or is it just the opposite, the "Hollywood view"—a carefree life with nothing to do but drive sport cars, eat caviar, to night clubs, drink champagne, and ignore all morals. Perhaps this is the American's idea of success.

The question is, "Has America lost sight of what it was established for?" We say we have political freedom, but how many turn out for the polls? We declare we have religious freedom, but why is it that the church pews are never full? We talk about our freedom of speech, but how many use it to speak out against an injustice? I believe in the Optimist's Creed, but how long can we just sit back and let things work themselves out?

As citizens of tomorrow, we must face up to these questions. To do this, we must prepare ourselves. I believe everyone realizes that education will be a big factor in the world of tomorrow. But we too often forget that before we can apply our education to help solve the problems of our world, we must be at peace with God and with ourselves. We must recognize the real values in life; its meaning and how to live it; love and how to apply it; forgiveness and how to practice it. A well loved American novelist has expressed what I am trying to say very well.

He says, "Oh Lord, thank You for the privilege and gift of living in the world filled with beauty and excitement and variety."

"Thank You for the gift of loving and being loved, for friendliness and understanding, for the beauty of the animals on the farm and in the forest and marshes, for the green of the trees, the sound of a waterfall, the darting beauty of the trout in the brook."

"Thank You for the delights of music and children, of other men's thoughts and conversation and their books to read by the fire-side or in bed with the rain falling on the roof or the snow blowing past outside the window."

"Thank You for the beauties of the four seasons and for the churches and the houses built by fellow men that stand throughout the centuries as monuments to man's aspirations and sense of beauty."

"I thank You for all of these things and many more, and above all I thank You for people with all their goodness and understanding which so far outweigh their vices, their envy, their deceptions."

"Thank You, God, for life itself, without which the universe would have no meaning."

At this time you may be asking yourself, "What does this have to do with democracy?" If so, answer this, Could people in a Communist-controlled country be thankful for these many things? From my conception of Communist rule, they could not.

Only in a free, democratic nation can such attributes such as ours prevail.

When my generation has lived its short time upon this earth, I pray that our descendants will be able to give thanks for what this novelist has. If they can, I believe our efforts will not have been in vain.

Therefore, the youth of tomorrow must be a well-educated citizen with a strong moral character. He must have faith, not only in God, but in himself. If our generation produces this person, then I feel confident that America will continue to be the Nation that it has in the past, and that no power on earth will be able to crush it out.

Report of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Society of American Registered Architects held their first national convention last September in Kansas City, and elected Mr. Wilfred J. Gregson of Atlanta, Ga., as their national president. This expression of trust and confidence in Mr. Gregson on the part of the membership of this society was in recognition of the fact that he was the moving force and the guiding light behind the creation of this organization.

The Society of American Registered Architects is a professional organization whose objectives are "the unification of all architects into a harmonious, democratic society and the improvement of architecture and architects by a recognition of the responsibility each architect has for each other." In the words of this society's recently elected national president, "The Society of American Registered Architects is a society designed to represent all registered architects. Its one intention is to operate under the Golden Rule and have all architects relate themselves to each other the same way, advancing in general the practice of architecture for all architects."

At the September meeting, Mr. Gregson made the president's report to the convention. The January 1960 brochure of the society carries the following article regarding this report:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

"You are my report. You are the ones who have made the first great step toward a unified profession of architecture. You are a living report that will go to every part of these 50 United States."

So said President Wilfred Gregson in his

report to ARA members at the opening sessions of the national meeting.

"You will take back the olive branch as a token that the waters of selfishness are receding" said the founder of ARA. Describing the founding of ARA through his own efforts and with the aid of many others, Gregson stated that ARA is now a powerful society throughout the United States.

"We have succeeded in proving that there is a great need for the Society of American Registered Architects; that there are unlimited ways such a society can be of value to each architect, his client, his town, State, and Nation. * * * We can't cure all the ills at once, but we have started and can see possibilities of great expanses."

The president of ARA predicted that the unselfish work of ARA members will end in finer architecture and more unified distribution of the proceeds.

He stated that the task of ARA members is to enlist every registered architect in the United States.

"Architects must be represented before Congress," the president declared. He asked that some ancient taboos on advertising be recognized as now out of date.

The theory "it's better to do nothing than to be called unethical" has played into the hands of a few moguls and helped a few gigantic firms to flourish, Gregson stated.

The ARA program is simple. It is all architects for all architects. ARA policy is to build up architects, not fence them in, the president explained.

"We must alert architects to the greatness which is ours. We must teach our own people that there is a god of plenty in the heavens and that the doctrine of insufficiency is evil."

"The control of ARA is by officers who are elected each year at the annual meeting. The nominations committee is also elected at each annual meeting. There can be no stacked vote or perpetuation of officers. This includes your president who automatically becomes past president at the meeting of 1960, when a newly elected president will take the gavel."

As a final charge he told members that ARA must not become overcomplicated, or its objectives forgotten.

WILFRED J. GREGSON,
National President.

Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian Explorer Yesterday, and Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian Training Ship Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting story in the American student's history of colonial America is that of Amerigo Vespucci, Italian navigator, from whom the American Continents received their name. Vespucci left accounts of his voyages the first of which, in June of 1497, seemed to have reached the South American Continent before Columbus or Cabot. A German mapmaker, Martin Waldseemüller, who translated the narratives of Vespucci, suggested in 1507 that because he was the first to make known his explorations in the New World that it might be proper

to name the new continent America. At first the name was applied to only the southern continent but gradually it came to include the northern also.

Another story relating to Vespucci is of current interest. This is the account of the naval training ship, the *Amerigo Vespucci*, named in honor of the Italian explorer. This ship is now in use in the Italian Navy to train sailors participating in NATO for the common defense of the West.

Both the stories, although over four and one-half centuries apart, are illustrative of the Italian's relationship toward America. The first shows how a skilled and courageous Italian seafarer was one of the first to explore our shores. The second is symbolic of the Italian peoples determination to align their efforts with America and other NATO nations for the defense of the free world.

Americans, also, have always felt a close relationship to the Italian people. For generations they have admired sunny Italy with her priceless monuments of the past. Moreover, they have always been grateful for the Italian immigrants' contributions to the political, economic, social, and cultural growth of America.

At times, however, Americans have been concerned about the fate of Italy. Her predicament under fascism troubled us profoundly. But since the war, this fear has been dissipated because Italy has shown decisively that she is glad to have reacquired her freedom and has shown this by her desire to be aligned with the West. This has been the will of the great majority of the Italian people. Italy has once more resumed her place of responsibility and cooperation in the family of free nations.

Ever since the inception of NATO, Italy has given her unstinted support to this Organization. Despite the numerous political, economic, and social problems that faced Italy at home after the war, she still has managed to do her share in this alliance of the nations of the free world. In the joint military exercises by NATO during the past few years, Italy has shown that she is an important and integral part of the Western defense system.

The progress of Italy since the war has been made possible by the generous and laborious character of her people as well as by the assistance granted by her allies, especially the United States. Nevertheless, Italy is the first to be aware that economic and political problems still have to be faced. Consequently, she is ever vigilant in the fight against poverty, fear, and aggression.

It is well that on this March 9, the birthday of Vespucci, we stress the close relationship that exists between the United States and Italy which goes beyond the military pacts and agreements that they have signed. Friendship between these two nations stems from an identity of democratic ideals and ties of affection and blood which existed long before these diplomatic pacts and which have tended to keep the two nations close in spite of the geographic distance that separates them.

Report by the Sigma Delta Chi Freedom of Information Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that most American citizens believe that during peacetime, at least, the people of this country are entitled to know what its Government is doing. Yet we know that certain officials in the executive branch of our Federal Government have taken upon themselves to deny information requested by the Congress.

Every Member of Congress knows that an informed public is an intelligent public. While we are aware of some fine work on the part of TV and radio in disseminating information, I feel that our American newspapers are doing a fine and intelligent job of informing the public.

With this in mind, I wish to bring to the attention of every Member of Congress portions of the 1959 report by the Sigma Delta Chi Freedom of Information Committee. This report recounts not only significant efforts of this professional group of 16,000 journalists on behalf of the public's right to know, but also continuing situations where that right has been denied.

I want to emphasize that Sigma Delta Chi has been a leader nationally in the fight to diminish unwarranted secrecy in government at every level and to open the conduct of public business to the people, through the press. Sigma Delta Chi is therefore to be commended on the great fight they have made and are making to remove excessive restrictions on Government information. The Congress must not let them down for the future freedom of the American press is tied up with the future freedom of the American people.

The report follows:

PROGRESS IN FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Piecemeal progress was made in 1959 against unjustified secrecy imposed by Federal officials on information involving the operations of Government. At the same time, however, the imposition of secrecy on the broad and undefined ground of executive privilege reached a new peak, posing the most serious threat to the theory of open government so far in U.S. history.

The major victory in the fight against Government secrecy was the opening of Senate office payrolls for publication. Newspaper pressure forced the U.S. Senate to open for publication the payrolls of individual Senators. Vance H. Trimble, of the Scripps-Howard Washington bureau, led the way to elimination of this payroll secrecy with his series of articles on congressional payroll scandals. Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, of Missouri, initiated the action in the Senate which resulted in the opening of the payrolls.

It is important to note that the pressure of public opinion resulted in opening the Senate payrolls after a Federal court had rejected Trimble's lawsuit in which he had contended the Senate had no legal right to

hide the payroll records. The court ruled that the Congress had a right to make its own rules relative to administration of its own affairs.

The case demonstrated how an overwhelming public opinion and a solid front of newspaper editorial support can force the opening of Government records, even when an agency of Government might have some legal right to withhold the records.

Late in 1959, Representative JOHN E. MOSS' House Subcommittee on Government Information issued a 454-page report on the year's running fight against secrecy in Federal Government, and it drew the following conclusions:

"1. Continued withholding of information and officials' reports from the public and the Congress solely because knowledge might create controversy or affect the sensibilities of Federal employees will inevitably destroy the very keystone of American Government—the principle that the operations of Government must endure the crucible of public debate.

"2. Neither the Constitution nor the laws enacted by Congress, nor the decisions of the courts, provide any basis for the claim of 'executive privilege' now imposed upon the public and the Congress. The 'privilege' of secrecy, claimed by officials far down the administrative line from the President, is nothing more than an insidious resurgence of the divine right of an all-powerful Executive—a doctrine laid to rest more than a century and a half ago by the American Revolution and the Constitution of the United States.

"3. To an alarming degree, the Pentagon's information organization has assumed characteristics of a propaganda ministry, and confusion has replaced candor in areas of vital importance to the survival of a democratic society.

"4. The bureaucratic attitude which holds that the people must justify their right of access to Government information requires a continuing congressional pressure to remind Federal agencies that 'public business is the public's business.'"

On October 17, in a speech to the College of Journalism at the University of Colorado, Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, said:

"The problem of secrecy in Federal Government probably will get a lot worse before it gets better, and it will not get better until the majority of the Nation's newspapers realize that the fight for freedom of information is a lot more than an attempt to get more handouts from more Government agencies so newspapers can fill their news columns using fewer reporters."

Your committee subscribes wholeheartedly to these statements from a congressional committee which has spent 4 years investigating secrecy in Federal Government.

GAINS AND LOSSES IN 1959

During the year, Representative MOSS' House Subcommittee on Government Information continued its watchdog surveillance over the Federal bureaucracy, taking up many complaints from the press and the public. In its final report for the year, the subcommittee listed 35 areas of inquiry, citing some gains and some losses. Here is its record:

"1. Every department which had cited the 'housekeeping' statute (5 U.S.C. 22) as authority to restrict information reported that the 1958 freedom of information amendment to the statute did not limit executive power to restrict information.

"2. The Defense Department established an elaborate 'hold for release' system to control nonsecurity information about missile and satellite projects and create a favorable public reaction.

"3. The Defense Department shrouded the Atlas-Score talking satellite project in deep secrecy and, when the event was publicized, created the false impression that the satellite was more than twice as big as the largest comparable Russian satellite.

"4. The Defense Department repeatedly used the claim of military security to refuse information about the use of monkeys in scientific efforts.

"5. The Defense Department refused to release pictures of the outside of the Titan missile even though the outside configuration had been declassified and the missile stood in full public view, but pictures were released of the President viewing the completed missile just before the November 1958 elections.

"6. The Defense Department reorganized information activities to give the Department's public relations office greater control over the release of information by the military experts.

"7. Executive agencies used the excuse of security censorship to delete nonsecurity information from congressional testimony.

"8. The Army supported the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors' policy of doing business in secret, admitting there is no statutory authority for the Board's secret meetings but contending secrecy permitted free discussion of controversial items in the billions of dollars worth of public works projects handled by Board.

"9. The Federal Aviation Agency refused to make public reports on malfunctions of new-type altimeters installed in commercial jet airplanes after restricting use of the altimeters, claiming the public might 'misinterpret' the facts.

"10. The Federal Power Commission refused to make public a Commission staff report on a proposed power exchange contract, claiming the staff would not comment freely on controversial matters if the information were available to the public.

"11. The Labor Department claimed Federal-State cooperation would be weakened by public access to Bureau of Employment Security analyses of administration of State unemployment insurance laws.

"12. The Bureau of Prisons denied public access to studies of conditions in local jails for fear of 'controversy,' claiming an 'executive privilege' for the restriction.

"13. The Housing and Home Finance Agency refused to make public audit reports of local housing authorities financed with Federal funds, claiming employees would not comment freely if the information were made public and asserting an 'executive privilege' to restrict the reports.

"14. The Air Coordinating Committee cited an executive privilege as authority for refusing a State official access to minutes of its meetings.

"15. The Civil Service Commission claimed an executive privilege to hide the result of an investigation of irregularities in a Virginia rural mail carrier examination.

"16. The Army refused to make public the records of military trials which had been held in public even though records of comparable civil trials are available, claiming as authority for the restriction the 'inherent authority of the executive branch to safeguard records in the public interest.'

"17. The Navy backed up a subordinate official's refusal of a congressional request for an unclassified report on the Naval Gun Factory, claiming that the report would cause controversy and asserting an executive privilege for the refusal.

"18. The White House refused a congressional request for information on Operations Coordinating Board guidelines directing the Defense Department information policies, claiming an executive privilege to withhold the information.

"18. The House and Home Finance Agency claimed an executive privilege to refuse information on an investigation of the Los Angeles City Housing Authority to the California State Legislature, the attorney general of California, and to the Congress.

"20. The General Accounting Office reported the citation of executive privilege for numerous refusals by executive agencies to make available information which the agencies are required by law to provide the GAO.

"21. The Civil Service Commission reversed its earlier policy of making public the names of retiring Federal employees, contending that the information should be restricted because there was no law authorizing the release even though no law prohibited it.

"22. The Electronic Production Resources Agency in the Defense Department reversed the policy of making available to the public nonsecurity statistics after the Department of Commerce protested release of the information.

"23. The Department of Justice continued restrictions on access to information about Federal prisoners.

"24. The Navy provided reports of tests of an arctic cargo sled to the designer of the sled who had been trying to get the information for 10 years.

"25. The Army disclosed information on medical payments after a private citizen had tried for 8 years to obtain the information.

"26. The Comptroller of the Currency initially refused to make public the blank forms filled out by persons applying for national bank charters, contending that only legitimate requests for the blank forms should be honored, but later made the blank forms available when asked to cite statutory authority for the refusal.

"27. The Budget Bureau clarified restrictions on testimony by Defense Department witnesses before congressional Appropriations Committees, contending that military experts are not completely free to express personal views at variance with budget requests.

"28. The Bureau of Public Roads removed restrictions on the availability of nationwide highway statistics, making the information available to local government officials who needed it for tax planning purposes.

"29. The Defense Department issued a directive declassifying most military documents originated before 1946 and continued its study of methods to declassify current documents and prevent overclassification.

"30. The Defense Department stated that an attempt by a Navy public information officer to screen questions which reporters ask of high-ranking officials was a mistake contrary to Department policy.

"31. The Federal Aviation Agency made available a previously restricted engineering report on the materials to be used in paving the new Washington International Airport.

"32. The Agriculture Department clarified regulations which had been misused to restrict public access to crop allotment records, particularly in California.

"33. The Interior Department made available previously restricted information on leases of public lands and took steps to revise information practices in Bureau of Land Management offices.

"34. The Treasury Department, under requirements of a new law, provided for public access to applications filed by nonprofit organizations for tax exempt status.

"35. The Internal Revenue Service made more information publicly available about tax court cases and established an information seminar for executives."

San Francisco, City by the Golden Gate, Lauded by Premier Khrushchev in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the New York Times of Wednesday, March 9, quoting the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union, Premier Khrushchev, as saying that San Francisco, my home city and my district, has done more to establish good relations between the United States and the Soviet Union than any other city. He also described San Francisco as the best city in the whole United States of America. Mr. Speaker, as a native of San Francisco, I am proud of the remarks of the Premier and I am certain his feeling is reciprocated by millions of Americans. His remarks were made to our mayor, Hon. George Christopher, who is now touring the Soviet Union as an official guest of the Government.

The article follows:

A U.S. MAYOR IS WARMLY RECEIVED BY
KHRUSHCHEV

(By Osgood Caruthers)

Moscow, March 8—Premier Khrushchev was reported today to have declared that the Soviet Union was ready to enter a worldwide pact to destroy all nuclear weapons "under proper surveillance." This was reported by San Francisco's Mayor, George Christopher, shortly after he and his party had had an hour-long talk with Mr. Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. The meeting was followed by a luncheon in the great Kremlin Palace. Mr. Christopher and his wife have been touring the Soviet Union as guests of Mr. Khrushchev since February 25. The interview in the Premier's office with Mr. Khrushchev and First Deputy Premiers Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol R. Kozlov was the climax of the journey.

Mr. Christopher said that there had been some heated debate on the general subject of rival ideologies but that with the exception of Mr. Khrushchev's brief remark concerning the banning of nuclear weapons specific world issues had not been discussed.

Mr. Khrushchev asked the mayor to tell the American people that the Soviet Union would never provoke or level an attack against the United States, Mr. Christopher said.

The general atmosphere of the meeting was warm hospitality, Mr. Christopher reported. The Premier recalled how his reception in San Francisco during his visit to the United States last fall was in warm contrast to the uncomfortable time he had in Los Angeles.

MAYOR MAKES PROPOSALS

"He told me that San Francisco had done more to establish good relations between the United States and the Soviet Union than any other city," Mr. Christopher said. "He said San Francisco had 'broken the ice' and he thought it was 'the best city in the whole United States of America.'"

The Soviet leader was said to have assured Mr. Christopher that when President Eisenhower visits the Soviet Union next June his reception here would be "even warmer than mine was in San Francisco."

Mayor Christopher has been peppering Soviet authorities with proposals for various types of exchanges between Moscow and San Francisco, including a possible return visit by Mr. Khrushchev.

He suggested that a future summit meeting be held in San Francisco, that the Kremlin hasten to agree to a direct route that would permit Pan American World Airways to fly from San Francisco over the polar route to Moscow, that the Soviet Union participate in a "world technical information and exchange center" he hopes to set up in his city and that the two cities expand cultural and student exchanges.

He also proposed that the Soviet Union permit Conrad Hilton to build a hotel in Moscow, that the Soviet Union buy California wines and that the Soviet Union agree to let Frank (Lefty) O'Doul bring all needed equipment here to teach the Russians baseball with an eye to future contests between the two cities. Mr. O'Doul, a former National League batting and outfield star, managed the San Francisco Seals of the Pacific Coast League.

The Soviet reaction to the baseball idea was somewhat less than enthusiastic, Mr. Christopher indicated.

The only proposal from the Golden Gate that was successful was for an exchange of animals between the zoos of the two cities. San Francisco soon is to receive a pair of Tibetan snow leopards and six saiga antelopes, the mayor reported. In exchange San Francisco is to send six California sea lions by air across the pole and is considering the Moscow Zoo's request for mountain lions, Canada geese pronghorn antelopes and other North American animals.

The highlight of Mr. Christopher's visit to the Kremlin, he reported, came when Premier Khrushchev walked with him, arm around his shoulders, across the Kremlin courtyard through throngs of Soviet sightseers and introduced him to them amid cheers and applause.

"I cannot imagine President Eisenhower doing that sort of thing in Washington," Mayor Christopher, a Republican, commented.

On the Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I have always said that as the leader of the free world, our country cannot escape its responsibility in helping to maintain the moral, social, and economic stability of other freedom-loving nations in the world in our common battle for survival against atheistic communism. And, Mr. Speaker, the record clearly shows that our people in the past have not shrunk from this responsibility—they have borne the crushing burden of extra taxes, they have permitted the future of our children to be mortgaged by the multi-billion-dollar foreign aid programs, but Mr.

Speaker, I wonder how long our President can expect the support of the people's representatives in Congress in his request for more and more foreign aid, when his administration becomes more and more critical of our requests for flood-control projects as insurance against disaster for our own people. As a matter of fact, I wonder how the administration expects us to be able to meet our commitments all over the world if we are not permitted to safeguard our natural resources from which our wealth flows.

I would remind my colleagues that while I have never asked for funds except for projects approved by the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the Committee on Public Works, none of the long list of flood-control projects set up in the foreign aid program have any such approval. I am confident that the Members of the House will not follow this narrow view and will this year, as they have in the past, support my requests for flood-control money to provide manageable streams as an investment in our future.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a fine column, entitled "On the Square," by P. Wendell, from the March 7 edition of the Newark Advocate, Newark, Ohio, Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing resentment among the good people in my congressional district against those policies which suggest that we have plenty of everything for the people in foreign lands but not enough for our own folks at home:

ON THE SQUARE
(By P. Wendell)

A flood-scarred citizenry is taking a dim view of the sudden switch to pinch-penny frugality within the Bureau of the Budget. If this strange impulse had been directed toward the billions being squandered in foreign aid, Newark would have joined in the applause.

But the refusal to grant \$32,000 for a flood-control survey of the Licking watershed is a pinch in the wrong place.

Such an appropriation, strongly urged by Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING, would have activated the first step toward vital measures of local survival.

It would seem a trivial contribution on the part of a free-spending Government—with the welfare of a populous community in jeopardy.

Instead, the Eisenhower regime is pressing Congress to appropriate new billions to succor the afflicted in foreign lands whose plight touches the President's heart.

Newark and environs still show the scars of the greatest flood disaster in history—and a similar preliminary setting is now in evidence.

It was no comfort to hear Herbert Eagon, director of the State department of natural resources, sound a warning against a sudden thaw.

If the spring rains should arrive while Ohio is still blanketed by a heavy snow, another flood catastrophe could logically ravage the State.

The conditions were similar—lingering snow, frozen soil, and a heavy rain—when the rising waters engulfed a helpless community a year ago.

And Newark is no better prepared today, even after 14 months' warning, to meet such an emergency.

The protective dike on the South Side, bogged down in pointless controversy, is just as inadequate as it was in 1959.

The waterworks dam, washed out in the flood to give the city the bitter taste of a water crisis, is still a grim joke.

And a new administration, redolent with promise, is diligently dickering over a sensible substitute that won't be delivered until in the spring.

Newark's smoldering wrath over the Federal budget rebuff will not be cooled when Congress votes still more funds to complete the Dillon Dam.

In the light of the millions poured into this project, worthless as a safeguard for Newark, the \$32,000 asked for at tributary survey is a mere pittance.

Yet, all of a sudden, the Bureau of the Budget decides to tighten the pursestrings until Ike taps the Treasury to sterilize foreign soil against the seeds of communism.

It would seem that the American people, who have rebuffed strange doctrines, should be rewarded, at least to the extent of receiving back a few of their own tax dollar for their own protection.

Perhaps we should begin sweeping off our front doorstep before running around with an eager broom to dust off the grimy premises of our distant neighbors.

What's Wrong With the Way We Pick a President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson has examined our method of nominating and electing a President and has found many shortcomings that prevent the quadrennial contest from becoming the forum it should be for serious discussion of the policies that would best serve our national purpose.

In two thought-provoking articles for This Week magazine, Governor Stevenson analyzed the problem and posed a possible solution: A televised great debate series on the pattern of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. It is a happy coincidence that Governor Stevenson is a great grandson of Jesse Fell, the Illinois editor who proposed the Lincoln-Douglas debates on the slavery issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the first of the two articles and will submit the second for publication in the next issue of the RECORD.

[From This Week, Feb. 28, 1960]

CHOICE BY HULLABALOO—I

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Shortly before last Thanksgiving, two candidates for Presidential nomination, one a Democrat and one a Republican, visited Wisconsin to win friends and influence people. The cranberry uproar was at its height: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had announced that cranberries might be contaminated by a chemical insecticide, and, with Thanksgiving at hand, "busier than a cranberry merchant" had become for the Nation's cranberry merchant a cruel mockery.

THE CANDIDATES ATE CRANBERRIES

Wisconsin raises cranberries, and Wisconsin growers maintained their berries were healthy. To prove it they entreated the Democratic candidate to drink a big glass of Wisconsin cranberry juice for all to be-

hold. He did. Then the Republican also came to Wisconsin, and of course he promptly ate four helpings of cranberries—for the benefit of the photographers.

But I submit that, however important the cranberry is to the cranberry merchant, whether a candidate indorses it has very little to do with his qualifications to be the President of the United States.

I do not mean to criticize these candidates for succumbing to the inevitable. I have been in similar predicaments. I've worn silly hats and eaten indigestible food; I've bitterly denounced the Japanese beetle and fearlessly attacked the Mediterranean fruit fly. This last, if you didn't know, attacks citrus fruits, a matter of no small importance to Florida citrus growers—and to politicians campaigning in the Florida primary.

No one would pretend that cranberry chemicals and citrus diseases do not deserve attention; of course they do. But so much attention from candidates for the highest temporal office on earth? Isn't it time we grew up?

It seems to me that we ought to revise the hit-or-miss system by which every 4 years we select a man to lead us. With the primary season of 1960 beginning, and the New Hampshire election almost at hand, maybe this is a good time to review the process.

First, the primary system. In 1956 I began campaigning in the primaries in January, continued without letup until June, turned immediately to the nominating convention, and then plunged at once into the general election campaign—a total campaign of about 10 months.

In all I made more than 300 speeches and traveled close to 75,000 miles and spent more money than I care to think about. (In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt made only about 107 speeches and traveled less than 15,000 miles.) I am told I set a record both for words uttered and mileage traversed—and I am not at all proud of it and I wish no presidential candidate ever had to do it again.

I talked about everything from nuclear bomb testing to the tariff on tunafish. A great deal of the speaking was repetitious, much of it reached only a handful of people, and little of it served greatly to clarify our national purpose—which is what presidential campaigns are supposed to do.

I can say all this without apology. I did what had to be done under the rules of the game.

Obviously a year of perambulating incessant exposure and talk is exhausting. You grow weary, frustrated and bored. Any man who has listened to himself several times daily since February is not likely to inspire his countrymen in October. The primary system weakens a candidate's ability to present his case.

WHAT DOES A PRIMARY ACCOMPLISH?

Moreover, the primary system operates under a hodgepodge of State laws. Some primaries are binding on convention delegates, some are partly so, and some not at all. Some, though binding, are shunned by candidates because of unfavorable special circumstances. Others, not binding at all and technically meaningless, are eagerly sought because of favorable circumstances. Some assume undue importance simply because they are held early.

I yield to no man in my affection for the lovely State of New Hampshire; but does it make sense that, solely because New Hampshire votes early, the opinion of a few thousand of its inhabitants should wield great influence in deciding who shall preside over 180 million of us? And in a State primary seldom more than 25 percent of the eligible voters participate anyway.

A primary campaign is a State campaign, in many respects not unlike a campaign for State office—Governor, attorney general, auditor. A candidate makes his speeches to meetings of party workers or to groups of

citizens gathered in halls, hotels, and picnic grounds. Such groups often don't want to hear much about complex national issues; they are more concerned with local party affairs and with meeting the candidate.

Moreover, as I said when I was Governor of Illinois in 1952, I don't see how any officeholder can participate in a nationwide primary campaign without neglecting the job the people elected him to do. In the case of a Governor, the chief executive of a huge business, neglect is serious. And if he doesn't neglect his job he won't do himself justice in the primary.

Actually primaries are more likely to destroy good candidates than to make them. The plain truth is that a primary campaign is not a suitable testing ground for presidential candidates.

Now as to the general election campaign, it presents one overwhelming problem: how to communicate ideas on complex issues to an audience of 180 million. In a simpler society, a political candidate could stand in the forum in Athens and carry his message to the voters by merely speaking in a loud voice. But not in America.

Traditionally we have attempted to reach American voters through a hodgepodge of rallies of party workers, huge public meetings, radio talks, and whistle stops, all reported nationally in the press.

The whistlestop is a venerable political institution and I daresay that in the days when the railroad tracks ran right down Main Street it was an eminently useful one. But at that time we were only a few million, not 180. Today it is utterly impossible for a candidate to reach more than a handful of the populace in this manner.

Moreover, whistle stopping has an inherent weakness. Woodrow Wilson put his finger on it when, at Michigan City in the 1912 campaign, he told a crowd of 600 what he did not like about speaking from a rear platform: "I have tried discussing the big questions of this campaign from the rear end of a train. It can't be done. They are too big, that is the long and short of the matter. By the time you get started and begin to explain yourself the train moves off. I would a great deal rather make your acquaintance than leave a compound fracture of an idea behind me."

In recent years candidates have attempted a variation on the whistlestop, the prop stop—a brief airborne stopover during which the candidate speaks from a platform beside his airplane while an uneasy audience stands blinking in the sun or shivering in the wind.

My own experience at prop stopping has been almost wholly unhappy. The sounds the candidate makes compete with the sounds of aircraft (which may be merciful to all). And an airport is remote from the city's center; to go out to it to hear, or try to hear, a political speech is almost unthinkable to anybody but a loyal party worker, who is already convinced.

A CITY MAY BE INSULTED

Finally, a city may be insulted by a candidate who deigns only to descend briefly on its airport. Airports and planes for some reason have not managed to arouse people's affection as did the iron horse. I have a feeling that the whistlestop is dead and the prop stop will never get off the ground.

Rallies of party workers are useful. The candidate may inspire his workers. He gives them arguments they can use in discussing issues with voters. He binds them tighter to their party. But I sometimes think candidates spend too much time addressing their workers and not enough trying to reach the public at large.

And I have never been convinced that such party rallies should be televised. A successful rally must be a noisy emotional experience of the convinced, and an independent

voter sitting in his living room, not converted to the candidate's faith but willing to listen to his arguments, must be repelled or at best only amused by the spectacle of eager partisans laughing uproariously at the candidate's every feeble witticism and roaring with glee at each intemperate assault on the opposition—and the more extravagant his language the better. A good political rally is no place for a sober, sensible discussion of intricate problems, and policies.

As for large public meetings, they, too, are useful and a candidate, by incessant effort, can reach a good many thousands this way—provided the people come.

Whether they come depends on the strength of his local political organization and to a far greater extent on whether the local press and radio arouse interest in advance to get out a crowd.

Those, then, are the traditional methods of reaching the voters face to face. And by using them, even if campaigns lasted much longer than 2 months, a candidate could reach but a tiny fraction of the 180 million Americans.

Now, of course, all these meetings are reported nationally in the press. But that way the candidate's views reach the voters second-hand, and I am talking about reaching them directly.

Moreover, to depend upon the press to report the speeches of the rival candidates with equal fullness and fairness, one must assume that newspapers are generally neutral and have plenty of space for politics. The press in the United States has always had the right to free expression of opinion.

HOW TO REACH THE PUBLIC

But a newspaper's editorial slant often affects the way it displays and balances the news. It is my experience that the press as a whole reflects a greater warmth for a Republican candidate than for a Democratic one—with, of course, notable exceptions.

It has been proposed that to reach more voters directly the candidate, instead of trying to leap rapidly from one city to another, visit regional centers around the country for a series of speeches and meetings with people who come in from the surrounding territory.

We attempted something on this order—a quick trip around the country—as a preliminary to the 1956 campaign. As a preliminary it was fine—it enabled us to address most of the party leaders in a series of strategic areas and to meet a good many of them. But I doubt if it would work well during the campaign itself.

A hundred years ago people would travel long distances to hear a candidate for President, but nowadays who would journey to any distant city to hear a candidate except a party worker? Regional meetings would ease the strain of travel on the candidates but I doubt if they would solve the problem of how he is to communicate directly with the people.

STEVENSON TRIED A NEW APPROACH

I tried another device in 1956: That of issuing a series of printed program papers setting forth in detail my views on various issues and proposals for dealing with them. They were detailed documents and they set forth programs for legislative and executive action in specific terms, not in the platitudes and generalities that make up most campaign oratory; and had I been elected I would have put them into effect.

I thought these documents useful and I wish all candidates would issue similar ones—no one would ever again need vote for a man without knowing exactly what to expect of him. But I am realist enough to know that the number of Americans who would read these documents was small. As a method of reaching the vast American public, they were a predestined failure. And as a stimulant for meaningful, thoughtful discussion they were a failure too, for

the Republican candidates ignored them and so did most of the press.

What then do we do? If candidates can't communicate by party rallies, large public meetings, whistle stops, regional meetings and program papers, where shall they turn? They have already turned—to television.

National political television came of age during the nominating conventions of 1952. It played an important role that year during the campaign and an even more important one in 1956. Soon it may be decisive. For by no other means can a candidate hope to communicate with so many voters directly.

So I suggest we give some thought to the way political television has been used in the past and to whether in the future it is likely to do what it ought to do in a democratic system: enlighten the electorate on the issues and on the candidates' views of those issues.

And about this I have many misgivings. Television is fantastically expensive. In a dark hour of the 1956 campaign, my manager Jim Finnegan muttered with fine irony: "If somebody doesn't come up with \$70,000 in the next hour and a half, 'that eloquent voice of the Western World' ain't gonna be on TV tonight."

Each half hour my voice burdened the networks cost my party \$70,000—which may explain why my speeches so often ran overtime. I was trying to crowd as many ideas as possible into the half hour.

SHOULD MONEY DECIDE A CAMPAIGN?

In 1956 the Republicans spent \$4,036,935 on radio and TV and the Democrats \$2,971,143, a total of \$7,008,078. No doubt they will spend more this coming year.

But this raises a serious problem, for it gives the best financed party a tremendous advantage. Should money decide who can carry his case to the people?

Again, 50 years ago audiences listened for hours while Bryan or La Follette held forth on such abstruse questions as monopoly and the tariff; but radio shortened the time of a political speech to half an hour. And in 1956 I was told that no television speech should be longer than 15 minutes, that 5 minutes was better and that a 1-minute "ID"—a spot commercial—was best of all.

So here is another serious question: How can a candidate possibly deal honestly in 1, or 5, or 15 minutes with any complex question—with inflation or disarmament, for example? Plainly, he cannot. He is reduced to sloganeering, to huckstering, to oversimplifying.

If he has ideas on a complex subject, he is not permitted to set them forth. Instead he must reduce them to a slogan. Slogans may be all very well to sell soap. But in politics they are dangerous. To reduce a foreign policy decision to a phrase is to give no hint of the perils, alternatives, and secondary issues that lie behind it. The slogan "Liberation" for the satellites may have been a good vote catcher for the Republican candidates, but the tragic fate of the Hungarian rebellion demonstrated its fraudulence as a policy.

DANCING GIRLS OR IDEAS?

Again, from the earliest times politicians have sought to please, to entertain; but television encourages this weakness. We are already familiar with rigged campaign performances on TV, with candidates that don't simply appear on TV but are "produced." Television watchers expect to be entertained. Dare politicians disappoint them? Will showmanship be substituted more and more for discussion, dancing girls for ideas?

And may not all this lead to even greater apathy on the part of the voters? Everyone decries apathy and agrees it can, if extended indefinitely, lead only to the death of democracy. I should think that the television of the future, if it follows the pattern of the

past, can only increase voter apathy. People will "consume" political broadcasts as they "consume" TV comedies, Westerns and spectaculars. They will sit back in their chairs and enjoy themselves—or they will switch to something else. Their attitude will be, let the performers perform.

This is apathy. TV requires no effort on the part of the viewer. Fifty years ago, men were not apathetic toward politics, for citizenship was highly prized and made demands on them. They had to travel long distances by wagon and stand in the hot sun for hours to hear or see Bryan, La Follette, McKinley, or Theodore Roosevelt.

POLITICS SHOULD BE SERIOUS

* Not today; a man need not even leave his living room to be entertained by Mr. X — candidate for President of the United States, the most powerful office on earth. Politics may have been "entertainment" in the old days, too, for there weren't very many other distractions. But in those days people took their politics seriously and were willing to work for their entertainment.

Today we have to find some means of making politics "serious" again—of making the business of presenting issues to the voters so interesting and so compelling that the voters will want to listen.

That's our problem.

Winning Essays by Fifth and Sixth Grade Students in Schools of Lynwood, 23d District, California, on Theme "Our Heritage of Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent so to do, I am privileged to present the text of the winning essays written by the students of the fifth and sixth grade pupils of the public and parochial schools in the city of Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif. These students and the schools they attend are all within the great 23d District which I represent this my 14th year in this great legislative body.

With these essays I also include the text of the letter, dated March 4, from the Americanism chairman of the Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary No. 86 of Lynwood, Calif. This letter being explanatory of the essay contest.

I am sure that all who read these essays will join with me in congratulating the sponsoring Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary No. 86, and the school authorities for joining in carrying this important essay contest to its fruition.

With Soviet Russia doing as she is with her children from very early ages, I think it behooves us to encourage and implement all we can, within our American freedoms for the individual, to early begin to inform young American citizens as to the functioning of our constitutional form of government. Therefore, I believe it is proper and constructive that these youngsters in the great 23d District who have participated as winners in this appropriate essay contest

entitled "Our Heritage of Freedom" be further encouraged along this very line. Certainly it is true that the future of America—our future—depends upon the children and youth of the present generation.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

AUXILIARY No. 86,

Lynwood, Calif., March 4, 1960.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Received your letter of February 26 regarding our recent Americanism essay contest held throughout the fifth and sixth grades of public and parochial schools in the city of Lynwood.

We are honored by your interest and privileged to have the opportunity to submit the two top essays for the Members of the House of Representatives to consider placing on record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is an annual program, starting each year on the first day of February and terminating the 23d of February. We have just concluded our ninth year and feel justly proud that we have had an opportunity to open an avenue to the youth of this community that they might travel and thereby gain a deeper appreciation for this great Nation and to realize that they must assume responsibilities, if our great democracy is to remain secure and a beacon of hope to the world.

Essays on Americanism are not unusual but we feel this program is because we have reached a rather young group of students. These students range from 9 to 12 years of age. Formative years in the lives of our children, where not only love of family, home, and religion must be developed but love for our Nation as well.

It has been my privilege to organize and chair this program and watch its growth for the 9 years and I am indeed grateful for this honor and for the splendid cooperation received from the superintendent of Schools, the principals, teachers, the press, and all concerned.

May I close with humble pride for your concern and thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

LUCILLE KANKA,
Americanism Chairman.

ESSAY WINNERS ON THE THEME "OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM"

FIRST PLACE

(By Ronald Nakamoto, Lindbergh School, fifth grade)

I am an American citizen. Although my hair, my skin, and my eyes are of a different color I am still an American. That's what's so wonderful about this Nation, is that even if I am different than some people in some ways I can take my place among other people as an American because I was born here.

We Americans have a country that is the dream of many people who live overseas or beyond our borders. They do not know the privilege and the liberty of being able to speak freely, worship as they please, and choose the profession they wish.

Sometimes we don't realize how lucky we are, nor how many hardships our ancestors endured to make us a strong nation and help us have a heritage of freedom.

I think we could say George Washington and John Paul Jones helped to start us on our road to freedom. Our world wars have helped us preserve this freedom.

But our freedom was not all won by wars. Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Dr. Salk, and other great men have made contributions to mankind and the freedom of our Nation.

Yes, I could go on and on but this is the real idea of our American heritage, and I

am a part of it. I may not go down in history, but if I do my best to live up to school, city, county, State, and National laws, I will help to write a chapter called peace in our heritage of freedom.

SECOND PLACE

(By Pamela Boyle, Will Rogers School, fifth grade)

Our American heritage means this to me: It has made our country brave and free. We've fought many wars and shed many tears, And helped many countries abolish their fears.

We believe in truth and freedom for all. Our rights are protected no matter how small.

It matters not, what color or creed, The size of the man or the size of the deed.

We worship and play and work as we please. We've never been forced to get down on our knees.

We've fought and we've won our liberty. Freedom, our American heritage, means this to me.

THIRD PLACE

(By Karen Gilbreath, Lindbergh School, fifth grade)

Our heritage of freedom are the rights we have inherited from our ancestors who fought for us in the wars against England and other countries.

Did you ever think about what our heritage of freedom gives us? Well for one thing it gives us the right to vote, to attend our own church and also lets us govern ourselves. It gives us the right to speak freely. It gives us the right to have a fair trial when we're accused of doing something wrong.

Our heritage of freedom is a great thing. But do you know who makes it so great? Us, the people of the United States of America.

Our forefathers made America great. To keep it great we must obey laws and pay our taxes. Yes; we have a great responsibility, the responsibility of keeping our United States great by being good American citizens ourselves.

FOURTH PLACE

(By Debbie Markovic, Will Rogers School, fifth grade)

"Rich man, poor man, farmer, and tradesman fought to make our American heritage possible. From our Eastern Atlantic shores to the far Western Pacific, our American heritage is always in evidence.

"The sight of many people going to the many different churches on Sunday shows us one freedom, freedom of religion. Our many newspapers with people writing and even criticizing our Government shows freedom of speech.

"When we see a policeman, we are thankful for his protection and in our courts we are innocent until proven guilty. These assure us freedom from fear.

"These things help always to keep in my mind how much Americanism and my American heritage means to me and how I must always do my best to help preserve these freedoms. The one almost sure way that I can help to insure these freedoms is to always vote when I am old enough."

FIFTH PLACE

(By James Miller, Seventh-day Adventist Academy)

I am glad for freedom. Freedom means a lot to me—for instance, my home, my parents, my religion, and other things. I am glad that I can go to the school I want to. I am glad that I can pick the friends I want. I am glad that when I get older I will be able to vote for the person I think will make a good leader for our United States. Without freedom this world wouldn't be worth living in.

SIXTH PLACE

(By Leslie Laver, Mark Twain School, sixth grade)

Our American heritage is a great and wonderful story in itself. It's the story of a great country that was created out of a vast wilderness in an unbelievably short time. It is the story of a nation founded on the principle of all men's rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Five hundred years ago there were only a few scattered settlements along the Atlantic coast. Even as little as 200 years ago, there was no United States of America. Today the United States stands first among the countries of the world in freedom and in opportunity. I myself believe that it is a great privilege to have a heritage such as the one that our forefathers gave for such a country as the United States of America.

SEVENTH PLACE

(By Bill Ball, Will Rogers School, sixth grade)

Our heritage of freedom
So dear to you and me
Is the challenge of tomorrow;
Today's opportunity.

Secured by our forefathers
This heritage sublime,
By faith and prayer, sweat and toil,
Lives sacrificed, and time.

The symbol of our freedom
Is our flag; our people, too,
Who pledge their lives allegiance
To our own red, white, and blue.

Our heritage of freedom
I shall guard, and all shall see
That America my homeland,
Is the land of liberty.

Our heritage of freedom
The whole wide world may share,
When men shall live as brothers
As freemen everywhere

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

California Gov. Edmund G. Brown Urges National Attention to County Prob- lems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Governor of the State of California, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, addressed the County Finance Congress of the National Association of County Officials in San Diego, Calif., on February 15, 1960. In that address, he pointed out how the major county problems had come to be in the urban counties, and that, because of lack of sufficient local revenues, the Federal Government should help meet the challenge. He cited as the most difficult problems the control of water pollution, the elimination of blighted areas through urban renewal, the development of adequate civil defense programs, the support of programs for developing and improving airports, and the provision of satisfactory educational facilities and well-trained teachers with the help of Federal aid to education. The Governor praised county officials for facing up to their obligations, but bemoaned the fact that the administration in Washington has been strangely insensitive to the problems.

Recognizing the need for Federal financial assistance, Governor Brown emphasized at the same time that we must be vigilant in preserving home rule and local initiative. He told the county officials who must provide this initiative that "I have every confidence that you have such leadership, and that county government will succeed in the new role to which history has assigned it." I also share this confidence since I have developed a deep respect for local government through long association with local problems.

After I was elected district attorney of Tehama County, Calif., in 1934, I was legal adviser to the Tehama County Board of Supervisors for 8 years and became intimately acquainted with the valuable services local government performs. This experience also led me to believe that government programs, whether Federal or State, should be administered at the local level, whenever possible, with sufficient flexibility to permit local governments to adjust the administration of these programs to local conditions and requirements.

I believe Governor Brown's speech makes clear the important role county officials must play in cooperation with Federal and State officials if we are to

solve the basic governmental problems of the space age. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, COUNTY FINANCE CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, SAN DIEGO, FEBRUARY 15, 1960

I am deeply honored by your request for an encore. At your meeting in Washington last year, I occupied you largely with a discussion of our problems in California, and I feared you might condemn me as incorrigibly western. Instead, I see that my references to California brought all of you here. Well, you couldn't have come to a nicer place, and I am happy to welcome you.

In coming here, you will not only have an opportunity to enjoy San Diego's famed winter climate and her other attractions. You will also find here, and in many other California counties a preview of what is in store for you back home. Because, in truth, the problems we face in California are the same as many of you in other States face, except that our more rapid population growth brings them on more rapidly.

The central fact in the experience of all of you is the transformation of the traditional role of county government. Less than a generation ago county government was essentially rural government. Today, in a great number of instances, county government is increasingly urban, with all the new responsibilities which that implies.

Indeed, even among those counties which remain preponderantly rural, technological developments have wrought changes in the responsibilities of county government. Far fewer people, for example, are raising our crops. And those who are producing them are, in the original sense of the word, urban, by which I mean conditioned to a great extent by values that prevail in cities. They demand the same kind of services as city folk; and in an increasing number of instances, they are getting such services from their county governments.

Let me return, however, to the area where the major problems lie—the urban counties. The population of the United States—about 170 million today—will be between 220 and 244 million by 1975. Shortly after the turn of the century, it will be somewhere between 300 and 400 million, and at least 85 percent of it will be concentrated in vast metropolitan areas. Thus, under the impact of profound social and scientific changes, county government is today shaping the environment for millions of tomorrow's urban inhabitants.

Quite literally, the challenge is to keep people from choking themselves in great metropolitan concentrations. In essence, you are challenged to fashion a new and more humane environment, not for a population but for people.

The way in which you fashion that environment is fundamentally a problem in the use of land. Although in many areas the hour is late, you still have an historic opportunity to avoid tragic errors which have marred urban development across the country for more than a century. I cannot exaggerate the magnitude of this problem, nor the opportunity we have.

In California, metropolitan growth is enveloping our most fertile land; particularly in the San Joaquin Valley, the Los Angeles Basin, and the Santa Clara Valley. At a daily population increase of 1,500 people, California is consuming 375 acres of land every 24 hours. This amounts to 140,000 acres annually; and at present densities, we can expect 3 million additional acres to be consumed by 1980—more than the entire area of San Diego County.

Now much of this urban spread is inevitable. But much of it is wantonly wasteful of our best soil. It is characterized by scattered development; and that not only takes land out of farm use, but also unnecessarily or prematurely commits additional land to urban development.

Santa Clara County, with large areas of our best soil, is an excellent example. If all the land withdrawn for urban use in the Santa Clara Valley since 1947 were consolidated, it would approximate 26 square miles. Instead, an area of about 200 square miles has been committed to urban development.

In the face of consequences such as this, it becomes imperative that county government encourage what is best in private development and provide a complement of well-conceived public policies. At its best, private enterprise has responded to the challenge of population expansion by developing impressive industrial parks, imaginative retail shopping centers, and vastly improved residential neighborhoods. But, as we all know, there are also ugly and wasteful abuses of our countryside.

To assure good land use, there must be close cooperation of public and private efforts in this field. That means sensible relating of home and shop and industry. It means a more efficient transportation system embracing more than automobiles and highways; it means foresight in the location of churches and schools; it means close-at-hand recreational areas, the proximity of woodland, the sight of pleasing landscapes and open sky. Much of this can be accomplished by looking ahead and without great outlays of public funds.

But having said that, I must add in all candor the sheer impact of growth requires tireless public effort if we are even to hold our own.

A spectacular example of the cost of mounting urban congestion is in air and water pollution. Fortunately, on both of those, we have made legislative headway in California during the past year.

Still another spectacular example is traffic congestion. Some weeks ago a dog ran across our heavily traveled Santa Ana Freeway during the rush hour. In an instant, 40 cars were wrecked. To me, that dog became a symbol of how fantastically complex urban life has become.

I am talking now about the need for new public services that will enrich life. I am talking about essential action just to keep life from becoming impoverished by the increasing strains and stresses of metropolitan living.

The great limitation even to doing that, of course, is lack of sufficient revenues. With the general public, two of the least known facts about contemporary American government are simply these; first, how sorely pressed State and local governments are for adequate revenues, particularly compared to the fiscal means of the Federal Government;

and second, the fact that the main burden of our population growth—the necessary costs and investments—fall not on Federal authorities but State and local agencies. School construction, street and highway needs, sewers and water pollution problems, and air contamination are just several such examples.

I most surely advocate keeping the responsibilities for functions like those with local officials. I believe in keeping the necessary offices of government as close to people as possible. But the simple fact is that we must go where we can get the money and, given our tax structure, that means to the Federal Government.

This represents no partisan insight. Let me quote the Rockefeller report on education.

It notes that the inability of local jurisdictions to meet the needs of an expanding society is "due partly to the excessive dependence of State and local revenues—particularly the latter—upon the real property tax, which is notably lagging in its response to rising income." "And it is due partly" the report goes on, "to the fact that State or local governments are reluctant to extend or expand their taxing systems for fear of placing their communities or States at a competitive disadvantage relative to other areas." In my judgment this is a real and quite understandable fear and it often stops the most forwardminded counties and States from moving ahead.

I frankly think State and local officials across the country are facing up to their obligations. Unhappily, the administration in Washington has been strangely insensitive to the problem. I say this with no partisan purpose. It is an unfortunate fact. Let me give you some examples of vital concern to every one of you.

Example No. 1 is water pollution. Water pollution abatement is one of the nation's most vital conservation programs and yet the President recommended that the popular and effective sewage-treatment grants program be cut from the \$45 million appropriated by Congress each year since 1956, to \$20 million. Both Houses voted overwhelmingly to pass a bill doubling the program—the House by nearly two-thirds, the Senate by more than a two-thirds majority. Yet that decisive mandate has been ignored.

Example No. 2 concerns urban renewal. In that program, the counties are already silent partners by virtue of their participation in the tax forgiveness clause of the Urban Renewal Act. Urban blight breeds crime and delinquency; it rots our cities at the core; and like all decay, it ultimately corrupts everything that surrounds it. County jurisdictions are therefore intimately concerned with correcting urban blight.

But here again, the Federal Government has consented to only a token program. Its authorizations are inadequate to the task of keeping up with the spread of blight, not to mention correcting the decay we already have.

Example No. 3 is civil defense, which I know will interest you because your association has an active and efficient civil defense committee. In California, local jurisdictions will spend about \$3 million this year on a civil defense program. Now Congress has accepted the principle of partial Federal responsibility for adequate civil defense by providing for half the cost of the administration of State and local programs. But the administration has failed to make budgetary provision for this minimal insurance against a military disaster.

Example No. 4 is the program for developing and improving airports. This program is of special interest to you because the funds are needed most at the county or local level for feeder-type airports which lack the financial support available to large metropolitan airports.

At the administration's initiative the matching funds provided by the Federal Government were cut from \$100 million annually to \$53 million. In an age when rapidly increasing air travel makes it imperative that we keep our airports up to standard, the administration slashed support by almost one-half.

Example No. 5 concerns Federal aid to education. The Nation is confronted by a massive shortage of 195,000 teachers and 140,000 classrooms. The country is confronting a near crisis in meeting its education needs.

Government at the State and local levels already is sorely strained financially to support education. And that includes the State of California. Here 42 cents out of every State tax dollar is going for public education. Yet with our "youngling" population—we have 500,000 more schoolchildren than New York, despite its larger total population—we simply are not doing all that is needed and certainly not all that I would like. Property owners at the level of local government are already heavily put upon in most areas to meet school costs. In the face of that, I believe it is only reasonable and proper that the resources of the Federal Government be brought to bear.

The alternatives, unfortunately, are an increasingly overcrowded school system losing ground in the face of the Soviet and scientific challenge; or mounting local school tax burdens, and those primarily and unfairly on property owners; or intelligent, carefully considered Federal contributions. Our choices are just that plain.

Believe me when I add that, in weighing Federal support, we must be vigilant in preserving home rule and local initiative. We must guard against rigid uniformity and insist on flexibility in Federal programs. Above all, we must never abdicate our own responsibilities.

Those responsible for county government have been thrust into a position calling for a high order of leadership. I have every confidence that you have such leadership, and that county government will succeed in the new role to which history has assigned it.

Meanwhile the problems ahead call for the cooperation of government at all levels: city, county, State and Federal; and for the vision of men who see beyond their own jurisdictions.

America's future deserves no less. I believe that we shall have such cooperation and enlist such vision. That is why, as the Governor of a great State, I face the future full of confidence and of hope.

Use of Carriers Is Our Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement and newspaper article concerning the effectiveness of aircraft carriers in our military defense program.

The controversy raging over the capability of carriers is somewhat clarified by an article by John J. Schieffelin which appeared in the New York Times of February 11.

The range of the carrier is almost incredible as it is possible, with its air complement, to reach out over thousands

of miles and cover tremendous segments of the sea. Mr. Schieffelin points out the difficulties involved in locating and destroying a carrier in the wide open regions of the oceans. A huge armada of submarines, plus swarms of aircraft and surface craft, would find themselves spread very thin on the surface of the sea in attempting to locate a carrier which has both speed and defensive capabilities, as well as terrifying destructive force.

The article follows:

USE OF CARRIERS FAVORED—FAST FLEET BELIEVED BEST DETERRENT TO WAR IN NEARBY WATERS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In connection with the current debate on defense I should like to call attention to the article by Hanson Baldwin on January 26 headed "Rough Seas for Carriers" touching upon an important feature of our defense.

He mentions a secret fleet-air defense exercise of the Navy and Air Force held off the Atlantic coast late in 1959. The conditions were controlled to the extent that the position of the fleet was known to the attacking land-based air forces of the Tactical Air Command. Apparently, the Navy ships, having picked up the attacking aircraft at a distance of over 200 miles, intercepted and, theoretically, splashed the vast majority of them before they got within 70 to 100 miles of the carriers. The fact of the matter seems to be that not a single attack plane got anywhere near the carriers.

While such a test is seldom considered conclusive, the exercise sheds light on a truth that is not understood by a good many sincere Americans. This truth is that carriers, protected by modern defense networks, are far less vulnerable than is supposed—that in fact they pose a very difficult problem to a would-be opponent.

First, they have well over 130 million square miles of ocean in which to operate, so that a strong initial advantage was given the attackers in this exercise. Second, even if their position is known it is hard, if not impossible for approaching aircraft to penetrate their defensive screen, with its modern electronic equipment.

RANGE OF AIRCRAFT

Moreover, the fact that a carrier's aircraft can reach out over distances now counted in thousands of miles, and deposit nuclear weapons on chosen targets, makes it essential for any group aiming to conquer the United States to make arrangements to put all of our carriers out of business before concentrating an all-out attack on our homeland.

The effect of this is that the major forces of a would-be attacker must be directed against any and all carrier task forces that may be at sea at any given moment. The problem of locating and destroying such task forces in the wide open reaches is so vast that even the most numerous submarine armada ever created, plus swarms of air and surface craft, would find themselves spread very thin, with no assurance of success.

In the two world wars the fighting and destruction have been far away from our country. The best insurance for keeping another war far away lies in a fleet of modern, fast carriers. As a deterrent to starting such a war, the presence of carriers cruising steadily beyond the horizon is tops.

SECOND BEST TYPE

And this brings up the final point mentioned by Mr. Baldwin—namely, that the Navy, in accordance with the recommendation of the administration budget, is building a conventionally powered carrier costing about \$290 million. A nuclear powered carrier would be better because, among other

advantages, she can sustain high speed over longer periods without refueling. However, a nuclear powered carrier costs \$130 million more, or a total of \$420 million.

With the safety of our people at stake this seems a poor time to be building the second best of a type of ship we well know how to build. Nuclear powered carriers, roaming the seas in cooperation with our nuclear powered submarines, would be a deterrent that would virtually eliminate the probability of another Pearl Harbor, and if a major war were to start would keep the fighting far from our land.

JOHN JAY SCHIEFFELIN.

NEW YORK, February 9, 1960.

West Virginia—Land of Scenic, Recreational, and Historical Values and Natural Beauty in Close Proximity to Population Centers—Foundation for a Potentially Thriving Tourist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an article I wrote at the invitation of the editor of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette on the attractiveness of West Virginia was published in yesterday's issue of that newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA'S NATURAL BEAUTY LURES TOURISTS

(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

There has been much comment on the human resources of West Virginia and the past and present achievements of some prominent West Virginians.

This discussion relates to the resources of our land and the scenic, recreational, and historical values which are the foundation for a potentially thriving tourist trade.

Our State parks and State forest facilities, given major impetus during the administration of Gov. H. G. Kump, and aided invaluably by programs of the Federal Government during that era, offer unique outdoor recreation for millions of urban dwellers in the metropolitan centers of the eastern seaboard, the Middle Atlantic, and the Midwestern States.

By the same token, the recreational areas within the Monongahela National Forest and that portion of the George Washington National Forest within West Virginia, afford other pleasant recreational opportunities for our own people and visitors from other States.

CLOSE PROXIMITY TO POPULATION CENTERS

There is probably not another State in the Union which is as singularly favored as West Virginia in being able to offer so much of natural beauty in such close proximity to the population centers of the eastern half of the United States, with 55 percent of the people of the Nation living within a 500 mile radius of our State. It is apparent, therefore, that, despite the significant increase in tourism West Virginia has experi-

enced in recent years, we have barely begun to benefit from its full possibilities.

The attractions of West Virginia's State park and forest facilities, and those of the National Forests within our State—ranging from the quiet grandeur of the scenery at Cacapon in the eastern panhandle to the spectacular New River gorge near Babcock State Park in the southern part of the State—provided unparalleled opportunities for the tired city dweller seeking the restorative values of outdoor life.

Fourteen of the State parks and forests offer cabin or lodging facilities or both, a majority affording a choice between rustic accommodations and modern deluxe facilities set in unspoiled natural surroundings. With reference to the developed recreational areas within the National Forests, the less than 10 percent of the George Washington National Forest situated in West Virginia has been too much overlooked in this respect, but the Monongahela National Forest, situated totally within our State, has extensive recreational facilities—without cabins, however.

NEARLY MILLION VISIT NATIONAL FOREST

It is probably a little known fact that the Monongahela National Forest, in 1959, received a total of 987,900 visits to its 50 special recreational facilities, broken down into categories of visits as follows:

Camping at 22 sites, 19,300; picnicking at 17 sites, 173,900; swimming in 5 pools and lakes, 72,300; hunting, 179,700; fishing in forest streams and 3 lakes, 344,600; hiking and riding, 1,800; organizational camping at one Forest Service-owned facility and three non-Forest Service-owned organizational camping sites, 7,200; sightseeing, 179,900; forest product gathering for pleasure, 21,200; visits for scientific studies and hobbies, 2,200; and other miscellaneous types of visits, 25,800.

Yet, despite the work of our State industrial and publicity commission, a study of our tourist trade would indicate that we have not adequately told the "West Virginia story." During the past 5 years tourist expenditures have increased dramatically from \$174,562,214 in 1955 to \$270,569,447 in 1959. What is probably more significant, however, is that the number of annual visitors has actually decreased during that period from an estimated high of 8,115,429 in 1955 to a low of 7,389,218 in 1958, with a slight rise to an estimated 7,450,625 in 1959.

Inasmuch as the average tourist stay has been relatively constant (between 4 and 5 days), the increase in gross receipts has been due to a step-up in per capita expenditures, rather than to a growth in the volume of visitors. In fact, the average expenditure has almost doubled during that period, from \$5.50 per person per day to \$8.07, thus proving the point of the Mississippi Governor who said that a tourist is "as valuable as a bale of cotton and twice as easy to pick." Nor should it be overlooked that tourism is the only kind of trade in which we do not export some portion of our natural resources for the dollars received.

Further observation seems pertinent with respect to the untapped tourist potential:

Last year, 59 percent of West Virginia's visitors came from the neighboring States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, while the even more heavily populated States of New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and Illinois—all within a radius of 500 miles or less of our State—supplied only 14.9 percent of the total.

Thus, it is apparent that we must do a major selling job making the charm and beauty of West Virginia more widely known in the population centers of the Middle Atlantic and Midwestern States.

PROMOTION IS COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISE

Nor should this be a task conducted solely by the State Industrial and Publicity Com-

mission and the U.S. Forest Service, insofar as the latter has to do with publicizing the facilities of the national forests within our borders. Despite the appropriateness of the efforts these agencies expend for tourism promotion, it needs supplementation. The privately operated hotels, motels, and restaurants obviously reap large shares of the profits from tourists drawn to our State primarily by its scenery and the publicly owned park and forest facilities. They, too, have obligations to assist with the State's tourism promotion.

According to the annual analysis of our tourist trade published by the West Virginia Industrial and Publicity Commission, last year 59.3 percent of our visitors were in the State on vacation. Of the number represented by that percentage, 72.7 percent were attracted by the scenery, the parks, and the forests; yet, during the same year, 71.4 percent of them stayed at motels and hotels, while only 15.4 percent lodged or camped at parks and forests.

In view of these statistics, it would seem only appropriate, therefore, that the trade associations and individual operators of hotels and motels should take an active and leading role in publicizing not only their own facilities, but the natural and scenic values of the State as a whole.

To come to something very close to my heart, I would mention, as an added tourist attraction, the rich historical lore associated with West Virginia. American history was formed in large measure by the Allegheny Mountains as the route of southward migration of the Scotch-Irish and German settlers, and the Ohio River as the gateway to the West. At a time when Americans might well be reexamining their cultural roots in an effort to arrive at a more meaningful conception of our national purpose, history as it was lived in West Virginia has much to contribute.

MORE THAN HALF MILLION VISIT HARPERS FERRY

Not the least important of our historical attractions is the Harpers Ferry National Monument under control of the National Park Service and situated in both Jefferson County, W. Va., and Washington County, Md. When a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives for 14 years, I was privileged to author the bill which established this site as a Federal park. Since that time the State of West Virginia has appropriated in full its share of land acquisition costs. Maryland is appropriating for this purpose on an annual basis. With the continued restoration work on the original arsenal and other buildings, there has been a constant increase in the number of visitors. Over the past 4 years the number of guests who have registered their presence has increased by more than 400 percent, from 115,667 in 1956 to more than 595,610 in 1959.

It is pleasing to report there is every likelihood that there will be added Federal facilities at Harpers Ferry which will doubtless multiply the number of visitors and the utilization very extensively. The Department of the Interior and its National Park Service have certified their approval to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of a bill introduced by me in the present 86th Congress to authorize acquisition of additional land, including inactive Storer College, to be used for monument area enlargement and new facilities for National Park Service personnel training. This measure has been approved by the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and is optimistically looked upon as one which probably will become law this spring.

Then, too, it is to be hoped that in the near future we shall be successful in establishing another national monument facility in West Virginia—the Washington Western Lands embracing significant parts of the area within the triangle formed by Parkers-

burg, Point Pleasant, and Charleston. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD is a cosponsor of a bill I introduced in the Senate, with a companion measure in the House by Representative KEN HECHLER, to authorize such a facility within the national parks system. A national monument of this nature would be an appropriate testimonial to the continued significance of the Ohio and Kanawha River Valleys since the days of the Revolution.

Harpers Ferry and the Washington Western Lands area are but two of the many points of historical interest in West Virginia which serve to keep alive the meaning of our national heritage for citizens of all the States.

Nature and history have combined to produce immense and varied resources in our State. It is now up to us to develop them wisely for our own benefit and that of future generations.

International Effects of U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Times of February 21, 1960:

ARE WE UN-COMPETITIVE?

Is the United States falling behind in terms of its competitive position in world trade? And, narrowing the question somewhat further, is it true that we are "pricing ourselves out of the international markets"?

Those who have undertaken to approach these questions open-mindedly are usually the first to point out that even after one has eliminated as many of the independent variables as possible he can offer the resultant figures only for what they are worth. Nevertheless, for what they are worth the figures produced by such studies seem invariably to add up at the minimum to the conclusion, "case not proved."

Typical of these is the staff report on "The International Effects of U.S. Foreign Policy" for the Congressional Economic Committee's inquiry on employment, growth, and price levels. Over the period 1950-58, declares this study prepared under the direction of Dr. Padraic P. Frucht, the United States share of world trade has shown no marked deviation from that of the longer-term past.

There were extreme discriminations against American exports in a number of markets—restrictions that could not have been surmounted regardless of American prices. This is particularly true in the case of the industrialized nations. To remove this disturbing factor the study concentrates on the nonindustrialized nations, where we compete directly with the other industrialized countries. Since these market shares vary considerably from year to year, the study assumes that a general decline of 5 percent would be required to support the thesis that we had lost our ability to compete. Actually, as compared with the base years 1954-56 to 1958, our total exports fell only from 34 percent to 33.3 percent of the total exports by the industrial countries to the non-industrial.

As to the alleged fact that we have been priced out of the world markets by rising

wage costs, the authors present a table on such costs for this country and its chief competitors. The ratio of 1958 wage costs to those of 1954-56 was 103 in the United States, a figure lower than that of 4 out of 5 of its chief competitors. And that competitor was Italy, a country that carries an oppressive burden of unemployment.

Waste of Taxpayers' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the average American taxpayer is a thrifty and prudent individual, willing to bear his or her share of the huge cost of the operation of our Federal Government, in confidence that that Government will in turn be thrifty and prudent in the spending of tax dollars.

It is when instances of outright waste and lavish spending of tax money are observed that taxpayers speak out in protest, as has Mr. George N. Bosnak, of Lorain, Ohio, in a recent letter addressed to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bosnak's letter on the subject of wasteful and unnecessary spending be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LORAIN, OHIO.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just returned from my annual Florida vacation and am more than a little burned up about the waste of the taxpayers' money as evidenced by the Government offices and activities set up in the plush hotels of Miami Beach.

It is a little difficult for me to appreciate why offices for the Departments of Agriculture, Ordnance, Employment, and Fish and Wildlife should be housed in the Americana Hotel. It would be hard for me to visualize a rustic farmer or a frost-bitten citrus fruit grower making inquiries at the luxurious Americana as to when his next support check might be paid.

Similarly, the gathering of our postmasters and their wives to hear Postmaster General Summerfield expounding the dire need for higher postage rates while surrounded by the plush appointments and services of the Deauville Hotel really floored me.

May I respectfully solicit the influence of your good office to have these bureaus and activities removed to some clean air-conditioned locations in some downtown office building or, at least, to a location closer to the areas of their responsibilities at an appreciable savings.

This letter is in no way intended as criticism of yourself as I deeply appreciate your personal efforts to effect economies. However, I just felt that I had to call your attention to something that was indicative to me that our tax money was being needlessly squandered by some divisions of our National Government.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE N. BOSNAK.

Dr. John W. Carr Dies at the Age of 100

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the outstanding educators of Kentucky died in New York City just 2 months after he had celebrated his 100th birthday. The first president of Murray State College, Murray, Ky., and later dean and acting president, he served the college actively for 26 years until his retirement in 1940. After that as president emeritus and college historian he went to his office daily until he was 93. He lived for more than 30 years in my home town of Murray. Through his labors and those of his predecessors, Murray College—founded in 1923—has grown to one of the fine State colleges in the United States. Dr. Carr deserves great credit for his work in bringing about this development.

Dr. Carr was a native of Indiana and spent nearly a quarter century in its schools. Later he was a school administrator in Ohio and New Jersey before coming to Kentucky near the close of World War I. In honor of his unusual career, I should like to reprint some of the details of his life.

On the occasion of his 100th birthday, December 13, 1959, Dr. L. J. Hortin, formerly professor of journalism at Murray College and now head of the journalism department at the University of Ohio, wrote the following account which appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat and, in part, in the New York Times and many other papers of the country. His article follows:

The dean of the American schoolroom, Dr. John Wesley Carr, will be 100 years old December 13.

After being in a schoolroom for 87 years—from 1866 to 1953—Dr. Carr is now living with his grandson, Frank Carr, in New York City. His only living son, Harry, also of New York, says his father is looking forward to his birthday, but he says, "He ain't hurrying it any."

The task which Dr. Carr faced when he arrived in Murray in 1923 at the age of 63 might have dismayed most men. He had \$116,000 for a site and building—most of this given locally—and \$30,000 for operations. He began in September of that year with a few rooms in the local high school, three full-time and two part-time teachers, a library which contained a dictionary and a Bible, and 87 college students. By 1926, shortly after he left the presidency for the deanship, the college had a \$650,000 plant, a faculty of 30, and a 4-year college course. He acted as both dean and president in the period of 1933-36, seeing the college through some of the more trying days of the depression. When he retired from the deanship in 1940, the college had 11 buildings and an enrollment of 1,111. He lived to see a college whose buildings, faculty, and student body more than

doubled in size. His name will be remembered in the John W. Carr Health Building which was built in 1937. On the occasion of its dedication, Senator Alben W. Barkley declared:

No man in any State has contributed more to the permanent values of life than has this man.

The following statement, written by Dr. Carr in 1933 to the freshman class of that year, reveals his ability to write moving prose and something of his philosophy:

To the incoming students, one and all, I greet you and welcome you to Murray State Teachers College.

I welcome you to the halls of learning where it will be your high privilege to be associated with the great and good of all the past.

I welcome you to this campus which you will learn to love and which, to me, is as fair as the garden of the gods.

I welcome you to our laboratories where the secrets and wonders of nature will be revealed.

I welcome you to the library where you will find the treasures of the past.

I welcome you to the departments of art, music, and literature where beauty is enthroned and where the mind is lifted up until it soars on the wings of the imagination.

I welcome you to the study of history and geography, economics and the science of government and the science of society, itself, where you will have an opportunity to learn about human relations, and where, I trust, you will learn how to cooperate with others in the creation of a better society than this world has ever known.

I welcome you to the study of psychology and education, where you will study the human soul, where you will not only learn its laws, but where you will learn how it is nurtured—where you will be trained in heart and hand in the art of arts, the teaching of little children, and where perchance you may even catch a glimpse of the Master.

I not only greet you and welcome you to this college, but I commission its worthy faculty as your companions and guides through the Elysian fields of learning, which a great and generous people have provided for you to the end that you may become worthy teachers of the children of the commonwealth.

The Late Dr. John W. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, as a former student of Murray State College during the period that Dr. John W. Carr, who recently died at the age of 100, was its president, I wish to add my words of praise to those given by my colleague, Congressman FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky, in whose home town Dr. Carr lived and worked for more than 30 years.

Hundreds of us who secured a college education during the depths of the depression of the thirties would not have been able to had it not been for Dr. Carr, then 76 years of age. He sought financial support from the legislature for the college he loved and labored to keep the

educational program going. I recall in particular his splendid efforts to arrange for jobs and financial aid for students so they might be able to stay in school. As a graduate of that institution I know that I speak the sentiments of all the graduates and students when I say that we are so happy and proud and grateful that Dr. Carr did what he did in our behalf.

He was a great force in education in the United States and especially in our part of Tennessee and Kentucky. He was an inspiration to all who knew him—a champion of education and a fine Christian gentleman.

I should like to concur in the statements made above by my distinguished colleague, Congressman FRANK ALBERT STUBBLEFIELD, in behalf of Dr. Carr. An excellent editorial appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of February 20, which was written by an outstanding editorial writer of this newspaper, Gene Graham, also a graduate of this college. This editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of Feb. 20, 1960]

DR. JOHN W. CARR: LONG, FRUITFUL LIFE

Dr. John W. Carr, who died Thursday in New York at the age of 100, was a man of remarkable stature in his chosen profession, education.

His active life was spent in Indiana and in Kentucky, but his influence was widely felt throughout the Nation and he was well known to many Tennesseans.

Dr. Carr, having served in the office of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Kentucky, moved to the small hamlet of Murray in weststate at an age when most men are looking toward retirement—age 65. There he helped to found what is today Murray State College, and he served it as dean, as president, and as president emeritus, a position he held at death.

Dr. Carr was an inspiration to all who knew him. Few have demonstrated so capably the continued usefulness of a life in its golden years.

Increase of Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly be considering a bill to increase the minimum wage and extend coverage of the Federal law to some 8 million workers who do not now enjoy protection of the Wage and Hour Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received recently from the commissioner of labor of the State of Wyoming, Mr. Burton L. Clark, who makes, I believe, a very cogent argument for passage of legislation increasing the minimum wage and broadening the coverage.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted recently by the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., pertaining to the same legislation.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING,
COMMISSIONER OF LABOR AND STATISTICS,
February 19, 1960.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I would like to add my voice to a great number of Wyoming people who think the enactment of improvements to the Fair Labor Standards Act at this session is a must.

1. The minimum wage should be raised to \$1.25 per hour in industries covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

2. The coverage should be extended to a great many more workers in our country. We think the coverage should be extended to at least 7 or 8 million more workers in retail, service, hotel, and other low wage industries.

In our State these requests not only come from labor leaders, welfare workers, etc., but from employers in our State who have a policy of paying a living wage. They point out they are faced with competition from employers who pay substandard wages to their workers. This, of course, is competition that can only be taken care of by legislation to protect both the worker and the employer.

Opposition to this legislation will say it is inflationary. We do not think it inflationary for a worker to make \$50 a week gross pay.

Certain groups will ask to be exempted from this act. It has been our experience in enforcement of labor laws, those asking for exemptions usually are the ones employing workers needing protection the most.

If we exempt certain businesses from this act according to the number of employees they have it would, in some cases, encourage them to hire fewer workers in order that they would not be covered by the act.

I further ask that this communication be read into the minutes of your committee hearings on this subject.

Very truly yours,

BURTON L. CLARK,
Labor Commissioner, State of
Wyoming.

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF RAISING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Whereas there is now pending legislation before Congress to increase the Federal minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour; and

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act calls for only \$1 an hour; and

Whereas there are nearly 20 million wage earners who are completely without any protection with reference to minimum wage earnings; and

Whereas in view of the steady rise in the cost of living and increased productivity, the city council hereby adopt this resolution calling upon the Senators of Massachusetts and Representative Thomas J. Lane, Majority Leader Congressman John W. McCormack and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell to lend their support to increase the Federal minimum wage and to support legislation to abolish this obsolete minimum Federal law and to broaden the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the above named.

U.S. Companies Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, at last count more than 1,000 American com-

panies were engaged in industrial and commercial activities abroad. Hundreds of American firms have established manufacturing facilities overseas. In many cases there foreign-made products are shipped back to the United States as components to be assembled in finished products.

Certainly no one can blame the managements of these corporations for seeking component parts at the lowest possible cost. You might say that by taking advantage of low foreign wages these companies are helping to hold down prices here at home and are thereby contributing to economic stability.

On the other hand, you might also contend that these manufacturing operations abroad really represent a serious drain on our economy through loss of jobs and job opportunities. Billions of American dollars have been invested in these foreign facilities—dollars that might have been used to create jobs for our own expanding population.

At any rate, the Journal of Commerce has published a timely and thought-provoking article on this important industrial trend, to which I respectfully call the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 24, 1960]

USE OF FOREIGN PARTS GROWING AS COMPONENTS IN U.S. PRODUCTS
(By Jerome Oelbaum)

Take a close look at the coaster brake on your boy's American-made bicycle. There's a good chance it's manufactured abroad. Or the bread-slicing machine in your neighborhood bakery. Or, ironically, the little name plate that identifies a truly U.S.-manufactured camera as "Made in U.S.A."

U.S. manufacturers are now importing a large number of parts and components from foreign companies to incorporate in finished products for the American market. Some are bought from independent foreign manufacturers. Some come from plants affiliated with American companies.

MORE IMPORT PARTS

According to reports presented at a meeting being conducted by the American Management Association the probability is that the practice will increase rather than contract. There are companies that have been fighting the trend, sticking to a "Buy American" policy. But many are apparently giving way under pressure of competition.

S. H. Mesha, purchasing agent for Arnold Schwinn & Co., Chicago bicycle manufacturer, indicated that foreign bicycle parts makers are supplying U.S. companies with many important components. He warned that some American parts producers have had to curtail or suspend their output and this narrows the sources of local supply for bike manufacturers.

USES FOREIGN PARTS

"But we have to take the risk in order to compete," Mr. Mesha said.

Schwinn and other U.S. bicycle manufacturers several years ago convinced the administration to raise tariffs to check sales by foreign bicycle companies to this market.

Mr. Mesha reported that now foreign companies furnish about 16 percent of an average Schwinn bike.

Frank X. White, vice president of American Machine & Foundry Co., said overseas affiliates of American companies are going to be used increasingly to make goods that the U.S. parent corporations sell back home.

"We may deplore that . . . we should do nothing to accelerate it," he said, adding, however: "But you've got to take this action if you want to stay in business."

He advised industrialists not to always look to the Government for protection against foreign competitors. The solutions lie to a large extent in American manufacturers' ability to cut costs, redesign products, develop new products and automate their production.

AIDED BY NEW PRODUCTS

American Machine & Foundry, he said, had been priced out of world markets in some products such as truck wheel rims and electric motors. But the company has come out with new products, notably an automatic pin machine for bowling alleys, that have pushed up total exports. Under development is new equipment for desalting of sea water.

Mr. White indicated that his company, nevertheless, is continuing to increase manufacture abroad.

The pin-setting machines are now being made overseas as well as here; bicycle manufacturing may have to be shifted to Mexico; older style bread-slicing machines and their parts are being made abroad, leaving the U.S. plants to make small high-speed slicers; and the company's De Walt saw will be made in Italy for exports to areas outside the United States.

WORLDWIDE BUYING

John Ricca, purchasing agent for Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco), said this oil company, which operates solely in Saudi Arabia, is buying hundreds of products—both industrial equipment and consumer goods for workers—on a worldwide scale.

This practice began after the war as the company attempted to use blocked funds in foreign nations. But it has continued, he said, because costs of some goods are lower outside the United States and the company, in any case, would like to buy where it sells its oil if prices and quality are adequate.

"We save from 19 percent to 25 percent on the average foreign purchase over United States, and on some items we find the combined material and freight cost as low as one-quarter to one-half of the U.S. cost."

PIPE PURCHASES CUT

A few years ago, the executive said, Aramco bought 90 percent of its oil pipe in the United States. This year only about 2 percent will be bought here.

In the equipment field, foreign companies' servicing facilities are generally as good as those of U.S. firms, he said.

Quite a lot of American companies with which Aramco deals are eager to get production facilities in Europe in order to capture Middle East oil business.

The American Management Association's meeting is designed to acquaint U.S. businessmen with problems and profit opportunities in organizing purchasing activities on a global scale. The concluding session of the 3-day conference will be held today.

**Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican,
New York, "Speaker of the Year"**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the University of Maryland sponsored the Capitol Hill debate tournament, which attracted wide attention. At the final ceremonies, held in the Senate caucus room on Saturday afternoon, February 27, 1960, one of our colleagues, the distin-

guished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was awarded the "Speaker of the Year" plaque, an honor fully deserved.

Upon receipt of the award, the distinguished Senator made a brief and outstanding statement on the subject, "Congress and the Supreme Court."

In the debate tournament finals, a University of Maryland contestant, Mrs. Jackie Crews, received the third place silver key award. The subject of her speech was "Mediocrity in American Life."

To take part in this debate tournament, students came from colleges as far away as the Air Force Academy in Colorado, the University of Miami, and Bates College in Maine.

In my opinion such a debate tournament is a most praiseworthy activity, and its sponsors should be commended. Also, I would like to commend those of the University of Maryland who managed the tournament in such an excellent manner.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article which appeared in the March 1, 1960, issue of the Diamondback, under the heading, "Maryland Speaker Places Third in Capitol Hill Tournament"; also a news article in the same publication headed, "New York Senator KEATING Honored at Debate Finals," and also the text of the address made by the New York Senator.

There being no objection, the articles and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYLAND SPEAKER PLACES THIRD IN CAPITOL HILL TOURNAMENT

(By Terri Goldberg)

A University of Maryland contestant, Mrs. Jackie Crews, received the third place silver key in the persuasive speaking contest of the Capitol Hill debate tournament held Saturday in the Senate caucus room on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Mrs. Crews spoke on "Mediocrity in American Life." First place went to Findlay College Representative Allen Jones.

The Capitol Hill debate tournament is sponsored by the University of Maryland under the direction of Mr. Malthon Anapol of the speech department. Thirty-two colleges and universities sent two teams, one affirmative and one negative to participate in the tournament.

Mr. Anapol remarked, "The interest of other colleges in the tournament is so great that several applications must be rejected due to limited time and accommodations. The tournament is growing every year."

One topic for debate is chosen the year. The topic for debate for each year to be used throughout debate for the year 1959-60 was "Resolved that Congress Should Have the Power to Reverse Decisions of the Supreme Court." The topic chosen is always one of national political importance.

B. Bruce Wagener of the University of Maryland Speech Department explained, "The tournament is unique in two respects: First, the finals are held on Capitol Hill, the seat of our National Government, and second, the debating is carried on before people who are likely to be influenced by what they hear. The issues debated are those on which Congress could act."

"In the past 3 years since the tournament began, it has rapidly become one of the big tournaments of the country, as indicated by the representation of the 32 of our top colleges and universities."

Students came from colleges as far as the Air Force Academy in Colorado, the University of Miami, and Bates College in Maine.

Both the affirmative team and the negative team of the University of Maryland won two debates against other colleges. Each representative team participated in six debates on the Maryland campus, held Friday and Saturday morning. The affirmative team winning the most debates in the preliminaries, and accumulating the greatest number of points, debated the top negative team in the finals held on Saturday in the Senate caucus room.

The final speeches of the Persuasive Speaking Contest followed a formal greeting by the Honorable Thomas Clark, Supreme Court Justice.

NEW YORK SENATOR KEATING HONORED AT DEBATE FINALS

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York was honored at the finals of the Capitol Hill Debate Tournament, sponsored by the University of Maryland Saturday, where he was awarded the "Speaker of the Year" plaque for his outstanding speeches on the subject of "Congress and the Supreme Court."

In his address to the 175 students and guests gathered in the Senate caucus room, Senator KEATING said that he felt there has been a failure on the part of the public to distinguish between criticism of the Court and criticism of the decisions of the Court.

The Senator explained, "The controversy between Congress and the Court in recent years is an inevitable and perhaps even an intended result of the division of governmental responsibility decreed by the Constitution. It is an example of our system of checks and balances in operation."

Those who are stanchly in favor of congressional power over the Court "have proposed remedies for some decisions that would endanger the Court's very existence as an independent, coordinate hand of our Government." On the other hand, "the Court's unqualified defenders are ready to burn at the stake anyone who suggests congressional perusal of the decisions of the Court."

Senator KEATING said that the Court should not be any more immune to criticism than the other branches of our Government. "The Court has served its country well in its 171 years of existence, but not all its precedents have withstood the test of time."

In favor of the Court, he said, "Congress also has the duty to prevent the undermining of our judicial system and to protect and preserve the role of law. The difference between a society governed by principles of justice and a society governed by arbitrary fiat is the difference between government and tyranny."

Then, in favor of Congress, Senator KEATING said, "Congress and not the Court is the supreme lawmaker under our system. Its attempts to deal with problems disclosed by judicial opinions should not be interpreted as attacks upon the Court."

Senator KEATING summarized his opinions on the subject by saying, "I believe Congress has been wise in rejecting all proposals to interfere with the jurisdiction or status of the Court. I also believe that Congress has been amiss in failing to moderate the impact of some of the Court's decisions on our defenses against crime and subversion, entirely regardless of whether the Court was legally correct or incorrect in the conclusions it reached."

Senator KEATING anxiously awaits the day when the measures he has introduced, that are important in our battle against communism or criminality, will be considered on their merits instead of as a part of a debate over the relations between Congress and the Court.

CONGRESS AND THE SUPREME COURT

(Text of address by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, on occasion of the awarding to him of a plaque as speaker of the year at the final ceremonies of the Capitol Hill debate tournament)

This is your day to debate and speak and so I will not detain you long.

I would, however, like a few minutes of your time to discuss my position on your debate subject and to try to put this issue in proper perspective, as I see it.

First, in my opinion, the controversy between Congress and the Court in recent years is an inevitable and perhaps even an intended result of the division of governmental responsibility decreed by the Constitution. It is an example of our system of checks and balances in operation. It is as natural as differences between the President and the Court or the President and Congress, and no more harmful to the public interest, if kept within proper bounds.

Second, the most unfortunate aspect of this controversy is the tendency, in some quarters, to classify all those interested in this subject either as defenders or detractors of the Court itself. There has been an abysmal failure to distinguish in public discussion between criticism of the Court and criticism of the decisions of the Court.

Third, this misunderstanding has been engendered in part by the pronouncements of the extremists on both sides of this issue. The Court's unqualified defenders are ready to burn at the stake anyone who suggests congressional perusal of the decisions of the Court. The Court's irrespressible detractors, on the other hand, have proposed remedies for some decisions which would endanger the Court's very existence as an independent, coordinate hand of our Government.

Fourth, the Court should not be any more immune from criticism than the other branches of our Government. To maintain that the Court is infallible is to deny history. The Court has served our country well in its 171 years of existence, but not all its precedents have withstood the test of time. The Justices of the Court deserve our continuing respect, but not our unqualified homage.

Fifth, I believe that lawyers have a particular duty to protect the Court against unwarranted attacks. The basis for this duty is explained very well in the first canon of professional ethics this way: "Judges not being wholly free to defend themselves are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor." But even this injunction should not be read to stultify constructive criticism of decisions of the Court by members of the bar.

Sixth, Congress has a like duty to prevent the undermining of our judicial system and to protect and preserve the role of law. This is a sacred mission. The difference between a society governed by principles of justice and a society governed by arbitrary fiat is the difference between democracy and tyranny. Congress must always treat the Court with the veneration due one of the pillars of our institutional structure.

Seventh, it should always be recognized, however, that Congress and not the Court is the supreme lawmaker under our system. Its attempts to deal with problems disclosed by judicial opinions, should not be interpreted as attacks upon the Court. And the proposals for corrective action should be considered on their merits and not as part of a battle over whether this is a good or a bad Court.

Finally, let me say that although I believe Congress has been wise in rejecting all

proposals to interfere with the jurisdiction or status of the Court, I also believe that Congress has been remiss in failing to moderate the impact of some of the Court's decision on our defenses against crime and subversion. And that is so, entirely regardless of whether the Court was legally correct or incorrect in the conclusion it reached. I have introduced a number of measures in the past few years which I believe are vitally important in our battle against communism and criminality. I anxiously await the day when these measures will be considered on their merits instead of as a part of a debate over the relations between Congress and the Court.

In closing, I should like to pay a richly deserved tribute to Mr. Anapol, director of debate of the University of Maryland, and committee chairman of the Capitol Hill tournament, and to the members of his committee for their initiative in organizing this fine tournament, for their vision in giving it the scope of such wide and choice representation, and for their sheer courage in attacking such a massive assignment and bringing it to fruition so successfully.

To win or to lose in this competition is important—but it is not all important. Each team—each individual contestant—in this tournament will leave with a more durable treasure than a cup or a medal. You have enriched yourselves personally through this experience. You have tested your mettle, and the mettle of others. You have had the benefit of a dress rehearsal for the drama of life that unfolds before you. May I wish each and every one of you—with all my heart—every success and every happiness in the years ahead. And whether in marriage or in single blessedness, may you never lack for issues that light the spark of constructive dissent.

University of Chicago Professors Compare Soviet-United States Strengths After Tour of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the March 1960 issue of the University of Chicago magazine:

SOVIET, U.S. STRENGTHS COMPARED—ARE RUSS SUCCEEDING IN "BURYING" US? DO WE TRAIL RUSS IN ARMS RACE? CAN RUSS TOP UNITED STATES IN EDUCATION?

(In a series of three features, the Chicago Daily News presented highlights of a tape-recorded interview its staff members had had with six University of Chicago faculty members this January. The faculty are: Dr. Paul C. Hodges, professor emeritus of radiology, recently returned from an extensive tour of Russia; Chauncey Harris, dean of social sciences and professor of geography, an expert on the growth and function of Russian cities, industrial resources and agricultural programs; D. Gale Johnson, professor of agricultural economics, one of 12 Americans who toured Russia under U.S. Government sponsorship; Everett C. Olson, chairman of zoology, expert on evolution; and Robert Osgood, associate professor of political sciences and research associate at Center for Study of American, Foreign, and

Military Policy. The following is excerpted from the News:

Question. "Dr. Hodges, can you tell us something about medical research and health programs in Russia?"

Mr. HODGES. I saw research going on in the First Medical Institute in Leningrad under Prof. Ugloff. Student surgeons were doing the sort of dog surgery, heart, and lung surgery that you would see at any good department of surgery in the United States.

Older men were doing similar operations on patients. I found them all extremely modest, well informed about what is going on elsewhere in the world and not at all boastful.

I saw research going on in a rather unique eye institute in Odessa. I doubt whether anywhere in the world one could see as many patients who have successful corneal transplants as we saw in a few hours there.

Any ophthalmic surgeon there who needs a cornea simply goes to the nearest undertaker and gets any eye that happens to be there at the time without the consent or even the knowledge of relatives.

Question. "How would you compare the health of the Russian and the American people?"

Mr. HODGES. Russians freely admit that at a given age they are considerably older biologically than we apparently are. They age earlier. They marvel when they see American men and women in their seventies and eighties touring in Russia.

I have assumed that this was simply due to the fact that in Russian life has been hard for a long time and that hard work wears people out. In that one respect, they are not as well off as we are.

In the matter of medical care, I think experience shows that when the average Russian needs medical assistance, he has only to ask for it and it is available to him.

They make a great deal of the fact that they never have to wonder how they are going to afford medical care.

Question. "Would you evaluate the medical care they receive?"

Mr. HODGES. Wherever I saw it, it was good. The Russian doctors are critical of it only to the extent that in the less populated areas they are distressed with the distance the patients may have to be taken for major surgery.

By our standards, the wards are crowded, the food is coarse, but I doubt that the crowding or the food in the hospitals is any worse than it is in the homes.

It's silly for us to judge these by our standards. Above everything else, there is a spirit of friendliness in the Russian hospitals.

Question. "Does a man have to be a Communist party member to direct research activity there?"

Mr. HODGES. We didn't feel like embarrassing our hosts by asking them. I am told that the students who come to us in this country are members of the party and that intourist guides are members of the party.

Mr. HARRIS. May I contradict this? Some of the students are members and some are not, and the same goes for guides. It requires enormous effort to become a member of the party. Many are not prepared to devote that much time to political affairs.

There is a considerable difference by fields. For example, in the faculties of the social sciences, nine-tenths of the staffs of universities are members of the party, whereas in the physical sciences it's only one-fourth.

Question. "Do you think, Dean Harris, that because a scientist is a member of the party it makes him more competitive with the United States—more desirous of 'burying' us in his particular field?"

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, probably in that he would try to follow the party line.

Question. "Would it make him a better scientist?"

Mr. HARRIS. It might make him a poorer scientist. However, any intense motivation, be it nationalistic, idealistic, religious, or personal, may drive a man to greater achievements.

Question. "Does this require comparing of morale among American and Soviet scientists?"

Mr. HARRIS. In the Soviet Union, there is an attempt to improve morale and to motivate people by a sense of urgency and national pride.

The desire to achieve, the sense that they must achieve for the honor of their people, is quite an important factor.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are big incentives. The richest guys in the Soviet Union are the physicists. The scientist is in the highest echelon of respect and well-being in terms of the goods of life.

Question. "What motivates an American scientist?"

Mr. ANDERSON. I think he is motivated mainly by the intellectual challenge he is offered, the chance to make a discovery or do something new.

Question. "Isn't that a better kind of motivation for productivity?"

Mr. ANDERSON. I wouldn't be a bit surprised. I am dubious that in the long run their system will pay off as well as ours.

Question. "Returning to the question of research, how well does the Soviet Government finance it?"

Mr. HARRIS. In order to improve production, the Soviet Government as a matter of policy invests very large sums in education and research. Research is not a sheer intellectual delight. Research is a productive investment. I have observed, the budgets are very generous.

The Institute of Geography at the Academy of Science has 300 full-time senior research workers. There is not a comparable research institute in this field anywhere else in the world.

Question. "Is there anything that gives them flexibility in key areas of research?"

Mr. HARRIS. They have both greater and less flexibility than the United States. They have greater in the sense that if an area like rocketry demands sudden great investments of manpower and capital by a central planned decision they can divert these on the highest priority quickly and flexibly.

On the other hand, they have less flexibility in that their scientific programs tend to be planned a year or two in advance and the scientist is supposed to achieve a certain end that is stated in the plan.

In America, if we see a promising new lead, we shift very quickly to wherever our curiosity leads us. In the Soviet Union, one may be inclined to say: "Well, we must finish this plan, then we must think about that a little later."

Question. "How did the Russians come to build the world's biggest atom smasher?"

Mr. ANDERSON. They had clearly resolved to get the biggest machine at the earliest possible time. The quickest way to do this was to take an American version known to be operating and to copy it, but make it bigger.

We wouldn't build a machine that way because we haven't the money.

Question. "Are there other signs of their copying us?"

Mr. ANDERSON. We found the same thing in labs. Often the designs were the same as ours. Wherever they wanted something in a hurry, they copied.

Mr. OLSON. They were smart enough to take what was available and use it well. This is one reason they've been able to progress so rapidly.

Question. "Yet they are doing basic research at the same time?"

Mr. OLSON. Yes, but they're using copies of existing instruments. In mineralogical laboratories I saw this continually.

Question. "How are they able to come up with more money than we to achieve certain ends?"

Mr. ANDERSON. Just a matter of allocating the funds. You start out with people who aren't used to having much.

You only have to contrast the Gum department store in Moscow and Marshall Field & Co. to see where the money is going. It's going into research and technological development.

Question. "As you run a box score and take the various subjects, say physics and geology and go right down the line, wouldn't we come out with a pretty good batting average?"

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't think anybody has any doubt including the Russians themselves, that our present position in science in general is superior to theirs. They're trying to reach us still.

Every Russian physicist worth his salt speaks English, a tacit admission that if they want to be up to date, they must read the American Physical Review.

Question. "Why our concern, if we have this solid foundation?"

Mr. ANDERSON. Their gain is faster than ours.

Mr. OSCOOD. I'm not sure I agree that every advance of the Soviet Union is to our disadvantage.

Mr. ANDERSON. I didn't make that statement. Science is competitive. It doesn't mean that a scientific advance in the Soviet Union acts to our disadvantage, it might even add to our advantage.

Question. "Turning to the much-discussed subject of education, is there anything about the Russian system that we might envy or borrow?"

Mr. HARRIS. I would say the state's taking broad financial responsibility for the support of education as a major governmental activity.

Mr. JOHNSON. The main place in which Soviet education has paid off, and where the emphasis has been important, has been at the elementary and secondary level. They have, I think, practically wiped out illiteracy for everyone under 40, by strengthening the elementary and secondary schools.

This has been a major factor in the great rise in production. They turned a peasant population into a population qualified for industrial work.

Question. "Does the average Russian child get more schooling than the average American child?"

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I don't think so.

Question. "More intensive schooling?"

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; he devotes less attention to extracurricular activities and to what we sometimes call fringe activities in school.

Question. "Then how do you get this creativity that they seem to be achieving?"

Mr. HARRIS. This probably is in a relatively small proportion of the population. Only 3 percent of the university undergraduates go to graduate work. In graduate work, they begin to select for creativity and originality.

Mr. JOHNSON. The areas in which they have shown the greatest creativity are those in which any conflict with the Communist interpretation of life is the smallest.

Question. "Assuming that their figures are correct, and that their rate of growth continues, where eventually will this place us in relation to them?"

Mr. HARRIS. If the Soviet Union were to continue to put a large proportion of its effort into coal and steel, and if we were to continue to put our efforts into a variety of activities, they would eventually surpass us in both coal and steel production and, because of the long American steel strike, they may have begun to challenge us in steel production.

Question. "Don't you think that our system fosters more creativity?"

Mr. HARRIS. We like to hope that it fosters it.

Question. "Could Khrushchev's intimidation that we shall 'bury' you come true in education?"

Mr. HARRIS. If we are complacent, if we think what was adequate for our grandparents is adequate for today, the Soviets would "bury" us. Or if we think that what is adequate for today will be adequate for 30 years from now, they would likely catch up to and surpass us.

Question. "Can we take up the question of production? We are told the Soviet economy is increasing at the rate of 9 percent a year while ours is increasing at the rate of about 3 percent. If that pace continues, sometime in the 1970's or probably later, they will have reached our level."

Mr. JOHNSON. If you accept these two assumptions, there will come a time when their output will exceed ours. There is a question whether they can maintain as high a rate of industrial growth as they have in recent years.

And their large rate of growth is due to the fact that they are willing to do something which I think we are basically unwilling to do and I would doubt whether, given our values, we should do.

They are willing to take a large proportion of this year's output and invest it in increased output in years ahead.

But there are many other factors in the economic picture.

Question. "If things continue as at present, what will happen?"

Mr. ANDERSON. What usually happens. There is much more drive and determination when you are trying to catch up than when you're already on top.

Question. "Should we adopt the policy to raise our steel production from 147 million tons just to stay ahead of the Russians?"

Mr. JOHNSON. No, it's not necessary that we stay ahead in steel production. Steel production, after all, as a percentage of the national output is relatively small.

It is really the question of how much we want to invest out of current earnings for the future.

Question. "What about Soviet plans to use increased production?"

Mr. JOHNSON. I think they are likely to go in several directions. One, I think there will be an honest effort to increase consumption at home.

Question. "But nothing will be done at the expense of the military, they will take that right off the top?"

Mr. JOHNSON. There is some real possibility that the relative share of the military might decline, even though the absolute amount might increase over time.

Question. "The Russians say that the American economy is bound to have depressions and of course that will play an important role in this competition. What is the thinking on that?"

Mr. JOHNSON. It's likely that we will continue to have dips, so to speak, in our economic activity, such as we had in 1948-49, or 1953-54, or 1957-58.

The likelihood of anything like the thirties again is very, very small.

Question. "Well, is the fact that Russia is catching up to what we consider a normal standard something to be feared or welcomed?"

Mr. HARRIS. Improvement of a standard of living in any part of the world should be welcomed by any person who has human welfare at heart.

Question. "We can't consider that then, in the context of one nation 'burying' another. But could someone bring this matter of production rivalry into focus?"

Mr. HARRIS. If the American economy stagnated, the Soviet Union would ultimately "bury" us. One of the real problems is the relative appeal of our system and their system for popular support. In their internal

propaganda, they emphasize how insecure life is in the capitalist world.

When I was in Moscow, they said it must be terrible to be unemployed. "We don't have unemployment. We don't have to worry." It's a sense of having security and care which by internal propaganda, by education, they tend to build into the system as important values in which they feel they exceed us.

Question. "Could you evaluate our strengths?"

Mr. HARRIS. We emphasize the value of freedom. We don't like to be assigned to our jobs. We don't like to have a paternalistic, even if a wise, government tell us what we should do.

The Soviets have built up one set of values and we've built up a different set.

For their set of values, the system gives certain satisfactions which our system wouldn't. For our set of values, our system gives satisfactions which the Soviet wouldn't.

Each society has built up internal support for the values which it emphasizes.

Question. "What are the areas in which Russia's advances become an important element in the cold war?"

Mr. OSGOOD. It's not clear that our own scientific advances should be determined directly as a reflex of Soviet advances, but rather according to our own purposes.

But in the area of military technology we are in the most direct competition and that, I think, has the greater urgency in the short run.

Mr. ANDERSON. Don't you agree that, besides the military, there are other fields which in some ways have comparable importance?

If the Soviet economic improvement becomes important enough, they could take away our markets. They could compete with us in every area.

Unless American national policy rises to the challenge in each of these fields of human endeavor, they'll do it.

Mr. OSGOOD. Regardless of their motivation, it will pay off if they can allocate and centralize sufficient resources to the areas of national power that are decisive.

It may be that they lag in basic research and motivation, but that won't make any difference if they continue at the present rate of advance in military technology.

Question. "What do you see happening?"

Mr. OSGOOD. We won't have a chance to see the results of long-term competition if we don't preserve a certain relative disposition of military power to defend our vital interests.

And I think it is extremely dubious that we will succeed, at the present moment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I attack this point of view. I don't think that the military position is all-important. It's very important to match and, if possible, keep ahead of the Soviet position in the military.

But that in itself is not sufficient. It has to be done all across the board.

Mr. OSGOOD. The short term may be decisive, is my point.

Mr. ANDERSON. This country has, on several occasions, been faced with the danger that over-exuberant enthusiasm for military preparedness has brought the country to the brink of economic disaster, or could.

Military preparation is so wasteful of economic and natural resources, the people, goods and productivity, that you have to be exceedingly careful. The defense effort absorbs a not negligible part of the national productivity.

Mr. OSGOOD. Defense is financially extravagant and impinges, in some respects adversely, upon every other aspect of national life. But it's indispensable. It's the precondition for anything else that we protect our vital interests.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have to maintain our military position, but I do want to point out the dangers of overdoing it.

Mr. OSGOOD. You evidently disagree with my assumption that we are not maintaining our military position.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't consider that the American military position is inferior to the Russian.

Mr. OSGOOD. I'm quite sure of it. I don't think it's a question of literally matching Soviet military power in every realm, or keeping ahead of them in the sense that if they create so many ICBM's you have to create so many.

The purposes that our military power serves are not identical to the purposes that Soviet military power serves.

What constitutes deterrence for us is based upon a complex of factors that are not the same as what constitutes the Soviet ability to support its quite different political objectives with military power.

I think we are falling behind rapidly and dangerously in the sense that we are losing our ability to deter aggression and to meet it without blowing up the world if we fail to deter it.

Question. "In the competition between the two worlds, are we equipped to win or to maintain our way of life? Will they bury us?"

Mr. HARRIS. In certain types of competition, they may turn out to be a much more efficient producer in ratio to effort. What is unclear is whether under individualism we tap certain reservoirs of human creativity which are untapped in the Soviet system. This may provide a margin for superiority.

I think the answer to that question cannot be definite. We don't know. Only time can tell. There are some evidences on each side of it.

Question. "You have stipulated certain areas that possibly are aiming to threaten us and you have stipulated others in which it is unlikely they are going to catch up in a long, long time."

Mr. JOHNSON. If you want to take the area of consumer goods, they're catching up with us on a per capita level, but it's so far in the future it's not too important at the moment.

But if you're speaking primarily of heavy industry, this is not so far in the future that we should be unconcerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Russians will make a great try to reach and surpass us in research. But I believe in the fundamental good sense of the American people that we scientists will be supported and supplied with the means and stimulation to help us maintain our position on top.

Mr. OLSON. In education, it is often overlooked that Russia is only now starting to attain a situation we have had for many years, complete literacy. They are quite a way behind us except in the very high centers.

However, I believe that in sheer factual education, before too long, they will equal and in some cases will be superior to us.

Young Republicans in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two excellent columns dealing with the work of the Young Republicans in the West, written by one of the West's outstanding columnists, Mr. George Todt, and pub-

lished in the San Fernando Valley Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Fernando Valley Times, Feb. 19, 1960]

YOUNG GOP'ERS WORK SERIOUSLY

(By George Todt)

"As I approve of a youth that has something of the old man in him, so I am no less pleased with an old man that has something of the youth. He that follows this rule may be old in body, but can never be so in mind."—Cicero.

What are California Young Republicans really like?

One hears many stories. Some seem fanciful, based on rumors. Others appear to be on the beam.

One of the best ways to learn the facts is to go to the scene of action and observe. Stop, look, and listen. I hid me over to the Young Republicans annual State convention recently in the Statler-Hilton.

What I found out at firsthand was heartening indeed. These kids are for real. In many ways they put their elders to shame when it comes to dedication to fundamental party principles, moral high mindedness, and ability to put out the work. They are business-like, attentive to duty, plain spoken and intelligent.

In the course of my rounds, I talked with many outstanding Young Republicans. Included among them were Virginia "Ginger" Savell, Sherman Wagenseller, Sandy Quinn, Pete Ashen, Betty Blake, Clifford Anderson, Jimmy Weir, Charles Wilding, Al Livingston, Steve Fryer, Nancy Root, Dick White, John Etherton and Alan Nichols—just to recall a few.

I asked many questions and found that they knew the answers I sought. They were not afraid to speak out on the important issues of the day, either. The rather typical timidity of the modern businessman to sound off on vital political issues was not to be found in this particular gathering.

Some of the issues on which the Young Republicans took a strong, determined position included national defense, narcotics, welfare abuses, and increased spending by Gov. Edmund G. Brown. They also expressed themselves as strictly against the action of a local union's leaders in dropping two men from the union for supporting a legitimate political issue which was before the California voters in the last general election.

Of Betty Blake, treasurer and past social chairman of the Wilshire Club, I asked how much of the Young Republicans' activity was social and how much the down-to-earth business of politics.

"We do have a certain amount of social activity to bring us together each month," she told me. "But it is really secondary to our interest in good government. That is the actual motivating force behind our organization. We are in this work to do something worthwhile for our country through the right kind of political action. There's very little nonsense in this group. Look around you and see."

This was true. As I looked about the various groups in their caucusing and meetings I was impressed by their moderation, good manners, and taste. There was no rowdiness, boisterousness, or sophomoric behavior going on anywhere that I saw. Good humor and pleasant fun, of course—but everybody seemed to stick to business.

One of my biggest thrills came when, attending the College Federation caucus, we heard Pete Ashen, who later was elected Young Republican national committeeman, answer a hot question put to him (at my instigation) by a likeable young Sigma Chi from USC named Steve Fryer. It was on

the loyalty oath contained in the National Education Act for university students.

"As one boy who has had the privilege of serving our country twice in war," Pete said, in simple, forthright honesty, "I can only say that I consider it an honor for me to sign any statement of loyalty to the American Republic. What's there to be ashamed of in doing so?"

[From the San Fernando Valley Times, Feb. 20, 1960]

YOUNG GOP'ERS PLATFORM STRONG

(By George Todt)

"Cherchez la femme." (Find the woman.)—Dumas, Les Mohicans de Paris.

In the person of Mrs. Fred H. Savell, Jr., La Canada, the California Republicans, found the right woman for the right job—so they gave her a rousing expression of confidence when she was elected president of the organization. Her election took place at the young GOP'ers recent annual convention.

Virginia, an attractive young lady whose Titian-colored tresses earn her the sobriquet of "Ginger," has mettle and spirit to correspond to the nickname. She is expected to spark Young Republicans' activities in this important election year.

Asked about her plans, she said:

"My first objective is to bolster our membership, which dropped considerably after the 1956 presidential election campaign. Our numbers are in the vicinity of 7,500 today, and we aim at a minimum of 10,000 by the end of 1960.

"Next priority will be closest possible liaison with the GOP Legislative Campaign Committee in special target areas, such as assembly districts where there is a real chance to pick up seats. A survey too is underway.

"It is my desire to tie the Young Republicans in closer with the senior members of the party. I hope the elder leaders will see fit to bring the younger people into positions of leadership and responsibility at a faster rate.

"We cannot compete with powerful organizations such as COPE (AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education), and the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) unless we have an enthusiastic mass movement of young people.

"It seems to me that the party can afford to place more confidence in its young people—those with good judgment that know how to work under pressure. Our YR's consider Vice President RICHARD NIXON an ideal example of what is meant here. Too many older men fold up in times of stress.

"I'm very proud of our YR's for another important reason: Their moral standards are high and they conduct themselves accordingly. They believe in the right kind of conservatism. They want the Government to keep hands off free enterprise as much as possible. And they have taken a tremendously strong stand against the evils of the foul narcotics business. Eventually I believe they will cause effective action to be taken by the present Governor in this respect. Incidentally, we see eye-to-eye with Assemblyman Lou Cusanovich, of the San Fernando Valley's 64th assembly district on this vital issue to our young people. We demand stiffer penalties for 'pushers.' We think the Governor should call a special session of the legislature to deal with the problem.

"I wish to emphasize that our most important job is to get down into the assembly districts to wage a successful campaign this time. We all ought to realize that a vote for the assemblyman amounts to a vote for the top of the ticket also.

"In the past 'A vote for Ike' didn't necessarily mean a similar ballot for the rest of the team."

Washington and the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune on February 22.

Believing that a maximum strength should be retained in the National Guard, I was sufficiently impressed with this editorial that I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in that I believe it should be called to the attention of all Members of the House. Support of this type from the press certainly gives strong encouragement to the officers and enlisted men of the guard, who, in many instances, make substantial sacrifices of time and work in order to remain members.

The editorial follows:

WASHINGTON AND THE GUARD

Two forces which helped form and sustain the United States merge today in a single observance. This is the anniversary of the birth of George Washington. It also is National Guard Muster Day. The two events have a definite relationship.

As a citizen-soldier Washington led units of the Nation's first National Guard in the battle for independence. He certainly would approve of the spirit of the modern National Guard, an ever-ready force to be used in local or national emergencies.

Today's guard has its roots deep in Washington's era. The oldest guard unit in the continental United States is the 182d Infantry of Massachusetts, originally organized as the Middlesex County militia regiment in 1636. Known as the Old North regiment, it responded to the call at Lexington and Concord where the American tradition of citizen-soldier "Minutemen" was born.

But today's guard can trace its heritage back even further than Washington and the Revolutionary War. The 295th Infantry of Puerto Rico dates back to the militia organized there in 1510 under the command of Juan Ponce de Leon.

General Washington depended heavily upon his colonial citizen-soldiers to carry on the battle against the Crown. Militias raised by the colonies for local and self-protection were formally organized into the overall defense force of the country in 1775 by the committee of safety of the Second Continental Congress. They provided approximately 165,000 of the 396,000 troops organized under General Washington's command.

There is little physical resemblance between the guard organization of Washington's day and the modern, well-equipped fighting force which exists today under this designation. But one essential similarity remains: both groups represent volunteer citizen-soldiers and demonstrate that our strength stems basically from nonprofessionals who prepare themselves to take up arms to defend the principles of democratic freedom.

Washington, himself, was an excellent example of a citizen-soldier. He had no formal military training except for limited service with the forces of General Braddock in the French and Indian War. He is not remembered so much for his ability in the field, but

for his determination, courage, character, resourcefulness and energy. As a tactician, he did not rank high. Thomas Jefferson records that Washington made many mistakes. But transcending these errors was an awareness of purpose and native wisdom which won a final and permanent victory for the colonies.

It is fitting, then, that today we honor both the memory of George Washington and the spirit of the National Guard. Together they represent extremely important factors in our way of life and as long as they endure no man or nation can charge the United States with an aggressive military spirit toward other lands.

The citizen-soldier concept is one of defense as illustrated in that old colonial banner which featured the coiled rattlesnake and the legend, "Don't tread on me." It is demonstrated by the fact that our civilian Government is by law superior to our military organizations and that only rarely in our history have we elected military men to the White House.

Washington lives today at a significant symbol and the National Guard reflects a citizen's love of freedom and determination to preserve it.

Prize-Winning Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring editorials I have had the privilege of reading was published in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle last July 5 and recently was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award. The award was sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

This outstanding editorial was written by Mr. George W. Kelly, editor of the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle editorial page.

The State of Tennessee is justly famous for its excellent newspapers, both daily and weekly, and its editors for generations have enhanced the newspaper profession with their dynamic editorial opinions.

In winning this national award, Mr. Kelly and Publisher Carl A. Jones, Jr., of the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle once again have brought well-deserved honors to all newspapers in the State and indeed to the press of the entire free world.

Other honors were won by Tennesseans in the contest. Martha Ann Shoun of Johnson City won a George Washington Honor Medal Award for a public address entitled "I Speak for Democracy." The Patton-Crosswhite VFW Post 6975 of Bristol and the Andrew Johnson VFW Post 1990 of Greeneville won medals in the community programs category.

Tennessee is justly proud of their achievements.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kelly's prize-winning editorial entitled, "The Pursuit of Liberty—In So Many Ways, Man Is Still a Slave," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURSUIT OF LIBERTY—IN SO MANY WAYS MAN IS STILL A SLAVE

What is independence?

We say it is freedom—the birthright of every American by virtue of the Declaration of 1776.

But what is freedom?

Is it something that can be "declared" into being?

A man can declare, as one did, "I am the master of my fate. I am the captain of my soul."

But is he? Can a person ever be that free?

The Declaration of 1776 proclaimed our independence of Great Britain. Then we fought a war to make it so.

Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Declaration that every man is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We wish he had used pursuit as a prefix for liberty too—the pursuit of liberty.

For liberty, freedom, independence—call it what you will—is something we must constantly pursue. If we do not, it will go far from us and we may lose it entirely.

We think we have broadened the concept of freedom much since 1776, and we have. But in many ways we are still slaves. True, no tyrant looms over us threatening to encase our ankles in chains. Due process of law protects us from that. But no law has been written, nor can there be, to protect us from the tyranny of our own mental processes or the despotism of our own souls. Many of us lie shackled in prisons of our own making, too weak and too afraid to declare our freedom.

Let us in this independence season of 1959 make a new declaration. Let us resolve to pursue:

Freedom from selfishness. Let us try to avoid the soul corrosion that comes from serving self alone. Let us not become a slave of our own greed.

Freedom from envy. Let us not despise our neighbor for his success. Let us not become a prisoner of little thoughts and mean deeds.

Freedom from prejudice. Let us accord every man his due. Let us judge him for himself alone, not by his color or class or station in life. Let us never yield to the tyranny of intolerance.

Freedom from cynicism. Let us not sit in the scorners' seat. Let us try to develop a belief in something. If we lack faith in ourselves, may we not try to inflict our misery upon others.

Freedom from ingratitude. Let us never be guilty of failing to say thank you for any service, any favor a fellow being may render. Most of all, let us never be guilty of failing to say thank you to the Giver of all Gifts. The most miserable prison of all is that which houses the ingrate.

The pursuit of liberty.

The pursuit of independence.

The pursuit of freedom.

It is a race that must be run. Both as a Nation, and as individuals, we must run it if we are even to approach the full meaning of the words.

The Women of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday there was a presidential primary contest in New Hampshire. Others soon will follow, and we are already deeply involved in the Nation's quad-

rennial game of speculating on the next occupant of the White House. There is, naturally, an attendant interest in the person who will be the next First Lady of the land.

An appropriate and timely address on the subject of the wives of past Presidents was delivered yesterday to the young women of Greenbrier College for Women in Lewisburg, W. Va., by the noted Southern writer and lecturer, Frederick Taylor Wilson, Mr. Wilson, author of "Pen Pictures of Presidents" and "Our Constitution and Its Makers," among other works, is a highly informed and well qualified speaker on the subject of the lives of our Presidents and their helpful wives. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from his most recent excellent address.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOMEN OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Although the female population of the Nation is greater than that of the male, there have been 71 sons born to Presidents and only 47 daughters. Several of the daughters died early in life; among them were two of Jefferson's five daughters and both of McKinley's.

There have been 34 wives of our 33 Presidents. These 34 were born in 16 different States. Virginia, Ohio, and New York each was the birthplace of six future wives of Presidents. Nine States have had one daughter to become the wife of a President. One President's wife (Mrs. John Quincy Adams) was born in London.

Jefferson, Jackson, and Van Buren were widowers when President and none of them were remarried. One President, Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, never married. Two Presidents, Tyler, of Virginia, and Wilson, of New Jersey, lost their wives by death and remarried while in the White House. The second wife of Tyler, Miss Julia Gardner, of New York, was 30 years his junior. Like Tyler's first wife, she bore him seven children, the younger of these was Mrs. William Ellis, of Shawsville, Va., who died in 1947. The second wife of Wilson, a Washington widow (Mrs. Galt), still lives (87). The best known of the early wives of the Presidents was Dolly Madison, a native of North Carolina, who served 8 years as hostess for Jefferson, a widower under whom her diminutive husband served as Secretary of State, and for 8 years as the wife of President Madison.

Abigail Adams was the wise influence behind her husband, John Adams, and also her brilliant son, John Quincy Adams, the only woman who was the wife of one President and the mother of another one. She died, however, before her son became President, the only son of a President yet to be President. It is tragically true that the wife of William Henry Harrison never saw her husband alive or dead as President. He died 30 days after his inauguration. She had remained in Ohio. She lived 23 years longer, dying at the age of 89, the oldest at death of any ex-President's wife thus far. Her grandson, Benjamin Harrison, became President (1889) 25 years after her death (1864). Mrs. Polk, who survived her husband longer (42 years) than the wife of any other President, died at 88 years of age. She served as secretary to her husband.

The wife of Pierce was perhaps the unhappiest wife of a President. She had lost all her children before he became President, and was an invalid.

The wife of Hayes (1877-81), like her husband, was a first honor college graduate. She was the first President's wife who was a college-bred woman. Grover Cleveland, a bachelor (48) married Frances Folsom (22)

who had once been his ward in Buffalo. After his death she remarried, the only President's widow so to do.

The wives of John Adams and Taft were the only wives of Presidents to have sons become U.S. Senators. The wives of John Adams, John Quincy Adams, W. H. Harrison, Tyler, and F. D. Roosevelt all had sons who served in Congress.

The two daughters of Jefferson who grew to maturity were the wives of two Virginia Congressmen when their father was President. The daughter of Theodore Roosevelt (Alice) was the wife of Longworth, an Ohio Congressman and onetime Speaker of the House, when he was President. One daughter of Wilson (Eleanor) married a member of his Cabinet, William G. McAdoo.

No President's son has been a minister, although the son of Wilson's daughter Jessie is now a prominent Episcopal clergyman (F. B. Sayers, Jr.).

The only two wives of Presidents who had university degrees were the wives of Coolidge (University of Vermont) and Hoover (Leland Stanford University).

Garfield, Hoover, and Truman were all in school with their future wife.

Fillmore and Johnson, accidental Presidents, both of whom once worked as tailors, were taught by their future wives.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has been the most active publicly of any President's wife.

The only daughter of Taft, Mrs. Helen Manning, is the most scholarly of all the daughters of a President. She has served as dean and as acting president of Bryn Mawr College. Thus far no President's daughter has held high political position.

At this time there are only three living wives of former Presidents—Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, and Mrs. Truman.

Two of Cleveland's and Theodore Roosevelt's daughters and one each of Taft, Wilson, and Truman are the only daughters of former Presidents now living.

It is difficult to imagine that a daughter of Tyler (1841-45) died 102 years after her father left the White House.

Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials which comment on the effort to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act of 1958. These editorials reflect but a part of the widespread support which S. 2929, the Kennedy-Clark-Javits bill, has received in the Nation's press.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Oct. 4, 1959]

LOYALTY OATHS

We are glad Harvard has now joined the long list of American colleges that balk at making their students take a special loyalty oath to qualify for Government loans.

Under the National Defense Education Act, as it now stands, applicants for student loans must not only take a special oath of allegiance to the Government but also disclaim by affidavit belief in or support for groups advocating overthrow of the Government.

Most U.S. students are both loyal to their own Government and totally uninterested in conspiracies to overthrow it. Why should they be subjected to the humiliation of swearing to an allegiance which in other citizens is taken for granted? Why should students, of all people, be bound by these extra ties of thought control?

So many colleges and college organizations have protested against this discrimination, that Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts introduced a bill to eliminate the offending requirements. Senator GOLDWATER offered a substitute which would simply make it unlawful to accept a Federal scholarship if one were involved with Communist organizations. But the Senate, in its peculiar wisdom, turned both proposals down.

We do not understand it.

Senator KENNEDY's statement of the case is still unchallengeable:

"I believe there is no reason why college and university students should be required to take this oath when the beneficiaries of other forms of assistance on the part of the Federal Government are not subject to such a requirement. Certainly the Smith Act applies to all Americans. Why should we not make a similar requirement of the farmers, the newspaper publishers, and those who receive mortgage assistance in connection with their homes?"

There was no answer to this challenge. Nor could there be. But since Congress has elected to be stubborn, the colleges should show themselves stubborn, too. They should withdraw from the aid program and wait for wiser counsels to prevail in Washington.

[From the Boston Herald, Oct. 7, 1959]

OATHS AND OATHS

Since our editorial on loyalty oaths appeared Sunday we have received several letters like the one in today's mailbag. Apparently we did not make our position clear. We'll try again.

"Why should not students of our colleges adhere to loyalty to our Government?" our correspondent asks.

Obviously they should. All citizens should be loyal to their Government. All citizens should be willing to swear to that allegiance under appropriate circumstances.

The bad thing about the oath requirements in the National Defense Education Act is that they single out one group of citizens for special treatment. They require students who receive Federal aid to swear to their allegiance, although farmers, and businessmen, and home purchasers, who are also assisted by Federal funds, are placed under no such obligations. They imply that students are less trustworthy and less loyal than other citizens, which is quite unfair.

"Would you entertain in your home anyone whom you knew would destroy your home?" the letter continues.

Again, the question answers itself. But, if we invited into our home a person whom we had no reason to suspect of destructive tendencies, we certainly would not insult him by asking him to swear not to blow us up. Nor would we expect such an oath, if it were taken, to add to our security.

The letterwriter is opposed to giving Federal scholarships to Communist infiltrators. We heartily agree. It is important to keep secret Communists out of education and all other fields of endeavor. But we don't think loyalty oaths are an effective way to do it. Communists are not afraid of false oaths.

The best that can be hoped from the oaths required by the Education Act is that they will screen out certain confused but conscientious young people who have played about the fringes of the leftist ideologies and are unwilling to lie about it. And it is far from clear that this will be a gain.

One of the prime purposes of democratic education is to clarify political thinking and show the waverers that communism and other totalitarian ideologies are wrong. Can this purpose be achieved by confining educational opportunities to those who have already seen the light?

More than enough has already been said on this subject. American education will not collapse if the oath requirements remain in force. But we agree with Senator KENNEDY that Congress acted in haste when it established them, and that it should be seeking now for more effective ways to promote loyalty in our colleges.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, Oct. 8, 1959]

HARVARD IS RED—WITH INDIGNATION

Diehard McCarthyites who like to picture Harvard as a hotbed of dangerous doctrines no doubt now feel that their worst suspicions have been confirmed. Because it objects to the loyalty oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act, the university has decided to forego some \$385,000 in student loans allocated to Harvard by the Federal Government.

The fact is, however, that Harvard is in excellent company on this issue. More than a dozen major liberal arts colleges—including Amherst, Bennington, Princeton, and Swarthmore—have already refused to participate in the Federal program on the same grounds. At Williams College, the faculty has gone solidly on record for repeal of the student loyalty oath provision. And lest this be deemed a symptom of radicalism, it might be added that this provision has also been vigorously opposed at congressional hearings by the Reverend Michael P. Walsh, president of Boston College.

The principal reason for this opposition is that demanding loyalty affidavits from college loan recipients is blatantly discriminatory when similar demands are not made of farmers, businessmen, homebuyers and others who receive Federal funds. To establish students as a special category by requiring them to swear to an allegiance that others take for granted is an indignity that smacks altogether too much of the sort of anti-intellectualism of the police state.

As a practical matter, moreover, exacting a loyalty oath in exchange for scholarship aid accomplishes nothing whatsoever, because the sort of persons this is designed to exclude from the program are precisely the sort who have no compunctions about taking a false oath. The net effect is not to bar Communists, but rather to bar liberals who are conscientious enough to object to such requirements in principle.

At the last session of Congress, a bill to strike the loyalty oath from the National Defense Education Act was sponsored by Senator JOHN KENNEDY, whose credentials as an anti-Communist would seem to be more than adequate, but after lengthy debate the Senate "chickened out" by sending the bill back to committee. Although a majority of the Senators doubtless shared Mr. KENNEDY's conviction that the oath is both unwise and pointless, they were afraid to go on record against anything with an anti-Communist label.

This illustrates once again the extreme difficulty of repealing hasty and foolish legislation in the internal security field once it has been enacted. The fact that the high purposes of the Defense Education Act are being largely impaired by the controversy over its loyalty provisions may help to teach Congress the high price of yielding to demagogic temptation.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Republican, Nov. 19, 1959]

WHY THEY OPPOSE STUDENT OATHS

Objections to the loyalty affidavit feature of the Federal Government's student loan

program have reached the point where Harvard and Yale no longer will participate.

The affidavit requires that before a student obtains a loan he must swear that he does not believe in, or belong to any organization that advocates the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or any illegal or unconstitutional means.

The educators are rightly disturbed about this provision, not because they believe in communism or anarchy, but because they see in the requirement a threat to long-established principles.

The idea that any citizen should be forced to subscribe to loyalty tests, as defined and administered by the Government, is repugnant to our democratic traditions and contrary to the basic principles of academic freedom.

It makes no difference whether the loyalty test happens to embody an idea which good Americans would freely endorse. The unobjectionable test today could lead tomorrow to demands for oaths of a far more restrictive and oppressive nature.

Colleges and universities, in company with private citizens, have a duty to resist any trend whereby the Government assumes to set itself up as the arbiter of individual beliefs.

Although to many persons it may appear that Harvard and Yale are making mountains out of molehills in the current case, the principle behind their stand is an important one and well worth defending.

[From the Woburn (Mass.) Independent, Nov. 19, 1959]

CLASSIC DISTINCTION

Harvard University's President Nathan M. Pusey has put an end—for the present—to participation by Harvard undergraduates in the benefits of National Defense Educational Act of 1958.

By that act, the colleges and universities of the country could distribute Federal moneys to needy or worthy students so that they could pay their tuition and continue their education.

In the act is the requirement that the loan recipient, in order to get the money, must disclaim belief and membership in and support for any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Pusey and a long list of leaders of the Nation's great universities and schools have opposed the affidavit of disbelief as an affront to freedom of belief and conscience.

These educators do not propose to subsidize the education of subversives.

When the student gets the loan he makes the normal student oath of allegiance to the United States and to uphold the Constitution.

The university men are against this misguided addition that touches a man's conscience and belief.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY tried to get the offensive section deleted from the act.

President Pusey is all for the oath of allegiance.

But he will have no part with a Government's attempt to make a man's personal belief the grounds upon which he will get an education or be deprived of one.

This may seem like a lot of teapot tempest, but if we do not keep a sharp eye on Federal do-gooders, we may establish precedents that seem to have the aroma of patriotism but may wind up, in the passage of years, to have the nauseous odor of discrimination, prejudice, and despotism.

We will defend our country and that for which it stands.

But we will never allow laws to tell us how we must think, or penalize us for our beliefs.

What Is a Liberal?—An Independent Weekly Editor in East Texas States His Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the favorite political and journalistic pastimes these days seems to be to try to define just what is a liberal. In recent weeks I have read articles and columns not only trying to ascertain just what is a liberal and who is a liberal, but also discussing various types of liberals.

For example, one writer had the opinion that there are basically two kinds of liberals—the winged liberal and the horned liberal. After all these articles, there still seems to be considerable question of exactly how one defines a liberal.

An interesting philosophic discussion of this question was written by Latane Temple in an independent "deep" east Texas weekly newspaper, the Angelina County Free Press, published at Diboll, Tex. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the front page editorial from the Angelina County Free Press of February 3, 1960, headed: "What Is a Liberal?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A LIBERAL?

(By Latane Temple)

The current vogue among many big metropolitan newspapers is to scorn the liberal. Whenever you read the term, it is with some scathing inference.

This tendency frankly disturbs us. We grew up thinking that liberalism was in the highest American tradition. We always thought that the signers of the Declaration of Independence were liberals as opposed to the Tories who adhered to George III. We thought that Thomas Jefferson, in outlining the freedom and equality of mankind, was a liberal. We have believed that Andrew Jackson was a liberal when he fought the New York banking interests who sought to run the U.S. Treasury for their personal profit.

It was the liberals, we thought, who saved our banks and farms and homes (and perhaps a few big newspapers) back during the great depression.

Frankly, we have always felt that we were a liberal, although admitting such in the face of such formidable stigma may be tantamount to social suicide among some of our best friends.

Can it be that these great papers are speaking actually of reactionaries who call themselves liberals? Reactionaries who want to revert from our traditional balance of democratic forces to a more totalitarian form? Reactionary forces which choose to rule by appeal to extremists views, reactionaries who seek power by appealing to blocks rather than to the people?

Since we are people ourselves and want the privileges and protection of the law for ourselves which has always been guaranteed in our form of government for people, we will throw our lot with the candidates and

parties who most clearly exhibit an understanding of and sympathy for these privileges and rights. We take this to be the liberal point of view.

If this term now carries stigma with it because it has been adopted by some extremists, we urge the great purveyors of the written word to retire the term of decent respect for great leaders who have borne it in honor. Otherwise, the confusion is such as to drive many unwillingly into the extremists' camp for want of a more congenial home.

Eulogy of Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, one of our Nation's truly great patriots, Herbert R. O'Connor, was buried on Tuesday. Mr. O'Connor was twice Governor of Maryland, as well as my predecessor in this body and it was my privilege to have him as a close, personal friend. At his funeral men and women from all stations of life joined in an inspiring testimony to his many achievements in behalf of his country and his church. The requiem mass for Senator O'Connor was celebrated in the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen, in Baltimore, and a beautiful eulogy was delivered by the Very Rev. Vincent F. Beatty, S.J. Father Beatty, who has been president of Loyola College, Baltimore, since 1955, is a man noted for his spiritual, scientific, civic, and humanitarian interests. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORDS OF EULOGY DELIVERED BY FATHER BEATTY AT THE REQUIEM MASS OF THE HONORABLE HERBERT R. O'CONNOR

May it please your grace, Archbishop Keough; your excellency, Governor Tawes; honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives; right reverend and very reverend monsignori; your honor, Mayor Grady; distinguished members of the bench; very reverend and reverend fathers; esteemed Knights of St. Gregory; officials of the Federal, State, and local governments; dear religious; beloved friends of Herbert O'Connor, in the ordinary events of everyday life words so often prove inadequate to convey the depth of human feeling. How utterly fragile they are today to bear the weight of love, of admiration, of genuine sorrow that floods our hearts in the presence of the death of a loved one. Realizing the weakness of speech at a time like this, Holy Mother Church wisely offers as her final eulogy to a beloved son the most holy sacrifice of the mass. It is through the mass, offered this morning by his grace, the archbishop, that Holy Mother Church bids an earthly farewell to Herbert O'Connor, in the presence of his family, his brothers, and sisters, and his many friends, as he leaves the ranks of the church militant to join the numbers of the church triumphant.

Here he lies in the splendid new Catholic cathedral dedicated to Mary our queen whose Son he had followed so well as a

devout, intelligent, and active Roman Catholic. Here he lies in this city of Baltimore that he loved and served so faithfully, in the State of Maryland that he rose to govern and to represent in the U.S. Senate. Here he lies surrounded by the members of his family to whom he was so dedicated, in the presence of a legion of friends from all walks of life whom he remembered and cherished even in the midst of public acclaim.

Herbert O'Connor was a man of God with a faith inherited from saintly parents. He was endowed by nature with a quick and keen intellect, and he lived his faith and exercised his intellect, united with God his Creator. God to him was supremely real, ever close at hand. He was a man who walked with all faith and simplicity in the presence of God amid the demanding duties of public office.

On Ash Wednesday he was at the altar rail. He received ashes on his brow and heard from the priest's lips and the ecclesiastical and familiar words: "Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return." Ash Wednesday was not the first time that he had heard this reminder of mortality, but it was to be the last, and I know that he lived ever in the memory that earthly life is an exile, that our true home is heaven, and that we must be prepared to leave exile for home and the joys of earth for the peace of heaven. For many years in many churches on the first Friday of each month, the Senator, with Mrs. O'Connor, received his Lord in Holy Communion, but on the first Friday of March 1960, his Lord received him into an eternal companionship so beautiful, "that the eye has not seen nor the ear heard nor hath it entered into the mind of man to imagine."

To Herbert O'Connor, his wife and family were inseparably joined in a bond of love. In the spirit of St. Joseph, the model of all husbands and fathers, he lived for his family. They were his joy and his crown. The hours he enjoyed most were not those when he was viewed by a nationwide audience on a television screen, but those when he could be with Mrs. O'Connor and the children stimulating attractive conversation around his own dinner table. One by one he gave up his children in marriage—first Herb, then Gene, Jimmy, and Pat—and in giving he received. How he cherished the tender love of his grandchildren and the joy of seeing his own ideals and hopes in the families of his children. And one of his last family duties was to stand as the best man in the marriage ceremony of his youngest son, Bob, just 11 days ago. Truly, no man loved his family more than Herbert O'Connor.

But he was not satisfied to be a man of God and nothing more. He was not content to return home after a day of trials and hearings, appointments and disappointments. His vision was broader, his love deeper, his dedication more perfect. He saw that other families than his own needed help, that governments can be no better than governors, and he gave himself to public life to serve the human family by taking an active, laborious, often heartbreaking and wearying part in public service. For him the people never receded into vague shadows—they were always real, they had names, they had faces. He was sensitive to the turmoils of the human heart and delicate and just in his opinions and decisions in matters of great moment and in those of lesser consequence. He loved the human family, and because he loved them, he served them; and because he loved them deeply, he served them well.

If we turn our thoughts from Senator O'Connor back to ourselves, the question that arises in our minds quite naturally is: Why must a man like this die? What is the meaning of death? For the Christian, death is something we owe to God. It is a debt that man must pay for the earthly life, and

it is part of the cost of eternal life. Without the grief of death, there can be no perfect union with God—the only complete fulfillment of the incessant demands of restless human nature. Death, then, is meaningful, even though sorrowful and intrusive. It brings forth tears to our eyes for the same reason that it brought forth tears to the eyes of Christ Himself at the death of Lazarus—because loved ones are separated. Although we weep at death, "We do not weep," in the words of St. Paul, "as those who have no hope." We hope for and believe in the resurrection of the dead and the communion of saints. We believe that if we die in Christ we shall arise in Christ. Our thoughts, then, cannot be of death alone but they must be of life, too—of eternal life.

Because of the love with which the O'Connor family have received me into their home over the years and because they have shared with me the joys of so many of their family celebrations, I feel that I am not usurping a sacred prerogative when I express their gratitude to you for your presence at these ceremonies this morning. I know how thoughtfully kind so many of you have been during these hours of tribulation and how appreciative are the relatives of Herbert O'Connor for these kindnesses. In their name, too, I publicly voice their gratitude to His Grace Archbishop Keough for celebrating the Mass of Requiem and for officiating at the last rites this morning for Herbert R. O'Connor.

May eternal light shine upon him, and may he enjoy the blessed companionship of God forever.

Father James J. O'Brien, Educational Leader, Pastor, Chaplain, and Servant of Mankind, Dies at Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an educator and pastor known and loved by thousands of Texans—Rev. Father James J. O'Brien—died recently in Austin at the age of 79. He had served on the faculty of St. Edward's University for 30 years and was vice president of the institution from 1934 to 1937. While I served as district judge at Austin, he was a pastor and teacher. Father O'Brien was my friend.

In addition to his service as a pastor, a university administrator, and a teacher, he also was chaplain of the Austin Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association. It was my privilege to serve with him in the Austin Reserve officers unit.

Mr. President, the Austin Chapter, Reserve Officers Association, passed a resolution in February honoring Father O'Brien. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Austin Statesman of January 25, 1960, entitled "Reverend O'Brien Dead at 79," and an article from the Austin (Tex.) American entitled "Reverend O'Brien Rites Slated."

There being no objection, the resolution and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION HONORING FATHER JAMES O'BRIEN

"Whereas the late Rev. James J. O'Brien, CSC, whose death occurred this past month, was a long and dedicated member of the Reserve component of our Nation's Armed Forces, and while serving as pastor of St. Mary's parish in Austin and during his tenure as president of St. Edward's University in Austin and later as chaplain at that school, served as chaplain of the Austin chapter of the Reserve Officers Association and participated in both local and State activities of the Reserve Officers Association, all as a result of his interest in his Nation's welfare: Be it

"Resolved, That the Sunday during National Defense Week of 1960 be dedicated by the Austin chapter in honor of the late Reverend Father O'Brien; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of the State of Texas, also a member of this chapter, be requested to make an appropriate entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD noting Father O'Brien's death and his past service not only to his church but to his Nation as a member of its Reserve Forces. Few clergymen have been known and loved as was this outstanding Reserve officer, not only in the State of Texas, but throughout the Nation."

Unanimously adopted this 8th day of February 1960, A.D., by the Austin chapter, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

RUSSELL E. FORESTER,
Commander U.S. Naval Reserve, President, Austin Chapter.

[From the Austin Statesman, Jan. 25, 1960]
REVEREND O'BRIEN DEAD AT 79

Father James J. O'Brien, C.S.C., longtime member of the St. Edward's University faculty, died Monday, January 25, 1960, at 1:30 a.m. at Seton Hospital.

A wake for Father O'Brien will begin at 9 a.m., Tuesday, in the Main Building Parlor at St. Edward's and will be continued through Tuesday night.

Most Rev. Louis J. Reicher, bishop of Austin, will celebrate pontifical requiem mass Wednesday at 10 a.m. at St. Mary's Cathedral. Pallbearers will be priests from Austin parishes.

Burial will be at Notre Dame, Ind., in the Holy Cross Community Cemetery.

The arrangements are under direction of Wilke-Clay Funeral Home.

Father O'Brien was vice president of St. Edward's from 1934 to 1937 and prior to that he had served as professor of history. In recent years, he was chaplain of the university. He once held the pastorate of St. Mary's Church in Austin and has also been president of the Deans of Men of Texas Colleges and Universities.

Always a man of great energy and strong personality, Father O'Brien had a host of friends both in and out of the Catholic Church. Having served at St. Edward's for a total of 30 years, 15 in one period from 1922 to 1937, and since 1946, he counted among his friends thousands of former students of the university.

Surviving relatives are nephews and nieces in Detroit and St. Louis, Mo.

Another activity that brought him many friends and acquaintances was long service as a chaplain in the Officers Reserve Corps, in which he held the rank of major for many years, after having served as a first lieutenant and captain during World War I. His last appointment was as a lieutenant colonel in November, 1952. He had been national vice president of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States and chaplain of the Reserve Officers Association.

Father O'Brien was born March 17, 1881, in Creve, Ireland. He received the habit of the Congregation of Holy Cross on July 3, 1909, and made his perpetual vows on July 4, 1911. He was ordained to the priesthood on June 26, 1914.

While Father O'Brien was serving as pastor of St. Mary's Church, Austin, in 1939, he observed the silver anniversary of his ordination. He received messages of congratulation from Pope Pius XII, Archbishop Arthur J. Drossaerts of San Antonio, and from the following Texas bishops: Christopher E. Byrne of Galveston; Joseph P. Lynch, Dallas; E. B. Ledvina, Corpus Christi; and Robert E. Lucey, now archbishop of San Antonio but then bishop of Amarillo.

While he was pastor of St. Mary's, Father O'Brien was active in a campaign to clean up the newstands of the city.

During his pastorate at St. Mary's he was also chaplain of Capital City Council, 1017, Knights of Columbus.

Father O'Brien was educated at the University of Notre Dame, Catholic University of America, and Columbia University. He held the degrees of Litt. B.S.T.B., and LL. D. The last named was conferred on him by St. Edward's University at the close of his term as vice president of the school.

[From the Austin American, Jan. 25, 1960]

REVEREND O'BRIEN RITES SLATED

Austin friends will pay final respects to one of the Southwest's best known and most popular clergymen in funeral services to be held Wednesday for the Reverend James J. O'Brien, C.S.C., 79, former vice president of St. Edward's University, who died early Monday morning in Seton Hospital.

In historic St. Mary's Cathedral, where he once served as pastor, a pontifical requiem mass will be sung Wednesday at 10:30 a.m. by the Most Reverend Louis J. Reicher, bishop of Austin. The eulogy will be given by the Reverend Joseph McAllister, C.S.C., former rector of the cathedral. Music will be sung by the Vincent Hall Choir of St. Edward's University under the direction of Brother Romard Barthel, C.S.C.

Austin priests will serve as pallbearers. They are the Reverend Donald Draine, C.S.C.; the Reverend Joseph McMahon, C.S.P.; the Reverend Herbert Hooks, O.M.I.; the Reverend Joseph Kmiecik, C.S.C.; and the Reverend Joseph Houser, C.S.C. Brother Raymond Fleck, C.S.C., president of St. Edward's University, also will serve as a pallbearer.

A wake, open to the public, will be held in the parlor of the main building of St. Edward's University, beginning Tuesday at 9 a.m. and continuing for 24 hours. The body will be sent by the Cook Funeral Home to Notre Dame, Ind., for burial in the Holy Cross Community Cemetery. Father O'Brien served one term as a pastor of St. Patrick's Church in South Bend, Ind.

Rosary services for Father O'Brien will be recited at 8 p.m., Tuesday, in the parlor of the Main Building at St. Edward's. The Knights of Columbus will be in charge.

At his death Father O'Brien was chaplain of St. Edward's University, where he was long associated. He had been in failing health for 6 months but had been confined to the hospital only 1 month. He also was a lieutenant colonel in the Retired Chaplain's Reserve, U.S. Army.

Father O'Brien was associated with St. Edward's University for a total of 30 years in two periods—from 1922 to 1937 and from 1946 to 1960. He served as vice president of that university from 1934 to 1937, and prior to that was professor of history. He served as pastor of St. Mary's Church here from 1937 to 1943.

Surviving relatives are nephews and nieces in Detroit and St. Louis, Mo.

Another activity which brought him many friends and acquaintances was his long service as a chaplain in the Officers Reserve

Corps, in which he held the rank of major. He had previously served as a first lieutenant and captain during World War I.

Father O'Brien was born March 17, 1881, in Creve, Ireland. He received the habit of the Congregation of Holy Cross on July 3, 1909, and made his perpetual vows on July 4, 1911. He was ordained to the priesthood on June 26, 1914.

Bernard Hillenbrand Timely Call for United Efforts of County Officials and Wildlife and Conservation Leaders To Save Natural Beauty of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the National Association of County Officials has long been recognized as one which reflects the forward-looking and aggressive thinking of local governmental leadership in America. The county officials throughout the Nation are close to the problems confronting our units of local government dealing directly with the people, and they therefore are keenly aware of the needs and interests of the American public.

On March 8, 1960, Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, the executive director of the National Association of County Officials, presented a forceful and thought-provoking message to the 25th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference meeting at Dallas, Tex. In his message Mr. Hillenbrand stressed the need for prompt and intelligent action in conserving the rapidly vanishing natural beauty of America. I urge every Senator to read his message.

At this time I wish to commend Mr. Hillenbrand and the National Association of County Officials for their support of conservation programs. This is a timely message. The need for action is urgent. The bills to create Padre Island, Cape Cod, and the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Areas are in keeping with Mr. Hillenbrand's aims.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the Dallas speech of Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand entitled "America the Ugly."

AMERICA THE UGLY

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand)

It is a sad commentary on America that the very things that have made the country great are now making it the ugliest looking nation in the world. The energy, imagination and drive of Americans that have created the greatest material benefits ever enjoyed by civilized man, have also created the neon sign, the treeless suburb and the stench of the polluted stream.

The aim of these remarks today is to enlist the support of conservationists everywhere in the cause of preserving a tiny part of the innate natural beauty of America for those poor souls who are doomed to live out their lives in the urban areas of the Nation. We are talking about 70 percent of

our population today; 85 percent of our population in the year 2000. We hope that we can get conservationists interested in supporting a specific proposal that we will make in a moment.

Problem: The problem is clear. Until now we have determined as a matter of national policy that nothing must stand in the way of building industrial might, a high standard of living and great material well being. We have been tremendously successful. Our philosophy has been something like this. We have to have jobs for our people and we must have industrial development even if the factories pour poison into the drinking water and pollute the air we breathe. People must have houses and the builders have raced into the suburbs and piled one subdivision upon another with no plan whatsoever to preserve any open space. Our civilization rests upon mass consumption and we must have billboards jammed on every highway urging that we eat more crunchies or buy more electric blankets. Trees do not pay taxes and they must be chopped down to make way for a pizza parlor.

The solution is also clear. We must now develop a new national policy that will both increase our material benefits and more important, create surroundings that are pleasant enough to allow us to enjoy these material things. Our premise is that a factory can be pleasant and inoffensive to humans; a highway that is beautiful can also be as useful as one that is not; and, suburbs can be constructed to preserve natural beauty and still make a profit for the builder.

Leadership: What is needed is immediate awareness that a plea to preserve natural beauty is not a move to stop progress. We are not against progress. We are for conservation of natural beauty.

It is possible to have natural beauty and still accomplish our other national aims. It does take action. Immediate action. We must get key areas under public control. Open spaces must be preserved now.

At the outset we would like to make it clear that while this is an urban problem it is not a municipal problem in the sense that it is going to be solved by cities. The key unit of government here is the county—or rather a partnership between city, county, and State, with the county being responsible for action.

County problem: Cities for the most part are almost completely developed and there are few open spaces to preserve. Most of the areas that we are talking about are outside the city—physically and jurisdictionally. In the typical urban area, the city is also handicapped in this problem because it does not have the broad tax base that is necessary for the initial expenditures to secure these spaces. Then, too, in the typical urban area there is not a single city but rather a welter of smaller municipalities—and it is always more difficult to get things done when you have too many cooks.

Counties, by contrast, are in a position to act. They have a long tradition of service having been formed at the earliest dates in our history. They predate most other units of government. They have political leadership and area accountability—two very important attributes in solving any governmental problem. Most of the land we are talking about—the picturesque farm, the patch of woods, the stream valley, the areas that must be preserved from ruin—are out in our county. Equally important, the county is a unit of government that serves both the city people and those in the rural or semirural areas outside the city. With few exceptions all are represented on the county governing body. Counties have an areawide tax base to draw upon for finances and have strong ties with the State legislatures.

Blueprint for action: If we have identified the key unit of government we also have a plan of action suggested by William H. Whyte, Jr., author and assistant managing editor of *Fortune*. Some day when we do have an adequate program of preserving open spaces we are going to get behind a movement to have them renamed. "Whyte Spaces" in honor of Holly Whyte. Most of you, I am sure, have read the August 17, 1959, issue of *Life* magazine in which he sets forth his plan to preserve the vanishing U.S. countryside. This is a review of that plan with some suggestions that we in county government might add.

The basic tenet of the plan is to buy conservation easements to preserve certain farm and undeveloped lands from being swallowed up by the developers' bulldozers. A county can purchase the development rights for a fair price and insure that a farmer or landowner will not be forced by economic pressure to sell to the developer. The easement is one of the oldest legal devices we have and has been used successfully to preserve undeveloped areas around airports and scenic places along highways.

It is basically fair. It compensates an owner now for the money that he might have made by selling his property to speculators. It enables the farmer to continue farming. It preserves the beauty of the area, and thus enhances the value of surrounding development. It is much less expensive than outright purchase of land and in most cases can accomplish the same purpose. It opens the way for subsequent purchase of areas for park or recreation purposes. Conservation easements do present many problems but it does appear that these can be worked out. Santa Clara County, Calif., is a pioneer in this area. Thanks to the planning director, Karl J. Belser, Santa Clara County has found the key to true urban-rural living; town and country coexisting without one destroying the other.

Purchase land: Of course, the obvious way to acquire streams, valleys, forests, and other open spaces is to purchase them. In many cases this will be the most practical solution. It must be done, however, before the price becomes too high. Imagine, for example, what it would cost today to purchase Central Park if it were not publicly owned. Much desirable land will also be donated for public purposes and provide the land for future park and recreational areas.

Note the emphasis upon either purchasing land or easements immediately. This is a far better approach than spending precious time and money on areawide studies although it is apparent that these will be needed, too. The trouble is that too often a prolonged study on open spaces results in loss of the very spaces that the study will eventually conclude should have been purchased in the first place. It is certainly better to have too much open space than too little.

Emphasis upon action to acquire open spaces is not to be interpreted as downgrading the value of preparation of a sound areawide land-use plan. Our problem is that we have reached a crisis. We must act now and take a chance that there may be error. Obviously every community should have a well thought out areawide plan for community development. Federal matching grants to smaller counties and cities are available for this purpose. In the case of areas that can qualify as metropolitan or regional in character, assistance is available to even the largest of communities.

Once a plan is developed it must be protected by adequate zoning regulations. It must be admitted that much of the open area that has to be preserved is located in county areas where no area plan has been developed and where no zoning protection exists. It must also be admitted that per-

haps in the case of preservation of open spaces, the use of zoning is inherently unfair to private landowners who must suffer the financial loss incident to not being able to develop their land and thus the public benefits at the expense of the few.

National committee: We at the county level, acting through the National Association of County Officials, are well aware of our responsibilities and are solidly behind the plan to preserve the innate beauty of America. We think that one of the most important elements that is lacking, however, is national leadership and direction. Ideally we probably need another Teddy Roosevelt to give expression to the sentiments that lie deeply inside most Americans. Plainly this is a national problem if ever there was one and it will require national direction to coordinate the work of nearly every citizen who must eventually become involved.

We would therefore propose to you now that we get behind the idea of creating in this session of Congress a national committee to develop a national plan to preserve the spaces of America. You will recall that a few years back the President of the United States appointed a similar committee to examine our national highway needs. The committee was headed by an outstanding American, Gen. Lucius Clay. The Clay Committee inventoried our national road needs and came up with a plan which, with important modifications, eventually became the basis for our present gigantic highway building effort.

A committee of this type, with adequate representation by conservationists, public officials, businessmen, labor leaders, newspaper representatives, and other outstanding citizens, could perform a tremendous national service if it accomplished nothing more than to identify the problem more clearly in the public mind.

It appears now that we have a spark plug here, a tire there, and a motor there, but we need to put it together and make a national vehicle. A committee could report in a year—to coincide with a new administration in Washington—with recommendations that could provide national direction.

Aroused public: We need an aroused public that understands that the natural beauty of America is as precious a natural resource as iron or oil and that, like the latter, its preservation and sensible use can bring important economic advantages to all citizens.

The National Association of County Officials invites you conservationists to join us in this effort because we have conclusively proven that a partnership between the two groups can be profitable to America. You will all recall that in 1956 conservationists and local public officials joined together to support national action to clean up the Nation's streams. You also know that in spite of setbacks here and there we have been able, through this partnership, to develop an important first step—the 1956 Water Pollution Control Act. At last we are beginning to get public awareness of the soundness of our recommendations and it won't be long before we get conclusive results.

It would be a particular pleasure to continue this partnership with "Pinky" Gutermuth and the other outstanding conservation leaders in this most challenging new area.

Perhaps the way to conclude this is to repeat the oath every Athenian took upon reaching manhood. It expresses in a few words the attitude that Americans must adopt if we are to continue to be great.

"We will never bring disgrace to this our city by any act of dishonesty or cowardice; we will fight for our ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many; we will reverence and obey the city's laws and do our best to incite a like respect and reverence in those around us; we will strive unceas-

ingly to quicken the public sense of civic duty; and thus in all ways we will strive to transmit this city not only not less but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Additional Support for Proposal To Establish a Department of Urbiculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, problems resulting from the explosive development of our urban centers become more acute daily. Our metropolitan areas are hard pressed to find answers to such complex challenges as transportation, traffic control, water resources, land use, planning, zoning, housing, libraries, schools, health and recreation facilities, and a host of other community services.

The problems encountered by city dwellers are compounded because although the growing cities are not limited by city, county, or even State boundaries, the governmental solutions to these problems usually are so limited. As a result, Federal assistance is vitally needed to help resolve some of these issues. This is not to say that local officials do not have grave and often paramount responsibilities in these areas. But we must not overlook the need for greater coordination and direction of the Federal effort to help our cities.

There is a growing realization throughout the Nation of the need for more efficient and cohesive Federal assistance to our urban centers. I have received widespread support for the idea to establish a Federal Department of Urbiculture, which I feel is the best means to achieve this goal. Recently, two distinguished constituents of mine, Harold Riegelman, counsel to the Citizens Budget Commission in New York City, and Roger Starr, executive director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York, wrote me about their views on this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from their letters be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITIZENS BUDGET COMMISSION, INC.,

New York, N.Y., January 13, 1960.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: This is to congratulate you upon your efforts to secure legislation to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urbiculture in the U.S. Government. We heartily endorse such a proposal and would like to help advance it.

We agree with you that the problem of metropolitan development is national in scope and requires the broad national view if the country's key areas are to develop in an orderly and efficient manner. The stake is not merely financial, but human, because

it is in these vast metropolitan areas that so large a proportion of America's population lives and works.

We suggest that you consider marshalling all voluntary civic and trade organizations throughout the United States in support of your effort. We shall happily join such a national movement.

Very truly,

HAROLD RIEGELMAN,
Counsel.

CITIZENS' HOUSING AND PLANNING
COUNCIL OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 25, 1960.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
The U.S. Senate,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have read with great interest your bill providing for the establishment of a Federal Department of Urbanization.

I am of the opinion that the establishment of such a department would be of great help in providing effective leadership for the solution of many problems common to all the cities of this country. It would place responsibility for the solution of problems on one executive head. At the present time we have a number of agencies whose heads are charged with the administration of laws. It is my experience in local government that there is a measurable difference in achievement when the one type of mandate is substituted for the other. It seems to me that such a department would not merely eliminate duplication and fill gaps between the areas of responsibility of separate authorities, but would give positive direction where the urban resident, worker, and investor, need it most.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER STARR,
Executive Director.

Advances in Defense Business Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by F. Trowbridge vom Baur, General Counsel for the Department of the Navy, entitled "Advances in Defense Business Management." This speech was delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Birmingham, Ala., on Tuesday, December 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVANCES IN DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
(By F. Trowbridge vom Baur)

I want to talk to you today about a subject which seldom seems to get into the newspapers, yet which is vital to the protection and pocketbooks of the people of the United States and which certainly should have the understanding of the American public.

This subject is the advances which have been made in recent years in the business management of the Department of Defense. What I am going to endeavor to show you is that, during the last few years in particular, great strides have been taken

in the direction of efficient management, elimination of waste, and duplication of effort, the providing for a better defense, and last but not least, economizing with the taxpayers' dollar.

THE EXTRAORDINARY SCALE OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS

Few people who have not worked in the Department of Defense have any real conception of the size of its operations or the magnitude of its problems in the field of business management, as well as in others. This Department is bigger than a number of the biggest corporations in America all rolled into one. As a result, it has problems in communication, organization, administration, and in sheer mass effort and activity, which are not approached by any business enterprise in the world. In addition, because of its relationship to the necessarily shifting tides of national policy, it has additional problems, peculiar to it alone, and highly intangible in nature, which are superimposed upon those problems which are common to both industry and defense. In appraising the subject of business management in this great Department, therefore, I think one must always bear in mind the size of the organization, the scale of its operations, and the magnitude and complexity of the problems with which it deals.

Let me illustrate this by mentioning just one problem alone—the inventory problem. A large mail-order house will carry approximately a hundred thousand different items in its catalog. And it is no secret that business people think that that is a lot of items. But in its supply systems, the Defense Department actually carries some 3,400,000 different items, not including the principal or end items such as aircraft, ships, tanks, etc. Also, the total value of all industrial inventories in the country is approximately \$85 billion. Yet, the Department of Defense owns inventories in its supply systems, again exclusive of these principal or end items, valued at \$46,400 million. Just imagine a business where the job of management is to manage inventories valued at more than one-half of those privately owned in the United States.

In addition, the Defense Department has management and distribution problems of this inventory which no private concern has. It must distribute this inventory on a worldwide basis with a positive assurance that the right material, in the right quantity, will be in the right place at the right time, and it must do this also in accordance with the shifting tides of international relations and domestic policy.

Motivation, too, is entirely different. In industry, the main objective is to get a fast turnover; to buy, to manufacture, and to sell quickly. If industry buys too little, some sales are lost and that is unfortunate, but not usually disastrous. If industry buys too much, specialized marketing techniques are employed to reduce inventories to normal size. But in the Defense Department, the motivation stems from different objectives. It must buy what it needs to fight a war which we all fervently hope and pray will never occur, yet at the same time, the only normal use of this great inventory is in peacetime training. As a result, this leaves the Defense Department with buying problems which industry has never even had to consider. For instance, if it buys too little, more than sales may be lost; indeed, the results can be catastrophic and could mean the destruction of the Nation. And if it buys too much, a completely different set of problems arise because of the fact that the Department of Defense can only dispose of surpluses in a very restricted market and under strict legal rules.

OBsolescence AND SURPLUS PROPERTY

And this brings me to the problem of obsolescence and of defense hardware becom-

ing surplus. Industry, of course, is free to make mistakes, and, as everyone knows, it does make them. However, industry has the great advantage of being able to make them, and to solve them with little or no publicity. Now, the Department of Defense makes mistakes too, because it is also run by human beings. Yet, because of the very magnitude of its operations and the additional problems with which it is confronted, its mistakes loom larger and seem to receive the very maximum publicity.

In any event, in disposing of surplus property, the operations of the Department of Defense are completely circumscribed by law. As you know, ours is a government of laws and not of men. The Federal Government is one of delegated powers only; and under article IV of the Constitution, only Congress can dispose of or authorize the disposition of Government property. This means that administrators in the Department of Defense cannot dispose of surplus property in any way which seems to them to be good at the time. On the contrary, there are definite legal rules which must be followed.

In addition, in the Department of Defense we are bound to have surpluses, because of scientific development, design changes, and planned events, such as the move from manned aircraft to missiles. There is nothing anyone can do about this, except to plan and adapt to the changes of science as best we can. The Department of Defense must not only plan to be prepared in the years to come, it must manage to be prepared at the present time, and indeed from week to week, day to day, and even from moment to moment.

Now, when property becomes surplus, unfortunately the Department of Defense cannot create an internal market by cutting prices and running special ads and special sales. Its operations are controlled by law, as I have indicated, and it must look outside the Department for sources of disposal. Moreover, even in this outside market, the Defense Department is still not free to compete with private industry. Prior to disposal in any significant volume, surveys are conducted in conjunction with the Department of Commerce to determine whether the market impact will be such as to harm industry. And in overseas areas, surplus disposal is even more complex because of the problems of security and the effect upon the internal economy of foreign nations. So perhaps you may agree with me, that in this area of surplus property disposal alone, there are enough problems to stir the imagination and stimulate the energy of any corporate executive.

Now, with this brief outline of some of the business management problems of defense and some of the basic differences with industry in objective and motivation, and the legal restrictions which circumscribe our actions, I would like to tell you about some of our more recent programs for the improvement of business management in the Department of Defense, and the great strides which have been taken. Specifically, I want to talk to you about cataloging, standardization, single managers, the Armed Forces Supply Support Center, and the efficiency which has resulted and the savings which have been and are being made for you, the taxpayer.

CATALOGING

The Department of Defense has recently completed the tremendous job of identifying and centrally cataloging every single item in the entire military supply system. And we have also completed the equally tremendous job of the necessarily resulting changeover in stock bins, production records, etc., worldwide. As a result today, from the procurement of an item to its final disposition, a single catalog number identifies each and every item of supply through-

out all stages of the supply management process. Thus we now have a common language of supply which means the same thing to all echelons, units, and people in the worldwide organization of the Defense Department and the military services.

This Federal catalog supply system was set up under Public Law 436, enacted in 1952. At that time there were about 5 million items—think of it—5 million items of military hardware. Now I am happy to be able to say that at the present time we have reduced this to about 3,400,000. That means that we have actually reduced the number of items by some 32 percent, and this total is presently being further reduced by the other programs which I will describe to you in a few minutes.

In addition, it should be recognized also that the maintenance of a catalog is a never-ending job. New items are being introduced into the system at a rate of about 250,000 a year as a result of the rapid developments in science and in the production of new hardware. Yet I am glad to say also that we are constantly removing old items through our standardization program. Last year, about 150,000 old items were removed from the catalog. In addition, as new and more experimental hardware tends to stabilize, the rate of standardization with respect to them may be accelerated.

STANDARDIZATION

Going hand and hand with cataloging is the standardization program. First, let me point out that there was an important prerequisite to the standardization program, and that was the Federal Catalog System which I just described to you. In other words, the uniform identification of each item was necessary prior to being able to standardize on any one of them.

Let me give you several examples. First, the standardization of loudspeakers (FSC class 5965) in the Signal Corps Supply System has resulted in 102 items being declared as obsolete for immediate elimination: 520 items have been declared nonstandard but to be issued until exhausted; and only 110 items have been established as standard for future procurement. Now this is a total reduction of 622 out of 732 items, or a reduction of about 85 percent in the number of items. In practical terms, this means that in the future, instead of having to buy 732 different items, only 110 items will actually have to be procured. It should be obvious to you, I think, that in the long run this means better prices and substantial savings to the taxpayer, as well as greater efficiency in supply management of the Department of Defense. Substantial savings in cost of administration, as well as directly in procurement, and in warehousing and distribution, are involved.

Let me give you another illustration. Under the program for the standardization of accessories for industrial engines, approximately 20 out of a total of 35 projects have now been completed. These projects covered such items as the engines themselves and their accessories such as battery charging indicators, air cleaners, oil filters, radiator caps, and V-belts, etc. As a result of the work done to date, 259 standard items have now been established to replace 3,955 items prior to standardization—or a reduction of about 93 percent. Again, this will mean better prices, greater ease of maintaining inventory and of distribution, efficiency in operation, a more adequate and effective defense, and finally, savings for the taxpayer.

In still another instance we have standardized on one type of 18-ampere automotive generators, which can now be used in place of 98 models previously used. In this case, other indirect benefits can come about since now we need to stock only 16 repair parts for this one generator, while in the past it had been necessary to stock 880 repair parts

to cover the 98 nonstandard generators. Again, this means greater efficiency, a more adequate defense, and savings for the taxpayer.

Also, in processing four simplification projects covering resistors (FSC class 5905), the Electronics Supply Office of the Navy has reviewed 19,824 items and has declared 7,929 nonstandard, again with improved results for both defense and the taxpayer.

SINGLE MANAGERS

Now let me mention the single managers. The development of the Federal catalog system with its common identification language, has enabled the Defense Department to take another very important step toward the integration of supply management of items which are common throughout the military services. This is the development of the single manager system. Under this single manager system, one service, that is one of the military departments, is assigned the task of buying and managing a whole group of commodities for the entire Defense Department. Thus, the single manager service buys, stores, and distributes the commodities for which it is responsible, and all the military services use this common wholesale system as their sole source of supply. Thus, instead of four different supply systems at the wholesale level in the Defense Department competing with each other with respect to a single set of subject matter, the single manager system provides a single point of contact with industry and an integrated material management process.

At the present time there are four commodity single manager assignments in operation. These are the Medical Supply Agency and the Petroleum Supply Agency, managed by the Navy; and the Subsistence Supply Agency and the Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, managed by the Army. Two additional assignments have recently been made. Administrative and Housekeeping Supplies and Hand and Craftsmen Measuring Tools have been allocated to the Army; and Hardware, Abrasives, Metals, and Paints to the Navy. In all of these systems, except the one for petroleum, the single manager owns or will own and distribute all wholesale stocks of the designated commodity.

Now, in addition to these commodity assignments, there are single managers handling services—notably transportation. Accordingly, ocean transportation has been assigned to the Military Sea Transport Service—commonly called MST—of the Navy. Air transportation has been assigned to the Military Air Transport Service of the Air Force, commonly called MATS. And land transportation has been assigned to the Military Traffic Management Agency in the Army.

Also, there are intangible as well as direct improvements in efficiency and savings in dollars which will result from the single management system. Among the economies which have been made possible by the single manager system are the following. First, total personnel engaged in supply systems operations for single manager commodities has been reduced by 752 people, with a resulting payroll savings of over \$4 million a year. This is a reduction of about 12 percent at the inventory control point level alone.

Second, inspection and test facilities have been consolidated, with resulting annual savings of \$2,280,000. The consolidation of wholesale stocks under single manager ownership has permitted an inventory drawdown with a one-time savings of \$235 million, based on the excess of sales over procurement.

Third, the consolidation and realignment of motor pool distribution system has resulted in the elimination of 66 storage locations and in the reduction of 4,758,000 square feet of occupied storage area.

Finally, the administrative lead time for the procurement of commodities has been reduced by 31 days in one single manager operation alone—that of clothing.

As these single managers progress, even greater savings will be made. Again, the implementation of the single manager concept has eliminated duplicatory effort, waste, and competition between the services, has promoted business efficiency in the Department of Defense, and is saving your money. Again, this is in the interest of the American public and the taxpayer.

A further expansion of the single commodity manager concept is contemplated. Studies looking to this end are now underway in the area of additional "general supplies," automotive, construction, and electrical-electronic items. They will undoubtedly extend to cover any other integrated items of subject matter common to the three services. And these actions are indicative of the rapid acceptance and progress of the single manager plan, of its effectiveness as well as its economy.

SINGLE DEPARTMENT PROCUREMENT

We have developed another device known as single department procurement. In this type of assignment, one department acts as the buying agent, in broad areas, for the other departments. For example, the Ordnance Corps of the Army, through its headquarters at OTAC in Detroit, is the sole buyer for all combat and general automotive equipment, such as tanks, trucks, station wagons, and other vehicles.

The Navy and Air Force in their turn buy certain types of items for themselves and their sister services. For example, the Navy buys material handling equipment, while the Air Force is the sole buyer of photographic equipment, airport lighting fixtures, electron tubes, etc.

This system of single department procurement has many benefits. First, it has benefits to industry; for to industry it means the procurement procedures become standardized and the job of doing business with the Defense Department is that much simpler and easier. For instance, there is now only one point of contact by industry for bid information, with resulting savings in getting educated, in time and travel costs. And to both industry and Defense there are the benefits of integrated, scheduled procurement, with an orderly impact on the total production capacity of the country. The military services do not bid against each other to force prices up, but rather gear their purchases to the economy as a whole.

We are still exploring further the use of single purchase assignments.

THE HIGH DEGREE OF COOPERATION AMONG THE SERVICES

I think there is one very significant feature of these different programs which I have been describing to you, and that is that they are essentially cooperative programs. They could not exist and work, they could not improve our defense and save the taxpayer's dollar, if they were not run cooperatively by the three military departments. Necessarily, each department has different functions, and the people in each have had different training. But it should also be understood that there is a highly developed system of co-operation among the three military departments, and highly organized teamwork. Basically, it is this powerful element of co-operation among the services on this broad scale, under the leadership of the Department of Defense, which has made these advances in business management possible.

THE ARMED FORCES SUPPLY SUPPORT CENTER

Another advance in business management in the Department of Defense was the establishment in July 1958, of the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. This, again, is a joint agency of the military services. It reports to a Council composed of senior lo-

istics officers of the services, with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics as Chairman. The Council, in turn, is responsible directly to the Secretary of Defense. Among other things, the cataloging program and the standardization program, which I have described to you today, are monitored by the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. This assures that they will be managed together and that the two programs will be properly integrated and geared together as they go along.

Another important function which has been assigned to the Armed Forces Supply Support Center is the material utilization program of the Defense Department. This program is another one of vital importance to all of us. Its important objective is to make sure that no unit in the Defense Department buys something when the required material is available elsewhere in the Department. In addition, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, this program has now been extended to all other agencies of the Federal Government, and through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the States and organizations of national interest. This program, in its turn, has been highly successful. Indeed, under it, over \$700 million worth of material is now made available annually, in lieu or instead of new procurement. This has meant a better utilization of our available resources; and, again, this program has meant better business efficiency in the Department and economy in dollars for the American taxpayer.

THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

We are living today in times where balancing the budget is difficult. The American taxpayer is carrying a heavy load. And even though the appropriations for the Department of Defense have not been increasing, the cost of defense has been steadily rising. For instance, today's nuclear submarines cost almost ten times as much as the World War II type. In addition, in the past 5 years, the number of aircraft in the Defense Department has remained about the same, but the value of these aircraft has increased about 80 percent. That 80 percent increase amounts to about \$12 billion in value.

However, we must keep the ships operating, the planes in the air, and the missiles ready. And all of these operating items cost money. As a result, it is simply imperative, in the interest of national economy as well as in the interest of national defense, that we strive constantly for the very best business management in this great Department. I hope these few illustrations will make clear to you in some degree that great strides have been made in the last few years in the business management of this enormous military operation. To be sure, it is not perfect, and there are many advances still to be made. But with these significant developments which have taken place recently, with the completion of the cataloging program, with the standardization program, with the setting up of single managers and the making of single purchase assignments, and the establishment of the Armed Forces Supply Support Center, substantial savings in dollars have been made for the American taxpayer, as well as in improving the efficiency of the business side of the Department of Defense.

Finally, while there is still a great distance to go, it is only fair that the American public and the American taxpayer, as well as American contractors, should know about these developments. The reason is that business management in the Department of Defense must have the confidence of the American public if it is to succeed. And they must know about these things which I have endeavored to describe to you today, and about comparable developments, if they are to have that confidence.

Lord Ashley Cooper's Dictionary of Charlestonese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a short dictionary of southern words. I did not know at the time the author of this amusing little collection of words was from the South. I have since discovered that its author is Mr. Ashley Cooper, a columnist for the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier. I am further told that this collection is published in the form of a small booklet; in fact, I have one in my hand. It is entitled "Lord Ashley Cooper's Dictionary of Charlestonese," and is compiled for the Charleston News-Courier.

The short insertion which I made in the RECORD the other day has caused quite a bit of comment among my southern friends, and among persons whom I have never had the pleasure of meeting.

I think that people, generally, across the country might become better acquainted with this very amusing work of Mr. Cooper. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the booklet to which I have referred may be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say that, while we are not supposed to advertise on the floor of the Senate, the booklet is sold for 25 cents a copy, and the proceeds are devoted to charitable purposes. The profits go to the newspaper's Good Cheer Fund for Christmas presents to the needy.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LORD ASHLEY COOPER'S DICTIONARY OF CHARLESTONENSE AS COMPILED FOR THE NEWS AND COURIER

FOREWORD

Although, as everyone knows, Charlestonians speak perfect English, residents of many other sections of the United States unfortunately do not. Ironically, these sloppy talkers from elsewhere complain sometimes, while visiting the Holy City, that they cannot understand the pure and clear accents of Charlestonians.

To remedy this deplorable situation, Ashley Cooper, columnist for the News and Courier, started publishing certain Charlestonese words in his column. A number of readers sent Charlestonese contributions, which also were published.

Now, for the first time (fust toyme), Charlestonese words have been compiled into a dictionary.

Published by the News and Courier, the "Dictionary of Charlestonese" sells for 25 cents a copy. Additional copies may be obtained by writing the newspaper, 134 Columbus St., Charleston, S.C. Profits go to the newspaper's Good Cheer Fund, for Christmas presents to the needy.

A

Abode: Wooden plank.
A boot: Approximately.
Ain't: Sister of one of your parents.

Air: What you hear with, i.e., "Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your airs."

Argon: A Pacific Coast State just north of California.

Arm: I am.

Armageddon: I'm gonna get.

B

Balks: A container, such as a match balks.

Ball: To heat a liquid until it bubbles.

Bare: A beverage made from malt and hops.

Barter: Something to spread on bread.

Beckon: Meat from a pig, often eaten with a-ligs for brake-fuss.

Bone: Blessed event, i.e., "I was bone a Charlestonian." (A very blessed event, in the minds of all Charlestonians.)

Bottle: A military engagement.

Bow-at: Something you sail in, off the Botry.

Boy: To purchase.

Braid: What you make toe-est from, to go along with beckon and a-ligs for brake-fuss.

Bucks: Something the library is full of.

Bull: Nickname for William. (Another nickname: Woolly.)

Bum: An instrument of destruction, as the H-bum.

Bun: Consume by heat, i.e., "When you make toe-est, don't bun the braid."

Bus: Upper part of the human body.

C

Caller: Part of a shirt that goes around the neck.

Canada: Politician running for public office.

Cane chew: Aren't you able to, i.e., "Cane chew talk like a good Charlestonian?"

Caught: A little bed.

Chair: A shout of approval, i.e., "Let me hair you chair and hawler for The Citadel."

Chalk-let: A flavor.

Chess: A strong balks (box).

Cholmondely: Pronounced Chumley, it's the brick thing on a roof that lets out smoke.

Coal: Allment that causes sniffles.

Coarse: Certainly.

Coat: Where they got that jedge an' all, i.e., "Stannup for hizzoner, coat's in session."

Coined: Humane, i.e., "He was always coined to animals."

Conduit: Impossible of accomplishment.

Cup: A place called home by hens, i.e., "Where's Woolly? Woolly's payntin' the hen cup."

D

Dearth: The world we live in.

Des Moines: They belong to me.

Dollar: Less sharp, i.e., "My knife was dollar than his-own."

Drug: Hauled.

F

Faltns: A barricade of works or brick.

Famine: Tilling the soil, i.e., "I've been famine all my life."

Fan Ella: The flavor of white ice cream.

Fare: To be a-scairt, i.e., "I fare it may rene, snow, and heel."

Feel: An open space.

Flow: What you stand on in a house.

Forks: Bushy-tailed animal hunted by riders in red coats.

Frustrate: Tops; initial ranking.

G

Garner: A man who tends to flowerbeds.

Gate: To obtain.

Gay-yet: Opening in a fence.

Go it: A smelly animal which eats tin cans.

Granite: Conceded, or given, i.e., "He was granite a pardon by the guv-ner."

Groan: Increasing in size.

H

Hall: The abode of integrationists, some damyankees and other evil spirits.

Hair: At this place.

Halo: A greeting similar to "how do you do," (see Higher) i.e., "Halo, Woolly, what are you doing hanging around hair?"

"Higher, Bubber, I'm just hanging around for the hall of it."

Harmony: Cooked grits.
 Hawzers: Hay-eating quadrupeds.
 Hell: An elevation lower than a mountain.
 Hem: Meat from a pig. Not to be confused, though, with poke or beckon.
 Hepcat: Act of giving assistance to a feline.
 Herring: The auditory function, i.e., "Pappa's hard of herring."
 Higher: See Halo.
 Hominy: What number?
 Hone: Something on an auto that you blow.
 Hot: An internal organ which, in every red-blooded Charlestonian, beats quicker when the band strikes up "Dixie."

Ice cool: The institution of learning which stands midway between grammar school and college.

Jell: Place of confinement for criminals.
 Durance viol.

Kin: Something usually made of tin that food is packed in.

Lack: Enjoy, i.e., "I lack fried chicken."
 Lane: Lying down.
 Lawn: Not short.
 Layman: A fruit from which layman-ade is made, i.e., "Is that your layman-ade?"
 "No, that's Pappa's-zone." "Well, poet back in the pitcher, 'cause Pappa's now drinking bare."
 Lean: A little road, i.e., "Lovers' Lean."
 Lease: The smallest.
 Loin: Storying. Not telling the truth.
 Lore: To let down.
 Loss: To mislay, i.e., "He loss his match balks."
 Lucid: Leggo it.
 Luck: To direct one's gaze, i.e., "Luck year, Pappa, what Bubber did to your match balks."

Mare: Hizzoner, the city's chief executive.
 Mean: A gathering of people, as a committee mean.
 Mine eyes: Salad dressing.
 Minuet: You and I have dined.
 Mow: An additional quantity.
 Muttered: A yellow condiment that goes well with hot dogs.

New sand Korea: Ashley Cooper's newspaper. (See Pay-upper.)
 Noise: Pleasant, i.e., "Noise weather we're having."

Oil and: A body of land surrounded by water.

Packing: Maneuvering an auto to the curb.
 Pain: A writing instrument mightier than the sword.
 Passe: Father has spoken.
 Pastor: Field where cows graze.
 Pat: Portion, but not all.
 Paunch: Blow struck with the fist.
 Pay-upper: What sells for a nee-y-cal and prints news and Lord Ashley's column.
 Pie sun: What you put out to kill roaches that they usually thrive on.
 Play it: Something you eat grits off of.
 Poach: A Verandah.
 Poet: To transfer a liquid; that is, "Poet from the pitcher to the glass."
 Poke: Hog meat.

Police: Term of polite request. A person desiring to maneuver a car to the curb might ask a pool-lease-man, "Cain I police pack hair?" To which the pool-lease-man would doubtless respond, "No, you cain not."
 Pool-lease-man: See above.
 Pre-shade: Grateful for; that is, "I pre-shade the compliment."

Rah chair: Where you are at.
 Rum: An enclosed space within a building.

Sane: Speaking; that is, "I can hardly hair what he's sane."
 Send wishes: Items of food made with bread, handy for a picnic.
 Sex: One less than seven, two less than eh-et, three less than noine, foe less than tin.
 Shasta: She inquired of her.
 Shot: Not long.
 Shout: What a baseball pitcher accomplishes when he prevents the opponents from scoring.
 Snow: To breathe loudly and heavily while sleeping.
 Syndicate: Located within a gate; that is, "Where's the sword at Henry Gaud's house?"
 "Syndicate."

Tarred: Weary.
 Tin sin stow: The foive and doyme.
 Toe: Preposition meaning toward; that is, "I went toe the Oil of Pams."
 Toll: Thin slabs of baked clay.
 Toll: Past tense of tell.
 Ton: To swerve. To ton around.
 Tone: Ripped.
 Toy: Cravat.
 Toyed: Something that ebbs and flows off the Bottry.
 Traffic: Something stupendous, like a movie that is beyond colossal or epic.
 True: Hurled; that is, "He true the ball."
 Tuck: Removed; that is, "He tuck pappa's nick-toy."

U.G.: A family name, also spelled Huger.

Version: The kind of queen that Queen Elizabeth I was.
 Vertigo: What happened to him?
 Voice: A squeezing tool, attached to a workbench.

Wheel: The sort of a mammal that Moby Dick was.
 Wretched: The long name for the nick-name "Dick."

Yawl: Mode of address used by N'Yawkers when visiting in the South.

Year: To listen.
 Yuk come: Someone approaches; that is, "Yuk come Romeo."

Zone: Belonging to someone; that is, "That nick-toy is pappa's-zone."

Memorial to Capt. Robert F. Scott at South Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on a cross erected in the South Polar regions to commemorate the sacrifice of Capt. Robert F. Scott and his party who perished in 1912 on their way back from the pole, are the following words: "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield." These words are taken from Alfred Lord Tennyson's "Ulysses."

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the delightful lines from that great work.

There being no objection, the lines were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FROM ULYSSES

There lies the port; the vessel puffs her sail;
 There gloom the dark, broad seas. My mariners,

Souls that have toil'd, and wrought, and thought with me,—

That ever with a frolic welcome took
 The thunder and the sunshine, and opposed
 Free hearts, free foreheads,—you and I are old;

Old age hath yet his honor and his toil:
 Death closes all; but something ere the end,
 Some work of noble note, may yet be done,
 Not unbecoming men that strove with Gods.
 The lights begin to twinkle from the rocks;
 The long day wanes; the slow moon climbs;
 the deep

Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,

'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
 Push off, and sitting well in order smite
 The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
 To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
 Of all the western stars, until I die.

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
 It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
 And see the great Achilles, whom we knew.
 Tho' much is taken, much abides; and tho'
 We are not now that strength which in old days

Moved earth and heaven, that which we are,
 we are,—

One equal temper of heroic hearts,
 Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will

To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

—Alfred Tennyson, 1809-92.

Judge Irwin D. Davidson of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Judge Irwin D. Davidson of New York, made headlines in the Nation's press this week with his statement that he would no longer approve wiretapping applications and that judges should not be parties to authorize wiretapping because it is an illegal act. Judge Davidson stated:

There are those who say wiretapping is a very effective tool for the investigation and discovery of criminal acts. I agree, but it is nonetheless an illegal tool at the present time and no more legal at this date than is a gun or a blackjack, both of which are also quite effective.

Many of my colleagues here will surely remember Judge Davidson, who served in this House in 1955 and 1956 during the 84th Congress. He was on the Banking and Currency Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He served with great distinction in the House and was highly regarded by all his colleagues.

Judge Davidson is now on the Court of General Sessions in New York, where he is also serving with great distinction.

He is not only a great and respected jurist, but has become known as a jurist with a heart, a judge who metes out justice with mercy.

In connection with his statement on wiretapping, the New York Times had an article in its issue of March 8, 1960, about Judge Davidson under the title "Justice With Mercy." Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article into the RECORD and call it to the attention of all my colleagues:

JUSTICE WITH MERCY: IRWIN DELMORE DAVIDSON

In the words of Judge Irwin Delmore Davidson of general sessions, "God has not been too good to many people."

The 54-year-old judge, who dismayed the District Attorney's office yesterday by saying he would no longer approve wiretapping applications, is not about to be second-guessing Divinity. But in his judgments from the bench he sees it also as his duty to weigh the bad breaks that life has brought to those before him and to insist on the full—and understanding—protection of the law for all.

Twenty-two months ago Judge Davidson sentenced four teen-aged gang members to prison terms ranging from 5 years to life for the killing of Michael Farmer, 15-year-old polio victim. But he announced from the bench that he was doing so "with a sense of frustration and a heavy heart" because society itself shared the guilt.

"I think of what might have been had society been willing to concern itself and act regarding the broken home, the truant, the street gang and youthful defiance—things no one can now deny unmistakable notice," he said.

AID TO MAIMED

In another case, Judge Davidson deferred sentence against a 16-year-old who had been convicted of stealing an automobile. The judge learned that the boy had been burned on the hand by his mother as a punishment when he was 8; the boy now had a crippled hand. Judge Davidson said the youth deserved one break in life and helped him get it by appealing for free surgery. Two months later the boy and the judge watched, both in delight, as the boy unclenched his fingers for the first time in 8 years.

It was a short-lived satisfaction, however. A few months later the boy stood in Federal Court and pleaded guilty to forging an \$85 social security check. He was confined to a correctional institution for an indeterminate period.

Judge Davidson, who served as a Democratic Assemblyman in Albany for 12 years and was elected to the House of Representatives in 1954 for the seat vacated by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., was known as "The Kid" in political circles because of his youthful looks. He still looks young; his black hair still shows no streaks of gray.

The judge likes jokes, his own and others, and is a popular after-dinner speaker, but he prefers to keep jollity at a distance when he is on the bench.

"We see a lot of very unhappy people," he says. "And sending people to jail day after day doesn't make for much exuberance."

ONCE A SCRIPT WRITER

Judge Davidson, who was born in the city and received a law degree from New York University Law School, supplemented his income as a young lawyer by writing scripts for Fred Allen, the comedian. When he was still a student, the dean selected him and two others to go to a Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer school to study dramatics. But his father wanted him to be a lawyer; so he gave up scripts for legal briefs. The two other students, who made the transfer, were Guthrie

McClintic and Rouben Mamoulian, both successful drama directors today.

Judge Davidson spent 6 years as a judge in the court of special sessions prior to his election to Congress. He was elected to his present \$34,500-a-year court post in 1957.

The judge usually gets to work in his seventeenth-floor chambers at 100 Centre Street about 9:30 in the morning, lights a Corona Queens cigar and checks over the day's work with Peter Stowe, his law secretary, and the probation officer.

RELAXES WITH CIGARS

A little after 10 a.m. he dons his robes and mounts the bench. He avoids restaurants, confines his lunches invariably—in chambers—to black coffee and fat-free buttermilk. He looks forward to the recesses, when he can light up another cigar.

His wife Bernice, an inveterate reader, recommends the books that he should read, and he says her selection is always "exactly right."

They have two sons, James, 19, and Mark, 15. Another son, Jon, died 5 years ago from football injuries.

The Need for a Department of Science

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Congress has a tremendous responsibility in 1960 to advance and to coordinate Federal scientific activities which are now dispersed among about 50 different agencies. I urge early action by this body on S. 1851 to establish a commission to study the need for a Department of Science along the lines of a proposal I made in the 85th Congress and again last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article I wrote entitled "The Need for a Department of Science" which appeared in the January issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE NEED FOR A DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE
(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)**

(Abstract: The Senate Committee on Government Operations, in which Senator HUMPHREY has taken an active role, has concerned itself with the need for a science department in the Government. A Department of Science and Technology they have found would be a very necessary and essential adjunct to our governmental system. Its main purpose would be the coordination and centralization of the now dispersed Federal scientific activities. The new Department would promote the clear-cut responsibility and authority in Government science needed for the enhancement of our national security. Yet the reorganization of the existing science units contained in various departments and agencies of the Government, has met strenuous opposition from sources in the administration. In addition to the proposed bill providing for the creation of the Department of Science and Technology, the Senate committee has initiated

another bill now before Congress which provides for a commission to study the various problems connected with the creation of such a science department.—Editor.)

The first finding of the original Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, submitted to the Congress in February 1949, and upon which the reports of the Commission were based, was that "the executive branch is not organized into a workable number of major departments and agencies which the President can effectively direct, but is cut up into a large number of agencies which divide responsibility and which are too great in number for effective direction from the top."¹

The proposal to create a Department of Science and Technology within the executive branch of the Federal Government, which I first proposed more than 2 years ago, was based upon that sound principle of government. This was 3 months before Sputnik brought the Congress and the American people to the realization that extensive reorganization of Federal science programs was necessary if we, in cooperation with other free nations of the world, were to reassert our leadership in the field of science.

During the last decade the United States and the entire world have been caught up and swept along by fantastic advancements in the scientific world. The executive branch of the Federal Government and the Congress have, fortunately, taken the initiative, through more or less haphazard and unrelated actions, to provide a spearhead for progress to meet the challenge of greater technological advancements. It is imperative, however, that this country continue to be the motivating factor and maintain its lead in scientific development, and be prepared to carry on a comprehensive and constructive program to meet the challenge of world communism. To continue this leadership, a complete reevaluation must be made of present Federal operations in science, research, and technological fields, and effective steps taken with the least possible delay to coordinate and improve the existing organizational structure of our Government which carries on these functions.

DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC AGENCIES

To meet the many problems as they arose, new agencies were created and efforts made to bring about improvements in the Federal science programs. The Congress has provided necessary funds as required in support of such programs, and I am confident it will continue to do so. Among the most progressive steps taken to meet the objectives in the civilian science field were the appointment of a Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology; the creation of the President's Advisory Committees on Science and Technology and on Government Organization; the establishment of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, later superseded by the Federal Council for Science and Technology; the extension of the authority of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics through the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the establishment of committees on science in the House and Senate.

While these steps have been helpful and undoubtedly are necessary actions in pursuit of the overall objective of efficient Government operations in the field of science, further consideration must be given to still existing inadequacies not only in these agencies but in other areas which must be co-

¹ Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, First Finding, a report to the Congress, February 1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 3.

ordinated with operations of a similar or related character and reorganized under more cohesive administrative controls.

The basic approach to reorganization recommended by the Hoover Commission was prophetic in regard to the present status of science operations of the Federal Government. There are approximately 50 agencies which perform some science and research activities having direct application to the overall science program of the Government. In addition to the four Presidential advisory groups dealing with science, there are three major independent science agencies or commissions and more than 40 components of other departments and agencies which operate science and engineering programs supposedly related to the major departmental mission for which the departments were established, or for which special agencies were created.

Some of these internal agencies, such as the National Bureau of Standards and the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce, are performing services not directly associated with the primary mission or even related functions of the departments in which they are now located. Consequently, they do not receive the technical administrative direction necessary to insure operations at their highest potential. On the other hand, some of these internal agencies, which include the National Institutes of Health, the Agricultural Research Service, the Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the Science Advisor to the Secretary of State, perform services which most authorities on science programs of the Government feel do have direct application to the program areas of the respective departments in which they are located and should retain their present status.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

From the beginning, the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve, in its studies of the problems, studiously avoided involving the civilian science activities with the applied science and research programs of the military departments which pertain to national defense and come within the jurisdiction of other committees, or with advisory or coordinating agencies or officials within the Executive Office of the President performing high administrative and policy functions under the direction of the President.

The major objective of the Science and Technology Act of 1958, which I introduced as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, was to bring about, under a Secretary at the Cabinet level, coordination and centralization of those Federal activities now scattered among existing departments, as well as those which had grown haphazardly following World War II in the field of civilian science.

It was proposed, as an approach to these problems of reorganization and improvement of science programs and for the purpose of eliminating duplications and waste of scientific, technological, and engineering manpower, to (1) promote closer cooperation between Federal agencies which carry on science activities; (2) improve, coordinate, and expand the Federal science information and documentation programs; (3) afford adequate Federal support for education in physical sciences and engineering; (4) encourage the establishment of institutions in areas of broad basic scientific activity, such as oceanography, meteorology, etc.; (5) to establish and maintain science programs abroad through the use of foreign currency credits; and (6) to improve and elevate the status of science within the legislative branch by creating standing committees in the House and Senate which would have direct jurisdiction over civilian science programs of the Federal Government. Thus full

congressional evaluation of all such activities and the relationship of these widely scattered agencies to similar programs and operations would be assured. All of these committee recommendations, except the proposal to create a Department of Science and Technology, have been activated in varying degrees, although continued reevaluation and further appropriate actions to fully implement these programs are necessary to achieve fully the objectives sought.

A new department

The Committee on Government Operations was confronted from the beginning with four primary problems: (1) Would a Department of Science and Technology afford the necessary administrative controls and science leadership required to correct existing deficiencies in Federal operations in science and research? (2) Would such centralization of functions and supervisory control afford an answer to the multitudinous duplications and waste that presently exist in our Federal science programs? (3) Would it in any way impair any of the independent activities and basic objectives of certain of the specialized agencies which had been established by the Congress and the President, or cause any disruptions in existing science and research programs? (4) If a Department of Science were to be created, which independent agencies, or components of existing Federal departments, should be incorporated within such a Department?

Provisions of the bill

In an effort to avoid disruptions of existing programs and to ensure that full appraisal of these problems could be made before any permanent reorganization was proposed the bill introduced in the 85th Congress, and again in the 86th Congress, to create such a Department of Science and Technology merely provided for grouping of Federal science agencies. The proposed Secretary of Science would have administrative control over certain of the independent agencies: the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, now the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and certain components of existing departments: the National Bureau of Standards and the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce, and the science functions of the Smithsonian Institution. The bill provided for no change in the basic statutes governing the operations of any of these agencies. Rather it was designed to promote more administrative efficiency in the government's scientific activities and to provide a framework for better coordination of all scientific functions. The committee proceeded under the assumption that, if a department was established, internal reorganization could be effected as experience and operation needs required.

There have been other suggestions relative to the creation of a Department of Science, which involve entirely different approaches. The proposal outlined by Dr. L. V. Berkner, President of Associated Universities which operate the Brookhaven National Laboratory for the Atomic Energy Commission, has received a considerable amount of support from scientists and administrators of science programs. Under Dr. Berkner's plan, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics, and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission would retain their independent status as specialized agencies, while the proposed Department of Science would set up centralized components in various areas of physical sciences, such as oceanography, meteorology, climatology, and standards.

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION

In recognition of the varying points of view held by those who were active in the Federal science program, the staff of the

Senate Committee on Government Operations, in carrying out the committee's directive to draft suggested legislative proposals to meet the needs of the Government, made numerous contacts with officials carrying on various science programs. Except in one or two instances, there was strenuous opposition to any change in the present organizational structure.

The Hoover Commission in its concluding report also warned of this type of resistance to any proposed reorganization efforts, as follows:

"It is natural to expect vigorous opposition to reforms from agencies and groups, each of which approves heartily of reorganizations that do not affect its own immediate interests. The Congress must be prepared to accept this fact and give careful attention to the validity of arguments of those who would seek to escape reorganization, as many have so successfully done in the past.

"While honest differences of opinion certainly may exist as to the best method of accomplishing any particular reform, such differences should not be accepted as valid arguments against the desired objective. Once the practice of exempting certain agencies and excepting particular functions has begun, the chances of achieving substantial improvements in the efficiency of the Government will speedily diminish."

At the hearings which followed the introduction of the bill proposing the creation of a Department of Science and Technology in the present Congress, all officials of the Federal Government who testified were vigorous in their opposition to any legislation to bring about better coordination of science activities, and insisted on maintenance of the status quo.

Political interference with science

Objections were also expressed on the premise that it would inject politics into science activities; that the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology would bring scientists under bureaucratic control, which would be detrimental to the performance of the functions presently vested in various Federal agencies.

This fear apparently exists only with reference to the brand of political overlordship emanating from an executive department; the brand of political control which could issue from the Executive Office of the President, and it seems to me most inconsequently, is apparently regarded as a benevolent variety of political control. This attitude ignores the fact that the President enjoys complete authority over the administrative functions of the executive departments, all independent agencies, and over the policies he establishes within his own office. In all instances, the appointees are named by the President. Those whom the President sees fit to vest with wide authority in the Executive Office of the President are his own selections, while those who are at the head of the departments and agencies must undergo close scrutiny as to their qualifications in their respective fields of operation before they receive Senate confirmation.

With particular reference to political interference, it is important to remember similar alleged forebodings in relation to the establishment of the present Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under which socialized medicine and Federal control of education in the United States was said to be inevitable. Nothing could have been further from the truth. It is a matter of common knowledge that, in the world-renowned laboratories and clinics of the National In-

* Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Concluding Report, a report to the Congress, May 1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), pp. 47-48.

stitutes of Health of the Public Health Service, an arm of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the freedom of the research scientist to pursue his investigations, wherever they may lead, is a zealously guarded personal prerogative. Of course there is political control, but a control executed by a government of laws; a control which has enabled this country to take a pre-eminent position in today's world.

It is necessary to remember, too, that a Department of Science and Technology would be new in name only; its constituent agencies would be taken from those which now administer the relationship between science and the Government. The need for the new department exists because these relationships are being administered without the coordination so urgently demanded by the exigencies of the time. This objective is in accord with another recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that "The numerous agencies of the executive branch must be grouped into departments as nearly as possible by major purposes in order to give a coherent mission to each department."

Progress in other areas

It is fortunate that real progress is being made in some scientific areas, as originally proposed in the Science and Technology Act of 1958, despite the present continuing disorganization. An illustration of this is afforded by title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 of which I was also a sponsor. This legislation requires the National Science Foundation to form a Science Information Service and an advisory Science Information Council to provide for the accumulation, translation, indexing, retrieval, and other services necessary to promote more effective availability and dissemination of the scientific literature of the world. Pursuant to this enactment, the Science Information Service was established and the Science Information Council was appointed.

Further, the National Science Foundation announced formation of the Federal Advisory Committee on Scientific Information, composed of representatives of 17 Federal agencies engaged in scientific information activities, the purpose of which, according to the Foundation, is to provide "an integrated approach to the Government phase of the intensified national science information effort." Also, the National Science Foundation supported the establishment, within the National Bureau of Standards, of the Research Information Center and Advisory Service on Information Processing, primarily to encourage automation in the processing of scientific information. However, the progress thus far made, through the information program and other programs now actually underway, toward effective coordination of all the Government's scientific interests is grievously outweighed by that which still remains to be done.

Operations differ

One of the most persistent arguments constantly advanced against the creation of a Department of Science and Technology is that the programs, responsibilities, objectives, and operations of each of the Federal agencies engaged in science activities are different in character and have special fields of responsibility, which must be rigorously preserved. Those who make this contention insist at the same time that there must be a uniform science policy. Thus, while contending that a Department of Science would drain off manpower and scientists now engaged in the various programs operating

within their own areas of activity, the fact that a centralized agency would bring all related science activities into closer contact and tend to eliminate the existing competition for and wastage of scientific and technological manpower, is completely ignored. The heart of this argument, as I understand it, is that the only way to insure coordination is to continue the multitude of independent agencies operating in specialized fields and to have superadvisory or coordinating scientific groups within the Executive Office of the President act as their guardians.

Clear-cut responsibility

Those who place their reliance on coordinating devices such as interagency committees for improving communications and for providing stimulus to Government science activities fail to recognize the built-in limitations of these approaches. By their very nature interagency committees cannot be creative except at a very low level of operation. They are inevitably restricted by the views of the most pedestrian and unimaginative members. Their product will almost certainly be a kind of lowest common denominator of their combined ideas. What is needed is dynamic, forceful, and continuing leadership which could best come from a cabinet department with clear-cut responsibility and authority in the field of science and technology. For it seems to me that the present structure of the Federal Government in other areas, with the programs devised and implemented by the concerted action of the Chief Executive and the Congress, is the obvious answer.

STUDY COMMISSION

At the hearings held before my subcommittee in April of this year, a number of witnesses suggested that, in order to solve some of the above outlined problems, a Commission patterned along the lines of the Hoover Commission should be established to make a study as to whether or not a Department of Science and Technology should be created. If such a department were found to be desirable, the Commission should then recommend to the President and the Congress which functions now being performed by other departments and agencies of the Government should be transferred to such a department. It was suggested that the Commission should be composed of eminent authorities in the field of science, representatives of the Federal Government agencies which were engaged in basic civilian science activities, and members of the legislative branch of the Government.

At the conclusion of these hearings, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations drafted a bill providing for the establishment of such a Commission. The bill was introduced as Senate bill 1851 on May 5, 1959. It was the view of the Committee that its provisions were broad enough to authorize the Commission to study: the need for strengthening American science and technology, one of our essential resources for national security and welfare; the reorganization of the existing departments and agencies to promote better centralization and coordination of Federal science programs and operations; and the formulation of effective policies for training, recruiting, and utilizing scientists and engineers.

Witnesses testify

At the concluding hearing of the Committee, which was held on May 28, 1959, witnesses were invited to direct their testimony not only to the bill proposing the creation of a Department of Science and Technology, but also to the proposed establishment of a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology. Some of the spokesmen for the administration who testified at these hearings contended that there was no need for legislative action and

opposed both proposals. Their opposition to the creation of a study commission to determine what might be done to improve and coordinate Federal civilian science programs was based on the contention that the President's Science Advisory Committee and the Federal Council for Science and Technology, both of which were then headed by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., would provide all the necessary information upon which the President could take appropriate action to bring about governmental reorganizations to correct deficiencies in present operations.

Government witnesses who opposed the creation of a commission to study these problems repeatedly placed heavy emphasis upon the personal ability and qualifications of Dr. Killian and the confidence placed upon him by the President and the scientific community. Yet, at that very moment, Dr. Killian's resignation had already been submitted to the President. Without reflecting in any manner upon the qualifications or potential leadership of any of the science advisers to the President, I think Dr. Killian's resignation makes it more imperative than ever that Congress reassert its legislative prerogatives in the field of science. An accountable officer, whether a member of the Cabinet or otherwise, should be made responsive to the needs of congressional committees which are attempting to eliminate the existing deficiencies in the science program of the Federal Government.

A real need exists

An analysis of the testimony of spokesmen who were representing the President at the hearing, will force the inevitable conclusion that it is the desire of the present administration to center within the Executive Office of the President all control over civilian science operations. If these recommendations are accepted, they would deny to the Congress access to information which is essential to the legislative branch if it is to perform its normal constitutional functions. It tends to preempt the scientists who are thoroughly informed and conversant about governmental science operation for the benefit of the President alone, and effectively prevents the Congress from obtaining information from qualified experts in the fields of science.

It was the conclusion of the Committee that a real need exists for a bipartisan Commission to study the problems related to the proposed creation of a Department of Science and Technology. Such a bipartisan Commission could find an equitable solution to the present chaotic conditions of Federal science. The bill to establish such a Commission is now awaiting approval by the Senate and the House of Representatives next session.

It has been stated by many who oppose a Department of Science that scientists must be free to learn through observations and contacts with other scientists in order to cope with the problems of science in their own fields. It would be hard to imagine a better means of effective observation than to have the basic science programs coordinated under central administrative control, where daily observations and contacts could be made as required, without having to make separate approaches to a number of individual officials and agencies carrying on related science programs with no central coordination of policy or operations.

Decision with respect to a creation of a Department of Science and Technology, or of another kind of authority of no less eminence, is, in my judgment, the overriding issue and the obvious need. Fettered leadership, which experience has so often demonstrated, is all that can be expected from makeshift, compromise arrangements devoid of statutory authority and totally dependent upon voluntary cooperation for its achievements.

* Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Recommendation No. 12, Report on General Management of the Federal Government, February 1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 34.

Achievements of the Rural Electrification Administration—Excerpts From Address by Clyde T. Ellis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an address by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The address is entitled "Prologue to a Golden Jubilee," and was delivered on February 22, 1960, at the 18th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. Ellis is one of the most loyal leaders in the movement to preserve the rural electric cooperatives of America, and through the years he has certainly proved himself to be a fearless and most capable leader. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I was instrumental in the organization of the first rural electric cooperative in America. So it has been with deep interest that through the years I have followed the growth of the electric cooperatives.

In my opinion, Mr. Ellis' address was the highlight of the meeting which commemorated the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. From the viewpoint of millions of farmers, the address or report is a historic documentation of their success. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Ellis' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Constitution Avenue in Washington, D.C., about halfway between the Capitol and the White House, there stands a magnificent building that houses some of our country's most precious documents. The Declaration of Independence is there and the Constitution.

It is the National Archives, a building and an institution dedicated to preserving the record of America's past.

In the stone near the entrance is engraved a famous line from Shakespeare which might well be an admonition to us here as we pause briefly at the silver anniversary milestone of our great rural electrification program.

"What is past is prologue," the quotation says.

"Prologue," according to Webster, means "introduction" or "preface." Therefore, what is past in the rural electrification program is but an introduction to what is yet to come.

Our past is precious. Our own archives are filled with the joys and sorrows, the triumphs and defeats, the accomplishments and failures which are interwoven in the story of these 25 years.

All of it, I think, can be reduced to the six words selected by your program committee to be the theme of this meeting: "Rural Electrification—Good for All Americans."

REWRITING HISTORY

I have an interesting publication just put out by the power companies' Edison Electric

Institute. It's called Rural Electrification in the United States and it tells all about how the profit power companies have electrified rural America. Among other things, it says—stretching the truth a little—that they supply wholesale power to two-thirds of the rural electric cooperatives.

It doesn't say that we paid them over \$72 million for supplying us this power in 1958, and even more in 1959, but we did. And even in a cost-plus business it's nice to pick up an extra \$72 million a year.

This little book, by the way, gives a very interesting history of rural electrification.

For example, on page 39 it says, "Bringing electricity to the farm has taken long, steady years of research, development, and sales effort on the part of the Nation's investor-owned electric utility companies."

How do you like that way of rewriting history? And you can bet this book will be purchased by the hundreds of thousands of copies by the power companies and spread through the communities you serve.

BENEFITS OF ORGANIZATION

In many States you have efficient and strong statewides, with excellent consumer publications. We feel the growing influence of these organizations and their papers in our legislative battles. Time after time your State managers and editors have provided the margin of strength that has carried the day.

More and more of you are pooling your business services through your statewides to achieve the greater economies of scale. This is the type of activity I feel we must do more of in the years ahead. Individually, we are small; united, we have tremendous power and strength.

We must find ways and means of working together—through the statewides, through regional power associations, and through NRECA.

We do not need to look far into the past to recognize the tremendous benefits of working together in the field of legislation. This was never demonstrated more clearly than last year.

Just look at a few of the issues you were up against. And look what you did to them.

1. You were up against a tremendous administration-sponsored power-company-supported drive to hike your interest costs and cut the big bankers in on your loan program.

2. You had just seen the Comptroller General concoct a ruling on REA that would have prevented you from serving anybody a power company wanted to serve and would have required you to repay immediately to REA millions of dollars you had borrowed and used in good faith.

3. You had seen your able REA Administrator stripped of his authority to approve major loans without first getting the Secretary of Agriculture's blessing on each loan.

Contemplate for a moment what might have happened had you not been organized to place your views before Members of Congress on these issues.

Do you suppose the Comptroller General's highly injurious ruling would have been overturned by the Senate in passing the Aiken resolution if you had been unable to speak with a powerful voice?

Do you think all damaging legislation would have been bottled up if you had not had national action? Don't forget there are gigantic forces, led by the President himself—you heard him last year—striving to get some of this legislation through Congress and into law.

You have told us of your national staff what to do, and we have done it. As a result, your system, no matter where it is, has realized enormous dollar savings, many times your dues in the national, annually.

Through NRECA, you have successfully fought for the Federal dams and transmission lines that have meant the difference be-

tween success and failure for many systems, and have helped lower the overall cost of power for all systems.

At your direction, we have gone all out in our opposition to REA interest rate increases and Wall Street financing schemes. Without a strong national voice speaking in your behalf, I am convinced you would be paying from 4 to 6 percent for your loan funds right now.

It is certain that ahead of us lie problems and challenges unmatched by anything we have seen in the past; new kinds of problems, more complex, potentially more deadly, than any we have known before; problems that arise from the changing shape and mood of the American Nation, problems that arise from our own growth and expanding responsibilities.

Just consider the somber implications of some of the major challenges that you have to grope with in the days, months, and years leading toward the golden anniversary year.

THE TIGHT-MONEY ISSUE

Consider the tight-money issue. This is upon us. It is an issue that no single co-op or power district could deal with individually. It is an issue that will require all the unity and cooperation we can muster among ourselves as well as among our neighbors, our friends in other areas of endeavor—consumers wherever they are. We are all affected tremendously.

We believe you want this whole tight-money high-interest policy reversed. Delegates to the last three regional meetings last fall passed resolutions to this effect. Our correspondence and conversations with you indicate that many of you feel the long-range solution to our own interest rate problem must be found along these lines.

People have finally begun to realize that the tight-money policy is a rigged affair. It is rigged for the purpose of redistributing the income and wealth of the land. It is a policy that transfers income and wealth from the lower and middle income groups, such as farmers and wage and salary earners, to those already rich.

You have a big stake in this issue, both official and personal. It hits you as one responsible for the management of your rural electric system. It also hits at you as a consumer and taxpayer.

Since 1952, we have had nothing but tight money, and we have already had two economic setbacks and a continuing farm depression, despite defense spending at almost wartime proportions.

In our current monetary struggles, one group after another has been battered down by the captains of tight money.

The veterans lost their battle against high interest. Farmers lost their fight to hold down Farmers' Home rates. Farm Credit rates are up. PCA rates are up. Housing rates are up. And so on, and on. Only the rural electricians have survived it.

The same philosophy surrounds the tight-money drive on REA. They want you to be gouged along with everyone else.

THE ANTI-REA CAMPAIGN

You remember last year at our annual meeting in Washington President Eisenhower himself came to sell his policy. For 2 years now his budget message has urged Congress to impose the high interest, tight-money policy upon your program.

Thus the leader leads and now the lieutenants follow. The Director of the Budget has been giving speeches before big-business groups in many parts of the country in an effort to get them behind the drive to raise your rates. The Secretary of Agriculture and many of his assistants have gone about trying to arouse people against the loan terms of your program. And the Secretary of Agriculture has ordered the REA Administrator to campaign and lobby for

changes in the REA law to inject the Wall Street, tight-money practice in our program.

Here is the language of the Benson orders to the Administrator:

"It is my thought that it will be necessary for you to do a great deal of ground-work between now and the next session of Congress on setting the stage for the new REA legislation. As you have indicated many times, it would never be possible to get new legislation in this field until there is a fair amount of support for it at the grassroots or local cooperative level.

"It would seem that there would be much that you could do between now and the time the new Congress convenes to develop support for this new legislation. One suggestion might be that you would concentrate your efforts as much as possible on just a few key States. I would like to discuss this further with you at a convenient time."

I have read you the entire memorandum which is signed by E. T. Benson and which is addressed to David A. Hamil, Administrator, REA, and is dated August 26, 1958. The memorandum is part of the official record of the Department of Agriculture and was printed in the transcript of a hearing before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture on February 18, 1959. The committee requested this and other memos after they were exposed in our Minuteman newsletter.

Just a few days ago, the REA Administrator was again obliged to issue a statement in support of the President's plan: "The recommendation of the President regarding REA interest rates," the REA Administrator announced on January 19, "is both realistic and necessary."

Realistic and necessary. For whom—you or the moneychangers?

What can we do about this threat to our program?

Two years ago at Dallas, we rallied behind the cry of "stand your ground." Today, just standing our ground will be inadequate. We have no choice but to march forward and do battle, to reverse this policy which threatens our very existence.

I am convinced that the kind of golden anniversary you will celebrate in 1985 will depend in part on how you deal with this great issue at this meeting.

DYNAMIC MANAGEMENT

Consider next the challenge of providing the dynamic management your system and the program as a whole must have to meet the problems of the future.

You are at the helm of a business that has become large in scope and in problems. The average rural electric system has \$3 million in assets. Only 7 percent of the corporations in America have assets of \$1 million or more.

Therefore, you, whether you are a director or a manager, have to know and practice the very best of modern management techniques.

Most of you, of course, have recognized this need. That's why you took group action through your national association in order to provide yourselves with comprehensive management services. You developed through your national association a program of management training which affects practically every aspect of your operations. You developed, again through NRECA, a consulting service in order that new ideas, new techniques, new experience, and new patterns might be exchanged for more effective benefit to each one of us.

This is how we have been meeting the challenge of management needs up to this point. We know from what we can see of the future that we have just begun to scratch the surface. We know that nobody is going to solve our management problems

for us; we are going to have to do it ourselves, working together.

PROVIDING THE CONSUMER'S NEEDS

Consider next the challenge presented to us by the consumer-member. He is—as he has always been—the heart of the program. This has been basic philosophy with us the last quarter century, and it must continue to be.

The whole world is now becoming aware of the problem of an exploding population. In the United States, cities are bulging out into territory served by the rural electric systems themselves, this is both good and bad. But it is a fact we have to deal with.

It is not possible at this point to forecast with too much confidence the extent of growth in the rural electric systems' areas. However, by studying census estimates, by studying actual growth as reflected by actual count of the increasing numbers of people we have served over the last several years, and by making certain assumptions and judgments, we can forecast some few years ahead and perhaps make some educated guesses as far into the future as 25 years from now.

It seems reasonable to predict that if the rural electric systems continue to serve the same territory as now, they will more than double the number of meters now served by 1985.

Are we preparing to meet this great challenge, with all its implications?

POWER USE

Take the matter of power use. This is something which concerns both you and the consumers.

A sound power use program can greatly strengthen the rural electric systems themselves. It can accelerate the expansion of average sales which produce bigger margins at lower rates. Thus, what is good for the member-consumer is good for the cooperative or power district.

All rural electric benefit directly from the sales campaigns of electric appliance and equipment manufacturers and distributors. They are now working hard in the rural market—they are spending huge sums of money to acquaint your consumers with electrical appliances that you want your members to buy.

This didn't just happen overnight or by chance. It's taken years of hard work—years of explaining the rural electrification program to the right people. It has taken a lot of coordination with your statewide organizations to give manufacturers a true picture of the market and a plan for selling to that market. But as a result you, through your NRECA, have become the organized leader in this area.

BILLION DOLLAR MARKET

We've had to prove to industry that rural electric members provide a tremendous market for their products. Last fall our power use section, with your help, conducted the first reliable national survey of the rural market. It showed that rural electric members would buy over \$1 billion worth of electrical appliances in 1960.

POWER CONSUMPTION

What can we expect to happen if we are able to meet this challenge involving power use and the consumer?

We can expect a phenomenal growth in the use of electricity and in the performance of your system.

By the end of our next quarter century, I am sure you will find that modern farms will be averaging 40,000 to 50,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. The average now is 4,200 per year, but many farms are already using in excess of 50,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

This could well mean that the total power requirements of rural electric systems will rise—again, if you meet the challenge—from about 29 billion kilowatt-hours input, which was last year's figure, to an estimated 250 billion kilowatt-hours in 1985.

This means that rural electric systems have the potential of providing more electricity to their rural members than was used by the entire country for all purposes as late as 1942.

POWER SUPPLY PLANNING

If rural electric is to meet the challenge, if they are to play their part in the country's all-electric future, there must be more than resolutions imploring the national administration or Congress to answer our prayer.

We must act, and act fast. We must undertake immediately, region by region, practical, long-range, joint power supply planning. We must employ the necessary engineering, legal assistance and other assistance to make our long-range planning concrete.

In this regard, our on-the-spot inspection of Russian power development last fall was a revelation. I saw that country in the process of building five giant regional power grids with more modern high-voltage long-distance transmission than anything in the United States. Ultimately, these systems will be tied together into one trans-Soviet grid, all fed by great hydro and thermal generating stations, the latter located near fuel reserves.

The free countries of Western Europe are doing the same thing. A study team of rural electric leaders found last fall that all these countries, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and from the Iron Curtain to the English Channel, are tied together with extra high voltage transmission. And they also found that these countries had evolved a formula under which all systems—government, cooperative, and power companies—work together to meet the common need for ample supplies of low-cost power for everyone.

A SIMPLE FORMULA

It's a simple formula, although varying in different countries. Basically a nonprofit stock company is formed, with the National Government being a major stockholder, but with all other producers and users of wholesale electricity owning part of the stock and helping to run the giant generating stations and transmission grids. This would be a way for us to get abundant wholesale electricity for all in America without the Government having to do it.

Former Federal Power Commissioner Leland Olds has given much study to this overall subject and has proposed two bold experiments.

The first would establish giant regional generation and transmission cooperatives—far larger than anything we have today—to meet the future power needs of all the Nation's electric systems at the lowest possible cost. The second would establish a Federal Public and Cooperative Finance Corporation to handle the financing of the public and cooperative sector of the Nation's economy, including the great regional G & T's.

Whether the ultimate answers will be found along these lines, or some modification of them, can only be determined after our practical long-range power planning activities begin to produce results. But at this point, they seem to hold real promise.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We've seen that the challenges of the future grow from the seeds of the past. The past is prolog.

Somehow in the future we must be better than we have been in the past. If we aren't better, we can expect to see our magnificent accomplishments of the first 25 years whittled

tled away and dissipated. We cannot stand pat and live on the glory of an era that is now the dead past.

The human memory is short. Already a generation has grown up that knows the old days only as legend—a new generation of our own members, a new generation of city people, a new generation of Congressmen. They have no firsthand knowledge of the miracles you have worked.

Yet, if we act wisely now, the future holds great promise for the fulfillment of our dream of abundant power at low cost for all rural America—an objective that will truly be good for all Americans.

It Is Already Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today we begin debate in the House on the so-called civil rights legislation. Ever since the many bills on this subject were introduced last year in the first session of this Congress, a number of us have given unlimitedly of our time, efforts, and whatever talents we possessed to prevent these proposals in any form from reaching this point of consideration on the floor. We were motivated, first, by a recognition that these proposals were primarily, if not solely, a political maneuver by self-styled liberals to gain the approval of minority groups and, second, by a fundamental opposition to this legislation as being unconstitutional. We were convinced that these proposals were a further studied effort to destroy the original concept upon which this Republic was founded as a government of united but sovereign States, rather than one of centralized power vested in a Federal bureaucracy.

On the eve of this debate we southern Representatives in the House caucused and perfected a broad organization to combat this movement to the best of our ability and with the limited opportunity offered under the parliamentary rules of this body.

Mr. Speaker, at this meeting a resolution expressing the sense of its members was adopted. It was proposed by the able and distinguished Member of the House and former Governor of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, Congressman WILLIAM TUCK. The resolution follows:

Resolved, That it is the fixed determination of this group to oppose by every method and argument the passage of a civil rights bill, and particularly the registrar amendment which will be offered. We are utterly weary of the constant efforts of the proponents of this legislation to adopt punitive measures aimed at the Southern States, which have been the bulwark of democracy from the founding of the Democratic Party by Thomas Jefferson.

The proposed legislation is an obvious and studied return to the force bills enacted by Congress in the Reconstruction days following the Civil War. The proposal applies to local, State, and Federal elections. Aside

from being unconstitutional invasion of the rights of States to determine the qualifications of voters, it is an invitation to rioting and bloodshed, which have already been induced by the agitation for the passage of this bill.

We expect to oppose it with the parliamentary procedure at our command to the utmost, and we commend the valiant and unflinching efforts of those Senators who are making full and effective use of the parliamentary procedure at their command, and for the brilliant debate which they have conducted in opposition to the bill on its merits.

Tight Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Business Week has made a nationwide survey of corporate executives regarding money conditions and in its February 27, 1960, issue printed an article on the results thereof, as follows:

WHERE THE CREDIT PINCH HURTS

(Small companies, and those in a few hard-hit industries, are the chief sufferers. Survey shows that most companies aren't—or say they aren't—much affected. Nobody seems afraid of an actual scarcity of credit, and most are prepared to pay even higher rates. Only a big upsurge in demand on top of further tightening by the Federal Reserve could bring about a new round in interest boosts. This is unlikely this year.)

Since 1951, when the Federal Reserve won the right to pursue an independent monetary policy, the cost and availability of money have been a constant problem for corporate management. At times, as in the tight money squeeze of 1957, it has been a major worry.

Company treasurers resented the high rates that banks charged on loans; they resented even more banks' insistence that they maintain compensating balances, depriving them of the full use of their borrowed money. And because they feared that rates would go even higher and that credit might not be available at all, they stepped up their demands—which had the effect of further tightening an already tight situation.

Today, borrowing is more expensive than it was at the height of the 1957 squeeze (the prime rate is now 5 percent, compared with 4 percent in 1957). Banks have many more loans on the books—and appear much more reluctant to increase their lending. Nevertheless, corporations are much less worried today about credit conditions than in 1957. They have no fears of an actual scarcity of credit. And they are prepared to pay even higher interest costs than we have right now.

CALM VIEW

This relatively calm appraisal of the credit outlook emerges from a nationwide survey of corporate executives made this week by Business Week. While most corporations are paying the highest interest costs in a generation, few executives say they consider this a matter of prime concern. However, despite their protestations, many admit taking steps they wouldn't have taken but for tight money.

Here is what corporations are saying about money conditions:

More than 90 percent report that tightness of money will not change overall corporate

strategy; the remainder, mostly smaller companies, admit that any further tightening would pinch very hard.

More than 80 percent report that their liquid holdings—cash and short-term investments—are satisfactory. However, many predict a decline in liquidity as they pay for inventories and pay their taxes.

More than 75 percent plan to increase their inventories in 1960. A majority in this group report that they will be making only "normal" and moderate—10 percent to 15 percent—increases. And about half say they will not have to borrow to do so.

About 60 percent plan to step up their expenditure for plant and equipment by a modest amount. But less than half of these say they will do any outside financing.

While almost every company says it is now paying higher rates on borrowings than ever before, there is no sign that corporations are planning to borrow in anticipation of even higher rates. Nor do they talk of borrowing for speculative purposes.

REASSURING

These responses indicate that corporate credit demand will not get out of hand and precipitate a drastic credit squeeze this year. Fear of this was widespread earlier in the year, but the survey makes clear that there is no mad rush to rebuild inventories that would require heavy borrowings.

This does not mean that borrowing rates are likely to go down. Credit demand this year should be about as strong as it was in 1959, when the banks were hard pressed to meet corporations' calls for loans. If the Fed sticks to its present course of keeping credit tight but not increasing its restrictiveness, the normal seasonal rise in demand at tax time may bring some stiffening of rates—but not any jump to new heights.

But it would take a combination of increasing Fed pressure and a big upsurge in demand to bring about a new round of interest rate hikes. This does not now appear likely, although a good many corporations say that if sales are better than they expect, they will increase their spending—and their borrowing—no matter what the cost in interest.

The financial vice president of a national food company in the Midwest says: "If you need money, you need it. And you go out to get it. The interest rate is unimportant when you need money."

LIVING WITH IT

This reaction appears to be typical of most corporate executives. They have no liking for tight money, but they have learned to live with it.

They have increased and expanded their credit lines. They are keeping closer tabs on their cash positions. They have learned to invest surplus cash in high-yielding short-term paper, mainly 91-day Treasury bills. As a result, they are much more assured than they were during earlier bouts with tight money.

SYMPTOMS OF PAIN

Some companies, though, are hurting—mostly because they are small or because they are in one of a few hard-hit industries—construction, lumber, retailing.

One big Eastern contractor says that the high cost of money is postponing a number of building projects, which is crippling some smaller construction outfits. Retail stores in a number of cities complain that high interest costs are narrowing their profit margins to the vanishing point. And a sprinkling of companies in various industries admit that they are depending on factors, whose charges are about double those of the banks.

Many big corporations confirm that smaller companies are having a rough time. A big Chicago manufacturer of machinery says that some of his smaller customers are very

slow in making payments; a New York appliance maker makes the same observation. In general, smaller companies are getting the funds they need, but they are paying higher rates than large and medium-sized companies, and they are required to provide greater justification for their borrowings.

While smaller companies are pinched the hardest, bigger corporations aren't altogether immune from the money squeeze. True, they have had little trouble in borrowing, but they are paying rates that are cutting into profits. Thus, the notion that tight money has no effect on company policy must be taken with a grain of salt.

INVENTORY PLANS

Certainly, the very cost of money explains some of the evident caution of inventory policy. When interest rates were much lower, many companies would take a gamble on inventories or even on a downright speculative venture—such as real estate. Now, the high cost of money makes such gambles too risky, even if the banks were willing to lend all the money the companies wanted.

The survey shows that less than 10 percent of the corporations interviewed plan big inventory increases—on the order of 30 percent to 50 percent, the sort of increase that would require heavy borrowing. Only one, a manufacturer of signs and displays, seems to be gambling at all; he plans a 50 percent increase in inventories because he expects a business boom. All the others who are budgeting for a big rise in inventory spending cite special circumstances.

For example, a big Eastern manufacturer wholly devoted to defense work plans a 50 percent hike in inventories because of new Government orders. A southern drug manufacturer is spending over 20 percent more for inventories, but only because it has made several acquisitions. A New York garment maker is also planning larger inventories as a result of taking over another firm. He explains: "Ordinarily, we would increase our stocks by 20 percent, but this year it will be larger because of our new acquisition."

Plans of a majority of companies to increase inventories only moderately seem to have been influenced by interest rates. In many cases, their budgeting for inventory appears to be determined by their ability to finance themselves. Many of them plan to build up their inventories without resort to bank credit, and a somewhat smaller group hopes to borrow less than usual.

WAITING FOR SALES

A few companies say they are already overloaded with inventories. For example, a Cleveland metal outfit, which started building up its inventory before the steel strike, says it has too much on hand. A California electronics maker is in the same fix, and companies in many cities report that in their rush to buy goods after the steel strike they have already amassed all the inventories they need.

Some companies are proceeding cautiously, waiting to see what sales will do. A Texas manufacturer of oil industry equipment says he will borrow to increase inventories if sales rise; at the moment, though, the ratio of inventories to sales is much lower than in past years. And a St. Louis electrical equipment maker says that better handling of materials deliveries makes it possible to get along on smaller inventories.

CAPITAL SPENDING

A similar pattern seems to prevail on capital spending. At one extreme are a small number of companies that plan big increases, mainly because of better business prospects or expansion plans; at the other are a small number that plan to cut back their spending. The majority say they will spend at a level somewhat higher than they reached in 1959. Most companies in this group add

that they expect to get by without relying on external financing.

INTERNAL FUNDS

This do-it-yourself financing indicates that corporations are generating more and more funds internally, but it is also a sign that business is reluctant to pay the high cost of external financing, whether in the banks or in the capital market.

Thus, money rates may not be crimping business, but they are high enough to make businessmen cautious, unwilling to increase borrowing unless they can see definite profits from it.

They can take this position because they have a fair degree of liquidity. Of course, company treasurers rarely admit to being satisfied with their liquid assets, but, by and large, corporate cash positions are good right now. They are a little below last year's level, but well above the troughs of 1957-58.

These liquid assets will melt a good deal in the next few months as corporations use them for inventories and taxes. Last year, corporations loaded up on short-term government securities, particularly when inventory buying declined during the steel strike. Now they will be selling these investments; the fact that they have such paper to sell is one reason that they feel so secure about the credit outlook.

IF SALES TAKE OFF

This cool and cautious attitude may change if sales begin to spurt. Corporations will not hesitate to spend more and borrow more if it appears profitable to do so. Thus, there may be a rush on the banks if sales take off—or if prices start rising.

Then it becomes a question of what the banks will do. The banks today are squeezed much harder than corporations. This contrasts with the 1957 squeeze, when corporations were hit hard. Today, the banks say that, while they have funds available for "legitimate and credit-worthy customers," they look closely at every loan proposal.

Some banks say that they are cutting down on practically all loan demands; others turn down everything but virtually risk-free short-term loans. As one St. Louis banker admits, "We have no room for anything but the best types of borrowers."

Bankers feel that the Fed will provide the reserves to take care of seasonal loan demands. But if demand exceeds seasonal surges, rates will have to go up. According to one New York banker, "It looks as if we will be able to get through the year without another hike in rates. But we can be surprised—we have been before."

Resolution by Lithuanian Americans of Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian Americans of Omaha, Neb., at a meeting on February 14, commemorated the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Those in attendance at this meeting adopted a resolution about the current negotiations in the international field,

and I deem it a pleasure to include it as part of my remarks, as follows:

Whereas the people of Lithuania, one of the first victims of Communist Russia, have been forcibly deprived of the exercise of their sovereignty and of the basic rights of individual, religious, political, social, cultural, and economic liberty, and are now subjected to the inhuman policy of oppression, terror, murder, and mass deportations to Siberia and other parts of the vast Soviet territory;

Whereas no nation, great or small, can today feel protected from the claim of international communism supported, as it is, by all the destructive weapons that modern civilization has devised for mankind;

Whereas the "peaceful coexistence" line of Moscow is designed to lull the free world into a sense of false security in order to gain time and to consolidate the Communist forces for further aggressions; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and the Members of the U.S. Congress with the request to do everything possible (1) that the liberation of Lithuania and other Russian enslaved countries be included in the program of the American foreign policy and in the negotiations at the summit conference; (2) that the Government of the United States enter into no agreement which would in any way acknowledge the fruits of any past, present, or future Soviet aggressions;

Resolved, That we urge the Government of the United States never to compromise for the sake of illusory coexistence between the West and East those eternal ideals of natural freedom and human rights defended throughout American history, but to do all in its power to liberate Lithuania and other occupied countries from Soviet tyranny;

Resolved, That we shall continue to support the Government of the United States wholeheartedly in its efforts to effect a just and durable peace in the world.

JOHN SARKA,

Chairman.

VITALIS A. GADELIS,

Secretary.

Mr. Eisenhower's Pollution Control Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I present an editorial which appeared in the February 29, 1960, issue of the Passaic-Clifton Herald-News concerning President Eisenhower's veto of the Water Pollution Control Act and my vote to override, and a statement bearing on the editorial:

MR. EISENHOWER'S POLLUTION BILL VETO

The criticism of President Eisenhower's veto of the bill to increase Federal spending for water pollution abatement is another manifestation of the "let's get the money from Washington" spirit.

In the veto message, Mr. Eisenhower emphasized his belief that pollution of streams, which he called "a priceless national asset," must be stopped. He contended, however, that it would be wrong for the Federal Government to "hold forth the promise of a large-scale program of Federal support," as the bill did, because it would "tempt municipalities to delay essential water pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds." He also said that pollution

abatement is a responsibility of municipalities, States and industries.

Mr. Eisenhower used strong language in presenting his views on water pollution:

"It is unconscionable for one town or city deliberately to dump untreated or inadequately treated sewage into a stream or river without regard . . . for downstream neighbors. Local taxpayers should be willing to assume the burdens necessary to bring such practices to a halt. Businessmen and industrialists must face up to the expenditures they must make if industrial pollutants are to be removed from the Nation's waters."

The President's stand should be applauded by residents of the Passaic Valley area. Fifty years ago, the municipalities bordering on the Passaic River banded together and, at a cost to themselves of millions of dollars, constructed a trunk sewer in order to clean up the lower Passaic River, which had become a malodorous open sewer. This is the kind of local initiative that Mr. Eisenhower believes the answer to the pollution problem. In view of the local effort to cleanse the Passaic River, the vote of Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of Paterson, to override the President's veto was a vote against the interests of Mr. CANFIELD's district.

The Passaic Valley communities continue to spend large sums annually to operate the trunk sewer system. It does not make any sense that their residents should be taxed by the Federal Government to pay for pollution abatement projects in areas whose residents want Washington handouts so they can escape paying their own bills.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CANFIELD

The Federal water pollution control program is expressly intended to encourage and stimulate local action in this field. The vetoed bill which I supported, H.R. 3610, had specific safeguards to assure that local responsibility would be maintained. For example, it provided that no grant could exceed 30 percent of the cost of a project or \$450,000, whichever was the smaller. Under existing law, which the vetoed bill sought to amend, grants are limited to 30 percent or \$250,000, whichever is the smaller.

Obviously, the major financial burden would have remained with local communities. Proof of this is the fact that since 1956 some 2,000 projects have received grants totaling \$163 million. The total cost of these projects is \$938 million. Thus, for every Federal-grant dollar, local communities have spent \$4.70. There is no other Federal-grant program which can match this performance of local participation.

The vetoed bill, which would have increased Federal participation from \$50 million to \$90 million a year, would not have altered the 70-30 ratio. It merely would have made it possible for additional communities to participate in the program.

President Eisenhower's argument that the additional Federal funds would "tempt municipalities to delay essential water-pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds" requires close analysis. According to the U.S. Public Health Service, sewage treatment plant construction has increased 75 percent since Federal funds have become available for this purpose. More than 14,000 miles of rivers and streams have been wholly or partially cleaned up as a result.

According to the conservative Washington Star in its February 24 editorial, "This record weakens the President's argument. Local efforts to eliminate or reduce residential and industrial pollution have been greatly stimulated by Federal aid already granted."

But probably the strongest answer to the President's argument comes from his own Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, established by law to advise him on matters relating to water pollution. About a month

before the President's veto that Board unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"The Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, after careful analysis of the construction-grant program for municipal waste-treatment works to control water pollution as authorized by section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, believes that these grants have significantly stimulated and increased construction of needed facilities. At the same time there has been no slowdown in the rate of construction of such treatment works financed entirely by non-Federal funds."

"The board further believes, to safeguard public health and other legitimate water uses, that additional incentives are needed to meet the backlog of municipal waste-treatment facility construction."

The President's Board then unanimously endorsed the bill which was vetoed.

With regard to our own area in the Passaic River Basin, it is certainly true that a sustained local effort has been made and that the citizens on their own have done much more than people elsewhere in controlling pollution. Still, the problem of pollution persists in the Passaic Valley, and this is evidenced by the fact that five of our communities have already received nearly \$471,000 in Federal grants. The five are Caldwell, Berkeley Heights, Paramus, Passaic Township, and West Paterson.

The very fact that the State Health Department recognized the need of these five communities for Federal funds is testimony that pollution was there.

In discussing this question we ought to remember that rivers and streams recognize no manmade boundaries, that they flow from the mountains of one State to the plains of another and the coastal basin of still another. Long ago the Supreme Court of the United States decided that waterways by their nature had to fall under Federal law.

I pose this question to you: Would I have been a good Representative if I had voted against pollution control just because my district has the problem licked? Am I supposed to close my eyes to the needs of the rest of the Nation simply because my district is indirectly involved? I think not. For in the long run, if the Eighth Congressional District is to prosper and grow, if it is to become and remain decontaminated from pollution, then it will do so only if the rest of this great Nation prospers and grows, if all of the rivers and streams are cleaned up. How many of you work in other river basins, or vacation there, or have friends or relatives there? In short, we are one Nation now. We cannot arbitrarily separate one little section from another, but we must recognize and solve common problems, we must understand how closely Paterson is related to New York, or Trenton, or Washington, or the fertile States where our food comes from, or the steel centers, or Cape Canaveral.

Finally, I want to mention pollution and foreign aid. Under the bill vetoed by the President, New Jersey would have received \$2 million in Federal grants. In his budget for fiscal 1961 he recommended a 60-percent cutback in the present program, which would result in an allocation of \$446,000 for our State. Compare this with the 3,795,000 American dollars spent in Pakistan on the Greater Kurachi water and sewage disposal project under the President's foreign-aid program. Compare this with the 2 million American dollars spent in Panama under the foreign-aid program for the extension of water pollution control and sewer development. And compare this with the 1,336,000 American dollars spent in Cambodia for health and sanitation projects. Each of these expenditures was specifically requested by the President. In voting the interest of my

district, I could not justify denying to it what the President asks we give to similar projects in far-off lands.

Power Companies Reap Huge New Tax Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently I made some remarks about the \$1½ billion subsidy the private power companies are enjoying as a result of the accelerated amortization benefits they received before the accelerated amortization program was repealed by the Congress. The same private power companies are now cashing in also on a new form of subsidy which is provided by the liberalized depreciation provision of section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

It is estimated that in the next 20 years the tax reductions that the power companies will receive under this provision will exceed \$10 billion.

The way that this present provision of the Internal Revenue Code is operating to give the private power companies this gigantic subsidy is most cogently described in an article by Mr. J. D. Brown in Public Power Magazine for February 1960.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

POWER COMPANIES REAP HUGE NEW TAX SUBSIDY—LIBERALIZED DEPRECIATION BENEFITS DWARF MULTIBILLION-DOLLAR FAST WRITE-OFF BONANZA

(By J. D. Brown)

The private power companies "from time to time get their hands in the honey pot, and, having closed their fists, they won't be able to get them out of the jar," said Representative (now Senator) CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, in a speech at the 1957 American Public Power Association convention in New York City.

It was Senator ENGLE's picturesque way of saying that the power companies were getting tremendous Federal subsidies through fast tax writeoffs. The power companies are still enjoying benefits from the use of these interest-free loans that may well run into billions of dollars. But Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who called the tax writeoffs "bluntly, a subsidy" and other Members of Congress were successful in stopping further Federal subsidies to the power companies through fast tax writeoffs.

Today, there's another "honey pot"—potentially more lucrative than even fast tax writeoffs—that the power companies have "their hands in." This is the much-discussed "liberalized depreciation" provision, section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Liberalized depreciation is a hot topic. A New York investment firm, Goodbody & Co., in a research study on the subject last year, said it "has created a greater controversy . . . than any controversy over accounting methods that we have seen." One case has already been before the U.S. Supreme Court.

And the issue involves big stakes. Over the next 20 years liberalized depreciation could hand the power companies a whopping \$13 billion in tax savings, with ultimate possible benefits to the power companies of as much as \$47 billion. By comparison, maximum possible benefits to private power companies from fast tax writeoffs are estimated at a mere \$5 billion. In other words, liberalized depreciation is a "honey pot" well worth digging into.

Yet the Goodbody & Co. study said "numerous utility executives would be glad to see" Congress "stop any further use of liberalized depreciation by utility companies." These private utility executives, the statement continued, "argue that the piling up of billions of dollars of deferred taxes creates a growing political risk as far as the utility industry is concerned."

And it must be embarrassing for the power companies—who spend millions yearly on misleading ads about public power and taxes—embarrassing because Federal Power Commission statistics show that in 1958 private power companies kept an average of 20 percent of every dollar they collected from their customers allegedly to cover the companies' Federal income taxes. Some companies, in fact, actually pocketed more than they paid to the Federal Government.

This was interest-free capital contributed by the companies' ratepayers * * * an interest-free "loan" made possible by the liberalized depreciation provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

As an example of the manner in which these benefits may build up, in 1958 Ohio Power Co. collected from its customers about \$15.6 million to pay the company's Federal income taxes. However, the company only paid about \$6.6 million to the Federal Government, and put \$9 million (about 57 percent of the total collected from customers for this purpose) into a "deferred taxes" account. That is, the company actually collected more from its customers as an interest-free loan than it paid in Federal income taxes.

How does liberalized depreciation work? For tax purposes, the company is permitted to write off more of its plant investment in the early years of service life, thus reducing its net income—and its Federal income taxes. But the company keeps another set of books for ratemaking purposes, and on these books it uses straight-line depreciation—that is, the same amount of depreciation each year over the property's service life. Thus the company's rates are high enough to cover Federal income taxes on the higher net income resulting from straight-line depreciation. But the company—since it keeps another set of books for tax purposes—actually pays lower Federal income taxes on the basis of speeded-up or "liberalized" depreciation.

If the company collects more from its customers for Federal income taxes than it actually pays to the Federal Government, what happens to the rest of the money? And who benefits? The big benefit, of course, comes from the interest-free use of the tax savings. If you received an interest-free loan, to be repaid in 33 years, and if you could invest this money at 6 percent (normal rate of return for power companies), you could pay off the loan and end up with a profit of more than three times the amount of the original loan.

Under liberalized depreciation, the tax savings, or interest-free Federal loan, is \$128,740 for every \$1 million of new plant investment. If a power company reinvests this tax savings, at 6 percent compounded over a 33-year period, the net benefits (or subsidy) will be \$473,740. Thus the power

company can net almost half as much as the plant originally cost—by the use of interest-free money.

At the end of 1958, FPC says 156 electric utility companies had accumulated nearly \$900 million from liberalized depreciation and fast tax writeoffs. At the end of 1959, this amount had grown to \$1.2 billion, according to Electrical World—and unless regulatory commissions and/or Congress put a stop to these huge tax subsidies, the amount will grow to even more staggering proportions in the years to come.

TAX-FREE DIVIDENDS

The power companies have insisted that these subsidies should be for the benefit of stockholders, not for ratepayers. This \$1.2 billion in interest-free capital, interestingly enough, is about three times the amount of electric rate increases (\$405 million) which private power companies obtained in the 9-year period from 1951 through 1959.

The most flagrant example of favoring stockholders is that last year at least 23, and probably as many as 29, private power companies distributed their tax savings to stockholders as tax-free dividends. In some cases, 100 percent of a power company's dividends were tax free, since the tax savings from liberalized depreciation and fast tax writeoffs were "flowed through" to stockholders as a "return of capital." (Of course this "capital" came from the ratepayers, not the stockholders.)

FPC Chairman J. K. Kuykendall, in a letter of January 14, 1960, to Representative AL ULLMAN (Democrat, Oregon), listed these 29 companies "whose 1959 common dividends may be fully or partially exempt from Federal income taxes," and indicated that fast tax writeoffs and/or liberalized depreciation were responsible, although other factors could have an effect.

However, FPC's Opinion 264, which permitted utilities to keep the tax savings resulting from fast tax writeoffs said: "Congress did not intend to provide a temporary fund to these companies which could be diverted to payment of dividends to their stockholders. * * * Consequently, we will take all steps necessary to insure that * * * the temporary savings produced by the deferral of taxes are not used, directly or indirectly, for the payment of dividends." This language seems clear enough, but to date the Commission has taken no steps to stop these tax-free dividends, even though 26 of the 29 companies passing out tax-free dividends are under FPC jurisdiction. As much as \$100 million in tax-free dividends were distributed by the companies last year.

The crux of the liberalized depreciation issue seems to be that this provision of the Internal Revenue Code should not apply to regulated utilities.

Logic supporting this point of view comes, oddly enough, from a private power company executive, John B. Madigan of Hartford Electric Light Co., speaking last year at the National Conference of Electric and Gas Utility Accountants, said the intent of Congress in passing section 167 was to encourage industry to modernize machinery and equipment.

"In our industry, however, to be realistic, accelerated depreciation does not stimulate to any great extent the replacement of obsolete equipment," Mr. Madigan declared. "Does anyone seriously contend that our plant would not have been expanded as fully or as rapidly, or that our maintenance program involving replacements of units of property would have been curtailed if it were not for accelerated depreciation? Perhaps it achieved all these things for other taxpayers, but certainly not for us. What was achieved was, in effect, nothing more than a reduc-

tion in taxes equivalent to the lowering of the present corporate rate of 52 percent; and if income taxes had actually been reduced in such manner, would anyone argue that we ought to be allowed to retain the savings over and above the fair and normal rate of return?"

At the same meeting, Arthur H. Kuhn, of Pioneer Service & Engineering Co., summed it up this way: "The concept of liberalized depreciation was sold in the first place by the capital goods industries, which are not regulated. * * * They were designed to meet many problems that are not related to the utilities. Once it was passed, it became available to all companies."

Even the FPC, in its 4 to 1 decision in 1956 in the Amere Gas case when it ruled that utilities should receive the benefits of these huge tax savings, said: "The extraordinary ability and willingness * * * to attract capital and construct new facilities causes us to question whether the incentive provided by section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code is necessary or desirable for this industry or will, in the long run, be as beneficial to the public interest."

FPC Commissioner William R. Connole, in a historic dissent in the Amere Gas case, said utilities "not only have the privilege and the incentive to expand, but indeed have a clear-cut, universally recognized and inescapable obligation to do so. * * * And it would be a vain act indeed were the Congress to enact a statute which would purport to cure a nonexistent problem or to provide encouragement where none is needed, indeed where none can be inferred without impugning the willingness of utilities themselves to conform to their existing obligations and the ability of the regulatory community to meet its statutory and constitutional mandate."

Allen S. King, president of Edison Electric Institute and president of Northern States Power Co., told the New York Society of Security Analysts on January 6 that private power companies invested a record \$3.8 billion in new plant and equipment in 1958—"one-eighth of the investment made by all American industry during that year." The electric power industry, Mr. King proudly declared, is a basic "growth" industry, which by 1964 will be investing \$4.5 billion a year in new facilities. The observer must wonder, then, why this basic "growth" industry needs the vast subsidies available through section 167, designed to encourage private firms to expand.

Power companies claim there is only a tax deferral, not a tax reduction, through liberalized depreciation. They'll eventually pay the same amount of taxes over the service life of the properties; it's just a shift in the timing of these tax payments, they say. But FPC, even though its rulings give these tax subsidies to the power companies, admits that the result of liberalized depreciation is "properly characterized a 'tax saving,'" rather than simply a tax deferral. In a growing industry like the electric power industry, the new investment becomes larger, the tax deductions due to liberalized depreciation grow correspondingly, and the total sum of "taxes deferred" becomes evermore huge. No power company will ever pay up or even decrease the amount of its "deferred" taxes unless the utility operation is liquidated or sharply reduced.

Also, there is another loss to the Federal Government, since lower tax payments by power companies mean the Government must borrow to make up for the loss in revenue. Fast tax writeoffs cost the Government several billions of dollars; but liberalized depreciation can eventually be much more costly to the Government.

Perhaps the most amazing event in the recent history of liberalized depreciation was a suit filed last year by a power company

combine against the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The power companies—Appalachian, Ohio and Indiana & Michigan—actually tried to stop the Institute from sending to institute members a letter saying that deferred taxes should not be shown in any account "included in the stockholders' equity section of the balance sheet." Said these power companies: we have \$65 million in "earned surplus restricted for future Federal income taxes account," and the removal of this so-called earned surplus from common stock equity would damage the companies' financing program. This case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, with the power companies losing. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants sent the letter. The incident makes clear the stakes in this issue.

UNJUSTIFIED SUBSIDIES GROWING

So one ends up with this picture: Congress in 1954 passed section 167 of the tax law providing Federal subsidies to encourage private competitive business to expand. Most private power companies—regulated, required by law to expand; given incentives through a guaranteed rate of return (after taxes) to expand—climbed on the free-enterprise bandwagon and took advantage of these subsidies. This was particularly significant because the power companies are a high investment industry—representing one-eighth of all investment by American industry in 1958—so they would benefit more than other industries since the subsidies related to investment.

The result: tremendous Federal subsidies to the power companies, subsidies which even some power company executives apparently are concerned about, subsidies which obviously are not needed by, nor justified for, the power companies.

If you are aware of these huge Federal subsidies to the private power companies, some of the national ads run by the power companies are laughable. For example, read this copy from a recent electric companies advertising program ad: Public power is "all so unnecessary. America's many independent electric companies are able—and ready—to supply all the electricity the Nation needs—without your tax money."

ECAP ads never mention the "hands in the honeypot"—hands of many "Independent" power companies accumulating vast amounts of interest-free capital. This year, a move is underway to further "liberalize" the depreciation provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to provide even greater "incentives" (subsidies) to the private power companies. The result would be to make further use of the Nation's tax laws to provide Federal subsidies to an industry which speaks loudly about its growth without the use of Federal funds.

INTEREST-FREE CAPITAL FOR POWER COMPANIES

Private power companies, on nationwide basis, pocket 20 percent of every dollar collected from customers to cover companies' Federal income taxes; some companies pocket over 50 percent.

The money they retain—because of a "fast depreciation" provision in Federal tax laws—is interest-free capital. Over next 20 years, total of this interest-free capital could reach \$13 billion. Reinvested at power companies' normal 6-percent return, this sum could build up to subsidy of \$47 billion over 33-year life of properties.

Total tax savings accumulated, at end of 1959, was already \$1.2 billion.

In addition, many power companies distribute their tax savings to stockholders, as tax-free dividends. Nearly \$100 million in 1959.

Loss to Federal Government from fast tax writeoffs and liberalized depreciation will run into billions of dollars.

Power companies issuing tax-free dividends in 1959

Company:	Percent
California Electric Power.....	62
California Oregon Power.....	100
Central Louisiana Electric.....	56
Central Maine Power.....	41
Connecticut Light & Power.....	30 or 35
Detroit Edison.....	37
Gulf States Utilities.....	36
Hartford Electric Light.....	60
Idaho Power.....	45
Interstate Power.....	8
Maine Public Service.....	13
Niagara Mohawk Power.....	67
Oklahoma Gas & Electric.....	10
Pacific Gas & Electric.....	30
Pacific Power & Light.....	100
Portland General Electric.....	100
Public Service of Indiana.....	50
Public Service of New Hampshire.....	40
Southwestern Public Service.....	14
Union Electric.....	50
Utah Power and Light.....	19
Virginia Electric & Power.....	10
Washington Water Power.....	55

Other companies whose 1959 common dividends may be partially exempt from Federal income taxes: Atlantic City Electric Co.; Central Hudson Gas and Electric Co.; El Paso Electric Co.; Fitchburg Gas and Electric Co.; Merrimack-Essex Electric Co.; and Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc.

Source: Standard & Poor's Weekly Dividend Record; compilation made by Federal Power Commission.

Buffalo: City of Good Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., a part of which I have the privilege to represent, is truly a city of good neighbors. I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an excellent article by Walter G. Young as it appeared in the March issue of Catholic Digest.

The article follows:

BUFFALO: CITY OF GOOD NEIGHBORS—WHERE MILLIONAIRES AND PAUPERS ARE SCARCE, BUT CHARITABLE HEARTS ARE AS ABUNDANT AS THE ELM TREES

(By Walter G. Young)

Late in 1959 Bishop Joseph A. Burke of Buffalo, N.Y., asked the Catholics of his diocese for \$2.5 million for a seminary. That's a lot of groceries, children's shoes, and gas bills when it comes out of workingmen's pockets. So he set aside one week for the campaign: a most conservative schedule, as it turned out.

It took all of 7 hours for the goal to be topped. By the end of the week it was on the way to being doubled, with \$4.4 million subscribed.

The Catholics of Buffalo were proud of the response, but not at all surprised. In this city such feats are taken as a matter of course, though visitors are often dumfounded.

Buffalo is one of a handful of the Nation's large cities where Catholics outnumber the rest of the population. A diocesan census in 1958 showed the population to be 63 per-

cent Catholic in the city, 53 percent in the suburbs.

About a third of Buffalo's 600,000 people are of Polish descent. Italian, German, and Irish groups are also numerically important. This distribution, of course, accounts for the Catholic preponderance. And it gives Old World charm to the city. On Holy Saturday Polish families carrying their baskets filled with Easter's breakfast throng to church for the ancient food-blessing ceremony, Swieconka; Italian neighborhood feasts mark St. Joseph's Day; and on March 17 the whole city puts on a green tie and claims to hail from County Cork.

The original village was planned shortly after 1800, with Washington, D.C., as its model. Today's city retains the original pattern of diagonal streets and spacious squares. Having been burned to the ground during the War of 1812, it started rebuilding on the hot ashes. In 1832 it incorporated as a city with 10,000 people. It grew steadily during the 19th century, and passed the half-million mark around the period of the First World War. Then it slowed down, girdled with annexation-resisting suburbs.

Since the Second World War the suburbs have had to absorb the growing population, and now find themselves saddled with the very thing they sought by independence to avoid—alarming tax bills.

Buffalo's location had much to do with its early prosperity. At the eastern end of Lake Erie, halfway between New York and Chicago, it quickly became an important distribution center for goods and a stopover for westbound settlers. Besides location, there was an abundance of water—there was the Erie Canal—and in time there was electric power from Niagara Falls.

Manufacturing plants began to dot the area; grain elevators appeared; lake shipping flourished. Railroads followed, until the city was the second largest rail center in the Nation. In Lackawanna, an independent adjoining city of (today) 30,000 people, the country's third largest steel mill was built.

Strong, farsighted men guided the city's early history. One of the first was Judge Samuel Wilkeson, who brought the Erie canal to Buffalo. Its terminus was already in the bag for Black Rock, a neighboring village down the Niagara River, when Sam roused the citizens, lobbied Albany, and dug out a harbor. He got his terminus; and although later the victory came to have small significance (Buffalo annexed Black Rock in 1853) it was important at the time. It marked the beginning of Buffalo's ascendancy.

If Wilkeson was the father of the city, Benjamin Rathbun was its first entrepreneur. In the 1830's he was Mr. Buffalo: the biggest merchant west of the Atlantic seaboard, a stage-route operator, a contractor who was completing two buildings a week, and the owner of the palatial American hotel.

But with so many interests, Rathbun eventually found the water too deep. Financial maneuvering proved his downfall; and if he gained any satisfaction from the experience, it would have to be that he was able to serve his 5-year sentence in his own Rathbun-built jail.

Then there was a dapper millionaire, Colonel Palmer, whose unorthodox business methods were typified by a deal he made one day at lunch. With no apparent forethought, he offered his companion \$150,000 for everything he owned except his "wife, babies, and household effects." The offer was accepted and ratified with a drink. And there was Joseph Dart, who pushed the city into its milling preeminence by building mechanical grain elevators over the objections of scoffers who insisted that the

only efficient grain elevators were Irishmen's backs.

Mark Twain lived in Buffalo for a spell; and in nearby East Aurora, Elbert Hubbard pasted together his "Scrapbook."

Today the colorful pioneers have gone; and Buffalo, the Nation's 15th city in size, is a conservative place short on splendor and long on the old look. No dominant industry signs most of the paychecks, for Buffalo's eggs are in many baskets: steel, automobiles, flour and feed, chemicals, paint, furniture—you name it.

The factories, largely absentee-owned, are as numerous as the downtown pigeons and as varied as the suburban tax rates. This diversity, coupled with conservatism in thought and action, stabilizes the city's economy. Even during the terrible thirties, Buffalo suffered no major bank failure. Breadlines and shanty towns were comparatively minor blights. Millionaires are scarce here, but so are paupers.

Notable public buildings include the 384-foot city hall, dedicated in 1932; Civic Stadium (1938), a fine football bowl, unimaginatively located; and Memorial Auditorium (1940). Kleinhans Music Hall, dedicated in 1940, is one of the country's finest, providing beauty, comfort, and almost perfect acoustics for 3,000 people.

But the real objects of pride are the trees, all 400,000 of them. The elms arch across the wide avenues like motorists' honor guards. Citizens write indignant letters to the editor whenever progress claims a few. Everybody worried about Dutch elm disease, now reasonably controlled. With replanting to cover its ravages already begun, a priceless asset appears secure.

Buffalo weather is noteworthy for its practically permanent breeze, which in winter finds its muscles. That's when Buffalonians are ready to challenge Chicago's Windy City title. Although the chamber of commerce says wind velocity averages less than 15 miles an hour, you'd have a hard time driving that point home to January's pedestrians trying to cross Niagara Square while hanging on to the winter rope railings. The ropes, after all, are placed there for only one reason; to keep struggling pedestrians from being blown out into the traffic.

The Lake Erie breezes do more good than harm. They carry away the smoke from factory chimneys, and they air-condition the summers. Buffalonians suffer no smog choke, few wet-dishrag days, and fewer sleepless nights.

The U.S. Government once seated itself at Buffalo—for only a few hours, to be sure, and under tragic circumstances. It was September, 1901. President McKinley had just died in a Delaware Avenue home, victim of an assassin's bullet. The Cabinet hurried to the city. It met in the Buffalo club, which became the Capitol pro tem, and decided, among other things, how the Vice President should be sworn in. On September 14, in another Delaware Avenue home, Theodore Roosevelt became our 26th President.

Buffalo politics was a springboard for two Presidents: Millard Fillmore and Grover Cleveland. Both were local lawyers. Fillmore was the first chancellor of the University of Buffalo, and Cleveland served a term as mayor.

Father John Neumann came to Buffalo in 1836, fresh from ordination. His labors in the mission parishes outside the city were rigorous. He often walked 20 or 30 miles a day. Before he left the city in 1840 he had established a network of parochial schools, which in those days were by no means common even in large cities.

Later, as bishop of Philadelphia, he organized the first diocesan school board. Today he is venerable John Neumann, and his works around Buffalo may some day help him to sainthood.

Father Neumann had hardly left for the redeemer Pittsburgh house when Nelson Baker was born in Buffalo. He was to be the city's best loved clergyman. He was ordained in 1876, and in due course received the title of monsignor; but always he was known simply as Father Baker—or, sometimes, as the padre of the poor.

In 1882 he was sent to neighboring Lackawanna as director of Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity. Under his care the homes gained national prominence. In 1920, when he was almost 80, he started to build a great church. Although Our Lady of Victory Basilica took 6 years to build he lived to see it, and he offered Mass there for 10 years before he died in 1936.

Hardly anyone thinks of it as Our Lady of Victory Basilica. To everyone, including pilgrims from all over the country, it is just plain Father Baker's. It is one of the most elaborate churches in America, and is internationally recognized for its works of art.

Each year on July 29, the anniversary of the padre's death, hard-boiled Lackawanna declares a civic holiday. Everybody from the mayor on down attends mass and gravesite ceremonies.

Educational institutions in Buffalo are headed by the privately supported, 12,000-student University of Buffalo. Catholic colleges include the Jesuits' Canisius, with an enrollment of more than 2,000; and D'Youville and Rosary Hill for women. Buffalo is a leader in the field of diocesan high schools, having at present nine in the city alone. The system was instituted by Bishop John O'Hara, C.S.C., now cardinal archbishop of Philadelphia, and is being expanded by Bishop Burke.

St. Rita's home for retarded children, the Plarist Fathers' Calasancius school for the exceptionally bright, and St. Mary's School for the Deaf are special establishments under Catholic auspices.

Roswell Park Memorial Institute is one of the world's two or three largest centers for cancer research and treatment. The institute was established 60 years ago. It operates today with a staff of 1,400.

Club owners in sports are often fans, but in Buffalo the fans are the club owners. In 1955, when the AAA baseball club seemed doomed, 3,000-odd fans put up close to \$200,000 to buy it. With such a wide base of ownership, the city has since led all the minor leagues in attendance. In 1950, fans had put up a like amount in a fruitless attempt to save the city's profootball. Diehards the Buffalonians are, indeed; and it looks as if they are soon to get the big-league status they crave.

If major league teams do come to Buffalo, they will be international favorites. Canada is only a few hundred feet away. A couple of million Canadians live within 100 miles. They pour into the city, on Canadian holiday weekends. Ontario license plates sometimes outnumber local ones on downtown streets.

The city's most public display of Catholicism happens every spring. Early in Lent, lampposts and buses blossom out with posters; newspapers, radio, and TV furnish unstinting publicity; and on Passion Sunday the Catholic Charities Appeal starts its week-long campaign. The drive has never failed to go over the top since its inception in 1924.

The few cities that boast similar appeals haven't approached this one's success, though most of them are patterned after it. The people give over \$2 million every year.

Msgr. Eugene A. Loftus, director of the drive since 1939, says, "The appeal has fostered harmony among our different national factions." In other words, the Catholic Charities Appeal is one of the forces that continue to make Buffalo the city of good neighbors.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my district are greatly concerned about the serious condition of agriculture in our country today, and I share their concern. These farmers do not embrace the philosophy that the Federal Government owes them a living, and they realize that a solution to the farm problem will not come about by sitting back and complaining about their troubles and hardships. Rather, they know that constructive thinking by the farmer himself—the man who is closest to the problem—is necessary.

Recently a group of farmers who reside in Otoe County, Nebr., expressed to me their views and suggestions relative to our national farm program. These constituents of mine are hard-working, serious-minded men and they are genuinely interested in assisting in working out a sensible solution to the problems which exist in the field of agriculture. Their observations are the result of earnest study and deliberation, and I think they present some interesting ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring the proposals of these farmers to the attention of my colleagues for their study in connection with farm legislation which will be considered by the Congress.

NOTES ON PROPOSED FARM PROGRAM

(By Paul Antes, Syracuse, Nebr.; John Pickerrill, Unadilla, Nebr.; Bill Davis, Syracuse, Nebr.)

During the past 50 years there has been tremendous technological progress in agriculture. This progress has resulted in widespread benefits to the Nation as a whole.

While productivity in agriculture has increased in a rapid rate, the income received by farmers has decreased. Agriculture as an industry is not receiving a fair share of the rewards of a highly productive economy. Programs need to be devised which make it possible (a) for farmers as a group to obtain a fair share of the national income, and (b) for these returns to be distributed in such a way that the "family farm" will continue to be the predominant type of land tenure in the United States.

Agricultural programs need to be reexamined from time to time and modified in order to more adequately fulfill these objectives. It is with this in mind that we submit the following proposals for your consideration:

A. Price support programs should be designed to strengthen the competitive position of the family-type farm and at the same time allow some large-scale operations without Government supports. This can be accomplished by providing a system of graduated price support levels for nonperishables based upon amounts produced.

One hundred percent of parity on first 2,000 bushels of wheat, corn, and milo.

Ninety-five percent of parity on next 1,000 bushels of wheat, corn, and milo.

Ninety percent of parity on next 1,000 bushels of wheat, corn, and milo.

Eighty-five percent of parity on next 1,000 bushels of wheat, corn, and milo.

Total, 5,000 bushels.

This (5,000 bushels) should be the maximum for Government support payments to any one individual. Each individual tenant should be limited to his share of the above supports. Landlords owning more than one unit would be entitled to their share of the above supports with a maximum in supports of \$25,000.

If supplies of wheat or other basic non-perishables reaches a 1½-year supply the Secretary of Agriculture would have the authority to implement production controls; also, he would be required to sell from Government stocks, each year, amounts equaling any surplus occurred in excess of 1½ year supply under price support programs.

Production could be limited in the following manner:

A. A basic family farm should be designed as a production unit with a minimum production base of 3,000 bushels of wheat, corn, oats, or milo with controls operating on a graduated percentage basis, the larger units bearing the greater percentage.

B. The operator of a family farm unit would be entitled to the above supports on basic nonperishables and production payments on perishables of a quality consistent with consumer demand, with a limit of \$2,000. No one farm unit would be entitled to combined price supports and production payments in excess of \$10,000.

C. Credit programs: Agricultural credit should be provided at a low rate of interest with a long repayment period. Agricultural credit should be provided with a 10- to 20-percent downpayment to help expand small units to reasonable sized units. In areas where climate is highly variable, the repayment plan should be devised to fit these conditions.

D. Rural housing: Most farm homes are old. There is a need to encourage the building of modern farm homes through housing loans similar to those used in urban areas.

E. Recreation: Positive programs should be developed to take submarginal agricultural land out of production. Wherever possible those lands should be used for planned recreational development.

F. Research: Research is needed to (1) develop new uses for agricultural products and (2) expand overseas markets.

G. Price supports on nonperishables and production payments on perishables should not exceed \$10,000 per unit or \$25,000 to any individual.

In the last 2 years imports of meats have increased to the amount of 8.4 percent of the total meat production of the United States. We believe that regulations should be implemented to control imports to the 1957 levels.

Thomas Masaryk: A National Hero of Seldom Paralleled Stature

SPEECH
OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is truly fitting that the first postage stamp in the Champions of Liberty series honors the founder and first president of Czechoslovakia, Thomas G. Masaryk.

In commemorating the 100th anniversary of his birth, we pay tribute to a national hero of seldom paralleled stature and an individual whose work constituted an enormous contribution to mankind's struggle for liberty.

The death of Masaryk and subsequent imprisonment of Czechoslovakia by totalitarian communism have not obscured the principles of freedom which flourished so abundantly during the tragically short term of democracy in that nation.

While we have expressed through resolution our deep sorrow at the plight of all peoples of the captive nations, it is important that we renew our expression and emphasize it with reference to individual nations to help their peoples bear their terrible burden of dictatorial bondage.

Issuance of champions of liberty stamps will help achieve this end.

Certain Organizations Previously Listed in Guide to Subversive Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1960, I inserted on pages 2668-2673 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of organizations which are referred to in the Guide to Subversive Organizations issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities on January 2, 1957.

In fairness to a number of organizations whose names appeared on the list, I would like to explain just what the list comprises.

The organizations listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were taken from the index to the committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations. Anyone consulting the body of the guide will find that most of the organizations have been cited as Communist or Communist front by Federal legislative and executive authorities or State investigating committees. A number of the organizations, however, have been characterized by official agencies as being "Fascist" or otherwise extremist in nature.

Three other organizations, whose names appear in the index to the guide and therefore appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, have been cited as Communist fronts in the past but the citations have been rescinded by the Committee on Un-American Activities. In justice to these organizations—the Consumers Union, Slovene National Benefit Society, and the Vanguard Press—I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time exactly what the committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations has to say in their behalf:

CONSUMERS UNION

This organization was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944 as a Communist front "headed by the Communist Arthur Kallet (whose party name is Edward Adams)." The citation appeared in House Report 1311 on the CIO Political Action Committee dated March 29, 1944.

The Committee on Un-American Activities in its annual report for 1953 (H. Rept. No. 1192, Feb. 8, 1954) stated that steps were

initiated by Consumers Union through its officers and legal counsel to clarify the exact status of the organization. The committee also announced in the same annual report that: "After hearings and thorough study the committee finds there is no present justification for continuing this organization as one that is cited, and future reports and publications will reflect that this organization has been deleted from the list of subversive organizations and publications."

Consumers Union was last listed in the May 14, 1951, edition of the committee publication, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, page 44. It has been deleted from this edition of the guide.

SLOVENE NATIONAL BENEFIT SOCIETY

This organization was originally described by the Committee on Un-American Activities as being among "the Communist-dominated organizations which have constituted a bulwark of financial support for the American Slav Congress." This description was contained in the committee's report on the American Slav Congress and Associated Organizations, House Report 1951, April 26, 1950 (originally released June 26, 1949).

On the basis of information which has been supplied by the Slovene National Benefit Society, the committee has conducted an additional investigation as to the true nature and purposes of this society.

This investigation disclosed that, while it was true that the Slovene National Benefit Society had financially assisted the American Slav Congress by purchasing advertising space in the publication Slavic American, the official organ of the American Slav Congress, this assistance, though misguided, was not done with the intent of assisting the American Slav Congress. Rather the Slovene National Benefit Society used the Slavic American as a medium to attract individuals to its fraternal insurance benefits.

The committee has satisfied itself that the Slovene National Benefit Society is not under Communist domination and since learning the true nature of the American Slav Congress it has ceased to furnish any aid, financial or otherwise, to the Congress or its affiliates.

The reference to the Slovene National Benefit Society appeared in the committee publication Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, March 3, 1951, edition, page 98. It has been deleted from subsequent editions of the guide.

VANGUARD PRESS

This organization was described by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a "Communist enterprise" which was established by a donation from the American Fund for Public Service. This description appeared in House Report 1311 on the CIO Political Action Committee, March 29, 1944, which also stated that "one of the first large publishing projects of the Vanguard Press" was "a series of propaganda books on Russia, edited by Jerome Davis."

The Committee on Un-American Activities is in receipt of a sworn affidavit, dated May 24, 1951, from one James Henle, who identified himself as president of Vanguard Press, Inc., of New York. Mr. Henle stated that he purchased one-half of the voting stock of Vanguard Press, Inc., from the owner, the American Fund for Public Service, on December 1, 1928, and that he and his wife acquired the balance of the stock on January 2, 1932. Since 1932, Mr. Henle deposes, "no member of the Garland Fund (American Fund for Public Service) has ever served as an officer, director or employee of Vanguard Press," and "The members of my family—those who actually control and run the business of Vanguard—are uncompromisingly

anti-Communist." Mr. Henie stated that Vanguard Press published its propaganda books on Russia prior to his acquisition of the corporation's stock.

References to Vanguard Press appear in the May 14, 1951, edition of this committee's Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, page 114. The committee has agreed to delete the reference from this edition of the guide.

Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that many newspapers throughout the country continue to express strong editorial support for my bill, H.R. 5401, to require disclosure of spending by Members of Congress traveling in overseas areas.

There can be no justification for the secrecy which surrounds expenditures for this purpose, and yet H.R. 5401 is described in some circles as "the bill least likely to succeed." Why?

Among the newspapers supporting the bill is the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, and I include as part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Register on March 4:

SECRECY ON CONGRESSIONAL TRIPS

Congressional Quarterly, a weekly publication which reports on Government matters, has just completed its annual checkup on trips to foreign countries made by Members of Congress. It shows that 190 Members of Congress made trips outside the United States during 1959. There were 31 more travelers than in the previous year.

The publication had to compile the information itself by contacting committees and Members of Congress. There is no information about the cost of individual trips. Congress, which battles mightily for freedom of information about some things, keeps this information secret.

Not all the trips, probably not the majority of them, are "junkets" to provide free vacations for Congressmen in far-off lands. Many are valuable in enabling Members of Congress to get firsthand information pertinent to legislative matters.

But the secrecy about what Congressmen spend from governmental funds on these trips has no justification. Secrecy isn't justified if its purpose is merely to avoid embarrassing a legislator or to make it easier to take junkets. This secrecy increases suspicion that much of the travel is solely for the purpose of giving Congressmen free sightseeing trips.

Congress should not restrict needed missions to foreign lands. But it should end its secrecy policy about junketing expenses. It could do so by passing a bill introduced last year by Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. Gross' bill would require that each lawmaker report his spending on junketing trips.

The Gross bill was approved by a House Administration Subcommittee last August but has been tied up by the full committee. The bill is referred to in Washington, according to Congressional Quarterly, as "the bill least likely to succeed."

We agree with Representative Gross that the measure could result in curbing waste-

ful junketing, without restricting useful missions abroad. The public would not oppose any and all trips. It would be critical only of contrived vacation jaunts at Government expense.

What America Can Afford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Helen Hill Miller as it appeared in the New Republic magazine of March 7, 1960:

WHAT AMERICA CAN AFFORD—A REVIEW OF NATIONAL NEEDS IN THE SIXTIES

(By Helen Hill Miller)

"A new 'great debate' is raging. . . . The debate has been inspired by a single idea: that the basic trouble with American society is that we devote too much of our resources to increasing an already affluent level of private consumption, and too little to public services of all kinds."—Edwin L. Dale, Jr., New York Times, February 7, 1960.

"The doctrine which determines [the President's] budget, his program, and his preaching to the Nation is, in the perspective of the world struggle, a most dangerous doctrine. The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people."—Walter Lippmann, February 9, 1960.

How the country's resources are to be used in this decade is, or ought to be, the major political issue of 1960, for on that decision U.S. national well-being, if not U.S. survival, turns. Democrats well shout that the Republicans are complacent, Republicans that the Democrats are reckless spenders of other peoples' money. Each will say that the other is living for the day and taking no thought for the morrow. But the real debate over the national rate of growth, and over what part of the U.S. output is to be channeled into public purposes, and what part is to be allocated in accord with semiprivate decisions of corporations, associations, and voluntary agencies and the private decisions of individuals, has barely started.

In view of the importance of this debate and the contradictory interpretations given the same economic facts by competing parties and candidates, the editors of the New Republic present some black and white figures showing how much income the United States now has and what it is now buying (last year, \$11 billion was spent on advertising). We note how much income the country will have in the coming years at various rates of growth, and some of the claims that will be made upon this wealth. And we cite statements and reports on national needs made prior to the 1960 campaigns by independent study groups representing a wide range of views and having unusual access to facts. The authorities to whom we refer do not blithely demand that more Federal money be poured into public pipelines. Rather, they assess the relevance to the needs of the decade of both the size and the kind of the largest current Federal programs.

Because this is a political year, we are not drawing on congressional committee re-

ports, or statements by political figures, however competent we believe some of them to be. A further reason for emphasizing independent citizen findings is because to an unusual degree the country is puzzled by what it hears from administration leaders. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury have made clear the primacy they place on the maintenance of a balanced budget, but on other matters of importance, the testimony of public officials is often conflicting. The story often varies according to echelon: The President in his messages or at his news conferences, and successive Secretaries of Defense in testimony before Congress, have defended heatedly the adequacy of present levels of military spending; but the uniformed service chiefs, while acknowledging their willingness to go along, have hinted broadly that they regard the proposed budget as inadequate in one way or another; and responsible persons who have recently retired or resigned are openly warning that various gaps are too wide and various margins of safety too narrow. The President tells the press he is undisturbed by the current primacy of the U.S.S.R. in space exploration; within days, both his chief scientific adviser and the head of the USIA, from their respective viewpoints, see in that primacy cause for anxiety.

In trying to judge whether enough is being spent or what is spent is spent wisely, the citizen who is not on the inside of things stumbles over two obstacles: The intricacy of the subject in this era of fast growth and supersonic science, and the classified nature of much of the information. This is especially so when military security is discussed. But though the ordinary citizen is bewildered by this inharmonious chorus, he is nevertheless dubious of uncritically accepting the charges of the Democratic opposition, or of writing any blank check for the Armed Forces.

Likewise bewildering is that, as of this moment, the country as a whole has never had it so good. It is hard to realize that the year 1960 cannot be sliced off and viewed as an isolated cross-section of time. What is done or left undone this year will greatly influence if not determine what can be done in 1961, or 1965, or 1980—or 1984. But to recognize that fact is by no means to know what to do about it, now.

GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL PRODUCT

The argument about what the United States can afford must—if it is to make any sense—start with a recognition of the resources at its disposal. The gross national product (GNP), which is the sum total of goods and services produced each year, represents the country's overall economic capacity. Only by keeping the size of this product in view can the capacity of the country to sustain public expenditures of various amounts be seen in perspective.

The following table shows the GNP over the last decade, and the portion of it that was spent to public account through local, State, and Federal Government budgets. To eliminate the effect of inflation from the comparisons, these figures are expressed in constant dollars, at their 1959 purchasing power.

Year	GNP	Total	Government purchases of goods and services			
			Total	Federal defense	Other	State and local
1949.....	\$328.2	\$57.1	\$30.6	\$18.4	\$12.2	\$26.5
1953.....	417.1	102.0	71.1	60.1	11.0	30.9
1958.....	448.6	94.9	53.3	45.0	8.3	41.6
1959.....	478.8	97.9	53.6	45.5	8.1	44.3

Money at the disposal of the Government is increased in two ways: By raising tax rates, or by applying the same tax rates to in-

creased amounts of income. The above figures show the relationship between the size of GNP and the country's ability to pay for public expenditures. In 1949 the money spent by all governments took almost 15 percent of the gross national product, while in 1959, government expenditures of more than double those of 1949 took only just over 20 percent. At current Federal tax rates, every \$10 billion of growth in the GNP brings in somewhere between \$2 and \$2.5 billion of additional Federal revenue.

The National Planning Association in its "Long Range Projections for Economic Growth," the Committee for Economic Development in its "Trends in Public Expenditures in the Next Decades," and the Conference on Economic Progress in its "The Federal Budget and the General Welfare," have analyzed the possibilities in detail. So has the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report over the years and in a 1960 study paper by its counsel, James W. Knowles.

Over the past 40 years (1919-59), with sharp ups and downs caused by depression, war, and recovery, the GNP grew at an average of 2.9 percent annually. From 1950-57, the growth rate averaged 3.6 percent, doing better in the earlier, and worse in the later years of this span. The difference between the GNP produced by different growth rates is impressive. A 2.5 percent growth rate (which is slightly higher than the actual rate of the past few years) would raise 1959's GNP of \$480 billion to \$557 billion by 1965 and \$713 billion by 1975. But a rate of 3.5 percent would up the 1965 figure to \$590 billion and the 1975 figure to \$832 billion. A rate of 4.5 percent would yield \$625 billion in 1965, and \$971 billion in 1975—double 1959's GNP.

In other countries, a growth rate of better than 4 percent is by no means unusual. Between 1950-57, Western European nations in the OEEC averaged an overall rate of 4.6 percent; the U.S.S.R.'s current rate is estimated by Western sources at around 6 percent—a widely accepted study by the National Planning Association sets the rate at 6.3; over the last 6 years Japan also has achieved a growth rate of better than 6 percent. Obviously, the smaller the base, the easier it is to obtain a high percentage rate of growth; but foreign gains in comparison with the U.S. total are nonetheless rapid. If the U.S.S.R.'s economy continues to expand even at 6 percent a year—a figure considerably less than the announced Soviet intention—and if the U.S. rate is raised to 4 percent, the Soviet GNP will be over half that of the United States by 1965, whereas in 1951, Soviet GNP was only about one-third of America.

GROWTH IN POPULATION

On New Years Day, 1960, 179.3 million people were estimated to live in the United States. Over the decade 1950-60 the population had increased by 28.2 million—or by about as many people as live in the less populous half of the 50 States. U.S. population levels are expected to range from 191.5 to 199 million by 1965, and from 215.8 to 243.9 million by 1975. Twenty years from now there may well be as many as 272.6 million Americans.

So far, per capita disposable personal income has gone up more rapidly than the population, even when the figures are expressed in constant 1959 prices to eliminate the effect of inflation.

Year	Total disposable personal income (in billions)	Population (in millions)	Per capita disposable personal income
1949	\$231.3	149.2	\$1,551
1953	276.0	152.6	1,729
1958	319.7	174.1	1,836
1959	334.6	176.9	1,891

Clearly, a substantial increase in GNP will be required if Malthus is not to ride again.

In addition, there are several new and very practical reasons why plans must be made now for the anticipated larger population. One is a sudden short-term need for additional jobs. As waves of war and postwar babies finish school and set out to earn their living, some 26 million young people over the years of the 1960's will be looking for places in a labor force that now totals almost 71 million. The influx will not be steady; it will have two peaks. One will occur next year, when the number of 18-year-olds will jump by 300,000 to a total of 2.9 million. A 10-12 percent upshoot in young jobseekers in 1961 could glut the labor market. But the major strain on the absorptive power of the economy will come in 1965, when in a single 12-month period the number of youngsters finishing school will skyrocket by a cool million.

The urgency of preparing early enough to receive these newcomers is underscored by the fact that in recent years relatively fewer people have found openings in fields such as manufacturing (which increase the material wealth of the Nation) and relatively more have gone into the service trades (which contribute convenience rather than wealth). A higher, and a rapidly growing capital investment is necessary to provide new opportunities in the sectors of the basic economy where electronics and automation are becoming standard equipment. The National Industrial Conference Board estimates that capital investment per production worker in manufacturing was \$17,800 in the first half of 1959, as compared with only \$10,423 in 1950. Yet these are the jobs that make an economy strong.

The importance of expanding the real wealth of the Nation is made apparent also when one looks at the new shape of the age curve in the United States—and it will be shaped the same way for some time to come. The bulges will be at the two ends, among the youngsters and the elders. Simultaneously, more Americans are being born and more Americans are living longer. Each has special needs: Educational and recreational facilities for the young; shelter, medical care, and basic income for the old. At the same time, the demand for community facilities—roads, hospitals, utilities, communications—will grow among the mounting population of all ages.

Even greater, however, than these domestic incentives to economic growth are the incentives from overseas. The middle-income families in America, with their average of \$5,050 a year, live in a fabulous glass house, wide open for world inspection. Most of those outside looking in have a per capita annual income of less than \$100.

Moreover, the population explosion in this country has been paralleled, and in most cases exceeded, abroad. World population in 1955 was estimated at 2,691 billion; continuance of the recent average annual increase could double this figure within 42 years. Between 1950 and 1975, an 86 percent increase is expected in Latin America, one of around 60 percent in Asia and Oceania, 52 percent in Africa, 43 percent in North America, and 31 percent in Europe including the U.S.S.R.

The Conference Committee on Population Problems, in its study, "Population: An International Dilemma," prepared by Frederick Osborn, notes: "Already in some countries the population is doubling in each generation of 30 years . . . and this rate of increase can be expected in other wide areas. If continued, such growth would multiply the population eight times in less than a century and would bring a 64-fold increase in less than two centuries. . . . The United States and Canada occupy a unique position, shared only by the Soviet Union, Australia, and New Zealand, in that their present balances of population to nat-

ural resources is still favorable to a continuous increase in the well-being of their people. But if present rates of growth should continue for as long as another two generations, both the United States and the Soviet Union will be reduced to a position in which the balance of population to resources may seriously handicap the effort to improve the level of living. They would then lose what is perhaps their major advantage over the other large but more heavily populated areas of the world." To maintain even a minimum food standard for 4 to 5 billion more people would probably require doubling the world's present agricultural production. The position of a high-income island in a world where most human beings face the prospect of growing poorer is bound to be a precarious one.

The Committee for International Economic Growth, in its just-published study of "One Hundred Countries: One and One-Quarter Billion People" prepared by Paul Hoffman, urges an increase in the level of outside public and private capital investment in these countries from its current figure of just over \$4 billion a year to \$7 billion. Such an investment could be expected to induce expansion of their economies by 1 percent per person per year in the 1960's—and to raise U.S. exports to these areas some \$14 billion annually by 1970.

And amid these pressures, a complex of nations in the Sino-Soviet bloc is committed to spectacular improvements in their own and the underdeveloped economies, and equally committed to the elimination of the liberal West as a primary center of power.

It is with these prospects in mind that the citizens of this country must assign priorities in an overall national agenda. It is in view of such facts that the people of the United States need to agree on how a growing national product shall be used.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For the past several years, in an effort to balance the budget at levels of taxation and economic growth rates current since 1953, increases in Federal spending have been almost wholly confined either to expenditures mandatory under such legislation as that establishing the farm program or veterans benefits, or increases made necessary by market conditions in respect to interest on the national debt. Since 59 cents of the Federal budget dollar goes for national security, the imposition of a ceiling has borne hardest on expenditures for defense and foreign aid.

The supremacy which the President and his advisers have attached to the present budget ceiling and their satisfaction with the sufficiency of U.S. defense have been challenged by competent critics. Thus, in July 1958, the Committee for Economic Development issued an analysis of "The Problem of National Security: Some Economic and Administrative Aspects," in which it said: "In determining the size of our defense effort, we must distinguish sharply between the limitation imposed by the amount of our total product that we are willing to devote to this purpose, at the sacrifice of other desirable uses of output, and the limitation imposed by the consideration that too heavy a defense burden may weaken our economy, and hence our long-term ability to maintain our security. . . . Fear that a high defense burden will weaken the economy has been exaggerated and should not be decisive in determining the size of a defense budget representing 10 to 15 percent of the GNP, or even more. . . . We can afford what we have to afford."

In a special study made for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of the Johns Hopkins University, issued on December 6, 1959, "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on U.S. Strategy and Foreign Policy," there

is this sentence: "The military position of the United States has, in short span of 15 years, declined from one of great security to one of great insecurity."

In his book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff, writes that: "The strategic doctrine which I propose to replace massive retaliation is the strategy of flexible response. . . . The new strategy would recognize that it is just as necessary to deter or win quickly a limited war as to deter a general war. Otherwise, limited war may result in our piecemeal attrition or grow into the general war we all want to avoid. . . . To make this change in strategy will require a lot of doing. . . . It will need a new kind of defense budget, to see that the dollars follow the approved priorities."

General Taylor's formula is very similar to that in a study released by the Council on Foreign Relations of New York on November 25, 1959, urging a defense structure resting on deterrent power, mobile forces capable of selective use, research and development, and longrange military aid. The council asked: "Even with greater understanding of foreign affairs, however, will the American people support the necessary policies at the cost of greater sacrifice to themselves? There can be no doubt, we are convinced, of the need for the United States to devote more of its resources than in the past to purposes related to its objectives and responsibilities in the world."

The President in his 1960 budget message set Federal expenditures at \$77.03 billion for all purposes. Of this, \$45.8 billion is for major national security, which includes funds for atomic energy development, stockpiling, and military assistance as well as \$40.85 billion for the Department of Defense. The Defense Department funds are within \$145 million of the previous year's; they work out at 8.5 percent of 1959's \$480 billion gross national product. The entire Federal budget amounts to just under 16 percent of the GNP.

Perhaps this is enough; but recent independent appraisals of defense and military aid programs do not support that conclusion. The Rockefeller report, "International Security—the Military Aspect," published in January 1958, said: "The overall U.S. strategic concept lags behind developments in technology and in the world political situation. In major respects defense organization is unrelated to critically important military missions. Systems of budgets, appropriations and financial management are out of gear with the radically accelerating flow of military developments. The U.S. system of alliances must be adapted to constantly changing strategic requirements. The United States is rapidly losing its lead in the race of military technology. . . . The power of these states, particularly of the U.S.S.R. has been growing both absolutely and relatively to the United States until today it constitutes a grave threat. . . . There exists the great danger that the Soviet Union will seek to use its nuclear striking force as a shield behind which to expand by more limited means. . . ."

"The aggressor need prepare only for the war he proposes to fight. But the side which is militarily on the defensive must gear its planning and procurement to the possibility of an attack at any moment. . . . The . . . deficiencies in our strategic posture can be removed only by substantially increased defense expenditures . . . the deficiencies . . . will require successive additions on the order of \$3 billion each year for the next several fiscal years."

The report of the Gaither Committee, appointed by President Eisenhower in 1957 to survey national security problems, has never been declassified. But its cochairman, Robert C. Sprague, testifying before the

Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery on February 24, 1960, said: "We seem to have accepted a policy limitation that we are not going to put more than about \$40 billion a year into our military effort. In 1957, when the Soviet GNP was \$20 billion less than it is now, their effort approximately equaled ours."

"There is no solid basis to argue that the Soviet economy will not continue to grow at its present rate. We cannot assume that they won't continue to plow at least 25 percent of their GNP into military effort as they have been doing for the past 8 to 9 years. And they will still have enough left to meet minimum domestic needs and wage economic warfare abroad."

"If, for the 10 years ending in 1967, Russia continues to increase her military position by 6.5 percent per year—while ours remains fixed at \$40 billion per year—then we will obviously fall far behind in relative military strength. . . . We are using less than 10 percent of our gross national product for all national security purposes, and the percentage is declining. Per capita disposable income—the amount we have left after paying taxes—is at an alltime high of nearly \$1,900. It probably is \$1,900 this quarter. It has risen about \$325 (measured in 1958 prices) during the last decade. If we were to devote only one-tenth of this increase to national security purposes, it would permit an increase of more than \$5 billion per year in our program for national security."

Similarly, the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program, headed by William S. Draper, Jr., after a 9 months' review in 1959 emerged with the conclusion that, "Entirely aside from the threat of Communist aggression, the United States and other free nations face the challenge of the revolutionary insistence on progress by the hundreds of millions of people in the less-developed areas. In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

The reduction in funds for the military assistance programs in the present fiscal year, this group believed, "involves a serious security danger for the United States and for the free world," and implies "major deterioration of military strength in forward areas, and a clearly apparent withdrawal of effective support from many of our allies." To reverse the trend and maintain a posture "strong enough to support all our activities for world peace . . . the annual cost of the military portion, below which we should not go, is about \$2 billion." (The current rate of spending is \$1.8 billion, but the amount requested in the President's new budget is \$2 billion.)

On economic foreign aid, the Draper Committee said: "We cannot assure equal opportunity for all peoples, but we can, along with other prosperous nations, help find a way for all peoples to see opportunities ahead. For us not to do so would be contrary to our national tradition." Among a series of recommended revisions of the economic aid program (including more multilateral contributions) this Committee proposed increasing the rate of developmental lending, "starting in fiscal year 1961 at a rate of at least \$1 billion a year." (The President's budget proposes an allocation for the Development Loan Fund of \$700 million.)

EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION

Probably no domestic item on the national agenda has had more public consideration than means of improving the quality and the quantity of education in primary, secondary, and higher schools. A large population is an asset if it is skilled and civilized. In the year 1958-59, expenditures for public schools

totaled \$14.5 billion, or 3 percent of the gross national product. A doubling of the costs of public elementary and secondary school education in the 1960's has been foreseen by a White House Conference, a Rockefeller Report, a study under the chairmanship of MIT's James R. Killian, Jr. Adoption of the recommendations of the Conant Report on "The American High School Today" would more than double costs. Supporting figures are easy to come by: The Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report has issued a special "Analysis of the Rising Costs of Public Education;" the McGraw-Hill Book Co. has released its findings on "Financing Higher Education, 1960-70" and the Committee for Economic Development, its study on "Paying for Better Public Schools." Among organizations close to the school system, the National Education Association, the Educational Policies Commission, the U.S. Office of Education have all prepared either estimates or proposals.

At the moment, the expansion of educational facilities is too slow even to wipe out the current backlog of deficits. The Office of Education estimates that recent building only reduced the net classroom shortage from 142,300 in the fall of 1957 to 140,500 in the fall of 1958. At last December's session of the American Statistical Association, a staff member of the Office of Education indicated that over the 10-year period beginning in the autumn of 1959, new enrollments and obsolescence will require 610,000 new classrooms, at an average capital outlay for site, construction, equipment, etc., of \$40,000 each, or \$24.4 billion in all. If the national education bill is going to double, how much of the additional \$15.5 billion that must be found by the end of the decade will be obtainable by allocating to education the same percentage of a larger GNP, and how much must be obtained from moneys currently used in the form of consumer expenditures?

Controversy over what proportion of school funds should be provided by each of the levels of government complicates the question. At present, this is how schools are supported: 56 percent from local funds, 40 percent from State, and 4 percent from the Federal Government. But real property, the usual base for local taxation, now forms a much smaller proportion of national wealth than used to be the case; over recent years, the burden of school budgets has shifted increasingly from local to State governments. Arguments are similarly heard for assumption of a greater share of school costs by the Federal Government, arguments based in considerable part on the wide range of income from State to State, with the States that have the largest number of school-age children the ones that have fewer resources to invest in schooling.

Proposals for further Federal support vary widely, though practically all of them agree on the importance of maintaining the local control that has been a traditional feature of U.S. education. The CED says: "The national interest in good schools everywhere and the national interest in a decentralized school system are not irreconcilable. The combination of these two interests calls for the assumption of an important but limited responsibility by the Federal Government. This is a residual responsibility. It is to provide support to the extent necessary in situations where the decentralized system cannot provide good schools. . . . The clear and present need is for Federal financial assistance to the States that have extremely low personal incomes relative to the number of schoolchildren."

The specific recommendation of this group is that States whose current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance falls below 80 percent of the national average—

there were 11 such States in 1957-58, with more than a fifth of the Nation's children in their schools—should receive Federal grants based on a formula that takes into account the personal income per student of the State and the national ratio of school expenditures to personal income.

EXPENDITURES FOR THE AGED

Last year there were 15½ million Americans 65 years of age or older. Three-fifths of them had less than \$1,000 a year to live on. About 7 in 10 citizens over 65 are eligible for old-age benefits as retired workers or their dependents under the social security program. The retired workers benefits range from \$33 to \$119 a month, averaging around \$70. About 2 million other aged persons are not eligible for benefits and must rely on relief; their receipts average \$64.10.

Yet these citizens, whose income dives when they cease to be employed, are subject to a particularly costly set of unavoidable expenses. A recent national health survey showed that the annual number of days of restricted activity was 47.3 for those 65 and over, as against 17.43 for those under 65. Other studies show that in the 65-and-over group, some 11 persons per hundred are hospitalized during any given year, with their hospital stay averaging from 2 to 3 weeks. Yet of all the items in the consumers price index (which went up 20 percent in the years 1948-58), the cost of medical care rose fastest—it soared 43 percent. So the need of the aged for more income, particularly to cover medical care, is acute.

State committees are now holding hearings preparatory to the White House Conference on the Aging scheduled for 1961. At the same time, insurance groups are considering incentives to persuade more individuals to save during their earning years—such savings would provide investment funds and so contribute to enlarging the economy at the same time that they would narrow the drop in income on retirement. The availability of variable payment annuities to hedge against inflation is a new development in this connection. The Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and the Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has likewise been taking testimony in all regions of the country, in sessions that permitted a number of citizens and citizens' groups to register proposals, many of them for housing and medical care.

The building of more facilities was strongly urged. For many elderly invalids, nursing home care would be quite as adequate as a bed in an expensively equipped general hospital. The case has also been put for inexpensive living quarters constructed with a view to the disabilities of the elderly, whether interspersed with other housing or concentrated in retirement villages, and housing combined with custodial care. Federal financing of private construction under the FHA formula; public housing; broadening of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act to include the building of facilities designed for the aged have all been advocated.

Comparably extensive testimony has been heard on the financing of the medical care: through including medical benefits in the Social Security Act as currently proposed in the Forand bill; through wider coverage under private plans organized either by medical associations, insurance companies, or special bodies; through institutional provisions for group insurance by corporations, unions, associations, with postretirement features.

The old-age assistance program, being a cooperative program in which initiative is taken by the State governments with the Federal Government matching their funds under an agreed formula, varies markedly from State to State, with each State having its own standards of minimum living costs. The medium estimate is that a man living alone in rented quarters needs \$89.50 a

month. But many State standards are deplorably low, and some even of the low ones are not met because of lack of legislative appropriations. Of the \$3.251 billion annually spent on public assistance of all sorts in this country, \$1.794 billion goes to the aged.

The Advisory Council on Public Assistance, a citizens group established under the 1958 amendment to the Social Security Act to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stressed in a January 1960 report that at the end of 1958 a 5.7-percent increase in assistance payments would have been necessary just to meet existing cost standards:

Recipients' monthly requirements.....	\$215,525,000
Recipients' own income.....	50,174,000
Deficiency.....	165,351,000
Assistance payments.....	156,458,000
Shortage.....	8,893,000

This same group declared: "The estimates suggest that the amount of unmet need in the old-age assistance and aid to dependent children programs ranges from about half a billion dollars to about \$1 billion."

EXPENDITURES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES

A year ago, the final report of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems contained a paragraph which, with the simple transposition of place names, could serve as a description of most of the 168 standard metropolitan areas of the country, areas which in April 1959, contained approximately 57.5 percent of the American people: "Its population is pressing against the limits of such natural resources as water supply. Its growth outstrips the capacity of existing sewage disposal plants. Where growth is most rapid, as at the suburban fringe, the shortage of Government facilities such as schools, highways, and parks is especially acute. With growing population has come territorial expansion into the metropolitan counties * * * and with the metropolitan explosion the decentralization of Government employment centers, retail trade and much other private business. The metropolitan expansion, coupled with fundamental changes in travel habits and transportation technology, has disorganized the older systems of mass transportation. * * * In the central city forces of social change have been accelerated by unprecedented migrations of population, the disorganization of residential neighborhoods, shifting land use, and the invasion of vehicles and parking facilities. The congestion and decay of the central city, the shortages and fiscal plight of the peripheral suburbs, the metropolitan transportation dilemma, and the dissipation of our natural resources are all parts of the same interrelated process of urban growth."

Some idea of the force of the pressures on U.S. cities is suggested by figures (and they already belong to the past) on the annual capital outlay of the five ranking metropolitan areas in 1950 and 1958.

	1950	1958
New York.....	\$435,000,000	\$532,400,000
Chicago.....	49,100,000	170,400,000
Los Angeles.....	104,800,000	128,500,000
Philadelphia.....	49,400,000	65,100,000
Detroit.....	43,100,000	53,000,000

Curbside estimates of the cost of carrying out all the needed metropolitan improvements across the country, over the coming 40-year period, range from \$60 to \$120 billion. The looseness of this estimate is in great part due to the new pattern's not having as yet jelled enough to make their requirements certain. For instance, shall their redesigned transportation systems be based

on rubber-borne transport, such as Los Angeles now has, or will a good many cities retain downtown centers so vigorous and so concentrated that mass transit by rail or subway will be needed? In Washington, D.C., the cost of workable mass transportation, including rail facilities, is estimated at \$500 million for the first step—and at about twice that figure for complete modernization. Yet, if Government policy should continue to disperse large centers of public employment over a 15 to 20 mile radius, the density of the requirements for mass transport might be reduced enough for motor expressways with limited lanes to do the job adequately.

In most States, planning groups are likewise working on the structure and cost of facilities that have to be mapped as requisite for larger-than-metropolitan areas. The Federal Government too is involved, usually on a matching-grant basis, in the solution of problems having interstate or national implications. No overall estimates exist with regard to anticipated costs, but budgets for some individual major expenditures are available. For instance, the 41,000 mile national system of interstate and defense highways, of which 90 percent of the cost is borne by the Federal Government, and on which work began in 1956 and will continue through 1972, was estimated to require an expenditure of some \$40 billion for completion. On 555,000 miles of secondary roads, and on 219,000 further miles of primary roads, Federal funds are available to the States on a 50-50 matching basis. Expenditures for such projects as prevention of stream pollution, development of river navigation, dams, public power, recreation areas, many of which are also on a Federal-State or Federal-local basis, vary greatly from year to year.

The private citizens group, Resources for the Future, is currently making estimates of the country's position over the years to the end of this century, ranging from the supply of water to the supply of outdoor recreational areas. Estimates made by this group in its forthcoming *Energy in the American Economy, 1850-1975*, shows the following changes in energy requirements over 20 years. Advance planning is clearly mandatory if such quantities are to be available:

Energy consumption, by source, 1955 and estimated 1975

	1955	1975	Percentage change, 1955-75
Bituminous coal (million tons).....	431	754	+74.9
Anthracite (million tons).....	20	14	-30.0
Oil and NGL (million barrels).....	3,034	5,923	+95.2
Natural gas (billion cubic feet).....	9,614	19,881	+106.8
Hydropower (billion kilowatt-hours).....	120	265	+120.8
Consumed as electricity (billion kilowatt-hours).....	633	1,966	+210.6

ALLOCATION OF THE GNP

At current levels of taxation, the best rise in the gross national product that the country is likely to get will not bring in enough funds to do what must be done. Recent testimony before congressional committees by informed citizens on the inadequacy of the present arms program has accepted and indeed assumed the necessity of more taxes.

The growth rate of the economy is very relevant not only to the amount of further taxation that will be necessary, but to the amount of economic control that will be required. In an economy that is growing too slowly, strict Government allocation measures would be required to obtain for public purposes an amount of the GNP adequate to carry necessary programs; in an economy that is being pushed at forced draft, as in war-

time, controls are necessary both to allocate and to put a lid on inflationary pressures. In the current view of many economists, a growth rate of between 4 and 5 percent would give us the additional resources which would ease the tax burden, and at the same time not generate pressures requiring the controls. But at a 4- to 5-percent rate, some transfer of resources from personal consumption through individual spending to resources for public spending—more taxes, that is—will be necessary if the quality of American life which most Americans want is going to be available to them and their children. It is a simple but central point. Until the general public gets the point, few politicians will have the courage to say: This is the price of progress and security—and it is the people who must pay the bill. Are the people incapable of responding favorably to such candor? No one can know until the appeal is made. But it cannot be assumed in advance that the electorate will reject the argument that its current level of spending on immediate, short-term personal satisfactions must be curtailed in the interest of the kind of national agenda whose main items have been reviewed above.

The editors of the New Republic believe that Americans both recognize, and have a contempt for, a "boondoggle" when they see one, whether it be publicly or privately financed. That contempt has nowhere been better expressed than in the remarks of Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, before Senator Jackson's Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, February 23: "I had found frills in the military departments objectionable in my time. I had in some fashion, perhaps unfairly, attributed those very largely to Government. But I do not think that they are. . . ."

"As I returned to civilian life . . . I found the most extraordinary examples of what seems to me to be a deterioration in either our national sense of proportion or our national sense of humor. . . . If anything else were needed in my case, I received for Christmas a small tool about the size in its grip of an electric battery used in a flashlight, and then it had a rod that stuck out and a loop on the end of it and a button. This was a drink stirrer, a portable drink stirrer. . . . That was one of three that I have added to my collection. I have two others. One is a foam rubber, electrically driven finger for use in massaging the gums. . . . The third . . . is a motor-driven, portable electric dry-cell manicure burr with six attachments. . . . If those things represent the amount of time and effort which I think any miniature production does, then I feel reasonably sure that there is excess engineering talent, time, and productive capacity to do those things which have a greater importance to us nationally."

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

"As I understand an economy, its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."—Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, January 27, 1958.

In 1958, Americans spent about \$293 billion on items of personal consumption. Here is where the money went:

	Million
Food and tobacco	\$82,980
Clothing, accessories, jewelry	31,459
Personal care	4,255
Housing	38,001
Household operation	41,809
Medical care and death expenses	17,826
Personal business	16,550
Transportation	33,607
Recreation	16,973
Private education and research	8,428
Religious and welfare activities	3,939
Foreign travel and remittances	2,629

Individual items in the above included:

	Million
Alcoholic beverages	\$9,210
Tobacco products	6,376
Toilet articles and preparations	2,351
Barbershops, beauty parlors, and baths	1,904
New cars	11,525
Kitchen and other household appliances	4,405
Radio and TV receivers, records, and musical instruments	3,098
Nondurable toys and sport supplies	2,195
Jewelry and watches	1,937

"The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."—CIA Director Allen W. Dulles, before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, November 13, 1959.

Judge John Keogh, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a true Connecticut pioneer, that rare combination of leader and humanist, Judge John Keogh, Sr., died a few days ago at his home in Norwalk. Few men have left as indelible a mark on their communities as this sturdy campaigner for improvements, dedicated servant of the courts and leader of men. For more than 50 years, he made the law his practice, serving as defense counsel, city attorney, city court judge, and referee in bankruptcy. His approach to problems of those he represented before the bench or those upon whom he was to pass judgment was always tempered by a deep humanism. Many young lawyers got their start in his law offices; among these the late U.S. Senator Brien McMahon. Some of his many achievements are noted in this fitting editorial tribute from the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour of March 7, 1960, which I include under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

JUDGE JOHN KEOGH, SR.

The passing of Judge John Keogh, Sr., leaves a void in Norwalk which will be hard to fill. Judge Keogh had spent a lifetime in promoting the best interests of the community.

A practicing attorney for more than half a century, Judge Keogh devoted most of the spare time in his busy life in working for the adoption of projects for the betterment of the city.

Way back in the early 1900's, Judge Keogh successfully campaigned for the replacement of the old wooden Washington Street Bridge across the Norwalk River with a concrete, modern structure which is still in use.

He was serving as attorney for the old city of South Norwalk when the consolidation of the twin cities, Norwalk and South Norwalk, and the East Norwalk Fire District was first discussed. He became secretary of the committee, favoring consolidation and he worked hard in a bitter campaign until consolidation was approved by the general assembly.

In the law profession, Judge Keogh was looked upon as a lawyer's lawyer. He was wise in the law, and was recognized for his human approach to business problems. He

maintained strong judicial respect for his fairness when he presided as referee in bankruptcy, appointed by Federal Judges Carroll C. Hincks and Edwin S. Thomas.

Judge Keogh was also active in securing for the city beach rights at Calf Pasture and he also worked for the acquisition of the Matthews' property, now Veterans' Memorial Park for Norwalk.

A veteran of World War I in which he was a captain, Judge Keogh was one of the organizers of the Frank C. Godfrey Post, American Legion, and he was its first commander. During all of his busy life, he helped to promote the interests of the post.

Yes, the passing of Judge Keogh leaves a vacancy in the ranks of Norwalkers working for the good of the community and that vacancy will be hard to fill.

The Real Castro—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the fourth in a series of articles on the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro. This series, written by Joseph Martin and Phil Santora, is currently appearing in the New York Daily News and this installment is from the issue of March 9, 1960:

HIS MUSCLE IS ALL IN LEFTWING

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

In a little more than a year, the Communists in Cuba have gained control of the armed forces, have thoroughly infiltrated the labor movement and agriculture and taken over the national bank. Through the Ministry of Education, they have embarked on a program designed to brainwash the children and encourage them to tattle on their parents.

So marked has been their animosity toward religion—the teaching of which has been ordered suspended in public schools—that a nun recently wrote her brother in Miami, telling him that she and her sisters were secretly allowing their hair to grow against the day "when we may be forced to flee the country."

Who are the Reds directing this totalitarian barrage? Salvador Diaz-Verson knows them better than anyone else.

Diaz-Verson, now exiled with his family to Miami was in charge of the intelligence service under President Carlos Prío Socarras from 1948 to 1952. He was chief of the national police in 1933, when he sided with Fulgencio Batista against the Machado regime.

He has spent 32 of his 55 years as a fighter against communism. His records, containing the intimate histories of more than 250,000 Reds and fellow travelers in Latin and South America, were confiscated by Fidel Castro's boys within 3 weeks after the revolutionists took Havana.

GIVES THE LOWDOWN ON CUBA'S RED SETUP

Here's where Diaz-Verson knows about the Red regime. The information he supplied has been checked with other sources.

Dr. Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado, currently president of the Cuban Republic: As a student at Havana, he was a leftist. He became attorney for the Communist faction in his native Cienfuegos and was secretary to Dr. Juan Marinello Vidaurreta, then presi-

dent of the Popular Socialist Party (the name for the Communist Party in Cuba). Diaz-Verson once had him arrested as a Communist.

Raul Castro, now minister of defense: Unlike Fidel, he liked to write about his Communist activities. At the time Raul was studying in Prague, Czechoslovakia, some of his letters were intercepted by Diaz-Verson and made part of his official files.

Raul has made numerous trips behind the Iron Curtain, visiting Moscow and spending months in satellite countries. He is bitterly anti-United States and possibly the bloodiest member of the revolutionary brass, personally giving the coup de grace to more than 30 executed prisoners.

PROFESSIONAL COMMIE HEADS NATIONAL BANK

Dr. Ernesto (Che) Guevara was born in Argentina and has made a career of agitation in Latin and South America. He is a professional Communist and now heads the National Bank of Cuba. He is close behind Castro in the government and is president of the ICEA—Cuban Institute for the Stabilization of Sugar. He is one of the leaders of the military forces at the Cabana Fortress in Havana.

El Che, as Guevara is known among Cubans, has been a fervent critic of the United States since he first became involved in Latin-American politics a dozen years ago. During recent speeches, he has said that "what the government of Eisenhower has done to the countries of Latin America will not be repeated in the case of Cuba."

During his last trip to Red China, El Che presented the policy of the Cuban government as one of the extreme left, assuring the Reds that Cuba would ultimately adopt a system similar to Tito's in Yugoslavia.

EL CHE IS THE HEIR TO CASTRO'S POSITION

There are increasing reports of friction among the big three—Fidel, Raul, and El Che. A top intelligence agency observes that Castro, a mere child in politics as compared to the veteran Communist from the Argentine, is fretting over the tremendous power being grabbed by Che Guevara.

Should Castro meet an untimely end, there is little doubt that El Che would take over the Cuban Government.

Dr. Ruiz de Zarata, minister of health, is a well-known Communist leader who worked for the Reds in Cienfuegos. A few months ago, he publicly bragged that "there is no doubt that the Communists are in first place in Cuba."

Osmani Cienfuegos, minister of public works, is a brother of still missing Camillo Cienfuegos, ex-head of the army. His present job was given him as a sort of sop by Castro to offset criticism directed against the regime as a result of Camillo's disappearance. Osmani was known as a leftist student leader at Havana. He has visited Prague twice and Red China to obtain "ideas" for his country.

THIRD MAN IN LINE IS IMPORTANT RED

Dr. Augusto Martinez Sanchez, minister of labor, was a Communist leader in the city of Holguin, in Oriente Province. He was one of the first to establish contact with the rebels in the Sierra Maestra and became a link between the Communist Party and the 25th of July movement.

Dr. Raul Roa, minister of state, was a close friend and confidant of Julio Antonio Mella, the noted international Communist, while a student at Havana University. Together, they formed the Anti-Imperialistic League there. He is recognized as an internationally important Communist.

Roa is right behind El Che and Raul as a pretender to the Fidel Castro throne. Potentially, he is one of the most dangerous Reds in the Cabinet.

Raul Cepero Bonilla, minister of commerce, is a member of the Cuban Commu-

nist Party and an outspoken sympathizer of communism.

Armando Hart, minister of education, is an attorney from a highly respected Cuban family. His father, Enrique Hart, is still a judge in Cuba. Hart is married to Haldee Santamaria, the rabid Red who took part in the Moncada attack. There is little doubt that she influenced Armando into joining the Communist Party. She was a member and he did not join until after their marriage.

Dr. Gustavo Alderregui, the Cuban Ambassador to Yugoslavia, is one of the oldest members of the regime—63. He is officially known as the founder of the Communist Party in Cuba.

Silvino Sorehigui, the Ambassador to Honduras, is the author of articles against American "imperialism" and for many years has been a Communist Party member.

Ambassador Extraordinary Harol Gradmage is a known member of the party and was once a columnist for Hoy, the Red newspaper suppressed during the Batista regime but now allowed to publish.

Throughout the island, youth brigades composed of youngsters in the 12 to 16-year category, are being organized. Their mission is to watch their neighbors, families and friends for any evidence of defection. Cuban newspapers frequently carry items about persons being arrested on information supplied by these youngsters.

Their reward is having their pictures published in Hoy and Revolucion, the two Red newspapers, and being called forward to be recognized as heroes at meetings.

Farmers, including women, are carrying rifles and pistols, ostensibly to guard their fields against saboteurs. Actually, they have been placed under the jurisdiction of the army and can be shot for disobeying a "military command" if they don't bear arms against the enemies of the revolution.

RAIDERS SEIZED FILES ON 250,000 REDS

Diaz-Verson was president of the Inter-American Organization of Anti-Communist Newspapersmen, which boasted almost 900 members in Latin and South America and has offices in Lima, Peru.

On January 24, 1959, just 3 weeks after Castro came to power, a dozen men broke down the door of Diaz-Verson's private office at 558 G Street, in the Vedado section of Havana. They bound and gagged Vicente Blaco, 41, the watchman, and removed the records of Communists and supporters that Diaz-Verson had so painstakingly collected for three decades.

Diaz-Verson said: "I publicly accused Che Guevara of masterminding the robbery, but I never got an answer. Two days later, on January 26, as I was leaving the offices of the Excelsior, where I was managing editor, I was confronted by Julio F. Escalona, Luis Mas Martin and Alfredo Guevara—all three well-known Reds.

"They were all carrying tommyguns and they told me, 'Listen, if you go on publishing accusations, it will cost you your life.'"

Diaz-Verson appealed to a journalistic group to which he belonged—the National Guild of Newspapersmen—and they asked the government on January 29 to give them guarantees that Diaz-Verson would not be molested. The request was refused and the next evening Diaz-Verson left by boat for Key West.

FAMILY FOLLOWED HIM INTO FLORIDA EXILE

His wife, Metodia, 38, two daughters, Silvia, 10, and Lourdes, 6, as well as Salvador Jr., 8, joined him 2 weeks later.

"Everyone tends to excuse Fidel Castro as a sort of impish boy on the grounds that pressure is being put on him from Red members of his regime," says Diaz-Verson. "Granted, some pressure is on him—but a great deal of what goes on is attributable to Fidel alone. He is a product of his background."

Preceding articles in this series have described what Fidel was like at Havana University, his peculiar behavior during the Moncada raid, his alliance with Spanish Communist Alberto Bayo in Mexico, and the invasion of Oriente, as well as the Bogota incident.

His hatred for the United States dates from before those incidents. His father, Angel, fought against the United States during the Spanish-American War and there is no doubt his sons inherited his dislike for this country.

Don Angel became a sort of feudal lord in Cueto, a small town in Oriente. He ran a large sugar plantation and was the owner of a good-sized department store. He was known as a sharp trader.

He insisted on doing business in cash so that, salesmen later charged, he could send his hired hands to rob the visiting drummers as they left Cueto.

Fidel grew up, then, as the son of a feudal landlord. Later, he was sent to Belian, a Jesuit school, for primary education. He grew up fast—with many of his father's less admirable habits ingrained in him.

When Don Angel died, he left his estate to the boys and to his second wife, the woman who had been a servant in his household. Ramon Castro bought out Fidel's share—and must have been somewhat astonished when Fidel later issued a grandiose statement, asserting that "his" farm was being tossed in to the agrarian reform kitty. It wasn't his to toss.

Mama Castro, on the other hand, armed herself with a shotgun and threatened to shoot anyone who set foot on her land.

While still a freshman at Havana, Fidel tried to organize a confederation of all schools—universities and high schools. The planned organization would have had more than 100,000 members and would have given him tremendous power—enough to overthrow any regime.

The plan fell through, and Castro was forced to wait for the power he coveted.

RAUL LAID LOW AND STUDIED MARX

During those years, little was heard of brother Raul, who rather quietly set about learning his Marxist doctrines.

As brothers, they differ in that Raul is a blind instrument and happy to be that. He is a perfectly disciplined Red agent, like Che Guevara.

Fidel is a Marxist because his philosophy employs any means to justify the end he has in sight. He firmly believes that he is using his fellow Communists. In reality, they are using him.

On one occasion, while still in the mountains, he was asked to renounce the Reds who were helping him. The request was made by the Catholic Church.

Fidel refused, saying that he needed Red backing to win. It wasn't until he took over that the prelates who had been in touch with him realized that Fidel wasn't just playing ball with the Communists, that he was really one of them.

The Reverend Ramon O'Farrill, one of those who originally helped Fidel and the revolutionary movement, said, raising his right hand in a solemn oath: "On my honor as a priest, Fidel Castro is a Communist."

Is the FCC Becoming a Captive Agency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, our so-called independent regulatory agencies

should not become captive agencies of the industries they are supposed to regulate in the public interest. One of these commissions—the FCC—has been very much in the news recently and, regretfully, the news has been most unfavorable. Chairman John C. Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission, after repeatedly denying to the press that he had accepted extensive hospitality from the owner of a large chain of radio and television stations, admitted before a congressional investigating committee that he did indeed accept this hospitality.

He then tried to brush off his 6 nights aboard a broadcaster's luxury yacht and his plane trip on his host's private plane to and from Florida as just a social engagement. It is unfortunate that the Chairman of a great agency, created to regulate an important industry in the public interest, would allow this Commission to become a captive agency of the industry to be regulated.

Conservative newspapers are calling for Mr. Doerfer's resignation and have pointed out that his actions make "his own position, as Chairman, untenable."

The lead editorial in the March 7, 1960, edition of the Nashville Banner states that Mr. Doerfer "has painted himself into a corner from which there is no possibility of graceful exit."

An editorial of the same date in the Washington Evening Star says that the Chairman "has been less than impressive or persuasive in defending his acceptance of George B. Storer's hospitality."

Mr. Speaker, these editorials speak for themselves and under unanimous consent I include them in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Nashville Banner]

AN UNTENABLE POSITION: FCC HEAD DOERFER PAINTS HIMSELF INTO CORNER

In accepting the hospitality of an owner of a radio-television chain, Federal Communications Commission Chairman John C. Doerfer has painted himself into a corner from which there is no possibility of graceful exit. All the explanations he has advanced cannot alter the fact that he has stultified the work of his agency, regardless of his assurances that the whole business thus disclosed was open and above-board.

There cannot be a set of double-standards—one to fit the industry supervised and administered by the public official or officials in the case, and the other to fit the administrators.

The FCC, in addition to awarding of frequencies and/or channels, is charged with policing the radio-television industry. This responsibility includes investigation into charges that certain radio diskjockeys have accepted payola for plugging phonograph records.

Mr. Doerfer has told a congressional subcommittee that his 6-day visit aboard a yacht owned by radio-TV magnate George B. Storer was just a "social engagement." He added that his "conscience is clear."

Both Mr. Doerfer's and Mr. Storer's motives may well have been beyond reproach. To date there has been no evidence that Mr. Doerfer granted any official favors or Mr. Storer sought any, but in the light of the payola revelations both are guilty of indiscretion.

Mr. Doerfer's injudicious acts places the Commission in a compromising position and makes his own position—as Chairman—untenable.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

MR. DOERFER'S BLIND SPOT

To put it mildly, Chairman John C. Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission has been less than impressive or persuasive in defending his acceptance of George B. Storer's hospitality.

The hospitality has taken the form of a vacation-bound ride on Mr. Storer's private plane, plus several days of pleasant living on his yacht in Florida. True, since the two men have been friendly for some years past, there certainly is nothing objectionable about this per se, but Mr. Storer—a respected businessman—happens to be the owner of 12 radio and television stations subject to the FCC's regulations.

Accordingly as head of the FCC, Mr. Doerfer seems to us to have shown exceedingly poor judgment, a blind spot, in socializing as he has with Mr. Storer, from whom he accepted similar hospitality in 1958. Although nothing in the law debar him from such camaraderie, he occupies a position in which a sense of the fitness of things ought to make him feel that he should maintain an arm's-length relationship—aloof and reserved, not intimate—with all broadcasters and telecasters who must do business from time to time with the Commission he heads as a sort of policeman patrolling the Nation's airways.

Mr. Doerfer apparently thinks otherwise. At any rate, in his appearance before the House subcommittee investigating the radio-TV field, he has declared, "My conscience is perfectly clear." And he has gone on to suggest that he feels free to hobnob with men like Mr. Storer as long as he regards them as friends and they have no business pending before his Commission.

This strikes us as a viewpoint betraying a certain obtuseness to the proprieties, a certain insensitivity that ill becomes anybody occupying a public office as important as the chairmanship of the FCC.

Castro's Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to the broad vision and wisdom of our great majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, that a newspaper of his home city, the Boston American, carried in its issue of Thursday, March 3, 1960, a leading editorial commending the majority leader's support of the proposal that the United States buy more sugar from the Philippines and less from Castro's Cuba. The editorial endorses Congressman McCORMACK's argument in which he points out that long ago under the provisions of the Sugar Act the Philippine quota was cut by a change to a fixed tonnage allotment. The editorial might well have reported further that Congressman McCORMACK has pointed out to us also that upon the revision of the Sugar Act in 1956 the Philippines alone of all foreign suppliers did not receive an increase in quota and that the President in signing the Sugar Act revision into law held out the promise that at the further revision of the law, which is before this

Congress, consideration would be given to an increase for the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the Boston American entitled "Castro's Sugar" appearing in the issue of March 3, 1960:

CASTRO'S SUGAR

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK wants the United States to buy more sugar from the Philippines, less from Castro's Cuba. We commend him for his campaign.

The Philippines are our ally, as the House majority leader points out, while the best that can be said of Castro's Cuba is that it's playing footsies with native and Russian Communists. Yet we buy Cuban sugar at an above-market bonus price.

There's more to Congressman McCORMACK's argument. He points out that long ago, in 1948, under provisions of the Sugar Act, the Philippines quota of sugar export to the United States was cut by about 3 percent by a change to fixed tonnage allotment. Up to that time the Philippines supplied a percentage of U.S. consumption rather than a fixed amount. Loss to the Philippine suppliers was gain to the Cubans. And the time has come to change this procedure.

A big country like ours cannot permit itself to be provoked into hasty and excessive retaliation against a small country like Cuba, and for this reason the administration has seemed irritatingly slow to many Americans in dealing with the open hostility of Castro's government.

But it is more than time that the turn-the-other-cheek attitude be ended. It is time for a firm assertion of our rights and dignity.

Under the present arrangement, as William Randolph Hearst, Jr., pointed out in "Editor's Report" in the Sunday Advertiser, Cuba gets a fixed quota of 96 percent of the difference between the estimated yearly basis needs of the United States and the fixed domestic and Philippines quota. The remaining 4 percent is allocated to other countries.

The 96 percent favor to Cuba would be questionable under any circumstances.

It is an economic absurdity in view of Castro's recent sugar-barter deal with Russia, his confiscation of American property, and the needs of other Latin American sugar-producing nations (such as Peru, Mexico, and Brazil) that are our friends.

A bill has been introduced in the House by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York Democrat, that would cut Cuba's quota by the amount it will export to Russia—1 million tons a year—and transfer it to other Latin American nations. A similar bill is sponsored in the Senate by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona Republican.

Not to be sugary about it, this bipartisan recognition of buying from our friends makes a great deal of sense. It ought to have administration backing and it ought to be enacted into law.

The Late Honorable Malcolm C. Tarver

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Judge Tarver

in a very close relationship in our work here in the Congress. When I first went on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, Judge Tarver, as we knew and loved him, was chairman of that committee. In the service that I have had in the Congress I have never known a brighter mind, a more energetic memory, a more tenacious worker for what he believed to be right.

We have had many outstanding Members of Congress in the years that I have been here, but Judge Tarver was one of those outstanding Members who set a fine example for the membership, one whom the Members could emulate, and one from whom practically any Member could learn.

His contributions through his own work and in his service in the Congress were outstanding. The effect he has had on Members who have served since then has been such as to add to the benefits he brought to the American Nation.

We hate to see him go. We extend our deepest sympathy to his loved ones who can take to themselves the comfort that he lived a full life and contributed his share during his days here through works that will redound to the benefit of all of us in the future.

Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Maryland sorrows at the passing of Herbert R. O'Connor. We all knew he had not been feeling well since an unfortunate train accident. Still, his sudden death at the age of 63 brought shock, deep sorrow, and a sense of great personal loss to the people throughout the State who have long made plain their affection for him. Our love and sympathy go out to Mrs. O'Connor and the members of his family in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

Herbert O'Connor was a man of outstanding legal ability and a dedicated public servant. I conceived an admiration for him early in political life. I felt the utmost confidence in his honesty, his leadership and outlook. I had a personal regard and affection for him which cannot be expressed adequately in words here today. As a former colleague, I have often been associated with him fighting for causes dear to his heart and to mine. The grief I felt at the news of his death summoned to my mind that I had not only lost a close friend but one with whom I shared the same philosophy of government.

Personal liberty and private enterprise were two of the prime factors which Herbert O'Connor believed we must protect if our country is not to follow a socialistic pattern. He believed this with all his heart and these factors mo-

tivated his actions in behalf of the people of his State and the Nation. In his long years of active and influential public service he pursued a single-minded policy—to guard and maintain our free way of life. He fought effectively for those freedoms which he felt have been our protection under the Constitution and which have made America the leading Nation of the world. He will long be remembered for these principles and for his leadership in the fight against subversive elements. Even after retiring from the Senate, he continued this fight and endeared himself in the hearts of the people of Maryland.

Herbert O'Connor was a devout Catholic and lived his faith. He has been referred to—and rightly so—as Maryland's best-known Catholic layman. He was a most able past chairman of the lay committees directing the Catholic charities appeal.

As Attorney General, Governor, and U.S. Senator, he rendered the citizens of his State and the Nation an invaluable service. Particularly, he distinguished himself locally and nationally as chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee and as chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

An inspired leader, eloquent speaker and an articulate writer, Herbert O'Connor had personal integrity, professional competence and sound judgment that commanded the highest respect in the U.S. Senate. He was the natural choice of that body to direct the activities being carried on by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. History will honor him for the brilliant and outstanding work he accomplished as chairman of these two highly important committees in their fight against the enemies of democracy. His devoted work in this field and his unrelenting fight against communism made him an invaluable contributor to the preservation of our American way of life.

Inside the Policy Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post magazine of March 8, 1960:

INSIDE THE POLICY RACKET—ARTICLE VIII
(By Ted Poston, with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Liberman and Richard Montague)

The multimillion-dollar shakedown racket which crooked cops operate for the protection of the numbers game is a major source of low morale in the police department.

As one authoritative source pointed out early in this newspaper's inquiry into the racket:

"How would you expect an ordinary policeman to feel about his job when he knows a fellow cop is knocking down three or four

times his basic salary by being on the pad (the approved list of protected policy spots)? "Take two chaps who come out of the police academy together. One, say, winds up on the Juvenile Aid Bureau. The other goes on a vice squad.

"The first may buckle down and do his best to perform his duties. He may even apply himself and earn promotion. But even if he makes sergeant or lieutenant and remains honest, he can't hope to approach the income of his fellow graduate who made the vice squad, even if that guy remains a plainclothesman.

"How long do you expect a man to remain honest under those circumstances?"

The Post investigation indicated that many policemen are forced to join the racket or be branded "finks" or "shooftys" by their grafting colleagues.

Take the experience of a sergeant who was transferred from a Bronx precinct to Harlem.

"This man had no connection with Sammy Schiltz' Bronx policy empire or with any of the other rackets in that borough," a Post source recalled. "So he immediately fell under suspicion when he was sent to the Harlem station.

"For the first week of his new duties in Harlem everybody gave him a wide berth. Then one day when he reported to work and opened his locker an unmarked white envelope fluttered to the floor. He opened it and pulled out a crisp \$100 bill.

"Flabbergasted, he turned around to see everybody watching him intently. He asked if anyone had accidentally put the envelope in his locker. No one said anything. They just sat there watching him.

"Finally, when he went through the station house seeking the bill's owner, a lieutenant snapped at him:

"Aw, put that money in your pocket and shut your yap. What the hell are you trying to pose as? A fink from the commissioner's office?"

One story widely known in the police department illustrates how law enforcement and discipline can actually break down when thieves fall out and the cops can't call the cops.

The story involves a plainclothes woman who was assigned to a geographic subdivision of a borough where vice squad cops were receiving an estimated \$300 a spot monthly from every "protected" policy location in the area.

DOUBLE SHARE

The woman, married to a policeman, immediately made guarded inquiries about the pad, and her "share," from her fellow officers in her new assignment.

She was assured that nothing like the pad existed and that there were no "shares" for anyone from the policy racket. But as the wife of a policeman she was not satisfied.

"If they think they're going to build a bridge over my nose," she told a veteran policy figure, "they've got another think coming. I'm going to get mine and I'll get it straight."

Armed with her badge, her service revolver and a quiet determination, the plainclothes woman began systematic visits to every grocery, tailor shop, bar or other protected "spot" in the area. And in each place, she stated her case bluntly.

"They tell me you're not on the pad," she said quietly, "but I know better. Now if you don't want all hell to break loose where you are concerned, you are going to take care of me, and my husband too. And if you think I'm giving, just try me."

The East Harlem Syndicate, which now controls most of the numbers spots in the area, was not as firmly established in its relationships with the cops then as it is now. So consternation flourished.

A man who followed the case closely told the Post the eventual outcome.

"She buffaloed them all," he said. "While her superiors and squad members were trying to figure out some way to cut her into the actual pad, which they had denied existed, she scared the spot operators so badly that they had to set up an individual pad for her. And she made them double the 'share' to include her husband, although he had never worked on policy or gambling."

"They got her money together weekly—not monthly as is the usual practice—and they turned it over to the owner of a night club where she picked it up regularly."

The case of the persevering plainclothes woman might have had a happy ending for her, except for one thing—

"She just couldn't stand prosperity," another source recalled. "She'd come into the night club to collect her pad, and then she'd have to run-'em-around-the-bar for everybody. In the process, she became very buddy-buddy with some pretty tough characters."

"One night she came into the club with (a prominent Washington policy baron) and her old man was in there waiting for her to collect and give him his taste. One thing led to another and she got mad and raised so much hell that the owner had to call the cops. They came and got her but they didn't take her to the station house."

The woman was taken around the corner to an empty hallway and held there until a higher police official arrived. Almost sober by then, the policewoman reportedly told this official:

"Go on and book me. Or bring me up on charges. And I'll blow the whistle on the whole pad."

OFF THE PAD

The next day she was back at her post as if nothing had happened.

But the story didn't end there.

Estranged from her husband, the woman cop established a liaison with a well-known confidence man who was working out a system to fleece the single action operators (small policy bankers who pay 8 to 1 on any of the three digits composing the day's official number, or 60 to 1 on "bolita" or combination of two of the three digits).

With the lush graft collected from her individual pad—she still collected for her husband, too, but had cut him out of the take—she helped buy a garage and filling station for her new love, plus extensive electronic equipment for the swindle he had devised.

The swindler planned to use the short-wave equipment to have a confederate flash him the first number after the third race totals at Hialeah, so that he could make last-minute sure bets on it with unsuspecting single action bankers.

The police got wind of the scheme, however, and tapped the swindler's phones. While seeking evidence against him, they heard many a torrid conversation between him and his plainclothes mistress.

Police raided the filling station and the swindler's home and confiscated the electronics equipment. Papers seized in the raid also established the policewoman as coowner of the filling station.

The swindler, since deceased, was arrested. And the plainclothes woman was called in for an all-night session of questioning. Again, she played the old record:

"You book me and I'll blow the top off the whole police department," she said. "You push me in a corner, and I'll tell the whole world who gets what, when, and how much."

They didn't book her.

But she didn't get off scot free this time. She was assigned to desk duty and paperwork, automatically cutting off her personal pad.

This woman's extraordinary feat was duplicated on a smaller scale in another area in another case unearthed by the Post investigation.

There a Negro plainclothesman was assigned to a morals squad unit, one of two Negroes "integrated" into the all-white outfit. In this case, the old hands couldn't deny the existence of the pad but the new men were told that only five "spots" were on it.

HE GOT HIS

The cop didn't believe it, of course. One by one, he proceeded to "knock over" protected policy spots in the area, while nabbing an occasional bookmaker on the side. In almost every case, the man arrested would complain:

"What're you trying to do? I'm on the pad."

And the cop would retort: "Whose pad? You ain't on mine. Nobody told me anything about you."

The retired numbers banker who told the Post this story chuckled at the recollection:

"That guy raised so much hell like that that before 3 months had passed they had to put him on the full pad for the squad. But they never forgave him, and a year or so later they busted him down to a foot cop in uniform. Which meant, of course, that he could never make plainclothes again."

"But the last time I saw him, he wasn't too unhappy, even though he was still pounding a beat."

"I got mine," he told me, "I'm just waiting to pack it in (retire)."

Post reporters uncovered similar cases during their 2-month investigation. One Harlem cynic summed it up neatly:

"When thieves fall out—in the police department—it doesn't necessarily follow that honest men will get their due."

James A. Adams, Late Dean of Wyoming Seminary Preparatory School, Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news story and an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Monday, March 7, 1960, as well as an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of the same date, that announce and comment upon the passing of the late dean of Wyoming Seminary Preparatory School, James A. Adams, who retired last year after serving for 23 years as dean of that institution and a total of 39 years as a member of the faculty. It was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Dean Adams as he was truly an outstanding educator and a fine gentleman. I know the graduates of Wyoming Seminary will be equally distressed to learn of his passing. It is said that the true measure of a teacher and educator is the mark made in later life by the students who passed through his classroom and were the recipients of his counseling. Using this as a yardstick and guideline, Dean Adams was eminently successful because many of his former students later became the leaders in the arts and professions, in busi-

ness and industry, and in many other important phases of our national life. The field of education has indeed lost an outstanding member and the district which I represent has lost a fine citizen. The news story and editorial follow:

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR EDUCATOR OF 45 YEARS TO BE HELD TODAY AT 3 IN HOLLYWOOD, FLA.

James Abram Adams, dean of Wyoming Seminary from 1936 until his retirement June 30, 1959, and a member of the faculty of that institution 39 years, died Friday night at his winter home in Hollywood, Fla. Word of his death was received locally by Dean J. Theodore Hughes.

Funeral services will be held today at 3 p.m. from a funeral home in Hollywood. Body will be flown to Bradford, Vt., for burial Thursday.

Mrs. Adams, wife of the deceased, and a nephew, Melvin Estey, and his wife will attend the burial services Thursday. Mrs. Adams then will return to her apartment in Wyoming.

One of the most popular administrators in the 116-year history of Wyoming Seminary, Dean Adams was an outstanding educator, devoting 45 years to the field of education.

A native of Orono, Maine, he was the son of hardy Scots-Irish parents and in spite of almost 40 years residence in Pennsylvania, he retained his habits of thought and manner of speech which reflected his New England background. Following graduation from the public schools of Orono, Dean Adams entered the University of Maine from which he received the degree of bachelor of science in mathematics in 1915.

In the years preceding participation of the United States in World War I, he served as principal of secondary schools in Exeter and Janesport, Maine, and as teacher of mathematics at the high school at Norwood, Mass.

When the United States entered World War I, Dean Adams left Norwood November 1, 1917, having enlisted in the Army. He was placed in a medical unit, trained in Camp Greenleaf at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., and then shipped overseas. He rose to the rank of top sergeant and had much of the responsibility of clearing the wounded as they were brought into the evacuation hospital for emergency treatment. After the armistice was signed, his unit was sent with the occupation army into Germany to serve as a post hospital in Mayen in the Rhineland where he remained until the spring of 1919.

Following his discharge in 1919, Dean Adams returned to teaching and accepted a position as submaster and teacher of mathematics at the high school in Biddeford. The following year, he came to Kingston where he had been employed as head of the mathematics department. His wife, the former Mildred Ordway, of Waterford, Maine, whom he married in Maine in 1919, accompanied him here.

When Dr. Levi L. Sprague died in 1936 and Dr. Wilbur H. Fleck moved from the dean's office to the presidency of the school, Dean Adams was elevated to the position in which he served 23 years. In that post, as second in command of the school, he had been responsible for the day-to-day administration of school affairs including most of the discipline problems.

Despite the many duties of the dean's office, Dean Adams continued to teach his highly regarded course in advanced mathematics. In addition, he had served as a member of the Board of Readers in Advanced Mathematics of the College Entrance Examination Board from 1927 to 1939. Continuing his pursuit of knowledge, Dean Adams took summer studies and the degree of master of arts was conferred on him by Columbia University in 1934.

A member of Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club and Wyoming Valley Torch Club, both of

which he had served as president, Dean Adams was also an active member of Kingston Methodist Church. With the presentation of the class of 1959 for commencement, Dean Adams had viewed the end of a parade of more than 5,000 students who passed through Wyoming Seminary during his tenure. Many of his former students have risen to positions of rank in Government or military service while others have become prominent in the professions. Among them are Pennsylvania State Supreme Court Justice Benjamin R. Jones, Luzerne County Orphans Court Judge Paul R. Selecky and retired Air Force Gen. Elwood R. (Pete) Quesada.

When Dean Adams arrived in Wyoming Valley in 1920, the school was just starting a period of building which reached a high point early in 1959 with completion of the new Wyoming Seminary gymnasium on North Maple Avenue. Among the other buildings the dean had seen rise on the campus are Sprague Hall, Carpenter Hall, Nesbitt Stadium and reconstruction of the dormitories on Sprague Avenue.

He and Mrs. Adams celebrated their 40th wedding anniversary in October, 1959. Together, the couple had visited the West Indies, Europe, the western United States, Alaska, and Canada.

Dean Adams also had been vice president of Wilkes-Barre Dinner Club, an organization which sponsored outstanding speakers in the field of current events.

Surviving in addition to his wife are a brother, George, Glens Falls, N.Y.; brother-in-law, Clarence Estey, Warwick, R.I.; niece, Phyllis Estey Philbrick, Warwick, and a nephew, Melvin.

JAMES A. ADAMS

After less than a year of retirement, James A. Adams, dean of Wyoming Seminary from 1936 to and well into 1959, has passed away. His retirement last July, after 39 years as a faculty member, caused profound regret and led to many expressions of appreciation of his high worth as an educator.

Woven into the character of Wyoming Seminary with its 116 years of history is the dedication of members of its staff and particularly those bearing the responsibility of providing leadership. Among the foremost was Dean Adams whose ability coupled with his integrity and depth of understanding enabled him to give service of the highest order.

It was with good reason personally that he was proud of the fact that as enrollment at the seminary climbed steadily upward, academic standards remained high. It was readily attested by associates that in no small part this maintenance of quality was due to the example he set and to his administration of the curriculum.

His good influence is a continuing force in the life of this community and in other places where seminary graduates are found, a circumstance enhanced by the parade of more than 5,000 students who passed through the seminary during his tenure as dean.

DEAN ADAMS

As a public-spirited citizen and dedicated member of the faculty of Wyoming Seminary for 39 years, 23 in the capacity of dean, James Adams, who retired last July and died in Florida over the week-end, made a considerable contribution to the betterment of this community as well as to the cause of education.

When he came here after the First World War, it was in the quest of experience at the onset of his career. He intended to stay for 2 years, but so impressed was he with Dr. L. L. Sprague, seminary's venerable president, that he decided to cast his lot with Wyoming Valley and devote his time and talents to the west side institution. It was

a decision neither he nor the community had any occasion to regret, for he found satisfaction in his work and greater Wilkes-Barre was delighted to acquire the services of an educator of his caliber permanently.

More than 5,000 students, many of them prominent in public life today, came under his jurisdiction. The list includes such familiar figures as Justice Benjamin R. Jones of the State Supreme Court, Judge Paul R. Selecky of the Orphans Court of Luzerne County, General Elwood Quesada, Dr. Charles N. Burns, Dr. Jacob Hyman, Dr. Eric Faigle, dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Syracuse University, Dr. Joseph Donchess, chief surgeon for the United States Steel Corp. Hospital at Gary, Ind., and Dr. Ralph Decker, former president of Wyoming Seminary.

Throughout life, Dean Adams retained the character of his New England forebears. His zeal and enthusiasm were matched by his integrity and ability. He was an able administrator as well as an outstanding teacher. His only master was duty. He was an understanding friend, as well as mentor, to his charges, winning their confidence and commanding their respect. A warm personality was not the least of his assets.

Dean Adams believed in the youth of America and his boys and girls at Wyoming Seminary fully justified that confidence. They never let him down.

Department of Justice Announces Indictment of Electric Manufacturers Charging Conspiracy of Price Fixing, Rigged Bidding, and Contract Allocations—Raising Costs of Federal Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Attorney General of the United States announced that a Federal Grand Jury has returned three indictments against several manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment, charging them with violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. These indictments describe the extraordinary means taken and methods used by these companies to monopolize and to divide among themselves the business of supplying electrical equipment to utilities purchased by the Government; namely, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the U.S. Air Force, the Navy, and the General Services Administration. These indictments of conspiracy to raise prices and allocate sales also suggest why the cost of Federal power projects has been increasing in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, we hear many complaints about the increase in the size of the national budget and we are daily exhorted to effect economies in Government operations. The American people have every right to be disturbed by the revelations that Federal agencies have been forced to pay excessive prices because of the price rigging and competi-

tion-destroying tactics described in these indictments—an old fashioned conspiracy of around-the-clock contract allocations.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the news release of the Department of Justice of February 16 about these indictments. The news release follows:

Attorney General William P. Rogers announced today that a Federal grand jury sitting in Philadelphia returned three indictments charging General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co., Federal Pacific Electric Co., and 18 individuals from these companies, with violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act in connection with the sale and distribution of various heavy electrical products.

The indictments returned today involved (1) power switchgear assemblies, (2) oil and air circuit breakers, and (3) low-voltage power circuit breakers—all are used in the generation, conversion, transmission and distribution of electric energy. These products are sold to various Federal, State and local governmental agencies throughout the United States as well as to electric utility companies and private concerns. Industry sales of these products, covered by the indictments, mount up to \$209 million each year.

Named as defendants in the power switchgear indictment were:

General Electric Co., New York, N.Y.; and George E. Burens, vice president and general manager, switchgear and control division; Lewis J. Burger, general manager, switchgear and control division; Clarence E. Burke, general manager, high voltage switchgear department; N. F. Hentschel, general manager, medium voltage switchgear department; Frank E. Stehlik, general manager, low voltage switchgear department; G. R. Fink, product sales manager, medium voltage switchgear department; and Houston Jones, manager, draw-out and load center sales subsection, low voltage switchgear department.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Landon Fuller, assistant general manager, East Pittsburgh division; J. T. Thompson, sales manager, assembled switchgear and devices department; and A. W. Payne, sales manager, assembled switchgear and unit equipment section, assembled switchgear and devices department.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., West Allis, Wis.; and L. W. Long, assistant general manager, power equipment division; David W. Webb, manager, switchgear department, power equipment division; and Frank M. Nolan, manager of sales, switchgear assemblies and unit substations, power equipment division.

I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Federal Pacific Electric Co., Newark, N.J.

This indictment charged that at least as early as 1956 the defendants conspired "(a) to fix and maintain prices, terms, and conditions for the sale of power switchgear assemblies; (b) to allocate among themselves the business of supplying power switchgear assemblies to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; (c) to submit noncompetitive, collusive, and rigged bids for supplying power switchgear assemblies to electric utility companies, Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, private industrial corporations and contractors throughout the United States; (d) to refrain from selling certain types of power switchgear assemblies or components thereof to other manufacturers of electrical equipment; and (e) to raise the prices of certain types of components purchased by nondefendant manufacturers of electrical equipment for

use by them in power switchgear assemblies to be sold in competition with defendant manufacturers, so as to eliminate and suppress competition from them."

The second indictment relating to oil and air circuit breakers named as defendants the following:

General Electric Co., New York, N.Y.; and Clarence E. Burke, general manager, High Voltage Switchgear Department; Royce C. Crawford, manager-marketing, High Voltage Switchgear Department; and William H. Schiek, manager, Power Circuit Breaker Sales, High Voltage Switchgear Department.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and J. W. Stirling, manager, Power Circuit Breaker Department.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., West Allis, Wis.; and L. W. Long, assistant general manager, Power Equipment Division.

I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Federal Pacific Electric Co., Newark, N.J.

This indictment charged that at least as early as 1951, the defendants conspired "(a) to fix and maintain prices, terms, and conditions for the sale of circuit breakers; (b) to allocate among themselves the business of supplying circuit breakers to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; (c) to submit noncompetitive, collusive, and rigged bids for supplying circuit breakers to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; and (d) to submit noncompetitive, collusive, and rigged price quotations for supplying circuit breakers to electric utility companies."

The third indictment concerning low-voltage power circuit breakers named the following as defendants:

General Electric Co., New York, N.Y.; and Frank E. Stehlik, general manager, low-voltage switchgear department; and R. W. Ayres, Jr., manager, air circuit breaker, fuse and accessory sales subsection, low-voltage switchgear department.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and J. T. Thompson, sales manager, assembled switchgear and devices department; and W. T. Pyle, sales manager, switchgear devices section, assembled switchgear and devices department; and I-T-E Circuit Breaker Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

According to this indictment, the defendants, at least as early as 1956, conspired "to fix and maintain prices, terms, and conditions for the sale of low-voltage power circuit breakers."

The indictment, for one example, relating to power switchgear sets forth the various actions taken by the defendants to carry out the alleged conspiracy. In addition to various meetings held throughout the country to discuss prices, the indictment charges that defendants met on at least 35 occasions from November 1958 to October 1959 to allocate bids to governmental agencies so as to provide each manufacturer with an agreed-upon percentage of the sealed-bid market, as follows: General Electric, 39 percent; Westinghouse, 35 percent; I-T-E Circuit Breaker, 11 percent; Allis-Chalmers, 8 percent; and Federal Pacific, 7 percent. At these meetings, according to the indictment, the defendants "would then discuss particular future bid invitations and designate which manufacturer should submit the lowest bid therefor, the amount of such bid, and the amount of the bid to be submitted by others." With respect to bids to public utilities and other purchasers, the indictment charged that defendants used a formula, designated as "phase of the moon," under which "through cyclic rotating positioning inherent in the formula, one defendant manufacturer would quote the low price, others would

quote intermediate prices, and another would quote the high price," and "these positions would be periodically rotated among the manufacturers."

Similar allocation methods were employed with respect to oil and air circuit breakers, according to that indictment. In addition to price-fixing meetings, the indictment charges that defendants in this case met on at least nine occasions between December 1958 and September 1959 to allocate bids to governmental agencies according to the following percentage shares agreed upon: General Electric, 40.3 percent; Westinghouse, 31.3 percent; Federal Pacific, 15.6 percent; Allis-Chalmers, 8.8 percent; and I-T-E Circuit Breaker, 4 percent. According to the indictment, "at these periodic meetings, a cumulative list of sealed bid business secured by all of the defendant manufacturers was circulated, and the representatives present would compare the relative standing of each company according to its agreed upon percentage of the total sales pursuant to sealed bids." Then, they would "discuss particular future bid invitations and designate which manufacturer should submit the lowest bid therefor." The indictment goes on to charge that "the manufacturer designated to receive a particular sale would then declare the price at which it intended to bid" or would later "notify the other representatives" of the "specific figure which he would quote on the bid invitation," and the other manufacturers would submit higher bids.

Two of the indictments allege that in the course of communications among defendants, "various procedures were adopted for the purpose of avoiding detection," one of which was the use of a "code number" for each manufacturer "in such communications either as the sole identification of the sender or in conjunction with the use of the first name of its representative."

As a result of these alleged conspiracies, the indictments charge that price competition has been eliminated in the sale and distribution of these products, and that various governmental agencies "have been denied the right to receive competitive sealed bids" and "have been forced to pay high, artificially fixed prices" for the products. Such agencies include Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, and General Services Administration.

Companion civil actions were also filed today charging the defendant companies with violations of the Sherman Act, and seeking injunctive relief against the various practices alleged. The prayers for relief in these suits seek to require the companies to issue new price lists based upon costs independently arrived at, to submit affidavits of noncollusion with future bids to governmental agencies, and to prevent any communications among the defendants with respect to future bids and price quotations.

Robert A. Bicks, Acting Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, in commenting on these cases, stated:

"These indictments and civil actions are the first in a series of proceedings arising out of the Department's extensive grand jury investigation into all phases of the heavy electrical equipment industry. The investigation is continuing into other phases which involve products of significance to industry and national defense."

These cases were prepared by William L. Maher, Chief of the Philadelphia Office of the Antitrust Division, under the general supervision of Baddia J. Rashid, Chief of the Trial Section of the Division, and assisted by Donald G. Balthis and Morton M. Fine, attorneys in the Philadelphia office.

Law Observance Exhibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the dedication ceremonies of the law observance exhibit, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association, Philadelphia chapter, on February 29, 1960, included the remarks of the chairman, Harry D. Shargel, Esq., of the law observance committee. These remarks and the description of the exhibits are very interesting and should be read by every Member, particularly because they illustrate the aphorism, "The law protects you; respect it, uphold it, obey it."

The remarks of Mr. Shargel follow:

REMARKS BY HARRY D. SHARGEL, CHAIRMAN, LAW OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 29, 1960

The Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter) through its law observance committee is engaged in a campaign to promote respect for law and legal processes on an everyday, year-round basis. Our program is designed to stress the value of law in a civilized society in an effort to prevent delinquency among both adults and juveniles.

The law observance committee includes representatives of law enforcement agencies, the offices of the United States and Philadelphia prosecuting attorneys, the United States and local judiciary and the U.S. Congress.

We have established a speakers subcommittee which furnishes qualified speakers to groups and organizations. Through the courtesy of the Display Corp. of America which supplied posters, and the Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia, which supplied the space, large signs have been appearing in the rear of taxicabs reading: "The law protects you; respect it, uphold it, obey it." The program has already received national attention by way of remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As the result of our activities, similar programs are being organized in other cities by local chapters of the Federal Bar Association.

Today, through the generosity of the Philadelphia National Bank we have arranged a display which depicts activities of the Philadelphia Police Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the postal inspectors and Treasury enforcement agencies including alcohol and tobacco tax, narcotics and Secret Service. This is the first time that such a joint exhibit has even been presented.

These agencies have joined hands in a program of crime prevention to make the public better aware of the functions they perform. The law enforcement agencies of the Nation can adequately protect the public only if they receive the cooperation of the public. Respect for law and observance of the laws are essential to the preservation of America's cherished freedoms.

We solicit the cooperation of organizations, firms and individuals in the furtherance of our program to promote respect for law and legal processes. You are invited to examine the exhibits and to furnish comments and suggestions for additional methods for promoting our objectives.

DESCRIPTION OF EXHIBITS

Federal Bureau of Investigation

The FBI exhibit depicts in graphic fashion the history, investigative jurisdiction, service functions, and geographical coverage of this agency. Emphasis is placed on the work of the modern FBI as it is best known to the public, following the appointment in 1924 of J. Edgar Hoover as its Director. There are photographs of the leading figures of the gangster era of the early and mid-thirties when a series of notorious killers and hoodlums were captured and killed by Special Agents of the FBI. With its present organizational set-up covering all fifty of the United States, the FBI can have a representative at the scene of a crime within one hour. There are photographs of FBI training procedures and data regarding the Bureau's high standards for selection and investigation of its personnel. Emphasis is placed sharply on the guiding principles that the FBI is at all times concerned with the maintenance of individual rights; that it is a fact-finding agency which does not evaluate information nor issue clearances; and that to the FBI the proof of guilt is no more important than the establishment of innocence. Throughout the exhibit, from the dramatic display of the 10 most wanted fugitives through the admonitions as to what the individual can do to fight communism and preserve America, emphasis is placed on the fact that the FBI is dependent upon all citizens of our country for the information which enables it to safeguard our national security.

Postal inspector

An exhibit furnished by the Bureau of the Chief Inspector, Post Office Department, portrays the history of the Postal Inspection Service, beginning with its inception in 1787 when Ben Franklin was first appointed by the British Colonial Postmaster General as postmaster of Philadelphia and given the additional duties of "regulating the several post offices and bringing the postmasters to account."

The display shows an outline of functions, and graphically portrays the general areas of investigations by three-dimensional exhibits of typical cases: Post office burglaries, holdups of mail custodians, stolen, and forged negotiable paper, bombs, and poison sent through the mails, extortion, and poison-pen letters, the vast direct mail selling pornography, and innumerable fraudulent schemes by unscrupulous promoters.

U.S. Treasury enforcement agencies

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax

The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit has prepared a dramatic exhibit of machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and automatic firearms regulated by the Federal and National Firearms Act.

Bureau of Narcotics

In view of our great national concern with narcotics traffic and addiction, the Bureau of Narcotics has supplied specimens of drugs and implements used in connection with narcotics addiction.

Secret Service

The Secret Service has furnished actual plates and molds used by counterfeiters, together with examples of their finished products.

Police Department, Philadelphia

Rounding out the highlights of law enforcement as portrayed in the exhibits of the Federal agencies, there is a traffic accident display by the Philadelphia Police Department. This is designed to emphasize the sometimes neglected fact that no aspect of law observance touches more lives each day than the use of motor vehicles. Instead of an exhibit of smashed cars and bloody heads, the traffic display is dramatized by a facsimile

ile traffic standard with its blinking green light, flanked by charts showing 1959 accident totals by day of the week and for each hour of the day. In 1959, motor vehicle accidents cost the United States 37,750 lives, 1,350,000 serious injuries, \$5½ billion. The Philadelphia toll in 1959 was 162 lives, 11,839 persons injured. It is hoped that the remainder of this display will help to reduce these figures in 1960.

Hon. Herbert R. O'Connor

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I rise to join my colleagues in the Maryland delegation to pay final tribute to former Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, Sr.

His recent death has deprived the State of Maryland of one of its most illustrious sons and distinguished citizens. I feel a deep sense of personal loss, and I join with my colleagues in expressing our most sincere sympathy to his wife and family.

Senator O'Connor leaves behind him a wonderful legacy of service to his country, his State, and the city of Baltimore. He also leaves behind the warming image of a man who throughout his busy eventful life set an example that all of us might well follow. This in some measure alleviates the sorrow that his family and his host of friends feel because of his untimely death.

Senator O'Connor throughout his life enjoyed the respect, the affection, and the esteem of the people of Maryland as few men have in the political history of our State. This respect and affection was demonstrated time and again throughout his meteoric rise through the various stages of his political career.

In 1921, he was appointed assistant State's attorney in Baltimore. This began a career in public life, which is without parallel in Maryland. From 1923 to 1924, he served as peoples counsel before the Public Service Commission. In 1924, at age 27, he became Baltimore's youngest State's attorney. He served in that capacity for 10 years during which time his vigor and skill as a prosecutor brought him great praise and national recognition. In 1934, he was elected attorney general of Maryland. In 1937, he was honored by being elected president of the National Association of Attorneys General.

In 1939, Herbert O'Connor was elected Governor of the State of Maryland, and in 1942, at the annual meeting of the Council of State Governors, he was elected president of that body. He was re-elected Governor in 1942. He will be remembered as one of Maryland's truly great Governors. During this term as Governor, many long overdue fiscal and judicial reforms were effected. In 1946, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served once again with distinction.

He was always vigorous in his devotion to Maryland's interests.

It was my privilege to know Senator O'Connor well. As a young man in political life, I called upon him for advice and counsel. He was always willing to give freely of his time.

The State of Maryland has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. His wife and family have lost a devoted husband and father. I have lost a true friend.

George Huddleston, Sr.

SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of George Huddleston, Sr., is mourned by all who knew and loved this former outstanding Congressman from Alabama.

I am sure one of the greatest moments in the full and active life of Congressman Huddleston was November 2, 1954, when his son, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., was elected to the 84th Congress from the Ninth Alabama District.

The Honorable GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., is serving with great distinction, as a respected member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a devoted servant of the citizens of his district.

I wish to join his many friends in expressing to Congressman HUDDLESTON my sincere condolences and deep sympathy in the passing of his father.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, recalling one of the incidents in the illustrious life of the late Congressman Huddleston, Sr.

The editorial follows:

GEORGE HUDDLESTON, SR.

It isn't often that a distinguished lawmaker lives to see his son likewise attain distinction, but that happened in the case of the late George Huddleston, Sr., of the Ninth Alabama District, Birmingham, father of Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., now one of the leading men in the Congress of the United States.

The elder Huddleston, when a comparatively young man, possessed one of the finest minds of any man in Congress and was a man of great eloquence.

In his younger days he also was a pronounced liberal and had a tremendous following among the laboring classes of the Ninth District. One of the foremost opponents he had to overcome was the Reverend W. E. Dickinson, a once noted Alabama minister.

Dickinson enjoyed the support of the Birmingham News, then edited by the late Frank P. Glass, who was a classmate of Woodrow Wilson at Princeton. And when the campaign got very hot, he got Wilson to endorse Dickinson, who was to engage in a debate with Huddleston at Woodrow Wilson Park in Birmingham.

But it so happened that Huddleston's train from Washington was several hours late, and his supporters, who had gathered by the thousands at the park to hear his speech,

believed that Glass and his associates had used their influence to hold up the train.

The train finally arrived, however, and as soon as he came up the steps of the station, Huddleston was put in a cane-bottom chair and carried on the backs of his followers all the way from the station to Wilson Park.

Huddleston received a great ovation that night, and the train incident evidently had played a part in his eventual election over Dickinson, in spite of Woodrow Wilson's endorsement, which any seasoned politician should have recognized as a campaign blunder.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended the 13th national award luncheon of the Voice of Democracy annual broadcast scriptwriting contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association, and State Associations of Broadcasters, in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the Statler Hotel here in the Nation's Capital.

This contest is a nationwide competition for high school students. Each contestant is asked to speak on the theme "I speak for Democracy." Each speaker was given the opportunity to present his or her individual views of what democracy means. There were 51 high school students present, one from each State and one from the District of Columbia.

I was very proud that Miss Janice Dwyer, a young lady from my congressional district, was the champion of the State of Massachusetts. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Fred D. Dwyer, 5 Newell Road, Wakefield, Mass., and a fine student at the Academy of Our Lady of Nazareth, one of the outstanding secondary schools in our State. Miss Dwyer competed with 133 high school students from cities and towns throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and her essay was judged the best submitted in the State. Miss Dwyer certainly has a special message for everyone who lives in a democracy and who would like to be able to define the system under which we live to as many people as possible. The essay which won Massachusetts honors for Miss Dwyer follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Janice Dwyer, Wakefield, Mass.)

Probably we have all heard the story of the millionaire who stood on a busy street corner trying to sell \$5 bills for a dollar. He didn't have much luck. That's because we Americans are skeptical of the value of something for nothing.

And yet every American is given a free gift the moment he comes into the world—the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the four freedoms. They might not be neatly gift-wrapped in a big box with a bow on top, but what greater gift could we ever receive?

Granted these freedoms were fought for and preserved by generations before us but to a teenager today, isn't that past history?

Are we not apt to take democracy for granted because it's so much a part of our everyday life? Just as a man doesn't give a thought to his arms until he loses one.

For myself, I have come to think about and appreciate democracy more since I met Peter last summer.

We met at a lake near Augusta, Maine. He was tall, 19, a caddy master for the summer at a nearby golf course, and he was also a Hungarian refugee.

His story didn't come out all at one time. He told me some of it at a dance, other parts while we sat in the swing on the porch, or walked down a dusty country road. But piecemeal his story unfolded.

His father was dead and he and his mother had lived in Budapest until October 1956. When he was 16, he had been selected to attend the Lenin-Marx Institute because of his fine scholastic record. He had been tabbed to be a good Communist leader of the future. But at the age of 17, Peter helped ignite a revolt—a revolt to gain freedoms about which Peter and his friends had been taught nothing—only what they felt down deep inside.

As Peter explained it, first came the whispers of discontent with close, trusted friends. Subjects were discussed that Peter had considered traitorous when they first rumbled through his mind. Then came frank discussions, then shouts, and finally outright rebellion.

Factory workers, schoolchildren, college students—all stormed into Budapest that October day. These desperate young people demanded much—withdrawal of Soviet occupation troops, free elections, freedom of speech and of religion.

That spark flamed into a fire and suddenly Peter and thousands like him tasted freedom for the first time in their lives.

They tasted freedom for 5 short days. Then came the tanks, the flame throwers, machineguns, street fighting, death, destruction, defeat.

While these Hungarian boys and girls my age were fighting Soviet tanks with nothing more than gasoline-filled coke bottles, I was enjoying my daily coke at the drugstore and having cider and donuts at Halloween parties.

"Hungary revolts" were just words spoken by a newscaster before I changed the station. But now I know what it all means.

Now when I open an American history book I don't see strange looking men in powdered wigs and pantaloons. I see young men like Peter fighting for the same freedoms, three centuries ago.

Yes, we are given democracy "free of charge," but it is as precious as life itself.

I speak for democracy; but in these troubled times, democracy speaks for itself.

Fishermen's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I often have heard it said that more Americans participate in the sport of fishing than engage in any other sport. If you are one of those who do, come to Washington State and get the biggest fishing thrill of all—that of

hooking and landing a big Pacific coast salmon.

The Washington State fisheries director recently reported that 821,814 salmon were landed by hook and line by sports fishermen last year. The salmon landed by sportsmen weighed an average of about 20 pounds each—more than 1,600,000 pounds—800 tons.

There are big salmon lurking in the waters of Washington State for you to hook. Come and get yours this year.

Awake America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the following letter from our beloved archbishop of Boston, Richard Cardinal Cushing, and the address by Norman Knight, president of the Yankee network, delivered on November 28, 1959, at the New Bedford Theater. I believe that all will find both most interesting reading:

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,

Brighton, Mass., March 4, 1960.

DEAR FRIENDS: We must never falter in our struggle against atheistic communism. Again and again, I have affirmed the crying need for every one in our great Nation to stand as one against this evil.

It is fortunate that here in New England we have leaders who give of their time, resources, and energies, to expose the Communist menace. In the forefronts of both New England and America itself is my close friend Norman Knight, who unceasingly places this problem ahead of all his other interests, business or social.

I hope you will take the time to read carefully what Norman spoke in New Bedford a short time past and reprinted for distribution to political, educational, business, and religious leaders.

With great respect and admiration for these and other courageous viewpoints that Norman has expressed, I write to you with the earnest hope that you will share these viewpoints and actively do all in your power to encourage great understanding of this massive menace and the danger which confronts all good people in America and throughout the world.

Let us work as though everything depended on us and pray as though everything depended upon God. The warfare in which we are engaged has been called a cold war, a psychological war and a political war. No matter what we call it, it is a struggle for survival. The goal is the minds of men. We can win if we keep one hand in God's hand and with the other work to preserve our freedom and the freedom of our Nation—under God.

Devotedly yours,

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

AWAKE, AMERICA

(By Norman Knight)

Thank you for being here tonight, and to all of you who have been here this week,

and who support and effectively work for those causes dear to us as Americans. There are so many of us who believe as good Americans and so few who do anything about it, you are in the front ranks of those who someday will be blessed by our children and by Almighty God for standing for America and standing up to communism.

Awake, America—from the grassroots, from every city, from every State—awaken to the dangers from without and from within.

We must insist that our leaders in Government stand up rigidly and uncompromisingly to communism.

When will we learn that a Communist promise is the word of the devil? When will we stop responding to Communist bluffs with invitations for negotiations where our fears are exploited? When will we become realists and start fighting in earnest, using our best brains, our full resources to seek victory in every arena in the world so that our democratic way of life shall finally win out over this bestial ballyhoo labeled communism?

When will we demand of our leaders that they stop playing the game of international politics as though it were a high school football game, replete with rules and umpires?

When will we as a nation face up to our responsibility as the only hope for a free world? When will we as individuals face up to our responsibility as Americans?

In dealing with communism we haven't made mistakes; oh, no, we've made colossal blunders.

Our greatest, undoubtedly, was our laxity in allowing Communists to infiltrate our Government, some of our educational institutions, and some of our important unions and businesses.

There have been many, many others—but our great shame is the stupidity coupled with good intentions that constantly brings our Government into naive negotiations with Russia wherein some of our officials display an incomprehensible innocence in assuming that a Communist has any intention of honoring the truth.

Only a few of us spoke against a Khrushchev visit to this country. It wasn't that the rest of the country was in favor of the visit; no, not at all, it was that they took no stand.

Khrushchev was the killer sent to the Ukraine in 1937 by Stalin when he invited all the members of the Ukrainian Government to a dinner and later disposed of most of his "guests" in the cellars of the Kiev and Moscow secret police. Two years after the arrival of the Soviet boss, we are told by Gene Lyons, the Reader's Digest senior editor and an acknowledged, competent foe of communism, 400,000 Russians had been liquidated.

Again, in 1943, Khrushchev was sent to the Ukraine where he committed a purge more bloodthirsty, more horrifying than the first.

This is the Communist who crushed the Hungarian revolution with tanks, who enslaved thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters and who ordered that the top freedom fighter, General Maletier, be summoned to a fake conference under a flag of truce and murdered him. Later, he ordered that Nagy be lured from the Yugoslav Embassy, and had him imprisoned and later executed.

Why can't we realize that this arrogant dictator and any other who follows him in the Communist orbit is the same, or worse than Stalin or Hitler?

Khrushchev doesn't really want a showdown, although we must be prepared for it at all times. No question about that—our goal should be perfection of a thorough retaliatory power so that the Soviets may rattle their missiles all they wish as long as they know that even a push button Russian rocket of flawless accuracy will bring swift retaliatory destruction to their native lands.

We must comprehend the fact that Russia has not won its greatest victories by war, that during the period when communism grew in strength to where it now encompasses almost a billion people, the free world had an overwhelming military superiority and a monopoly of nuclear power.

What then is the Communist advantage? I call on Gene Lyons' testimony and make reference to it herein when he testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities last September 4 and pointed out that their real advantages are not military, but political and psychological.

Why can't we be like the gentle Quaker, who hearing a strange noise in his house one night, got up and discovered a burglar at work.

So he went and got his gun, then came back and stood quietly in the doorway.

"Friend," he said, "I would do thee no harm for the world, but thee standest where I am about to shoot."

We must set the standard, we must lead.

We must stop defending positions; we must attack communism with every political and psychological weapon at our disposal and let them know we're not bluffing.

We have a right to expect some of our leaders in whom we have entrusted our future to substitute boldness and strength in areas where, saddening as the truth is, they previously operated with some degree of naivete and weakness.

When we invited Khrushchev to these shores we only added prestige to the Communist effort.

Communist propaganda has already taken advantage of this symbol of American weakness.

Inviting Khrushchev to America and giving him red carpet treatment is tantamount to a betrayal of the hopes of the enemies of communism everywhere * * * in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, certainly in Russia itself, and yes, even in this country.

Neither should our top leaders allow themselves to be the guests of butchers who hate us and everything for which we stand.

In plain talk * * * let's match communism's arrogance with a firm decisive policy of rugged competition that will put it on the defensive and create respect for America.

One night at a testimonial dinner in New York, Herbert Bayard Swope replied to numerous tributes with these words, "I cannot give you the formula for success, but I can give you the formula for failure—try to please everybody."

Let's stop trying to please everybody * * * least of all, Communists. Let's make it unprofitable to be a Communist. Let's set a strict no-trade policy with Communist nations; let's be absolutely rigid in this regard. Let's be tough and let's be strong wherever and whenever we meet communism. Let's only please our friends, at home and abroad.

And let's start right here at home in honoring those educators, communications people, religious leaders, businessmen, scientists, and others who promulgate American traditions, and who fearlessly fight Communist ideology. Let's make it difficult for those who object to being patriotic, or who refuse to sign non-Communist affidavits regardless of their hanky-panky reasons for so doing, or, for any businessmen who can't take even a minute to worry about the system that makes their profits possible, or for those union leaders who are unmindful of America's welfare, or for anyone anywhere, who thinks that this Nation can survive when selfishness and greed are substituted for pride, dedication, and strength.

What an opportunity we missed in Hungary. When we sent a film crew there in 1956 it was tragic to report the sorrow and total bewilderment of these gallant people, while we sat as observers and watched Russia slaughter their best.

John Donne once wrote: "No man is an island unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent * * * a part of the main."

"Every man's death diminishes me because I am involved in all mankind."

"Therefore, send not to learn for whom the bell tolls * * * it tolls for thee."

And I shall not forget the thought of the wise man of Athens when he was asked when injustice would be abolished. He said, "When those who are not wronged feel as indignant as those who are."

We should not only have been indignant about Hungary * * * we should have been mad, real mad * * * mad enough to make Russia stay out. I think our people were mad * * * apparently, the men who direct our policies did not properly gauge the emotions of the American people and they failed to take prompt, significant action.

It is good for America that J. Edgar Hoover chose the FBI as his lifework. His service to America is monumental, but how wonderful it would be if this courageous, dedicated, understanding man were placed in a position where he could direct his total energies against the Communist menace throughout the world as well as within our own borders. Why is it that his thorough understanding of the Communist conspiracy and his recognition of it as a worldwide entanglement sworn to world domination, is so lacking in so many other men in high positions—or if recognized, why are their actions so weak as contrasted with Mr. Hoover's? Again, I urge you to request extra copies of Mr. Hoover's "What You Can Do To Fight Communism" which can be obtained free from the FBI and circulate them everywhere. More important, seek every effort to support the aggressive patriotic activities that Mr. Hoover directs, often against great odds, and make sure that he is supported in every direction. Most of all, let's pray God, one and all, that our leaders in America who direct foreign and domestic policy, will, by association with Mr. Hoover in Washington, have some of his zeal, knowledge, and realism rub off on them.

In the forefront of our fight is our own Cardinal Cushing who has dedicated so much of his time and his resources to this problem. Members of all faiths, Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant, have great admiration for the effective actions of this great prince of the church.

We should never forget that communism is atheistic—it is anti-Catholic, it is anti-Semitic and it is anti-Protestant as well. No religious faith can breathe freely as long as communism seeks to dominate the world. There are no exceptions to Communist tyranny.

My mention of J. Edgar Hoover and Richard Cardinal Cushing does not detract from the work of others who have done much—it is only that I would hope by these statements to again indicate to everyone these great examples, one on the national scene and one in New England, so that all of us can be inspired to find equal satisfaction in similar dedication.

It is good for America that there are people and organizations who place greater values on the welfare of our Nation than they do on their personal comforts.

Such people are here tonight in New Bedford, and such organization is The American Heritage Committee. All of these men and women who have organized and spearheaded the work of The American Heritage Committee deserve more than thanks—they deserve duplication of their efforts by other people throughout this Nation. These people work not for personal gain, only for national pride and an American concept of fearless resistance to tyranny in any form. They, and all of us who have espoused the need for appreciation of our American heritage, disregard as unimportant the praise

of well-meaning people. Instead, we need, as never before in our history, the best efforts of our best men in business, in science, in Government, in education, in communications—and of women and children, too—everywhere in this great Nation.

Why must it be that only a few in each field (1) speak and act forthrightly for greater knowledge of our priceless assets, (2) defend those persons and public officials who continue to serve our communities and our Nation courageously even though maligned by the Communists and the fellow thinkers, and (3) themselves take time from their families, from their means of livelihood, from their personal comforts to work for America first.

It is time we used every means at our command to make it fashionable, profitable, praiseworthy, and essential for all Americans to be as dedicated to this country as were our Founding Fathers * * * to love all fellow Americans who live as good citizens of God and of Nation, to proudly exhibit a fierce patriotism, to elect public officials who are honest, fearless, uncompromising foes of communism and who in every way will place America's welfare above personal gain.

Our elected officials in high office should never be concerned with personal health or comfort—they control the future of 180 million Americans and the entire free world and they should work night and day, giving of themselves for this great Nation, if need be, sacrificing their lives while in office because this present test is greater than any war, more critical than any crisis in American history.

Perhaps our problem is that we take things for granted. Maybe each time we breed a new generation we breed a greater desire for comforts and luxuries. Maybe we stress too many artificial means of recreation * * * too many specialized courses in school that do not involve work. Perhaps we're just becoming plain soft * * * it might even be that we don't have enough first generation Americans * * * people who have seen how miserable life is in most other parts of the world so that they can truly appreciate America.

It might be well for every one of us to remember that each of us * * * every one except the Indian among us * * * is an immigrant or descended from immigrants and to take heed of the credo inscribed over the door of LaGuardia House in New York: "It is better America should be born in the man than that the man be born in America."

Lenten Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 8, 1960]

THE INCIDENT THAT GAVE ME AN APPRECIATION OF THE BIBLE

(By Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army)

From my earliest recollection, the Bible had a prominent place in my boyhood home. Appreciation of the Bible as a true and reliable source of guidance for everyday living was fundamental as the necessity of air and food.

My widowed mother read to my two brothers and me from her well-worn Bible, and

implanted in us the Biblical truth that the highest wisdom is obedience to the voice of God.

Among her favorite passages was the 91st Psalm: "I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and strength: My God, in Him will I trust." Upon this Biblical foundation she built her own life and the lives of her three sons.

Armed with this shield of faith, she faced the untimely death of our father with courage, and worked long hours to hold her family together.

It was the 91st Psalm that was marked on my exchange of letters throughout the battles of World War I. It was that great Psalm to which that same Bible was opened when I took the oath of office as Michigan's 32d Governor. And it was the 91st Psalm that was read by the chaplain when I took my oath as Secretary of the Army.

Needless to say, the knowledge my mother implanted in me as a boy that in God's word are straightforward answers to all human problems, and her own example, have been a constant source of inspiration to me through the years.

The Real Castro—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the fifth in a series of articles on Fidel Castro now appearing in the New York Daily News. This installation is from the issue of March 10, 1960:

KILLED PRIEST'S FAITH IN FIDEL

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

"He could see in my face that I was bringing bad news. I started talking about religion, about the life after life. He began weeping and hugged me like a child. Then, feverishly, he began to put his cell in order."

Father Juan Ramon O'Farrill has heard the last whispered confessions of at least 15 men sent to the wall to face Castro firing squads. He has accompanied the condemned along the last mile of dark corridors, trying to soothe their troubled minds with mere words, reciting the Litany up to the moment when his words were drowned out in the rattle of gunfire.

The experience has scarred him—even more so than the executions conducted by former dictator Fulgencio Batista, because Father O'Farrill is one of many men who believed that Fidel Castro was the answer to Cuba's problems.

He has been thoroughly disillusioned. He has seen men condemned to die with little or no evidence of guilt against them. He has seen prisoners suffer cruel mental tortures in sadistic execution rehearsals.

He says of Castro, whom he once followed: "Fidel is a magician, a master of simulation, of pretense. He says one thing today and the opposite tomorrow. He is a great actor. His ego has no limits and his cruelty has no limits. Compared to him, Batista was a benevolent man."

STREET NAMED FOR GRANDFATHER

The 5-foot-6, brown-haired, brown-eyed priest was born on O'Farrill Street in Havana 43 years ago. The street is named for his grandfather, who fought with Jose Marti in the war against Spain. The little priest's

father, also Juan Ramon O'Farrill, was a distinguished officer in the Cuban Army.

He was educated in Cuba and Paris and ordained in 1945 in the Province of Cienfuegos.

During the Batista regime, Father O'Farrill was accused of secreting arms for Castro. He was taken into custody by the infamous Capt. Esteban Ventura, of the fifth precinct, and brutally beaten. Ventura's men smashed his ribs with rifle butts and partly destroyed the hearing in his left ear during a 9-hour grilling.

The youthful-looking cleric was forced into exile in Miami. On January 6, 1959, a few days after Castro's successful revolt, he obtained permission to go back to Cuba and visit the prisons to console and bring spiritual peace to the prisoners.

"The Castro people thought I would obtain evidence against Batista followers," said Father O'Farrill, "but I refused to use my priest's robes for such purposes. My visits to the cells of the condemned, the kangaroo courts that passed capricious judgment on political prisoners, the cruelties and the utter disregard for human life and human rights sickened me."

SADISTIC JOKES ON CONDEMNED MEN

"The Fidelistas became masters of the sadistic tricks. One of these was to tell condemned men they had been pardoned, that the president had signed their release from prison. While they were still rejoicing over the good news, an American, Herman Marks, would show up and tell them they were doomed to die."

Herman Marks is typical of the Castro regime—the group that ironically came into power because Cubans were sick of being subjected to Batista's butcheries.

His police record includes 32 arrests on charges ranging from drunkenness, vagrancy, and assault to auto theft, draft dodging, and rape. Born in Milwaukee, Marks cut quite a criminal path for himself. In 1938, he escaped from a Wisconsin reform school. In 1946, he got away from an Ohio jail and in 1950 from a California industrial farm.

He did 3½ years in the Wisconsin State Prison for raping a 17-year-old girl. Warden John C. Burke remembers him as "a real stinker."

The 38-year-old soldier of fortune has a flair for the dramatic. On his left arm he wears a tattooed double heart inscribed, "Love, Nellie." On his right arm is an 8-inch snake coiled about a dagger stuck through the top of a skull with a motto, "Death before dishonor."

MILWAUKEE BOY MAKES GOOD AS EXECUTIONER

And death is what Herman Marks has been dealing in; he has given the "ready, aim, fire" orders to more than 200 firing squads. He joined the Castro forces in the Sierra Maestra in December 1957 and has admitted executing as many as 11 men in a single night. He lost his job as executioner recently and was transferred to an obscure post in a rural province.

"Many times, in the final moment of truth, the condemned pleaded their innocence," recalls Father O'Farrill, "but these last words cannot be told, nor can all of the men be identified, because of the sacredness of the confessional. But there are some I can talk about."

Reinaldo Baro Merodio, for instance.

Reinaldo was 22, one of the hundreds of Batista soldiers thrown into jail by Castro after the successful revolt. Castro had promised Gen. Eulogio Cantillo, head of the Batista forces, that he would not prosecute soldiers unless they had committed crimes of terrorism.

He ratified this promise in a speech in Santiago de Cuba on January 1, 1959. He repeated it in a speech at Columbia Barracks on January 28. It turned out to be a

clear-cut betrayal; he was in this way able to win over the army.

"Reinaldo's only crime was that he had been a soldier, and at his age not a soldier for very long," said Father O'Farrill.

"His trial was conducted at night. I asked to be present and permission was denied. At 2:30 a.m. the trial was adjourned and he was taken to his cell. I presumed it would go on the next day and was about to leave when I overheard a group of officers say, 'Che Guevara has given a personal order that Reinaldo must be executed right now.'

PRIEST DOESN'T CARE IF THEY ARREST HIM

"I went to Duque Estrada, in charge of the tribunal, and asked him for the written sentence. He said the command came from El Che and what else did I need? He said there was nothing we could do. I asked permission to go to Reinaldo and break the news and give him absolution.

"He replied that he had no authorization to allow me in Reinaldo's cell. I told him he would have to arrest me if he wanted to keep me out and finally I was allowed to go.

"He (Reinaldo) could see in my face that I was bringing bad news. I started talking about religion, about the life after life. He began weeping and hugged me like a child. Then, feverishly, he began to put his cell in order.

"He gave his cellmate his belongings—a sheet, a towel, a bottle of medicine, shoes and shirts. It was May 4, about 3:45 a.m. It wasn't raining and the stars were out. He shook hands with the eight men in the adjoining cells and told them, 'I hope you have better luck than I did.'

"He left a gold watch for his mother. They had put handcuffs on him and now four bearded soldiers came for him. I walked by his side. Herman Marks was on the other side as we went down the dark corridors. The Cabana Fortress is a huge place and we had to take a car.

"Reinaldo had stopped crying and was quite composed at this point. I recited the Litany as we walked, then rode, to the execution yard—'Help of the Christians, refuge of sinners, mother of consolation, mother of mercy.'

"IF THIS CHRIST IS MADE OF STONE

"The beacon from Morro Castle was splashing light and in the car Reinaldo alone gave the answer to the Litany—'Pray for us.'

"We could see the huge Cristo de Havana in the rays of the beacon and I told Reinaldo that Christ is the only one who can penetrate the human soul—'take a look, Reinaldo.' He replied, 'For what, Father, if this Christ is made of stone it is useless—in a few minutes I'll present myself to the true Christ.'

"We stopped at the courtyard. The wall was stained with the blood of others who had gone to their deaths. The firing squad was ready. I had heard his confession and I asked him if he had any last words. He said: 'Padre, I forgive them and I only hope my blood is the last to be shed.'

"There was no blindfold. He stood there with his hands in handcuffs. I turned my face and didn't look again until I heard the shots. I turned just in time to see him jerk convulsively into the air. He fell with his face on the ground.

"Marks gave him the coup de grace."

Reinaldo was the last man Father O'Farrill ever visited in prison. Permission was withdrawn for the clergyman to console the prisoners and once again he was exiled to Miami.

On one occasion, before the Reinaldo incident, one of the political prisoners was taken out shortly before dawn, placed in front of the firing squad and "shot" in a mock execution in which blanks were used.

DESTROYED HIM—LITTLE BY LITTLE

"They might as well have used real bullets," said Father O'Farrill. "He was more dead than alive when they brought him back. Later, they really did execute him."

A sample of the mental torture undergone by the prisoners in the case of Col. Rogelio Sopo, a Navy physician. He had been acquitted by a revolutionary tribunal of having taken part in the Batista coup of 1952—but he was kept in jail.

"They destroyed him little by little," said Father O'Farrill. "I knew this man well. His conduct was above reproach. He was a dedicated doctor. He had studied in the United States.

"They kept him in a completely dark cell and they reversed his schedule so that he lost all track of time. His breakfast would be served at midnight. They would send guards to insult him, break his spirit.

"They would address him as Antonio Fernandez and kept repeating this until he almost believed he was Fernandez. Then they switched to other names. He lost all sense of time and self-identification.

"In 3 months, he lost 25 pounds. They wouldn't allow him to sleep—another Communist trick. Finally, he went against the religion that had been a great part of his life. On March 18, 1959, he leaped to his death from the roof of the Morro Prison."

The colonel's son, Edgar Sopo Granda, 20, lives in Miami with his mother, Josefina, 41, and a sister, Mariella. He still refuses to believe that his father was a suicide.

SON TOLD HIS DAD WOULD ROT IN JAIL

"I went to see Armando Lora, secretary of the Prime Minister," said young Sopo, "and he got in touch with Comdr. Juan Castineiras. When I got to Castineiras' office, he told me, 'Let him rot in jail.'

"He whipped a pamphlet my father had written, calling Castro a Communist, out of his desk and repeated the threat of letting my father rot in jail.

"Lora protested, 'You cannot do this. The man is free—acquitted. This man must be allowed his freedom.' Castineiras told him, 'This is none of your business.' That was that.

"I was allowed to see my father. He told me to take care of my mother and sister. I put my arms around him. His arm felt as thin as a boy's under my touch. I said, 'Fuerte, Papi'—(chin up, keep strong). I never saw him alive again."

Edgar Sopo treasures a snapshot his father once gave him. It says on the back, "To Edgar, my best friend, son of my heart, who will surpass me in everything."

"There were no witnesses to his death," he says, "and no one can tell me what my father—who was in solitary confinement—was doing on the roof of the prison. My father was a very devout man who said his rosary daily. He could not have committed suicide. Castro has eliminated others whom he did not like—my father is another of his victims."

The 110th Birthday of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, Founder and First President of Czechoslovakia

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, among the great men of this century Thomas Masaryk is assured a distinct and honored place. He was not only the greatest Czechoslovak statesman of modern times, but also great in his own right in a number of other fields: a distinguished man of letters, an illustrious philos-

opher, a great teacher, an eminent parliamentarian, an inspiring leader, a devoted public servant, a humanitarian, and an outspoken defender of freedom. These attainments made Masaryk widely known beyond the boundaries of his native land, and thus he became a man of international fame. His greatest and lasting accomplishments, however, were in the field of statesmanship, and there he ranked as equal among the very great men of his day. He is rightly credited with the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. And, besides becoming the founding father of that Republic and its first President, he was the beloved father of his country and the admired leader of his grateful countrymen during his long and fruitful life. On the 110th anniversary of the birth of this great man we pay tribute to his blessed memory.

ADA: Blueprint for Socialism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an analysis of ADA prepared by Mr. Kelvin Bailey who heads my research staff:

ADA: BLUEPRINT FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA

The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) program has been properly described as "a collectivist bill of goods . . . a program of laundered communism . . . with the Bill of Rights tacked on." And still another disclosure terms the ADA as "a group of leftwing Democrats who hope, as either the senior or junior partner of a labor alliance, to capture the Democratic Party and bring about a system which would amount to national socialism in America."¹ These serious statements are not reckless or politically inspired, instead they are warning signs of peril that, unless heeded, our country will be further guided down the avenue of darkness toward socialism. And communism is merely a practical application of socialism. The vehicle for this transition is the infamous ADA.

In 1942 the Committee on Un-American Activities disclosed a popular front organization known as the Union for Democratic Action. The committee found that 50 UDA leaders had Communist connections. Because so many liberals found themselves in the corner with the Communists and fellow travelling coterie in advancing their pet policies, a sort of purification rite became necessary, thus the ADA was created. This 1947 change-in-name-only ceremony carried with it at least 29 of the 50 leaders.² The ADA set out to prove that it is possible in America to be ultra-radical without being Communist, to advocate change in our politico-economic traditions without being disloyal. But their long honeymoon of frolicking in the Red mud with Communists and Sovietiers still left these fake liberals—this ADA—as hard-core troublemakers and crypto-Fabians which are collectivist in principle and unprincipled in politics.

Footnotes at end of speech.

American principles and ideals are being betrayed by subterfuge and deception. This betrayal of the American way of life is spearheaded by the ADA reactionary radicals masquerading as liberals. It is selling socialism under the guise of liberalism. It is practicing the greatest deception of our time. And unless their Trojan-horse methods are exposed and understood, America is doomed to be remade in the image of Marx.

The ADA is the planning body for the whole Socialist movement. Its propaganda is advanced in newspapers, radio, TV, magazines, and speeches. And like their English cousins, it never admits that it is selling socialism. It doubletalks about planned economy, social reforms, constitutional rights, civil liberties, and patriotism, while working for its ultimate goal: The replacement of the free-enterprise system with Marxian socialism. Meanwhile, of course, they fight for civil license for the leftwingers, ignore the civil liberty of rightwingers, wage psychological warfare against the anti-Socialist, and employ character assassination against the anti-Communist.

The ADA campaigns for higher taxes, more Government intervention through regulations and controls, expansion of Federal power over the States and individuals, rocketing subsidies forever for farmers and workers, and a telescoping bureaucracy—all in the name of liberalism. The ADA has perverted the word "liberalism" to mean "socialism." And we must never forget that a Socialist is nothing more than a housebroken Communist. A prominent Socialist affectionately said of the ADA: "The national program of the ADA is so close to that of the Socialist Party that the Socialist National Committee recently passed a resolution saying that membership in the ADA was politically compatible."³

On the key issues of our time, the ADA dramatizes its radicalism, or liberalism, by fighting against the exposure of Communists, against the Smith Act trials of top Communists, against loyalty programs, and against congressional investigations of Communists, but for investigation of the late Senator Joe McCarthy.

On foreign affairs, the ADA's views are singularly divorced from American thinking. During the Korean war the ADA was clamoring for relief aid to Red China, which was supplying the arms which killed American troops. They continually prate for recognizing the Communist government of Red China as a fact but agitating against aid to Spain, obviously not a fact. They trumpet for a superworld government. By creating fear, the ADA is trying to panic the American people into the acceptance of our cessation of nuclear testing and armaments. Meanwhile, and as expected, they join the Communists in denouncing our nuclear contribution in defense of West Germany. No mention is made of Russia's nuclear armaments surrounding West Germany.

The ADA loudly protests that it is anti-Communist. Its self-proclaimed great and heroic fight with communism has apparently been carried on in the belief that the really effective way to fight the Communist cause is to kill it with kindness. And since the ADA claims to be anti-Communist, let's look at the record:⁴

- (a) It opposed the Mundt bill to control communism in 1948.
- (b) It opposed the Communist control bill in Illinois in 1949.
- (c) It opposed the Communist control bill of 1950.
- (d) It opposed the Maryland Communist control bill in 1950.
- (e) It opposed the Smith Act in 1952.
- (f) It opposed military aid to Nationalist China.
- (g) It attempts to discredit the FBI.
- (h) It defended Communist student groups.

(i) It repeatedly attacks the House Un-American Activities Committee and urges that it be abolished.

(j) It urges the United States to withdraw recognition of Nationalist China, while plugging for Red China's admission into the U.N.

(k) It endorsed Truman's removal of General MacArthur.

(l) It defended the Institute of Pacific Relations (found to be an instrument of Soviet policy by a Senate committee).

(m) They condemn loyalty oaths.

(n) It called for an investigation of the American Legion.

(o) It opposed a bill to permit the FBI to tap telephone conversations of suspected Communists.

(p) It defended fifth-amendment teachers.

(q) It opposed a bill requiring Communists to testify.

One of the disconcerting things about the ADA is that it seems to attract so many prosperous people. Incongruously it combines big money, big labor (labor union contributions represent about one-third of the ADA budget⁵), and big names. Who supports the ADA? A few of their organizers and members are:⁶

(a) Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.: "The faults and injustice in our present system which make even freedom-loving Americans look wistfully to Russia."

(b) Eleanor Roosevelt: "Smearing good people like Alger Hiss is unforgivable."

(c) Joe Lash: officer of Communist front American Youth Congress.

(d) Francis Henson: "I'm a Marxist."

(e) Senator PAUL DOUGLAS: "I'm a Socialist."

(f) Telford Taylor: defended Communist Harry Bridges.

(g) Adlai Stevenson.

(h) Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

(i) Senator WAYNE MORSE.

(j) Walter P. Reuther.

The record makes it clear that the ADA now dominates the policy-forming levels of the Democratic Party. And locally, like COPE, their influence is effective. Mayor, and ADA'er, Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, says his recent victory over Harold Stassen was managed exclusively by ADA staff and volunteers.⁷ Nor is the Republican Party entirely free from the ADA menace. Governor McKeldin of Maryland warmly embraced the socialist ADA line with glowing terms, and even a White House staff member offered an apology, or token blessing, to the ADA.⁸

As a power-hungry, control-minded cell of intellectual radicals, they bear careful watching, especially this year, a major election year, since most of the presidential hopefuls are either officers, complete adherents, or favorably endorsed by the radicals at the ADA summit.

ADA, like COPE, has a single composite objective: to centralize political and economic power. They would have individuals give up much of their freedom and the States give up much of their sovereignty to the Federal Government which can easiest be controlled by a partnership of union bosses and Fabian liberal intellectuals, or apostles of the ADA.

³ Senate Republican policy committee report, Apr. 7, 1958.

⁴ (a) House Rept. 2277, 2d sess., 77th Cong.; (b) Los Angeles Times, Sept. 14, 1952.

⁵ Santa Ana Register, Oct. 30, 1954.

⁶ Santa Ana Register, Oct. 30, 1954.

⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1958, p. 10280.

⁸ (a) Santa Ana Register, Oct. 30, 1954;

(b) Hon. Kit Clardy speech, June 2, 1954.

⁹ ADA World, January 1960.

¹⁰ Washington Post, Sept. 27, 1954.

COPE: Control, Then Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an analysis of COPE prepared by Mr. Kelvin Bailey, who heads my research staff:

COPE: CONTROL, THEN DESTROY

Labor unions have been active in America since 1823, and their rocketing success (using the techniques of gangsters, Socialists, and Communists) continues unchecked because of their fanatical adherence to their basic reactionary premise: "We'll get from the company what we have the power to take."¹ Power, therefore, regardless of how achieved, is their revolutionary war cry. And the frightening truth is that today, 1960, the unions boast of their chokehold on America by asserting, for example: "I control Philadelphia. The union controls the country."²

Today the greatest concentrations of political and economic power in the United States are found—not in the overregulated, overcriticized, overinvestigated, and overtaxed business corporations—and certainly not in their hag-ridden, brow-beaten, publicity fearful managers. The greatest concentrations of political and economic power are found in the underregulated, undercriticized, underinvestigated, tax-exempt, and specially privileged labor organizations—and in their belligerent, aggressive, and far-too-often lawless and corrupt managers.³ Such is the stormy existence of the union's political mouthpiece, the treacherous COPE (Committee on Political Education).

COPE was uncorked in 1955. COPE grew, like cancer, out of CIO's political action committee which was conceived in 1943 under the tutelage of FDR's strong right arm, Sidney Hillman, long known for his radical left-wing views. Thus COPE became the concentration camp for unionism by means of which money could be siphoned away from the workers (without regard and consent as to disposition) for purposes of electing politicians who have no integrity whatsoever and will do whatever the unions ask. And what do unions and COPE demand? Anything at all that favors collectivism over individualism.

Labor unions moved to control Federal and State Capitals, and cities as it would operate to organize workers in industry. But picket lines were found unnecessary. Elected representatives, owing their political lives to COPE, demonstrated an eagerness to insure long tenure by following the wishes of the labor barons. The procedure is simple; the docile members get financial support from labor political committees; they are eulogized in the union newspapers whose circulation totals over 17 million; and the million-odd union shop stewards seek to regiment the rank-and-file union members into voting for them.

A formidable force, COPE and organized labor, with a structure suited to engage in politics, and having the three essentials for successful political action—money, organization, and driving lust for big government, big labor, big spending, and bigger taxing which can be gained through hip-pocket, COPE-captive Congressmen.

Incidentally, since 95 percent or more of labor's support has been given to liberal

Footnotes at end of speech.

Democratic candidates, this is taken to mean that when the unions can control Congress from inside the Democratic Party, there is simply no sense in organizing a separate Labor Party. In fact, in 1958, organized labor plunked more money into the Democratic campaign kitty than the national Democratic committees themselves did.

There is no mystery about the staggering control which COPE has over congressional members. In 1959, in the Senate, no less than 66 of 98 Members, a two-thirds majority, could be depended upon to obey labor dictates much of the time. In the House, a minimum of 237 Members have the pro-labor brand. For Members opposed to union dominance, the penalty of their antilabor stigma was made abundantly clear in the 1958 elections. Of 204 House incumbents, supported by COPE, 189 were returned to office, or 92 percent. Of 187 incumbents opposed by COPE, 166 retained their seats and 21 were defeated, or an 11 percent loss.¹

COPE endorsed 24 candidates for Governor in 1958, of whom 18 won and 6 lost for a winning percentage of 75 percent.² It should be remembered that unions, through COPE, are similarly busy on the local level. A little imagination should awaken the citizen into realizing what is happening to his city hall.

While the Nation was busy electing a President in 1956, the unions and COPE were more successful in electing a captive pro-union Congress. After all, Congress makes and changes the laws.

COPE is headquartered in the new \$3.5 million AFL-CIO building across from the White House. COPE functions in all 50 States and in cities down to the precinct level. (There are 42 national union headquarters in Washington, D.C.)

The chief textbook in COPE's political school is a booklet, "How Your Senators and Representatives Voted." Every Federal lawmaker is listed, along with his right or wrong voting record on legislation labor considers important. More than 11 million of these booklets are sent out to union members and used in local meetings to point out the "blackguards" in Congress. From this record, it is not hard to see well in advance of the local conventions which lawmakers will be the main targets of COPE, and who will get full-scale COPE aid.

Of the 33 Senators up for reelection in 1960, 6 show up in the COPE "record" as extremely bad. Naturally they are all Republicans (COPE piously claims nonpartisanship). The remaining 27, or a whopping 80 percent, are either captive-COPE Senators, or sufficiently weaned into their camp for purposes of echoing the COPE-ADA Socialist line.

Presidential hopefuls, Senators KENNEDY, SYMINGTON and HUMPHREY, have a 100-percent pro-union voting record. With a liberal Supreme Court, a pro-union Congress, and now the possibility of a COPE-captive White House occupant, the American people would be further hammered to their knees. After all, this coalition of radical left-wing ADA'ers, Socialists, and power-hungry unions admit they are playing a " * * * courageous and active role in changing the shape of things." ³

In 1958, 32 of organized labor's political committees reported spending a total of \$1,828,777. This figure is absurd. Political groups whose activities are limited to a single State, city, or district do not have to report. Therefore, accurate figures on all campaign spending—national, State, and local—are impossible to obtain. Thus the amounts listed by unions do not truly reflect the total amount of union participation. Even \$5 million is unconvincingly low.⁴

A more realistic COPE expenditure is reflected in the 1954 campaign of liberal Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, where the unions spent an estimated \$841,000 to achieve this single election. (For example, 500 "special organizers" were employed by the unions, costing \$300,000.) From case histories and experience it is known that actual expenditures are more than 10 times those required to be reported. This means that approximately \$10 million was spent in Michigan alone. And inasmuch as unions collect about \$620 million per year (up from \$458 million in 1955) it can be assumed that 10 percent is spent for political purposes, or \$62 million for political purposes annually, or a total of \$124 million for each biannual election of House and Senate Members.⁵

Contributions received by COPE in 1958 were 14 percent higher than in 1956 while contributions by COPE to candidates for Federal office were 27 percent higher in 1958 than in 1956. In 1958 awards for 100 percent COPE contributions were given 404 local unions and 39 international and national organizations that fully met their obligations to COPE, 27 of which completed a 3-year record of full participation. Not bad. Not bad.

In addition to COPE's reputation as a "fatcat," they are becoming equally famous in slippery procedures, shared by their puppets. Democrat JOHN FOLEY, a COPE candidate from Maryland, filed expenditures of only \$620 with the Clerk of the House, while filing \$18,728 at the county courthouse. In short, 30 times as much. Also in the same 1958 elections, COPE-backed candidate McGovern, of South Dakota, filed a paltry \$6,554 contribution with the Clerk, but in his State he filed nearly twice as much—\$11,442. Further peculiarities appear when his statement in South Dakota lists only \$2,000 from COPE, and his Washington statement lists no COPE contributions. Yet COPE's own statement to the Clerk reflects two \$2,000 contributions to McGovern.⁶

The decision as to who receives this money rests principally with one man, Dr. Walter P. Reuther (6 doctorate degrees, although he never finished college), AFL-CIO kingpin, and one of the financial angels of the radical ADA. Reuther does not give campaign funds to anyone except those he expects to further in his legislative aims, which included all but 2 of the 27 planks included in the 1957 platform of the Communist Party.⁷

Reuther's present influence and background, association in Communist-front organizations, his working in a Soviet machine factory, and his statement that he did not believe in God, his abiding affection and advocacy for socialism, and his letter recommending that workers in America "work for a Soviet America," should dramatize the fate of the United States if this little Caesar is permitted to elect or defeat through his political front, the infamous COPE.⁸

Some Congressmen are feeling the sting of COPE's political pay-offs. A young Congressman was compelled to appoint a former union organizer as his assistant. "I've lost control of my own office force," the freshman legislator bitterly remarked. "Now I'm beginning to wonder how far the payoff will extend and whether it's worth it."⁹ And still another new Congressman appointed a high-ranking UAW union official as his assistant, possibly to insure 100 percent submission to their will by their political debtors.¹⁰

But money is an incidental explanation of the immense power of COPE. It has at its command, and under strict union discipline, thousands of workers—that indispensable factor in winning elections. COPE's pre-election preparations are extensive. COPE has headquarters in most precincts recruiting members, wives, teenagers, and children. They are given jobs as checkers, telephoners,

messengers, drivers, babysitters, poll-watchers, leaflet passers, sound truck crews, coffeemakers, and coordinators. With this kind of mechanically smooth-running operation, it is little wonder they can cockily boast: "We are started on a course that will allow us to deliver Illinois in 1960 to the candidate we think best for labor."¹¹

COPE is a beehive of booming activity. During 1958 and 1959, 33 different items of literature were printed and distributed, with a total circulation in excess of 31 million. In early 1959 the circulation of "Political Memo From COPE," published biweekly, went over the 100,000 mark. Paid resubscriptions have been running at the rate of 2,300 per month. The "Keeping in Touch" newsletter has a circulation of 4,000, while 10,000 copies of "Notes From COPE" are sent out twice a month. During 1958-59 over 2,100 requests for research material were handled by COPE.¹²

Much of COPE's successes can be traced to their variety of activities which extend into (a) high school and college democracy programs, (b) libraries, (c) training films, (d) book clubs, (e) dramatic pageants, (f) choral groups, (g) arts and crafts, (h) painting classes, (i) shop lunch time democracy programs, (j) education for new immigrants, (k) international union exchanges, (l) old-timers' centers, (m) use of noted movie and TV personalities, (n) veterans, (o) religion. With a blitz movement like this it is little wonder that COPE was able to dominate the political affairs in the 1958 congressional campaign in Idaho.¹³

The women's activities department, WAD, is a part of COPE's regular organization. WAD, like COPE, operates on national, State, county, city, and congressional district levels. WAD carries out year-round programs of education and action in trying to help their union husbands, fathers, and brothers in their struggle. They savagely work the other side of the street, such as PTA's, service clubs, small businesses, churches, women's clubs, and telephoning. They develop and maintain an intricate central card file system on community citizens—available only to COPE.¹⁴

Thirty-six WAD women did the following in one Senate election:

1. Handled 47,850 pieces of literature.
2. Made 6,704 telephone calls.
3. Made 9,528 home calls.
4. Provided 5,798 hours of voluntary work.¹⁵

In 1958 COPE neatly packaged a 311-page speakers' handbook on 24 issues for use in preparing speeches, leaflets, pamphlets, and campaign material. The purpose is to standardize the "line" from their highest captive congressional robots, to the lowest card-carrying unionworker. Without surprise the booklet is permeated with typical dialectical ADA-COPE jargon designed to brainwash their corralled listeners with falsehoods, and to panic them into believing that the Republicans are responsible for everything that is wrong, evil, unsuccessful, untried, or even unthought of, whereas the Democrats remain perfumed, saintly, and untouchable. No mention is made that the position taken on all 24 issues follows the socialist ADA platform which, in most cases, closely parallels that of the Communist Party. Their guided lectures, principally social reforms in nature, are: Atomic giveaway, civil rights, corruption, cost of living, education, foreign policy, Government pay raises, housing, immigration and citizenship, jobs and recession, labor law, minimum wage, natural gas, natural resources, old-age and survivors insurance, political money, public assistance programs, public power, REA social security, taxes, TVA, unemployment insurance, and why labor is in politics.

A little arithmetic applied to the adoption of their COPE-sponsored reactionary programs suggests an increase in our national budget of about \$40 billion, or about double

Footnotes at end of speech.

our present individual tax burden. And even worse, it means complete, and final, slavery for America, handcuffed to an all-powerful centralized government. We would then have attained Reuther's ambition, "a Soviet America."

If it is only security for which COPE and Reuther plead, then they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads.¹⁹

The programs and dogma prescribed by COPE are unacceptable. Deal high handedly as they would have us do with the mechanisms of the marketplace, and the mechanisms will blind. Preempt the surplus of the people, and surpluses will dwindle. Centralize the political function, and then lose touch with reality. Stifle the economic sovereignty of the individual by spending his surplus dollars for him, and you stifle his freedom. Socialize the individual's surplus and you socialize his spirit and creativeness; you cannot paint the Mona Lisa by assigning one dab each to a thousand painters.²⁰

¹⁹ Santa Ana Register, July 25, 1955.

²⁰ Human Events, July 28, 1958.

²¹ "Labor Union Monopoly, a Clear and Present Danger," by Donald R. Richbert.

²² American Mercury article by Edward Willard.

²³ COPE publication No. 59.

²⁴ ADA World, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, January 1960.

²⁵ American Mercury article by Willard Edwards.

²⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 24, 1958.

²⁷ Human Events, Dec. 22, 1958.

²⁸ National Republican Congressional Committee.

²⁹ (a) National Republican Congressional Committee; (b) Walter Reuther, by Eldorous L. Dayton.

³⁰ American Mercury article by Willard Edwards.

³¹ Human Events, Dec. 22, 1958.

³² Newsweek magazine, Mar. 10, 1958.

³³ U.S. Chamber of Commerce pamphlet.

³⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, 1958.

³⁵ COPE publication No. 58.

³⁶ COPE publication No. 55.

³⁷ General Eisenhower, Galveston, Tex., Dec. 8, 1949.

³⁸ "Up From Liberalism," by William F. Buckley, Jr.

We believe in instilling, promoting, and proclaiming pride in our Nation and its Government; pride in working for that Government; pride in the Veterans' Administration; pride in the VA's mission of sympathetic service to the veteran, his family, his widow, and his orphan; pride in our dedication to the highest attainable quality in every program and service.

We believe in reporting clearly and simply, promptly and meaningfully, uniformly and fully to all members of the VA family; to the President and the Congress; to veterans and all other citizens of this Republic.

We believe in a policy of decentralization, that the point of decision should be as close to the area of action as is reasonable.

We believe recruitment and promotion should be based on merit; that dedication, ability, and hard work should be the standards for sound appraisal, and for career development; that the key is in the search and the discovery and use of the most competent people.

We believe that all things can be measured; that for all parts and programs, as well as the whole VA, standards, tall and idealistic, should be set, for the short range and the long range; that performance should be constantly evaluated against these standards; and that everything is susceptible to improvement.

We believe in cooperating with other Federal and State Government agencies and private institutions in furthering common program objectives.

We believe that our mission is broad; that if we of VA are to be advisors to the President, spokesmen before committees of Congress, interpreters of veterans' needs to the Nation, planners for today and for the long future, then we must seek fresh ideas, think anew on concepts of both the past and the present, accepting the Nation as our obligation, the world as our source; that out of the dedication, the imagination, the contributions of all 170,000 of us come sounder programs, truer fulfillment of veterans' and the Nation's needs, and finer means of healing and cure, even miracles of research and discovery that will benefit not alone the veteran but all mankind.

is shown in his own statement when he said:

If the organs of the government consider that I am dying too slowly, then let them order my physical liquidation as they ordered my juridic liquidation 14 years ago.

St. Cyprian gave 25 pieces of gold to the executioner who was to behead him. I have no gold. I can only pray for the person who may eventually execute me, asking the Lord to forgive him in eternity and asking the Lord to allow me to die in peace.

The article follows:

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, Feb. 27, 1960]

CARDINAL URGED PEOPLE TO STAND FAST IN THE LORD—LATE YUGOSLAV PRIMATE, IN SPIRITUAL TESTAMENT, NOTED INFILTRATION—LAST LETTER REVEALED—NOTE TO RED COURT TELLS OF CONSTANT SUFFERING YET UNWAVERING DEFIANCE

VATICAN CITY.—Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac in a spiritual testament made a last exhortation to his Yugoslav flock to resist the pressures of atheistic communism, it was revealed here.

Excerpts of the testament were published in L'Osservatore Romano, Vatican City daily paper. L'Osservatore said that the document was dated May 28, 1957, a time when the Cardinal Archbishop of Zagreb felt that his death was near. It said he wanted to protect his flock, even after his death, against dangers to their faith and happiness.

Cardinal Stepinac died February 10 at the age of 61. He had been isolated in his native village of Krasic since 1951 by the Communist government, which had previously held him in prison for 5 years.

WARNS OF ATHEISTS

In death, Cardinal Stepinac told his people:

"Atheists have infiltrated into your midst who, although they are a minority (as I am writing they are hardly 2 percent), have done everything in their power to remove the name of God from your souls and to make you happy—they say—without God.

"But as I prepare to leave this world, I must repeat to you, in the face of every attempt of this kind, what the Prophet Isaiah said: 'O my people, they that call thee blessed, the same deceive thee, and destroy the way of thy steps'" (Isaiah 3: 12).

The cardinal warned that every attempt to create a culture and a civilization without God would seal the people's doom for time and for eternity. To this he added:

"In taking my leave of you, therefore, my beloved children, I address to you the words that St. Paul wrote to the Philippians, to 'stand fast thus in the Lord,' (Philippians 4: 1). Those who despise the Lord want to take you from Him and in this way they degrade you to the lowest level. Their work is condemned by God.

BE FAITHFUL TO MARY

The cardinal then urged his people to have special devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary:

"If you love and venerate the Mother of God with sincere and constant affection, the words of the Wise Man—'He that honoreth his mother is as one that layeth up a treasure' (Ecclesiasticus 3: 5)—will be true for you as well.

"Only atheistic communism has been capable of inserting blasphemies against the Mother of God even into school manuals, blasphemies which I reproved in 1946 during the so-called trial with which it was hoped to cancel the Catholic Church from our country with the stroke of a pen. May the Lord not permit that any of you will ever imitate those evil persons in insulting the Mother of God. To such a one, the words of the same wise man would apply: 'He is cursed of God that angereth his mother'" (Ecclesiasticus 3: 18).

Administration Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been impressed with the competence of Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent statement of his that outlines the Administrator's policies:

ADMINISTRATOR'S POLICIES

We believe in the importance of the individual, veteran and employee, and citizen; the heightening of human dignity; inspiration rather than compulsion; with emphasis upon the positive rather than the negative; healthy competition born of comparison and contrast, of a spirit of striving toward higher standards of quality and service; motivating all members of the VA family to contribute fully, creatively, and imaginatively to the fulfillment of VA's precious mission.

Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet on February 27 and which was sent to me by my constituent Mr. Jozo Poduje, of Larchmont, N.Y.

It points up the superb qualities of Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac manifested under severe pressures of involuntary confinement. He appealed to Catholics to cast aside and repel the pressures of atheistic communism. In his last sufferings Cardinal Stepinac avowed that he would refuse to give any kind of response to questions asked him under the threat of torture or other physical force. The character and nobility of the cardinal

LAST LETTER REVEALS SUFFERING DEFIANCE

VIENNA.—What is perhaps the last letter written by Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac reveals his great suffering and his defiance of the church's persecutors in the final days of his life.

The letter, addressed to the district tribunal of Osijek, Yugoslavia, is dated December 4, 1959, only 63 days before his death.

Father Ciril Kos, spiritual director of the seminary at Djakovo, had been brought to trial and Cardinal Stepinac had been summoned for interrogation in connection with it. Father Kos was found guilty of alleged anti-Government activities and sentenced to 7 years in jail.

Excerpts from his letter in answer to the summons follow:

"To the organ of the government power which was to have interrogated me in connection with the citation sent me by the District Tribunal of Osijek:

"A reason why I cannot comply with the citation is this:

"I was condemned by a supreme people's court of the people's Croatian Republic on October 11, 1946, to 16 years of forced labor, first in the prison of Lepoglava and then to my present internment in Krasic. That sentence was juridic homicide of an innocent man. That was the interpretation given to it by the whole civilized world.

"This was admitted even by certain leaders of Federated People's Republic of Yugoslavia who met with Prof. Ivan Mestrovic in the United States. All this was communicated to me by word of mouth by Professor Mestrovic when he came to visit me this year at Krasic. He knows their names.

"The consequence of the condemnations, which scandalized the whole world, is that my physical life, during the 13 years spent in prison and confinement, has reached the edge of the tomb. Our doctors and foreign doctors have done everything possible to prolong my life, but they have not restored my life to me.

"Until today they have extracted 34 liters (66 pints) of blood and this is not enough. They have had to perform operations on both my legs to save me from imminent death by thrombosis (blood clot).

RARELY WITHOUT PAIN

"As a result of these operations, I am practically an invalid who drags his feet around the house with a cane. Moreover, for the past 5 years I have been ill with prostatism and, despite all medicines which I take frequently, it is rare that I am completely without pain.

"I will not mention the deadly infirmity which struck me 2 years ago when journalists reported me near death. Nor will I recall the many other ailments from which I suffer, as for example, bronchial catarrh. I have suffered from this for years. When Dr. Serce asked that I be allowed to go to the seashore, the request was refused.

*"The serious state of my health is better known to the parish priest of Krasic and to the nuns, who often spend whole days at my bedside to assist me. I often must skip the celebration of holy mass, even on Sunday, because of my pain * * *."*

WHO VIOLATES U.N. CHARTER?

"If I combat the ideology of the party being convinced that it is wholly false, is this combating the state?"

"It is lawful for the Yugoslav Communist Party to persecute the Catholic Church with fire and steel for 15 years, separating men from the church, preventing baptism of children, preventing Christian instruction of youth and the celebration of religious marriage; if it is lawful for the Yugoslav Community Party to destroy Catholic institutions and schools, printing presses, newspapers and their properties, and to commit innumerable acts of suppression, how can

one ever dare to accuse me of crime if I raise my voice in defense of the sacred things of catholicism?"

"Have I perhaps violated the charter of human rights of the United Nations; or is it not others instead who have violated that charter since, after the bloody injustices and many suppressions, some wish to torture me with long interrogations regarding a subject on which I will never admit guilt?"

"Is it not enough for you to know that some of your leaders have openly confessed to Professor Mestrovic that they have no grounds for instituting proceedings against me, and to know that even so a trial was held with consequences resulting practically in my death, as I have outlined above?"

REFUSES TO GIVE ANSWER

"Therefore, I say to you that I am a man with both feet in the grave and am almost descending into it. Since I am seriously ill, I cannot comply with your citation. If, then, there will be an attempt to torture me by force with questions either on my bed of pain or during my painful walks in the courtyard, I refuse from now on to give any kind of response. And moreover, I decline every responsibility for the public scandal that will result therefrom and which will be publicized in the world press when the new attack perpetrated against a half-dead man becomes known.

"If the organs of the government consider that I am dying too slowly, then let them order my physical liquidation, as they ordered my juridic liquidation 14 years ago.

"St. Cyprian gave 25 pieces of gold to the executioner who was to behead him. I have no gold. I can only pray for the person who may eventually execute me, asking the Lord to forgive him in eternity and asking the Lord to allow me to die in peace.

"If you have provoked me to speak of your inhuman treatment during these long years, do not take it badly, since the Romans said:

"Sunt certi denique fines." (There are certain limits.)

"My jailers may continue to mount guard according to your instructions so as to make my life impossible, but I know what my duty is. With the grace of the Lord, I will fulfill it to the end—to the end without the least hatred, without the least revenge on anyone, but at the same time without fear of anyone."

Adlai Stevenson's Great Debate Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the second of Adlai E. Stevenson's two-part article in This Week magazine in which he presents a plan for taking some of the waste and foolishness out of our presidential election campaigns, as follows:

ADLAI STEVENSON'S PLAN FOR A GREAT DEBATE—PART 2

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Last week I outlined what I consider to be the major problems of political television. These troubles can be summarized quite briefly. The costs of TV force on any political candidate the awful demands of brevity—and these demands can only eventually lead to sloganeering. In addition, every candidate is confronted by the natural desire of the TV public to be entertained. And be-

cause the public is constantly offered such a variety of TV fare, it cannot help being apathetic to a great deal of what it sees and hears.

I would like to try to feel my way toward a single solution of these complicated problems. I would like to propose that we transform our circus-atmosphere presidential campaign into a great debate conducted in full view of all the people.

More than a hundred years ago my great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, an Illinois editor and friend of Abraham Lincoln, proposed the Lincoln-Douglas debates on a great issue: slavery. Imagine a debate now, or at least a discussion on the great issues of our time with the whole country watching. Disengagement or containment, farm policy, disarmament, aid to India, the defense budget, the problems of old age and of urban growth and of civil rights—because candidates neglect these questions, few people understand them, but how we decide them may fix our children's future, and mankind's. And we can decide them not after canned rhetoric and TV spectacles but only after intelligent discussion, which the candidates and the network can provide.

TWO CANDIDATES MEET FACE TO FACE

Suppose that every Monday evening, at peak viewing time, for an hour and a half, from Labor Day to election eve, the two candidates aired their views. They might on each evening take up a single issue. Each in turn might discuss it for half an hour, followed by 15-minute rebuttals of one another for the third half hour.

There are other possibilities, including face-to-face debate. But the central idea is that in some manner the candidates for president appear together at the same prime time each week for a serious presentation of views on public questions. The time should cost them and their parties nothing.

Now this idea raises a number of questions, some quite difficult.

Who should pay for the time?

It has been suggested that Congress appropriate money to pay for it but nothing has come of this. Yet the idea is not revolutionary—many years ago Theodore Roosevelt proposed that the Federal Government bear the cost of political campaigns.

SHOULD TV TIME BE FREE?

It has been proposed that the networks should provide the time free as a public service, either voluntarily or be required by law to do so. This has been opposed as discriminatory. Presidential candidates, it is argued, must pay for planes and trains, newspaper advertisements, sound trucks, campaign headquarters, confetti—why should only television be provided free?

Well, none of these other campaign expenses involves a communications medium licensed by Government to operate in the public interest. It is true that railroads and airlines are also Government licensees—but they are not media of communications. It is true that newspapers are media of communication—but they do not use the people's property and are therefore not Government licensees.

The air belongs to the people, and the people have granted the radio-TV industry immensely valuable monopolies free of charge. Radio and television are unique in this respect and, therefore, it would seem to me to justify unique treatment under the law.

Other problems arise. Shall only the Republican and Democratic Parties be given time? Or all parties? To give so much time to all parties is manifestly absurd. But how eliminate any without abridging their rights to be heard?

Perhaps free time should be given only to parties that polled 20 percent of the vote at the preceding election and to new parties

which can demonstrate substantial national support.

Again, shall we prescribe how the free time is to be used to insure sober discussion and avoid entertainment by bigger and bigger spectacles? Should the candidates be required to appear on the program alone, not surrounded by friends, who cannot share the responsibilities of office after the election?

One more problem: Would anybody watch such a 90-minute program? Confronted by a long serious discussion of public questions, will people turn to another channel? The remedy, of course, is to preempt all channels. But I have confidence enough in the American people to believe that given a chance they are willing and eager to listen to serious discussion of their most important business.

But if all channels are not preempted and we permit other programs at the same time, Candidate A may during his half hour find himself competing with "Gunsmoke," while Candidate B, following a half hour later, may compete only with an ancient grade B movie that nobody wants to see anyway.

Yet preempting all channels smacks of cramming politics down people's throats, an abhorrent idea. Here, too, is a difficult question.

I realize I have raised more questions than I have answered—and I have not by any means raised them all. They can be resolved only by thorough discussion. It is my hope to stimulate such discussion. But let us not forget the main point—to provide presidential candidates with free prime time on TV at the same time each week for continuing sober discussion of the issues. Once we determine to do this, the details can be worked out.

TV'S OBLIGATION TO THE PUBLIC

Television is today the most powerful medium of communication available to candidates for public office. It owes an obligation to serve the public good. That it has not always done so in its nonpolitical broadcasts has been shown by the quiz shows, payola and other frauds on a gullible public. Used in politics as it has been in the past, it may likewise lose the confidence of the people in the political area. Such a useful means of mass communication must be conserved for the improvement of the democratic dialogue, not allowed to encourage its debasement.

During the 1956 campaign, I was urged by some of my advisers to challenge President Eisenhower to a debate. I did not, for I feared the challenge would be misunderstood, would be taken as a gimmick. What I am proposing now is no gimmick; it is the establishment of what I hope will become a national institution, a great debate for the Presidency.

And I don't mean a "debate" in the literal collegiate sense of that word, but a sustained discussion. Only television can establish such a forum. I propose that it provide a quadrennial clearing of the air by the use of the air.

Sustained, serious discussion on all networks would reach all the people directly. It would require effort on their part, mental effort, and I know of no better cure for apathy. It would end the financial problem that TV now presents to the parties. It would end the tendency to reduce everything to assertions and slogans. It would diminish the temptation of politicians to entertain, to please and to evade the unpleasant realities. It might even help to restore what we seem to have lost—our sense of great national purpose.

A GREAT DECISION OF THE SIXTIES

I would hope that the networks and the political parties would voluntarily take the initiative in this matter. If they do not, then I think Congress should.

Legislation on this subject has been introduced in Congress but has died quickly.

I would urge its revival, and that the television networks participate fully and thoughtfully in the ensuing discussion. For in the long run it may turn out that the direction we give to political television is one of the great decisions of the decisive decade of the sixties.

The primary system ran away with the nominating process because we allowed it to get out of hand. Let us get television under control before it runs away with the electoral process.

University of California Cracks Down on Housing Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of California, at its Berkeley campus in the Seventh Congressional District, recently took steps to strengthen its policy of nondiscrimination in providing housing for its students and staff.

The following article from the Berkeley Daily Gazette outlines this action in detail. I would call particular attention to the university's policy statement:

The university is proud to have native born students of practically every race, creed, and color, as well as foreign born from more than 80 nations.

In a recent letter discussing this university policy, Mr. Lawrence Crouchett, housing chairman of the Berkeley branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, pointed out:

As far as we are able to find out, this is the best university housing policy in this country.

Mr. Crouchett goes on to say:

This is one type of effort integrated universities and colleges may make in the total goal of complete equal educational opportunities. As you are aware, equal educational opportunities extend far beyond the boundaries of colleges and universities.

Regarding this action as sound, realistic, and forthright, I wish to submit the following report for the RECORD under permission to extend remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CRACKDOWN ON DISCRIMINATION—RENTAL LISTING SERVICE BARS BIAS

Householders in Berkeley and adjoining communities who make use of the University of California rental listing service after March 1 will be asked to sign a statement agreeing to abide by the university's policy of nondiscrimination in providing housing for its students and staff.

The new requirement, which in essence only augments a long standing policy of the university to provide equal opportunities in all of its services, was announced today by William F. Shepard, dean of students, and Mrs. Ruth N. Donnelly, supervisor of housing services.

"The main purpose of the written agreement is to clear up any confusion that may exist in the minds of interested parties, and to make sure that everyone who uses our

housing services has a clear understanding of our policy," Dean Shepard said.

INCREASING NEED

"We recognize and appreciate the aid that householders have given us in a time of increasing need for student housing," he added, "and we believe that most householders are already well aware of our policy and conform to it."

A letter explaining the nondiscrimination policy will be sent to all householders who have listings on file, as well as any who request listing after March 1. After that date, the privilege of listing with the university will be afforded all those who sign and return the accompanying statement of understanding.

The explanatory letter states, in part, "The university is proud to have native born students of practically every race, creed, and color, as well as foreign born from more than 80 nations."

AGREEMENT QUOTED

The statement of agreement itself is worded as follows:

"In availing myself of the university listing service I acknowledge that I am aware that it is against the public policy of the State and the policy of the regents of the University of California to make such service available to anyone who, in affording housing, discriminates on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. I hereby agree not to engage in any such discriminatory practice in providing housing for students or staff at the University of California."

As in the past, Dean Shepard pointed out, evidence that a householder has failed to abide by the nondiscrimination policy will result in withdrawal of that landlord's listings.

Last year, more than 7,800 listings of accommodations were filed with the university housing services and approximately 56,000 contracts were made by students and staff members in the office located at 2620 Bancroft Way.

Squaw Valley Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I reported to this Congress on the successful staging of the Winter Olympic games in Squaw Valley, Calif. Much of the success was due to the fine newspaper support given this project during the formative years when we all worked so hard to achieve this international goal.

The McClatchy newspapers, represented by the Sacramento, Modesto, and Fresno Bees, was one of the main supporters of this effort. May I commend the staff of the McClatchy newspapers for their fine assistance before and during the games and include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial published Sunday in all three papers.

The editorial follows:

The winter Olympics which will end today at Squaw Valley have been a success even beyond expectations.

Almost without exception everyone attending the games has been tremendously

impressed by both the events and the facilities. What little griping there has been has come from those who are professional grippers or have not been within 100 miles of Squaw Valley. A day at the Olympics has been a once in a lifetime experience.

California has done itself proud in staging the winter games. Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, stated:

"Nearly all nations represented have come to me and said they were not only happy but enthusiastic. It's almost unanimous."

The California Olympic officials and all those who have had a part in the event are to be commended unreservedly for the splendid job they have done. And this sentiment is shared by those with long experience with winter Olympics held in many other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to add to these remarks the views of Mr. Theodore Rosequist, planning coordinator of the California State Fair and Exposition, who wrote the following letter to the editor of the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner:

FEBRUARY 29, 1960.

EDITOR, SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Squaw Valley is presently the most widely known winter sports area in the world. It is no longer "Squawk" Valley by sheer weight of success. The VIII Olympic winter games is a universally conceded success. The athletes broke record after record, proving the excellence of the facility planning. All who were privileged to witness the opening day pageantry and the succeeding days of the world's finest athletic competitions were thrilled and rewarded with a once-in-a-lifetime Olympiad.

For an all too brief period, the divergent national interests of the world's finest winter athletes were combined into one friendly group in the dining halls, recreation rooms, and quadrangle of the Olympic village. This never before has been accomplished in the history of the winter games.

While there are many proud moments for America and her athletes, as the games progressed, the overwhelming superiority of the Soviet was unmistakable. Pseudoamateurs or not, they were great competitors.

Above all this, the spirit of the Olympiad was everywhere in evidence and the conduct of the games was a great tribute to the organizers and its staff. The \$15 million investment in the VIII Olympic winter games pales into insignificance in the light of the resulting international attention and good will.

What of the future? Why not plan ahead in view of the foregoing. Preserve these world-renowned facilities for the benefit of generations to come in the fast-growing West. Conduct an annual California, Pacific coast, or Western States winter (Olympics) festival which will afford incentive and training for American youth so that future Olympic games will place America first among the competing nations. Let's make it plain that we are out to win more gold medals—yes, even if we must overcome the entrenched system of idealistic but possibly outmoded amateurism. These are big stakes involved and time marches on.

With continued good management and promotion, Squaw Valley, as a State park or otherwise, will become a shrine for winter sports enthusiasts and embryo Olympic athletes which literally could attract the support of organizations throughout the Nation. Where else in the world does there exist so much possibility for so little extra effort?

A unanimous "well done" to the VIII Olympic Winter Games Commission, organizing committee, and the great dedicated staff which planned and executed the all-

time best in winter Olympiads. And congratulations to those who supported the games by attending.

Sincerely,

THEODORE ROSEQUIST,
Planning Coordinator, California State
Fair and Exposition.

The Life and Times of Nicholas Appert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein, an article by Norman Sorensen, 1959 president, National Canners Association, entitled "The Life and Times of Nicholas Appert."

Mr. Speaker, January 3, 1960, marked the 150th anniversary of the birth of canning—the official acceptance by the French Government in 1810 of Nicholas Appert's method of preserving food by cooking it in a hermetically sealed container, and on August 25, 1810—6 months after Appert's method was published to the world—the first patent for the manufacture of a metal container was granted by George III of England.

These important happenings lead to the establishment of two great industries—canning and can manufacture.

I urge the Members of the House to read the most timely article which I include herein, entitled "Norman Sorensen Salutes Appert":

NORMAN SORENSEN SALUTES APPERT

(By Norman Sorensen, 1959 president, National Canners Association, Washington, D.C.)

The art of canning, as discovered by Nicolas Appert in 1810, freed mankind from the bondage of the seasons. It has enabled the farmer to plant his crops free of fear that his work of many months might be lost in a few days at the marketplace, and has enabled almost everyone, everywhere, to enjoy the products of the field without regard for the calendar. As someone stated it once, "It puts June peas on the December platter."

Appert worked for 14 years before attaining his goal. His simple theory was that if food is sufficiently heated while sealed in a container that excludes air, the food will keep. This is the fundamental modern principle of canning as practiced today, as we mark the 150th anniversary of Appert's important contribution to mankind.

From Appert's time to the present, the story of canning is one of inventive genius devoted to scientific research, development of better containers, improved equipment, and timesaving machinery, to which many have contributed, and the results of which canners have been quick to utilize.

Canning has indeed been brought to a high point of efficiency, placing choice, nutritious, and wholesome foods within the reach of all. Today, in this era of new-product development, with widespread public recognition of the importance of convenience foods, it is interesting to contemplate the significance of Appert's discovery of the art of canning. For canned foods were our first convenience foods and are today one of America's fastest growing food lines.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF NICOLAS APPERT

Year 1752, October 23: Nicolas Appert, born in Chalons-sur-Marne, France.

Years 1752-1795: Appert lived in moderate circumstances and was self-educated in his home village; he conducted and superintended operations in making confectionery, in brewing, distilling, storehouses for grocers in Paris and environs, and in the wine cellars of Champagne.

Year 1795: French Government (the Directory) offered prize for a method of conserving food so that it could be conveyed on sea voyages and military campaigns and transported to the civilian population in various parts of the nation.

Years 1795-1809: Appert conducted continuous self-financed experiments in self-built workshops, and with self-built apparatus at Massy, near Paris, using glass bottles and jars.

Year 1803, November: The Board of Health presented to the Marine Prefect at the port of Brest a favorable report on Appert-prepared supplies (broth with beef, beans and green peas), based on their condition after 3 months of roadstead.

Year 1805: In "Almanach des Gourmands," volume 3, Grimod de la Reyniere, leading gastronomist of the time, approved Appert's results and announced Appert had bought land near Massy to grow fruits and vegetables close to his experimental workshop. (In later statements Appert annunciated the theory that adjacency to source of raw product was a prime consideration in attaining the celerity that is indispensable in successful preservation of food.)

Year 1806: The Society for the Encouragement of National Industry brought Appert's results to the attention of the Government. Appert-prepared foods were carried across the Equator and far south so as to subject them to extremes of temperature, humidity and transportation. There were favorable reports from Admirals Martin and Allemand and the maritime prefects of Bordeaux and Brest, calling attention to the possibility of provisioning the Navy with foods, which, by replacing the salt meats, would prevent the ravages of scurvy, the greatest scourge of seafaring men. The society suggested that Appert's methods be published, stating, "It will be serving the country and humanity by publishing, with the eulogies it merits, a discovery so generally useful."

Year 1809, February 10: "Courier d'Europe" eulogized Appert's work saying "M. Appert has discovered the art of fixing the seasons."

Year 1809, March 15: The French Minister of the Interior, Count Montallivet, requested the Consulting Bureau of Arts and Manufactures to investigate the Appert method. The committee did so and recommended that the 12,000-franc award be granted to Appert.

Year 1810, January 30: Count Montallivet bestowed the award on Appert, requiring him to "write an exact and detailed description of these processes," this to be deposited with the Consulting Bureau of Arts and Manufactures for their examination and review, after which it was to be printed at Appert's expense and 200 copies delivered to the Minister.

Year 1810, February 26: August de Heine patented the use of iron containers for preserving food (English patent No. 3310) but never engaged in commercial canning.

Year 1810, June: First edition (6,000 copies) of Appert's required treatise was published at the house of Patris & Co., Printers-Booksellers, Quay Napoleon, Corner Street of the Dove, No. 4, Paris, under the title "Le Livre de Tous les Menages ou L'Art de Conserver, pendant plusieurs annees, Toutes les Substances Animales et Vegetales" ("The Book of All Households; or The Art of Preserving Animal and Vegetable Substances for Many Years"). It gave detailed instructions for canning more than 50 different food

items. In that same year it was translated into a German edition.

Year 1810, August 25: Peter Durand, merchant of Hoxton Square, Middlesex Shire, was granted a patent by King George III (English Patent No. 3372) authorizing him to "use, exercise, and vend within England, Wales, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, an invention communicated to him by a certain foreigner residing abroad, of the Method of Preserving Animal Food, Vegetable Food, and Other Perishable Articles a Long Time from Perishing or Becoming Useless." This required Durand to place a description of the "invention" in writing in His Majesty's High Court of Chancery within 6 calendar months.

Year 1810, August 30: Durand filed his description which included the statement "I place and inclose the said food or article in bottles or other vessels of glass, pottery, tin, or other metals to fit materials * * *." This reference to tin or other metals is the only particular in which the Durand description differs from Appert's, and has been referred to in much of the canning history literature as a first patent for the manufacture of the tin can. Since this is the first record of using the tin can as a food container, its invention is attributed to Durand. It is recorded by Dr. A. W. Bitting, however, that even previous to 1800 the Dutch put up fish in tin, although their methods were not those now generally recognized for canning. The fish were boiled a short time in salt brine, smoked for 2 days, put in cans, covered with hot butter or olive oil, and sealed.

Year 1810-1830: Bulletins of the French Society for the Encouragement of National Industry periodically contained accounts of the work of Appert, with eulogistic reports.

Year 1811: The second edition of "Appert's Treatise," revised and augmented by the author, was published in France and translated into Swedish and English.

Year 1811: A food preservation process based on that of Appert was developed in England by John Hall and Bryan Donkin of the Dartford Iron Works.

Year 1812: The second English edition of the "Appert Treatise" was published, and the first American (by D. Longworth, Shakespeare Gallery, New York) from the second English edition.

Year 1812: Appert established "The House of Appert" in Massy, the first commercial cannery in the world.

Year 1813: The third edition of the "Appert Treatise," revised and augmented by the author, was published in France.

Year 1813: Foods canned by Donkin & Hall were being favorably tested by the English army and navy.

Year 1813, April 30: An agent of the Duke of Wellington wrote favorably to Donkin & Hall about their preserved meat.

Year 1814: Appert delivered certain products requested by the French Government: "fresh meats, game, consomme, milk, fish, lobster pates of meat and fowl, fresh eggs, cream, butter, vegetables, fruits, and antiscorbutic juices." In that year he went to London to demonstrate his methods. Afterwards he made his own cans—of iron, coated with tin. Although the French Navy demanded square cans, for facility of loading and storing, Appert recommended round cans and oval for fish and certain fowl. He used all three types in his packs but stated that round cans contained the best foods.

Year 1814: Appert requested his government to test his bouillon cubes. (Bitting credits him as the inventor of this form of food preservation also.)

Year 1814: Admiral Cochrane, commanding England's West Indies Station, sent for "patent preserved meats" from Donkin & Hall, and some were also shipped to St. Helena. Sir Joseph Banks, president of the

Royal Society, wrote Donkin & Hall: "in favor of the nutritious qualities of your embalmed provisions."

Year 1814: John Ross, in command, and Edward Parry, his lieutenant (later Captain Sir Edward), on an expedition to Baffin's Bay, fed the crews of their two ships "preserved meats, vegetable soup, concentrated soup" at the rate of 1 pound meat, 1 pound vegetable soup per week.

Year 1815: Otto von Kotzebue, Russian explorer, used Donkin & Hall preserved meat successfully on his Arctic voyage to try to discover a northwest passage.

Year 1815, June: Admiral Cochrane gave Donkin & Hall an enthusiastic report on the canned food stores used at the British West Indies station.

Year 1816: Appert was awarded a silver medal by the French Society for the Encouragement of National Industry.

Year 1817: William Underwood arrived in New Orleans from England to establish food canning in America.

Year 1818, March-December: The British Admiralty victualing depot of Deptford received 45,360 pounds of food in 23,779 canisters ranging in size from 1 pound 6 ounces to 4 pounds, at a total cost of 5,481 pounds, 4 shillings, or an average of 2 shillings, 4½ pence per pound. The products were: mess beef; corned round of beef; roasted, seasoned, and boiled beef; boiled mutton; seasoned mutton; mutton and vegetables; boiled, roasted veal; veal and vegetables; soup and bouilli; vegetable soup; mess beef and vegetables; and concentrated soup. About one-fourth was earmarked for ships voyaging to the Arctic Circle.

Year 1819: Underwood established a cannery in Boston and started packing fruits, pickles, and condiments in bottles, mostly for sale in South America and the Far East. Thomas Kensett and Ezra Daggett canned salmon, lobsters, and oysters in New York City. Both operations used the Appert process.

Years 1819-26: Sir Edward Parry continued to use canned foods on his four voyages of discovery of the northwest passage and his surgeons wrote letters of endorsement to the suppliers (Donkin, Hall, Gamble, Morrison).

Year 1820: Appert was awarded a gold medal by the French Society for Encouragement of National Industries.

Year 1822: The French Society for Encouragement of National Industries bestowed on Appert the title, "Un Bienfaiteur de l'Humanite" for his contribution to the world of the canning method and his continuing efforts to improve it.

Year 1824: Appert delivered juices of meats and vegetables in "tabloid form" (concentrates) to the Society for the Encouragement of National Industry.

Year 1825: President James Monroe granted Kensett and Daggett the first American patent for preserving foods in "vessels of tin."

Year 1826: Canned meats used on voyage to the Sandwich Islands by HMS *Blonde*.

Year 1831: The fourth edition of "Appert's Treatise," revised and augmented by the author, was published in France. This contained, for the first time, plates showing his arrangements and apparatus.

Year 1839: Both Underwood and Kensett changed their containers from glass to tin. Isaac Winslow, of Maine, makes first attempt to can corn.

Year 1840: Oyster canning is started in Baltimore. Tristram Hollday canned salmon and lobsters in New Brunswick. Upman Stower treated canned salmon and lobsters in Maine.

Year 1841: Appert died in Massy, leaving The House of Appert in charge of his nephew, Prieur-Appert, who had been his associate during Appert's last years.

(Compiled by Nelson H. Budd)

"The Canning of Foods," by A. W. Bitting, USDA Bureau of Chemistry Bulletin No. 151, June 6, 1912.

"Appertizing or the Art of Canning: Its History and Development," A. W. Bitting, The Trade Pressroom, San Francisco, Calif., 1937.

"The Canning Clan," by Earl Chapin May, the Macmillan Co., New York, N.Y., 1937.

"Historic Tinned Foods," International Tin Research and Development Council, Greenford, Middlesex, England, July 1939 (second edition).

"Nicolas Appert, L'Inventeur des Conservees," article by Michel Agnellet, "Samedi-Solr," Paris, June 7, 1952.

"The Canning Industry," The National Canners Association, 1952.

"The History of Canning," article in "Travers' Circular," Joseph Travers & Son, Ltd., London, England, January 10, 1953.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued on civil rights, rejecting cloture motion on substitute bill, and acting on two amendments.

Senate committee approved second supplemental appropriations.

House debated civil rights.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4764-4785

Bills Introduced: 21 bills were introduced, as follows:
S. 3156-3176. Page 4766

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. 1283, to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use (S. Rept. 1158). Page 4766

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 4764

President's Communications—Supplemental Appropriations: The President transmitted two communications, as follows, which were referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as Senate documents as indicated:

Proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1960 in the amount of \$670,690 for the legislative branch, \$755,000 for the executive branch, and \$364,000 for the District of Columbia (S. Doc. 86); and

Proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgment rendered against U.S. in the amount of \$4,948,934, together with amounts for interest and costs (S. Doc. 87). Pages 4764-4765

Public Land for School Purposes—Civil Rights: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 8315, directing the Secretary of the Army to lease certain property in Missouri for school purposes, taking the following actions thereon:

Adopted: By unanimous vote of 89 yeas, Ervin amendment to first branch (regarding obstruction of certain court orders) of Dirksen amendments (in nature of a substitute for the bill) comprising "Civil Rights Act of 1960." The Ervin amendment would reduce criminal penalties from \$10,000 fine or imprisonment for 2 years, or both, to \$1,000 fine or imprisonment for 1 year, or both; and

Rejected: By 42 yeas to 53 nays, Douglas cloture mo-

tion to bring to a close debate on Dirksen amendments (in nature of a substitute for the bill). Two-thirds affirmative vote of Senators present and voting are necessary to adopt a cloture motion. Also rejected was Case (South Dakota) amendment to strike out last word of Ervin amendment, above described, and to substitute language to empower the Attorney General to initiate injunctive relief in all classes of civil rights cases (by adoption, 55 yeas to 38 nays, of motion of Senator Johnson of Texas to table Case amendment).

Senate tabled motions to reconsider each of the three actions above described.

Pending at recess was Lausche amendment to first branch (regarding obstruction of certain court orders) of Dirksen amendments (in nature of a substitute for the bill) so as to make the language applicable to obstruction of any court orders rather than solely those having to do with question of school segregation.

Pages 4728-4764, 4785, 4797-4798, 4799-4829, 4830-4838

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced Senate will recess on Friday until Monday. Pages 4829-4830

Record Votes and Quorum Calls: During Senate proceedings today three record votes and one quorum call were taken, which appear on pages 4763-4764, 4828, and 4829.

Treaty Received: Treaty of mutual cooperation and security between U.S. and Japan, signed at Washington on January 19, 1960 (Ex. E, 86th Cong., 2d sess.), was received and referred to Committee on Foreign Relations. Pages 4774-4775

Confirmations: Four judicial nominations were confirmed. Page 4838

Program for Friday: Senate met at 9 a.m. and recessed at 9:49 p.m. until 11 a.m. Friday, March 11, when it will continue on H.R. 8315, to lease certain property in Missouri for school purposes. Pages 4829, 4838

Appendix

A Truly Balanced Industrial Complex Is Attainable in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been invited by the editor of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette to prepare, and present for publication yesterday, an article on the elements and attainability of a balanced industrial complex in West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WEST VIRGINIA GOAL: A BALANCED INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

Through most of the first half of this century the economy of West Virginia was dominated by our natural resource extractive industries. During that time the wealth wrung from our earth in the form of coal, oil, and gas fueled the furnaces and factories of America and, together with the timber cut from our hills, made West Virginia one of the main contributors to the economic and industrial might of the United States.

In addition to those basic natural resources industries, and along with the early glass and pottery productions of the upper Ohio Valley and the Monongahela Valley, and the iron and steel industry of the northern panhandle, there has been added during the past three decades—mostly in the Kanawha and mid-Ohio River Valleys—the vital chemical and petrochemical industrial complex. This development will continue at an accelerated rate.

Today, West Virginia ranks first in coal production, fourth in natural gas output, and fifth in the construction of new chemical facilities. And though our State ranks but 40th in area and 41st in population among the continental States, it stands 15th among the States in per capita value of products added in mining and manufacturing, and 16th in per capita corporate income.

Most of the product value added and much of the corporate income leaves the State, and, as I stated in the Senate, February 4, 1960, during a discussion on taxation, "because most of the large corporations doing business in our State are incorporated in other States, we receive little Federal tax credit for the great corporate wealth produced in West Virginia."

TAX CREDIT NEEDED FOR WEALTH PRODUCED

We are happy to have the nonresident corporations producing and doing business in our State, but we do believe the value of their Federal taxes paid on profits derived from operations in the State should be credited properly to West Virginia. If this were an accomplished fact, the standing of our State among all States in the matter of Federal tax

payments would be much more favorable. We could thus make a more convincing case for the equity which is inherent in Federal grants, payments, loans, et cetera, to West Virginia for defense installations, public works, airports, and other worthy and necessary facilities and activities.

It is clearly evident that our State has not yet achieved a balanced industrial complex, nor have we yet developed the means of overcoming the unemployment created in a major degree, but not wholly, by the process of automation in our principal industries.

While the national economy as a whole has shifted from extractive and basic manufacturing industries, as the main source of employment and personal income, to the distributive and service industries, the West Virginia pattern continues to rely primarily upon the extraction and production of goods.

Here are some statistical examples: In 1920, for the United States, mining, agriculture, manufacturing, and construction accounted for 61 percent of the total civilian employment, with 39 percent in services such as communications, wholesale and retail trade, transportation, education, government, the professions, et cetera. In West Virginia, at that time, the figures were 71 percent in mining, agriculture, manufacturing, and construction, and only 29 percent in the services. By 1958, the figures for the Nation had shifted to 46 percent in the field of production and 54 percent in services, while for West Virginia the figures were relatively reversed—56 percent for production and 44 percent for services.

MORE SERVICE INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT NEEDED

Thus, although the service industries, since 1920, have increased their share of the total employment 15 percent throughout the United States, in West Virginia we have placed the preponderant burden of employment upon mining, primary manufacturing, and agriculture.

Wholesale and retail trade accounts for 20 percent of the total employment of the United States, but only 14.5 percent in West Virginia.

Financial, insurance, and real estate businesses employ 4.5 percent of the national labor force; whereas the percentage of jobs in these categories in West Virginia is only 2.1 percent.

Contract construction embraces 6 percent of the labor reservoir of the United States, but in West Virginia only 3.3 percent.

Miscellaneous and personal services employ 11 percent of the workers in the Nation, but in West Virginia this category of employment is only 8.6 percent.

It is worth noting, also, that in only one of the above categories has there been any appreciable change from the recession years of 1954 to 1959. This occurred in the field of miscellaneous services, which rose from 8.1 percent in 1954 to 8.6 percent in 1959. But in the other previously mentioned groupings the variation was limited to one-tenth of 1 percent or less.

It is apparent, therefore, that we have failed to keep pace in employment opportunities with the shift in our national economy from the production to the distribution and servicing of goods. Consequently, we are also relatively more vulnerable to the displacement process of automation, not only in coal but throughout the major segments of the economy of our State.

To illustrate, reciting again the recession

year of 1954 as a point of departure and 1959 as "a year of normal national prosperity"—even though not a "normal prosperity year" in our State:

GAP BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT

In 1954, the West Virginia coal industry produced 116.3 millions tons and employed 71,300 workers; in 1957 production rose to a high of 155 million tons and employment stood at 77,400 workers; but in 1959 production fell back to substantially the 1954 figure, having been 117.1 million tons for 1959, but with 14,800 fewer workers in the industry now than were employed in 1954.

The circumstances are repeated in manufacturing, although with a difference in degree. In 1954, manufacturing industries employed 125,500 persons, while in 1959, in spite of a substantial increase in capital investment and gross product, employment opportunities had increased for only 1,900 new workers.

Thus, the contribution to our long range improvement by new primary industries is somewhat limited. This observation is in no sense an implication that we should stop our efforts to build new industries in our State. Indeed, we should increase our thrust in this field, and I believe we are on the verge of some gratifying successes in industrial development. But we must recognize that new industries will not, in themselves, provide the total solution to our problems.

What I am emphasizing is that if we wish to escape the economic imbalance and unemployment problems which we seem to share with such heavily industrialized areas as Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo, we must balance the development of new major industries by encouraging the growth of locally owned and locally financed small businesses.

The ideal program would be to have a constellation of small independent businesses developed around each of the major industrial establishments. Compare, for example, the relative lack of independent aluminum fabricators and processors at Ravenswood with the 66 locally owned fabricating plants surrounding a similar Kaiser plant in a Far West community. It is to be hoped that the newly constructed plants of Ravens-Metal Products, Inc., in Wood, Ritchie, and Wirt Counties will represent a growing trend in this area both geographically and functionally.

MARKET ADVANTAGES ARE PRESENT

The same market advantages which drew the Kaiser plant to Ravenswood also exist for potential satellite fabrication establishments which might be developed in the area surrounding the primary production facility at Ravenswood.

What is being suggested here is that we can, as a State, apply to our major industries the same principle of vertical integration that some of the mammoth corporations resort to in their operations. The Ford Motor Co., for example, has sought to control each phase of production of the materials that enter into its final product—from rubber plantations and iron ore deposits to the final assembly line off which comes a finished, ready-to-roll automobile.

There is no reason, in logic or in economics, why West Virginians should not reverse this process and enlarge our resources beyond the extractive and basic manufacturing level.

We have the natural, human, and industrial resources to provide a truly balanced industrial complex—a system of small independent businesses existing in healthy relationship with the major chemical, primary metals, and lumber industries—and eventually with the coal industry, too, if coal research is stepped up as it should be without delay.

The Current Salary Study for Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I offer for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement on the subject, "The Current Salary Study for Teachers," at the request of Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr. Mr. Speaker, by this I do not mean to express my position in regards to this legislation.

The statement follows:

THE CURRENT SALARY STUDY FOR TEACHERS
(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Research Director, American Federation of Teachers)

LARGEST CITIES

Salaries are slightly higher in a majority of the 32 largest cities this year, but the Consumer Price Index reports an increase, for the same period, of 1.5. The average increase for beginning salary of those with the bachelor's degree is \$163, with Baltimore, St. Louis, Washington, D.C., Boston, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Atlanta, Louisville, and Denver reporting no increase. Philadelphia's increase came after the study was completed. The 1958 average was \$4,034, and the current one is \$4,197.

The top salaries for those with the bachelor's degree went from \$6,342 in 1958 to \$6,570, which represents an average increase in the 32 cities of \$228. The same cities, that are noted above with the exception of Denver, reported no salary increase. While Chicago, with \$5,000 beginning salary, led the group, New York City and Newark had the highest salary for the bachelor's degree, which was \$7,900.

NORTHEASTERN SECTION

The northeastern section of the Nation has an average beginning salary of \$4,002, with the following State averages: Connecticut, \$4,102; Maine, \$3,625; Massachusetts, \$3,869; New Hampshire, \$3,536; New Jersey, \$4,164; New York, \$4,364; Pennsylvania, \$3,844; Rhode Island, \$3,856; and Vermont, \$3,563. The national average beginning salary for the bachelor's is \$4,033, while the top national average is \$6,161. For the master's degree, the national average beginning salary is \$4,408 and the top one is \$6,557.

The highest ranking cities in the northeastern section for teachers with the bachelor's degree are as follows: Greenwich led in Connecticut with a beginning salary of \$4,500 and ending salary of \$7,500; Lewiston, with \$3,700, and Portland, with \$5,200, led in Maine; the men teachers of Winchester, with \$4,350, and the men teachers of Wellesley, with \$7,250, led in Massachusetts; Nashua, with \$3,600 and \$5,400, led in New Hampshire; Jersey City, Linden, and Summit, with \$4,400, and Newark, with \$7,900, led in New Jersey; Mamaroneck, with \$5,000, and Scarsdale, with \$9,000, led in New York; Johnstown, with \$4,100, and Yeadon, with \$7,000, led in Pennsylvania; Providence, Pawtucket,

Warwick, Coventry and Cranston, with \$4,000, and Providence, with \$6,275, led in Rhode Island; and Bennington led in Vermont with \$3,800 and \$5,800.

CENTRAL SECTION

The central section of the Nation has an average beginning salary of \$4,223, with the following State averages: Illinois, \$4,368; Indiana, \$4,412; Iowa, \$4,161; Kansas, \$3,750; Michigan, \$4,483; Minnesota, \$4,218; Missouri, \$3,967; Nebraska, \$3,780; North Dakota, \$4,200; Ohio, \$4,033; South Dakota, \$3,800; and Wisconsin, \$4,171.

The highest ranking districts in the central section for teachers with the bachelor's degree are as follows: Franklin Park led in Illinois with a beginning salary of \$5,040, and Highland Park led with an ending salary of \$9,000; East Chicago with \$5,092; and Gary with \$7,380, led in Indiana; Des Moines, with \$4,500 and \$7,050, led in Iowa; Kansas City, with \$4,200 and \$6,000, led in Kansas; River Rouge, with \$4,900, and Dearborn, with \$7,645, led in Michigan; Mountain Iron, with \$4,692, and Minnetonka, with \$7,500, led in Minnesota; special district in St. Louis County, with \$4,500, and University City and Clayton, with \$7,200, led in Missouri; Omaha, with \$4,200 and \$6,650, led in Nebraska; Fargo, with \$4,300 and \$6,350, led in North Dakota; Cleveland, with \$4,350, and East Cleveland, with \$7,100, led in Ohio; Sioux Falls, with \$4,000 and \$5,850, led in South Dakota; and Milwaukee, with \$4,550, and Shorewood, with \$7,500, led in Wisconsin.

SOUTHERN SECTION

The southern section of the Nation has an average beginning salary of \$3,472, with the following State averages: Alabama, \$3,210; Arkansas, \$3,333; Delaware, \$4,100; Washington, D.C., \$4,500; Florida, \$3,633; Georgia, \$3,412; Kentucky, \$3,040; Louisiana, \$3,358; Maryland, \$3,825; Mississippi, \$3,194; North Carolina, \$3,389; Oklahoma, \$3,552; South Carolina, \$2,869; Tennessee, \$3,437; Texas, \$3,756; Virginia, \$3,325; and West Virginia, \$3,578.

The highest ranking districts in the southern section for teachers with the bachelor's degree are as follows: Mobile, with a beginning salary of \$3,600 and an ending salary of \$4,700, led in Alabama; Little Rock, with \$4,255.90 for 12 months, and \$5,517.54 for 12 months, led in Arkansas; Wilmington, with \$4,100 and \$6,600, led in Delaware; Washington, with \$4,500 and \$6,600, led in the District of Columbia; Dade County, with \$4,000, and Broward County, with \$6,130, led in Florida; Atlanta, with \$3,636 and \$6,036, led in Georgia; Louisville, with \$3,360 and \$5,184, led in Kentucky; East Baton Rouge Parish, with \$3,550 and \$6,100, led in Louisiana; Baltimore County and Anne Arundel County, with \$4,000, and Baltimore County, with \$6,500, led in Maryland; Hattiesburg, with \$3,260, and Jackson, with \$4,800, led in Mississippi; High Point, with \$3,496.30, and Charlotte, with \$5,341.95, led in North Carolina; Oklahoma City, with \$3,800, and Tulsa, with \$5,880, led in Oklahoma; Columbia's A teachers, with \$3,000 and \$4,152, led in South Carolina; Oak Ridge, with \$3,675 and \$5,500, led in Tennessee; Dallas, with \$4,100, and Houston, with \$6,000, led in Texas; Richmond, with \$3,500 and \$5,000, led in Virginia; and Hancock County, with \$4,130 and \$5,730, led in West Virginia.

WESTERN SECTION

The western section of the Nation has an average beginning salary of \$4,434, with the following State averages: Alaska, \$5,293; Arizona, \$4,289; California, \$4,587; Colorado, \$3,981; Hawaii, \$4,020; Idaho, \$3,982; Montana, \$4,249; Nevada, \$4,491; New Mexico, \$4,233; Oregon, \$4,093; Utah, \$3,771; Washington, \$4,209; and Wyoming, \$4,280.

The highest ranking districts in the western section for teachers with the bachelor's degree are as follows: Fairbanks, with a be-

ginning salary of \$6,150 and ending salary of \$7,650, led in Alaska; Tucson, with \$4,550 and \$7,550, led in Arizona; Kern County Union, with \$5,100, and Redwood City, with \$8,340, led in California; Pueblo, with \$4,200 and \$6,575, led in Colorado; Honolulu, with \$4,020 and \$6,000, led in Hawaii; Lewiston, with \$4,200, and Boise, with \$5,680, led in Idaho; Anaconda, with \$4,475, and Great Falls, with \$6,600, led in Montana; Clark County and Washoe County, with \$4,500, and Ormsby County, with \$6,200, led in Nevada; Clovis, with \$4,300, and Albuquerque, with \$6,700, led in New Mexico; Portland, with \$4,300 and \$6,600, led in Oregon; Salt Lake City, with \$3,870 and \$6,060, led in Utah; Port Angeles, with \$4,430, and Tacoma, with \$6,200, led in Washington; and Casper-Midwest, with \$4,600 and \$6,394, led in Wyoming.

TERRITORIES

The Canal Zone has a beginning salary of \$5,625, while Guam's is \$3,770. This would make an average of \$4,698.

Snow Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard many statistical arguments intended to prove that commuter trains can carry a greater number of passengers more efficiently than individual automobiles and other forms of transportation.

Convincing as these arguments are they are not quite as dramatic as the demonstrations of rail reliability which occurred during last week's snowstorms. When all else was slowed or stopped, the trains continued to operate.

An editorial in the March 5 Newark Evening News discusses the situation in one part of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNOW TRAVEL

The good old railroads came through again. With air and highway traffic paralyzed by the snowstorm, the trains kept running. And if they were running late, it was chiefly because they were swamped by refugees who normally use buses, cars and planes that weren't running at all.

The railroads, so often accused of shirking their responsibilities to the traveling public, put on extra cars and special trains. And they must have lost money because thousands crowded aboard without bothering to buy tickets and rode free because collectors couldn't push through the jammed cars.

The collapse of rubber-based interstate transportation was complete, with the Lincoln Tunnel blocked and Port Authority bus terminal officials halting ticket sales and advising commuters to seek other transportation. The vulnerability of the motor vehicle to the rigors of winter was demonstrated anew, and the storm reinforced, if reinforcement were needed, the argument that railroad service must somehow be preserved.

So, it should be added, must local public transportation systems. Around here the buses didn't do too well during the worst of the storm. As usual, they were delayed by private cars not equipped for snow. But they did get through eventually, while a lot of cars didn't. And yesterday, like the railroads, they were jammed with extra riders, the inevitable foul-weather friends.

As for all the grousing being done about municipal efforts in Newark and elsewhere to combat the snow, perhaps a better job could have been done. But the situation wouldn't have been nearly so bad if a lot of people had left their cars home after it started to snow Thursday morning, and if a lot of abandoned cars without snow tires or chains hadn't blocked the path of the plows.

New Wheat Bill Holds Hope for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to discuss briefly a new wheat marketing bill, H.R. 11022, which I introduced in the House on March 9, 1960. The bill, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, would establish a wheat marketing program for the thousands of farmers whose principal product is wheat and who, for the past few years, have been suffering a severe setback because of falling prices and mounting surpluses.

Basically, this is the same bill that I introduced last year along with a group of my colleagues from the wheat-producing States of the Midwest and Pacific Northwest. However, the bill has been changed in several respects and we hope that this year it will be more acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under provisions of this bill the most dramatic change from old programs is contained in the bushel quota proposal rather than the old acreage allotment system. We all fully realize that the acreage allotment system has not functioned well. The wheat in storage continues to mount up and the cost to the taxpayers and the farmers themselves continues to rise. These price-depressing surpluses have become an almost impossible burden to America.

The purpose of my wheat bill is to stabilize prices to the wheatgrowers, lower the surpluses now in stock and prevent the accumulation of further unwieldy surpluses in wheat.

To accomplish this we have switched from the acreage control to the bushel control.

Each year, under the proposal, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to assay the wheat market, both domestic and foreign, in terms of bushels of wheat. Once this assessment is made, the Secretary would then draw out of storage 150 million bushels of wheat to be sold on the domestic or export exchanges at not less than 100 percent of parity.

The rest of the market would be divided up among the wheat producers whose bushel allotment would be based

on the present acreage allotments. However, in order to get marketing certificates the wheat producer would have to withdraw 20 percent of all his land from production. Of this 20 percent, at least half would be in the acreage reserve and the Government would be required to pay the usual soil bank fees. The other half would simply be withdrawn from production without compensation to the producing farmer.

Once a farmer has received a certificate to sell wheat, the sales would be made on the open market at the going price. This competitive sales principle would put the wheat producer back on his feet as an independent.

Obviously, only top grade wheat would go into the domestic and foreign markets for human consumption. Lower grades would be sold as feed. Feed grain producers, however, would not be as severely penalized by this plan as they are at present, because the wheat producer would not be sowing part of his land to feed grains as he is now; it would be out of production altogether.

By reducing our surpluses at the rate of 150 million bushels annually, the storage costs to the taxpayers would be lowered and the general public would benefit. By withdrawing 20 percent of the wheatland from production, future surpluses would not be allowed to accumulate. By putting the 150 million bushels on the open market, the Secretary of Agriculture, in effect, would force a short market which, in turn, would stabilize prices at or near 100 percent of parity without cost to the Government.

Although no legislation ever drafted is ideal or 100-percent foolproof, Mr. Speaker, this measure seems to me to be most meritorious and a long step along the road to solving a very difficult problem.

Strong Support for Legislation To Provide Overtime Compensation for Substitute Employees in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years I have sponsored legislation to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal service. It is the purpose of this bill to bring the overtime wages of the substitute employees of the Post Office under the same provisions which govern those of the regular employees.

In other words, if a substitute works over 8 hours in 1 day, he should be paid time and a half, as is a regular employee. If a substitute works over 40 hours in a week, he should be paid time and a half, as is a regular employee.

Under the current provisions, the substitute carrier or clerk may work any number of hours in 1 day or 1 week, and yet never receive additional pay for over-

time. This is grossly unfair, and certainly not in keeping with established wage practices in private industry. My bill, S. 1444, would correct this injustice, and therefore deserves widespread support in this body.

I was gratified recently to receive a letter from the Postal Union of Manhattan-Bronx Clerks supporting this measure. Because of their intimate knowledge of this situation, I am particularly pleased to have the backing of this organization. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter and the bill printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POSTAL UNION OF MANHATTAN-
BRONX CLERKS.

New York, N.Y., March 8, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This union, at its last membership meeting, went on record in support of your bill, S. 1444, to provide time-and-a-half overtime pay for substitutes in the postal service after 8 hours in 1 day or 40 hours in a week.

The postal substitute works under conditions today which belong to the past century. The conditions would never be tolerated elsewhere, in fact, they run counter to what is advocated by Uncle Sam himself when he speaks to other employers. We think it high time that Uncle Sam practiced what he preaches—became a complying employer.

Your interest in the miserable status of this unfortunate worker, the post office sub is indeed appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS BILLER,
President.
WILLIAM J. KARP,
Secretary.

S. 1444

A bill to amend section 4 of the Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out the period in the last sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided further, That in emergencies or if the needs of the service require, substitute and hourly rate employees in post offices of the first, second, and third class may be employed in excess of eight hours per day or forty hours per week and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of pay received by such employees."

The Water Pollution Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the fol-

lowing editorial from the Lake Charles (La.) American Press, of February 25, 1960. I feel that this editorial is most timely and accurate in its views. I was most happy to be one of those in 1956 who assisted in the framing and preparing of the water pollution bill and, together with Congressman BLATNIK and others who have worked so hard to attain some relief for our people, to attempt to continue to expand this program, which is not a giveaway. Should the program be continued, it would eventually save billions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States through the raising of health standards and the lowering of hospital costs. It is, indeed, unfortunate that some of the good legislation, such as this, airport construction and flood control and navigation, must be accomplished over the objections of the Bureau of the Budget and the President. These vetoes and threatened vetoes are an attempt to force legislation by coercion and should it prevail, the legislative branch of our Federal Government will be reduced to a group of lackeys to the office of the President. The editorial follows:

VITAL BILL

Today the House is scheduled to attempt to override the President's first veto of the present session—that of the water pollution bill.

The veto was presented Tuesday shortly after the President left on his South American tour. And his reason for vetoing the bill was one he has cited often before—that water pollution is a local, not a Federal responsibility, and should be dealt with on a local basis.

The President's reasoning is difficult to understand on this bill just as it was difficult on the airport bill which he also claimed was a local responsibility. Pollution may be a localized problem but it can affect a number of localities through the acts of just one community.

For instance, several communities have contributed to the pollution of the Calcasieu River. Happily, most of the pollution problems on the upper reaches of the Calcasieu have been eliminated through construction of a sewage disposal plant at Oakdale. The main source of pollution now appears to be those areas surrounding Lake Charles which do not have sewerage facilities.

What has happened on the Calcasieu has happened on countless rivers across the Nation. The problem has been most acute on some of the larger rivers, such as the Missouri, where many small towns dump raw sewage into the river, the same river that communities downstream depend upon for their water supply. A low level dam has been proposed on the Calcasieu and it is expected that Lake Charles will one day get its drinking water from the river rather than deep wells, hence the purity of river water is of great concern here.

So water pollution is not exactly a local problem. And it isn't necessarily a State problem since many rivers cross State lines. It is a national problem just as much as the farm problem.

Actually, the water pollution bill that has been in effect since 1956 has furnished an incentive for local communities to launch construction of sewerage systems and the expenditures on such projects have increased tremendously since the bill went into effect. And the Federal contribution has been small—one-third the cost of disposal plants in small communities. The Federal Government has contributed nothing toward the cost of collecting systems which generally cost more than the disposal plants.

Here in Calcasieu Parish, West Lake and Hollywood have taken advantage of Federal aid to build sewerage systems. The Hollywood system is in operation and West Lake is just getting underway on theirs. Iowa recently passed a bond issue to finance a sewerage system there.

The battle between Congress and the President is essentially over the extent to which the Federal Government will participate in sewerage projects. The President wants to extend the act 10 years and allow for \$50 million per year in Federal contributions. Congress wants to raise it to \$90 million a year.

The increased Federal expenditures which Congress has approved would allow the Federal Government to extend financial aid to larger communities. At the present time no Federal grant can exceed \$250,000 which means that the largest plant that can be constructed under the bill is three times that amount or \$750,000.

With this limitation only small communities can qualify. Lake Charles would not be eligible under the present program. The bill passed by Congress would approximately double the maximum Federal contribution and would enable many more communities to qualify for Federal aid.

The bill passed by Congress has been referred to as a \$900 million measure rather than the \$500 million the President requested which sounds like Congress is seeking to practically double the amount the President asked. But it is for a 10-year period and \$90 million per year in Federal money for sewerage projects is a piddling amount compared to most appropriations asked by the President.

Considerable sums have been expended by local communities since 1956 on sewerage projects and Federal funds have furnished the incentive. And each dollar of additional Federal funds would probably result in at least a tenfold increase on the local level. It is difficult to conceive a more worthy use of Federal funds, especially since the movement toward the urban areas has heightened the need for sewerage facilities.

Water pollution is a growing national problem and if more communities aren't furnished incentives toward developing adequate sewerage facilities the health of perhaps millions will be jeopardized.

Battle of Natural Bridge in War Between the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we are about to have the centennial observance of the War Between the States, and matters that are of historical interest relating to that war are particularly interesting at this time.

I doubt if many Senators know that the capital of Florida, Tallahassee, was the only capital of any State east of the Mississippi not captured by the Federal troops during that war. There were three battles fought near there, the Battle of Olustee, the Battle of Marianna, and the Battle of Natural Bridge.

I was pleased to read in the Monday, March 7, issue of the Tallahassee Democrat an article with special reference to

the Battle of Natural Bridge, fought March 6, 1865, described by my good friend, Maj. Gen. Mark W. Lance, the adjutant general of the State of Florida.

I believe this article will be of interest to all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. MARK LANCE REPORTS BATTLE OF NATURAL BRIDGE

How teenage cadets and old men of the Home Guard defended Tallahassee was described by Maj. Gen. Mark W. Lance, of St. Augustine, adjutant general of Florida, yesterday afternoon at the site of the Battle of Natural Bridge, fought March 6, 1865.

His address was part of a ceremony that marked an annual pilgrimage to the battle-site marker, near Woodville.

Many townspeople joined in memorializing the heroes of that battle, the last one fought in Florida in the Civil War. Their valor resulted in Tallahassee being the only southern capital east of the Mississippi River which was not captured during the war.

General Lance has served in the Navy, Army, and Florida National Guard, and has studied the historical events surrounding the Battle of Natural Bridge.

FLORIDIANS HELPED

He pointed out that in addition to the several thousand men from Florida serving in the Confederate Army and Navy, as a great contribution to the war effort by Florida was the supply of cattle, hogs, sirup, salt, and leather to the Confederate armies.

In the third year of the war Union military forces were ordered to destroy the railroad running east and west through north Florida and connecting lines into Georgia, and also to destroy all the plantations and farms producing these essential agricultural products.

A Union force of about 5,000 soldiers, under command of General Seymour, marched west from Jacksonville in February 1864, following the railroad connecting Jacksonville and Tallahassee. At Olustee, Gen. Joseph Flanagan, with about 2,000 Confederate troops, defeated the Union, force which withdrew back to Jacksonville.

NEXT ATTEMPT

General Lance recalled that the next attempt to capture Tallahassee came from the west. Early in September, 1864, Gen. Alexander Asboth with 700 Union troops left Pensacola marching east. After a heavy skirmish they entered Marianna on the 27th. The small Confederate force opposing General Asboth at Marianna was composed of about 300 old men and boys.

Driven out of town, they withdrew to the east bank of the Chipola River where the Federal troops were prevented from crossing. The reported approach of Confederate reinforcements caused Asboth to retreat back to Pensacola, destroying farms, crops and livestock on the way.

Both attempts to reach Tallahassee from the east and west having failed, the Union command decided to launch a combined sea and land operation, General Lance related.

NEAR ST. MARKS

Union Navy transports embarked troops at Key West, Fort Myers and Cedar Keys for an amphibious landing in the vicinity of the St. Marks Lighthouse, then to march overland the 25 miles up the St. Marks-Tallahassee railroad, and capture Tallahassee from the south.

Gen. John Newton, commanding the Union forces, arrived aboard Navy transports off St. Marks Bar on March 1, 1865, where ships of the Union Gulf Blockade Squadron

met the transports to furnish naval support for the landing.

General Lance said Newton's plan of action was: first, at night put landing party ashore, capture Confederate pickets and secure bridge over the river; second, follow landing party during darkness, with troop debarkation and landings; third, march upriver to Newport, destroy Newport, take Fort St. Marks from the rear, cross the river and move up the railroad to Tallahassee.

To protect his force from Confederate reinforcements by rail movement, he sent small raiding parties to destroy the railroad bridges over the Aucilla River east of Tallahassee and the Ochlockonee River southwest of Tallahassee.

When the Union ships arrived off St. Marks Bar, a heavy fog and high surf prevented landing until midnight of March 3. Meanwhile, word of the enemy force had reached the capital. Tallahassee was alerted and dispatches sent to commanders of Florida troops in the area to move immediately toward the capital.

General Lance said there is no doubt that but for the delay in the landing of Union troops, the defenders of Tallahassee would not have reached the excellent defensive area at Natural Bridge in sufficient numbers to have held the ground.

"Once the enemy troops had crossed to the west bank of the river and exited from the hammock defiles, their approach to the capital through open wooded areas might not have been stopped," he said.

BRIDGE AT NEWPORT

On March 5 the Federal force under General Newton advanced up the east bank of the St. Marks River to Newport, hoping to cross the river on the bridge there. The Confederates had destroyed the bridge, forcing the Federals to continue their movement up the river with expectations of crossing near Natural Bridge.

This march was made during the night, with the leading elements arriving at the eastern approach to Natural Bridge at daylight of March 6, there to be confronted by well entrenched defending forces.

After the main Federal force arrived, an attack was launched. The Confederates under Gen. William Miller repulsed several charges but were finally forced to withdraw their forward elements back to the main line of resistance. Effective fire forced the Federal troops to retreat to the east side of the river, followed by part of the Confederate force. The Federal force retreated during the night to the St. Marks Lighthouse, later reembarking on naval transports and sailing to Key West.

When news of the Federal troop landing at St. Marks Lighthouse had reached Tallahassee the night of March 4, General Lance said, the militia was assembled, which consisted of every man and boy capable of bearing arms. The West Florida Seminary cadets who were over 12 years of age, numbering about 30, reported for the defense of the capital, under command of Capt. V. M. Johnson, the seminary superintendent.

General Miller moved every available effective soldier to the Newport-Natural Bridge area on March 5, placed pickets along the east bank of the river, placed a defense force to prevent crossing by bridge at Newport and entrenched his main body to repulse the enemy attack at Natural Bridge.

General Lance said military historians agree that the opposing forces in the Natural Bridge engagement were about of equal strength, with an estimated 500 to 600 on each side in the battle and with reported losses being 21 Federal killed and 89 wounded, and 3 Confederate dead and 23 wounded.

Senator Richard L. Neuberger

SPEECH OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the sad and untimely death of my good friend, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, leaves me with a deep sense of personal loss. It is tragic indeed that one so young, with a past that was great but a future greater still, should be taken from us and that we should be so deprived of his leadership, his wisdom, and his shining courage. My wife, Martha, and I extend to his widow, Maurine, our heartfelt sympathy with awareness, however, that his qualities of greatness will continue to inspire her.

DICK NEUBERGER's death does not bring a family sorrow alone—there is an unbridgeable void in our lives—our Nation has lost an outstanding statesman, one of her most dedicated sons; his own State of Oregon, a great Senator; the State of Alaska, a good friend; the people as a whole, a leading exponent of their causes, their hopes, their dreams; the literary world, a voice of conscience and great talent. His voice is silent, his pen is still, but to those of us left behind he bequeathed the inspiration of his high courage and integrity. He was a gentle and kind and tolerant man who believed unerringly in the democratic principles of our Government and unfailingly in the fundamental rights of mankind. He was a true "liberal" in the full sense of the word.

From his early days at the University of Oregon, DICK NEUBERGER could always be found out in front fighting for good causes, regardless of their current unpopularity, or prevailing complacency. He was a man of basic wisdom with the courage of his convictions. He was a champion of the underprivileged, a passionate believer in democracy, a true American.

We in Alaska who have at long last found our place among the society of States will forever be grateful to him for his steadfast support of statehood. He was one of the early advocates of statehood for Alaska and likewise for Hawaii. He would, of course, be such an advocate for he lived by and worked for the ideals he so eloquently expressed. During the construction of the Alaska Highway by the military during World War II, he lived among us, worked with us, wrote about us, understood our endeavors, and left with us an even greater appreciation of our beautiful and bountiful State than we had had before—a richness that stretches before us in a never ending progression. To all of us he brought into sharp focus the problems of the Northwest in such perspective that we cannot but be blind to reality if we do not continue his good fight to preserve for posterity some of that beauty of mountain and stream and forest that was so much a part of

RICHARD NEUBERGER, the man; RICHARD NEUBERGER, the American.

While he sleeps peacefully in his beloved Northwest, I should like to think he is doing so beneath stately trees he loved so much, and in the shadow of towering mountains marked with all their splendor and natural beauty. He has left us poor with his passing, but indeed we are rich for having known him, having worked with him, and having been inspired by him. Our loss, but Heaven's gain.

A Situation of Monopsony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the March 1960 issue of the bulletin on Business and Economic Conditions published by the First National City Bank of New York there is, on page 30, an article entitled "A Situation of Monopsony." This article deals with one phase of the report of the majority of the Joint Economic Committee recently submitted to the Congress. I call particular attention to this paragraph in the article, which reads:

But the advocacy of competition in the Government securities market collides with quite another line of thinking; namely, that the Federal Government, being such a large and frequent borrower, should exercise a monopolist's power and hold its borrowing costs down simply by refusing to pay more.

The point here, as the article makes clear to readers, is that the majority in the committee, on the one hand, are critical of a lack of competition in the Government securities market, whereas, on the other hand, they are anxious to have the Federal Reserve bank, representing the Government, step in and buy huge quantities of bonds in order to stabilize the bond market. Such action would be bringing monopolistic power into a market which they say should be free of monopolistic influences.

This article points out the inconsistency in the position of the majority, and I think will be of interest to students of this issue.

Speaking of the criticisms of the Treasury, which the majority in the joint committee has voiced from time to time, because they assert the Treasury does not get the best prices it should for its offerings under the system it uses, the article states the following:

In the year 1958 the Treasury, taking advantage of cheap money and also facing some sizable bond maturities, did issue a considerable volume of bonds. These totaled \$15.6 billion, including the ill-starred 2½s due in 6½ years which involved speculative buyers in such heavy losses.

The heavy losses suffered by investors and speculators in the 2½s.

Which, I say parenthetically, were only market losses, but need not have

been losses if the bonds had been held to maturity—

along with other less spectacular examples of Government certificate, note, and bond issues going below par soon after issuance, cast doubt on the theory that the Treasury, in setting rates on such securities, has been giving anything away. It is true that some other issues have proved profitable to initial purchasers, but there must be counterbalancing profits to warrant the underwriting risks assumed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks just delivered be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, followed by the article I have mentioned.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SITUATION OF "MONOPSONY"

The Joint Economic Committee's report, in urging more use of the auction technique of selling Government securities, argues that this can make the Government securities market more competitive and hence cheapen Treasury borrowing costs. On this point many experts would disagree though there might not be any harm in trying out, say, a sale of 1-year Treasury certificates of indebtedness on a competitive auction basis.

But the advocacy of competition in the Government securities market collides with quite another line of thinking, namely, that the Federal Government, being such a large and frequent borrower, should exercise a monopolist's power and hold its borrowing costs down simply by refusing to pay more. Under the heading of "Imperfect Competition in the Government Bond Market," the JEC majority states:

"The borrowings of the Federal Government are of such large volume both in total and in comparison with the volume of bonds of corporations and of State and local governments that they help markedly to determine interest rates instead of merely conforming to the forces of competition and supply and demand as has so often been asserted by the Treasury.

"In economic language, the situation approaches 'monopsony' or a market in which one buyer purchases such a large proportion of the supply that imperfect competition results.

"The facts are that in 1958, the Federal Government borrowed three-quarters of the funds in the long-term market (excluding short-term bills, mortgages, and consumer credit)."

To people in the business, any figures showing the U.S. Treasury as a dominant factor in the long-term market are hard to believe. The most striking facts of the capital market since World War II have been (a) the dominance of real estate mortgages and (b) the comparative abstinence of the Treasury from the long-term market, even though it had a huge floating debt in need of funding into bonds. The committee omits mortgage investments from its analysis and includes, as Treasury borrowings in the long-term market, sales of certificates of indebtedness due within 1 year and notes due in 1 to 5 years. Such short intermediate borrowings totaled \$46.9 billion during 1958, as the table below shows.

In the year 1958, the Treasury, taking advantage of cheap money and also facing some sizable bond maturities, did issue a considerable volume of bonds. These totaled \$15.6 billion, including the ill-starred 2½s due in 6½ years which involved speculative buyers in such heavy losses.

The heavy losses suffered by investors and speculators in the 2½s, along with other less spectacular examples of Government certificate, note, and bond issues going below par soon after issuance, cast doubt on the

theory that the Treasury, in setting rates on such securities, has been giving anything away. It is true that some other issues have proved profitable to initial purchasers, but there must be counterbalancing profits to warrant the underwriting risks assumed.

Bonds due in 5 to 10 years have more of an intermediate than long-term character. In the fullest sense, long-term bonds would be those due beyond 20 years. Treasury issues which fulfill this criterion have been few and far between and modest in amount. As a matter of record, the Treasury has come to market with bonds due beyond 20 years only six times since 1946—once in 1953, twice in 1955, twice in 1958, and once in 1959. Treasury issues of bonds due beyond 20 years were the largest in 1958 of any of the 14 postwar years. Even so, they reached only \$2.9 billion.

Gross issues of marketable U.S. Government securities (In billions)

	1958	1959	1946-59
Bills due within 1 year.....	\$97.2	\$102.7	\$1,044.2
Certificates due within 1 year.....	36.6	19.7	357.7
Notes due in 1 to 5 years.....	10.3	26.7	178.4
Bonds due in 5 to 10 years.....	12.7		44.3
Bonds due in 10 to 20 years.....		.6	2.0
Bonds due after 20 years.....	2.9	.9	9.2
Total.....	159.7	150.6	1,635.8

The Late Honorable George Huddleston, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Montgomery Alabama Journal on Wednesday, March 2, in tribute to a former distinguished Alabamian, the late Hon. George Huddleston, Sr., whose record of service in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress from the Ninth District of Alabama is an enviable one.

The editorial follows:

GEORGE HUDDLESTON'S RECORD

George Huddleston of Birmingham who served in Congress from 1914 to 1936 was one of the most controversial and independent figures who ever appeared in Alabama politics. His passing at the age of 90 marks a notable epoch in Alabama's political history.

Mr. Huddleston started out as one of the most ardent advocates of better laws for the laboring man. He drew the line tightly, so that he made himself known as a friend of the "common man," which in Birmingham politics meant that he was opposed by the corporations and big business people of Jefferson County.

Yet in the last years of his public service he was regarded as a warm friend of business and an opponent of many of the radical elements which had so long supported him. Mr. Huddleston claimed that he had not changed, but that the attitude of the people of his district had changed.

He won the friendship of business by

ardent attention to the public's business. For example, Charley DeBardleben, an industrial leader, on one occasion had something very important he wanted attended to in Washington. Repeated requests to the State's Senators got no action at all.

At last in desperation he sent a telegram to George Huddleston, a man he had always opposed in politics. It is said that within 3 hours Mr. Huddleston wired back that the matter had been attended to and said he was glad to be of service. There were many cases like that. Businessmen who did not like Huddleston and did not vote for him invariably found him honest in his convictions and quick to be of service any time a request was made. This kind of record gradually made an impression with the result that business people in Jefferson County became Huddleston's friend.

When the First World War broke out Mr. Huddleston was violently criticized for some of the steps he took in opposition to President Wilson's handling of the situation. It stirred passions in his home city, but before the war had gone very far Mr. Huddleston had shown himself as ardent a patriot as anybody.

In his early days when he had to campaign hard to get elected Mr. Huddleston spent weeks out in far reaches of the county. Time after time he would spend the night in the home of a constituent and thus form ties that could not be broken. With such backing any opposition to Huddleston was futile, as was shown by the many years he spent in Congress though he had stirring opposition nearly every time he had to run for reelection.

Mr. Huddleston established a record of political independence and along with it a reputation for able and honest administration of his office that will be long remembered.

Helping Citizens To Understand Their Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. has begun a new series in its monthly publication, New Jersey Bell. The series will discuss the governments of the State, counties, and communities. It is non-partisan in approach and is intended to help citizens of that State to understand a few of the levels of government that have a direct effect on them.

The first article in the series deals with the Governor of New Jersey, Robert B. Meyner. In a letter to all Bell Telephone employees, Governor Meyner tells what he hopes the series will accomplish. His letter says:

It is my earnest hope that this series will stimulate increased interest in government, for while the benefits of a democratic system are universally enjoyed, its responsibilities are individual. In other words, government—local, State, or National, is not better than the degree of interest and participation displayed by its citizens.

This responsibility extends beyond voting. It includes the duty of always being aware of issues and questions facing our government, and of giving your elected representatives the benefit of your opinions. I also urge

every New Jersey citizen to take as active a role as possible in the affairs of his community.

In another article in the same issue of the magazine the editors have quoted the views of Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives. Mr. McCORMACK exhorts the American people to make their views known directly to their Congressman about many issues.

It seems to me that the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and other private companies that make efforts to stir interest in public questions can perform notable public service. If there ever was a time when we need crystal clear understanding of our Government, that time is now.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the March 1960 issue of New Jersey Bell be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNOR: NEW JERSEY'S CHIEF EXECUTIVE LEADS ONE OF THE NATION'S OLDEST STATES UNDER A FRAMEWORK OF GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHED BY ONE OF THE NEWEST STATE CONSTITUTIONS

(By R. H. Yard)

Footsteps rang through the empty corridors of New Jersey's State House in Trenton as an overcoat-clad figure, burdened under the weight of a pair of bulging briefcases, hurried out a side door to a waiting limousine. "Good evening, Governor," greeted a waiting State trooper who has long since become accustomed to waiting for his distinguished passenger until long after other State House workers have left for their homes.

Although working late at his State House office is not a nightly habit with Gov. Robert B. Meyner, neither is it unusual. While the State's new (1947) constitution charts the Governor's official duties, his important office cloaks him with a host of unofficial, but nonetheless important, assignments. He is, for example, leader of his political party, a constant target of newsmen seeking a story, and a ceremonial leader who is expected to be present at an astonishing number of civic functions ranging from testimonial dinners to plant dedications. These extra-constitutional duties require the Governor to be on the road 2, 3, or sometimes even 7 nights a week.

Because of these uncompromising demands on his time, the Governor and his briefcases are constant traveling companions. State House aides like to recall the fall day several years ago when Governor Meyner attended a world series game in Yankee Stadium. As long as his car was embroiled in stop-and-go traffic in Trenton, the car was filled with small talk, but when they reached the open stretches of Route 1 the Governor murmured "Excuse me" and reached for his ubiquitous brief case, whose contents absorbed his attention until the car reached New York City. Demands on the Governor's time are no respecter of party, for the incumbent's predecessors were subject to the same pressures, as will his successor in 1962.

WHO CAN BE GOVERNOR?

Though we are all familiar with Governor Meyner, who is now beginning the third year of his second 4-year term as the State's chief executive, few of us have any real idea of the responsibilities and duties required of our Governor by the constitution and the law, nor of the changes in this office that have evolved during the 184-year history of

our State which has operated under three constitutions.

The constitution of 1947, which has been widely hailed as a leading example of a modern State charter, spells out who may serve as Governor, his term of office, and his official duties.

The Governor, according to the constitution, "shall be not less than 30 years of age," a citizen of the United States for at least 20 years, and a resident of the State for at least 7 years before his election (unless he has been absent from the State on the public business of the United States or of this State.) He is elected by legally qualified voters of the State (and he is the only State official elected by the people of the entire State) for a 4-year term. Under the new constitution, the Governor for the first time in the State's history is eligible to succeed himself, but only for a second successive term. Alfred E. Driscoll was the first chief executive to be reelected to a second term. New Jersey pays its Governor \$30,000 per year.

In the event of the Governor's death or resignation the reins of government are inherited by the President of the State Senate, and, should he then die, or retire, the Speaker of the General Assembly becomes Governor.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GOVERNOR

What then are the Governor's duties and responsibilities? Listed first in our constitution is the requirement that "The Governor shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Because it is obviously impossible for one man to see that all the State's laws and regulations are obeyed, the constitution permits the establishment of 20 administrative departments in the executive branch of the State government which is headed by the Governor. Fourteen of these departments are now in operation, with the head of each a member of the Governor's cabinet. These 14 departments include: agriculture, banking and insurance, board of public utility commissioners, civil service, conservation and economic development, defense, education, health, institutions and agencies, labor and industry, law and public safety, state, state highway, and treasury.

Generally speaking, department heads are appointed by the Governor, but his nominations are subject to the "advice and consent" of the Senate. Although most of these appointments are approved without serious objection by the senate, there is an old, and unwritten custom known as senatorial courtesy, which occasionally pits the senate in a bitter battle with the Governor. If a nominee is declared to be personally displeasing to the senator from the candidate's home county, then other senators invariably refuse to confirm the nomination. Each cabinet member serves at the Governor's pleasure, with the exception of the attorney general and the secretary of state, who are appointed to terms of office that coincide with the Governor's term.

The Governor's appointive powers include also the right to appoint judges in the State's court system, along with the members of the many State boards and agencies, and other policymaking officials. This appointive power is tempered by the requirement that the Senate give its approval to most gubernatorial appointments.

A STRONGER VETO POWER

The Governor's role in his relations with the legislature was strengthened greatly under the new constitution, which granted him a far stronger veto power than had ever before been entrusted to the chief executive. When the State's first constitution was written in 1776, its authors were all too familiar with the dictatorial rule of British Royal Governors to entrust their Governor with virtually anything but ceremonial powers.

Today, both houses of the legislature—the general assembly and the senate—must each muster a two-thirds majority vote in order to override. After a bill is passed, the Governor has a 10-day period during which he can approve or reject a bill. Should he fail to sign within that period, the bill automatically becomes law—if the legislature is in session. If the legislature has ended its session during the 10-day span, an additional 45-day period of grace is permitted. Then, if the Governor wishes to veto a bill he must call the legislators back into a special session.

The Governor is required to send a message to the legislature at the opening of each regular session, reporting on the condition of the State, and recommending legislation. But just as the Governor can exert some control over legislation through his veto power, so can the legislature accept or reject the Governor's legislative proposals—an illustration of the checks and balances system that safeguards our rights as citizens by preventing one branch of the government from dominating the governmental processes. The chief executive can call the two branches of the legislature, or the senate alone, into session whenever he considers such action necessary.

NO NEW TAXES IN 1960-61 BUDGET

Another responsibility of the executive branch which each year attracts widespread interest is the preparation of the budget. In his most recent budget message delivered February 1 to a joint session of the senate and the general assembly, Governor Meyner proposed a record outlay of \$431,365,104 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. As required by the constitution, the budget was balanced against an expected income of \$432,475,057. Although the Governor stressed the fact that the budget—\$24,212,000 higher than the current year's spending—would require no new taxes, he did not rule out the possibility of increases in some existing taxes.

Budget preparation is no easy task, for State government is becoming an increasingly complex operation. Unexpected events can exert a real impact on budgetary planning. For example, the tragic epidemic of eastern viral encephalitis that swept southern New Jersey last year shows up in the Governor's proposed budget in which he called for a safe and sane approach to the problem, combining both research and control measures, under an appropriation of \$535,000 for the coming fiscal year, compared to this year's anti-mosquito appropriation of \$135,000.

Another innovation in the new constitution gave the Governor, for the first time in the history of the State, a constitutional power to remove State officials. Department heads, with the exception of the secretary of state and the attorney general who serve for definite terms, serve at the Governor's pleasure, which means that he is able to request—and get—their resignations at any time. Other officials may be removed "for cause." Employees subject to this removal power, however, are protected by the requirement that charges must be filed, and that they be given an opportunity to be heard at a public hearing. Not subject to this gubernatorial removal power are members and employees of the legislature, the courts, or officers appointed by the legislature in joint session.

GOVERNOR'S ARREST ENDS BRITISH RULE

Our State was born in 1776 amid a turbulence that we can scarcely imagine today. The British Royal Governor was William Franklin, son of Philadelphia's Benjamin Franklin. William chose to ally himself with the British—a decision he may have come to regret by 1776 when he found himself attempting to enforce the infamous stamp tax. It was the passage of this act by the British

Parliament that gave rise to the rallying cry, "No taxation without representation."

Resentment boiled up rapidly and reached a climax with the arrest on June 15, 1778, of Governor Franklin as "an enemy to the liberties of this country." A committee quickly began drawing up a constitution outlining the government of the new State which was passed by the provincial congress in Burlington on July 2, 2 days before the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence were signed by the Continental Congress in Philadelphia.

The first legislature organized under the new constitution met in Princeton in late August, and its members elected William Livingston, of Elizabeth, as the State's first Governor. Because of their bitter experience with the personal power wielded by Royal Governors, the architects of the new constitution gave Governor Livingston little power in a government that was dominated by the legislature.

The State's second constitution was approved in 1844. Though the new charter was an improvement in many ways, it did little actually to strengthen the Governor's role in the State administration. He still lacked a worthwhile veto power, and his power to remove State officials was severely limited. This constitution served the State until 1947 when the people gave an overwhelming vote of approval for our present document, which has restored the balance between the three branches of the State government, greatly increased the Governor's personal executive authority, and streamlined the State's archaic court system, which today is one of the most highly esteemed judicial systems of any State in the land.

The governorship, and the State government as a whole have undergone considerable change since the more carefree days of Gov. Daniel Haines who, in his message to the legislature more than a century ago, declared: "I have no hesitation in recommending that no money be raised by taxation for the current year; and I confidently hope that in the future we will be wholly relieved from any such burden."

PUT IN YOUR 2 CENTS' WORTH

(By JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Congressman from Massachusetts, and majority leader of the House of Representatives)

Americans have a way of expressing their views in down-to-earth, simple terms, and one of these phrases is: "I put in my 2 cents worth."

Putting in our 2 cents worth, or expressing our individual opinions, can be vitally important to the future of our country.

Americans have a God-implanted love of free speech, but I have observed during my service in Congress that too few of our citizens take advantage of this privilege of speaking up on government matters.

A reason may be that many people believe their Congressman does not welcome a letter or a telephone call from a citizen who has an opinion on some past, pending or future matter. May I correct this mistaken idea as simply and as clearly as possible? Every Congressman welcomes the opinion and counsel of our citizens because his primary job is to do just that: represent our people in the government of our country. To do this well, the Congressman must know what his people are thinking, and the more opinions he gets the better will be his decisions. Public opinion is a very important factor in a democracy.

The very basis of our Government is built around people. What we call politics, elections, legislation—all are attuned to one great determinant, the voice of the people or public opinion.

The people created America, and the people—you and I—must continue to watch over and improve the country our forefathers built and our contemporaries are building. This is our duty and our greater obligation.

As a country, we decided long ago to place this responsibility upon our citizens. Freedom for all was the fruit of this decision, but freedom carries with it the cost of widespread citizen interest and participation in the affairs of Government.

One of the best ways to fulfill your duties of active citizenship, of course, is to help elect the man or woman of our choice to public office. But do not stop there. Let me encourage you to take the next step. Keep the persons who represent you in Government informed of your views throughout the year. This is an equally important responsibility in our democratic form of Government.

Sometimes I think it might be well if we erect a large sign over Congress which contained this theme. Here the opinions of all Americans are heard—should be heard—with equality. As a result, the aim of their proposals becomes the law of the land.

Or perhaps we should put it in more typical American language: Here your 2 cents worth does make a difference.

MATS in Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an excellent editorial appeared in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, concerning the Military Air Transport Service.

This editorial deserves much consideration, in view of the tremendous job MATS is doing at the present time.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial dated March 8, 1960, follows:

MATS IN DANGER?

A House Armed Services Subcommittee reported a few months ago that the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) is "probably more important to our defense today than any individual supply component has been through history." It is difficult to reconcile this finding—derived from testimony of high-ranking officers—with a Pentagon proposal that more military business be transferred to commercial airlines.

The services lack adequate airlift as it is. The limited Lebanon crisis of 1958 demonstrated that. Any reduction or idling of its personnel and equipment would mean a grave weakening of MATS capability of providing transportation for men and military freight to any part of the world—which is its mission.

MATS has been under attack by several airlines, mostly cargo carriers, which complain that it operates in competition with them. And yet these private carriers received about \$85 million in military contracts last year. They are hoping for another \$100 million if the Pentagon proposal is approved in congressional committee. With all sympathy for the private operators' desire for more business, it is to be hoped that nothing will be done that would impair the effectiveness of our armed services. And deterioration of MATS would seem to threaten exactly that.

Student Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the news story concerning the resolution of the National Conference on Higher Education on the student loyalty oath. At its meeting in Chicago this week, this group went beyond its position of last year, when it limited its objection to the disclaimer affidavit. The college and university representatives now ask for the elimination of both the loyalty oath and the affidavit which are required of students making loans under the National Defense Education Act. I also ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune and editorials from other newspapers which discuss various aspects of the loyalty oath.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 10, 1960]

STUDENT LOYALTY OATH DECRIED BY EDUCATORS

CHICAGO, March 10.—The National Conference on Higher Education yesterday called for elimination of both the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit in the student loan section of the National Defense Education Act.

The conference thus went a step further than it did last year when, after much debate, it limited its objections to the affidavit alone.

When a student applies for a loan under the act, he must sign a loyalty oath and an affidavit that he does not believe in any organization which advocates violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. A number of colleges and universities, including Yale and Harvard, have stayed out or withdrawn from the program in protest.

OBJECTION ON PRINCIPLE

Most of the protest centers on the affidavit on the basis that you cannot pass laws about what people shall believe. Those who object to the loyalty oath do so generally on principle. They say it makes college students a particular center of suspicion, since the oath isn't required of farmers getting crop loans or veterans getting home loans.

Many college officials call both the oath and the affidavit offensive and ineffectual.

Yesterday's action came during the final session of the 3-day conference, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, a department of the National Education Association. About 1,300 college and university presidents, deans, faculty members, and graduate students attended the conference.

Another resolution adopted also concerned the student loan program. Under present law, up to 50 percent of a loan may be forgiven if the borrower later teaches in a public elementary or secondary school. The conference recommended that this forgiveness provision be extended to anyone who later teaches in any institution of higher learning.

ON RACE ISSUE

The conference took note of the current segregation controversy in the South with the following resolution:

"We condemn political interference in the operation of schools and colleges and urge regional and national accrediting agencies to investigate and take appropriate action when such interference occurs."

This is a modified version of a resolution submitted by the United States National Students Association, which dealt specifically with the situation at Alabama State College. The students association said nine Negro students were expelled there on direct orders of the Governor of Alabama, for participating in a sit-in strike.

Members of the resolutions committee declined to accept the wording of the students association, saying they (the committee members) just didn't know enough about it right now.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, December 10, 1959]

IKE ON THE AFFIDAVIT

At his last news conference before leaving for his good will tour, the President spoke out against the so-called non-Communist affidavit required of students receiving Federal loans under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The President said he believed the standard oath of allegiance also required of the student was "sufficient." He left the impression that he would like to see the affidavit provision repealed.

Many of the Nation's leading educators will welcome Mr. Eisenhower as an ally in their fight against the affidavit.

The simple oath of allegiance which the student loan applicant must take has not aroused as much opposition. It is the "affidavit of disbelief" which has been largely responsible for the withdrawal of a dozen or more colleges and universities from the loan program. This compels the student to swear that he "is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

When Harvard University announced the withdrawal from the program recently, President Nathan M. Pusey pointed out that the oath of allegiance made the affidavit "superfluous."

The affidavit, he objected, was discriminatory, singling out "students alone in our population—and among students the neediest—as subjects for special distrust." Furthermore, he said, it would "present no barrier to those it was designed to catch." He found it, along with many other distinguished educators, "an affront to freedom of belief and conscience."

At the next session of Congress, a serious effort will be made to repeal the affidavit requirement. There will be some pressure, too, to repeal the oath of allegiance provision but this is generally considered less objectionable.

With the "affidavit of disbelief" removed, most of the protesting colleges and universities could participate in the loan program in good conscience. We hope that Mr. Eisenhower will press for its removal. His influence might well prove decisive in a close fight.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 19, 1960]

KILL THE AFFIDAVIT OF DISBELIEF

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee is scheduled within the next few days to bring to the Senate floor an amendment which would remove the affidavit of disbelief from the National Defense Act. The act as it stands requires recipients of Federal student loans to swear allegiance to the

United States, and in addition to execute an affidavit declaring they do not believe in, do not support, and are not members of any organization advocating overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or other illegal or unconstitutional method.

We urge Congress to adopt the amendment and eliminate the affidavit.

At the very least the affidavit is superfluous—something like requiring a student to swear disbelief in dishonesty in addition to pledging his honesty.

The utility of the affidavit as a means of catching Communists is completely nullified. It seems to us, by the fact that no dedicated Communist would hesitate for a moment in swearing to a lie.

But the principal reason that one leading university after another is dropping out of the Federal student-aid program rather than accept the "affidavit of disbelief" is that it is basically un-American.

It is un-American because it singles out a particular group of citizens and imposes upon them a special oath not required of other Americans.

It is the more so because it intrudes into an area held inviolate by the most fundamental doctrines of the American system—the privacy of men's minds and thoughts.

To some it may seem picayunish to quibble at signing a statement disclaiming subversive thought or intent at a time when communism is a major menace—a threat to our very way of life.

But communism would not be a threat to our way of life had the Russian people been able to maintain the same freedom of thought, the same freedom from the governmental domination of people's minds, that is our heritage.

The time to head off that kind of domination is before it begins—and the "affidavit of disbelief" is a beginning.

Explaining the University of Chicago's withdrawal from the Federal aid program, chairman Glen A. Lloyd of the board of trustees said the affidavit requirement could lead to "star-chamber investigations into a man's beliefs," and to "governmental interference in the conduct of universities." We agree, times and views change, moreover, and if the Government can proscribe belief in subversion it can also, at some future time, place its own arbitrary definition upon subversion as meaning whatever a majority of its members declare it to mean.

It is far safer to keep Government's foot out of the door entirely, and Congress can do its part by striking out a phrase which is, intentionally or not, a manifest of lack of faith in the loyalty of America's youth.

[From the Hartford Courant, Nov. 19, 1959]

YALE AND HARVARD REJECT AN OATH

Students who benefit from the loans provided by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are required to take an oath of allegiance to the United States. But to the authors of the act this was not enough. The student is required also to take a second oath, by signing an affidavit saying that he doesn't believe in or belong to or support any subversive organization. It is this second oath that has now prompted both Yale and Harvard to withdraw from the loan program. In so doing they follow what other colleges and universities have done before them, either by refusing to accept the program in the first place or by withdrawing from it since. Among them are institutions like Oberlin, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Reed, and perhaps half a dozen others—with Wesleyan and others apparently still to come.

It is piling on top of the first oath a second one, which President Griswold of Yale calls negative and President Pusey of Harvard calls superfluous, that has prompted Yale and Harvard to act. Presumably they

hope by lending their prestige to this protest to dramatize the desirability of another attempt, like the one that failed in Congress last summer to repeal the requirement.

Obviously there is little harm in requiring the first oath of allegiance. But, if two oaths are better than one, why aren't three or even four still better? And why not make the student repeat them every day, or even several times a day? The basic trouble is, as President Griswold puts it, that loyalty "cannot be coerced or compelled; it has to be won." And "loyalty oaths are inherently futile, as no subversive or treasonous person hesitates to use them as a cloak for his intentions."

Let's first try to stay ahead of Russia by seeing to it that every talented youngster in the country has a chance at as much education as he is capable of. Let us never try to catch up with Soviet Russia in enforcing orthodoxy by state compulsion.

[From the Greenville (Mich.) News, Dec. 1, 1959]

EDUCATION ACT NEEDS REPAIRS

Here in Michigan there has been no big fuss over the provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 requiring a loyalty oath from any applicant for a Federal student loan.

Most of the complaints have come from ivied halls of learning in the East. Because of this requirement, schools like Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Amherst, Sarah Lawrence, Bates, and others have withdrawn from the program.

Dartmouth and Columbia are taking the money but they don't like the ground rules—and say so.

The affidavit states that the student "does not believe in, and is not a member of and doesn't support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

And what are the objections of the schools and their students to signing such an oath? Basically, they are these:

1. They see an implication that is repugnant in being singled out as a group. It is pointed out that the Government gives away and loans billions without asking recipients of its largesse to take any such oath.

2. They don't believe a needy student who is a traitor would hesitate for a minute to lie and sign such an oath.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, sought to have this provision altered at the last session of Congress. He failed. It is to be hoped that he will make a second try.

It seems to us that the complaints of the educators are justified and on this occasion we agree with them.

Can We Eat Our Way Out of the Surplus Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the magazine *Minnesota Farm and Home Science* last month an interesting, informative article on the agricultural surplus problem. At the same time it has an important bearing on human diet and health. I believe the article deserves study, as this subject

agricultural overproduction is being considered by many Members of this body.

The article follows:

CAN WE EAT OUR WAY OUT OF THE SURPLUS PROBLEM?

(By Martin Abel, research assistant, Department of Agricultural Economics)

Solving agriculture's surplus food problem by increasing domestic consumption has been a popular idea since the early 1930's. Considerable thought and energy have been devoted to developing means to increase food consumption and reduce surpluses. The food stamp plan of the late 1930's and early 1940's, the present school lunch program, and the special milk program are examples.

The goals of increased food consumption are (1) to reduce agricultural surpluses through increased food consumption and (2) to improve the health and vigor of our Nation's people. If consumers are enabled to eat more and better foods the nutrient content of their diets will be improved. Although all nutrient deficiencies will not be eliminated (even the highest income groups have nutritional shortages), the size of the deficiencies will be reduced.

Many ways for increasing the demand for farm food products have been suggested. Three broad approaches¹ examined in considerable detail are:

Income approach which involves subsidizing low income consumers for food needs (i.e., giving low income consumers the food purchasing power of a higher income group).

Price approach which calls for reducing retail prices of food and paying producers the difference between the resulting prices and some established "fair" price.

Nutrition approach which assumes that everyone would eat a nutritionally adequate diet at some specified level of cost.

Several levels of achievement under each approach are analyzed. By level of achievement we mean the degree to which an approach to demand expansion is pursued. The changes in total food consumption represent an upper limit for each level of achievement. The potential changes assume no lags or leakages. If programs were implemented to achieve demand expansion, however, not all eligible consumers would participate nor would all who take part use the program fully. Thus, somewhat smaller changes in food consumption might be expected when specific programs for achieving demand expansion are implemented.

How much will these approaches reduce agricultural surpluses? Total surplus production in agriculture—both food and non-food—in 1955 was about 6 percent. However, it is probably considerably higher now. Since 75 percent of total agricultural production is food production, food consumption would have to increase by 8 percent to eliminate total surpluses of 6 percent in agriculture.

INCREASING INCOMES

Table 1 shows the food consumption potentials under the income approach.

Raising all per capita incomes above \$1,000 would increase total food consumption by 7.3 percent, which is near the 8 percent surplus that exists. However, this would involve a food subsidy to half the Nation's people, and this would appear to be unreasonable. At a more reasonable level, such as raising all per capita incomes to \$500, total food consumption increases by only 2.4 percent. Almost one-fifth of the Nation's people would be affected, but the increase in total food consumption would not be enough to eliminate total agricultural surpluses.

TABLE 1.—Percentage changes in total quantity of food purchased under assumed changes in per capita income, United States, 1955

Per capita incomes raised above	Changes in total quantity purchased	Proportion of total United States population
	Percent	Percent
\$200.....	1.0	8.9
\$500.....	2.4	18.1
\$750.....	6.1	36.3
\$1,000.....	7.3	50.1

REDUCING FOOD PRICES

Table 2 shows the results of specified reductions in food prices at retail on food consumption use.

A 20-percent decline in the price of all livestock and livestock products would increase food consumption 3.3 percent. However, a 20-percent decline in retail prices will mean about a 40-50-percent decline in farm level prices of livestock and livestock products. The subsidy to farmers for the difference between the new low farm price and an established fair price would, undoubtedly, be large. And still, the price approach would not completely eliminate agricultural surpluses.

TABLE 2.—Percentage changes in total quantity of food purchased under price declines of 10 and 20 percent

Price declines for—	Changes in total food consumption due to a price decline of—	
	10 percent	20 percent
All food.....	2.1	4.6
Meat, fruit, and vegetables.....	1.7	3.7
Meat.....	1.1	2.4
All livestock and products.....	1.5	3.3

IMPROVING NUTRITION

The nutrition approach to demand expansion specifies that all individuals eat a nutritionally adequate diet, including recommended caloric intake, at some specified level of diet cost.

If everyone ate a nutritionally adequate diet of moderate cost (i.e., a diet representative of food consumption patterns of families whose income was between \$4,000-\$4,999), total food consumption would decline by 5.5 percent. The decline in total food consumption results primarily from an adjustment for excess calories rather than a downgrading of the diet as such.

Adjusting everyone's consumption to a liberal cost diet plan (i.e., a diet representative of food consumption patterns of families whose income was between \$6,000-\$7,999) would increase total food consumption by 2.3 percent. But the liberal cost diet plan requires everyone in the Nation to eat a high cost diet and achieving this potential would, again, seem unreasonable.

Expanding the demand for farm food products does not provide a single, easily attainable solution to the agricultural surplus problem. Reasonable levels of achievement will not completely eliminate agricultural surpluses. However, demand expansion policies offer a partial solution and when combined with other agricultural surplus policies may provide a means of reducing and even eliminating agricultural surpluses.

The aims of demand expansion are not solely surplus elimination. To the extent

that increased food consumption enables people to eat more and better food the overall health and productivity of our Nation's people will be improved.

South Dakota Poll Shows Nixon Far in Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues in Congress and the people in the country generally will be interested in the latest report of the South Dakota Poll, published on March 9, analyzing the convictions and preferences of South Dakota voters in the forthcoming presidential campaign. I ask unanimous consent to have the poll printed in the Appendix of the Record.

DICK NIXON, it will be noted, is leading the top Democrat contender in South Dakota by a margin of more than 20 points. HUBERT HUMPHREY, a native son of South Dakota, is the top Democrat contender in our State, with LYNDON JOHNSON rating a second; STUART SYMINGTON rating third; JOHN KENNEDY fourth; and Adlai Stevenson showing up in fifth place. It is also interesting to observe that DICK NIXON shows considerable vote-pulling appeal among South Dakota Democrats and that among independents he also leads all except HUMPHREY. Furthermore, the defection among Republicans is negligible.

In 1952, the South Dakota poll called the shots accurately in the hotly contested Eisenhower-Taft primary and its predictions were again accurately substantiated in the presidential elections of November in both 1952 and 1956. It is sponsored by three of the largest and most influential newspapers of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES RATE AGAINST NIXON IN SOUTH DAKOTA POLL

More than 20 percentage points separate front-running presidential candidate RICHARD NIXON from his nearest Democratic rival in South Dakota, the South Dakota poll revealed today.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, leading Democratic contender in the State, received the support of 39.8 percent of the poll respondents, as compared with the 60.2 percent favoring NIXON, at present unopposed for the Republican presidential nomination.

Respondents were asked to indicate for whom they would vote "if the November election were held today" and if the candidates were Vice President NIXON and, in turn, each of five possible Democratic opponents.

KENNEDY FALLS INTO FOURTH PLACE

Democratic Senators LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas and STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri show new strength in the poll, joining Min-

nesota's HUMPHREY to relegate Senator JOHN KENNEDY of Massachusetts to fourth place in competition for support against NIXON. JOHNSON is especially strong, with 38.0 percent against the Vice President, less than two points behind HUMPHREY.

Both SYMINGTON and KENNEDY edge Adlai Stevenson, twice-defeated Democratic nominee against President Eisenhower. Of the candidates listed, only Stevenson has indicated that he will not seek the nomination.

Other findings of the new sampling indicate a pronounced preference for Democratic candidates among younger voters, an almost equal division of rural support between the parties, and a tendency to vote fairly consistently along party lines.

VOTE BY RESIDENCE

Tabulation of the poll according to residence follows:

	Farm	City	Town	Total
Hubert Humphrey (Democrat).....	52.9	30.3	26.1	39.8
Richard Nixon (Republican).....	47.1	69.7	73.9	60.2
Lyndon Johnson (Democrat).....	50.0	33.3	17.6	38.0
Nixon (Republican).....	50.0	66.7	82.4	62.0
Stuart Symington (Democrat).....	42.2	29.4	22.2	33.9
Nixon (Republican).....	57.8	70.6	77.8	66.1
John Kennedy (Democrat).....	41.9	29.4	16.7	32.7
Nixon (Republican).....	58.1	70.6	83.3	67.3
Adlai Stevenson (Democrat).....	34.2	32.5	22.2	31.1
Nixon (Republican).....	65.8	67.5	77.8	68.9

HOW VOTE SPLITS ON PARTY LINES

In terms of partisan support the Republicans stand more solidly behind the Vice President than do the Democrats in support of any of their party's possible nominees. The following table reports the contests in terms of party preference of respondents:

	Democrat	Republican	Independent	Total
Humphrey.....	86.0	5.6	51.7	39.8
Nixon.....	14.0	94.4	48.3	60.2
Johnson.....	91.6	8.1	46.1	38.0
Nixon.....	8.4	91.9	53.9	62.0
Symington.....	84.3	3.7	47.6	33.9
Nixon.....	15.7	96.3	52.4	66.1
Kennedy.....	70.0	6.1	48.2	32.7
Nixon.....	30.0	93.9	51.8	67.3
Stevenson.....	76.3	5.6	49.3	31.1
Nixon.....	23.7	94.4	50.7	68.9

Most respondents—65.8 percent—voted consistently for the candidates for one party in all five mythical contests. Party regularity was highest among the Republicans (87.2 percent), lowest among the Democrats (31.2 percent), and a surprising 71.6 percent among the "independents" who expressed a preference for neither major party.

HOW VOTE IS DIVIDED BY AGE GROUPS

Apart from the strictly partisan analysis the greatest divergence is to be found in terms of the age of respondents with the youngest group favoring the Democratic candidates, while Republican support increases with the age of the respondents:

	Under 40	Age 40 to 59	60 and above	Total
Humphrey.....	73.4	32.0	30.3	39.8
Nixon.....	26.6	68.0	69.7	60.2
Johnson.....	68.2	41.4	16.1	38.0
Nixon.....	31.8	58.6	83.9	62.0
Symington.....	61.9	40.7	15.4	33.9
Nixon.....	38.1	59.3	84.6	66.1
Kennedy.....	55.4	36.0	18.9	32.7
Nixon.....	44.6	64.0	81.1	67.3
Stevenson.....	63.5	24.7	13.9	31.1
Nixon.....	36.5	75.3	86.1	68.9

NOTE.—The South Dakota poll is sponsored by the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Watertown Public Opinion and Aberdeen American-News.

The Springfield Daily News Achieves Notable Publishing Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pride that I announce to the House today that one of the great Democratic daily newspapers of the country, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, has achieved another notable milestone in the field of journalism and publishing by exceeding for the first time in its 80 years of existence the 100,000 circulation mark.

I am personally thrilled at this news for many reasons. Foremost in my mind, at the moment, is the fact that this is the newspaper that gave me one of my first jobs as a young boy in the circulation department. I do not presume to take any personal credit for the Daily News' record of exceeding 100,000 circulation.

CREDIT GIVEN TO EDITOR FRANK H. KELLY AND STAFF

The credit for this achievement rightly goes to Editor Frank H. Kelly and his staff of well trained and qualified newspapermen who daily publish a newspaper that presents the news and editorial opinion without fear or favor on local, State, National, and international events.

DAILY NEWS FOUNDED 80 YEARS AGO BY CHARLES J. AND EDWARD BELLAMY

One of the few evening daily newspapers in New England to publish over 100,000 issues, the Springfield Daily News is also celebrating its 80th birthday. The newspaper was founded by Charles J. and Edward Bellamy, and the first issue was published on February 24, 1880. Edward later became the famous author of "Looking Backward." The Bellamy brothers made a simple pledge in their first edition, as follows:

We mean to interest our readers, but we shall not seek to do so by spicing our columns with questionable personalities. The News means to be a gentleman.

NEWSPAPER GREW IN STATURE, INFLUENCE UNDER SHERMAN H. BOWLES

The editors who succeeded Charles and Edward Bellamy certainly have lived up to the code set forth on the first day of publication. The Daily News was acquired in 1915 by the Springfield Republican Publishing Co., and under the guidance of Sherman H. Bowles, a member of the fourth generation of the famous Springfield publishing family, grew in stature, influence, journalistic quality and circulation until today, when it proudly joined other respected newspapers selling more than 100,000 copies daily.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to salute the Springfield Daily News on this glorious occasion and congratulate Editor Kelly and members of his staff for their achievement in fulfilling the hopes and aspirations and goals of Charles and Edward Bellamy, and Sherman H. Bowles.

Margaret Yamashiro: American Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN E. LONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the National Education Association Journal for March 1960 carries an article about Miss Margaret Yamashiro of Hawaii. Because the story of Miss Yamashiro illustrates both the best in American teaching and the importance which Hawaiians attach to education, I should like to bring the article to the attention of the U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the story be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARET YAMASHIRO: A SUPERVISOR IN THE 50TH STATE

(By Lillian A. Givens)

It was 1942 on the island of Hawaii scarcely a year after that memorable December 7th, and Margaret Yamashiro had an important job to do.

It was not a job on the front line as a nurse, nor in a munitions factory, but in a first-grade classroom full of youngsters.

The first year was a busy one for the young teacher just out of college: In addition to her regular teaching responsibilities, she had the difficult task of allaying the fears of her young charges while at the same time reminding them of the need to observe curfew and blackout regulations.

She was a building representative of the local association; she assisted at the Information Center of the Office of Civilian Defense after school and on week ends; she worked in canteens of the United Service Organizations.

Such a schedule might have caused many people to give up the work they had chosen, but not Margaret. And the steadiness of purpose with which she entered the pro-

fession has now brought her to the position of field assistant in elementary education for Oahu Schools, Department of Public Instruction, Hawaii.

Miss Yamashiro is a typical Hawaiian product. She was born in Hamakua, Hawaii, to immigrant Japanese parents who had left Japan in the early 1900's to work on a Hawaiian plantation. There they raised a family of seven children: six girls and one boy.

While Margaret was still a child the family moved to Olaa, a town closer to Hilo, the county seat of the big island, and second-largest city in the State. All the children attended public schools and played with young friends from such varied backgrounds as Chinese, Korean, Hawaiian, and haole (Caucasian).

Because Japanese was the language in the Yamashiro home, Margaret spoke no English until she entered first grade. There, because of her language handicap, she was placed in a special reading class. Although this was a sensible administrative move, it humiliated the little girl and made her work fiercely to learn English as fast as possible. She soon accomplished her goal and was removed from the special class by the end of the year.

Margaret's desire to become a teacher followed a one-track pattern, influenced by her teachers, who, as she recalls, "set an example for me." While a teenager, she taught Sunday school in a Buddhist temple to gain experience teaching children.

After graduating from high school, she attended the University of Hawaii and obtained a Bachelor of Education degree, and after continued studies, earned a fifth-year certificate at the same campus. Not content with the certificate, she took a year's sabbatical leave and obtained her M.A. in curriculum and supervision from Columbia University.

Her experience in the teaching field covers a wide background from the first through the sixth grades; in the intermediate level (as junior high schools are termed in the Islands); as vice principal in an elementary school; as part-time supervisor of evening community school classes for adults; to her present position as field assistant. She has also taken and passed the principalship examination.

This young woman serves 11 of the 77 elementary schools on Oahu, covering 8,375 pupils and 178 teachers. The Oahu district is one of four districts, all a part of the centralized school system in Hawaii, headed by a superintendent and one board of school commissioners. The Hawaiian system embraces 207 schools, 140,518 students, and 5,270 teachers.

Margaret pays high tribute to the teachers and principals with whom she works and regards them as very dedicated people. She assists both individuals and groups in the area of curriculum and instruction and in providing inservice education. She also helps in obtaining resources and teaching aids, and serves as reading consultant to grades 7 and 8.

Margaret expresses enthusiasm for the work she is now doing. "I particularly enjoy working with young people fresh out of college," she said. "Even though they naturally have had little experience, they come with so many ideas and theories that helping them make practical application of these theories is most rewarding."

Although her work finds her "on the road" to schools as distant as 40 miles from her office, Margaret still finds time for professional association matters and is a member of local, State, and National education associations. As chairman of the educational policies committee of the Hawaii Education Association, she is on the HEA board of directors and will be a delegate to the 40th annual HEA convention scheduled for April 12 and 13.

She has given much professional leadership to the policies committee. The committee is now involved in a project to further upgrade certification, and on this subject she has some definite ideas.

"I believe in high standards; we should not water down qualification requirements to the point where anybody can be a teacher," she insists.

"Teaching requires rich subject-matter background and deep understanding of the principles of education. Here in Hawaii, I believe, we have one of the highest standards; for young people who want to go into teaching are required to have 5 years of university preparation for the professional certificate.

"According to a recent NEA Research Bulletin, of the 50 States, 39 require at least a bachelor of education degree for teaching. I think that high certification standards will encourage many young people to go into teaching as a profession or a career, instead of using it as a steppingstone to something else."

She is State chairman of the NEA National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, serves the Hawaii Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development as its membership chairman, and is an officer in the local chapter of the Association for Childhood Education.

Margaret is not the only teacher in her family. Her sister is a teacher at the Hawaii Technical School in Hilo, and a niece teaches in Los Angeles.

Although the family is scattered, they recently held a reunion when the parents celebrated their golden wedding anniversary. Mr. and Mrs. Yamashiro, now 74 years old, still live on the Big Island, where they enjoy tending their chickens and garden. Margaret's father likes flying the hundred miles to Oahu Island, but her mother voices skepticism at this modern mode of travel and prefers to remain on the ground.

Margaret is a many-sided person. Her interests include knitting, crocheting, amateur photography, and her favorite—music. Nothing is more relaxing to her than to come home after work, slip into a muumuu (Hawaiian Mother Hubbard), sit on a stack of zabutons (Japanese floor cushions), and listen to recordings on her hi-fi set. An avid record collector, she likes to sip tea and listen to the album that is her current favorite, "My Fair Lady."

Margaret Yamashiro is humble and quiet in manner and speech, she is friendly and sensitive to the feelings of others, and she has great resourcefulness and strong conviction of purpose. A dedicated educator, she can be just as thrilled by the progress of one small first-grader as by the progress being made daily in the profession she loves.

This crisis requires action at all levels, including postsecondary education. The community junior college idea is one which is, in many ways, particularly adapted to our needs as a democratic society committed to maximum educational opportunities. It is because I feel so strongly that this is the case that I have introduced the bill referred to and continue to urge its favorable consideration by the Congress.

I am certainly not alone in this belief and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enter into the Record an important address on this specific subject, presented to the recent annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators.

The address follows:

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NECESSITY OF COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

(By Dr. Peter Masiko, Jr., dean, Chicago City Junior College, on February 16, 1960, at annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J.)

This is a most intriguing title for a talk. The fact that a discussion session has been set aside by the American Association of School Administrators shows that this group feels, as do many educational groups at all levels of American education, that the community junior college has an important role to play in helping to meet the total educational needs of American youth and adults.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School described the American ideal in education as follows:

"Every individual regardless of race, creed, or color or national origin, shall have the opportunity to develop his or her best self, to continue appropriate education up to his or her personal point of optimum development."

Dr. Conant recently expressed the national need in these terms:

"A modern industrial nation needs more than a few brains; it has to uplift talents at every level. It cannot afford technological unemployables—spiritually, politically, or economically."

The distinguished anthropologist, Margaret Mead, in an article in the Harvard Business Review, described the challenge to American education as follows:

"We need lateral transmission of knowledge; not an outpouring of knowledge from the 'wise old teacher' into the minds of young pupils, as in vertical transmission. Rather, it is a sharing of knowledge by the informed with the uninformed, whatever their ages."

In these three quotations, we have the challenge that is before us today. At the post high school level, we believe that the community junior college is ready and able to bring this ideal into reality, not only for the young college-age group, but for adults as well.

The effects of the population explosion are well known to educational administrators. We are already feeling the pressures which the high birth rates in the 1940's have brought to the American elementary and high school. Within 3 or 4 years, the first large increase in high school graduating classes will begin to impinge on the colleges of this country.

Let us review very briefly the facts in just one of our States, New York:

In June, 1958, there were 115,000 high school seniors who graduated in that State. By 1970, this will increase to 240,000, more than a 100-percent increase.

In 1958 about 30 percent of the high school graduates entered college. We estimate that by 1970 this percentage will in-

The Social and Economic Necessity of Community Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1958, I first introduced a bill to provide Federal assistance in the development of community junior colleges. Last year, I again introduced such a bill in H.R. 967. We hear much, and rightly so, of the current crisis in education.

crease to 40 percent. In other words, there will be not only a 100-percent increase in the number of high school graduates, but there is expected to be a one-third increase in the percentage of these graduates going on to college.

For the country as a whole, it means that instead of the present 3 million students in college, we may conservatively estimate that more than 6 million will be seeking a college education in 1970.

There has been a tremendous increase in the interest shown in community junior colleges in recent years. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School gave considerable attention to the importance of the 2-year community college and urged the public to consider the advisability of expanding these institutions in the years ahead. Dr. Conant has emphasized the community junior college in his recent publications and statements. He urges that every interested and capable student should have at least a 2-year college experience. He believes that many students who now go to 4-year colleges and universities are not adequately served there because the most appropriate curriculums for them frequently are not available.

At the last session of Congress, Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, introduced a bill into Congress which would provide financial assistance for the construction of a system of 2-year community colleges across the country. He believes this is the only way in which we will be able to make a real start toward meeting the needs of post high school educational opportunities for the vast increase in the number of college students we know will be upon us shortly. Two similar bills were introduced in the House by Representatives PRICE and ULLMAN.

Most of our States have made recent comprehensive surveys of their needs for post high school educational facilities. In State after State, the recurring theme has been that one of the most economical and most promising developments is the 2-year community college. In almost every instance it is felt that the only way in which college opportunities can be made more nearly equal is to bring them close to the homes of students and to provide these opportunities at little or no tuition cost, thereby virtually eliminating the economic cause of the failure of large numbers of talented high school students to seek admission to college.

What is the role now being played by the community junior college in American higher education? In 1958-59 there were 677 junior colleges and they enrolled 905,000 students, including 180,000 adults. Of these colleges 400 colleges were public, enrolling 807,000 students, while the other 277 were private institutions, enrolling just under 100,000 students.

The junior college is a uniquely American institution. In 1900 there were eight junior colleges, all private. By 1915 there were 74, 19 of which were public and 55 private. By 1929, this number had risen to 436 of which 178 were public and 258 private, but by 1957, the public junior colleges outnumbered the private by 392 to 276.

As dramatic as the increase in the number of institutions has been, there has been an even more dramatic increase in the enrollment. In 1900, the 8 junior colleges had an enrollment of 100 students. By 1929, it rose to 78,000 of which 61 percent were in the public institutions, and by 1958-59 the total had reached 905,000, of which 89 percent were enrolled in the public institutions.

Thus, across the Nation, the community junior college has already demonstrated its vitality and its ability to develop in response to local needs. For the years ahead an even greater growth and expansion in this American institution can be anticipated.

The picture in some of the individual states is as follows: Illinois has 18 public junior colleges with an annual enrollment in excess of 37,000. Michigan has 16, enrolling over 38,000. New York has 20 with an enrollment of over 34,000. Texas has 35, with over 66,000 enrollment, and Washington State has 10, with over 30,000 enrollment. Nationally, one out of every four freshman students in American colleges gets his start in a junior college.

The greatest development of community junior colleges has taken place in the State of California. In 1958-59, this State had 65 community colleges with an enrollment of over 417,000. California has a well-developed State plan for post-high-school education and the results in that State have indicated that there is a tremendous increase in the percentage of high school graduates who go on to college when opportunities are readily available to them at little or no cost. For the year 1958-59, the public junior colleges in California enrolled 73.3 percent of all full-time students in public higher educational institutions in their freshman and sophomore years.

On December 18, 1959, the regents of the University of California and members of the State board of education met in joint session to approve unanimously the so-called master plan for higher education in California.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 88 had asked the two boards to assist in a basic study of higher education and to develop a plan "to meet the needs of the State during the next 10 years and thereafter." The eight-man team to conduct the master plan survey included two representatives each from the University of California, the State colleges, the junior colleges, and private institutions in California.

It was recommended that the University of California, the State colleges and the junior colleges make studies to tighten and standardize admission requirements. A suggested formula: that the University of California in the future admit the top 12½ percent of high school graduates instead of the top 15 percent; and that the State colleges admit the upper 33½ percent instead of the upper 40 percent.

It was recommended that freshman and sophomore students in both the University of California and in the State colleges be reduced to 10 percent by 1975. This recommendation, plus the first one, is expected to channel some 50,000 additional lower division students to the junior colleges in the next 15 years.

It was recommended that junior colleges receive more State support—not only for operating budgets but for new buildings as well. It was also recommended that those areas of California not in junior college districts be included as soon as possible. Twenty-two new junior colleges were proposed.

The heart of the entire proposal is in its delineation of the functions of the three systems of public-supported higher education. Junior colleges would continue to be locally governed with minimum standards set up by the State board of education.

It would therefore appear that in California and in a number of other States we have already reached the point where we are saying that every student in the State should be given the opportunity for at least 2 years of collegiate experience at virtually no cost to him and within commuting distance of his home. We may soon be at the point throughout the Nation where we will have universal community college opportunities on the same basis as we now provide high school education. There is much in our recent history to suggest the urgency of this development, and a look at the economic wealth and productive power of this

Nation should demonstrate that this objective is within the economic reach of this country.

If we were to assume that we should provide public 4-year colleges and universities to take care of most of the high school graduates who will be seeking admission to college in the years ahead, the cost of doubling present college facilities becomes fantastically high. We need to ask ourselves, first, whether we are able to afford this kind of development, and, secondly, whether such a development is necessary. If we answer the second question first, the economic cost may not be so staggering. If we study the statistics at our senior colleges and universities, particularly the dropouts and failures, we may reasonably conclude that either we have faulty admission policies and procedures, or the kinds of curricula which are available at our 4-year colleges and universities are not suitable to the needs, interests, and abilities of many who are presently admitted to these institutions. We could accommodate larger numbers of the more able youth within our present 4-year college facilities if other institutions were developed at the community college level to serve those who do not want and do not need 4 years of college, and if we provided the variety of technical and terminal curricula which are so urgently needed by industry and by government.

The community junior college can serve as a screening device for the senior colleges and universities. We have enough experience to report that the graduates of the academic curricula of community colleges make very acceptable students at the senior colleges and universities. They hold their own academically and they are a credit both to the colleges from which they came and the colleges to which they have transferred.

We must face frankly the question of possible competition between the public and private colleges and between these institutions and the new community junior colleges. There is no single pattern emerging in the development of the community junior college. It varies from State to State, but it is fair to say that the most frequent development is that of a tuition-free institution under the control of a local board of education or a specific regional board of education set up to operate a junior college. It is supported largely or entirely through local taxes although a large number of States now provide State aid on a per student basis, some going as high as \$250 per student. Some States also provide capital funds for construction.

For the time being, the community junior college may provide a kind of competition to the other State-supported colleges and universities and to private higher education institutions. Within a very few years, however, the numbers of students who will need to be, and must be, serviced by all of the existing higher education institutions will be larger than all combined can adequately handle. Moreover, experience shows that senior colleges in the area reap the benefits of greater educational opportunities made possible by the public junior college.

The question of the cost of going to college is a very perplexing one, and if you have sent a son or daughter to college in recent years, you know that it is a very severe strain on the family budget to provide a reasonably comfortable experience for a son or daughter away from home. There is pressure from the private colleges who are urging the public colleges to increase their tuition, thereby reducing the differential between the cost of attending private and public institutions. This would help to minimize the alleged unfair competitive advantage that the public institutions have.

In a recent talk before the American Association of Land Grant Colleges in St. Louis, Chancellor Lawrence Kimpton of the University of Chicago had the following to say:

"Anyway, from a moral point of view, why should not a student pay for his education if he can afford to and why should not the private institutions charge what its product costs. It is the professor and his family who are currently subsidizing higher education, and if labor can talk about a day's pay for a day's work, why cannot the academic world.

"All these are arguments that the private institutions have made among themselves, and the results are apparent. Tuition has gone up year after year and my guess is that a figure of \$2,000 will not be uncommon within another 6 to 8 years.

"Now comes the rub. To put it into the crassest terms possible, and I know this will offend many of the brotherhood, it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away.

"The ability of a private institution to raise its tuition has varied inversely with its proximity to strong public institutions. It was only natural therefore, that presidents of private institutions, singly and collectively, should suggest to the heads of neighboring public universities that they raise their tuition rates, thereby reducing this ruinous competition. The suggestion was received by the public institutions without enthusiasm. In fact, they thought it was a lousy idea and said so."

"Lest you get the idea that Chancellor Kimpton is opposed to public higher education, let me quote further from this same address.

"The State owes to everyone the opportunity to receive all the education he has the ability and will to acquire, and any other view of education is debasing and erroneous."

In looking at the cost of education, I think it is appropriate to think in terms of the total social cost. In other words, What is the cost to all concerned to provide, say, 2 years of collegiate experience for our young men and women? We should consider not only the tuition cost to the student, but the additional cost of going to college away from home, including room and board, travel, and other expenses, and the loss of family income that the student could provide to a family if he were working and living at home. We must also include the very substantial additional cost in our private colleges which is not received from the student in tuition, but which must be made up by endowments or gifts, or, failing these, by low salaries to the faculty of these institutions. When you add all these costs of attending college away from home and compare them to the cost of providing a comparable 2-year college experience in a community junior college within commuting distance of the students, the difference is most substantial.

If we look at the experience in California and study the dimensions of our problems within our own States and relate these to the financial problems which all of us face, we may well come to the conclusion that in the near future we will need to provide, within commuting distance, community college opportunities for the bulk of the students who graduate from our high schools. We may have to reserve the upper division college and university opportunities for those who demonstrate that they are both able and willing to do the quality of work necessary for success at the 4-year colleges and universities.

Our population explosion, the Russian sputnik, and the work of Dr. Conant and others, have given school administrators a tremendous task for the days ahead. We are being asked to reexamine to their very

foundations the ways in which we have organized ourselves for education. Many radical changes have been introduced in the last few years. We now teach modern languages in our elementary schools. General science is now taught in the upper elementary grades. Many high schools offer calculus to their students. Educational television is in use on a large scale. We are even thinking about the 6-4-4 plan again.

Many will remember Prof. Leonard V. Koos and his advocacy of the 6-4-4 plan, particularly his emphasis on the need to integrate the work of the upper high school years and the junior college years. It may well be that Koos was ahead of his time, since the development of the junior college movement in the last 20 years has not followed his suggestions. It may be time, however, that we study Koos again and learn from what he had to say. The tremendous growth of the community colleges and the role they will be asked to play in the years ahead gives us an opportunity to relate this institution more closely to the high schools, and particularly to integrate the work in these two institutions for the benefit of the students attending them.

Junior college authorities believe that a better job can be done when the community junior college has its own facilities, and I would agree that this is most desirable when local finances permit. In many situations, however, there seems to be no choice at the start except to share facilities with high schools. Whatever facilities are available, close coordination and integration with the high school below and the senior college above is a necessary responsibility of a good community junior college.

Across the land there have been notable developments in advanced placement work for gifted high school students. Community junior college could play a tremendous role in expanding such opportunities for the more able high school youth. We could organize classes and schedules for them comparable to those available to freshmen and sophomores in college. These are the years of growth and maturity for these young people. They are seeking their independence. What better way to encourage them to become independent, to do independent thinking, than to provide them with a college atmosphere during their 11th and 12th grade years. The integration with the first 2 years of college would be a natural, normal development and these high school students could move ahead into senior college level work as rapidly as they were able and willing to move.

We have to keep in mind that while many of these 15- and 16-year-old youths are able to do college level work, many are not socially and emotionally mature enough to leave home. Hence, a 2-year community junior college can give these able youngsters the opportunity to advance in their academic work and make progress toward their 4-year college and university goals and at the same time remain within the environment of the home, so that greater emotional and social maturity can be developed before the students are sent away to school.

We must remember that human beings still require essentially the same length of time to achieve mental and emotional and psychological maturity even though we have learned how to speed up the educational process. Many 15- and 16-year-old high school youths can be taught to master the calculus, but this does not mean that they are well enough developed in other important regards to be sent to college away from the home environment.

Aside from the social and economic advantages of community junior colleges, it is important to bear in mind that many of our 11th and 12th grade teachers in high school are better equipped by training, ex-

perience, and teaching know-how, to provide freshman and sophomore college instruction than many of the instructors who are presently teaching freshmen and sophomores in our 4-year colleges and universities. This is particularly true in the larger universities with graduate degree programs, in which graduate students, who are working on advanced degrees, pay for their own education by teaching freshmen and sophomores. Many of these are very capable research students, but they are not primarily interested in teaching as a career, as is true of the high school teacher or the junior college teacher.

The net result is that many students experience a poorer quality of teaching in their first 2 years of college than they had in their high schools. We believe that the community junior college, under local control with certificated teachers, with a minimum requirement of a master's degree, can provide and does provide in many cases a better educational experience at the freshman and sophomore level than is available at many of our larger colleges and universities.

As we look upon the experience in communities that have had good community junior colleges, it is apparent that these institutions attract a larger percentage of the high school graduates into college than is true in those communities which do not have comparable opportunities. This means that many youngsters who normally would not attempt a college career are encouraged to do so. Large numbers of these are then encouraged to transfer to senior colleges and universities, where they have made very fine records.

This means we not only have helped to develop talents which otherwise would not be developed, but we have helped to increase the number of upper classmen at our 4-year colleges and universities. In fact, if we develop a system of community junior colleges throughout the country to bring post high school educational opportunities, both of the traditional liberal arts and preprofessional varieties, as well as new terminal and technical curriculums which are so urgently needed, we may well increase substantially the total demand for 4-year college education. The community college experience is that larger numbers of students are encouraged to seek a college education when it is available close to home and at little or no cost.

Each year sees higher admission requirements being imposed by our colleges and universities. This poses a real problem for the so-called "late bloomer." The President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers raised this warning:

"For some years to come the arbitrary restriction on college entrance will be directly contrary to our national interest. Moreover, denying admission to all who did not meet fairly high academic standards would in the future deprive the country of the not inconsiderable number of scientists and engineers who, in their early years, show little promise but whose late development or innate drives ultimately lead them to outstanding performance."

As we look at our total task in education, we know that we must prepare our students not only for the immediate years ahead, but for the problems of their living 20, 30, and 40 years hence. We also have a responsibility to the adults whose previous educational experience is proving woefully inadequate in meeting the challenging problems and issues of the day. The community junior college again can come to the rescue as has been demonstrated in California and elsewhere. Hundreds of thousands of adults who are beyond the normal college attendance years are willing and anxious to come back to school to enable them to adjust to

the changing times, to understand the issues of the day, to prepare for new jobs which demand higher levels of skill and technical knowledge. A college atmosphere in a community junior college within easy access of the adults, at little or no cost, would encourage many adults to continue their education and would be an invaluable service to our whole society.

I would hope that as this new community college develops throughout the country, we will think not only of the expansion of facilities and the expansion of opportunities in campus situations, but that we will also make provision for the new technologies which can enlarge our educational opportunities in ways undreamed of a few years ago. I refer for example to television in education. We have enough experience in this medium to assert that it is perfectly possible to provide high-quality instruction to students in their homes with only occasional contact with the college campus. With the full development of television in education, we can say with confidence that we can provide for every man, woman, and child in this country a reasonable opportunity for at least 2 years of college education, either through a full development of community junior colleges, or with a combination of such institutions and 4-year colleges and universities, plus the full utilization of educational television.

In the first 3 years of our experiment with open-circuit telecasts in the Chicago City Junior College's TV College, 7,572 individuals registered for college credit courses and 22,030 registered on a not-for-credit basis, a total of 29,603 individuals and 46,936 course registrations. One course in Spanish had 3,995 registrations in 1 semester. In addition to the formally registered students, it is estimated that there are 10 casual viewers for each registered student. In June 1959, 42 graduating students earned their associate in arts degrees entirely or in large part via TV, including the mother of 10 children, 2 of whom were born after she began her TV courses.

Going back briefly to our earlier discussion of the population explosion, we should keep in mind that another aspect of that problem relates to the tremendous mobility of our population. Educational opportunities play a significant role in that mobility. Better schools entice rural families to move to the cities, and city families to move to the mushrooming suburban developments. States which provide free or low cost college opportunities attract families from other States in large numbers. Can your community or State afford to lose its more ambitious families and youth?

Our postwar families are having 3, 4, or 5 children, and these are closely spaced. Figuring \$2,000 per child per year to send the child away to college, it would cost \$8,000 per child and \$32,000 for a family of four children to provide a college education only as far as the bachelor's degree, and this financial burden might fall within a 6- or 8-year span. A recent poll of 20 high-quality private eastern colleges shows that the cost to the family for 1 year of college is \$2,500 and that within 5 years this will probably be \$3,000. It is this kind of financial calculation that causes many families to move to towns having a free public college. Can we blame them? Can we afford to let this continue and perhaps become more widespread?

I have attempted to outline the challenge and the opportunity that is before us in post high school education. I have indicated that the community junior college can play a crucial role in meeting this challenge. As Ordway Tead says in the January 1960 issue of the Junior College Journal, the junior colleges have a distinctive and necessary role in higher education.

"This college is not a dilution of the 4-year college, nor is it a substitute for it. It is rather a ministry to students who confront other, and for them not less important, problems and purposes."

The junior college has demonstrated that it can do a fine job in preparing students for senior colleges and universities and for the professional schools; it offers a variety of 1- and 2-year terminal and technical curricula for those planning to go directly into employment; it provides a good general education background for all; and it provides an ideal setting for the promotion of "continuing education" for adults and our senior citizens.

Let us recognize that the community junior college has a meaning and competence in its own right. Let it continue to be an experimental multipurpose institution, adjusting to the ever-changing needs of our society. Only in this way can we democratize higher education and give to our Nation the variety of educated talents that it so urgently needs.

Needed: Realistic Pilotage Requirements for Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 opened a new era of economic progress for the Upper Midwest and the Nation. This waterway provides a lifeline from the greatest agricultural-industrial complex in the world to ports, countries, and people around the globe and offers ever greater opportunity for the future.

The ever-expanding traffic on the Great Lakes and the seaway requires realistic standards for pilots to assure safe travel for vessels in these waters.

The expansion of traffic through the seaway and on the Great Lakes, however, is not without its inherent problems.

Today I refer specifically to the tasks of determining the right kind of pilotage requirements for navigation on this tremendous waterway system.

For some time now, United States and Canada—including port, shipping, travel and other commercial and trade interests—have been attempting to find common ground for agreement on pilotage requirements.

Currently, a bill, S. 3019, designed to establish fundamental criteria for pilotage requirements is pending before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Hearings have been held. As I understand it, the measure has the general approval of both the United States and the Canadian Governments.

Recognizing the importance of establishment of sound requirements for pilots as soon as possible, I believe the Congress should act expeditiously on this legislation.

I am respectfully urging, therefore, that the measure be favorably reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as early as possible. Moreover, I believe that Congress should expeditiously approve the bill, S. 3019, with any necessary modifications—to help assure traffic safety, by adoption of adequate pilotage requirements, on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Recently, I was pleased to receive messages from first, Harry Brockel, municipal port director of Milwaukee, Wis.; and second, Ray Weisbrod, executive vice president of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce endorsing the objectives of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have these messages, along with a recent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "A Good Pilotage Bill, at Last," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the messages and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MILWAUKEE
BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 4, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have your letter of recent date and very much appreciate your expression of interest in S. 3019 to establish pilotage requirements for navigation on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway waters.

Legislation earlier proposed by pilot associations and unions, to require compulsory pilotage throughout the seaway and the Great Lakes system, was strongly opposed by Great Lakes-overseas shipping lines, Great Lakes ports, the Great Lakes Commission, and other interested parties. Although this bill had the approval and sponsorship of the U.S. Coast Guard, on the basis of improved marine safety, it was generally opposed as piling an unconscionable economic burden on Great Lakes-overseas shipping, and thereby tending to defeat the economic objectives of the St. Lawrence Seaway and its shipping services.

The bill was also objectionable from the standpoint of our international relationships, since it tended to destroy the tremendous equity and interest of the Dominion of Canada in the boundary waters of the Great Lakes and in the success of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, a joint undertaking by our country and Canada.

We are glad to advise you that there has been effective consultation between our State Department and the Dominion of Canada. Participating and assisting in the discussions have been the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Lake Carriers' Association, pilots' association representatives, and Great Lakes-overseas shipping services.

From these consultations S. 3019 has emerged, representing the results of careful and comprehensive study and presenting a compromise measure acceptable to all interests. The Great Lakes Commission, representing the public interest of six Great Lakes States, has actively participated and is satisfied that this bill protects the public interest and also safeguards the marine safety requirements of the waterway system.

We can therefore recommend S. 3019 for your favorable consideration and support. We understand that an identical companion bill H.R. 10593 has been introduced in the House by Mr. BONNER and will be the subject of hearings on March 9-10.

The port of Milwaukee has not appeared in the hearings on this measure, and we have relied on the Great Lakes Commission to present our viewpoint. The Great Lakes Commission has presented the viewpoint of six Great Lakes States and the general viewpoint of the port cities, including Milwaukee.

We appreciate your careful consideration of this important matter, and are glad to advise you that S. 3019 should have your full support, representing as it does a carefully considered compromise bill which recognizes the rights and equities of all parties, and the economic capacity of Great Lakes-oversea shipping to absorb the cost of pilotage where demonstrably needed.

Very truly yours,

H. C. BROCKEL,
Municipal Port Director.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., February 29, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our association, through its international trade and export-import traffic committees, strongly favors the passage of S. 3019 relating to pilotage requirements for ships on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway. Sincerely hope you will support this position in the interest of Milwaukee and Wisconsin shippers and agencies.

Thanks for your letter telling of your support of our invitation to Secretary of Commerce Mueller. We are most anxious to have him and urge that you follow up your preliminary contacts in this regard.

RAY H. WEISBROD,
Executive Vice President, Milwaukee
Association of Commerce.

A GOOD PILOTAGE BILL, AT LAST

The long fight for reasonable pilotage requirements in the Great Lakes, to head off a "featherbunking" rule that would have saddled prohibitive costs on foreign ships, now nears successful conclusion.

A proper bill has been worked out in the proper way—jointly by the United States and Canada through diplomatic channels—and hearings on it will open before the Senate Commerce Committee in Washington Monday. It will be made wholly reciprocal through parallel legislation by Canada.

This came about only after Congress had twice been alarmingly tempted by the Coast Guard bait—a claim that safety required licensed pilots throughout the lakes, even during the 80 percent of the time when vessels are docked or sailing open waters. Since United States and Canadian captains are so licensed anyway, this was aimed at foreign vessels, and interests hostile to a flourishing seaway were quick to support it. Canada properly resented it, and objected. So, of course, did seaway port interests in Milwaukee.

The new bill provides that the President will designate Great Lakes waters—presumably limited to certain locks, canals and restricted channels—in which a registered United States or Canadian pilot will be required on board. It authorizes international arrangements to regulate the pilotage service, including rates.

In undesignated waters ships will need only to have one of their own officers qualified for lakes navigation and so certified by either country. In practice Canada, being the point of entry into the waterway, will do most of this certifying. And most foreign ships will have captains or mates with the necessary command of English, sailing experience and knowledge of local sailing rules. Many of them, in fact, could qualify as pilots if allowed.

This must certainly satisfy any reasonable concern for navigational safety. Since it is an administration measure, the Coast Guard

has to acquiesce in it. As an agreed bill with Canada, it recognizes the necessity for international collaboration in regulating an international waterway. Its prompt passage will be a happy end to what had threatened to be a sticky business.

Policy: How the "Banks" Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post's daily magazine of March 9, 1960:

(By Ted Poston, with Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman and Richard Montague)

The citywide numbers racket here is at least a quarter-billion-dollar business, but the profits are no longer as astronomical as they were in the old days.

Operating expenses eat heavily into the daily gross, the Post investigation showed. The biggest single bite is in the stiff payments to those vice squad cops who operate the pad, the multimillion protection racket for the policy banks.

Once the police have gotten theirs "off the top," today's policy operation is faced with strong fixed expenses which must be deducted from the gross take which pours in 6 days a week. A table of organization for the average operation runs like this:

The runner: He collects numbers bets in specific places, such as apartment houses, tenements, offices, factories, or street corners. Since he deals directly with the public, like a bank teller, he is most often the man arrested. The runner gets a commission of 25 cents on every dollar in bets he collects, and he turns his "book" over to the controller. Few runners have contact with a policy banker; usually, they don't even know who the actual banker is.

The controller: He is the branch manager of the bank and handles the business of the runners. One controller may have as many as 100 runners and he gets 10 cents on every dollar they turn in to him.

The ordinary controller may operate from his home, several ever-changing apartments, a bar or another designated spot. He is regarded in the industry as "the man with all the headaches," for in most cases, he must take care of the cops in his area, the lawyers and bailbondsmen in the "accommodation arrests" which are necessary to protect the pad. And he must also make good any shortages in cash which the runners may come up with.

Spot controller: This is a controller who operates without runners but takes bets across the counter in a tailor shop, grocery, fruit market or any other protected location on the pad. Because no runner's commissions are involved in this operation, the spot controller keeps 35 cents out of every dollar played. This is the kind of operation favored by the syndicate, which has brought the bribery setup to its highest point of perfection. But a spot writing less than \$300 a day in numbers won't cover its own costs.

The banker: This is the president, the chairman of the board. He puts up the money to operate the policy bank, collects his 65 cents on every dollar, and pays off all "hits." He has to be able to put his hands on large sums of money at any time, so

many policy kings finance their ready-money business from the cash receipts of the related narcotics trade.

The banker is the man who sets up "connections" with the cops on the take. In most cases, the bank is responsible for the heaviest higher level payments to the Pad, but where the controller receives 10 percent, the latter must pay the "bite" from the cop on the beat on up through the precinct.

Policy barons usually maintain their "banks" outside the area in which they have the most "spots" as their base of operations. As one of them put it, the vice squad cops will say: "Don't keep your bank in our area. If it's located there, we may have to raid it. And if we don't raid it, we may have to explain why. We'll protect your spots but take your bank elsewhere."

As a result, most of the major banks are in New Jersey, Westchester, Nassau, or any adjacent center outside the five boroughs.

Although the runner, the controller, and the banker are the important cogs in the policy operation, there are also others who make their livelihood from it:

The writer: He works in one of the spots and writes the bets as the players come in off the street. He has to be able to write quickly and legibly, add swiftly, and have a flair for figures. He is paid a minimum of \$85 a week.

Lookout man: He keeps an eye out for uncooperative policemen and steers the customers to the new spot when an old location is changed or "busted." He generally gets \$10 a day for this chore but can earn more by taking on other duties.

Pickup man: This is the one who takes the "works" (policy slips) from the controller to the bank. In Harlem, women are used mainly for this task. The controller furnishes cab fare and pays about \$40 a week to each pickup man, but the pay is higher when the "works" are large. Of this operation, one numbers man said:

"This is another point where the cops on the take can get an extra taste from the business. Between 1:30 and 2:30 in the afternoon—especially in Harlem—those cops are so busy shaking down cabs with only one passenger in them that anybody else could run off with the rest of the community."

"If they catch a pickup man or woman with the 'works,' they'll hold on to it until a call goes through either to the controller or the bank. If the cop himself is on the regular Pad, he may release the 'works' in time for the final figure for about \$50. But some of the freebooting cops have demanded and got as much as \$500 for surrendering the 'works' in time."

Payoff man: He is the guy who collects the winners' money from the bank and makes the payoff. This may take place in the "spot" where the original wager was placed, but often a "payoff station" is established in a nearby bar during certain specified evening hours. This is considered "good public relations" so that unlucky suckers can see that it is possible to "hit" the number and maybe get as much as a 600 to 1 payoff (on a 1,000 to 1 gamble).

The payoff man, who gets about \$100 a week, must be a solid citizen who can ward off hijackers and stickup men. And, of course, he must be trustworthy. One Harlem bank is still looking for a payoff man who ran away with \$14,000 in one day's hits.

Tenant: An apartment dweller who lets a controller use the premises for a few hours each day to tally up the policy slips before sending the "works" to the bank. The tenant is usually an employed person who is away from home during this time.

There are hundreds of such apartments in use all over the city. The controller may pay the tenant's rent—or perhaps \$10 a day—for the privilege.

Adders: They work inside the actual bank itself and operate the computing machines and other modern office equipment to make up the "ribbon" which is the total list of the day's bet. More highly skilled employees calculate the percentage of hits daily and the profit and loss. These office workers average about \$75 a week, and each bank or subbank has a manager, who gets about \$125 a week.

Many of the runners and some of the controllers also work part-time as single action bankers, offering odds of 8 to 1 on any one of the three official digits (in order) or 60 to 1 for a "bolita," or any combination of two of the three official figures.

Many of these margin operators use money they have collected (runners) or sums held for the bank (controllers) to bank their single action. This often accounts for the "shortages" which the controller must make up in his weekly report to the bank. For to prevent seizure by the cops, both honest and dishonest, most controllers send in the policy slips daily and hold the week's cash accounting for Saturdays.

AND MORE TO COME

There are other single action bankers—many of them former full member bankers whose operation has been taken over by the East Harlem mob—who deal exclusively in this operation. They will take bets of from \$2 to \$1,000 on any chosen number.

Single action is predominantly a Negro operation and is estimated to involve about \$15 million to \$20 million in wagers each year. Although some large white banks have been moving in on the larger bets, the syndicate generally shies away from it here because single action is too complicated to handle.

Single action, however, is the backbone of another operation which is part of the expense sheet of the swindle. This involves:

Service men: A "service" maintains employees at the specified "numbers" race track—Hialeah in Florida is the designated one now—to furnish the banks, especially the single action bankers, with each official number as it comes out.

The men at the track maintain an open telephone line to the New York "service," which sells this information to the bankers and single action men.

For three individual digits a day, 6 days a week, the "service" receives \$20 a week from each client. The East Harlem mob maintains its own "service," which is available to its West Harlem outlets, but most Negro single action bankers prefer to buy their "service" from a member of their own race, who, in turn, employs several "wire men," operating from rented private phones, to rush the digits to the single action bankers between races.

Another major expense for the bankers and the controllers in the daily operation of the racket is the legal costs for the runners and other employees who may be arrested—even those who are taken under accommodation arrests.

Several banks are assessed a specified number of arrests each month by the crooked cops operating the pad, to meet quotas for the official police records.

Each wino or junkie, or anyone else who accepts the role, must be paid \$50 a "bust" when he takes a "stand-in" arrest for a policy employee. In addition, the lawyer and bondsman in each case usually get \$25 apiece.

In the case of a "legitimate" arrest and a conviction and jail term, the expenses are much higher, for if a runner with a good book is picked up and sent away, the industry must arrange to take care of his family until he gets out.

The amount given the family depends upon the size of the runner's book. It usually averages about \$50 a week. A good controller, accustomed to a higher standard of living, can expect his family to get from \$75 to \$150 a week if he goes to jail.

In the case of an infrequent arrest of a banker, the East Harlem mob may take over his bank, put his profits away for him, and give him an accounting on his return.

In any case, none of today's policy barons are likely to come near the \$10 million which Al Adams, their predecessor, salted away after muscling in on the game, back in the gas-lit days, in such the same way that the Syndicate has taken over the citywide operation here. The overhead is too high now.

Federal Judge Lemley's Decision in the Little Rock School Integration Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was recently in Chicago and spoke at the Chicago Conference for Brotherhood. While there I listened to the president of the Monumental Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., the Reverend Morris H. Tynes. I found him to be a brilliant speaker, thoroughly dedicated to the cause of human rights.

Mr. President, at that dinner my attention was called to a letter to the editor which Reverend Tynes wrote, of recent date, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the editor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DEAR EDITOR: Federal Judge Lemley's decision in the Little Rock school segregation crisis is tragic, disgraceful, and a dangerous precedent for American jurisprudence.

Most laws fall into a rather objective category but racial laws are always highly subjective and controversial. Nobody organizes a mob to protest the placing of a signal light at a dangerous intersection, or an ordinance that forbids jaywalking or spitting on the sidewalk. But whether objective or subjective, all laws are enacted for the regulation of human conduct, and in a democratic society should be given equal respect and enforcement. It would be admirable if a law (even one such as the Federal income tax law) would engender an attitude of goodwill and brotherly love. But above and beyond any consideration of whether we like or dislike a particular civil rights law, the fundamental justification for its enactment is the protection of human rights. The primary function of the law is not conversion but regulation and prosecution. It is the function of religion to convert people, to cause them to respect and love one another. If we were spiritually what we ought to be, we would not need the external compulsions of the law to force us to do what is morally and ethically right. If we were what we ought to be on the streets and highways of our Nation, for example, the billions spent for traffic law enforcement could be used more constructively for the benefit of humanity. We would insure the safety of streets and highways by habitually following the rules of courtesy.

No nation can long endure where some laws are respected and rigidly enforced and others are not. Anarchy prevails where citizens can choose the laws they will respect and obey.

A number of Communists have been prosecuted under the Smith Act for advocating the violent overthrow of the Government. I would like to know how many white supremacists, under the banner of states rights, have been prosecuted for advocating that the Federal laws, affecting integration in the public schools, be disobeyed.

Judge Lemley's decision in the Little Rock school segregation crisis is very much like saying to a criminal: "You are violating the law of the land but I will grant you permission to violate it for another 2½ years. The hammer in your hand drips with the blood of your victim's head but I am going to give you 2½ years more to apply the crushing blows." This kind of arbitrary decision has destroyed the effectiveness of our voice in world affairs. It is sheer acquiescence to mob rule.

If all the Negroes in the United States refused to respect the law of the land as it relates to service in the Armed Forces and the annual payment of Federal income tax would Federal Judge Lemley similarly render such a biased decision favoring their actions? How much longer must American Negroes pay first-class prices for second-class citizenship?

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS H. TYNES,
Minister, Monumental Baptist Church,
Chicago, Ill.

Your Stake in Research and Regulatory Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an interesting and informative address delivered last month in Kansas City, Mo., by Dr. M. R. Clarkson, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture:

YOUR STAKE IN RESEARCH AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

(Address by Dr. M. R. Clarkson, Associate Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., at annual meeting of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association, Kansas City, Mo., February 11, 1960)

Thank you for inviting me to talk with you today.

I am going to examine the demands on the livestock industry in the years ahead and some of the difficulties in meeting them.

We can take it for granted that livestock will continue to be a dominant feature in American agriculture. We are a nation of meat eaters. We eat meat because we like it. It's good for us. We can afford it. The supply is ample. And we can buy meat with confidence that it is safe and wholesome.

What are the probable demands for meat and other livestock products in the years immediately ahead?

Let's take 1975 as a benchmark. Barring catastrophe, we can expect our population to increase by almost a third within the next 15 years. A reasonable estimate is that by 1975 the United States will have a population of 230 million people.

To supply 230 million people with the same kinds of food we ate in 1958 would require one-third more of red meats. Think what that would mean to your operations. We would also need one-third more produc-

tion of poultry, meat, and eggs and the same increase in milk. Total crop output would need to be increased by one-fourth that of 1958.

This may sound far-fetched. Supply is fully equal to demand. However, with 230 million people, I don't see how these estimates can be wrong.

During the past few years the gross national product has climbed from slightly under \$300 billion to almost \$500 billion. It is expected to reach \$775 billion in 1975. Measured by current dollars, that represents an increase of 77 percent. Disposable income will go up slightly more. It is expected to rise by 80 percent.

More people with more money to spend are very likely to spend more for meat, milk, eggs, and the other livestock products that add quality to our meals.

One point to keep in mind. The demands of this expanding agricultural market must be met without adding to present acreage. They can only be met through new technology—a more intensive application of science, through agriculture, to meet the needs of the people.

We will have more intensive production and greater concentration of poultry and livestock. This means greater danger from disease. When livestock concentration doubles, the hazards of disease increase fourfold. The rate goes up in geometrical progression.

Our livestock is the envy of the world. But the good health that adds to its value also makes it highly vulnerable to any exposures to foreign diseases.

The growing volume of international trade and travel is building heavy pressure on Federal inspection and quarantine, our first line of defense against threats to livestock health.

A work force only slightly larger than that of 1946 is handling 100 percent more ocean traffic and 600 percent more air traffic.

USDA inspectors now intercept an important crop pest, from some other part of the world, on the average of every 20 minutes during the working year. Last year, Federal inspectors found nearly 65 thousand pounds of prohibited meat in passenger baggage and mail from other countries—countries where foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest are known to exist.

Some travelers who carried the meat didn't know it was restricted. Some of them tried ingenious ways to get it into the country. One sealed it in a can of olive oil. Another wrapped the meat in corn husks. Still another brought the meat in wrapped in pastry.

We've strengthened our defenses against imported livestock and poultry diseases in a number of ways—by intensive training for inspectors, by more specific information to travelers, and by cooperation with other inspection services. Our people get round-the-clock help from inspectors for customs and public health. They are assisted in the surveillance of military planes from abroad by officers in the armed services.

Even so, the size of the job is increasing faster than our forces can keep pace. The new St. Lawrence Seaway is bringing ships from all over the world into the heartland of North America. Traffic from Mexico is growing at the rate of a million vehicles a year. A few tourists are already traveling the Inter-American Highway as far south as Costa Rica.

Every ship, every plane, every car coming into our country holds a potential threat in the form of destructive plant and animal diseases and insect pests.

The guard against foreign animal diseases was strengthened immeasurably, 4 years ago, when we moved into the new U.S. Animal Disease Laboratory on Plum Island, N.Y.

In this \$10 million installation we have for the first time, the facilities needed to

study foot-and-mouth disease and other foreign diseases to provide greater protection for our own livestock and poultry.

At Plum Island we have added significantly to basic understanding of the virus that causes foot-and-mouth disease. We have assembled materials and devised techniques for early diagnosis of a great many others of the most dangerous foreign diseases of livestock and poultry.

Along with hazards from abroad, we also face greater dangers at home as our livestock population is increased. We are losing animals and productivity to many diseases that are widely prevalent and that, with present knowledge, we can neither prevent nor cure.

Shipping fever is a good example. Corn Belt feeders have watched shipping fever cut profits for more than 50 years. The disease takes a toll wherever large numbers of cattle are held together. And it's like the common cold. It is widespread but not much is known about it.

Research to date suggest that shipping fever is caused by a complex of viruses and bacteria. The scientists have made a good start in isolating and identifying causative agents (myxo-virus para-influenza 3(SF4) pastuerella multicauda, and pastuerella hemolytica). When the mechanism of infection is fully understood, it will be possible to develop diagnostic tests. We then have a means for mapping reservoirs of infection, for isolating carriers of the disease, and working out techniques of prevention and control.

This is one of the difficult disease problems that will receive a high research priority when we move into the new Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames. Modern facilities and equipment, new techniques, and, most important of all, a staff of fine scientists will be brought to bear on this and other important livestock diseases. We are proud to have Dr. W. A. Hagan assume the responsibility of directing the laboratory. He will be ably assisted by Dr. Chester Manthel and Dr. J. E. Williams.

We estimate that hazards to the health of livestock and poultry now cost more than \$2 billion a year. You can document the high risks in meat production with dramatic examples from your own experiences. In addition to shipping fever, a high toll is taken by anthrax, mastitis, transmissible gastroenteritis, and a whole complex of diseases of cattle, swine, and poultry.

The national laboratory will be large enough and with sufficient isolation facilities so that work can go on simultaneously with complete safety on many of the most dangerous diseases. There will also be laboratories for work in connection with our livestock regulatory programs.

One of the first orders of business—when we move into the new laboratories—is to establish standards, improve procedures, and provide for the testing of vaccines and other veterinary biologics.

This becomes increasingly urgent as a wide variety of new and different biologics come to market and as more and more of them are put to use. Last year's record output of 3.9 billion doses—over 95 percent of them modified live-virus vaccines—is strong evidence that the livestock and poultry producers of America believe an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The Department of Agriculture has a proud record of screening out those that don't measure up to standard.

For instance, enough brucellosis vaccine for 500,000 calves was destroyed last year because it did not meet inspection standards. Actually, this represented only a small percentage of the total brucella vaccine manufactured—less than 8 percent of the lots . . . but from one point of view the most important percentage.

The tremendous rise in the production of biologics for veterinary medical use calls for improved procedures for rapid and continuous tests. Efforts to improve testing have been hampered by lack of facilities. These will be available with the opening of the National Animal Disease Laboratory.

All signs point to rising investments in protective measures in the years ahead. Profits in livestock feeding and nearly every other farm enterprise depend on the prevention and control of diseases and pests. In the future they will depend on new techniques that do a precision job at reasonable cost with safety.

There is great concern about the effect the growing use of chemicals in our daily lives may have on our health.

The people of this country look to those in agriculture—producers, processors, and marketers—researchers, extension workers, and regulatory officials—to use all chemicals wisely for the safety and the quality and quantity of the food supply.

We are responsible for exploring opportunities to use chemicals in agriculture, for maintaining rigid standards to measure their effectiveness and safety, and for drawing up recommendations for their proper use.

Agricultural scientists help build up the body of knowledge about chemicals. Agricultural teachers help to train the technical people who staff our food supply line. And agricultural leaders such as yourselves help perpetuate the climate of opinion that says our food supply must be of high quality and completely safe.

The Government has assumed increasing responsibilities for the preclearance of foods and the materials used in the production and preparation of foods before they are permitted in commerce.

One of the earliest steps in this direction by the Federal Government was the passage of the Meat Inspection Act over 50 years ago. Under this act the Secretary of Agriculture is made responsible for the wholesomeness, safety, and proper identification of red meats in interstate and foreign commerce.

Chemical and other additives, processing methods, and product composition are carefully controlled. Each animal is inspected under veterinary medical supervision. Although most of the 100 million animals are healthy, inspectors condemn and destroy nearly a million pounds of products each working day, because of disease, spoilage, or contamination.

Evidences of contagious disease are referred back to Federal and State veterinarians to aid in disease prevention on farms and ranches. For example, the progress against tuberculosis of cattle and the eradication of vesicular exanthema of swine would have been impossible without this coordinated effort.

This meat inspection system is the envy and model of the world. It has maintained public confidence in the safety of our meat supply and thereby assured producers of a steady demand for meat.

The Department's newly established poultry products inspection program is rapidly achieving this same status. These two inspection services by the Department of Agriculture cover a most important part of the total food supply.

In recent years, the Congress has provided for the preclearance by the Food and Drug Administration of new drugs for man and animals, residues of pesticide chemicals, and additives for foods not covered by the Department of Agriculture in meat and poultry products. Responsibility also is given to the Department of Agriculture for prior registration of pesticide chemicals. All this covers interstate commerce, of course.

Enforcement of these interlocking acts requires the closest coordination between the

Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the case of additives to feed, or drugs given to livestock, the Food and Drug Administration acts on petitions for specified uses. The Agricultural Research Service also must decide upon acceptance of the practice from the standpoint of the safety and wholesomeness of the meat passing through its inspection. Such acceptance is based upon adherence to the details of the practice.

Some questions have been raised about the requirement that animals on feed containing chemical additives should be taken off such feed 48 hours before slaughter. As an added safety measure, the Director of the Division issued instructions to inspectors and inspected meatpacking plants to withhold such animals from slaughter for the required time. This is just one example of the routine actions taken to keep secure the public confidence in its meat supply.

There is a very simple admonition we must observe in using drugs, pesticides, and feed additives for livestock: "Use chemicals safely—follow the label." This must be done. You must do it. You must help see to it that others do it. The integrity of your industry depends upon it.

Clearances of chemical usages are given on the basis of effectiveness as well as safety. There is no gain in misuse. There is only extra expense, often a loss of effectiveness, and a chance of real trouble.

Public controls of chemicals and other factors affecting food are here to stay. If anything, they will be made more stringent.

To meet the increasingly urgent needs for maintaining the health of livestock and the safety and high quality of the food supply, a greatly accelerated research effort is needed. This is a job for industry and the States as well as the Department. New and improved chemicals and new techniques for their use are required to avoid questionable residues in food. Biological methods of disease and pest control must be developed wherever possible. This is a real challenge in basic research and we cannot overlook the need for continued nutritional evaluation of the end products.

The Agricultural Research Service accepts its share of the responsibility for these tasks. I know you accept yours. Let us show the world that we can do this job.

The World Court and the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should We Trust a World Court To Stay Out of Our Affairs?" published in the Saturday Evening Post of March 12, 1960.

The editorial points out concisely why we should think carefully before we vote to repeal the Connally amendment.

I commend the Saturday Evening Post for its constructive and timely approach to this subject through its editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE TRUST A WORLD COURT TO STAY OUT OF OUR AFFAIRS?

There has been a lot of high-level support, from President Eisenhower down, for the idea that this country should surrender its right to withhold from the International Court of Justice cases which we think concern domestic matters. In 1946 the United States accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court in cases which we agree should come before the Court. But, by means of the Connally amendment to the Senate resolution of adherence, we retain the right not to submit cases which in our opinion are of domestic concern. Those who wish to repeal the Connally amendment think we should let the International Court decide whether a case is domestic or international.

Among the arguments in favor of this proposal are: This country ought not to be the judge of whether or not a case is "within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States"; such reservations reduce the number of cases for the International Court and thus delay the inauguration of a system of law among nations.

Vice President NIXON, who is among those proposing that Congress repeal the Connally amendment, agrees that "all disputes regarding domestic matters must remain permanently within the jurisdiction of our own courts. Only matters which are essentially international in character should be referred to the International Court." But he thinks the Court itself can be trusted to decide which cases are domestic and which are international. Secretary of State Herter has expressed the view that it was extremely unlikely that the Court would take jurisdiction over a matter which we regarded as of our own domestic concern. He thinks the Connally amendment puts this country in the position of sitting in judgment in its own case when we decide for ourselves that a given matter is our own business.

But why do so many eminent people believe that an international court would never intervene in our domestic affairs? In a letter to the New York Times a few months ago, Philip Marshall Brown, former professor of international law at Princeton University, pointed out that, for one thing, "the Declaration of Human Rights sponsored by the United Nations actually operates to invite intervention by one nation in the domestic concerns of another nation." It is easy enough to imagine an international court holding that the griefs of minority groups in this country constituted a violation of this declaration and was therefore an international question. Our immigration laws might easily be defined as beyond domestic concern. After all, we are denying the right of people from other nations to come to this country.

Undoubtedly, by insisting on withholding from the International Court cases which we declare are exclusively domestic, we can be said to sit in judgment on one aspect of our own case. But is this bad? There is a point at which every nation has to be judge of its own case, or go out of business. For example, the Panama Canal—already there are rumblings to the effect that it should be "internationalized" after the matter has been adjudicated by an international tribunal. To that proposal this country would have to say, "No, the canal is a factor in our national-defense system, and we occupy and administer it under a treaty entered into in good faith by both parties. We can't agree to gamble away our security to satisfy the sea lawyers of Latin America or our own visionaries."

Professor Brown tied up the subject tight in the letter quoted above: "At this time of world revolution and cold war we Americans need to observe the utmost caution in taking any steps which might impede our freedom of action in unforeseen emergencies."

Frustrated Narcotics Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times for March 3, 1960, which has been brought to my attention by Mr. Nick B. Williams, the editor:

FRUSTRATED NARCOTICS FIGHTERS

"The dope traffic in Los Angeles County has reached epidemic proportions. We cannot turn our backs on this problem, which has become a public health and safety problem."

MEASURES SOUGHT

This was Dr. Stuart C. Knox, chairman of the county medical association's committee on narcotics and alcoholism, speaking to the board of supervisors. The supervisors had been studying proposals for broadening police powers in narcotics cases and sharpening the penalties for dope peddling.

There is much room for improvement in the handling of narcotics cases in this county, as we shall see. It is important that improvements should be made. But most important is suppressing southern California's dope traffic is stopping the smuggling from Mexico. The Times has been crying the international aspect of the narcotics plague for nearly a year. The State can improve its law enforcement, but only the U.S. Government treating with the Mexican Federal Government can cut off the major source of supply of heroin.

MUST PLUG THE HOLE

State judges and law-enforcement officials are like deckhands working the pumps of a leaking ship. They must bend their backs and sweat—and their pumps had better be functioning efficiently—but they cure nothing; the ship's carpenters have got to go below on the double to plug the hole in the ship's side.

Some suggested changes in State narcotics laws—on improvements in pumps and their management—have been sent to Sacramento. The proposed amendments to the statutes have two aims—harder penalties for narcotics violators and easier rules for the police who must catch them.

PROPOSED PENALTY

Some of the penalties should be more severe. The worst of narcotics crimes, in the general opinion, is furnishing the horrible stuff to minors. Under the present law, the penalty prescribed for a first offender is a prison sentence of not less than 5 years. Five years of solid time might be enough—but the prisoner would be eligible for parole in 20 months. The proposed law would prescribe 10 years to life for this offense, with no parole eligibility until 5 years had been served. This example of increased penalties is typical of the proposals for strengthening the punishments for transportation, sale, furnishing, etc., with stiffer terms for second offenders all along the line.

But proclaimed penalties do not stop the narcotics traffic; they must be imposed on the violators. The present penalties, which may be too mild, have never been tested for their full effect. Some of the recent records tend to show that offenders are treated too leniently in the courts. The statistics suggest that judicial discretion is almost boundless.

Several undercover men of the Los Angeles police department were assigned last year to make narcotics purchases from "pushers." They submitted their evidence

to the Los Angeles County grand jury, which returned 90 indictments. Then the police rounded up 79 indicted persons. This is what happened to them:

Cases	
Without prior convictions turned over to the youth authority.....	9
Without priors sentenced to prison.....	5
Without priors sentenced to county jail (less than a year).....	15
Without a prior given probation.....	1
With priors sent to prison as first offenders (priors ignored).....	8
With a prior sentenced to jail (less than a year).....	1
With priors sent to prison (priors recognized).....	8
Cases disposed of with some kind of sentence.....	47
Acquitted.....	7
Dismissed.....	3
Identified but not apprehended.....	9
Not identified and not apprehended.....	10
Still pending.....	3
	32
Making a grand total of.....	79

TOO MANY ESCAPE

Here is justice holding not a balance but a sieve. Note that 10 defendants with prior narcotics convictions were sentenced as first offenders. Also note that while the police department made 90 cases, all with sales to police officers, only 47 resulted in prosecution (by February). The indictments were returned last August. The tabulation suggests that harsher penalties, particularly for those with prior narcotics convictions, might not make much difference in the dope trade—unless judicial discretion were circumscribed by the legislature. Perhaps it should be mandatory upon judges to recognize prior narcotics convictions in sentencing a defendant in a present narcotics case.

The record embitters zealous law-enforcement officials, naturally. And they have other complaints against the courts, which cut them very fine on search and seizure in narcotics cases under the so-called exclusionary rule. Police have a hard time digging into narcotics cases because violations differ from other crimes; there is no victim to report to the police.

EXCESSIVE LICENSE

But it seems to us that in their zeal the enforcement officials want to swing the pendulum from too much restriction to too much license. The recommendations for law changes submitted to the legislature contain this hair-raising sentence:

"No evidence shall be excluded because of the manner in which it was obtained."

The Times will fight until the narcotics blight is ended, but we believe the fight can be won without suspending constitutional guarantees. Before we accept the police state as a remedy let us urge the courts to look to their evident responsibilities and let us above all press the Government in Washington to get the heroin cut off at its Mexican source.

What the Negroes and Whites Must Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was called to a press interview

had with Dr. Morris H. Tynes, minister of the Monumental Baptist Church, 729 East Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., in which Reverend Tynes discussed some of the problems of human rights in this country as they relate to the Negro. He discussed the problem under two headings: first, his views as to what the Negro must do; and, second, his views as to what the whites must do if we are going to reach a settlement of this great problem which will result in first-class citizenship for all Negroes of America. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a portion of the interview with Reverend Tynes be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(The following is a portion of an interview that a reporter from the Chicago American had with Dr. Morris H. Tynes, minister, Monumental Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill.):

Realizing that "all generalizations are false, even this one," I certainly would not have the temerity to suggest that all Negroes or all whites fall into the classifications enumerated. Such ideas can only serve as a barometer of self-examination and general improvement in human relations.

WHAT THE NEGRO MUST DO

He must develop a mature sense of values that embrace education, character development, community pride, civic responsibility, technical skill, thrift, stable family life, home ownership, and sensible religion.

He must keep his neighborhoods clean and attractive. He must realize that to be accepted, he must be acceptable.

He must stop expecting God and white people to do for him what he can do for himself.

He must make his religion a daily practice rather than simply an emotional affair. His religious life needs more rationality and less emotionality. Witchcraft and superstition have kept his religious experience on a naive, primitive level.

He must stop rationalizing his faults and failures on a basis of color.

He must learn how to keep both his word and his friends.

He must learn how to operate business; not "Negro business."

The average educated Negro must develop a deeper social consciousness. He must learn how to walk with crowds and not lose his virtue and talk with kings and not lose the common touch.

He must assume a greater responsibility for such agencies as the NAACP, the Urban League, the church, and his other civic and charitable institutions.

He must develop a more mature sense of humor. He is too sensitive.

WHAT THE WHITES MUST DO

White people must stop penalizing Negroes for not being white. There is no inherent virtue in being either white or black. Color is not character and pigment is not principle. It is only a distinguishing mark.

They must stop decrying integration and social equality in the daytime while many of them practice both in the nighttime.

They must stop trying to disprove the religious and scientific fact that "God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell upon the face of the earth."

They must start practicing in their economic, political, and religious life the brotherhood they preach.

They must stop denying Negroes the kind of democratic citizenship that the Constitution guarantees to all Americans. Ours is either a democracy or it is a hypocrisy.

They must stop using Negroes politically and exploiting them economically. As long

as the Negro or any other element of our society is economically insecure, America is insecure.

They should stop treating the Negro in such a way that he develops an inferiority complex and loses his motivation and ambition for decent, purposeful living.

They should stop lumping all Negroes into one general category. Negro society is as highly stratified as any other.

They should stop expecting all Negroes to be great or outstanding. The Negro should have as much right to be a bum as the white man.

Finally, both Negroes and whites should strive for a better understanding. If we do not live together as those who have been created equal, we are destined to die as those who have been cremated equal.

Cold War GI Bill Needed Now: Corpus Christi Caller-Times Shows Student Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, time is running out for the cold war veterans' educational opportunities. The cold war GI bill (S. 1138) was passed by the Senate in July 1959. It is now being heard before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The urgency of this legislation is forcefully proven by two recent articles in a dynamic and forceful Texas newspaper, the Corpus Christi Caller-Times. It is a leader in Texas journalism; its editorials and news selectivity show an awareness of America's position of leadership and peril in the world today and of the relationship of our domestic problems to our international leadership.

Mr. President, the argument that "every boy can go to college if he wants to" and that "the GI bill isn't needed" are equally fallacious, and both are effectively answered in an article by Terry Ferrer in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of Friday, March 4, 1960, entitled "Scholarships Not Plentiful or Adequate for College Costs."

This article proves statistically that college has become a necessity as well as an ideal for Americans.

The hard-hitting editorial "Complacency" from the same paper, ends with this true warning:

Of course, if we cannot agree that the best education obtainable in schools which demand hard mental discipline is the fundamental basis for democratic citizenship, then there is no need to worry. We can go our carefree way, piling material prosperity on material prosperity, and, as with Louis XVI, let our descendants cope with the torrent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record, and that there be printed with them from the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller-Times the following editorial "Complacency" of

Sunday, January 31, 1960. Article, Friday, March 4, 1960, "Scholarships Not Plentiful or Adequate for College Costs."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

COMPLACENCY

It seems far away and long ago, now, the sudden cold fear that gripped so many Americans when Soviet Russia launched its first sputnik in October 1957. Time has quieted our fears. We face a pleasant presidential election year that may be won on the lotus-land slogan of "peace and prosperity."

The late sputnik unpleasantness, for all our willingness to lock it up in the past, did have a message for us. The message is still there if we care to heed it. It was expressed by an eminent scientist, Lloyd V. Berkner, member of the President's Scientific Advisory Council, in these words:

"The achievement of the Soviet satellite has demonstrated to Americans what they refused to believe before, that they are in a race for intellectual leadership when they hadn't realized that there was a race. In the complacency of our assumed technological lead, we have confused our high standards of living and material prosperity with intellectual stature. It is an extravagant and dangerous mistake."

This quotation, too, seems to come from the remote past. A few voices here and there are raised in defense of a much more purposeful and demanding educational effort, but they are lonely ones indeed. It almost seems as if the American public has concluded that it was frightened needlessly by Soviet technological success in a field that, after all, has no bearing on our way of life.

A feeling almost of complacency has crept even into the recent publication of the Committee for Economic Development, "Paying For Better Public Schools." One of the most startling findings of the study was expressed in these words: "The growth of the national economy, without any increase in the share of total output devoted to public schools, will supply most of the resources needed to keep pace with rising school enrollments." This seems to presuppose a continuation of the present level of plant and instruction. Furthermore, a Texan would find it difficult indeed to single out any school district in the State that can look forward with any confidence to natural growth for a solution to its fiscal problems.

All too many legislators and professional States' righters have refused to come to grips with this central and overriding question: Is it in the interest of the United States to insure that every child is educated to the maximum of his mental capabilities? If so, who shall pay for that education if local school districts cannot afford, or refuse, to do so? It is on this point that the move for Federal aid to education inevitably flounders. Beyond these preliminary questions is another of vital importance to the United States: What steps would be taken to insure that the superior student, wherever he is found, is encouraged financially and otherwise to enter college, obtain a degree and urged to take postgraduate work that may fit him for the tasks of leadership tomorrow?

Of course if we cannot agree that the best education obtainable in schools which demand hard mental discipline, is the fundamental basis for democratic citizenship, then there is no need to worry. We can go our carefree way, piling material prosperity on material prosperity and, as with Louis XVI let our descendants cope with the torrent.

[From the Corpus Christi Times, Mar. 4, 1960]

SCHOLARSHIPS NOT PLENTIFUL OR ADEQUATE FOR COLLEGE COSTS

(By Terry Ferrer)

NEW YORK.—"I'm not worried about paying for my daughter's college education. She's a bright girl and I'm sure she can win a scholarship. After all, there are thousands of scholarships around."

The uninformed father who made that remark recently was earning \$12,000 a year. What he did not realize was that vast changes have been made in who gets a scholarship, in the actual part of the college bill a scholarship will pay—in fact, in the whole student-aid program at all colleges. For the majority of today's college students who need financial help, a scholarship is no longer the assured way of financing 4 years of college.

This is particularly true for families whose incomes are in this father's bracket. Twenty years ago, the bright students did win scholarships and often went off to college with added funds that were not essential, while a less talented child from a poorer family stayed home because he couldn't afford to go. Now, almost all scholarships are awarded on the basis of actual financial need, and even then, they must be supplemented by loans, savings, student work during the summer and winter, and some family support.

The cost of going to college has more than doubled since 1940, and will double again by 1970 if the inflation spiral continues, according to Ernest V. Hollis, college financial expert of the U.S. Office of Education. With the present college population of 3,400,000 students expected to double or triple by 1970, the financial headaches for families with teenage children will become endemic unless some planning is done.

Unfortunately, such planning has not been evident so far. A recent survey of 5,000 heads of households across the country conducted for the Ford Foundation by Elmo Roper and Associates revealed these facts: Parents say that almost 7 of every 10 of the country's children will go to college (the U.S. Bureau of the Census says the 2 of every 10 college-age youngsters were actually in college in 1958). But 60 percent of these parents have not saved any money for their children's college education. Among those who have saved, the average nest egg was \$150 last year.

And parents have no idea of how much college costs now, let alone 10 years from now. Those surveyed expected that a private college would cost them an average \$1,574 a year a child and a public institution \$1,370. Dr. Hollis has computed the average all-expense cost this year at \$2,354 private and \$1,980 public. "Parents," he says "are completely unrealistic, and they're in for a terrible disillusionment."

If tuition and expenses are to double in 10 years, this means that 4 years of residential college with all expenses may cost from \$16,000 to \$19,000 or \$20,000. Of course, 2 year colleges are less expensive, and living at home can save \$400 or \$500 from the annual bill. But the total is still staggering, especially for a family with more than one child. Obviously, planned saving, endowment plans or insurance will be necessary for most families of college-going students.

Most college financial experts advise using a variety of ways to pay for college expenses. These would include a combination of a scholarship (if one is available), a loan, student work during the summer and college year, personal savings and parental support.

Today the estimated \$100 million available in scholarships through the colleges and such programs as the National Merit Scholarships is divided among some 690,000 boys and girls. This makes the average scholarships less than \$145 a head.

In loans, the outlook is brighter. The National Defense Education Act has provided funds for college loans worth almost \$44 million which are currently held by 95,841 college students in 1,368 participating colleges. And 30 percent of the loans were taken out by freshmen. The colleges must put up \$1 for every \$9 the Government gives. Administered through the individual colleges, the loans can run up to \$5,000, at the rate of \$1,000 a year a student. Repayment begins 1 year after leaving college and continues for 10 years with an interest rate of 3 percent. For borrowers going into public-school teaching, half the debt is forgiven.

While some parents have been dubious about saddling their youngsters with, say a \$4,000 debt at the end of college, Dr. Morse points out that the monthly payments on such a figure would be only \$38.64.

In terms of money, a college education is worth \$113,000 more in lifetime earnings than a mere high school diploma, the U.S. Department of Labor has calculated. Inflation being what it is, Dr. Seymour Harris, Harvard economist, has raised this estimated differential to between \$200,000 and \$250,000.

In earnings, in prestige and, most of all, in educating a first-class citizenry, college has become more and more of a necessity as well as an ideal for Americans. To insure that young child will have his chance at college, the requisite is that you chart a long-term course to the campus—beginning now.

William E. Keith, Regional Manager, Veterans' Administration, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and grieved to learn of the death of a devoted public servant and friend of thousands of veterans. Mr. William E. Keith, regional manager of the Veterans' Administration, with offices in Chicago, Ill., passed away Monday night March 7, 1960 in the Veterans' Administration Research Hospital in Chicago, Ill. Along with his family and a host of friends, thousands of veterans will long remember his many kindnesses and sympathetic understanding for the problems of veterans of all wars, their widows, and orphans.

The Chicago regional office serves veterans in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and is the second largest VA office in the country. Mr. Keith took over as regional manager in June 1958, after serving as assistant manager and regional representative. He was active in Illinois veterans affairs for 25 years and once served as assistant deputy adjutant for the Illinois Department of the American Legion.

Since coming to Congress I have handled thousands of cases for veterans and since he has been manager I have always received prompt and courteous replies to my inquiries. Mr. Keith was a good administrator and his services will be sorely missed by the Veterans' Administration, veterans, and all of us who deal with this most important agency.

We all mourn his passing and extend to his wife and two daughters our heartfelt sympathy during this sad time of bereavement.

The Coming of His Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

67

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I think we often become so engrossed in our own little private worlds and personal ambitions we forget temporarily the thought expressed by Hamlet to Horatio when he said, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will." Not only do we fail thereby to draw upon that source of infinite wisdom and strength which we need so much in coping with the problems and cares of this life, but we also overlook the spiritual things which, in the final analysis, are the only things that last and endure. I realize this shortcoming in myself, and I am often brought face to face with a greater awareness of the fact as I read the lines penned by Lyman W. Allen entitled "The Coming of His Feet." Keeping in mind the exhortation by the psalmist, "Be still, and know that I am God." I commend to the attention of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this stimulating and inspiring verse. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lines were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the crimson of the morning, in the whiteness of the noon,
In the amber glory of the day's retreat,
In the midnight, robed in darkness, or the gleaming of the moon,
I listen to the coming of His feet.

I heard His weary footsteps on the sands of Galilee,
On the Temple's marble pavement, on the street,

Worn with weight of sorrow, faltering up the slopes of Calvary,
The sorrow of the coming of His feet.

Down the minster aisles of splendor, from betwixt the cherubim,
Through the wondering throng, with motion strong and fleet,

Sounds His victor tread approaching, with a music far and dim—
The music of the coming of His feet.

Sanded not with sheen of silver, girded not with woven gold,

Weighted not with shimmering gems and odors sweet,

But white-winged and shod with glory in the Tabor light of old—
The glory of the coming of His feet.

He is coming, O my spirit, with His everlasting peace,
With His blessedness immortal and complete;

He is coming, O my spirit, and His coming brings release—

I listen for the coming of His feet.

Early Approval of House Bill 10590 Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the face of rising costs of Federal operations, the Congress and the executive branch must make realistic efforts to put the country's financial house in order.

As we recognize, today the Nation has a national debt of \$290.4 billion. The interest charges on this debt for the fiscal year 1961 amount to \$9.6 billion annually—a big slice out of the budget.

We realize, therefore, that the cost of financing is a major factor in our fiscal program.

As we recall, the administration has recommended—and soundly, I believe—that the ceiling of 4½ percent on long term bonds be raised, so that the Treasury can compete more favorably in the money market. If this is not done, Uncle Sam will need to continue to borrow money on a short term basis at substantially higher rates of interest.

Fortunately, the House Ways and Means Committee has now reported out a measure, H.R. 10590, providing for a lifting of the interest ceiling under specific conditions.

As I understand it, the administration feels that this bill—although a compromise—would, if enacted, better enable our Government to handle its financing problems.

Because I believe that such action is essential in terms of fiscal policy, as well as for the protection of the U.S. taxpayers, I feel that the measure now pending on the House calendar, with whatever revisions may be deemed necessary, should receive early approval by the Congress.

Recently, the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce published a report on national governmental affairs. In the report, the chamber supports the enactment of H.R. 10590. In addition, the Wisconsin Bankers' Association has also expressed approval of this measure.

Because the report reflects the broad gamut of responsible views of these organizations, which include in their membership men in business, in the professions, in finance, leaders in civic and community affairs, and others, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the report by the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, as well as a telegram from George Forster, executive director of the Wisconsin Bankers' Association, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST CEILING ON U.S. BONDS

A compromise interest ceiling plan on U.S. bonds, H.R. 10590, was favorably reported recently by the Ways and Means Committee and House action is forthcoming this week.

Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson said at the hearings on February 23 that the administration would continue to press for the complete removal of the interest ceiling but added that the bill would permit the Treasury to "a substantial extent, in the period immediately ahead to achieve the debt lengthening which is so highly important in the national interest." Under Secretary Julian B. Baird went even further to say that the bill would provide the Treasury with "enough authority to meet the financial crisis now confronting it."

On the Ways and Means vote, all 10 Republican committee members voted for the bill, but only 8 of the 15 Democrats so voted.

The bill provides four modifications:

(1) In the case of bonds, etc., issued for periods of more than 5 years in exchange, before maturity, for outstanding bonds, etc., the bill provides that the 4¼ percent maximum interest rate is to be determined on the basis of the coupon rate alone and is not to take into account any investment yield attributable to the bond being exchanged at a discount.

(2) The bill provides that the 4¼ percent ceiling for interest on Government obligations may be exceeded (upon a determination by the President that the national interest so requires) to the extent of 2 percent of the outstanding debt included in the public debt limitation. To the extent that this allowance is not exceeded in any fiscal year, the excess may be carried over to the 2 next succeeding years (except that there is to be no carryover for the fiscal year 1960).

(3) The 4¼ percent ceiling on interest rate for Government obligations is not to apply to the special issues for the Government trust funds, such as the OASI trust fund, etc.

(4) The 4¼ percent ceiling presently applicable to savings bonds may be exceeded without limitation upon a finding by the President that this is in the national interest.

The Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce recommends support of H.R. 10590.

MADISON, WIS., March 9, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Wisconsin Bankers Association sincerely urges that you support the compromise interest ceiling plan on U.S. bonds H.R. 10590 which was recently favorably reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

GEORGE FORSTER,
Executive Director, Wisconsin Bankers
Association.

Preaching for a New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial written by William H. Robinson entitled "Preaching for a New Era," which comments on the high order of spiritual leadership Rev. Morris H. Tynes is giving to the congregation which he serves in Chicago. Although he happens to be a Negro, Mr. President, it was interesting to me to discover the congregation is an integrated one. There are white members of the congrega-

gation as well as colored members of the congregation.

I think it will be of interest to the Senate to have this editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, commenting on the great spiritual leadership Dr. Tynes is giving to his congregation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREACHING FOR A NEW ERA

(By William H. Robinson)

We who live today are the most fortunate people in the history of the world. We live in the richest and most powerful country in the world and we are the most prosperous and comfortable people on earth. Our material achievements are dwarfing our moral and spiritual progress. Unless we can bridge the gap between our material progress and moral and spiritual growth, disaster hovers over our civilization. This situation is a historic opportunity for the church. The minister is challenged to preach to a generation which is groping for spiritual satisfaction in confused and troubled times.

The layman, today, needs preaching that enriches one's insights and gives a sense of direction in the day to day business of living. A grinding need of our times is a clarification and interpretation of old religious teachings which are no longer valid in our scientific age. The beauty of the Bible's great writings shine through when old myths, stories, allegories, etc., are interpreted in the light of new knowledge and current discoveries and investigations.

Monumental is fortunate to have a minister who preaches for a new era. He is a scholar who translates difficult Bible truths into simple and plain language which all can understand.

Preaching for a new era by our pastor is an eloquent exposition of religious views which are current. He is prophetic and profound. His sermons are protests against wrong and urging calls to repentance.

Reverend Tynes prophesied that the current corruption in city government would run its course. He prophesied concerning police scandals which now shock all America. He predicts that more scandals will come as the result of the moral decay which is at the heart of this city. Like Jeremiah, Amos, and Isaiah of old, Monumental's pastor stands four square and proclaims the good tidings and message of civic and social redemption.

The Mounting Plea for the Politician.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we in politics sometimes receive the impression that many of our fellow Americans have a distinct and heartfelt prejudice against politicians.

If, for instance, a man wants to disparage the ambitious white collar colleague who is rising to the top in a hurry, he refers to his industrious associate as the office politician.

We have all heard comments about politicians' promises.

And we certainly wince a little when someone talks about political cunning.

It is always refreshing, therefore, when an editor or writer comes right out and admits that politicians are needed in government, and that they should be good politicians if they are going to accomplish anything at all.

In a nation such as ours, every citizen should be somewhat of a politician, and by that I mean he should have some degree of the skills and knowledge that we must have to make a democracy work for the good of its people.

An editorial in the March 9 edition of the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., quotes a Member of this body and a New Jersey candidate for public office on this subject, and it quotes them well.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOUNTING PLEA FOR THE POLITICIAN

To the defense of the politician have come in recent days two thoroughly qualified apologists, Thorn Lord of Trenton and JOHN F. KENNEDY of Boston.

Mr. Lord, newly announced candidate for the Democratic nomination to be U.S. Senator, and Mr. KENNEDY, who currently has that office for the Massachusetts constituency while seeking a higher one, spoke to widely different audiences geographically and philosophically. But their message was the same:

The country needs politicians.

The scene of Mr. Lord's lecture was a political dinner in Paramus. And this made it more than just another Saturday night political dinner: It was the first one Mr. Lord attended as a committed candidate. "People like ourselves," he told the audience, "who are interested in government, are the hope of the Nation and the world."

Mr. KENNEDY's environment was somewhat more picturesque, as was his audience. Mr. KENNEDY spoke at Dartmouth College on the eve of New Hampshire's early-bird primary. Dartmouth seems to be a warmup area for presidential aspirants. One of the college's distinguished alumni, Nelson A. Rockefeller, almost got his nomination off the ground there last fall. Mr. KENNEDY was there opportunely to speak to the college's Young Democratic Organization. He threw away his text on South America, and talked instead about Daniel Webster and politicians.

To say anything unkind, about Daniel Webster in New Hampshire, especially at Hanover, is feebly comparable to slandering the Lodges or the Cabots, not to say the bean and the cod, in Boston. But Mr. KENNEDY boldly pointed out there was some sly cunning in Daniel Webster's political background and all this proves is that politics shelters a great many divergent people. There is a saying about bedfellows.

"Students," said Mr. KENNEDY, "should not unthinkingly disparage the profession of politician."

We hear of this all the time, from increasingly surprising sources. Businessmen are telling other businessmen they had better get into politics if they want to protect their investment. Professional men are being told by outsiders and by themselves they can no longer stand aloof if they wish to assure their profession's reputation and integrity.

It's all true, of course. But it seems a difficult lesson to learn. The politician is the practitioner of the science of government. In that capacity he needs, deserves cannot do without the help and respect of

his neighbors no matter where they may be. But too many of us still think of the politician as Boss Tweed.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams—May Providence Make Him an Instrument for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, because Gov. G. Mennen Williams and his wife Nancy are constituents of my congressional district, I take the privilege to make known their remarks on the occasion of the Governor's decision not to seek a seventh term as Democratic Governor of Michigan:

ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS ON TELEVISION AND RADIO, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 3, 1960

Good evening, friends and fellow citizens of Michigan.

In the Book of Ruth, there is an inspiring passage on loyalty and devotion: "For whither thou goest, I will go; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

I quote this passage as a sort of text for our talk tonight, because it expresses my feeling about the people of this State, where I was born, and in whose service I have spent most of my adult life.

Eleven years and two months ago, I stood on the steps of Michigan's Capitol to take the oath of office for the first time as your Governor. Although I had served in important appointive positions, and had done my stint as an officer in the Navy, I had never been elected to public office before. The job of Governor of Michigan loomed as a huge task.

Yet, as I stood there on the capitol steps on that cold, bright New Year's Day of 1949, I felt a deep sense of confidence and faith. I looked out over the faces of the crowd which had gathered to see the inauguration of this brash young fellow everybody called "Soapy"—and I saw in those faces something that transcended the difficulties we faced.

That something was the awareness of a common bond of unity. We, the people of Michigan, were as one family. We had a common goal. That goal was to realize the great promise and opportunity of the second half of the 20th century.

That was when I knew that you and I, working together, could succeed at this job, because you, the people, were with me.

Since that cold New Year's Day of 1949, a decade—more than a decade, an era—has passed. The face of Michigan has changed. We have achieved great progress in many important fields. State government has been brought closer to the people. The State now has a real two-party system, with all the good results of competition for the confidence of the voters. Our schools, colleges, and universities are better staffed and better equipped to meet the challenge of rising population and the increased demand for education. Our mental hospitals no longer are merely places in which to lock patients up; they are places where people with mental illness are being treated and cured.

The century-old dream of a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac is a reality. We are rapidly crisscrossing the State with a net-

work of four-lane divided expressways. We have improved all of our social services.

The administration of justice has been modernized and tempered with mercy and human understanding. We have made the language of the Declaration of Independence a living thing in Michigan as we approach closer, year by year, to the ideal of equal dignity for all our citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Other problems, such as fair apportionment of the Senate, tax revision, governmental reorganization, and constitutional reform have been brought into focus, and there is no question in my mind but that an aroused people will find the solutions.

Thus Michigan has moved ahead into the second half of the 20th century. To accomplish this progress has required hard work on the part of many people. For my part, although public problems have absorbed almost every moment of my life for these 11 years, I have worked happily and with the greatest satisfaction. I have never made a secret of the fact that I love the job of Governor of Michigan. I am deeply grateful to you, the people of Michigan, for giving me your confidence and permitting me to serve you in this highest State office for so long a time. I am grateful to all those who have in innumerable ways helped me and given me their friendship.

Whatever may lie ahead for me in a personal sense, I have every intention of continuing to serve, to the best of my ability, the interests of the people of Michigan. I intend to do all in my power to promote the things I believe Michigan needs—particularly constitutional reform and a fair standard of representation in the legislature.

Yet it is obvious that no man can, or should, occupy the highest executive office indefinitely. Over the last few months, I have been facing a decision—whether I could best serve the State and the country I love as a seventh-term Governor of Michigan, as a private citizen, or in some other public office.

As I faced that decision, I was aware that the new decade of the 1960's has brought with it a new basis for judgment. When I took office as your Governor in 1949, the great challenge was to realize the social and economic gains a new technology made possible, and past neglect made imperative. The United States, at that time, was unquestionably the most powerful nation in the world. We had exclusive possession of the atomic bomb and we feared nothing. Our primary purpose was to build, behind the great shield of the Strategic Air Command, a more abundant life for our people.

Today, that picture has changed. The Soviet Union has the hydrogen bomb and the missiles to deliver it. Other nations are entering the nuclear weapons race. The dreadful nightmare of the movie, "On the Beach," has become more than a bad dream; it has become a possibility. The human race, for the first time, has the capacity to destroy itself.

The great imperative of today is not domestic progress—important as that is. The great overriding imperative of today is peace. Our most important need is not for longer cars and wider television sets, nor even for bigger profits, higher wages or lower taxes, desirable as those may be. Our great need is for a just and lasting peace. Until we succeed in building such a peace, we live on the edge of nuclear destruction.

As far as my duties as Governor would permit, and to the extent of my influence outside of Michigan, I have addressed myself to this challenge. I have tried, through reading, travel, and personal contact, to acquaint myself with the problems and hopes of people in other parts of the world. I have visited the Middle East, Africa, South Amer-

ica, and the pressure areas of Central Europe. I have called together, at my own expense, conferences of experts to get the best thought in this field.

As a consequence, I am convinced that the greatest challenge to anyone in public life today lies in the advancement of peace and in the supporting fields of national economic growth, education, and the elevation of human dignity everywhere in the world.

I want to work for this cause. I would like, frankly, to work for the cause of peace in some public office where I could be effective. But I have made no commitments for national office. I am perfectly willing to work for this cause as a private citizen, if that is the role providence has assigned to me, using whatever influence I have in the interests of a strong American nation in a peaceful family of nations.

As a matter of fact, I came to this conclusion many months ago, during my visit to the Holy Lands and Central Europe. But when I returned to Michigan, in late October, I was greeted by many of my dear friends with the urgent suggestion that my party needed my help here in Michigan and that I should be a candidate for a seventh term. As the weeks went on, these suggestions became more insistent, and I felt that I must give them my most sincere consideration. Because of my high regard for these friends, and my loyalty to the Democratic Party of Michigan, I was deeply moved and concerned.

Now, after exhaustive consideration, I am convinced that I can leave this office to meet a challenge to be of service in a wider field, with complete loyalty to my friends and my party in Michigan. The Democratic Party of Michigan is not the infant organization it was in 1949. It has grown up and become the majority party of this State. It had developed sound leadership and a living program which I am confident will have the continued support of you, the people. It is equipped to present effective solutions to the State's problems, and candidates for office who will carry on the work of the last decade. I am confident that the Democratic Party can win the State election of 1960, and that it will carry Michigan for the Democratic national ticket. Certainly it is my intention to do everything I can to make this prediction come true.

So I have made my decision. I will not be a candidate for a seventh term.

I would be less than honest with you if I did not confess that I make this decision with a heavy heart. I shall leave our old gray capitol with deep regret. This, for almost 12 years, has been my life. The capitol has almost been my home, as Nancy and I have dedicated nearly every evening and weekend, as well as normal working days, to public tasks. I shall deeply miss the friends in both peninsulas, whom I will not be able to see as frequently in the future. I shall miss the day-to-day contact with your problems.

But while I will be leaving this job, I don't feel that I will really leave this work. I will still be working for your interests, wherever I am.

I remember something Frank Murphy said when he was leaving the office of U.S. Attorney General to take his seat on the Supreme Court. I was a young assistant of his and, like all of his staff, I did not want to see him go. But he said to us: "I have never left an office without sadness, but I have never felt regret in taking up my new work."

The years ahead hold great promise for the people of Michigan and of the United States. It is up to us—you and me, whether as private citizens or public officials—to make that promise come true. A new decade is beginning. Let us strike forward boldly, remembering the words of the psalmist: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills."

May God bless the State and the people of Michigan.

STATEMENT BY MRS. NANCY WILLIAMS

With all its hard work, the Governor and I have really loved the jobs we were doing. It has been a privilege never before granted to be Governor of such a wonderful State for so long a time.

The many people who have chosen to make Michigan their home present a very colorful population, rich from its blending of nationalities and cultures from many lands. We have enjoyed knowing them personally, and working with them to build Michigan for the future and to produce legislation of value to all.

We have both devoted all of our energies to it, and it is with real sadness that I see this part of our life drawing to a close. Whatever the Governor decides to do in the future, I will be with him to help as much as possible. He had never intended to run for a seventh term until he found pressures mounting and many friends shocked at the thought that he might be laying the governorship aside.

The children have been in on the decision and approve heartily. My personal feelings are of mixed joy and grief as the future holds for me time for so many things I have long wanted to do. I shall work first on our house at Mackinac which is such a great thrill for me.

Waste in Armed Services Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks I place in the RECORD two articles issued by the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain dealing with waste in the supply functions of the Department of Defense. These articles stem from hearings held by the Special Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee. The basic work on these articles was done by reporter Jack Steele and he is to be congratulated on his fine work.

I want to point out that there may be some confusion over the fact that a statement is made that 1.8 million common-use items have been cataloged. There have been 3.4 million items cataloged but these include common use as well as other types.

The present interest in elimination of waste in military supply is certainly understandable. I am sure that every American citizen wishes to do whatever is necessary in the way of defense effort, but we all revolt at the idea of paying tax money to support uncontrolled bureaucratic in the Department of Defense. There has been a wide gap in top management in obtaining necessary economy and efficiency in these areas. If the Bureau of the Budget, with its great authority, and the Secretary of Defense would exercise the authority vested in him by the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958 in all supply and service areas, I am confident that billions of dollars could be saved.

The articles follow:

[From the New York World-Telegram, Mar. 9, 1960]

SURFACE ONLY SCRATCHED

For sheer size, there is no business to match our armed services. In buying, supplies on hand, and surplus disposal, a congressional committee reports, the Defense Department is without parallel. It is also, the report makes plain, the most wasteful business.

For years, Congress, top Government officials and others—such as the Hoover Commission—have been trying to get the Armed Forces to pool their buying on so-called common-use items—of which more than 1.8 million have been cataloged.

The new report of the Joint Subcommittee on Defense Procurement says: "But efforts to date have only scratched the surface."

Less than a sixth of the common-use items have been standardized for purchasing purposes.

As a result, the armed services now have surplus supplies costing \$26.7 billion. The job of disposing of this excess material is so staggering the Defense Department estimates it will take 3 years—and more surplus is accumulating all the time.

"The net return to the Government on surplus disposal sales," says the subcommittee, "is less than 2 percent of the acquisition cost."

Billions of taxpayer dollars simply vanishing.

This is bureaucracy in action—a bureaucracy so vast, so glued to its ways and so cumbersome that it is able to resist all efforts to control it. Congress, a succession of Defense Secretaries, the Hoover Commission—all have tried—in vain.

Despite this record, though, we believe this problem can be licked if some military heads are bashed together and firm orders issued.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 7, 1960]

REPORT HITS SERVICES FOR WASTE IN BUYING (By Jack Steele)

The Defense Department, despite many "surplus" scandals in the last decade, has made little headway in eliminating waste and duplication in the purchase of military equipment and supplies.

This charge was made today by the Joint Economic Committee, headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, after an exhaustive staff study of Defense procurement.

The committee's report charges that the Defense Department, despite repeated promises to Congress, has been "extremely dilatory" in unifying and standardizing its buying.

BLAME

But it blames the foot-dragging chiefly on the Army, Navy, and Air Force, which have fought doggedly to keep their separate procurement services and stave off formation of a single military buying agency as proposed by the Hoover Commission and many other groups.

The report charges that waste and overlapping which result from this individual service buying have helped build up a huge surplus of 2.67 billion in military supplies.

It notes that the Defense Department—to get rid of this vast surplus and more in prospect—plans to dispose of \$10 billion worth a year for the next several years. The Department expects to get back only about 2 cents on the dollar of the original cost of this material, even though much of it is new and unused.

This surplus-disposal program is almost twice as big as that needed to get rid of the vast military supplies after World War II, which the old War Assets Administration

liquidated at the rate of \$5 billion worth a year.

FEW STEPS

The Douglas committee accuses the Defense Department of making many studies, but of taking few steps to unify and standardize its procurement.

Its report notes that:

"Defense has spent \$200 million to catalog the 3.4 million different items bought by the armed services. But only an estimated 14 percent of the 1.8 million common-use items in the catalog have been standardized. The remaining still are bought separately by the three services—even though they differ only in color, finish or even terminology. About \$450 million a year might be saved by standardizing these items.

"The Department has not yet forced the services to adopt joint purchasing of such common items as hand tools, hardware, office machines, furniture and even athletic goods and toiletries."

In 1956, under pressure from Congress, single manager buying programs were set up for four types of military supplies—food, clothing, medical supplies, and petroleum. These have worked well.

But, after a gap of 4 years, it was not until last month that the Department got around to ordering single manager buying of two additional categories of military supplies—housekeeping items, and hardware and paint.

Remarks of Congressman Robert W. Hemphill Before the Washington Area Clemson Alumni Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

MR. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress from the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District, before the Washington Area Clemson Alumni Club, at Britts Cafeteria, Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va., March 9, 1960:

Mr. President and members of this distinguished and privileged group of the Clemson alumni, when I first received the letter from my boyhood friend and companion, Howard Nottingham, now a distinguished architect, I wondered whether I should risk acceptance, not because of the traditional rivalry between Carolina and Clemson, a happy and lively one, to be sure, but because I knew I would be tempted to express my opinion as to the truth of our present national position because of the quality of my audience. I am neither a seer, a prophet, nor even a great statesman. I am simply a Congressman from a proud State, representing a proud people, and I have done my best to inform myself. I hope my remarks reflect application and some knowledge. I assure you they will reflect concern.

For about four decades now we have been involved in international affairs in an increasingly complicated fashion. Up until World War I, and actually until the successful use of the airplane reduced the water defenses, the Atlantic and Pacific, to minimum advantage, we in this hemisphere enjoyed a semi-isolation which was reflected in our strength as a nation. We were strong and proud and free, and we were very, very

moral. No one in the world either doubted our strength or questioned our future.

After World War I, the internationalists were able to lure us into playing the game about which we knew so little, and about which they had been so busy for generations before our Nation, as a neophyte, was invited to sit at the council table; they assured us that we, as one of the leaders of the world, would be listened to, and that we would be benefited. If we suspected, we did not heed the warning of time and events that the British Empire was to disappear as the leading nation on earth, nor did we recognize the truth of the fact that we were called to the council table for the purpose of saving the British Empire. We were to be the chief vehicle in that effort.

Now we did not know the rules of the game; if we did, we paid no attention. British diplomacy is based purely and simply on what is best for the British Empire. This has been their theme song since the days of Runnymede, and had we listened to the warnings of our forebears, we would have been duped into the belief that either the British Empire had changed, or that it will ever change, that diplomatic philosophy. That is their philosophy today, and if they are to continue as a sovereign nation in the future, that will be their philosophy, and, in my opinion, they will play Communism against Americanism to any degree to accomplish and preserve that purpose.

When we entered the international picture, somebody gave us the idea that we could change the rules. We did not change the rules, but we brought Santa Claus to the conference table. Now assuredly, we have always had a governmental duty to protect our own people and preserve their freedom. I would not for one minute, have you believe that I think we have any other than a Christian duty to go out to the world and to publish and to save and to help, if possible. But since we believe in separation of church and state, why did we not leave to the church those things which the church has as its mission, and to the state those things that are within the peculiar province of the government. I feel free to question this international philosophy of ours, if we have any policy or philosophy, and not because I am in any sense an isolationist. I just recognize the results.

We have not asked the Christian church to govern, but we have asked our Government to spend itself blind for charity that is misused, abused, distorted and subject to the vandalism of every sort of international cheat and vulture. And we have spent billions and billions and billions to lose friends and antagonize peoples.

The only victory I know of that the State Department of these United States has had in the last 10 years, if it is to be called a victory, is in usurping the powers of the State, or misusing the powers of the Federal Government, in the Chessman case. If this had happened in my own State of South Carolina, I would consider it as a personal insult to me as a citizen of South Carolina. It is my considered opinion that the Governor of California used the State Department's Mr. Rubottom or Nudebottom, or Falsebottom or whatever his name is, as a fall guy. In any event, we have the unorthodox interference by a bureau of the Federal Government in the affairs of a sovereign state.

Meanwhile the world is going to hell and the fires of discord are running rampant while Eisenhower plays golf and uses an Air Force plane to fly his grandchildren down to Puerto Rico for a vacation.

Let us examine our international policy for a minute. Closer to the mainland of the United States than we are to our beloved State of South Carolina is a little island we know of as Cuba. Cuba was once under the domination of the Spanish Government, and

we freed Cuba for the purpose of bettering Cuba and giving that country and its people a future. As time progressed our policies with Cuba did not develop Cuba or its resources to the fullest. The people remain ignorant and hungry. I would not for 1 minute blame the United States for this, but I do say the policies toward Cuba have not been so productive that we can afford to have the State Department of this country spend its time interfering in the domestic affairs, particularly state, while a little Communist shrill by the name of Castro shakes his fist at the great Government of the United States and shows off to his Latin neighbors and to the world that he can violate any agreement, seize property, trade with Russia, and get by with it. I read only this morning that he was thumbing his nose at Secretary Herter. I am here to tell you that anytime the Secretary of State of the United States is not a bigger man in the eyes of the world than a rabble-rousing dictator, our international philosophy and our foreign policy is not only woefully inadequate; it is innocuous and disgusting.

When I first came to the Congress we had a terrific emergency. For many nights I stayed awake concerned over the fact that the President of the United States, in the Mideast, was asking the Congress of the United States to give him the power to virtually declare war, by the use of troops without the permission of the Congress. I fought that resolution, and I thought it was wrong at the time. Then we interfered to save Nasser. We doublecrossed Great Britain and we doublecrossed France, who were our friends, at least a lot better friends than Nasser will ever be. We ignored the fact that we had already committed against the Arab people one of the sins of our generation and there are today in miserable camps in parts of the Mideast people who have been displaced, their accumulations depleted, their homes taken away from them, and who rightfully blamed these United States for that fact. These refugees are mostly Arabs, and they hate the United States. My friends whose origin are in the state of Lebanon and elsewhere in the Mideast, who return home as often as they can to their homeland, now tell me that these people, these Arab people, who formerly loved the United States and respected its flag, now hate the United States and curse its purposes. How is such a policy as productive of good will, or good future? Nasser, another peanut-sized dictator, shakes his fist at the United States whenever he wants to.

Recently the President returned from a trip to Latin America. I listened last night, and to make sure that I missed nothing, I read the text again this morning. I followed the trip with great interest, and I find nothing, absolutely nothing, productive in that visit. I hope he took Rubottom with him, and I think he did. I hope also he took the man with him that was making the concessions to Panama which the Congress found out about and stopped.

Let us transfer our thoughts to national defense. Surely it is a concern of every one of you, because it is purely and simply a matter of survival. In the event of a nuclear war, Washington would probably be one of the targets, one of the prime targets of our enemy. It would be so easy and so simple to paralyze the United States by decimating its Government, knocking out its Capital City, and depriving the people of a seat of leadership. Thank God for the National Guard. We in the Washington area would live or die—you and I.

We are told that we are behind in the missile race. There is no excuse for it. We are told that we are behind in the arms race, and it is my considered opinion that the Russian serviceman is better equipped today than the average American serviceman. The Strategic Air Command has been char-

acterized as our last desperate line of defense. In the Air Force magazine of this week, an able writer began to point out the possibilities of a missile-age Pearl Harbor. Not too long ago, a member of the Armed Services Committee told me that if the American people knew the truth of our defense picture we would have a panic on our hands. And, while all of this is going on, I notice that the DAV had a noble purpose to raise a shrine to the battleship *Arizona*, and its loyal company of heroes. Is there a duty on the President of the United States, first to ascertain the truth of the situation, and, second, to tell the people? In our part of the world I believe there is and I believe you do too.

The domestic scene presents no pretty picture, either. As we gather here tonight, a thin gray line in the Senate, and an equally thin gray line in the House of Representatives, seeks some relief, some avoidance of the worst legislation since Reconstruction, force bills commonly called the civil rights bills. In the House of Representatives a committee is concerned over "payola," bribery in our communication industry. Meanwhile, within the shadow of the Capitol, there is a farm at Gettysburg furnished with gifts, gifts, and more gifts. I noticed where the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission received a rich trip to Florida and then off on a yacht. I think that was wrong, but some people think it is not wrong for the President and has family to receive jeweled gifts and all sorts of other things from all over the world. Harry Truman put his in a library, but maybe he did not know how to use the farm to get out of income taxes.

Make no mistake about it. I would not for one minute tell you that this world is not going through a revolutionary period, the likes of which it has never seen before. Men are demanding their place in the sun, men and women who hitherto have been satisfied to sit under the shade of an olive tree and live an undisturbed, provincial life. We have engineered a great part of this thinking by means of communication, and by our promises to the world that we are going to develop, at an American pace, undeveloped portions of the world. We have failed to take into consideration the limitations of these people, a majority of them, but we have promised, and they will look for Santa Claus to come down the chimney. Disappointed children are unhappy children, and so the uneducated and the unlearned and those who can be swayed around the world, such as the people of Cuba, now look to Santa Claus with bitter tears of disappointment.

I do not think we can prevent the revolution from succeeding. I do not believe we can now tell the peoples of the world that they are not entitled to food and clothing, and education. We have told them so long that they are entitled, and we have told them that we are doing something for them, and sometimes we impose the yoke of a dictatorship who would steal everything we sent to a country, and whose corruption was attributed to these United States.

It is therefore time to evaluate our position and our potential to help or not help, and consider it in the light of the future of the American taxpayer, the breadth of his freedom, the soundness of his dollar as the evidence of his economic stability.

And so we find that the future so far as you and I are concerned is either one of two kinds, either a future controlled by these United States, or a future not controlled. Any future of this world not controlled by the United States is a future of slavery for people like you and like me, a future of absolute governmental regulation for your and my children and our grandchildren.

Some years ago, teaching at the Xavier University, was a Catholic priest by the name

of Father Thompson. Because he made some unorthodox statement he was shipped to Nova Scotia. He believed, and I subscribed to his theory, that you cannot teach Christianity to empty stomachs. When he arrived at Nova Scotia he found that 80 percent of the people were out of work, they were dismayed, and they were not interested in religion. They were hungry. He set to work to organize the communal life, into community participation in fishing, canning, and the like. Within 5 years 96 percent of the people were employed, were happy, and useful citizens belonging to the church. The moral is evident.

How can we expect the rest of the world to look at the fact that we have a surplus in food, and a surplus in clothing, and that we dump it into the ocean practically on the one hand or give it way to a private business interest in a foreign country on the other, and these people whom we have told that the United States believes in and is their champion of freedom and their champion against poverty, go hungry and naked. This is the underlying philosophy of all those people who hate us today. Santa Claus has promised so much, and has not delivered.

Now why should I talk to an audience such as you in this particular manner? I have dared to tell you what I believe to be the truth, dared despite the fact that I realize some of you will not like it, and that my words can be misinterpreted and taken out of context, and used by any opponent that I might have in the forthcoming election, if I am opposed. I tell you because we have had the best sort of training in the world. While I may have been against you on "big Thursday," I recognize the fact that you are the kind of men I can depend on, as my forefathers and yours have fought together. After all, men are government, and if we ever depart from that conception, we after all are citizens of the Government, then we have departed from that conception which gave us independence, determination, and a willingness to die for our country.

You and I must face the problem. I have proposed a Great White Fleet filled with surplus goods. At least that would reduce scandalous storing charges. So far the executive department is against it. I shall seek other means of meeting the challenge before us. So must you.

I am telling you because it is men like you that must awaken to the seriousness of the situation, become witnesses for freedom in your own right, and you must be the Government. I enlist you in the army of freedom for the future.

Thank you very much.

Inside the Policy Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Post, March 10, 1960:

INSIDE THE POLICY RACKET

(By Ted Poston With Alfred Hendricks, Irving Lieberman and Richard Montague)

Have all the Negro bankers been driven out of Harlem's lush numbers racket through police connivance with white racketeers, as Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., has charged?

No. There are still some Negro policy banks in operation. Several of them have been listed in the Post's series on the alliance between corrupt police and the policy barons.

But this does not completely discount Powell's charges. The number of Negro-controlled policy banks have been reduced from about three dozen to less than 12, and some of the remaining ones are suspected of domination by the East Harlem mob which controls the citywide game.

The fate of a handful of Negro bankers, of course, hardly accounted for the most startling revelation of the Post's investigation into the policy racket.

The corruption which makes for collaboration between crooked policemen and policy bankers goes well beyond the borders of Harlem. The Post team found that it extends throughout the city, and, in many ways, permeates the police department.

The pattern of corruption is often established even before a rookie enters the department, and in some instances, it continues years after a veteran leaves it.

A Negro ex-cop recalled his experience at the Police Academy for the Post.

"There were quite a few of us Negroes in our class," he said, "and most of us were puzzled over the number of our white classmates who said they wanted to work in Harlem when they graduated."

"At first I thought they were just trying to be nice, although I felt they were really being a little condescending, but when they started talking about the money that could be made in Harlem, we got the drift."

"You can believe me or not, but I first heard of The Pad [the multi million-dollar policy protection racket] in the Police Academy, of all places. Then I found out something that shook me up more. I found that many of these guys had actually been recruited for the force by friends and relatives who were already on the take in the department."

"One fellow told me how he had planned to study law at first. But an uncle, who although a plainclothesman, had made more money than anyone in the family had ever dreamed of, 'put him straight.'"

UNCLE KNEW BEST

"My uncle told me," this boy said: "You go on to the academy and get on the force and I'll see you make enough money not only to put yourself through law school in style, but to pay the rent on a downtown law office while you get your business started."

"And, you know, I think he did just that."

Some Negro policemen, past and present, complained to Post reporters that they were discriminated against in the parceling out of policy graft. "The white boys try to keep it all for themselves," they said, observing, seriously, that Negroes on the force often were denied equality of opportunity even in the matter of making a fast buck.

Yet the Horatio Alger of the hustlers in the policy grab turned out to be a young Negro cop who never rose above the rank of plainclothesman but retired in 8 or 9 years with more money than many successful honest men accumulated in a lifetime.

This man went almost directly from the Police Academy to the staff of a high ranking official and the graft came fast.

A recently retired Negro numbers banker with whom the plainclothesman was friendly recalled the other day the cop's decision to leave the department.

"He had been called down to District Attorney Hogan's office and sweated about the pad," the banker said, "and they really shook him up down there."

"He made up his mind then and there that he was getting out, but his boss urged him not to. The boss asked him to stay on just 1 more year. 'By then, I'll be ready to

pack it in, too,' the boss said. But my man said he'd had it, so he quit anyway."

The ex-plainclothesman is now a very successful businessman and coowner of a plush supper club.

Of course, when a plainclothesman leaves the department after serving the expected number of years, he doesn't necessarily have to leave the pad completely. If he was a "stand-up guy" when he was on the force, he can work as a "bagman" for the various squads preying on the policy game, earning as much as \$25 per spot just for picking up the monthly graft for his associates on the pad.

Ex-Sgt. Joseph Luberdia, for one, made a lucrative career as a "bag man" until he got drunk one night and was picked up by State police with over \$19,000 in cash and a list of the Harlem spots on the pad for which he had been collecting.

Luberdia's arrest sent more jitters through the department than anything since the expose years ago of the Harry Gross book-making empire in Brooklyn, but Luberdia went to prison rather than name the police officials for whom he was serving as "bag man."

Before the East Harlem mobs took over major control of the Harlem game, Negroes, including some bankers, served as "bag men" for the grafting squads.

A well-known Negro nightclub owner was once the "bag man" for most of the community.

"When the money got so big and the take so fabulous," one ex-banker said, "the boys decided that they were better off with one of their own handling the bag. And the East Harlem guys went along with the idea all the way. They didn't want any Negroes to know too much about their operations anyway."

As for the recruits on the force, a rookie who doesn't happen to learn about the pad while studying in the Police Academy can't remain ignorant of it more than a few days after he gets his first assignment, the Post found.

One authoritative source put it this way:

"One of the first things the kid will find out is that he can't even make a legal arrest without it costing him money. If he doesn't slip a few bucks to the right person in the station house, he'll find himself swamped under with paper work. If he doesn't 'see' the man in charge of roll call, he may find himself exiled to a deserted beat. If he doesn't 'see' the right man in court, he'll find his case put on the bottom of the calendar and have to spend all day warming a bench in court."

"This whole system of cops grafting on cops is a direct outgrowth of the pad. The guys inside the station house know that the boys outside are pulling it down and they feel entitled to get a taste of the take themselves."

THE TAKING WAYS

Now to get back to Harlem and the sunset of the Negro policy bankers.

It is true, the Post found, that the pad has priced many Negro bankers out of the Harlem policy business, and that the police have helped to consolidate the racket in the more lucrative hands of whites. But there were other factors, too, as one veteran policy man explained.

"One of the ways the white mobsters took the business over," he said, "was by getting the Negro bankers into 'peonage' through loans. Once a Negro banker got in hock to a white mobster, he had to stay in line."

"If he tried to stop working for the white bank and took his action elsewhere, the white man would contact all the other white banks, and order the would-be rebel frozen out. No one would touch his business when this happened. And some Negroes who tried to switch were dealt with more directly. They just had the hell beat out of them."

"What the whites had, and still have, is organization. Even the cops know when a Negro is in bad with the white bankers. And when you're in bad, the cops help put you out of business with harassment and arrests. They'll even carry 'dead' policy slips around in their pockets, and if the word is out to get you, they'll plant them on you even if you insist on being taken to the station to be searched."

And how do many Negro bankers get into hock? One observer put it this way:

"Too many Cadillac cars, fur coats, high living, women, and Harlem society stuff. The big white boys go around looking like bums and banking their loot. The Negro boys think that even a Brooks Brothers outfit is bargain basement stuff. Then one big 'hit' and 'bang.'"

A veteran policy player, a woman, touched on that last point.

HIT AND RUN

"You spend your money playing with these Negro banks and you hit them big and can't find the runner, the controller or the banker," she said. "That's why I leave my play in a spot. I know that if I hit, they ain't going to close up the grocery store or the fruit market or the bar where I played. I'm as much of a race woman as the next one, but when I gamble my money I want to be paid."

A cynical single action man termed the white mobsters' success "a matter of public relations."

"You hit one of these white cats," he said, "and they pay you off in brand new crisp \$10 and \$20 bills. You hit one of these darker brothers and if you get paid at all, you might have to take some old greasy, crumpled up bills and maybe part of it in quarters and halves."

"Now when you see that sawdust, you know that the mill can't be far behind."

In the Bronx, one operator said that the East Harlem higher-ups had ordered their white operators to get out and "socialize" in the Negro community, visit the bars and order the bar-maids to run 'em around for the house.

"One cat," he said, naming one of Harlem's biggest white bankers, "maintains at least two Negro girl friends that he takes around and introduces as 'my wife' or 'my old lady.' I don't think that's doing him much good though. Some of the brothers don't like it."

The few Negroes left in the game are not exactly starving, of course. One of them summed it up whimsically this way:

"If I had it all to do over again, I don't think I'd go into the numbers business. I think I'd just graduate from the Police Academy and become a lowly cop."

"Then I'd be guaranteed to get my dime out of every dollar that's bet on the figures. And I wouldn't have to worry about the odds, or paying off bets, or splitting down the line with anybody."

Citizen Responsibility and the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. LAFORE, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1960, it was my privilege, along with some of my colleagues in the Congress from the great State of Pennsylvania,

to join with members of the committee on Federal taxation and expenditures of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce at a meeting held in Washington, D.C.

I was given opportunity to address a few remarks to the gathering and at that time I expressed appreciation for the opportunity of meeting with such outstanding business leaders from my State. It has been my experience that these fine Americans epitomize the finest attributes of responsible citizenship and of devoted patriotism.

During the events of the evening Mr. B. Frank Spicer submitted to the group the report of the committee on Federal taxation and Government expenditures of the Pennsylvania State chamber. This report evidenced a keen understanding of the important national issues confronting our country and its citizens today. So that the text of that report may be publicly available, I will include at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Mr. Spicer's very well considered presentation:

I have been asked to present the report of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce Committee on Federal Taxation and Government Expenditures program with respect to Federal tax and Federal spending, and it is both a privilege and a pleasure to address the Pennsylvania Members of Congress and my fellow members on the Federal taxation committee of the State chamber. There may be some gaps to bridge between the tax field and the political field, but with honest efforts and understanding on both sides, we feel that much can be accomplished in closing these gaps.

It is rare, indeed, in these times, to find a newspaper, magazine, or other form of publication that does not make some reference to proposals for Federal tax reduction and reform. An editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of February 27, 1960, presents a provocative argument for a more liberal and realistic depreciation policy for Federal income taxation under the title "Tax Rules Hamper American Industry in Replacing Its Wornout Machines." Some reasons why Federal taxes and the budget are so high are set forth in a revealing article in the Reader's Digest of March 1960 by Mr. Morris H. Stans, Director, Bureau of the Budget, on the subject "Shocking Facts About Our Federal Budget." The newspapers of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and all of our cities are publishing stories about the Federal spending, tax, and debt outlook, the tighter enforcement of our high income taxes, and the deliberations in Congress over the President's appropriation requests, and other questions involving the taxpayer's purse. All of these straws in the wind are indicative of the concern of the Nation over its tax burdens and the possibilities of tax reduction and reform.

This is the season of Federal budgetmaking, and the lines of battle over spending and taxation measures are being drawn. The possibility of at least a moderate surplus in 1961 has excited the hopes of those praying for tax reduction, as well as those looking for additional millions to spend upon their pet projects. Confusion is compounded by the fever over the national elections next November. In these days of uncertainty, when taxes and more taxes are trying men's souls, it is time to take inventory of the costs, as well as the assumed advantages, of our widespread Government establishment and its multitudinous activities.

Those whose lives are dedicated to careers in public service and who are under constant pressure to obtain increased funds for every

imaginable project and service and at the same time to secure tax reductions for their constituents must find it difficult at times to walk the tightrope of popularity. Perhaps the great British statesman, Edmund Burke, had this dilemma in mind in a speech to Parliament in the year 1774 concerning the hotly debated issue of taxing the American colonies when he said, "To tax and to please, no more than to love and be wise, is not given to men."

OUR HIGH RATE OF TAXATION

We are all aware that the vast expansion of Government activity in nondefense areas and the continuing tensions in the world have caused our taxes to be maintained at deplorably high rates, particularly when we add our State and local tax burdens to that of the Federal Government. How many would have dreamed, when the 16th amendment became effective in 1913, that by the year 1960 the personal income tax rates would be graduated from 20 to 91 percent; that corporate income in excess of \$25,000 would be taxed at 52 percent; that the estate tax would be graduated up to 77 percent; gasoline would be taxed at the rate of 4 cents a gallon; cigarettes, 8 cents a package; and liquor, \$10.50 a gallon; not to mention the additional State and local taxes?

A built-in gimmick in the income tax automatically imposes higher rates as the income of an individual increases. The first \$4,000 of taxable income is taxed at the rate of 20 percent, which rate in 1913 would have been regarded as confiscatory. As a man's income rises, his tax rates also mount. In due time, if the man is fortunate to earn sufficient income, he will be honored with a tax rate of 50 percent or greater.

As we all recognize, much of the increase in our incomes is fictitious. The Consumer Price Index for November 1959 was 125.6 percent of the 1947-49 average. The Consumer Price Index for 1939 was 59.4 percent of the 1947-49 average. The consumer dollar on this basis bought, in 1959, less than half of what it bought in 1939, and we do not enhance this picture when we consider that the income tax rates are now much higher than they were in 1939, when they ranged from 4 to 75 percent. Those with incomes lagging behind the rising costs of living are especially hard hit, and, as previously noted, because of the scheme of rate graduation, an increase in income in depreciated dollars automatically brings higher tax rates.

To some extent, one may become adjusted to the pains of increased taxation as the corns on his feet become adjusted, through much misery, to tight shoes or the shoes become stretched with age, but old taxes, contrary to an ancient adage, are neither painless nor perfect—they still deprive the taxpayers of money which they could otherwise use.

To some extent, also, the burdens of taxation may be relieved by beneficial Government expenditures and by the illusions of prosperity resulting from inflation, to which increased Government spending has significantly contributed. But high spending and high taxes add to the inflationary pressures, both by raising costs and by forcing more money into the markets. Inflation breeds on inflation, with everybody seeking more dollars to offset the decline in purchasing power of the dollars he presently possesses. It may take longer for creeping inflation to bring the inevitable financial and economic collapse than runaway inflation, but its potency may be just as deadly.

The pressures of heavy taxation intensify the resentment of the citizens against it. Excises and sales taxes are denounced as regressive imposts, and our onerous income taxes are scored as confiscatory. There are many who feel that the income tax has passed the point of diminishing returns as a revenue.

The apparent widespread evasion of the income tax, which has recently been given much publicity in the press, is a symptom of its partial breakdown as a revenue and the demoralization of the taxpayer. One is reminded here of the famous indictment of the income tax many years ago by Gladstone, who warned that the tax had made the British a nation of liars.

The problem of the many legal loopholes in the income tax is further evidence of its inequities and its inadequacy as a revenue measure when its rates are pushed beyond what the traffic will bear. It is the history of the income tax in this country, as well as in other countries, that as the rates increase to unreasonable heights, the base of the tax is eaten away both legally and illegally. Of all taxes, the income tax requires popular acceptance and effective cooperation to enable a proper enforcement, but, in a democracy, a tax deemed to be excessive cannot possibly win public approval.

As tax men who live and breathe taxes every day and see their effects on business management and the economy, it is our deep conviction that the Federal taxes on personal and corporation incomes are too high to be long endured if we are to maintain a healthy, growing, and reasonably stable modern enterprise economy. When taxes take over half of the upper brackets of personal income and of corporation income, it is only natural that they play a leading role in business and financial decisions and in the lives of consumers. Such taxes drastically curtail private funds for both consumption and investment, and tend to dampen initiative, risk taking, and economic motivation.

SOME TAX PROPOSALS

Our close contacts with taxation as a factor in business and economic activity have resulted in the formation of some firm convictions about our taxes and the need for tax reduction and reform. In facing the tax and budget battle of 1960 over the fateful decisions for 1961 and subsequent years, we can only reach the conclusion that we should join with the other business groups seeking tax revision along the lines of the Herlong-Baker bill.

Members of the business community have often disagreed over the major features of Federal taxation. Out of our studies and those of other business organizations has emerged the prevailing conclusion that business can advantageously unite in pressing for a definite pattern of tax reduction and reform. The Herlong-Baker bill, as you know, provides for an annual series of substantial revisions in the personal and corporation income taxes and a sharp reduction in the rates of the estate and gift taxes. Over a period of several years, the personal income tax rates would be lowered to a scale of 15 to 47 percent, and the corporation income tax rate of 52 percent would be cut to 47 percent. The bill would also provide an appropriate step toward the much needed liberalization of depreciation allowances.

In addition to these tax reforms, the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce committee on Federal taxation and Government expenditures, which is continuously studying the impact of Federal taxation on a community, proposes the following:

- (1) Further alleviation of the double taxation of dividends received by individuals.
- (2) The elimination of tax penalties on intercorporate dividends and consolidated returns.
- (3) The taxation of cooperatives under the Corporation Income Tax Act with a deduction for dividends distributed in cash to the patrons.
- (4) Government enterprises engaged in business and in competition with private enterprises should be taxed as a private business.

TAX REDUCTION AND THE BUDGET

The Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce does not advocate irresponsible tax cuts which would unbalance the Federal budget. We are mindful that if economic conditions are favorable and the Federal expenditures are wisely strained, a sizable surplus will be available in 1961 for tax and debt reduction. Tax reductions along the lines outlined here would, in time, strongly encourage economic growth and enhance the national income and taxable economic activity. Over the long pull, more moderate taxation, in our opinion, will produce more revenue than the present oppressive tax rates.

Substantial reductions in Federal spending are both desirable and feasible, waste should be minimized, and activities which the State and local governments can, and should, assume should be transferred to that area.

Some guidelines growing out of the studies of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other business organizations and research by public and private experts suggest several avenues of greater economy in Federal spending, and would include the following:

- (1) Eliminate nonessential expenses for national security without weakening our national defense.
- (2) Review unexpended appropriations to determine extent of necessity.
- (3) Stop backdoor Federal spending measures which avoid review and approval by the Appropriations Committee.
- (4) Keep highway financing on a pay-as-you-go basis.
- (5) Reverse the growth of Federal grants-in-aid to the States.
- (6) Liquidate Federal lending programs for area development and community construction facilities.
- (7) Place the responsibility for the financing of education with State and local governments.
- (8) Reexamine agricultural aid, with a view to its substantial reduction and eventual elimination, if possible.
- (9) Limit public works to those which are vitally needed but cannot be financed locally.
- (10) Stop the construction of Federal public housing.
- (11) Reject general health insurance or reinsurance proposals.
- (12) Take action necessary to eliminate the postal deficit.
- (13) Discontinue the operation of Federal business-type enterprises in competition with private enterprise.
- (14) Reduce Federal civilian personnel where it will not have an adverse effect upon the essential functions of government.

BUSINESS MUST SPEAK OUT

Our proposals for retrenchment in Federal spending are strong medicine for the serious disease of "budgetitis" which has afflicted our Nation. The small Federal, State, and local governments spending of a few decades ago may be swollen to a total of \$156 billion in the fiscal year 1960, according to a recent survey by the tax foundation. State and local governments may add \$58 billion of spending to the \$98 billion of Federal money. Our Government expenditures are increasing faster than our population and faster than prices, and it is not national defense but our domestic expenditures which are swelling the tide of Government spending. Government influence is being extended everywhere in the economy and the community. Socialization and centralization are growing apace, and with them have come higher taxes and creeping inflation.

We have not rationally compared the supposed advantages of every Government spending program and every dollar poured

out with the costs. Perhaps in our form of government, it is not given to the great majority to understand the relationships between Government activity and high taxes. We are reminded here of the comment of Thomas Jefferson when he submitted a report on banking to the Nation. He stated, after witnessing much popular misunderstanding of money and banking problems, "In matters of arithmetic, the bulk of mankind are schoolboys through life."

We feel that it is the duty of taxmen and business executives to inform the public, members of legislative bodies, and those in public administration of the results of their studies of the impact of taxation on economic activity and our institutions. It is also our duty, when other groups are presenting their views, to suggest such courses of action as our experience and judgment may deem to be wise and fair.

In closing a taxman may humbly say, "The difficulties encountered in tax and financial education are indeed great." And perhaps the Pennsylvania State chamber may be permitted to point out to the Pennsylvania Members of Congress that the formidable task of education will be even greater if legislation is not enacted which will permit business, labor, and other taxpayers to deduct lawful expenses for influencing legislation and determining liability for income taxes. If such deductions are not allowed, we shall be in the strange and unfair position of being taxed to provide funds for Government agencies to influence legislation which will, in turn, tax us on the funds we, as taxpayers, devote to setting forth our views on vital legislative proposals. In such a one-sided battle over taxes and the budget, the outcome is clearly prejudiced in favor of the spenders against the taxpayers. No better way could be found to encourage fiscal irresponsibility and the unwise use of our Nation's material and human resources.

Effective Soil and Water Conservation Is a National Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, much concern is being registered all over the country by farmers, townspeople, district soil conservation commissioners, watershed boards, and municipal officials, relative to the comparatively small amount of funds in the budget for the Soil Conservation Service to expend in fiscal year 1961.

I shall take for example the proposed watershed of which I am very familiar, other proposed watershed projects in my county, district, and State are in a similar situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you know that I would be the last Member of Congress to ask for an appropriation that cannot be completely justified, and I am also sure that every good American wants our very necessary soil conservation and flood prevention program to continue on a sound, effective basis, which cannot possibly be done with the funds in the budget. There are hundreds of places where savings could and should be made and a small part of such savings used

to better conserve our priceless soil, and to avert disastrous floods.

Just a few days before returning to Washington for the opening of this Congress, I attended a meeting of the town council at my home in Exira, Iowa. They were interested in the possibility of obtaining a supplemental water supply in a multiple-purpose dam. A watershed project under Public Law 566 is being planned in the vicinity where a water supply could be developed in conjunction with a dam planned for flood prevention purposes. Exira, like hundreds of other towns in the United States, has been short of water for a number of years and urgently needs an additional supply.

Now I am informed that the Town Council of Exira has reached the point where it must take action very soon on a plan to finance the local cost of such a water supply dam. But they are wondering what to do in view of the situation pertaining to Federal funds available to carry out the Public Law 566 program. If they issue bonds or make an appropriation and then find that Federal funds are not available, where does that leave them?

Similar situations exist elsewhere. In many States funds have been made available to highway departments and other agencies of the State to carry out small watershed projects. These funds, if not spent within the period for which appropriated, due to failure of the Federal Government to carry out its end of the bargain, will be lost.

Right now, for example, in the Mill Picayune watershed in my district in Iowa, the local organization has provided rights-of-way and easements valued at \$292,000 including \$198,000 for putting roads across dams in lieu of building bridges. The road costs are to be provided by the county board of supervisors of three counties and the Iowa Highway Commission. If the Federal Government does not come through with funds to build the dam, this money will be lost.

I believe that local communities spending their own time, effort, and money in an agreed-upon cooperative undertaking with the Federal Government have a right to know where they stand; that they have a right to expect their Government to treat them fairly.

One of the Nation's major needs is sound, continuing resource development programs. The strength of our country is no greater than the natural resources we possess. Our resources are not unlimited, yet we continue to make increasing demands upon them, year by year.

A basic resource is water. And we have a water problem. It is nationwide in scope. One of our greatest challenges is how to avoid water scarcities on the one hand and floods on the other. We must take all necessary steps to assure our Nation of water in appropriate quantity, of adequate quality, in the right places and at the right time.

Our water needs are increasing at a tremendous rate as our population grows and industry expands. These needs must be met from a water supply that remains constant. The answer lies in

water resource developments that will prevent water losses in floods that do untold damage, and in providing for storage and better use and distribution of the available supply for our basic domestic, industrial, and agricultural needs.

The Federal Government has long recognized its responsibilities in the water field, a responsibility that is shared by the States, by local communities and by the operators of the Nation's farms and ranches.

Our major water resource activities are those embodied in the programs of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture. These programs are sound. They deserve full support on a continuing basis.

The President's 1961 budget calls for an increased appropriation of \$118 million in the combined budgets of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. This proposal would raise their combined total to more than \$1.1 billion.

In startling contrast is the budget proposal to increase the small watershed program which provides for the Public Law 566 projects by only \$5 million. Actually, the budget leaves this program with about \$4.5 million less funds because of using up the carryover funds from prior years. It is my understanding that a construction slowdown is already threatened.

We cannot afford to minimize the small watershed program by this kind of inequitable treatment. It is fully as important to the national welfare as the programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Indeed, watershed protection and flood prevention work in our small watersheds—where about half of our annual flood damage occurs—is essential in most instances to protect our investments in flood control and water storage projects in our major river basins.

There is another compelling reason why full Federal financial support should be given to the small watershed program. This is a partnership program—a cooperative undertaking between the local people, the State, and the Federal Government. The Federal Government has an obligation to keep its end of the bargain it makes with the local sponsors of small watershed projects.

The Federal Government does not keep its bargain when it fails to keep pace with the commitments that local people and the States are making in many parts of the country when it causes postponement of construction after the local people have carried out their end of the bargain and are ready to proceed.

I understand that the proposed budget for the small watershed program means that construction starts cannot be made on a sizable number of local projects that will be ready to go in fiscal year 1961; that even funds for technical services will not be available for a large number of local projects that will be fully planned and ready to be authorized for operations in fiscal year 1961 and finally that the amount of construction funds available will cause a stretch-out of construction time on the average small project from the scheduled 5 years to 10 years

or longer. The 30-percent reduction in watershed planning proposed in the budget will mean a cut from 42 to 30 watershed planning parties, and preparation of about 70 work plans instead of 100.

Not only is the proposed budget increase for the small watershed program completely unrealistic, but the budget also proposes to cut back the program on the 11 authorized flood prevention watersheds from \$18 million to \$15 million. This program includes the Little Sioux watershed in western Iowa where work started in 1947 is proving to be of outstanding benefit to people in my district and the district of my esteemed colleague, Congressman HOEVEN. Even at the \$18 million level of appropriations, it will take an estimated 21 years to complete the Little Sioux project. How, I ask you fellow members of the Appropriations Committee, can we rationalize increasing the rate of construction on major river dams while cutting back the rate of construction in these long-authorized watershed projects?

Failure to provide adequate Federal financial support is a real disservice to the State governments and to the community organizations that have made tangible commitments in these watershed projects. The local people are required to operate and maintain the project when completed. In Public Law 566 projects, they are also required to do the construction or let contracts for the construction; to acquire water rights; and to obtain agreements from farmers and ranchers to plan and apply soil and water conservation measures on their lands.

In projects involving multiple-purpose dams, such as for municipal water supply storage in combination with flood prevention, the local people must pay all the costs of the structure chargeable to municipal water storage.

The local costs of small watershed projects often involve bond issues and assessments. They involve appropriations by State and the county governments.

These local people who have kept their agreements with the Federal Government to the point where they are completely ready to start construction certainly have a right to expect their Government to be ready to carry out its commitments.

But many of them are going to be sorely let down by their Government if the funds proposed for fiscal 1961 are not increased by the Congress.

The State of Iowa and the people of my own district are deeply concerned about Federal financing of small watershed projects. Iowa is one of the 13 States that made available a total of about \$1.1 million this year to accelerate watershed planning. Iowa appropriated \$50,000 for this purpose; the Federal Government provided \$76,000 in Iowa for planning.

The effect of the proposed budget for watershed protection and flood prevention will be to slow this worthwhile program to almost a standstill just when it has reached maturity, with local

groups in hundreds of communities across the country ready to proceed.

The Federal Government has an obligation to give adequate and continuing support to this program. It is sound. It is geared up for action. The costs are divided in accordance with the benefits. Let not the Federal Government be responsible for crippling it, especially when it is proposed in this same budget to add many millions of dollars to speed up construction of Federal dams on major rivers to which not one cent of State or local contribution has been made.

Some Case Stories of the Health Needs of Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from Californians indicating great interest in providing health care benefits to the aged in connection with the Social Security Act. Most recently I have had a number of letters from social workers in the Los Angeles and adjacent areas who know the problem of hospital and medical care needs of older people because they are employed to serve them in public and private agencies and in the social service departments of hospitals.

I was interested to note that in my district and the several other districts that constitute Greater Los Angeles, we have something like 40 percent of the 1,250,000 residents of California who are 65 years of age and over. I am glad these older people have chosen my part of the country as a place to retire to, but I am distressed that such a high proportion of them—estimated at about two-thirds—have no hospital or medical insurance; yet 10 to 20 percent of these older people require 60 days or more convalescent or nursing care per year—10 times the amount needed by younger adults.

The testimony of a couple of my correspondents was with respect to the difficulties and inadequacies of public medical care. Said one correspondent:

I am a social worker in the county welfare department and my attention is drawn daily to the health problems presented by older people and their delays in securing care because of the lack of availability of medical care and the stringent eligibility requirements for free medical care. To receive care at the county hospital it is necessary to sign a reimbursement agreement to repay the hospital and it means a lien on real property. If nursing home is required, personal property of a person or a couple must be reduced to \$300. This has kept many from seeking medical care until they were critically ill, long periods of illness have resulted, and it has been more costly to the taxpayer.

Another social worker indicates as follows:

I have been employed in the public welfare department of a large county, on the

faculty of one of the schools of social work, and with the department of mental hygiene. In each agency I have seen numbers of older persons, both old age assistance recipients and those with limited financial resources, faced with the necessity of limiting essential medical care because of heavy demands on an inadequate budget for food, clothing and shelter.

All too often we hear of instances in which children appear to avoid what are their responsibility and appropriate obligations for the care of their parents. I was interested, therefore, in an illustration that demonstrates a counterexperience.

This involved an elderly widow who has been a resident of California for many years but moved to another county in order to be near her only son. She was supported solely by OASDI benefits and a small supplement from her son. Eight months ago she suffered a severe heart attack and because she did not have any insurance, her extensive and expensive care in the hospital had to be paid for by her son who was already carrying heavy family responsibilities. Nursing home care was indicated but the high cost of such care, about \$200 a month, was not possible and so Mrs. K. moved in with her son. Because she required constant care—since she was bedridden most of the time—heavy financial and emotional stress has been placed upon the entire family. Undoubtedly, further hospitalization will be required which may mean turning to public assistance since the son's resources are stretched to the limit.

Still another illustration by one of my correspondents of the strain placed on family relationships by the sickness of an elderly parent is given in the following case:

Mrs. G., 76 years old, was admitted to the hospital for cataract surgery from an outlying area. Her husband, 76 years old, a stroke victim, remained at the couple's home as he was not physically able to accompany his wife to the city. Family income amounted to approximately \$100 (from social security). Prior to hospital admission, with some supplementary financial help from their married son who lived in the same community, this elderly couple was managing on the above income. Problems arose in the medical-social planning for Mrs. G. because, after she had her surgery, it was going to be necessary for her to remain in the city near the hospital so she could return to the eye clinic weekly for 6 weeks. Because she needed convalescent care, a nursing home was necessary (\$225 minimum monthly). The married son, who had three young children and a modest salary, contributed a small amount and the nursing home operator, after an emotional appeal, agreed to subsidize the balance of the cost of the patient's care in his institution. Aside from the family worry about trying to work out a solution so the patient could have adequate medical care, it is not difficult to speculate on what it means to an individual to have to go through such an experience, especially when he has not been dependent on charity or relief previously in his or her life. Yet, in this case, the patient was quite healthy with the exception of needing cataract surgery, and barring unforeseen circumstances, still has many years left.

Important as are the humanitarian aspects of health care benefits for older

people, there is also an economic side which could benefit health services to all of us. Thus, as one of my correspondents put it:

I can see needed new equipment, less overloading of medical personnel, thus encouraging an increase of services to the patient and more adequate members of medical staff to care for them.

Most of all I see the tremendous relief from increasing county taxes to homeowners, businesses, and corporations when these costs for medical care are spread throughout the Nation to the employees covered by the Social Security Act. Many of the patients now in overcrowded public facilities will wish to patronize private hospitals, dentists, physicians, and private nursing homes who can afford to maintain higher standards on the standard fees which will then be available.

Many of the present nursing homes have minimal standards because they are forced to depend on the limited amount a State like ours, which is overcrowded with aged, can afford to pay.

I recall that when we held hearings on the Forand bill last July, one of the witnesses for the National Association of Social Workers was Dr. Charles I. Schottland, Social Security Commissioner from 1954 through 1958, and now Dean of the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University. Mr. Schottland, a Los Angeleno, and director of the California State Department of Social Welfare before President Eisenhower appointed him as Social Security Commissioner, knows this problem of medical care as both a State and Federal administrator. Out of this experience he testified emphatically for the need for health care benefits for the aged and the administrative practicability of inclusion of such benefits in old age, survivors, and disability insurance.

Finally, I am including in my remarks a copy of a telegram from the Los Angeles Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers which reads as follows:

One thousand one hundred and fifty members Los Angeles Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, representing both public and private social agencies, endorse Forand bill as initially introduced. This endorsement agrees with thinking of 28,000 national membership of NASW. Please be assured of our concern and appreciation of any efforts you may exert in behalf of this bill.

International Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the *Pekin Times* of March 2, 1960 as follows:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

Maybe Americans can be scared into doing something about an international language—scared by Russia.

Russia is molding its grade school pupils into weapons for attack against the United States of America. How? By requiring them to learn languages. The Reds know that a Russian who speaks the third fellow's language can make friends faster than an American who doesn't understand a word that is being said.

The Russians are in a slow, apparently successful, campaign to take over all the world except Switzerland and the United States of America—then overwhelm us.

I have no hope that Americans have enough get up and go to learn foreign languages. It seems too remote. But the jet age has come.

Folk from India, Russia, Africa will be winging into America in hours. You and I will fly to Asia in 2 or 3 hours.

We need to be able to talk.

With this new urgency, may I repeat my hope for a plan that could have us all taking within 10 years. It is a simple plan: Have an international committee pick out 10 words to be introduced in every school in the world each autumn.

Let me illustrate:

The first word Ceil and I learn in any country is "where." It is "wo" in German. That is just the kind of international word we need. It is an emphatic word, easily said, short to speak or write, and already widely known.

For "is" they might use the English "is." It also is short. Of course it would be spelled "iz" like it sounds. Above all things they should avoid the spelling horrors of the English language. Imagine spelling "iz" "is."

Next word needed is "thanks." I don't know a short word for "thanks" but if the committee could not find one from Sanskrit to esperanto, they could invent one. It is used and needed so often that they might just use "o" for thanks.

In 10 years the whole world could say (in the new language) where, iz cafe, want, bed, bread, water, coffee, rice, fish, how much? hotel, sick, airport, tomorrow, and please and thanks, and 82 more words.

We'd be visiting. And let me forecast that once we got it started, we would be adding 50 instead of 10 new words each autumn. In fact, there are already dozens of words (like cafe, theater, chocolate, garage, telephone, and concert) that already are common in many of the world's languages.

'Twould be no trick at all to start a world language.

Let's do it.

What Goals for Africa's New Leaders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, truly 1960 promises to be an eventful year in Africa's march toward independence. Already this year self-government has been achieved by the Cameroun, with similar prospects awaiting Togoland, Somalia, Nigeria, the Belgian Congo, and possibly the Mali Federation of Senegal and the French Sudan later in the year. By the end of 1960 it is expected that virtually half of Africa's 220 million people will be living in countries which have gained their independence.

Simultaneous with this political revolution, Africa is undergoing equally profound economic, technological, and social

changes which are transforming the face of the so-called Dark Continent. Development programs are proceeding apace: Transportation systems are being modernized, new harbors are being constructed, and vast hydroelectric projects designed for aluminum production or other industrial use are either under construction or in the advanced planning stage.

As Africa emerges into independence and her leaders increasingly assume the responsibilities that go with freedom, the need for intelligent understanding becomes ever greater. In its "Great Decisions" for 1960 series, the Christian Science Monitor has published a most penetrating and informative article on Africa, entitled "What Goals for Africa's New Leaders?" This excellent article by John Hughes in the March 9 issue of the Monitor is certain to be of wide interest.

Under leave, I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 9, 1960]

GREAT DECISIONS FOR 1960—WHAT GOALS FOR AFRICA'S NEW LEADERS?

(By John Hughes)

1. DYNAMIC MARCH TO INDEPENDENCE

CAPE TOWN.—In Ghana they call it "freedom." In the Belgian Congo it's "independence." And in East Africa "uhuru." But it all adds up to the same boisterous, confident African march to independence which is today the most dynamic and significant movement in this continent. The nationalism which liberated Asia from colonialism in the years following World War II has leaped the oceans and now is crackling through Africa.

Some observers say it should more properly be termed "Africanism." Britain's Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, on an African tour earlier this year, spoke of an "African national consciousness."

But whatever the terminology, the principal goal of Africa's new leaders is this assertion of the black African's right to rule himself. There is an exciting declaration of the African's new-found identity and individuality, and of his increasing influence.

This goal of African independence is well on the way to being fulfilled. By the end of 1960 more than half of Africa's 225 million nonwhite peoples will be sovereign.

Target dates loom

Already this year the French Cameroons has become independent. Following will be French Togoland, Italian Somalia, the vast Belgian Congo, Britain's West African colony of Nigeria with its 35 million people, probably the Mali Federation of Senegal and the French Sudan, as well as Madagascar and other French African states.

These will join the list of countries already independent—the West African Negro nations of Liberia, Ghana, and Guinea, as well as Ethiopia, the Sudan, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and Morocco. Another independent state, although white-dominated, is the Union of South Africa.

Many more Africans will be virtually governing their own affairs without having formally achieved independence. Tanganyika, for example, will achieve self-government under African rule in the latter half of this year, although still a ward of Britain. But even in these lands the lines are drawn, the target dates for independence are just around the corner, and it is only a matter of not too much time before they, too, are completely free.

Thus with the exception of a cluster of white-controlled territories at the southern end of Africa—the Union of South Africa,

Portuguese Angola, and Mozambique, and the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland—the achievement of this African freedom goal is a foregone conclusion.

Even in these expected lands it seems doubtful whether political responsibility and influence can be permanently withheld from nonwhites.

Thus tomorrow's Africa will be one dominated by the black man.

Colonial rule shrugged off

All this has been brought about by a political revolution as one country after another shrugs off colonial rule. There are two particularly interesting points about this revolution. Firstly it has come about with dramatic swiftness. The pressure of African nationalism has sent white plans tumbling and has compressed the colonial powers' timetables beyond anything that could be imagined 5 years ago.

The second point is that this great upheaval has taken place very often in an atmosphere of remarkable amity between ruler and ruled which permits a friendly relationship after independence. Ghana and Nigeria, with their cordiality toward Britain, are cases in point.

There have, of course, been tragic outbursts of violence, as in Kenya during the Mau Mau rebellion and in the Belgian Congo. Algeria, although a north African rather than black African territory, has an unhappy history of conflict. It is only realistic to recognize the explosive character of some other situations.

But nevertheless in vast tracts of Africa the transfer of power from white to African hands has gone relatively smoothly and peacefully.

African identity sought

After independence has come black Africa's debut into international affairs. The goal of African leaders like Ghana's Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah and Guinea's President Touré is to establish an African personality. They are working for the recognition of a distinctly African dignity, culture, way of life, and outlook on world affairs.

Already the voice of black Africa is airing its views at the United Nations on issues from the H-bomb to Tibet. Less and less are Africans a mere appendage to the Afro-Asian bloc as in earlier days.

Yet, of course, they see eye to eye with their fellow nonwhite Asians on such burning topics as colonialism and racial discrimination. Africans have shown themselves particularly sensitive to color prejudice, whether in Little Rock, Ark., or London's Notting Hill district, or Blantyre, Nyasaland.

Thus leaders like Prime Minister Nkrumah feel responsible for helping to free Africans elsewhere who, despite the rapid pace of change in the continent, still are for the moment under white rule. This is another goal in which there is sustained interest in such West African capitals as Accra, Conakry, and Monrovia.

Finally a major goal of Africa's new leaders is to guard jealously the new freedom which their nations have so recently won. Thus there is not a single one prepared willingly and voluntarily to surrender this independence to foreign powers either Western or Communist.

At the same time, although publicly proclaiming a policy of nonalignment in world affairs, some may, like Guinea, indulge in a flirtation with the Communists for the sake of economic aid and material benefits. The danger is that in their overconfident inexperience they may find themselves too deeply involved to break off the association when they wish.

2. SIMULTANEOUS REVOLUTIONS

Africa's new leaders are caught up in several revolutions all at once. There is the political revolution, which is thrusting po-

litical power upon Africans so dramatically and swiftly. There is the social revolution which is disrupting not only the African's own traditional tribal background, but also the color bars imposed by white men during the colonization of the continent. And then there is the economic revolution which has jerked Africans out of conditions often primeval and dumped them down in the factories and machine shops and blast furnaces of the new Africa.

Quite a common sight in the South African mining capital of Johannesburg are strings of unsophisticated Africans being hustled goggle-eyed through the concrete canyons between the skyscrapers to the big mine labor compounds. These are Africans who have been recruited thousands of miles away, from as far distant as Mozambique and Tanganyika, to serve contracts of several months and more as laborers in the Transvaal gold mines.

They have been recruited in the bush, often straight from their village kraals, and theirs is literally an overnight transition to the 20th century. They are whisked in by aircraft, the first which most of them have seen, and plunged into a strange new world of streetcars and traffic lights and giant buildings with elevators. To some of these men, boots are a completely novelty, for they have never before worn them.

Basically underdeveloped

This is an extreme example of the journey many Africans are making from their mud-and-dung huts into the atomic age. Indeed, Africans under white supervision in the Belgian Congo mined the uranium for the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombs.

And there are Africans today ably flying airliners, captaining steamboats, conducting geological surveys, and performing many other complex jobs created by the economic revolution which is afoot in Africa.

But all this may be a little deceptive, for, despite these substantial achievements, the African Continent is basically an underdeveloped area.

Africa does, it is true, produce the bulk of the world's diamonds, more than half its gold, more than a fifth of its copper, and major slices of its chromite, manganese, and other minerals.

But the bulk of all this comes from the Union of South Africa, most developed country on the continent and perhaps the only one which can fairly be said to have an industrial economy. South Africa accounts for 43 percent of the mineral output of the whole continent.

Africa's other lands exist on predominantly agricultural economies. For millions of Africans this is agriculture at the subsistence level, grubbing merely enough from the sun-baked soil to meet the needs of their immediate families.

Per capita income is unbelievably low. Illiteracy is high, and life for the African peasant is burdened with poverty and hardship.

Potential wealth

Ironically, Africa possesses much potential wealth. It can grow most crops, is rich in raw materials and deposits of minerals, has some oil and, though there is not much coal, is fabulously wealthy in river water for hydroelectric power.

A major goal, almost without exception, for Africa's new leaders is to bridge this vast gap between poverty and prosperity, to harness their power, mobilize their resources, and industrialize their economies in the fastest possible time so that they can produce for their people tangible benefits of independence.

"We prefer poverty in liberty to riches in slavery," Guinea's President Touré told France's President de Gaulle on the eve of Guinea's independence. Yet Guinea, like every other independent African State, is

organizing desperately to ensure that poverty lasts as short a while as possible.

The most exciting, moving force in Africa today is the desire of black Africa for freedom and independence—the breaking of colonial ties.

From Nigeria, the Belgian Congo to Kenya and Tanganyika the drum beat of "freedom" is heard as Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana and Sekou Touré in Guinea move on the free Africa stage.

Balkanization decried

There is talk of a United Africa, a decrying of Balkanization. In the exciting atmosphere of independence, black Africans perceive vistas of Africa's potential contribution to the United Nations and the peace of the world.

Like Asian leaders, young Africans recognize the need to steer a course between the West (with its taint of colonialism) and the stranglehold of communism.

As Kenya's fiery Tom Mboya told a gathering of 4,000 Africans on his return from the London Conference on Kenya's future, Africans have been knocking on the door of freedom for 3 years, and now the door is open.

Ghana has its Volta hydroelectric scheme, Guinea its Konkouré, the Belgian Congo its Inga project—all the African lands have hydroelectric plans for aluminum production or other projects designed to swing their economies from an agricultural to an industrial base. Ghana, for example, currently is dependent on cocoa as its principal export. If the cocoa price drops, Ghana may be in serious trouble, hence its urgent need to diversify.

The challenge for these young African leaders is lack of capital, an absence of technological know-how, and an appalling shortage of technicians, scientists, and key administrative personnel.

Millions poured in

Colonial countries have poured in millions of dollars of development capital, and the World Bank loaned nearly \$540 million for African development projects between 1951 and 1959. But this totaled only 13 percent of the loans made by the bank, and there is a vast backlog in African development.

At the same time, dollars and pounds and francs are not alone the solution. Ghana currently is embarked on an ambitious \$957 million 5-year development plan, but many economists would be surprised if the Ghanaians are physically able to expend that amount even if they can find it. There is, for example, a limit to the capacity of existing transportation systems which must serve development projects. Similarly the shortage of technicians and administrators limits the expansion which many African lands can undertake in a given period.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa reports that African governments must themselves in many cases become entrepreneurs to stimulate development, yet the most serious shortage confronting these governments is that of trained administrators and managers.

These economic deficiencies already have attracted the attention of the Communists, who have been quick to offer emergent African states technical aid. Guinea and Ethiopia have accepted development loans from the Soviet Union of \$35 million and \$100 million respectively.

Thus the search for the ideas, the men, and the money which will serve as the catalyst for economic development is one of the principal tasks confronting Africa's new leaders.

3. AFRICAN SOLUTIONS FOR AFRICANS

What sort of Africa will Africa's new leaders build? What will Africa look like in 5 years or 10? Against the background of dramatic change in the past few years, it takes a bold prophet indeed to forecast. But we do know that great dams and engi-

neering projects and manmade lakes such as the 175-mile-long one at Kariba are changing the physical face of the continent.

It is doubtful, too, whether the present boundaries between various African countries will remain constant. Many of these were imposed arbitrarily and artificially by the colonial powers. Thus there are instances where a single tribe is strung across three or four international boundaries. Ludicrously, tribesmen may work in one country, live in another, and have relatives in a third.

Thus there are sometimes strong regional movements for tribal reunification which may modify existing borders.

At the same time, these comparatively minor alterations are a very different proposition from the United States of Africa concept, a fusion of independent emerging states, of which some African leaders like Ghana's Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah dream.

There are indeed strong economic arguments for cooperation and closer association between African states but there are also some quite massive political obstacles to be overcome.

Rickety union formed

Ghana already has formed a loose union with Guinea as the nucleus of a type of West African federation. But the union is rickety and Guinea's President Touré has different ideas from those of Dr. Nkrumah on its future. M. Touré is also a thoughtful observer of various realignments in French Africa and it is perhaps there that his main interests may yet lie.

Meanwhile, Liberia's President Tubman, recognizing that the pan-African unity movement may yet become a significant force, has climbed on the unity bandwagon. But he seeks a cautious "association" of African states which would leave Liberian sovereignty and independence unimpaired.

In recent weeks, Dr. Nkrumah's unity overtures have been snubbed by his two neighbors, Togoland and the Ivory Coast. In October the big colony of Nigeria becomes independent to challenge Dr. Nkrumah's claims to pan-African leadership. And before Nigeria begins to think about submerging its newly won identity in a wider grouping of African States, it must consolidate national unity among its own diverse tribes, regions, and peoples.

This same problem of preserving national unity among clans and groups quite hostile to one another is one which looms for many another African country, as evidenced in recent intertribal warfare in the Belgian Congo. For although millions of Africa's black peoples are termed "Africans," it must never be forgotten that there are among them differences as great as between Frenchmen and Yugoslavs, Indians and Japanese.

Democracy's future

Thus although pan-African unity is a major goal of some of Africa's new leaders, there are major obstacles to its implementation.

Meanwhile, what of the future of democracy in Africa? Many African leaders have been schooled in American and British universities and are well-steeped in the atmosphere of democracy. Yet, though many of them say it is their goal, there is a distinct trend toward strong, one-party rule, toward the erosion of parliamentary opposition, and in some instances, toward government by decree.

Some observers are aghast at this trend. Others inquire whether it really is reasonable to expect African countries to achieve overnight the type of democracy which has taken centuries to mature in other lands.

Africans themselves frequently are amused at the debate, for they hold that colonial government rarely was democratic and that political opponents of the colonial govern-

ments were jailed, banished, harried, and deported.

Yardstick questioned

Further, they say that democracy is far from being practiced in the white-controlled Union of South Africa and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. And, when emergent African nations are compared with countries outside Africa, Africans say the comparison is always with the most advanced democracies like Britain and the United States, never with some states with less creditable achievements.

Africans question whether "Western Christian civilization" really is a suitable yardstick for measuring the ability of an essentially non-Western person like a black African to run his own affairs in his own land. Although the application of many Western techniques to African problems may have beneficial results, one does indeed wonder whether it is realistic to assess African achievements by Western standards.

Thoughtful, and often anxious, white men in Africa sometimes ask whether the African accession to power, influence, and independence is not proceeding too swiftly. One wonders, however, whether that query really is pertinent any more. For this African landslide is no more than the reality of the situation in Africa today, whatever it may bring, and debate as to its desirability seems redundant.

Africa's new leaders certainly need white men, if only for the benefit of their technical knowledge and administrative experience. Nations like Ghana, where more white men now are living than in preindependence days, are seeking white specialists from overseas in large numbers, and they face no disability or discrimination under Dr. Nkrumah's African administration.

Equality, not privilege

But the proviso is that the white man must seek only equality, and no special privilege or political dominance, on account of his skin.

Thus the problems of these lands are problems essentially African, and the goal of their leaders is to solve them in a distinctly African way. This may mean the establishment of an African-style democracy different from that of the West. It may mean the steamrolling of tribal, chiefly rule by the eager young nationalist rulers.

There may be corruption and maladministration—not entirely unknown in lands elsewhere—and African leaders conceivably may be from time to time as imperious and hypersensitive and immoderate as other leaders before them in history.

Then, too, they may be less preoccupied with the conflict between Western and Communist worlds than Westerners and Communists themselves. For Africans are engaged in a struggle with neither of these forces. They have their own battle against poverty, underdevelopment, and ignorance among their peoples.

Although outside assistance may be gratefully received, the achievement of these goals is essentially the privilege of black Africans themselves.

Has Benson Worn Himself Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Has Benson Worn Himself Out?" which appeared in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune under date of March 5, 1960.

The Bismarck Tribune's very able editor, John Hjelle, has made some observations which I am sure will be of interest to Members of Congress and all others who are concerned about agriculture.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS BENSON WORN HIMSELF OUT?

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has denounced as "political demagogues" those who are opposing his policies, thereby sticking to the defensive line which has helped stall on dead center all attempts to grapple with the American farm problem.

It is true that undoubtedly some of those who don't agree with the Secretary probably deserve the classification of demagog, and that many others disagree with and attack him for purely political reasons.

The Secretary makes a mistake, however, if he feels that all who refuse to buy his views do so for only demagogic or political reasons.

Much of what Secretary Benson has to say is true. The present farm program, given birth back in the depression days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has not brought us closer to solution. It has stolen wheat acres from North Dakota and given them to Eastern and Southern States which need them less. Costly surpluses are building up. The controls the program imposes are objectionable.

But all that Mr. Benson has to propose, basically, is the scrapping of all Federal efforts to equalize agriculture's position in the total economic picture and return to the laissez faire, or noninterference, policy which prevailed back in the early thirties. He says that if we were to do this everything would work itself out. But would it? It didn't then, and it probably couldn't now.

Secretary Benson's own Department has reported that 1959 farm net income dropped 16 percent in 1959, from \$13.1 billion in 1958 to \$11 billion last year. Production costs went up again while prices went down. Another drop of almost \$1 billion is forecast for 1960. Average net income per farmer in North Dakota was down 36 percent last year, the Department said Friday. Part of that was due to the short crop, but a lot more was due to the general income-outgo squeeze. And where and when will it end?

We have generally admired Secretary Benson's strict adherence to his principles, and supported him in his resistance to greater governmental interference with and control of the farming segment of U.S. economy, feeling that the ultimate answer lies in a freer functioning of the supply-and-demand, free market system. At the same time, it has been obvious that, inasmuch as every other part of the economy has its built-in governmental-protective devices, it would be disastrous to chop down only those intended to keep agriculture from falling into an even more inferior position.

Unfortunately, most of Mr. Benson's time is spent on the defensive. He may be right, but he has become a symbol of most that is considered objectionable. His talk in Yankton the other night had overtones of desperation. He is such an ardent crusader for what he believes that after 7 years of defending he seems incapable of understanding that there may be merit in other points of view. But while he defends, gaining few if any new defenders among farmers, farm income still slips.

The new administration which will come in next January may find that another name

and another face, even with the same general program, will gain ground where Benson would still be defending against losses.

Methodist Laymen in Bessemer, Ala., Opposed to Lowering of Racial Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in a very strongly worded memorial addressed to the general conference of the Methodist Church, the Methodist laymen of the Bessemer, Ala., district have stated unanimously and unequivocally that they will not accept any action by the general conference which would lead to changes in the Methodist church jurisdictional system resulting in racial integration in churches. At a meeting last Tuesday night, March 8, 1960, the group, representing 25 Methodist churches in the Bessemer district, went on record in a manner that cannot be misunderstood by anyone.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD a newspaper article by the religion editor, of the Birmingham News, Mr. Claude Keathley, dealing with the meeting of the Methodist laymen, which appeared in the News on Wednesday, March 9:

WON'T ACCEPT JURISDICTION CHANGES—
METHODIST LAYMEN IN BESSEMER OPPOSED
TO LOWERING RACIAL BARRIERS

(By Claude Keathley)

The Methodist general conference was put on notice last night that Bessemer district laymen will not accept any action which will lead to changes in the Methodist jurisdictional system resulting in racial integration in churches.

Meeting at Fairfield First Methodist Church, the Bessemer district chapter of the Methodist Layman's Union of Alabama, adopted a strong memorial to the general conference stating its views.

The meeting, attended by about 450 laymen and laywomen from 25 of the more than 50 churches in the Bessemer district, unanimously adopted the memorial to be sent to the general conference. The general conference will meet April 27-May 5, at Denver.

"We submit this memorial to the general conference to be certain that this body unmistakably understands our views concerning the report of the general conference commission to study the jurisdictional system," the memorial said.

The general conference of 1956 set up the study commission to study the jurisdictional system and to recommend action to eliminate the racial segregation of Negro Methodists. Negro Methodists, under the present structure, are in a jurisdiction of their own, known as the central jurisdiction.

The study commission's report was released early this year. It recommended no basic changes in the jurisdictional system but did make recommendations which would ultimately lead to a breakdown of the organic system and force racial integration in Methodist Churches, it was pointed out.

The memorial declared: "It is our desire to preserve the unity of the Methodist Church, but we cannot, within the bounds

of self respect, indefinitely continue to be subjected to the condemnations, overt and implied, contained in the official pronouncements, church-school literature, and other sources speaking in the name of the Methodist church."

"We reject the principle that the separation of the white and Negro races is always and under all conditions contrary to the Christian religion and the spirit of Christ," the memorial vowed.

Recognizing the right of others to differ and to integrate churches according to their own desires the Bessemer lay group asked that the general conference give churches in the South the same right to not integrate if they so desired.

Firmly vowing that "we cannot and will not submit to integration of the races on any level in local churches as recommended by the study commission," the group asked the general conference to give "careful consideration" to the views of Methodists in the South.

The memorial also declared that "we cannot tolerate the use of world service benevolences or any other funds contributed to the general church or any of its agencies to support the recommendations of the study commission or to promote integration of the races in any manner."

The memorial also strongly urged the general conference to "be very certain that the Methodist Church, in making its decisions, does not become greatly influenced by or entangled in the affairs of national politics."

The memorial was presented by Dr. H. N. Carmichael, chairman, of the Central Park Church. Judge Ellis Brown of the Ensley First Methodist, Mosteller Cost, of Shady-side Church, Claud Smithson, mayor of Fairfield First Methodist Church, Mrs. Walter S. White of Ensley First Methodist Church, and Frank Parsons, District Layman's Union president, prepared and signed the memorial.

"It is with a genuine feeling of concern for our Methodist Church, and not in any excitable manner, that we present this memorial for your consideration," Dr. Carmichael said as he prepared to read the memorial. It was adopted unanimously.

Address by Adm. Arleigh Burke at San Jose State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently San Jose State College, in my congressional district, was honored by a visit from one of the soundest thinking military men of our time, Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations.

In this day of controversy involving our military posture, the realistic words spoken by Admiral Burke at San Jose State College are of great significance.

I commend Admiral Burke's speech, which follows, to my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE, SAN JOSE, CALIF., MARCH 4, 1960

Addressing you this morning is a particular privilege—one I have looked forward to for quite some months. It is invigorating to visit this thriving southern bay region. Both

the climate and the exchange of ideas with young men and women are exhilarating.

American students have always been alert to the affairs of our Nation, both domestic and international. In recent years, ever since the mantle of free world leadership so clearly fell on American shoulders, young citizens of our country, in San Jose and throughout the land, have shown a deep interest in international affairs and in the problems that accompany them.

The fact that many of you will serve in the Armed Forces plays its part in creating this interest. But it is deeper rooted than that. Each college or university tries to stimulate students to think, to think deeply and well of the real values, of things past and present, of things academic and things worldly.

Paramount among such thinking is the current and future well-being of the United States and the problems which so deeply affect our well-being. The dynamic and ever-changing problems of national defense are a vital and important part of these considerations.

Today the adequacy of the composition of our military forces are public issues. People are interested, and this is good. It is good because defense is a serious business and defense problems are complex. They don't fall into neat, tidily packed bins, as much as some may want them to. There are no quick, easy solutions to these problems. They must be examined to be understood.

Defense problems start with the threat we face, and it is not simple. This threat has many aspects, many mechanisms, each of them constantly working, probing, pushing, each creating issues, presenting challenges which must be met.

The major threat facing the United States today is the grim dynamism of communism driving toward one goal—a Communist-controlled world. This is communism's major and self-proclaimed aim.

Working always with this goal in mind, communism's big problem is how—how to achieve it. The Communists will do anything, absolutely anything—to achieve world communism, to gain world empire. They recognize only one restraint, excessive risk. They will not do anything which gravely risks the destiny or existence of communism.

The Communists are bound by doctrine to choose means that keep this risk to a minimum.

That is what the cold war is all about. It is simply communism's day-to-day effort to achieve world domination by economic, political, psychological means, any means short of armed conflict. It is an effort just as deadly, just as fatal to freedom on this earth as are their overt attempts at aggression.

To the Communists, the cold war has two advantages. First, it keeps their risks to a minimum. Secondly, most cold war actions evade the headlines; they sneak past freedom everywhere. Unnoticed actions sneak by, but they keep adding up until their aggregate, the sum of many actions, forms a Communist major victory. This is the most insidious aspect of the threat we face.

The cold war is marked by constant Communist proberings for weaknesses—moral weakness, physical weakness, any lack of strength. When they find such a weakness they exploit it in every way they can, including the use of arms. Such aggressions by the Communists mark the spillover from cold war to limited war.

Limited war is more risky for the Communists than is the cold war. For this reason communism's masters will not lightly commit Soviet armed forces to such adventures. Instead they prefer to use puppets, stooges, whose loss would not endanger the cause of communism and whom they could abandon should the risks become too great.

But more than this, they keep themselves flexible; they can back down. Faced with strength, with increased risk, they do back down; they step away. By flexibility, by constantly pushing but stepping back when the going gets too rough, they know they can make progress. They once gave up Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, even the Ukraine, but these countries are part of the Soviet Empire today. They have gained much of the world; they have gone a long way toward their goal.

The Communists have created their empire wholly by cold and limited war means. They have not had to undertake the grave risks, the very grave risks of general nuclear war.

The Communists have a nuclear punch. It is formidable, but it is not overwhelming. Nevertheless, their capability for general nuclear war is the most dramatic and consequently the most discussed aspect of the threat we face. As important as this is, it is but one part of the whole threat. The whole threat is more than just military. It involves every human endeavor. The Communist military forces play a very important role in that threat. They are what give it substance; they are the vital part of every intimidating Communist declaration.

These military forces can also be used to misdirect our attention to grab the spotlight while deadly things go on outside the glare of the world's attention. We must be alert to this. We must keep a constant eye on other things as well as Communist military activity.

One of the most important things we as a nation and as individuals must do is to keep the overall threat in perspective, to view each part in relationship to the whole. Otherwise, we can become so fascinated by just one small part which may be fearfully dramatic that we lose sight of the whole threat.

Not only must we view the threat completely, we must view our own capabilities similarly. Our capabilities, particularly our military capabilities are based on our needs. Our needs are not the same as communism's needs. The Communists hold nations captive; we do not. The Communists seek to control the world; we do not.

We rely upon the seas; the Communists do not. We want to see a world of order and justice, one in which freedom may thrive. The Communists want the opposite.

Thus our desires are not their desires; our needs are not their needs; and our military requirements are not their military requirements. This is why the United States need not match the Communists' bomber for bomber, missile for missile, division for division, or submarine for submarine. Our requirements differ throughout the whole spectrum of war.

Our military requirements for general nuclear war can be stated simply. We need sufficient strength to deter the Communists from starting general nuclear war or, failing that, to defeat them if they do.

The main thing in deterring any aggressor is for him to know that no matter what he does, no matter how hard he strikes first, he will be hit back, hit back so hard that his whole system will come falling down.

Aggressors must know that if they start general nuclear war there would be absolutely nothing they could do to prevent their own destruction. It would be inevitable. This makes starting such a war suicide; they dare not start it. This is what deterrence is all about.

Our deterrence of general nuclear war has been successful. It is successful right now, and it will continue to be successful in the ballistic missile era. We are a powerful Nation and we will remain powerful as long as we work at it, work hard at it.

The advent of the ballistic missile does not affect this. What it does affect is the rela-

tive vulnerability of nuclear delivery forces. This comes about because ballistic missiles can hit anything that stays in one place, once its location is known. On the other hand, ballistic missiles cannot hit anything that keeps moving or whose location is unknown.

When the location of anything is known, its address can be put into a ballistic missile. The missile can be aimed and fired. Just like a bullet leaving the barrel of a gun, a ballistic missile goes where it is aimed. Its aim cannot be changed in flight; it has to go where it was told to go. When the missile gets there, if the target is still at that place, it gets hit. If the target is not here, it does not get hit.

Thus, true mobility and unknown location are basic to invulnerability in the missile age. And in the missile age invulnerability is an indispensable part of a successful deterrent. It is indispensable because invulnerability provides the assurance that we can hit back at the enemy no matter what he does. And that is what keeps him deterred.

How do we stand on vulnerability relative to the Soviet Union? Once again our needs differ. Everyone knows we won't start general nuclear war, we are not aggressors. Therefore our retaliatory forces must be invulnerable so we can strike back and bring the aggressor to his knees.

The vulnerability of fixed launching sites will increase as the accuracy and power of ballistic missiles increase. But it will be a long, long time before any single attack will be able to wipe out all our fixed launching sites.

Launching many missiles from many sites to land simultaneously and accurately on many, widely dispersed targets is extremely complex, very difficult. Such a task is monumental and for the near future, highly doubtful.

It is almost impossible while liquid fuel ballistic missiles are the predominant type. There are a lot of steps in getting liquid fuel missiles ready to fire—they take time, some of them are sensitive. They must be done with care.

We have fired a lot of test missiles, under test conditions and on test schedules, but the number launched exactly at the time planned is small, very small. This is just handling one missile at a time. It is a condition that typifies missile development anywhere in the world right now. But trying to fire many, in salvo and with perfect confidence, like the broadside of a ship, is many times more difficult.

Until such a capability becomes real no one will be able, in one attack, to wipe out all our fixed base launching platforms. Some sites would be warned by the first hits on other sites; their weapons would be launched. Others might not be hit at all, certainly not on the first salvo. Their weapons too would get off. Fixed launching platforms in known locations will become more and more vulnerable in the missile era, but it will not happen overnight.

At the same time, mobile launching platforms remain virtually invulnerable. The more an aggressor shifts his nuclear weapon capabilities to ballistic missiles the less vulnerable mobile launching platforms become and the more they will be needed.

Launching platforms can be moved about on land. At sea they can go in any direction, can be truly mobile. At sea, too, we can keep the location of weapon launchers unknown. There, they can be dispersed, widely dispersed in millions of square miles of ocean and they can move at will. We have such mobile launching platforms right now. At sea in the Mediterranean and in the Far East are aircraft carriers with nuclear weapon delivery capabilities. The aircraft in these amazingly versatile ships out-

number the heavy bombers in the Soviet Union. Their weapons are many times more powerful than the atomic bombs used in World War II. This nuclear delivery capability is significant all by itself.

These carriers have the low vulnerability of all moving things. We exploit this. When international tensions mount we get an even greater number of carriers; more aircraft, and other ships at sea. We keep them moving, thus low in vulnerability. At sea, we enhance our strike-back capabilities.

The unique operational environment of the sea provides an ideal medium for mobility and for dispersal of retaliatory striking power. This is the why behind the new Fleet Ballistic Missile System Polaris. This wonderful weapon system combines two revolutionary developments, solid propellant missiles with nuclear powered submarines. It has the great advantages of concealment, of virtual invulnerability and of assured strike-back capability. It is testing out well, testing so well that the Navy has assured the Congress that there will be 2 Polaris-equipped submarines, 32 nuclear tipped missiles, operational, ready for sea, ready to be used, by the end of this year.

Polaris and the other sea-going retaliatory capabilities are wonderful things. They are significant in themselves, even more significant in the aggregate. Yet these capabilities are just a part of our deterrent capability.

The many aircraft in the Strategic Air Command have a tremendous capability to deliver nuclear weapons. There are more planes to carry nuclear weapons in the Tactical Air Command and their capability is significant. There are intermediate range ballistic missiles now deployed overseas and there are more coming. The sum of these strengths is mighty, no one has yet equalled it.

This is why it underrates our total strength to count only one type of weapon, one type of missile, and compare it alone with the number another country may have. Such exercises in one weapon arithmetic can distract our attention from the quality of weapons. They can distract us from considering the invulnerability of retaliatory systems. They can distract us from considering the total strength available to do the job in the many ways it can be done.

One weapon arithmetic can also create doubts of our own strength. When we really have strength, as we do now, and as we will in the future, doubting our strength is hazardous. It is hazardous because it fosters fear and fear, false or real, creates moral weakness.

Since the Communists exploit weakness, we must be strong and without fear because we are strong. Fear has no place on the American scene. We are stronger, far stronger, than any potential aggressor. This is true not only of our nuclear weapon capabilities; it is true of our whole military posture.

Our limited war capabilities too are strong and they start with the weapons we have been discussing. They start with these because the area destroying weapons, basic to our general nuclear war deterrent and strike back strength, are what keep limited wars limited. They do this well. But in limited wars, area destroying weapons have no other use.

In limited war, forces and weapons of precision are needed, weapons whose effects can be limited, weapons that allow discrimination. These we have in our forces at sea and in our forces based on land.

These forces stress mobility. They stress it because mobility allows us to get adequate military strength where needed, when needed. Mobility frees us from the neces-

sity to post sizable forces near every potential trouble spot in the world. Instead, we move forces to where trouble erupts and we move them out when trouble ceases. They are then ready to move to the next trouble. This is a significant capability and we have it.

We have mobility in our hard-hitting Navy-Marine Corps team. The Tactical Air Command has it and uses it. The Strategic Air Corps is predicated upon it.

Mobility is one of our most important capabilities in any type conflict. It is there for us to use. We need only exploit it and see that we keep it.

There is more to U.S. total strength than our weapons, our mobility, our forces. We have allies and friends. They add to our strength. Some of them are strong; some are not so strong now. But they all believe in freedom; they have men willing to fight for it. Men with the will to fight for freedom are vital, so are weapons, and so is training. But some of our allies are far better off in men willing to fight than they are in weapons and training.

Our military assistance program works toward providing both the weapons and the training for these men. It takes a lot of hard work, time, and effort here and abroad, but it is well worth it. Military assistance is worth it because while we help freedom-loving men develop the capability to preserve their freedom we also make our freedom more secure.

In talking to you today, I have stressed what the Navy can do in our total military posture. But this does not mean that anyone in the Navy ever thinks the Navy can do it alone. We can't.

We know that a strong, potent, able Army is the only solution to extensive land campaigns. We know, too, that the amphibious capability of our fighting Marines is unexcelled by anyone, anywhere. And that marines are good in any ground fight.

We know the Navy can and will back up the Army and the Marines as we did in Korea. But we also know that land fighting is their business; they are experts at it; they work hard at it, and they are second to none at it.

Every sailor knows too that any campaign on the surface of the earth, at sea or ashore, needs airpower. The Navy provides its share at sea, but the air support for large land campaigns, inland battles, comes from land-based airpower. The United States needs land-based airpower. We have it in the Air Force and it is potent and ready.

The Army, the Air Force, and the Marines, as well as our Navy, are each vital parts of our strength and a big reason for confidence in American strength.

Strength is important, for freedom, but so, in today's world, is vigilance. We must be vigilant to every aspect of the threat to freedom. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. This is true. But today, the vigilance that is required is far more than an alertness to danger or a careful provision for our personal security. The vigilance that must characterize America as the leader of free society, demands, perhaps most of all, our willingness to recognize our national and international responsibilities.

We must recognize the hard work, the effort, the sacrifice that these responsibilities entail. We must grasp these responsibilities willingly and eagerly. We must use the strength, the courage, and the enthusiasm that our freedom insures to serve the cause of justice and peace in the world.

Proposed Stamp Honoring Ignace Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the 169 years since the Polish people proclaimed their Constitution, there have been many reversals of freedom and fortune in that country. But the history of the struggle for democracy in Poland is symbolic of the struggle for democracy in all countries.

Therefore, with much humility, I have suggested to the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, the Postmaster General of the United States, that every possible consideration be given the issuance of a stamp in the "champions of liberty" series in honor of Ignace Paderewski. I believe it is fitting and proper that we Americans pay such tribute to Paderewski, a man dedicated to establishing liberty and independence in his beloved Poland. In honoring Paderewski, we would be honoring the Poles still striving for independence in their homeland, Polish-Americans who are endeavoring to help in restoring Poland to its proper place among the family of nations, and to freedom-loving peoples all over the world.

My letter to the Postmaster General is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1960.

The Honorable ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
The Postmaster General of the United States,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL SUMMERFIELD: Just recently I had an occasion to read about the life of Paderewski and I was fascinated by it, particularly in view of the many fraternal orders, religious, civic, educational and political organizations representing Americans of Polish ancestry in Michigan's Sixth Congressional District. I know they would deeply appreciate an Ignace Paderewski stamp in the "champions of liberty" series.

Paderewski, whose 100th anniversary of birth is November 6, 1960, will be commemorated not only by Poles and persons of Polish origin, but by many thousands of all nationalities throughout the world for his selfless service to the cause of freedom.

Acclaimed and revered as one of the greatest artists at the turn of the century, Paderewski was instrumental in organizing an independent Polish Army, recruited in 1917-18 in the United States, France, Canada, and other countries, including some in South America. The army fought at the side of the Allies on the Western front and, in later years greatly contributed to the rout of the Bolshevik forces in the heart of Europe, known as the Battle for Warsaw or the Miracle on the Vistula. With the outbreak of World War II, Paderewski became the Chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland which, first in France and later in England, became the rallying point for the Poles in exile as well as a source of inspiration and faith for the Poles in the

homeland during their heroic struggle with the invaders and the terrible torments of occupation.

Paderewski died in New York on June 29, 1941, and his remains were consigned to a crypt in Arlington Cemetery until such time when his beloved country could receive them in freedom.

Surely a man of Paderewski's stature belongs to the Champions of Liberty. Honoring him in this series would have tremendous psychological impact on the people of Poland, still longing for deliverance from the Russian yoke and would be gratefully accepted by Americans of Polish origin.

I urge that every possible consideration be given to Ignace Paderewski as a real Champion of Liberty.

With my kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

St. Patrick High School's First 100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to call attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 10 about one of the outstanding high schools in Chicago. St. Patrick High School, situated virtually in the geographical center of my district, will be observing its 100th anniversary next year.

It would be very difficult to enumerate the large number of Americans who attended this fine school in the past 100 years and who are today leaders in almost every field of our society, not only in Chicago, but throughout the country.

The Brothers of Christian Schools, a Roman Catholic order of men devoted to teaching and study, deserve the highest degree of commendation for maintaining this fine high school during the past century. They are particularly deserving of praise for the fact that despite great difficulties, they managed in 1953 to build the beautiful three-story structure in my district at a cost of more than \$2 million to replace the original St. Patrick High School.

Americans of all religious beliefs could take pride in the high educational standards which this school maintains and the great contribution that it is making toward America's intellectual and scientific development. This modern high school is indeed an inspiration to educators throughout the country who not infrequently, during their visits to Chicago, come to admire this modern structure and its very high educational standards.

The Sun-Times article follows:

ST. PATRICK'S FIRST 100 YEARS—CITY'S OLDEST HIGH SCHOOL ACCENTS SCHOLARSHIP

(By William Baldwin)

St. Patrick's High School is a study in contrasts. It is the oldest parochial secondary school in Chicago but is housed in strictly modern surroundings.

The school's 100th anniversary next year will be celebrated in a gleaming three-story structure of steel, stone, and glass.

Behind this bright facade lies an educational plant combining enlightened teaching with first-rate technical facilities. The result is high morale and rate of scholarship among students and faculty.

St. Patrick opened its doors in 1861 on Chicago's Near West Side. It remained in that area until 1953 when it moved to its new \$2,250,000 quarters at 5900 West Belmont. Three years later, in response to growing community needs, a freshman wing was built to accommodate 500 additional students.

The school is run by the Brothers of Christian Schools, a Roman Catholic order of men devoted to teaching and study. The order was founded in France nearly three centuries ago by Jean Baptiste de la Salle. Since that time the Christian Brothers—as they are better known—have increased to 20,000 members, instructing more than half a million students throughout the world.

St. Patrick is unique among Chicago Catholic high schools in that it draws its pupils from 50 designated parishes. This quota system was established by the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch to relieve attendance pressures on other schools in a heavily Catholic area of the city.

Each parish decides which elementary school graduate will attend St. Patrick. The school then accepts them regardless of their academic ability.

Despite its new facilities, St. Patrick is filled to overflowing with 1,825 students. They are instructed by 38 brothers, most of whom have at least one master's degree. In the last 5 years, 23 lay teachers have been added to accommodate the swelling student body.

FORTY BOYS TO CLASS

At their head is Brother Adrian, school principal, who has been at St. Patrick 5 years.

Unlike many school heads, Brother Adrian is not unduly worried about the pressure of larger enrollments.

"We have 40 boys to a class, which is about the maximum one teacher can handle," he said. "However, a number of schools will open soon in this area, and this should enable us to reduce our student-teacher ratio."

Though St. Patrick has a full sports program, its emphasis is on brains rather than brawn.

THE ROUNDHOUSE

"Sports are important and we try to develop our boys into fine athletes," Brother Adrian observed. "But we want to instill in them that they are here primarily to receive a well-rounded education."

All first-year students study together in the freshman annex, dubbed "The Roundhouse" because of its cylindrical construction. There, as throughout the school, pupils work in large, brightly colored rooms with outside glass walls. Ramps between floors and doors connecting study rooms allow students to move swiftly from class to class, saving extra minutes for instruction.

St. Patrick makes every effort to place the student in his proper academic niche. The school maintains a full-time guidance counselor who tests entering freshmen and places them in one of three "tracks" or ability groups.

Exceptional students are picked early and encouraged to take advanced courses to better prepare them for college. Students are required to take 4 years of religion, English and physical education, and a year of science, American history and mathematics.

In his junior year a student who maintains good grades may (with parental ap-

proval) choose his own courses. At this stage he begins to specialize in one of three fields—science, business or skilled trades.

Whatever field he chooses, he is provided with excellent facilities.

REBUILD MOTORS

Typical is the automotive shop. There, under the guidance of a brother trained in industrial crafts, students tear down and rebuild car engines and transmissions provided by the school. At times they are allowed to bring in their own vehicles and do extensive repair work.

In the Spanish-language classrooms are gaily decorated Mexican rugs and pictures on the walls. On the blackboard is a large mural, drawn by one of the pupils, depicting a Spanish religious scene. A sign above the doorway translates, "Leave Your English Outside."

In such pleasant surroundings students learn Spanish, using language recordings and special television programs to increase their proficiency.

St. Patrick, however, does not confine itself to a narrow academic path. Students can participate in numerous extra curricular activities, ranging from hi-fi and camera clubs to playing in the swing band.

Throughout the school year there are dances such as the Sock Hop, where the wild and wooly music of rock 'n roll is still very popular.

ABILITY REWARDED

But for most students the dominating thought is not Elvis but education, and they constantly seek out Brother Louis, chief student counselor, for advice on further schooling and job opportunities.

This year Brother Louis and student counselors from four other Christian Brothers schools in the Chicago area are initiating a series of lecture discussions for their schools' outstanding pupils.

Visiting speakers will discuss the role of the school in the education of the individual. During the series the students will be assigned selected reading and will discuss the material with their instructors and other talented pupils.

"In this way," said Brother Louis, "we hope our boys will gain new insights into the what, why and how of learning, and they will begin to realize the scope of reality, the challenge of learning, and the reward of attaining truth."

The Fate of Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the spot light of public interest now concentrated on the problem of keeping Berlin free from the creeping imperialism of the Soviet Union, it is vital for all Americans to support their Government during the forthcoming negotiations at the Summit Conference. The problem of a free Berlin is inseparable from the greater question of the reunification of Germany, and in turn, the integrity of the free world of which Western Germany is a vital part.

An Associated Press dispatch from Jakarta, Indonesia, quotes Nikita S. Khrushchev as warning the West that unless there is an agreement on West

Berlin status, the Soviet Union will sign a separate treaty with Communist East Germany.

This news story is disquieting in view of the high importance attached by this Nation to the guarantee of the continued free status of West Berlin. If our support of this status should be withdrawn, or compromised, by terms of an agreement, we would be selling out not only the immediate future of several hundred thousand Berliners, but also ourselves as the symbol of freedom in the world today. The continued presence of our troops and the President's firm stand at Paris are the assurances Western Berlin and all Europe require that we mean what we say when we pledge ourselves to the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this news dispatch, as published in the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 1, 1960]

KHRUSHCHEV WARNS: AGREE ON WEST BERLIN—SAYS SUMMIT MUST SETTLE STATUS OR HE'LL SIGN A SEPARATE TREATY

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, February 29.—Nikita S. Khrushchev warned today the May summit meeting must bring agreement on West Berlin's status or he will sign a separate treaty with Communist East Germany. And in that event, the Soviet Prime Minister said, West Berlin—where the western Big Three have garrisons—would come under authority of the East Germans "because West Berlin stands on territory belonging to the (Communist) German Democratic Republic."

But at a free-wheeling news conference near the end of his Indonesian visit, Mr. Khrushchev vowed to work for "a successful conclusion" at the Paris summit, and declared:

"I do believe in the good intentions of President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President Charles de Gaulle."

Mr. Khrushchev often has threatened to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany. But this was the first time he had tied the threat to the Paris summit meeting.

ANSWERS QUESTION

He made the remark in answering a question about reports that he will insist at the summit meeting, scheduled to start May 16 in Paris, that the Western Allies leave Berlin regardless of any concessions they may offer to Soviet views on disarmament.

Mr. Khrushchev replied this was really two questions because disarmament involved the question of peace for the world while Berlin was "a question of doing away with the vestiges of World War II, a question whose solution has been dragged out for 15 years."

"How much longer can we drag this out? We will do our utmost to remove the vestiges of World War II and urge our former allies to do the same."

"If they do not understand, or, if they understand but do not want to agree, then we will sign a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, and all consequences of the last war enforced in Germany will cease to be valid, and that includes West Berlin because West Berlin stands on territory belonging to the German Democratic Republic."

The peril of a Soviet-East German treaty to the Allied position in Berlin is that the East Germans would take over control of the supply lines to the city—110 miles behind

the Iron Curtain. The three Western powers refuse to recognize the East German regime.

REJECTS PLEBISCITE

Mr. Khrushchev rejected the idea of a German plebiscite to choose between the Western and Soviet plans for German unification, a proposal said to be under study by American Secretary of State Christian A. Herter.

"We are not going to take part in such a plebiscite since this would be interfering in the internal affairs of another country."

The Soviet Union wants unification through negotiations between the two Germans. The Western plan calls for U.N.-supervised elections in both parts of Germany to elect an all-German government.

In a statement opening the news conference, Mr. Khrushchev said a stable and lasting peace is the main question facing mankind and 1959 "brought the easing of international tension." Referring to the Paris summit meeting, he added that 1960 "has started with good signs."

IN JOVIAL MOOD

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, February 29.—Prime Minister Khrushchev was in a jovial mood today when he exchanged final toasts with President Sukarno.

"We will take the Communist path and you will take your path, but let us be friends," he told the Indonesian leader. "It is true I always praise communism. We are prepared to be friends with capitalist countries. History will decide which social system is best."

Mr. Khrushchev told his hosts: "I am not calling on you to become Communists." But he added that "the old and the rotten will always fight with the newly emerged; but it is a law of history that the new must always win."

President Sukarno, in his response, indicated that Mr. Khrushchev plans another visit to Indonesia, although he did not disclose the date.

The Negro Crime Rate: A Failure in Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, dedicated and sincere citizens, including certainly Members of the House, are deeply concerned over the civil rights issue and the factors that lie behind it. Understanding and tolerance are very important. We Members of the House do not question the sincerity of other Members. Yet we are well aware that human beings make mistakes and a failure to understand is the rule not the exception in human relationships, particularly of the controversial nature typified by the civil rights bill. All American citizens believe in two basic principles: First, the rule of law, and second, equal justice for every individual.

It is axiomatic that good law must be based on fact, not prejudice nor emotion, without regard to fact. In this spirit of searching for the truth, I present for fellow citizens and colleagues an article from Time magazine, April 21, 1958, en-

titled "The Negro Crime Rate: A Failure in Integration." I respectfully present this article for the study and criticism of my colleagues and those who are interested in this grave problem. It follows:

THE NEGRO CRIME RATE: A FAILURE IN INTEGRATION

They are afraid to say so in public, but many of the North's big-city mayors groan in private that their biggest and most worrisome problem is the crime rate among Negroes.

In 1,551 U.S. cities, according to the FBI tally for 1956, Negroes, making up 10 percent of the U.S. population, accounted for about 30 percent of all arrests, and 60 percent of the arrests for crimes involving violence or threat of bodily harm—murder, non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. In one city after another, the figures—where they are not hidden or suppressed by politicians—reveal a shocking pattern. Items:

New York (14 percent Negro): Of the prisoners confined in houses of detention last year to await court disposition of their cases, 44 percent of the males and 65 percent of the females were Negroes.

Chicago (15 percent Negro): In 1956 twice as many Negroes as whites—1,366 to 679—were arrested on charges of murder, non-negligent manslaughter, rape and robbery.

Detroit (25 percent Negro): Two out of three prisoners held in the Wayne County jail are Negroes. Last month 62 percent of the defendants presented for trial in Recorder's Court were Negroes. Of last year's 25,216 arrests resulting in prosecution, excluding traffic cases, Negroes accounted for 12,919.

Los Angeles (13 percent Negro): In 1956 Negroes accounted for 28 percent of all arrests, and 48 percent of the arrests for homicide, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny and auto theft.

San Francisco (7 percent Negro): The victims in 896 of last year's 1,564 recorded robbery cases reported that the assailants were Negroes.

Negro leaders sometimes argue passionately that arrest statistics widely distort the comparative incidence of crime among Negroes and whites because cops are more likely to arrest Negroes for petty crimes or on mere suspicion. Protests Executive Editor Charles Wartman of Detroit's Michigan Chronicle, a Negro weekly: "The number of Negroes booked is at least partially indicative of subconscious if not conscious racial persecution on the part of police officers."

But inequality of treatment by the police may actually tend to shrink rather than inflate the statistics of Negro crime. Says Newsman Wartman in the next breath: "When Negroes violate social morals—sex, drinking, gambling—white cops bypass this as typically Negro." Many Negro leaders protest that the police are far from diligent enough in dealing with crimes committed against Negroes—and Negroes are the victims in a great majority of Negro crimes of violence. Since Negroes even when they are victims or innocent bystanders, are often wary of calling the police, many offenses of disorder and assault go unreported when committed by Negroes in the depths of a ghetto.

Whether the statistics of Negro crime overstate or understate the reality, they are shrouded from public attention by what a Chicago judge last week called a conspiracy of concealment. In many cities, Negro leaders and organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People put pressure on politicians, city officials, and newspapers to play down the subject. Fearing loss of Negro votes, few elected officials dare to resist the pressures.

Abetting the concealment campaign is the feeling shared by many whites that it is unfair, inflammatory, and even un-American to talk about Negro crime. This feeling is reflected in the widespread newspaper practice of not mentioning a criminal's race unless he is at large and the fact would help in identifying him.

In hiding the facts about Negro crime, the conspiracy of concealment helps blur the causes of it. Negro leaders themselves often put forward explanations that are oversimple. Some hold that Negro crime is largely the result of migrations from the South: in the unfamiliar environment of the North, the argument runs, Negroes tend to be more crime-prone, just like white immigrants from abroad. But in fact, some studies have shown that, contrary to popular conviction, crime rates among foreign-born whites were lower than among U.S.-born whites.

Most often, Negro leaders point to poverty as the No. 1 factor in Negro crime. As Editor Louis Martin of the Chicago Defender sees it, the main cause is poor and crowded housing. But the moderate crime rates among European immigrants, subject to similar stresses of poverty and bad housing, suggest that other factors may be more important.

Providing better housing for impoverished Negroes is a necessity, but it would not solve the problem of Negro crime. Crime rates run high in the Negro slums of Harlem and South Side Chicago, but they also run high in the Negro districts of Los Angeles and San Francisco, where the houses are comparatively decent. As many a public-housing official has learned to his dismay, better housing does not automatically bring about the improvement in character and conduct that do-gooders used to predict. Slum dwellers who move into brand-new public-housing projects often turn them into new slums as verminous and crime-ridden as the tenements they left behind.

Negro leadership could make a start toward lowering Negro crime rates by abandoning the conspiracy of concealment and urging full disclosure of the facts to be met. Once they faced the facts, Negro leaders and organizations—including the NAACP—could help by wholeheartedly undertaking short-term efforts of rehabilitation, by accepting responsibility in an area where they habitually look the other way.

But even heroic efforts by Negro leadership could only dent the Negro crime problem, because essentially it is a white problem. And it will remain a severe problem until northern whites, private citizens as well as civic officials, recognize that Negro crime is basically a symptom of a failure in integration, and start attacking discrimination in the North with the same fervor they show in arguing for civil rights in the South.

Unlike the caucasian immigrant of an earlier day, a Negro can scarcely ever hope, even in the North, that the white society will really accept him on his human merits. Negroes are more prone than whites to break the laws, rules, and customs of society because they are excluded from full membership in it. In gross and subtle ways, from unwritten ban on employing Negroes to the faintly patronizing tone that even liberal-hearted whites take toward them, Negroes are made to feel alien and inferior. This pervasive discrimination holds down capable Negroes at the top of the social ladder, dims their voices among their own people, builds up tensions and resentments inside the Negro society, and keeps great masses of Negroes segregated in ghettos where the standards of personal morality, discipline, and responsibility are lower than those in the white world outside.

"Slam enough doors in a man's face, and he may break one of them down," said San Francisco's Negro deputy city attorney, R. J.

Reynolds, last week. The way to reduce the percentage of Negro crime, he believes, is to stop slamming the doors, or at least, as a start, give the Negro a new hope that maybe the next door won't be slammed. Spreading the message of that new hope, he says, is a responsibility that Negro leaders will be very glad to assume.

Federal Referee Vote Proposal Restores Carpetbag Rule in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine discussion of the Federal referee vote proposal presently under consideration in the House of Representatives, by our friend and colleague, Ed WILLIS, of Louisiana. This article appeared in the Birmingham (Ala.) News on Wednesday, March 9, 1960, and I commend it to the careful study of every Member of the House. There is more to this proposal than meets the eye.

The article follows:

FEDERAL REFEREE VOTE PROPOSAL RESTORES CARPETBAG RULE IN THE SOUTH

(U.S. Representative EDWIN H. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, a constitutional lawyer of wide experience, and a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, analyzes the so-called Federal referee voter registration plan in the following article. The referee proposal, aimed at the South, is the center of a Senate controversy leading to the current filibuster.)

(By Hon. EDWIN H. WILLIS, Member of Congress)

WASHINGTON.—Very few people have had the opportunity to read and study the voting referee provision of the pending civil rights bill rigged up by the U.S. Attorney General and so-called liberal groups. It is one of a series of punitive political measures designed to penalize the Southern States in order to appeal in the coming presidential election to the organized minorities in the large cities of the North and West.

This effort to make the Southern States the political whipping boy is participated in with equal vigor by leaders of both the national Democratic and Republican Parties. PROPOSAL GOES BACK TO CARPETBAG FORCE BILLS

Fundamentally, it restores the old force bills of the chaotic Reconstruction days following the Civil War when the people of the South lived under a government by carpetbaggers. The pending bill was conceived by the same minds and the same U.S. Department of Justice that induced the President to commit the tragic error of sending the Army into Little Rock.

The bill was cleverly drafted and hastily introduced, and is sought to be grafted without hearings, on a comparatively moderate bill reported out of the House Judiciary Committee. The desperate filibuster now being conducted in the Senate hinges around this new bill, proposed, devised, and written by people outside of the legislative bodies. It takes from the States and vests in Federal authorities the supervision and control of elections, Federal and State, from the jus-

tice of the peace to the Governor of the State.

Here is how the bill will work if enacted into law:

Upon complaint, the first step will be, upon request of the Attorney General, for the Federal court to "make a finding" whether discrimination exists against Negro voters "pursuant to a pattern or practice."

BILL REMAINS VAGUE IN DEFINITION OF TERMS

The bill does not define what constitutes a pattern or practice and the decision on this question is left entirely to the discretion, whims, or prejudices of a Federal judge. It does not require that the Federal judge shall be a local one. A judge from any other State in the Union may be designated to preside and supervise the local elections. It will be remembered that a Federal judge from North Dakota was designated to preside over the hearings that led to the Little Rock incident.

There is a total lack in the bill of any provision of how this finding shall be made, or the rules, procedures, or evidence under which it is to be done. After the Federal judge, under the guidance of the Attorney General and without any specific provision for a hearing on the part of the State involved, makes a finding that a pattern of discrimination exists, the decree would establish a conclusive presumption that all Negroes, who were not even parties to the initial proceeding, have in fact been discriminated against. It would make it totally unnecessary for them to prove any alleged discrimination on account of race or color. That is the rub, the crux, and the very heart of the bill.

In the next step, the referee, appointed by the Federal judge takes the statement of the applicant and the specific language of the bill requires that "the applicant shall be ex parte," which means that the other parties, the State and the authorities in the locality, are denied the opportunity to be heard. The first bill introduced on the subject specifically required that these referees be selected from persons outside of the State. This was such an obvious carpetbagger requirement that in the revised bill that provision is omitted. But there is no provision in the present bill that the referee shall be a local person with knowledge of local people and it still permits, although it does not require the court to appoint carpetbagger referees from out of the State.

The next step in this cunning scheme compels the referee to presume that the applicant has been denied the right to vote on account of race or color and to accept as true his representation or misrepresentation as to his age, residence, etc. The referee really does not referee anything. He hears only one side of the issue.

CONFRONTATION RIGHT DENIED TO THE STATE

The bill, in violation of all standards of due process, denies local registrars of voters or State officials, who are presumed to have denied the right of an applicant to vote on account of race or color, the right to be present with counsel at the so-called hearing and the right to confront and cross-examine their accusers.

In the next step, the referee reports the result of his phony hearing to the court. At this point only, the attorney general of the State is invited to file exceptions to the report, but since the report contains only the self-serving declaration of the applicants, without the right of confrontation and cross-examination, this investigation is practically meaningless.

When all of this unprecedented procedure has been carried out according to plan, the court gives to the Negro a certificate that he is a qualified voter and then authorizes the referee or such other person or persons as he may designate to attend the election at all polling places, look over the shoulders of

the State authorities and see that the person is voted, and that the vote is counted. State law requires election officials to keep people a stated distance from polling places and voting booths, so that under the bill, if they admit the Federal agents, they go to State jails, and if they exclude them, they go to Federal jails.

ELECTION OFFICIALS DENIED TRIAL BY JURY

Likewise, in all other respects, if complaint is made by a Negro voter that the judge's orders have not been carried out to the letter, the State election officials may be hauled into court on a contempt citation and sentenced to jail, or fined, or both, and deprived of the right to trial by jury. It is a frightening prospect that in the United States our Federal jails could be filled with political prisoners consisting of State officials.

Such is the devil's brew that is cooked up for consumption for the Southern States alone. It is utterly unconstitutional. It is devastating. It is the sure breeder of racial troubles of untold proportions.

Address of Hon. John E. Fogarty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the Open Forum on the White House Conference on Aging, sponsored by the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association, at the Coliseum, St. Petersburg, Fla., on January 18, 1960:

WHAT I EXPECT OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Congressman from Rhode Island)

Dr. Andrus, Miss Adkins, Mr. Whittier, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a real privilege to have this opportunity to participate in this open forum on the White House Conference on Aging. The National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons deserve high praise for sponsoring this meeting to provide the occasion for older persons to share their rich experiences and to make suggestions and recommendations that will contribute to the success of the conference scheduled in Washington, D.C., January 9-12, 1961.

As you know, I have a deep personal and official interest in the results of this, the first White House Conference on Aging. I am personally interested to the extent that I introduced H.R. 9822 calling on the President to hold such a conference and my official interest is that of chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

For the last 14 of my 20 years in Congress, I have been active on the Health Subcommittee on Appropriations. During this time I have derived a great deal of satisfaction in having a part in establishing broad, forward-looking programs of research in the medical and biological sciences.

Throughout these years it has been a very exciting and humbling experience to witness the progress that has been made in the prevention and control of dreaded disease.

We know for example that:

One cancer patient out of three can now be saved, as compared with one out four in

1938, which means that there are now 800,000 persons living in the United States who have been saved from cancer.

Advances in research now permit significant reduction in disability and premature death among those who suffer from heart attacks and high blood pressure.

Thousands of individuals born with heart defects, once doomed to invalidism and early death, are leading useful and productive lives because of advances in heart surgery.

Progress in the infectious and communicable diseases has revolutionized medical and public health practices in these fields, as illustrated by recent advances against tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, and rheumatic fever.

Because of new medical and surgical treatment now available, approximately 80 percent of all people with epilepsy are capable of regular productive employment in a wide range of jobs.

Research has led to methods that can reduce tooth decay by 50 percent.

A major cause of blindness among infants has been discovered and eliminated.

With new drugs and methods of treatment and diagnosis, it is possible to prevent crippling in 70 percent of patients suffering from rheumatic disease.

For the first time discharges from mental hospitals have outnumbered admissions, based on new methods of treatment resulting from research.

The progress in medical research has not only performed literal miracles in the health field, but prevented the loss of goods and services to our economy that is measured in billions of dollars.

You must be impressed as I am with the fact that the examples I cited are not diseases of any one age group—but are threats to us all. It is true that some are more prevalent in the young and old but the research into the basic disease affects people of every age.

Sincerely concerned with the depth of the problems which are represented in the programs that come before my committee for supporting funds, I have frequently encouraged the increase in appropriation requests for research, study, and demonstration to meet the challenges of a dynamic economy.

I firmly believe that the health of all our citizens must always rate one of the top priorities in our efforts to improve the State of our Nation. There are, however, other areas that demand the attention of the most experienced and capable minds of our people.

There are many who say that the role of American education must be redefined and strengthened to maintain our position in the family of Nations and achieve the intellectual and social challenges of our time. I do not have to stress the problems confronting us in the field of education to this audience. We are, however, just beginning to be effective in having lifelong education accepted as the pattern for our lives rather than the academic concentration for limited periods.

This new approach to education was one of the many fine results of the White House Conference on Education. We must continue in our efforts to place education in its proper perspective for all age groups, and I believe your associations can be expected to give leadership to such a national program.

Everywhere there is mounting concern for equal employment opportunities for those who are willing, able and desire employment. Perhaps in no other field is "aging" more flexible. We must recognize that employment as a problem associated with aging must not be regarded as a special handicap for those in their later years. True, it becomes more acute, but we must recognize that our definition of age or aging must be related to the situation and the person on an individual basis.

We must come to grips with the prevailing practice of mandatory retirement. There are real problems to be solved on the basis of seniority and insurance costs. It is unfair to compulsorily retire a person by reason of age alone.

Our statistics have proven the worth of older employees, life expectancy has been extended, medical care and research have practically insured a longer, healthier life—and yet almost nothing has been done to eliminate or delay compulsory retirement beyond the age of 65 which was psychologically established by the passage of the 1935 Social Security Act.

The amount of income needed to maintain a decent standard of living has never been fully defined or broadly accepted. The best studies do document that too many retired individuals are living on incomes that are inadequate to provide for minimum health care and the necessities to maintain a self-respecting independent role in the community. The threat of inflation to those on fixed incomes is very real and must be given more understanding consideration in our tax programs, social security benefits, limitation on earnings, and provisions for hospital and medical care.

One cannot review the problems facing the Nation without including the place and importance of housing and its influence on the family and its members of all ages. There have been demonstration projects, but the balance in providing living accommodations for all of the age groups has not been maintained. The needs of the older members of our society have been overlooked, neglected, or ignored until recently—and today plans to meet the backlog of suitable housing at prices they can afford have not been forthcoming.

Perhaps this appears to have been a devotional approach to "What I expect from the White House Conference on Aging." Rather, it is an attempt to show the needs that became apparent to me as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

I was convinced that in the public interest, legislation was needed immediately to improve and develop programs "to permit the country to take advantage of the experience and skills of older persons; and to create conditions which will better enable them to meet their needs."

It is not necessary for me to develop the statistics of the aging for this audience. Within the age limits that qualify individuals for membership in your associations, there are more than 30 million persons 55 years of age and over in our country representing approximately one-sixth of our total population.

I have been very critical of the lack of breadth and scope in the Federal programs in the field of aging, and have encouraged the expansion of staff and facilities to meet the challenge. It became evident during hearings on appropriations and during the hearings conducted by Congressman Wier on bills relating to the aging, that Congress would have to take the initiative if it were to be done—before it was too late.

The bipartisan support given my bill in both Houses of the Congress is almost without parallel in the history of major legislation. It is a tribute to their interest and desire to accept their full responsibility as the representatives of the people to act in their best interest and for the good of our Nation.

I would like to add also that the appropriations for the White House Conference on Aging have been made available in the amounts requested. I have even asked if additional funds were needed to make this conference the most effective to date. I have been determined from the beginning that everything that we could do at the congressional level to assist and support this important meeting would be done. It has the

potential of being one of the most significant national conferences ever held.

To earn this distinction certain very specific things must take place—before—during—and following the meeting.

Before the meeting, each State must survey its needs, involve its ablest leaders at every level within the State, to determine what are the resources and the potential of its people. This must also include the direct expressions from older persons themselves, as we are seeking here—not others speaking and thinking in their behalf.

Responsible national organizations must identify their role and educate their members to the important contribution they can make as an informed group at the local, State and regional meetings. Those responsible for the overall planning at the Federal level must provide the leadership needed to assist the States and organizations in their task and structure a conference in 1961 that can truly be the crescendo of all the effort and results that will have developed from the "grass roots"; been strengthened at the State conferences and culminating in a meeting that will in every sense be a "Citizens Forum."

During the Conference every effort must be made to take full advantage of informed delegates. The broad representation of interests must result in conclusions that are improved by the strength of cooperative judgment and not decisions of any special interest or partisan group or overzealous individuals.

Positive action programs must be proposed and adopted to keep this conference from the fate of too many others held in the name of aging. I said at the time of introducing my bill that the greatest accomplishment in the field of aging to date had been the production of words. I would not want to have been a contributing factor to furthering this claim. The words that result from this White House Conference must be symbols for action.

Following the conference, I would like every delegate to consider that he has a mandate to interpret the conference to those he represents and to initiate the steps necessary to implement the recommendation within the State or at whichever level the program is directed.

I think it is important to emphasize that the primary responsibility for meeting the challenge of aging is that of the State and communities.

I do admit to a great deal of optimism over the results of the conference, but I must also share some of the thoughts that trouble me in the planning and activities to date.

There are indications that the bipartisan support given in the Congress is not being maintained in some of the appointments and designation of persons responsible for conference leadership.

Some of the developments at the State and local levels seem slightly superficial and have not carried out the grassroots approach that was hoped for in our goals.

It is natural for organizations of divergent points of view to want to be well represented, but I would question the results of any conference that were influenced by delegates committed to a narrow point of view rather than the best interests of the age group for whom the conference was called.

It is also disturbing to hear of planning that appears to be directed toward the Conference as the goal in itself. The Conference will be the beginning of a national, balanced program in which government at all levels, organizations public and private, and individuals will know their important role and prepared to undertake the challenge and opportunity that our increasing number of older persons present to each of us.

In summary—the White House Conference on Aging must not be another "hand-writing" demonstration of pity for the prob-

lems of the aging. It must be a forum dedicated to positive action that will be carried out wherever older people are working and living and want to remain independent, respected members of the family, community, and Nation.

These are not the demands of a special interest group—but rather the aim for Americans of all ages.

I am convinced that when blueprints have been forged out in the communities and States, they can be brought together and shaped into a comprehensive program for the guidance of the whole Nation and an example to the whole world.

Enlisted Men in Armed Services Deserve Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public is understandably indignant over press reports of an incident in Germany in which the young son of an Army colonel was allowed to take part in an official inspection of troops and to find fault with the men.

An excellent editorial on this incident was carried on Wednesday, March 9, by the Hartford Times, one of New England's leading newspapers.

The Times points out that the incident is more serious than the Army apparently considers it to be. The basic issue, the editorial says eloquently, is the right of the enlisted man in the armed services of the United States to respect.

In our services, Mr. Speaker, we have the finest young men in the world. They are a credit to the uniforms they wear, and for their uniforms and for their role as defenders of democracy they are entitled to the respect of all of us, including their officers. The large majority of military officers maintain this respect for the enlisted man, but those who regard him as somehow of a lesser breed are doing the Defense Establishment and our country a grave disservice.

The American enlisted man wants to do his share in our national defense. He wants to feel that he is part of a common team effort. He knows that when he is assigned to be a personal servant in an officer's home, or when his job is to bag groceries in a commissary, or when he must serve as a bartender or a waiter, or when an officer's small son, in uniform, is allowed to inspect his unit—he knows then, Mr. Speaker, that instead of contributing to our defense his services are being wasted.

I wish that every policymaker in the Pentagon would read this editorial from the Hartford Times and take its message to heart.

The editorial follows:

DISCIPLINE THE COLONEL

If the respect of enlisted men of the 22d Ordnance Company in Munich for their officers has dropped to near zero, it's understandable. Men of the company were inspected recently by Col. K. E. Juergens. It

was a barracks inspection, and the men stood at attention while the colonel looked over their barracks bags and uniforms.

Behind the colonel came a strange sight, the colonel's 11-year-old son Richard wearing the full uniform of a lieutenant, complete with swagger stick and campaign ribbons. He pawed through the bags and chewed out at least one man for not having a shoulder patch on his parka. The colonel, the Army claims, didn't know Richard was making his own inspection.

The soldiers naturally got sore. Some of them griped to their Congressmen. The Army seems inclined to pass it off as lightly as possible. One official statement was that there was no violation of Army regulations in the unauthorized wearing of the uniform.

This is a much more serious matter than either the colonel or the Army seems to believe. The uniform is a mark of honor. If Army regulations don't punish its misuse, Federal law does. We do not mean that Richard should be hauled into Federal court; a spanking which was suggested by one sergeant who witnessed the inspection, would suffice. However, his father has a heavier responsibility. If he didn't know that Richard was inspecting the troops, he knew the boy was wearing a uniform to which he was not entitled—indeed, the colonel had it tailored for Richard.

Richard's actions reflect an attitude he must have learned at home. They betray a lack of respect for the enlisted man of the U.S. Army. Unfortunately, there are some officers in every military service who believe they are of a breed different from the common species of which enlisted men are members. They forget that the salute is a gesture of respect for the rank, not for the officer until he has earned it.

There is a difference between dignity and snobishness. Colonel Juergens and his family should be taught what it is.

Florida's Good and Bad Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the Florida Education magazine, January 1960 issue, entitled "Florida's Good and Bad Schools," written by Mr. Ralph E. Odum, assistant attorney general, State of Florida. Mr. Odum has a lot to say and he says it well:

FLORIDA'S GOOD AND BAD SCHOOLS

(By Ralph E. Odum)

I am happy to accept your invitation to talk about Florida schools. I am vitally interested in this subject, both as a parent and as an assistant attorney general assigned by Attorney General Ervin, to handle the legal work for both the State department of education and the State board of control.

There is a furniture dealer in central Florida who has a good, honest sign over his store. The sign and his advertising read, "Good and bad furniture."

This businessman has enjoyed unusual prosperity over the years and I cannot help but believe his candid appraisal of his merchandise has contributed to this success.

I also believe that such an honest appraisal of our Florida schools would be helpful. We have both good and bad schools available

and the customer can take his choice, depending upon what he wants and how much he is willing to pay.

Today I am going to assume that you as school customers—as all of you are either directly or indirectly—are discriminating in your tastes both in furniture and schools and are not interested in being shown a bad product in any category. As a cross section of business and professional leaders in this city, I have no reason to think you are shopping for anything cheap or inferior so I am going to talk about Florida's good schools.

I have another reason for deliberately showing you our best quality schools and the best things about our school system.

In checking newspaper files in recent years I find that a large part of printed comment about Florida schools, both editorially and in the news columns, has been concerned with our bad schools.

Doctors, lawyers, editors, businessmen, farmers, statesmen, and even schoolteachers have been having a wonderful time accentuating the negative. Much of this criticism has been well founded and constructive. Some of it has been based on fancy rather than fact, but even constructive criticism, necessary as it is, can be overdone.

A growing boy sometimes needs a dose of castor oil or some other potent therapy, but a steady diet of castor oil, with never any ice cream and cake might stunt his growth and have other undesirable results.

This report on Florida education is going to be ice cream and cake and I believe it is justified. I have tried to find out everything good I can say about our schools in the time allotted—but I reserve the right to go back to the castor oil treatment at some other time and place if I want to.

One of the best ways to get an idea of how well our schools are doing is to look at them through the eyes of impartial authorities outside of Florida.

Last year Dr. Benjamin Fine, writing an education editor of the New York Times, said that Florida has shown more improvement on every level of education, from elementary to graduate schools, than any other State in the Union.

In the examinations for the first Air Force Academy class several years ago, Florida's 78 nominees ranked No. 1 as a group among the States. The five nominees who were selected as cadets in the first class also ranked No. 1 as a group.

A few weeks ago Mr. Zollie Maynard, State supervisor of health and physical education, attended a meeting at the Air Force Academy as a member of President Eisenhower's National Committee on Physical Fitness.

The Registrar of the Academy told Mr. Maynard that to officials of the Academy, Florida is the most interesting State in the country. He said by way of example that if all admissions to the Academy had been made on purely a competitive basis, they would have had to admit fully 50 percent of all Florida applicants since the opening of the Academy.

The astonishing accomplishments of students in Brevard County schools have been the subject of articles in outstanding magazines such as U.S. News & World Report and Time and in the national press.

Let's take a short look at just three of the literary hundreds of Florida graduates who right now are achieving national recognition in one way or another of their scholastic accomplishments.

Paul Hendrick was born in Mayo, Fla. He graduated from Jasper High School on May 26, 1958. In March of 1958 he applied for a State teaching scholarship loan and scored in the top 2 percent on the scholarship qualifying examination using national norms. At the beginning of the 1958-59 term he entered the University of Florida as a freshman in teacher education.

In the spring of 1959 the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of State, and the Department of Commerce decided to participate in the International Agricultural Fair to be held in Burma, India in 1960. The three departments appointed a joint committee to plan the U.S. participation. They decided to send four boys and four girls to describe the exhibits to the fair visitors. They divided the United States into four regions—northwest, northeast, southwest and southeast. Each State selected from all farm youth the one boy and one girl they felt to be most outstanding. Their academic records were forwarded to the committee in Washington and the committee selected one boy and one girl from each region.

The southeastern region contains 56 percent of all farm youth in organized Future Farmers of America and 4-H work in this country. This region is composed of 13 States. From this intense competition Paul Hendrick was selected as the outstanding farm youth from the southeastern region and one of the group to represent the United States at the fair.

Paul and the others in the group are in Washington at the present time being trained by the State Department for their work. Paul plans to return to the University of Florida at the beginning of the 1960-61 term to continue his teacher training program.

From the other end of the State, Enith Vardaman was born in Miami and reared in that city. She graduated from Miami Edison Senior High School on June 6, 1958. In March of 1958 she applied for a State teaching scholarship loan and on the examination scored in the top 2 percent as did Paul Hendrick. She entered Stetson University at DeLand as a freshman in teacher education at the beginning of the 1958-59 term. At the end of the term she had earned the highest grade point average of all freshmen students at Stetson and was awarded the academic council class award for that year.

Out in west Florida, David A. Sellers was born in Bonifay in 1940. He started to school in Chipley and graduated from the Chipley High School. Last year he scored the highest score in the Nation on the competitive examinations for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and then for good measure passed the U.S. Air Force Academy examination, finishing first among the Florida applicants, which means he must have been first in the country or close to it. Congressman Bob Sikes nominated David for the Air Force Academy and he accepted the nomination.

Considered as a group, Florida students who are given State teaching scholarship loans are important as evidence of academic excellence in many of our Florida schools. They also provide an indication of the caliber of some of the people who will be our future teachers.

A report from Florida State University for the 1957-58 school year showed that the average score on the statewide 12th grade test for all students at the university was 315. When 441 recipients of State teaching scholarship loans were considered as a group, their average score was 407. Studies now in process show that the average score is higher now than at the time of the 1957-58 study.

Only applicants scoring in the top 17 percent (using national norms) on the scholarship qualifying examination are considered for a State teaching scholarship loan. The median percentile score for the 287 awards for the 1959-60 term was 96. This means that one-half of those entering teacher training on State scholarship loans at the beginning of this school year were in top 4 percent of the students in the Nation with reference to academic ability and achievement.

The ratio of applicants to scholarship loan vacancies during the past 4 years has been about 7 to 1. Each year about 50 percent of the applicants have earned a test score which qualified them for an award; however, there have been scholarship loans for only 13 percent of the applicants.

Eighty percent of the scholarship graduates at the end of the last 2 years accepted teaching positions in Florida public schools. Ten percent entered military service or qualified for a 1-year deferment. Only about 1 out of 10 elected to return to the State in cash the funds received and not to teach. There is no evidence of any teacher scholarship program in the Nation which equals this record of effectiveness.

Quite a number of instructional materials developed in Florida for Florida teachers have attracted national attention and in many instances have pioneered the way for instructional improvements in other States. For example, the book "Functional Mathematics in the Secondary Schools" which we began using 10 years ago, contains many of the proposals for upgrading mathematics instruction to an advanced level which are now beginning to be recommended nationally.

This may help explain why in 1958 although only 46 percent of Florida white high school seniors scored above the national average on general ability or intelligence tests, 67 percent scored higher than the national average on achievement tests in mathematics and 68 percent scored higher in the natural sciences.

In 1943 a comparison was made of general achievement of a 5 percent random sampling of high school seniors throughout the United States and it was found that the average rating of the Florida students was ninth from the top. The same kind of study was made again in 1955 and Florida ranked sixth from the top. These facts are derived from a report to the States based on an analysis of the general educational development test scores made by Bloom and Statler at the University of Chicago. If a similar study were made this year, my guess is that Florida would show even more improvement.

This guess is based on the following facts: Florida was one of the first States to make science a required subject in elementary schools as well as secondary. Advanced courses in mathematics and science are now available to 95 percent of all senior high school students in Florida. Last year seven-eighths of all students in Florida high schools were enrolled in schools offering foreign languages. Some offer as many as five foreign languages—for instance, some schools in Brevard County. More and more Florida schools are starting foreign language instruction in the elementary schools—to name a few, Collier, Okeechobee, Orange, and Bay Counties.

Certain schools in every area of the State are doing an outstanding job and I do not know of any county school system which has not shown impressive improvement during the last 10 years.

Coral Gables High School, for example, was rated in Time and Newsweek magazine reports as among the 38 outstanding schools in the country based on schools producing 20 or more finalists in national merit scholarship competition. Students in this school received various scholarship awards last year totaling \$502,373.

This year some 550,000 students in more than 14,500 high schools throughout the country took the national merit scholarship qualifying test. On the basis of this test, approximately the top 1½ percent were selected to enter the semifinal competition, some from each State prorated according to senior high population.

In Florida the winners of this high scholastic honor came from city schools and country schools, large and small, scattered over the State. Specifically, they came in

varying numbers from the following places: Baker County, Bartow, Bradenton, Clearwater, Coral Gables, Crestview, Daytona Beach, DeLand, Ft. Lauderdale, Ft. Myers, Gainesville, Gulfport, Hialeah, Hollywood, Jacksonville, Lakeland, Lake Worth, Largo, Melbourne, Miami, Miami Beach, Milton, Mount Dora, New Port Richey, North Miami, Panama City, Pensacola, Plant City, Pompano Beach, Rockledge, Sarasota, Shalimar, St. Augustine, St. Leo, St. Petersburg, Tallahassee, Tampa, Tarpon Springs, Umatilla, West Palm Beach, Wimauma, Winter Garden, Winter Haven, and Winter Park. Here in Orlando, Edgewater High School had eight students who qualified and Boone High had three.

The important thing to remember about this is that schools located in each of the 45 places listed above have one or more students, totaling 187, who rank scholastically in the top 1½ percent of the more than half million high school seniors in the United States who took the examinations.

Perhaps an even more significant indication of schools that are doing an outstanding job are the ones with a high percentage of students whose scores on achievement tests are in line with or above their showing on ability tests.

In fact, I intend to suggest to the State board of education that it establish an honor roll of Florida high schools each year on this basis, along with such other reasonable criteria as could be established. Last year the following schools could have been on the honor roll of this kind: Boone High in Orange County, Palm Beach High, Leon High in Tallahassee, Plant High in Tampa, Coral Gables High in Dade County, Boca Ciega High and Clearwater High in Pinellas County, Fort Lauderdale High, Northeast High in Pinellas County, Hillsborough High in Tampa, Columbia County High, Pasco County High, Winter Park High in Orange, Bradford County High, Dan McCarty High in St. Lucie, Clay County High, Walton County High, Choctawhatchee High in Okaloosa County, Martin County High, Kathleen High in Polk County, East Bay High in Hillsborough, Turkey Creek High in Hillsborough, St. Cloud High in Osceola, Lake Weir High in Marion, University High in Leon, Quincy High in Gadsden County, Charlotte County High, Williston High in Levy, Ponce de Leon High in Holmes, P. K. Yonge in Alachua, Hernando County High, Cottdale High in Jackson County, Clewiston High in Hendry County.

Florida is fortunate with respect to the organizational structure of its school system. A statutory provision made by the judgment and foresight of the 1947 legislature, which was enacted at the same time as our famed minimum foundation program, insured not only the success of this program but set the tone for local control by the counties.

In the same omnibus bill with the minimum foundation program itself was a section which abolished 703 small school districts in Florida and created 67 districts whose boundaries are coextensive with those of the counties themselves.

Mr. Tom Morgan of the State department of education tells me that by comparison, there are many otherwise progressive States which still suffer from this confusion of the "horse and buggy" era. California is one of these. The State of Illinois at one time had the incredible number of over 12,000 small school districts. Within the past few years Illinois happily reported that this number had been reduced to six or seven thousand districts.

In Florida the picture prior to the 1947 law was dismal and confusing. Take for example Polk County where I grew up. Official records show that Polk County in the fiscal year 1941-42 had 40 districts levying constitutional millages for support and

maintenance of schools. By 1946 Polk had reduced this number to 37 by local referendum. Each one of these small school districts could issue its own bonds and had its own separate budget. They pretty well selected their own teachers and paid them according to their own ideas without any countywide policy to guide them. Sometimes they would levy enough taxes to run the schools and sometimes they wouldn't. The records show that the bond districts in Polk at one time exceeded the support and maintenance districts in number. There was at one time a district No. 54 in Polk which collected taxes for the retirement of bonds. At a later date No. 48 was the highest number shown as collecting taxes for principal and interest due on bonds, this reduction being due to consolidation of some of the districts.

This administrative nightmare gives some idea of the improved system we now take for granted in Florida; an administrative system which in terms of better instruction for each child is definitely tied in with efficient organization, particularly with respect to financial support by both county and State.

When I was in Lakeland High School in 1930 we were the only school in the county which had a gymnasium. As I recall, there were at least a dozen other high schools in Polk County at that time and they used to consider it a great privilege to play basketball against Lakeland, for the simple reason the kids wanted to see how it felt to play on an indoor court. Dr. J. T. Kelly who is now with the State Department of Education was principal and coach of the Haines City High School that year and he told me he joined the National Guard primarily to get the Guard to let his kids play basketball in the armory.

We had a tin gym and a chemistry lab at Lakeland but no school library. Very few schools in the State had any of these things. There were no free school buses, free textbooks, audiovisual aids, publicly supported school lunchrooms and 18 percent of the high school principals in the State had not finished college. In fact, about 5 percent of the teachers had only a high school education or less.

In 1930 we had 10,960 teachers in Florida and 7,285 of them were teaching in elementary schools for a school term which averaged 6½ months. Most of them were lady teachers whose annual salary was about \$750. For a while in Lakeland and many other places, the teachers were not paid in money but in something called "scrip" which could be traded for groceries for about 50 cents on the dollar if they had a friend in the grocery business.

Today we have approximately 40,000 teachers and 98.12 percent of them have a 4-year college degree or more. They are required to teach a full 9 months by Florida law and they are paid an average annual salary of \$4,948. I doubt there are many principals, if any, who do not have a master's degree.

When I was in Lakeland High School in 1930 there were 7,080 seniors in the entire State. Last year we graduated approximately 30,000.

Since 1895 we have spent an estimated \$489,054,346 buying land and building buildings for public schools.

Since then and especially during the last 10 or 15 years land in Florida has multiplied in value and the cost of construction has skyrocketed. In recent years Dade County has had to spend as much as \$100,000 per acre for land to enlarge a Negro school. I believe a most conservative estimate of the present-day value of school property in Florida would be well over \$1 billion and this does not include the cost of such things as school buses. Florida operates a transportation system in order to get its children to school which requires more vehicles than all the interstate bus companies operate in Florida combined, and is certainly one of the safest in the

country from the standpoint of driver requirements and bus specifications.

We now take all these things for granted, along with educational television in many areas of the State, driver education, summer school programs which the Kefauver committee said have made a major contribution to reduction of juvenile delinquency in Florida, a program for handicapped children which in 1958 provided specially trained teachers for 44,604 children who although able to learn cannot be properly taught in the regular classroom, vocational and evening schools for 211,562 people during the past year, 16 junior colleges with an enrollment last year of 12,592 whose graduates show up considerably better scholastically when they transfer to the universities than the average college student, kindergartens in 11 counties, an athletic and physical fitness program that is considered excellent by many other States, and a school band and music program that will hold its own in any competition.

These things and many other school services which the people of Florida demand and the legislature has required by law help me to understand why we are now spending (not counting building costs and paying for bonds) about twice as much to educate each child as we did 10 years ago. The estimated expenditure per pupil for operating expenses in 1958-59 placed Florida 34th among the States. Personally, I think that in most counties, we are getting more than our money's worth.

In 1948 we had 368,587 children in school and spent \$58,305,345 for current expense which amounted to a cost per pupil of \$158.19.

Last year we had 814,888 children in school and spend for current expense \$239,705,500 or \$294.16 per pupil.

Although Florida ranked 16th among the States last year in the amount we paid our teachers, we did provide them with probably the best retirement system in the country.

For example, let's compare Florida with California, which is one of the top States salarywise. A Florida teacher who retires at age 60 with 35 years' service and a 10 years' average salary of \$6,950 would be paid a monthly retirement income of \$405 and she would have contributed \$7,428 of her own money in the retirement fund.

A California teacher in the same category would receive \$388 per month retirement pay and it would have cost her \$10,698.

Florida during the past 10 years has embarked on one of the largest school construction programs in the country. It had to in order to keep up with the population increase which keeps doubling and redoubling in many counties.

Florida's modern, functional school buildings have attracted nationwide attention and have been the subject of many articles in national publications. Latest to draw praise are school buildings in Sarasota County called by Time magazine a "showcase of school architecture."

And yet, generally speaking, construction costs of school buildings in Florida run about 20 percent less than in Northern States.

Another major development in Florida schools recently is its effort in pioneering in the development of salary schedules which recognize exceptionally meritorious teaching ability and service.

Efforts along this line have been made from time to time in other States but have generally failed because of administrative difficulties. There is good reason to believe that the approach recommended by Governor Collins and approved by the Legislature will prove to be successful.

I think probably Florida's major contribution to schools throughout the Nation, however, has been its massive Minimum Foundation Program which was enacted into law by the Florida Legislature in 1947. This was

truly an all-important breakthrough in school administration which has revolutionized the schools in this State and is serving as a model in many other States.

These are a few of the things going on in Florida schools which sometimes get overlooked in our agony of adjustment and reappraisal but which lead me to believe that we may not be doing so badly after all.

We have come a long way in the past 10 years but I believe we will have to travel faster in the next if we are going to provide even an adequate education for our youngsters who are already living in the space age whether we like it or not.

The bright ones are concerned with abstract ideas for which the education of your day and mine does not even provide a means of communication. If you do not believe me, ask your high school math student what is a googolplex and what it's for, as I had to do when I first heard the word.

One thing I know, I do not intend to use the castor oil treatment again when discussing education until I have found out a lot more about what I am talking about than I know now.

I intend to find out to the best of my ability because I know of nothing more important as far as the affairs of this earth are concerned than how we use and transmit the knowledge which has been loosed upon us. I think this knowledge must be used and conveyed in such a way as to preserve the fundamental values which transcend knowledge but which can be destroyed in this day by either a perverse knowledge or lack of knowledge.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified on this, my first day as a Member of this great deliberative body, to have the privilege of participating in the important debate on civil rights, and to lend my support to H.R. 8601, which is now before the House for consideration.

During my years of service in the New York State Legislature as a member of the assembly and the senate, I lost no opportunity to champion the cause of civil rights; my efforts will be continued here. It is admitted that flagrant discriminatory practices abound in public housing, public schooling, in voting, job opportunities, as well as in other fields. This is a sad and awful commentary on the integrity of our Nation, where our Constitution guarantees equality of all our citizens. Until every vestige of discrimination is wiped out, the honor of our country is in doubt, in the opinion of all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The time for moderation and compromise is past; we must end the unconscionable discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and other human indecencies which are being inflicted upon a vast segment of our population. We cannot claim to have true democracy in our country, equality of men, equality of

opportunity, freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution, until all discrimination because of race, color, or religion is abolished.

Congress is the special guardian of the right to vote and I trust that this Congress will meet its obligation fairly and courageously, and pass a strong, effective civil rights bill which will deal fairly with our Negro citizens and finally provide machinery by which the rights of Negroes to vote will be protected, and which will give countless citizens, now discriminated against, other necessary protection as provided in H.R. 8601. We must not fail to take decisive action now, for not only those discriminated against, but also all right-thinking citizens, demand that we do so.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the city commissioner of Birmingham, Ala., Mr. Eugene "Bull" Connor, recently warned Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON that if he lends his support to the "voting referee plan or any other of those northern radical Senators' plans for civil rights, you can expect to lose the solid South" for the Democratic nomination for President. This is, of course, bullheaded, shortsighted, and biting one's nose to spite one's face.

It is ironical that Senator JOHNSON should be the object of threats of losing the solid South because of his advocacy of civil rights for all Americans. The answer to this is in the feeling prevalent in enlightened quarters throughout the Nation that his championing of the cause of civil rights has won many friends for Senator Johnson and that, furthermore, it is helping to educate the South.

As an example, let me cite the Florence Times of Florence, Ala., which in an editorial published in its issue of February 18, 1960, urges southerners to stop acting as political crybabies for the time has come for southerners to act like Americans.

If civil rights are eventually to be accepted by the South, the man who should get the credit for it—perhaps more so than anyone else in the country—is most certainly Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is he who is providing the guidance and the leadership in these trying moments. It is he who maintains a calm and commonsense approach to an emotionally charged issue which could flare up and cause untold harm to our Nation at a very crucial period in our history.

As a northerner, who has always fought for equality of opportunity for all Americans and for the elimination of racial and religious prejudice, I want to

congratulate Senator JOHNSON on his demonstration of able and responsible leadership which the whole Nation sorely needs. Those in the South who are threatening him or trying to stab him in the back, will only discover that they will hurt themselves and the South more.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the editorial referred to above:

[From the Florence Times, Feb. 18, 1960]

ALABAMA DEMOCRACY IS IN A SORRY STATE

How to make enemies and turn people against you may not be the title of any book but it aptly describes the antics of some of our southern politicians when it comes to dealing with so-called civil rights measures, now again before Congress.

For the so-called friends of segregation in the South, more particularly Alabama, continue to follow the very lines of action that will most rapidly tear down the State's accustomed way of life with the ultimate jamming of one civil rights measure after another down our collective throats.

We are fast getting into the position of the man who was surrounded by enemies—and deserved every last one of them.

What good does it do for State officials to make their appearances in Washington expressing their adamant opposition to all civil rights proposals when they do nothing at home to correct the very abuses civil rights legislation is designed to correct?

While it is true that denial of civil rights is a national and international problem, it is further complicated in the South by the unusual form in which our society has evolved before, during and since the Civil War.

But the South is not going to get fair treatment unless it goes to Washington with clean hands.

As we have said before, we have found much sympathy among the people outside the South for continuance of segregated schools, provided really and truly equal educational facilities are provided our Negro citizens, but we have never found one American outside the South who failed to exonerate our failure to allow qualified Negroes to vote as we do in some counties.

Read what Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, said on the Senate floor the other day regarding Macon, Bullock, Barbour, and Lowndes Counties:

"I will not detain the Senate with a detailed account of the long and cumbersome voting procedure which each Negro applicant faces in Macon County nor of the complicated voucher system requiring that each new voter be vouched for by another registered voter. Suffice it to say that even if the board were functioning continuously, it would take 203 years under current regulations to register all of the county's unregistered Negroes."

He then told the Senate of the arrest in Bessemer of Asbury Howard, Sr., a Negro, who had ordered a sign painted urging Negroes to register and vote; of his subsequent arrest for publication of "libelous and obscene" material and of the assault upon him by "between 40 and 50 white men carrying knives and blackjacks" as Howard left the courtroom. He also mentioned the order by then Attorney General John Patterson (now Governor) denying voting records of Macon to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and of then Judge George Wallace's threat to jail Justice Department officials who came to Bullock County to look at records.

He cited similar instances in other Southern States.

Of course, the Federal Government is not going to sit on its hands and permit this form of tyranny to endure. It will, in the final analysis, do whatever it wills to do to

end these abuses regardless of the opposition offered by the Deep South's handful of Senators. The small bloc of southern Senators can no more stop civil rights legislation in the end, than can one man stand in the middle of a regional blizzard and stop the snow from falling with his outstretched hands.

It is this futile defense of wrongdoing that has brought about the condition in which neither the Republican nor Democratic Parties has nominated a southerner for President for many long decades.

Right now the South is suffering grievously from this very thing. Perhaps the most qualified man in either party for the Presidency this year is Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, but astute political observers say it will be nothing short of miraculous should he be nominated.

Even now as Senator JOHNSON is trying to negotiate through the Senate a compromise civil rights measure that makes some sense, Birmingham City Commissioner Eugene (Bull) Connor, a candidate for Alabama Democratic national committeeman, warns JOHNSON:

"Of all the candidates who have been mentioned as the Democratic nominee for President this year, without a doubt you are the only one that the solid (?) South could support this fall. But if you lend your backing to the Eisenhower voting referee plan or any other of those northern radical Senators' plans for civil rights, you can expect to lose the solid South, and without the southern delegates' votes at the convention, you wouldn't stand a chance to be nominated. Senator, we in the South are depending on you to use every resource you have to defeat these antisouthern bills."

Of course, this is nonsense. Those who hold the attitude of Commissioner Connor are the very ones who will bring about the destruction of Senator JOHNSON's candidacy.

And after they have succeeded in destroying the sons of the South who will we vote for in November? Of course, for the nominees of the National Democratic Party or the Republican Party, whose sympathy for our peculiarly southern problems is nil.

We are destroying ourselves by defending practices against which there is no defense in any decent democratic society and in the process we are striking down, decade after decade, our most noble sons on the governmental front. We are following the path of political suicide.

Will we wake up only after our house has been pulled down upon us and the South is left in political shackles and political shambles?

Even closer at home the State Democratic executive committee at its recent meeting in Montgomery again left the way open for so-called Democratic(?) presidential electors to vote for John Doe or Sam Jones or anyone else, if they so desire, following the general election next fall. We want to be members of the national Democratic Party but we want to play the part of a bunch of undisciplined political brats who pick up their marbles and go home whenever we can't force our will upon the majority in defiance of the rules of the game.

How much respect do you think our delegates to the Democratic National Convention will command when they report in at Los Angeles? They will be looked upon as political cry babies for that is the very role we are choosing for ourselves.

We suspect we are not alone in thinking that the time has come for southerners to act like Americans. When we get our house in order at home we can oppose punitive civil rights measures in good conscience.

When we are ready and willing to play the political game according to the precepts of democracy then, and only then, will we command the political respect our great Southland so sorely needs.

Civil Rights and Senator William E. Borah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the late William E. Borah, Republican of Idaho, stands down the corridor in our Statuary Hall of Fame. His was not only a profile in courage, but a profile of justice, honor, and patriotism. Mr. Speaker, here is what Senator Borah had to say about the punitive, vindictive, and unnecessary legislation of his day:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH, OF IDAHO, ON JANUARY 7, 1938

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this measure, in a slightly different form but embodying the same principles, came to this body about 25 years ago. At that time I was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and was appointed by the late Senator Nelson, chairman of a subcommittee to pass upon the measure, particularly its constitutional features. I shall not at this time go into the history of the action of the committee at that time. It may be necessary to do so later in order to throw light upon some features of this matter. It is sufficient now to say that I reached a conclusion as to the merits of the bill, which conclusion I still entertain.

Heretofore I have confined my remarks upon this bill largely to the question of its constitutionality. Those questions still interest me, and probably I shall discuss them later. Today, however, I desire to address my attention for a time to the policy involved in this measure. Assuming for the purpose of the argument that we have the constitutional power to pass such a measure as this, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the wisdom of doing so. I think it only a little less important, perhaps no less important, than the constitutional question itself.

Notwithstanding anything that has been said or that may be said to the contrary, this is a sectional measure. It is an attempt upon the part of States practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister States where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute. It is proposed to condemn these States and the people in them because it is claimed that they have failed properly to meet and adjust the most difficult of all problems. No more drastic condemnation could be offered by a measure than that which is offered by the measures now before the Senate.

It proposes to authorize the National Government to enter into the States, and to take charge of and prosecute as criminals the duly elected officials of the States, from the governor down. It proposes that the Federal Government shall be the sole judge of the guilt or innocence of State officials.

In my opinion that requires a review of some unfortunate history, and the recalling of some unpleasant facts. These States are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature. Let us inquire what it is that the

South has had to do, how it has done it, and what reason there is now, after 70 years of great effort, to pass censure or condemnation of those great States and that great people.

Paraphrasing the language of one of the most eloquent of men, when the Confederate soldier pulled his gray cap over his brow, and lifted his pallid and tear-stained face for the last time to the graves which dotted the hills of old Virginia, and started on his slow and painful journey home, what was he to find? What were the problems, what was the task, what were the conditions which confronted him? His home was destroyed, his plantation devastated, his help gone, his money worthless, his civilization imperiled. This was the condition in addition to the other problem with which we are more particularly concerned today, and which confronted the South as it entered upon its great task of rebuilding.

I shall not go into details as to the reconstruction period. I recall it sufficiently and only that we may understand something of the antecedents of this problem and something as to the good faith and the ability with which it has been met. I recall a single instance in the way of illustration. When Congress met in December 1865, the then leader of the House—perhaps the most complete master of the House of Representatives that history records—Thaddeus Stevens, outlined the program with reference to the then pending situation. Among other things, he said:

"The future condition of the conquered power depends upon the will of the conqueror."

He said further that the conquered provinces were to be admitted as States—

"Only when the Constitution has been amended so as to secure the perpetual ascendancy of the party of the Union"—

The Republican Party—

"Every government is a despotism. . . . The Constitution has nothing to do with it [the program]. . . . I propose to deal with you [the South] entirely by the laws of war. . . . The conquered people have no right to appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of the law. The Constitution has nothing to do with them or they with it."

Thus they were to take up the work of rebuilding and of carrying the race problem with the threat of having all constitutional guarantees withdrawn.

Mr. President, I have always felt that in many respects the Reconstruction period is the most regrettable page of American history. Had Abraham Lincoln lived through his second term, it probably would have been the most readable page, one of the noblest pages in all history. It would have been characterized by wide sympathy, by breadth of understanding, and by that wisdom which flows from the heart as well as the brain, which passeth all understanding. It would have been free from that blind partisanship which disregards constitutions and constitutional limitation as well as national honor and national unity.

A short time before the Great Emancipator was removed from the scene he had outlined his views on reconstruction. What a different story would have been written had those views prevailed. What a different national life would have been lived had those views obtained. But before his body had reached Springfield the committee had met and had determined upon the complete rejection of the entire policy theretofore announced by the dead President. Ben Butler's views superseded those of Abraham Lincoln; and a more tragic thing could not happen in a crisis confronting a nation. These measures with reference to reconstruction therefore were written from the standpoint of partisanship not unmingled with a desire to punish.

The measure now before the body embodies the same principle upon which those measures were founded. The same arguments are made in support of the pending measure, to wit, that the southern people are to be distrusted and are incapable of local self-government.

We know now what those measures in those days did. They retarded and frustrated the coming together of the people of the different States. They gave us the solid South. They separated us politically, which separation continues until this day. They implanted a sense of bitterness in the minds of those people, not because of what had happened upon the field but because of what happened in Congress.

It is not in the interest of national unity to stir old embers, to arouse old fears, to lacerate old wounds, to again, after all these years, brand the southern people as incapable or unwilling to deal with the question of human life. This bill is not in the interests of that good feeling between the two races so essential to the welfare of the colored people.

Nations are not held together merely by constitutions and laws. They are held together by mutual respect, by mutual confidence, by toleration for conditions in different parts of the country, by confidence that the people of the different parts of the country will solve their problems; and that is just as essential today as it was in 1865 and 1870.

In the beginning, Mr. President, I reject the pending measure as fundamentally not in the interest of the white people of the South, not in the interest of the black people of the South, not in the interest of national unity nor of national solidarity, not in the interest of eliminating crime. History has proven that it will be a failure, and those who suffer most will be the weaker race.

Mr. President, the race problem is the most difficult of all problems, and, in addition to the conditions which I have outlined briefly, the southern people had placed upon them the race problem under circumstances and conditions never before experienced by any people, so far as I know, in recorded history. In addition to and on top of all other problems the South had to grapple with the race problem. How well has it dealt with it?

At the close of the Civil War there were a little over 5 million white people in the South; there were 3,500,000 Negroes. In Mississippi there were 100,000 more colored people than white people. In South Carolina there were something like 150,000 more colored people than white people. There were the two races, living upon the same soil, now equally free under the Constitution, one of them untrained and unschooled in the affairs of state, and untrained in citizenship. The problem had to be met. Was it easy of solution? Can one conceive of a more difficult problem placed before a people? I wish we could place ourselves in their position. It will help us to be sympathetic, sane, and just.

I call attention to some facts which lead up to the question of lynching. History shows that in the North in 1889, 1 Negro in every 185 was in jail; in the South, 1 in every 446. In the North the percentage of Negro prisoners was 6 times as great as that of the native whites, in the South 4 times as great.

Monroe S. Work, of Tuskegee College, has said:

"There is a much higher rate of crime among the Negroes in the North than in the South."

That speaks volumes for the southern Negro and no less for the whites.

Professor Johnson, of Fisk University, has said:

"The rate for Negroes is much higher in the northern States than in the southern States as to crime. Judging by the figures

alone, for a 10,000-Negro population, the commitments were 88 in the South, 283 in the North."

In a volume entitled "Negro Housing" published in 1932, I find the following:

"The extent of property ownership by Negroes has in the past been greater in the South than in the North."

It will be disclosed that in some of the southern cities the percentage of Negro ownership of homes runs as high as 45 percent of the Negro population; in other places as high as 30 to 39 percent of the Negroes own their own homes.

In a bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1930 we find the statement that the value of land and buildings of farm property owned by Negroes increased from 1910 to 1930 as follows, giving the round figures:

	Percent
Virginia.....	58
North Carolina.....	140
Georgia.....	11
Florida.....	29
Louisiana.....	142
Texas.....	97
Mississippi.....	68
Alabama.....	54
Oklahoma.....	41
West Virginia.....	37

I mention these figures to show the progress of the Negro throughout the South in an economic way, for, after all, only in proportion as he acquires property and economic power can he hope to be secure in his political rights. That is just as true of the white man as of the colored man. And in proportion that he advances in education, in the acquisition of property, and in the acquisition of economic rights, in that proportion he will come to be regarded as an essential factor of the southern civilization, and treated as such; and to accomplish that has been the aim of the southern Negro, encouraged and assisted by the white people of the South.

I shall now read from a little volume to which I called attention a few days ago during the debate on the farm bill, a volume written by Gerald W. Johnson, who, I have been informed, is one of the editors of the Baltimore Evening Sun. He has written a remarkable volume upon the questions which pertain to the southern portion of the country. On page 8 of the volume he says, referring always to the South:

"The problem of public education, for example, has not been solved. It is further from solution in the South than in any other region. But when one considers that the South has to teach more Negro children than there are children of all kinds in New England; and when one notes that it is spending far more of its total income on schools than is spent by any other region, its effort, even though but half successful, must command respect and admiration."

They must educate more Negro children in carrying this load than all the children of New England, and they are doing so; and by educating them they are fitting them for citizenship, schooling them against crime, and they are laying the only sure foundation there is for the extinguishment of crime among the Negroes. They are laying at tremendous cost the foundation for the good citizenship of the Negro, and while lynching can never be justified, nevertheless there is no more successful approach to the ending of lynching than through education, through bringing both races to understand their responsibility to society. I know of no finer sense of duty than that displayed by the South in the help it gives the Negro in bettering his condition as to property, as to economical strength, and as to education.

I read again from this able writer:

It has been the fashion in some quarters to assume that the Southeast has remained

almost completely inert in the presence of its social problems. This is far from the truth. A mere glance at the educational statistics of the region is enough to dissipate the impression that the Southeast has been indifferent or lethargic in this respect. The State of Florida, for example, spends 5.76 percent of its total income for school purposes, and North Carolina 4.38 percent; this is the largest percentage that is spent for similar purposes by any other States save the Dakotas. * * * The Southeast spends 3 percent of its total income for higher education, the highest percentage in the Nation. It enrolled more high-school students in 1930 than the whole country did in 1900, and there are more accredited high schools in this region than there were in the United States at the end of the century. Its present army of 60,000 high-school graduates annually represents an increase of 500 percent within the last two decades.

I pause to say that, if we knew as much about the South and what they have done and are doing as we pretend to know, we would not be so free to criticize. It is a horrible thing to see the body of a Negro burned to a crisp, swinging from the limb of a tree; it is a horrible thing to have a daughter or son, perhaps a mere child, snatched from your home, carried into hiding, perhaps murdered. These are our problems, pressing for consideration, and they are making as determined an effort to clear the stain from the honor of the South as we are to rescue our honor in the North. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

During the last session of Congress we had under consideration in the Committee on Education and Labor what is known as the educational bill, and, of course, it vitally affected the Negro people of the South, and they appeared in great numbers before the committee. At that time Senator Black, now Justice Black, was chairman of the committee. The most difficult problem was to work out absolute protection for the colored children in the enjoyment of the fund proposed to be set up. I must say that I never knew a person more meticulous, more determined, more vigilant to protect the colored students in the enjoyment of that fund than was Justice Black. I was impressed with the fact that there was a determination upon his part to reach the Negro at that point in his life where he could best serve him not only with reference to general citizenship but as to the reduction of crime. Mr. Johnson states further in this volume:

"The most conspicuous characteristic of the southern population, however, is its bi-racial character. A group of 8 million people of a different color from the other 17 million is a feature so startling that it may be expected to attract more attention than perhaps it deserves."

"The inevitable result has been enormous waste of the Negro's potential value to the social structure. Not all of this is the fault of the white South by any means. The hasty and ill-advised effort made in the sixties to project the newly emancipated slaves into a political and social position they were not prepared to occupy has made any realistic treatment of their position extremely difficult. Not only did it create appalling prejudices but it erected very substantial legal barriers against any direct and forthright approach and forced southern political and social polity into a sinuousness that has been productive of a thousand evils."

"This is, however, water over the dam. What confronts the Southeast today is the problem of making the best possible use of 8 million blacks."

"Only comparatively recently has any considerable effort been made to treat the dis-

ease, rather than to alleviate its symptoms—or, rather, only recently has the idea begun to spread that perhaps there isn't any organic disease, but only a series of functional disturbances. Since the turn of the century the Southeast has been making real, if not always adequate, efforts in the field of Negro education. With the rise of the Negro in the cultural and economic scale there has come also an appreciable reduction of the rigor of civil and social disabilities. And with both there is a strengthening belief that perhaps the traditional approach to this situation has been faulty."

Everywhere we find a determination to find the right way. The Negro is there. He is there to stay. The South knows that he is there to stay, that he is a part of the wealth of the South. We in the North may be interested in the Negro politically. We care little about him economically. But he is an indispensable factor in the economic development of the South. They can and will do for him far better without our interference or advice than with it.

Mr. President, the Negro has had a hard road to travel ever since he was given his freedom. A hundred-and-odd years of slavery afforded poor training for citizenship in the most advanced of nations. Almost overnight he went from slavery to take up the obligations of a freeman in a free country; but, everything considered he has done well; his advancement has been marked. Restricted, not by the Constitution of his country or the decisions of its highest courts, but restricted, almost cabined and confined, by the iron laws of society, nevertheless he has made progress. And where has that progress been greatest? In the South. In spite of prejudice and statements to the contrary, facts and figures show it has been greatest in the South. In the acquisition of property and economic advancement generally the Negro has fared better in the South than elsewhere.

It is true, as is contended here, that at times he has suffered from mob violence in the South, but it is equally true that he has suffered from race riots in the North. But in all things which make for the advancement of the race as a race, the North has no advantage over the South in the story of the advancement of the Negro. We have shown no greater patience, no greater tolerances, no greater ability to deal with this race than have our brothers of the South. And now, because there is the power, because there are the votes, because it is possible to do so, it is proposed to call these great States and these people before the bar of public opinion and, after 70 years of arduous effort on their part, condemn them as unfit and unwilling to deal with this great problem, condemn them for having failed in the essential principle of home government, of home rule. After these 70 years, and after 150 years, taking the Government's history as a whole, we now come to the time when we are asked to say that home rule or local government has broken down in a number of the States of the Union. We call these States and these proud people to judgment before the whole world and spread upon the records of the Congress our condemnation, our judgment that in the most vital things of free government they have failed.

Broken down. Why? Because eight Negroes were lynched last year. There were 30 kidnapping cases in the United States last year. After all the efforts of the States and all the efforts of the Federal Government, taking charge of those who crossed State lines, we still had 20 kidnapping cases as against the 8 lynching cases in the South. Is that an indication that the South is not in good faith and with honorable effort trying to protect the colored race and to give it the same protection that it gives the white race?

Lynching is the one crime, Mr. President, that is distinctly and markedly on the decrease in the United States.

I shall take time to read briefly some facts and give some figures.

Prof. Charles S. Johnson, of Fisk University, says:

"Taking the period of 1889 to 1893 as 100 percent, it is of interest to note that every 5-year period has shown a decrease in the total number of individuals lynched."

He then gives the figures showing that from 1924 to 1928 there was a decrease of Negro lynching amounting to 84.8 percent. He concludes by saying:

"It will be discovered from the accompanying graphs and tables that at the present rate of decrease lynching will apparently cease to be a problem in race relations due to its disappearance."

Further, he says:

"In the 30-year period from 1889 to 1918, inclusive, there were 2,522 Negroes lynched."

That is about 84 a year.

He then calls attention to the fact that in 1924 the number had dropped to 16. Last year the number was 8. In many of the Southern States lynching has practically disappeared. Virginia had only 1 case in 10 years. West Virginia had none during the past 5 years. South Carolina had none during the past 3 years. Oklahoma had 1 in 10 years. North Carolina had 2 in 7 years. Arkansas had 3 in 9 years. Maryland had 2 in 10 years, and none for the past 3 years.

I call your attention to a statement from the great Tuskegee Institute located in the State of Alabama. It reads:

"There are a number of interesting features to be noted. From 1882 to 1885 there were more whites lynched than Negroes. Concerning the decline of lynchings in the United States, I call attention to sheet No. 2, 'Lynchings, white and Negroes, by periods, 1882-1936.' You will note that there has been a steady decline in the number of lynchings for each of the 10-year periods, 1887-96 to 1927-36. Judging from the trends shown in this table, there is every reason to believe that there will be a further decline in lynchings."

"There are probably three major factors that have contributed to this decline. The first of these is the tendency for frontier characteristics in the South to disappear (lynching was a special characteristic of the frontier in America, both in the West and in the South). Second, the breaking down of isolation in the South by increased facilities: (1) Rural free delivery; (2) more telegraph offices; (3) more telephones in small towns and rural areas, and (4) recently the radio and paved roads. Third, increasing agitation within the South during the past 40 years against lynchings. This has resulted in an increasing sentiment against the evil. This sentiment has expressed itself in the increasing efforts to prevent lynchings."

"From 1914 to 1919 the number of persons lynched was much greater than the number of persons prevented from being lynched. From 1920 to the present the number each year prevented from being lynched has greatly exceeded the number lynched."

"These facts and trends seem to indicate unquestionably that there will continue to be a decline in lynchings in the United States. Not only in these statistics but in many other ways is there employed a growth in the humanitarian attitude of the American people. This growth, I believe, has paralleled the development of educational and social agencies, all of which bid fair to rid this Nation of the barbaric practice of lynching."

In other words, the problem is being met, the problem is being solved, and it is being solved in the way that America solves her problems when they are local and of a local nature; and that is through the activity and

the cooperation and the determination of the people themselves.

Mr. President, suppose Congress passes this bill; suppose it becomes a law; where must we go for its enforcement? The bill may be passed by votes from other States, but for its enforcement we must go to the juries in those communities which we condemn. The bill may be passed in the theoretical atmosphere of Washington, but it must be enforced down among the people in the realistic atmosphere of the Southern States. There will be the southern district attorney, the southern judges, the southern juries, and they must be depended upon for the enforcement of the law. Do Senators think they will more likely enforce the law when they have been condemned in the sight of all the world, and in face of such condemnation, than when they are appealed to from the standpoint of the sense of duty of their State and their sense of duty of citizenry?

We get back, after all, to the people themselves for the enforcement of the law. We have had an experience in this country showing that we cannot enforce a law when public opinion is not behind the law. The only way in which we can hope to have the law enforced is by the method that is now pursued by the southern people—that is, to educate the people up to an understanding that it is to their interest and to their honor to maintain law and order in their communities—and that they are doing.

Some years ago a great southerner discussed this question, and I cannot refrain from calling attention to some of his language. It seems to me fair, just, and so in accordance with the sentiments of the true patriot that it is worth while for us to stop and hear the voices of those who are wrestling with the problem at home.

Mr. Henry W. Grady said:

"Nothing, sir, but this problem and the suspicions it breeds, hinders a clear understanding and a perfect union. Nothing else stands between us and such love as bound Georgia and Massachusetts at Valley Forge and Yorktown. . . ."

"I thank God as heartily as you do that human slavery is gone forever from American soil. But the freeman remains. With him a problem without precedent or parallel. Note its appalling conditions. Two utterly dissimilar races on the same soil—with equal political and civil rights—almost equal in numbers, but terribly unequal in intelligence and responsibility. . . . Under these, adverse at every point, we are required to carry these two races in peace and honor to the end."

"Never has such a task been given to mortal stewardship."

Is that not true? Can we find anywhere in history a task such as was assigned to the southern people at the close of the Civil War, with slaves for 100 years released, free as they should have been, but given the power to participate in politics without any training and without any experience? It was beyond their capacity, as it would have been beyond the capacity of any race immediately to assume in full, and properly discharge, the duties of citizenship. But those were the conditions which confronted the South, and with which they have been dealing.

"The resolute, clearheaded, broadminded men of the South . . . wear this problem in their hearts and brains, by day and by night. They realize, as you cannot, what this problem means—what they owe to this kindly and dependent race—the measure of their debt to the world in whose despite they defended and maintained slavery."

"If you insist that they are ruffians, blindly driving with bludgeon and shotgun to plunder and oppress a race, then I shall sacrifice my self-respect and tax your patience in vain. But admit that they are

men of commonsense and common honesty, wisely modifying an environment they cannot wholly disregard—guiding and controlling as best they can the vicious and irresponsible of either race . . . admit this, and we may reach an understanding without delay."

Let us admit that the South is dealing with this question as best it can, admit that the men and women of the South are just as patriotic as we are, just as devoted to the principles of the Constitution as we are, just as willing to sacrifice for the success of their communities as we are. Let us give them credit as American citizens, and cooperate with them, sympathize with them, and help them in the solution of their problem, instead of condemning them. We are one people, one Nation, and they are entitled to be treated upon that basis.

Mr. President, I now turn briefly to another feature of this measure. I shall discuss it later in more detail, referring to court opinions. But I call attention to this feature now which must be of concern to every Member of this body, to everyone who believes in our dual system of government. This bill as it is drawn—observe my language—this bill as it is drawn strikes at the very heart, at the very life of local self-government. I ask Senators to reread the bill in the light of that assertion. It would place a construction upon the 14th amendment never contemplated by the men who wrote it—in fact, specifically rejected by them—and which, in my opinion, a fair construction in no sense sustains.

The bill openly and professedly declares in effect—and that is the theory upon which it rests—that the people in these States are either unwilling or unfit to maintain the most ordinary principles of organized society, and that in the face of the facts which I have shown, that they are really solving the problem.

Permit me to say here before I go further that I make no contention but that the 14th amendment has forever placed it beyond the power of any State to deny any person the equal protection of the laws, or to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process. I recognize also that the State acts and speaks through its officers, legislative, judicial, and executive. I am not going to take refuge in technicalities, but I contend for what I believe to be a fundamental principle, and that is that while you may call a State thus acting and thus speaking to account, you cannot take jurisdiction over or deal with acts and deeds not done by the authority and by the direction of the State. It must at all times be State action. You cannot deal with acts under the 14th amendment not done by and under the authority and direction of the State. The dereliction of an officer in violation of the laws of the State, in disregard of the sworn duty exacted of him by the State, and subject to punishment by the laws of the State, cannot by any possible construction, either in law or in conscience, be the act of the State. To establish any such principle would be to undermine and break down the integrity of every State in the Union. If a State may not be entrusted exclusively with the authority and relied upon to exercise the authority to punish those who violate its own laws, public or private persons, then there is no such thing as local government, because the State is deprived of the very instrumentality by which it maintains State integrity.

Since this proposition first came before Congress the Senators from the Southern States have borne the brunt of the debate. They have been made to feel the criticism of those who look upon opposition as mere local prejudice. We are all prone to consider the race question as peculiarly a southern problem, and we leave our southern

friends to deal with it without very much sympathy or interest. But assuming that we are going to continue this narrow and selfish course, when we come to read this bill it is found that it goes an arrow's flight beyond any race question. The way it is drawn and its legal terms lift the bill out of the region of the race question into the region of governmental principles.

I do not contend, of course, that the authors of the bill or its supporters are taking advantage of the horror which we all feel toward the crime of lynching to strike a blow at our dual system of government, but that is precisely what is happening; that is precisely what will happen in view of the manner in which the bill is drawn. The constitutional feature of this bill under its terms is just as vital to Idaho as to Alabama; it is of just as much concern to Massachusetts as to Georgia. If the Federal Government can send a U.S. marshal into the State of Tennessee to arrest a sheriff because he failed to protect a colored man from violence, it can, under the same principle, send a U.S. marshal into the State of New York to arrest a sheriff, or other officer on whom the duty is imposed, because he neglected to protect the life of a citizen against the violence of thugs. It is just as much the duty of the State to protect the citizen from violence not under arrest or not assailed by three but by two or one. The Constitution does not classify crimes. It does not say that lynching is subject to the terms of the Constitution and that death by the act of thugs is not.

What does this bill provide? There is not a word in it which indicates that the failure to protect in any instance was due to the fact that the prisoner was a Negro. There is no provision indicating that the States of the South or their officers maintain one rule of conduct for the Negro and another for the whites. There is nothing to the effect that the laws of the States favor the whites and do not favor the Negro. There is no indication or intimation in the bill that the failure of the officer to act was due to the fact that his prisoner was a Negro. This bill is not based in its terms upon discrimination against the Negro, because of unequal treatment of the Negro, but upon the theory the States have broken down in maintaining order and protecting life. That is not a local question but a national question. If the States no longer protect life and property not because of discrimination but because of failure to execute laws regardless of race then we have a great national problem to be met by constitutional amendment. The 14th amendment does not cover any such question.

In all the cases which are cited in the briefs sustaining this measure there will be found a specific provision in the statutes concerning the failure of the officer to act being due to the fact that the party in interest was a Negro. There is no such provision in this bill. This is a general proposition, dealing as much with one race as with the other. Let me read from the bill:

"Sec. 3. Whenever a lynching of any person or persons shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee—"

That would include the Governor and all his subordinates in the executive department—

"to protect such person or persons from lynching and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who shall have had custody of the person or persons lynched and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or per-

sons from lynching, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who, having the duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully neglect, refuse, or fail to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute the members or any member of the lynching mob, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Where is the provision there that deals with the lack of equality between the races or discrimination as to the races? There are no provisions in the bill requiring a showing that the failure of communities to protect a person was due to the fact that he was a Negro. In all the cases cited, there will be found a statute specifically requiring a showing that the officer refused to act or failed to or did not act because of the fact that race was involved and that a Negro was the person involved.

Let us carry this a little further. It is the first duty of a State, is it not, to enact laws to provide officers to protect life, liberty, and property? That is the first duty of every State. Suppose that a man is killed by thugs, we will say, in one of the great cities, without mentioning any particular one—and while the South lost eight Negroes by lynching last year the North lost hundreds because of acts of violence committed by thugs—and suppose that the State failed to take proper action under its laws and by its officers to protect the citizen on the highway or in his home against the acts of thugs; may we not, under the principle of law invoked in this bill, send an officer into that State to take charge of those police officers? What is the distinction in this bill between violence committed by a combination of thugs and violence committed by those who are combined into a mob? We are somewhat at a disadvantage in discussing the bill, because its authors have been entirely silent in presenting those features, and I am having to present it upon the briefs which I have read.

I think it might not be out of place here to call attention to another matter. The proponents of the bill are undoubtedly maintaining that the Federal Government will protect men in the South better than will the local communities. They are undoubtedly basing the entire measure upon the proposition that the Federal Government will execute the law. Well, we have the Federal Government in control of the city of Washington, which now, if not the first, is at least the second, capital city of the world which is most plagued with crime. Seventy-five people here have been robbed of their property in 1 night. How close the police were I do not know. I understand the police escaped being robbed.

We can all recall instance after instance published in the papers of young women disappearing and their bodies being found outraged and the criminals never being intercepted. Why is there any reason to believe that the Federal Government can enforce criminal laws better than can the State governments? The enforcement of law and the punishment of crime depends upon the will and purpose of the community where the crime is committed. Those advocating this bill are on a venture. They are going to take the responsibility away from the people in the South; they are going to say to them, "You are not ~~able~~ or willing to do the work; we are ~~going to~~ do it." Where is the record which shows that they will do it? What is the record?

We have now at the head of the crime department, if I may call it that, in the Department of Justice, perhaps the greatest specialist in the world in the running down of crime and criminals; we have a Federal kidnapping law by reason of the fact that

kidnaping crimes generally pass State lines; but last year, 1937, there were 20 kidnaping cases in the United States, with the State and Federal Governments both working, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover says that there never will come a time when there will not, in all probability, be kidnaping in the United States; that it is impossible to wipe out the crime; that so long as greed and the appetite for money are found in the human system, there will be kidnaping. Mr. Hoover very frankly states that it is impossible to wholly wipe out such crimes. They can be reduced to a minimum and lynching has been reduced to a minimum in the South.

Coming back to our Capital as an example of Federal enforcement, I read from a local paper:

"The criminals of Washington are taking \$30 million a year from the citizens of this city."

They are being deprived of life, liberty, and property, certainly without due process of law as that term is applied here. And the men in charge of the District seem to have thrown up their hands; they do not know how to deal with the situation. Yet, the Federal Government is in control here; the Federal Government is back of them. They are by any means doing as well as are the people of the Southern States in meeting the crime problem.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the race problem. We need not blind our eyes to that fact. And the race problem is a problem which does not readily yield to legislative solution, to the rigid demands of the law. Take, for instance, the colored girl who, under great handicaps, has earned the right to be employed by her Government upon an equality with everyone else. She goes with a certificate of competency from the Civil Service Commission to one of the departments here in Washington—here in Washington, under the aegis of the Federal Government—and when she enters the door and her color is discovered, she is told that the place is filled, which is probably false. That happens not once but many times. She suffers injustice at the hands of her Federal Government. But that is a race question, and no law was ever made tight enough or strong enough to remove all its harshness and to eliminate all its injustices. Only the patient process of education, the uplifting power of religion, the tolerant, noble-minded men and women who give their thoughts to the cause, can remove or mollify such injustices or such harshness. And that is being done; it is being done in the South; that result the South is achieving; the record so shows; and the people of the South are entitled to our commendation and not our condemnation. They are entitled to our cooperation and support.

This Mr. President, is another compromise with a vital principle of our dual system of government. It is bartering the future for the supposed and transient demands of the present, and at a time when the present is taking care of the problem. It is another instance in which our confidence in our scheme of government is not strong enough to say to all races, all creeds, all groups, and all factions: "Your problems, however serious are subordinate to the principles of this Government; and you must work them out within the compass of the long-tested and well-accepted principles of democracy."

Every American must feel a slight sense of guilt, if not a sting of remorse, when he reads the Premier of Italy's reference to the bellowing herds of democracy, to free institutions as the decadent breeding grounds of insincerity and confusion. The fundamental principles and precepts of popular government are not in doubt. There is no confusion there. The confusion arises when we depart from those principles. It was the embodiment of the precepts and principles of popular government in the Constitution

of the United States which put confusion to rout in this country, gave ordered liberty to the people, and strength and direction to government. For centuries prior to the declaration that the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, and the dedication of a new continent to that sublime conception, there had been nothing but confusion, nothing but turmoil and misery, nothing but brute force and enslaved masses. And all that will happen again if the advocates of arbitrary power, now inveighing against free institutions in the presence of their assembled slaves, have their way and the world again comes under their sway. Contrast the conditions of those periods with the period since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, with its establishment of law and order, the spread of contentment and happiness among the masses, with its unprecedented progress in the arts and the sciences, and you not only have your answer to those whose sole right to rule rests upon the law of force, but you have the most powerful appeal that can be made by mortal man to those who would compromise or weaken the safeguards of popular power.

I am perfectly aware, as we all are, of the tide which seems to be running against popular government everywhere, of the base betrayal of the people in many countries where they once had at least some authority and hoped for more, of that profound egotism which regards as of no significance the bitter experience of men and women in their long quest for liberty. But against all these things, if we have the confidence in our form of government which we profess, we can place, not theory, not hopes, not ideals merely, but 150 years of achievement, of demonstrated popular rule, with its wealth of human happiness and human progress. How puny and hollow and fleeting in comparison are the achievements of usurped power, every hour of whose existence depends upon the continued suppression of human liberty.

And, Mr. President, in conclusion, the progress, the development, and the advancement of the South, including the last 70 arduous years, her history from Washington and Jefferson down, rich with the names of leaders, orators, and statesmen; her soil, her sunshine, her brave and hospitable people, her patient and successful wrestling with the most difficult of all problems, are all a part of the achievements of our common country and constitute no ignoble portion of the strength and glory of the American democracy. I will cast no vote in this Chamber which reflects upon her fidelity to our institutions or upon her ability and purpose to maintain the principles upon which they rest.

She Loved Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a tragic accident occurred this week in Berlin, Conn., in my district. It took place at a grade crossing of railroad tracks shortly after 8:30 a.m. Killed were Mrs. Emily Whitaker, of Berlin, and seven schoolchildren—six of them her state wards. She was driving the children to meet a school bus when she came to the crossing. She waited

for a freight train to pass, then started across and was hit by a fast passenger train headed from Hartford to New York City.

Mrs. Whitaker had done a wonderful job in her lifetime of caring for children who might otherwise have been homeless. In 14 years, she and her husband had cared for 18 foster children. In 1957, the Catholic Transcript praised the work she and her husband were doing.

Another article appeared this week in the Transcript; I think the story itself is a remarkable lesson for this world, and I include it in my remarks so that all of us may take its message to heart:

SHE LOVED CHILDREN AS OWN

(By Joseph A. Owens)

A woman who clearly saw her purpose in life—to care for unfortunate children—died Tuesday morning with seven children brought into the world by other women. All these children knew 57-year-old Mrs. Emily Whitaker as mother.

The grim facts of one of the Nation's most tragic train-automobile crashes were rapidly broadcast across the country. Newspapers used their boldest type; newscasters, dramatic tones. Seven schoolchildren and a foster mother had died at an unmarked railroad crossing in the central Connecticut town of Berlin, while the woman's husband, John Whitaker, watched in anguish a few hundred feet away.

Had the accident not snuffed out the lives of this woman and her loved ones, Mr. and Mrs. John Whitaker would today be living the simple, model life that they had known together for years.

In December of 1957 I visited Mr. and Mrs. Whitaker in their small farmhouse home on Norton Lane. They reluctantly consented to the interview. They didn't want publicity.

However, they put their personal feelings aside. If by reporting what they were doing might interest other Negro couples in becoming foster parents, the Whitakers were willing. As they talked, it was strikingly obvious that these were unusual people; a man and woman with tremendous capacities for love, a couple with inborn qualities of sacrifice.

The surroundings were humble and spotless. Three preschool children living with the Whitakers at the time were home. Four others were at schools. The toddlers enhanced the atmosphere.

The story wrote itself. These kind always do. Here are a few of the highlights from the page one article which appeared in the Catholic Transcript of December 5, 1957:

"A child doesn't ask to be born, but he does need care."

"This simple statement opens the door on the happiness shared by Mr. and Mrs. John Whitaker, of Berlin. They love children—especially the unfortunate and homeless."

"The Whitakers are rich in only one respect—love. Both are converts who recognize the responsibilities of their faith as well as the fruits."

"Caring for children brought into the world by an unwed mother or parents now living apart makes the life of the industrious Whitakers full. In some 14 years as foster parents they have had 16 children under their protection at various times. Fatherly and motherly love has never been rationed."

"When they come here they are my children, the same as my own flesh and blood," stated Mrs. Whitaker, leaving little doubt about anyone's status.

"To Mrs. Whitaker, a choir member at St. Mary's, New Britain, there is nothing unusual about this outlook. 'Our Jesus loves all of us. Why shouldn't we share our love

with each other? I'm only a small spot down here on earth. Maybe the only reason I am here is to take care of unlucky children."

"Shortly after the first children were placed with the Whitakers the wage earner was out of work for several weeks because of a strike. Supporting the entire group emptied a small bank account which was intended as a downpayment on a home. The money was never replaced, but there are no complaints—the Whitakers, remember, are endowed with true love of neighbor."

"Many times friends pointed out to Mrs. Whitaker that the weekly board money does not result in a profit for her. Without hesitation she retorts:

"If you think about life in terms of what you are going to get for yourself, you won't get anything."

A flat tire prevented Mrs. Whitaker from taking her children to Mass last Tuesday morning. Six of the children will be with Mrs. Whitaker in St. Paul's Church Friday morning at 9 a.m. as a Solemn Requiem Mass is celebrated.

Mr. Whitaker will be there, too. A man left with nothing but memories.

The Dignity of the Postal Vocation Must Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to enter in the Appendix of this Record a statement made by Mr. Andrew T. Walker, president of Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, entitled "The Dignity of the Postal Vocation Must Be Maintained."

Mr. Walker is a gentleman who has dedicated more than 60 years of his life in fighting for the rank and file in the postal service.

The statement follows:

THE DIGNITY OF THE POSTAL VOCATION MUST BE MAINTAINED

(By Andrew T. Walker)

The largest employer in the Nation and perhaps in the world with a working complement of 2 million men and women spread out in a vast network reaching far beyond our shores and into the innards of Europe as well must of necessity set an equitable working pattern for its employees.

It is significant too that from this vast group has come more than its share of manpower and women, too, for our Armed Forces in time of peace and war. And that nowhere will there be found a more dedicated public service minded group of employees. Certainly it is not the underscaled civil service salary which keeps these men and women on the job, but I do know it is a form of fierce loyalty and stick-to-it-ness so often encountered in civil service but found lacking in private industry.

Our ranks of civil service people form an integral part of community life in every hamlet, town, and city of the Nation. They have families, pay their taxes, take part in community life and in general contribute in a multitude of ways to the betterment of the country and its citizenry. One characteristic of postal and Federal people is that they intensely hate Communists and all they stand for.

As a whole every governmental agency has shown over the years a marked awareness of the human rights, working morale and welfare of its dedicated employees. The postal service as well in the past has demonstrated a similar understanding, that is up to a few years ago. I can readily speak with faculty since I myself have served 50 years in a service I have grown to love. All the more reason for feeling so distressed over the actions of those in command of the Post Office Department in recent years. As a representative of members of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen I am mindful of the many unnecessary changes made in the Postal Manual aimed at the curtailment of the employees and the tightening up of requirements. As an example are the insertions regarding the raising of the scheme passing mark from 95 percent right, out of a hundred to 97 percent right out of a hundred cards in a scheme examination; limiting the use of rest bars in certain mail operations. The restbars are a sort of half chair and half standing bar to rest the back of mail distributors.

Another instance when the private check-cashing services in many cities had a holiday collecting from 80 cents to a dollar for cashing the checks of postal employees when Lincoln's Birthday fell on a Friday. Since all of the banks were closed in many parts of the country on Friday, February 12, payday, postal employees had no place to cash their checks other than these check-cashing places. Several days before the 12th National President Joseph F. Thomas had asked the Department to relax the rules and advance the issuance of checks on Thursday, February 11, 1960, but to no avail. Result many had to wait till Monday, February 15, to cash checks or pay the check fee on the 12th. The employees would have been grateful for this small concession to advance the check day. It was a deserving request.

It might well be that the Department is so absorbed in its giant steps to modernize the service for the tremendous loads of mail yet to come with the expansion of business, but certainly these small human considerations are the items that go far in building up that valuable asset—esprit de corps—and top morale without which any business cannot properly function. Clerks who have been for years sincerely and conscientiously doing a good job are now confronted with a new chore of keeping cards on their person and keeping a daily check, hour by hour, of what and how much they are doing. These figures are finally condensed, at a central point in a large room full of clerks rattling away at machines or bending over charts, to a 28-day average for every distributor in the service where the guide system is being used.

It is true that we have been promised the distribution guide system is not intended to be a punitive program, but one cannot help but wonder what the daily work check and the 28-day average is meant to be used for after the next few months. Certainly, any organization or place of business is entitled to know through the time cost analysis pattern whether or not they are making or losing money. That is good business sense, but no such business would continue such a survey on an unlimited time basis. It would be far too costly and against good sound business procedure. The piles of records would keep mounting and mounting and in time would not be worth the space it takes up for storage.

Letter carriers are treated to a mail check from time to time, custodians are time and work checked, and certainly postal clerks would have no objection whatsoever if the Department wanted to check their production at stated intervals to evaluate production. That is management's right, but to continue such an individual survey day by

day for an unlimited period would create the atmosphere of resentment and dissatisfaction among employees. Such a check hour by hour, tray full of mail by tray full of mail, would instill fear in the minds of distributors. Fear that the worker on the right or left is doing more than normally possible through apprehension. For those in the elderly group having 30 or more years of service, a fear that the younger man would soon put him far behind, and so it goes—female worker against the male, young against the old, handicapped trying to keep up with the able. A sense of insecurity on the part of the older worker and its dreadful effect on morale.

It is apparent that private industry would not for an instant tolerate such a measuring standard or evaluation on a continuing basis. The net result would be a resentment strike in outside industry but those of us in Government cannot avail ourselves of this weapon and must therefore look to the Congress for remedial relief if a compromise cannot be reached with the administrative heads of an agency.

There is a common meeting ground on this all-important issue. Let management in the postal service sit down with representatives of organizations to work out a solution. As I said before, if a check is necessary let it be on a spot check basis. Invoke it at certain stated intervals. In any event national postal leaders want to share in the progress of mail improvement, but it must be in a spirit of harmony and give and take. The National Unapoc Staff in a true democratic fashion wants to work things out with postal officials. Let us hope that that time comes soon.

Family Farm Income Bill Contains Principles of Good, Workable Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, testified February 29 before the House Agriculture Committee, he reviewed the basic elements of the farm income problem and noted how the proposed Family Farm Income Act of 1960 would meet the various parts of that problem. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of Mr. Patton's testimony in the Record:

STATEMENT OF JAMES G. PATTON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION, ON GENERAL FARM-INCOME-IMPROVEMENT LEGISLATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, we have noted with commendation the large numbers of excellent farm-income-improvement proposals introduced the past 14 months by members of the House of Representatives. Moreover, we have been gratified and encouraged by the recent introduction of the proposed Family Farm Income Act of 1960 by such a large group of eminent and distinguished Members from various farm regions and from cities. My personal thanks to all who did so.

This Family Farm Income Act of 1960 incorporates many of the basic principles that

I feel to be essential for a good and workable farm-income law to handle the situation of commercial family farmers with units large enough to engage in efficient operations.

The current and prospective farm situation, and the causes for it, are quite familiar to the members of this committee. You know as well as I that farm income has dropped seriously over a period of years when farm costs and the incomes of almost all other groups in society have been going up.

You are aware, and many of you have pointed out the facts in dramatic ways, that prices received by farmers have fallen, while prices paid by consumers in the grocery store have gone up.

You are also fully aware that Federal Treasury costs of the farm program have soared as farm income dropped and Government ownership of farm commodities increased severalfold. This is perhaps the first time in history that all of these things have happened at once.

I have read many of the statements made by authors of the Family Farm Income Act. They have made a strong and persuasive case for the preservation and improvement of the family farm and its place in the American way of life. I cannot improve on what they have already said, nor could I improve the policy statement in section 1 of the bill.

We must immediately take heroic measures to strengthen the bargaining position of the family farm or we shall lose it. If we don't reverse this movement toward the so-called free market, we shall see a rapid revolution toward an industrially integrated agriculture within which the values of the traditional family farm will be lost to the Nation. As I see it, the basis of the farm income problem is farmers' almost complete lack of bargaining power in an otherwise administered-price economy.

Lacking market strength based on bargaining power, farmers sell for less and less as they continue to place more supply on the market than will balance demand at a fair price. When farm prices fall, farm income falls with them.

The implications of the free market to farm prices and income are abundantly clear by the scientific study conducted by economists and statisticians of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and presented in Senate Document No. 77. I commend it to your reading, if you have not already done so. Their conclusion is that the free market for farmers would mean less than half the family income from farming they had in 1958.

Various of the bills pending before your Committee, including the proposed Family Farm Income Act of 1960, meet the major element of the farm income problem face on. They propose a workable and effective series of measures to solve the commercial farm income problem by authorizing and enabling farmers to strengthen their market bargaining power.

Our goal is to establish, legislatively, the ways and means by which the net family income of farmers from farming can be maximized, within the general national welfare and specific consumer safeguards as a long-term proposition. Our fundamental aim is not just a fixed price or volume of marketings. Rather, what farmers need is a rational and workable way to manage the abundance they produce so as to get a parity of income for the hours they and their family members work and on the capital investments they have made.

For some commodities, the marketing order approach has worked satisfactorily for both the general public and the producers involved. The right of farmers to make use of this proven procedure on a nationwide basis should be extended to other commodities in addition to those now specified in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937.

The producers of some commodities may not care to avail themselves of the opportunity to set up nationwide marketing orders. In the case of many commodities, some other approaches to reach similar results by using somewhat different techniques may be more effective than marketing orders.

For those commodities whose producers do not choose to use nationwide marketing orders, I suggest general enabling legislation that will permit and require the Secretary of Agriculture, working with producer committees elected by producers, to develop needed bargaining power through income and supply stabilization programs, for each commodity. Closely related commodities, such as feed grains, should be combined in joint programs. Appropriate safeguards for consumers and the taxpayers should be spelled out in the enabling legislation, with the details of administration left to the Secretary and the farmer committee.

I note with gratification that many of the bills provide for an expanded foods utilization program. This has our full support. I would have preferred that the purposes of this program would already have been initiated under the national food allotment stamp plan drafted by your committee and enacted into law in 1959. Unfortunately, however, the legislation adopted last year is not being carried out.

If specific mandatory authorization is required to activate the operations covered in the discretionary stamp plan program, with local purchases and reimbursements provided for, by all means it should be enacted. The agricultural conservation practices program should be expanded.

This move will be welcomed by farmers and people in rural America generally. As you know, the soil bank has not been generally popular in areas where it was used to the greatest extent.

We must put the emphasis back on conservation and land use adjustment within the fence lines of operating farms. Doing so will avoid the defects that have shown up in operation of the soil bank.

I think farmers generally will welcome the opportunity to make a voluntary contribution of a specified part of their tillable acres to help solve the farm supply imbalance that now exists. Such a program should be voluntary, rather than mandatory; but it is only right that only those who make this contribution of tillable acres in behalf of conservation and adjustment should be eligible for the benefits of the income improvement program. Crops covered by nationwide marketing orders or other special programs should be excluded from the tillable acreage definition.

Any farmer who is willing to contribute additional acres to augment conservation and agricultural adjustment should be encouraged to do so up to not more than 2 or 3 out of each 10 of his tillable acres and receive an augmented ACP cover-crop payment thereon. On both producer-contributed and Government-rented acres, the producer should receive regular ACP cost-sharing payments.

If special provision is made for payments in kind, such provisions should make it optional with the producer whether he is paid in cash or in kind. I see no purpose in a broad application of payments in kind especially for cotton. However, if they increase a farmers' net income, they should be used.

Not long ago, I spent some time in the Philippine Islands. I was greatly impressed by an adverse condition that would worry me greatly if we should allow it to redevelop in this country.

In the absence of an effective supply management program operated by neither the Government nor by producers' cooperatives,

the price of rice fluctuated greatly within each marketing season. A few days before the harvest began, the price of rice would be several times as high as it would be several days after harvest started. Then as the season wore on, the price of rice would rise a great deal more rapidly than justified by the cost of storage, until it reached the extremely high point just before the next harvest.

The consequence of this kind of thing is that the price is abnormally low when the farmer has something to sell and does not rise to a fair level until after the middlemen have taken over the harvest from the farmer. This contributes to low-farm income and high profits of speculators.

To meet this need, provision must be made for some kind of loan or other stabilization device to prevent large seasonal fluctuations in commodity prices. Specifically, I am concerned that some provision be made to assure that farmers may be able to obtain full value for their commodities when they sell them by having some means to hold them off the market until the fair price is approximated in the marketplace.

Such a device is essential whether farmers' returns are protected by compensatory payments or not.

We are also concerned that necessary provisions be made to enable the establishment of adequate and workable programs for those commodities which must be sold domestically and in export in competition with industrially produced synthetic substitutes. The major one of these that I have in mind is cotton. With presumably quite elastic long-term demand in relation to price, cotton needs the kind of program proposed in the bill introduced several years ago by Congressman POAGE. The provisions of the legislation must be sufficiently broad and permissive to allow the establishment of the kind of program we must have for cotton. Similar provisions will be needed in application to other major export crops such as wheat, soybeans, and rice and possibly for other import commodities in addition to wool and sugar.

As a matter of fact, in my way of thinking we should make separate provisions apart from the farm program, for three major types of programs the costs of which have been chalked up to farm price and income stabilization. I refer to:

1. The establishment and maintenance of the needed national supply reserve or security stockpile of food, fiber and biological oils. This should be in the province of the Director of Civilian and Defense Mobilization and the National Security Council. The costs of such storage programs should be charged to disaster relief and national defense.

2. Domestic welfare-type food utilization programs such as the food stamp program, food distribution and the school lunch and childrens' milk programs. These should probably be in the province of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and it should be his responsibility to prepare and justify the budgets used for these purposes.

3. The entire operation of farm commodity exports, export subsidies, Public Law 480 aids and donations, international commodity agreement, and food for peace, generally. These should probably be in the province of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State should have final responsibility for determining these needs and should prepare and defend the budgets required for such purposes.

These officials should be charged with determining quantities of each farm commodity required for needs under their jurisdictions and remit it to Congress for appropriation to pay for such purchases and utilization.

The Real Castro—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the sixth installment in the series currently being published in the New York Daily News on the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro. The following article is from the issue of March 11, 1960:

DID FATE OR FIDEL DO IN MAJOR?

(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

The disappearance of Maj. Camillo Cienfuegos, former head of Castro's revolutionary army, has been swathed in mystery and speculation ever since the small plane in which the popular Cuban hero was flying from Camaguey to Havana vanished 5 months ago.

Did his plane crash or was he liquidated? During its probe of the Castro regime, the News team talked to Matias Farias, the officer who was in charge of the official investigation of the incident. He charges that Cienfuegos was shot down. His testimony is corroborated by Maj. Pedro Diaz-Lanz, ex-head of the Cuban Air Force.

When Castro took over, Farias was training in Texas as a Cuban Air Force cadet. On February 26, 1959, he went back to Cuba and was assigned as a first lieutenant to a B-26 squadron in Camaguey.

Promotions were coming fast in the Castro regime and young Farias became chief of the small airbase at Camaguey. Last August 8, after Castro forces put down a budding revolt in the city of Trinidad, Farias and three other pilots—Jorge Requeny, Adolfo Leon, and Luis Munoz—fell under suspicion as enemies of the government. They were sent to Columbia military prison.

Matias now admits he was a member of a conspiracy and knew others involved in a plot to overthrow Castro.

"One of the men," he said, "was sentenced to 30 years and the rest of us were fired from the air force. However, there was a peculiar turn of events. At 3 a.m. on October 30, shortly after Cienfuegos had disappeared, I was summoned to headquarters at Columbia. There was a shortage of pilots and they needed men to help look for him.

"I reminded them I was fired as a pilot and they said to forget that. Either fly or go to jail. Then they told me to go to Camaguey and try to find out what had happened. A couple of guards went with me to make sure I got there."

Never was an investigation launched under such odd circumstances—with the officers in charge under guard.

"We were supposed to look for the missing plane," Farias said, "but it was dark and that was impossible."

At Camaguey, Farias went directly to the control tower. The tape that records all arrivals and departures showed that Cienfuegos and his pilot, Luciano Farinas, known as a poor navigator, had taken off in a Cessna 310 on runway 7 at 6:01 p.m.

CLAIMS HE WAS JUST PRACTICING

"The tape also showed that a much faster plane—a British-made Sea Fury fighter—had taken off at 6:11. The pilot was Blas Dominguez, who had been Raul Castro's personal pilot," Farias said.

As the investigation continued, an odd point developed.

"Usually, there is masking tape covering the mouth of the 20-millimeter cannon on a Sea Fury. It is removed only when the cannon are to be used. When Dominguez's plane returned to Camaguey after the 45-minute flight, there was no masking tape. Furthermore, the cannon showed evidence of being fired. Blas claimed he had been practicing.

"Capt. Roberto de Cardenas was in charge of the base. He didn't believe Blas' story and had him placed under arrest on suspicion of having shot Cienfuegos' plane down.

"Fidel arrived the day after the incident and ordered that no one be allowed to talk to Dominguez. He also talked to the man who had been in charge of the control tower at the time the Cessna and the Sea Fury had taken off.

"Less than 24 hours later, the man shot himself. The newspapers said he committed suicide because he was ill. This I do not believe.

ARGUED AGAINST THE EXECUTION

"Blas was released from jail and promoted to first lieutenant. Capt. de Cardenas was thrown into prison for exceeding his authority. He was kept there for a month."

There are stories to support Farias' contention. The week before Cienfuegos' disappearance he and Raul Castro had had an argument, during which blows were exchanged.

Cienfuegos was an easygoing man who enjoyed women, good food, and the company of convivial friends. He had been a bus boy in San Francisco, a dishwasher in New York, and he was a live-and-let-live kind of a man who frequently argued against the executions ordered by Castro as "unnecessary."

Consequently, he was admired by many Cubans—and the popularity of others never made Fidel happy. A few weeks after Cienfuegos' disappearance and a widespread hunt for him—in which Castro even asked the help of U.S. authorities—Osmani Cienfuegos, a brother, was appointed minister of public works. It was clearly an attempt to soothe suspicious Cubans.

Farias spent 3 days in Camaguey. Then he flew home to Havana. En route, the left engine of his B-26 conked out. The plane struck a TV antenna on the roof of a building near the Havana Airport and just about made the airstrip.

"I was met by Raul Castro," he said with a grin, "and he told me to keep my mouth shut about why I had been fired. But I was in a flight suit and photographers were taking pictures. The fact that I had brought my plane in on one engine made me a hero. Raul was on a spot.

"The next day I was made a captain—me, who had been kicked out of the Air Force a week or so earlier. They couldn't do much else, I guess.

"But I felt my friends would misunderstand my promotion. I couldn't let them think I had sold out. As a captain, I was assigned to a crop-dusting plane. They would fill the gas tanks only part way so I couldn't fly out of Cuba.

On December 11, I said the hell with it and I took off for Key West. There were no instruments in the plane. Not enough gas, but I had to make the try.

"I had less than 5 minutes fuel left when I spotted a ship that later turned out to be a Norwegian ship, the *Fromhill*. I made a belly landing in the water and finally got aboard. I found out then that I was off course and would have missed Key West even if I had enough gas.

"I said to the captain, 'If you're going to Cuba, for God's sake give me a boat.' I was willing to row to the United States. Fortunately, he was going to Florida."

There's a sequel.

Major Naranjo, a close friend of Cienfuegos, had been asking questions, conducting his

own investigation. A few days after Cienfuegos' disappearance, he showed up at Camp Columbia with two other officers and demanded to see Raul Castro.

HE REFUSED TO BE A CASTRO STOOGES

Naranjo and his two friends were promptly machinegunned to death by a guard. The official version was that Naranjo reached for his gun—but when authorities got to the scene, it was found he had only his identification card in his hand.

Maj. Pedro Diaz-Lanz, who quit as head of the Cuban Air Force rather than deal with Communists, corroborated Farias' story in every detail but one—he said he believed the masking tape on the 20-mm. cannon of the Sea Fury fighter was shot away, not removed in advance.

Diaz-Lanz is another of the many patriotic Cubans who are neither pro-Batista nor pro-Castro. There is a misconception that men who criticize the Castro regime are disgruntled Batista exiles.

Only one confirmed Batista follower—Roldando Masferrer—was interviewed by the News team. The rest are dedicated to freedom for Cuba and to their own high principles.

Diaz-Lanz is typical of the Cuban who gives up his career, his home, and his friends for an ideal. He could have stayed on as the respected chief of Castro's air force if he had just kept his mouth shut and followed orders. This he refused to do.

He testified before a House committee in Washington last July 14 with regard to the Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean.

Diaz-Lanz, 33, flew into the Sierra Maestra Mountains some 18 times with arms for Castro.

"Before I ever heard of Castro, I was bringing in arms for Carlos Prio Socorras," he said.

"I've been anti-Communist all my life. My father was anti-Communist. He was formerly Minister of the Interior. When I saw Prio living lavishly while his men were having a tough time, I became disillusioned. I took sides with Castro—only to be disillusioned again later on.

THEN FIDEL LAUNCHED INTO A LONG SPEECH

"I remember the first trip I made to the Sierra. I flew in machineguns, M-1 rifles, Browning automatic rifles and ammunition. It was the 31st of March 1958, and I had to land a C-46 in a cow pasture. It was damaged and I had to burn it after it was unloaded.

"The men were crying out of gratitude. They were without weapons and ammunition until I arrived. Fidel congratulated me. He said, happily, that now he could do something. He launched into a speech, talking about restitution of the constitution and free elections. He said the barbarities would cease. He didn't want to be part of the government, he told us—he was too young to run the country. He was convincing, as usual.

"I found out many things about Fidel during those days. He had been raised in a Jesuit school, but he didn't believe in God. He was a great admirer of Che Guevara and even I knew that Che was a professional Communist.

"When we arrived in Havana after the revolution, women pinned religious medals on Fidel and El Che asked him what they were. Fidel told him not to scoff, that 90 percent of Cubans are Catholic and that 'this sort of thing can mean a lot to us.'

"For the first time, I became aware that this was not the kind of a man I wanted to follow. I had been duped—just as the Cuban people are being duped now but do not yet realize it.

"Raul and El Che are more bloodthirsty than Fidel. Originally, they wanted to purge

more than 40,000 Cubans. Fidel objected, saying this would not sit well with the Cuban people.

"One day, they sent a man to my headquarters. He said his job was to help indoctrinate the air force. I objected, but he had been sent by Raul and he stayed. It now became known that I was against the regime.

DAYS ARE NUMBERED AND HE KNOWS IT

"One day Fidel told me, 'Pedro, I'm going to give you a supervisor. I think you're getting too noble for your own good.' I began to argue, but he cut me short with, 'I don't want to hear another thing about it, or you'll face charges of insubordination.'"

It was 2 days later that Diaz-Lanz developed typhoid and was confined to his bed for a month. When he recovered, he tried to forestall possible court-martial on trumped-up charges but knew that his days were numbered.

There was one last heated session with Castro. Diaz-Lanz told him: "You are not the owner of this country. We fought to be able to say and do things when we want to. I'm against communism and you don't seem to like that."

"He became very angry and said he would take action against me. I knew that my hot temper had forced me too far. Two days later, I skipped the country."

Diaz-Lanz and his wife, Tania, now live in Miami. He is still active in the fight against Castro and many pilots who have defected are in constant touch with him in the event "we have a chance to strike a blow" against Castro.

Cyrus Eaton Asks President Eisenhower for Immediate Ending of Nuclear Tests as Essential First Step in Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Cyrus Eaton, in a well reasoned letter to the New York Times on Friday, March 4, 1960, has called on President Eisenhower to conclude an agreement for the immediate ending of nuclear tests as the essential first step in disarmament. Mr. Eaton terms the President "the one man who can make the fateful decision."

Mr. Eaton's most recent public expression of his views on this vital subject has been featured by the New York Times on Friday, March 4, 1960, as the leading letter to the editor, as follows:

TEST BAN PACT URGED—HAZARD TO MANKIND SEEN IF AN AGREEMENT IS NOT REACHED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

At the time of the first Pugwash Conference of nuclear scientists the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom were the sole possessors of the dread secret of the bomb.

Over a 4-year period, five Pugwash scientific conferences have brought together 112 eminent specialists from 23 major nations, East and West, all of the unanimous opinion that weapons of mass annihilation must be universally banned, and that delay can only lead to the eventual possession of the worst forms of weaponry by every country of consequence around the globe.

With the recent French explosion in the Sahara, membership in the nuclear club has increased to four. Unless international agreement is reached soon to prohibit tests and ban nuclear weapons, each of the other 19 nations on the Pugwash list, along with others, will in all likelihood be equipping itself with nuclear weapons. All of these countries now have the requisite scientific manpower and industrial capacity in the key fields of electric power, steel, chemicals, engineering, and large-scale construction.

PRESSURE EXERTED

Grave considerations dictate the urgency for the early conclusion of a clear-cut test ban agreement at Geneva, where negotiations have been dragging along for 15 months. There can be no hope whatever of agreement at Geneva as long as pressure for further testing, however limited, continues to be successfully exerted on the White House and the Congress by the United States Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the small handful of official scientific advisers with a vested interest in urging the United States to run the risk of more tests.

America's closest Western allies have restrained themselves from open criticism of the U.S. position with the greatest forbearance, but now seem determined to convince world opinion that they, for their part, favor a different course. The Canadian Government has just announced a straightforward new foreign policy calling for the end of all nuclear testing and the complete prohibition of nuclear, biological and chemical warfare. At the same time Great Britain is giving every evidence of intending to follow the Canadian example promptly.

The rivalries that now seem to loom large between the United States and the U.S.S.R. will be overshadowed by the terrible hazards that will confront mankind if 23 or more nations become manufacturers of their own nuclear arms. The eyes of the world are focused on the President of the United States, the one man who can make the fateful decision. Let us hope that his concern for humanity and respect for world sentiment, coupled with his profound knowledge of weaponry and broad experience in warfare, will tip the scales toward the immediate end of nuclear testing as the first step in disarmament.

CYRUS S. EATON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, February 29, 1960.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on postal rate raise.

Senate continued on civil rights, acting on two amendments.

House debated civil rights.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4839-4862

Bills Introduced: 15 bills were introduced, as follows:
S. 3177-3191. Page 4841

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3005, relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules (S. Rept. 1159);

S. 2669, to extend the period of exemption from inspection for certain vessels operating in inland waters of southeastern Alaska (S. Rept. 1160); and

H.R. 10743, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1960, with amendments (S. Rept. 1161).

Page 4841

President's Message—Postal Rates: Message was received from the President pointing out that postal deficits are increasing each year, urging that the Post Office Department should be made self-supporting, and advising that the Postmaster General is transmitting to Congress proposals for increases in postal rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail to yield an estimated \$550 million of new postal revenues in fiscal year 1961—referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Page 4853

Corrupt Practices: S. Res. 285, to authorize investigation of certain election charges, coming over from a previous day under the rule, was laid down and considered, but at conclusion of morning business at 1 p.m. the resolution went to the calendar under the rule.

Pages 4862-4863

Public Land for School Purposes—Civil Rights: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 8315, directing the Secretary of the Army to lease certain property in Missouri for school purposes, after adopting the following amendment and motion:

By 65 yeas to 19 nays, Lausche amendment to section 1 (regarding obstruction of certain court orders) of

Dirksen substitute bill, as amended, so as to make the language applicable to obstruction of any court orders rather than solely those having to do with question of school segregation; and by 49 yeas to 35 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Morse motion to table section 1 of Dirksen substitute bill, as amended (in effect rejecting this branch of the substitute). Pages 4864-4895

Record Votes and Quorum Calls: During Senate proceedings today two record votes and four quorum calls were taken, which appear on pages 4861, 4882-4883, 4879, and 4889.

Nominations: One nomination in the Foreign Service was received, and one Foreign Service nomination was withdrawn. Page 4895

Program for Monday: Senate met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 6:02 p.m. until noon Monday, March 14, when its unfinished business will be H.R. 8315, to lease certain property in Missouri for school purposes. Page 4895

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CCC GRAIN STORAGE OPERATIONS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Special Agriculture Investigating Subcommittee resumed its hearings on grain storage operations by the Commodity Credit Corporation, having as its witnesses Earl C. Corey, former Director of the Portland, Oreg., Office of the Commodity Stabilization Service; and W. George Goold, Assistant Director of Personnel, Department of Agriculture.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

APPROPRIATIONS—MUTUAL SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Committee held executive hearings with regard to proposed fiscal 1961 budget

Appendix

West Virginia Admirably Situated for Marketing and Has Readily Adaptable Labor Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, the editor of which invited me to prepare an article evaluating West Virginia's location, its raw materials, and its labor force, published my observations on March 11, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA ADMIRABLY SITUATED FOR MARKETING AND HAS READILY ADAPTABLE LABOR FORCE

(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U. S. Senator from West Virginia)

Fundamental problems of unemployment in West Virginia are not due solely to mechanization by the coal industry and primary manufacturing. This fact was emphasized in prior articles of this series in which it was suggested that much of our difficulty is attributable to the lag in the development of secondary manufacturing, as well as slow growth of service industries, including construction and trade. When referring to secondary manufacturing the connotation is satellites of our primary coal, chemicals, timbering, and metals industries.

This is a problem not necessarily unique to West Virginia—except in the matter of degree. The conditions we face today—very acutely in some parts of the State—will be confronted by many areas of the country within the next decade.

By 1970, the United States must provide 13.5 million new jobs to accommodate the growing population, and this will necessitate a rate of increase in our labor force 50 percent greater than that of the 1950's. West Virginia must accomplish its proportionate share of fulfilling the mission which this problem will pose.

The bulk of the requisite new jobs probably will have to be provided by economic activities other than manufacturing, transportation, public utilities, mining, and agriculture—industries which now comprise approximately 43 percent of our national employment and which provide approximately 61 percent of West Virginia's total jobs. The implication seems clear that we must look beyond this group of job-producing industries if we are to achieve sustained improvement of the total economy.

A consulting economist with whom West Virginia's situation was discussed last year referred, during the course of the conversation, to the mining psychology of much of the business and financial community of our State. His thesis was that many West Vir-

ginians, having earlier become accustomed to the quick and high returns on capital investment in coal, oil, and gas are reluctant to invest in other businesses which take longer to develop and offer lower returns. Thus, he suggested, much of West Virginia's savings, instead of going into new enterprises, go out of the State into government bonds and other investments. Meanwhile, the economist suggested, too much of the development of West Virginia's business and industry is left to outside capital.

How much of this is speculative and how much is factual, I am not prepared to say—although I do believe that, if it is true, it is more an attitude of the past than of the present or the future. One of the most recent indications that the future may see more West Virginia savings invested in our State is noted in the chartering of the West Virginia First Small Business Investment Corporation under the Federal Small Business Investment Act. With a capitalization of \$160,000, this firm, with principal offices in Huntington, will be able to lend up to \$500,000 to business firms in West Virginia, consistent with provisions of the act.

One field which might be fruitfully explored for the development of more locally owned businesses is the lumber industry, with its yield of approximately half-a-billion board feet per year. In spite of such a large cut, our State conservation officials declare that the annual new growth is almost double the amount cut, exceeding the loss by more than 494 million board feet. Yet, 80 percent of our commercial timber is shipped to out-of-State users.

West Virginia, situated in the center of the great eastern marketing area, has an abundant supply of raw materials, as well as a labor force readily adaptable to its use in fabricating. This latter point was made dramatically clear to me by a letter I received about 4 months ago from the manager of one of the newer industries of the State.

Several years ago, I participated with other citizens in the creation of the Elkins Industrial Development Corp. In our activities of seeking new industries for the community, we were successful in bringing to Randolph County the Metalab Labcraft Division of the Norbute Corp., manufacturers and engineers specializing in scientific and laboratory equipment.

Last November I received a letter from the plant manager, John P. Russo, which clearly expressed his belief in the advantages West Virginia offers for industry and business. Russo states: "As you probably may remember, Metalab Labcraft settled in Elkins just 2 years ago this month. At that time we had a backlog of orders which amounted to several million dollars. We had no trained source of labor and were in reality engaged in fulfilling these contracts with no qualified personnel. The most remarkable fact concerning this situation was that we employed immediately approximately 75 persons with no past experience or skills in our industry, (who), within the period of 6 months, produced all of the items required for our backlog of work at that time.

"At the present we are employing approximately 250 local people. We have just recently completed an expansion to our facilities, giving us approximately 50,000 additional square feet of working space. Our an-

nual payroll at the present time is approximately \$750,000 and the anticipated payroll in perhaps another year will probably reach \$900,000 annually.

"As a personal observation, let me state the following: I have been involved in our industry for the past 24 years. During that time I have been located in approximately eight different parts of the country and exposed to the qualifications, capabilities, and aptitudes of the labor pool in those areas. I also estimate that during this period of time that the number of people who have been under my direction, either directly or indirectly, approximately 5,000 persons. I say without equivocation that I have never before seen a group of people who have combined their zeal, attitude, cooperation, and native capabilities to achieve the measure of performance that we have here."

The experience of Mr. Russo is not unique. It has been duplicated by many others who have had experience with the industriousness and adaptability of the men and women of West Virginia.

On May 30, 1955, I had the privilege of introducing Henry J. Kaiser when he addressed Ravenswood's celebrated annual "\$5 banquet" and told why the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co. selected its site near that West Virginia community for its huge aluminum mill. Mr. Kaiser said—and I quote from his text: "We like the location. We like the transportation facilities. We like the wealth of natural resources. We like the geographical relationship which Ravenswood holds to our vital eastern markets. Most of all, we like the people here . . . the spirit of cooperation and a substantial evidence that we would be welcome."

Walter T. Phair, assistant to the vice president of Kaiser Industries, who verified the quotations, further advised me in a February 18, 1960, letter:

"I would like to underscore Mr. Kaiser's remarks by stating that from the time of the ground-breaking ceremonies, the area people who make up at least 98 percent of our work force have contributed immensely to the success of the reduction-fabricating operations. From the start we have found the workers to be quickly adaptable to aluminum operations, energetic, enthusiastic, productive, and loyal."

Also last month, in correspondence with F. J. French, president of the General Chemical Division of Allied Chemical Corp., concerning matters affecting that firm's operation at Nitro, near Charleston, it was encouraging to have received this comment from that experienced industrialist who heads a highly successful organization: "My company's opinion with respect to the opportunities for industry to thrive in West Virginia is best illustrated by the fact that our hydrofluoric acid plant at Nitro, put into operation as a new plant only 14 months ago, is now in the process of being substantially expanded."

Yes, there are countless numbers of persons and firms familiar with the quality and adaptability of those who form the labor force in our State and are well satisfied with their experiences.

I am equally confident that the success of the Elkins Industrial Development Corp. is not unique. Other business and industrial development groups such as those organized in Clarksburg, Beckley, Bluefield, Fairmont, Grafton, Huntington, Wheeling, and elsewhere in West Virginia will improve

the economic growth of their communities. And these are but a few of some 120 local development efforts in our State.

This fact—the existence of such a number of community development and improvement bodies—is perhaps the most effective testimony of the faith of West Virginians in the continued vitality and the promise of our State's economy.

Toward Christian Attitudes on World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a sermon given by Rev. W. Cecil Findley, pastor of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, Manhattan, Kans., for World Order Sunday. In addition to his duties as pastor, Reverend Findley serves as minister to students who attend Kansas State University in Manhattan. I am certain that all Members of Congress will find Reverend Findley's sermon most penetrating and thought provoking.

Reverend Findley has made the following comments regarding this outstanding sermon:

I am not personally a committed pacifist, nor is my church one of the historic peace churches, but this is an area in which I have become greatly concerned because I am seeking to apply Christian principles to all of life. If the remarks in this sermon are critical, they are not intended to criticize one administration or party, but are critical of all of us.

The sermon follows:

TOWARD CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES ON WORLD ORDER

Walter Rauschenbusch talked long ago about "the knights of the washbowl," that venerable order which stems from Pilate's washing of his hands before the people, allowing Jesus to be crucified, but declaring at the same time, "I am innocent of this man's blood." We too, ask for the washbowl rather than accepting our hardest responsibilities. As Christians, confronted with the issue of war or peace in our world, we rejoice that we can have refuge in the order of the knights of the washbowl. We will wash our hands of the matter, that is what we will do.

But the problem still persists, and still grows more urgent. It does not go away if we wash our hands of it; it persists even if we shut our eyes and hope it goes away. And this is World Order Sunday, when our very schedule clamors for a word to be spoken that is both Christian and relevant to the world situation.

And so we venture to see the world situation today from a Christian perspective. We not only renounce the ancient and venerable order of knights of the washbowl, but we even stray away from our office as Curators of the Cubbyhole—where we put our faith in one cubbyhole and world problems in another, and comfort ourselves with the magic formula, "Never the twain shall meet." In doing this, we have three things to say about Christian attitudes in this area of world order.

I

First, if we are truly Christians, and if we are in any meaningful sense a Christian nation, then our Christian faith should be the basic determinant in our attitudes toward this problem. Christ calls us to no halfway discipleship, where we give Him our hearts but not our minds. He brooks no secondary loyalty, where we let Him clear supreme in some areas, but keep him clear out of others. Christ is either Lord of all of life, or He is not Lord at all. If He said anything that has bearing on our attitudes toward the world problem, obligation is laid upon us as Christians to listen to Him first of all.

Hear Him: "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for He makes His sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust."

Or again: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God."

We could multiply quotations from Jesus, but it appears that the requirement laid out in these few words is both clear and demanding. If we are to get our basic approach to life from the Master, we are to be—in whatever the situation—persons of love, persons of the kind of active good will which will promote peace, rather than war, kindness rather than enmity, understanding rather than strife. This active good will is not to be withheld from any because they are our "enemies"; we are bid explicitly to include them within the circle of our concern.

If these statements from our Lord are said to be too idealistic for the harsh realities of our modern world, if we claim that they are not relevant in the situation in which we live, then it is as simple as this: We have forfeited the right to be called Christians.

Far too often we of the church—in good Knights of the Washbowl tradition—have abdicated our responsibility in the formation of attitudes toward peace and war. There are those in our land who have eagerly seized upon the opportunity left by our failure as a church, and have shaped attitudes according to other principles than those of Christ.

To put it frankly: Our attitudes toward war and peace and foreign policy are shaped more by the military than by all others, including Christ.

Look at our present approach to the problem. We frantically produce more and more weapons and armaments, even though we could already obliterate civilization with what we have. We live with constant reminders that Russia could push the button any time which would start the war, so we must be ready to destroy Russia. Our greatest expenditures are for military preparations.

Is all this because Christ has bid us kill and wound and maim as many of the enemy as possible if he starts anything? Are the most gigantic military preparations in the history of mankind being made today because we have accepted Christ's idea that active love is the most powerful force in the world?

To be sure, there are those who insist that we have gotten these ideas from our Christian faith—God is a great commander in chief, and Christ is his chief of staff. One minister during World War II was laboring with the text "God is love," and concluded that saturation bombing of enemy cities—dropping bombs indiscriminately on all men, women and children—may be one expression of the divine compassion. Harry Emerson Fosdick, who reports this example of ration-

alization, goes on to comment, "Such preaching, obliterating all difference between Christ and Mars, and making the church a mere adjunct to the war department, seems to me a complete negation of Christ's teaching." To which we only add, Amen.

The plain fact is that our policy and attitudes are built in disregard of Christian principles. We have made the charge that the military leaders of our Nation have wielded more influence on our attitudes toward war than have the prophets of Christendom. Let's look at this charge.

Col. William Neblett, who was stationed in the Pentagon for a number of years, wrote a book in 1953 called *Pentagon Politics*. In this book he asserted that the Pentagon planned a nationwide campaign to create the impression "that we were living in a state of undeclared emergency; that war with Russia was just around the corner, and that we not only had to keep our military strength, but we had to increase it." You can judge for yourself how successful this planned campaign has been.

We all like the feeling of power, of running things, and military men are no exception to this. They have gloried in the fact that they have virtually taken over things. The Army and Navy Bulletin of 12 years ago already said, "Today the army has virtual control of foreign affairs."

In 1953 there were 67 army generals and colonels assigned to civilian agencies of government. By 1957, the number had increased to 200 generals or admirals, and 1,300 colonels or naval personnel of comparable rank, plus 6,000 officers of lower grade. Progressively, the military viewpoint has been gaining more and more control in all phases of our Government's program.

The results of this militarization of our thinking are evident in many ways. One way is seen in the virtual universal military training we have, under which every young man has to face the prospects of military service, even though we are technically at peace. This is necessary to maintain the peace, we are told, even though the judgment of history is clear, that "to be prepared for war is to be predisposed to war." That is, every nation in history that has given its energy to preparations for war has ended up fighting.

After World War II, Congress failed to pass the selective service bill that the military wanted. One general spoke of the "appallingly bad judgment" of the "old men" in Congress "who would have been eliminated in any other nation." There is here the sinister hint that Congress had better do what the military asked or run the risk of elimination. Congress took the hint, and in the face of a huge propaganda effort by military men, made selective service a permanent institution in 1951.

I would like to mention one other way in which the military influence is being felt right here where we are, at Kansas State University. Our Government is spending over \$30 million to keep over 300,000 students in ROTC. The aim is quite frankly that of indoctrination. It has been pointed out that the system is very inefficient in producing officers, since 73 percent serve only the minimum term and then quit; actually the Armed Forces use ROTC for indoctrination and propaganda purposes. I say this realizing that some of you have been indoctrinated with this military system so that you will dislike my saying this to you. I oppose the idea of compulsory ROTC as a part of education, because the aim of true education and the mark of an educated person is the ability to make intelligent judgment and to have critical understanding. Any system of indoctrination or propaganda is out of place in creating these qualities.

This is perhaps more than enough substantiation to my charge that we are letting

the military call all the shots for us. My reason for including all this in a sermon is to leave us with this question—please get this: Is our basic orientation military, or is it Christian? Do we get our fundamental notions on how to solve our problems from those who say, "You must be prepared to fight, or from him who taught us to try the way of redeeming love? Is our approach to our enemies to be learned from a manual of military discipline, or from the words from the cross, "Father, forgive them?"

II

The second thing that must be said about Christian attitudes toward world order is that the Christian way does not mean to give in weakly to evil. It does not mean that we must be irresponsible in the face of our obligations to the world and to our own future generations. Surely the Christian of all people is responsible to do all that he can to promote the good and defeat the evil.

But this idea of Christian responsibility in resistance to the forces of evil does not mean putting our trust in the weapons of force and violence. Is this the way of responsibility, to rely on a system that has us more insecure than ever, to count on a way out which would leave over 50 million Americans dead and countless others wounded and dying, should we have to actually use it? It seems clear that the way of responsibility to ourselves, to the world, and to our future generations, lies down another path.

We must resist the forces of evil, but we must find better means of doing it. Communism is our present enemy, but why must our so-called Christian Nation stoop to the methods of the godless in combating them? Our point is that the Christian attitude is not based on cowardice that refuses to resist the advance of evil, but it is a resistance based on Christian lines.

Recent history has provided us with a powerful demonstration of resistance without bitterness or violence. The Negroes of Montgomery, Ala., were the victims of subhuman treatment on the buses of their city. Finally the time came when they could stand it no longer, and they refused to ride the buses until they were guaranteed courteous treatment. They walked and caught rides as they could for a year; but the amazing thing is that during their whole protest, it was only the white community that reacted with violence. Martin Luther King was a Negro leader in the movement, and he made it clear that the people must resist the evil, but they must not hate their white brothers, and must not react with violence. Perhaps the crucial test came when his own home was bombed, and a mob of Negroes gathered, ready to start a violent race riot. Martin Luther King, standing on the porch of his bombed home, could have spoken the word to start one of the worst race riots this country has seen, but instead he said to the assembled mob: "We must love our white brothers, no matter what they do to us. We must make them know that we love them. Jesus still cries out in words that echo across the centuries, 'Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; pray for them that despitefully use you.'"

The crowd that had gathered for violence went home peacefully. They who had come with blood in their eye demonstrated that you can resist evil best when you refuse to fight.

May we learn and demonstrate this truth as a Nation in the sphere of our national responsibilities. May we learn that we cannot advance the cause of righteousness with the tools of evil; that we cannot promote peace by fighting. The question of how to do this leads to our third point.

III

The third thing we must say is that the Christian will do all he can to understand the nature of our struggle, the responsibilities upon us, and the requirements of our faith in this situation. Uninformed good will does not do the job. An approach not grounded in the realities of the situation may meet the requirements of piety without actually saying anything to help us find a way out of our dilemma. There is no excuse for a Christian refusing to give his best thought to this problem.

It seems clear that this very study of the situation indicates that a nonmilitary solution must be found. The deputy chief of our Central Intelligence Agency, whom the United Press calls one of the best informed Americans on what the Russians are doing, states emphatically "that Russia is neither ready for war nor preparing for war, that the Kremlin does not want a war, though the Communists will fight if they are forced to." The point is, he says, "that peace is essential to the accomplishment of Communist aims." What they want to do is to win the world by economic development and technical aid in underdeveloped countries. They know that all would be losers in a global war, but they are confident that they can whip us by outdeveloping, outproducing us, and by using the fruits of their peacetime production to win the world.

This means, you see, that we are playing right into their hands when we refuse to set up a balanced peacetime economy. We further their chances for expansion by pouring the vast bulk of our resources into those military preparations which can do nothing for the betterment of the world.

Instead of using our energy and resources in the preparation for war, we must begin throwing the same kind of energy and the same extent of resources into preparations for peace. It is only when we get seriously to work to create conditions throughout the world that make peace possible that we will be doing that which thwarts the spread of communism.

We must show real Christian concern for the needy of the world. We must demonstrate to the world that we stand for those things which they need. Along this line, what could better demonstrate to the colored majority of the world the integrity of our faith than to grant first-class citizenship to the Negroes within our own land? I am suggesting simply that when we learn to regard others, not as objects of exploitation for dollars or for military advantage, but as brothers under God, then we can hear the words, "Blessed are (you) peacemakers."

I am not an economist, nor is this a political science lecture. My suggestions are not that we must follow any particular strategy of foreign aid or economic development.

But I am a minister of Jesus Christ, and my call to you is that we must follow those approaches which are in keeping with the spirit and aims of our master. My contention this morning has been that not only is this our imperative, but that this is the only practical way open to us, to lay down our arms of war, and pick up our tools of peace.

The prophecy can yet come true: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." This prophecy can come true, but not until we want it to come true, and work for it with all our energy.

The World Court and the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Connally Amendment," published in the Sumter (S.C.) Daily Item of March 10, 1960. The Sumter Daily Item is one of the permanent newspapers of my State and is edited by the very able H. D. Osteen, its publisher.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNALLY AMENDMENT

"I have seen no argument in favor of repealing the Connally reservation which has any purpose other than to establish world government over the United States," says George Sokolsky, well-known columnist.

We were delighted to see that a number of South Carolina county Democratic conventions, including Sumter, adopted resolutions urging the defeat of the resolution offered by Senator HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY. As Mr. Sokolsky says, the passage of the Connally reservation "disappointed those who had sought to develop the United Nations into a world government."

The resolution adopted by the Sumter County Democrats (similar resolutions were adopted by other county conventions) expresses the view we believe of the masses of the people in this section. The resolution says:

"Whereas the World Court was established by the United Nations with the intent that it should be superior to all domestic courts of each participating nation in those matters within its jurisdiction; and

"Whereas in adopting the resolution committing and binding the United States to participate in and accept the jurisdiction of the World Court, the Congress of the United States would have no jurisdiction over disputes with respect to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States; and

"Whereas Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, has introduced a Senate resolution calling for the elimination of the words 'as determined by the United States'; and

"Whereas if these words 'as determined by the United States' are eliminated from the agreement of this Government to accept the jurisdiction of this World Court, the United States will have virtually surrendered its Constitution and its national sovereignty and accepted the dictation and control by foreign governments of its internal affairs; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Sumter County Democrats Convention:

"(1) That this convention urges the Senators representing the State of South Carolina in the U.S. Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate to oppose repeal of the Connally amendment and to defeat Senate Resolution 94.

"(2) That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of this convention to U.S. Senators OLIN D.

JOHNSTON and J. STROM THURMOND and to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate with the request that it be called to the attention of the whole committee and that the delegates from Sumter County are requested to present this resolution to the State Democratic convention."

The Item has on several occasions expressed its strong opposition to any repeal of the Connally reservation and we were delighted to see the Democrats of the county take a stand against it.

Federal Aid to Education—Financial and Educational Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. Lloyd Morey, president emeritus and former comptroller of the University of Illinois and former Illinois State auditor.

Mr. Morey's background eminently qualifies him as an authority to speak on the ramifications and end result of proposals for broad extension of so-called Federal aid to States and communities in all levels of education. His candid appraisal is as follows:

URBANA, ILL., March 9, 1960.

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am deeply concerned over the proposals for broad extension of so-called Federal aid to States and communities in all levels of education. I firmly believe that for the most part such actions would be both unnecessary and highly undesirable. My reasons are these:

1. Actually there is no such thing as "financial Federal aid." All the money thus provided comes sooner or later from the same taxpayers who provide the funds for State and local financing. To channel it through the National Government increases overhead costs and tends to centralize decision and supervision in others than those who bear educational and management responsibility.

2. While the Federal Government has done much for education in the past, the major burden of both financial responsibility and educational development has rested with and been assumed by communities, States, and private institutions and agencies. This is as it should be. To place this responsibility and authority in any degree in a central government would seriously reduce the independence of spirit and action on which our system of education has been built and has flourished.

3. The progress made by the States and citizens in solving their own problems of educational finance in recent years is impressive. There is no reason to believe this will not continue and generally be adequate. Federal help would tend to reduce their feeling of responsibility for their problems, and encourage them to rely on a mythical source which really amounts only to giving them back their own money.

4. By almost common consent, inflation is the greatest burden upon the country at the present time. Inflation is not caused solely by Government expenditures or

deficits, but it is materially increased by them. Educational expenditures are not the sole cause of Federal deficits, but they contribute to them. To create a new and major addition in the face of present deficit and debt, without revenue to meet it, would increase the financial instability of the Government and the consequent burdens of inflation.

There may be a few areas in which local resources are sufficiently behind the general average and local educational conditions are sufficiently in arrears to warrant temporary and selective outside assistance. If such there be, as determined by demonstrated need and conclusive evidence of inability to meet their own problems in reasonable time, such aid may be warranted from the Federal Government. To make these few situations the excuse for general Federal grants to all States is both financial and educational folly.

Your very truly,

LLOYD MOREY,

President Emeritus and Former Comptroller, University of Illinois, and
Former Illinois State Auditor.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Station WGN, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the adoption of more public service programs by radio and television, as now being undertaken by the major networks and independent stations, represents, I believe, a most commendable effort by these information media to better serve the American people.

In this age of fast-changing events, the task of keeping our citizenry informed and up to date on issues of vital importance is difficult and complex.

Consequently, we, as a people, need information media that include discussions, reviews, and analyses of as many of the major problems before us as possible.

From time to time, I welcome the opportunity to participate in such programs.

Recently, for example, I had the opportunity to discuss major problems including defense, disarmament, mutual security, and other aspects of the challenge in the international field, on "Your Senator Reports," over the fine facilities of station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my remarks on these current issues printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN OF WISCONSIN, RANKING REPUBLICAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO, ON MARCH 6, 1960

Fellow Americans, the decade of the 1960's, now opening to us, offers great promise of progress, prosperity, and opportunity to build a better life.

As you well recognize, there are also serious challenges on the horizons—at home and abroad.

These promises of the future, however, can only be attained: (1) By dedication of the necessary energies and resources; and (2) by preventing world war III with its disastrous effect upon the globe.

Regrettably, the choice of peace or war, the most momentous of our age, is not solely a free world decision.

Instead, peace—indeed, survival of mankind—may be determined by the mind, or the trigger finger of conquest-happy Communists, although we pray that this will not happen. These are the facts of life, however. We must—in our time—do everything possible to discourage such a foolhardy act, and to guard against it. At the same time, we need to design ever more effective programs to prevent the Communists from attaining a world takeover through persuasion, subversion, economic penetration, and other devious tactics.

This is a touch and go business.

The task will be complex and difficult; yet, we can do no less than succeed.

MAJOR DECISIONS AHEAD

Briefly now, I would like to review some of the major decisions we will face in the days ahead. These will include: The need to devise ever improved programs to create ever greater retaliatory strength in missile-nuclear space defense; strengthen the alliance of free nations in their efforts to oppose communism; effectively utilize all deterrents, military, economic and psychological, to curb communism; make further efforts to find safe guaranteed agreements for reduction of armaments; and, finally, we must assure a sound, strong program for the economy in this country.

Despite the fact that—to rational men—it would be foolish, if not suicidal, to "touch off" a world conflict, the chance nevertheless exists—particularly if our avowed enemy, communism, feels that we are weak, and could be overcome easily—with little damage to them.

As a result, we—the United States and the free world—must maintain a strong, effective deterrent power.

Although it may seem contradictory, history has shown that one of the most effective ways of discouraging attack by a would-be aggressor is to develop the strength to carry out, if necessary, a devastating counter-attack.

That is why we must remain strong.

This can be accomplished by a two-pronged program: (1) Creating an ever-stronger, hard-hitting defense; and (2) further strengthening the free world alliance—militarily and economically—to enable the countries to better withstand the economic, industrial and cultural expansionist pressures of communism.

Question: "Senator WILEY, as a member of the Senate Space Committee, I recall that you and your colleagues have held joint hearings with the Preparedness Subcommittee on the status of our defense. Do you feel that we have a good defense now?"

Answer: "Yes. Fortunately, there is almost unanimous agreement among our military experts that the military strength of the free world—at this time—is of tremendous magnitude and power. In effect, that it is now a strong deterrent."

Question: "We recall, of course, that there was considerable difference of opinion on the adequacy of our defense for the future. What is your view?"

Answer: "Now, I am not a defense expert. There are, however, wide difference of opinion on the adequacy of our defense now. There are also sharp differences of view as to just what kind of defense would do the job for the future."

"The intercontinental missile will, in all likelihood, be the workhorse, by and large,

around which will be centered the defense of the future.

"We recognize that the Soviets have developed tremendous thrust for launching their intercontinental ballistic missiles. However, in this complete technological age, an effective defense cannot depend upon a single weapon—even the powerful ICBM.

"Instead, there are a wide variety of other weapons for defense systems for detection of enemy approaches and capable of retaliatory counterattack that must be kept at the ready if we are to be adequately protected.

"The objectives of President Eisenhower, in recommendations to strengthen our defense, however, has not been to put all our eggs in one basket—that is, rely entirely, for example, on intercontinental ballistic missiles—now only in the early stages of development—with present models in all likelihood becoming obsolete in the near future—not to burden the American taxpayer with a crash program in every field—as is being proposed by the critics. Rather, the effort is to provide the United States with a well-balanced defense system involving a wide variety of systems.

"These include an up-to-date radar system for detection of approaching enemy planes or missiles; maintenance of a well balanced, striking power, including jet planes, ICBMs, intermediate-range missiles, air-to-air, ground-to-air, and air-to-surface and other missiles; submarines equipped with rocket launchers; adequate numbers of aircraft carriers for launching of jet planes bristling with nuclear weapons and missiles; mobile, atomic firepower for air, ground, and sea forces.

"The maintenance of an adequate defense system to deter aggression—now and in the future—is one of the major challenges confronting the Nation. Because of its significance, it is absolutely essential that there be balance and perspective in our thinking and planning.

"Even among experts, however, there are differing opinions on: (1) What is an adequate defense; and (2) is the U.S. program sufficiently strong—particularly in relation to the Soviet Union?

NEEDED: A STRONG MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Question: "Senator WILEY, you mentioned also a strong mutual security program. What do you feel are the real benefits of relying upon our allies?"

Answer: "There are, of course, a great many advantages. These include: More manpower than the United States itself could muster; missile-bristling bases placed strategically around the Communist orbit—closer to the potential target—less likely to be knocked out than if the bases were concentrated only on U.S. soil; bases close to the cause of possible trouble, too, enable us to utilize ready-to-go intermediate-range missiles, while we are shaping up our intercontinental ballistic missiles for the arsenal of peace; in addition, the programs provide more sea and air power than could otherwise be obtainable. Although it amounts to less than 10 percent of our U.S. defenses along, the mutual security program has been proclaimed by well-qualified individuals from nearly all walks of life who have studied the program as, dollar-for-dollar, our best investment in defense.

SIGNIFICANCE OF A STRONG PROGRAM

In addition to its military significance, the enactment of a strong mutual security program would signify:

1. The dedication of the United States to world peace;
2. A sense of responsibility in carrying out our role as leader of the free world;
3. Assuring our allies that we stand shoulder-to-shoulder with them against aggression;

4. Assurance to less developed nations that we recognize a need for establishing a world climate in which they, by self-determination, can attain their national goals.

Overall, the effort, too, will keep alive the ideal of America.

OTHER DETERRENTS TO COMMUNIST EXPANSION

Question: Senator, you feel then that militarily we have adequate strength now; and that, as we face the challenges of the future, we will be able to meet the growing power in the Communist bloc?"

Answer: "Yes. While it is not, of course, possible to foresee the future, I am confident that we will meet the challenge."

Question: "Are there any other deterrents, Senator WILEY?"

Answer: "Yes. Frankly, I believe there are a number of other deterrents which are often overlooked—as we plan ahead for the long-range struggle against global communism.

"First of all, we must not forget that a great many people under Communist domination maintain an inherent resistance to tyranny—whether Communist or in other forms.

"If war can be forestalled, the yearning for freedom of these people—nearly 1 billion of them—will be our allies—so to speak.

"From the so-called neutral countries also, I believe that we can expect in the years ahead a larger support for our efforts to halt the spread of communism. The moral pressures of a world disillusioned, and by nature against totalitarian communism, will, I believe, eventually make itself felt in world affairs.

"We realize, of course, that these pressures—as deterrents—are for the allies for the 'long haul.' Nevertheless, I am confident that time is on the side of freedom."

DISARMAMENTS

Question: "What about disarmament, Senator WILEY? What are the prospects for a real reduction of arms in the world?"

Answer: "Naturally, we all look forward to the time when we can beat our swords into plowshares, when we can lift the great burden of costly, deadly arsenals from the sweating backs of humanity; when, at long last, we can channel the vast human and natural resources, now going into armaments, into constructive programs for building a better life for the people of the earth.

"In considering the reduction of arms, however, the question is: In dealing with a tricky, deceptive adversary, how can we safely reduce our security forces?"

"As you know, the United States recently presented at Geneva a proposal for ending of nuclear weapons tests 'in all the environments that can now be effectively controlled.' The plan, if accepted, would end: all nuclear tests in the atmosphere; in the ocean, in space, and beneath the surface of the earth.

"At the same time, the program provided for joint research and experimentation by the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and the United States for the detection of tests—to safeguard against violation by any power."

Question: "Do you feel that Red China should be included in 'reduction of armaments negotiations'?"

Answer: "Recently, President Eisenhower—and wisely, I believe—stated that he thought that once there had been agreement on measures on general disarmament between East and West, it would be necessary to find a means of including Communist China."

Question: "Why?"

Answer: "With a population of about 650 million people, in the future Communist China can expect to exert more and more pressures in world affairs, particularly in the economic and military spheres.

"Realistically speaking, the development of disarmament plans that would not include all the potential powers of the globe would not be effective.

"However, inclusion of Red China in such plans would not necessarily mean either: Recognition of Red China; or admitting that Communist nation to the United Nations.

"In view of the belligerent policies of Communist China's leadership, however, it would certainly not be wise to ignore the threat to world peace which that nation would eventually be—if not included in a general disarmament program.

"Despite the difficulties involved in reaching disarmament, the Western Powers—constructively, I believe, are making a real effort toward arms reduction—aimed at lessening the possibility of war."

CONCLUSION

These, then, are a few of the major aspects of the national and international problems confronting us—as a nation, and a leader of the free world.

Now, I would like to stress one more point: It is absolutely essential that we maintain a sound forward-looking economy at home. Unless we can accomplish this, we cannot support the efforts to meet the needs of our citizens domestically—to provide them with an ever better life for the future; nor will we be able to successfully meet the international threat to our security posed by communism.

Thank you, friends, for the opportunity to discuss these issues with you.

Storing Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, a great many of us who are opposed to the farm subsidy program have wondered what the actual cost per day is to the American public for storage of commodities under this program. I read with interest in the Wall Street Journal the following editorial which illustrates the exorbitance of this program. Its title is "Storing Insanity" which I think is a very apt title and reads as follows:

STORING INSANITY

Would you care to know how much it costs the taxpayers every day for storage of commodities Uncle Sam has on hand because of the farm program's high price supports?

Let's ease into this with two low ones: honey and tobacco. Uncle Sam pays out only \$131 a day for honey and only \$238 a day for tobacco, which, if it indicates anything at all, suggests that people smoke nearly all the tobacco that's grown here and that the bees aren't nearly as busy as the peanut farmer.

The peanut storage costs come to \$6,000 a day; flaxseed and rye costs come to \$7,000 each a day. Oats cost the taxpayer \$15,000 a day for storage; rice \$17,000 a day; soybeans, \$23,000; milk and butter fat, \$29,000; barley, \$64,000 a day and cotton \$78,000 a day.

But even these are peanuts compared to the big boys. Have a good look:

Grain sorghums cost \$262,000 a day for storage.

Corn costs \$444,000 a day for storage.

And wheat cost \$579,000 a day for storage.

That's every day. None of these costs include what was paid by the taxpayers, through their agent, Uncle Sam, for the stuff. It's just storage costs.

Total cost of storage for all these commodities comes to \$1,547,000 a day or better than \$550 million a year—and that, in anybody's book, is a lot to pay for storing up our harvests of insanity.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of University of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on March 1 of this year the University of Arizona observed its 75th anniversary. I recognize that compared with the institutions of higher learning in the eastern part of our country this is by no means a long life but in the comparatively new West, 75 years of service is a remarkable accomplishment. To properly recognize the importance of this event the university invited one of Arizona's first two Senators, Henry Fountain Ashurst, to deliver the principal address. Henry Fountain Ashurst is one of Arizona's most beloved sons, not only because of the immortal impression he left on this body but also because of his long and notable record of public achievement in the legislative body of Arizona. It was while serving in the territorial legislature that he was instrumental in forming the favorable opinion that resulted in the establishment of the University of Arizona and the Arizona State College at Flagstaff. His has been a full life devoted to the betterment of people everywhere and all Arizonians are proud of him and his accomplishments. So that the readers of the RECORD might better understand this pride, I ask that the address by the Honorable Henry Fountain Ashurst made at Tucson on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST ON MARCH 1, 1960, AT THE FACULTY CONVOCATION COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDED OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, TUCSON, ARIZ.

Mr. President, my first duty is to you, to Governor Fannin, to the board of regents, and to the faculty for the doctoral degree you have so graciously conferred upon me. Such an authentic honor comes so seldom and to so few that it is difficult to express the measure of one's gratitude, hence I shall employ that beautiful phrase: "Thank you" and I am making no attempt to conceal my emotion on this occasion.

This institution of learning is now and for many, many years has been an object of my pride and affectionate solicitude and I may be pardoned this effusion of sentiment when I perceive how from meager but worthy beginnings this university has grown in grace, dignity, and strength. From this university there have been graduated many

persons now famous for their moral and intellectual achievements.

In stately ceremony with the buoyancy and confidence of youth, many young ladies and young gentlemen, educated and equipped with cultural and social resources and skills, have from these doors entered into a busy and, thank Heaven, a commercial and competitive world. I emphasize the importance of habits of industry and I commend the goddess of hard work. She loves her votaries and few be they who, following her precepts, come away from her altars empty handed or visit her shrine in vain.

"Consider how time's vastly corridors
Ring with the words of famous orators.
Are their epigrams spontaneous
Off the cuff, extemporaneous?
Or do they while in the shower or while shaving
Think up some brilliant phrase worth saving,
Then roll it on the tongue and smile
And store it away for future file;
Not even the great Churchill, without notes
Could stand and deliver such golden quotes.
Had he not learned in his earliest boyhood days
To store away many, many a brilliant phrase.
And when he stood before the throng
He could draw upon a treasury of phrases
all day long."

The flowers of art which gave fragrance and beauty to the world—the great institutions of learning and culture did not evolve in ease, comfort and sweetness—as did the flowers in the meadow—but were evolved through years of patient toil and hard labor.

An attachment to the fascination of bygone days is a sentiment found in all civilized peoples. Romance clusters around the history, the genesis, of every one of the States of our Union but it is doubtful if, in the history of any other State, there may be found—characters more vivid, dramas more poignant, actions more heroic than those clustering around Arizona.

I have no pen dexterous enough, and neither silver tongue nor golden larynx is eloquent enough, adequately to portray the contributions made by Arizona's pioneer women. In hunger, in thirst, in childbirth pain, in cruel isolation, in peril of savage men and savage beasts, the Pioneer women walked their uncomplaining way and, with a courage beyond the range of eulogy, cheered their men onward, in Arizona's panoramic settlement and development.

The same sun splashes its genial brilliance upon this landscape—the same mellow moonlight glows as softly as 75 years ago, but all else, how altered. I will remember the year 1885; in that year this University was founded; in that year Grover Cleveland was inaugurated into the Presidency of the United States; in that year President Chester Alan Arthur, one of the most urbane and debonair of our Presidents, left the White House. Arthur is now forgotten as fame is a fickle jade. In that year General Grant died; in that year Mr. Thomas Bullock, a distant kinsman of President Theodore Roosevelt's mother, began the construction of a railroad into Prescott, then the capital of Arizona Territory; in that year the Aztec Land and Cattle Co. brought 9,000 head of cattle from Texas into northern Arizona and established the hashknife brand. It was the largest thundering herd that ever came into Arizona and the 50 Texas cowboys, who brought the herd, were spicily and chivalrous men. In that year I reached the age of 10 years.

All the characters who had to do with the Arizona Territorial Legislature of 1885 founding this university have completed their earthly journey; have gone beyond the twilight's purple haze to that vast realm where the innumerable dwell. Some of the pioneer men may, at times here have trod-

den a tangled trail but they were gay, gallant, and generous and are now, beyond doubt, happy on the serene and shining pathway of the stars.

In attempting to describe the grand drama of Arizona's settlement one is reminded of the lines in the prolog of Shakespeare's play, "King Henry the Fifth": "O for a muse of fire that would ascend the brightest heaven of invention! A kingdom for a stage, princes to act and monarchs to behold the swelling scene."

In the rhythm of life we revere bygone days and try to reconstruct their scenes, and when one speaks of Arizona's early days, one needs not garnish one's narrative with prismatic allusions, that is: one is not tempted to overstatement—the simple facts require no embroidery and the wildest hyperbole—the wildest rhetorical exaggeration could not make our territorial days seem more romantic and glamorous than they really were.

To survive the pioneer must needs be resourceful and of fortitude and endurance as well; life for many of them was necessarily a life of severe isolation hence the lonely ranchman, prospector, teamster, cowboy, and sheepherder frequently took refuge from loneliness by entering into the domain of the imagination—that faculty of the human mind—where ideal experiences are possible without objective restraint—where globes of gold expand and float—glittering towers up-thrust themselves—that domain peopled with a phantom throng—invisible to all persons but the eye of the imaginer, and thus many pioneers became endowed with intellectual power and tremendous personal charm.

I am not attempting to recite a history of Arizona—competent historians will discharge that duty—but I am certain that you will not deem it amiss if I try to present a thumbnail sketch of some of the characters, events, and customs of Arizona's bygone days.

Although territorial days were filled with tragedy and fantastic exploits, courtesy and good manners were the rule. The pioneers, generally, were intelligent, many of them were fairly well educated; they were good humored and were hospitable toward religion, science, and literature.

Most of the pioneer men would have been at home in any metropolitan club and most of the pioneer women were familiar with art forms, cottage industry, domestic science, and with the fashion edicts of New York, London, and Paris.

Nowadays, it is frequently said by world-weary persons that the glamour and high emprise of long ago days have departed and that in this highly mechanized 20th century there is nothing that savors of the romantic or fabulous.

When, however, we make a careful survey, we perceive that high emprise and romantic exploits are occurring all about us; that opportunities for achievement are ever present in our world of today and are at the beck and call of all those persons who will woo those opportunities. The lovely enchantments of bygone days are with us here and now; there is much in everyday life that inspires and gives a mighty upsurge to the human spirit, and as for my single self, I should prefer to live in this present epoch rather than any other epoch this world has known.

We thrill to read of the dramatic advance of Arizona, likewise we thrill to read of the birth and progress of liberty in America, and is it any wonder?

Until the birth of the U.S. Government, nations generally had an unregistered birthdate. Their beginnings were legendary or obscure. They had no birthday celebrations because through the centuries they had at some unknown date severally emerged from some dim, mysterious region supposed to be peopled with giants or heroes, but the beginnings of our Nation are well known.

We know the names of the founders of the U.S. Government, where they were born and where they were educated. We know that the founders were not chasing any will-o'-the-wisp; they were not idle dreamers out on a holiday excursion; they knew mankind cannot construct a society where all persons shall be equal as to intellect, ingenuity, adaptability, temperament or ambition. They knew that a government cannot redeem the ruined spendthrift by filling his pockets with money. They knew that a manmade law cannot give to the nightingale the talons of the eagle nor give to the eagle the art of trilling the beautiful midnight minstrel of the nightingale; that freedom, liberty and livable conditions of life do not come from the graceful wavings of a magician's wand, but that these things—like our daily bread—must be earned.

It would be a fascinating drama in the realm of fancy to see pass before us in review all the men who wrote our Declaration of Independence and also all the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights—documents of grandeur in world annals. All the characters of men known to history, biography of fiction would appear.

Some men wearing brocaded waistcoats; some wearing silken breeches, with silver buckles at the knee and instep; the powdered wig, lace cuffs, the ivory snuffbox. The quick, razor-edge tempers, the punctilious pride, the scholarship, the statesmanship; some of them could have outshone Lord Chesterfield in an exhibit of graceful manners. Brilliant rhetoricians shaping sentences like daggers of jade; world stylists; some of them spoke like a sweet-singing wasp.

Many of these men comprehended the garnered wisdom of the ages and were familiar with the history of the republics of the antique world. Not a few had been graduated from colleges in the Colonies; Harvard, King Williams School (now St. Johns College), Yale, William and Mary, Princeton, Kings (now Columbia), and the Pennsylvania College; some had been graduated from English, Irish, and Scottish universities, and one need not be acutely fanciful to seem to hear the eager and eloquent oratory, the vibrant words and gorgeous rhetoric of that romantic long ago. Some of these men ascended the steep acclivity from obscurity to far-shining fame. Some of them with steady hand at sunrise, held dueling pistol and with same steady hand, at sunset, held mint julep or hot-buttered rum. Nearly all were devoted equestrians—good riders who daily printed their horses' hooves into the receiving earth. They were men of courage, fortitude, and self-esteem, of energy and action with bold inquiring eyes, projecting noses and sunburned faces. They were drawn from the various trades, professions and occupations, and were shrewd to a remarkable degree. They were fiercely determined to set up a government assuring civil liberty, and they launched mankind's first major Republic since the days of ancient Rome. They bravely raised the banner of a republic at a time when the entire world seemed forever fixed in autocratic systems of government. The principles of their Declaration and the guarantees of their Constitution and Bill of Rights have withstood the mutations and vicissitudes of time, and have beaten back the wildest storms that ever blew because they embody the inborn, invincible sentiments of those persons who respect the dignity of human freedom and the sacredness of human life.

The founders attempted to guarantee freedom of opportunity only, and thus they guaranteed the right and the privilege of every citizen to employ that opportunity and to try to earn or win as many of the prizes of this life as character, intelligence, zeal,

skills, creative imagination, courage, and luck might bring.

Lack of monetary wealth does not necessarily indicate lack of success in life. Many persons who have not accumulated riches live happy, noble, useful lives and are truly good and truly great. Multitudes of American men with the purse of a peasant carry themselves with all the politeness, pride and bearing of a prince.

Multitudes of American women with meager financial resources walk with courage and spread mercy and kindness with a charm and grace that any queen might well emulate. Conversely, now and then, some indifferent person by the legerdemain of chance of the impishness of the dice of destiny is awarded a fortune.

Frequently some worthy person by industry, integrity and business judgment earns a fortune and believe me when I say that if the refreshment of adventure, risk and hazard were eliminated, life would become flat, insipid and almost unbearable and it is also quite true that success in all departments of life generally gravitates toward those who are competent, industrious and patient.

I take no stock in the gloomy Jeremiahs so constantly chanted that the human race will destroy itself; I do not subscribe to the defeatist attitude which declares that human beings are nothing but the helpless zanies of a witless fate and thoughtless chance which will overthrow the wisdom of the wise, overthrow the valor of the brave and the trophies of the truth. I utterly reject such philosophy and assert that mankind is endowed with God-given conscience, with reason, judgment and ample power of self-direction and has his fate in his own hands. We make our world quite as much as we are made by it.

No nation—no group of nations—can destroy civilization. America does not belong to the past—the past belongs to her and every American may proudly exclaim: Mine is the majestic past, mine is the shining future. Paraphrasing a great character: "All things for America; she is the vital axle of the restless wheels that bear us onward. Beyond the map of America our hearts can travel not but fill that limit to its utmost verge."

Mankind is inexterminable and there is everywhere a conservation of moral and spiritual energy that preserves the core of every noble resolve and worthy action and molds them into a beneficent achievement aiding the human race in its arduous struggle to conquer all the arts and sciences.

4 years, might hope for something dramatic. We do not believe Mr. Khrushchev does.

The nations represented at Geneva will be 10 in number: 5 representing the West and 5 representing what Moscow wants. They will be there in verbal harmony with a U.N. Assembly resolution unanimously passed last October expressing "the hope that measures leading toward the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time." The phrase "general and complete disarmament" was Mr. Khrushchev's, and it was manifestly intended to please the eye and ear without involving any trouble for Mr. Khrushchev himself. Everybody, including Mr. Khrushchev, knows this.

We must, however, make whatever progress we can toward the ancient goal of disarmament if only for the simple reason, expressed some time ago by President Eisenhower, that there is more risk in building up armaments than in any probable program of disarmament. This country is in general accord with the British plan, expressed at the U.N. last fall by Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd, of a step-by-step program.

In the preparatory stages four of the Western allies had a little difficulty in agreeing with France, which at the moment desires quite a large conventional army to operate in Algeria and is inclined to put the emphasis on restricting atomic weapons carriers rather than the atomic weapons themselves. But as the Western negotiators prepared to move up to Geneva, their differences had been ironed out as far as words would do it.

The disarmament meeting cannot be wholly disassociated from the three-power nuclear weapons discussion which has been plodding along in Geneva with a recess or two since October 1958, nor from the summit conference that is set to take place in May. If there were even a little movement toward agreement among the 10 powers meeting at Geneva, we could feel more hopeful about nuclear disarmament and a more stable relation between the Communist East and the non-Communist West.

Communism is new, disciplined, and temperamentally aggressive. The real question remains: Is it willing to turn its aggressiveness away from the military field into the realms of economics and psychology? War and preparation for war are played out. Does Moscow realize this? We look to Geneva for some indication of an answer.

The Plowshare and the Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Record, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 13, 1960:

THE PLOWSHARE AND THE SWORD

The world's swords will not be beaten into plowshares as an immediate result of the 10-nation conference that will begin in Geneva day after tomorrow. Some who recall Mr. Khrushchev's speech at the U.N. Assembly last September, in which he proposed the abolition of all armaments within the next

Fish and Wildlife in the California Water Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the State of California, as I think most of the Senators know, is embarked upon a gigantic water development program on its own responsibility and at its own expense, which will, of course, supplement and be coordinated with the continuing programs of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers in my State. I am particularly pleased that the State water plan is truly multiple purpose in scope—that it includes, for instance, full recognition of recreation, fish and wildlife values.

A good description of the place of fish and wildlife in the California water program has been presented by William E. Warne, former director of the California Department of Fish and Game, who is now director of the State Department of Agriculture in Sacramento. I think everyone concerned with the relations of fish and wildlife conservation to water resource development will be interested in this clear presentation which I wish to offer for publication in the RECORD.

Mr. Warne's statement was presented recently before the California Senate Factfinding Committee on Water, and in slightly different form before a field hearing of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLACE OF FISH AND WILDLIFE IN THE CALIFORNIA WATER PROGRAM

(By William E. Warne, director, California Department of Fish and Game)

Next year the voters of California will go to the polls to vote on a \$1,750 million bond issue. With its passage the State will embark on a water development program unequalled in size and complexity in this country. Under Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown's leadership and through action of the State legislature this State water program has been conceived. It is bold and comprehensive and it is cut to fit the out-sized requirements of California's immediate future. It has been advanced to the point it has reached today not one single day too soon. The people expect much of this program. As it moves into and through the construction stage, the people will be watching eagerly, anticipating the great benefits the program will produce.

A multitude of questions involving policy that will govern the program, costs, benefits, and repayment methods are being asked and answers must be forthcoming very soon. Your committee is involving itself in a timely manner in the study needed to provide the answers. I am pleased to come before you and to render such help as I can.

Included in the costs of development of the project will be those related to recreation, fish and wildlife. That large expenditures will be both necessary and desirable for fish, wildlife, and recreation will be inescapable.

Major fish and wildlife and recreation benefits can be made to flow from the State water program. For millions who have learned to take their drinking water for granted, the recreational benefits may actually seem dominant. In any event, the program is truly multiple-use in its conception and any frustration of any of the uses would be unworthy of the plan.

With reference to the development of policy as it will apply to fish and wildlife and to recreation, certain basic concepts are required. I set these considerations down in an appearance before the Kerr Committee on Water Resources of the United States Senate in Los Angeles, October 16. I will state them again here:

1. No renewable resource should be destroyed in development of or in controlling another. For example, fish should not be destroyed in controlling a stream for irrigation. Mind you, I use this example deliberately, though I have been and am an irrigationist and though others might be cited. Conflicts in uses that require destruction of

a resource, I can assure you from 25 years of experience in the field of water planning and projects, are rare indeed, and usually are merely apparent because of lack of advance planning. The rule I have stated is sound and is compatible with irrigation, power, flood control, domestic water supply and other uses, as well as fish and wildlife.

2. Each manipulation of a renewable resource should be made to serve the maximum number of human desires and needs. This means we have outgrown the "single purpose" project. Certainly there is no place for it in California's State water program.

3. Enhancement of one resource, or improvement of one use of a resource, while developing or controlling another, should be made a part of the basic plan for the primary purpose of the development.

For example, power developers should not be permitted to overlook fish and wildlife or other benefits in which they are less directly interested when they make their plans.

4. Esthetic values should be recognized in terms other than those of economic values. To do otherwise is to price all of our scenery, songbirds, wildflowers, and little fishes and beasts at no dollars and cents. That is not the way we measure their worth in our civilization. We should not try to measure their worth so in our water projects.

5. Fish and wildlife, a publicly owned resource, belongs to all of the people and, therefore, fish and wildlife is the responsibility of all of the people. When the responsibility is so diffused, sometimes the people wake up too late to do anything about a loss they have sustained. We need strong policy now and sound execution to avoid such occurrence with regard to the State water plan.

6. Water for fish and wildlife is a beneficial use of water. This sounds like a truism, for who would doubt the benefit of having fish in our streams or a place for the deer to drink? Remember, however, that "beneficial use" when applied by law to water has become a term of art. It is only in the last 2 months, since a new law has become effective in September, that fish and wildlife has been included in this significant and specialized meaning of the term.

A GOOD START HAS BEEN MADE

Legislation already on the books sets the precedent for conversion of the philosophies I have expressed into specific laws.

Section 1243 was added to the California water code this year and provides that: "The use of water for recreation and the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources is a beneficial use of water. In determining the amount of water available for appropriation for other beneficial uses, the State water rights board shall take into account, whenever it is in the public interest, the amounts of water required for recreation and the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources."

"This section shall not be construed to affect riparian rights."

Section 1257 of the Water Code provides that "in acting upon applications to appropriate water, the State water rights board shall consider the relative benefit to be derived from all beneficial uses of the water concerned, including, but not limited to, use for domestic, irrigation, municipal, industrial, preservation of fish and wildlife, recreational, mining and power purposes, and may subject such appropriations to such terms and conditions as in its judgment will best develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water sought to be appropriated."

Section 233 of the Water Code says: "No plans or proposal for authorization of a project for construction or operation by the State shall be submitted to the legislature

by the department of water resources unless the plans or proposal includes (1) the comments and recommendations, if any, of the department of fish and game, and (2) provision for any water or facilities necessary for public recreation and the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources that the department of water resources determines to be justifiable in terms of statewide interest, and feasible, as a non-reimbursable cost of the project."

Sections 12880 through 12891.1 of the Water Code provides the mechanics and the funds for a large program of local water development. It is particularly significant that, among other things, this State-aid-to-local-projects program provides for grants for (a) the part of construction costs of the project properly allocated to the enhancement of fish and wildlife that are incidental to the primary functions of the project, and (b) the construction cost of the dam and reservoirs of the proposed project properly allocated to recreational functions of statewide interest that are incidental to the primary functions of the project.

Several of these provisions of the law were recently adopted by the Legislature.

COMMON REFERENCE POINTS ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTANDING

Let us consider some definitions in order to be sure we have a common understanding of problems and proposals. Some distinctions between recreation, fishing, and hunting on the one hand, and fish and game on the other, are needed. Most certainly, otherwise, my discussion would result in adding to an already unfortunate confusion. Lumping of fish, game, hunting, fishing, and other considerations into the catchall term of "recreation" has been responsible for many misunderstandings.

To establish some common reference points and terminology, let us define a few terms.

Fish and wildlife: The renewable resources of wild animal and fish life belonging to the people, here the people of the State of California. This is a commonly owned resource which survives in, or whose existence depends upon water in varying quantities. "Game" are those few species of wildlife which may be taken by hunting.

Fish and wildlife measures or facilities: Those measures or facilities taken or constructed and operated for the maintenance or enhancement of fish and wildlife or the mitigation of losses thereto in connection with water project development.

Hunting and fishing: These are methods of harvesting or utilizing the natural resources of fish and game. Hunting and fishing for sport are considered recreation. Hunting and fishing for food and profit are considered commercialized harvesting of the resource.

Recreation: Water-associated recreation is comprised of all of those outdoor enjoyments obtained by people as a direct or indirect result of the presence of water including such things as water skiing, swimming, boating, sport fishing, hunting, esthetic enjoyment, as through camping and picnicking, etc.

Recreation measures or facilities: Those measures or facilities taken or constructed and operated for the purpose of making water-associated recreation available and usable by the public.

Maintenance (or protection) of fish and wildlife resources: This refers to the measures necessary to protect the existing fish and wildlife resource, and to maintain natural productivity in connection with a water development project.

Mitigation (or compensation) of fish and wildlife losses: Those measures taken or facilities constructed and operated for increased production of fish or wildlife as compensation for an unavoidable loss to the re-

source as a result of water development. Provisions for a fish hatchery to compensate for lost spawning areas; provision of a larger minimum pool in a reservoir to compensate for reduced flows in the project stream, such can be considered as mitigation measures.

Enhancement of fish and wildlife: This means the improvement of conditions for fish and wildlife; making the habitat better than it was under natural or preproject conditions resulting in increased postproject populations of fish or game. Improved streamflow maintenance below a project dam would be a typical enhancement feature.

SEPARATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE FROM RECREATION

From the foregoing definitions I believe you can begin to see the dangers of generalizing under the term of "recreation," especially when generalization involves a discussion of cost repayment.

FISH AND WILDLIFE MAINTENANCE COSTS

The maintenance of fish and wildlife in the process of developing water resources has long been recognized as the responsibility of the sponsor of the project in question. Very old sections of the Fish and Game Code relate to this. The maintenance of the State's fish and wildlife resources will be incorporated into the planning and will be one of the accepted features of the State water program.

The constructing agency, whether public or private, must provide downstream water release or take other measures or provide suitable facilities to prevent reduction in fisheries and wildlife values from the construction of any project. This policy is equitable and has application to State projects.

The costs of maintaining existing resources are considered an integral part of the cost of the project and appropriately should be included in the costs allocated to each major project purpose; for example, municipal water supply or irrigation. Thus such costs would become repayable by the recipients of project vendible services just as would the cost of the concrete that goes into the dam. I believe there is question that State funds can be expended for such purposes. If any such questions exist anywhere they should be specifically dispelled by action of the legislature.

COST OF MITIGATING LOSSES TO FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mitigation of unavoidable or accepted losses to fish and wildlife will also be a standard feature of State water development as is maintenance. Similarly, mitigation costs should also be considered part of the basic project costs repayable by the recipients of project vendible services such as power or flood control.

To our knowledge no legislation has ever been enacted which authorizes any water development agency, either public or private, to destroy fish and game resources without compensation or mitigation. The principle seems well established. There are examples of failure to apply it, however. There should be no such failures in the execution of the State Water plan.

COST OF ENHANCEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Unlike maintenance or mitigation, enhancement of fish and game should not be repayable by the recipients of vendible project services. Enhancement of the publicly owned fish and game resources should be financed by the State on a non-reimbursable basis. Where enhancement is desirable and justified, it should be included as a project purpose to be paid for by the people from General Fund appropriations and not repayable by the water users. Enhancement of fish and game should be considered as a wise investment in the improvement of a State resource or property. The Department of Fish and Game is financed by revenues of licenses and fees, excepting that capital

improvements are financed through Wildlife Conservation Board funds, made available from the tax on horse racing.

Fishing and hunting licenses cannot be increased and decreased to meet the needs of construction programs governed by considerations of the State Water Plan, even if it were desirable or theoretically necessary. Since the resource is owned by all the public, warranted expenditures in enhancing it should be borne by all. This is the de facto breakdown of the present financing of the Department's activities. Hunters and fishermen pay their fees for their specialized use of the resources involved.

RECREATION COSTS

Now we turn to recreation, that big mushrooming, booming activity which is big business in California, and is apt to be bigger. Recreation in all its phases must be looked upon as a desirable, beneficial use of both undeveloped and developed watersheds. With increased leisure time and with growing complexities in our daily lives, recreation can only become each year more important to each of us and to all of us.

Water development, especially that which results in the creation of large, low elevation reservoirs, automatically creates a recreation attraction for swimmers, boaters, water skiers, and fishermen, and often waterfowl hunters. Such uses are apt to come whether on a planned or unplanned basis. I urge the more orderly, economical, and public service approach of the planned program. So much more in the way of use then can be accommodated.

I want to make a special point of acquiring land for a freeboard around reservoirs and other water sites as a routine practice in the State water plan. Unless this be done, the public may and often will be denied recreational use of the project facilities. It should be a cardinal principle that the construction agency must protect the public interest by providing a freeboard for public use and development. This, I believe, should be a part of the project costs.

Facilities necessary for an orderly use of the recreation potential of a given water project should be constructed as a part of the project. These include toilets, campgrounds, docks, and boat ramps, to name some that are typical. I believe their cost should be borne by the State as a whole and not charged against the contractor for vendible uses.

LOCAL PARTICIPATION DESIRABLE

I support those who advocate operation of State constructed recreational facilities by and at the expense of local governmental agencies under agreements which would insure satisfactory operation and care of the facilities. Generally speaking, and based on our admittedly meager experience in this field, I would be inclined to favor a program whereby the costs of operation were defrayed by fees levied on those using or benefiting from the recreation facilities. Although repayment of capital costs of recreation facilities through fee charging might sound attractive, I believe it would be unwise to adopt it as a policy in the State water development program. Assurance of repayment capacity would be extremely difficult to forecast and could very well become the damper on a program badly needed by the general public.

ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN

The Department of Fish and Game has already gone into action to fulfill its obligations under the provisions of the law on water planning and use. We are reviewing, commenting on, conducting studies on, and making recommendations for the maintenance and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources and proposals for mitigation of losses thereto on all segments and on each unit of the California water plan.

We are seeking better ways to maintain and improve these resources in connection

with the plan. For instance, we are carefully weighing the possibilities of developing artificial spawning beds for salmon below Oroville Dam on the Feather River, and energetically seeking other means of maintaining the valuable salmon and steelhead runs of the Sacramento River. We will not lose the Sacramento runs as we did those in the San Joaquin.

We will seek to obtain maximum utilization and production of fish in our existing reservoirs and in the scores of new reservoirs and other project waters envisioned in the State plan. These waters probably must provide for most of California's future freshwater angling, if population trends are the criteria.

The potential of these waters is high and fishing can almost certainly be improved in them. We have retailed plans ready to go for experimental reservoir management to create this better fishing. We will seek to learn how to "farm" these aquatic pastures more effectively than in the past.

The department of fish and game has been adjured and encouraged to make these preparations by the legislature, which has enacted new laws, by Governor Brown, who has earnestly sought each of the affected departments to be alert and active in efforts to make his water plan fulfill its great promise, and by the Fish and Game Commission, which has adopted succinct policy guides for us.

I, personally, see the possibilities that are opened, and because of my long connection with water development, get excited about realizing them.

Never before has so young a civilization as ours in California had opportunity for developing vast natural resources in a way planned to bring maximum benefit to its people. The techniques have all been developed for us and are known. It is not necessary for us to narrow our water development plans to single purposes and to experiment and suffer painful losses. We can look far to the future and mold our splendidly conceived water development projects for the preservation and improvement of all values, including the esthetic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values so often in the past ignored or overlooked.

Negro Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the following column written by Mr. Henry Butler should be included in the records of this Congress while we are debating the civil rights issue. It sets forth an honest and objective exposition of a subject that is often handled loosely.

[From the Indianapolis Times, Feb. 22, 1960]

THE WORLD'S A STAGE

(By Henry Butler)

I wish to enter a protest against loose talk about "the increase in Negro crime."

A couple of years ago, Time magazine, in one of its frenzies of shrill clairvoyance, had a story on the subject. The story proved nothing. It merely gave another twirl to the old hatewheel with its evil little flags.

"Negro crime," the phrase, becomes in the popular mind an "entity," as doctors say when they talk of a disease. "Negro crime"

is something the white mind easily accepts. The phrase fits into a place long prepared for it.

You don't hear about an "increase in white crime." "White crime" is merely "crime."

This begins to sound almost jazzy, and indeed the whole thing is ridiculous enough to be parodied. But it has potentially disastrous ingredients.

You might think it unnecessary to restate here unbiased opinions of sociologists. "Negro crime," they say, "is a loaded phrase inseparable from prejudice."

Item: Negroes, being physically conspicuous in a white environment, easily become targets of suspicion. Add suspicion to die-hard racism, and you have an attitude that stifles truth.

Item: Negro crime is presented in percentage rates. Related to the entire Negro population, the crime figures may seem alarming. That's if you compare them with the crime figures for the entire white population.

But suppose you compare—and I doubt if anybody's done it—the white crime figures with only that percentage of the white population living at or near the Negro's depressed economic level.

In other words, can anybody prove that whites would statistically behave any better than Negroes if they were treated like Negroes.

And there is another dimension to this problem. Note how discussions of Negro crime invariably quote Negro leaders on the subject.

Ever hear of a white leader being quoted on white crime? Ever hear President Eisenhower say, "We whites must mend our ways"? It might be a good thing if we did, but the President isn't saying that.

Since we don't talk about white crime, but do talk about Negro crime, we're hiding some cards. We're being intellectually dishonest—a favorite American pastime, and not just in the Deep South.

We're viewing the problem of crime not as a problem affecting all American citizens (whether or not they're permitted civil rights). We're viewing it as a problem largely, if not mainly, concerned with an imagined black threat to white society.

If self-deception and wallowing in prejudice were simple and harmless matters, like rooting for one ball team against another, much of this talk could be laughed off.

And if there were any indication this country's white majority is going to use more sense and see more clearly, the talk about Negro crime as being responsible for deteriorating race relations might be passed over.

But there's too much embedded nastiness in the white mind. Granted hostility is not one-sided, yet the modern trend of middle-class whites moving from cities out to suburban apartheid is significant. White folks (like most white churches, in the opinion of a cleric I recently talked with) want no part of social responsibility.

They want out, leaving Negro ghettos behind them.

Nobody seems to understand the price you have to pay for rejection. If ever there was a fate worse than death, it is the fate of being rejected. This is the supreme, the mortal insult. None of us white folks can understand it, never having been rejected because of our pallor.

With all the colored races on earth now in a mood to tear the world apart—mainly in reaction to centuries of rejection and exploitation by whites—it's time we palefaces wised up.

Shaking Out a Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 10, 1960, entitled "Shaking Out a Compromise."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAKING OUT A COMPROMISE

Much current comment on the Senate filibuster overlooks basic facts about the American system. When tempted to assume that whenever a count of heads shows a majority in favor of any proposal that measure should be made law forthwith, we should take another look at the Constitution. For the Founding Fathers set up a republic, not a simple democracy. And they built into the Constitution a whole series of brakes to protect minorities and guard against hasty, moblike action.

True, the filibuster does not appear in the Constitution. But it is in accord with the whole system of checks and balances there provided. And it derives much of its power from recognition of the framers' consideration for dissident views. They had just broken away from a government which had made too little effort to obtain "the consent of the governed." At every step in shaping the new Nation they moved with the aim of obtaining as much agreement as possible. Included was disproportionate representation in the Senate—which helps make filibusters possible.

Let's note some of the other checks on simple majority rule. First, it is a dual system, divided between Federal and State governments. The National Government is basically separated into three sections—legislative, executive, and judicial—each having power to delay the others until compromises are worked out. The President has a veto—much used these days. So does the Supreme Court. The electoral college is republican, not democratic.

It can be argued that this combination designed to get action through compromise is too slow for cold war times and should not be encumbered further by filibusters. But actually when foreign danger has been apparent the system has functioned well. It is on domestic affairs where the problem is getting acceptance of changes deeply disturbing to one section of the population that delays have usually occurred.

This is because experience teaches that successful operation of new laws requires a large measure of agreement on their justice and wisdom. That is why the Senate sanctions filibusters. That is why it refuses to shut off the current talkathon—even though most Americans believe it is using poor tactics in a poor cause.

Of course, filibusters are not always justified. Of course they have been abused. But they can serve useful purposes. They expose the intensity—and exaggerations—of opposing views. They can clarify the meaning of proposals. They can shake out workable compromises. The current filibuster has not appeared to do these things very well. Indeed, it has often displayed fine men doing such silly things and talking

such arrant nonsense as to present a damaging spectacle in the eyes of the world. It suggests that this braking process costs too much.

Yet informed opinion expects a good civil rights bill to emerge from it. So let's look at the filibuster process in the perspective of the American system. Let's not condemn all filibusters but try to understand why they are used and prevent misuse.

Give Ex-Presidents Senate Seats?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the McClatchy newspapers of California on February 15, 1960 with reference to the proposal of James A. Farley of New York:

GIVE EX-PRESIDENTS SENATE SEATS?

(By Gladstone Williams)

Big Jim Farley has come forward with a proposal for utilizing the services of our former Presidents which if not entirely new has the merit of being extremely timely.

He would have Congress take the necessary action to give every former Chief Executive a seat in the U.S. Senate upon his retirement from the White House. Each would be a lifetime Member representing the country at large rather than any individual State, with all of the privileges and prerogatives of the Senate except the right to vote.

Similar proposals have been advanced for years but nothing ever has been done about them. Farley's recommendation is particularly timely because after next January 20 the country will have three former Presidents, assuming all still are living at that time.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower will join the list of Ex-Presidents when his term expires in January. The other members of this exclusive club are Harry S. Truman and Herbert Hoover. It will be the first time in years that the country has had so many living past Presidents.

Farley, who was generalissimo of Democratic forces under the Roosevelt New Deal and is recognized as one of the shrewdest political experts in the country, discussed the subject fully in a recent article in *This Week* magazine. He said it is "a tragedy" that we are not availing ourselves of "the wisdom and experience of our former Chief Executives."

The Senate, he urged, "would be a proper place for using the services of our past Presidents."

"In the Senate," he wrote, "a former President would be constantly available to Congressmen needing his help and advice. And a former President, whatever his party and whatever his record, acquires a vast amount of information and insight that Members of Congress and the general public can never have. This is the priceless experience that we are wasting."

Big Jim, as he is affectionately known to his old associates points out that the Senate would be an excellent forum for former Presidents to use in speaking out on major policy questions. This would be especially important, he says, in

foreign and military affairs, as well as in other areas where a retired chief executive would have special knowledge.

He makes the further point that a past President, by not representing any State or section and not having to bother about being reelected, could speak with more force and freedom than most Senators. In other words, he would not be guided by the political restraints which apply to those who have to seek reelection every 6 years. That in itself would add a refreshing note to the Senate, where political considerations are too often uppermost.

Many Presidents have left the White House with years of useful service ahead of them. Former President Hoover is a striking example. Although he retired from the White House 27 years ago, in 1933, he is still active at 85. Truman also has been out of office since 1953 and still is going strong.

Among our other Presidents a number lived long after retirement. To cite only a few, John Adams survived 25 years after leaving the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson 16 years, Andrew Jackson 9, U. S. Grant 5, Grover Cleveland 12, and Theodore Roosevelt, who was only 50 when he retired, lived for 9 years.

Congress only a short time ago made provision for our former Presidents by giving them a pension of \$25,000 a year, together with office accommodations and secretarial assistance. Since we are continuing to pay them, why not make use of their counsel and experience, asks Farley.

The Filibuster and Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, several times during the course of the debate on the pending so-called civil rights bills, many of us have listened with great interest and profit to the very fine legal and constitutional arguments made in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I am very much interested therefore to read an outstanding editorial entitled "The Filibuster and ROBERTSON," which was recently published on one of the truly great newspapers of this Nation, the Richmond Times-Dispatch. I agree so heartily with the substance of the editorial, as well as the points made by Senator ROBERTSON as quoted therein, that I think it is worthy of circulation throughout the country. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Mar. 13, 1960]

THE FILIBUSTER AND ROBERTSON

The discussion which has been proceeding for weeks in the U.S. Senate in connection with the civil rights bills is far from being the all-out session of whole windjamming that is normally associated with filibusters. We aren't being regaled with discussions of how to fry oysters or what George Sisler's batting average was in 1920—as has been the case on some previous occasions.

On the contrary, the 18 participating southerners are addressing themselves, by and large, to the issue in hand. Some will disagree with their contentions, but it is impossible to deny that most of what they are saying has a direct bearing on the meaning of the civil rights bills, their constitutionality, and their probable impact. True, occasionally unduly long extracts from history books or other works are quoted, but they usually have a bearing on the question under notice.

In other words, the 18 Senators are not "speaking merely to consume time"—the phrase used in Webster's definition of "filibuster". They are consuming time, of course, but they are bringing out many salient facts concerning the pending legislation. One of those who did depart at great length from the subject was Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, who took occasion to assail the Eisenhower foreign policy. But there have been few, if any, other such instances.

Virginia's Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, for example, has been truly impressive in his scholarly interpretation of the proposed legislation and its relationship to the Federal Constitution. In three major addresses, each lasting several hours, he has probed into legal, political, and social history, quoting from the Magna Carta, the Federalist, Blackstone, Edmund Burke, Thomas Jefferson, and Daniel Webster, as well as from numerous Supreme Court decisions.

Senator ROBERTSON's addresses dealt, respectively, with the referee voting proposal, the fair employment practices proposal, and the proposal to abolish jury trials in certain civil rights cases. They were delivered February 29, March 3, and March 8, with the text of each published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Lest Mr. ROBERTSON's position be misunderstood, we quote from his address of March 8:

"The two Senators from Virginia have made it crystal clear that they consider the right to vote to be a vital constitutional right which should be granted under State law without discrimination on account of race or color, and they have pointed with pride to the fact that in Virginia, on the basis of population, the percentage of non-whites registered to vote is nearly as high as the whites."

We congratulate Senator ROBERTSON on the manner in which he is representing Virginia and the South in this historic debate. Recognized as an authority in the fields of conservation, taxation, the tariff, and banking and currency, he has also acquired genuine stature as a constitutional lawyer. He reflects credit on the Commonwealth.

Polaris Missile Can Revolutionize Our Defense and Cut Costs If We Let It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in this age of the ballistic missile, two basic considerations come to the fore either in attack or retaliation, namely, first, mobility of missile launching platforms and second, concealment of launching site. At the certain risk of "parochialism" charges from some quarters, I wish to discuss Polaris, the Navy's answer to

both mobility and concealment. The very oceans themselves permit instant maneuverability of guided missile surface ships and the complete concealment of the Polaris submarine.

On land, the U.S. Air Force's Strategic Air Command, enjoying no such natural advantages as offered by the oceans, has announced its solution to this vexing two-fold problem is to shuttle railroad trains back and forth over present railroad lines for mobility and to sink huge post holes in the ground for concealment.

The Air Force does not disclose how a silo would be reloaded for additional firings if required. In the case of missile firings from the sea, both submarines and ships are designed to carry racks of missiles which can be hurled one after the other. The present Polaris submarine is designed to fire 16 missiles before the necessity of restocking supply.

Comparisons between the solutions offered by the two services simply cannot be made for Polaris is not just another weapon system, it is a means by which our entire strategic situation can be improved immeasurably. Writing under the title "The Question of National Defense" Prof. Oskar Morgenstern put it this way:

If the system were better understood, the Navy and the country would press harder for it. We seem to be a long way from the point where the other services, the Department of Defense and the National Security Council realize how profound an entire strategic situation can be improved. To them Polaris is apparently only another weapon system.

Explaining why Polaris is not just another weapon system, L. Edgar Prina, military editor of the Washington Star, has written masterfully under the title "Missile Accomplished" in the latest issue of Navy magazine.

This competent and respected military author takes a second look at the current political missile gap in which the United States is supposed to find itself and finds as follows:

That missile gap is pointless prattle if the onready submarine Polaris weapon system is installed on appropriate surface ships of the striking fleets.

That the furor over the missile gap is not much different than the bomber gap of a year ago, a gap that never occurred.

That land-based "Cassandras" are heedless of the fact that refinements in the seagoing Polaris will permit this missile to span 3,000 miles.

That ship-carried Polaris is a better proven war deterrent than land-buried ICBM's locked in concrete, because of mobility.

That cruiser-based Polaris is a better proven retaliatory weapon than a parlor car equivalent aboard exposed tracks.

That ship-based Polaris in addition to submarine Polaris would give the Navy 100 additional Polaris missiles using a minimum of 8 cruisers for launching platforms.

The text of Mr. Prina's excellent article is as follows:

MISSILE ACCOMPLISHED

(By L. Edgar Prino)

For less money than it takes to buy 15 copies of the billion-dollar-a-wing B-58 medium bomber, all talk of a missile gap could be transformed into an exercise in pointless prattle.

No magic wand is needed. A decision to exploit more fully the most mobile, least vulnerable ballistic missile system now within our grasp could do it. In short:

Put the solid-fuel Polaris intermediate range rocket into appropriate surface ships of the striking fleets.

While the Pentagon talks of putting large ICBM's on special railroad cars, if feasible, in 1965, it could have combat-ready Polaris missiles roaming the world's oceans on speedy cruisers early in 1962, if the decision were made now.

This would give the Nation the quickest, most secure additional deterrent force for the least expenditure.

But this is a presidential election year, and defense has become a political football subject to the most violent partisan kicks. The chant of "missile gap" again reverberates over Capitol Hill. No surcease is likely before November.

Critics have been charging for more than a year that the administration is deliberately allowing the Soviet Union to attain a wide superiority in intercontinental ballistic missiles. They predict that the United States will, therefore, face extreme peril in the 1962-63 period when the gap will be at its widest.

These critics are the same Cassandras who predicted a bomber gap some years ago, a gap that never occurred. Now they are beguiled by ICBM's. They ignore other retaliatory weapons, including even the 1,500-mile Polaris which, because it can be brought up close to the Soviet Union for firing, is an ICBM-equivalent.

The answer to the gap, in their minds, is to produce more 85-foot Atlases and 100-foot Titans (when available in 1961) and bury these first-generation liquid-fuel monsters deep in concrete-lined holes. They advocate, too, a desperate, extremely costly stopgap measure: An immediate airborne alert for a substantial number of B-52's.

On its side, the administration contends its new intelligence estimates of what the Russians probably will do make unlikely any meaningful Soviet superiority in numbers of ICBM's. And there will be no deterrent gap at all.

The administration earlier had decided to increase ICBM production by one-third, giving us a total of 270 Atlas and Titan missiles by 1963. This augmentation will cost upward of \$750 million, perhaps as much as \$1 billion.

Why this continued investment in vulnerability when a much more secure alternative can be had more quickly and for less money?

Will it be any real consolation to know that we have 270 ICBM's on 27 zeroed-in bases rather than 200 on 20?

We may never get a satisfactory answer to the first question, but a junior high school pupil can provide the proper one to the second.

Anyone with half an eye can see that big fixed bases, no matter how deep you dig them and no matter how much concrete you pour over them, are finished. ICBM accuracy is already phenomenal. The recent Soviet shot in the Pacific roared 7,800 miles to within 1.25 miles of the target. Our Atlas has been landing, on the average, within a 2-mile circular error probable. These accuracies can only be bettered. And new and more powerful booster engines will mean larger hydrogen warheads.

The Navy has pushed hard, but perhaps not hard enough, for money and permission to build more missile submarines and to put Polaris on surface ships.

The fight for money has been pressed only to a point because of the ridiculous percentage freeze whereby each service gets roughly the same portion of the defense dollar year after year, despite major new weapons developments.

For the Navy to go all out, in the circumstances, for strategic weapons, might mean starvation for other vital needs, such as new aircraft carriers and antisubmarine warfare tools.

In addition to money, there is another problem. It must be acknowledged that not every one at the Pentagon—or in the airplane and concrete business—is happy over the inevitable shift of a major part of our deterrent/retaliatory force from fortress America to mobile bases at sea.

Thus, one hears high-ranking officers dwell on various unsolved problems facing Polaris, which is actually ahead of even its accelerated schedule. But these officers, who seek to belittle the real significance of the Navy's rocket, express no doubts whatever about weapons systems of their own service which are 3 to 5 years away from combat-ready status and are, therefore, destined to be only indevelopment spectators during the most critical period of the so-called missile gap.

Under present administration plans, there will be 15 atomic-powered Polaris missile submarines, each carrying 16 of the hydrogen-tipped rockets, at sea by the end of 1963. This would mean a total of 240 missiles, each 15 times more powerful than the A-bombs which devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, ready for instantaneous or, if desirable, leisurely retaliatory fire.

The Navy could have 100 additional Polaris missiles at sea in 8 cruisers, including the nuclear-powered *Long Beach*, in the same time period. The cost: About \$450 million. This is less than the cost of one-third of a wing of golden B-58's, planes which might never get off the ground in the event of a surprise missile attack. It is less than the cost of 6 months of an airborne alert for only 100 B-52's.

Even if the Kremlin was convinced it could destroy our fixed-base missiles on the ground—and unless we somehow build a foolproof instantaneous warning system in the next couple years—this is a definite possibility—340 Polaris rockets would give it cause for pause.

There are 156 cities in the U.S.S.R. with a population of 100,000 or more. All these cities are, or will be, within range of Polaris. An arsenal of 340 would provide slightly more than two missiles per target. Even the piddling 20-kiloton Hiroshima bomb could destroy 95 percent of any one of these Russian cities, if exploded at the right point.

What advantages are to be gained, aside from bargain rates and a speedy addition to our mobile deterrent force, by putting Polaris in surface ships? Here is a partial list:

1. It would saddle the enemy with a new and urgent defense problem. Fighting our atomic Polaris subs with his conventional types is one of his headaches; fighting far-ranging task forces of surface ships carrying ballistic missiles is another he has not yet had to face. It would drain off men, money, and materials from other military missions, offensive or defensive.

2. There would be no danger of unsuccessful shots landing on the United States or Canada, a hazard with our land-based ICBM's.

3. Any enemy attempt to destroy Polaris launchers at sea with nuclear weapons would not give him bonus kills of American citizens through radioactive fallout.

4. Polaris has a maximum flight time of 15 minutes as against half an hour for a U.S.-based ICBM. This means less reaction time for Russian defenses.

5. Polaris would not be vulnerable to sabotage. (This will be a tremendous worry to the Air Force—and to John Q. Public—in

1965 when it hopes to begin putting its Minuteman ICBM aboard railroad launching cars for random travel over a network of 100,000 miles of the Nation's tracks.)

6. The space and weight for a Polaris installation has been reserved in the U.S.S. *Long Beach*. If the decision were made now to go ahead, it would save time and money.

7. The current Polaris is in the Model T stage. A version soon to follow will have a 1,700-mile range and, by 1964-65, the weapon will be able to reach out to 3,000 miles. This will make Polaris even more attractive as surface ship armament. Important note: Ranges up to 3,000 miles can be cranked into Polaris without changing the size of its canister. Increased warhead size and improved guidance also may be expected.

8. It would give the Navy, in the words of Adm. Charles R. (Cat) Brown, "a visual symbol of power * * * a big war, small war, cold war weapon, all in one."

In lauding the projected B-70 bomber recently, Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, said the big jet plane, unlike a submerged submarine, would be seen by our friends and allies and would, therefore, contribute to free world solidarity and confidence.

Although one may wonder how many persons would be able to see a 2,100-mile-an-hour plane at 70,000 feet, the general had a point. And it is pertinent to the Polaris-on-surface-ship proposal.

The decision against the Navy for surface-ship Polaris is not final. As the missile continues to tick off successful firings, there is a growing appreciation among high Government officials of the need to put more of our strategic deterrent to sea.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, top scientific advisor to President Eisenhower, called Polaris a "unique strength," a sure, secure deterrent.

Dr. Howard A. Wilcox, Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering, recently told the American Ordnance Association:

"These strategic deterrent weapons should best be lodged in the ocean, where they are most invulnerable to knocking-out by enemy action and where they can retaliate without requiring instant communication, instant intelligence and instant early warning."

"The retaliatory capability, if lodged in the ocean, does not depend upon the integrity of the parent continental United States any longer, and this gives it an inevitable nature which I believe will most strongly act as a deterrent to all-out war."

More importantly, perhaps, Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has told Congress that the administration would expand and accelerate the Polaris program, "no matter what the cost," whenever tests provide "a little firmer basis on which to proceed."

The Polaris is proving out. Recent shots have demonstrated amazing accuracy—a circular error probable of less than half-a-mile. Testing is said to be running a month or two ahead of schedule. The missile may be pronounced operational late this summer.

Augmentation of the submarine building program and a green light for Polaris installation in a number of cruisers could come before Congress adjourns. It would be none too soon.

Homesteading in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a year ago, there was a good deal of pub-

licity about a number of families from Detroit who went to Alaska to settle. A great many of them were unaware of the difficulties they would encounter. They were unprepared for some of the physical hardships and other obstacles which homesteading pioneers will meet on the last frontier.

Alaska welcomes men and women of the pioneer type and spirit; but we feel it important that they be prepared, not merely for the rugged conditions of terrain and climate, as well as the financial realities, and also for some of the man-made obstacles which homesteaders in Alaska have long encountered.

An informative article dealing with this particular group appeared in the Parade magazine of the Washington Post, yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKAN PIONEERS—1 YEAR LATER

(By Sid Ross)

TALKEETNA, ALASKA.—Last year, 41 American families very much like your own made national headlines by turning their backs on civilization. Like many people, they had heard of homestead lands free for the taking in Alaska, so they quit their jobs and sold their homes around Detroit to head for the frozen frontier.

A newspaperman, in tribute to our pioneer ancestors, dubbed them the "Fifty-niners"—and the name stuck. Their first caravan, flying "Alaska or Bust" banners, left just a year ago this month.

How are the Fifty-niners doing, after a year in the rugged north?

A few weeks ago I traveled to their settlement near here, 115 miles north of Anchorage, to find out. I lived for nearly a week in the Fifty-niners' crude cabins and sampled their daily hardships. And I watched what began as a bright new dream sputtering, flickering and dying out.

The Fifty-niners' goal was a prosperous "New Michigan," a cooperative community in which all hands would pitch in to clear the land and to build creamery, clinic, church, and school.

But today, I found, the community consists of only four families and three "winter bachelors," strung out along 16 miles of gravel road. And I found that after a year of weary struggle, these few are nearly broke. They live on a minimum diet in which eggs, milk, and meat are luxuries. They live without even the most fundamental of amenities—such as an outhouse.

Yet I also found an amazing record of accomplishment and courage. Each family independently has dug in and built with bare hands at least the beginning of a new life. Each has done so in the face of total inexperience and incredible hardships. And while the Fifty-niners have bickered, they have not belittled.

"I guess Nature has thrown just about everything possible at us," said Gerry Donaldson, one of the diehards, one night as we huddled around his oil-drum stove. "We've even had earthquakes. But my wife and me, we're sticking it out. After this year, I don't fear anything Alaska can do."

Donaldson, 47, a tile contractor in Detroit, was so green at first he even brought golf clubs. Yet he has hewn out his own cabin of foot-thick logs, harvested a small crop, dug a well, and beat back an acre of wilderness. He has found Nature a savage, unyielding enemy. But like the other Fifty-niners, he has found another formidable enemy in man.

A SNUB IN THE COLD

During my stay, I lived with Marino Sik, 33, a descendant of northern Michigan Swedes, who had been a repairman back in Detroit. Donaldson immediately came by; the next day, I talked to Nick Rubino, a former pipefitter who has a road gang job for the winter, and later to Eric Eklund, an ex-clerk working temporarily in Anchorage. Three other Fifty-niners—Bill Orzechowski, an plumber; Ray Kula, a former machinist, and Steve Pankewicz—never appeared.

This surprised me since Alaskans are proverbially friendly. Then one day Sik and I were standing by the road when a family came by on a horse-drawn sled. To my amazement, Sik and the other man ignored each other. I asked Sik who the man was.

"That was Ray Kula," he said. From that incident and others, I gradually realized that the Fifty-niners today seldom speak and rarely cooperate. Thus they have added a new hardship—one that may doom their dream if others do not. For each must now do, wastefully and arduously, what all might have done easily together. Just this winter several grimly built their own livestock shelters although a completed community barn stood half-empty.

Perhaps the falling-out among the remaining Fifty-niners was inevitable. For theirs has been an odyssey of breakdowns enroute, disappointments on arrival and hardships here.

The Fifty-niners' original destination was the Kenai Peninsula, south of Anchorage. A scout had told them Kenai was "like an indescribably beautiful painting." But what the scout had omitted was that Kenai had nowhere near enough unclaimed land for all of them.

Only in the Susitna Valley was good land available in such quantities. But settling here would mean the city-dwellers would be miles farther from civilization, isolated most of the year by the "godawful" Susitna River, and confronted by a far harsher climate.

THE SUSITNA SHOWDOWN

Such a raw existence was more than most of the colonists had bargained for. Some wanted to turn back to Detroit. Others said they were too far committed and hadn't the funds. Squabbles broke out over the community treasury and the community equipment.

After much arguments, 16 went back to Detroit; 7 chose Kenai; 8 took city jobs in Anchorage. Fifteen families voted for Susitna, but only 11 actually made the trip; and 4 of these never crossed the river. Three who did gave up. Shortly afterward, 76 new Fifty-niners made the same disappointing discovery; all gave up the idea of homesteading.

The handful left cooperated at first, then began bickering. Today it focuses on the depleted treasury, on who should lead and on personalities. "These people had better grow up fast," one veteran homesteader said to me. "Alaska don't fool around with little kids." And the Fifty-niners have much to fight without fighting among themselves.

When I arrived in Talkeetna, it was the coldest night of the year. Etched by a brilliant moon, the snowscape looked so brittle you thought it would crack at a touch. I wore sealskin mukluks, three pairs of socks, three suits of underwear, wool pants and a wool shirt, a jacket, a lined parka with a hood, a knitted helmet and two pairs of gloves.

The thermometer read 52 degrees below zero when Sik, his wife Carol and I set off on the 2-mile walk across the frozen Susitna. Sik piled my luggage on a small homemade sled, added three bales of hay he had bought for his livestock and slipped into a crude rope harness. He handed me a pushing pole, and we set out through feathery snow along a barely visible trail.

My every breath was agony. My glasses froze up almost immediately. The earpieces were so cold, despite my two head coverings, that afterward I found I had been frostbitten where they touched. Every few minutes we had to pry our frozen eyelids apart.

"At least there's no wind," Sik gasped during one stop. I lost all track of time and steps. At 4 a.m., we stopped for coffee at the cabin of veteran homesteader Shorty Bradley. (In Alaska doors are always open, for to be stranded outside can mean freezing to death.) At 7:30 we reached Sik's. Including the stop, it took us 6½ painful hours to travel 5½ miles.

Inside I saw a three-sided log box tacked onto a house trailer, which served as fourth wall and bedroom. At one end, Carol Sik, feeding spruce slabs into a stove, cooked flapjacks—a staple in a diet that is mostly potatoes, bread and soup. The floor was packed earth. The cluttered living area, sparingly lit by kerosene lamps and Coleman lanterns, centered around a cozy oil-drum stove.

Near the door stood two pans of water, and I asked Carol about them.

"That's the washroom," she laughed. "Our well went dry 3 weeks ago and we have to melt snow to drink and to wash in. It's a chore. I manage to bathe Lindy (their 20-month-old daughter) every other day, but I haven't had a real bath myself since September."

I had been told in Anchorage that "anyone who comes to Alaska with little kids is nuts," and I asked Carol how she managed. "Oh, Lindy's a good kid, she entertains herself around the cabin pretty well," Carol said. "But we really worry about her getting sick. The nearest doctor is at Palmer—70 miles. And we have that godawful river to cross."

"You saw the river on a good night," Sik said. "It's full of ice much of the year and really boiling. When we need to cross, Shorty Bradley sets off a charge of dynamite to signal the bush pilots. They charge \$7.50 or \$10 for the trip. But the signal doesn't always work. It didn't when Bertha Donaldson got sick."

That night I heard the story from Bertha Donaldson herself. One day she came down with a high fever and pains in her arms, legs and chest. Bradley set off a dynamite charge, and then another. When neither brought a response, he tried flares. Two days passed, and Gerry Donaldson, in desperation, coaxed an old Alaska hand into braving the river in a skiff. Mrs. Donaldson was in bad shape when the bush plane finally arrived and whisked her to Anchorage. With modern medical care, she recovered quickly.

"When we got here, the ice was beginning to break up, and the current was 10 or 12 knots," Sik told me later. "Everyone said we couldn't possibly cross."

MY LAST CIGARETTE

"Well, we worked night and day, all of us, for 3 days. The tractors hauling the trailers had to weave their way, dodging soft places and open water. On the third day, it was so weak we couldn't even use tractors."

"Finally, we just carried things in our arms—men, women, kids. Two men would carry a stove between them. And the ice was cracking and shaking all the time—we were all afraid we might drop into 18 feet of cold water at any minute."

"I still remember Ray Kula standing on the bank, joking about 'smoking my last cigarette.' Well, all of us did fall in—I changed clothes at least three times—but we got everything over but one trailer."

Sik went on with his narrative, telling of first shoveling away 2 feet of snow, then trying to clear the land amid rains and insects and 100-degree heat, of carrying water a half mile and learning by trial and error to plow and to plant. And he led me to

inevitable questions: Why in the world did he choose such a bleak existence? Why in the world did he stay?

"You think I should go back to Detroit?" he burst out. "Listen, back there I worked all day for this gas company and then till 2 a.m. as a policeman at a drive-in. And where was I getting? Why, the only time I saw Carol was when she came to the movie."

"Now, up here, sure it's a tough go, but at least we're working together on it, and we're going to have our own land, 160 acres of it, in the end."

Under the homestead law, Sik explained, the Federal Government will grant you 160 acres if you clear and cultivate 20 acres within 3 years. You must have a habitable dwelling on your claim at the end of a year. The next year, you must clear and cultivate 10 of the 160 acres. The third year, you must clear and cultivate 10 more. Total cost: \$10 for filing fees.

These requirements are stiffer than they look, as Alaska's land records show. Today only about half of the State's available homestead lands are occupied. The other half never have been claimed, or have been claimed and then abandoned.

To make a go of homesteading, I was told in Anchorage, takes 20 years' hard work and a \$65,000 investment. One official told me, "What this State needs is young, vigorous childless couples with about \$10,000 in the bank." Clearing is a formidable task for a lone man. Hiring men and machines costs \$150 to \$350 an acre. The fifty-niners cannot afford such prices.

"Everything is tough, or costs money," Sik sighed one afternoon. "None of us ever had been farmers, or well diggers, or loggers before. I cleared 1 acre last year, and I borrowed a bulldozer to do it. We've had to learn everything the hard way. Carol's had to learn canning, preserving, butchering, even how to bake bread. I never handled livestock until I bought my cows and my horses."

"If Shorty Bradley, the oldtimer, hadn't been here to help, I don't know what we would have done."

GETTING A HEAD START

Already, Sik showed me, he is getting ready for the Fifty-niners' make-or-break year. Vegetable seeds are germinating in window boxes to get a head start since next winter the Siks must live on what they can grow. Sik has mentally marked off 10 acres for clearing with chain saw, hand axe and his team of horses.

The cabin must be made more liveable, and a new well and outhouse added. And he must try to rustle up part-time jobs for he has only \$50 left.

Let one of these projects fail, and his whole venture may fail.

My last night, a gay little get-together was thrown at the Donaldsons' just-finished cabin. Visiting and reading old comic books and television magazines are virtually the only Fifty-niner recreations so I had hoped the party might bring all the Fifty-niners together for once, but the gap was still too wide.

The next day, Sik and I headed back across the river—on snowshoes this time—and he gave me one more shot of the faith that had carried the Fifty-niners so many miles. "We'll make it through this winter and the next one, too," Sik said grimly. "Sid, you come back in 10 years. One of these days, they'll build a bridge across this river, and we'll have roads to take our crops to market and we'll have schools to educate our kids. We'll have a real flourishing community, with all the things we planned."

I left him in Talkeetna and slugged off toward the train. I hoped his dream would come true, although I couldn't help feeling that the odds were rather long. But I

hoped—as I still do—that Sik and all the Fifty-niners would work together to attain it. For only that way, I felt, can they ever build a New Michigan, hacked with their own hands out of the wilderness.

RLCA Press Release Charges Undermaintenance by Railroads Creates Dangerous Condition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a press release issued March 1, 1960, by the Railway Labor Executives' Association:

PRESIDENT OF BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYEES CHARGES UNDERMAINTENANCE BY RAILROAD HAS CREATED DANGEROUS CONDITION

President Harold C. Crotty of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees said today that "the drastic extent to which the railroads have curtailed the maintenance of their tracks, bridges and structures in recent years has created and is perpetuating a dangerous situation."

In an article written for the President's Page of the March issue of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Journal, Crotty said that he was confident that a thorough inspection of railroad tracks and structures by a competent and neutral authority would more than bear out this opinion.

"Deferred maintenance of tracks and bridges is difficult to determine in the aggregate unless one has access to the records and reports of the maintenance engineers on each railroad or is in a position to make complete and detailed inspections of railroad facilities," Crotty said.

"No data is now compiled by the ICC to indicate directly the degree of undermaintenance. There are, however, several general indicators which reflect the extent to which maintenance work is or is not being done."

MAINTENANCE WORKERS CUT IN HALF

Pointing out that, obviously, the roadway plant cannot be maintained without an adequate number of employees, Crotty cited the following statistics in support of his contention that there has been "a serious deterioration of safety standards" for maintenance by the railroads:

1. Maintenance-of-way employment on class I line-haul railroads declined from 256,748 in 1946 (ICC midmonth count of 16 classes) to only 119,728 in 1958—a decrease of 137,020 or 53.3 percent.

2. The reduction in maintenance forces was not due to a comparable reduction in railroad traffic—freight traffic on class I railroads aggregated 551 billion revenue ton-miles in 1958 as compared to 591 billion revenue ton-miles in 1946.

3. In 1958 class I railroads replaced only 16 million cross-ties compared to an average of 34.5 million annually in the 5 years from 1946 to 1950 and 27.3 million annually from 1951 to 1955.

4. Only 920 thousand tons of rail were laid in replacement during 1958 compared to an annual average of 2.6 million tons from

1946 to 1950 and 2.1 million tons from 1951 to 1955.

"Adequate maintenance of track requires that ties and rail be renewed regularly as they wear out," Crotty said. "During recent years, these renewals have declined severely, a condition which would naturally be expected to accompany such heavy reductions in force."

DIVIDENDS TO STOCKHOLDERS NEARLY DOUBLE

Crotty noted that railway maintenance officials admit that much needed track and bridge maintenance has been and is being deferred and said that the railroads generally contend that this is due to lack of money.

"Yet during the years the standard of maintenance has been permitted to deteriorate so seriously," he said, "the payments of dividends to stockholders has increased substantially. In 1946, when class I railroads had 256,000 maintenance-of-way employees in the service, replaced more than 37 million cross-ties and laid 2.5 million tons of rail, they declared dividends of \$234.6 million. In contrast, during the year 1958, when they had less than 120,000 maintenance-of-way employees, replaced only 16 million cross-ties and laid only 920,000 tons of rail, they declared dividends of \$418.8 million."

"It is quite apparent that the railways consider the payment of dividends to their stockholders of much more importance than the safe maintenance of their roadway or the welfare of their employees."

When employment figures for 1959 are available, they will show a still further decline in maintenance-of-way employment, Crotty predicted.

SAFETY STANDARDS IGNORED

"Dieselization, improved materials and work methods, centralized traffic control, mechanization, automatic protection of traffic at highway crossings—these, and particularly mechanization, are the major causes for the gradual decline in maintenance-of-way employment through the years," he said. "They do not, however, account for the fact that maintenance-of-way employment decreased from more than 225,000 in 1953 and 170,000 in 1956 to less than 120,000 in 1958 and even less in 1959."

"Beginning in the fall of 1957 and continuing through 1958 and 1959, the railroads have cut maintenance forces to the bone. It is my opinion—and I think this is readily apparent from the figures I have given—that the bare skeleton forces being presently maintained by the railroads are not sufficient to keep their tracks, bridges and structures in safe condition."

Crotty said that the standards of safety varied from railroad to railroad with some being high, some adequate, and some barely adequate, adding, "It is my opinion that the standards for roadway safety now being maintained by many railroads are marginal and border on the dangerous."

Legislation is now pending in Congress to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to inspect railroad trackage and, if found unsafe, to order the railroad to make necessary repairs or alterations. In the absence of such a law, the railroads themselves are the sole judge of the condition of their trackage.

"We have found," Crotty said, "that in allocating money for maintenance work the railroads are often motivated by considerations other than safety."

BACKED BY RLEA

Crotty's views were given the endorsement of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, which represents 23 standard railway labor organizations. A. E. Lyon, executive secretary of the RLEA, said that the RLEA's committee on safety has repeatedly expressed grave concern over the failure of the railroads to maintain their trackage and

equipment up to adequate safety standards in recent years.

Lyon released, on behalf of the RLEA, four tables prepared by Crotty which show the serious decline in maintenance-of-way em-

ployment, the steady drop in the hours of maintenance work per mile of road and the big jump in the average number of miles of road operated per maintenance employee, the amount of ties and rail laid in replace-

ment, and the steady decline in the budget for maintenance of way and structures as contrasted to the steady rise in railroad dividends to stockholders.

These tables follow.

TABLE 1.—Employment trend, by classifications, maintenance-of-way department, class I railroads in the United States, 1946 and 1958

Classification	Average number of employees, middle of month count		Decrease ¹		Classification	Average number of employees, middle of month count		Decrease ¹	
	1946	1958	Number	Percent		1946	1958	Number	Percent
Bridge and building gang foreman.....	4,100	2,892	1,208	29.5	Gang foremen (extra gang and work-train laborers).....	4,136	2,459	1,677	40.5
Bridge and building carpenters.....	14,596	8,015	6,581	45.0	Gang or section foremen.....	24,754	14,363	10,391	42.0
Bridge and building ironworkers.....	953	646	307	32.2	Extra gangmen.....	45,905	16,212	29,693	64.7
Bridge and building painters.....	2,313	1,076	1,237	53.5	Section men.....	126,015	52,193	73,822	58.6
Masons, bricklayers, plasterers, and plumbers.....	2,084	2,415	331	15.9	Maintenance-of-way laborers (other than track and roadway) and gardeners and farmers.....	3,272	1,508	1,764	53.9
Maintenance-of-way and structures helpers and apprentices.....	7,380	4,083	3,297	44.7	Bridge operators and helpers.....	1,019	974	45	4.4
Portable equipment operators.....	4,496	6,132	1,636	36.4	Crossing and bridge flagmen and gatemen.....	13,179	6,158	7,021	53.3
Portable equipment operator helpers.....	663	420	243	36.7	Total.....	256,748	119,728	137,020	53.4
Pumping equipment operators.....	1,913	182	1,731	90.5					

¹ 1946-58: Decrease, \$138,987; increase, \$1,967; total decrease, \$137,020.

² Increase.

Source: Annual M-300, ICC.

TABLE 2.—Maintenance-of-way hours of service per mile of road operated and average miles of road operated per employee—Designated classes, selected years—Class I railways in the United States

Year	Maintenance-of-way hours worked per mile of road operated ¹		Average miles of road operated per section foreman	Average miles of road operated per section man	Average miles of road operated per designated group ²	Year	Maintenance-of-way hours worked per mile of road operated ¹		Average miles of road operated per section foreman	Average miles of road operated per section man	Average miles of road operated per designated group ²
	Hours	Index (1922=100)					Hours	Index (1922=100)			
1922.....	3,892.7	100.0	6.0	1.17	0.82	1950.....	2,045.0	52.5	10.1	2.13	1.30
1925.....	4,134.7	106.2	6.0	1.17	.78	1953.....	1,631.8	41.9	11.4	2.65	1.65
1930.....	3,426.9	88.0	6.2	1.35	.90	1956.....	1,531.5	39.3	12.1	2.87	1.78
1935.....	1,965.6	50.5	9.1	2.29	1.53	1957.....	1,389.3	35.7	13.1	3.21	1.98
1940.....	2,103.0	54.0	9.8	2.36	1.49	1958.....	1,071.8	27.5	15.4	4.23	2.60
1945.....	3,362.6	86.4	9.0	1.62	.96						

¹ 16 maintenance-of-way classifications.

² Combined total of section foremen, section men, extra gang foremen, and extra gangmen.

Source: "Transport Statistics in the United States, ICC," Interstate Commerce Commission M-300.

TABLE 3.—Ties and rail laid in replacement, class I line-haul railroads, 1939-58

Year	Wooden cross-ties			Rail			Year	Wooden cross-ties			Rail		
	Number	Index, 1947-49=100	Average number	Number of tons ¹	Index, 1947-49=100	Average number		Number	Index, 1947-49=100	Average number	Number of tons ¹	Index, 1947-49=100	Average number
1939.....	Millions	129.5		Millions	71.7		1951.....	29.06	83.5		2.31	85.9	
1940.....	43.62	125.3		2.14	79.6		1952.....	30.33	87.2		2.06	76.6	
1941.....	47.22	135.7		2.50	92.9		1953.....	29.81	85.7		2.30	85.5	
1942.....	48.62	139.7		2.52	93.7		1954.....	23.17	66.6		1.92	71.4	
1943.....	45.44	130.6		2.70	100.4		1955.....	24.15	69.4		1.89	70.3	
1944.....	48.03	138.0		3.22	119.7		Average, 1951-55.....			27.30			2.10
1945.....	43.91	126.2		3.31	123.0		1956.....	23.65	68.0		1.73	64.3	
Average, 6, 1941-45.....			46.64			2.85	1957.....	22.08	63.4		1.59	59.1	
1946.....	37.56	107.9		2.58	95.9		1958.....	16.03	46.1		1.92	34.2	
1947.....	37.29	107.2		2.84	105.6		Average, 1956-58.....			20.59			1.41
1948.....	36.84	105.9		2.75	102.2								
1949.....	30.28	87.0		2.47	91.8								
1950.....	30.49	87.6		2.45	91.1								
Average, 1946-50.....			34.49			2.62							

¹ Tons of 2,000 pounds.

² "Statistics of Railways of Class I, Calendar Years 1948-58," Association of American Railroads, August 1959.

Source: "Transport Statistics in the United States," ICC.

TABLE 4.—Maintenance-of-way and structures expense, operating revenues and dividends declared, class I line-haul railways in the United States, 1946-58

Year	Operating revenues	Maintenance-of-way and structures expense		Dividends declared		Year	Operating revenues	Maintenance-of-way and structures expense		Dividends declared	
		Amount	Percent of operating revenues	Amount	Percent of operating revenues			Amount	Percent of operating revenues	Amount	Percent of operating revenues
	Millions	Millions		Millions			Millions	Millions		Millions	
1946	\$7,628	\$1,150	15.08	\$234.6	3.08	1953	10,664	1,584	14.85	412.1	3.86
1947	8,685	1,212	13.96	236.5	2.72	1954	9,371	1,352	14.43	379.3	4.05
1948	9,672	1,348	13.94	289.2	2.99	1955	10,106	1,387	13.72	448.2	4.43
1949	8,580	1,284	14.97	251.9	2.94	1956	10,551	1,405	13.32	461.7	4.38
1950	9,473	1,287	13.59	312.1	3.29	1957	10,491	1,431	13.64	438.4	4.18
1951	10,391	1,479	14.23	328.5	3.16	1958	9,565	1,223	12.79	418.8	4.38
1952	10,581	1,519	14.36	338.1	3.20						

¹ "Statistics of Railways of Class I, United States, Calendar Years 1948-58," Association of American Railroads, August 1959.

Source: Transport Statistics in the United States, ICC.

Loyalty Oath in National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a set of editorials commenting on the effort being made through S. 2929, the Kennedy-Clark-Javits bill, to rescind the disclaimer affidavit provision in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. There has been an increasingly strong body of editorial opinion regarding this matter during recent months, as this selection of editorials well indicates.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Bulletin, Nov. 21, 1959]

THE LOYALTY OATH SHOULD BE DROPPED FROM THE DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

The decisions of Harvard and Yale Universities and Oberlin College to drop out of the Federal student loan program are welcome acts of academic courage in the face of a threat to a basic American freedom—freedom of thought.

By their action, the three schools dramatize the urgent need to cut the loyalty oath requirement out of the National Defense Act of 1958, the Nation's answer to sputnik and the Soviet intellectual challenge.

In purpose, that act is good. Indeed, it was overdue. For too long, the United States has wasted one of its most precious assets—brainpower—because of the limited capacity of colleges to provide loans to able but needy students.

The defense education law attempted to meet that need in American higher education by providing accredited schools with a total of \$1 billion over a 4-year trial period to minimize brainpower wastage in the fields of science, math, languages, and teaching. Such assistance clearly would serve to strengthen national security at a basic level.

But as long as the loyalty oath remains, it is a bad law, with a greater potential for harm than good.

The oath itself, requiring a loan recipient to disclaim belief and membership in and support for "any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence, or by any

illegal or unconstitutional means," reads innocently.

In fact, however, it subtly inhibits free thought by suggesting in negative terms that there are areas of intellectual heresy that must be avoided, or risk aid loss, disgrace, and perhaps even jail for unintentional perjury.

The oath is offensive in many other ways. It is discriminatory since it singles out needy students from the list of Federal loan recipients, ranging from businessmen to farmers, by requiring a loyalty pledge. Dangerously unspecific as a legal document, it encourages a confusion between nonconformity and disloyalty that threatens to throttle independent thinking, the root of America's greatness. It also is futile and generally fatuous.

But the foremost objection to the oath requirement is that it seriously, if subtly, transgresses the spirit of free inquiry central to the American academic tradition and to democracy itself.

This is not an idle or theoretical concern. Most responsible educators opposed the loyalty oath provision from the beginning, but accepted it the first year in view of the urgent need for scholarship funds, in the hope that the affidavit proviso would be eliminated by Congress during the last session.

The effort, sparked by Senator KENNEDY, not only failed, but the 1960 appropriations bill even had tacked to it a rider prohibiting public schools from buying Communist-made science and other teaching equipment with Federal funds, or even State funds used to match Federal school grants.

Thus, the oath became confirmed as the thin edge of a wedge by which zealots in Government might use the law to gain greater control of education, with the danger of subjecting thought to the tyranny of orthodoxy or actually forcing it into channels of revolt.

Many universities and colleges like Brown have chosen to remain in the program while continuing to fight for an amendment of the act, and that is an acceptable, if expedient course. But Harvard, Yale, Oberlin, and the other 11 schools that have either withdrawn from the program or never accepted it are serving America well—at great cost to themselves and even damage to some students—by dramatizing what could prove otherwise a dangerous compromise with America's idealism, its Constitution, and its strength.

[From the Boston Herald, Nov. 24, 1959]

STUDENT AID

It is being said in some quarters that the refusal of Harvard and other leading universities to participate in the Federal student loan program does no harm.

The universities' objection to the affidavit of disbelief in communism, it is alleged,

merely saves the taxpayers money. It is no skin off anybody's nose if students fail to accept loans under the Federal program.

But the issue is not that simple.

The purpose of the National Defense Education Act, which set the program up, was not primarily philanthropic. Congress was concerned, and rightly so, because our educational system was producing so few scientists, mathematicians, and foreign language specialists.

It had heard its own Atomic Energy Committee declare that the atomic energy program would be in serious danger unless something was done to expand the education of engineers and scientists. It had heard the President's 20-man Committee on Scientists and Engineers say that our scientific training must be stepped up if our scientists and technologists were to remain on a par with the Russians.

So Congress was thinking of the national safety, not the need of individual students, when it launched its aid program. In a policy statement written into the bill, it spelled its purpose out:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends on the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge."

In view of this, how can it be said that the withdrawal of 16 colleges and universities from the program, some of them the best scientific training institutions in the country, doesn't matter. The withdrawals are defeating the program.

When Congress meets again, it should ask itself whether the negative affidavit, the piling of oath on oath, which is what most of the colleges object to, is worth what it is costing. A simple oath of allegiance by student borrowers surely should be enough (and many will question whether even this is necessary).

The need to draw more talented young people into science education is real. If we fail, we may lose the cold war by default.

Congress must take the refusal of the universities to participate in the loan program seriously, and do something about it.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Dec. 3, 1959]

DR. PUSEY—THE KIND OF COURAGE EDUCATION NEEDS

One of the most remarkable young men in education today is President Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University.

In recent days President Pusey, along with a few other courageous school administrators, has told the Federal Government it can keep its student loan and scholarship funds if the offensive loyalty oath must be taken by a student applicant as a condition precedent to getting the loan.

It would be an easy thing for a man in Pusey's position to ignore the principle involved and take the Federal money. It would help some of his needy students and it would undoubtedly be popular with the overwhelming majority of the conservative Harvard alumni.

But Dr. Pusey has not made a habit of ducking principle and doing the popular thing.

We remember him best in this State for his courage in the days when the McCarthy scourge was driving everyone into the storm cellars.

Pusey then was president of Lawrence College, a very conservative small college in McCarthy's hometown of Appleton. A book was published by a group of citizens who wanted the people of Wisconsin to know the truth about McCarthy.

The book dealt with McCarthy's public record.

There were scores of people in this State who knew that the book told the truth about McCarthy, but they declined to allow their names to be used as sponsors. They felt, and with considerable justification, that if McCarthy denounced them in the hysteria that existed they could be ruined.

But Dr. Pusey showed no hesitation. He became a sponsor of the book and prime target of McCarthy. Shortly thereafter, at the height of McCarthy's power, Dr. Pusey was named president of the oldest and perhaps greatest university in this country.

There is an interesting story about this. A man who was on the Harvard board that hired Dr. Pusey called a Wisconsin resident seeking information about him. He was told of the Pusey troubles with McCarthy.

That was all he needed to sell him on Pusey and it appeared to have clinched the appointment with the other members of the board.

Dr. Pusey is carrying on in the tradition he established in Wisconsin. He takes his stand on principle. Education should cherish men of high principle such as this. They are so rare.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 5, 1959]

AGAINST STUDENT OATHS

Politicians have had a strange faith in non-Communist oaths. It has not been supported by any persuasive evidence of their value in weeding out Communists. Instead there is reason to believe that a Communist not already exposed would hardly balk at one more lie for his cause. The risk of perjury penalties he is likely to take even more lightly than did the 100 citizens who lied about TV quizzes. Yet last year when Congress adopted a plan for loans to worthy college students it not only required them to take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution but to make an affidavit of non-allegiance to any organization seeking overthrow of the Government.

Now it may seem that even if this is not effective it is harmless. But students ask why only they among the many groups of citizens who get Federal loans—farmers, homeowners, etc.—are required to make two affirmations of loyalty. And a growing number of colleges object that this kind of demand conflicts with their efforts to encourage students to seek the truth for themselves.

At the start several courageous small colleges refused to enter into the loan plan under such conditions. Recently they have

been joined by Harvard and Yale, with Presidents Pusey and Griswold making strong and reasoned statements of protest. Last summer a repealer of the double oath narrowly failed in the Senate. Now President Eisenhower has added his respected and nonradical voice to the pleas for repeal.

We trust Congress will heed them. For this requirement is discriminatory. As the college revolt grows it could seriously hamper the aim of the loan program. The double oath also tends to work against its own purposes by fostering disrespect rather than loyalty. Indeed, what kind of loyalty can be so purchased?

[From the Boston Herald, Dec. 18, 1959]

THE OATH AND LIBERTY

There is a side to the oath and affidavit requirement of the Federal student loan program that has not been much touched upon. Yet it concerns a principle of the profoundest import.

You will recall that to qualify for a loan, the student must (1) take an oath to "bear true faith and allegiance to the United States," and (2) swear to an affidavit that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support "any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The colleges, which must match with 10 percent the 90 percent Federal funds, are required to administer the oath and affidavit. About a score have refused, including Harvard.

The pro and con have been much discussed, and will be further debated when the Kennedy-Clark bill to repeal the oath and affidavit requirement comes up in Congress again next year.

The affidavit requirement has been called futile, discriminatory, degrading and an affront to freedom of thought and conscience. It has also been called a reasonable condition for Federal assistance and an aid to the prosecution of Communists by means of a perjury indictment.

What has not been sufficiently stressed is that the Government is here laying down boundaries to intellectual exploration. It is saying to the student, "Think on revolution only at your peril. In fact, don't even think on anything in association with revolutionists."

These may seem like mandates that any government interested in surviving might reasonably make. Particularly the Government might seem justified in not wishing to have its own funds used to subvert it.

But this view defames the spirit of the American democracy.

The right of the people to alter or abolish a form of government for just cause was recognized in the Declaration of Independence, and the signers carefully specified their just cause.

The eternal right to review the basis on which this Government is set up surely is implied by the Declaration. It was never intended that certain areas of thought should be put out of bounds for exploring minds.

Those who advocate a Constitutional Convention in Massachusetts do, in the precise meaning of the words, believe in the overthrow of the present form of State government by an unconstitutional method. They are appealing to the people to set up a new form of State government.

They are acting in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. The oath-affidavit provision is not in that spirit.

The colleges and universities are among those institutions that ought to be particularly free to make a continuing audit on the American form of Government. The oath-affidavit provision is calculated to re-

strict that freedom, and to make the Government less answerable to the people.

It would tend to destroy the "monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

The Political Grass Seems Greener in the Other Cabinet Officer's Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there is good reason to evaluate the intense interest of Secretary of Labor Mitchell in the situation of the seasonal agricultural worker as a political rather than humanitarian phenomenon, but, for whatever reason, it is a disgraceful situation when the Congress is obliged to consider legislation to restrain a member of the President's Cabinet from attempting to do what the Congress never intended him to do.

Secretary Mitchell has had considerable experience in the labor relations field, particularly in the building trades and in retail merchandising, but his acquaintance with the problems of farmers in assuring the rapid and efficient harvesting of perishable field and orchard crops has not been established. His proposed excursion into the regulation of seasonal agricultural employment not only has caused grave apprehension among farmers who must depend on seasonal labor, but has prompted objections from Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Those of us who have been engaged for some time in the effort to curb Mr. Mitchell's plans to move in on agriculture are encouraged to find Republican Members of this House joining in the sponsorship of legislative restraints on this unwarranted grab for regulatory power.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an excellent summary of the situation written by Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the March 1960 issue of *Nation's Agriculture*:

Of grave concern to farmers who obtain workers from other areas through the Federal-State employment service are new farm labor regulations approved by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

These new regulations became effective December 20, 1959.

Farmers who do not depend on the employment service may disregard the new regulations.

The regulations are of particular significance to farmers producing fruits, vegetables, cotton, and sugar beets. Farmers producing other commodities are not usually dependent upon the employment service for workers.

The regulations would require any farmer wishing to recruit workers through the employment service to:

1. Pay prevailing wages.
2. Provide housing meeting State standards. If there are no State standards the

State employment service shall establish standards, giving full consideration to specified Federal standards.

3. Offer to pay transportation to workers in accord with prevailing practice in either the area in which workers are to be employed or in areas which recruit workers from the same service.

4. Provide other terms and conditions of employment not less favorable than those prevailing in the area.

The full implications of these rules will not be apparent for many years.

For example, how are prevailing wages to be determined? Indications are that the Department of Labor will use the same formula (the 40-51 formula) used to determine prevailing wages for purposes of the Mexican farm labor program.

This formula works this way: If 40 percent of the workers in an area are paid one wage rate, this is the prevailing wage. If this is not the case, the prevailing wage will be determined by examining an array of wage rates to determine the range in which the 51st percent of all workers, counting from the bottom of the array, will be found. For example, let's assume that wages in a particular area are as follows: 10 percent at \$1.05 an hour, 20 percent at \$1 an hour, 25 percent at 95 cents an hour, 20 percent at 90 cents an hour, 15 percent at 85 cents an hour, 10 percent at 80 cents an hour.

If we start counting from the bottom in the above illustration, 45 percent of workers are paid 90 cents an hour or less and 70 percent are paid 95 cents an hour or less.

The 51 percent falls within the 95 cents an hour range. The prevailing hourly wage rate in this area would therefore be determined to be 95 cents.

All farmers who recruited workers through the employment service would be required to pay at least 95 cents an hour.

Needless to say, the actual determination of prevailing wages is far more complicated than indicated in this simple example, particularly when piecework rates are under consideration.

The most important aspect of the situation is not what is in the regulations as now issued, but the fact of their issuance.

These regulations were issued under the asserted authority of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. This is the act which created the Federal-State employment service.

It is doubtful that any single Member of the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate who voted for the Wagner-Peyser Act had any idea that there was anything in the act that could be construed to authorize what Secretary Mitchell is now undertaking.

Certainly if there had been any supposition that the Wagner-Peyser Act might be so interpreted, the legislative history of its enactment would have so indicated. The complete silence of the legislative record on this point is persuasive.

It is, or should be, axiomatic that it is Congress that should decide important policy issues, and that the heads of agencies should endeavor to administer laws in accord with the actual intent of the Congress.

If this sound principle is violated, the heads of agencies are in effect engaged in writing legislation by Executive order.

The history of the freedom of man is the history of the substitution of government by law for government by men.

The arbitrary actions of Secretary Mitchell in this respect have been regarded with concern by the White House and by congressional leaders of both parties.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson says the proposals "retain the concept of Federal intervention and administrative control and regimentation that is contrary to the principles of this administration."

As might be expected, the AFL-CIO and the various organizations subsidized by

AFL-CIO have applauded Secretary Mitchell's action.

If the present regulations are valid, there is no discernible limitation on the authority of the Secretary of Labor to issue whatever regulations he may choose in the future. Since Congress did not suppose the act would be so construed, it did not provide standards, criteria and limitations on administrative authority.

This is too much power over farmers to be vested in one man.

The Mexican farm-labor program, authorized by what is commonly termed Public Law 78, has also been used as a means of extending regulation to the employment of domestic farmworkers.

This statute contains a provision that the Secretary of Labor must determine that the Mexican farm-labor program is not adversely affecting wages and working conditions of domestic farmworkers.

To an increasing extent this authority is being used by the Secretary of Labor to require either increases in wages paid Mexican workers to avoid adverse effect on domestic workers or to require employers to do certain things for domestic workers as a condition of eligibility for employment of Mexican nationals.

Public Law 78 contains no criteria or standards to be followed by the Secretary of Labor in administering this authority. His authority is therefore without limitations.

Again, this is too much discretionary authority to be exercised by one man.

Well, what's the answer?

One answer is legal action. As yet no approach to legal action has yet developed which holds promise of successful accomplishment.

The other answer is legislative.

Farm Bureau will promote a positive legislative effort to terminate the asserted authority of the Secretary of Labor in this respect.

What appears to be the most immediately feasible legislative approach is presented by the fact that the legislative authorization (Public Law 78) for the Mexican farm-labor program is scheduled for extension in 1960 or 1961. The present authority for this program expires June 30, 1961.

Farm Bureau recommends that the bill to extend this program be amended in several key respects, as follows:

1. That neither Public Law 78, nor the Wagner-Peyser Act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary of Labor to regulate the wages, perquisites, transportation, or other working conditions of domestic farmworkers.

2. That the Secretary of Agriculture should participate with the Secretary of Labor in joint approval of any farm-labor regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor.

3. That Public Law 78 be amended to provide legislative criteria and standards to be used in determining "adverse effect."

Bills to accomplish this objective have been introduced by Congressman Dixon of Utah (H.R. 9869), by Representative McIntire of Maine (H.R. 9875), and a somewhat different approach by Congressman GARNINGS of Arkansas (H.R. 9871).

Hearings will be held on these bills in the near future.

Widespread understanding, among all farmers in all areas, of the significance of these efforts by Secretary of Labor Mitchell to regulate farmers, is a necessary prerequisite to successful legislative action.

It should not be presumed that the present regulations are all that we need be concerned about. If the Secretary of Labor is successful in this reach for power, the next step toward subjecting farmers to regulation may be uncertain as to time and character, but inevitable as to eventual action.

Award of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws to Arizona Supreme Court Justice Levi S. Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on March 1 of this year, the University of Arizona bestowed an honorary degree of doctor of laws on the Honorable Levi S. Udall, a justice of the Arizona Supreme Court. I have known Judge Udall for all of the 29 years which he has devoted to the Arizona judiciary. He has a reputation for eminently fair and learned decisions, and is highly respected by the bar of Arizona.

Judge Udall is from a pioneer Arizona family which has given many members to the courts and the legal profession in my State. All of his sons are lawyers, and one of them, the Honorable STEWART L. UDALL, has been a Member of the House of Representatives from Arizona for the past 5 years. I ask unanimous consent that a column by Claiborne Nuckolls which appeared in the Arizona Republic on March 6, reporting on Levi Udall's career, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE WE'RE IN

(By Claiborne Nuckolls)

When the University of Arizona last week conferred upon State Supreme Court Justice Levi S. Udall the honorary degree of doctor of laws, the distinction added a new peak to the career of one of the State's most distinguished jurists.

This column joins his many friends and admirers in saluting this tribute to a deserving and completely dedicated man who has devoted much of his life to the cause of right and justice.

Justice Udall, all who know him agree, exemplifies the high type of men Arizona has been fortunate in having on the bench of its highest appellate court.

The honor bestowed on him is all the more fitting because Justice Udall is a self-made man. Born and raised on an Apache County farm, as a young man he knew very well what hard work was. Early in life he developed an interest in law and, while clerk of the superior court of Apache County, he studied law on his own time under the tutelage of the late Judge A. S. Gibbons.

Admitted to the bar in 1922, he subsequently was elected county attorney, then to the superior bench, where he spent 16 years before being elevated to the supreme bench by Arizona voters in 1947. He now is the court's senior member.

During his 29 years as a member of the Arizona judiciary, he has earned the respect of attorneys, fellow jurists, and the public for his learning, integrity, and strong sense of justice. His outstanding record as a trial judge is borne out by the fact that 70 percent of his decisions and judgments which were appealed were affirmed by the supreme court.

Reporters who cover the supreme court welcome his written decisions for their clarity and understandability. If some legal point confuses their laymen's minds, Justice

Udall is always willing to take all the time necessary to explain it. His pen can drip acid when occasion calls for caustic comments. On the other hand, his kindly, understanding nature is revealed in many of his decisions, such as his recent discussion of the role human emotion properly may play when a trial judge imposes sentence and judgment on an offender against law and society.

Levi Udall is a patriarch of the famed Udall clan of Arizona, often referred to as Arizona's royal family. He also is a patriarch of the Phoenix North Stake of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, whose precepts of humanitarianism, right living, and helpfulness to others he has always followed to the letter.

As was stated during ceremonies attending the conferring of the valued honor he now holds from the University of Arizona: "No Arizonian of his generation has better exemplified the ideal of able and devoted public service."

Justice Udall admits being a little nonplussed at this and several other honors bestowed upon him in recent months. Last November the same school awarded him its medallion of merit in recognition of his leadership in a number of fields of endeavor. Last February, the Roosevelt Council, Boy Scouts of America, awarded him its highest honor, the silver beaver award for distinguished service to boyhood.

"A friend," Justice Udall remarked, "humorously asked what else I had to live for after receiving all these honors on top of those the Arizona public has bestowed on me by repeatedly electing me a trial judge and a member of our supreme court."

"My answer is this: I have all the more to live for to endeavor to prove myself worthy of these honors."

Arizona, say those who know him well, needs many more men like Justice Levi S. Udall.

Prayer in House by Rt. Rev. Theodore J. Kojis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the prayer opening today's session of the House was delivered by a distinguished resident and religious leader of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. Serving as today's guest Chaplain, the Right Reverend Theodore J. Kojis, O.S.B., abbot of St. Andrews Abbey in Cleveland, Ohio, represents the Slovak community of America which today commemorates the 21st anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence.

Abbot Kojis' prayers are offered as an inspiration of hope and courage to Slovaks behind the Iron Curtain whose misfortune and enslavement are a constant reminder to freedom-loving people everywhere of how precious is our liberty.

We cannot take our democracy for granted. We need only look around the world at those regrettable instances where sovereign peoples embraced an ideology only to find that they surrendered their freedom and lost their national integrity.

New England College Story One of Pioneering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, New Hampshire has long been proud of her outstanding institutions of learning. Over the years many noted individuals have been graduated from New Hampshire's schools of higher learning and have gone on to seek their rightful place in the world.

The most recent arrival on the educational scene in my State is New England College, located in the town of Henniker. Although founded only 14 years ago, this school has fashioned an outstanding record under the capable guidance of its president, Dr. H. Raymond Danforth.

Recently an article appeared in the Boston Herald outlining the great strides this institution has made in recent years. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled, "New England College Story One of Pioneering," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE STORY ONE OF PIONEERING

(By Haydn Pearson)

HENNIKER, N. H.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON probably did not realize. But when he stopped at New England College in this small, typical Granite State village he gave the college national publicity. Mr. NIXON was on his way to dedicate the huge Hopkinton flood-control dam.

From President H. Raymond Danforth the Vice President of the United States accepted a symbolic key to this growing institution. The story of New England College is a story of pioneering. Founded in 1946, it has grown to an enrollment of 260. There are 14 girls and they have their own modern home, tastefully decorated, and with their own cook.

HEADQUARTERS IN INN

Headquarters building is the oldtime Henniker Inn. Probably some of you have eaten there. In its heyday it was a widely known smalltown hostelry. Now it houses the president's office, secretarial offices, commons for the freshmen, the dean's office, and 38 students.

As I sat in his office and talked with Dr. Danforth I could feel the drive and dedication that is behind the growth of this non-denominational institution.

New England College was founded in the fall of 1946 with a faculty of 8 and 63 students. All but one of the students were veterans. Today, with an enrollment of 260, the faculty comprises 15 full-time and 13 part-time professors and instructors. The college has 14 buildings, an athletic field, and recently made plans for its first new men's dormitory on a 100-acre campus site beside the Contoocook River.

At present the college offers a 3-year accelerated program and the more usual 4-year program. Tuition is \$750 for the academic year. Room charge for the 13-week term is \$70 to \$80.

Courses of study are offered in three divisions: Liberal arts, in which the student earns a bachelor of arts, or a bachelor of science degree if he specializes in science;

business administration; and civil engineering.

"Education on any level is a challenge," Dr. Danforth said. "We have an excellent faculty and a good, solid educational program. Anything less in an education endeavor is false. Education is a developmental situation for the individual, and here we can give individual attention to each student. In everyday language, we want to help our young men and young women to develop their abilities and become productive members of society."

A VERY ACTIVE MAN

Dr. Danforth, former superintendent of schools in Nashua, N.H., who is a dynamic, forward-looking educator with deep sympathy for the lad who is working hard for an education.

Some years ago before he became superintendent of schools, he lived in Acworth, N.H., commuted 23 miles each way to Claremont to teach in the high school. While in Acworth, Dr. Danforth was chairman of the board of selectmen, chairman of the school committee, and overseer of the poor. And just to keep himself busy, he served as lay preacher in two churches.

"Somewhere along the line," he said, "we have lost something in American education. Perhaps it is a part of the era in which we are trying to learn to live without working."

"We do not have the traditions of the Ivy League Colleges, but we are making our own traditions. We don't have the ivied halls and impressive buildings, but in their village homes, converted into dormitories and classrooms, and meeting in small groups, our students are learning many lessons that will stand them in good stead."

"I want to ask an important question," I said.

Dr. Danforth leaned back in his chair and laughed. "Go ahead. I tell the boys to speak what is on their minds."

"How come you left a position as superintendent of schools in Nashua, N.H., to take one that I can see is a real battle?"

He looked at me with a quizzical expression. "Don't you ever feel you would like to leave the security of the Boston Herald column, and to do a Henry Thoreau stint?"

I wanted to say that the readers of the Boston Herald keep me on my toes and sometimes rock my security—but I didn't. I knew what Dr. Danforth meant.

"Here is a new college," he said. "You've seen and talked with some of the students. You can sense for yourself what I mean when I say this is a challenge. Here is a school that is going to grow. We can do many worthwhile things for young men and young women."

"The Nation's population is growing rapidly and the standard of living is rising. We shall need more and more colleges, and we hope to make New England College one of the outstanding institutions of its type. Maybe it's a bit corny, but you have heard of the American dream. Look at those young men and young women out here. They have the American dream—and we want to help them make that dream true."

Trucker Offers Railroad a Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the March 13, 1960, issue of the New York Times my good friend and home-

town neighbor, William W. Ward, Altoona, Pa., was the subject of an interesting article by Robert E. Bedingfield on the subject of "Togetherness."

The article which explains Mr. Ward's proposal also outlines his highly successful career in the transportation field where he is recognized as one of the outstanding trucking executives in the Nation.

The article referred to is as follows:

PERSONALITY: TRUCKER OFFERS RAILROAD A LIFT—WARD EXTENDS HAND OF "TOGETHERNESS" TO THE PENNSY

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

William W. Ward is an Altoonan who turned his back on the curve that made Altoona, Pa., famous, and now has become an Altoona landmark himself.

Approaching that central Pennsylvania city nowadays, the wriggling mountain roads are bordered with signs bidding: "Welcome to Altoona, Home of Ward Trucking Corp. and the Horseshoe Curve." Until a few years ago the sweeping reentrant curve, which the Pennsylvania Railroad employs to get over the Alleghenies that crest nearby, had solo billing.

Already sharing the hometown spotlight with the Nation's biggest railroad, Bill Ward, 53, founder and president of Ward Trucking, has aspirations to coster his company with the Pennsy in a much broader role.

His company, unlike the Pennsylvania Railroad, is not the No. 1 in its industry. It is not even among the top 10. It is, however, one of the biggest in Pennsylvania. Its high-density routes through that State and New Jersey into New York City, together with its high operating efficiency, have enabled it to rank among the most profitable in the Nation in ratio of gross carried through to net.

PROponent of COOPERATION

Mr. Ward is one of his industry's foremost exponents of the contention that rail-truck cooperation in getting freight from door to store must come through coordinated routes and rates of separately owned rail and truck systems.

"It is the answer to the problems of surface transportation," he said last week.

In the West, this concept of "togetherness" in routes and rates has been embraced to a limited extent by the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad and Consolidated Freightways, Inc., of Menlo Park, Calif. Few railroads and intercity truckers in the East believe it would work in their area. Mr. Ward hopes to break down Eastern resistance with his home ground of Altoona as a starting point.

He hopes to interest the Pennsylvania in integrating its merchandise freight traffic there, and allow his trucks and trailers to take it over the hills of the 16 central western Pennsylvania counties in which he has certificated operating routes.

"The Pennsylvania," Mr. Ward said, "could save itself several hundreds of thousands of dollars if it had a joint through rate system with us at Altoona. The railroad would be able to eliminate considerable dead mileage and at the same time give its shippers much better service—daily service, rather than the two or three times a week it now provides."

The reason for this, of course, would be that in the area Mr. Ward serves it is a lot easier to find a buyer for a truckload of freight than for a carload. Moreover, while the carload is the billing unit, a railroad lets the car wait until there's a train going its way.

STILL IN TALKING STAGE

Mr. Ward explained last week that his proposal to the Pennsylvania still was in an early talking stage. He said he believed he

had more than one willing ear listening to him among the railroad's operating officials. However, with the rails pleading for Government permission to operate their own common carrier motor routes and the truckers—with Mr. Ward right out in front—fighting this suggestion to the fullest, he is prepared for the Pennsy to move thoughtfully before adopting his project.

It is only since the war that the truckers themselves have been interchanging their trailers under joint through-traffic agreements. And there still is reluctance on the part of most trucking lines to interchange more than 35 percent of their freight.

Mr. Ward contends that his company's success while interchanging something more than 60 percent of its freight disproves this fear—that it's a matter of balancing terminal and over-the-road costs and dividing tariffs equitably.

Ward Trucking was founded by Bill Ward in 1931. He was then 24 years old and had been forced out of his job as a Chevrolet automobile salesman because of the deepening depression. He was newly married and to make a living he had taken on a distributorship for automobile cylinder lubricants, working a route with an old three-quarter-ton panel truck for which he had paid \$100.

"It wasn't much of a living," he said. "I knew I had to get something else. I used the three-quarter-ton truck for a down payment on a one-ton truck and started to haul coal and sell 50-gallon empty oil drums to oil distributors, continuing the lubricant distributorship as well."

"I still wasn't making ends meet and so I created a chicken and egg route to New York. I charged \$1.15 a crate. I'll never forget it if I live to be 1,000 years old. Competitors moved in on me and undercut my rate steadily. They finally took the rate down to 35 cents. I was returning from New York one night after delivering a cargo of chickens and eggs and after paying traveling expenses had \$77.50 left. And out of that I still had to pay my helper, Bob Kelley."

Mr. Ward and Mr. Kelley had about reached the decision to quit trucking and to try something else. But the next day the business got its first real break. The J. C. Blair Co. of Huntingdon, Pa., one of the largest manufacturers of converted paper products, became a customer.

"Blair was our first customer as a common carrier," Mr. Ward said, "and we've still got them as a customer."

Other customers were obtained. In a year the business had grown to the point where two additional trucks were needed. The customers multiplied regularly thereafter. So did the trucks. Today Ward's fleet consists of 119 tractors, 61 trucks and 196 trailers, and this year's capital budget call for purchasing 20 more trailers and 15 more tractors.

Mr. Kelley, Mr. Ward's first employee, now manages the line's Harrisburg, Pa., terminal, one of six on the company's routes. Where the business was started with one employee, now there are 425 and the company, Mr. Ward believes, is the only one in the industry with a profit-sharing program for its workers.

He has had many attractive proposals made to him over the years to merge or sell out his company, but he has refused them all.

GROWS FROM WITHIN

"We have not increased either by purchase or new authority our original operating routes granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1936," he said. "Our growth has been entirely from within, and I might add that being located on the main line at a key point on the Nation's largest railroad hasn't made the task easy."

Bill Ward's reputation doesn't stop at being a successful trucker. He is one of the most civic-minded businessmen in Altoona

and is determined to help make his native city a cleaner, happier and better place to live. Recognizing his efforts along this line, the city's businessmen service clubs three times since 1954 have named him the Altoonan of the year.

He is a director and past president of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, a director of the Community Chest, the American Red Cross, the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, the Altoona Symphony Society, a trustee of the Mercy Hospital in Altoona, and chairman of the board of advisers of St. Francis College in neighboring Loretto, Pa.

With all his other activities, Mr. Ward is a farmer too. He owns a splendid 135-acre chicken and dairy farm on Brush Mountain, the highest point in Blair County, 5 miles from Altoona, overlooking the Horseshoe Curve. There he has built not only a home for himself and his wife, but one for each of his two married sons.

Connally Amendment to Ratification of the World Court Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the people of America continue to express their concern over Senate resolution 94, which calls for the abolition of the so-called Connally reservation. Many newspapers across the country have expressed this concern. One of the most active of these has been one of Arizona's leading newspapers, the Arizona Republic. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "To Find Rule of Law," published in the March 9, 1960, edition of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO FIND RULE OF LAW

The argument that the rule of law should be established among the nations of the world is being used as a reason for seeking the repeal of the Connally reservation. This is the amendment to the ratification of the world court statute by which the United States reserves to itself the right to determine whether a dispute with another nation is international in nature and thus subject to world court jurisdiction, or domestic and thus to be settled by negotiation or the national courts of the nations involved.

The rule of law is indeed a desirable objective. So it is worthwhile to examine carefully the question whether the attainment of that objective would be hastened by repealing the Connally reservation at this time.

The nearest approach to the rule of law existing anywhere in the world today is probably in the United States. It is a rather general assumption that the rule of law and not of men is precisely what governs in America. This assumption is based on the premise that the Constitution provides a basic set of standards which prevail, which are enduring and reliable, so that these fixed standards rather than the ideas or whims of the men who happen to be in power are the basis of the systems of justice and law.

How true is it that the Constitution is an enduring and reliable standard? There prevails widely today, and reaches into the solid majority of the Supreme Court, the philosophy that the Constitution is a living document. What is meant by this is that the Constitution's meaning should change with the changing times. Related to this philosophy also is the common judicial practice, prevalent in this Supreme Court, of seeking to go behind the words of a law or the Constitution itself to find that the writers intended to say something which will support a desired finding which cannot be supported by what the law or the Constitution actually does say.

Is this rule of law? Emphatically not. It is rule by the opinions of the men who happen to be interpreting the law at the moment.

What does the World Court have to serve as the basic foundation for a world rule of law? It has precedent which has been established in prior international dealings, running the gamut from the common law of Great Britain and America to the ukase law of absolute monarchs and the decree law of Communist and other dictatorships. It has the Charter of the United Nations which contains among other things a set of vaguely defined human rights to such things as full employment, higher standards of living, and economic and social progress.

The Charter contains a provision that the United Nations and its subordinate agencies shall not in any case interfere in the domestic affairs of member nations. But this has not in the least deterred the writers of the human rights covenant and the Genocide Convention from seeking to thrust the activities of the U.N., and the jurisdiction of the World Court, very deeply into the domestic affairs of member nations. The Genocide Convention, which was once rejected by the U.S. Senate but nevertheless still lies before it, would give the World Court criminal jurisdiction over individual citizens, who could be taken from their native lands and tried secretly in distant chambers of the International Court. The human rights covenant would expose property rights to destruction, and would reduce other human rights to the level of meaningless platitudes to which Communist delegates were willing to agree.

This is the manner of rule of law which could be expected from the World Court, if its jurisdiction over the United States and other nations were compulsory and absolute. And there is no appeal, none at all, from the decisions of the World Court.

In order to advance toward universal rule of law, the first and most vital thing to do is to preserve and strengthen rule of law where it exists. It does exist to a substantial degree in the United States. In order to preserve it, the Connally reservation by all means must be kept in order that the United States may at any time prevent any attempt to reach in and damage or undermine American rule of law through the actions of the World Court, to which rule of law means something quite different from what it means to Americans.

The Sky Is Falling In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article "President's Message,"

appeared in the March issue of "Navy", the official publication of the Navy League of the United States, and is written by Frank Gard Jameson, president of the Navy League.

Mr. Jameson has said briefly and factually many things that need to be brought into focus this election year.

Politics, and vote getting especially, have no part in the defense of our country, and we had better realize it before it is too late or it may be that the politicians will bring about a tragedy that they will be powerless to stop.

The article follows:

[From Navy magazine, March 1960]

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—THE SKY IS FALLING IN

We wonder, from where we sit, how many of our readers recall the children's fable of Chicken-Little and the day the sky fell in—or, at least, it was rumored the sky was falling in by Chicken-Little who spread barnyard panic with his estimate of a false situation.

At this time in our defense affairs it is recommended that this and "Missile Accomplished" (this issue) be required reading for the calamity howlers of this country's defense posture.

Playing it strictly by ear and memory, the story had to do with a fuzzy chick who wandered beyond the barnyard and rested under an oak tree. A ripening acorn dropped and struck poor Chicken-Little on the noggin.

He took off in high gear for home and barnyard yelling: "The sky is falling in. The sky is falling in." And what do you think happened then? Why panic, of course. And there was a grand exodus into the outer-world because their own world was not safe. The sky was falling in.

With this as their chant the ill-assorted pilgrimage made its way to the forest where a sly old fox was waiting and chuckling to himself at the manner in which deliverance of coveted succulence came unto him in the form of some very plump fowl.

So, when Mr. Fox was invited to join the panic-fleeing fowl because the sky was falling in, he said: "Sure, pals, I'll join you. And I know a safe place to go to save us all from the falling sky. Thanks for the warning—follow me."

And they did. The end.

Moral: The defense program of our country is becoming a political football and it behooves every mature American to listen carefully and eschew pushing the "panic button" and so walk into a trap of our own making.

The country is not in imminent danger of attack because the Russians do not now have, nor in all probability will have for many years, the quantity of accurate missiles to knock us 100 percent out. By the time they have the capability, if ever, our Polaris equipped fleet ballistic missile submarines will be built and at sea providing a power able to knock out Russia. This will deter her from action against us.

It is one thing to have laboratory research and development type missiles with the theoretical ability to launch at a moment's notice and to program correctly all the way to a target halfway around the world, but it is certainly another to have 300 foolproof missiles that you can count on to each work as planned.

I am sure that even today with our Atlas missiles at Vandenberg Air Force Base on the pads, we could not say even on a Wednesday that we would fire the missile on Friday morning at 10 o'clock and be more than 50 percent sure it would fire on schedule although the Atlas is a great missile. The Russians have the same problem and even after they would fire 300 of them in

future years they would not be sure that they would all hit their targets. We will always have plenty of strength left to knock Russia out and they know it.

The Strategic Air Command will come up with what I think is a good idea soon to put two or three big bombers at each big civilian airport in the country capable of handling them and thus have triple the diversification of targets for the Russians to shoot at and triple the chance of having plenty left in case of an attack. This makes much more sense than an air alert which will keep one-quarter of their planes in the air and many of the rest on the ground unready due to maintenance to keep up the air alert.

The Polaris fleet ballistic missile submarines will be operational in October of this year and it is the official position of the Navy League that more should be built than those 15 presently scheduled. We need 45 for full deterrence and should expedite construction.

We are all going to hear much election year propaganda. Some of it will take this angle: "It is not can we afford increased defense costs but can we afford not to have it" and other such "I-love-my-mother" type talk which is difficult to argue against because of the generalities. Specifically we must put increased dollars into certain projects like more B-52's, ASW work, Polaris FBMs and Minuteman missiles and certain Army weapons but we must cut out others such as Nike, Bomarc, continental air defense, which were designed to combat the Russian manned-bomber threat which has never materialized.

We must also be sure that the "theory boys" do not cut out our practical JCS system. With the Secretary of Defense sitting with the JCS on all problem areas of disagreement we have pricked the balloon of any single Chief of Staff argument.

Democrats' Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Evening Herald Express, Feb. 17, 1960]

DEMOCRATS' STATEMENT

Many loyal Democrats in California must be dismayed by the astonishing statement of policy which emerged from the California Democratic Council Convention in Fresno, and which must be assumed to be the key to Democratic Party campaigning for the big election in November.

Probably the most astounding feature to many thousands of Californians is the policy of opposition declared in the statement to measures which for years have been regarded as strengthening the security and safety of Americans from the dangers of communism.

Take, for instance, the policy statement passed by the delegates favoring world disarmament to this fantastic degree:

That if the negotiations at Geneva should fail, then the United States should take unilateral action; in other words this Nation should scrap itself of military weapons and stand forth naked of any defense against Soviet Russia or any other attacking nation.

To Mr. K., this would seem too good to be true. All he would need to do would be to just carve the turkey.

One is reminded of an episode in Allen Drury's best selling novel, "Advise and Consent," in which a U.S. Senator becomes a strong supporter of a Communist-front movement in the United States and makes a passionate appeasement speech in which he says:

"I would crawl on my knees all the way to the Kremlin to prevent the Russians from dropping the bomb."

In the book the climax comes when patriotic U.S. Members of Congress and other leaders refuse to be cowed by Soviet threats of destruction.

It was notable at the Fresno meeting that Senator STUART SYMINGTON, despite his desire to get the backing of California Democrats for the Presidency, could not stomach the radical nature of the disarmament statement.

SYMINGTON agreed that the world arms race should be ended, but he warned that it would be dangerous for the United States to strip its defenses with no assurance that Russia would do the same.

The California Democratic Council also called for the repeal of the Connally amendment under which the United States reserves the right to refuse to submit to World Court jurisdiction on domestic or internal matters which it feels are not subject to international law.

CDC also urged remodeling of the United Nations into a world organization "that can enact world law, interpret it, and enforce world law upon individuals and governments alike."

Can one imagine Soviet Russia agreeing to such outside domination?

Also, can one imagine this is "Dateline, America," where the Democrats' statement asserts that Russia is serious in its "policy of peaceful negotiation," while America's disarmament position appears "divided, weak, and inadequate"?

The council asked for repeal of State and Federal "nondisloyalty" oaths now required of public employees, candidates for public office and applicants for educational grants or loans as well as other requirements for loyalty oaths.

It approved the proposal to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has done so much over the years to expose American Communists.

It took a stand against any action to "nullify" U.S. Supreme Court decisions "upholding the Bill of Rights." There has been a wave of public and official criticism directed against Supreme Court decisions regarded as greatly weakening the Nation's defense against the cancer of internal communism.

The Democratic council asked President Eisenhower to review the conviction of Morton Sobell, sentenced to 30 years in prison for conspiracy to commit espionage, after he was tried with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the atom bomb spies who were executed. The campaign for a review of Sobell's conviction has long been a favorite of leftist and Communist units.

Outside of subjects within the scope of national security was that statement of policy by the CDC which urged abolition of the death penalty, a movement which has been supported by Gov. Edmund G. Brown and Attorney General Stanley Mosk, but which was turned down definitely at the 1959 session of the California Legislature following heavy public protests.

Believe it or not, these were some of the highlighted accomplishments at the convention of California Democrats which was attended by Governor Brown and U.S. Senators Kennedy, Humphrey, and Symington.

There can be little doubt that the California Democratic Council statement is sensational. There must have been quite a few Democrats that we know who were not present.

Objective Analysis Reveals Strength of America's Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the finest and most objective studies I have seen concerning America's defense posture was recently penned by Paul Martin, who is chief of the Washington Bureau of the Gannett News Service. In brief and cogent terms this outstanding journalist and student of national affairs set forth the strong points of our defense establishment vis-a-vis the Soviets.

At a time when far too many people tend to make an emotional or partisan thing of our military might, dispassionate and knowledgeable analysis is very much needed. That is exactly what Mr. Martin has done and his able presentation deserves a wide readership. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, Feb. 28, 1960]

UNITED STATES HELD STRONGEST IN DEFENSE SETUP

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The defense posture of a nation comprehends a great deal more than just its armed forces.

It includes the morale and skill of the civilian population, the capacity of its industry and access to raw materials, the strategic territory available for deployment, and the quality of its allies.

Ask any responsible military man this question: "Which would you rather have—the defense posture of America, or that of the Soviet Union?" You will get a resounding and unanimous affirmative in favor of the U.S. position.

In the great debate today over national defense, it is strange that more consideration has not been given to the combined assets of the free world, measured against the internal weaknesses of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, brought up this significant issue in testimony before the Senate Preparedness Committee.

GREATEST DETERRENT

"The greatest deterrent to war is not military," Burke said. "Khrushchev has got to think of the psychological effect of his actions on other nations, the economic situation in his own country, and what other countries will do if he makes a move."

"Maybe Khrushchev doesn't intend to strike this country. Maybe he proposes to take over the world by peaceful means, as he says he intends to do."

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON traveled 5,000 miles through the Soviet Union last summer, where he was able to observe some of the strengths and weaknesses of that Communist citadel.

Accepting the annual patriotism award at Notre Dame University, Nixon said that the nonmilitary struggle between the United States and world communism is a greater problem than any threat of an armed attack.

The Vice President warned that any attack on this country would result in swift annihilation of the aggressor.

UNRELIABLE TERRITORY

Consider this:

The Soviet Union is bounded on the west by seven East European satellites plus three forcibly annexed Baltic States containing 100 million persons, none of whom have voted to accept Soviet domination or communism in free elections.

Khrushchev knows this would be completely unreliable territory for the Soviets in event of war. The fact was spelled out for him by the Hungarian freedom uprising of 1956-57, the public demonstration for Nixon in Poland last summer, and various revolts against Communist oppression in East Germany and other satellites.

On the east the Soviet Union joins Red China, second big member of the Communist bloc. The Soviets have been unwilling to arm their unpredictable Chinese allies with atomic weapons, or to contribute extensively to the buildup of Red China as a competitive industrial and military power.

FEAR IN ASIA

Khrushchev is traveling through southeast Asia, trying to undo some of the fear and suspicion of communism in the "neutral" nations of India, Burma, and Indonesia created by hostile acts of the Chinese Communists in Tibet, Laos, and on the Indian border.

In event of a general war, the whole Asian situation most certainly would be opened up, with a three-front assault on Red China from Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam.

These free-world forces, supported by the United States from a variety of land, sea, and air bases, can count on an atomic capability in a growing family of nuclear weapons which could be used to pinpoint military targets.

Inside the Soviet Union today, there is a great demand for more consumer goods, a higher standard of living, better housing, more freedom from Communist controls, and above all a deep longing for peace.

WHOLE ARMIES SACRIFICED

The Russians suffered much greater manpower losses during World War II, sacrificing whole armies to the Nazis to buy time, than anyone in the West ever realized. Between 6 and 8 million Russians died during the war.

In addition, approximately 20 million of the Soviet population were liquidated during the great Stalinist purges immediately before and after the war, when Khrushchev was Stalin's executioner in the Ukraine.

Friends and families of those who perished in the Communist atrocities, as well as former members of the Politburo whom Khrushchev has deposed in his climb to power, remain a large, sullen, and uncertain element inside Russia.

SIGNIFICANT LETTER

A significant letter by an anonymous Russian author recently was published by the Sunday Times of London. It purports to give a picture of how the Russian people really feel about life inside the Soviet Union.

The writer refers to the tyranny of the omnipresent, hundred-headed Russian State—under the czars or under the Communists—as the "hydra." He says in part:

"The present Russian Government has not the slightest authority among the people. Anecdotes about Khrushchev, Furtseva and the others have become almost a sign of good form in the most varied circles. If Stalin was feared, he was also respected (and many believed in him) Khrushchev, even if he is feared a little bit (he is an expert with the brick!), is not in the least respected. It is impossible to respect him."

"The complete collapse of the hydra's authority has enormous consequences. In

the first place, war has become impossible. The people will sweep the hydra away if he risks such a monstrous adventure. In conditions of atomic war with the dispersal of ground forces, nobody would fight, when he was away from the hydra's eye."

NO MORE GAINS

Since the conquest of China in 1949, the Korean war in 1950-53, and the division of Vietnam in 1954, the Communists have made no territorial gains at the expense of the free world. They have aroused suspicions in Asia, and lost strength in the internal Communist parties of the Western democracies.

Bottled up by the U.S. mutual security program, vexed by internal troubles in East European satellites, and challenged by Chinese Reds as the ideological leader of communism, there is reason to believe that Khrushchev had reached a dangerous point insofar as his own position was concerned, when we gave him new stature and respectability by inviting him to visit America, and talk on equal terms with President Eisenhower.

The Sino-Soviet bloc is ringed today by free world military power strategically deployed over vast land and sea areas, including the U.S. Strategic Air Command, long- and medium-range missiles, aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines, and special purpose ground forces with a versatile atomic capability.

The overall defense posture indicates that if the Soviets should launch a general war, while the United States and Western Europe might sustain considerable damage, it would result in the complete destruction of everything the Communists have struggled to achieve since the 1917 Bolshevik revolution.

It is hardly likely that Khrushchev is going to choose that route, as a deliberate and calculated policy. The greater danger is that such a war might occur through miscalculation.

Federal Aid to States and Uncontrolled Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles published in Life Lines of March 9, 1960. The first article is entitled "Federal Aid to States"; the second, "Uncontrolled Spending."

Life Lines is edited by the very able writer, Mr. Wayne Poucher.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life Lines, Mar. 9, 1960]

FEDERAL AID TO STATES

More and more the States and cities of this Nation are learning that the so-called free money they are getting from Washington is far from free. They are at last discovering that every time they get a Federal grant it costs them money in the long run.

Every year Washington's giveaways get bigger. The domestic spending program is the fastest growing item in the entire Federal budget. And now some State and local taxpayers are wondering if they can afford

to accept any more Federal aid. They are wondering if the Federal Government isn't luring them down the primrose path that leads to bankruptcy.

When you ask State and municipal officials why they can't cut expenses, they reply: "If we don't match the free money the Federal Government offers, we lose out and some other State or city will get it. We can't afford not to increase our spending if that means we get more free money."

The truth is, of course, that these Federal grants are never free and they are hardly ever even cheap.

In public housing and slum clearance projects, the Federal Government requires the cities to exempt the land from local taxes. Slum clearance projects also demand donations from the cities equal to about 50 percent of the Federal grant.

Even on school lunches—where the Federal Government donates surplus foods and, in some cases, cash—the schools must provide \$3 for every \$1 that comes from Washington.

UNCONTROLLED SPENDING

There is a growing realization that many, many Americans are deeply concerned about taxes that never go down and a Federal debt that keeps going up. This is a time for people who feel this concern to inform themselves as fully as possible about the basic causes of our Government's financial plight.

One reason is to be found in the appropriation processes which have the effect of transforming our responsive government into irresponsible government.

In the first place, the appropriation process followed by Congress is piecemeal in nature. Each detail of expenditure is approved after the case in favor of it has been made by those who will benefit from the spending. No cross-examination is conducted from the standpoint of overall governmental cost. Proposed expenditures are not weighed against each other in the entire picture to see which are the more important expenditures and which are the less important.

Secondly, means have been developed by which expenditures can be authorized without going through even this inadequate and piecemeal process of appropriation. This is what is called the back-door method of appropriating and spending public funds.

In the third place, Congress does not set annual expenditure limits on various items of spending. The total is not controlled—in fact, it is not even officially estimated—until after Congress has adjourned.

Fourthly, there is no congressional machinery for relating authorized or annually controlled expenditures to estimated revenue. Neither is there any way of assuring an overall fiscal policy involving spending, taxes, and debt. The whole process is haphazard and almost impromptu.

All these factors add up to a sorry situation in which the Government is responsive to the spenders and not to those who pay the bill.

A Lesson for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have noted a growing reluctance on the part of many of our political leaders to stand up and proclaim

the principles on which the Constitution of the United States is based—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It was, therefore, with special interest that I read excerpts from an address by Senator Arturo Uslar Pietri in the Congress of Venezuela, extolling the constitutional principles and history of the United States. These were quoted in an editorial in the March 5, 1960, issue of the Tablet, the well-known weekly newspaper of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, N.Y. They show that the virtues of our great country are appreciated beyond its borders better than we realize and that we have thoughtful friends to the south of us despite the current turmoil.

The editorial follows:

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, Mar. 5, 1960]

A LESSON FOR AMERICANS

"The United States has been the greatest military power of the world, has decisively won the two greatest wars in history, and it is the only country that has made no colonial acquisitions in the shadow of such great victories, when innumerable countries of much less military and economic might have immediately transformed their military victories into territorial conquests."

Was the speaker an American Fourth of July orator? No, he is Senator Arturo Uslar Pietri, who arose in the Venezuelan Congress to reply to an attack on the United States by a Communist senator. Senator Pietri continued:

"The United States is a country which was founded in the name of principles respected by all men. Those principles are liberty, respect for human dignity, representative government, observance of law, repulsion of violence, acceptance of justice."

In this day when quite a few Americans (not so many, really, it just seems so because they get into the public print and onto radio and television so often) seem to be almost ashamed to be Americans, it remains for a Latin American to tell us the truth about our own country. To continue with Senator Pietri's splendid statement:

"The history of the international life of the United States is extraordinarily clean when compared with any other great power."

True, every word of it.

But how long is it since you have read or heard such words from those voluble Americans who wish to surrender portions of our national sovereignty to some international organization?

Or from those strange creatures who would have us quit nuclear tests permanently, and unilaterally, in the vain hope that Russia would then follow suit?

Or from those Americans who, appearing to be suffering from an inexplicable guilt complex because this country is so far advanced beyond others, feel that we should tax ourselves heavily in perpetuity to help the remainder of the world?

The Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt

from the radio transcript of Life Line of December 23, 1959, relative to the battle of the budget.

Life Line, the patriotic and religious educational movement which features the very able Wayne Poucher as Life Line minister, has become a vital force in stimulating thought and discussion among the American public.

This particular broadcast states succinctly and accurately the necessity for placing the fiscal house of this Nation in order, and I recommend it not only to Members of Congress, but to all others as well.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Again in 1960 the battle of the budget will make headlines in Washington and all over the country. Here in the Nation's Capital the lines are already being drawn. There is a growing realization that many, many Americans are deeply concerned about taxes that never go down and a Federal debt that keeps going up. This is a time for people who feel this concern to inform themselves as fully as possible about the basic causes of our Government's financial plight.

One reason is to be found in the appropriation processes which have the effect of transforming our responsive Government into irresponsible Government.

In the first place, the appropriation process followed by Congress is piecemeal in nature. Each detail of expenditure is approved after the case in favor of it has been made by those who will benefit from the spending. No cross-examination is conducted from the standpoint of overall Governmental cost. Proposed expenditures are not weighed against each other in the entire picture to see which are the more important expenditures and which are the less important.

Second, means have been developed by which expenditures can be authorized without going through even this inadequate and piecemeal process of appropriation. This is what is called the "back door" method of appropriating and spending public funds.

In the third place, Congress does not set annual expenditure limits on various items of spending. The total is not controlled—in fact, it is not even officially estimated—until after Congress has adjourned.

Fourth, there is no congressional machinery for relating authorized or annually controlled expenditures to estimated revenue. Neither is there any way of assuring an overall fiscal policy involving spending, taxes, and debt. The whole process is haphazard and almost impromptu.

All these factors add up to a sorry situation in which the Government is responsive to the spenders and not to those who pay the bill.

The spending machinery is such that it creates a fertile field for the machinations of the various pressure groups. It also gives rise to the fallacious argument that if one group is getting something from the Government, other groups have a right to get something as well. Thus, the foreign aid program becomes an excuse for greater domestic spending—with not much attention given to questioning the need or wisdom of foreign aid. Thus, a subsidy to one group becomes an excuse for a subsidy to another group.

Of course this kind of unreasonable reasoning ignores the fact that one expenditure reduces the resources prudently available for another. Your family has to adjust its spending to the family resources that are available. The Federal Government's present money troubles grow out of a continued refusal to recognize that same necessity with respect to public funds.

These are matters we need to learn about. Reform of congressional budget procedures would not immediately and automatically reduce taxes and cut the national debt. But it would be a long step in the right direction. It would mean that Government officials must meet squarely their responsibilities in setting spending, tax, and debt policies.

With everybody's taxes so high, there is a great deal of tax consciousness among Americans. But there is a great deal less controlled spending consciousness. Yet we cannot escape the fact that the high taxes and the heavy debt are a direct result of uncontrolled spending beyond our national means. We need Federal Government budget procedures that will make the people tax conscious and spending conscious at the same time.

Department of Defense Does It Again— Another Silly Guidebook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of our esteemed colleague, Hon. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, opened hearings on the subject of military manuals.

At our session, Secretary of the Air Force Dudley C. Sharp and the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, gave us firm assurances that new procedures had been adopted to place the issuance of manuals under strict, responsible controls. They further assured our subcommittee that they renounced any implication in any manuals that any nonclassified information should be kept from the American people.

It now develops, Mr. Speaker, that at the very moment our subcommittee was receiving these assurances, the Air Force and the Army were jointly issuing a guidebook—on how to boost public support of the post exchange system. It bears the approval of the Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force and the Army.

This handbook, while purportedly encouraging general release of information about PX's, cautions information officers against release of information about the sale of beer or comparisons of PX prices with those of civilian stores.

What the Air Force and Army are saying, in effect, is that the American people should be told only what is, in their minds, favorable. Anything that might lead to criticism, they are saying in this guidebook, should be kept secret or played down. The Pentagon is playing the role of censor.

Let me quote one priceless passage from this guidebook:

Any emphasis on beer trade, whether in photographs or in news stories, should be avoided. Emphasis should be placed, instead, on such information as the number of soda fountains, snack bars and the like.

Mr. Speaker, something is organically wrong in the structure of the Department of Defense, and in the structure of the individual services, when these man-

uals and guidebooks continue to appear. One would think that the furore over earlier manuals would have alerted the services to the need for precautions against publications that are irresponsible or worse.

In an editorial this afternoon, the Washington Daily News asks justifiably, as a result of this latest guidebook, "Who are they kidding?"

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the perusal of my colleagues the editorial in tonight's Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 14, 1960]

THEY KEEP ON KIDDING US

Air Force Secretary Dudley Sharp and Gen. Thomas D. White, the Chief of Staff, marched up to Capitol Hill the other day and deplored the manual craze afflicting the Air Force in recent years.

"There has crept in a tendency," said General White, putting it softly, "to try to write a manual on every conceivable subject."

In recent weeks, Air Force manuals of just about that much variety have been brought to public attention. There was a manual telling airmen how to set the table, mix drinks, and take care of officers' dogs. There was one on marriage and romance. Another clumsily linked the National Council of Churches and Communists, and flatly said the idea that the people had a right to know what was going on was "foolish."

Now, according to Secretary Sharp and General White, the Air Force will reduce the number of manuals (to essentials, we hope) and subject each to a rigid review (for commonsense, we hope).

But the same day another manual, a joint job by the Army and the Air Force, turned up. This 10-page guide, prepared for military press agents, apparently is designed to "sell" the folks on post exchanges (PX's), which sometimes have been under fire from Congress and from neighboring merchants who didn't like the cut-price competition.

This pamphlet advises playing down beer sales and playing up PX soda fountains. Emphasis should be on the "service mission" of PX's, rather than sales promotion. And for goodness' sake don't anybody go around comparing PX prices with civilian store prices—it stirs up trouble.

Who are they kidding?

Paradise Key and Everglades National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the Saturday, March 12, edition of the Miami Herald appears a fine article by Mr. Nixon Smiley, relative to the Everglades National Park and to the very fine job of preservation and restoration of natural wildlife in that subtropical area which is now being accomplished by the National Park Service, and which was earlier handled in a more limited way by the Florida State Federation of Women's Clubs, the State Park Service, and the Audubon Society. For the information of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent

that Mr. Smiley's fine article, "Man Aids Paradise Key in Staging a Comeback," may be made a part of my remarks and may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN AIDS PARADISE KEY IN STAGING A COMEBACK

(By Nixon Smiley)

Some years ago I fell heir to a paper-covered bulletin entitled "Natural History of Paradise Key and the Nearby Everglades of Florida," by W. E. Safford of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It was part of a Smithsonian report of a study made by Safford in 1917.

Although Safford was an economic botanist, whose specialty was useful plants, his bulletin takes in the total biology of the key located just inside the Everglades National Park. In 57 pages he deals with the soil, climate, plants, snails, spiders, moths, butterflies, ants, wasps, fish, frogs, snakes and alligators, and he winds up with something on the mammals, including ancient man and the relics he left behind. The bulletin has 64 pages of plates of photographs.

I like to thumb through this little volume after a visit to Everglades National Park. It's interesting to compare conditions as Safford found them with conditions today, and to consider the changes which have taken place in the intervening years.

Safford described Paradise Key as a "remarkable example of subtropical jungle within the limits of the United States in which the primeval conditions of animal and plant life have remained unchanged by man."

That was written 43 years ago. A lot has taken place since.

Although the key was periodically guarded by a State warden, collectors cleaned out most of the colorful tree snails and most of the orchids. Disastrous fires swept through the hammock, destroying most of the giant, orchid-laden live oaks and nearly all of the 100-foot royal palms mentioned by Safford and earlier writers.

Naturalist Charles Torrey Simpson counted 500 royal palms when he visited Paradise Key soon after the start of the century. Early photographs show colonies of these palms standing high above the large live oaks of the hammock.

But fires struck the hammock in the 1920's and 1930's, killing every living thing in large areas and destroying the humus which lay heavy over the limestone floor. Today only a few big live oaks and tall palms remain.

Under the protection of the National Park Service, the key is rapidly returning to something of its former self. But it will take many years for the hammock to be like it was before the Everglades were drained, resulting in a lowering of the water table so that fire could sweep across the sawgrass and burn through the hammock's dry floor during times of prolonged drought.

And, yet, if you were to take Safford's bulletin and spend day comparing your own observations with those of Safford, you would find, in several instances, an encouraging similarity between 1917 and 1960.

If Safford could take a stroll today along Anhinga Trail, a walk made into a slough bordering Paradise Key, he would see as much wild life as he did in 1917. And he would be able to see it more closely, since the birds, alligators, snakes, and turtles have become used to people and do not dash for cover.

A photograph of the slough, made by Willson Popenoe, shows the willows and water plants to be just about the same as they are today. But there is no sign of wildlife in his picture.

Today, one might see large alligators sunning themselves along the banks of this area, while coots and gallinules swim about nearby without apparent fear of the monsters. And there is a good chance of seeing egrets, herons, and bitterns, as well as the anhinga, or water turkey, for which the trail is named.

On the hammock trail, which begins near the very modern-looking ranger station built by the park service, one would see the same species of tropical and subtropical trees which Safford saw and listed. And, if one looked carefully, there's a good chance of seeing a golden miranda spider, which Safford described as "a beautiful, black and yellow" resident. The female eats the smaller bridegroom as soon as the honeymoon is over.

But the tree snails are scarce and one has to look sharply to see even an ordinary variety. Only a few orchids may be seen. And very few of the giant live oaks Safford saw can be found today. They fell after the big fires and, if one were to go far enough into the hammock, some of their reclining forms might be found, rotting away while smaller trees grow thickly about them.

Among Safford's photographs is a color plate of the roseate spoonbill, under which he noted was "fast disappearing from the Everglades."

Whether Safford actually saw a roseate spoonbill in the vicinity of the key he does not say, but at that time biologists thought this bird was headed for extinction in Florida, along with a number of other water birds. Fortunately, the roseate spoonbill has come in large numbers and apparently is now safe from possible extinction, thanks to the efforts of the park service and the Audubon Society.

Safford, we are glad to report, would see many more birds in the 'glades today than he saw in 1917.

All of which should make us pleased to realize how much enlightenment has taken place—how we have come to appreciate and support conservation—since Safford wrote his interesting bulletin on Paradise Key, just 43 years ago.

Rails to the Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that when the going gets rough, it is the railroads that go through. It is the railroads that carry the load when other means of transportation fail.

The Government, especially the Post Office, and private shippers and travelers in their day-to-day operations look around for the fastest or most convenient mode of transportation when everything is normal and weather is fine. But as soon as the weather is bad, everyone depends on the railroads, sometimes exclusively.

At the close of my remarks I am inserting an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 5 entitled "Rails to Rescue When Snow Falls." I commend it to my colleagues.

I believe we all know how often the Post Office Department is unable to rely on any form of transportation except

the railroads. While there are times when the railroads may not get through, it is usually long after all other forms of transportation have ground to a halt. Usually it is the rails alone who carry the burden of private and Government business when all other modes fail.

I have introduced H.R. 9488, which would forbid the transportation by air of mail on which airmail postage has not been paid. The 6-year-old experimental airlift of mail on which airmail postage has not been paid has diverted millions of tons of mail from the rails and other surface media. I do not believe this experimental program should be allowed to continue. It is a penalty on the railroads when they need our help and support.

The people of the country choose the basic type of carrier they want when they affix a postage stamp to their letters. Millions have selected surface transportation but instead have run the risk of having their mail dumped at an airmail terminal until weather clears or until it is sent to the train depot, where it belonged in the first place. They run the risk of an airplane crash which could destroy their letters. They lose the advantage of en route distribution and sorting carried on in the RPO cars.

At the same time the railroads lose revenue which they badly need and to which they are entitled. Yet when an emergency arises, we all turn to the railroads and expect them to work the miracles they almost always are able to do and handle mail, freight, and passengers which in other times are spread among other modes.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Mar. 5, 1960]

RAILS TO RESCUE WHEN SNOW FALLS

As residents of the Philadelphia area and other metropolitan centers dig their way out of snowdrifts this weekend they should thank their lucky stars that the railroads were on the job when other means of transportation failed—as they nearly always are in a winter weather emergency.

Philadelphia would have been paralyzed without the rails. Trains and subways not only operated very close to schedule throughout the storm and its aftermath but shouldered a heavy additional burden. Thousands of persons who usually do not ride on trains turned to them in time of need as the only reliable all-weather mass transit system. The relatively few minor delays on the rail lines were due more to the sudden increase in patronage than to the snow.

Meanwhile, motor traffic was stalling or crawling everywhere. Some bus lines shut down and others operated far behind schedule. Buses couldn't get by the jams of autos.

The traffic situation was worse in New York City where the snowfall measured 14 inches. Thousands of vehicles were choked to a standstill and bus service on many lines was halted at the peak of the evening rush period on Thursday. There, as in Philadelphia, trains and subways came to the rescue. They were the only dependable means of transportation.

Detailed accounts of the transit picture in Philadelphia, New York, and other cities during the past few days should be required reading for Members of Congress. The rail commuter lines could be doomed to extinction if Congress fails to enact legislation to save them. Supporters of the rail aid bills—which would correct tax injustices, provide loans for new equipment and authorize other

worthwhile programs to keep the commuter trains rolling—should call the attention of Congressmen to the railroads' role in saving snow-covered cities from isolation.

It should be noted also that many long-distance travelers patronized the railroads when it became apparent that autos, buses and planes could not get through the storm.

Our hats are off to the many commuting motorists in suburban Philadelphia who sensibly left their cars at home or the nearest railroad station parking lot and took trains to the city Thursday and Friday. They saved themselves a lot of grief. It is possible that some drivers who went by rail in the emergency were favorably impressed by the speed and convenience of trains and will use them regularly.

The closing of schools in the Philadelphia area was another good move that reduced traffic on treacherous highways. In many communities the Friday school closings were announced late Thursday, which was better than waiting until Friday morning and causing some mothers to miss the message and send children to closed classrooms.

Philadelphians, in both city and suburbs, came through the big storm in good shape for the most part. This was due in large measure to quick action by well-prepared municipal officials and wise decisions by motorists to apply chains or, better still, leave the car at home.

Most important of all was the reliable rail transportation. The Nation was given another spectacular example of why commuter trains are the lifelines of big cities and must be preserved.

Pioneer V Scans Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the launching of Pioneer V last Friday indeed constitutes a marvelous American scientific achievement.

The recording and transmitting equipment in this space hurtling artificial planet will greatly increase man's understanding of the mysteries of outer space. Hopefully, this date will hasten the day when human beings will travel the heavens.

Mr. President, the achievement of Pioneer V and the job which it is intended to do are not easily understood by the layman. It is for this reason that I want to call attention today to an excellent and very clear statement about Pioneer V which was written by William L. Laurence and which appeared in this Sunday's New York Times.

Mr. Laurence's article makes us all junior spacemen—and at the same time gives us good reason to be proud of the American scientists responsible for the solar orbiting Pioneer V.

I commend Mr. Laurence for his fine article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIONEER V IS LAUNCHED—ARTIFICIAL PLANET WILL ORBIT SUN AND RADIO INFORMATION TO EARTH

(By William L. Laurence)

The United States successfully launched its second artificial planet, named Pioneer V, at 8 o'clock Friday morning from Cape Canaveral, Fla. The beachball-sized aluminum package, weighing 90 pounds and measuring 26 inches in diameter, will orbit at a distance of 75 million miles from the Sun between Earth and Venus.

This is the second planet launched by the United States. The first, Pioneer IV, launched March 3, 1959, weighed only 13.4 pounds. Russia launched the first artificial planet, Lunik I, on January 2, 1959. It weighed 3,245 pounds and carried instrumentation weighing 794.8 pounds. It is orbiting the Sun on a 15-month cycle. The second Soviet Lunik hit the Moon, while the third circled the Moon and then returned to orbit around the Earth. Both Pioneer IV and Lunik I are orbiting the Sun between Earth and Mars.

STRONG RADIO

Pioneer V is made of aluminum. Its instruments include a 150-watt transmitter designed to permit communication with earth at distances up to 50 million miles. The transmitter is believed to be the most powerful ever flown into deep space—roughly 20 times more powerful than any U.S. experimental space transmitter to date.

Pioneer V's 150-watt transmitter contains solar cells that will recharge the payload's nickel-cadmium batteries every 4 hours and 55 minutes. It is hoped it will stay in touch with earth for 4 or 5 months, until it is out of range, and that it will resume contact in 1963, when it comes within range again.

Pioneer V is expected to describe a 506-million-mile path around the Sun in a year of 311 days. Its trajectory is expected to carry it to the earth's orbit at aphelion (greatest distance from the sun). At perihelion (closest distance to the sun) it should intersect Venus' orbit. The earth travels a 584-million-mile path around the sun in 365 days, while Venus covers a circuit of 422-million miles in a 225-day year.

The farthest Pioneer V could ever be from the earth, on its planned trajectory, would be some 186 million miles. The closest could be several hundred thousand miles, within the next decade.

TIME FOR SIGNAL

A radio signal transmitted over a 50-million-mile route would take approximately 4½ minutes to make the trip, at the speed of light (186,000 miles a second). At that distance, Pioneer V itself would have traveled about 5,300 miles during the radio's signal's transit time. Similarly, the earth would have covered about 4,900 miles.

In the early part of the flight, a 5-watt radio transmitter is being used to send out experiment data. After Pioneer V gets more than several million miles from the earth, the 5-watt unit will serve as a booster amplifier for the 150-watt transmitter which thereafter will be the sole radio contact.

One reason for the powerful radio transmitter is to demonstrate the feasibility of long-range space communication. Another reason involves a new method of measuring astronomical distances. To astronomers, the basic unit of measurement is the mean distance between earth and sun, about 93 million miles. Most scientists agree that this measurement is accurate to only plus or minus 50,000 miles.

NEW ACCURACY

While this tolerance may seem small when dealing with billions of miles, it is regarded as important to future space missions to have more precise measures. Successful long

range communication with Pioneer V, it was pointed out, "will surely aid in our spatial measurement knowledge, as the scientists should be able to triangulate between earth and several signal plots from the probe to give us new values."

Like Explorer VI, Pioneer V carries four paddlewheels, jutting out from the sphere's equator. They measure 14 by 18 inches, and carry 4,800 energy-converting silicon solar cells. The solar cells will get 30 to 40 percent more intense solar energy than those on Explorer VI, because Pioneer V will be flying closer to the sun.

Pioneer V is instrumented to get some basic measurements on radiation, magnetic fields in space, the action of gaseous "clouds" of plasma (electrified gases) floating through space, micrometeorite activity and solar flare effects.

One instrument is a 5-pound radiation device, developed by the University of Chicago, to measure high-energy radiation, such as the rays hurled into space by the sun. Since no previous probe has flown so close to the sun, the scientists do not know precisely what to expect. A similar instrument on Explorer VI tentatively located a band of hitherto undetected high-energy radiation near the inner edge of the earth's great radiation belt.

Dr. A. Hamilton Reid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a great article about a wonderful, fabulous man from Montgomery, Ala., where Jeff Davis was sworn in as President of the Confederacy. I am speaking of Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, of Montgomery, Ala., executive secretary of the Alabama Baptist Conference. I wish it were possible to put the wonderful picture that one of the oldest and best papers in the South, the Mobile Register, carried along with this article that I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that will go everywhere. This story and picture were in the Mobile Register Monday morning, March 7, 1960.

Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, along with another great and wonderful friend and hard-hitting preacher, Dr. A. E. Carpenter, had invited me to be with them on Sunday, as they dedicated this great church. How I wish I could have been with them, but you know, Mr. Speaker, you asked all of us to be here, and that is exactly what we did. But this was a great occasion. There were 1,050 people who attended this meeting, and I wish everybody could do that. It must have been just about the size of the meeting that we had when we honored you at the banquet I gave for you so long ago that brought us so close together.

I hope many people will read what this great and fabulous man who is working for God and man, Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, had to say in this article that I am inserting in the RECORD, that will go to every library in the Nation and

many libraries in other parts of the world.

It was a great day and it was a good day, and I wish all of you could not only know Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, but to also know the man that worked, pulled, and prayed and helped get up the money to build this wonderful Central Baptist Church on Fulton Road and Hurtel Street in Mobile, Ala.

The Alabama congressional delegation, Mr. Speaker, had a meeting yesterday to go over the plans for next week, and I had this Mobile Register with me with the picture and parts of the great sermon preached by Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, and how I wish every one of you could have heard what Senator Hill, Senator Sparkman, Congressman George Grant and every one of the men that attended the meeting had to say about this man who has worked so hard and done so much in the Lord's vineyard—Dr. A. Hamilton Reid.

ALBERT RAINS, the great orator and such another great man, said some very beautiful things. I cannot begin to tell you all the things they said, because every one of them had wonderful things to say about a great man that is doing a great work for God and man.

The article follows:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, Mar. 7, 1960]

NEW BUILDING IS DEDICATED BY BAPTISTS (By John Will)

The new \$360,000 educational building of the Central Baptist Church at Fulton Road and Hurtel Street was dedicated yesterday at services which also commemorated the 14th anniversary of Dr. A. E. Carpenter's pastorate.

The educational building is the first unit in a long-range plan which calls for later construction of a large sanctuary and development of an extensive recreational area.

Meanwhile, a maximum congregation of 1,050 can be accommodated in a temporary auditorium in the educational structure which has a total of 90 rooms.

It was in the auditorium that dedicatory services were held yesterday. Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, of Montgomery, executive secretary of the Alabama Baptist Convention, preached in the morning and Dr. Leon Macon, editor of the Alabama Baptist at Birmingham, spoke at the night service. An afternoon service was followed by open house for public inspection of the building. Dr. Carpenter, the pastor, presided at the services.

Dr. Reid declared in his sermon that "we cannot think of any greater accomplishment than people building a House of the Lord" and he referred to the divine words concerning the Temple at Jerusalem: "For now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that My name may be there forever."

"First," Dr. Reid said, "this building is dedicated to the Lord as His house for His glory and for the advancement of His kingdom. It is dedicated with Christ at its very center. The sacredness of God is in its walls."

"More specifically," he continued, "it is dedicated to the cause of worship. The call to worship runs throughout the Bible. The hunger of the soul for fellowship with God can be satisfied only with worship. We will be stronger tomorrow as a result of waiting before God today in worship."

Next Dr. Reid spoke of the building as "dedicated to the preaching of the gospel."

"We must recognize the importance of preaching," he said, "Right at this hour, there are thousands of voices preaching in

the churches of all faiths in our great State of Alabama. And it is a different State because of these voices echoing across Alabama on this Lord's day.

"We should be thankful for freedom to preach the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ. Freedom of religion is fundamental in our country and it is one of the elements that has made America great."

Then the Baptist leader turned to the question of the church's teaching function and he asserted that "Jesus commissioned His church to be a teaching institution."

"The church," said Dr. Reid, "is responsible for religious instruction. And the home and family have an equal responsibility."

But Dr. Reid made it clear that Baptist thinking holds that the teaching function of the church relates only to spiritual development and not to secular instruction.

"We believe in our public schools," he told his listeners, "and we will stand by our public school system. May the time never come when we will find it necessary to convert our church schools to elementary training."

Finally, Dr. Reid proclaimed the need for dedicating the church to "our great world ministry."

"We should be ready," he stated, "to blend our efforts with those of other churches to advance the Kingdom of Christ in all the world. We should seek to build a Christian world, with peace, love, understanding and harmony among all the peoples of the world."

The Central Baptist Church moved to its present location on Fulton Road last September. It is maintaining mission work at its previous site at Church and Claiborne Streets.

Twenty Billion for Welfare—Story of a Growing Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the U.S. News & World Report, entitled "20 Billion for Welfare—Story of a Growing Expense."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY BILLION FOR WELFARE—STORY OF A GROWING EXPENSE

Welfare programs designed to give everyone security are rapidly catching up with national defense as the No. 1 program of Government spending.

The dramatic rise in the flow of dollars for welfare is hidden from the public by accounting for most of this type of expenditures—old-age pensions, widows' pensions, disability pensions—outside the Treasury's regular budget of income and spending.

Add the spending and taxing to support the growing welfare state, and the Government's finances are transformed.

What you find is this:

All spending for national security, including military aid abroad and atomic programs, has tended to stabilize at around \$46 billion a year. When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, that spending was around 50 billion, owing to the Korean war.

Welfare spending, however, has skyrocketed. In 1953, as shown by the accom-

panying charts, that spending was at the rate of less than 7 billions a year. In the year to start next July 1, welfare, as shown in the Government's financial statement, will pass \$20 billion a year. That cost has, thus, been growing by well over \$1 billion a year.

In Congress at this time are plans to speed that growth. One plan is to increase the size of many pensions. Another is to set up a system of hospital and surgical insurance for persons 65 and older. A third is to make more liberal the terms on which pensions are given to those who are permanently and totally disabled. Some of these proposals have administration, as well as congressional, support.

The whole welfare system is in the midst of a boom.

RISE IN TAXES, TOO

Along with the boom in spending comes an increase in payroll taxes to support large parts of the program. On January 1, 1960, the tax on payrolls for old-age and disability pensions went up to 6 percent of all pay of \$4,800 a year or less. That tax is shared by the worker and employer. For the self-employed, the tax is 4.5 percent.

A tax rise, step by step, to 9 percent of payrolls by 1969 is scheduled by law, and still higher rates seem certain if new programs are adopted.

The spending for welfare outlined above is not the whole story. If you add veterans' pensions as a "welfare" cost, the spending rises by another \$1.7 billion a year. That does not count compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities. Spending by States to match Federal funds going to people on relief accounts for an additional \$2.1 billion.

All of this means that, in the relatively short period of 25 years, the United States has become—in dollar terms—one of the world's greatest welfare states. Outlays for this purpose still are not as liberal as in some other countries, in relation to national income, but the proportion spent in the United States is increasing rapidly.

You can see this when you compare welfare spending with what the Federal Government spends for all purposes. In 1953, welfare took about 9 cents out of every dollar spent. In the year ahead, it is scheduled to take about 21 cents. In the same period, the amount devoted to defense has dropped from 66 cents to about 48 cents of each dollar.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

The scope of the welfare state is vast, both in terms of money and in terms of the numbers of people affected. In the coming fiscal year, it is estimated, more than 20 million people—about 1 out of every 9 in the United States—will receive help through a Federal welfare program.

As you glance down the following list of beneficiaries, note how near the Government approaches to providing security "from the cradle to the grave"—

Retired workers and dependents getting pensions, including railroad retirement: 15.3 million.

Elderly people on relief: 2.4 million.

Retired civil servants getting pensions: 583,000.

Disabled persons on relief, including the blind: 488,000.

Disabled workers receiving pensions: 592,000.

College students receiving federally supported loans: about 100,000.

Dependent children on relief: 3 million.

The number of people getting Federal help is greatly increased, if you count 1.9 million veterans and families of deceased veterans on pensions, 271,000 retired from the Armed Forces on pensions, and 13.5 million schoolchildren whose lunches—2.3

billion meals a year—are paid for in part through the Federal school-lunch program.

WHERE COSTS MOUNT UP

The chart on these pages shows what major types of welfare are to cost in the year ahead.

A large part of the increase in cost in the last 8 years has come in the old-age-insurance program. The \$11.2 billion to be paid out next year compare with \$2.7 billion in the 1953 fiscal year.

The number of people receiving old-age pensions has more than doubled, and the size of pensions has been increased.

When old-age insurance was established in 1935, it was expected eventually to eliminate the need for relief. But Congress and the States keep increasing the size of relief payments and the number of people eligible to receive them. There will be about 5,599,000 children and adults getting Federal relief money in the coming year, compared with 4,902,000 in 1953. The Federal share of relief checks will come to about \$2.1 billion, compared with \$1.3 billion 8 years ago.

For an example of the way in which new programs tend to mushroom, take a look at the disability pensions. These started going out to disabled workers 50 years of age or older just 2 years ago. Initial cost: 178 million a year. The cost in the coming year is forecast at 610 million. Plans now receiving serious consideration would give this program a big lift by easing rules and removing the age requirement.

HARD TO STOP

The Government's venture into aiding education shows it is much easier to start paying out money for welfare than it is to stop. The President this year, as in the past, is trying to cut down on grants to public schools and again is meeting powerful opposition in Congress. Meanwhile new proposals for educational aid are receiving serious consideration.

However, the new program that many in Congress think has the greatest potential for growth in future years is the plan to add hospital insurance to the old-age pension system. Initially, this legislation, introduced by Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, would cover only some of the hospital and surgical bills of people retired on old-age pensions, but opponents of the plan see it as the beginning of a vast new system of national health insurance.

While opposing the Forand bill, administration officials have indicated they are likely to have a compromise plan of their own.

This much is sure: Steps to expand the welfare programs will be enacted into law in this election year. Hospital insurance may not make the grade, but there will be moves to increase the size of pensions, make it easier for millions to qualify, and broaden educational assistance.

Even without new legislation, the welfare program has built-in increases. More people retire each year on old-age pensions. More workers come under the unemployment insurance plan. Add plans afoot for new benefits, and you have a welfare program that can rival defense for the No. 1 spot in the cash budget before the 1960's end.

Who gets the \$20 billion in welfare money—
(Official estimates, year ending June 30, 1961)

	Million
Retired and disabled workers:	
Old-age-insurance pensions.....	\$11,248
Civil Service pensions.....	886
Railroad workers' pensions.....	979
Disability pensions.....	610
People on relief.....	2,087
Unemployed workers:	
Jobless benefits.....	1,973
State employment services.....	311

Who gets the \$20 billion in welfare money—
Continued

	Million
Students, colleges, school districts:	
Grants and loans.....	565
School lunches.....	150
Hospitals, health.....	904
Other welfare costs.....	468

NOTE.—Figures include relatively small amounts for administration.

California Home for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial has been brought to my attention by constituents of mine regarding the outstanding accomplishment of one community project in the Los Angeles area to bring practical and effective aid to the aged.

The editorial by Mr. Al S. Waxman, editor-publisher, appeared in all six of Mr. Waxman's papers, the Los Angeles Reporter, the Wilshire Reporter, the Park LaBrea Reporter, the Pico Reporter, the Beverly Hills Reporter, and the California Jewish Press.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the text of Mr. Waxman's editorial from the March 9 issue of the Los Angeles Reporter.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Reporter, Mar. 9, 1960]

CALIFORNIA HOME FOR AGED

(By Al S. Waxman)

Mark Twain once said "people talk about the weather but do nothing about it," but in Los Angeles people began to talk about the need of the aged in a Jewish community and decided to do something about it.

Now as they embark on a \$1 million expansion program, it is time to mention the splendid work and to point out that the California Home for the Aged at Reseda is a glowing tribute to things which can be done when an entire community decides to "do something about it."

It hasn't been an easy thing to accomplish as the history of the institution reflects.

Necessity is the creator of many things and it was during one of America's most bitter and depressing eras that necessity fostered the Industrial Center for the Aged at Reseda, Calif.

During the depression days of the early 1930's a group vitally concerned with the trials and tribulations of their fellow man organized the center in order that elderly men and women who were outcasts from the business world, because of their age, would have a home to maintain themselves during their "sunset" years.

With the aid of their benefactors, residents at the center soon went into business. At the center they operated a thrift shop which became a thriving and profitable adventure. Old furniture and clothing were collected, restored to usefulness and sold in the thrift shop. This was a start.

Broken and weary refugees from Nazi-ridden lands came to this 8-acre site just prior to World War II and during the years of global conflict that followed many found the industrial home a haven where they could finish out the remaining years of their lives in simple dignity and serenity.

The medical sciences took great strides forward following the war and the population at the center budded and blossomed. As does rapid growth create problems everywhere so it did at the center. Thus, the need developed to increase facilities for care of those over 65.

It was in December of 1947 that a new organization, a new program, a new executive director and a new name for the center became children of necessity. And California Home for the Aged at Reseda started making history.

It is never entirely possible to acclaim any one individual or group in a project as vast as the California home. There is, however, one person to whom tribute must be paid.

Ben Garon, executive director of the home, since 1947, lived on the east side of Los Angeles and for years came into contact with the many problems of the aged and it was his driving force which took the germ of an idea and molded it into the lofty position the home enjoys today. Garon and his directorate have even greater plans for the California Home for the Aged at Reseda.

As problems go with progress the home in this respect was no different. But it grew until today the onetime rather barren spot is covered with a residency building, a dining and recreational hall, a hospital unit, a chapel, and meeting quarters.

The 75 elder residents of the home today live in peace and contentment in an atmosphere charged with a progressive pace of golden age hobby shops and occupational therapy programs which are the most modern attitudes and methods in the area of geriatrics.

Residents at the home have many advantages. Culture and religious observances, parties, and the production of a monthly newspaper are all a part of their lives. The best of medical care is ever in evidence. Over 30 of the city's finest physicians and surgeons voluntarily are the custodians of health at the home.

Unique in such programs is an allowance of \$2.50 each week to residents of the home. Married couples have double rooms, and all other residents have private rooms. Well-balanced meals, including kosher meats and poultry, are a part of the regular fare at the home.

And the home never forgets its neighbors on the outside. An intensive casework and counseling service to any aged person or family in the community is offered as a part of its program.

Thousands through the years—not eligible to enter the home—have been helped free of charge to find a way of life which creates a more happy existence for the individual and those with whom he or she is associated.

The California home organization consists of over 4,000 persons united into 16 affiliated auxiliaries and chapters for the purpose of maintaining and supporting the home's purpose and programs.

This organization is, in turn, assisted by nonmember individuals and groups which have contributed large sums of money over a period of years.

It is a tribute to Los Angeles that every service, each building, every bottle of milk is the result of some person or group's contribution.

The California home is not resting on its laurels. Recently it launched a \$1 million expansion program, made possible to a great degree by a Federal Housing Authority grant.

At the conclusion of this expansion project an additional 100 needy aged persons will find refuge at Reseda. And there they will find four resident buildings, a new dining hall, hospital unit, and many other necessary facilities.

These additional units are not yet a reality. There is much work to be done first, but already architects have spent 3 years in

planning and perfecting a design conducive to the special housing and living needs of elderly persons and the FHA took 2 years to investigate and approve the plans.

Officials of the home are optimistic. "We know we are making major strides in helping to dispel the fear of old age for many, and assuring many that they need not be afraid to grow old. That the best is yet to come," are their encouraging words.

The Cloak of Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the *Record* an article entitled "The Cloak of Words," published in the Wall Street Journal of today, March 14, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE CLOAK OF WORDS

No one expected the Senate to get the two-thirds vote necessary to limit debate on the civil rights bill—a minority of southerners were supposed to block that.

But as matters turned out, the proponents of the legislation couldn't even muster a simple majority of the Senators willing to turn off the talk against the bill.

The result has been a bit of confusion as to what happens next. It has also, it seems to us, confused the arguments of those who pictured the filibuster as the wicked machination of a stubborn minority thwarting the set will of the majority of the Senate.

The Senate rules, as everyone knows by now, provide that no legislation shall be voted upon until every Senator has had his say, unless two-thirds of the Senators agree to halt debate. The Senate has invoked cloture upon occasion, but rarely.

The purpose of these rules is not to favor a minority southern bloc, although the casual follower of current events might suppose so. The purpose is first of all to make sure that any great issue is fully debated before irrevocable decisions are made; and, beyond that, to provide a deliberate brake against a simple majority running roughshod over a large minority on issues of very great moment.

Now it's quite true that these rules—like many other procedural safeguards in our constitutional system—are sometimes put to strange uses. The right of unlimited debate can be used not to debate but simply to delay. The words of a filibuster can be a cloak to cover many things, and it is this aspect of it that has many times brought the filibuster into public disfavor.

But the disfavor, be it noted, has a strange way of shifting. Last week, for example, Senator MORSE of Oregon voted to shut off debate because he did not agree with those talking. Yet upon another day and another issue it was Senator MORSE who invoked for himself the same right to talk; for a long time he held the Senate's filibuster record.

Moreover the power to talk has been vastly overrated as a power to halt the Senate from what it would do. A Senate of a hundred men which truly wanted to vote on an issue could, if it chose to do so, outlisten

any handful of Senators. Others besides Senator MORSE have shown remarkable endurance at steady talking, but human endurance still has an end.

The truth is that there are a good many Senators outside the Southern bloc who might have had some hard choices to make if forced to vote on this particular bill. The filibuster by the determined opponents delivers them from the necessity of voting on the bill itself and offers them at the same time a whipping boy to castigate.

Thus, while there were only 18 Senators who by their talking openly sought to put off a vote on this controversial legislation, there were 52 Senators who, on the test, were opposed to suspending the debate and thus hurrying the bill to a vote.

All this suggests, we think, a little perspective on last week's events and the controversy over the ancient safeguard of unlimited debate provided in the Senate's rules.

What ought not to be obscured in the cloak of words is that the will of the Senate was not thwarted by a handful of Senators. When the Senate gets a civil rights bill which the majority is truly determined to have, then the Senate will have it, filibuster or no.

Strange Voices and Senate Resolution 94

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a number of previous statements to the House, I have quoted thoughtful editorials opposing rescission of the Connally reservation to the United Nations World Court resolution adopted by the U.S. Senate on August 2, 1946.

Among the strongest statements in opposition yet made is House Joint Resolution 41 of the Commonwealth of Virginia quoted by me in the *Record* of March 2, 1960, on page A1811.

The latest that I have read is an editorial in the March 5, 1960, issue of the *Tablet*, the influential weekly paper of Brooklyn, N.Y., which features the views of Dean Manion, the Nation's leading constitutional lawyer.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Tablet*, Mar. 5, 1960]

STRANGE VOICES AND SENATE RESOLUTION 94

Five years ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur told the American people to "be not deceived by strange voices heard across the land decrying this old and proven concept of patriotism . . . seductive murmurs are arising that it is now outmoded by some more comprehensive and all-embracing philosophies . . . that there is a higher destiny for us under another and more general flag." These strange voices are currently pushing a thing which would repeal the so-called Connally amendment. It is Senate Resolution 94 and it would delete from our treaty accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice a clause allowing the United States to determine if a case in question is domestic and hence not within the Court's province. It is waiting in the Senate wings until the proper time—when Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Foreign Re-

lations Committee chairman, feels it will get the necessary two-thirds vote of approval.

What do the voices say? We must abolish the Connally amendment to prove this country's good faith in the rule of law replacing the rule of force. Repeal is the action "most readily apparent with which to underscore American reverence for law and set it by contract against Communist materialism and expediency"; that admittedly the Connally amendment has done much to cripple the International Court," since other countries invoke their own Connally clauses to bar the Court from assuming jurisdiction. After all, didn't Russia claim its shooting down of American airmen in the Japan Sea was a domestic matter? The reasoning seems to be that if the United States would suspend this protection of our domestic affairs, the Reds will follow suit.

But what hath it profited this country to expend hundreds of thousands of lives and billions of dollars of wealth in the pursuit of law and order, if other nations still doubt our reverence for said law and order? It has not been shown where we have invoked the Connally reservation when the point at issue was not a domestic matter. As the *Tablet* has stated, if friendly or neutral governments resort to this subterfuge to avoid the Court's interference then of what worth is this righteous profession of belief in justice and rule of law?

In masterful testimony during hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, former Notre Dame Law School Dean Clarence Manion stressed the United States "is not attempting to judge itself or decide its own cause when it withholds from the Court the right to be the final arbiter of its own jurisdiction. There is no court in our entire judicial system that has such a sweeping prerogative. An omniscient court with self-determined jurisdiction over all things and everybody under all circumstances would be the very definition of tyranny."

Systematically, Dean Manion asserted, the "melodic phrase 'world peace through world law' has been made to resound throughout the country as the bright alternative to our selfish addiction to the Connally reservation." Indeed one "voice" goes so far as to charge that "until the individual statesmen and citizens in this country know more about and have more confidence in the institutions and principles of our international society, the rule of law throughout the world will remain rather meaningless." Thus, the chief troublemaker in the world is not the Soviet conspiracy but Americans who would maintain a rampart against decisions by—according to the Court's statutes—merely two judges, and these could be from Communist countries.

On the international plane, since legal sanctions are impossible, said Dr. Manion, "moral sanctions are imperative. Such moral sanctions are the only hope for what we call international law because on the international level, law must depend solely upon international morality for its preservation and enforcement." But in the present deranged state of mankind where is morality and the natural, moral law recognized as the motivation of governmental action? Murdered Hungarian patriots are but one of many symbols which bear testimony to this myth.

Let's face it: Neither peace nor law is possible for a world that is locked in a death struggle between freedom and communism. We can think about "world peace through world law" after the diabolical menace of communism has been swept from the face of the earth. Until it is it would be the height of folly to weaken these United States, which represents truly the last, best hope for peace.

Marie C. McGuire: She's Helping Add Life to the Years for Senior Citizens: San Antonio Pioneers Better Housing for Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, observing that medical science has substantially increased the life expectancy of man but that we have not found satisfactory solutions to cope with the problems of the aged and aging, a noted sociologist sized it up this way:

We've added years to life. Now we've got to figure how to better add life to the years.

Texans are indeed fortunate that one of the outstanding workers and authorities in this field in America is a San Antonio lady—Marie C. McGuire, executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority. Under her dynamic leadership, San Antonio has built the Golden Age Center, a public-housing development for elderly citizens that is a model for such projects all over the Nation. The building, specially designed to meet the needs of the aged, will not be completed until this summer. But architects, planners, and city, State, and Federal officials already have visited San Antonio in droves to see this new dimension in housing for the aged.

Recently two excellent articles on the Golden Age Center have been written by Mrs. McGuire and published in Retirement Life magazine and the American City. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following articles: From Retirement Life of January 1960 the story entitled "Toward Independence for Senior Citizens"; and from the American City of January 1960, the article "People Live Longer Today."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Retirement Life, January 1960]

TOWARD INDEPENDENCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS
(By Marie C. McGuire)

The development of a housing policy and program of the U.S. Government has weathered a series of crises. Its present effort to establish a variety of methods to provide adequate housing for senior citizens presents a new challenge to the communities of America to meet a new crisis. The extent of the problem is grasped when we realize that in 1900 there were only 2 million citizens over 65 and by 1975 this age group will number 21 million. In the 1950 census, 65 percent of the 12 million persons over 65 years of age had incomes of \$2,000. Thirty percent of the dwellings owned by persons over 65 and 43 percent of those rented by them were substandard. This is the area of concern of the low-rent public housing program.

As local public housing officials entering this newest field, we are engaged in another fascinating and rewarding undertaking. There was joy in having been present when the first public housing project offered escape from the slums in 1938 for the family with

children; to see the unbelieving look in the eyes of people who could not understand that they and their families were important enough to be well housed; there was high excitement in planning and managing housing for the war worker and the military and the feeling of contribution to a Nation in conflict; there was a sense of fulfillment when the Congress in 1949 recognized that slums and their effect were a No. 1 domestic problem and provided tools to fight this disgrace on many fronts.

SPECIAL LEGISLATION ENACTED IN 1956

In 1956 we saw the Congress enacting special legislation to meet the increasing housing demand from the elderly at all income levels with recognition of the additional costs of special health and safety features in the home needed to meet the diminishing mental and physical prowess of the aging as well as related community facilities to create a proper living environment.

The last session of Congress, under the able leadership of Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and Representative ALBERT RAINS, provided other financial assistance programs attractive to private builders, religious and fraternal groups, profit and nonprofit organizations, as well as direct loans to the elderly at favorable interest rates. A variety of housing choices and designs should spring from the broad interest in the problem and the availability of Federal financial assistance. The Congress has indeed met the present-day challenge with commendable alacrity and vision.

Senior citizens in local communities now have an opportunity to take an active part in encouraging their local housing authorities to undertake programs essential for the low income elderly. Local authorities are political subdivisions of the State, the boards are local citizens appointed by the mayor or council of the city and they are amenable to the wishes of citizens interested in the low-rent program.

While many local authorities will quickly take advantage of the new provisions of the law, some may be slow to do so unless local citizen interest is expressed. This is due partly to the fact that the low-rent public housing program is still controversial in many places even though its detractors can offer no substitute plan for providing a decent standard of living within the paying ability of low-income families who live in the squalor of the slums of America.

Since 1949 the policy of our Government as stated in the Housing Act of that year is: "The realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

INCREASING NUMBER OF ELDERLY HAS HAD IMPACT

From the beginning of the public housing program in 1937, local housing authorities have provided older people on limited incomes with standard housing within their ability to pay. The same formula for all families, approximately 20 percent of income for rent, is applied. Today, even though State pension programs have improved, despite assistance through social security and other more adequate pension plans, the increasing number of elderly in this country, due largely to the progress of medical science in the field of geriatrics, has had a dramatic impact on all areas of our society and at all levels of government. Housing authorities in the cities of this country on the last count provided small apartments for independent living for over 80,000 elderly persons of low income.

The San Antonio Housing Authority began its study of local need and how best to meet it in 1954. We are a city of 580,000. Best estimates are that a minimum of 50,000 are over the age of 65. On the State pension rolls alone in our city were 10,000 elderly with an average income of \$55 a month. In

the small units available in our low rent housing projects, there lived 610 low income elderly. Applications from the elderly came in a never-ending stream and the backlog grew steadily. Older residents do not move out unless they become too ill to live alone, or death takes them.

Specially designed housing to meet this crushing need was certainly indicated. Three years of research now set forth in a booklet entitled "Housing the Elderly" led to the present construction program that has become something of a model for private and public groups throughout the country.

Our basic concepts included recognition of the fact that older people, like all others, differ in their tastes and needs. Therefore, no one housing concept would suffice. There should be variations that permitted choices. Already having the row house design, we therefore undertook a one-story cottage-motel type and a close-to-the-city-center, nine-story apartment building. But, ask many, don't most older people want to return to a rural setting with a garden and a few chickens and welcome chores about the place? Extensive surveys proved that while a few wanted this, the large majority wanted the convenience, comfort and accessibility of a midtown area. Extensive surveys demonstrated that the same facts that prompt high-income elderly to live in residential hotels are valid for the less economically fortunate. A survey of 400 of our residents indicate that 37 percent of them would prefer an apartment building.

CLOSE BY BUT SEPARATED FROM GROWING CHILDREN

Our next question was whether older people should be housed separately from families of all ages. Again a survey. The overwhelming majority wanted to be close by, but physically separated from growing children. "We love them, but we like to live on our own schedule," summed up the replies. The older person wishing to retire at 9 o'clock is disturbed by the teenage party just getting underway. The younger children seemed to have no respect for the flowers tenderly planted and nurtured by the elderly, and a host of other complaints left no doubt of the older person's choice. Therefore, the apartment building for the elderly is across the street from 800 growing families and some 4,000 children of all ages. Children are accessible but they cannot set the living schedule of the seniors.

The cottage-motel development is on one square block at one end of a project of 450 family dwellings and a long block away from the playground. Everyone is happy with the arrangement.

Our next concern was with the health, safety, and comfort factors that differentiated housing design for the elderly from that of younger families. Bathing, cooking, reaching, stooping, in the physical sense; loneliness; emergencies; being bedridden; usefulness and pleasure were categories explored. Since many accidents occur in the bathroom, we came to these decisions: a shower with comfortable wooden seat, instead of a bathtub; tempered glass doors that won't break instead of dangerous shower curtains; no curb at shower so that a person in a wheel chair may roll to the shower seat and not need an attendant to bathe; emergency bell 2 feet off the floor and placed between commode and lavatory (it rings on the outside gallery so it may be heard by a neighbor); infrared lamp in ceiling for heat; no stove to fall against; continuous grab bars at varying angles in line with posture at time of use; nonslip floor, strong light.

In the kitchen, all cabinets and shelves within arm's reach; electric stove; refrigerator on a foot-high platform to prevent sometimes painful stooping; suspended light over the stove; dining space close by but in

front of a window so that the single person may associate himself with outdoor activity and therefore retain a more healthy pleasure in eating. Low bracket light over the table. All doors are wide enough for wheelchairs, no thresholds are used and levers instead of doorknobs will permit easy opening.

The living room and bedroom were studied jointly. At times a private bedroom is desirable, at other times it is better not to isolate the bedridden person from the view or activity of other parts of the home. Therefore, three portable closet sections that stop 2 feet below the ceiling are the divider. They may be unbolted and pushed against the wall if one big room is desired; or by the use of a door and panel with closet design, the bedroom may be completely quiet and separated. Space for nursing care on all sides of the bed; a double wall light for flooding the ceiling and direct light for reading, a continuous night light for safe access to the bath and low windows for enjoying the out of doors though bedridden are other features. Electric outlets are 3 feet from the floor to eliminate the need for stooping and bulbs in all light fixtures may be changed without standing on a chair or ladder.

After these and many other factors were decided on, we asked ourselves if housing did not encompass more than safety and convenience. What about loneliness, the absence of useful pursuits, opportunity for learning, for playing, for creative expression for productivity?—in a word, a way to assure a motive for living, to see to it that longer life meant fruitful and rewarding years.

WELL-ROUNDED NEIGHBORHOOD IMPORTANT

This concept led us to decide that housing for the elderly meant a whole living environment; a well-rounded neighborhood which is just as important to seniors as to juniors.

The Public Housing Administration imposes restrictions on community space and the limitations have not been lifted for the elderly. It was necessary for the commissioners of the local housing authority, nearer to the problems and acutely aware of need, to wage months of argument to achieve the many-faceted center needed for the 300 occupants in the apartment building, the 400 elderly across the street, and indeed any lonely elderly of all incomes in the city. The housing authority turned to the community welfare council for its support and assistance. Their response was immediate. A 40-man citizens' committee went to work.

The end result was that educational, counseling, recreation, library, and health programs were promised in writing by more than a dozen public and private city agencies. In addition, this committee agreed to see that funds were obtained to furnish and equip the center. Agency representatives worked with the housing authority architects on specific designs for their areas of concern. Armed with this kind of broad support, a 5,600 square-foot center on the first floor of the apartment building resulted—a veritable USO for the elderly of the city of San Antonio. Campaign for funds is well underway—citizens and clubs have been interested and generous. This again demonstrates that by pooling the efforts of public officials and private citizens, achievements beyond the potential of either working alone, are possible. The cottage-motel development now occupied received its community space furnishings through community welfare council efforts, and it was the occasion for joyful celebration and humorous vying for being the first to sit on the love seat.

The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, of the University of Texas, will provide a center coordinator in the high-rise building for 3 years to assure program success.

Building completion is expected in February 1960.

SAN ANTONIO GROUPS EAGER TO PARTICIPATE

Eagerness to participate in helping adequately to provide for all the needs of the elderly has marked this undertaking. The latest are the art groups of San Antonio who now are at work on murals, sculpture, paintings, a fountain for the patio, and a series of other embellishments, some gay, some spiritual, all significant, in recognition of the spirit of man and his innate appreciation of beauty.

These generous and creative gifts of loveliness are another demonstration of the current deep concern that, as a society, we shall mold for our valuable senior citizens a rewarding and fulfilling environment with endless opportunities, opportunities for continuing contributions which enrich our society far beyond the capacity of the young alone. In a sense, it is also a fulfillment of Robert Browning's philosophy—

"Grow old along with me; the best is yet to be—

The last of life for which the first was made."

All of this and more is what we mean when we utter those prosaic words, "housing the elderly." Or, as a little ashtay I recently acquired says, "Go, girl, go—you're only old once. Make the most of old age; it is a privilege denied to many."

[From the American City, January 1960]
PEOPLE LIVE LONGER TODAY—SO SAN ANTONIO ADJUSTS ITS PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM TO THE INCREASED LIFE EXPECTANCY

(By Marie C. McGuire)

Our city, already experienced in blending the Latin and North American cultures, is taking definite steps to accommodate comfortably that growing segment of our population who now enjoy increased life expectancy. In 1900 there were only 3 million in our country over the age of 65—today there are 16 million; in 1970 there will be 20 million and in 2000 the average life span will be 82 years with a potential of 125 years.

The San Antonio Housing Authority 3 years ago recognized this trend. Our plans encompass more than just a place to live for these mature citizens blessed with an increasing life span. We aim at something that will permit them to be useful in a youth-centered society. This thinking has influenced the design of two new housing developments in San Antonio.

One is an apartment building of 185 units with zero, one, and two bedrooms. The first floor is a 5,600-square-foot center with auditorium, craft room, counseling offices, library, clinic, and demonstration areas. The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health of the University of Texas, sensing the research potentials, will provide a center coordinator and more than a dozen local agencies will staff and operate it. The center will serve the social, educational, and leisure-hour needs of the older people of the city, not only the building occupants. For this reason and because surveys indicated the elderly prefer the convenience, the sense of security and opportunity of being in an active area, the building is located close to the center of the city.

The building will house only older folk, but it is located immediately adjacent to an 800-unit, 2-story family housing project. Again surveys among older people showed that they preferred the privacy and quiet, the opportunity of being on their schedule and pattern of life, but also the opportunity of having younger companions when they wanted them.

The apartments are replete with safety factors, many of which probably will be adopted in all types of housing. Shelves and light fixtures are low, to rule out climb-

ing and reaching; refrigerators are on a 14-inch platform to eliminate stooping; doors will have levers instead of knobs and will be wide for wheelchairs; there will be no gas appliances; showers will have Alaskan cedar wooden seats and will be designed to permit regulation of water flow and temperatures before entering; they will have tempered glass shower doors rather than dangerous curtains and grab bars at different heights and angles throughout the bathroom; there will be an emergency bell between commode and lavatory that rings on the outer gallery and a protected record on the inner door of whom to call in case of emergency.

Of particular design interest is the space flexibility. The apartments can be turned into one big room or separated through use of portable closets into private areas. This permits different arrangements during illness and also permits a wider range of family size. Dining space is by a window so that the lone person's appetite may remain normal by associating himself with outside activity.

There is a small laundry on each floor rather than the less convenient and often drab basement treatment. The laundry area is roomy with opportunity for comfortable visiting and thus the backyard social aspect of this phase of living is recreated. Ironing as well as washing may be done.

Only the first floor of the center is air-conditioned but the thin building (38 feet wide) permits each apartment to have complete cross ventilation. The building itself is oriented to the prevailing southwest breeze on the 2½-acre site.

Outdoor living in San Antonio's warm climate is emphasized. An 8-foot wall makes the shady garden patio completely private from an adjacent busy street. It is reached by a large veranda closed on three sides and opening off the lobby. Even the lobby came in for psychological analysis. It is not just an entry but is the play area, complete with a billiard table, card tables, TV and just sitting and visiting space. Quietness was emphasized only for the library, clinic and counseling offices.

ART INTEREST

The pride of the city of San Antonio in this broad undertaking is no better demonstrated than by the keen interest of the art group of the city in embellishing the structure. Sculptors, potters, painters, glass workers—some 30 distinguished art workers—are donating their time, labor, and materials to translate in art the great social concept of the undertaking. Enthusiasm has even reached across the border and a distinguished Mexican sculptor will send a piece.

A second housing development for older citizens is already complete and occupied. It consists of 36 one-story, cottage-motel units situated on a square block within another family housing project. The unit designs are identical with those in the apartment building. A community center for the elderly also is a part of this development. The authority believes that there must be choices in ways of living if the diverse needs of the elderly are to be met. It also believes that health groups must speed their programs to be able to give proper medical care to this growing population group.

"Independent living at a cost that they can afford is what most elderly people want," the authority says, "and in addition, it is far less costly than public institutions for the well elderly."

Says San Antonio's Mayor Pro Tempore Mike Passur, "Our entire city is proud of the pioneer work of our housing authority in the field of housing for the elderly. Private builders, church, and fraternal groups in and out of the city have watched with interest and I'm sure have learned a great

deal from our effort. This undertaking is a new industry in human welfare and we hope that what San Antonio is doing will be emulated in cities across the country to relieve the impact created by the dramatic increase in the life span."

Playing Politics With Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the administration is playing politics with survival at Geneva. Apparently some powerful members of the administration, perhaps including the President, now want to resume testing. In the Nation for February 27, Edward Gamarekian, science reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, makes this serious charge:

During the past few months, some top U.S. officials have attempted to make the Russians appear more hostile in order to reduce the chances for a nuclear test ban agreement. Such manipulation of public opinion is a dangerous game when the stakes are this high.

Mr. Gamarekian knows that this charge is serious. In his article he sets forth the supporting facts.

Under unanimous consent I am including the entire text of Mr. Gamarekian's article, "Quarrels Over Underground Testing."

[From the Nation, Feb. 27, 1960]

WHY WE WALKED OUT AT GENEVA—QUARRELS OVER UNDERGROUND TESTING (By Edward Gamarekian)

An East-West agreement on a nuclear test ban has not been brought any closer by President Eisenhower's proposal of February 11.

Although the administration is proclaiming it a real step forward, the Soviet Union refuses to consider it. The plan would permit the testing of fairly large nuclear weapons underground and it has become apparent to everyone, including the Russians, that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department are eager to begin such tests as soon as possible. The underground tunnels are now being dug and the weapons readied.

The Russian argument is relatively simple—there is no logic in having a nuclear test ban that permits tests. The Russians insist that they will not agree to any proposal that permits tests of any size, anywhere.

Many Americans, on the other hand, fear that a total ban cannot be reliably policed at the present time because of the difficulty of distinguishing small explosions from earthquakes. What looks even more difficult is the detection of a weapon test that is intentionally concealed in a large underground hole. The Eisenhower proposal provides for a joint research program that should eventually make it possible to solve the underground detection problem.

In the meantime, however, the proposal would permit the United States to test new weapons. Those who want to resume testing say the Russians have a bad record on keeping agreements and would probably cheat if

they could. Therefore, they argue, the United States itself must test in order to maintain its lead.

Although the Eisenhower administration says it would agree to a total ban if there were a reliable way of detecting violations, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department seem more interested in showing that a test ban won't work than in trying to make one work. To illustrate, a group of scientists headed by the noted physicist Lloyd V. Berkner, after studying the problem of underground detection, came up with a set of recommendations last March which would have gone a long way toward solving this problem. However, nothing was done for 9 months. After Khrushchev's visit, the prospects of an agreement brightened suddenly and caught us unprepared. The Defense Department hurriedly set up Project Vela to implement the recommendations of the Berkner panel, but little has been accomplished so far.

During this same period, however, the Atomic Energy Commission has carried on an energetic program to show how an explosion may be concealed by setting it off in a sufficiently large underground hole. It has already made at least eight test shots in a Louisiana salt mine with small quantities of chemical (nonnuclear) explosives under extremely difficult conditions. The scientists have been held up by mud, but the sense of urgency has already produced preliminary results—which indicate that concealment is possible.

Most experts agree that the United States is well ahead of the Russians in nuclear-weapon development and would have less to lose from a nuclear test ban. But the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and some key Members of Congress are solidly convinced that the Nation's security depends on the development of new weapons. The lack of a foolproof test ban is used to justify more tests.

Against this background, the problems of general disarmament appear staggering. If they have this much trouble over the possible concealment of underground tests, how are the nations ever to deal with the possible concealment of missile and nuclear weapon stockpiles?

Last November 17 President Eisenhower touched on this problem in a letter to Senate Disarmament Subcommittee Chairman HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota:

"The best and most carefully elaborated disarmament agreements are likely to carry with them some risks, at least theoretically, of evasion. But one must ponder, in reaching decisions on the very complex and difficult subject of arms control, the enormous risks entailed if reasonable steps are not taken to curb the international competition in armaments and be more effective in the direction of disarmament."

Very few would disagree with this statement, but some risks, enormous risks, and reasonable steps mean different things to different people. Also, they mean one thing when the Russians seem friendly and cooperative and something else when they seem hostile and belligerent.

During the past few months, some top U.S. officials have attempted to make the Russians appear more hostile in order to reduce the chances for a nuclear test ban agreement. Such manipulation of public opinion is a dangerous game when the stakes are this high.

The charge is serious; here are the facts to support it:

After Khrushchev's visit to the United States last September, the Soviet delegation at the Geneva test ban talks adopted a more cooperative position. Having dragged its feet for several months, the delegation suddenly agreed to a scientific conference on the detection and concealment of underground

explosions. The United States had been pressing for such a conference since the previous January.

Scientists from the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain met in Geneva on November 25. No one had any idea how long the meeting would last, but one thing was apparent: If it went beyond December 19—the date on which the political conference was set to recess—the scientific conference would have to recess also and reconvene after the first of the year. President Eisenhower's moratorium on nuclear tests was set to expire on December 31. The scientific conference would have a critical effect on whether or not it was extended.

The scientists began their discussion with a reexamination of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the 1958 conference of scientific experts. The U.S. team then presented new data from the underground nuclear explosions that were held in the fall of 1958 during the Hardtack test series. These findings produced considerable discussion and debate, with the U.S. delegation contending that the detection network was not as good as it first appeared to be and the Soviet delegation replying that it was not as bad as the Americans said and could be made better. The English did not participate to any great extent.

It is not possible here to go into all the details of the arguments, but an indication of what they were beginning to show can be gotten from comments made by Sir William Penney, head of the British delegation, on December 3:

"Listening to the presentations so far, I had formed the opinion that the Hardtack data did show that the system we recommended was not as good as we thought. I have also formed the opinion that certain improvements in apparatus can regain some or perhaps most of the ground which had been lost."

Sir William criticized the Russians for trying to make the problem look too easy and later criticized the Americans for trying to make it look too difficult.

These three delegations maintaining consistent attitudes on all controversial issues. The United States was invariably pessimistic about the capabilities of the 180-station detection network proposed at the 1958 conference. The Russians were invariably optimistic. The British were in between, tending toward the American position on some questions and toward the Soviet position on others.

The going became particularly rough when the U.S. delegation brought up its big-hole theory. The American scientists said that it would be feasible to dig a hole large enough to conceal a 700,000-ton explosion (TNT equivalent; the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs were 20,000 tons each). It would have to be 800 feet in diameter (almost three football fields) and five-eighths of a mile underground. It might cost \$30 to \$40 million to flush a hole this size out of an underground salt dome and would probably take 3 to 4 years, they said, but it was possible. A much smaller hole would do the trick, they added, if special material were distributed through the cavity to absorb heat from the bomb and reduce the pressure.

The Soviets said they doubted that it would be possible to get the reduction calculated, took issue with the heat-absorber theory, and said the big-hole idea didn't look too practical.

The British agreed with the big-hole possibility, but supported the Soviets on the heat-absorber idea and the practicality of the overall scheme. They raised some serious questions about the assumptions on which the big-hole theory was based and wondered if they could be realized in practice. They also wondered about the likelihood that the hole would cave in.

On this issue, as on many of the others discussed, the differences were very great at the start but gradually diminished during the interchange that followed. On the big-hole theory, for example, the Soviets accepted the idea that a test could theoretically be concealed, although they continued to question its feasibility. The United States dropped the heat-absorber idea in the final report.

Another major argument arose over the problem of distinguishing the tremors produced by underground explosions from those produced by earthquakes. It was a key point because the number of annual onsite inspections depends on the difficulty of detecting this difference. The Russians, fearing that inspections might be used for snooping, were opposed to a great many (some say to more than 10 a year) and wanted a quota. The United States, fearing that a quota might make it easier to cheat, wanted no limit on the inspections.

According to the U.S. delegation, the Hardtack tests showed that it was much more difficult to distinguish an underground explosion from an earthquake than had previously been thought. At one point, U.S. delegate, Dr. Albert Latter, said an examination of the Hardtack data showed that it would be impossible to distinguish a 1,800,000-ton explosion with certainty. This annoyed the Russians since an explosion of such magnitude would be almost impossible to contain underground. E. K. Federov, the head of their delegation, declared that the Americans were "on the brink of absurdity." Much capital was to be made of this remark later by those who wanted to show how belligerent the Russians were.

Dr. Latter derived the very large figure from the Hardtack data by assuming that one detecting seismograph would be used. With 100 seismographs, Latter added, it would be possible to distinguish underground explosions of 50,000 to 100,000 tons. The Russians said the U.S. estimate was too pessimistic—that it would be possible to distinguish smaller explosions.

The British thought so too. The U.S. delegation apparently didn't take its own estimate of the lower limit too seriously because it was dropped from the final report. In the Eisenhower proposal, the lower limit has been dropped to 20,000 tons.

To top it off, Latter—the day before the holiday recess—came up with a new set of criteria which he said would improve the system by a factor of 30, thereby cutting the 50-100 thousand-ton limit to 1.7-3.3 thousand tons. This important development should have brightened the chances for agreement but it was quietly forgotten as the U.S. delegation curtly announced its plans to wind up the conference on December 19.

The test moratorium was due to end on December 31. The AEC, Defense Department, and some Members of Congress argued against an extension, charging that the moratorium was giving the Russians a test ban without inspection. A few also charged the Soviet Union was carrying out secret underground tests in the meantime, but admitted that they had no evidence.

At Geneva, where agreement was coming close on a number of important points, the British and Soviets protested the ending of the scientific conference by the U.S. delegation. Federov suggested that the decision be left to the political conference. Penney, speaking for the British, said:

"Of course, I agree with Dr. Federov that whether we reconvene or not is a matter for the political conference and our governments to decide. The technical matters which Dr. Federov himself listed show signs of coming together and I would be glad to join my colleagues in telling the political conference that although we do have these disagreements—some still serious and some not so

serious—we might well be able to make further progress if we did reconvene.

"As I said yesterday, the things we are doing here are of vital importance. They affect the world at large."

But the U.S. delegation held to its proposal to adjourn immediately. It added, significantly, that it planned to publish a report which would show the areas of disagreement. The fat was in the fire. Penney apparently saw at once what effect a report on disagreements would have and how it might be used. He objected, saying:

"If we follow your suggestion, the political conference (the echelon above) will have to consider what it says to the world. If it decides that we must come back it will also consider releasing none of this information to the world. If we are to come back it will certainly be unwise to reveal differences at this stage."

The British and Soviet delegations pleaded for a joint report, as is customary. The Americans refused. The head of the U.S. delegation, Dr. James B. Fisk, said a joint statement would give an unbalanced picture, but told the other delegations they could sign the U.S. statement if they wished. (Fisk is the president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and a member of President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee.)

Penney and Federov were furious. Penney said: "In some ways I am sorry, but if the U.S. delegation has their very firm view, if one delegation does that, the others must do it also."

Federov said: "I consider the action of the U.S. delegation as unprecedented, at least in the history of our technical talks, and extraordinary." On the matter of the balanced report, he said: "The U.S. delegation could always have informed its Ambassador at any time and in any form it chooses as to its own view. What is important is to have three delegations in a three-power conference come to an agreed scientific decision."

"I think such action is aimed at undermining our deliberations because, just as soon as some partial agreement came into sight, just as soon as we got to that agreement, immediately the U.S. delegation has taken steps to ruin it. Do as you will, Dr. Fisk. The Soviet delegation will report, then, on the whole of the agenda and will also report on our view of the action that you are taking."

Fisk's reply to all this was: "The U.S. delegation fully acknowledges the agreement which we have reached on this subject."

The U.S. group put out its report the next day and went home. The British and Soviet reports came out soon afterward. The three groups issued a joint statement on methods for improving the 180-station detection network. Although it was very encouraging, it had little effect on the generally pessimistic conclusions in the U.S. report.

The Soviet report was optimistic about the capabilities of the 180-station network. It criticized the U.S. delegation on a number of points—for modifying calculations that were based on the underground nuclear tests of 1957 and 1958, for misrepresenting the amount and type of instrumentation used during these tests, for using data in a way to make the 180-station network look ineffective, and for specifying detection criteria which made it seem impossible to detect underground explosions reliably in the order of hundreds of thousands or millions of tons. Their charges were strongly worded but were supported to a considerable extent by the record.

This report, plus Fisk's personal account of the conference to President Eisenhower on December 29 (he quoted out of context the Russian remark about "the brink of absurdity"), angered the President so deeply that he immediately made it known he would let the moratorium expire on the 31st.

He declared the United States free to resume testing.

A date was secretly set for the resumption of tests underground and Atomic Energy Commission officials began to make speeches to prepare the public. In an address prepared for delivery at the Business Outlook Conference in Los Angeles on January 13, AEC Chairman John A. McCone put the full blame for the outcome of the Geneva talks on the Russians. He said they refused to give serious consideration to the scientific data presented by the United States and submitted little or no data of their own. Their report was void of scientific evaluations, he added, and contained bitter denunciations and accusations.

The AEC Chairman went on to say that this behavior made it necessary for President Eisenhower to bring to the attention of the world this intemperance and the destructive tactics of the Soviets, and to declare an end of the 14-month moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons. The United States, he concluded, cannot lower its guard until the Soviets modify their unyielding position. "Until then, we must face resolutely the hazards of the future. To me, the greatest danger would be to see our country weak and prostrate—an easy prey for a Communist dictator whose stated objective is to destroy all that we cherish." McCone gave similar but off-the-record speeches to a women's political forum and to a group of reporters in Washington.

On January 21, AEC Commissioner John F. Floborg was even more blunt at a luncheon of the American Ordnance Association in Washington. "The Soviet representatives, wearing the guise of scientists but obviously just going through the motions in the spirit of a formality which had to be endured, furnished not a scintilla of scientific information but instead satisfied themselves with a tirade against the men whom the United States had selected."

The verbatim record of the Geneva conference and testimony given by members of the U.S. delegation to the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee on February 4, contradict the McCone and Floborg statements.

At the subcommittee hearing Fisk said, "Up until the last day, the Russians were their usual selves. They discussed sensibly and made good contributions. They are a very able group of people." The comments they made on the analyses of the U.S. delegation were "very good" and "made us think hard and do work we had not done," Fisk said under questioning. It was only on the last day that they "improperly" questioned the intentions of the U.S. delegation.

The man of second rank in the delegation, Dr. Wolfgang K. M. Panofsky, of Stanford University, told the committee that the Russians made "elaborate theoretical contributions on the distortion of seismic waves," submitted data on large underground chemical explosions, and contributed seismic records taken in the Soviet Union which showed the earth tremors from the U.S. underground tests in Nevada.

Mr. Eisenhower does not appear to have been fully apprised of what happened during the scientific conference in Geneva. That seems the best explanation for the developments that followed:

1. The end of the test moratorium.
2. The setting of a date for the resumption of underground tests in Nevada (it has been put off for the time being).
3. The new test-ban proposal of February 11 which will make it legal to carry out underground tests on nuclear weapons that can be fairly large if they are exploded in a huge underground hole deep below the surface.

The Russian counterproposal would ban all tests and allow the West to examine a limited number of suspicious events any-

where in the Soviet Union. The Russians would have the same privilege in the western nations. This plan looks attractive because it would permit the use of intelligence information to uncover a violation. How far the plan gets depends on whether the Soviet Union will agree to the number of inspections the United States would consider adequate.

Defacement of Religious and Other Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Nation was shocked recently by what hopefully we all believe was only a temporary and passing wave of vandalism and swastika painting.

The religious and community leaders in Detroit held a special meeting with Police Commissioner Hart. In addition, the executive board of the UAW issued a special statement condemning these activities. We must all be alert to potential dangers to our community and to our Nation in any outbreaks of this type. I ask unanimous consent that two statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS IN DETROIT FOLLOWING A SPECIAL MEETING CALLED BY POLICE COMMISSIONER HERBERT W. HART TO DISCUSS THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS, JANUARY 15, 1960

We as religious and community leaders in the city of Detroit representing all faiths and races met at police headquarters today. We were concerned with a series of incidents involving the defacement of houses of worship and other buildings, and met at the request of Police Commissioner Herbert W. Hart to discuss and evaluate the problem and to suggest the best means to combat it.

Respect for human dignity and respect for differences, whether of race or religion, are foundation stones of our American way of life and basic in a democracy. No action is more revolting than the senseless and cowardly desecration of a house of worship. An act of violence against any houses of worship or public or community buildings is a threat to all faiths as well as to democracy itself.

In the past 2 weeks there have been several instances of such desecrations. We all deplore these incidents as evidence of the neurotic or psychotic personalities who we believe are responsible.

While we are of the opinion that there is no organized pattern, we do not minimize the seriousness of these outrages. These individual acts of vandalism emphasize for us the continued existence and danger of racial and religious prejudice. Such extreme acts grow out of racial and religious prejudices and discriminations all too widespread in our community and are fostered by improper attitudes or guidance in the home.

We affirm our conviction that brotherhood, mutual respect and cooperation predominate in our city. We are determined, however, to be a part of the building of a moral commu-

nity that takes every opportunity and effort to eradicate the virus of hate in our midst.

We express our confidence in the competence of the Detroit Police Department to cope with this situation and our assurance in its continuing vigilance in uncovering those who have perpetrated these outrages on our community. Similarly we recognize our responsibility in this community for the inculcation of democratic ideals as a vital part of the educational responsibility of the home, at all levels in our schools and just as vital a part of the teachings of our churches and synagogues, community groups, press, radio, and TV.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE UAW INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD JANUARY 20, 1960, DETROIT, MICH.

World War II—its concentration camps, its extermination ovens, its 6 million Jewish dead—are not so far in the past that we in America can look upon the revival of the swastika across the face of our synagogues as merely the twisted work of pranksters.

These are acts of bigotry as basic as those which swelled to carry a civilized nation down the road of savagery just three decades ago. These acts shame and humiliate all who believe in democracy and scorn those who have died for it.

Each day brings news of yet another community shamed by those who would resurrect that insignia of hate—the swastika. An ugly pattern of hate has formed, inspired in part by the fact that other acts of bigotry have failed to arouse the total Nation into realizing that bigotry is a terribly contagious disease.

The swastika-painters and the cross-burners look alike and are driven by the same distortions. They can't channel their hatred in one direction. No one religion, no one race, no one nationality is the sole target of their hate. Every person who believes in, fights for and lives democracy is their victim.

The swastika that now appears in the night indicates a quickening in the rhythm of hate. Anti-Semitic incidents have been erupting with such rapidity and on such a widespread scale that no one has a single explanation.

It is the belief of the UAW international executive board that much of the anti-Jewish vandalism expresses hatred and hostility only incidentally directed against Jews, that a frightening depth of racial, religious and institutional hatred exists and is promoted by professionals.

Racial and religious hatred can often go undiagnosed, its promoters operate unexposed. But in raising the swastika insignia, so soon after the most devastating war in history, the hatemongers have aroused men of good will everywhere.

The international UAW executive board joins religious leaders of all denominations who have denounced these outbursts of anti-Jewish feelings and have called on municipal, State, and Federal governments to take adequate and affirmative steps to expose and punish those who are guilty of peddling hatred and who, if permitted to go unchallenged, would desecrate and destroy our free institutions.

The Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, high taxes represent a common burden and source

of grievance to the American people—not to mention a drag on our economy—and most of us resent seeing someone take advantage of loopholes in the law to avoid bearing their fair share of the taxload.

Perhaps this resentment explains the outpouring of indignant editorials which greeted the disclosures of tax privileges now enjoyed by cooperative corporations competing with tax-paying enterprises.

Under a cloak of immunity of tailor-made for co-ops in the earliest days of the income tax, these commercial organizations have grown and prospered. Many own assets valued in tens of millions of dollars. They engage in many different commercial activities, wholesale and retail, manufacture and distribution.

Shielded from taxes, co-ops have built up their highly profitable empires at the expense of competitors, and often wind up absorbing their tax-burdened rivals into their sheltered domains.

At long last, however, the co-ops' free ride seems to be nearing an end, and much of the credit for arousing public opinion in support of tax equality must go to the alert and conscientious editors who in recent weeks have issued strong demands for legislative reform.

For my colleagues' benefit, editorial response to the facts developed at recent hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means is sampled as follows:

The Wilkes-Barre Record, January 29, 1960:

"Taxation of earnings of cooperative associations which had not been distributed or allocated to patrons was imposed by Congress as part of the 1951 Revenue Act at the request of the Truman administration. But some co-ops have continued to avoid taxes on their earnings by issuing certificates from time to time stating the member's share of earnings. Courts held that these certificates were not taxable inasmuch as they had no determinable market value. The earnings certificates were taxable only when cashed in."

"Meanwhile, co-ops were free to invest their profits in other enterprises. Frequently these were in direct competition with businesses paying the corporate tax rate on profits ranging up to 52 percent."

The New Orleans States and Item, February 3, 1960:

"Businessmen who must pay all the regular taxes and still try to compete with co-ops have justice on their side. The tragedy is that in spite of justice on their side many of them have been driven out of business."

"Co-ops should pay their way taxwise and we hope Congress is fairminded enough to insist on the ending of an injustice against taxpaying private businesses."

The Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald, February 1, 1960:

"The steady increase in business transacted by co-ops during World War II, contrasted with heavy wartime taxes on other businesses, created widespread agitation for equal tax treatment."

The Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, January 14, 1960:

"Key Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee are reported to have decided to push legislation that would close one of the biggest loopholes for income tax evasion, by increasing Federal taxes on incomes of cooperatives, which because of their tax exemption have had a phenomenal growth."

The Roanoke Times, February 9, 1960:
"The tax 'gravy train' being ridden by co-operatives may be nearing the end of the line.

"For far too many years cooperatives have enjoyed an unfair advantage over taxpaying businesses."

The De Kalb (Ill.) Chronicle, February 5, 1960:

"Co-ops, as everyone knows, are big business. Nourished by their colossal tax advantage to continue to grow at an alarming rate * * *"

"Any effort to strengthen the unworkable 1951 law, a procedure which some members favor, would leave the co-ops as freewheeling as ever and simply shift the tax burden that is properly theirs to the backs of the farmer members."

The Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times, February 1, 1960:

"The broad investigation of Federal individual and corporate income tax structure sparked by the House Ways and Means Committee today is aimed at law changes in 1961 or 1962 rather than this election year, but Congress may make a small start in 1960 by closing a tax escape route to cooperatives."

The San Diego Evening Tribune, February 12, 1960:

"Cooperative commercial ventures in this country are now big business.

"They should be considered as such—particularly with regard to taxation.

"This is not the case at present. As a result, many of the Nation's taxpaying corporations face unfair competition from their free-riding, co-op rivals * * *"

"Equality in this matter is long overdue."

The Chicago Tribune, February 14, 1960:

"In its search for inequities in the income tax system, the House Ways and Means Committee ought to be particularly interested in the virtual immunity which is enjoyed by thousands of cooperative organizations. * * *"

"If corporate taxes were applied to cooperatives, the tax yield might be as much as \$200 million a year."

The Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, February 4, 1960:

"Co-ops drill oil wells, operate refineries and filling stations. They engage in mining, insurance, banking, publishing, paper-making, lumbering, and homebuilding. * * *"

"All of this is in direct competition with taxpaying private enterprise. Sort of a 'kingdom within a kingdom.'"

Americanism Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a distinguished and greatly respected citizen of Scranton, Pa., Mr. William W. Scranton, has received the accolade of a number of his fellow citizens through the annual Americanism award of Amos Lodge 136, B'nai B'rith.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of this occasion in the Scranton Tribune of March 7, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM AWARD GIVEN TO SCRANTON

Amos Lodge 136, B'nai B'rith, last night for the second time in the 8 years in which it has bestowed its annual Americanism award honored a member of the family for which the city is named.

More than 300 persons at the award dinner in the Jewish Community Center gave a rising ovation to William W. Scranton, son of the late Worthington W. Scranton, who was the first recipient of the award, as he received the plaque from Attorney David B. Miller, first vice president of the lodge.

In giving the award to Mr. Scranton, Attorney Miller stressed the unaffected, unassuming, modest simplicity of Mr. Scranton. He noted, "He knows our community and our people intimately, for he is a descendant of Scranton's founding family who has long been prominent in the civic and economic life of our community.

"Bill has been in the forefront of our charity and welfare campaigns for years, giving unstintingly of his time, talent, and money."

He cited Mr. Scranton's service during World War II in the Air Transport Command and his service last year in the Department of State as special assistant to the Secretary of State and the Secretary's glowing tribute in accepting his resignation, quoting Secretary Christian Herter as saying, "I have never seen anyone grasp with greater rapidity not only the factual details but the implications in the many knotty problems which came to this office."

Mr. Scranton in accepting the award noted that he had accepted the first Americanism Award given by the lodge on behalf of his father and that his father, though he hung none of the diplomas, certificates or other recognitions of honors given him in his home or office, did have the Americanism award from Amos Lodge displayed upon the wall of his home.

Mr. Scranton also spoke of the ideals of justice and service shared by members of the lodge and declared that in accepting the award he was very honored and most grateful.

Principal speaker was Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, past commander of the Jewish War Veterans, author of the Klein report for the Senate Committee on Appropriations Armed Forces Subcommittee, commander of the 23d Quartermaster Truck Regiment in the South Pacific during World War II, and recipient of numerous military medals and governmental commendations.

General Klein termed the Senate filibuster "a tragic spectacle" and noted that while citizens of the United States are somewhat amused by hearing of it, the Soviet Union, the Soviet satellites and Africa are giving it and the human rights question behind it serious consideration.

He condemned as well the book, "The Ugly American," and said of State Department workers abroad, "If you could see those young people during their best, I say, they are combat soldiers and we can be very proud of our Foreign Service."

He also strongly supported President Eisenhower's views on national defense and spoke sharply of those who, for political or other motives, are now criticizing them.

General Klein also dwelt at some length on the U.S. need to prevent its concern over Soviet missiles from dulling awareness of Soviet gains in other fields, and he stressed that the United States must stand fast on the present policy toward Berlin.

"If Berlin is abandoned, we have lost World War II and surely the Korean war," he cautioned.

He referred to Israel as "the only little democracy in the Middle East the United States can depend on," and he said that in its dealings the United States has met the

Soviets "more than half way," adding that in the way of trade agreements, any course that would make American dollars available to promote the Soviets' aims would be "suicidal."

Attorney Jerome E. Parker, president of city council and a past president of Amos Lodge, was toastmaster. Paul Magida was general chairman.

Rabbi Milton Richman, spiritual leader of Madison Avenue Temple, offered invocation, and Rabbi Simon H. Shoop, spiritual leader of Temple Israel, benediction. George W. Unger, president of the lodge, spoke briefly and distributed awards to various members of the lodge. Mayor James T. Hanlon extended greetings.

Introduced were the members of this year's Americanism Award selection committee: John P. Barrett, president of the chamber of commerce; Gerard J. Ferrario, president of the junior chamber of commerce; Harold M. Brandamore, president of the Lions Club; Louis J. Nappi, president of the local unit of UNICO National; Attorney Joseph C. Kreader, president of Rotary Club, and George F. Peck, president of the Kiwanis Club, as well as Charles Luger and Max Spindel of Amos Lodge.

Previous recipients of the lodge's Americanism Award, in addition to Worthington W. Scranton, who was the initial recipient, are I. E. Oppenheim, 1954; A. B. Cohen, 1955; Roy Stauffer, 1956; Ted V. Rodgers, Sr., 1957; Morris Goodman, 1958, and President Judge T. Linus Hoban, 1959.

Mysterious Reasoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Charles City, Iowa, has attacked me for voting to sustain President Eisenhower's veto of the so-called water-pollution control bill, H.R. 3610. This, of course, is his privilege, just as it is the privilege of the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier to question his reasoning in demanding bigger and better handouts from Washington.

As part of my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the Courier on March 6:

Mayor Mike Micich, of Charles City, former Democratic candidate for Third District Congressman, recently attacked Representative H. R. Gross for supporting President Eisenhower's veto of a bill to increase from \$500 million to \$900 million the amount of aid to help local communities solve pollution problems.

Micich is concerned, because Charles City had hoped to obtain 30 percent of the cost of constructing a sewage disposal plant (\$200,000) from the Federal Government. He says Charles City shouldn't have to pay the entire cost of the project; and this is his reasoning:

"Charles City does not take its water supply out of the river but has deep wells. Many communities below Charles City do take their water out of the Cedar River for human consumption and that is one of the principal reasons we must see to it that we do not pollute the water here in Charles City, making it unusable to cities downstream. It is not solely a Charles City prob-

lem; therefore, it is unfair to expect the local taxpayer to pay 100 percent of the cost of pollution control."

This is a wonderful example of the type of reasoning which leads to demand for Federal aid. Charles City is polluting the Cedar River but because Cedar Rapids uses water from the river the Federal Government ought to help pay the cost of a Charles City sewage disposal plant. By this reasoning, a chemical plant belching poisonous gas into the air is entitled to Federal aid because everybody in the country might sometime breathe this same air.

It is a great mystery to us that anyone should see an advantage in Federal aid. If sewage disposal plants are to be financed from Federal taxes, the cost will be greater because of the inevitable Washington "service deduction" on tax dollars sent to the National Capital and returned to local communities.

The people of Charles City should be happy that the rash increase in Federal aid was defeated. In the long run the policy of imposing local responsibility for solving local problems will lead to greater economy because voters are able to exert strict supervision over the spending of local tax dollars.

Plucky Israel: Wonderland of the Unexpected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, bustling, up-to-the-minute Israel is speedily growing into one of the more important tourist centers of the world for visitors from every nation. Informality and ease of manners, customs, and hospitality are the keynotes, as I can attest from my journeys to this modern miracle land.

A graphic description of incredible Israel, as a place to which visitors are gravitating from everywhere, especially the United States, was recently carried in the *Diplomat* magazine. In an interesting article, contained in a special supplement devoted to Israel, many of the wonders which await visitors are outlined. I hope publicity such as this will encourage more people to visit this noble bastion of liberty in the Middle East, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INCREDIBLE ISRAEL: WONDERLAND OF THE UNEXPECTED

(By Jerald F. Ter Horst)

TEL AVIV.—"Shalom," the stranger said cheerily. "I believe we have an appointment?"

I rose from my chair, eyeing his tieless shirt, short sleeves and crepe soled shoes. It was 8 o'clock in the evening on the fashionable terrace of the Grand Accadia Hotel on Tel Aviv's magnificent seaside. And my appointment was with an influential Israeli banker-diplomat.

Cautiously, I introduced myself. The stranger grinned, extended a tanned hand. "Fine," he said in solid Middle West English. "Where do we start?"

Such was my introduction, not only to the executive of the largest private investment firm in Israel but to life in the young country itself. Lesson No. 1, I mentally jotted. Expect the unexpected. The man in the gray flannel suit will probably be, not an Israeli, but another tourist.

I felt better several days later when I learned that Abba Eban, former Israeli Ambassador to the United States and a favorite of the Washington diplomatic set, had to be taught the same lesson about Israeli informality.

Hang up that pin-striped suit, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion advised his young protégé as Eban switched from the protocol circuit to the political campaign in his bid (successful) for a seat in the Knesset and Ben-Gurion's Cabinet.

So Eban jointed the ranks of the sport-shirted. It was the same Eban otherwise, entrancing audiences in fluent Hebrew, German, English, Arabic or Persian, as he hunted votes among the 70-plus nationality groups which make up this Middle East melting pot. But the sight of Eban's elbows would have startled anyone accustomed to Eban in the formal surroundings of the United Nations.

The classic case for informality involves Ben-Gurion himself. Rushing from a state ceremony to a meeting of leaders of the Histadrut, Israel's powerful labor body, the bushy-haired Prime Minister found no time to change his attire. Anticipating their reaction, Ben-Gurion rose to speak with this explanation:

"Excuse me. I come to you in my working clothes."

All this is related, not to glorify the merits of conducting business and affairs of state in short sleeves and open throats, but to illustrate the mood of a dynamic country and its energetic people. This is a land, not of milk and honey as the Bible bespoke, but of rock, sand, drought and old-fashioned hard work.

Except for the hard cadre of Sabras (native Palestinian Jews named after the sweet, prickly cactus fruit), most of the Israelis are refugees from oppression in Europe, Africa, and neighboring Arab lands. Israel's leaders, for the major part, are self-made men and women who came up from the ranks of peasants. Dressy attire has a place in Israel—at the theater, the opera, and some stuffy bars. But a visitor or an Israeli can go just about anywhere in sports garb. And he does.

Thus geared to expect the unexpected, it was comprehensible to come upon an encampment of nomadic Bedouins just a 90-minute bus ride out of Tel Aviv's westernized metropolis. Hard by Beersheba (Well of Sheba) on the edge of the Negev Desert lives Sheikh Suleiman and his 2,500 tribesmen, their goatshair tents, and flocks of sheep, goats, and camels.

The bearded old sheik is still carrying a torch for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—to whom he proposed several years ago. Her picture adorns the walls of the stucco quarters the sheik himself calls home. He never misses an opportunity to call upon her when Mrs. Roosevelt visits Israel. Suleiman's ambition is to add a 40th wife to his collection, but the monogamic law of Israel and Cupid has thwarted his desire. The last to turn him down was an 18-year-old blonde German fraulein who had answered an advertisement in the European press.

Israel has ambitious plans for the Negev, a wilderness of dry, rocky hills and indescribably beautiful gorges and cliffs that stretches its lonely, virtually uninhabited length from Beersheba to Eilat on the Red Sea's Gulf of Aqaba. A costly project is now underway to channel water from Lake Tiberias (the ancient Sea of Galilee) in the north down to the Negev. Ben-Gurion hopes to turn the Negev into a fertile garden spot, perhaps as it once was in the days of the Nabataeans who inhabited the area

2,000 years ago. "And they shall build the old wastes," said the prophet Isaiah, "they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations."

At Eilat itself, it is possible to glimpse camels near the ancient Well of Abraham or journey a few miles to the Mines of Solomon where slaves mined the copper which Solomon traded to merchants of the Far East for gold, silver, silk, and fabulous treasures.

More importantly to modern Israel, however, Eilat some day will be its seaport on the Indian Ocean. Under Israel's planned economy, 6,000 people live there now in quarters erected by the government. In time, a city of 60,000 will be built, serving as a rail, oil, and export center. The traveler today can still go skin diving in the crystal, mildly brackish waters of the gulf or glimpse the aquatic wonderland via the comforts of a glass-bottomed boat.

My first sight of a pretty young thing named Elana on the edge of the U.N.-patrolled Gaza Strip made it hard to believe that she was a symbol of a waning era in Israel. Elana, as beauteous as the Biblical Ruth, is one of the leaders of about a hundred young Israelis who live, work, and operate a large kibbutz (collective farm) in the shadow of no man's land between Israel and Egypt.

All of these youngsters are between 19 and 21, many just out of their compulsory service in the Israeli Army. Elana—she said her last name was unimportant—is one of these. Garbed in a sweater-blouse, blue shorts and barefooted—the workaday uniform—she guided us around the quarters of Kibbutz Nahal Oz, through the communal dining room and out to the nursery-schoolroom—home of the young children of the five or six married couples in the group. The youngsters see their parents from 4 p.m. until bedtime. Married couples are entitled to a pair of neat, small rooms. Elana, being single, shares a room with two other girls.

With flashing dark eyes, she described the way the men and women of the kibbutz are turning the dry brown soil into green, productive fields through irrigation and perspiration.

"No," she said thoughtfully to the obvious question, "I don't miss the city lights. Here I have a chance to contribute, to share in the future of Israel. It is much more important than just living in the city."

Kibbutzniks own and operate their own lands, borrowing money from the Jewish Agency, much of it contributed by American Jews, on long-term loans. Nahal Oz is but 3 years old, but some kibbutzim have swimming pools, "espresso" bars and their residents live as comfortably as any wealthy Iowa corngrower. The exception is that they cannot take their wealth with them if they should leave the kibbutz.

Yet the kibbutzim, backbone of the Zionist movement for more than a quarter century, are fading away. In the days before statehood, the kibbutz was like a pioneer settlement in America's wild West. Its people had to work and share together to ward off drought, marauding Arabs and the impossible loneliness of isolation in a desert. Today the trend in Israel is toward the moshavim—cooperative farms where the people pool their tools and product-marketing but still own and farm individual hectares of land. Kibbutzim like Nahal Oz exist only along Israel's tense borders where the kibbutzniks must serve as border troops as well as farmers in event of hostilities.

Another unexpected facet of Israel is its diminutive size. In a land not much bigger than New Jersey, it is possible to headquarter at an American-style seaside hotel such as the Grand Accadia at Tel Aviv and make daily forays by bus or rented auto to every point of the country. One gets in more roadwork this way, and from early spring

until late October, can relax at the end of a day with a brisk swim in the azure Mediterranean.

However, even in a minimum 2-week stay in Israel, it is much the best to plan an overnight stop or two in Jerusalem's commodious King David Hotel or the peaceful, smart Galei Kineret Hotel on the western shore of Lake Tiberias when visiting Nazareth.

At the latter, it is possible to escape the omnipresent dust and souvenir hawkers and meditate on what this land must have been like in the days of Christ and St. Peter. The lake, fresh and invigorating in daytime, wears a brooding air of mystery at twilight as the sun sets on the Syrian hills.

It is impossible in any brief odyssey to capture all the moods and impressions of Jerusalem, a holy city of Jews, Christians, and Moslems. Unfortunately for the visitor in Israel, the ancient landmarks of Old Jerusalem are in the zone occupied by Jordan and travel between the two parts is not permitted except on rare occasions of pilgrimage, which must be arranged well in advance.

But unless one is a pilgrim, with a pilgrim's insistence on personally touching the holy or ancient spots, the modern Israel should more than suffice the brief traveler. Language is no barrier, since English is the second tongue of most Israelis; a visitor is likely to encounter in the cities, shops, hotels, government offices.

Eating can be a minor irritant since Israel, although established as a haven for the oppressed, so far has applied the rabbinical bans on pork and the mixing of meat and dairy products in the same meal for all who must dine in public places. But though one must inevitably choose between "meat or dairy" meals, the latter can open up new vistas of fruit and vegetable concoctions to ease a jaded appetite.

Israel is a land where one learns early to expect the unexpected. But the rewards are likely to be beyond your expectations.

James Wesley Rearden—Lesson in Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the report of the President of the Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C., which pay tribute to one of the most remarkable men who ever lived, James Wesley Rearden. This man served one company for nearly 87 years. This is believed to be a record unequalled in the history of mankind. Mr. Rearden's service is truly a lesson in loyalty, but it is more than that. It is also a tribute to his employers and is indicative of the fine relations generally prevailing between management and labor in South Carolina. I know personally and number among my good friends most of the officers and many of the employees of this fine company. While I did not know Mr. Rearden well, I was familiar with the high regard and esteem in which he was held by his fellow man. I respectfully present these excerpts from the report of the president, Samuel H.

Swint, and commend them to my colleagues for reading.

The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, GRANITEVILLE, CO., GRANITEVILLE, S.C., FOR THE YEAR 1959, PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE STOCKHOLDERS, FEBRUARY 23, 1960

HISTORICAL EXHIBIT: JAMES WESLEY REARDEN

When Graniteville's "Grand Old Man," James Wesley Rearden, passed away at his home in Graniteville, S.C., on March 25, 1959, the last chapter was written and the book was closed on a very interesting and unusual life. His time spanned all but 16 of Graniteville Co.'s 114 years of existence. And during 87 of those years he was an employee of Graniteville Co.—a record of continuous service with one business firm which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been equaled by anyone else anywhere.

A book could be written—and it should be—about Mr. Rearden's unique and dedicated life of service to his family, his church, his community and the company for which he worked so faithfully from May 10, 1872 until his death on March 25, 1959. Unfortunately, space does not permit us to do him justice here, but the pictures and the notes which appear on pages 28 through 31 will serve to give our stockholders a glimpse of this remarkable man and, at the same time, will preserve something of him and his distinctive contributions in the Graniteville Co. archives (p. 7).

NOTES MADE ON A VISIT WITH MR. JAMES WESLEY REARDEN ON THE MORNING OF MAY 10, 1957, THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT WITH GRANITEVILLE CO.

This morning we three (Samuel H. Swint, president; F. A. Townsend, vice president; and William C. Lott, assistance vice president) went up to Mr. Rearden's home at 78 Canal Street in Graniteville to see him. We found him in very good spirits, and in better condition than we had thought he might be. He was pleased to see us, and we sat and talked with him for about an hour. We encouraged him to do most of the talking, and he did this with some effort but with evident enjoyment. He asked who had sent him flowers and was very much interested in things at the office. Mr. Swint "kidded" him about not coming to the office to see us, telling him that he had too good a record to go and spoil it by "loafing around." Mr. Rearden did not really understand this, but when Mr. Swint began to ask him questions about his early days with Graniteville, he brightened visibly and told us quite a lot that was interesting and informative.

Mr. Swint asked Mr. Rearden exactly what had happened on May 10, 1872, 85 years ago. Mr. Rearden said that he had been fishing on the banks of the creek (Horse Creek) very near where a portion of the fence surrounding the mill (original Graniteville mill) was placed. He stated that his own home, which he described as a "half log house," was close by the same spot. He described how a tree grew just on the banks of the creek and how the water seemed to form a rather deep pool as it passed beneath the roots of this tree. He said he had learned this was a good place to fish and that it was not long before he caught the biggest red-breast perch he had ever caught "before or since." Mr. Rearden went into some detail in describing the size and the coloring of this fish. He said that when he caught the fish he became quite excited and jerked his fishing pole entirely over his head, which threw the fish over the fence against the gutter of the mill. He wasted no time climbing the 7-foot fence to retrieve the fish. When he got inside the fence he saw watching him Mr. Tillman Faulkner, who was overseer of

the cloth room. Mr. Rearden had spent quite a bit of time looking in the door of the cloth room and watching the people at work there, and he already knew how to do some of the jobs there even though he never actually run any of them. He said that Mr. Faulkner complimented him on the size of his fish and then asked him, "Would you like a job?"

Mr. Rearden answered very promptly, "Yes; what do you want me to do?"

"I want you to tack," Mr. Faulkner said.

"What time do you want me here?"

"Tomorrow morning." And Mr. Rearden said he was there at 5:30 the next morning.

Mr. Swint asked Mr. Rearden how many hours a day they worked in those days. Mr. Rearden replied that they worked 12 hours a day 6 days a week, except that Saturday was a short day. He went on to explain that they usually worked a little extra time every weekday so as to be able to have some time off on Saturday—if they picked up 5 or 6 hours extra work during the weekdays then they would have to work only 6 or 7 hours on Saturday. For this he received the sum of \$1.80 per week, paid every 4 weeks. He said that the excuse or reason given for paying off at such lengthy intervals was that to pay off more often would give the office man too much work to do.

Mr. Swint asked Mr. Rearden where he went to school. He replied he had gone to school at the "Academy" for about a year. "I wasn't a bad boy," he said, "but my daddy decided to send me to somebody who could handle me." He stated that a man by the name of John Snead had started a school, and his daddy sent him there. He said that Mr. Snead could handle him all right. "He would switch us at the drop of a hat." He mentioned that Mr. Snead had only one leg, saying, "He brought it back from the war." Mr. Swint asked Mr. Rearden if he remembered William Gregg. Mr. Rearden replied that he remembered him well. He mentioned that Gregg used to live in the house where he (Mr. Rearden) was now living, spending part of his time there and part of his time at his home on Kalmia Hill. He told about seeing Gregg on a good many occasions come to the "Academy," as he called it, with his buggy loaded with peaches. He said that Gregg had a sizable peach orchard, and he shipped peaches to New York; he would load up his buggy with ripe peaches and drive in the yard of the "Academy." Mr. Rearden said that as soon as Gregg would arrive he usually "hollered out," and that signaled the dismissal of all classes. The children would crowd around his buggy and he would hand the peaches out, taking particular care to see that all the girls got one. Mr. Rearden asserted that the boys, "including me," did manage to reach in and get at least one, and sometimes were able to get two or three and stick them inside their jackets.

Mr. Rearden told the story of how a boy named Bill Gullede was standing on the streets one day when Gregg passed by in his buggy. He said that Gregg stopped the buggy and asked Gullede what he was doing on the streets instead of being at school. He did not know what excuse Gullede gave, but, in the meantime, Mr. Gregg had sent someone to get his father (Gullede's) out of the mill and come and see him. When the father came out, Gregg asked him why it was his son was not in school, being of school age. Mr. Gullede said that he (the boy) did not have enough clothes to wear to school. Mr. Gregg then told Mr. Gullede and his son to follow him to the store run by a Mr. Berry. When they got in the store Mr. Gregg instructed the storekeeper to see to it that young Gullede was fitted with everything he needed in the way of clothing. Mr. Rearden said most of the clothing was secured in the form of cloth; Mr. Gregg then told Mr. Gullede to take all of this ma-

terial home and tell his wife to make the boy some clothes and see to it that he attended school. Of course, Mr. Gregg paid the bill at the store.

Another interesting incident concerning William Gregg was also told by Mr. Rearden. He said that he could call the name of the individual concerned but that he would rather not, since he had descendants still living around here. Mr. Gregg was on his way from his home on Kalmia Hill to Graniteville one day when he passed this man at the top of Cemetery Hill. He was carrying a gallon jug, and Mr. Gregg stopped and called him over. "What have you got in that jug?" he asked. The man did not answer and Gregg said, "Hand it here." He handed it up to Gregg in the buggy—Gregg removed the cork and sniffed it—it was corn liquor. He raised the jug and brought it down sharply on his buggy wheel, breaking it in many pieces. Then he asked the man, "How much did you pay for this whisky?" The answer was \$1.25. Gregg reached in his pocket and handed \$1.25 to the man, and said, "Take this \$1.25 home to your wife and tell her to buy some clothes for the children." Whether or not he did this nobody seemed to know.

Mr. Rearden talked with great clarity and perception; he was particularly attentive to small details of events that happened 85 years ago. He exhibited a keen sense of humor, as illustrated by the fact that he mentioned some lady in one of his stories and stated, "I do not know how old she is, but there's one thing I have learned, and that is not to ask any lady her age." Another illustration of his sense of humor came when he was talking about John Snead, the schoolmaster—he said that Snead's wife actually bossed the school, " * * * bossed him too, I think."

We thoroughly enjoyed our visit and our talk with Mr. Rearden this morning. He is truly an amazing man with a remarkable record of 85 years of continuous service with one company—a record which, undoubtedly, cannot be equaled by anyone else in industry anywhere (pp. 29-31).

SAMUEL H. SWINT.
FRANCIS A. TOWNSEND.
WILLIAM C. LOTT.

GRANITEVILLE, S.C., May 10, 1957.

NOTE.—Mr. Rearden died on March 25, 1959, just 1½ months before he would have completed (on May 10, 1959) 87 years of continuous service with Graniteville Co.

To the beautiful little church (St. John Methodist) just around the corner from his home in Graniteville and one of the two built by William Gregg when he was building the community, Wesley Rearden paid constant devotion. He joined it in 1884, was married there to Allie Quimby 3 years later, taught the Young Men's Bible Class every Sunday for 31 years, was a member for 68 years, and was a lifetime member of its board of stewards.

When the Thomas De La Rue Co., Ltd., of London, England, had an employee, Harry Adkins, to complete 75 years of service in 1950, the company asked the National Association of Manufacturers to search for that person in the United States who could most nearly equal Mr. Adkins' record. Of course, when Mr. Rearden was located, the De La Rue Co. was surprised to learn that he had already exceeded Adkins' record by 3 years. Mr. Rearden was invited to come to London and bring someone with him as a guest of the De La Rue Co.; his health would not permit him to take the trip. However, on the day on which Mr. Adkins completed his 75 years of service with De La Rue, there was an exchange of telegrams between the two "oldtimers," and Mr. Rearden was presented a silver salver or tray by the De La Rue Co., identical to the one presented to

Mr. Adkins. On the tray the names of both men were engraved, the names of the two companies they had served, and the words "Loyalty is the true insignia of manhood" (p. 28).

"The Air Force Reserve Manual"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters to an editor:

COUNCIL AND PROTESTANTS

In a recent editorial, the Easton Express bemoaned the state of public apathy. The situation was accurately appraised, but it is possible from the pages of the same paper to trace the factors in one issue which contribute to public apathy. It is the age-old maneuver of clouding an issue instead of squarely answering the charges involved.

The issue involved is whether or not the National Council of Churches in particular, and Protestant clergymen in general, have been infiltrated by the Communists. The evidence in support of the charge is voluminous. To date, however, no honest effort has been made to prove or disprove the charges.

Instead, an Express editorial labeled the charges "unsupported." George Cornell, AP religion writer, said in effect that such a charge is not new. Then he went on to speak in less than complimentary terms of those who would dare to question the National Council of Churches or the Protestant clergy, singling out Dr. Carl McIntire of the International Council of Churches. In its Roundtable, the Express quotes an article by Murry Kempton in the New York Post which criticizes Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER and his House Un-American Activities Committee. This is the group which has amassed the evidence which directly supports the charges.

If the charges are not new, as Mr. Cornell states—and no wonder, since the infiltration is not new—the tactics in defense are less so—if you cannot answer the charges, smear, and deprecate those who make them. Cloud the issue, keep the public uninformed about the truth of the charges. Does this or does it not contribute to public apathy? After all, the millions of Protestants for whom the National Council of Churches purports to speak have a right to know.

As the Federal Council of Churches, as it used to be called, the National Council of Churches came under fire on the charges of communistic infiltration and began to feel the displeasure of its membership in an economic way. However, with the royalties from its best seller, the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, it has molded itself into an organization which is virtually independent of its membership. Impervious to criticism, it has developed into a powerful force exerting its influence in the affairs of government, in the press, on the radio, and on television. Though it purports to speak for Protestantism, its policies do not always represent the will of its membership. The recommendation for the recognition of Red China is a classic example. We are presently witnessing its influence upon Government and the press to keep the public in a state of uninformed apathy.

The Reverend HORACE H. HOEY,
FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, PHILLIPSBURG.

THE MANUAL

The Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald recently broke the story of the National Council of Christian Churches of the United States demanding the immediate suppression of the Air Force Reserve manual containing a section entitled "Communism in Religion."

Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, ordered the manual withdrawn. Secretary of the Air Force Dudley C. Sharp apologized to the officials of the National Council of Churches.

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, accused the Secretary of Defense of issuing a groveling apology, when the Air Force manual's statements are true. He said the reference to communism in religion was based on facts and that Gates should have investigated the facts before issuing this groveling apology to the National Council of Churches. He declared: "The leadership of the National Council of Churches, which claims to speak for 38 million American Protestants, has in the aggregate a record of hundreds of affiliations with Communist fronts and causes."

Dr. Clyde J. Kennedy, president of the American Council of Churches, Dr. Carl McIntire, president of the International Council of Christian Churches, Dr. Ralph I. Yarnell, secretary of the American Council, Dr. Harlan J. O'Dell, vice president of the American Council, and many other church leaders and Protestant Christians, objected to the suppression of the manual.

Maj. Edgar C. Bundy, director of the Church League of America, said: "The National Council officials merit the disdain of liberty-loving Christians in America."

The spectacle, however, of the Department of Defense surrendering is even more tragic when one realizes that the president of the National Council, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, has been an insistent enemy of the Defense Department.

It will always be noble for us to fight for the freedom of our country, no matter what the cost may be, regardless of the odds or fierceness of the battle.

For the Secretary of Defense to capitulate to a church organization with a president who denounces the myth of national defense and ridicules the nobility of the spirit of a Patrick Henry is the height of insult to our integrity as a Nation.

The Reverend D. A. KING.

BETHLEHEM, PA.

New England Fuel Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on March 12, 1960:

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DICTATORSHIP

Congress is solemnly considering the establishment of a dictatorship over New England fuels. It is looking to a scheme by which some well-meaning bureaucracy in Washington will deny us the right to decide which energy source is most economical for us—oil, coal, or natural gas.

This is the plan for a "national fuels policy" proposed in a couple of concurrent resolutions. Already 42 Senators have co-

sponsored the Senate bill Senate Concurrent Resolution 73.

New England has already taken a beating from the oil import quotas, which deny us our full reliance on residual oil and so enable coal prices to be raised. The national fuels policy plan would carry this elimination of competitive price curbs to the ultimate conclusion.

New England is nearer to coal sources than to oil or gas. So it is quite likely that a fuels policy would dictate the use of coal by New England industry. This would be great for coal, as it would relieve it from meeting the price competition of residual oil. But for New England it would mean a possibly disastrous increase in fuel costs.

Oddly enough, the independent Texas oil men are in on this deal, too. The politically powerful Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association has discovered that coal and oil are not mortal enemies. The reason is that one of coal's major competitors in industry is imported crude and residual oil, and the independent oil men would like to see these imports cut off.

The excuse offered for a fuels allocation is the "uneconomic exploitation of and wasteful competition between limited energy resources."

But proved reserves of crude oil and natural gas are at an alltime high. Enormous quantities of shale oil can be tapped. Coal is in vast supply. Solar energy, the fuel cell, and atomic developments promise unlimited resources in the future.

And competition, instead of bringing waste, has brought producers to the point where even byproducts are closely controlled. This fuels policy plan is yet another of the various schemes to replace competition with a comfortable cartelism.

New England, at the end of the line and with small energy resources of its own, stands to lose heavily by this sort of business.

Adenauer Calls MRA World's Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am pleased to include an article from the New York Journal American of Sunday, January 31, 1960.

During these days we are honored and happy to welcome to this country the distinguished Chancellor of West Germany.

In the years since World War II he has stood out as a dauntless fighter for freedom and an architect of the unity of the West. Better than most he understands the nature of the ideological struggle we are in right now. For he and his country are on the very front line of that struggle.

He and his family were among a group of 150 picked leaders of Western Germany who, at the end of the war, came to the Moral Re-Armament Assembly at Caux, Switzerland. There began the close friendship of the Chancellor with Dr. Frank Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, an association which has grown and deepened over the years, and which has had a profound effect on the history of Western Europe.

The Chancellor's convictions about the world work of Moral Re-Armament are well expressed in an article which he himself wrote for the New York Journal American on January 31 of this year, and in the handbook to which I am about to refer.

The article follows:

ADENAUER CALLS MRA WORLD'S HOPE

(The ideology of moral rearmament is seen by West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer as vitally important at this stage of world affairs. His Government has awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit to Dr. Frank Buchman, founder of Moral Re-Armament. In the following article written exclusively for the New York Journal-American, Chancellor Adenauer discusses this ideology.)

(By Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of West Germany)

At this time of confusion in Europe we need, and especially in divided Germany, an ideology that brings clarity and moral power into shaping international relations. A nation with an ideology is always on the offensive. A nation without an ideology is self-satisfied and dead.

Communism has gone through many phases—Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, now Khrushchev. But one thing has remained unaltered—its aim of world domination. We must be prepared to continue the ideological struggle for several decades yet, but I am convinced Khrushchev's grandchildren will not be Communists.

Dr. Frank Buchman, founder of Moral Re-Armament, is making a great contribution to international unity and to the establishment of social justice. A lasting memorial to his work is established in the hearts of mankind of this age. The way he has labored to establish relationships between men and nations on firm foundations of moral values will never be forgotten.

Now is the time to work more strongly than ever for European unity through MRA. A Europe in which freedom and brotherhood should reign can only be created when nations are mutually conscious of their moral responsibility. MRA has given most valuable stimulation to the great work of uniting Europe. Unless this work is carried forward, peace in the world cannot be maintained.

If all nations are to continue to live together, one of the most pressing tasks of our age is to overcome prejudices that exist between people, races and nations. In this field MRA has made an important contribution.

May it above all pass on the truth that the one real hope of nations living together in peace can only be found through a change in the human heart.

We can be grateful to the men and women of Moral Re-Armament that in this world of destruction they have had the courage to raise the banner of moral values. MRA has become a household word in postwar Germany.

The German people gratefully recognize the help which has come so readily to them through MRA. Very soon after the end of the war this ideology reached out a hand to the German people and helped them make contact again with other nations. In Western Germany MRA has worked very forcefully in the creation of good relations between management and labor.

Men and nations cannot outwardly enjoy stable relations until they have been inwardly prepared for them. In this respect MRA has rendered great lasting services.

We have seen the conclusion after some difficult negotiations of important international agreement. MRA has played an invisible but effective part in bridging differences of opinion between negotiating

parties. It has kept before them the objective of peaceful agreement in search for common good which is the true purpose of human life.

Begin with yourself—that, in my opinion, is the basic challenge of MRA. May this challenge ring out far and wide across the whole world and into all nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is by a most happy combination of events that at this time a new weapon in this ideological struggle is being put into our hands. It is this handbook, "Ideology and Co-Existence," prepared by Moral Re-Armament. It has been published as a weapon to put America and the free world on the offensive in this war of ideologies. It sets forth in pungent sentences the true nature of communism and presents the one effective universal answer.

The strength of the statements in this handbook and the ideology which it represents is proved by the violence of the attacks which Tass—the Soviet News Agency—Pravda, Izvestia, Trud, Life, and Literature, and the Moscow, Tashkent, and Peiping radios have launched against it, noting that this handbook "is putting an end to the ideological softening up of the free world."

To my knowledge this handbook is receiving one of the most massive simultaneous distributions in the history of the world. A copy has gone to every home in the Scandinavian countries, including Greenland and Iceland, to every home in Holland, and in Switzerland where it was given a foreword by General Guisan, the famous commander in chief of the Swiss armies in World War II. Last week it went to every one of the 4½ million homes in Canada. At this very moment it is being distributed to every family in Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Australia, and before the end of this month it will reach every home in this Nation's Capital.

It is fitting that at the time of Chancellor Adenauer's stay in this country means such as this are available to strengthen the fundamental beliefs and qualities of the American people and restore to new life and power the precious heritage of our forefathers and the great destiny of our land.

The Foremen's Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have previously outlined in the RECORD the plight of the foremen in American industry, who are in the no man's land between management and labor, without collective bargaining rights or the protection of laws of the land concerning labor-management relations.

The following address, by Joseph Murphy, temporary president of the Foremen's Federation of America, elo-

quently and adequately amplify what I term the "Foremen's Story":

ADDRESS MADE BY JOSEPH F. MURPHY, OF BUFFALO, N.Y., TO THE STRIKING STEELWORKERS OF THE BUFFALO STEEL CO., AND THE FOREMEN AT THE SAME MEETING

Mr. Chairman, brother steelworkers, and foremen of the Buffalo Steel Co., it is an honor accorded to me to appear here this afternoon and address you men who are waging a battle for the principles that we all treasure highly. You men of the rank and file have the support of your very noble organization back of you. Through the efforts of the many men who in the past have fought for the right to association, you men have today the weight of the U.S. Government supporting your just cause. But you foremen are in a very precarious position. The words of the Labor-Management Act state that you are not to be deemed as employees within the words of the act. To me, my friends, this is a mockery. I can recall the days when, as a youth, I attended the schools of our land. I was proud of the fact that I had been blessed by being born in America. For, as I read the words of the immortal Declaration of Independence and the amendments of the U.S. Constitution, sponsored by the outstanding American, Thomas Jefferson, I felt I was very fortunate indeed to be an American citizen. I can recall the lessons by the good Sisters in my early schooldays when they taught me of the many rights that the just and merciful God has bestowed on me. Rights, my friends, that no government could deny.

But, as I grew to manhood and took my place in the industrial world to gain for self and my family, I found that when I endeavored to exercise these rights, I was halted by the masters of industry. Many a time have I since the days of 1909 suffered the results of the blacklist for my membership in the trade-union movement. I have seen my fellowmen shot in cold blood by the thugs employed by the masters of steel in their endeavor to stop the organization of men into the unions for their economic welfare. I have traveled many a time away from my family to parts far away in order to secure employment, and many a time under a false name.

Many a time when alone I have pondered over the conditions that made me an exile as it were from my family, owing to my demanding the protection of my rights as given me by my Creator. I have at times wondered if this was America—the land of the free and the home of the brave. But the lessons taught me by my dead father always remained with me and I had the faith that some day the laws would be enacted that would protect me in my rights. When in 1943, gentlemen, I became a member of the Foremen's Union, and I read the words in that document I assumed that owing to the fact that the foremen in the years gone by also were guaranteed the protection of the law, the same as the boys who worked under me.

But when the Taft-Hartley Act came into being I was confronted with the fact that I, a foreman, was not entitled to the same privilege that my fellow foremen in the maritime, railroad, and the building trades, enjoyed. I was a potential economic slave to the whims and the policies of the steel barons. They, through the law, stated that I was part of management. I had no voice as to the hours I worked, the pay I received, and that at any time the management decided to eliminate me from the payroll, I took it with no help from my Government or any of my fellow foremen.

During the war we have been on the firing line, as it were, producing the necessary weapons to win the war for democracy, and the freedom of the many in Europe from the rule of Hitler and his cohorts only to find out that when peace came we were worse off

than the ones we had fought to liberate. What a shock this was to us born in America. I consulted with many of the clergy and tried to find out whether I was wrong in my belief as to my rights, only to be told that I was correct. That Almighty God had made no distinction between men and foremen, and that I, too, had my station in society to protect, and that the welfare of my wife and kids were entitled to the same protection of their bread earner as the men that I supervised.

You men of supervision are faced with the command that you, too, must insist that this Government of ours must also protect us; that we will fight for the recognition of our rights; that we, too, are entitled to all the privileges as the men we supervise; that simply being a foreman does not mean that we are a simple mechanical robot in the great industrial machine to be discarded whenever the boss wants to remove us from the scene.

It is up to you men to assert your manhood and citizenship. During this month we celebrate the birthdays of two great men, Washington—the father of our Nation—and Lincoln, the savior of the Union. Write your Congressman and request him to support the amendment to the Labor Management Act to protect the foremen. Then go to your church, no matter what faith and ask the Divine Giver of all the good things in life to send to the lawmakers of our Nation the wisdom of granting first class citizenship to we foremen.

I do hope that very soon we can tell the management of steel that this is America, and not Russia; that the words of the Declaration—"That all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that among those rights is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Again, I thank you for the honor given me and all I can say, in my humble and sincere manner, may God bless you.

Cuba: Hands-Off Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a letter received from a resident of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, which letter makes a lot of sense so far as our relations with Cuba are concerned.

This letter from David R. Richards, of Spearfish, S. Dak., is as follows:

I have been reading with some interest the State Department's hands off attitude as concerns Cuba. In turn I have kept silent, thinking that things will work out.

However, the time has come to have Congress now advise the State Department to put their foot down and in the same token demand that Cuba reduce the price of sugar to that price which the U.S.S.R. is paying.

Power hungry people can only be dealt with through the stomachs of their people and certainly no one in the West or East can ball the Cuban people out of their bondage and servility to Castro, without first making things worse before they get better.

The United States of America for years has always turned the other cheek and then walked the "second mile" with other countries just to have peace. There can be no peace at any time with bullies, robbers, murderers, and dictators, and it is time

that we stood up and punched back such as Herter did recently in Cuban affairs.

Dignity of people and nations cannot be achieved by letting a bunch of hooligans run over them and by polite words between their State Departments. This type of respect can be obtained only by firm, fair, sincerity of action against those that cause the trouble, not by running scared or offering bribes just to keep the peace.

Red Growth Rate Found Lagging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we in this country have contracted a new and virulent disease. It should be called Soviet, or Russian, neuroses.

Those in the throes of the disease believe firmly that everything from the ballet to the ballistic missile bigger and better in Russia than anything of its kind in the rest of the world. This is especially true of our productivity rate compared to that of the Soviet Union.

Now comes an English economist who knocks the theory of Russian productivity into a cocked hat. Like most people near the U.S.S.R., Mr. Colin Clark is not particularly terrified of the Russians. He leaves that fear to his American cousins who are over 3,000 miles away.

The following article by Frank C. Porter appeared in the Washington Post of March 12 and gives a brief synopsis of Mr. Colin Clark's findings:

RED GROWTH RATE FOUND LAGGING—ECONOMIST FINDS SOVIET PERFORMANCE MEDIOCRE

(By Frank C. Porter)

The specter of burgeoning Russian productivity has caused considerable consternation in the United States.

Politicians, businessmen, economists, and scientists have pointed to figures showing an annual Russian growth rate of 6 percent or more against our 3.5-percent average.

Some have called for extraordinary measures to close the gap, to protect the United States' productive superiority, to give the lie to Khrushchev's boast that the Soviet's real national product will match or top ours in a decade or so—a boast which many Americans seem to fear may prove only too true.

Almost alone is a British economist who, in effect, calls the whole thesis tripe.

"Like so many other things which 'everybody knows,' this supposed growth trend of the Soviet economy is an illusion," writes Colin Clark, Oxford University economist and research director of the Econometrica Institute. Fortune magazine has printed the main conclusions of Clark's forthcoming book, "The Real Productivity of Soviet Russia," in its current issue.

The illusion arose, Clark says, through expectations that a spurt in Russian productivity, reflected in data for the period 1949-53, will continue indefinitely. He chides fellow economists for overlooking a commonplace: After a war or other disaster which has drastically reduced its productivity, a nation will go through a period of rapid growth followed by gradual deceleration of this rate "as productivity approaches that position on its normal trend line which it might have been expected to reach had the war not occurred."

"The information for the years after 1953 shows in actuality the rate of (Russian) growth slowing down," he points out.

Clark likens neurosis over Russian growth to the prognosis of a physician who, finding that a child recovering from a serious illness shows a rapid gain in weight for two successive weeks, plots the figures on a logarithmic diagram and tells the parents that in a year the child will weigh more than the father.

As for Clark's own figures, he finds the annual rate of Soviet growth per man-hour to be only 1.2 per cent over the period 1913-56. Reckoned from 1928 the average is 1.7; from 1939, only 1.6 percent.

Against this, the average rate of growth per man hour in the United States has been 2.3 percent a year from the 1890's, Clark says.

Since population increase is also a factor in growth of the total national product, Clark takes some pains to show that the Soviet Union falls far behind the United States in this category as well.

Russia's rate of population growth has been 1.5 percent and "possibly" is now decreasing while the U.S. rate stands at 1.8 percent and is increasing, Clark claims.

The British economist comes to a political and moral conclusion: "Governed by fanatical materialists, the Russian people have been called upon to sacrifice their personal liberties, their national traditions, and their religion for the sake of material progress; and all that they have received in return is a rate of material progress far below that of most other countries It should be made clear how very mediocre the economic results of communism have, in fact, been."

The Super-Bomarc Missile in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last year when the armed services appropriation bill was being considered by the House, there was opposition during debate on the floor to the inclusion of funds for the super-Bomarc missile. At that time, I did not argue merits or military facts; nor did I shed crocodile tears for the Bomarc B just because it happens to be a product of the Boeing Airplane Co. of Seattle which I represent. I did state that laymen should leave technical decisions to the military engineers who can evaluate scientific capabilities and defense needs. All the while, of course, I recognized in the debate the earmarks of typical interservice competition between the Bomarc as against advocates of the Nike missile, or you might say it indicated Army versus Air Force rivalry.

Mr. Speaker, there are rumblings that this same rivalry may break out again. Indeed, publicized troubles of Bomarc firings are good material for use in attempts to withhold funds for its continued development.

Again, I must make my position clear. I will not subordinate in this the national interest to the special interest of my own district or support military waste or unnecessary duplication. The troubles encountered in super-Bomarc

firings should be fully aired in the House Defense Subcommittee. But I do hope members will not prejudice the facts. Necessarily, missile development involves trial and error. After all, the Atlas had successive problems before its long series of satisfactory firings.

My point is that it would be unfair to make an important military decision based on news articles—especially headlines. The testimony of the Defense Department, not news reports, should decide the issue.

Notwithstanding, I offer as a matter of information a newspaper article which I think covers the situation fairly. Here is the most objective news coverage on the Bomarc troubles I have read. I commend to all Members of Congress the following article which appeared in the Seattle Times of March 8, 1960:

SUCCESS SEEN FOR SUPER-BOMARC—GIVEN ADEQUATE TEST TIME

(By Robert L. Twiss)

It is time to put the trouble-plagued super-Bomarc flight-test program in perspective.

A super-Bomarc—the Boeing Airplane Co.'s solid-fuel-boost defensive missile—was destroyed by fire Saturday on the launch pad at Cape Canaveral, Fla., 30 minutes before the countdown reached zero.

Boeing was readying the missile for a seventh super-Bomarc flight attempt when a failure in instrumentation, not the weapon itself, led to destruction of the missile.

None of the six previous flights was completely successful. The shoots were not complete failures, either, for important lessons were learned. On several of the tests, the ramjet engines, which provide cruise power for the interceptor, failed to ignite.

BIGGEST HURDLE TAKEN

On the sixth test, the solid-boost rocket hurled the missile skyward and the ramjets ignited. But a malfunction in the flight-control system—which had worked perfectly in previous flights of the Bomarc Model A—caused the missile to plunge into the sea short of its planned flight.

However, the Air Force said then the missile in that flight passed the major hurdle of the flight-test program.

Missile failures and partly successful flights are not new to the military services and aerospace industry. Cape Canaveral is a testing ground to perfect weapon systems; problems are part of the development cycle of all missiles.

The Bomarc troubles are occurring at an unfortunate time, however. Both the Air Force Bomarc and the Army's Nike-Hercules defensive missiles have been targets of congressional criticism for years.

The fiscal 1961 military budget, now being discussed by Congress, contains \$420 million recommended by the administration for the Bomarc system.

AMMUNITION FOR CRITICS

The Superbomarc test troubles undoubtedly will be used by congressional critics as evidence that the program should be reduced or canceled.

Given reasonable development time, however, there is no reason why the advanced Bomarc will not be an effective weapon against manned aircraft and air-breathing (nonballistic) missiles.

Its predecessor, the liquid-fueled Bomarc, has compiled an enviable test record against both drone aircraft and supersonic missiles. The Superbomarc is a longer ranged weapon than its model A predecessor.

The Superbomarc should be able to prove its worth in a few more test flights, for the

earlier shoots clearly indicated the problem areas that needed correction.

FEUD BLAMED

Unfortunately, both programs have been the targets of irresponsible criticism, much of which has arisen from the Army-Air Force feud over defensive missile assignments.

In the case of the Superbomarc fire Saturday, the Associated Press' reporting of the incident will add to the controversy.

The article stated that a congressional committee has been critical of Bomarc and might drop it in favor of Nike-Hercules. The article failed to mention that Nike-Hercules has received equally strong congressional criticism.

The Senate Armed Services Committee last year voted to withhold most Nike-Hercules base funding, for example, because of its doubts of the merit of the weapon system. A compromise resulted in continuing both the Bomarc and Nike-Hercules programs.

At stake in the Superbomarc program for the Seattle area are many of the 15,000 jobs in the Boeing project.

Billions for Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a most timely and well-written editorial, entitled "Billions for Research," which appeared in a recent issue of the Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La.:

BILLIONS FOR RESEARCH

As the 1950's were a decade of startling scientific fireworks, many of which promise to project a concept of civilization and human endeavor not yet fully realized, the 1960's are already being heralded as a period of great research and study.

Many new horizons were glimpsed through partly opened doors during the latter half of the last decade. So enticing were the rewards promised by this brief look, many individuals in many walks of life are laying the foundation for further pursuit.

This foundation is research. The fulfillment of one of man's most fervent desires—to travel beyond the confinements of his planet—is now within reach. There is no longer doubt that universal travel is possible. Only the completion of present scientific experiments is necessary.

The centuries-old search for an economical means of converting sea brine into potable water is about to come to an end. Only a little more experimentation and a little more research are needed. Even the elimination of man's most common diseases has been brought closer by discoveries in recent years. Who can predict what a little more laboratory study will produce?

Thousands of minor puzzles have been brought closer to solution by greatly expanded facilities for research. There are now 7,500 research bodies in the world—more than 5,000 of them in the United States—employing 800,000 persons. In 1920, the United States had only 290 research groups. It is a rare industrial concern which does not devote large amounts of capital to the research and development necessary for the introduction of tomorrow's products and services. Universities, govern-

ment, and private foundations all contribute handsomely to the investigation of the unknown, as well as the improvement of the present.

Crawford H. Greenwalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., has characterized research as a "savings account from which we make withdrawals as we convert that knowledge through applied research to new products and processes. As with all savings accounts, bankruptcy lies ahead when withdrawals exceed deposits. To keep our scientific balance in healthy condition, we must insure always that our deposits derived from basic research are never less than our technological withdrawals."

Anticipating the great use to be made of present knowledge and that which will be forthcoming at more frequent intervals, industry is determined not to go bankrupt in its potential progress derived from research. Segments of industrial society which wish to expand and perhaps increase their influence in the future now realize a laboratory filled with research personnel is a guarantee of display cases filled with new merchandise.

The Late Senator Richard L. Neuberger

SPEECH
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues across the Nation in expressing my deep sorrow at the death of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and my sympathy to Maurine Neuberger. The thoughts of Mrs. Reuss and I are truly with her.

DICK NEUBERGER was a remarkable man—a great Senator and statesman, a prolific writer, a man of deep human insight and compassion, a close friend and legislative partner.

It was my privilege to work often with Senator NEUBERGER. No one was more dedicated to the conservation of all our Nation's resources than he, and I was proud to be associated with him in this great cause. He fought wholeheartedly for the interests of the Klamath Indians of Oregon—and when we had some difficulty guarding the interests of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, he helped us out, too. In fighting for adequate health and medical research programs, in enacting billboard regulation, in many other endeavors, it was a pleasure to be allied with DICK NEUBERGER.

Most recently, Senator NEUBERGER joined me in introducing a bill looking toward the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps, to enable young Americans to serve our country and help the peoples of other nations in technical assistance missions in far-off lands. DICK NEUBERGER's sponsorship of this legislation was typical of his deep interest both in young people and in America, showing to the world our sincere dedication to peace and friendship.

We in the Congress have lost an inspiring friend, and the Nation has lost a brilliant son.

National Council of Churches of Christ in U.S.A. Urge Medical Care for Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the March 5, 1960, issue of the AFL-CIO News:

FOR AND PRINCIPLE BUTTRESSED—COUNCIL OF CHURCHES URGES MEDICAL CARE FOR ELDERLY

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.—The general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has conditionally endorsed the principle of the Forand bill to provide medical care for the aged, declaring the Government must act if voluntary insurance plans fail to offer needed protection.

At a 2-day meeting here, the board adopted a statement expressing deep concern over the availability and financing of medical care of high quality, and called on the medical profession and the public to maintain flexibility in considering new approaches aimed at meeting the problem.

The board, governing body of the 40-million-member religious federation, said the "continued growth of prepayment methods shows promise of insuring high quality of medical service."

"The churches should encourage the inclusion of mental, dental, nursing, and other health services in programs of prepaid care, and the extension of the amount and kind of care available to retired and other aged persons and to persons living in rural areas," it added.

"If voluntary prepayment plans cannot accomplish the desired ends, Government should protect the health of the people by making possible the prepayment of health services."

A floor move aimed at striking from the resolution the reference to the Government's role was defeated after the Rev. Charles C. Webber, director of religious relations for the AFL-CIO and a member of the National Council's executive board, spoke in favor of retaining the original language.

In other actions, the religious federation's governing body—

Opposed extension, in its present form, of the Mexican farm labor program due to expire June 30, 1961, declaring the importation of foreign workers "tends to produce a labor surplus, thereby depressing wages and labor standards for domestic agricultural workers."

Urged amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit the agricultural employment of children under 14, except those working on farms owned by their parents. "Health and safety records," the council noted, "now place farm operations among the most hazardous occupations."

Called on candidates in the forthcoming presidential campaign to adopt high ethical standards, disclaim all forms of demagoguery, and insure that there is "no resort to intimidation or bribery, direct or indirect."

HEALTH A KEY RESOURCE

The Council of Churches statement of concern for the Nation's health services declared that "it is now widely recognized that the health of people is an important national resource, and therefore Government has increased its responsibility for the maintenance of optimum health." It continued:

"With the rising cost of medical care, serious or extended illness has imposed eco-

nomic burdens which are beyond the capacity of many individuals and families to meet from current income. There is need for churches and church members to study the economic aspects of health services.

"Experimental patterns of health service, such as group health programs under the auspices of labor, management, or other responsible voluntary associations of people, deserve encouragement."

Railroads to the Rescue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the special subcommittee on the Federal-aid highway program recently completed hearings dealing with the difficulties the Defense Department has experienced in moving the largest items in our missile arsenal through bridges and underpasses on the Interstate System. We have yet to meet to attempt to come to an agreement as to the import of the facts brought out during such hearings, and to approve the recent decision of the Bureau of Public Roads ordering a minimum 16-foot vertical clearance standard on such system in lieu of the original 14-foot standard.

We did discover, I think, that there are many more facets to this problem than originally met the eye. It is to be greatly hoped, therefore, that the subcommittee will not approach its decision-making responsibilities in a hasty or partisan manner, but in an objective and properly deliberative manner.

It is my understanding, though I as a minority member of the subcommittee have yet to see it, that the Association of American Railroads has submitted a written statement for inclusion in the record of the hearings to the effect that raising the vertical clearance standard will not enable the highways to accommodate any important military shipments which cannot now be handled by the railroads which, goodness knows, need the business. Certainly, in view of the added financial burden any such change will bring to an already overloaded highway trust fund, this is one facet of the overall problem to which the subcommittee should give serious consideration.

As further evidence of that I herewith include, under leave to extend my remarks, the following editorial from the Sarasota News of March 4, 1960:

BACKWARD PROGRAM

Now it turns out that our missile gaps aren't big enough. Since 1956, 2,259 bridges, overpasses and underpasses have been built or authorized on the Federal Highway System—with too little clearance for modern missiles to be trucked through.

The House Public Works Committee investigating, estimates that changing these and the others to come would add about a billion dollars to the cost of the highway program.

It seems that up to 1957, the Defense Department thought 14-foot clearances would be enough to clear the heaviest missiles the United States might build. In that year, they changed their minds and decided they'd need 17 feet. Now there's talk of compromising on 16 feet, which, we presume, would confine the United States to building smaller missiles. Or to building bigger missiles but not sending them anywhere.

Perhaps, before the bridges are adjusted on all 41,000 miles of new Federal highways, the Defense Department might be asked just where it wants to send its missiles. The big ones aren't now sent everywhere from coast to coast and border to border, anyway. It's doubtful they'll ever need to be, seeing as how their range is in thousands of miles and that they cover space more rapidly on their own than on trailers in traffic jams.

Further, we've been reading that the defense experts are talking in terms of putting our missiles on railroad cars so they can be launched from anywhere. Launching sites would be moved frequently to keep any enemies from zeroing in on them. If they're to be on rails, why doctor the bridges to accommodate them?

We hope some serious study will be given to these questions—more serious study than evidently went into the original planning.

Let's be sure how much clearance is needed just where, before getting out the jacks and putting up the jack.

Proposal for an Impartial Study of New York City Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as our civilization grows more and more urban with each passing year, new problems arise on the need of more adequate housing, eradication of slums, decaying neighborhoods, transportation facilities, more and better schools for our children, more parks and playgrounds, water pollution, industrial and economic growth, and numerous other problems facing the modern city.

All of this requires not only a greater outlay of funds, but also an adjustment and modernization in municipal government and a more efficient city governmental structure. Perhaps even more important is the need for establishing better cooperation between States and municipalities. It is not necessary to wait until there is a breakdown in municipal government operations before studying the situation and seeking ways to improve it.

This is true today of nearly all of our major cities in the country. I am, of course, particularly interested in the problems we are encountering in New York City, where improvements are sorely needed. While this matter has received some attention, nothing of a concrete nature has been done thus far.

Recently, a proposal has been advanced by Mr. Frank D. Schroth, former owner of the defunct Brooklyn Eagle, for one or more of our public-minded private foundations to undertake jointly

an impartial and nonpolitical study of the New York City government with the idea of subsequently recommending constructive plans how to improve the municipal government and bring it more in accord with the times.

This proposal deserves very serious consideration and early action. Once the study is decided upon, it should be pursued in a nonpartisan manner with only the welfare of the people of the city of New York in mind, irrespective of party affiliations. It is estimated that such a study would cost approximately \$2 million. This is not too huge a sum for one of our larger foundations.

Perhaps a joint study sponsored by several foundations could be undertaken, and if necessary some of our universities which are doing admirable research work in political science could be interested to participate in the project. This kind of a study would be of great value not only to New York City, but could serve as guidance in the planning and improvement of other urban communities in the country.

I am today writing to several foundations regarding the proposal, among them the Ford Foundation, the Fund for the Republic, the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, the Twentieth Century Fund, and others.

Also in connection with this matter, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Daily News of March 14, 1960, in order to give this proposal wider attention. The editorial reads as follows:

PAGING SOME FOUNDATION(S)

The so-called little Hoover commission, appointed by the legislature to dig into New York's governmental setup and recommend improvements, has stubbed its toe several times and isn't looking nearly as healthy as it once did. This despite a surprise shot in the arm from Controller Lawrence E. Gerosa.

Its main trouble seems to be that it is overloaded with Republicans who can't resist the temptation to try to undermine the democratic city government, rather than work out constructive suggestions for strengthening that government no matter which party controls it.

This weakness seems almost sure to afflict any such committee having a political background. Meanwhile, the city goes on needing an impartial, overall analysis of the way its government operates, plus disinterested plans for bettering the operation.

Comes now Frank D. Schroth, onetime owner of the strike-killed Brooklyn Eagle, and suggests a plan which seems eminently practical and promising to us.

Why, says Mr. Schroth, doesn't city hall ask one of the wealthier foundations to put on a detailed, impartial, nonpolitical study of the city's government, department by department and bureau by bureau?

Such a project might cost \$2 million or even more. But that is peanuts to such outfits as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Fund for the Republic, and the like.

If one of these institutions didn't want to take on the whole financing job, several of them could chip in to build up an adequate kitty.

Thus these foundations, says Schroth, "not only would be fulfilling a great public need but would also be improving the investment climate for their tremendous resources"; and "this would be an opportunity to repay the people of New York in some slight way." They would also kill off some

of their reputation for spending money foolishly.

What with recent scandals in various areas of city government, the mounting complaints against high taxes, the spread of slums, and so on and so forth, a study like the one Mr. Schroth suggests is obviously needed. Just as obviously, politicians can't fill this particular bill.

We pass the Schroth idea along with the recommendation that it receive earnest consideration from the mayor, the board of estimate, and the city council.

Missing War Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting and enlightening editorial that appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on March 11, 1960, which warrants the attention of each and every Member of the Congress:

MISSING WAR PRISONERS

Khrushchev's resumption of the Berlin cold war and the determination of free-world nations not to be driven from the defense of a besieged ally could lead to renewed demands by the West for some news of the hundreds of thousands of German soldiers captured by the Russians during World War II and never seen again.

German Red Cross offices list more than 2 million soldiers who disappeared during the bitter fighting, never to be heard from again. Thousands of inquiries continue to flow in each year from relatives seeking some clue to the fate of their missing kin. Most officials, and surviving relatives, have given up hope of seeing any of them alive, but they would like the consolation of knowing how they died.

A great majority of the missing Germans were last reported fighting on the Russian front. It is known that in the battle of Stalingrad alone more than 200,000 were killed and 500,000 captured from the German 6th Army. Most of these were never reported by the Russians. The dead were interred in mass graves and the captured shipped to Soviet labor camps and oblivion. How many of the latter managed to survive Russian brutality is not known, but it is doubtful there are many still living in Russia.

As is the case of the missing Americans in Korea—Communist prisons are believed to hold more than 500 American servicemen captured during this conflict—the Russians have denied any knowledge of the missing Germans. This was one of many acts of savagery perpetrated during the regime of Josef Stalin which have not been repudiated by succeeding rulers in the Kremlin.

If the Russians show a determination to follow through with their threat to turn the keys to East Germany over to the puppet government and attempt to swallow West Berlin, the spirit of Camp David will automatically dissipate. If the cold war is to be resumed, let the Russians be presented with the long list of atrocities, reneged promises and broken treaties they have accumulated over the years.

Breaking the peace for moments of propaganda advantage has been one of the prime tactics of the Soviet Union. If the Kremlin should undertake to destroy the momentary

peace so painstakingly conceived, the West should not hesitate longer in an all-out assault on the most heinous record ever gathered by a world power.

A Warm Ambassadorial Embrace for a Dictator?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the President endorsed Milton Eisenhower's recommendations in January 1959 the hemisphere has been waiting to see what implementation the administration would give the fully endorsed and loudly trumpeted doctrine of "a formal handshake for dictators and warm embraces for democratic leaders."

Our Ambassador to Nicaragua, Thomas E. Whelan, has been there for 9 years. The U.S. Embassy in Managua is so located as to appear to be an outbuilding of the Somoza estate, or vice versa.

This situation, which should be embarrassing to the administration, but which is apparently entirely acceptable, is described in the February 27, 1960, issue of the Nation by James L. Busey, in his article entitled "Mission to Somoza-land." Mr. Busey teaches political science at the University of Colorado and visited Nicaragua on a faculty fellowship award for research in Central America. His findings are summed up in this paragraph:

No rational person expects an ambassador to be openly hostile to the regime to which he is accredited. But in Nicaragua we have a clear-cut case of the United States obdurately retaining one whom Central Americans widely believe is playing footsy with a hated dictatorship. In the face of the Smith-Batista revelations, and the widespread Latin American impression that this is precisely the way the United States conducts itself with dictators, the State Department should either explain or correct the Nicaraguan diplomatic situation.

The entire text of the article, under a previous consent, follows:

MISSION TO SOMOZALAND

(By James L. Busey)

One would suppose the Department of State must have learned something from the fairly recent entanglements of Ambassador Smith with the Batista regime. It would be reasonable to expect that Latin America's frequent protests against alleged U.S. affection for dictators would have had some impact by now on our diplomatic practices in this hemisphere.

Apparently not, at least in Nicaragua.

Next to the bizarre Trujillo tyranny (since 1930) in the so-called Dominican Republic, the Somoza family dictatorship over Nicaragua, established in 1937, is the oldest in the New World. The two rulers of the country are Luis Anastasio Somoza and his brother, Anastasio Somoza, Jr., who have shared power since the assassination of their father in September, 1956. Luis, a civilian, is the President; Anastasio, a military man, is head of the national guard, or army.

The opposition circulates typical anti-dictator reports about the brutality and corruption of the Somozas. Dr. Guillermo Urbina Vázquez, a leftist, asserts that the personal fortune of Luis is no less than \$300 million. Nicaraguans who have been close to the Somoza family have given me even higher figures. Academicians confirm that the Somoza wealth is very great. Charles W. Anderson of the University of Wisconsin, who wrote an excellent, objective summary of the background of the Somoza dictatorship (Canadian Forum, August, 1959), gave \$150 million as a conservative estimate of the family's fortune. He quite accurately reported that most foreign transport by air and sea, and about 10 percent of the country's arable land, belong to the Somoza clan.

Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, of the conservative opposition to the dictatorship, writes in his *Estirpe Sangrienta: Los Somoza* (Mexico, 1957) on the torment undergone by political prisoners (he had been one himself). He tells of elegant zoological gardens adjacent to the presidential palace, where some cages contained African lions—and adjacent cages housed political prisoners, several of whom he names.

There are signs that Luis Somoza, if not his brother, would like to liberalize his rule; but it seems quite likely that the Somoza dynasty—which ex-President José Figueres of Costa Rica would call a "hereditary satrapy"—will eventually disappear. When the debacle comes, will Latin American public opinion again deem the United States to have been clearly on the side of a discredited dictatorship? Present evidence indicates that this will be the case. What is worse, the United States is doing nothing to correct the impression.

Critics of the Somozas differ politically among themselves. Dr. Guillermo Urbina Vázquez, president of the Junta Revolucionaria, obviously taking his cue from Castro, promises to shoot all Nicaraguans who have contributed in "greater or lesser degree" to support of the Somoza regime, and to include Communists in a seven-member coalition cabinet. Dr. Enrique Lacayo Farfán, Jefe of the Unión Nacional Opositora (UNO), is determined as anyone to be rid of the Somoza rule, but is more conservative. Whatever their political differences, however, all anti-Somoza leaders, and all Central Americans I have interviewed on the subject, charge that U.S. Ambassador Thomas E. Whelan is inextricably involved with the dynasty.

In Chamorro's book, it is alleged that Ambassador Whelan has participated in social functions in a salon looking out upon the cages which confined some of Somoza's political opponents. Emilio Borge Gándales, exiled professor of law of the University of León, wrote in a scholarly Costa Rican quarterly that Mr. Whelan "acts as a propaganda agent for the Somoza brothers." Time, in its issue of October 1, 1956, described the Ambassador as "a poker-playing personal friend of Somoza" (the reference was to the assassinated dictator).

There are two curious facts about our diplomatic representation in Nicaragua. The first has to do with the physical location of our Embassy there. The second is related to Ambassador Whelan's long tenure of office.

One cannot say much about the Somoza dictatorship without talking about La Loma de Tiscapa (or La Loma, as it is popularly called), a great hill that looms above the streets of Managua. Official government offices, including the Palacio Nacional, which houses the Nicaraguan Congress, are located in various parts of the capital. But the actual command post of the dynasty is at La Loma. On its topmost ridge are the huge, ostentatious homes of the Somoza brothers, commanding a view that extends

over substantially all parts of the city. The mansion to the west belongs to Luis, the President; the other—literally a castle complete with towers and turrets—is the home of Anastasio of the National Guard.

To the south—behind the palaces—La Loma drops off precipitously into La Laguna de Tiscapa, a deep crater lake. In front of the mansions, to the north, the descent to the streets of Managua is less steep. Sentry boxes guard the approaches, and soldiers are everywhere. Halfway down the slope is a long, east-west wall with gun emplacements, to keep back the rabble. There is an elegant Casino Militar, or Officers' Club; a large field, and an ornamental Tribuna Monumental, or parade reviewing stand. All the buildings and grounds are protected by security regulations; once within the borders of a boulevard that encircles the area, one must have official permission to take photographs.

The widow of assassinated Anastasio Somoza, Sr., lives in a relatively modest home—modest, that is, by Somoza standards—within the edges of La Loma, below and to the east of the Somoza brothers' palaces.

Outside the charmed circle, but bordering on the boulevard, are homes of National Guard officers. Nearby, also immediately outside the area of La Loma, are the huge walls and grounds of the Academia Militar, as well as the offices of the police.

A few foreign embassies, notably the French and Dominican, are within a short distance of the security area of La Loma, but most are in other areas of the city. Not so the Embassy of the United States, which occupies a large building within the restricted circle of La Loma, not over 20 feet from the home of Señora Somoza. With the reservation that Eisenhower is no Somoza, it is as though the Nicaraguan Embassy in the United States were situated on the President's Gettysburg farm. To all appearances, the U.S. Embassy in Managua is either an outbuilding of the Somoza estate, or vice versa.

The reports current in Latin America of our intimate relationship with the Somoza regime may or may not be true; the point is that most Central Americans believe them. And it would appear that in its choice of an embassy location, the United States is doing what it can to confirm the belief.

If the location of our Embassy seems odd, the tenure of our Ambassador is even odder. Thomas E. Whelan has served in Managua longer than any other U.S. diplomatic chief-of-mission has served at his present post anywhere on earth. My compilation of data from the Foreign Service List of October 1959, indicates that 68 of our 83 chiefs of mission have held their present posts only since 1957; 10 of the remainder were appointed in 1956, 3 in 1955, 1 in 1954, none in 1953 or 1952. Only one—Thomas E. Whelan in Managua—has been serving since 1951.

Mr. Whelan, a Republican from North Dakota, was appointed to Managua by a Democratic President, Mr. Truman. The unusual appointment needed some explanation, and Time (August 6, 1951) offered one: Mr. Truman wanted to reward Republican William Langer of North Dakota for having furnished crucial support.

In response to my request for an explanation of this long tenure, Wallace W. Stuart, Deputy Director of Personnel, Department of State, wrote me on December 16. His explanation was that "all ambassadors are appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, and are commissioned by him to 'serve during the pleasure of the President of the United States'; that Mr. Whelan was appointed by President Truman on July 28, 1951, and reappointed by President Eisenhower on February 26, 1953; and that Mr. Whelan 'continues to serve as Ambassador to Nicaragua at the pleasure of

the President of the United States." Mr. Stuart added that "Ambassador Whelan's tenure in Nicaragua sets no precedent," and cited the cases of Claude G. Bowers, Ambassador to Chile from June 1939, to August 1953, and of Harold Tittmann who, while not at one post as long as Mr. Whelan, "was Ambassador to Peru for nearly 7 years from June 1948, until March 1955." Mr. Stuart commented that "from 4 to 6 years' service as ambassador to one country is not uncommon for U.S. Ambassadors throughout the world." Mr. Whelan is now well into his 9th year in Managua.

Mr. Stuart concluded by writing that "I hope that this information will be helpful in explaining the length of Ambassador Whelan's service in Nicaragua." Most Latin Americanists would say that the explanation was not particularly helpful.

There may be some personal reason why Mr. Whelan must remain in Nicaragua; if so, it would seem that the U.S. Government could find some other useful employment for him in Managua. Or it may be relevant that Dr. Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States, is the dean of the Washington diplomatic corps. Still, there is no protocol requiring the reciprocal retention of Mr. Whelan in Managua; and in any case, if this were indeed a factor, there is nothing to prevent personnel officers from saying so.

Managua is hot, muggy, and infested with mosquitoes as well as Somozas, and few would relish the post; but considering some other spots to which Foreign Service personnel are assigned, this is of course, no bar to finding a replacement for Mr. Whelan.

It may be that the Ambassador is quite popular with the Somoza family, and that the Nicaraguan Government wants him to stay.

No rational person expects an ambassador to be openly hostile to the regime to which he is accredited. But in Nicaragua we have a clearcut case of the United States obdurately retaining one whom Central Americans widely believe is playing footy with a hated dictatorship. In the face of the Smith-Batista revelations, and the widespread Latin American impression that this is precisely the way the United States conducts itself with dictators, the State Department should either explain or correct the Nicaraguan diplomatic situation.

Or if that is impossible, we might at least move our embassy to some other part of Managua.

Local and Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald Express, March 1, 1960]

LOCAL AND FEDERAL FUNDS

It is encouraging to note that while Governor Brown recommends asking for Federal funds to help State and county governments, California's State director of finance, John E. Carr, is of a different mind entirely.

Here is what Mr. Carr had to say after declaring the State should pay its own way in education and other matters:

"When we get Federal money, it always costs us more than if we used our own money without detouring it through Washington."

As for the State's public schools, he told the California Taxpayers' Association here that the schools are what he termed "de luxe" and do not need Federal help.

Well, he was asked, how about the proposed new \$450 million bond issue for schools in California?

Although his reply was cautious, it was obviously not designed to give comfort to the big spenders of public money.

Whatever is done, he said, the State should proceed carefully. And then he added these words of warning:

"Sooner or later the cost of government has to be faced by the people of California."

"We are going to have to accept a period of austerity sooner or later."

"Government costs increase normally about 5 percent a year and efforts should be made to absorb this by more modern technical methods."

The main, central, strong theme of Mr. Carr's message was to save, not spend.

This the people of California should demand of their Governor and their administrators of various State systems, as well as of their legislators.

Hold the line on spending and resultant higher taxes, Carr recommended, by such things as:

1. More efficient business management of State departments, including reduction of overlapping and parallel functions, to save large amounts of money in proposed costly office buildings.

2. Restriction of borrowing and issuing of bonds to those which are absolutely necessary, thus keeping the State from being financially overburdened and running up the cost of State financing.

3. He said the Governor's budget should go through without any additions by the lawmakers, but added that there is even now talk that the legislators are going to ask for money to provide new State services which would cost between \$35 million and \$40 million more.

The State director of finance is in a position where he can clearly see the dangers. His warnings should be heeded before California reaches the point of financial chaos or insolvency.

There is a ray of hope for the taxpayers of California (and that includes almost everybody and not just the property owners, but the payers of income, sales, gasoline, and many other forms of State taxes) when some of those prominent in government are brave enough to buck the easy come, easy go spenders.

Loyalty Oath in the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the first of what I anticipate will be a series of resolutions passed by American Legion posts in South Dakota and across the Nation demanding that Congress retain the loyalty oath in the National Defense Education Act.

The resolution is based on the fact that the American Legion realizes the subversive nature of many of the foreign ideologies and urges Congress to not only retain but strengthen the loyalty requirements of educational loans made

by the Federal Government under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The resolution is as follows:

Realizing the subversive nature of many of the foreign ideologies, especially those of Red Russia and Red China, we, the members of Dwight Wood Post of the American Legion, of Springfield, S. Dak., in session this February 22, 1960, request and urge our National American Legion organization and our congressional delegation to press for such legislation as will retain and strengthen the loyalty oath requirement in the making of college educational loans by the Federal Government under the National Defense Act of 1958.

Mock War in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative analysis of the first major field maneuvers of the U.S. Armed Forces with those of the Latin-American countries participating, March 4-18, 1960, by Hanson W. Baldwin, distinguished military and naval analyst of the New York Times, was published in the March 6, 1960, issue of that paper.

The analysis follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1960]
MOCK WAR IN PANAMA—FIVE LATIN COUNTRIES JOIN THE UNITED STATES IN TESTING "REMOTE" CANAL DEFENSE

(By Hanson Baldwin)

Five thousand men and 150 aircraft from the United States and five Latin-American countries will participate this week in a mock war in Panama and the Canal Zone.

A parachute infantry company from Brazil, an airlanded infantry company from Colombia, a company of the Panamanian National Guard, and Lockheed F-80 fighter-bombers from Chile and Peru will join U.S. forces in simulated defense of the Panama Canal.

This will be the first time Latin-America will have joined with the United States in a major field maneuver. Therefore, the exercise, called Banyan Tree II, have more political than military importance.

All of the participating Latin American countries except Panama have bilateral military assistance agreements with the United States. These agreements provide for the development of specific military units to carry out hemispheric defense missions.

UNITED STATES PROVIDES TRAINING

For the last 7 years, the United States has been providing military training and military aid to these countries. Brazil, an ally in World War II, provided a division that fought in Italy. A Colombian battalion participated in the Korean war.

The active phase of Banyan Tree II will take place in the Canal Zone and in a treaty provided training area near the town of Rio Hato on the Pacific side of the Republic of Panama.

The first phase of the exercise, which will last until March 18, started Friday as United States and Latin American units were marshaled at their home stations and prepared for air movement to the Panama area. The highlight of the second phase is the airborne operation, scheduled for Tuesday at Rio Hato.

The Brazilian parachute company is scheduled to lead the assault from the air, followed by elements of an airborne battle group of the 82d Airborne Division from Fort Bragg, N.C., which will be transported in Lockheed C-130 Hercules aircraft.

The Panamanian National Guard unit will simultaneously make an amphibious landing on the Rio Hato Beach, using medium landing craft and the minesweeper *Falcon* under the general direction of Rear Adm. Lewis S. Parks, commandant of the 15th Naval District.

The Colombian infantrymen and other U.S. troops will land in the assault area in Fairchild C-123 assault transport aircraft. The fighter-bombers of Peru and Chile will fly close tactical-support missions from Howard Air Force Base in the Canal Zone for the ground troops.

LONG-RANGE AIR SUPPORT

During the third phase of the exercises, U.S. North American F-100 super-Sabres will provide long-range support, with the aid of air refueling, from Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., 1,160 miles from Panama. Later phases will involve jungle and tactical training, and the redeployment to home bases.

Lt. Gen. Riddley Galtner, commander in chief in the Caribbean, will control all forces while they are in the area. Maj. Gen. Charles L. Dasher, commander of the U.S. Army in the Caribbean, is maneuver director, and Maj. Gen. Leland S. Stranathan, chief of the Caribbean Air Command, will direct tactical air operations against the "aggressor" forces.

The role of "enemy" will be played by the 1st Battle Group of the 20th Infantry, the principal tactical unit and the only infantry component in the permanent garrison of the Canal Zone.

The maneuver is to test the post-World War II concept of the "remote" defense of Panama by aircraft and troops normally based in the United States or Latin American countries but ready at short notice for air movement there. Maj. Gen. Henry Viccellio, head of the Tactical Air Command's 19th Air Force, will command the combined air strike forces.

Red Poland Is Still Blazingly Polish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. James Morris, which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post.

The article vividly describes the situation in Poland today and demonstrates again that despite that Nation's present Communist rulers, the Polish people continue to manifest their sincere dedication to the principles of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1960]

RED POLAND IS STILL BLAZINGLY POLISH

(By James Morris)

On the stroke of every hour throughout the day, a small shutter opens in the belfry of St. Mary the Virgin, in Cracow, the oldest and most beautiful of Polish cities, and a trumpeter, the bell of his instrument shin-

ing dimly in the shadows, blows an ancient call to arms.

Bold, clear and beautiful, it sounds across the market square where the women squat beside their flower stalls and the taxis squelch among the slush, and it rings away among the tumbled houses of the place to the broad, frozen Vistula and the high ramparts of the castle, where the old kings of Poland lived in a splendor of gold bowls and tapestry.

But suddenly in midphrase the trumpeter stops, and his music ends abruptly with a kind of dying jerk. Four times he tries, turning north, south, east, and west, but four times his fanfare is interrupted, and he never completes it.

A TART SPIRIT

The trumpeter blows this way because many tangled centuries ago, in the dim recesses of Polish history, a predecessor rousing Cracow against a Tartar invasion was shot in the back by a barbaric arrow halfway through his summons. The fact that to this day he never finishes his call, and that his heartrending failure is broadcast each day at noon by the Polish state radio, is a gage of the depth and resilience of Polish tradition.

In considering the People's Republic of Poland, as a political phenomenon, as a Communist experiment, as a dependency of the Soviet Union, it is wise to bear in mind the trumpeter of Cracow and all he so picturesquely represents. Poland is still blazingly Polish, and she breathes a tart spirit peculiar to herself.

Poland lies in the bowels of Europe, her western frontiers well to the east of Rome, her eastern on about the same longitude as Mersa Matruh. Yet she feels unmistakably a country of the West, a Christian country, a country of individualists, with humor and skepticism and argument like a tang upon the air.

Poland has been under unwanted Communist rule for 15 years, and since 1939 her story has been one of unrelenting foreign domination, actual or implied. But pay a visit to a students' theater in Warsaw, with its tinkling piano and its pretty feathery girls, its faint but pleasant baritones, its light-hearted attempts at a soft-shoe shuffle, and were it not for an excess of aspirants and a shortage of vowels in the lyrics, you might be at a little London revue.

GUSTO IF NOT LOGIC

The Poles are by nature a people of ease, fun and elegance, a people always con brio. Their manners are impeccable, their tastes ornate, and even the insistent objections of the hygiene specialists have not broken the feudal elaboration with which they kiss a lady's hand.

The Poles pursue their professions, their hobbies and their prejudices with equal gusto, not always indeed with great logic or overwhelming efficiency, but with a panache, nicely tinged with irony, that often reminds me of the Irish.

This punch and pungency of character has sometimes brought the Poles great suffering, but has at least enabled them to survive both as a nation and as a culture; and in our times it has prevented their land sinking once and for all into the alien uniformity of the Communist block.

In 1956 the ebullience of the Poles coupled with their well-known penchant for romantic if hopeless causes led to a relaxation of the Communist grip so generous that for a moment Poland seemed the progenitor of a new political compromise—a Communist state, but one so liberal that it might form a bridge of reconciliation between East and West. Today Poland is not quite so exhilarating as she was 3 years ago; but, thanks entirely to her own prickly pride, she re-

mains much the most relaxed and open-minded of the Communist powers.

THEY AREN'T SCARED

We may safely assume that three-quarters of the Polish people loathe the form of government that rules them, but nevertheless this is not now one of your grisly whole-hog police states. There is a censorship of newspapers; passports are not always easy to come by; Western diplomats and local die-hards will make your flesh creep with tales of hidden microphones, informers and tape recorders. But though the apparatus of complete despotism undoubtedly exists, since 1956 it has not been exercised.

There are, I am assured, no political prisoners in Poland today. People talk to you with abandoned liberty and outspokenness. Nobody, in my experience anyway, is scared to be seen with a foreigner. The bookstalls are heavy with the world's pinker press, but anybody who likes can read the organs of Western reaction in the bars of the big hotels.

Poland does not feel a happy country, but she does not feel a frightened one.

Intellectually she is in a turmoil of activity, her coffee shops buzzing with the exchange of ideas and the clash of opinion. Western culture of all kinds ferments and flourishes. Plays English, American, French, German are translated by the dozen and performed in a myriad of theaters. Western books are on sale everywhere, side by side with mountains of Russian technical works.

Many abstract artists are at work, many 12-tone composers, poster painters of involved technique, angry young men and existentialists. Architects are just beginning to squirm themselves out of the awful stultification of Stalinist taste.

Above all, Poland remains an intensely religious country. The intelligentsia, like its brethren everywhere, is mostly agnostic, but the people at large are said to be more staunchly Catholic than any other nation within the wide fold of Christendom.

The Church, which is engaged in a perpetual running battle with the regime, is the only organized opposition in Poland; but so powerful is it, so patently does it represent the feelings of its faithful millions, so stubborn is its hierarchy, that it remains inviolate the most powerful body of dissent within the Communist bloc.

How you respond to the fervors of the Polish church depends upon your own predilections, but for myself there is nothing more moving in Europe than the spectacle of a Polish church at evening mass, when the crowds of the poor and ever-faithful stream from the snowy streets into the dim cold church, to a glitter of vestments and candles and ornaments.

The vast congregation stands there in a condition halfway between slump and ecstasy, and the intensity of belief is so profound that it feels almost tangible, hanging and drifting about your head like a cloud of incense.

I am moved not simply by this unyielding faith but because you can see in the eyes of these people something of the tragic quandary of Poland, something of the terrible pathos that lies behind its gaiety. All that the Poles have snatched out of communism, they have won by their own strength of character; but for such a people it is not much.

Much has indisputably been achieved in Poland under Communist rule: the reconstruction of Warsaw from a wilderness of bloodstained rubble, great new housing schemes, new industrial projects. Nobody, so far as I know, is starving in Poland. People are reasonably well dressed, shops are moderately well stocked.

The present Communist leaders of Warsaw, notably Gomulka himself, are not power-drunk egotists; on the contrary, they

seem to live lives of ascetic restraint. There are few flashy cars for the wide boys of the party, such as you see brazenly skidding around the streets of Prague.

When Gomulka was sent a new kind of television set, as a gift from the state factory, he asked if he might pay for it on the installment system; he is a plain, humorless, dedicated workman, and he lives in genuine simplicity in a two-room apartment.

Nor can one be blind, in theory anyway, to the practical advantages of the system. Poland is a poor and in some respects backward country, and though her prewar government worked energetically enough to raise her from the slough, still there remains a heavy legacy of old unhappy times.

The country is congenitally against the government. It is riddled with corruption, evasions, black markets. The Poles have inherited from all their past tyrannies and occupations a natural tendency toward the crooked way, the slipped note from hand to hand, the little backstairs speculations.

They are flaming patriots, but they have been dominated by alien or unpopular authorities for so long that they often find it difficult to equate love of country with social conscience; and on paper anyway, communism can provide the element of discipline and communal effort that everybody (not least themselves) agrees they need.

Nevertheless, Communist government in Poland is a tragedy, if only because it really represents the domination of a foreign power. Few would deny, not even the staunchest party workhorses, that were it not for the ever-present threat of Russian power, communism would be swept out of Poland in a few crowded, glorious hours.

Only the wildest conservatives wish to return to the prewar past, to restore the great industries to private hands, and summon back the exiled aristocrats. But nearly all Poles would probably vote, if they had the chance, for some kind of democratic socialism that was truly independent.

They care less about economics, if I judge them right, than about freedom, national and personal. They are sick to death of norms, congresses, delegations, medallions of Lenin, party bonhomie, state enterprises, and all the tedious paraphernalia of the creed.

More than anything, they are sick of Russians. The Russian troops stationed in Poland are kept strictly within their allotted limits, for fear of incidents; and if ever the people of Warsaw could knock down the "palace of culture," Stalin's enormity of a gift to the nation, it would be a Mafeking, a Mardi Gras, a blockbuster of a fireworks night.

But there is nothing they can do. This is their age without a name and Gomulka represents the most they can hope of contemporary history.

In 1956 their spirit, fortunately met by Khrushchev's brand of gambler's liberalism, enabled them to achieve the degree of independence they enjoy now. But time has passed, the world has shifted, and today the events of 1956 have to them miraculous air, as if some divine thunderbolt had intervened on their behalf.

I am told that if the present ration of political tolerance were withdrawn from Warsaw, a revolution would occur, and optimists say that Khrushchev, his fingers still smarting from Hungary, would hesitate to stifle it by force. But for myself I have my doubts.

So, I suspect, do most Poles, and in a way this makes the vivacity of their intellectual life all the more poignant since in political terms it is achieving nothing. I do not know if they have really settled into a mold of political impotence—they certainly do not give that impression in the sparkle, skepticism, and irreverence of their conversation. But I think they realize that in the

unhappy poker school of our times, they have no more cards to play.

They turn from politics, most of them to other and more hopeful pursuits: to their profession, to illicit commercialism, to drink, to religion. Their dinner tables ring with infectious bravado, but after a few days in Poland you will begin to perceive the core of hopeless cynicism that lies behind the fun, and to grasp the tearing pathos of their realism.

For realism is what they like to call it. By instinct, they are anything but realists. They are an imaginative, high-flown artistic people, and nothing illustrates their character better than the mad but marvelous rising against the Nazis in 1944, when Warsaw, so many miles from friends, rose to arms in desperate inspiration, as on the wings of a Chopin polonaise.

In 1956, they were prepared to do the same again but in 1960—"Well, times have changed a bit. We must count our blessings and be realists."

In 1956, when Poland's grim period of Stalinism ended, Gomulka and Khrushchev, separately appraising a ticklish situation, presumably reached this common conclusion: that the Poles being the people they were, their political system had better be relaxed. If rule by secret police was going to incite them to violence, very well then, call off the cops.

Today in Warsaw, you hear constant ominous hints that the regime's methods of control are getting tighter, harsher, cruder again. If this is true, it is because liberalization has not worked from a technical point of view.

Everybody admits that the Poles are bad workers, and that the economy of the country is slipshod and ill-organized. This is only partly due to communism, and is chiefly the legacy of a raveled past.

Life among the Poles can be delightful, but could hardly be called efficient, or even indeed predictable. The queerest anomalies of economics and logistics give a truly Irish piquancy to financial affairs, and half Warsaw seems to conduct its commercial affairs with a wink and a rubbed thumb.

The big state-run stores are slovenly and illogical; the city streets are thick with sludge; petty embezzlements complicate half the official accounts. Poland feels disheveled, incompetent, and—compared with either Moscow or New York—unkempt.

All this shambles the Communist regime still hopes to reduce to order, and even the most blatant of their opponents admit that "some discipline" is necessary.

How to achieve it? We would say by increasing incentives, whose paucity keeps the Polish worker in a condition of disgruntled apathy; by widening the private sector of industry and commerce, now the subject of steady, rather than vicious, discrimination; by making more allowance for the Polish sense of nationality and individualism.

But the Communists might answer that they have tried a dose of liberalism, and it has failed. If nonconformism does not bring Poland to her senses, then perhaps uniformity will. There are indeed signs—straws in the wind, no more—that the regime may be tightening its dogmas.

I find it difficult to believe that with Khrushchev's ideas paramount among the Eastern countries, the full terror treatment is to be revived in Poland. The springs of the system, though, undoubtedly exist, like a mastiff leashed or muzzled.

It is all there, lying dormant: the secret courts, the camps, the whole hideous apparatus of despotism. The Poles know well enough that this instrument of repression still hangs over them, to be dropped at a word of harsh command, and the realists among them, at least, will think twice before uncoiling enough rope to hang themselves.

Thus Poland seems fated to compromise or uncertainty. Today the Poles do not know whether they can haul a new national identity out of the tragedy of their situation, whether they must remain a precarious half-way house or whether in the long run they will be absorbed once and for all in an inexorably expanding Mother Russia.

A melange of figures crosses my mind when I survey my stay among this striking people: the elert young students of the hitchhikers club in their vaulted basement in Warsaw; the preoccupied multitudes in the Cathedral of St. John, huddled in scarves and old coats; the gay and talented young people who produce Polish television; the friendly souls at the Hotel Bristol reception desk, inviting me to correct the grammar of their English brochure; the waiters clicking their heels like Uhlans in the steamy restaurant car; the wanderer who used to keep a hotel in Teheran; the cocky black marketeer; the faded patricians wandering like wraiths through the cracked bric-a-brac of the antique shop.

Young or old, successful or awash, in all their eyes there lurked, I thought, that most affecting of the qualities, pathos. The Poles are pathos personified, souls of brave pathos, through whose affairs there runs, like some distant plucking melody, an unbroken threat of sadness.

American Lithuanians Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the annals of recent history record the tragic story of the vicious and tyrannical occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russian troops and her subsequent annexation by the Soviet Union. Thus the Lithuanian people have experienced the terror of communistic imperialism at first hand. They have seen their very freedom as a people and as a nation snatched away from them by forcible means. These people have not been forgotten or forsaken by the free world. The Republic of Lithuania retains its sovereign identity in the minds and hearts of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

As freedom-loving people, all Americans are ideologically opposed to communism. As citizens of a nation eternally dedicated to the principle of self-determination for all nations, all Americans detest and abhor Communist imperialism and its enslavement of free nations. As a nation which is truly "e pluribus unum," the United States of America is privileged and strengthened by having citizens from every ethnic and national origin in the world. One such origin is represented by those American citizens who are of Lithuanian descent. These Americans, particularly, have not forgotten what Communist imperialism has done to Lithuanian freedom. Recently the Americans of Lithuanian descent in the Detroit area held a mass meeting at which they drafted a resolution proclaiming their continuing love of freedom and their hatred of commu-

nism and its concomitant—imperialism. I ask that this resolution be inserted in the RECORD as an inspiration and a lesson to freedom-loving people everywhere.

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of Detroit and vicinity, sponsored by Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, held February 14, 1960, at Western High School, 1500 Scott Avenue, Detroit, Mich., to commemorate the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas Lithuania formally declared herself a free and independent nation on February 16, 1918; and

"Whereas in violation of international law, and unlawful, forcible occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against the will of the Lithuanian people, the Kremlin rulers annexed her to the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania were and still are suppressed by tyrannical Communist dictatorship, her culture distorted, and thousands of her people deported yearly into prison camps; and

"Whereas our Government has never recognized the fraudulent and violent annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of Detroit and vicinity, calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism in the free world; be it further

"Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States not to trust the Soviet "peaceful coexistence"; and finally be it

"Resolved, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom, sovereign rights and independence, to Lithuanian and other enslaved Eastern European nations."

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Congressional Tour of New York City Scheduled for May 13, 14, and 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this week all Members of Congress will receive a notice from me advising that the annual tour of New York City for Members of Congress and their families is being arranged for May 13, 14, and 15. The trip is planned with the cooperation of the Honorable Richard C. Patterson, Jr., Commissioner of the Department of Commerce and Public Events, and Mr. Carmine A. Liguori is the program coordinator.

As Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, an effort is being made to set up a most interesting and enjoyable program which will include visits to New York's Chinatown, the Empire State Building, a trip around the New York harbor, and many other interesting entertainment features.

As in the past, the visit to New York City will begin Friday morning, May 13,

when a special Pennsylvania Railroad train will depart from Washington Union Station at 9:45 a.m., DST. The group will return via the Pennsylvania Railroad, arriving at Union Station about 10:30 p.m., DST, on May 15. The all-expense tour will cost \$39.50 for adults and \$34.50 for children from 5 to 12 years of age.

All Members interested in the all-expense tour of New York City should mark these dates on your calendar immediately and await further information from me regarding the complete tour schedule and list of features. Miss Patricia Bryan of my office staff is in charges of reservations and can be reached on extension 4576.

Tax Problems in Connection With Payment of Dues of Chamber of Commerce Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury Department is now proposing to tax business and professional men's contributions or membership dues to chambers of commerce if and when those dues are used to present to the public the pros and cons of pending Federal legislation. The excuse used for this new ruling is that presenting the pros and cons of pending legislation to the public is lobbying.

Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1959, the U.S. Treasury Department published a final regulation, to be effective immediately, covering the administrative policy on the tax status of expenditures for lobbying purposes and payments to labor unions or trade associations. Prior to this publication in the Federal Register, the Internal Revenue Service had held a public hearing on November 12 and 13, 1959, at which time more than 40 witnesses testified in opposition to the regulation. Approximately 200 written comments were received by the Internal Revenue Service also protesting the issuance of these regulations. Despite the opposition from interested and affected taxpayers and organizations, these regulations were published unchanged. The regulations purport to explain the administrative enforcement policy as to items which will be deductible for Federal income tax purposes as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. In the area of legislative activities or lobbying the regulations limit the tax status as follows:

Expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes (including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office), or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) related to any of the foregoing purposes are not deductible from gross income.

As to the tax status of payments made by a taxpayer to an organization which he may financially support, the regulations provide that:

Dues and other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, which otherwise qualify as business expenses, are deductible in full unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consists of those activities listed above.

These regulatory limitations have the effect of questioning the taxpayers' tax deductibility of legislative activities or so-called propaganda activities which a taxpayer may use on his own behalf or through a trade association which he may support financially and which he may consider an appropriate ordinary and necessary business expense.

Mr. Speaker, the broad scope and ambiguities of the terms used in this administrative policy will no doubt pose difficult problems for taxpayers in seeking to determine in advance what tax consequences may result from their having made expenditures or payments of this type. There has been widespread concern that because of these ambiguities and lack of definitive criteria that this administrative enforcement policy will result in a form of governmental censorship or limit the presentation of views on matters of government—at all levels of government.

Congress has never limited the tax status of ordinary and necessary business expenses in the manner or form covered by the regulations. The terms "lobbying purposes," "propaganda" are not defined nor is there any definition as to what type or degree of activities will constitute a "substantial part" of an organization's activities.

Congress has never expressed a legislative intent to use the tax laws as a means of curtailing the expression of views by taxpayers, or their organizations, on matters which relate to their business or their right to stay in business. Congressional clarification through legislation appears to be the only effective means whereby this problem can be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, several bills have been introduced in the Congress which provide relief and clarification in this area. These bills are H.R. 7123, H.R. 10272, and H.R. 10502. These bills have been introduced by Congressmen HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana, WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican of New York, and JOHN A. LAFORE, Republican of Pennsylvania, respectively. These bills would amend Revenue Code section 162 by adding a new paragraph authorizing the tax deductibility of the following:

(4) expenses lawfully incurred in supporting or opposing or otherwise influencing legislation in the Congress or in a State legislature or in the legislative body of a county or other local governmental agency or in any submission of proposed legislation to the voters.

In order for taxpayers to utilize this tax deduction, if it is enacted, it would be necessary that the payments meet two basic and restrictive criteria: (a) the expenses would have to be ordinary and necessary to the business of the taxpayer or be related to the production of in-

come; and (b) the expenses would have to be lawfully incurred and thus the payments or expenses would not qualify if they violated any laws, such as the bribery and graft provisions of the Criminal Code or the Corrupt Practices Act.

Also within the provision of these bills would be the type of expenses which meet the foregoing limitations but relate to the submission of proposed legislation to the voters as in a State initiative or referendum.

Why Americans Should Not Buy Renault and Dauphine Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following release by the conference of presidents of major American Jewish organizations, issued on January 7, 1960, together with a résumé of the Arab League boycott and the Renault Co.

The release follows:

The presidents of 17 major American Jewish organizations today, January 7, 1960, released the following statement regarding the Arab League boycott and the Renault Co.:

"Recently, the Renault Co., manufacturer of automobiles, doing business in the United States, announced the termination of its business relations with the Kaiser-Fraser assembly plant in Israel. The Renault Co. admitted that it had withdrawn from Israel because of pressure from the Arab League boycott office. Subsequently, at the request of the Renault Co., the boycott office removed its name from the Arab League blacklist.

"We believe capitulation to Arab pressure by business firms is harmful to American and U.N. efforts toward stability in the Middle East and world peace. It is gratifying to note the large number of enterprises throughout the world that have refused to surrender to the boycott. It is unfortunate, however, that some, like Renault, have seen fit to yield to the Arab League boycott.

"The Arab League boycott also makes it impossible to achieve progress toward peace in the Middle East. U.N. Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld has characterized the boycott as a dead weight upon our efforts. It is a form of political and economic aggression that creates and maintains tension in the Middle East. By keeping the Middle East in a state of near war, the boycott is a continuing threat to world peace. So long as the boycott lasts, interests vital to America are jeopardized.

"The boycott has brought about violations of the rights of American citizenship and interference with the freedoms to trade, invest and travel. Because the boycott imposes unnecessary expenditures and economic losses upon all the countries of the Middle East, it subverts the purposes of U.S. economic assistance and makes the Middle East more dependent upon such American aid. Arab League economic warfare therefore places unnecessary and additional burdens upon the American taxpayer.

"We shall continue to expose these evils in the conviction that on political and economic, as well as moral grounds, the Arab League boycott must be resisted by the U.S.

Government, by American business, and by the American public."

The statement was signed by: Mr. Bernard Abrams, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, American Israel Public Affairs Committee; Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Mr. Moe Falikman, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel; Mr. Moses I. Feuerstein, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; Dr. Miriam Freund, Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America; Mrs. Rose L. Halprin, Jewish Agency for Israel; Mr. Adolph Held, Jewish Labor Committee; Mrs. Charles Hymes, National Council of Jewish Women; Mr. Bernath L. Jacobs, United Synagogue of America; Mr. Label Katz, B'nai B'rith; Mrs. Clara Leff, Labor Zionist Assembly; Rabbi Irving Miller, American Zionist Council; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, American Jewish Congress; Mr. Abraham Redelheim, Zionist Organization of America; Rabbi Isaac Stollman, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi and Mr. David Ullman, Nation Community Relations Advisory Council.

RENAULT

In 1955, Renault of France entered into a contract with Kaiser-Fraser of Israel. Under its terms, Renault cars were to be delivered "knocked-down" for assembly in Israel. Accordingly, in 1955, Renault furnished Kaiser-Fraser in Haifa with unassembled parts for approximately 200 cars; in 1956 with approximately 500; in 1957, for almost 800 and in 1958 for more than 2,000 cars.

Although the original contract called for annual renewal, in September 1958, a 3-year extension was proposed. Negotiations continued until February 1959 when Renault agreed with Kaiser-Fraser to deliver from that date to December 30, 1960, unassembled parts for 2,400 cars. This commitment came in the form of a letter from Mr. M. Pierre Dreyfus, president-director of Renault.

However, in August 1959, when the agreement had 18 months still to run, and when "knocked-down" parts for only 800 cars had then been delivered by Renault to Haifa, Renault unilaterally canceled its commitment. It waited until October to make a public announcement of the cancellations, but its statement included a concealed significant admission: that it withdrew from Israel because it was unable to persuade Arab authorities to permit it to do business in their countries so long as it continued its commercial involvement in Israel. The complete statement, in the form of a release dated October 22, 1959, was issued from the home office of Renault in France, a translation of which follows:

"The following statement has been issued by the information service of Regie Nationale des Usines Renault:

"The backwash raised by publication of news concerning commercial activities conducted in Israel by Regie Renault requires the following correction:

"1. It is true that after many years, contrary to the rules of law and practice, certain states prohibited the admission of merchandise to proceed from firms executing industrial contracts with enterprises situated in the State of Israel.

"2. Regie Renault, being unable, despite repeated effects, to bring an end to this situation of fact, found, as have numerous French and foreign businesses before her, it had to make an unwilling choice. For an enterprise exclusively industrial and commercial, this choice is obviously not motivated by political considerations. The sole criterion is the number of vehicles sold, on which depends, in the final analysis, the number of jobs assured to French workers.

"3. Regie Renault, after having weighed all the consequences, signed in 1955 a 3-year

assembly contract with an Israeli firm. In 1958, Regie Renault offered to renew the contract with that firm if it could make assurances of a reasonable minimum number of vehicles per year, and was turned down, although the attention of competent Israeli authorities had been drawn to the possible consequences of a negative response.

"Although the assembly contract could not be renewed under these circumstances, Regie Renault continued to supply the Haifa factory for several months, preventing an abrupt halt of manufacturing there.

"Be assured, of course, that Renault will undertake, to the degree to which the Israeli public powers will permit, to send assembled cars to Israel, and will provide replacement parts no matter what happens."

Despite the Renault assertion that the Kaiser-Fraser failure to guarantee annual sales of a reasonable minimum number of vehicles was an important factor behind its cancellation decision, it seems obvious from all surrounding information that Renault's essential reason was its wish to be removed from the Arab blacklist. It is also clear from an intimate knowledge of Arab Boycott Office operations that Renault's immediate offer to sell assembled cars to Israel would not jeopardize its new relations with Arab countries. The Boycott Office is adamant about working interests in Israel; it is less severe about ordinary sales to Israel.

Subsequent public statements by Arab authorities revealed that there had been prior consultation and agreement between Renault and themselves before the cancellation announcement was made. On November 9, the Egyptian newspaper, El-Ahram, disclosed that the Arab League Boycott Office had required Renault to furnish authenticated documentation establishing conclusively that it had actually discontinued its business connections in Israel in accordance with the Boycott Office's regulations. Among the documents required was a certified copy of an appropriate cancellation notice. When the Arab League Boycott Office announced that it had received the required proof from Renault, it added that it had received at the same time a request from Renault that the company's name be removed from the blacklist.

On November 30, the Lebanese Embassy in Paris disclosed that Renault had submitted to the Arab League its proposed letter of cancellation before sending the final document to Kaiser-Fraser in Israel. It seems reasonable from the foregoing that the price of removal from the Arab blacklist was an official and public acknowledgment by Renault of its reason (the Arab boycott) for terminating its Israeli contract. Having complied, Renault was granted permission by the Arab League Boycott Office to open markets in Arab countries.

Several days later, the Egyptian newspaper, El-Akhbar, reported that Renault had begun negotiations to establish an auto assembly plant in Egypt. And, on December 7, the Cairo Radio reported that Renault had committed itself to a \$22,400,000 investment for the construction of the new plant.

RENAULT IN THE UNITED STATES

In February 1957, a certificate of incorporation for Renault, Inc., was filed in the State of New York and, among other things, the corporate purposes were described as follows:

"(1) To purchase or otherwise acquire, by importation or in any other manner, automobiles and other vehicles and all accessories and other things appertaining thereto, including engines, bodies, chassis and spare parts generally and to sell the same in the United States, Canada or elsewhere; and in connection therewith to operate display rooms, sales agencies and such agencies as may be required to provide maintenance and repair service for vehicles sold by the corporation.

"(2) To import, export, manufacture, purchase or otherwise acquire and to hold, own, sell, mortgage, pledge, assign, transfer and otherwise dispose of, and generally to invest, trade and deal in goods, wares and merchandise of every class and description."

The office of the corporation is located at 750 Third Avenue, New York City.

A highly placed official of Renault, Inc. has indicated that it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Regie Nationale des Usines Renault. Wards Automotive Reports (the industry's authoritative research organization) describes Renault, Inc. as a factory-owned import agency.

A leading credit agency lists the following Renault, Inc. officers: Pierre Molhan, president, Robert Volode, vice president and general manager, both of whom reside in France; Kenneth C. Howard, assistant general manager and assistant treasurer; James E. Hughes, treasurer, and Hugh Fitzgerald, secretary, all of whom reside in the United States. Molhan and Guy De Berc, Ernest Dale, Volode and Hughes are the directors. According to this same source, De Berc is the general manager of the French Line in the United States and Dale is a professor of economics at a French university. Hughes and Fitzgerald are attorneys associated with the New York law firm of Couderd Brothers.

The sale of Renault (and Dauphine) automobiles in the United States is achieved through 17 regional distributors and approximately 800 local dealers. The regional distributors sell Renaults and Dauphines exclusively, but the 800 retail dealers are outlets which sell Renault cars in addition to other foreign cars or standard American automobiles.

R. L. Polk, a business research agency, reports 765 local Renault dealers, broken down as follows: New England, 68; Middle Atlantic, 152; South, 155; East-Southwest Central, 96; Northwest Pacific, 50; Southwest Pacific, 85; Mountain, 34; West-North Central, 64; West-South Central, 61.

It is generally conceded in the automobile industry that Renault in the past few years, has made rapid inroads in the U.S. market. According to Fortune magazine, October 1957, Renault in 1955 sold 800 cars in the United States, in 1956, 2,900. Wards Automotive Reports reports the following sales figures: 1957, 22,587; 1958, 48,054; for the first 10 months of 1959, 76,750. According to Renault, its sales for the first 11 months of 1959 totaled 85,131. Ward quotes the company as stating that it expects to sell 100,000 vehicles in the United States in 1959.

RENAULT IN FRANCE

Renault in France, known as Regie Nationale des Usines Renault, was founded in 1896 by Louis Renault and his brother, the company turning out cars well before Ford came on the automobile scene.

In World War II, Louis Renault collaborated with the Nazis and his factories were largely destroyed by Allied bombing. According to Time magazine of January 6, 1958, the Renault Co. during the World War II occupation rolled out 34,232 tanks, trucks and other vehicles for the Germans. Workers who protested working conditions were shot on the spot by the Nazis.

After the liberation, the then-ailing Louis Renault was accused by the French Government of collaborating with the Nazis; 4 weeks later he died in a private clinic. The French Government, according to Time magazine, confiscated his 95-percent interest in the company and seized the remaining 5 percent held by private investors who were later paid off.

Fortune magazine of October 1957 reports that the company is 100-percent owned by the French Government. It is generally conceded, however, that Renault is "a far cry

from the classic nationalized company." According to Time magazine, January 6, 1958, it has never had a government loan. The Government keeps hands off, aside from examining Renault's books once a year and tapping civil servants for appointment as its top managers.

M. Pierre Dreyfus, the president-director general of Regie Nationale des Usines Renault, is described by Time magazine as being a scholarly doctor of law, lifelong civil servant and 10-year Renault veteran. In describing the company, Dreyfus is quoted as follows: "We operate like an absolute monarchy. I make all of the decisions. We have one stockholder—the French state. The state merely judges the financial results at the end of the year. If the results are bad, the state can fire me."

In addition to the manufacture of automobiles, Renault sells machine tools to such leading manufacturers as Opel in Germany, Fiat in Italy, and is believed, in 1956, to have entered into a license agreement with Rolls Royce. Currently the company has 10 plants in France and 7 in other countries. The company also is reported to produce petrol and diesel tractors, industrial engines and railway rolling stock. The company has its own steel foundry and is reported to produce half of its own steel needs.

Junkets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another newspaper has expressed editorial support for enactment of legislation to require full disclosure of spending by Members of Congress on trips overseas at Government expense. The Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, properly points out that since public money is involved, there is good reason for disclosure.

As part of my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Citizen on March 4:

As long as there are Congressmen, there'll be junkets.

At least 190 Members traveled, mostly at Government expense, to all parts of the world in 1959.

It was a banner year for congressional tourism.

Trips were made by 51 Senators—just enough for a quorum—and 139 Representatives.

The leading attractions were found in Western Europe, with 102 legislators visiting there during the 12-month period. Half as many journeyed to the Far East. Thirty-one Members of Congress traveled behind the Iron Curtain as compared to only six in 1958.

The amount of public money spent by junketing lawmakers on these trips—and no doubt many of them are worth while both to the Congressmen and to the Nation—is a secret tightly guarded by Congress.

There are many persons outside Congress, as well as a few inside, who think each lawmaker should be required to make all of his junket spending public.

One foe of junketing, Representative H. R. Gross, (Republican, Iowa,) introduced a bill last year to accomplish this, but its prospects appear dim. It has been referred to as "the bill least likely to succeed."

Since public money is involved, there is good reason for disclosure. For one thing, it would stop any wasteful junketing. For another, the voters back home would not be irritated if it is shown the traveling solon was performing a useful mission properly and adding to his knowledge of global problems.

An Able Soldier and Engineer Reports on the Arkansas Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the address delivered at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association on March 11 by Brig. Gen. William Whipple, division engineer for the southwestern division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

General Whipple has not only won a host of friends in the Southwest during his distinguished tour of duty in that area, but has also made an outstanding record as an imaginative, industrious, and farsighted planner of the future of the Arkansas Basin.

His report to the basin association is sure to be of interest to many in this body, and throughout the Nation, who are interested in the future of this great river program.

General Whipple's speech follows:

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM WHIPPLE, DIVISION ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN DALLAS, TEX., TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC., TULSA, OKLA.

It is a real pleasure to meet again with the Arkansas Basin Development Association, its distinguished guests, and its members and associates from Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas. It is not surprising that there is progress in the Arkansas River Basin when there are such enterprising people behind the work.

Governor Edmondson has already made a name for himself in the capable and aggressive way he has met the problems of Oklahoma since taking over the reins of State government. We are most aware of his substantial accomplishments in connection with the development of the State's water resources. From the moment he took office he faced up squarely to the difficult problems of planning the extensive highway relocations so as to provide adequately for the future traffic of this State. We of the Corps of Engineers could not have asked for better cooperation.

Congressman Edmondson has one of the clearest grasps of the problems of water resource development of any Congressman I have ever known. He is the perfect catalyst between the technical problems with which we are concerned in our work and the broad policy problems of those who direct us in our efforts.

Congressman CARL ALBERT and I were Rhodes scholars together at Oxford a good many years ago and I have a respect for him of long standing. But as great as it was, this respect has continued to grow as I have ob-

served him in this important work and his heavy nationwide responsibilities as majority whip of the House.

Senator MONROE is an able and respected Senator who is active and effective in many fields. His influence is widely felt.

No one needs to say anything to this group about the high stature of the senior Senator from Oklahoma in national water resource development circles. He is not only a man of ideas and of vision, but a man who has the know-how and the force to put them into effect. Senator KEARNEY can live up to any superlative that you or I can apply to him.

I am also particularly happy to recognize here tonight that far-sighted and brilliant leader, Clarence Byrns. Although he has been far from well, he has again recently demonstrated anew his courage, his sound judgment and his devotion to the good of the entire basin.

The stature of these leaders and the cooperative effort of the many others here tonight add up to an impressive force. As one who has served in water resource development over the years from coast to coast, I know by experience the hampering effect of divisive quarrels and futile bickering between factions. I know there are differences of opinion, but you seem somehow to hammer out a beneficial solution and then get together to put it across. Let me wholeheartedly congratulate those responsible, and this association in particular.

My appearance before you at this meeting comes at a good time. Not only can I report on a year of progress but also something of my testimony for next year's funds before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Of course, as most of you know, the Corps of Engineers is required strictly to support the President's budget. However, when required by the Appropriations Committee, we can give our engineering advice as to capabilities for using additional funds, irrespective of the budgetary aspect. I mention this so that as I mention such capabilities later on, I will not be misunderstood.

The first item I would like to mention to you, very briefly, is the progress in building up our engineering in the Tulsa district of the Corps. This district had simply become unable to keep up with its tremendous and ever-increasing workload. Last summer, to meet this situation, we took four steps. First, in picking the new district engineer, the Chief of Engineers picked one of the very finest officers in the Corps, Col. Howard Penney. Next, to cope with the immediate situation, we assigned to another district elsewhere the preparation of the plans and specifications of two of the smaller flood-control dams. Third, we beefed up the planning and reports branch. Fourth, we created an entirely new design branch, doubling the normal organization, and brought in some good engineers from other parts of the country to help. Progress under this new organization is such that I now consider the Tulsa district, which was formerly a weak spot, one of the strongest in the United States.

During the year we have made a lot of progress on certain surveys and studies of considerable long-range importance. Funds are available to continue and complete a number of studies. I would particularly like to mention the central Oklahoma project. After completion of a long period of preliminary studies, we will initiate a survey during the current year.

We have also started work this year on a study which is absolutely unique and unparalleled anywhere in the United States and which may be of great significance to Oklahoma and to adjacent areas in Texas. I refer to the pollution control study from the Arkansas and Red Rivers. The U.S. Public Health Service is charged with the general responsibility of locating the sources of natural brines and salt which are largely respon-

sible for the poor quality of water such as that of the Arkansas River, here at Tulsa; and the Corps of Engineers is working on the structural means of blocking off the salt springs, bypassing the salt flats, or disposing of the highly concentrated brines in isolated valleys or pumping them back down into abandoned oil wells. Curiously enough, by far the greater part of this pollution comes from a small number of highly concentrated springs and salt beds extending right across Oklahoma and north Texas. If we can work out means to control this pollution, at reasonable cost, an immense improvement in water quality may be within our grasp. Since this is a pioneering effort, an intensive investigation will be required, using the best scientific brains available, and the full talents of both the Public Health Service and the Corps. I cannot forecast the complete answer. Nevertheless, although I was originally skeptical, I am now quite optimistic that this study will result in a feasible program for improving usability of your existing streamflows.

We were given funds in the amount of \$73,000 for the current year for our part of this antipollution study. A resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee on December 16, 1959, cleared up any question about legislative authority and also established a channel through which a report on a construction program can be submitted. Our budget for next year does not include any funds for continuing such work; but in response to committee questions, I replied that we have the capability. I certainly did not conceal my opinion that this is one of the most interesting and potentially valuable studies on which we have ever been engaged. The committee appeared sympathetic.

Since your last meeting two major projects in Kansas have been completed and dedicated. The Toronto Reservoir and the Wichita and Valley Center Floodway have begun long and useful lives in the service of the people of that part of the basin. Work under the first major contract on the \$32,800,000 John Redmond Reservoir was started, and the budget includes \$3,800,000 for its continuation next fiscal year. The first contract on the Council Grove Reservoir, for project buildings, is scheduled for award before the first of July. The budget for next year contains \$2 million for the continuation of this \$13,700,000 project. However, the Appropriations Committee was extremely critical of the fact that we had not yet been able to complete arrangements for water supply storage. This matter will have to be cleared up before we can start construction.

In Oklahoma the local protection project at Enid is 20 percent complete and contracts for the relocation of railroads and erosion control are to be awarded before the end of the fiscal year. We expect to complete the project with the funds presently available.

Although this is in the Red River Basin, I will mention that there was considerable interest during the Senate hearings on appropriations for starting construction on the Broken Bow Reservoir. Our planning has reached a point where I was able to testify to a construction capability for the next fiscal year. I also testified that from the engineering point of view this appears to be a fine project, which will meet urgent needs, in what has been a serious problem area for the last 15 years.

I am happy to say that the budget recommendations will provide all the funds that we can economically use on the reservoir projects now under construction as a part of the main control plan for the Arkansas River.

For the Oologah Reservoir the amount is \$3,700,000. This \$35,100,000 project is about 65 percent complete with most of the work under contract. Last month a contract approaching a half a million dollars was

awarded for the relocation of county roads, as well as an \$87,000 contract for public use facilities. Scheduled for award before the end of the fiscal year are contracts for the relocation of electrical and telephone lines and plugging oil and gas wells in the reservoir area.

The budget allowance for the Keystone Reservoir is \$17,400,000. This project is now well underway. A contract for the spillway and main part of the dam was awarded in November for the exceptionally good price of \$16 million. This was one of the reasons we were able to reduce the project estimate from \$137 to \$111 million during the year. Award was made in January on about \$2 million worth of State highway and bridge relocation work, and other contracts will soon be awarded for relocation of telephone, power, and pipe lines. The heavy schedule of relocation contracts awards will continue into the next fiscal year.

The budget allowance on the Eufaula Reservoir is \$20,700,000. The big contract on the spillway, power intake and powerhouse substructure went for \$14.7 million, another excellent award. Bids on the first two sections of the joint relocation of U.S. Highway 69 and M-K-T Railroad have been opened but a material error in the low bid was alleged and we have not been able to make award yet. We have made a reduction in the estimate of project cost from \$157 million to \$141 million, and will probably be able to reduce it even further next year.

For the Dardanelle Dam the budget recommendation is for \$6,100,000. The first major contract on this \$94.6 million project is now about half completed. This was a \$3 million job for the first part of the navigation lock and the embankment of the north side. It is certainly welcome news to know that the first navigation lock on the Arkansas is now solidly underway. Just this week we advertised for bids on the overflow section of the dam. The bids on this work, to be opened May 5, are expected to run somewhere on the general order of \$10 million.

Progress and the outlook on appropriations permit us to hold to our scheduled completion dates on these large dam projects. More critical points now concern bank stabilization and planning, which I will mention later.

Last month the Tulsa district awarded bank stabilization work approaching \$1 million, and another award to run around a third as much is to be made before the end of the fiscal year.

The Little Rock district has had active work at 15 locations in the last year. About \$1 million worth of awards has been made since last July. About one-half million dollars more in awards is scheduled for the remainder of this fiscal year.

In the Vicksburg district new work exceeding \$1 million was awarded early this fiscal year for work at six locations, in addition to recent awards on repairs for nine locations at about \$600,000 and regular maintenance for \$100,000 at three locations.

The budget recommendation was for \$5 million to continue bank stabilization, under the emergency program. It was apparent during the hearings that not everyone considered the restrictions surrounding this emergency designation as appropriate and, in the face of engineering facts, I could not take issue with this view. I have again testified of the savings in cost and engineering advantages of getting on with the very large permanent program with completion of as much as possible prior to 1964. At the present rate of progress we would still be less than half done when we close the reservoirs in 1964. I testified that we have capability of \$9 million for bank stabilization.

Taking a long-range look at where we stand on all of the units of the main control plan for the Arkansas River, there has been allotted \$122 million through fiscal year 1960.

For fiscal year 1960, \$39.6 million was received and the budget allowance for the next fiscal year is \$53.3 million. The reason a larger sum is not required for optimum progress is that bids have been running so much lower than original estimates.

Progress on the ground is very gratifying. It is beginning to be worth your time to visit these projects, and we hope all of you come and see them in the near future.

However, perhaps the signal accomplishments of the year are in planning, rather than construction.

One of the major accomplishments has been the resolution of the controversial question as to the route to be followed below Pine Bluff. Instead of the proposed North Bank Canal, which was bitterly opposed by the residents of the lower valley, we will follow the river route all the way to Arkansas Post, leaving the Arkansas River only for the last few miles of swamp. The difference in cost turned out to be much less than had been thought; particularly after we had found that we could leave out one dam on the river route. The economic values of future valley development made up the difference. All factors of comprehensive development considered, this was clearly the best alternative, although it did cut into savings made elsewhere.

During the last year and a half we have devoted a tremendous engineering effort to solving the problem as to how best to create navigation by locks and dams on a river that carries a great natural silt load. We knew this could be done; but it had never been before; and we did not know the best way to do it. We have made a system analysis of the Arkansas River and come up with a perfected plan based on a concept new to engineering science.

In essence this concept is simply the spacing of dams farther apart, with variable-width regulated channels between the dams, to provide equal sediment-carrying capacity throughout the entire length of the navigation pools. Although the mathematics behind it is highly technical and involved, this new concept will produce quite simple practical results. We have been able to eliminate three previously planned locks and dams between Dardanelle and Arkansas Post. Pool levels will not have to be raised; in fact, 5,000 acres less land will be required than would have been taken by the previous system. The navigation conditions will be improved by elimination of three lockages on every tow, and there will be a net construction savings on this account of \$37 million. We had to work night and day to get all the new plans and estimates approved by the Chief of Engineers so that I could testify at the hearings on the basis of a complete plan.

Now that these questions have been settled, we know exactly how many structures we will need between the head of navigation at Catoosa and the mouth, namely 20, rather than 24 or some other larger numbers that had previously been considered. We know what type each will be, and approximately where it will be located. We can announce locations soon, so that plans of local interests can be adjusted accordingly. Locations and pool elevations will still be subject to some change as a result of detailed planning of individual structures. From your point of view, the big point is we are now ready to proceed with detailed planning as soon as appropriations are made.

We did not reduce the over-all cost estimate of \$1,201 million as a result of the project cost reductions I have been telling you about. We still have a long way to go, and the Engineering News Record of construction costs has been climbing 3 or 4 percent every year. There may be other contingencies which will come up—for example estimates on bank production costs on the

river below Pine Bluff have had to be increased as a result of recent experience. While indicating assured reductions on individual projects underway we have had to escalate other unstarted projects upward conservatively. However, the net indicated savings appear sufficient that we can set aside now \$45 million in general contingency reserve, over and above the cost we could surely complete the program for if we could be assured a continuation of present price levels. This represents a sounder basis and more conservative estimate than we had last year.

The goal of completion of the entire program previously given as 1972, has slipped forward to 1973, as the optimum completion date based upon the situation as a whole, including the budget. During the recent hearings I was questioned on this point by the Senate Committee. I testified that we could hold the line on further slippage subject always, of course, to the rate of appropriations. I also said that from the engineering point of view we could move back to the 1973 completion schedule if planning were commenced during the coming fiscal year on one navigation dam below Pine Bluff, on one between there and Dardanelle, and on the Short Mountain Dam as previously scheduled. We have such a capability.

During the early days of my time as Division Engineer I sometimes encountered the view that the Corps need not be too hasty about the Arkansas; the appropriations to complete it on the early schedule would never be forthcoming. That I refused to accept. Our job, I said, is to get ahead, so that the engineering is ready for the maximum program. Any decision to reduce the optimum rate of progress should be a policy matter, to be decided between the people of the area, the administration, and the Congress, but in any event not to be due to the failure of the Corps of Engineers to keep up. It has been a source of great pleasure and pride to me to have had the opportunity to guide the engineering of this great program through a critical period. I look forward to the day when it will be complete, with navigation bringing ever increasing industry and commerce to the great Arkansas basin.

Cranberries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, among the resolutions adopted by the 45th annual convention of the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture on January 26, 1960, in Trenton, was one concerning cranberries. Inasmuch as this concerns an agriculture problem that is national in scope, I commend Resolution No. 10 to the careful study of the Congress. It follows:

RESOLUTION 10—CRANBERRIES

Whereas the production of cranberries is an important segment of New Jersey's agricultural economy; and

Whereas the industry has been done irreparable harm by the untimely and indiscriminate announcement by an agency of the U.S. Government concerning alleged contamination of cranberries and cranberry products; and

Whereas New Jersey cranberries were not contaminated, as alleged; and

Whereas it was impossible to market them due to this action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this agricultural convention strongly urge the Department of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to indemnify the industry for its actual monetary losses; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and each Senator and Representative.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of March 12, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 12, 1960)

H.R. 5, a bill to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, surprisingly never came to a vote after debate. The laudable enacting clause in the view of many was not matched by the contents of the bill. Most approved the original intent of deferring U.S. income tax until earnings were brought into the United States. Many felt misgivings over the foreign competition in low wage-cost areas hurting U.S. industry.

Other arguments against the bill included: (1) A complicated bill under closed rule (no amendments permitted) should be carefully explained in debate and understood. Few, including Ways and Means Committee members, understand this technical bill, so different from the original bill on which hearings were held; (2) two other bills, comprising the sections stricken from the original bill have yet to be considered and are related to H.R. 5. Perhaps the uncertainty surrounding the bill was best described by the minority views . . . "further work should be done in committee to find answers to the many problems that either are unanswered in this bill or are created by the bill."

The authorization of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) of \$915 million provided for: salaries and expenses, \$171 million; research and development, \$621 million; and for construction and equipment, \$122.7 million. This was \$113 million more than originally budgeted but was requested by the administration. The manned satellite, missile systems, propulsion engines, new space vehicles, and tracking systems were all included under research and development. Although appropriation of the money comes later (after this authorization) there is little disagreement or doubt that Congress will approve the expenditure. So far as we know this is all the money that can be used. The bill passed handily.

The military construction authorization bill passed with little difficulty. This bill, similar to the NASA bill, is so comprehensive that Members accept generally the committee members' views. The absence of controversy usually suggests a sound bill. Of the \$1,104 million, less than \$150 million was allocated for expenditure outside continental United States. Texas' total was \$23.6 mil-

lion, with Dallas receiving \$2.6 million for the naval air station and Army Reserve center (No. 3). Four hundred and seventy-seven total installations are covered in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Department of Defense, and Reserve components.

The civil rights debate in the House contrasted sharply with the unlimited debate of the Senate (see Newsletter, March 5). A tight time allocation limited all House Members, with members of the Judiciary Committee, responsible for the bill's explanations, getting preference. The 15-hour rule was cut short by House leadership agreement, further limiting the time allocation, a strange and dangerous move, it seems to me. Controversial issues need to be thoroughly thrashed out.

Actually, all House Members start with the same belief, enunciated by the President, namely: (1) the rule of law is supreme; (2) every individual is entitled to equal protection of the laws. Proponents of civil rights legislation are sure that southern Negroes are denied these basic principles. Opponents of this civil rights bill generally are sure that Negroes are not mistreated; nor do northerners do not understand; this bill is the wrong approach; and even greater discrimination against the Negro exists outside the South, to which many close their eyes.

Many Congressmen doubt that in the heat of an election year, this highly emotional issue will or can be properly solved. Though politics is ever present, the sincerity of many on both sides is quite evident. Surprisingly good humor is the rule, not the exception. Questions I have raised in debate include: (1) Does this bill permit several prosecutions for the same act? (2) Will the Judiciary Committee approve the additional Federal judgeships needed, particularly in view of the added work entailed by this bill? (3) Why pass more civil rights legislation without reports from the Civil Rights Commission? (4) Why get into other fields than voting rights? (Fugitive from justice in property destruction; education; court obstruction, etc.). (5) Why should Federal Government interfere in local and State elections? (6) How can another Federal law solve an evolutionary process in human relations? Behind this facade of gentlemanly debate lurks the political expediency of an election year. Unfortunately, the rights of the majority, rather, of all citizens may be jeopardized or violated by well-intentioned, zealous citizens trying to protect what they are sure are violations of a minority groups' rights. Not forgotten by some is the threat of race riots which are potentially far more dangerous in the northern cities (Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Cleveland, Detroit) than in the South. Next week amendments may improve or water down the bill, depending on your viewpoint. Either way, a rough road lies ahead.

Adam Powell Fearless Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial: [From the Omaha (Nebr.) Star, Feb. 26, 1960]

ADAM POWELL FEARLESS CHAMPION

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, New York Congressman, representing a district heavily populated with Negro and Puerto Rican vot-

ers, is scheduled to succeed a North Carolina Congressman next year as head of the House Labor and Education Committee. This possibility has stirred up quite a number of unkind comments against Congressman POWELL. Unfortunately, most of the hand wringing is coming from people who are usually thought of as friends of the Negro such as Mrs. Roosevelt, and George Meany, the head of the AFL-CIO. We feel that since no one has complained about Congressman BARDEN's chairmanship of the committee, nor of Senator EASTLAND's antics as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee where he held up an Eisenhower appointment to a Federal court for almost a year merely because the appointee did his job well in breaking up some attempts to flout the Supreme Court desegregation decision, we wonder why there is so much worry about Congressman POWELL's right to head a Senate committee. We feel that Congressman POWELL has been a fearless champion of Negro citizens and often a voice in the wilderness when all others wanted to compromise and postpone giving the Negro what was rightfully his. Probably the main reason Congressman POWELL is so disliked is because he never fails to add a clause to bills supposed to aid education making it mandatory that no money be given out where Negro children are segregated or not treated equally. In doing so he is merely enforcing the Supreme Court decision. Too often our friends feel that if white children are going to be hurt by this kind of tactic also then it should not be used. They say that Federal aid is good for everybody and we can wait a little longer to enforce the Supreme Court decision. Despite the widely publicized attempts to discredit Congressman POWELL, we feel that he has done a great job and has refused to back down on issues involving Negro rights. Therefore, we are with him. We wonder where George Meany gets off attacking Congressman POWELL as "stirring up race trouble" when it practically takes an act of Congress to get a Negro into Meany's own plumbers union and into a lot of other building trades organizations such as Meany heads. We expect Meany will be a lot madder when Congressman POWELL gets through having a hand at correcting some of this foolishness.

Uncontrollable "Control"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Nature magazine of January 1959:

UNCONTROLLABLE "CONTROL"—WILDLIFE THE VICTIM OF DEADLY, CHAIN-ACTION POISONS

(By Marguerite Angelo Smelser)

Such is the current passion for poison that yearly, upon millions of American acres, Federal and State agencies are spreading tons of grain and meat impregnated with the most spectacularly deadly poison known to man: Sodium fluoroacetate.

Commonly called Compound 1080, this all-killing poison was developed by chemists during the Second World War when red squill was hard to get. So extremely toxic is 1080 that minute amounts kill, and it possesses an annihilative chain action destructive to all wildlife. "Unfortunately that

1080 was ever discovered," writes a noted research biologist.

Man also is highly susceptible to this tasteless, odorless white poison; it has caused human deaths. Taste it, breathe it, and although it may work slowly and you get the best medical aid, you are doomed. There is no known antidote.

In the wake of Compound 1080's dramatic discovery have followed widespread tragedy to wildlife, and almost unbelievable official incompetency, complacency, and concealment.

Although Compound 1080 is used ostensibly for so-called predator control—in itself more often than not questionable—and for rodent control, this dastardly poison plays no favorites. Its chain action kills much of the wildlife in large areas. Many scientists realize the danger, but are unable to change official policies. Poisoning is big business.

This indiscriminate killer is in common use today widely over the United States.

Some idea of the extremely deadly nature of Compound 1080 can be gained from records of the American Medical Association. Babies ranging from 6 months to 2 years have died from merely chewing on cups that had contained 1080 bait. In a masterly understatement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service warns: "A single teaspoonful of the poisoned water solution as used for rats (one-half ounce to the gallon) may be sufficient to produce the death of a child, and three times that amount could kill an adult person. In addition, 1080 possesses a high degree of secondary hazard. A single mouse killed with the water solution may contain enough poison to kill a full grown dog."

Warnings by the U.S. Department of Health against the use of 1080 in solid baits have been disregarded. Some wild animals die slowly and wander far before they fall; they and their vomitus to become in turn lethal bait to other animals, including birds.

Two eminent biologists, Robert L. Rudd and Richard E. Genelly, Department of Zoology, University of California, state that, among other alarming aspects of 1080, "There is little doubt that rodents killed by 1080 and later eaten by carnivores are responsible for the loss of many furbearers. . . . As long as mammal control depends on poisoned baits, hazard to other animals will be high. . . . It merits a full and impartial review."

No such full and impartial review is forthcoming. Whenever an investigation is made, it becomes a farce conducted "by the very men who put out the poisons and by their supervisors," writes Arnold Rieder, a Senator in the Montana State Legislature. "It's like sending a bank robber to investigate his own robbery."

Control programs are completely out of hand, but the directors of the programs either will not admit it, or do not think it worth doing anything about. These directors are the men who hold our wildlife welfare in the palms of their powerful hands.

One official device used repeatedly to sidetrack investigation is the soothing assurance that compound 1080 no longer is being manufactured; hence objections are out of date. This misinformation has been spread so widely that the author time and again has met chemists and biologists repeating it and apparently believing it themselves. These are men whose very vocation should lead them to know better, and should move them to concern regarding the actual situation.

So hush-hush has been the use of 1080, with its dangers, that the general public has had little knowledge of what is going on. But with the scandalous poisoning of thousands of geese, pheasants, and other animals in Washington, Oregon, and northern California during an attempt to control a serious mouse infestation in 1957 and

1958, the facts are beginning to come to light.

A one-man information bureau in exposing the danger to wildlife, domestic animals and humans implicit in the use of 1080, the cyanide gun and certain other poisons widely used in control is Lester Reed, for 17 years an official trapper. He was also a poisoner for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—until his conscience overcame his desire for a regular paycheck. Mr. Reed resigned his official job in October 1957, and now devotes his life to informing people that: Most wildlife will be destroyed if they do not demand a stop to the 1080-poison programs.

Already, in areas where a few years ago wildlife was fairly plentiful, this skillful outdoors man and his equally skillful companions find little sign of even coyotes in thousands of miles of travel and search. This bears out Dr. Durward Allen's prophecy in his book, "Our Wildlife Legacy," written when he was a biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: "Widely spaced 1080-injected carcasses are deadly baits to the far-ranging brush wolf, and its extirpation in large regions is now but a matter of time."

Let it be stated now that officials in Government agencies employing this deadly poison claim that those now sounding the alarm are "misinformed," or "fanatics." Or a "few faddists," as the National Agricultural Chemical Association recently dubbed the hundreds of thousands of people aroused over the widespread use of certain dangerous insecticides manufactured by association members.

The Government officials also deny there is widespread and indiscriminate slaughter by 1080, claiming that "extreme caution" by "experts" is exercised in the placement of 1080-baits, and that it is "selective"—killing only coyotes and rodents. These statements are serious falsehoods, and can be proved to be such.

It is worse than unfortunate that the writer must accord the anonymity of the confessional to some biologists, and others in important places, who acknowledge the 1080 poison programs are dead wrong and destructive. They are happy that someone is willing to arouse the public, but dare not do it themselves.

Neither Lester Reed nor anyone else will deny that the farmer needs control of rodents, and, at times, the elimination of individual carnivores. But for rodents, there are safer poisons with which to achieve results; for carnivores, there is the more biologically sound trapper-instructor-farmer system used successfully in Missouri.

Rodents and rabbits are the main diet of bobcats, coyotes, foxes, and badgers. The trapping and poisoning of these so-called predators for monetary gain, whether bounties to individuals or appropriations for officials, has been a racket for many years. With carnivores killed off, rodent populations multiply and flourish, ruining untold acres of grasslands. This results in larger rodent and grasshopper poisoning programs, and appropriation of more millions of taxpayers' money to control these real pests. This is a tragic rat race, as Colorado cattlemen found to their great financial loss. Now, to protect the few remaining predators, the embattled ranchers guard their lands with a vengeance against Federal, State, and county trappers and poisoners.

In California during 1957 alone, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service spread 8,892 pounds of meat, each 100 pounds poisoned with 1.6 grams of 1080 (about one-twentieth of an ounce). It spread 15,175 pounds of grain, each 100 pounds poisoned with 2 ounces of 1080. The cooperating agency, the California Department of Agriculture, spread 327,257 pounds of grain, similarly poisoned. This does not take into account the unavailable figures for 1080 used in this State by

military installations and commercial pest eradicators.

Once 1080-bait is out of the poisoners' hands, there are no safeguards humanly possible. "Pieces of solid bait may be carried by rats or mice into stored food or other places where they remain dangerous for an indefinite period," warns U.S. health authorities. In the field, birds and other animals carry baits long distances.

The manufacturer admits in Tull Bulletin No. 1, "Carefully collecting and burning all surface kill that can be located, still has not prevented accidental poisoning. * * * Residues or uneaten baits constitute a hazard to beneficial wildlife in the same habitat."

The 1080-grain poisoning of deer in California in 1955, and the scandalous 1080 and zinc phosphide poisoning of thousands of geese, pheasants, and countless other animals in Washington, Oregon, and northern California in 1957 and 1958—as a result of widespread rodent "control"—show safeguards to be as absent as the proverbial hens' teeth.

After the 1957-58 fiasco was over, a biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service wrote to a medical doctor, who was shocked by the tragedy: "Our Service has had no legal responsibility in the mixing, placing, or use of these poisons or baits provided the farmers by the counties. We have furnished technical guidance when possible."

Another statement is that compound 1080 is "remarkably selective," killing only coyotes; that, in fact, it is a "great benefactor" of other furbearing animals, since they have "almost doubled in numbers, or (and here enthusiasm for 1080 runs hog wild) become even more plentiful." Many wildlife men brand this "a damned lie."

"Why is it," this author asked ex-poisoner Lester Reed, "that government officials and others hot in pursuit of poison panaceas, will allege—and their reports show—that animals other than coyotes and rodents are not killed by 1080-poisoned baits?"

Replied ex-poisoner Reed, "I can tell you from my own experience, and I have personal knowledge that other trappers and poisoners would tell you the same thing if they were not afraid of losing their jobs. When I first began to trap and poison, I listed all the animals I killed—and got called on the carpet. My supervisor admonished me, 'Report only the number of coyotes and bobcats killed; do not report other animals—it might bring public censure.'"

"Furthermore, my supervisor ordered me to hide the bodies of these other animals and birds, including farmers' dogs, so that the harm I was doing would not come to the attention of the public." A Federal trapper, quoted by Wallace Taber in "Poisoners at Work" (Nature magazine, June-July 1949), stated that mink, marten, fox, and badger were being exterminated by the 1080 coyote bait. The trapper gave figures to prove his point, figures he did not turn in to the Washington office for fear of losing his job.

Another assurance—intended to lull but actually alarming—of Government officials using compound 1080 in both grain and meat baits, is this one by the Assistant Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "The use of 1080 by the Bureau is confined to cooperative pest control projects in the more sparsely populated portions of the Western States" (although in the following paragraph he writes: "It is probable that some 1080 is used in every State by some State agency or commercial concern"). The agricultural commissioner for the author's home county wrote in a letter that the 1,698 pounds of 1080-injected bait he used last year was mostly in remote areas.

Remote areas, sparsely populated portions. There, of course, is where our remaining wild animals live. When this fact was called to the attention of a public official, he replied: "Well, the supervisor of our

poison program took a botany course in college."

A staggering lack of knowledge of the relationship between plants, wildlife, and humans is exhibited by the great majority of Government officials—with a few notable exceptions—from county politicians to directors of agriculture and directors of wildlife agencies. Nor do these officials with power over this Nation's wildlife resources seem susceptible to learning from experience.

Late in 1957, more than 3,000 dead geese, ducks, pheasants, and other birds were counted in a 1080 mouse-control project in Oregon, according to Senator Richard L. Neuberger in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1958. And in the State of Washington, a like tragedy.

Yet 3 months later, the men playing God in California who, like their northern counterparts, had spent years poisoning, trapping, and shooting foxes, coyotes, bobcats, badgers, skunks, hawks, owls, and other rodent eaters, now got busy with their poison pots to meet their explosive mouse population.

The California Agricultural Department, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the farmers killed, by actual count, more than 2,500 geese—among the dead, 40 of the rare Ross geese—according to the California Tulelake Reporter, of March 6, 1958, a newspaper located in the midst of the murder. "At least 3,000 geese, and probably three or four times that, reportedly have been killed by poison bait in the Klamath Basin," is the estimate by Western Outdoor News, a leading hunters' publication. None alludes to the countless other dead animals not valued by hunters, but which are a necessary part of balanced wildlife.

These very officials who should be educating the public as to the value of wildlife are, instead, spending our own money to perpetuate indiscriminate poison and "predator" trapping programs to the tune of millions of dollars without heeding the scientific findings of biologists and naturalists, some of whom are in their own agencies.

A news item headed "Many an Argument," in the Arizona Farmer, June 10, 1950, quotes the complaints of Everett Mercer of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, who "pays his respects to those who circulate 'wild stories' about the danger of 1080 to game, especially quail, turkeys, and javelinas," says the Arizona Farmer. Too much of the "education" end of the job, Mr. Mercer complains, has been left to the personnel of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the State Game Department. "He and his men had to put in too much time explaining and defending the program. The program had to be explained to literally hundreds of people to get permission to put 1080 on their property."

This author has many eye-and-ear witnesses' accounts of this official type of "explaining." A medical man who went along with a Government poisoner on one such trip reported that the poisoner did not merely explain, he "argued and persuaded" until the ranchers gave in and signed the waiver, thereby permitting 1080 poisoning on their property and absolving the Government agency of responsibility "against any and all claims arising out of accidental poisoning."

Lester Reed states that all indications from his extensive contacts with stockmen lead him to believe that the idea of coyote and other carnivore damage has had to be promoted in order to put over poison programs.

Dr. Allen, in his book mentioned earlier, wrote: "It is well known that popular reports in support of Government predator control programs are not distinguished for being critically impartial."

In writing of this tendency to exaggerate and misrepresent the activities of carnivores, Ian I. McMillan, an influential central Cali-

fornia rancher and author, writes in *California Farmer*, November 1951:

"In my experience of some 30 years in raising cattle where coyotes and eagles were at times abundant, I have never suffered any such loss nor have I found any conclusive proof of such loss from predation as reported by others. Both these species will feed upon carrion, and when found feeding on the carcasses of calves that have died from other causes, the loss is commonly attributed to whatever animal is found at the carcass."

The official departments, depending on repeated rodent-poisoning operations for continued Government monetary appropriations, rejoice openly because 1080 used to poison rodents will, by its chain action, also exterminate coyotes—Nature's rodent control, and therefore the departments' competitors.

The Honorable Arnold Rieder, Montana state Senator, a man of long experience with cattle and a vehement opponent of the 1080 poisoning programs, has written an excellent report, "The Coyote's Fading Howl." In Montana there have been placed some 2,000 of the 1080-bait stations annually for 10 years. The coyote is virtually eliminated, yet more poison than ever is being spread. "A wanton waste of money and natural resources," Mr. Rieder writes.

He places the blame on government poisoners—and "armchair" biologists—with the woolgrowers as their political affiliates, as against independent biologists, "the naturalists, sportsmen, cattle-growers, and for the most part the general public."

Mr. Rieder writes that the 1080 poisoning "has been beneficial to the sheep people to a degree, but everybody else loses. . . . I spent an entire winter where 10,000 sheep wintered in eastern Oregon. Without poison being used, not one sheep was lost to predatory animals, and there were plenty of coyotes."

He writes: "The Fish and Wildlife Service tell the cattlemen that the coyote is a great killer of calves. This really disturbs me, for I have followed cows and calves for many years and have talked with many old-time cattlemen about it . . . and anyone who knows the cattle business from a working cattleman's standpoint will not hesitate to tell you that the loss of calves to coyotes is so rare that it is not worth talking about."

The Montana legislator points out that the stomach analysis of 8,263 coyotes showed that 80 percent of the animal items on the coyotes' menu are detrimental to man; thus the brush wolf is an ally. The small percentage of domestic stock he attributes—as do other authorities—mostly to animals dead of natural causes, which are simply there for the coyotes and birds to clean up.

Further, writes Mr. Rieder, "Whenever the balance-of-nature topic is brought up at a discussion of coyote control, the Fish and Wildlife Service is quick to hand out a printed report called 'The Predation Question—Facts Versus Fancies,' which tries to impress that there is no such thing as balance of nature, and cites a few cases where there were lots of coyotes and rodents at the same time. It does a good job of confusing the novice, or one who has not lived with the facts . . ."

In attendance at a secret "appraisal" meeting was Mr. H. Nelson Elliott, District Agent, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He is among the officials who promote and foster the continued destruction of carnivores and insectivores. In the California Department of Agriculture's Annual Report for 1957, he attempts to justify the slaughter by the 87 official trappers and poisoners in California of 21,462 "predators" (not including the rare golden eagles and the endangered kit foxes). In one area, he claims "an estimated 60 lambs were killed by golden eagles . . . and instances of lamb killing by eagles also occurred in five other counties."

No evidence presented. No substantiation. A mere allegation intended to convince you by the official position, not the competence, of the man with a monetary interest in convincing you. This is an example of flagrant official disregard for even rare or doomed species of wildlife. Naturalists and other authorities dispute the claim that golden eagles are a menace to livestock. Being carrion-eaters—as well as rodent and rabbit catchers—the few surviving eagles are being killed by 1,080-poisoned animals, they are shot from airplanes, shot by the high-powered guns of the professional trappers, and have long been targets for unscrupulous gunners, who kill them just for the "sport" of it.

Mr. Elliott claims that his joint predatory control program now receives Army funds, and "valuable help" is given by the California Woolgrowers Association, the co-operating officials of the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, military installations, and the California Farm Bureau Federation, along with many others.

One out-of-State trapper, typical of others, writes: "I am with a fish and game agency using Federal aid in predator control. Though this department does not use poison and knows the harm it does, I have been seriously cautioned against saying anything against 1080. Our department must maintain friendly relations with the Fish and Wildlife Service."

In the Arizona Sportsman, May 1958, Potter writes: "With the Fish and Wildlife Service's expensive laboratory equipment and biologists counting the pinfeathers on doves, checking the reproductive organs of deer, here eight javelinas [peccaries], our leading game animal, turn up their heels and die near a 1080-bait station and nothing more was done than a hasty check by a decidedly biased official of the Service. . . . This is only one of many cases where the poison program has backfired and the officials have suppressed the facts to shield the poison programs from public criticism at any and all costs."

The poisoning still continues. How much? When you write these various Federal and State officials for figures you get ambiguous, ever-varying, and indeed conflicting information. The first 6 months of 1958 in California, using the smallest non-conflicting figure of just one department alone, saw at least 95,840 pounds of 1080-poisoned bait visited on us—and so on you. Similarly, the poisons destroying wildlife in your State, in official quietude, are visited on us.

Every American has a stake in the Nation's remaining wildlife—whether it is in California, or Michigan, or Maine—and a responsibility to see that it is saved for future generations without further inroads by the serene bunglers.

Suckers for a Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 29, 1960]

SUCKERS FOR A SLOGAN

Some people are suckers for a slogan. "Federal aid to education" is a rolling phrase and there are persuasive spokesmen

who speak of it as a way to bring quick improvement to the Nation's school buildings, and quick advances in teachers' salaries.

We hear few voices asking if there isn't a better way to accomplish these desired results. But these few voices are critical and pointed.

One sharp critic is Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican, of Santa Monica, Calif.

He makes some trenchant points:

Not only is the \$1.8 billion aid to education bill inflationary, but, by including money for teachers' salaries "makes inescapably clear the fact that passage of the bill must bring Federal direction of American education. The political implications of federally paid teachers is so clear as to require no elaboration."

From the very beginning of public education in this country, it has been recognized by educators and politicians alike that the real foundation of democracy is locally controlled schools. Federal school systems are for dictatorships.

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin comments:

"The plain facts are that in the last 10 years, this Nation has undergone the greatest expansion of public education in the history of any nation in the world and without general Federal aid."

"Since 1950, public school expenditures have risen from \$5.8 billion to \$14.4 billion and teachers' salaries, on the average, have gone up from \$3,010 a year to \$5,160, or 71 percent. Classrooms have increased 30 percent since 1954, and the number of pupils per classroom is down from 30.6 to 28.1."

"During the present administration, an average of 62,725 classrooms per year have been built, three times as many as during Truman's administration and almost 6 times as many as during F.D.R.'s. The spenders know that time is running out on them, insofar as making a case for Federal aid to education."

"Thus, in one fell swoop, the Senate decided to wipe out at least one-quarter of a surplus badly needed to fight inflation and restore fiscal stability."

Representative JACKSON, who visited Hawaii as a fighting marine during World War II, and was here briefly last year on Marine Reserve duty, makes another point that Hawaii's delegation in Congress would do well to consider.

"We do not intend to vote to seat Uncle Samuel as an ex-officio member of the school boards of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, and Beverly Hills. These communities have built fine schools by the hundreds, and are meeting the problems of exploding population in a businesslike way."

"Passage of the instant bill would mean that California and the taxpayers of that State not only would pay for hundreds of schools that must be built in the next few years, but would also be required to finance, in part, the construction of schools elsewhere throughout the land."

And so would Hawaii. The more prosperous States, which include Hawaii, would, through Federal aid, have to contribute to the less prosperous ones—Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas.

Furthermore it costs money to collect taxes in Hawaii, take the money to Washington, shuffle it around among hundreds of bureaucrats—all of whom have to be paid—and then return it to Hawaii.

The sooner we get over the notion that Federal aid is "free money" the better. The sooner we realize that for Hawaii, at least, some Federal aid can be a losing proposition, the more we will come to realize that local solutions of our educational problems will give us more money to do the job in the long run—at less cost to Hawaii's taxpayers.

The Policy of International Giveaway of Historic Rights Strikes at Every American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues of the House, especially those whose congressional districts include coastal areas and fisheries, are not failing to see the implication of a death sentence to certain segments of the U.S. fishing industry through Canada's proposal on the law of the sea.

Where a nation historically has fished outside the traditional 3-mile limit, both a moral and legal right has been established which must be recognized under international convention.

However, Canada sees in the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, starting Thursday, March 17, 1960, an opportunity to gain for herself an exclusive fishing zone on the Pacific coast where our American fishermen have pioneered and long established an international right to take fish within the 12-mile limit.

Will the Representatives in Congress of the American people see in this threat to my State of Washington and Pacific coast fishermen a potentially immoral and dangerous policy of international giveaway that strikes at every U.S. citizen's rights regardless of geographical residence. I hope so, and that my warning protest will not go unheeded and unsupported.

The following Seattle Times editorial points up that traditional fishing rights must be guaranteed:

FISHING RIGHTS MUST BE SAVED

The agenda for the Second United Nations Law of the Sea Conference, convening March 17 in Geneva, will be limited specifically to two subjects: Territorial sea limits and exclusive fishing zones. Upon the outcome of this convention, much of the future of the fishing industry in the State of Washington may depend.

Two main proposals before the conference probably will dominate its deliberations. The Canadian Government will propose that the territorial limits of any coastal nation extend 6 miles offshore. In addition to this 6-mile territorial sea, Canada also will propose an additional 6-mile exclusive fishing zone. In effect, the Canadian plan creates a 12-mile exclusive fishing zone.

The American plan differs from the Canadian proposal only in that the United States takes cognizance of historic fishing rights. Under the American plan, fishermen who had traditionally depended upon fisheries falling under these new territorial limits would be allowed to continue their operations. Basically, while agreeing with the need for a wider territorial sea buffer zone and broader protection of fishing rights, the United States seeks to preserve the status quo.

The Canadian plan is aimed, frankly, at banning American fishermen from offshore areas in which they have fished for many years and which hitherto have been regarded as international waters.

Canadian External Affairs Minister Howard Green, in a speech to the Dominion House of Commons, made his country's point crystal clear. He emphasized that the Canadian plan would "wipe out" historic fishing rights now enjoyed by the United States.

U.S. convention delegates must make it equally clear to the conference that this country's economic dependence upon the fishing industry is too great to write off in a grand gesture of international good will. Traditional fishing rights should be guaranteed by any plan to which this country is a party.

Illinois Medical Society Makes Effort To Solve a Very Difficult Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Medical Society is to be commended for making an effort to provide for the health needs of older citizens who are not in a financial position to pay the full price for expensive surgical operations and certain other medical care.

The society has announced a voluntary insurance program for persons over 65 to be administered by Blue Shield and to cost subscribers \$1.65 per person. This is not a complete solution of the problem but it is a step in the right direction. The society expects that most doctors will accept the scheduled allowances as full payment for surgical and medical care in hospitals for persons with limited assets and small incomes. The society also anticipates that Blue Cross soon will match this program with one providing low-cost hospital insurance for the same group.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include here a letter from Dr. Joseph T. O'Neill, president of the Illinois State Medical Society, and a fact sheet on the program:

ILLINOIS STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Chicago, Ill., March 11, 1960.

Re Forand bill.

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACK: As you are aware, we have been very much concerned with the difficulties of our older citizens to provide for their health needs at a time of life when their income is decreasing and their medical needs are increasing. The medical profession has been studying this problem and working on solutions offering a cheap and realistic answer.

We are happy to inform you that on February 25, 1960, the Illinois State Medical Society announced a low-cost voluntary insurance program for persons over 65, to be administered by Blue Shield. This program will cost about \$1.65 a month per person. Its benefits include allowances for surgical and in-hospital medical care, and certain diagnostic procedures. Preexisting conditions are covered after 180 days of membership and no physical examination is required.

The officers of the society anticipate that the majority of doctors will accept the scheduled allowances as payment in full for those with limited assets and with incomes of less

than \$2,000 per person or \$3,000 per couple.

This is just one program of the Illinois State Medical Society which is evolving under our free enterprise system to meet the needs of our people as they arise. No controls are imposed on anyone and no tax moneys are required.

An accompanying low-cost hospitalization program for those over 65 is expected to be made available by Blue Cross within the very near future. We hope that you will bear these developments in mind when evaluating legislative proposals which purport to deal with this particular problem.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH T. O'NEILL, MD.,
President.

ILLINOIS STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY'S MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE PLAN FOR PEOPLE OVER 65

THE BACKGROUND

Following recommendations of the American Medical Association and a directive from the house of delegates of the Illinois Medical Society this new program has been developed by the society.

THE PURPOSE

This program is designed to make it possible for the person over 65 who has to go to the hospital for an operation or in-hospital medical care to have a practical plan to help him pay the physician's bill.

Growing life expectancy has resulted in over 900,000 people in Illinois now being in the over-65 age group. In George Washington's time, the life span was a mere 35 years. In Lincoln's day, it was 38 years, and today it is 70.2 years and still rising rapidly.

THE NEED

Many of these people over 65 are living on social security or on small pensions. A large number of them have no medical plan and find it difficult to finance surgical and in-hospital medical care. To help them finance such care, the voluntary way, this program has been developed.

THE SCOPE

This program will provide benefits for the over-65 subscriber who has to go to the hospital for an operation. A schedule of maximum allowances has been developed which provides allowances according to the type of operation. And the subscriber may receive benefits up to a maximum of \$200 in a 90-day period for surgery performed in a hospital.

The plan also will provide 30 days of in-hospital medical care benefits for those who do not require an operation but do need medical care in a hospital.

SPECIAL FEATURES

Preexisting conditions are covered after 180 days of membership. People can get benefits over and over again for the same condition. For example, a subscriber may receive benefits for a number of cancer operations or he may receive 30 days of in-hospital medical care benefits over and over again for a heart ailment, any time he has been out of the hospital for 90 days.

BENEFITS THIS PROGRAM WILL OFFER

Surgical benefits vary from \$5 for lancing a small abscess to \$200 for a gastrectomy (removal of stomach.)

Allowances are provided for surgical services for correction of fractures or complete dislocations.

A maximum of \$200 in surgical allowances may be provided in a 90-day period.

General medical care in a hospital

In-hospital medical care will be covered to the extent that when a patient is hospitalized for three or more consecutive days of bed care, the plan will pay the physician \$5 for each of the first five daily visits and \$3 for each of the next 25 daily visits * * * for a maximum of 30 daily visits.

If subscriber is discharged from the hospital and 90 days separate date of discharge and readmission, he may receive allowances for another 30 daily visits of his physician.

Other professional services

Schedule of Allowances

Diagnostic X-ray service: A maximum of \$50 per illness or accident.

Radiation therapy: A maximum per calendar year of \$150 for treatments of malignant conditions with X-ray, radium, radon and radioactive isotopes and \$50 for superficial malignancy.

Clinical and surgical pathology: A maximum of \$50 per accident or illness.

Anesthesia: A maximum of from \$10 to \$35 per procedure to the anesthesiologist.

Shock therapy: A \$10 allowance per electric shock treatment, \$3 per insulin shock treatment, with a maximum of \$50 per calendar year for a series of each type of treatment.

Robert A. Bicks, Chief of Antitrust Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, March 12, 1960, in which the question is raised as to why Robert A. Bicks, who has been Acting Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, has not had his nomination sent over to the Senate.

I think everything that is said in the editorial about Mr. Bicks, worth is eminently true. One of the foundation stones of the private enterprise system is adequate and equitable enforcement of antitrust legislation. It is very difficult for those of us who believe in the marketplace as an efficient and effective method of making economic decisions rather than a political bureaucracy or oligopoly to maintain this position if the marketplace is not kept truly free. Antitrust legislation adequately enforced is one of the essential features in keeping it free.

The editorial follows:

ANTITRUST LAWYER

One of the great strengths in the performance of William P. Rogers as Attorney General has been his record of antitrust enforcement. The Justice Department has been more active in this field than it has been for many years, bringing more cases and more significant cases. It has been firm in moving against anticompetitive practices. At the same time it has shown welcome imagination in trying to make out the vague contours of the antitrust statutes and especially in developing coherent theories for controlling the merger trend.

Those familiar with the antitrust field are in agreement that the person chiefly responsible for this excellent record is Robert A. Bicks. For some years the No. 2 man in the

antitrust division, Mr. Bicks became its acting head last April. He has won the respect of Congress, of the antitrust bar and, perhaps most significantly, of the lawyers who have dealt with him as an opponent in the big cases.

Why, then, has Mr. Bicks not been nominated as chief of the antitrust division? The explanation most often heard is that certain business interests oppose him as too zealous an advocate of the antitrust laws. But that answer cannot appropriately come from either Mr. Rogers or President Eisenhower. The administration has properly taken credit for adopting the strong antitrust policy urged by Mr. Bicks. Since it obviously believes in that policy, it should have the courage to say so by nominating Mr. Bicks, and promptly.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a brief moment to remind the Members of this body that this is the 21st anniversary of Slovak Independence Day. To most people in America, this day has no significance. Furthermore, high-ranking officials in our Government especially in the pre-World War II period, and during the diplomatic negotiations with the Soviets in the latter days of the war failed to understand the aspirations of the Slovak people for independence.

At the present time, the brave Slovak people share a common misery with other groups behind the Iron Curtain; that common misery is the dread oppression of communism. It is my hope and prayer that the spirit and love of freedom on the part of the Slovak people and all other captive peoples, will continue to grow and someday manifest itself in the reality of national independence. Surely justice will someday free the courageous Slovak people from Communist persecution and provide for the goals that they so fervently desire.

May I further call to your minds the fact that the Slovaks are a Christian nation—a great majority being Roman Catholic—and, therefore, this religious heritage provides them with the inner strength necessary to resist Communist philosophy.

As I have indicated on many previous occasions, history will someday reveal the tragedy that followed the unfortunate wartime Yalta Agreement, when the occupant of the White House at that time delivered, in addition to the Slovaks, millions of people into the hands of Communist tyranny.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I commend the Slovak League of America for its effective work in maintaining among the 2 million Americans of Slovak origin the faith and confidence in eventual liberation of the Slovak people.

Law Our Only Hope for Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Law Day U.S.A. will be observed throughout America, on Sunday, May 1, 1960. It has been so proclaimed by the President of the United States, and is being given official designation in our State by the Governor of Texas and scores of Texas mayors.

Directed at the national level by the American Bar Association, the Law Day observance in Texas is being coordinated by the State bar and 180 local bar associations.

The distinguished president of the State Bar of Texas, the Honorable A. J. Folley, of Amarillo, is the author of an article on Law Day U.S.A. for the March periodical of the Texas Law Enforcement Foundation, an organization dedicated to teaching public respect for law and its enforcement.

It is fitting that Judge Folley is author of this article, for he has served with distinction at virtually every level in our system of the administration of justice: practicing lawyer, prosecutor, trial judge, associate justice of an intermediate appellate court, and as an associate justice of the supreme court, Texas' highest tribunal in civil matters.

In view of the significance of law to our country's greatness and its unchallenged position of leadership among nations of the free world, I include Judge Folley's article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LAW DAY U.S.A.

I appreciate the opportunity to write this article on "Law Day U.S.A.," fully realizing the important role that the Texas Law Enforcement Foundation maintains in teaching respect for the law and its enforcement, and in encouraging its support from the people of Texas.

In the course of 2 or 3 years, Law Day U.S.A. has become somewhat of an institution in the United States, and in Texas, particularly. By Presidential proclamation, and by proclamation of the Governors of our several States and of the mayors of our cities, May 1 of each year is proclaimed Law Day. These proclamations urge our people everywhere to join in a nationwide observance of Law Day, either the week before or the week after May 1, with patriotic programs in churches, schools, courts, service clubs, fraternal organizations, and private organizations of all kinds.

The purpose, of course, is to cause the people to foster an abiding respect for the law, enabling the Nation to grow in moral strength as it grows in population, resources, and world leadership; and to provide an occasion for the American people to rededicate themselves to freedom for the individual under just laws administered by independent courts, and in so doing to emphasize before the world the contrast between the rule of law in the United States and the rule of force and fear under communism.

The purposes of Law Day are educational and patriotic. Though the lawyers of the

country assume the principal burden of sponsoring the event, Law Day is not a "lawyer's day," as the name might imply. It is a day for honoring the place of law in American life and the contribution which it has made and must continue to make in the Nation's growth and development, as well as its great potential as an instrument of world peace.

The full purposes and aims of Law Day U.S.A. are too numerous to discuss here in detail. Suffice it to say that the lawyers of the United States and other public-minded groups like the Texas Law Enforcement Foundation, are attempting to impress upon the minds of the people everywhere the importance of law as an intangible force that makes freedom and progress possible.

It is the law that brings order into the affairs of men, enables them to survive, accumulate possessions, develop the arts and sciences, pursue knowledge, and enjoy the freedom of life. Law gives the individual security that he can obtain in no other way. It protects his home, his family, his property and his ideals for the advancement of common interests. It permits the growth of great cities and the development of vast enterprises. In other words, it is the cement that holds our free society together.

Law Day U.S.A. is dedicated to an understanding of this powerful force and to more extensive use of it for the benefit of mankind. Men attain the high state of social, political and economic development we call civilization by thinking and working together for the good of all. The full flower of human endeavor is possible only when the individual is free to think for himself, to follow his own bent, and to enjoy the fruits of his own efforts. He can do this only if he lives in a society of freemen in which his rights are protected and his basic obligations are fixed by law. It is therefore literally true that law is the alternative to chaos on the one hand and terror on the other.

The law is the servant and not the master of freemen. It is our only hope of lasting peace. It is not good to lie down at night in solemn sleep realizing that no gestapo is about to break in and that the silent protection of the strong arm of the law is ever present as a shepherd watching over his flock? Americans are truly fortunate to live in such a good, free world. I urge all groups everywhere to join in this nationwide observance of Law Day U.S.A. and hold high the banner of the law and spread its good tidings around the world so that peace and security shall not perish from the earth.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I like the editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of this date on postal rates. It puts the truth right on the line. I am glad to say that our House subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments concurs in this expression. The editorial follows:

POSTAL RATES

In principle, Congress favors pay-as-you-go for the Post Office. A law passed in 1958 specifies that postage rates be adjusted periodically to pay the cost of service. But,

in practice, Congress is extremely reluctant to fix stamp prices high enough to do this.

Last week, President Eisenhower reminded Congress both of its own law and of the postal deficit, now running \$2 million a day. He asked for increases in rates to raise \$550 million in fiscal 1961.

As the President point out, big postal deficits date from the inflationary period following World War II. They have amounted to \$6.8 billion in the last 13 years and are costing the taxpayers an extra \$200 million a year in interest charges alone.

Insistence on a break-even operation for the Post Office is an important phase of the general effort to balance the budget and pay something on the national debt. This new revenue is a part of the estimated budget surplus for next year.

Congress is squeamish about raising anybody's rates in an election year and the prospects for this one admittedly are not good. We hope this attitude will change. The vast majority, in our opinion, will not begrudge the extra stamp pennies necessary to insure a sound, businesslike operation for this great public utility.

A Prayer for the Creed of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I welcome the opportunity to place in the RECORD an eloquent and moving prayer in which hundreds joined 2 weeks ago, on the occasion of a dinner given by the Young Democratic Clubs of the District of Columbia honoring Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Father Harry J. Magoulias of Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C., delivered the memorable benediction, which follows:

O Lord, our God, as we depart this evening from this table and communion of love, we pause to recollect Thy sustaining words, "Man liveth not by bread alone." Do Thou, then, we beseech Thee, ever sustain us in Thy love for Thou art the bread of life and the living water of faith.

O Lord, who in Thy mercy and loving kindness dost regard the prayers of all who call upon Thee with their whole heart, incline Thine ear and hear our prayer, now humbly offered unto Thee.

Bless, we beseech Thee, Thy gracious servant whom we have honored this evening; grant unto her many more years of fruitful labor in Thy vineyard.

Be mindful, O Father, of this God-loving Nation. Confirm and strengthen it, keep and preserve it in peace, the peace which cometh from above, the peace of Thy life-giving spirit.

Be mindful, O Savior, of our Nation's leaders, of our Armed Forces, of our country's citizens, and of this Capital City in which we dwell.

In the face of a suffering world let this be the creed of our country, this wondrous land of promise whence flow milk and honey—the creed of humanity enunciated by Thine own living word: "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me;

I was in prison, and ye came unto me: Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." May Thy symbol of faith, O Lord, our God, forever be the soul and heart and life force of these United States. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

The Real Castro—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the last of a series of articles on the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, published in the New York Daily News. The last installment appeared in the issue of March 12, 1960:

MERE MINUTES SEPARATE HIM AND THOSE HE FEARS

(Last article of a series)

Behind Fidel Castro's almost hysterical attempts to sell himself and his regime to the Cuban people—attempts that have taken the form of circus trials, rob-the-rich-and-help-the-poor land grabs and TV and radio attacks on the United States—lies a growing fear of his enemies.

He's not as cocksure as he was a year or so ago. He knows that his foes are busily organizing in areas within a short bomber hop of Cuba.

He's worried and he has reason to be.

One of those reasons is a hard-bitten, lean, gimlet-eyed man whose son was killed by Castro's soldiers—Gen. Jose E. Pedraza. As of this moment, he represents the greatest single threat to Castro and his regime.

Pedraza is a man of mystery who lives quietly in Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic. He shuns all reporters and publicity. He's passionately anti-Communist, anti-Batista and anti-Castro.

The general has highly skilled followers in the Dominican Republic and many more in Cuba—some of these last within Castro's armed forces. Born 56 years ago in Espezanza, in the Province of Santa Clara, he joined the Cuban Army in 1919 as a private and rose to the rank of general.

GETS S O S FROM A WORRIED BATISTA

From 1933 to 1939 he was the head of the Havana police. In 1939 he became chief of the Cuban armed forces, serving until 1941, when enemies informed Batista that Pedraza was disloyal. As a result, he was placed on the inactive list and exiled to the United States.

About 18 months later, cleared of the charges, he returned to Cuba and became a cattle rancher, fading into obscurity until Christmas Day, 1958, when a desperate Batista recalled him just before Castro began his march on Havana. The assignment lasted exactly 1 week and he was forced to flee Cuba.

Pedraza is dedicated to the destruction of the Castro government. Whether this determination is based upon his hatred for Communists or because his only son, Rodolfo Pedraza Patino, 29, was ambushed and murdered by Castro soldiers near Manacas, in Santa Clara, cannot be verified. Confidants of the general claim his mission is not inspired by vengeance.

HIS REPUTATION: TOUGH, BUT JUST

He is a religious man—meticulous, efficient, grimly silent, and conservative. The few men who make up his intimate circle of friends describe him as physically powerful, with the large, rough hands of a farmer. His black hair is graying at the temples and he seldom smiles. He is an ardent friend of the United States.

As a police chief, he had a reputation as a tough, but just, disciplinarian. He maintained perfect peace and order in a hard-to-manage city without creating enemies and had the habit of roaming the streets after dark without the protection of the bodyguard which usually accompanies such officials in turbulent Latin American countries. He is absolutely fearless.

During the Batista regime, Pedraza was given the task of putting an end to Communist demonstrations in Cuba. He did the job in his usual efficient manner.

There is no other man capable of taking on the task of wresting Cuba away from Castro.

Rolando Masferrer is another man whom Castro fears—and hates. But Masferrer, a former senator, attorney, newspaper publisher, and the head of a gang of terrorists that did a lot of Batista's dirty work, has the support only of Batista followers.

In Miami, Masferrer heads a group that is well-heeled and knows all the tricks needed to start—and possibly complete—a revolution. But there is a hitch. The Cubans are unwilling to accept him because of his past.

Yet, so greatly does Castro personally fear this powerfully built, ruggedly handsome man that recently he sent men to kidnap him from his Miami home. The plot was thwarted by an FBI agent, who posed as a venal deputy sheriff and "accepted" \$25,000 to lure Masferrer to a waiting ship.

GAVE CASTRO THE HEAVE-HO

"You might say that I was Fidel's tutor," he told the News. "In 1947 I organized an expedition against Trujillo and the Dominican Republic. Castro was one of the men I helped train. Even then he had a bad temper, was insolent, arrogant, and intolerant. He was so bad for morale I had to remove him from command of a platoon. That was at Key Confites, on the north coast of Camaguey. We had 1,500 men, PT boats, and about 15 planes—with members of the famed Flying Tigers flying them.

"But the thing was called off. He has tried to kill me before this. He wants me badly. He has given me a death sentence in absentia. He's scared because he knows I know means of fighting him."

Masferrer is said to have left Cuba with \$17 million. He grinned, and said, "All I can tell you is that I don't own a car, that my wife does the cooking and household chores, and that I don't have a big bank account."

SOURCE OF DOUGH? HE'S NOT TALKING

The money to fight Castro must be coming from some place but Masferrer won't talk about it. He has his own counterintelligence service and gave the News a list of the more active Castro agents in Miami and New York.

"There are 2,000 exiles ready to fight," he said, "and many thousands waiting for the call in Cuba. Our main trouble is that the anti-Castro groups are not under one leadership."

Masferrer is confident, however. "I've made Fidel Castro run before," he said, "and I'll do it again."

Also gunning for Castro is the FAYCA—Fuerzas Armadas y Civiles Anti-Comunistas, the armed and civilian forces against communism.

FAYCA was created in early 1959 and boasts a membership of more than 4,000 in Cuba. Former navy officers, former army officers, mechanics, pilots, radio operators, and armament experts are included in its ranks.

The brains of the underground organization are in Miami, Central America, and New York. From Central American points, they have been sabotaging Cuba's sugarcane fields almost nightly with incendiary bombs.

The FAYCA invited the News team to fly on one of its missions out of a Central American base, but the offer was rejected. Castro has used less than this for anti-American propaganda.

Destruction of the cane, ironically the principal Castro weapon when he was fighting Batista, has been principally in Oriente and Camaguey, the two largest sugar-producing provinces. Millions of pounds of cane have been destroyed.

On January 20, in Batabano, Havana Province, the headquarters of the 26th of July movement were burned to the ground. Eight days later, Havana was without electricity for more than 4 hours as the result of anti-Castro sabotage of a powerplant.

None of these incidents has been reported in the government-controlled press.

Castro has troubles elsewhere, too. In New York, the White Rose movement is gaining impetus. It is headed by Fidel's ex-brother-in-law, Rafael Diaz-Balart, and it must gall Fidel to realize that his only son goes by the name of Fidel Rafael Castro Diaz-Balart.

Diaz-Balart, who was Castro's best friend during their student days at Havana University, said: "Castro, since the beginning of his public life, has shown he is a completely unscrupulous man. His only values in life are the acquisition of power—by any means."

SAYS MARX, ENGELS ARE CASTRO'S GODS

"His bible is the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. I separated from him because he was a murderer and a Communist. He has no respect for either God or human life.

"He is not, nor has he ever been, an idealist. He is a pure and simple farsante—a liar, a pretender. It is a tragedy that he has been able to fool so many people of good faith, but now the Cuban people—as well as the other people of the free world—are getting to know the real Castro."

Castro, his beard, his gestures, his fatigue cap and his personal magnetism made a big hit when he came to New York last year. Cubans here, as well as native New Yorkers, greeted him like a conquering hero—which he was at that time.

Now, they are among the disenchanted.

Gen. C. P. Cabell, deputy director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, testifying last November before a House subcommittee investigating administration of the Internal Security Act, said Castro had delegated authority in key areas to Reds.

RED PROPAGANDA A HIT WITH FIDEL

"In turn," he said, "he appears to be increasingly susceptible to Communist propaganda, which is designed to exploit 'evidence' that the United States is an enemy, to discredit charges of Communist influence in Cuba and witch hunting—or, as they call it, maccartismo—and to glorify the Cuban revolution, and particularly the agrarian reform, as a pattern for the liberation of the masses in other Latin American countries.

He added: "At present, therefore, their (Communist) primary interest is to influence Castro in favor of an aggressive anti-imperialist nationalism supported by non-Communists, but which will defend the rights of Communists to express their views openly and engage in legal activity."

This is a cautious estimate of the situation.

Castro, despite his enormous ego, is beginning to feel the pangs of uncertainty.

He also recognizes the danger of the underground groups—for it was he who coordinated similar groups to stage the revolt that sent Batista into exile and resulted in

the entrenchment of the Reds who now run Cuba.

COLLECTOR'S ITEMS: ARMS AND FUNDS

He is desperately collecting arms and funds, with agents dealing in every market of the world—Belgium, Paris, Miami, New York, and the other key spots where guns, ammunition, bombs, planes, tanks, and flamethrowers can be had for a price.

His TV and radio appearances are calculated efforts to keep the Cubans at a high emotional pitch. He is so afraid of being assassinated that he moves from house to house, hardly ever spending two successive nights in the same one.

Beyond that, he is courting Russian intervention and aid to his country and he dreams of the day when Cuba will be the hub of Latin America. This from the man who prattles against imperialism.

A great many dictators and revolutionary leaders—most of them more powerful than Fidel—have fallen victims to their own consuming ambitions during the past 60 years of Latin American history.

The United States is facing up to the fact that Castro is not the Messiah.

Maybe the Cubans will be next.

Bond Rate Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, February 27, 1960:

BOND RATE CEILING: NO DEAL

For a time it appeared that Treasury demands for a lifting of the bond rate ceiling and congressional committee criticisms of debt management policy might end in a compromise. But if so, the agreement has been deferred.

The Joint Economic Committee demanded at least three changes in Treasury methods before it would assent to removing the 4½ percent limit on long-term Government bond interest. On each point the committee had a persuasive argument but Secretary Robert B. Anderson also had a specific rebuttal.

The first was that long-term bonds should be sold by the auction method. Theoretically this should have an advantage, but Mr. Anderson said experiencing in auctioning 1-year bills indicates it may increase the cost to the Government.

The second was that long-term bonds, especially those issued in times of the high interest rates, should be made callable after a certain period. This is a common practice by corporate borrowers and seems desirable notwithstanding the objection that a temporarily even higher rate may be necessary to make them attractive to investors.

Third, the committee urged that long-term borrowing be concentrated in periods of low interest rates rather than high. This would seem obvious except that, as Mr. Anderson pointed out, the periods of low interest rates are those of recession when capital ought to be encouraged to go into home and factory construction instead of being sopped up by the Government.

All in all, the hearing on these points suggests that the Treasury should have as much latitude as possible and at the same time should maintain flexibility. Meanwhile, the case for removing the artificial interest ceiling

ing, so that the Government may pay a going rate for money and spread its borrowings beyond a 5-year term, remains a valid one.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland on March 13 under the auspices of the Slovak League of America, at ceremonies commemorating the 21st anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence—Slovak Independence Day:

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

I am honored by your invitation to speak on this eve of the anniversary day of Slovak Independence. I deem it a privilege to associate myself with the ages-long inspiration and struggle of the Slovak people for their national independence. Long years of study of the Slovak nation and the aspirations of her people have convinced me that the cause of human freedom has a staunch and proven ally in the Slovak nation.

The cause of the Slovak nation has been much maligned in recent years, particularly since World War II. A concerted effort has been made to brand the leaders of the Slovak independence movement as Nazis or Nazi collaborators. This attack stems from several quarters and is by no means restricted to the propaganda organs of the Russian imperialists. Those who seek to degrade the cause of the Slovak nation play upon the general public's ignorance concerning the historic aspirations of that ancient and honored nation. The opponents of the national independence movement, whatever hue and color they may be, have made the Slovak nation the symbol of their determined effort to preserve organized tyranny, colonialism, and imperialism.

Because of recent attacks made against the just aspirations of the Slovak people, I would like to set the public record straight on several important points.

The first is that the Slovaks are a nation who trace their history back for more than 1,000 years. This history is replete with examples of the struggles of the Slovak people to throw off a wide variety of alien occupations and dominations. During and following World War I this popular movement toward self-government and complete national independence was led by Monsignor Hlinka, who founded the first truly democratic party in that country. Monsignor Hlinka had been imprisoned for his views on Slovak independence. He was released from prison and immediately went to Paris to plead the cause of the Slovak independence before the leaders of the great powers then meeting to work out a peace settlement. Following this appeal for the Slovak nation, Monsignor Hlinka returned to his homeland where shortly thereafter he was again jailed for insisting on the right of the Slovak people to absolute and complete national independence. These are some of the reasons why Monsignor Hlinka stands today as one of the bright symbols of his countrymen in their continuing struggle for national independence.

It is a fact of history that the Slovak nation became a part of the Czechoslovak federation against the will of most of her national leaders. It is also a fact of history

that the Slovak people were treated as second class citizens by the Benes regime which ruled the Czechoslovak federation following the death of Thomas Masaryk. It is little wonder then that the Slovak people felt no sense of loyalty for the Benes regime and others associated with him in discriminating against the natural rights of the Slovak people. It is understandable that the Benes regime was thus unable to stand up against the dictator Hitler and as a consequence, both the Czech and Slovak people were viewed as easy game for the tyrant on the march. With the fall of Czechoslovakia, it was to be expected that the Slovak people, true to their traditions, would make a renewed effort for their national independence. History records that the Slovak people declared their national independence and being caught between the totalitarianism pincers of nazism and Russian communism, fought a valiant battle to preserve their identity as a nation. Hitler attempted to make Slovakia a vassal state, completely subservient to the will of nazism, and in this effort he failed completely. Thus the Slovak people and their leaders were faced with the task of preventing both the Nazis and Russian Communists from gaining a foothold in their country.

During the days of World War II the Slovak leaders had the single purpose of preserving the national integrity of their country. This was a tremendous challenge because agents of the twin tyrannies of nazism and Russian communism were attempting to destroy the newly independent state. In these circumstances the Communists charged the Slovak independence leaders with being Nazi collaborators, and at the same time, Nazi agents were seeking to take over the country under the guise of protecting it against Communist infiltration. These are the facts in the case. These are the facts I have found after many years of careful and intensive study of the role of Slovakia during World War II.

The price Benes paid to the Russians for the reconstruction of the Czechoslovak federation was complete subservience to the masters in the Kremlin. The treaty which Edward Benes signed with the Russians at a Kremlin meeting during the closing days of World War II led to the Communist enslavement of both the Czech and Slovak nations. This was a terrible price to pay but Edward Benes, whatever his motives may have been, was prepared to pay this price.

It is important to know that in contrast to the charges being made against the Slovak nation by Communist agents in the free world, the leaders of the Russian Kremlin are attempting to win the loyalty of the Slovak people by recognizing the popular aspirations for complete national independence. It is a well known fact that the Russians have attempted to secure support and approval from the leaders of the Catholic Church in Slovakia in exchange for granting their country complete national independence. It is to the everlasting credit of the leaders in Slovakia that they have refused to engage in any deals or bargains with the Russians even when it involves a promise of national independence. The Slovak people and their leaders know that the only way they will be victorious in their fight for national independence is to remain firmly attached to the spirit of individual liberty and freedom. They also know that any deals with the Russian imperialists would be selling their rich heritage for a mess of pottage.

I am convinced beyond any doubt that the most powerful force at work in the world today is the national independence movement. We have seen the inspiring victories of this movement in farflung parts of the world, from south and southeast Asia to the Middle East and Africa. No less than 20 nations have won their national independence since the end of World War II. The day is not far distance when every colonial and dependent

territory in the free world will have its national independence and complete self-government. This powerful human force is the moving spirit among the masses behind the Russian Iron Curtain. The captive nations behind that Iron Curtain are struggling to throw off the chains of the new Russian imperialism, the new Russian colonialism. In this struggle the Slovak nation takes second place to none, because the people of Slovakia are in the vanguard of this national independence movement. I am equally convinced that the Russians are finding it impossible to hold their empire together and that they desperately seek the cooperation of the United States in maintaining their slave empire. This is the real meaning of status quo. This explains the frantic efforts of the Russians to force the United States, France, and Great Britain into a second summit conference. Therefore the second summit conference to be held in Paris May 16 presents a great opportunity for President Eisenhower—an opportunity which he must seize if our country is to maintain its leadership as champion of a peace with justice for all nations and people. President Eisenhower can strike a powerful blow for the cause of peace with justice by going to Paris with a dynamic political action program. Here is what I mean by a dynamic political action program.

The 86th Congress enacted the Captive Nations Week Resolution which is now known as Public Law 86-90. Public Law 86-90 is a public declaration of American foreign policy and intention toward all the nations and people held in Communist bondage. This declaration of intention states simply and clearly that the United States recognizes the right of all these submerged nations to their national independence. It is imperative that President Eisenhower make certain that the Russians understand that we mean business by the terms of this resolution. He can do this best by challenging the Russians to permit free and unfettered elections in all the captive nations, such elections to be under United Nations supervision.

Such action on the part of President Eisenhower will put into sharp focus the basic and fundamental cause of world tensions. The President can, with confidence, assure Khrushchev and the other Russian leaders that if they accept his proposal there will be no further need for talks on disarmament, talks on banning nuclear bombs, talks about the control of outer space, and such other matters as are basic to the question of peace or war. It is a certainty that free and unfettered elections held in all the captive countries will resolve each and every one of these problems because such elections will result in the complete dismemberment of the modern day Russian Empire, which alone stands as a threat to the peace.

While the Captive Nations Week Resolution does not distinguish the Slovak Nation as a separate and distinct nation, a development which was beyond the control of those of us who brought about its passage, such action by the President would have equal force and effect for the Slovak Nation. I say this because free and unfettered elections under United Nations supervision would present all the people concerned with a series of options. These options would, in all justice, require the following:

- (1) The right to remain under the domination of Russian imperial communism.
- (2) The right to accept or reject previous or existing federative arrangements.
- (3) The right to establish independent governments, irrespective of previous geographical and political settlements.
- (4) The right to determine the form of government which the people concerned determine most likely to guarantee them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those who know the true story of the Slovak nation in history would have no fear whatsoever of accepting such a formula because it would give to the people of Slovakia the rights which have been denied them for all too long. Such a formula would settle, once and for all times, all outstanding questions involving the Slovak nation.

If President Eisenhower fails to confront the Russian dictators with the full meaning and serious purpose of Public Law 86-90 it will be fair and proper for the American people to say that the second summit conference was nothing more than a part of the "mirage of peace" and a further step along the road to appeasement. It is now widely held in the United States that the Khrushchev tour of our country, accompanied as it was by complete access by him to all our mass media of communications, particularly television, was an important part of this "mirage of peace" concocted by the Madison Avenue soap salesmen. This was intended to be a 1960 political special in which the "mirage of peace" would be used to justify the Republican campaign slogans of peace, prosperity, and progress. Fortunately for the cause of peace with justice, the "mirage of peace" has now been exposed as a fraud and a massive deception of the American people.

For those who innocently believe that by allowing Khrushchev to see firsthand the great industrial power of the United States, he would be dissuaded from his evil ways and would, practically overnight, give up the communist objective of world conquest, the evidence is overriding to the contrary. Khrushchev has interpreted his visit to the United States as a sure sign of the triumph of communism in the world, as an indication of weakness on the part of the United States, as reason to believe that the policy of appeasement guides our foreign policy. Our allies in NATO and SEATO have begun to wonder whether the United States has wearied in its task of leading the cause of human freedom. The uncommitted peoples of the world are showing dangerous signs of looking towards Moscow and its claims to represent the wave of the future. The people of the captive nations behind the iron curtain are surely wondering whether the United States is being led down the road to associating the destiny of our Nation with the Russian despots in a common effort to hold the slave empire of communism together. This, my friends, is the Pandora's box in the field of world affairs which President Eisenhower's invitation to Khrushchev has opened up.

But there is a brighter side to life than that which results from the Khrushchev visit to the United States. There are ever growing signs that the people of the United States are becoming restless and dissatisfied with the many failures of leadership by the Eisenhower administration. The American people will not long suffer at being second best, too little—too late, and a national posture of passivity in circumstances of opportunity calling for dynamic action.

Foreign policy will be a major issue in the fall campaign because the failure of the Eisenhower administration to develop a realistic policy to advance the cause of freedom and national independence for all nations has made it an issue. The Eisenhower administration has turned its back on the fight for national independence now raging behind the Russian Iron Curtain. The overriding problem facing the American people today is to put a new President in the White House who publicly rejects the road to appeasement and who sets a steady course of meaningful political actions along the road to peace with justice for all nations and all people. The history of our country teaches us that in periods of crisis great and enlightened leaders rise up to lead us out of confusion, uncertainty, and fear. Our people

recognize the perilous situation into which our country has fallen and their demands for such leadership cannot be denied. I am confident that we are at the doorstep of a new and dynamic era in which the United States will return to a position of world political leadership.

In conclusion, I give you my assurance that I shall continue my efforts to make the great moral and political principles of our country the cornerstone of all our actions and programs in the field of world affairs. With our country returned to the firm leadership of men who will permit no compromise of these sacred principles, you and I can be confident that Slovakia will soon be free and independent.

Problem of Mass Transportation in Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, digest, and memorandum in regards to the problem of mass transportation in metropolitan areas:

BOSTON & MAINE RAILROAD,
Boston, Mass., March 8, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: The problem of mass transportation in the metropolitan areas has become a Federal Government problem for these reasons:

1. Over 65 percent of our total population lives and works in metropolitan areas.
2. The Federal highway program of 1956 has caused the building of great arterial highways in the metropolitan areas which, unfortunately, are no longer functional in the peak commuting hours.
3. The municipally owned transit systems of the United States and the great majority of the commuting railroad lines are not in a financial position to develop by themselves a sound mass transportation system.

The solution of the problem requires the cooperation of the Federal, State, and local governments, in order that short-range and long-range planning be introduced to develop a sound plan of mass transportation in these metropolitan areas.

Because the Federal Government controls the highway program, no plan can be evolved without its cooperation.

Legislation is needed to establish within the Department of Commerce a plan to extend financial assistance to State or local governments or public authorities. The Department would be charged with the responsibility of financing for these metropolitan areas a system of mass transportation during the peak commuting hours at the lowest possible cost, whether it be by highway, municipal transit, or commuting railroad.

Mr. Patrick H. McLaughlin of the American Municipal Association is coordinating the sponsorship of legislation to accomplish this purpose and will call upon you to discuss this matter shortly. Attached to this letter is a short digest of the proposed bill; also a copy of my idea of the position of the commuting railroad.

We hope that you will give serious consideration to our suggested solution and

assist in developing an overall plan which will benefit the great majority of our people.

Your sponsorship of the legislation would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

PATRICK B. MCGINNIS,
President.

DIGEST

The legislation contemplated sets up a Mass Transit Financing Corp. in the Department of Commerce, with an authorized capitalization of \$500 million, to be used as a revolving fund for advancing long-term, low interest loans to State or local governments or public authorities operating or providing transit and commuter service.

These loans shall be used to acquire equipment, land, stations, right-of-way, tracks and track materials, electrification facilities, or other real or personal property necessary for the operation of transit or commuter service.

The loans are made to duly constituted public bodies and not to private operators. The States, municipalities, or public authorities will in turn contract with the private operators for certain mass transportation services to serve the people in their area, and on the basis of such contracts lease the equipment to the private operators.

The loans are to be used, not only for rail commuter service, but for all forms of mass transportation, including bus, subway, rapid rail and other forms of mass transportation.

WHY ARE FEDERAL LOANS REQUIRED?

In the case of rail commuter service, no railroad can presently borrow money for equipment because the railroads are losing millions of dollars on commuter service, and no banker would lend them money to finance a deficit operation.

No private enterprise can be expected to continually sustain losses and stay in business. The only alternatives for the railroads are to raise their rates to the point where they will drive customers in private automobiles, to cut down service with the same result, or to abandon service entirely.

Similarly if other forms of mass transportation aren't improved and extended to rapidly growing suburban areas, the people from these areas will be forced to move in and out of the metropolitan area solely by private automobile. When you reach the outer stretches of these areas it is not profitable for private operators to operate presently, nor can they borrow money from private sources for such unprofitable service.

The alternative is to move all of the people in and out of metropolitan areas by private automobiles. The costs of moving the same number of people by highways and providing parking space, police and traffic controls, etc., is so fantastically high as to be almost beyond human comprehension. In just the five cities of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, and Cleveland, the cost of providing highway facilities to move the same number of people who move by mass transportation presently would be over \$30 billion.

WHY CAN'T THE PROBLEM BE HANDLED LOCALLY

What creates the problem of mass transportation is the fact that people are moving over a vast metropolitan area, which extends across city, county and State lines. There is no jurisdiction with authority to tackle the problem in its entirety, even if it had the tax resources to do it. The core city does not have the authority to tax its residents to provide facilities outside of its boundaries to serve people who live outside of its jurisdiction. Cities must help in the solution to this problem, and will to the limits of their resources, as will States, but a combined local-State-Federal approach is required to solve the problem.

WHAT IS THE FEDERAL STAKE IN THE PROBLEM

At the present time, 65 percent of the Nation's population live in the 170 metropolitan areas affected by this problem. In the next decade 80 percent of our population will live in these city-suburban complexes.

Not only our national defense but our national economy depends on the industrial, financial, research, university, medical, and other facilities located in these areas. If people cannot move in and out of these centers the repercussions on our national economy will be staggering.

The Federal Government is committed to a highway program, to which in some categories it contributes 90 percent of the revenues. If mass transportation services collapse the Federal funds required to move people by highways will soar beyond the capacity of the Nation to finance it. The Federal Government is also pouring millions of dollars into urban renewal programs which will be entirely wasted if mass transportation does not keep pace with urban renewal.

Even the farmer living in the most remote section of the country is affected directly, because if railroads lose millions of dollars in metropolitan commuter operations they can only recover such losses by increasing freight revenues, which affects the price paid on every commodity and manufactured article used in our national economy.

THE POSITION OF THE COMMUTING RAILROADS
(Memorandum by Patrick B. McGinnis)

Subsidies to our competitors have existed for a long time and continue to expand. Railroads operating on strict private enterprise principles may not be able to exist indefinitely in competition with other modes being assisted generously by Government.

The suburban services which a number of railroads perform at substantial losses are basically required to be performed not for the benefit of the railroads but as an essential public necessity in the interests of a balanced and economical system of transportation in the large metropolitan areas. Participation by Government at any or all levels in providing this essential public service is no more a subsidy or a form of public hand-out than is the maintenance of police protection, fire protection, and other community services. No one can logically suggest that it is unsound for Government to undertake any activity which is primarily a public function and thus not basically a task of private citizens. For example, there is no business market for long-range missiles and other forms of armament and it is only natural and proper that Government finances this entire effort. And, what is more significant for our purpose, it is impossible to suggest that the private companies receiving Government contracts for producing these commodities are being subsidized or aided by Government.

We feel strongly that there has been a failure to place the commuter problem in its proper setting, and a tendency to assume that any Government participation in any phase of railroading is a subsidy and will be the entering wedge for ultimate public ownership. We are dealing with a situation which has no relationship at all to farm supports and housing subsidies. No law compels farmers to operate farms or people to buy houses. The law does, in effect, require railroads to perform suburban services; and this only serves to emphasize that those operations are essential in the broad public interest and lend themselves to treatment as a type of essential Government function.

It is simply not true that government participation in any activity leads inevitably to government ownership or complete control of that activity. Our competitors in the transportation business are perhaps the very best example of the fallacy of this idea.

They have been assisted by public expenditures in numerous ways over a period of many years and we find today that they are actually under far less government control or regulation than are the railroads, who have always posed as champions of private enterprise. Actually, when it comes to problems such as suburban services, we are firmly convinced that the very best assurance we can have of avoiding an ultimate financial crisis and government ownership will be to have government assume some responsibility for providing these essential public services which cannot be performed profitably by private enterprise alone.

What we have said so far explains our views on the validity and even the necessity of Government participation in providing suburban rail services in metropolitan areas. With regard to the part the Federal Government should play, we must remember that it is already deeply involved in providing transportation facilities in all areas of the country, including the heavily populated metropolitan areas. This is a vast and costly program from the standpoint of highway facilities alone. Thorough studies by impartial authorities into the overall problems of transportation in metropolitan areas have demonstrated that the improvement and extension of rail suburban services, and other mass transportation facilities, will be less costly to Government than an attempt to duplicate those facilities with urban highways. For this reason Federal expenditures in connection with participation in the commuter problem will actually save the Federal Government money.

To our minds, the suburban service problem is one which should be dealt with honestly and forthrightly.

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Hungarians are one of the sturdiest workers and courageous warriors in Europe. They have worked hard in making their naturally picturesque land one of the most beautiful countries in Europe, and they have fought valiantly for their freedom and independence. But they have not always enjoyed their freedom in the past, and particularly during the first half of the 19th century when they were held down by the oppressive regime of the Austrian empire. Under its iron-fisted and arch-conservative leader Metternich, that government did everything in its power to hold down all subject nationalities and stifle their national aspirations. But this was not an easy thing to do in the case of the Hungarians. They were restive, clamored for reforms, demanded freedom and independence. They had their chance in the revolution of 1848.

In that year Hungarians were prepared to stage a revolution of their own for the attainment of their goal. But as the forces of freedom and liberty were gathering momentum, and those of despotism were weakening, revolution proved to be unnecessary in Hungary.

As the startling news from Paris and Vienna reached Hungary, a band of youthful idealists in Budapest held a bloodless demonstration on March 15. They presented their grievances and demanded freedom and participation in the government. Fortunately for the government and for all concerned, these demands were met: Freedom was granted, and a new day dawned for the Hungarians on that March 15, 112 years ago. Today on the observance of the anniversary of that day, unhappy Hungarians still yearn for their freedom from Communist tyranny.

President's Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in his column printed in the New York Times of March 7, 1960, Mr. Edward H. Collins presents a thoughtful analysis of the annual report of the Joint Economic Committee dealing with the President's Economic Report. I have requested permission to have Mr. Collins' column included in my remarks and it follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1960]
CONGRESSIONAL STUDY—AN ANALYSIS OF
UNIT'S ECONOMIC REPORT FINDS IT BASED
UPON A FALSE PREMISE

(By Edward H. Collins)

For the second time in a little more than a month the Joint Economic Committee of Congress has published a report in which the Democratic majority and the Republican minority are so far apart that they have filed separate reports. The newest of these documents, which was released last Monday, is the regular annual report dealing with the President's Economic Report.

In the preceding report, that on "Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," published on January 26, the distinguishing characteristic was that the cleavage between the majority and minority rested on grounds more serious than mere disagreement on policy.

The most important single issue raised by the minority on that occasion concerned the quality of the majority report, and hence its usefulness. To the minority it was "partisan, cavalier about simple rules of logic and evidence, and disrespectful of legitimate differences of values, opinions, and judgments."

POSTULATE CRITICIZED

There can hardly be any doubt that the majority courted just such criticism, which is perhaps the most serious criticism that can be brought against the authors of what is purportedly an objective study of an issue of major importance.

That was the postulate that there had been a letdown in the rate of economic growth since 1952, when the previous administration went out of office. It was this basic assumption that was supposed to have justified the year-long \$200,000 inquiry of which the January 26 report was the capstone, despite the fact that the assumption rested on a statistical foundation that can only be described as completely spurious.

It is possible to show, of course, by taking the right number and combination of years (such as 1947-52) that over that period the rate of economic growth was not far below 4 percent. But how meaningful is such a figure when subjected to even the most superficial examination? It does not tell one, for example, that Mr. Truman's administration consisted of 4 years of peace and 3 years of war, or rearmament on a wartime scale; that if one takes all 7 postwar years the annual rate of growth drops from 3.9 percent to, roughly, 1.5 percent; or that when one separates the 4 peacetime years from the 3 nonpeacetime years one is confronted with the startling discovery that not only do the former reveal no net growth, but an average annual decline in the rate of growth of 2.2 percent.

This is the historical foundation on which the meretricious "4-percent average" was contrived, a figure that has been sedulously employed to convey the notion that there must have been a magic in the economic policies of the Truman administration that we have not been able to recapture over the last 7 years.

Plainly, if the majority members of the Joint Economic Committee regarded it as their appointed task to validate this preposterous thesis it would have been unrealistic to have expected from them a set of findings that aspired to either objectivity or consistency.

REPORT IS SCORNE

Nor is it surprising to find that the most recent report, which emerged last week, should have produced even more strident criticism of the kind associated with its immediate predecessor. Indeed, the "Additional Views" inserted in the report by one of the most highly respected members of the minority—Senator PRESCOTT S. BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut—deals exclusively with the quality of the majority findings. The Senator declares:

"At one time reports of this committee were entitled to serious consideration by the legislative committees of Congress, by the Executive and by professional economists. That time has passed. Their specific recommendations in this report will most likely be ignored by the legislative committees which their own party controls in this Congress—and has controlled since 1954. Instead of a useful guide to public policies they have written a campaign document for the 1960 elections.

"Were it not for the fact that valuable additions to economic knowledge are often made in papers prepared by contributing economists I would recommend that the committee be abolished. It fails to discharge its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946."

The majority's findings with respect to the President's Economic Report are, as a matter of fact, little more than a warmed over version of those contained in the report on "Employment, Growth and Price Levels," and, if anything, even more slipshod.

ADMINISTRATION ASSAILED

Reverting to the latter's thesis of the administration's "failure" in the area of economic growth, it hazards, for example, the suggestion that the administration has failed to act "quickly and promptly" in dealing with cyclical downturns in the economy. Perhaps this is carping criticism, but somehow that explanation sounds strangely unrealistic when one recalls that the contraction of 1957-58 is reflected in only two quarterly figures on the gross national product—those of the fourth quarter of 1957 and the first quarter of 1958.

By contrast, for example, the 1948-49 recession started from the fourth, and peak month

of 1948, and its performance as late as the fourth quarter of 1949 was one that might be better described as one of "flattening out" than turning up.

It would be difficult to convey the full flavor of the majority's findings in the limited space available here, but one finds it difficult in reading it to get far away from the conviction that it is essentially an effort to justify the preconceived views of the authors, or the things the authors would like to think were true.

Nowhere is this more clearly apparent than in its observation at one point that "the administration's fight on inflation resumed in November of 1958 after a year of stable prices. The result is [was?] an unemployment rate higher than it need have been or should have been."

Now, let us pass over, in the interest of timesaving, the fact that the record would seem to show that the change of direction in money policy had been initiated at least as early as August. And let us ignore, also, the fact that unemployment, as measured by adjusted percentage of those out of work, reached its high point in August, declining steadily from the 7.6 percent shown in that month to a double bottom of 4.9 percent in May and June 1959 (the 2 months, it so happens, that immediately preceded the month of the steel walkout).

The important point here is that having become accustomed to repeating it on every possible occasion, these more or less full-time critics of the Federal Reserve have obviously convinced themselves that that body is actually dedicated to but one task, namely, the task of halting inflation, actual, potential, and even imaginary. Fortunately for all of us, the Federal Reserve has not itself been similarly convinced.

One would suppose that it would have been obvious to even the most hardened enemy of flexible monetary policy that Reserve policy in mid-1958 was not concerned with price inflation, but with the staggering outflow of the Nation's gold, then proceeding at a rate of close to \$250 million a month. And we can thank the Reserve for the fact that though some find the present level of gold stocks disturbing, they could have easily been \$2,500 million lower had the money policies of early 1958 been retained.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress To Enact Legislation Amending the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

"Whereas it is advisable to raise the maximum which an individual can earn while obtaining full social security benefits from the present \$1,200 a year to \$2,500 a year, and to permit wives to earn more than the present maximum of \$1,200 a year: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give early and favorable consideration to the enactment of legislation to amend the social security laws to raise the maximums which may be earned under the social security laws; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth."

House of representatives, adopted, February 29, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

Clerk.

Senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 2, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Tax Relief for the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing sentiment in our country to provide tax relief for disabled persons. I was glad to see in today's New York Times an editorial endorsing a bill introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

The Keogh bill would permit disabled taxpayers to deduct the cost of transportation to and from work. I might add that I have introduced similar bills in the last two sessions of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

TAX RELIEF FOR THE DISABLED

For the past two sessions Congress has had before it a proposal for tax relief for the disabled. Introduced by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of Brooklyn, the measure would permit disabled taxpayers to deduct the cost of transportation to and from work and would provide an additional exemption for a taxpayer (or wife) who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.

There are compelling arguments in favor of these proposals. Persons with disabilities nearly always have extraordinary expenses in the production of income. Their inability to deduct such expenses means that they get very little or no net return for their work. Many end up with less actual cash than if they accepted public assistance. This is not good medicine for them, nor good economics for the Nation.

Persons who are disabled to the point that they cannot care for themselves also incur expenses far beyond those that can be deducted under the medical-care provisions of our income tax laws. Mr. KEOGH's proposals would give them the same additional exemption which is now available to those who are blind or over 65.

This proposal, if enacted, would mean only a small loss of income to the Federal Government—a loss far outweighed by the moral and practical issues involved.

Congressman Gilbert's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my annual report to my constituents. The report will cover legislative work done by the Congress, and my efforts in behalf of the people I represent.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Medical Care for the Aged—Government Cure Is Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the labor-boss-led battle to foist socialized medical care on the American people reaches its height in political pressure, the editorial pages of America's great newspapers are patriotically pointing out the pitfalls inherent in such a step.

To anyone who is knowledgeable about the typical labor boss tactics the endeavors on behalf of the Forand-Kennedy socialized medicine proposal can be likened to the labor-boss-inspired objections to the Landrum-Griffin bill of last year. Last year the labor boss was against ridding the labor movement from corruption; this year the labor boss wants to corrupt the quality of medical and hospital care through socialization.

Examples of editorial comments on this unwise and ill-considered endeavor were recently contained in the Chicago Sun-Times, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the Chicago Daily News. As a part of my remarks I will include these editorials at this point in the Record.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 25, 1960]

RIGHT CAUSE—WRONG CURE

To insure that all persons over 65 who need medical care shall have it—and particularly to insure these senior citizens against financial ruin by "catastrophic" illnesses—is an obligation that this country must face.

But to assume—as do the sponsors of the Forand bill—that the way to bring this about is by bringing old age health insurance into the social security program is unsound to the point of recklessness.

The Forand bill—rejected last year but now before Congress once more—would increase the social security tax (already scheduled to reach 9 percent) and with the proceeds make available to some 16 million eligibles a maximum of 120 days' free combined hospitalization and nursing home care per year. Surgical care would also be provided. Most of the eligibles are over 65.

Our first objection is that this measure would convert social security into something it was never intended to be. Up to now it has provided benefits in money, alone. The Forand bill would turn it into a compulsory health insurance program, and in effect, reduce the money benefits in proportion to the individual's and employer's investment. In terms of individual desires and needs social security and health insurance are entirely separate matters; they should not be lumped together.

But the Forand bill would also put politics irrevocably into the health insurance business on a massive scale. No private insur-

ance company could compete against the Government. And all that is good about the private, personal relationship between physician and patient would, we believe, ultimately be lost as the Government forced the medical profession (and the patients) into an impersonal, socialized system. Individual choice of physician would be increasingly difficult. Patient and doctor alike would be forced into a rigid schedule of fees. Administrative waste and bungling would inevitably increase. Malingering would almost as inevitably increase, crowding the hospitals with freeloaders, running up costs of services and new facilities.

In the course of time the present anticipated ceiling of 9 percent on social security taxes could be pushed upward to 15 or 20 percent. This is the kind of confiscation that leads to socialism, across the board. In this case, moreover, it would immediately place the whole burden of financing medical care for the over-65 people upon the younger people still actively contributing to social security. Meanwhile, it would do nothing whatever for those millions of older persons who are not now covered by social security.

We do not take the medical profession completely off the hook in point of responsibility for conditions as they are. We believe doctors have generally been unduly slow in working out schedules of fees which older people of limited means could pay without undue burden. There are unquestionably many older persons whose life savings have been totally and swiftly consumed by the high costs of prolonged treatment and hospitalization. And private insurance companies, although making progress, have not yet been able to make moderate-cost catastrophe covering available to all the millions who need it.

The Health Insurance Association of America estimates that about 43 percent of our over-65 people are now covered by health insurance. They estimate that the proportion of coverage for those who want and need it will reach 75 percent by 1965, and 90 percent by 1970.

Short of the socialized medicine route, what can be done to speed the spread of this vital coverage?

We suggest that the medical profession move promptly to survey its own fee structures for the over-65 group, and as rapidly as possible bring them into line with what the patients can afford.

We suggest that the insurance companies make special efforts to provide essential coverage to this group for the lowest costs consistent with sound operations.

Finally, we urge the Federal Government to take a bold look at the possibility of subsidies to make up the difference, in cases of authentic need, between the actual cost of providing the insurance and the amount the patient can afford to pay. One such method would be to make additional Federal assistance funds available to the States, which in turn could funnel the money through the regular facilities of private insurance companies to older people of demonstrated need.

We don't like subsidies, but we also believe the health and dignity of the Nation's older people is a high-priority obligation that the Nation must accept. A program such as outlined above would, at least, be preferable to turning the whole program over to the Government and imposing socialized medicine

upon a whole broad segment of our population.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Feb. 27, 1960]

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MORE TAXES

Taxes are a primary function of the House Ways and Means Committee, and that is the reason most of the social security bills are before that committee. They are primarily tax bills. If enacted some of them would mean TAXES—in capital letters.

A measure like the Forand bill, for instance, would probably hit taxpayers—by way of pay envelope deductions—for about \$2 billion the first year, followed by a big increase year after year. This is the one so drawn as to get the socialization of medicine under way. It would grant to all social security old-age pensioners and dependents (also those eligible for the pension) 120 days a year in hospitals and nursing homes and pay the physicians. The service would have to be obtained from hospitals and doctors listed by the Welfare and Health Department. The Government would pay the money, not to the pensioners, but to the hospitals, nursing homes, and doctors.

This venture into socialism would cost real money, of course. Its sponsors say that it would increase the social security pay envelope deductions only one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent—at first, anyway. But the fact is that the payroll cut is already up to 6 percent and in another 9 years will be at least 9 percent without any further liberalizations and without the Forand bill. The way things are going the deduction soon could be 12 or 15 percent (half from employee and half from employer). Add that to the Federal income tax deduction of 20 percent or more plus still more deductions to come, and it can be seen that the take-home could be pretty badly shrunk. Some States are working on the envelope deduction for State income taxes (which are tending to rise) and there is a bill in Congress now to authorize the Government to deduct city transaction or income taxes from the salaries of Government employees for the account of the city governments.

As an election year gesture, Congressmen feel bound to do something in line of social security—at the public expense, naturally. Maybe they are not quite ready to take the leap into Forand socialism but there are plenty of other envelope-deduction plans they can choose from. Senator JOHN KENNEDY has one in to allow people 65 or over, 90 days of hospitalization and 120 days of nursing. That would be very costly also.

The administration, acting through the Welfare and Health Department, is expected to come up with a counterproposal to grant any person 65 or over a hospital policy (not surgery or medical) that would pay the hospitalization after the beneficiary paid the first \$200 or \$250.

In connection with these bills, the public, it seems to us, needs to consider two things: How much payroll deduction it can stand for these social security liberalizations and how far it wants the Government to go with its medical socialization.

Within a few years, we surmise, practically everybody will be covered with private pre-paid medical and hospital policies, if the present trend is not interrupted with Federal socialization. The real problem here is to provide policies that will reasonably

meet the soaring cost of medicine and nursing. Some hospitalization policies are now fairly adequate but generally insurance policies for medicine and surgery for people over 65 are either too costly or are inadequate.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 1, 1960]
VOLUNTARY MEDICAL CARE BETTER THAN U.S.
HANDOUT—HELP FOR THOSE PAST 65

A few generations ago, health care of the aged posed no particular financial problem. The family gave grandpa such nursing as they could, with the counsel of the family doctor. If there was no family, the elderly fended for themselves as long as they could, often with the aid of neighbors, and quietly died, believing it to be so ordained.

Today there is a vast machinery of medical science and hospital care to lessen pain, to heal and to prolong life. Since it exists, the prevalent view is that a reasonable amount of it, at least, should be available to everybody regardless of personal means.

The reason medical care costs so much today is because it is so extensive and because we use so much of it. The problem then arises of how to finance care for the aged who can't afford it.

The Illinois State Medical Society is sponsoring a low-cost insurance plan to meet surgical and in-hospital medical expenses for persons 65 and older. Planned through Blue Shield, it will cost about \$1.65 a month. The society is exploring a Blue Cross plan that will apply to hospital costs.

The alternative approach to this and other private insurance is the proposal that the social security system be expanded to include medical care to retired persons. The Forand bill now in Congress is designed to accomplish this.

The proponents of this are usually those who urge Federal subsidies for schools, for public power systems, for depressed areas, and in other fields. Consciously or otherwise, they favor a socialized state in which the distribution of benefits is unrelated to individual contribution—and, more importantly, where there is an intense concentration of political power.

A scant generation ago, the Forand bill would not have received serious consideration. The thought of taxing someone else for one's personal benefit was foreign to our tradition. We would have rebelled at the suggestion of a giant bureaucracy selecting a physician or a hospital for us, and clipping our paychecks to pay for it.

It goes almost without saying that the Forand bill would open the door for a full program of Government-run medical care, with age limits removed and membership compulsory. This would spell the doom of the many voluntary plans such as that of the Illinois medical society.

Nobody can guess the future cost to the taxpayers, but \$2 billion a year is estimated for a starter. Sooner or later the dubious "trust funds" from special taxes for these Federal programs would be found useless. Then we would become frankly the wards of the Government, with general taxes distributed as our wardens saw fit.

One man's guess is as good as another's as to the extent to which malingering, overutilization of hospitals, and the nature of the system itself would impair the quality of medical service.

Such issues as this one have probably become so imbedded in emotions, depending upon how much one thinks he is going to get "for nothing," that discussion will not prove fruitful. For ourselves, we consider that the voluntary plan would not only best preserve individual independence but give the country better medical care.

West Virginia Undergoing Period of Economic Transition Which, When Fulfilled, Will Provide a Broader and More Secure Foundation for Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette's issue of March 12, 1960, an article the editor of that newspaper invited me to prepare on future prospects in West Virginia and to discuss some of our State's needs in the field of Federal legislation and administrative actions.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA UNDERGOING PERIOD OF ECONOMIC TRANSITION WHICH, WHEN FULFILLED, WILL PROVIDE A BROADER AND MORE SECURE FOUNDATION FOR PROSPERITY

(By JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

We have been seeking to diagnose the major economic ailments which beset the State of West Virginia, to evaluate the human and material resources we can bring to bear in providing a cure, and to indicate briefly some of the lines of future development.

There is no element of belief on my part that our economic problems are those of a dying State. The pangs we presently experience are growing pains, not those associated with senility and decay.

There is abundant evidence that West Virginia is undergoing a period of economic transition—though a painful one in some sections—which, when fulfilled, will provide a broader and more secure foundation for the future prosperity of our State.

Our present problems, as well as our future promise, are but different aspects of the transition which emerge from the technological revolution at work in West Virginia and throughout the country. And, in the long run, there cannot be valid objection to the use of machines where men once served in mining and manufacturing—provided that we find economic use and devise adequate living standards for the humans thus displaced. This is one of the fundamental elements of the challenge to which we must address ourselves, and it is to this goal that the creative efforts of both private enterprise and government must be devoted.

TWO FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES

The objectives toward which we should work seem to fit into a fundamental two-fold pattern: first, to relieve the immediate effects of the poverty and distress brought to many of our citizens by continued and long-standing unemployment; second, to lay the foundations for long-term development of a balanced economy and the wise conservation and utilization of our national resources.

As a Senator from West Virginia, a major portion of my endeavor during the past 16 months has been devoted to efforts to help seek the fulfillment of these two goals.

Criticism has been directed at me for some of the actions taken on behalf of West Virginia, some claims having been made that I have painted too bleak a picture of the circumstances prevailing in our State. As asserted heretofore, I recognize that public officials are subject to condemnation as well as commendation. It is my hope always to be able to accept both with equal good humor and awareness of the circumstances from whence they arise. But I must emphasize that we do not solve problems in this life by looking the other way or by lulling ourselves into a false sense of security in the belief that they do not exist.

Earlier in this discussion the opinion was expressed that the best efforts of both private enterprise and Government must be devoted to the building of a better State. It has been pointed out, too, that all elements for success are present. If the constructive potentials of private enterprise, government action, and individual initiative are fully developed and made to complement each other—rather than clash—real progress for West Virginia will be assured.

INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN PROVIDES IMPETUS

But in this field, as in others, the initial impetus must come from the enterprise and imagination of the individual citizen. Such a person is Hayes Scott, of Mill Creek, in my home county, who has built a thriving business through his own vision and drive and the natural resources immediately at hand. He started by buying dead chestnut trees, which he hauled home in short sections in the back of his old model Ford. He then trimmed and fashioned chestnut rails and posts for the rustic fence industry. As the market widened for his product, Hayes Scott employed his neighbors, so that he now has an average wintertime work force of 40 men and a summertime peak of approximately 80 men. He has, in addition, expanded his operations to include hardwoods for the furniture industry.

This is but one of many instances of the individual initiative of West Virginians. To preserve and foster its development, and to prevent the demoralization of our people and the destruction of their health, we dare not permit chronic unemployment and lingering distress to continue. In attempting to serve the most immediate needs of eliminating such distress, the State's delegation in Congress has been in the forefront of the constant efforts to increase the quantity and variety of food supplied under the surplus commodity distribution program. We have sought, and will continue to press for the augmentation of the inadequate diet afforded by the few items of food available under this program. Though our efforts thus far have been frustrated by the failure of the national administration to use the means at its disposal, we shall continue to strive to communicate a sense of urgency to members of the executive branch.

A PROGRAM FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Over and over again the testimony recorded during official hearings by Senate committees in West Virginia, and substantiated by constituent correspondence, bluntly and forthrightly states: "West Virginians don't want handouts—they want work." The desire and the will to work is another of our assets which we must preserve through area redevelopment aid in conjunction with industrial development and diversification; by research to find new products and markets for our coal industry and agriculture; by furthering useful public works; by stepping up water antipollution programs in spite of executive decrees to the contrary; through expediting needed military construction and utilizing Government-owned former defense production plants, such as those at Mor-

gantown, South Charleston, and Huntington, for private peacetime production; by qualifying for and utilizing Federal aid for airport improvement and modernization; and by conserving our natural beauty and natural resources and expanding the State and National forests and parks, including the Monongahela National Forest, the Harpers Ferry National Monument, and a proposed Washington's Western Lands Monument area.

All of these would increase tourism, enrich the economy, provide needed employment for thousands of West Virginians, preserve much of our heritage, and help restore dignity, health and self-respect to many of our citizens presently in distressed circumstances.

As one of the Senators from West Virginia, I am dedicated to every activity and desirable result so stated. In most efforts I have been joined by my colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and our State's delegation in the House in the advocacy of appropriate action or indicated legislation—some of it pending in the Congress, some enacted by the Congress and in effect, and some of it passed by the Congress and disapproved by the President.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY IMPORTANT

To further help in stabilizing and, hopefully, to improve the vitality of our basic coal industry, I strongly advocate legislation to bring into existence a sound and necessary national fuels policy, and I am the chief sponsor of a measure in the Senate to bring this into being. The West Virginia delegation in Congress has achieved an active role in successfully advocating mandatory controls on residual fuel oil imports—and we must be vigilant and aggressive in working for the maintenance of this procedure for protecting coal's domestic fuel markets against unfair competition from abroad. There must be equal effort expended on behalf of other of our important industries, especially glass and pottery.

Better opportunities for small enterprises to survive and thrive must continue to be explored. In this respect, there have been some helpful developments in recent weeks for small businesses and small industries in both the northern and southern parts of West Virginia through loans made by the Small Business Administration under liberalized legislation which I supported. We must also work to procure more technical assistance from the SBA facilities.

There is an increasing awareness of the worth of the programs administered by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. There must be additional participation by West Virginia in the programs administered by this agency, especially to increase home building starts, urban development and renewal, and to provide more college dormitory facilities.

BETTER ROADS AND ENRICHED EDUCATION

Certainly collateral with any substantial improvement of the economic and social aspects of our State should come better roads and expanded and modernized education facilities with an enriched curriculum. It is an unfortunate truth that the high cost of living for the individual, and the increasing cost of operations in commerce and industry, also are experienced by the public roads and educational systems. Although there seems to be general countrywide acceptance of and reliance on Federal aid for highways, it is paradoxical that the same is not true with respect to advocated Federal aid for public education.

Yet, as we have reiterated in this series of articles, the people are West Virginia's most important assets, and nothing will contribute more to the development of our human resources than the improvement of our public educational system.

The importance of the individual was again brought to my attention with considerable impact during a recent conversation with a young woman from West Virginia. While preparing this article, I received a visit from Janet Lea Cavender, a charming senior at Morris Harvey College.

Miss Cavender was in Washington as one of six 4-H Club members representing a total nationwide membership of two and a quarter million youth. She is the first person from West Virginia to have achieved this annual distinction in the 4-H movement. During our conversation the Charleston girl referred to her interest in international relations and her desire to help alleviate tension between the people of the world. "But," she remarked, "Senator RANDOLPH, I am just as interested in helping to solve the problems of West Virginia."

With the devoted interest and assistance of young people like Miss Cavender, who see their own community in relation to the world, we possess the certain proof that our West Virginia of the future will usher in a challenging era of notable achievements.

Suffering in the Wake of the Movement of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been a great campaign organized and put into effect by the various State and subdivisions of government.

This campaign has been designed to attract industry into a given State or community.

Too few of us have taken time to study this campaign and the net results of its operation.

In many communities the movement of an important production facility has meant personal and business hardship beyond the ability of the community and its people to sustain.

Every now and then industries are moved for one reason or another.

The plight of those severed from their jobs had been given very slight notice or attention by either the newspapers or the general public.

In this regard it seems that the adage of "It depends upon whose ox is being gored," best describes the attitude of those who think they are benefiting from the movement and displacement of industry.

The seriousness of this situation is best described in the letter which follows these remarks.

The case described shows vividly what happens when a production facility is uprooted and the workers are severed from their jobs after years of service and faithful work.

No matter what the reason, the results are the same.

The failure of Congress to recognize this type of unemployment, coupled with spending of millions of Federal dollars to create the very conditions pertinent to

the Nuttall case, may cause very serious disruptions in our economic future.

This case is shocking in its apparent disregard for the families deprived of their means of making a livelihood.

With the approval of organized labor leaders, chambers of commerce, and the Manufacturers Association, this Nation has been building production facilities abroad which have cut into the American market and has without a doubt caused a great deal of permanent employment.

If we continue on this disastrous route and if Congress passes H.R. 5 (Boggs, Louisiana), entitled "To Aid Foreign Investment" by American individual and corporation investors you can look for many more "Nuttalls" all over the United States of America.

I want to say that Congress should immediately start to inquire into the entire picture of the movement of, closing of, and curtailing of industrial enterprise.

In order to give all of you a firsthand view of the situation insofar as one community and its workers are concerned I submit a letter from the President of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Albert J. Fitzgerald:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., March 11, 1960.

Congressman JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: Approximately a year ago I sent two letters to the Members of Congress dealing with the effect of corporation policies upon the lives and welfare of American workers. The first letter, dated January 31, 1959, dealt as you may recall, with the calamitous effect upon employment of the runaway plant and runaway job policies of the two largest corporations in our industry, the General Electric and Westinghouse companies. The second letter, dated March 23, 1959, dealt with the destruction of jobs by the collusive, profiteering pricing policies of these same corporations, as exemplified by the loss of an important TVA turbogenerator contract to an English firm.

I am writing you now to call to your attention a particularly shocking example of corporation irresponsibility and callousness toward employees of many years' service.

The Westinghouse Electric Co. is abandoning one of its oldest plants, the Nuttall Gear Works. It is terminating the employment of some 400 employees. The average length of service of the approximately 270 production employees represented by this union is more than 25 years and runs as high as 42 years.

These are people of the highest skills. The Nuttall Gear Works has been famous for 2 generations, and the Westinghouse Co. has drawn profit and prestige from the work of these employees for many decades. The company still requires the products that the Nuttall workers make, but intends to manufacture them elsewhere because to do so will increase the profits of the corporation.

The Westinghouse Co. employs approximately 40,000 people in the area surrounding the Nuttall plant. Nevertheless, it refuses to continue the Westinghouse employment of the Nuttall people in its other operations in the area. This deprives workers of many years' service of valuable pension and other rights of seniority, as well as throwing them into the street without means of making a living. Naturally in

a plant where the average length of service is as great as at Nuttall, the workers discarded by the company are seriously handicapped because of age in obtaining other employment.

Westinghouse takes the position that for its own pecuniary advantage, it may, without responsibility or liability, inflict crushing financial loss upon its own employees.

While going through the motions, the company has thus far refused to bargain collectively in good faith on the future employment status of the Nuttall employees. It has, on the other hand, persistently attempted to circumvent its collective bargaining obligations by a barrage of threats against individual workers. It tells them that unless they accept a meager and discriminatory severance and insurance proposal made by the company when the plant closing was announced, that the company will dump them without paying anything at all.

This union, the UE, is asking that the company provide employment for these 270 workers among the 40,000 other workers it employs in the area. Failing that, we ask that pension, insurance, and severance arrangements be made that come somewhere within rifle shot of the needs of the workers and the responsibilities of the corporation.

We ask your support in achieving these very modest objectives. It must be remembered that no Nuttall worker stands to gain a single thing by what we ask—that he will only escape some, not all, of the crushing burden the company proposes to lay upon him. Further, the company can still give fair recompense to its workers and increase its profits by the move.

Westinghouse is a rich company. Last year it increased its net profits by 15 percent, on an increase of less than 1 percent in sales. It did so with an average employment 2,000 less than in depression 1953, and 16,000 fewer employees than in 1957.

Westinghouse is a callous and irresponsible company in its relationship to its employees, as evidenced in the Nuttall and other similar situations.

I ask you on behalf of the Nuttall workers to communicate with President Mark Cresap of Westinghouse expressing your human concern at the plight of these workers, your interest as a consumer, and your concern as a Member of Congress charged with watching over the rights and equitable interests of the people.

The situation at Nuttall is symptomatic of a much larger problem that requires congressional attention.

Against the concentrated economic power of the big corporations, the ordinary American city is powerless. There is now no law that interferes with the ability of a corporation if it chooses for the sake of greater profit, or other private advantage, to pass economic sentence of death upon a community and its citizens, and to carry it out totally free from any legal responsibility or liability for the consequences of its act. A corporation is at present legally free to condemn any number of thousands of its employees, no matter what their length of service, to all the privations of long-term or perpetual unemployment, and the community in which they live to economic stagnation and bankruptcy.

In the view of this union, the exercise of such economic power without clearly defined legal responsibility is intolerable and urgently requires the serious attention of Congress.

Yours sincerely,

ALBERT J. FITZGERALD,
General President.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an outstanding editorial which appeared in the February 8, 1960, issue of the Sumter Daily Item. It is entitled "We Must Fight Desperately To Salvage Our Government," and contains some very strong points against the various proposals for general Federal aid to education. The Item is ably edited and published by Mr. Hubert D. Osteen, and has on its staff a very talented and highly respected editorial writer, Mr. Harold Booker.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST FIGHT DESPERATELY TO SALVAGE OUR GOVERNMENT

(By Harold Booker)

The U.S. Senate voted last Thursday to give the States \$917 million a year for 2 years in Federal money for school construction and teacher salaries.

A dispatch from Washington says that a Presidential veto seems likely if the bill ever gets to the White House carrying its present total of \$1,834 million.

This total is small compared to that proposed by Senator CLARK, a Democratic spender from Pennsylvania, whose plan to provide \$1,100 million a year indefinitely in Federal grants to aid construction and teacher salaries was defeated Wednesday night. The vote on this plan, shocking as it may seem, resulted in a tie and Vice President Nixon wisely cast the deciding vote against it.

Anyone who followed closely the debate on this measure in the Senate could see that the supporters of the measure are believers in a big government, a government that will be the master of the people instead of its servant.

The story is told that as Benjamin Franklin came out of the final session of the Constitutional Convention, a woman approached him with the eager question, "Well, Doctor, what have we got—a Republic or monarchy?" Franklin replied, "A Republic if you can keep it."

It has been within the last 30 years that any serious threat to our form of government developed. Until the hectic days of the New Deal the people of this old Republic withstood their misfortunes and setbacks as our forefathers intended they should. But in the days of the New Deal we began to weaken and to become more and more dependent upon the Government.

Those early Americans who wrote our Constitution and founded the United States were deeply aware of the dangers growing out of big Government. They knew that government in itself had a capacity to accomplish a mushroom growth and a basic tendency to usurp the freedom of the governed. The Founding Fathers therefore recognized as their foremost task that of defending future American generations against a government that would become dominant over the individual.

It was the view of our Founding Fathers that the government must be held to the role of servant—not master—of the people. Its creators foresaw the dangers that would beset it. They knew that a force greater than the weakness of human nature would be necessary to preserve it. Being unwilling to trust men they ordained a government of laws. They feared—and rightly so—that George Washington called "that love of power and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart."

The fear was expressed in even stronger terms by Thomas Jefferson when he said: "It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights. * * * In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of a Constitution."

Obviously these early architects of our Government knew what they were about. It is unmistakably clear that the revered liberty would be destroyed by the weakness and whims of men—and could be maintained only by the strength and constancy of the law.

Particularly within the last 30 years the greatest task of governing our country has been the struggle to keep government down to size—to administer according to law rather than according to man—to hold steadfastly to that fine line of distinction between the rights of the individual as against the protection of all. In recent years, sad to relate, people have generally been losing and big government has been winning.

We are even losing our freedom to refuse the monetary assistance of the Federal Government. As an example we cite the case of a county in eastern Ohio which carried on a 4-year fight against accepting Federal aid for their totally and permanently disabled citizens. The county commissioners said they were able and willing to do the job themselves. But the Ohio State Supreme Court handed down a decision that the county commissioners had to accept Federal aid whether they wanted it or not—because their refusal would endanger the handouts for the 87 other counties in Ohio.

It is inevitable that with every acceptance of Federal aid we yield a bit more of our local independence. We shrink the measure of self-reliance given us in the original distribution of human virtues. Actually, we lose a portion of our total character. Increasing control of the individual by government that grows bigger and bigger is truly immoral because it results in a steady deterioration of the individual's character.

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics in the State of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, as a salute to cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of Indiana, performed under the auspices of the Purdue University Agricultural Extension Service, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I should like to call to the at-

tention of my colleagues the noteworthy increase in the service's activities during 1959.

Mr. L. E. Hoffman, director of the program, has informed me that a steadily increasing number of urban families are benefiting from the services of Purdue's agricultural extension staff. This past year, 129,511 urban Indiana families were provided with assistance.

Of pride to all Hoosiers, I am sure, is the fact that Indiana had 86,766 boys and girls enrolled in 4-H Club work last year,

which represents an average of 954 members per county. As Mr. Hoffman points out, I think it is quite interesting to know that 51 percent of these boys and girls came from nonfarm homes.

Mr. Speaker, the extension service's activity in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, has been, and I am quite certain will continue to be, highly laudable. A summary of extension services for 1959 in Indiana's Sixth District reveals a remarkable degree of program bene-

fits extended. Families assisted by the program in making changes in agriculture or homemaking total 22,254, of which 10,265 were farm families, 5,187 rural nonfarm families, and 6,802 urban families.

The following summary tabulation indicates by activity breakdown and county the signal agricultural and homemaking contributions rendered by Purdue's Agricultural Extension Service to the people of the Sixth Indiana Congressional District:

Summary of extension activities, 1959, 6th Congressional District

	Warren	Fountain	Vermilion	Parke	Vigo	Putman	Henricks	Montgomery	Boone	Hamilton	Total
Personal consultations	6,883	3,500	3,538	6,937	12,168	11,797	5,289	7,057	5,066	6,205	68,500
News articles prepared	238	176	111	385	364	275	123	465	217	679	3,033
Radio broadcasts prepared					244						245
TV broadcasts prepared			3	9	93	3			1	6	115
Publications distributed	2,786	2,257	3,974	2,258	6,973	7,940	8,686	3,607	1,501	5,635	45,617
Meetings held by agents	342	278	324	623	600	460	361	336	503	333	4,250
Meetings held by leaders	466	426	466	300	1,023	902	813	924	487	851	6,652
Number of local leaders assisting in the program	463	544	351	452	623	1,029	834	760	424	925	6,345
Number of home demonstration clubs	18	21	16	23	40	34	43	51	32	39	317
Number of members, home demonstration clubs	400	460	329	650	1,047	606	950	1,129	687	833	7,091
Number of 4-H Clubs	25	29	23	27	64	33	49	26	30	35	341
Number of 4-H members	597	714	407	813	2,261	990	1,376	971	907	1,157	10,193
4-H members from farms	396	362	165	593	706	437	583	537	595	506	4,910
4-H members, rural nonfarm	79	147	223	220	622	274	453	186	177	407	2,788
4-H members, urban	122	175	19		933	279	340	248	135	242	2,493
Families assisted by the extension program in making changes in agriculture or homemaking:											
Farm	600	900	475	878	1,120	1,247	1,925	1,300	800	1,020	10,265
Rural nonfarm	61	420	240	410	600	841	885	900	175	650	5,187
Urban	175	280	80		545	967	505	3,600	175	575	6,802

Barry Scobee: Historian of Trans-Pecos, Tex., and Leader of Fort Davis National Historic Site Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, able and energetic Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD of the far west Texas district is the leader of the congressional effort to have old Fort Davis in Jeff Davis County, Tex., declared what it in fact is, a national historic site.

To aid in this, I have introduced a Fort Davis bill in the Senate as S. 3078.

But the man who has worked for 35 years on this task of preserving this important historic site for the American people is Judge Barry Scobee of Fort Davis, a Missouri-born Texas historian and newspaperman. His life is worth noting here.

It has been briefly sketched in a Sunday feature article by Ray Camp in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for Sunday, February 28, 1960, under the title: "West Texans Awaiting Action on Fort Davis."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the February 28, 1960, article from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram entitled "West Texans Awaiting Action on Fort Davis."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST TEXANS AWAITING ACTION ON FORT DAVIS

(By Ray Camp)

FORT DAVIS, February 27.—Citizens of this beautiful little top-o'-Texas town are delighted over recent dispatches from Washington that Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD, first, and now Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH have introduced bills to designate old Fort Davis as a national historic site.

All west Texans, in fact, will share satisfaction with the mountain folks if the proposed congressional action is adopted.

To Barry Scobee, of Fort Davis, the measures offer fulfillment of the hope long cherished. For 35 years he has urged that the old fort, one of the most important and picturesque frontier outposts, be restored and preserved for enjoyment and inspiration of the Nation.

Well it might, for it is located in surroundings of surpassing natural beauty, and midway between two great national attractions, the Big Bend National Park, a few miles to the south, and the Carlsbad Caverns, a short distance north, the three linked by splendid highways.

LOCKE OBSERVATORY

Also near Fort Davis, and all served by the 74-mile Scenic Loop that traverses the mountains, are the internationally famous McDonald Observatory atop Mount Locke, the Harvard-U.S. Air Force Radio Astronomy center, and the delightful pueblo-type Texas State Park Indian Lodge.

Scobee has been an able and consistent chronicler of the folks and facts, the lure and lore of this fascinating region. Many of his articles and scores of fiction stories based on the area have appeared in national periodicals. Two of his booklets, "The Story of Fort Davis," and "The Steer Branded Murder," and a book, "Old Fort Davis," have had wide circulation.

Leading newspapers of the Nation, including the Star-Telegram, for years have carried his news and feature stories.

Scobee was born in Pollock, Mo., learned the printing trade at Unionville, and as printer and cub reporter earned his way through State Teachers' College, Kirksville, Mo. He then hit the road to see the world as printer and/or reporter in the Midwest, ending up by enlisting in 1907 in the U.S. 9th Infantry. Last year of his hitch was in the Philippines. He returned to Missouri immediately to marry Miss Katherine Ford at Kansas City in 1911.

MARKET FOR STORIES

They headed southwesterly, working for various newspapers, and reached San Antonio in 1914, where he was a reporter 3 years, with the Express first, then the Light. By then he had developed a steady market for his fiction, and when a historian offered him a chance to do some research in the Davis Mountains area, Scobee accepted, and he and his wife arrived in Fort Davis March 31, 1917.

A few months later he entered officer training camp, but almost immediately the war ended. He went to Fort Davis again to edit the Fort Davis Post, but left soon for Bellingham, Wash., where he was courts reporter and feature writer on the Morning Herald 3 years.

Fiction sales continued to increase, much of it west Texas in flavor, so he hied himself back to Fort Davis in October 1925, for keeps. The Scobees took naturally to the life of ranch folks, and for years he traveled the region, with ear to ground for fact and fiction material. He became a welcome hand at roundups, and expert with branding irons. Once at the J. W. Merrill 7 U Bar Ranch he branded 120 calves in 120 minutes, as ropers brought the bawling animals to the branding fire.

TOP O' MILE HIGH

Scobee helped in 1939 to organize the Mile High Club and three times was president of the group, which functions somewhat as chamber of commerce for the area. He likewise helped form in 1953 the Fort Davis Historical Society, a group devoted to research.

On the death of Nick Mersfelder, noted border lawman, in 1939, Scobee was appointed justice of the peace for Fort Davis, a post to which he has been regularly reelected. His office is in the Jeff Davis County Courthouse, on the lawn of which he has developed a beautiful arboretum, including about 40 types of trees native to west Texas.

Letters to the mayor of Fort Davis, to the fire chief, to the chamber of commerce, find their way to his pleasant little office. There began correspondence that led to establishment of the McDonald Observatory, the Harvard-U.S. Air Force radio astronomy installation, and other advances for the region.

The Scobees have done a lot of happy living in this mile high town, rich in friendships, legends, and lore.

The Massacre of Budapest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the uprising of the Hungarian people against the Russian regime on March 15, 1948, has been a monument to the Magyar Nation which has, throughout history, remained faithful to the Western ideals of freedom.

In the Hungarian uprising of 1956, this historical tradition has again revealed itself to the world and proved that the imposition of the Communist ideology on the people of Hungary has failed and that their spirit could not be broken. Thus, the Hungarian people have in a manner triumphed over their Soviet hangmen.

However, and this is a matter of conscience to all of the Western world, these undaunted people are today enslaved by the sheer might of the Soviet army.

No amount of words can ever justify the massacre of Budapest, nor can diplomatic casuistry ever justify any further concessions to or coexistence with the Bolsheviks while present conditions in Hungary exist.

The Soviet rulers may talk about coexistence and they may haggle for peace in the world on their terms, of course. They may raise the issue of Berlin and peddle disarmament proposals. But, it is folly to ignore the fact that they have under their thumb millions of captive human beings, while operating today with the same unvarying purpose of ultimate world conquest that existed in their minds in 1917.

We must remain aware of this and we must avoid any consideration or agreement on issues which would black-out the actual situation existing in Hungary and the other enslaved nations of the Soviet colonial empire.

The issue of Soviet conquests must be brought to the fore and kept alive at the forthcoming summit meeting. We must stand firm if we agree to bargain with the butchers of Budapest, and we must force them to consider the plight of the captive nations before we consider their cover-up issues.

Nixon Has Made the Vice Presidency an Important Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as citizens of a Republic created to provide government "of, by, and for the people" we recognize that local, State, and national elections—even though these may interfere with the day-to-day regularity of carrying on the business of the people—are significant—in fact, fundamental—to our free way of life.

Since our Declaration of Independence in 1776, the Nation, as we all appreciate, has experienced tremendous growth and progress. As a result, there has arisen a need for new, more effective ways to carry on the business of the people.

In recent years the spotlight has focused especially on the office of the Presidency and the tremendous magnitude of its responsibility.

As Senators, we are well acquainted with the broad scope, complex challenge of representing millions of citizens in our respective States. The Office of the Presidency, of course, involves the responsibility of attending to the business of all the people which we here represent collectively—as well as involving other myriad broad-scope national and international problems and challenges.

In the light of the ever-growing burden on the President, there has been increased concern as to just what should be done to keep the functions and responsibilities of the Presidency within realistic boundaries.

Under the Constitution, we elect a President and a Vice President. Throughout history, men of great ability and integrity—both Republican and Democrat—have occupied both offices.

Unfortunately, however, there has been a reluctance, historically, to utilize the Office of the Vice President as an effective, functional office, bearing a proportionate share of the executive responsibility.

Currently, there has been a creative, commendable effort during the present administration to change the trend. Wisely, the President has made provisions for greater participation by the Vice President in the affairs of the Nation.

The policy of President Eisenhower—carried out, for the most part, to a larger degree than previously in history—provides, I believe, a key to resolving the problem of lessening the tremendous burdens on the President of the highest office in the land.

As the second highest office in the country, the Vice Presidency can and should serve a functional role, bearing a proportionate share of the load; and in any regrettable instances of temporary, or permanent incapacity of a President, it should be so integrated in the wheels of operation that there would be mini-

mum interruption in the work of the executive branch.

Naturally, the involvement of more responsibility upon the Vice President presumes, of course, an incumbent capable—and willing and able—to shoulder a larger share of the Executive burden.

In such a role, Vice President Nixon has done a remarkable job.

In view of what I strongly feel is a need for assumption of even greater responsibilities by the Vice Presidents of the future, however, I believe the American people will want to take an especially close look at the qualifications and capabilities of the candidates for this high office in the 1960 elections.

For upon this office, of necessity, I believe will—and should—evolve more and more responsibility of the executive branch of the Government—leaving the President greater opportunity to deal more exclusively with the really top level problems, decisions, and challenges.

Overall, the Eisenhower-Nixon teamwork, I believe, has established a real foundation upon which to build further for the future.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published a constructive editorial relating to this Presidential-Vice-Presidential co-operation. Reflecting upon the situation that is of real concern to all American citizens, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON HAS MADE THE VICE PRESIDENCY AN IMPORTANT OFFICE

During Vice President Nixon's visit to Milwaukee recently he told newspaper reporters that the old methods used to select vice presidential candidates are now obsolete.

The old method of course was to select a candidate whom the party leaders believed could carry along with him the strong support of the section of the country in which he lived.

There was no thought or very little thought of his other qualifications for the office for indeed little was required of him except to preside over the Senate. All of this changed because of the relationship between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon. In the past the candidate for President has been consulted on the selection of a Vice President, but the main reason for the selection was often the belief that the candidate might add some strength to the ticket. Vice President NIXON, it is generally conceded, will be the Republican candidate for President. As such he will undoubtedly have a great deal to say about the choice of Vice President. He laid down his version of the new rules for such a choice which very briefly are that the candidate for Vice President should have views similar to those of the President, be able to handle the expanding duties of Vice President, and be able to serve as President.

Always in the past when a vice presidential candidate was chosen it was well known that he might step into the office of President upon the death of his superior but little thought was given to that possibility for no party nominates a man for President with any thought that he will die in office.

Because President Eisenhower suffered severe illnesses during his term of office public attention was centered upon the office of Vice President not only because of the possibility that the Vice President might succeed to the Presidency but also because

there was the possibility that he might succeed to the office of Acting President in the event of the incapacity of the President due to illness.

It must be pretty obvious that in such a situation if the Vice President did not have views similar to those of the President the situation would be awkward to say the least. In fact it might be said that the Vice President should be a man in whom the President has absolute confidence. That is necessary if there is to be any thought of turning over the office to him during a period of a President's inability to perform the duties of his office. Thus it would appear that if anything approaching the relationship between Vice President Nixon and President Eisenhower be continued, it would seem that the presidential candidate must have the final say in who is to be his running mate.

People have watched with great interest the obvious interest President Eisenhower took in training Mr. Nixon for the Presidency. It is doubtful if any person in America ever had such training directly for this position. We think the policy of the President and the enthusiastic work of the Vice President have had the approval of the American people. It appears that they have succeeded in converting the office of Vice President into something great and useful. It is to be hoped that both parties will find a way to continue this policy.

The 1960 Program of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had the pleasure this morning of hearing the statement of Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, national commander of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., which was very interesting.

Under unanimous consent, I include the statement as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES A. MCCARTHY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1960, ANNOUNCING THE PROGRAM OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Charles A. McCarthy, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., and I wish to express the appreciation of the national officers and the entire membership of our organization for the courtesy and opportunity afforded by this august body that allows my appearance here today.

In reminding you that on July 18, 1958, H.R. 11077 became Public Law 85-530, I am only building up to the statement that, having been granted a congressional charter, we accepted also the duty and obligation to carry out the objectives and purposes of the corporation as specified in this charter. That does not, however, bar additional activities and endeavors in behalf of and for the veterans of the United States of America in general, and the veterans of World War I in particular.

Let us review, for the sake of handy reference, the objectives and purposes:

(1) To provide for the veterans of World War I an organization for their mutual benefit, pleasure, and amusement, which will afford them the opportunities and means for personal contact with each other in order to keep alive friendships and memories of World War I and to venerate the memory of their honored dead;

(2) To cooperate to the fullest extent and in a harmonious manner with all veterans' organizations to the end that the best interests of all veterans of all wars in which the United States of America has participated, and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of such wars, may be best served;

(3) To stimulate communities and political subdivisions into taking more interest in veterans of World War I, the widows and orphans of such deceased veterans, and the problems of such veterans and their widows and orphans;

(4) To collate, preserve, and encourage the study of historical episodes, chronicles, mementos, and events pertaining to World War I;

(5) To fight vigorously to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, as well as the individual States of the Union and to foster the spirit and practice of true Americanism;

(6) To fight unceasingly for our national security in order to protect Americans from enemies within our borders, as well as those from without, to the end that our American way of life be preserved;

(7) To fight to the utmost all those alien forces, particularly forces such as communism, whose objectives are to deny our very existence as a free people; and

(8) To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

It is quite true that the word "pension" does not appear in any place or at any time in section 3 quoted above in its entirety. However, it is pertinent and necessary to ask your attention to (3) of section 3 as quoted above, "To stimulate communities and political subdivisions into taking more interest in veterans of World War I, the widows and orphans of such deceased veterans, and the problems of such veterans and their widows and orphans."

Let us briefly review one of the greatest and most serious problems that is posed to the aging veteran of that first great world conflict that occurred to us in 1917-18. The man-child born into this world in the closing decade of the 19th century, the boy who came to the defense of his country in the First World War, is of that generation that bridges the gap from the first century of our national existence to the great second century of automation and higher education. He is, for the greater part, one of that generation of boys who had to go to work as soon as he was able to reach up to the handle of a plow, or fit into the position of roustabout in a shoe factory. He is of the generation who was told that "a big boy like you should have a job," and he left that job only when he went to war.

Did he have that job when he returned? Did he have 52 weeks in which to find a job and draw a cushion of \$20 each and every week until the time he might land a job? He did not. What were the opportunities offered for furthering his education, suddenly become so necessary in a world upside-down to prewar concepts and requirements? None. What were the inducements and incentives for starting a small business, securing a small farm or purchasing a modest home? None—none at all. But he did survive those heartache days and months, until he found some sort of a job in a land of silent factories and smokeless smokestacks, found the girl of his choice, raised that curlyhead in the highchair up to manhood

only to see him swept into a later war. The now fast-aging veteran of the First World War gladly paid the soaring taxes made necessary by war, in addition to striving for those benefits in favor of the boy who was to return, if he did return, in order that the son would not have the worry, the disillusionment of walking the streets, the highways and byways, looking for work, while he bitterly asked himself that age-old question, "What Price Glory?"

Once the torn telephone books and ticker-tape turned the old home port into a blizzard but in the months and years that followed things quickly changed. Attacks and vituperations have dogged the veteran of 1917-18. A long and searching study of the Nation's press covering the decades of time since "Johnny Came Marching Home," exposes the astounding fact that almost without exception the veteran of the First World War was the whipping-boy for the editor, the columnist, the commentator, and the cartoonist who required a suitable aiming-point in order to hit that target which is the subconscious mind of the American citizen, taxpayer, and voter.

Only threatening war clouds on the distant horizon eased the attitude of these leaders. In retrospect one is reminded of poor "Tommy Atkins" of Kipling:

"It's Tommy this, an' Tommy that,
An' 'Get behind, you brute,'
But it's Tommy come a-runnin',
When the guns begin to shoot."

A lot of things have happened since little Bill Huska of the Bonus Marchers was shot down in cold blood not too many yards from where I stand. They tried to make out that Bill was no veteran, that he was a radical, but those medals his family hurled away in disgust as his poor, emaciated remains were brought home were not given to him for killing potato bugs. Several of those kids who were driven into the night at that time later coughed out their lives in the Second World War, thus wringing afresh a veteran-father's heart.

It has been said that the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. are just a bunch of disgruntled old men. The question is asked, "Why another veterans' organization?"

While it is true that there are others—and who should know it better than the now old men who founded them and built them—their membership is now predominantly of men of another generation. The natural differences between ages separated by the gulf of a quarter of a century, is accentuated by the type and nature of their service, further deepened by the new viewpoint in national objectives, and colored by the strange but subtle influence of a world transformed by the advent of instant communication and faster-than-sound transportation.

Intelligent and serious-minded citizens realize that the Second World War, triggered by the Pearl Harbor attack, and engulfing our beloved country in years of conflict, also drew a curtain on the bloody adventure of 1917-1918 to the extent that the First World War is relatively forgotten.

That is most clearly demonstrated by the examination of an alleged history, a high school textbook, revealing the astounding fact that the entire story of the First World War is told in exactly 1 paragraph of 26½ lines.

Once, in addressing a class of students and for the sake of proving something to myself, I asked if anyone knew and would tell me when the First World War started. "Pearl Harbor," a big boy answered, "but I don't know the date." "No, no," I cautioned him, "the First World War." "That was when they blew up a ship in Cuba," another one

contributed, "and it was just before Christmas."

At long, long last, the veterans of 1917-18 awoke to the fact that unless something was done, and done quickly, nothing would remain to tell future generations of Americans that once there was a war "To Make the World Safe for Democracy and to End All Wars."

It is true that our organization is for an outright pension. As I travel this great land of ours from coast to coast, I see and hear so much that it convinces me of how badly a general pension is needed by so many of the veterans nearing the seventies in age, and in the twilight of their lives.

But a pension is not all we are striving for. Because we realize the crying need for an increase in payments to the widows of World War I veterans. We know only too well the need to increase the compensation to service-connected disability patients in order that they can meet the tremendous rise in the cost of living. We have witnessed so many dire cases that we strive for the hospitalization of World War I veterans without the "pauper's oath." We feel that there should be no pauper's oath necessary in order for World War I veterans to secure treatment for non-service-connected disabilities. We feel that the problems posed by the veterans' needs for remedial legislation, now and for many years to come, should encourage us to press for a Veterans' Committee in the U.S. Senate, as embodied in S. 19.

Nor is that all. We are striving to build an organization which will be a monument to the veterans of that first great national adventure that sent American boys into European battlefields. Their footsteps followed the legions of Cato, Alexander, Caesar. They trod the terrain of Jean d'Arc and Wellington. They mingled their fresh American blood in the sands that have soaked up the blood of youths for untold centuries.

The Congress of the United States officially recognized this when it specifically stated that we were, "to collate, preserve, and encourage the study of historical episodes, chronicles, mementos and events pertaining to World War I."

And we are reminded subtly but forcefully, that we are Americans, with just as great a responsibility, just as great a call for service now, as nearly a half century ago, in this challenge to the American heritage posed by the enemies from within as well as those from without. So, we are directed by that congressional charter "to fight unceasingly for our national security in order to protect . . ." Again we are pledged "to fight vigorously to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States, as well as the individual States of the Union."

We are directed by that congressional charter "to stimulate communities and political subdivisions into taking more interest in veterans of World War I. . . ."

I repeat, it is true that our organization is for an outright pension. But we are not unmindful of the need for study, examination, and decision, as veterans, on questions of the day, problems of the times. The national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. has developed a national commission within the organization which is making a quiet but comprehensive study of many things affecting the welfare of the Nation—that Nation for which our members once offered their lives.

Yes, we are trying for a pension now because, while it seems only yesterday since Pearl Harbor, by the time that period is repeated there will be left a very few tired old men in their eighties who can say they fought a war which was "to make the world safe for democracy and to end all wars."

Proposed Increase in Interest Rate Upon REA Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Rural Electric Stake in This Issue." It appeared in the March 11 issue of the Rural Electric Minuteman. It deals with the proposal to increase the present interest rate upon REA loans.

For over a year now, we have been besieged with the threat of high interest, tight money, and increased taxes upon REA cooperatives. I cannot agree with these proposals. They appear to be based upon the premise that the battle for REA has been won and it is time to liquidate. It is true that most farmers now have electric lights. It is a fact that REA cooperatives and power districts are established and accepted enterprises. But it is not true that the fight for rural electrification is over.

We need to complete the task of electrifying our farms. And it is in those uneconomical areas where private companies will not go that the need is greatest. We must expand the use of loans to install telephones in rural communities. We must increase the generating and transmitting facilities.

The article clearly shows how dangerous an interest rate increase would be to the REA program and to the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RURAL ELECTRIC STAKE IN THIS ISSUE

Rural electric members probably have a bigger stake in the battle to retain the 4½ percent ceiling than any other segment of the economy.

In the first place, high interest hurts them as consumers, just as it does everyone else. They pay more for houses, clothes, cars, farm machinery and just about everything else they buy.

They have an even more direct interest by virtue of being owners and consumers of rural electric systems.

The advocates of the high-interest policy are waging an all-out campaign to more than double the rate on REA loans. They have succeeded in convincing many people that REA borrowers are parasites because they pay only 2 percent.

Why this concerted attack on the REA rate? Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina put it this way at the recent NRECA annual meeting in St. Louis:

"Because the co-op loan program was written into law and cannot be changed by administrative action, it has become a symbol of resistance against high interest rates in the money world. The REA loan program is a thorn in the side of those who have promoted tight money and high interest rates. It is a source of antagonism to Agriculture Department officials who have hiked hardship interest rates on farmers; it is a point of departure from the smooth operating high interest rates imposed on

housing loans by the Administration. It represents contrariness by a certain group of people to the money lenders who have succeeded in raising their rate of income from every other group of Americans. The co-op program in truth has become the last remaining symbol of reasonable rates of interest on loans of any sort in this Nation."

Advocates of high interest for REA loans are not concerned with the effect it would have on the rural electrification program. Yet it is a fact that area coverage depends upon low-interest, long-term loans.

There was little criticism of the 2-percent rate during the years that it was higher than the cost of money to the Government. The 2-percent rate looks bad to outsiders only when compared to the inflated level of other interest rates.

If the 4½-percent limit on long-term bond interest is lifted, it will undoubtedly set off another round of increases in all interest rate. This will bring even more pressure on the REA rate.

But rural electric members have an even more direct stake in the fight over the long-term bond ceiling.

Three bills have already been introduced in Congress to carry out the administration's new REA interest increase formula. This formula would tie the REA rate directly to the rate the Government pays on long-term bonds. If the 4½-percent ceiling is lifted or bypassed, and the long-term rate goes up to 5 percent or higher, that is the rate rural electric would have to pay under the administration proposal. And to this would be added one-fifth of 1 percent for administrative costs.

It's dangerous to assume that such a bill has no chance of passing Congress. It could, if not this year, then next, or the year after that.

REA's friends in Congress cannot hold the 2-percent rate indefinitely in the face of ever-rising interest costs for everyone else. The pressure to pass the administration bill is tremendous right now, even in this election year.

The only ultimate solution to the problem is to take action now that will help check and reverse the upward spiral of all interest rates.

The alternative is to jeopardize the entire rural electrification program. Many systems could not survive an increase in the rate on ordinary loans. Their service areas are too sparsely settled or marginal in income.

But this is only part of the danger. A sharp increase in the REA rate would virtually wipe out the generation and transmission program. Foley Treadway, consulting engineer for many rural electric, pointed out this danger in a panel discussion at the NRECA meeting. He said the rate proposed by the administration would add 1.67 mills per kilowatt-hour to the cost of power generated under a typical REA G&T loan. This would destroy the feasibility of most of the loan applications.

"In such an event," Treadway said, "the G&T potential will have been dealt a death blow."

With G&T loans no longer feasible, he added, the power companies would be expected to raise wholesale rates. In 1958, he said, a 1 mill per kilowatt-hour increase in wholesale power purchased from power companies would have meant a \$12 million increase for rural electric systems.

This would have reduced the total net margins of REA borrowers in 1958 by about 17 percent.

Nor can systems purchasing power from Government projects expect to escape the effects of the high-interest policies. Interest is charged on the cost of the power facilities at such projects, usually 2½ percent.

A higher rate would sharply increase the cost of power from new projects, even if it were not raised for the old ones. A 1 percent increase at Montana's Hungry Horse Dam, for example, would increase the cost of the power by 24 percent.

The Ford Farm Efficiency Awards Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the most commendable public service projects being carried on by American business firms is the Ford farm efficiency awards program. These awards are given to farmers selected from throughout the United States for their record of efficiency in their farm operations. The competition and the examples set will be of vast benefit to all the American farmers.

The winner of this first award for cotton production was Mr. Hugh Nichols, Jr., of Tchula, Miss., in my congressional district. At the award dinner, Mr. Henry Ford II, suggested that these representatives of the U.S. farm community could help to advance our country's efforts to achieve world peace and cooperation by personally visiting key agricultural countries outside the United States on a "farmer-to-farmer" basis. Mr. Nichols is going with a group to the Far East on a 4-week trip, which will be a further public service contribution of the Ford Motor Co.

Under unanimous consent I am including the address made by Mr. Henry Ford II at the Ford farm efficiency award banquet on February 15:

I should like to add my own word of welcome to all of you who honor us by being our guests this evening. We are delighted that you are sharing this occasion with us. In particular, I want both to welcome and to congratulate the winners of the Ford farm efficiency awards and their wives.

In our daily concentration on new and improved products and better engineering and manufacturing methods, we in industry are all too likely to forget that the technical gains scored by industry are matched or surpassed by tremendous advances in agriculture. The efficiency and productivity of American farmers have won the respectful attention of all the world.

In these days, much is being said about the worldwide population explosion and the economic battle between communism and the West. The productivity of the American farmer will bear importantly on the outcome of both these problems. Because of him, the United States was able to ship abroad in 1959 the output of 41 million acres of cropland. It is difficult to measure or even to guess the social and political impact of this achievement on other countries, but I think we may safely say that it has been great indeed.

Ford Motor Co. has been very close to the farm community for more than 50 years. We have been concerned with farm problems and have worked with farmers to provide the kind of equipment they need to get their job done efficiently and at lower

cost. Consequently, we share a great pride in their accomplishments.

You who have earned tonight's farm efficiency awards are among the best and most experienced of America's farmers. For that reason, I believe that you, as individuals, can do a great deal to help advance our country's efforts to achieve world peace and cooperation. And so, before I present your awards, I should like to issue you an invitation. On behalf of Ford Motor Co., I invite each of you to take an expense-paid trip, as our guests, either to Latin America or to major agricultural areas in the Far East, especially India. As representatives of American agriculture and of the American way of life, you will be able to discuss farming on a person-to-person basis with people who have problems and goals similar to your own. The U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service and the International Cooperation Administration know of this offer and have agreed enthusiastically to put their official stamp of approval on these visits. We know that absence from your farms will involve some sacrifice on your part. But I am so convinced that you have something of value to offer the people of other nations that I sincerely hope you will see your way clear to undertake this important mission.

I should now like to award plaques to the gentlemen here tonight who have demonstrated their knowledge, skill and efficiency in the various areas of agriculture.

Hospitalization Insurance for People on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a great many moving letters from people in my State and in other States urging the Congress to take action on a medical pension plan which at least will carry out the principles of the Forand bill in the House and the Morse bill in the Senate. I have received a particularly touching letter from an Oregon constituent, Mr. Bertram Jenkins, who asks me in another letter to send copies of his letter to me to other Members of Congress.

I have replied to Mr. Jenkins that I think it would be preferable for me to put his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that the Members of Congress will have access to it.

Mr. Jenkins says in his letter,

Let us live and let live. It is hoped insurance companies will not be able to block hospitalization insurance for people on social security.

Then Mr. Jenkins proceeds to cite his own case. He is 73 years old and his wife is 71. He makes what is to me a very moving and I think unanswerable plea for hospitalization and medical insurance.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., January 14, 1960.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

OUR DEAR SENATOR: "Let us live and let live."

It is hoped insurance companies will not be able to block hospitalization insurance for people on social security. Let me cite my own case: American Can Co., Portland, Oreg., closed plant complete. Left me with no insurance or pension. In fact I lost both by 5 months.

I am 73 past, my wife 71.

It is positively inhuman for anyone to oppose passage of this bill to help us old people, just when we could use it most.

Yours very truly,

BERTRAM JENKINS.

Statement of A. E. Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the testimony of A. E. Cross, of Arkansas, national hospital chairman of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs today, regarding the hospitalization and medical program of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I appreciate this honor of having the privilege to appear before this great committee in regard to all veterans of the United States of America.

I want to explain what the Veterans of World War I are attempting to do. We are undertaking a survey of all hospitals, including VA, State, city, county, all denominational hospitals, as well as rest homes to determine how many veterans of all wars are in such hospitals throughout this great Nation of ours, and to show how many veterans are on the waiting lists. We are doing this to try to show our Government the necessity of having a larger number of hospitals and the need for more beds. From the reports that we have been able to attain, the shortage of beds is distressing. By making this survey, it will give us the actual number of veterans that are in our hospitals. We will secure a completed questionnaire signed by the Administrator, or the person in charge of each hospital, giving the names and addresses of the hospital in question. In this way, we will have a true picture. We are indeed anxious to see that an adequate number of beds are available to disabled veterans.

At the present time, the veterans' hospital system operates under a ceiling of 125,000 beds. This, of course, is inadequate to meet present needs. Today, the average age of World War I veterans is 65 years, and the average age of World War II veterans is 40 years. As the veterans' population ages and their medical needs grow, there will be an increasing demand for hospital beds in Veterans' Administration units. A particular problem in accommodating the aged veteran is the growing need for facilities to provide immediate and future or long-time care.

Before continuing on with the facts of this survey, I should like to relate some ex-

periences I have had, to try to point out to you the need for this survey and for more VA hospitals in some sections of the country.

I visited one particular VA hospital, located in one of our larger southern cities with a population of over 1 million people a few weeks ago. This hospital is literally "falling apart at the seams." The administrative wing of the hospital was completed in the year 1891, and the newer wing was built in 1930. Time has taken its inevitable toll as evidenced by the conditions I saw while I was there. The ceilings have collapsed; plumbing and wiring are wearing out, and are inadequate for present-day needs; and this hospital does not have a single room with private bath nor does it have a signal system whereby a patient in need of attention can summon help.

At the time of my inspection trip, I observed three women patients confined in this hospital with no facilities for their special care. I also observed that it was necessary for these three patients to share one of the men's toilets which was located at the end of a long corridor, and had been blocked off for their use. I further noticed that after these sick women had strolled the length of this long hall, it was necessary for another patient (man or woman) to guard the outside of the toilet while it was in use. This was the limit of special facilities for these ladies. Photographs of conditions are submitted for your examination.

We are reliably informed there are several other veterans' hospitals which are deteriorating rapidly due to lack of proper repairs and maintenance.

This, of course, is only an example for you to compare with the abundant and modern facilities of other hospitals today with private rooms, private baths and showers, telephones, elaborate X-ray rooms, the best in modern equipment and instrument, whereas this hospital is ill equipped with old instruments and is inadequate in every way.

There was one other thing which drew my particular attention, and that was what I saw in connection with the care of the veterans' service records. The record room, storage room, or whatever you want to call it (anyway, it was where the records were kept) was in a horrible condition. There were no file cabinets at all, and the files were placed on board shelving reaching across a long room. It would have been utterly impossible to check an individual record. This, in my opinion, is one reason why so many veterans are unable to get the care to which they are so rightfully entitled. It is urgently important that the records of veterans be kept in a well preserved and orderly condition for future reference. As of today, there are many, many veterans throughout this Nation who should be in our hospitals but, due to the fact that their records have been misplaced, they are unable to get their service-connected disability which they definitely deserve. With the large increase of veterans which we have who are seeking hospital care, files certainly should be cared for with precaution. It would be impossible for me to give you a detailed description of the deterioration of the aforementioned hospital, but I do want to emphasize to this committee the fact that this 300-bed facility was erected for the care of the Spanish-American War and World War I veterans.

It is true that in some sections of the United States we do have some of the finest VA hospitals in existence. At the same time, however, I should like to emphasize the dire need for more hospitals in other sections of the country where conditions exist such as I have just described.

There is one other desperate need for more hospitals throughout our Nation, and that is for the care of the ever-increasing number of psychiatric patients. It is a well-known fact that many of our city jails are overflowing with psychiatric patients who have been

placed there through no fault of their own, but for safekeeping of themselves and the protection of the public. Many of these individuals are veterans who suffered strenuous hardships protecting our country, and who could become self-supporting and respected citizens if given the proper care. The waiting list for these patients is entirely too long.

The majority of veterans cannot afford the high cost of new drugs and the psychiatric care required for treatment of these afflictions, and at the same time it has been confirmed by many doctors that a large percentage of patients if treated in time, could be cured. This fact supports the need for additional trained personnel, equipment and the use of new drugs and methods of rehabilitation.

To help provide for additional relief for disabled veterans, the Veterans of World War I, Inc., think that the passage of legislation similar to that which has been outlined in H.R. 10594, recently introduced, would be of great help to our program.

Now, getting back to the survey which I mentioned in the beginning, there are no statistics available by any veterans' organizations that actually show the number of veterans who are in the hospital as of today, other than those by the Veterans Administration. At the present time, I shall give you a partial report as to what we have accomplished with our survey to date. We have received partial reports from 10 States, including the District of Columbia, and 140 VA hospitals.

The figures for the VA hospitals are as follows:

Spanish American War veterans.....	1,278
World War I veterans.....	35,390
World War II veterans.....	44,885
Korean conflict.....	9,477
Female veterans (WAVE's, WAC's, Nurses).....	1,569
Veterans of other wars, and peacetime.....	2,434
Number on waiting list.....	20,274

The figures of the partial reports for the 10 States to date for State, city, county, and denominational hospitals, as well as rest homes are as follows:

Spanish American War veterans.....	212
World War I veterans.....	2,472
World War II veterans.....	4,893
Korean conflict.....	909
Female veterans (WAVE's, WAC's, Nurses).....	488
Veterans of other wars, and peacetime.....	1,480
Number on waiting list.....	808

When we, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., complete our survey we will be able to furnish to this committee the exact number of veterans in all VA, State, city, county, and denominational hospitals, as well as rest homes in the United States.

In closing, I want to thank each and every member of this committee—and the last words I want to leave with you are these: "Hospitalization delayed is hospitalization denied."

I thank you.

Encouragement of Foreign Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance of applying international law

and morality to foreign investment is highlighted by recent events in Cuba and other countries where American industry has invested millions of dollars plus its know-how and technological experience. If the world's economically advanced countries are to increase the level of assistance to the emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and South America, through and with the aid of their own private citizens capable of doing so, some form of international action will have to be taken to make fair and just the consistency of national sovereignty and the attractiveness of private investment in the less developed areas. The subject of encouragement of international capital investment is discussed and analyzed in a recent article by Pierre Rosenstock, vice president of the Banque Commercial de Paris, appearing in *American Banker*, issue of February 19, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL PROTECTION CHARTER
URGED BY FRENCH BANKER—ABS PROPOSAL
FOR RESPECT FOR COMMITMENTS ENDORSED
(By Pierre Rosenstock, vice president, Banque
Commercial de Paris, France)

An analysis of the relations between primitive and advanced peoples shows the existence of an initial period during which the newcomers from abroad limit their contacts with the natives to the exchange of manufactured articles for raw materials. The colonial period, which follows this initial stage, sees the settlement of the more advanced newcomers in the younger countries and the organization of the means of production to the advantage of the settlers.

The settlers, by introducing schools, hospitals, and churches, believed that they had given these primitive peoples the means of growth and development, in the course of time. This is no longer true.

We now witness in many places the outright confiscation of the natives' goods, carried out in the name of national liberty. The obsession with the idea of liberty, which is kept alive among these primitive peoples, makes it difficult to organize exchanges which would be beneficial to both natives and settlers, and produces for the time being a marked economic recession.

COLONIAL ECONOMIC EVOLUTION

The first brutal contacts of the settlers, who gained the upper hand by force, with the primitive peoples gives way to the phase during which the local chieftain supports the colonists and governs jointly with them. Now the leading elements among these peoples intend to free themselves from their chieftain.

This stage of development is not yet completed; the subjects seek to free themselves from their ruler—whether it be a prince, a dictator, or a dominant party—in order that the mass of the population may benefit from the fruits of their joint labors.

It is only if they are conscious of this evolution that these large numbers of potential consumers can come to represent a field of expansion for the economy of the civilized world.

It is only if the standard of living of these underdeveloped populations is raised that civilized industries will find the consumers for the goods which they produce, while absorbing the raw materials which these less advanced countries should be able to supply.

If each man in India were to buy one shirt a year, the textile industry of the entire world would not be sufficient to satisfy the demand.

This illustration throws more light on the problem than any long explanations.

DEVELOPMENT BENEFITS

The potential markets which would be created in the world by spending the development of the underprivileged would be so important that each one of us would benefit indirectly as a result.

It is possible for the rest of the world to set aside from its output a sufficient quantity of goods to enable the less advanced peoples to survive. The public conscience has already brought this about; however, this effort of subsidizing should be only a transitional stage.

A delicate and costly work of preparation is necessary, both physically and morally, before a community can become productive and represent a potential market. It is not until he has come to accept a civilized standard of values that the member of a less advanced society can assimilate the idea of sustained effort with a view to acquiring a little more than the bare necessities of life.

INVESTMENT PLUS KNOW-HOW

However, it is not possible to give people who possess no equipment whatsoever the means to work and produce without raising the problem of investment in these underdeveloped countries.

We can no longer go to these young countries demanding concessions: we must go taking with us technical aid and equipment, repayable from the proceeds of the future production to be organized. We must accept the risk of the possible failure of our venture, but we must eliminate all risk of dishonesty.

We must invent a means of guaranteeing that these pioneers of industry will be repaid for what they have created or carried out, and that neither the local rulers nor the dishonesty of the participants will have the power to wreck the project.

Industrial settlements abroad must be legally protected from what amounts to theft by expropriation until their cost has been met by those who benefit from them.

MUST HONOR PROMISES

The obligation to keep one's promises should be among the first ideas to be instilled in the underdeveloped countries. It is no longer possible to send, as in times past, a gunboat to ensure a hearing for our opinions and obedience to our orders, the political competition is too keen between the two ideologies which direct the world.

It would be preferable for an international charter to exclude defaulting countries from the world market. The necessity to find outlets would rapidly oblige the rulers of these countries to honor their engagements.

Dr. Hermann Abs, president of the Deutsche Bank, is at the origin of this idea of an international charter the terms of which all the civilized countries of the world would undertake to respect and protect all legitimately acquired property abroad; any breach of this charter would be submitted to international arbitration. The same ideas are to be found in the report of the Committee on Foreign Economic Policy set up by President Eisenhower whose findings were published in 1954 under the title "Randall Report."

UNITED FRONT NEEDED

It is imperative that the countries capable of introducing technical progress to the underdeveloped regions should form a united front.

While it is to be feared that international competition would create difficulties in the way of the application of a treaty of this kind, it is quite certain that any political system—be it collectivist or capitalist—it will not be possible for any length of time to ask the more advanced peoples to work free of charge for any group which was manifestly dishonest.

The United States has sufficient wealth to enable her to be generous for a certain length

of time. Russia has the means at her disposal to enable her to be generous toward those whom she wishes to convert to her doctrines. Generosity, however, can only provide a temporary, and limited solution.

In America and Germany study circles such as the Cologne Society are actively engaged in drafting suitable texts in respect of investments abroad. In France there would appear as yet to be no interest in this major problem; yet France, more than any other country is fitted to exploit to the full the natural resources of regions whose activities should complete our own.

Adequate Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting editorial on our foreign policy, which appeared in the *Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun*, on March 13, 1960.

The editorial follows:

ADEQUATE FORCE

"No foreign policy can have validity," Sir Winston Churchill has written, "if there is no adequate force behind it." That is quoted by the distinguished military correspondent and historian, George Fielding Elliot, in the lead article of the February issue of *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*. Mr. Elliot stresses the word "adequate"—and it is his obvious belief that we may fail to achieve this because of a static strategy in which the emphasis is on defense.

As he puts it: "The spectacle of the United States busily engaged in entombing its freedom of action in a complex of concrete missile bases planted in its own bosom can hardly be encouraging to peoples in whose memories the tragic history of the past 25 years still lingers." He then cites a series of examples—such as that of France in the last war—where events proved that the available military force, and the military thinking that directed it, were sorely inadequate in the light of foreign policy, and disaster resulted. France, for instance, placed virtually her whole faith in a vast defensive work, the Maginot line, and, says Mr. Elliot: "Obsessed with this preconception, France forfeited all freedom of action to meet any other form of enemy attack against herself or her allies."

As for ourselves, Mr. Elliot is gravely disturbed because, in his view, we are "moving step by annual step toward immobilizing our strategy in a form which will be able to react effectively only to a single contingency—to deter or avenge a Soviet nuclear assault on the United States." This, he is convinced, defeats the needs that the free-world collective-security system imposes on us. Missiles are taking an ever larger part of the resources available to our military system. And he believes also that the changes and the huge problems that the nuclear age as brought about may be blinding us to lessons from the past.

Mr. Elliot's primary point is that a sound strategy must be based upon deterrence—and that "deterrence of the Communist enemy from resorting to violence must be applied over the whole scale of violence." The Communists, obviously, would prefer to win the world without going to war, and over the years they have demonstrated beyond any doubt their desire and their ability

to make huge gains on the step-by-step principle. Mr. Elliot states, "It will do us little good to deter nuclear assault only to have the free world taken over by a process of piecemeal aggression." And the type of force needed to deal with local and limited aggressions is a very different thing from the type of force demanded by all-out nuclear war.

Mobility is the key to the kind of force Mr. Elliot is convinced we must have. In his words, we need "to provide ourselves with a nuclear deterrent force which is relatively immune to destruction by the enemy's weapons, in which case the Soviets cannot under any conditions initiate nuclear action themselves without assuring their own destruction." So, he then reasons, "... the only choice for a global coalition requiring a nuclear deterrent force is to establish it in mobile bases at sea." Such sea-based power, he is convinced, would prove the solution to dealing with local Communist aggressions, because of its virtues of great flexibility and its relative invulnerability to surprise.

Mr. Elliot's article is long and detailed, and a brief summary does it less than justice. He is arguing against putting all, or too many, of our military eggs in one basket—and most particularly into an immobile, essentially defensive basket useful only in the event of unlimited United States-Soviet war. Not everyone, of course, will agree with him. But he has made an important and thought-provoking contribution to the great and crucial debate over the possible strengths and weaknesses inherent in the military policy that is the keystone of our foreign policy.

George Stadelman's Report on Bali and Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a very outstanding leader among Oregon businessmen, Mr. George Stadelman, who is president of Stadelman Fruit, Inc., of Oregon. Mr. Stadelman is a former student of mine. Although we have very definite differences of opinion in regard to matters of political philosophy, Mr. President, he is a very able Republican in my State. He has had his secretary send to me a release which he wrote in connection with a trip he is now taking in Asia, and this release has been made available to the Oregon press.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter I receive from Mr. Stadelman's secretary and a copy of the release on the situation as he has seen it and interpreted it in Asia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Dalles, Ore., March 7, 1960.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: At the request of Mr. George Stadelman, I am enclosing a copy of the account which is being published in our local and adjoining county newspapers of his difficulties encountered in Bali and

Indonesia. As you know, Mr. and Mrs. Stadelman and Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Stearns of Shell Oil Co. are on an extended trip around the world and this phase of the trip has been less than pleasant.

It would seem that their experiences with our State Department representatives would bear out the accusations of the recent censorious book published about the ineptness of this group.

Yours very truly,

LORES SAWYER,
Secretary to Mr. Stadelman.

We have been looking forward to our visit to beautiful Bali and a good part of our trip was necessarily planned around this visit because there is air service only once a week to Den Pasar, the capitol. We arrived in Djakarta where we were to spend the night before going to Bali and the roof fell in. We were advised that Mr. Khrushchev had decided to go to Bali and that all tourists were being removed and no others were allowed to go in.

After this blow, we were to find out how much of a police state Indonesia really is. At customs one must declare all currency, travelers' checks, cameras, etc. The currency must be exchanged for rupials (the Indonesian currency), and it may not be changed back when one departs. The rate of exchange is 45 rupials to 1 U.S. dollar, but one gets only 36 to \$1 as there is a 20 percent transaction tax. The black market rate is from 450 to 500 rupials to \$1, or 14 times as much. One is then faced with the decision of obeying the law and paying outrageous prices for everything, or going on the black market. A number of Americans have been caught and fined up to \$1,000, or up to the amount of money they declared they had when they entered the country. There are rumors of Americans being framed with counterfeit money, then fined the amount of their funds by the police but this did not happen to us. Since prices necessarily are based on the black market rates, a very poor lunch for four persons costs us \$40, and the food wasn't fit to eat. The Des Indies Hotel, once one of the best in East Asia, is going to ruin. There is no running water in the rooms, the plumbing doesn't work, the food is terrible and the dining room is so dirty one just couldn't eat. The tablecloth is left on for days at a time, the dishes only half washed, and flies cover everything. The dining room seats about 400 persons and when it was operated by the Dutch, it was full. There were not more than 20 persons in it while we were there. Although it did not happen to us, it is common for the hotel to assign extra guests to your room if space is short. They simply put in another bed and you have a stranger for a roommate.

Indonesia is a police and army state now. When the army wants space on the airline, they simply move tourists or civilians off. Recently the Committee for Improvement of Tourist Travel decided to meet in Bali, so they kicked all of the tourists out of their rooms making them leave Bali, although they had confirmed and prepaid space in the hotel. Sometimes one is taken from the plane at Surabaya and turned loose without a hotel room or other place to stay. At the airport women and men are frequently stripped and searched. A special room for the process is provided and everyone must go there and go through it before boarding the plane. The custom guards are demanding, unreasonable, arrogant, and generally as hasty as they can be.

The police and army are involved in graft up to their elbows; 14 percent of the rice imported last year disappeared off the docks. Foreign companies are employed by the navy to certify that they purchased certain materials so that the army does not steal them.

The streets of Djakarta were decorated with thousands of Russian flags and great pictures of Khrushchev and Sukarno. Several arches were built and the most friendly atmosphere prevails.

Perhaps it is necessary for America to have access to the raw materials of Indonesia—tin, rubber, pepper, ore, etc.—as it is a country rich in natural resources. We probably can't turn the country to Russia without a struggle but we do not believe we are getting our money's worth. (We gave them some \$50 million last year.) We believe the entire country's economy is going to break down soon and that there is a good possibility of a rebellion. Some 2 million Chinese merchants have been refused the right to continue in business and are being moved out of the country. Last August the government took 90 percent of all funds in banks and gave the depositor 45-year bonds for these funds. The bonds can't be used as security, and, of course, there is no market for them. They are not worth the paper they are written on. The government simply took 90 percent of everyone's money.

Regardless of what our official position of assistance should be with Indonesia, our official position as far as tourists are concerned should be changed. Our Ambassador, Mr. Jones, apparently is going along with the myth that Indonesia wants tourists. This is not the fact and our Embassy knows it. The Indonesian Government should be advised to treat our tourists reasonably or no visas will be issued. Tourist visas for Americans are not being issued at our Singapore consulate because of the situation, and the issuing of visas in America should be stopped until such time as the conditions or attitude of the Indonesian Government changes. We called on Mr. Smith of the transportation division of the American Embassy requesting assistance in getting air space back to Singapore, and he said there was nothing he could do. He seemed to be willing to shrug and accept the situation as it is—he wouldn't even try to help. We know the Embassy has been plagued with tourists in trouble, but why should they continue to allow them to come in if they know they will get in trouble?

Our happiest moment in Indonesia was when we went up the ramp to board our plane to get away. Don't go to Indonesia.

Hon. Edward H. Rees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, few men who have announced their retirement from the House of Representatives have revealed more regret on the part of their colleagues than when Ed REES, of Kansas, said he would not be a candidate this fall. His colleagues, his constituents, and the people of Kansas sadly regret his decision.

As a fellow Member from Kansas, it would be an idle gesture and a waste of words to try and paint the Ed Rees picture as has been done by the foremost editor of Kansas, Rollo Clymer, of El Dorado, who, by the way, comes nearer than anyone to using the power-laden pen of that alltime great Kansan in the editorial field, William Allen White.

I commend this editorial to my fellow

Members and trust that in future years new Members may read and review the contents of this tribute:

END OF AN EPIC

(Rollo Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times, who was present at the fourth district Republican convention in Emporia last Saturday, writes that Congressman Ed REES' announcement that he would not run again set off a tremendous scene, "the like of which I have never witnessed in any political gathering." Herewith are his observations and a tribute to Mr. REES:)

In the simple and straightforward fashion which has always characterized his every act, Representative E. H. REES stood before the Fourth District Republican convention at Emporia Saturday, and said:

"I am here not only to express my appreciation and gratitude to the Republican Party and to the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, but to tell you that I am not a candidate for reelection in 1960."

This was a memorable and emotion-packed event in Kansas political history. For almost a quarter of a century—24 years at the end of his current term—Ed REES has carried the trust and confidence of his constituents in a degree with few parallels in the State's annals.

Some say sentiment has no place in politics; nearer the truth likely is the belief that sentiment rules as strongly in this field as in all other human relationships. At least, this was true at the moment when Ed REES—silvery-haired and bent from the public burdens he has borne—voluntarily surrendered the office with which he has so long been entrusted and which he has served so well.

He was given a rousing ovation when he first went to the rostrum; he was given another when he stepped down, after his brief address with its unwelcome announcement. Then two of his friends went to the microphone to pay him tribute. Their words were impromptu, halting, and unpolished—but minted directly from their hearts' deep feeling. When they had finished, a remarkable occurrence took place. The entire assembly arose—without cheers—and stood for a long moment in spontaneous silence, in token of deep affection for this man who has served his people's needs with unbroken and unwavering faithfulness.

Poignant regret hung like a blanket over the scene. Tears rolled unashamedly down many cheeks. A spirit of reverence and allegiance to the truest ties of friendship ruled the entire gathering. As a testimonial to a living man who was present, this instance comprises one of rare precedent.

ALWAYS HONEST AND CONSCIENTIOUS

What has brought about his singular standing that Ed REES enjoys among the hundreds of his fellow Kansans who know him best? He has no side. He has never practiced the arts of the statesman, nor employed the genteel tricks of the seasoned politician. He is not a brilliant orator. In all his long congressional tenure, he has never set himself at the head of a legislative crusade. In the main, he has worked quietly and diligently, without fanfare of any sort. What, then, has so endeared him to his district?

The answer lies in the rock-solid fact that he has always been his honest, conscientious self, that he has never indulged in double talk, that he has dealt fairly and squarely with all men over the years, and that he has been guided by unwavering uprightness and unshakable integrity.

He has carried his credentials in his square-hewed, Welsh features and has never departed from the basic simplicity of his character. He has rendered countless favors to the people of his district and has extended effective help in many important

instances. While steadfastly true to his party creed, he has never been domineering nor hidebound in his views—but gentle and persuasive in his approach. And so, he has made fast friends without number, and has always been able to turn back the sternest challenges to his occupancy of high office that the opposition has flung at him.

When the Fourth District came into its present form of 15 counties, it was so arranged with a practical political purpose. This was that the normal Republican majorities in the up-district counties would be sufficient to offset what was once a dominating district Democrat majority in Sedgwick County. Ed REES became the first Congressman of the remodeled district—and the force of his personality was such he went one better than the framers of the district had intended. He gained so much headway in the esteem of Sedgwick County that he frequently carried it by smashing margins. This originally unexpected development, coupled with his unbreakable hold upon the up-district counties, has combined to give him uninterrupted possession of his office. He retires with the satisfaction of never having been defeated.

REES IS "IKE'S CONGRESSMAN"

As a Congressman, Mr. REES has been industrious and always available. He has kept in close touch with his constituency, not just as an errand boy but as counselor and friend. He has enjoyed high standing among the House membership for his responsible and obliging ways. As chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he performed a vast amount of useful service. He also has been a member of other important committees. Since Dwight D. Eisenhower calls Abilene his home, the President refers fondly to Ed REES as "my Congressman."

Now Ed REES is out of the congressional picture. He took himself out, making his own decision after long wrestling alone with his problem. He will serve out the balance of his term this year. In another 2 years the present form of the fourth district will have disappeared—under the knife of the State's enforced congressional redistricting—and another fourth (of impossibly speculative form) will have taken its place. So the old fourth will be gone and Ed REES along with it. It is not a pleasant outlook to contemplate for those who have always held pride and affection for the fourth as it now stands.

Mr. REES' abdication has left the field wide open for both Democrat and Republican contesting. After the election tumult and shouting has died, the fourth will have a new Congressman—and doubtless a good one, whatever his political affiliation.

Whoever he is, he will not be Ed REES. None will be like Ed REES. The mold that shaped him on a Lyon County farm, in the edge of the hills, 70-odd years ago has long been broken.

The fast-moving world of today will create its own paladins and prodigies. But to many thoughtful and sincere men and women in the Kansas Fourth District, Ed REES will always stand as the prototype of the finest figures in American public life in his day and generation.

Free Parliamentary Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix to the RECORD two excellent editorials on the subject of full and free debate in the U.S. Senate. One is entitled "Free Parliamentary Speech" and was printed in the February 20, 1960, issue of the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., which is ably edited by Mr. Edward H. Sims and capably published by Mr. James L. Sims.

The other one is entitled "Senate's Refusal To Gag the South Encourages Hope for Free Country" and appeared in the March 12, 1960, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C. This outstanding newspaper has as its able editor, Mr. Thomas R. Waring who is well known for his staunch defense of the principles of constitutional government.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE'S REFUSAL TO GAG THE SOUTH ENCOURAGES HOPE FOR FREE COUNTRY

Refusal of the U.S. Senate to vote for cloture on the issue of civil rights carries a message of victory beyond the borders of the South. While specifically the vote of 53 to 42 sustains the right of southern Senators to present fully a case that has been willfully misrepresented before the American people and the world at large, the Senate's action also shows that constitutional safeguards are not yet repudiated in this Republic. Such a demonstration is welcome among sober citizens of all regions.

Though a battle has been won, the South is not yet secure from oppressive legislation in a campaign year. The fashion still is strong to flaunt the issue of race. We deem it important to continue defense of States rights not only for the sake of the South, but for survival of the Republic.

Many more rights are involved than the privilege of Negroes to vote in Southern States. Scores of thousands of Negroes already are registered voters. As more of them qualify, they will continue to exercise the franchise more broadly—and, we hope, more intelligently.

The principle now at stake in Congress is not the registration of Negroes, which in some instances may have been slowed or prevented as part of a long history of political immaturity. The principle is the authority of the States, as guaranteed in the Constitution—the original pact on which the Union was founded—to determine election procedures and qualifications. This authority, like the police power to keep order, is a key to self-government and liberty in the American sense of the word.

Election rules should and are being handled within the existing legal framework. If in some localities qualified Negroes find difficulty in registering, it must be remembered that no system is perfect. But southerners deny that political virtue and honesty are found exclusively north of the Mason and Dixon Line. They resent implication that they must be policed by Federal wardens. They feel fully able to maintain the institutions of a people experienced in Anglo-Saxon freedom long before the Republic was created. They resist designation as second-class States requiring overseers out of Washington.

With distortion typical of the paper Current Press, Time magazine's account of the filibuster charges the South with the aim of denying the southern Negro his constitutional right to vote. We cannot speak for every southern precinct, as Times dares to do, but from personal observation of South Carolina polls on election day we flatly deny the charge.

Time magazine picked up comments from two southern newspapers to bolster its own viewpoint. Naturally it chose to quote voices of the carpetbagger press: The Knox-

ville News-Sentinel (Scripps-Howard chain) and the Charlotte Observer (Knight chain). Said the Observer: "Here is a fight of words against time, of men against inevitability, of voices against the ebbing strength that portends eventual silence."

So long as freedom of speech exists—and the Senate's refusal to apply the muzzle gives us hope—there will be no silence about injustice to the South.

FREE PARLIAMENTARY SPEECH

An interesting situation arose in Albany, N.Y., recently. Albany, of course, is the capital of New York State.

In a move designed to curb the use of the senate floor for irrelevant discussions, the Republican majority in the New York senate pushed through two rules changes limiting debate.

A number of Democratic senators took the floor to denounce the changes as an attempt to gag and stifle freedom of speech and debate in the senate.

Ironically, down in Washington, southerners were being put to the test while using their traditional powers of free parliamentary speech in the U.S. Senate—on the perennial civil rights question. Southerners at one time had what was considered a foolproof filibuster device—unlimited talking, but they now are subject to debate shut off by a vote of two-thirds of those Senators voting.

No one would suggest that the Democratic senators in New York State and the Democratic Senators from the South, in the U.S. Senate, see eye to eye on certain facets of political, governmental and social progress. However, in this instance, they were fighting for the same principle—freedom of speech, as it is preserved in many of our upper legislative bodies in the States, and in the U.S. Capital, and it has been the safeguard or refuge of minorities for decades—which enables the majorities to fight successfully, sometimes, against what has been termed the tyranny of the majority, or punitive legislation.

A Million Dollars Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

A MILLION DOLLARS SAVED

Quarter boats are a type of craft used by Army Engineers to house personnel engaged on bank protection projects during the working season on the lower Mississippi River.

The Memphis engineer district is in need of replacements in the quarter boat category and \$1,500,000 had been made available for that purpose. Col. Marvin L. Jacobs, district engineer, heard that the Navy had some craft in mothballs in Florida which might meet the district's needs. He sent his executive officer on a reconnoitering mission, the report was favorable and a full cooperative Navy agreed to lend the Army two of the craft. These had been built to house Navy Seabee battalions during the war, have had efficient maintenance care since, and are in excellent condition. They will be towed to Memphis and reconverted to meet river construction needs.

Conversion costs are not expected to exceed \$500,000 and will probably be less. If this expectation is realized, the Memphis district will have saved a million dollars. As we see it, this is the result of a most com-

mendable example of service unification operating as it should.

As for Colonel Jacobs, he is not only an officer not afraid or ashamed to use some Navy hand-me-downs but a gentleman decidedly after the taxpayer's heart.

Art for the Aged To Be Incorporated in San Antonio's Model Golden Age Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Golden Age Center, a model public housing project for elderly people, that is being built in San Antonio, Tex., will offer a great deal more than four walls and a roof.

This Golden Age Center, 9½ stories high, is a model for the Nation. Designers and other people from all over the Nation have come to San Antonio to inspect this example of high rise housing for the aged.

Under the guidance of Mrs. Marie McGuire, executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, this home for the aged will be developed as a sort of USO for elderly people. It will have a library, indoor and outdoor recreation areas, and outstanding art exhibits.

Mrs. McGuire, working with some of Texas' best known artists and a group of civic clubs headed by the community welfare council, has been able to plan attractive, superb quality artwork into the basic design of the building. Two major examples of this are a ceramic sculptural group at the water fountain and a series of three mosaic murals flanking the main entrance to the building. All of these artists contributed their creations. All of us owe them our thanks for their generosity.

Mr. President, recently *La Prensa*, a newspaper in both English and Spanish published in San Antonio and circulated in the Gulf of Mexico area, printed an excellent article on this subject written by Mrs. McGuire. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the article from *La Prensa* of January 27, 1960, by Marie McGuire, headed "The Golden Age Center."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLDEN AGE CENTER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Marie McGuire, executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, is considered to be an authority on public housing and it has been through her vision, hard work and close cooperation with the architects that art has come to be accepted as part of our every day lives—as is evidenced by this housing center for the elderly. This is the first high rise Federal sponsored housing for the elderly. Will art be incorporated within city- and county-owned buildings that are projected for construction in the future?)

(By Marie C. McGuire)

It is safe to say that no public building is ever undertaken where controversy does not arise between the idea that a bare-bones structure is sufficient and the architect's desire to achieve some beauty of design within reasonable economy. When the San Antonio Housing Authority and its architects began studying housing for the low income elderly some 4 years ago, they determined that the first high-rise apartment building in the low rent program of San Antonio should make a contribution to the city's beauty as well as achieve the necessary functionalism and economy. The struggle was long and often bitter, but the result is a building that does not reflect the utter monotony of most public housing apartment buildings. The housing board, staff, and architects held tenaciously to the belief that ugliness was not necessary, given a little understanding by national and regional officials.

A competent city planner recently stated that we must get back to the fact that "the work of art should be a focus round which the harmony of the whole building revolves."

While fine art was not an inherent part of the housing authority's building, nevertheless the design lends itself to the use of beautiful art objects it will have through the participation by many of San Antonio's outstanding artists.

COMMUNITY INTEREST

The artists thus become a part of broad community interest that has marked this undertaking from its beginning. Under the leadership of the Community Welfare Council, funds are being received to furnish and equip the 5,600-square-foot center on the first floor of the building that will be a veritable USO for all the elderly of the city. Programs covering recreation, counseling, library, indoor and outdoor play and health are now being planned. The art work enhancing these activity areas will add to the joy and spirit of the surroundings and become a part of the everyday environment for living, which art should be. Garden clubs, civic groups and interested individuals are participating in large numbers.

The apartment building is 9 stories with 185 apartments located at Labor and Barrera Streets just seven-tenths of a mile from the city's center. It already has attracted some 700 applicants 4 months before building completion, demonstrating the stark need as well as desirability of the planning. The structure is T-shaped to provide exposure for all apartments to the prevailing breeze. The lead architects are Thomas B. Thompson of Noonan and Thompson and Kroker, and Harvey Marmon of Marmon and Mok.

BOLD THEME

Flanking the main entrance of the building on Barrera Street is Cecil Casebier's mosaic abstraction 45 feet by 6 feet. Seen across an expanse of lawn and trees, the bold theme executed in yellow, gold, gray, black, and white enriches and gives a glow to the entire building.

Entering the lobby, the floor and walls will be gay with multicolored patterns as the light filters through three panels of fused glass executed by Dorothy Steinhilber using a variety of imported glass.

Continuing along the east wing of the building, we find a mural in quiet shades of blue on one entire wall of the library. Choosing themes from the Old and New Testament, this large mural by Ruth Dunn will be an intrinsic and natural part of the library decor.

Across from the library one enters the private patio with its 8-foot chocolate brown walls. Looking straight ahead, June Kroll's sand sculpture employing her unusual technique and approach to this media will be seen. Using Genesis as her theme, this sculp-

ture of depth, set into the wall, demonstrates her personal style and use of the media.

The viewer will next see the corner rectangular pool. Seven San Antonio ceramists of note combined their talents to develop a whimsical fishing scene which will afford hours of delight for the elderly at rest or play in the shaded patio. A small boy 4 feet in height executed by Mary Vance Green shows content with his catch of a large enamel fish of golds and greens—the work of Nessye Scharlack. Surrounding the lad are several large ceramic birds, a frog, and plants in brown stoneware placed at different levels to catch the fountain water as it falls. Martha Mood, Bess Semmes, Margaret Wray, Mildred Cocke and Lola Smith are contributing these pieces as well as the small and brilliant enamel fish on the floor of the pool.

On the east patio wall, we come upon Amy Freeman Lee's "Enhanced Voyage." The two panels 6 feet by 40 inches each translate Mrs. Lee's paintings into ceramics. The day voyage and its imagery is developed in brilliant sunlight colors, using imported glass, while the night voyage is bathed in the softer shimmering colors of the moon's light.

LIMESTONE SCULPTURE

As we leave the patio through iron gates to the outside, we find a 5-foot sculpture in Texas limestone surrounded by trees and benches and set off by the brown wall background. This piece is the work of Robert Lancaster, director of the Arts Department of Southwestern University and is being executed in his studio at Georgetown.

The large recreation room in the west wing of the first floor will be enlivened by a games mural now underway by Margaret Pace in her home studio.

The enthusiasm of the San Antonio artists and the city's cosmopolitan spirit attracted also the interest of the renowned Mexican sculptor, Augusto Escobedo. He is fashioning a garden piece to take its place with the work of San Antonio artists, thus contributing to the good-neighbor policy in the cultural field. He expressed as his only regret his inability to contribute a large fountain for the front lawn which he felt befit the magnificence of the structure and what the social concept will mean to all American countries.

MANY WORKERS

Helping to make his wealth of artwork possible have been a host of other workers. Harold Rams, owner of the Orco Glass Co., gave space and labor for the execution of the three largest pieces. Volunteers ranging from teenagers to retired military personnel and "the boys in the backroom" at Orco put in long hours with the artists helping to place the thousands of small pieces in their designs. Some of the fountain sculpture was executed in the studio of Harding Black, nationally known ceramist and one of the outstanding experimenters in glazes in this country. Superintendent of the construction for Farnsworth & Chambers, Gerald Lyda, prepared the structure to accept the art pieces, and Elton Wyatt, architects' inspector, found time to join in the behind-the-scenes work and help make possible the vast undertaking of the artists. Architect Thompson, with Harvey Marmon to watch over his shoulder, acted as coordinator, passing on all designs, colors, and locations of the various art pieces.

Architects, planners, Federal, State, and municipal officials from across the country have come to see this development. Others are coming, some waiting for the building completion this summer. Over 600 copies of the Housing Authority's research study, "Housing the Elderly" have been requested from across the world. Five national magazines interested in the field of gerontology and modern municipal developments have

carried articles and pictures and made mention of the community cooperative plan that has achieved so much in social welfare and art. Is this a renaissance born in St. Anthony's pueblo? A renaissance in mañana town? Could be.

A Modest Proposal for Narrowing Any Possible Missile Gap Even More Rapidly—Put Polaris Missiles on Surface Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, as the debate with regard to any possible missile gap in the years immediately ahead has continued, more and more Members have recognized the tremendous potentialities of the Polaris ballistic missile firing submarine as a source of nuclear deterrent power for this country which is far more invulnerable than the present manned bombers of our Strategic Air Command, and which is today almost within our grasp as an operational weapon.

President Eisenhower himself has recognized the importance of Polaris, a weapon capable of ranging the seas at will and carrying a deterrent nuclear power which can be brought to bear on the Soviet Union at ranges much shorter than those required of an intercontinental ballistic missile. So important are the advantages of this remarkable new system, that many of us feel it should be developed even more rapidly than the President has requested, so that any possible gap between Soviet missile capabilities and our own can be narrowed just as quickly as we are humanly able to do. In that connection, I have myself introduced legislation to appropriate funds for the construction of some six additional Polaris ballistic missile firing submarines in the 1961 Defense Department appropriation bill. Even though these ships will be costly, totaling some \$975 million for the six of them, the security of an invulnerable deterrent which they can afford is well worth the cost to us.

Nevertheless, even with these 6 additional ships we will have only 21 Polaris submarines, which is less than half the fleet which our Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, has said would be required to provide us adequate protection and deterrent power in this novel and invulnerable way. While Polaris will be available to us more quickly than other types of missile systems, it is still a weapon that will require time in order to be built in sufficient quantities, largely, of course, because of the necessity of constructing the highly complicated nuclear submarines which are such a vital part of the system.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the Polaris missile it should not be overlooked that the missile itself is already operational and has actually demonstrated its capacity in exhausting tests by the Navy. Only the more delicate marriage of the missile itself with the nuclear submarine remains to be carried out, although I have no doubt that this too will turn out as satisfactorily as Admiral Raborn and his associates predict.

Now, the other day there came to my attention an article which I believe to be of great value to those of us who are interested in the national defense and which I feel merits the immediate attention of this body. In our concern with the Polaris nuclear submarine we may have overlooked the fact that in Polaris the United States already has available the first solid-propellant effective intermediate-range ballistic missile. Surely it would be a mistake if we were to fail to utilize this part of the Polaris system as fully and as rapidly as possible, even while we wait for additional nuclear submarines to be built. Surely in the quest for the almost complete invulnerability which the nuclear submarine can give to the overall Polaris system, we would be making a serious mistake to neglect the substantial defensive possibilities of the more moderate degrees of invulnerability that could also be attained by placing these solid propellant missiles, in the form in which they are already available today, on existing surface ships of the Navy.

I am advised that equipping surface ships for this type of activity would not either be greatly expensive nor would it take great time; and even though a surface ship would not, of course, have the degrees of invulnerability that would be characteristic of a nuclear submarine, by placing these missiles on a larger number of surface craft, doing it more rapidly and moving these craft over the surfaces of the ocean we would achieve a degree of dispersal and hence a very real measure of invulnerability which it would be almost impossible for the Soviet Union to match. Without abandoning in any way the drive for increased production of Polaris submarines, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a corresponding responsibility to the security of this Nation to make the missile itself available during this interim period for use on existing ships of the Navy, and perhaps even calling some ships back out of mothballs for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe this proposal has such far-reaching consequences I commend it to my colleagues, and urge their attention to the article which appeared in Navy—the Magazine of Sea Power for March 1960 written by the brilliant military editor of the Washington Star, Mr. L. Edgar Prina, and which also appeared on March 14, 1960, in the Appendix of the Record in the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged— XVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 16 times before I have addressed the House to advise my colleagues that West Virginia is getting shortchanged by the agencies of the Federal Government.

Particularly I have singled out the Defense Department, which controls the spending of more than \$40 billion a year, more than half of our national budget.

The Defense Department, on a per capita basis, has ranked West Virginia a dead last among the States in military and civilian payrolls and in the number of installations within the State.

This is doubly regrettable in view of the fact that our State has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation today, and that improvement of the condition of the State's economy will require efforts on many levels.

One big boost for the economy would be the fair allocation of military contracts and payrolls within the State.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to present recent and comprehensive figures to prove that just the opposite is being done.

These figures pin down not only the total military and civilian payrolls, but also the total spent on supplies, services, and construction within each State.

I hardly need tell you where West Virginia ranks on a per capita listing of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. It is last, 51st.

In fact, although West Virginia is 30th among the States in population, it ranks a low, low 50th on the list of total funds spent. Only Vermont, with barely a sixth of the Mountain State's population, rates below the Mountain State on this list.

Mr. Speaker, I have never maintained that West Virginia is geographically or strategically situated in a manner that would justify an expenditure as great as California's or New York's.

But surely West Virginia deserves a per capita share more than one-fiftieth that of California's, or more than one-fiftieth that of New York's.

Surely it merits more than one-fiftieth that of Alaska's announced per capita share—which does not even include supplies, services, and construction spending.

And it seems hard to explain why Connecticut should get 37 times as much business as West Virginia on a per capita basis, and why Arizona should have 24 times as much spending on supplies, services, and construction.

Mr. Speaker, every single State in the Union shares in the annual budget to more than three times the extent that

West Virginia does—while our State remains the most sorely depressed in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the following statistical table documents the unfair way in which West Virginia is getting shortchanged:

States' apportionment of U.S. defense budget for year ending June 30, 1959

[Ranked on per capita basis]

Rank	State	Military spending for supplies, services, construction, etc.	Pay to military personnel	Pay to civilians	Total	Amount spent per capita	Rank	State	Military spending for supplies, services, construction, etc.	Pay to military personnel	Pay to civilians	Total	Amount spent per capita
		Million	Million	Million	Million				Million	Million	Million	Million	
1	Alaska	(1)	\$124	\$43	\$167	\$759	27	Ohio	\$1,031	\$79	\$211	\$1,321	\$166
2	California	\$5,283	757	780	6,820	644	28	North Carolina	321	248	56	625	154
3	Washington	961	185	142	1,288	537	29	Alabama	138	87	209	434	142
4	Arizona	239	84	39	362	483	30	South Carolina	38	182	78	298	141
5	Connecticut	920	20	13	953	475	31	Michigan	783	51	52	886	139
6	District of Columbia	98	73	188	359	448	32	Rhode Island	27	25	48	100	125
7	Hawaii	(1)	133	124	257	438	33	Indiana	389	31	60	480	122
8	Utah	175	13	96	283	411	34	Nebraska	63	61	23	147	111
9	Maryland	509	174	224	907	387	35	Pennsylvania	684	57	376	1,117	106
10	Delaware	74	30	8	112	355	36	Louisiana	151	90	38	279	104
11	Nevada	11	29	15	55	344	37	Montana	28	25	4	57	96
12	New Mexico	73	95	61	229	336	38	Mississippi	87	91	32	210	96
13	Colorado	252	111	77	440	332	39	Illinois	491	170	159	820	94
14	Kansas	450	135	35	620	325	40	Minnesota	238	19	9	266	89
15	Virginia	263	307	428	1,028	310	41	Kentucky	39	136	66	261	88
16	Massachusetts	1,150	143	139	1,432	305	42	South Dakota	12	29	8	49	75
17	Florida	405	248	137	790	285	43	Tennessee	106	71	43	220	67
18	Texas	1,305	630	315	2,250	278	44	Iowa	155	8	3	166	63
19	New Jersey	919	158	142	1,219	252	45	Idaho	9	20	4	33	56
20	New Hampshire	41	36	49	126	237	46	Vermont	14	6	1	21	55
21	Georgia	271	259	180	710	205	47	Wisconsin	168	20	11	199	55
22	Maine	117	54	10	181	198	48	North Dakota	17	12	4	33	53
23	New York	2,400	153	300	2,865	193	49	Oregon	31	19	20	70	46
24	Missouri	571	111	4	763	192	50	Arkansas	16	42	20	78	41
25	Wyoming	41	7	4	52	179	51	West Virginia	20	2	6	28	13
26	Oklahoma	135	118	135	388	174							

¹ Data unavailable.

Source of basic data: U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Census Bureau.

Research To Brighten Economic Outlook for Great Lakes Fish Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in promoting economic progress for the country generally and for industry specifically, we recognize that research plays a tremendously significant role.

In many cases it provides the foundation essential for building progress for the future.

Today I would like to call attention to a specific problem that is confronting the fish industry in the Great Lakes region in terms of the need for an expanded research program.

Over the years the commercial fishing industry has depended upon the supply of choice fish in the waters of the Great Lakes for economic health.

Recently, unfortunately, the deadly lamprey have killed off large numbers of the lake trout, whitefish, and other prized species. As a result, the fishing industry in Wisconsin and the Midwest is facing serious difficulties.

Currently an antilamprey campaign underway is making progress toward elimination of the lamprey eels. However, it will be years before the lake is likely to be replenished with stocks of choice fish.

Meanwhile there is an abundance of other kinds of fish—formerly food for

the prize species—in the lakes, including Lake Michigan, which can be utilized for such commercial uses as pet and animal foods, and other purposes.

There are, however, serious difficulties in adapting processing techniques of the fishing industry for a changeover to this kind of commercial operation.

Currently the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is carrying on research in this field to provide for better, wider utilization of these resources.

Recognizing the plight of the fish industry, I believe that Congress—before which the Fish and Wildlife Service appropriations are pending—should approve adequate funds for a good, sound research program. In addition, I have urged the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to direct as much of the fish research as possible to meeting the specific problems in the Great Lakes regions.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have a brief résumé of the kinds of research needed to resolve the problems and thus brighten the economic outlook for the fish industry in the Great Lakes region printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE-POINT RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY IN GREAT LAKES REGION

1. Exploratory fishing and gear research, including modern fish-finding equipment with trawls and other fishing gear to appraise the commercial potential of the fish stocks on Lake Michigan and Green Bay to determine the most economical means of capture.

2. Technological studies on the adoption of modern mechanized equipment to permit

efficient handling and processing of fish catching in sufficient volume.

3. Information on the chemical composition of raw fish supplies and the effect of processing factors on nutrient values of industrial food fish.

4. Market research to provide liaison between industry groups and the various State, Federal and other agencies at work in market development; and to assist producers, processors and industrial shippers in the location and distribution of fish supplies.

5. Biological studies of the entire lake waters to measure changes and to forecast fishery trends and conditions. These studies should be accompanied by statistical matter to aid in the management and regulation of future fishery harvests.

Government Subsidy Historical Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, because of the great emphasis placed on subsidies in connection with agriculture by the various news media as contrasted with little or no public attention being called to the fact that practically every other segment of the economy is supported by our Government in one way or another, the average American appears to have a distorted view on the subject of subsidies generally. I dare say almost everybody thinks that farmers are receiving handouts from Uncle Sam, which of course is not the case, but

I doubt if very many people are aware of the fact that the Federal Government pours out \$10.2 million every day to subsidize transportation facilities alone; that postal deficits over a 10-year period in behalf of business have exceeded the cost of farm price support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation over a 25-year period.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a study made by the House Committee on Agriculture which summarizes the use of subsidies to advance the aims and purposes of government since the First Congress to 1958, entitled "Government Subsidy, Historical Review." Irrespective of what the public thinks about the matter of Government assistance, I call the attention of my colleagues particularly to the conclusion of this study which indicates that few if any, areas of the economy are untouched by subsidies; that subsidies are as old as our Government and long have been used as an acceptable and serviceable adjunct to the free-enterprise economy; and that condemnation or praise of subsidies as such is academic and unrealistic, without taking their public purposes into account; that in agriculture, therefore, as with industry, business, and labor, the true evaluation of subsidies must depend on the public interest being served.

The study follows:

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY, HISTORICAL REVIEW

The subsidy is the oldest economic principle written into the laws of the United States.

It has been used from time to time since the inception of this Government to influence the direction of economic development and to moderate the impact of the normal workings of supply and demand. The principle has been employed to promote science, the arts, research, and for other Government aims and purposes.

When the First Congress convened in 1789 its first act was to devise a system for administering oaths. The next business by the Members—legislating for the new Nation then populated almost completely by farm people—was the enactment of a tariff law, to protect and promote the infant and frontier industrial development of America. Significantly, moreover, this legislation set up a special subsidy mechanism to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. It stipulated that goods imported into the United States on American vessels should have a 10 percent reduction in customs duties, and a tonnage tax also was imposed in favor of American shipping.

GROWTH OF SUBSIDIES

From this early beginning, subsidies through the years have taken many and various forms.

The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests, between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants. The Government made other contributions by direct appropriations, stock subscriptions, and loans to private canal companies.

Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

Many millions of dollars have been assigned by the Federal Government to ocean and airmail subsidies, to foster the development of transportation, as was the case in the special considerations for railroads and

waterways. This first mail subsidy was paid more than 100 years ago, in 1845, according to available records.

Additional millions of dollars have been used to subsidize the building of ships on American ways. As a recent illustration, approximately \$40 million in subsidy was paid on the private luxury liner, *United States*, that plies between this country and Europe. The total cost of the ship was given as \$76,800,000.

While originally the subsidy mechanism was employed to expand transportation, to encourage foreign trade, and to foster domestic industrial development, more recently subsidy and subsidylike programs have multiplied to such an extent that their impact is felt by virtually all elements in the Nation's economic structure.

TO CONDEMN OR TO PRAISE

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in a special survey, *Subsidy and Subsidylike Programs of the U.S. Government*, concludes:

"Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time."

Any broad condemnation of subsidies as such confronts these hard facts:

America's infant industry, without the aid of subsidy laws in the early years after the formation of this independent Nation, would have been slow to develop and the emergence of the United States as a world power could have been retarded for many years.

Without subsidy there would have been no early development of an American merchant fleet. The first accomplishments of inland transportation in this country—by canals and river improvements—would have been delayed.

Had there been no subsidy, in the form of extensive assistance to railroads in spanning the continent, the settlement and development of the West would have been retarded for years.

The age of air travel in America, unless aided by subsidy, would have been late in arriving, and the contribution of airpower to our military preparedness would have been slowed down.

Without subsidy, no commercial seagoing ships—perhaps even now—would be built on American shores.

Subsidy has had a substantial and beneficial role in the Nation's overall industrial development.

It has been important in aiding the economy and the people—especially in times of depression.

It has been essential in stimulating vital production in wartime.

It has financed scientific development.

It has been used in efforts to balance the economic positions of vast segments of our total society.

TO DEFINE A SUBSIDY

Any study of the subsidy principle and its history and place in the Nation's economy and social structure is complicated by definition. There is no unanimous or uniform agreement on what constitutes a subsidy.

Some contend the tariff system is a subsidy structure, since it involves Government action that enables protected industries to charge more for their goods in the American markets. Moreover, some consider that accelerated tax amortization for defense plants subsidizes the owners of these plants, that "depletion allowances" provide subsidylike benefits to the petroleum and some other industries, that Federal noninterest-bearing deposits of billions of dollars in

private banks and certain services of the Federal Reserve System amount to subsidies for large private bankers, that sale of Federal surplus property at a loss is a subsidy to the purchasers, and that the postal deficit on second-class mail is a subsidy to business. Others confine their definition to direct Government payments, to the remission of charges, and to the supplying of commodities or services at less than cost or market price.

There is one concept of subsidy which extends to all persons and enterprises whose economic positions are improved, or whose purposes are advanced, as the result of Government action. This embraces industries whose profits would be less without protection of the tariff laws and the many other statutes that soften the full force of competition in a private enterprise economy; and this broad definition likewise encompasses all working people whose earnings are greater because of minimum wage, collective bargaining, and immigration laws.

It is pointed out, by those favoring this definition, that the economic benefits accruing to industry and labor, from Government policies, are paid for—as are the costs of the farm program—by the general consuming and taxpaying public.

INDUSTRY, LABOR, AGRICULTURE

Thus virtually all the population would seem to be in a subsidy recipient posture and, moreover, almost all are participating in the payment of the costs. It is certain that the total population feels the economic impact of the subsidy programs for industry, labor, and agriculture.

In this overall subsidy concept the Nation's agriculture no doubt is a lesser recipient than either industry or labor. Yet the farmer, in some areas of public opinion, seems to have been cast in the role of chief villain in a drama of Government largesse.

Perhaps an explanation is that public acceptance of a particular subsidy may relate directly to how well it is disguised as such, and to its adaptability for being covered up in bookkeeping. It certainly is true that, in the broad definition of subsidy, there is no way to measure in dollars the benefits to industry and to labor from all the laws aiding them; yet the principal costs of agriculture's programs are constantly subjected to strict and public accounting.

In the case of industry and labor, the benefits from Government policies are paid largely by consumers. In the case of agriculture, the benefits come principally from taxpayers. Of course, consumers and taxpayers are one and the same.

Currently the subsidy principle is thrust into public attention by the contentions over farm price-support policy. This has brought about a demand for facts and figures relating to subsidies received by agriculture, by industry and business, and by labor, down through the years.

The price-support operations conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation in behalf of agriculture are at the core of the subsidy issue. The opposition to this farm program, in and out of Government, may have left an impression on the public mind that a subsidy is something inborn and inherent with agriculture, and entirely foreign to the remainder of the economy.

It is interesting, therefore, to note that CCC farm price-support losses from 1933 to January 1, 1958, have cost the taxpayers less than subsidies to business through postal deficits alone during the 10-year period 1946-56.

Moreover, the losses connected with price supports for farmers have amounted to only a fraction of the cost of business-reconversion payments, including tax amortization, and other financial aids to industry during the past few years.

The CCC farm price-support losses from the beginning of the program to January 1, 1958, amounted to \$5,173,746,788.

The House Committee on Appropriations published in the hearings on the agricultural appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1959 a table setting forth certain Federal expenditures in recent years for business aids and special services. This showed:

	Millions
Mail subsidies (10-year period 1946-56).....	\$5,968
Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization).....	43,262
Subsidies to maritime organizations (1938 through fiscal 1957).....	3,500
Subsidies to airlines (1938 through fiscal 1957).....	614

The foregoing shows in excess of \$50 billion of subsidy or subsidy-like benefits to industry, the greater part of which has occurred since World War II. The tabulation is meaningful only as an illustration since, as heretofore noted, there is no way to arrive at the dimensions of the benefits to industry and labor over the years as a result of Government actions such as the tariff and minimum wage and collective bargaining laws.

A significant part of our industrial establishment operates today on Government defense and other noncompetitive contracts, without normal risks, and with profits assured. Some 50 of the Nation's largest corporations have received \$80 billion in Government contracts during the past 5 or 6 years. Such contracts cannot be labeled as subsidies to industry, but they do reflect certain Federal financial support. It is notable, moreover, that the Government generally obtains the industrial materials of defense under contracts drawn to assure profits to the producers, whereas the food for the Armed Forces is procured generally without reference to profits or losses of farmers.

SUBSIDIES TO MAGAZINES

As heretofore set forth, the postal deficits over a 10-year period in behalf of business have exceeded the cost of farm price-support programs through the CCC during the last 25 years. The Post Office Department has made estimates of the annual revenues and costs involved in the handling of several larger magazines. These estimates were published by the House Appropriations Committee. Revenues were found to account for only 35 percent of the cost of handling these publications.

Here are the Post Office estimates of revenues and costs, for a year, along with a third column showing the difference, or amount of subsidy, involved, as published in the Appropriations Committee hearings:

TABLE I

Publication	Estimated revenue	Estimated cost	Amount of subsidy
Life.....	\$7,485,000	\$16,979,000	\$9,494,000
Saturday Evening Post.....	3,488,000	9,557,000	6,069,000
Reader's Digest.....	1,082,000	5,891,000	4,809,000
Look Magazine.....	1,534,000	5,016,000	3,482,000
Collier's (discontinued).....	1,238,000	4,415,000	3,177,000
Ladies' Home Journal.....	1,530,000	3,449,000	1,919,000
Woman's Home Companion.....	741,000	2,325,000	1,584,000
McCall's magazine.....	1,097,000	2,604,000	1,507,000
National Geographic.....	486,000	1,821,000	1,335,000
Good Housekeeping.....	881,000	2,175,000	1,294,000
American Home.....	623,000	1,753,000	1,130,000
Better Homes and Gardens.....	758,000	1,904,000	1,146,000
American Monthly.....	326,000	1,359,000	1,033,000
Coronet.....	180,000	976,000	796,000
Total.....	21,442,000	60,224,000	38,775,000

In general, the revenue estimates are based on data from administrative records cover-

ing the mailings of all issues of these publications for the month of March 1956, extended to annual revenues on the basis of the number of issues per year. However, other mailing periods were used for some of the publications, in computing mailing revenues and costs to the Government. Representatives of some of the publications have contested the Post Office estimates using average costs figures, as in the above table.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

The farm program, which evokes this review of subsidies in the total economy, came into being when agriculture was on the edge of bankruptcy during the grim depression of the thirties. This program was based upon the parity principle. It embodies the computation of prices at which farm commodities should sell to maintain agriculture in a reasonable income relationship with other segments of the economy. The "parity price" of a farm commodity, thus, is based upon the prices of things farmers must buy—tractors, fuel, fertilizer, seed, insecticide, etc.—and the parity price goes up or down with the prices of these things, fluctuating as do some wage rates in industry that are tied to the cost of living.

To maintain farm prices at reasonable levels, the Government decided to make loans on storable crops at a stipulated percentage of parity—never as much as 100 percent. The crops are put up as collateral by the individual farmers and, if the farmers do not repay the loans by a specified date, the Government assumes ownership of the collateral. The Government then stores the commodity and moves it into use at times and in a manner that will not depress normal farm prices. This is a major aspect of what is known as the farm program.

The following table summarizes the costs of the CCC price-support operations—first, for the 20-year period 1933 to 1952, inclusive, and second, for the 25-year period 1933 to 1957, inclusive:

TABLE II.—Summary of CCC program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1957 (realized gains and losses)

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1952	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1957
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM (CCC NONRECOURSE LOAN, PURCHASE, AND PAYMENT PROGRAM)		
Basic commodities:		
Corn.....	\$53,166,802	\$673,020,646
Cornmeal.....		30,813,137
Cotton:		
Extra long staple.....		6,146,942
Upland.....	208,629,425	439,737,896
Export differential.....	41,361,218	41,361,218
Puerto Rican.....	130,198	130,198
Cotton-rubber barter.....	11,055,451	11,055,451
Peanuts.....	91,687,005	151,129,448
Rice.....	1,422,757	70,768,110
Tobacco.....	4,585,150	4,326,570
Wheat.....	183,490,156	510,721,419
Wheat flour.....		65,967,730
Total.....	13,011,290	1,902,067,863
Designated nonbasic commodities:		
Honey.....	873,405	808,646
Milk and butterfat:		
Butter.....	45,286,347	430,421,755
Butter oil.....		121,205,843
Cheese.....	25,021,168	302,514,035
Milk:		
Dried.....	58,215,808	518,832,477
Fluid.....		187,301,019
Whey.....		3,584,209
Subtotal.....	133,396,788	1,563,859,338
Potatoes, Irish.....	478,080,248	478,577,870
Tung oil.....	78,904	1,063,125
Wool.....	92,163,834	113,829,214
Total.....	702,719,774	2,158,198,193

TABLE II.—Summary of CCC program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1957 (realized gains and losses)—Continued

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1952	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1957
Other nonbasic commodities:		
Barley.....	\$9,621,953	\$101,663,747
Beans, dry, edible.....	31,800,769	72,679,309
Castor beans.....	171,193	171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian.....	273,760	28,827
Cottonseed and products.....	15,360,619	116,786,256
Eggs.....	189,704,186	189,698,695
Flax fiber.....	397,113	397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil.....	66,065,232	166,034,288
Fruit, dried.....	14,882,320	14,882,320
Grain sorghum.....	35,804,103	183,384,438
Grapefruit juice.....	1,732,374	1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber.....	21,459,155	21,459,155
Hops.....	954,200	954,200
Naval stores.....	11,372,873	815,375
Oats.....	1,338,827	166,962,650
Olive oil.....		578,132
Peas, dry, edible.....	889,436	824,435
Pecans.....	3,751	3,751
Rye.....	169,455	17,448,925
Rye flour.....		7,080
Seeds.....	1,349,516	38,705,486
Soybeans.....	4,376,694	1,577,300
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands.....	23,830	23,830
Sugar beets.....	16,517,269	16,517,269
Sweetpotatoes.....	135,421	135,421
Turkeys.....	11,070	11,070
Vegetables, canned.....	11,942	11,942
Total.....	874,908,741	1,013,329,084
Exchange commodities.....		10,151,648
Total price support.....	1,064,617,225	5,173,746,788

¹ Denotes loss.

The Commodity Credit Corporation costs, as shown in the foregoing table II, bear the brunt of antismuggling and antifarm program criticisms. Generally, these criticisms ignore or obscure the subsidy aspects in the rest of the economy.

The Department of Agriculture prepares a table each year under the heading, "Realized Cost of Programs Primarily for Stabilization of Farm Prices." This includes the CCC price supports and other costs, many of which have been challenged as not being justifiable charges against the farm program.

The Director of Budget and Finance of the Department has prepared a cumulative table which is presented by the Department as representing costs of programs "primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income," for the fiscal years 1932 through 1957. This table follows:

TABLE III.—Realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, fiscal years 1932-57

[Millions]	
Commodity Credit Corporation:	
Nonrecourse loan purchase, and payment programs.....	\$4,603.0
Supply, commodity export, and other activities.....	15.4
Interest, administrative, and other general costs.....	991.9
Total, CCC.....	5,610.3
National Wool Act program.....	63.5
International Wheat Agreement.....	899.2
Donations of commodities to other nations.....	384.3
Commodities sold for foreign currencies under title I, Public Law 480.....	931.6
Development of foreign agricultural markets, title I, Public Law 480.....	2.6
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	2,154.3

TABLE III.—Realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, fiscal years 1932-57—Continued

[Millions]	
Sugar Act.....	\$373.6
Federal crop insurance.....	203.7
Soil bank—acreage reserve program.....	518.3
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program.....	2,354.8
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas.....	177.6
Parity payments.....	1,016.6
Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates.....	1.4
Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts.....	571.1
Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products.....	76.6
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred.....	378.6
Other functions.....	38.2
Total.....	15,009.1

¹ Represents income or minus expenditures.

The first printing of Government Subsidy—Historical Review, in June 1954, carried a similar compilation by the Director of Budget and Finance of the Department of Agriculture, showing that the realized cost of programs, "primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income," for the period 1932 through 1952, amounted to \$7,510,400,000. Thus, these costs as set down by the Department have doubled in the last 5 years.

It should be emphasized that certain of the programs emphasized in the compilation of table III, involving large expenditures, result in important benefits to other segments of the economy and to many people who are not agricultural producers. This is particularly true with respect to programs for disposal of surplus agricultural commodities acquired under CCC price support and other stabilization measures. These include Government donations of foods to school lunches to the Veterans' Administration and to the armed services, and to millions of needy people at home and abroad. At this writing these foods go to approximately 14 million schoolchildren in the United States, 4.5 million needy persons in this country, 1.5 million people in charitable institutions, and to as estimated 80 million needy persons in 85 countries around the world.

The question, therefore, is: Should this program, where the benefits are shared so extensively by the consumers of the food acquired by the Government, be charged exclusively against farmers and the farm program?

CREATING PROFITS AND JOBS

This question would not arise, of course, except in response to the steady bombardment of the public mind with implications that farmers exist primarily on Government checks and that subsidy is the evil and virtually exclusive hallmark of agriculture.

Manipulation of the language can foster the impression that almost every Government dollar expended in relation to agriculture is a subsidy to farmers, while the billions of dollars in Federal outlays for nonfarm purposes—creating profits for industry and jobs for workers—are somehow more respectable and proper. Rarely are they labeled as "subsidies" to those who are benefited.

During the postwar period from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1957, the United States extended aid totaling \$59,998 million to foreign governments and international organizations. This aid involved a great movement of the products of American industry to other nations, meaning profits for industry and

jobs for workers in our own country. But this is not deemed to be in any way a subsidy to our industry or our labor.

The Government, of course, has expended many more billions of dollars in purchases and arrangements for defense purposes. A substantial portion of our industry operates without risk and with assured profits, in producing for the Government. A sizable portion of our labor force is employed in producing for the Government. This is not, and should not be accounted as a subsidy.

However, it must be noted that when the Government ships food to other nations, or when it supplies food for the unemployed and their families in our own country, or donates food for school lunches, to the Veterans' Administration, and to the Armed Forces, the Government books list the charges against the farm program, and in the minds of many people this seems to be a subsidy to farmers.

It should be pointed out also that in the production buildup for World War II and for the Korean conflict our industrial expansion was underwritten by the Government. Profits in industry producing with Government contracts were guaranteed. When no longer needed, industrial war plants were recognized as surplusage, and charged off to war or defense. After World War II the billions in surplus war materials, including trucks, automobiles, and the many other items usable in peacetime, were kept off the normal competitive markets, to protect industry. All this was not, and should not be charged as a Government subsidy operation.

But in the case of agriculture, farmers responded to war needs with a 40 percent increase in their productive capacity. They paid from their own pockets for this vast expansion of their productive resources. At the end of World War II and again after the Korean conflict there excess capacity was not written off by the Government and charged to war. Their surpluses, from a war-generated capacity, still are listed on Government books as charges against the farm program, and some opinion seems pleased to regard these charges as subsidies to farmers.

"SUBSIDY" BECOMES A CATCHWORD

From the foregoing there would seem to be a cultivated propensity to tie a "subsidy" tag to any Government program that seeks to bring the income and living standards of farm families into a parity position with the other great segments of our economy.

"Subsidy" has become the catchword of a drive to break down the program of effective price supports for major crops. The drive, with support in and out of Government, is succeeding. A flexible system of deteriorating supports is supplanting the stabilizing supports which hitherto had applied to the group of major commodities. This has been followed by a general decline in the income structure of farmers and, ironically, a vast increase in agricultural subsidies.

Comparing 1957 with 1952, total farm production was up 6 percent, farm prices down 16 percent, farm parity ratio down 18 percentage points, total farm income down 20 percent, realized net farm income at the lowest point since 1942, purchasing power of that farm income down 24 percent (lowest since 1940), and the farm population had declined from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 20,396,000 in 1957. Farm debt has reached a record high, above \$20 billion.

The official reports of the Department of Agriculture show that the price-support program, through the CCC, operated for 20 years prior to 1953 at an actual profit of over \$13 million on the programs for the basic crops. The loss on all crop operations at the end of the 20 years was only \$1,064 million (as shown in table II), whereas losses in the last 5 years have amounted to more than \$4 billion. With price supports at 90 percent of parity for 11 consecutive years prior to 1953 the average prices for all farm

commodities in the marketplace were at 100 percent of parity or better, and farm program costs were negligible; whereas, during the following years of constantly deteriorating prices, program costs, or subsidies, have increased fourfold.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing it is manifest that few, if any, areas of the economy are untouched by subsidies; that subsidies are as old as our Government and long have been used as an acceptable and serviceable adjunct to the free-enterprise economy; and that condemnation or praise of subsidies as such is academic and unrealistic, without taking their public purposes into account.

In agriculture, therefore, as with industry, business, and labor, the true evaluation of subsidies must depend on the public interest being served.

Russian Electric Power Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, was one of the consultants who accompanied a special subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee on a visit to Russia last year to observe the hydroelectric power development of that country as compared with that of the United States.

Upon their return to this country, Mr. Radin wrote a series of three articles for the North American Newspaper Alliance, in which he summarized his observations while in the Soviet Union. In my opinion, the articles are well written and are very penetrating. I think they very well summarize the observations made by the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of three articles may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REDS' POWER THREAT—AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO UNDERESTIMATE RUSSIA'S ELECTRIC POWER PROGRAMS—U.S. INSPECTION TEAM FINDS EVIDENCE WHILE ON TOUR THAT SOVIET UNION HAS ATTAINED DEVELOPMENT LEADERSHIP

(By Alex Radin)

WASHINGTON, November 28.—Americans have become painfully aware of Russian leadership in the exploration of space. A delegation representing two committees of the U.S. Senate, recently returned from a month-long, 12,000 mile trip in the Soviet Union, has impressive evidence that the Soviet Union has also overtaken the United States in the building of hydroelectric power dams.

We cannot afford to take lightly the Russian program in hydroelectric power development, and the possible impact of this program on world affairs.

In fact, the power program, though less dramatic, ultimately may prove to be of even greater significance than the missile and space exploration program—for electric power forms the basis of the industrial might of a modern nation.

INSPECTED 10 PROJECTS

The delegation inspected 10 waterpower projects on seven rivers, from the Ukraine in the east to the Lake Baikal region in Siberia. The group also held numerous conferences with officials of the U.S.S.R. ministry of power station construction, and visited a thermal power station, various other electric facilities, and four hydroelectric institutes. We found this evidence that the Russians have now attained world leadership in hydroelectric power development:

1. The Russians already have in operation the world's largest dam—Kuibishev, with a capacity of 2,300,000 kilowatts. Prior to completion of Kuibishev, the world's largest was America's Grand Coulee, with a capacity of 1,900,000 kilowatts.

2. The Russians are nearing completion on another dam, Stalingrad, which will have a powerhouse even larger than Kuibishev. Stalingrad's capacity will be 2,530,000 kilowatts.

3. A dam being built on the Angara River in Siberia and scheduled for initial operation in 1961 will have an installed capacity of 4,500,000 kilowatts—more than twice the size of Grand Coulee.

4. Still another dam, Krasnoyarsk, under construction in Siberia, will have a capacity of not less than 5 million kilowatts—which is almost twice the power capacity of all 31 dams in the Tennessee Valley.

5. The Russians have developed new techniques which they contend will revolutionize the art of building dams.

The author accompanied an 11-man Senate delegation which recently conducted a 31-day inspection of vital Soviet hydroelectric power projects. Mr. Radin is general manager of the American Public Power Association, representing more than 1,000 municipal and other local, publicly owned electric utilities throughout the United States. A former newspaperman, he has testified on electric power development before several congressional committees and was asked to accompany the Senate group.

LONGER DISTANCE

6. Power is being transmitted considerably longer distances in the Soviet Union than in the United States, and the ultimate goal of the Russians is to have an interconnected transmission system stretching all the way from Vladivostok in the east to Leningrad in the west—a distance of some 4,000 miles. Already the Russians are transmitting power for more than 600 miles; our longest transmission lines are about 300 miles.

7. The Russians are transmitting power at higher voltages than in the United States. The highest voltage now in use in the United States is 345,000 volts; the Russians are transmitting power at 400,000 volts, and within the next few months will step this up to 500,000 volts. Moreover, they are making plans to transmit power at up to 800,000 volts, by direct current.

8. Larger generating units are being used in Russian hydroelectric plants than in the United States. The largest generating units now in use in hydroplants in the United States are those at Grand Coulee, with a rated capacity of 108,000 kilowatts each. The Russians already have installed 115,000 kilowatt units at Stalingrad; they will install 225,000 kilowatt units at Bratsk, and 500,000 kilowatt units at Krasnoyarsk.

UNITED STATES HOLDS LEAD

9. Although the Senate group's mission was to study only hydroelectric power, the delegation also learned that the Russians now have a 2,400,000-kilowatt steamplant under construction in Siberia. The largest now in operation in the United States is the Tennessee Valley Authority's Kingston plant, with an installed capacity of 1,440,000 kilowatts. However, the size of the units in the Russian steamplant is smaller than the largest on order today in the United States.

To place the Russian power program in proper perspective, it should quickly be pointed out that, despite the leadership which Russia has achieved in the building of individual dams and generating units, the total power capacity of the Soviet Union is still considerably below that of the United States. As of the beginning of this year, Russia's total power capacity was about 53 million kilowatts, whereas that of the United States was about 142 million kilowatts.

The significance of the Russian power program, however, lies in several factors:

1. If the rate of growth of the United States and the Soviet Union continues at the present pace, the Soviet Union could equal if not overtake the United States in power capacity in the 1980's.

2. Even if the Russians have less electric power capacity than the United States, the Russians contend that they can outstrip the United States in production because they are devoting a larger share of their power to industrial uses. For example, the Russians now use 79 percent of their electric power for industry; we use about 49 percent of our power for this purpose.

3. The Russian hydroelectric power projects are being used as the basis for a vast complex of new industrial development, particularly in Siberia. One evidence of the Russian intentions in this regard is the fact that all of the construction camps for hydroelectric projects are built as permanent cities. As work on the dam slackens, industries are built in the immediate areas, and the new cities are used to house industrial workers.

4. Contrary to some statements, the Russians are not slowing down their construction of hydroelectric power projects.

In our first meeting with officials of the ministry of power station construction we questioned the ministry officials as to whether or not there was a cutback in the building of hydroelectric projects. The answer was a flat "No."

Officials contend that the pace of the dam building program was being maintained, but that the steamplant construction program was being accelerated, and added on top of the hydro program, mainly because of the Russians' desire for speed of industrialization.

REDS' POWER THREAT—REDS AID CHINA, INDIA, EGYPT IN PLANNING FOR HYDRODAMS

(By Alex Radin)

WASHINGTON, November 29.—Having established world leadership in the building of hydroelectric dams, the Russians are now taking advantage of this position by providing both technical assistance and equipment to Communist and non-Communist countries of the world.

As a byproduct of their recent 31-day tour of Russian hydroelectric power developments, an 11-man delegation from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate learned a great deal about the work which the Russians are doing with other countries in the development of hydroelectric power.

In no country is this work of more startling proportions than in Communist China.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE DAMS UNDERWAY

We have learned that Red China now has 255 dams underway and that the goal of the Chinese is to have a capacity of 70 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power in production by 1970. (As of this year, the United States had a capacity of more than 29 million kilowatts of hydropower and a total capacity of more than 142 million kilowatts. The Federal Power Commission estimates we will have 45 million kilowatts of hydropower and a total utility capacity of 283 million kilowatts in 1970.)

A Russian engineer told us that the extent of the dam building and other public works

projects in Communist China is of such magnitude that the Chinese now have a shortage of labor, despite the fact that they have a population of more than 620 million, and women are used extensively in their labor force. The shortage results from the fact that the Chinese have undertaken a large-scale construction program with very little mechanization.

The power projects being undertaken by the Communist Chinese are of very considerable size. For example, we were told that the largest of these projects now underway would have an installed capacity of 3 million kilowatts—or half again as great as Grand Coulee Dam, the United States largest. The 3-million-kilowatt project is being built on a tributary of the Yangtze.

Although the Red Chinese attach great importance to power production, their primary objective in building these dams is flood control, according to the Russian engineers.

To assist the Chinese in this program, the Russians have assigned 50 engineers to Red China. At the same time, there are also a group of Chinese engineers undergoing training in the Soviet Union.

GIANT DAM PLANNED

The Russians reported that the Chinese engineers are most capable.

In addition to the projects underway, engineering work is going forward in Leningrad on a project that staggers the imagination—a dam at Itchang Gorge on the Yangtze River in China. The project would have an initial capacity of 25 million kilowatts (about 8 times the amount of power capacity in the entire Tennessee Valley Authority's hydroelectric projects) and the ultimate capacity of this project would be about 40 million kilowatts.

The first work on the Itchang Gorge project was done by an American engineer, John Savage, who was the designer of Grand Coulee, Hoover and many other dams. In 1943, at the request of Chiang Kai-shek, Savage was loaned to the Chinese Government by the Bureau of Reclamation, to make some preliminary studies of the Itchang Gorge project, which was needed primarily for the purpose of flood control.

Although the magnitude and velocity of the Red Chinese program was news to our delegation, we were not surprised, of course, that there was close cooperation between the Russians and the Red Chinese on power matters. We were, however, astonished at the extent to which the Russians are using their leadership in power development in order to strengthen their ties with many other countries.

For example, at the Electrosila Works, in Leningrad, where huge generators are manufactured, we learned that this plant is now supplying equipment for 23 countries—both people's democracies and capitalist countries, according to the director. The capitalist countries, he said, include India, Burma, Finland, and Egypt.

SOUTH AMERICA DISCUSSED

The various design institutes for hydroelectric projects also are working with many other countries. At one such institute we saw experimental work which was going forward on the Aswan Dam, in Egypt.

At the Leningrad division of the all-union hydro-energy project we asked the director whether they were doing any work for South American countries.

"No," he replied, "that is your business."

Despite this disclaimer of interest in South America, it was clear that there was no lack of interest in much of the remainder of the world and that the Soviets' leadership in hydroelectric power is being used today as an effective instrument of international influence.

RED'S POWER THREAT—SOVIET DAM BUILDING METHOD SHOWS DESIRE TO BEAT UNITED STATES

(By Alex Radin)

WASHINGTON, November 30.—“We are happy when we have a month with 31 days.”

This comment by a Soviet hydroelectric engineer typifies the driving force behind the Soviet Union's extensive program of building hydroelectric dams. Time and again Soviet engineers emphasized their principal problem is one of time—time to catch up with and surpass the United States in production. In fact, it appeared that time was a more important factor than money in the buildup of the Soviet economy.

In a gravel pit where workers were excavating rock for use in building a dam, in numerous conferences with Soviet engineers, in conversations with a director of a collective farm our group visited, we were repeatedly told that the primary objective of the Russian people is to beat the United States in the production race, and to do so at the earliest possible time.

PREFORMED BLOCKS USED

This race against time undoubtedly was the principal motivating force behind the Russians' development of significant new techniques for cutting both time and money in the building of dams.

Although we saw the use of these techniques in some of the dams under construction, it was not until our final meeting with officials of the Ministry of Power Station Construction that I. T. Novikov, the minister, proudly showed us a model of a dam that he said would “revolutionize” the art of building dams.

The principal construction feature of this 1 million kilowatt dam, which is to be built soon on the Volga River, involves extensive use of preformed concrete blocks.

Such blocks have been used in Russia for some time in building dams, but the Russians have now refined this technique to such a degree that it apparently will result in great savings in time and money.

In the model which we were shown, the Russians had standardized six different types of concrete blocks which will be used to build 65 percent of the structure. In fact, the only monolithic concrete to be used in this dam will be a pad or footings for the blocks.

By the use of these blocks, it will not only be possible to simplify the pouring of concrete, but, more importantly, the tremendous carpentry work in the building of wooden forms for concrete will be eliminated.

WORK IS TELESKOPED

The use of these blocks also will permit a telescoping of some of the work; the blocks can be manufactured at any time, without waiting for other work that normally would have to be done before pouring concrete.

As a result of this technique, the Russians expect to cut the time of building this single dam from the 5-year period which would normally be required, to 3 years. Savings in costs are expected to amount to 30 percent.

After showing us this new model, Minister Novikov turned to Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, chairman of our delegation, and said, “Now do you see how anxious we are to catch up with you?”

After spending 31 days in the Soviet Union and traveling 12,000 miles through many parts of that vast country, our 11-man delegation could not but be impressed with the tremendous drive of the Russian people for industrialization.

Everywhere one is confronted with many charts showing the goals of the current 7-year program, and exhorting the people to fulfill the program in 6 years. And always the charts show the lines going upward at a steep incline.

Although our delegation readily conceded that the Russians had made tremendous advances in the development of hydroelectric power, and had achieved world leadership in this field, we did not feel the Russians had made any momentous scientific breakthrough. Rather, the Russian program seemed to represent primarily a determination to sacrifice other objectives, such as consumer goods, in order to build the all-essential electric energy base for productive capacity.

MOVING FORWARD SWIFTLY

As Senator MOSS put it, “The Soviet Government simply channels vast amounts of the Nation's resources to its power and steel and other developments rather than into consumer goods such as our people enjoy. Whatever one may think or say about this practice one must concede that Russia is moving forward very swiftly and her industrial might is everywhere apparent.”

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat of Maine, another member of the delegation, noted that the Russians' power program “should give us pause to reevaluate our own power development. This doesn't mean—and I would not even hint—that we ought to adopt their methods, speaking of political and economic methods. But I think it is as important for us as it is for the Soviet Union to give appropriate attention to this natural resource.”

In the eyes of the third Senator of the delegation, ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska, one of the best places to accelerate the momentum of our hydroelectric power program is in America's 49th State. Here, upon the conclusion of our tour of the Soviet Union, we flew over the Rampart Canyon in Alaska, where a hydroelectric project of about five million kilowatts has been proposed.

We could not escape the conclusion that what the Russians are now doing in Siberia might well be accomplished in the United States in our Far North frontier. Or in our other power-hungry areas, for that matter.

The Facts About the High Interest Policy as Disclosed by the Honorable Byron Johnson, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has prepared one of the best and most concise statements on interest rates that I have ever seen.

More than that, this statement brings out some new facts and some new ideas which I have not previously seen. It gives several facts which illustrate how the present high interest policy of our Government is reaching into the pocketbooks of the great majority of the American people. This high interest policy is shooting holes in everybody's pocketbook—everybody's pocketbook, that is, except a small minority of wealthy families who receive their income from clipping bond coupons and, of course, the bankers and other financial institutions, which are all profiting very handsomely.

The Members who read our colleague's statement will, I think, dismiss any question of removing the interest rate ceiling

on Government bonds as the President has requested, and dismiss any question of passing the Ways and Means Committee bill, H.R. 10590, which would have the same effect as removing the ceiling. Instead, I believe that the Members who consider this statement will demand an end to the policy of maintaining interest rates at their present artificially high levels. They will demand, in short, that interest rates be brought down to the point where Wall Street has only a finger or two in our pocketbooks instead of having both hands in our pocketbooks.

The statement which has been prepared by our colleague from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is devoid of any oratory. It simply sets out the facts in 1, 2, 3 order. And the importance of these facts surely makes this statement required reading for all Members of the House. It is as follows:

FACTS ABOUT INTEREST RATES

IN GENERAL

Interest is a cost item; it is the price of money.

Higher interest rates increase costs without increasing output. Therefore, high interest is inflationary.

The administration opposes increasing the prices of everything except money.

THE MATHEMATICS OF PUBLIC DEBT

The increased cost to the taxpayer of a one-quarter of 1 percent rise in interest on \$1 billion of Government bonds is \$2.5 million a year; over 20 years it is \$50 million.

During the next year about \$100 billion of Treasury borrowing must be undertaken. Each rise of one-quarter of 1 percent will add \$250 million to the cost of carrying the debt each year; each 1 percent increase adds \$1 billion to the cost of the debt in the first year, and more in later years. Ultimately, each 1 percent adds \$2.9 billion a year to the taxpayer's burdens.

None of this increased cost gives the taxpayer a dime's worth of additional services. Instead it pushes up the cost of all the other money borrowed.

The cost of interest on the public debt was \$4.8 billion in 1946; \$5.8 billion in 1952. Note the rapid upward revisions in estimates now as a result of interest increases: It was first estimated at \$8.1 billion for 1960; in June 1959, the President raised it to \$8.6 billion for fiscal 1960. The present estimate is \$9.4 billion for fiscal 1960, and \$9.6 billion for fiscal 1961. This is more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in any New Deal year before World War II. The total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was \$7.9 billion.

THE EFFECT ON OTHER DEBT

Government debt is roughly one-third of all Federal, State, local, business, and consumer debt. Gross debt, public and private, is roughly \$900 billion.

The economy is paying at least \$10 billion more this year for the use of money than it would have paid under the rates prevailing in 1952. This is a part of the inflation created by the administration.

The Federal interest rate is basic to all others. Hence private interest rates and State and local interest rates will go up as the Federal interest rate goes up.

EFFECT ON INDIVIDUALS

Higher interest makes homes more costly. In 1952 a \$10,000 Government mortgage at 4-percent interest would be paid off over 25 years at a total cost of \$15,840, of which interest was \$5,840. In 1960, the same mortgage at 6 percent can be paid off over 25 years at a total cost of \$19,330, of which in-

terest is \$9,330. The increase of \$3,490 would have been enough to pay for two more bedrooms and a bath. To put it another way, if you wanted to refinance this 4 percent—25 year—\$10,000 mortgage on today's 6-percent market, and keep the monthly payments the same, you would need a 50-year mortgage, making the home twice as costly.

The higher interest rate has added the cost of a new set of tires to your car, which you pay for but do not get; on a new 20-room school, it has added the cost of 6 classrooms which you pay for but do not get. Higher interest makes costs to farmers and small business even higher, and leads to more liquidations and bankruptcies. Higher interest makes home appliances more costly. It raises the cost of living and cuts the standard of living.

HISTORY

The maximum rate of interest of 4½ percent was fixed by Congress in 1917 in the Liberty Loan Act. The Treasury has operated within that ceiling through World War I, a depression, a boom, the great depression, World War II, postwar readjustment, and the Korean incident, down to date. Within that ceiling the Federal debt soared in a few brief war years from \$45 billion to \$270 billion, but the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling held because the Federal Reserve co-operated with the Treasury.

The Treasury can sell its bonds without an increase in long-term interest rates and without inflation if the Federal Reserve will use the power it already has to preserve the value of Government securities by using its open market policies consistently to these ends.

The Federal Reserve notes in your wallet, which carry no interest, always trade at par. It is a sad commentary that Government bonds, bearing interest, are permitted by the Federal Reserve to sag indefinitely in value. The Federal Reserve is supposed to provide an orderly market for Government bonds. It should do so now. A firm statement by the Federal Reserve that it intends to do so, in a manner sufficient to meet the monetary needs of an expanding economy without inflation, would quickly firm up the market. Increased purchases by the Federal Reserve need not create inflationary pressure. If bank reserves rose too sharply, a simple increase in reserve ratio requirements would prevent any inflation. What is more, a more attractive inducement to the public to buy savings bonds—without piercing the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling—will also help the Treasury sell long-term bonds.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Along with its hard-money policies, the widespread fear of inflation last year sent investors into stocks and out of bonds, which raised the yields on U.S. Treasury bonds. Forces are now in motion to lower the price of stocks and raise the price of bonds. As a result, the yields of Government bonds are falling. At the first of the year, 1960, almost every issue was selling at prices to yield more than 4½ percent, three of them to yield more than 5 percent. At the close of business on Friday most Government bonds were selling at yields below 4½ percent. All the bonds with 10 or more years to run were below 4½ percent. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 9, pp. 4679-4680). In the face of these market developments, there is no urgency in acting at this time. If these trends persist, there may be no need for action.

CONCLUSION

Any sanction of the proposal to breach the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling at this time would be a betrayal of our own party's position, as set forth in the 1956 party platform: "Debt management: The Republican debt-management policy of higher interest rates serves only to benefit a few to the detriment of the general taxpayer, the small borrower, and the small and middle-class investor in

Government bonds. We pledge ourselves to a vigilant review of our debt-management policy in order to reduce interest rates in the service of our common welfare."

It is economically sound, historically fitting, and a proper discharge of our duties to oppose further increases in interest rates.

India's Food Deficits and America's Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. J. R. Wiggins, the distinguished executive editor of the Washington Post, has recently completed an extensive tour of India and has written a brilliant and exciting series of articles for the Post.

There is one that appeared on Tuesday, March 1, that I particularly want to call to the attention of my Senate colleagues. The lead paragraph gives the theme of the article:

India's food deficits and America's surpluses ought to go together like the "love and marriage" and a "horse and carriage" of the song hit.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS HUNGER FOR SURPLUSES OF UNITED STATES

(By J. R. Wiggins)

India's food deficits and America's surpluses ought to go together like the "love and marriage" and a "horse and carriage" of the song hit.

They are as complementary as the parts of a mortise and tenon joint.

They do go together, to a degree. Under Public Law 480, the United States, since 1956, has agreed to furnish India surpluses worth \$959.73 million. These have been paid for in counterpart funds, the rupee accounts of which are expendable in India and thus do not add to India's foreign exchange problems. They have gone largely to projects under India's 5-year plans.

These programs have included more than 10 million tons of wheat and 350,000 tons of rice.

BILLION A YEAR FOR STORAGE

They have come out of the bulging warehouses of America's surplus agricultural commodities, on which the country is spending \$1 billion a year for storage (more than \$1 million a day for wheat alone).

To a sixth-grade student of arithmetic it looks as though we could save \$1 billion a year by giving India the whole stock—kit and kaboodle.

Why haven't we?

One of the reasons for my trip was to find out why India didn't ask for more and why we didn't send her more, if not all, of our surpluses.

There are encouraging reasons to believe the program will be stepped up. Among them is the projected visit of S. K. Patil, Minister of Food and Agriculture, who is bringing to the United States his plan to put from 1.4 million to 5 million tons of wheat in reserve storage. Patil began to

pull over his plan long ago. He got more steamed up over it as the result of figures supposed to have been given President Eisenhower:

"Every year the earth produces 1.7 billion tons of food. Divided equally among the planet's 2.8 billion people this would furnish a diet of 2,350 calories to each one. But the United States has surpluses worth \$9.2 billion—1.4 billion bushels of wheat."

STORAGE BINS ABUILDING

The Indian Government has begun to add to storage capacity and to buy land for more bins. A dispersed storage is envisioned so that supplies may be quickly available in case of crop failures. The plan has the interested backing of the Prime Minister. Patil is thinking of initial storage of 55 million bushels.

This is a needed and a useful and prudent thing to do in a country with limited storage facilities and the menace of local shortages. It costs the United States 17 cents a bushel to store grain; some Indian experts think they can store it for 7 cents. (FAO figures do not show this discrepancy.) It would meet a greater need at a lesser cost in India. It would help to stabilize prices in India, too.

The best place to store grain (and the cheapest) is in the bellies of hungry people. There is (according to social scientists) no large-scale starvation in India; but the odds are they are well-fed scientists. There are plenty of people who can and should eat more. Even 130 million bushels in Patil's outside plan wouldn't notably diminish the wheat stocks we are piling up at 400 to 500 million bushels a year.

OBSTACLES ARE LISTED

What holds up a larger movement? What are the obstacles in India?

There is some fear that accumulations of counterpart funds in rupees might have an inflationary effect, or at least put into foreign hands too much control over Indian monetary stability.

Some Indian officials fear Indian farm output might slow down if relieved of the pressure of stark necessity.

There is some fear that heavy inshipments would unsettle the markets of Indian farmers and thus slow up their production.

There is uncertainty about the ability to handle the off-loading and dock storage and transport of a greatly accelerated movement. Wheat shipments are all off-loaded in bags at a rate as slow as only 1,000 tons a day compared with 5,000 tons off-loading rate for bulk grain at modern terminals.

Flat storage construction might cost from 35 to 70 cents a bushel and not all experts agree it is as good as upright concrete storage which costs from 75 cents to \$2 in the United States. (This would be another drain on foreign exchange.)

In the Indian Government there is an astonishing unanimity of belief that food grains should not be brought in under title III in the form of grants for charitable distribution except in cases of flood, famine, and disaster. I heard warnings about demoralizing the needy with free contributions that I hadn't heard since debates on the relief bills of the 1930's in the United States.

Worry was expressed that our surpluses will not last forever and India might develop a dangerous dependence and then be suddenly left without American grains.

Many of these objections to larger intake of wheat do credit to Indian prudence, pride, and independence. They are, in part, however, considerations that a short diet for Cabinet Ministers probably would remove.

OBJECTIONS IN UNITED STATES

In the United States there are also objections based on:

Shipping costs (often compounded by returning ships empty).

Skepticism about the adequacy of storage in India (and pest control).

Fear of offending other grain exporters. (The Joint Wheat Utilization Committee, representing Canada, Australia, France, Argentina, and the United States, may help solve this issue.)

These attitudes, on both sides, are not altogether of imaginary origin. Still, there are those commercial warehouses bulging with 1,028 million bushels of wheat, those Commodity Credit bins with another 39 million bushels, those old Liberty ships with their 37 million bushels. (Fall of 1959 figures.) And there also are those hungry people.

It seems as though most of the legitimate fears of India could be met by more formally tying the food imports and their counterpart funds to a program for improving Indian agriculture at the same time. Some of them have been spent for this under existing programs. But what if the rupee accounts were committed officially to building drainage ditches, irrigation canals, bunds, terraces, farm-to-market roads, godowns (or storage pits), buying seed, building fertilizer plants and educating farmers? Then the American surpluses would fill the current and impending gap between production and need; and would hasten the day when there would be no gap to fill.

Apart from the mutual economic advantages of such an accelerated program there is that other consideration cited by Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

"... never before in history was it possible to say, as we can say now, that the kind of poverty that destroys individual dignity and stifles individual creative effort is not necessary."

Some of the simple agricultural construction projects that would increase India's farm output would also attack its problem of underemployment and unemployment—most of it in rural villages. P. C. Mahalanobis, director of Indian statistics, has used figures that show 20 million Indians are employed less than 1 hour a day, 27 million less than 2 hours, 45 million less than 4 hours. He recently said he had heard it stated in another way—that there are 30 million people who work 5 days a month, 40 million who work less than 10 days a month, 53 million who work less than 15 days a month. This, of course, is no fault of the thrifty and would-be industrious Indian workers. To help diminish this staggering economic waste might greatly advance India's progress toward a self-generating economic growth.

World Refugee Year, Lake County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Region of Indiana has grown in industrial expansion and population phenomenally in the last 20 years. Thousands of World War refugees have come to this area to make their home during this period of time. The Lake County (Ind.) Citizens Committee on World Refugee Year has contributed of its time and services to aid these new

citizens to establish themselves both educationally and economically to the American way of life.

I wish to incorporate with my remarks, an article from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune regarding the activities of this highly necessary and deserving committee in the work which it has been doing in its preparation for cooperating in the World Refugee Year program.

I also wish to include a resolution unanimously adopted by the above organization at its recent meeting:

PLAN UNIFIED SUPPORT OF REFUGEE YEAR

Plans for coordinated Lake County support of World Refugee Year were discussed last night at a dinner meeting of 40 area religious, civic and educational leaders at the YMCA.

The Lake County Citizens World Refugee Year Committee named Donald Housekeeper as its permanent president and Miss Elizabeth Wilson as secretary, and appointed a committee to work on a countywide project for the week of April 18.

The committee includes Nick Stepanovich, East Chicago attorney; Paul Carter, Gary YMCA; Miss Gertrude Mack, Catholic Social Service Bureau; Miss Lynne Blanning, American Association of University Women; John Ziemba of the Polish National Alliance; Joe Milosevich of the First Presbyterian Church and D. R. McDevitt.

While World Refugee Year, conceived in England and authorized by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly to run from July 1959 to June 30, 1960, is more than half gone, activity thus far has been largely on a national level and generally is only now reaching the local levels throughout the country.

Speakers last night included the Reverend Humphrey Walz of the Crown Point First Presbyterian Church, who said there were 41 million refugees from war, communism and disaster around the world; Stepanovich, area representative on the U.S. Committee for Refugees, who told of the international structure for the care of refugees, and Winston Cone of the Purdue Calumet Center, who gave impressions of visits to the Near East and Africa.

Carter, YMCA secretary, reviewed the community guide published by the national committee, and Miss Irene Gullette of the Gary Public Library told of films available on the refugee problems.

Last night's meeting adopted a resolution presented by Ziemba urging congressional support of a refugee program, including admission of 20,000 to this country as immigrants, the use of \$10 million from mutual security funds in helping solve the refugee problem, and use of surplus commodities for refugees coming to this country.

THE LAKE COUNTY CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed the period from July 1, 1959 to June 30, 1960, as World Refugee Year to focus the concern and the ingenuity—and the generosity—of the people of the United States on the continuing problem of refugees; and

Whereas the Lake County Citizens Committee on the World Refugee Year was formed in order to coordinate the activities of the citizens of Lake County who were desirous of contributing their joint efforts to the support of the United States Committee for Refugees and international bodies aiding refugees; and

Whereas the Lake County Citizens Committee on Refugees has taken steps to keep the people of Lake County currently in-

formed about the refugee situation throughout the world and has urged active participation in the World Refugee Year; and

Whereas the sympathetic consideration of the U.S. Congress is necessary so that U.S. participation in the World Refugee Year is commensurate with the traditions and history of our country in rendering assistance to refugees and persons in dire need; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lake County Citizens Committee on World Refugee Year go on record in appealing to all citizens and organizations, civic, cultural, and religious, of Lake County to extend every effort for active participation in the World Refugee Year program, and rendering such assistance, including financial, as may be necessary to insure the accomplishment of the desired objectives; be it further

Resolved, That an appeal be made to our legislative and governmental officials urging the adoption of the remedial legislation as sponsored by the U.S. Committee for Refugees, specifically,

1. A Federal appropriation of \$10 million over and above present outlays for refugee programs.

2. A generous allocation of additional surplus commodities.

3. New legislation permitting the annual immigration of 20,000 refugees beyond those authorized in existing quotas; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to members of the Congress of the United States, to Federal, State, and local officials and to interested organizations in Lake County.

LAKE COUNTY CITIZENS COMMITTEE
ON WORLD REFUGEE YEAR.
D. L. HOUSEKEEPER, Chairman.

New Holiday for Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in April, the 1960 navigation season of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway system will open.

In Wisconsin and throughout the Great Lakes, lakeshore and inland communities are looking forward to a renewal of travel, trade and commerce that is of ever-growing significance to their economic life.

During 1959, the first year of operation of the completed and modernized seaway, the volume of traffic increased substantially over the previous years.

For 1960, the flow is expected to be even larger.

So great has been the beneficial impact, that many communities consider the arrival of a new season as cause for real celebration.

The Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., for example, recently published a constructive, forward-looking editorial on the opening of the 1960 navigation season. Because of the tremendous importance of deep-sea navigation, by way of the seaway, to Superior, the editorial constructively suggests the opening day

of navigation as a "New Holiday for Superior."

Reflective of the tremendous significance which the seaway is for Superior, as well as Wisconsin and Great Lakes communities—I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW HOLIDAY FOR SUPERIOR?

Superior's most significant day of the year, economically, will soon be here. The opening of navigation.

There have been times, in the early years of Superior, when anxious folks, uninformed as to the date when the people of the settlement would again have their connection with the outside world restored, would hopefully stroll out toward "Bay" Street and see whether the ice had broken up in the harbor and whether possibly there were signs of steamboat smoke on the eastern horizon out over the lake.

If there were such signs a day of rejoicing was at hand. At least in one of those early years it meant that the threat of actual hunger was soon to disappear as the ship would surely carry flour and other food items that would replenish the supplies in the warehouse on Quebec pier, the source on which all the local stores at that time depended. The proprietor of the warehouse was R. G. Coburn, who early saw the necessity for rationing certain items, especially flour. He won the gratitude of the people depending on his stock by refusing to raise prices.

The conditions in modern day Superior are a far cry from those of the city's youth. Even in winter months railroads and trucks often haul to the elevators here enough grain to make a sizable year's business for some terminals that are considered grain centers. The one little Superior warehouse of 1860 is today replaced by vast terminals and by elevator capacity which in the summer season will receive and ship enough grain to supply flour to the whole Nation of 170 million people for a good share of a winter season.

Conditions have also changed otherwise in Superior. Even now ships that have been serving ocean ports are making plans for coming to Superior as soon as the locks and channels of the St. Lawrence Waterway are opened. That will be next month. In Montreal the tentative date has been fixed as April 15. Some predict it can be earlier.

Regardless what the date may be it will be a matter of but a few weeks. It will mark the opening of the first full year of ocean shipping for Superior. For generations the people of Superior have talked and dreamed about such an occasion. Now it will happen every year and each year should be fraught with increasing interest as Superior's connection with the whole world of commerce increases, as more and more cities and countries of other continents become our neighbors in trade.

Superior thus acquires a new red letter day in its calendar. It is both fixed and flexible, being thus of the greater interest because it combines certainty and uncertainty.

Preparations for the day start the trek of hundreds of men back to work. For 2 to 3 months their employment has been intermittent. For some of them it has been an inverted vacation, winter instead of summer. Insurance may have filled the financial gap for them, but they prefer the work and meet it with renewed zest and interest. Ore docks, coal docks, railroads have all participated in the slowdown. As they resume their normal activity the spirit with which they do so pervades the whole city.

Opening of Navigation Day should henceforth be anticipated and celebrated. In con-

trast to the unpredictiveness of the openings of a century ago, the date can now be closely predicted and even assisted in getting here on time. Likewise, its approach will differ in that instead of need for a period of rationing the many stores and warehouses here invite the use of their supplies and their competition prevents the need of the imposition of rationing. The stores themselves may well give their customer the cue and put them in the mood to celebrate Superior's Navigation Day.

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, we of the free world join today in the solemn observation of the 112th anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day. Unfortunately, it is a day of sad contemplation, rather than one of great rejoicing.

It is a solemn day and one of sad contemplation because of the rules of Soviet Russia. In defiance of all that is legally and morally right, the masters of the Kremlin have placed the Hungarian nation under the yoke of Soviet Russia and taken from its freedom-loving people all the rights that are inherently theirs.

In observing this anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day, it is well to relate some of the history of Hungary so none will ever forget the ruthlessness and cruelty of the Soviet and its ultimate aim—the placing of the entire world behind the Iron Curtain and making all people of the world its captives.

It was on March 15, 1848, under the leadership of the famed and great Louis Kossuth, that the patriots of Hungary boldly bid for freedom after being tied to Austria for centuries. It brought freedom and national autonomy.

Then in 1945, Hungary found its freedom crushed through occupation by the crawling octopus called Soviet Russia. Yet, the cruel yoke of the Communists could not crush the desires of the Hungarian people for a free and independent nation. It burned steadily in their hearts and in their minds. There were many evidences of it. Then, in the tragic fall of 1956 the Hungarian people again rebelled against alien rule.

Once again the Hungarians demanded freedom and independence and they fought courageously for it. Sadly, the freedom day victory of 1848 was not repeated. Soviet tanks and artillery proved too much for these inspired and dedicated people.

The shocking end of the Hungarian bid for freedom in 1956 cannot and must not be forgotten. Although physically and ruthlessly crushed by Russia's disregard for the fundamental aspirations and rights of mankind, the patriots of Hungary gave enduring proof that their desire for freedom remains unquenchable.

Since the uprising of 1956, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted 12 resolutions on Hungary, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops and free elections under international control, while condemning the brutality of the Soviet Union. The Soviet has defied each and every one of these resolutions.

The Soviet continues to defy the United Nations and its resolutions. In view of this and what continues to transpire within Hungary, I sincerely hope the opportunity will present itself at the soon-to-be held East-West summit conference for a full-scale discussion of the Hungarian situation. It is my strong belief that no effort should be spared in our striving for the restoration of independence to Hungary.

Today, as we commemorate an earlier era of Hungarian freedom, we honor all Hungarians for their gallant and tenacious longing for liberty and we pray that the day soon will come when the light of freedom and independence again will be burning brightly in their beloved homeland.

Spenders or Savers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the Record an editorial from the Clinton (S.C.) Chronicle of March 10, 1960, entitled "Spenders or Savers?" This excellent editorial poses a very important question for our presidential candidates and the voters of this country.

The Chronicle, one of South Carolina's best weekly newspapers, is published by Mrs. W. W. Harris.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPENDERS OR SAVERS?

Writing in U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence points to "the most important question before the Congress." It is whether the expected Federal budget surplus for the coming fiscal year (estimated by the President at \$4.2 billion) shall be spent, or applied to the reduction of our national debt. As he puts it, "Shall we become 'spenders' or 'savers'?"

There is small doubt what will happen if the spenders rather than the savers have their way. The surplus will be dissipated, there is every possibility that a deficit will take its place, the already weakened dollar will become weaker in world money markets and there will be new rounds of inflation. In this connection, the President made a remark of the utmost significance: "Personally, I do not feel that any amount can be properly called a surplus as long as the Nation is in debt. I prefer to think of such an item as reduction on our children's inherited mortgage. And, once we have established such payments as normal practice, we can profitably make improvements in our tax structure and thereby truly reduce the heavy burdens of taxation."

Finally, Mr. Lawrence posed another big question in these words: "What presidential candidate will espouse the doctrine of paying off the public debt by annual contributions from surplus?" The country deserves—in this election year—an unequivocal answer.

Would Raising the Legal Wage Minimum Benefit Our Lower Paid Workers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Willford I. King, in a recent issue of *Spotlight*, discussed the pending proposal to raise the Federal minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25. He questions whether raising the minimum would actually benefit our lower paid workers. Dr. King is an eminent economist, nationally known statistician, a former adviser to the U.S. Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Census. In view of the timeliness of this article and the provocative thoughts embodied in it, under unanimous consent, I ask that the article be reprinted at this point in the Record:

At present, the average wage of U.S. factory workers is more than \$2 per hour. But, at the same time, cases are not lacking in which employees in various lines of work are paid only 50 cents per hour—or even less. It is an indisputable fact, that, in the United States, large numbers of persons receive rates of pay too low to enable them to live in the style that seems to most of us to be appropriate for Americans. Some of these workers actually are unable to earn enough to maintain the health of themselves and their dependents. Is not this clearly a case calling for governmental intervention to protect helpless workers from exploitation by grasping, ruthless employers? Labor leaders so contend, and hence demand that the legal wage minimum be raised to \$1.25 per hour.

All that advocates of minimum-wage legislation ask is that Congress require employers to pay decent living wages. Can anyone take issue with such an obviously reasonable demand? Clearly, poor people need additional income. Congress is admittedly the most powerful legislative body on earth. Is there any logical reason for its not acting at once to remedy this untoward situation?

Any defensible answer to this question must take into consideration the fact that, in any given plant, the various employees are likely to differ greatly as regards their respective endeavors or abilities to add to the values of the products turned out. So, in a typical hour, the value added by one worker may be only 50 cents, while another may increase returns by \$5. Any employer who pays an employee in the first category \$1.25 per hour is courting bankruptcy. But it may be profitable to employ such a worker at a wage of 40 cents per hour.

Worldwide experience throughout the centuries shows that production is maximized, not by having wage rates and other prices fixed by government, but, instead, by having them arrived at competitively. In either case, the results are determined by the laws of supply and demand, two of which set forth the general principles that raising the

price of a good tends to lessen the quantity of it which can be sold and increases the quantity of it which will be produced; while lowering the price has the opposite results.

And, despite popular opinion to the contrary, governments find it little easier to repeal these laws than to abrogate the law of gravity. So, when, in recent decades, our government has supported the prices of farm products at levels higher than those which would be determined by competition, it has been compelled to buy huge quantities of these products to keep their prices up to the artificially set figures. And the laws of supply and demand apply just as rigorously to the price of labor as to the price of anything else. Raising wage rates always reduces the volume of labor which can be sold.

Is it not distinctly antisocial to prevent the less efficient members of the working class from earning an honest living; or from at least earning as much of their living as they are able to pay for? Those who can pay their way ought not to be pauperized. For those who are too inefficient to make both ends meet, it is legitimate to make up the deficit out of relief funds, but there is no good excuse for not requiring every adult to go as far as he can in the direction of providing for himself.

A vital fact which is overlooked by most advocates of minimum wage legislation is that the total volume of products which can be sold is rigidly limited by the combined net new spending power of all potential customers. A nation's net new spending power equals the algebraic sum of its national income and any change in its volume of circulating medium. Careful investigation shows that, except in periods of currency inflation or deflation, the total amount of new spending power in any nation in any given month depends primarily upon the amount of the nation's income in the period just preceding. This means that, by and large, people govern their spending by their incomes. This is, of course, a matter of common observation. It follows that, if higher minimum wage laws compel employers to raise the prices of their products enough to cover added wage costs, they will find that their physical volume of sales will decline. When this happens, they will, of course, require fewer workers. Those laid off will be the least efficient. They, and not the employers, will be the principal sufferers from the advance in the legal minimum wage rates.

But, at this point, the labor leader will assert that we have ignored the fundamental fact that raising wage rates increases the spending-power total. Were it not for the fact that this fallacy is so widely accepted, one would not need to take the trouble to refute a contention so manifestly unsound. Obviously, if an employer pays out an extra thousand dollars in wages, he increases the purchasing power of the employees to the extent of \$1,000. But, just as obviously, he decreases his own purchasing power by \$1,000. The net influence on the total is zero.

If, by raising the price of labor, total purchasing power could be increased and prosperity induced, clearly the same principle would apply to raising the prices of other goods. Grocers could increase their purchasing power by raising the prices of foods, clothiers, by raising the prices of clothing, and so on without limit. Moreover, if this principle were sound, it would be the height of folly to discuss raising minimum wage rates to \$1.25 per hour. If Congress really has power to repeal the law of supply and demand and legislate prosperity, it is not doing its duty unless it raises the minimum wage rate to at least \$5 per hour. Why be niggardly?

Clearly, no firm can afford to keep on its payroll any employee who fails to earn his pay. So, when Government advances wage

rates, the employer who does not believe it feasible to raise his selling prices, he has no option except to dismiss those marginal employees whose services to him are worth less than the new legal minimum wage.

It is true that the demand for certain types of labor is inelastic. When this is the case, an increase in wage rates may appear to produce little unemployment. Let us suppose, for example, that the wages of bakers are raised from \$1 to \$3 per hour, and that as a result, the price of bread rises from 15 cents to 25 cents per loaf. In a country as prosperous as the United States, the probability is that bread consumption will not decline noticeably; hence few bakers will be discharged. Apparently, the minimum wage legislation has produced almost no unemployment.

This conclusion is, however, entirely unjustified. Customers are spending a dime more for each loaf of bread purchased. Their incomes have not been increased. Therefore, for every loaf of bread bought, they necessarily spend a dime less for something else—probably for some luxury. This decreased demand for luxury goods makes it unnecessary to hire so many workers in those fields of production. Workers there lose their jobs. The law of supply and demand has not been circumvented. It has worked just as inexorably as ever. Legislating upward the wage rates of the bakers has caused unemployment, reduced the Nation's production total, and made the Nation poorer.

As the law of supply and demand indicates, pushing up prices cuts down the physical volume of goods sold, and, with sales reduced, employers can get along with fewer workers; so layoffs result. Therefore, the number of unemployed is increased, and more people are thrown upon the relief rolls, thus adding to the burdens of the taxpayers.

Unfortunately, the laws of nature make it impossible to increase the real national income by any means other than the arduous process of producing goods. Such financial legerdemain as minimum-wage legislation results only in unemployment, diminished total production, and hence lower total real income.

What any minimum-wage law really does is to determine what portion of the potential working force of the Nation is to be condemned to idleness, and converted into a burden to be borne by those at work. This is the prime result of all minimum-wage enactments. Therefore, the real question before Congress for decision is what percentage of our citizens it believes it desirable to pauperize.

Construction Differential Shipbuilding Contracts for West Coast Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commission of Public Docks of the City of Portland, Oreg., has brought to my attention a copy of Resolution 1467 adopted by the commission on March 1.

This resolution urges retention of the 6 percent construction differential for west coast shipyards as a fair and equitable measure designed to maintain a reasonable amount of shipbuilding work in west coast ports.

A strong and active shipbuilding industry on the west coast is important, not only to the West, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse the continuation of the 6 percent construction differential. I urge serious consideration of the resolution by all of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1467 OF THE COMMISSION OF PUBLIC DOCKS OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND OREG.

Whereas the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides for an award of construction-differential shipbuilding contracts to west coast shipyards, in the event a west coast steamship company is involved and the bid is within 6 percent of any bid submitted by eastern or southern yards; and

Whereas it has been established that west coast shipyards are faced with higher costs than yards on the Atlantic and gulf coasts, principally because the suppliers of materials for ship construction and outfitting are generally located in the Eastern United States; and

Whereas the continuance of a major shipbuilding program on the west coast will be jeopardized if the present 6 percent differential is either reduced or eliminated; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commission of Public Docks of the City of Portland, Oreg., urges the retention of the 6-percent differential as a fair and equitable measure designed to maintain a reasonable amount of shipbuilding work in west coast ports; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission of Public Docks of Portland, Oreg., endorses the activities of the Western Shipbuilding Association which are aimed at preserving the differential and investigating other means of insuring that western shipyards continue to contribute to the economic welfare of the ports and vessel operators they serve.

THOMAS P. GUERIN,
Secretary.

Hearing-Aid Industry Conference

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the Forand bill becomes understood by the people, more and more opposition appears. The following resolution expresses the stand of the hearing-aid industry:

The hearing-aid industry yesterday went on record against the Forand bill, concerning broadening medical services to recipients of social security benefits, even though it might increase sales of its products.

The national trade group, the Hearing-Aid Industry Conference, adopted a resolution opposing the bill on the basis that "compulsory insurance on the Federal level would destroy voluntary insurance plans and result in medical care inferior to that evolved by the normal incentives of a free society."

"We are convinced this bill would lower the standards of medical care," Leland A.

Watson, president, commented. "Voluntary insurance plans, like most things in a democracy, are not perfect. But looking to the Federal Government is not the answer. Federal 'cures' are often worse than the 'illness.' Our study of this bill, based on our experience as an industry offering paramedical goods, convinces us it is in this category. From both the social and economic points of view, it would be detrimental. Medical care would become inferior and the taxpayer would be saddled with another burden."

The logical involvement of such a compulsory system would be provision of such prosthetic devices as hearing aids, eyeglasses, dentures, and so on, particularly because they are most needed by persons in the age groups covered by social security. On the face of it, Mr. Watson said, the industry should favor this, since it will act as a "built-in sales guarantee." However, the industry feels this would be a shortsighted point of view that might eventually lead to some Federal control of its own operations, as well as bringing a deterioration of medical care.

Mr. Watson urged the public, trade associations, civic and social groups, to go on record in opposition to the bill by writing Congressman FORAND and their own Representatives.

A Diplomatic Service Second to None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during my period of service in the Senate I have supported many measures designed to strengthen our Foreign Service. In these days of competitive coexistence with world communism we cannot afford to be second best in our official representation abroad. Mr. President, I elaborated this point in a recent article, "A Diplomatic Service Second to None," which appeared in the January number of *Stentorian*, a publication of the Public Administration Society, City College, New York, N.Y., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DIPLOMATIC SERVICE SECOND TO NONE

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

It is an old American custom to snipe at our diplomats. For generations the virile, aggressive man of business, the laborer, the frontiersman were representative of our forming national tradition. The diplomat, however, was looked upon as an un-American type, distrusted as too cultivated, too restrained. He seemed to be too much at home in the semiaristocratic atmosphere of European courts to be a real, he-man American. And it has only been during the past 30 years, since the Rogers Act of 1924 established a career foreign service, that American diplomacy has become fully recognized as a profession.

American diplomats have a remarkably sensitive and complicated task to perform. They represent abroad a vast, energetic, and diverse nation. Many Americans speak out with different voices, often contrary to the official policy the diplomat must represent.

Yet the diplomat must seek to represent, and interpret, the central, the basic American will and intent.

During the past 20 years few American professions have undergone such rapid change as diplomacy. Before World War II, the United States was believed to be splendidly secure; Europe's quarrels seemed quaint and distant affairs. Then the diplomat merely observed, reported, and kept his superiors in Washington informed. Incidentally, American diplomats even then had a very high reputation for knowing what was afoot abroad.

Since World War II, however, the American diplomat is in the front line of world conflict. We and the rest of the free world rely heavily on his sharp eye, his feel for intricate political or military developments abroad. He is the top administrator overseeing and meshing the complex activities of American military, economic assistance, and information missions. Each of these is made up of specialists, often persuaded that they alone know all the answers to American policies and American needs. It is the diplomat who must fit each specialist into his proper place in the total fabric of American national policy. He represents us in other countries; he also represents us at NATO and at the United Nations, not just during the headline days when the big names come but also during the dog days of patient discussion and the exploration of each party's point of view. He looks out for the needs of Americans doing business abroad.

He recognizes that each nation has its own set of interests that spring from its political life, its traditions and its peoples' sense of what is important. The interests of states often conflict. Specific American interests often contradict the ardent desires of other countries; their needs often work against our own. Our own interests must be protected in such a way as to retain the goodwill of the foreign country with which he deals. If we trample on our friends today, who shall stand with us tomorrow? The diplomat's task is also to seek out areas of agreement and mutual adjustment, to overpass disagreement or details by emphasizing agreement on larger, more fundamental issues.

In dealing with the Soviet Union and China, he takes the measure of the Kremlin's vaulting ambitions; he knows how to interpret Mr. Khrushchev's optimism about the future. He understands the necessity of strength in all its many forms, of showing determination and power in the face of Soviet demands. He also comprehends the costs of ill-considered stand-patism. Often, by refusing to budge in a fast-moving play, the man who loses the initiative also loses the game. The slow-moving Sunday driver is as much a hazard on the highway as a speeder the police have not yet apprehended.

These are special skills of judgment and personality. They are not given to any man at one moment. Only by training and experience can they be acquired.

American diplomats are often accused of becoming too close to whatever government happens now to be in power. The error is obvious, it is said, since every government now in power is bound to be out of power 10 years from now. The critics argue that we must be friendly with all political groups in a country so that we shall be "in" with a future government. But this is not always easy outside of Europe and North America. In many countries, the notion of a loyal opposition is unthinkable; opponents of the government are looked upon as traitors. For diplomats to consort with them is to render our representatives incapable of performing their principal duty—to represent American interests in dealing with the sovereign government. Yet we must be sensitive to the currents of public opinion, to the ideas of organized

labor, or racial or religious groups in other countries. The diplomat must be friendly with these political forces that may mold the politics of tomorrow while he deals directly with the governments of today.

For the sake of serving their country abroad, the diplomats give up normal family life; they stay in no one post more than 4 years as a rule; they forego the warmth of neighborhood, of a permanent circle of friends and loved ones. Mothers abroad sometimes watch their children become stricken with strange diseases. The social obligations of foreign service wives are very heavy, and family life for young children is often disrupted. As children grow, their parents must send them home for advanced education. Our diplomats wander the world like nomads, having seen all places, but profoundly at home in none. Those of us who remain at home might ponder what our lives would be like if we had to uproot ourselves once in every 3 or 4 years for the balance of our working lives, moving from one country to another. These men and women should be amply rewarded for their services.

We continue to show our disregard of the diplomat's skill by our unwillingness to provide highly qualified career men with necessary entertainment and representation allowances, although every salesman and business executive with one-tenth the responsibility of these men have generous entertainment allowances indirectly falling upon the taxpayer through deductible business expenses. As a result, we block the advance of our most qualified men from the responsibilities of some of our most important embassies. These go, instead, to political appointees as rewards for political support and for having been endowed with a private income. The best man for the job is often passed over.

Of course, no profession is perfect. There have been instances where professional American representatives abroad have lacked the necessary sensitivity, curiosity, and openness to cultures that are often very different from our own. Too few of our diplomats in the past have known necessary foreign languages. In exotic lands where mothers do worry about their children's health, where local food and household supplies are short, or where the very safety of our representatives may be at stake, Americans may live too much apart from the local community. Local governments may even encourage the clustering together of American families because it is easier to protect American and other diplomats from local upheavals. Contacts with the local people may then be impeded. Political appointees, ignorant of the country they go to, ignorant, even, of the name of the country's Prime Minister, take a long time to understand the rigorous and difficult art of diplomatic representation. These are all weaknesses we must overcome.

It has been very encouraging to me to see the growing evidences of the American people's interest in the quality and performance of our Foreign Service officers abroad. Numbers of highly qualified young applicants are again competing for Foreign Service appointments by taking very stiff examinations. The Congress has authorized and the State Department has undertaken expanded language training programs. Officers in mid-career now have opportunities to be temporarily relieved of their duties for a period of study and contemplation. New men experienced in Washington have been drawn into the Foreign Service.

These are all good steps in the direction of providing us with a diplomatic service adequate to the task of confronting the total Soviet challenge. We should settle for nothing but the best.

More on Trade Policy and the Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, surely it is becoming apparent to those in various Federal departments who sit in judgment of American industry in matters involving foreign trade that further efforts to perpetuate the myth of reciprocal trade can only result in additional serious damage to our economy.

Over the past 2 years an impressive body of evidence has accumulated to prove beyond doubt that our Nation's ability to compete effectively in world markets is deteriorating. We are at one and the same time the victims of our own inflated economy and the rugged resistance to American products abroad.

Consider, for example, the great U.S. automobile industry, pioneer of mass production. Few industries can match our auto manufacturers in their degree of mechanization. Auto making is a highly efficient industry, geared to produce a modern durable product for the largest consumer market in the world.

Yet this streamlined industry, this model of American inventive genius and mass-output efficiency, has seen its market deeply penetrated by overseas competitors. Over 10 percent of its domestic market has been overrun by imports, and in 1959 exports of American cars tumbled to their lowest point since World War II.

One of the reasons for the loss of foreign markets is the determination of many countries to maintain stiff barriers against American products. Other factors, of course, play a part. High wages and costs in American industry has elevated the price of our autos to a non-competitive point.

Furthermore, it may surprise some of my colleagues to learn that it costs our producers more than twice as much to ship a car to Europe as it costs their competitors to ship a car from Europe to the United States. This is not simply a matter of size. It applies even if the identical car is involved.

This grossly unfair situation is explored in a timely article appearing in the March 10 issue of *Iron Age* magazine. I commend this article to the attention of all Members of the Congress who are seriously concerned about the crisis in our country's international trade.

CAN UNITED STATES HURDLE EUROPE'S WALL?

Popularity of foreign cars isn't the only reason for an out of kilter import-export picture in the United States.

A major reason why imports sell like hotcakes in the United States, while most U.S. built models are shunned overseas is "discriminatory practices" in duty, taxes and shipping rates, says W. H. Thoreson, director of automotive export for American Motors.

ROAD BLOCKS

Mr. Thoreson says duty and taxes in European countries are set at almost prohibitive levels, and shipping charges from our east coast ports to Europe are double those for the same car returning to the United States. Consequently, only wealthy Europeans, as a rule, are buying American cars.

These barriers have been rough to overcome, he says. They led to a postwar low of 116,520 cars from the United States to foreign markets in 1959. Meanwhile, import shipments soared to a record 668,070.

"At best, the United States will hold its own in 1960," Mr. Thoreson predicts, "even though many of the cars built abroad are too small for average family use, and are underpowered." He doesn't see domestic cars putting much of a dent in the overseas market, even though Rambler sales abroad are continuing to climb and other U.S. compacts are now available to whet European interest.

ONE-WAY STREET

"Duty rates and taxes on U.S. cars in Europe are impossible," he points out. "They range from 35 to 69 percent in countries with their own car-making plants, based on landed cost price, including ocean freight and marine insurance, on engine cubic inch displacement, and on weight."

By contrast, the United States charges a flat 8.5 percent import duty on all cars, excluding ocean freight, plus 10 percent Federal excise. All imports get the same treatment, regardless of size, horsepower, weight, price or country of origin.

"The U.S. rate used to be higher. But at intervals in recent years it's been lowered by 0.5 percent to help bring about tariff reciprocity. But reciprocity hasn't been realized from an automotive point of view," claims Mr. Thoreson. "It's time we stopped making automotive tariff reductions a one-way street."

LIMITED ACCESS

The AM official says the situation isn't improving. "Certain car-producing countries in Europe, which now have a great stake in the U.S. market, claim they have eased restrictions against our cars," he says.

"But the steps have been mostly meaningless. We feel other automobile manufacturing nations, which enjoy relatively free access to the U.S. auto market, should give our automobiles reasonably similar treatment," Mr. Thoreson contends.

Formation of the European Economic Community (Common Market) isn't likely to ease the situation, as Mr. Thoreson sees it. West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Belgium formed the group a year ago. They decided on an eventual average of a 31 percent import duty rate on cars imported from nonmember nations, plus taxes set separately by each member nation.

At the same time, duties are being reduced on EEC member products. By 1970 there will be no duties levied against any products of these countries. Similar objectives were set later in 1959 by the Outer Seven Free Trade Area. This group includes Great Britain, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Denmark, and Portugal.

YANKEE STAT HOME

Mr. Thoreson says shipping charges set by international ocean shipping conferences also work to the disadvantage of U.S. auto makers. "For example," he says, "a Rambler shipped from New York to Germany has a freight bill of \$328. But if the same car is shipped back to New York the charge is only \$158."

"This illogical and unfair method of determining ocean rates serves further to dis-

courage the purchase of American-built cars in Europe, and to encourage the importation of European cars into this country," he says.

Mr. Thoreson takes exception to arguments that perhaps domestic auto makers shouldn't be too upset by their current import-export disadvantage because it was the other way around for many years. "The disparity in our favor in early postwar years wasn't caused by discriminatory taxes on our part. It was because Europe simply didn't have the capacity to produce cars in great quantity."

Mr. Speaker, the discriminatory trade practices by foreign countries against U.S. exports must be brought to an immediate end.

Canning: How It All Began

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this year is the 150th anniversary of the invention of canning. The science of food preservation by canning has taken such great strides in recent years that this anniversary is of special significance. In my own State of Wisconsin the canning industry began in 1887, when Albert Landreth established the first cannery in Manitowoc. Today, about one out of every eight people employed in industry in Wisconsin is engaged in the processing of food. A few statistics reveal Wisconsin's place in the canning industry. Forty percent of the canned peas produced in the United States are produced in Wisconsin. Wisconsin also ranks first nationally in the canning of carrots, beets, and sweet corn; second in sauerkraut, cranberries, and pickles; and third in green and wax beans and green lima beans. Wisconsin also cans major quantities of cherries and apples, in various forms. There are about 120 canning plants in the State, which employ as many as 40,000 people in the harvesting season. They produced about one-fifth of all the canned vegetables in the United States last year, which works out to five cans for every person in the country.

Beer and milk are two other leading canned products in which Wisconsin leads the Nation. All this canning activity has led to another huge industry in Wisconsin; namely, the tin can industry. Well over 2 billion cans are manufactured each year in Wisconsin.

In each case cans provide a vital link between the producer and the consumer. As Norman Sorenson, 1959 president of the National Canners Association, recently wrote:

The art of canning, as discovered by Nicolas Appert in 1810, freed mankind from the bondage of the seasons. It has enabled the farmer to plant his crops free of the fear that his work of many months might be lost in a few days at the market place, and has enabled almost everyone, everywhere, to enjoy the products of the field without regard for the calendar.

As we view the multicolored array of canned foods now available to every consumer it is difficult to realize that just a century and a half ago the need for a reliable method of preserving food was so desperate that the French Government offered a generous prize for a method of conserving food so that it could be conveyed on long sea voyages. To bring the exciting tale of the development of canning from the discovery of the basic technique to its present position as one of the Nation's leading industries, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Canning: How It All Began," by Nelson H. Budd, information director and assistant executive secretary of the National Canners Association, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANNING: HOW IT ALL BEGAN—A VIVID HISTORICAL DIGEST

(By Nelson H. Budd)

In 1960 two important holidays will occur:

January 30 marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of canning—the official acceptance by the French Government in 1810 of Nicolas Appert's method of preserving food by cooking it in a hermetically sealed container.

And on August 25, 1810, 6 months after Appert's method was published to the world—the first patent for the manufacture of a metal container was granted by George III of England.

These important happenings led to the establishment of two great industries—canning and can manufacture. In 1960 these industries have a right to be proud and to broadcast the information that they have been "serving mankind for 150 years."

Accordingly, joint ceremonies are planned for the convention of the National Canners Association at Miami Beach during the period January 17-20. In programming these events, NCA is joining hands with the Can Manufacturers Institute in launching a year-round observance during 1960 of the birthday of the food preservation method known as canning and the beginnings of the metal container, which has played so great a role in carrying canned foods into the kitchens and pantries of a vast world population.

Most hardheaded businessmen have no patience with the past. They regard observance of anniversaries and birthdays as trivial, sentimental, even wasteful activities. This was apparent in 1952 when NCA staged official celebrations with the French Embassy of the 200th birthday of Appert. Nevertheless, because of the publicity that ceremony received, millions of consumers were made acquainted with the accomplishments of canning, with the scientific and economic progress it has made, and its great contributions to public health and welfare. As President Sorenson has pointed out, "The very act of paying honor indicates to the bystander that honor is due." He has urged that canners take the lessons of the past, apply them to the present, and in that manner be looking to the future. The NCA policy on the sesquicentennial year activities is to use past events only to illustrate and measure to the consumer the progress of the industry to its eminence of today.

THE HISTORY OF CANNING

In 1795 France not only was fighting most of Europe but was in the throes of revolution at home. She was victorious over enemy nations, but her governing body—the Di-

rectory—was gravely concerned over one enemy found to be unconquerable. French soldiers and sailors were dying from scurvy and malnutrition. Except when they could forage, their diet was largely salt meat and bread.

The problem was critical. The Directory voted to offer a 12,000-franc prize to the citizen who could devise a method of preserving food for transport on military and naval campaigns.

An obscure confectioner and chef named Nicolas Appert worked for 14 years on the problem. His simple theory was that if food is sufficiently heated while sealed in a container that excludes air, the food will keep, and this is the fundamental modern principle of canning as practiced today. Appert filled bottles with various foods, sealed them with wired and wax cork stoppers, and cooked them in boiling water. Samples of his preserved vegetables and fruits were put on sailing vessels and sent around the world. They retained their wholesomeness and, on January 30, 1810, Appert was awarded the prize by Count Montallivet, Minister of the Interior. The Emperor, Napoleon, succeeding the Directory as head of the government, maintained support of the project, because he, more than any other French leader, realized its importance to successful military campaigns.

Appert's procedures, used in canning some 70 different products, were set forth in his treatise, "The Book of All Households; or the Art of Preserving Animal and Vegetable Substances for Many Years," published in June 1810, and immediately widely distributed and translated into many European languages.

From Appert's time to the present, the history of canning is a story of inventive genius devoted to the development of better containers, improved equipment, timesaving machinery, and research. All of this had led to the discovery and understanding of the scientific principles on which canning is based and the practical application of science to the industry's operations. Although the humble Appert was not a scientist, he had the scientific instinct. He knew that his process preserved food, but not why. It remained for the great French scientist, Louis Pasteur, to reveal to the world that food spoiled through the process of fermentation because of the action of ever-present bacteria. Pasteur magnanimously acknowledged his debt to Appert, stating, in 1873, when he published his experiments on wine conservation, "I made only a new application of the method of Appert." Due to the foundations laid by Pasteur for the science of bacteriology, the canning and preserving of foods made real progress, although it was near the end of the 19th century before the pioneer studies of H. L. Russell in Wisconsin and Samuel C. Prescott and W. Lyman Underwood of Massachusetts, demonstrated the importance of destroying bacteria in order to make food keep.

Two months following publication of the Appert treatise in Paris, Peter Durand, a merchant in England, applied to King George III for a patent covering a "method of preserving animal food, vegetable food, or other perishable articles a long time from perishing or becoming useless." His application, filed on August 25, 1810, contained a description including the statement "I place and enclose the said food or article in bottles or other vessels of glass, pottery, tin or other other metals of fit materials." This being the only particular in which the Durand description differs from Appert's it has been referred to in much of the canning industry literature as a first patent for the manufacture of the tin can, although no record has been found that Durand either manufactured canned foods or a metal container. Durand sold his patent to John Hall.

founder of the Dartford Iron Works, and his partner, Bryan Donkin. They used tin canisters made of iron coated with tin, which a good tinsmith could turn out at the rate of 10 cans a day.

Donkin and Hall, in 1813 sent tins of food to authorities of the British Army and Navy for trial. Supplies, sent to stations at St. Helena and in the West Indies, added desirable variety to the diets of these garrisons. By 1818 considerable amounts of canned meats, vegetable combinations, and soups were being supplied to the Admiralty. The term "bully beef" is said to come from sailors' efforts to pronounce "soup and bouilli," a popular canned food of those days.

"Tinned foods" steadily gained acceptance, not only among soldiers and sailors, but also among civilians.

CANNING LAUNCHED IN AMERICA

William Underwood arrived in America from England in 1817 determined to establish food canning in this country. His efforts met only with rebuffs, and from New Orleans, where he had landed, he decided to strike north. Without funds, he is said to have walked the entire distance to Boston, endeavoring en route to interest people in his project, but without success. Finally, in Boston, after 2 years in America, he was able to establish a small canning plant where he packed fruits, pickles, and condiments in bottles, most of which were sold in South America and the Far East. Authorities are not in full agreement as to which operation was first, but there is record of the packing of salmon, lobsters, and oysters in New York by Thomas Kensett and Ezra Daggett in 1819. Kensett was granted the first American patent on the tin container in 1825. An Underwood Co. book-keeper began to abbreviate "canister" to "can," and a new and important noun was born. The word "canning" came to be the designation for the operation of sterilizing food by heat and sealing it in airtight containers, regardless of whether the container was tin or glass, or whether the food was being prepared commercially or in the home.

CRUDE STEAM COOKER

In 1839 Isaac Winslow began a series of attempts to cook corn in a crude steam cooker at his home in Maine. Between 1840 and 1850 salmon and lobster were canned in Maine and New Brunswick, oysters in Baltimore, and tomatoes by Crosby in Pennsylvania.

During the next decade commercial canneries were started in New York, Maryland, and Delaware. Gall Borden in 1856 became one of mankind's greatest benefactors through his development of a process for condensing milk and sealing it hermetically.

A technical advance was achieved by canners in 1861, when they began to add calcium chloride to the water in which the closed cans were cooked. This method measurably increased production volume.

The real expansion of the canning industry in the United States actually began in that decade. Processing plants for fruits and vegetables sprang up in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and California. Winslow finally was successful in his efforts to can corn, and in 1862 was granted his patent. Pacific Coast salmon was first canned on the Sacramento River in 1864 and on the Columbia River in 1866.

The War Between the States gave many people their first taste of canned foods, although the more adventurous had become familiar with their use on numerous westward migrations as the country was being settled.

One of the great developments which helped the growth of the industry was the invention of the retort, or pressure cooker, by A. K. Shriver of Baltimore in 1874. This enabled canners to control temperatures accurately while cooking the sealed cans. In

fact, the half-century immediately following the war was characterized by numerous mechanical developments and inventions, each of which helped put canning on a progressive automatic mass production basis. For salmon canning an automatic device was perfected to clean and trim the fish; for corn, special machines to husk the ears, free them of cornsilk, and cut kernels off the cob; for tomatoes, machinery to wash, scald, and fill; for peas, device that removes the entire pea vine from the ground and shells the peas without picking pods. There were refinements in the speed and accuracy of machines to fill the various foods into cans and ingenious conveyors to move the raw food, cans, and other supplies from stage to stage of the processing line. Canning thus became a pioneer in automation.

PLANTS START IN MANY AREAS

Naturally, the industry continued to expand. Canning plants were started in new areas, and new products were added to the canned food lists. Vegetable canneries appeared in Iowa between 1870 and 1880. Meats were canned in Chicago in 1872; shrimp in New Orleans in 1875 and canned sardine production began in Maine the next year. In 1878, a salmon cannery was built in Alaska; peas were first canned in Wisconsin in 1881. The first pineapple cannery was built in Hawaii in 1892, although pineapple was among the foods Appert had packed successfully. Soups had been among the products canned by the English pioneers, Donkin and Hall. Condensed soups were added to the canned product list in the United States in 1897. The number of establishments increased from less than 100 in 1870 to 1,800 in 1900 to some 2,700 today.

Another important technological development that did much to expand canned foods production was the invention of what was called the sanitary can, about 1900, which in less than two decades practically replaced all former types of metal food cans in commercial use. This was the open-top cylindrical can, into which canners could fill larger pieces of food, with no damage to the food particles such as had been experienced with the "hole and cap" can which it outmoded. The new sanitary can was so made that the lid could be crimped on by machine. The solder once used to seal cap holes no longer came in contact with the food.

And then in 1903 came the mechanization of glass blowing, making possible the mass production of glass food containers, the most revolutionary advance in the realm of glass container since the birth of the Mason jar in 1858.

The 20th century witnessed a continuation of canning industry expansion and further development of automatic machinery. Mechanisms were devised to pit cherries; to peel, halve, quarter, slice, and core apples and other fruits; and to snip the inedible ends off beans. The industry trended toward a scientific basis. The National Canners Association was formed in 1907 and 6 years later established important research laboratories to study canning technology. From this research came important scientific findings that resulted in safe times and temperatures for processing and many other developments that improved the industry's products. Canning leaders were in the forefront of efforts that resulted in establishment of the original Food and Drugs Act of 1906. Research was applied to the growing and control of the raw products of the farm and orchard. Many strains of fruits and vegetables particularly suitable for canning were introduced.

During World War I, an enormous amount of canned foods was consumed by our armies. Soon after we entered the conflict the War Department bought up 75 percent of all available canned salmon, 40 percent of the tomatoes, and other foods in quan-

tity. The industry, through N.C.A., developed the system by which canners were ordered to set aside and reserve varying percentages of each year's production for first call by the Army and Navy.

In peacetime between the two wars canners continued their awareness of the changing needs of the homemaker and tried to keep pace with modern requirements through introduction of new products. By 1921 canned citrus juice and grapefruit segments were being shipped out of Florida. In 1924 tomato juice was first marketed in Indiana. Other fruit and vegetable juices found immediate favor and grew to become volume packs. Canned baby foods also were introduced in the early 1920's. The rapid development of these three items—canned citrus, baby foods, and juices—was a notable reflection of the growing public acceptance of canned foods.

World War II accentuated their essentiality, the Government granting priorities for scarce metals needed to maintain canned foods production at peak. Two-thirds of the food supply used by the fighting forces of America and its allies came to them in cans and jars. The seizure by the Japanese of the important tin sources in Malaya brought about a critical conservation of tin and led to new packaging practices. Glass containers, always in use for certain preserved foods, helped relieve the demand on tin.

In the postwar period it was found that the public would consume the full production capacity of the industry, and record annual packs have been made.

Since the days of the crude experiments by Appert about 150 years ago, canning has been brought to such a high point of efficiency, through the genius of American inventors, scientists, and businessmen, that civilized progress could not exist without it. Canning is a priceless boon to the housewife; furnishes profitable outlets for the products of the farm, the orchard, and the sea; reduces food costs for the average family; and places choice, nutritious, and wholesome foods within the reach of all, producing for America in particular the highest of living standards.

And so now, today, to measure the growth and tremendous expansion of this industry from Appert's crude beginnings, here are some facts about the size and economic importance attained by the industry he fathered:

The canning industry comprises about 2,700 canneries in 49 States, which annually produce some 1,200 different canned food items: fruits, vegetables, juices, fish and sea foods, meat, poultry, soups, baby foods, milk, and many formulated foods.

Production of the canning industry amounts to more than 22 billion pounds annually representing about 9 percent of the Nation's food supply, packed in about 700 million actual cases (about 22 billion containers) of canned and glassed foods, having a retail value of about \$4.7 billion.

Farmers and growers market a large portion of their annual harvest through canners and often are guaranteed a cash income which helps absorb risks involved in marketing other crops on the fresh market. Canners contract in advance of planting for many vegetables. They pay farmers and other producers about \$1.5 billion annually for the raw products.

Workers in the canning industry receive wages and salaries totaling more than \$500 million a year. At peak season employment in the industry totals as many as 350,000 persons.

The canning industry was one of the first to utilize the principle of automation. The industry today is one of the most highly mechanized of all American industries.

The canning industry is the Nation's third largest user of steel. The quantity of steel used by the canning industry for cans, ma-

chinery and other equipment is exceeded only by the totals for the automobile industry and the construction industry.

Canned foods are available at any place, at any time, for consumption in homes or restaurants. Canned foods provide important sources of vitamins, minerals and other nutrients. They have become a necessity in time of war.

Russian Efforts To Conquer Space Are Really Designed To Win Control of the Earth—and Us—an Address by Gen. James Doolittle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address given recently by Gen. James H. Doolittle on the occasion of his receiving from National Business Publications its Silver Quill Award. This is about the finest brief statement I have seen of the essential priorities America must adopt in dead earnest if we are to win this hard world struggle or even to survive. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Burke, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am proud and grateful to be the 1959 recipient of the Silver Quill Award. I especially appreciate the generous words that have been addressed to me in presenting it.

Your business publications have contributed much to the advancement of our national knowledge. You who plan and publish them are educators of a high order. The professional man does not complete his education in the university. To excel he must continue to study for the rest of his active life. Your publications provide regular refresher courses to keep busy executives, farmers, lawyers and doctors abreast of the rapidly changing times. For the scientists and engineers your technical periodicals are "must" reading. They do indeed help, to use your phrase, to "power the progress of our technology."

I have followed the discussion tonight with keen interest. It has given timely recognition to the new development in the struggle between Communism and freedom. The panel has emphasized that the American economy must be strong and our leadership enlightened and firm.

In my mind, there are six fundamental factors which must be considered if we are to deal with the Soviets:

First. There is no sound indication that they have abandoned or indeed altered their basic objective of world communization and world domination.

Second. Our military might has to date deterred them from quickly achieving their objective by force of arms.

Third. They will continue to endeavor to advance the cause of communism by propaganda, infiltration, subversion, and if permitted, by limited warfare.

Fourth. Over the long haul, economic warfare may well offer the best means of achieving their objective.

Fifth. The present Soviet peace offensive must be considered in the light of their desire to reduce military expenditures,

strengthen their economy and improve their present low standard of living.

Sixth. "Peaceful coexistence," to the Soviets, means the eventual imposition of communism by means other than all-out-war.

Against this background, I want to talk with you about national priorities—important not only in the present struggle but to our future.

May I begin by drawing your attention to a striking fact: the Soviet economy is, in effect, a space economy now while ours is largely a consumer economy. They are concentrating on the space race as much of their scientific, technological and economic resources as they think necessary to win it.

I'm sure they don't expect to win converts to communism on the Moon or Mars. They are using their space "firsts" in an effort to win converts here on Earth—in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas.

When we probe space, we insist—and rightly—on getting a high yield in scientific information for our investment. And we weigh such investment against alternatives that might produce bigger dividends in national security and national welfare. By contrast, the Soviets measure the value of their space ventures, regardless of any other results, primarily in terms of waging and winning the cold war.

During my visit to the Soviet Union last summer, I found that their priorities differ greatly from ours. Education, science, heavy industry, power, and transportation—these are key words which identify their top priorities, with military strength as the overriding objective. Consumer goods have a very restricted claim on their allocation of resources.

I do not cite this comparison to suggest that we scrap our consumer economy. For the standard of life it has given us has been historically our sputnik, drawing world attention and, if not admiration, at least envy. The question now is whether we can hold to that standard and at the same time meet the priorities of the space age. I believe we can. But we must understand that in a butter and eggs, high-fat economy, it is necessary to work hard—produce much to match a Spartan, all-out-for-space economy.

It is quite obvious that the Soviets can outdo us in selected fields by investing more of their resources in a particular activity than we are willing to do. There is, however, no doubt in my mind that we can still outdo them in any field of endeavor if we choose to concentrate enough of our human and material resources on a specific goal.

I believe we have to make some hard choices in the next decade concerning what we, as free people, want to do with our talents, our technology, and our time. That means selecting and giving attention to certain priorities.

Walter Lippman recently wrote, "The critical weakness of our society is that our people do not have great purposes which they are united to achieve, the public mood is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not to push forward and create." The danger implied prompts me to plead the case for setting our sights on five points which are essential, in my judgment, to clarifying and then achieving our national purposes.

Of first priority is an appreciation of moral values and a commitment to live in accordance with them. This is the sound foundation on which our ideology must rest.

There are many differences between our system and communism, but the basic moral difference can best be expressed by the difference between the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would that they do unto you"—and the law of expediency, "The end justifies the means."

The one leads to improvement of the human species, to making man more nearly approach the image of his Maker. The oth-

er degrades man. Our morality gives us our greatest long-range advantage over communism. We must explain this to our own people and to the peoples of the world, to many of whom Russian communism and American capitalism appear to be only competing materialisms.

A second priority is the improvement of our educational system. Any individual or nation will profit and progress in direct proportion to what they know and to what they do with what they know. Knowledge and effort spell success.

I have nothing against cosmetics and horse racing, but we can no longer afford, if we ever could, to spend more on such luxuries than on our schools. The low esteem in which education has been held for years is evident from the dollar value we have attached to its support. The consequence is a serious shortage of classrooms, of teachers, and of highly trained people, particularly in science and technology, in research and development.

The average teacher's salary of \$5,000 falls some 60 percent below the average income prevailing in 17 other comparable professions. It is a wonder that we face only a teacher shortage, not a teacher famine. This is explained, in large part, by the motivation and dedication of our teachers.

Yet the gap between what we have and what we must achieve in education cannot be closed by dollars alone.

Parents have a responsibility to help close that gap by sending their children to school disciplined, eager to learn and unafraid of the difficult.

The basic differences between Soviet education and our own is that they better understand the importance of education and the Soviet child is more disciplined and studies harder.

No group has a bigger stake in better education—from elementary through graduate schools—than business management. I feel I am putting this proposition to the right audience.

Let's take the lead in supporting a revival of learning. Let's insist that the scholar get at least the accolades accorded the athlete. Let's call a halt to the march toward mediocrity. Let's make our school courses difficult enough so the average student has to study hard—so even the gifted does not find it so easy that laziness is encouraged.

Let's help all who are willing to learn and let's provide extra faculty guidance and stimulation for the gifted as well as for the retarded. We must find, encourage, develop and utilize genius.

Our success in every major endeavor, whether in social and political life, or in technological advance, depends largely upon what we do now to elevate American education.

A third priority is the need to step up the pace of science and technology to serve better both human needs and national security. Science must increase our stockpile of basic knowledge and technology must apply that knowledge for human welfare.

We could lose all by allowing an adversary to gain a technical advantage in space weapons. We almost did when we allowed Stalin a nearly uncontested 8 years head start on rocket and missile development. It took us 6 years of all-out effort to catch up—technologically. In this connection I would like to say that our last 15 Atlas ICBM firings have been successful and the accuracy, CEP, circular error probable, has exceeded our optimistic expectations.

But to win the world for freedom takes much more than weaponry. It calls for the application of science and technology to human needs—making the deserts bloom with desalinated seas water, converting solar energy to power, unlocking the secrets of the living cell to achieve a longer, healthier

life span, and eventually through the life sciences and social science, developing better understanding and cooperation between peoples.

A fourth priority is a sound and expanding economy. In this connection I would like to refer you to two excellent addresses on this subject, before this august group, by two distinguished former recipients of the Silver Gull Award; Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless.

Almost everything we do, from helping to keep the free world united to deterring aggression, depends upon a thriving, ever-expanding U.S. economy. In my opinion, this is so all-important that we simply cannot be content with a mere 3 percent annual increase in our gross national product. We must raise that to a 5-percent rate of economic expansion just to maintain our present lead over so determined a competitor as the Soviet Union.

The Soviet economic objective is outlined on a billboard I saw in Crimea. It said: "By 1965 the Communist bloc will account for more than half of the world's production"—will produce more than all the rest of the world put together. To stimulate their people to greater effort they promise them that: "Within 10 years the Soviet citizen will be the most contented in the world"—that is to say will have a higher standard of living than the American. To counter this we must produce more. We must employ improved methods. We must work harder.

A final, overriding fifth priority is national security itself. Weakness, on our part, would encourage aggression—would lead to war. Only adequate military strength can deter war. Furthermore, it is vital in the present global contest for all of us to keep in mind that a weaker economy can overwhelm and defeat a stronger one by giving the military demands a higher priority than civilian needs. I would point out that while the Soviet steel production is only half of ours their rate of increase in steel production is twice ours and almost all of it goes into heavy industry and the military. Very little goes into consumer goods—where most of ours goes.

The problems of national security take on new dimensions in the space age. For one thing, deterrent power that really deters has to exist in a state of split-second readiness. It has to be safeguarded against a surprise first strike with nuclear weapons. Civilian indoctrination and protection, especially against fall-out, is vital to the ability to sustain and recover from a nuclear attack.

The importance of the race for space comes into sharper focus when we consider the need for perfecting satellites for reconnaissance, communications and early warning systems. We are already at work on second and are thinking about third and even fourth generation space vehicles for a wide variety of military missions. Adaptations of these space vehicles can also serve the national security by providing reliable methods for inspection of arms control agreements. Such vehicles can be used to patrol peace as well as to deter war.

Perhaps we can better understand the role of national security if we think of it as the roof over the whole structure of American life.

These, then, are the high national priorities as I see them:

1. Commitment to moral values.
2. Support for education.
3. Concentration on science and technology.
4. A sound and growing economy.
5. Dedication to national security.

These priorities are interrelated and interdependent. Our principles, our knowledge and our effort are foundations for what we do in using science and technology to expand our economy and provide for the national security.

We must establish and support these priorities if we are to maintain our way of life, preserve our freedom, and meet our obligations to the free world.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by again expressing my heartfelt appreciation for the honor bestowed upon me tonight and also for the privilege of sharing my thoughts with this distinguished company.

Heal the Sick and Feed the Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the needs of the peoples of the Middle East for food, clothing, and medicines and for schools and hospitals are urgent. I have long felt and often said that we Americans have a special responsibility in conscience to share from our abundance of food, fiber, and technical skill with the peoples of the underdeveloped nations still living in desperate poverty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article I wrote which appeared in the March 1960 issue of *Adult Student*, periodical of the general board of education of the Methodist Church, and which is entitled "The Christian Imperative: Heal the Sick and Feed the Hungry," be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN IMPERATIVE: HEAL THE SICK AND FEED THE HUNGRY

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

For years the underdeveloped Middle East has needed medicine, not machineguns. It has needed schools, not soldiers. It has needed food, not foxholes. Medicine, schools, and food are the three ingredients necessary to battle the "Four Horsemen."

For a long time, some of us have been contending that:

First. Most of the critical areas of the world do not need American arms, guns, and tanks as much as they need American helping hands.

Second. If America will put more of her international effort into constructive channels—such as medicine, schooling, and food—we shall have far more of an impact on the minds of the underdeveloped countries of the world than we shall if we proceed by way of the military type of aid which we tend to extend.

Third. Conditions among the average people in the underdeveloped countries are so bad that they will tend to accept almost any form of quick, dramatic salvation. The tragic truth, which we must realize, is that while the living standard of the people in the industrial nations is rising, that of the people in underdeveloped countries is actually deteriorating.

Interestingly enough, while President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, continues with his so-called diplomatic victories, the truth is that the standard of living of his people is abysmally low; in fact, there has been little or no improvement. I have heard that there has actually been a drop in the per capita income of the people of Egypt. What a shame. These

people desperately need a more constructive use of their meager resources.

Something can be done about this matter; but it cannot be done by the sending of tanks, guns, and soldiers. Instead, it can be done by meeting the needs of these people, by sending to them teachers, medicine, food, social planning. It will not be achieved by sending military missions or by trying to bolster up old, feudalistic governing groups which will be rubbed out of existence as surely as the dawn follows the night. Today a revolution is underway. No amount of patching up or firming up old, feudalistic, monarchial, or aristocratic systems will succeed; and we shall be well advised if we kept that fact in mind.

This situation means that we must have a program which at least will lend itself to constructive results.

The Middle East is not only a hotbed of intrigue, conspiracy, and East-West conflict but also a hotbed of human disease and suffering. With such conditions, it is impossible to have peace; the world's peace is bound to be threatened. The people of these countries are emotional and explosive in temperament; and with such problems ever present and, indeed, becoming aggravated, there is an inevitable trend toward trouble.

Let the American people ask themselves about the ragged rioters—the pro-Nasser demonstrators—in the streets of Tripoli, Lebanon, or Beirut, or in the streets of Baghdad, Iraq, or Amman, Jordan. "Exactly who are these rioters—these riflemen and hand grenade throwers? What is their condition in life? What, if any, possessions do they have in the world?"

Let the American people also ask, "How well, physically, are these people and their families?"

If we ask ourselves the latter question, we shall find that in these Middle East countries we are dealing with populations which contain a fantastically large number of sick and diseased persons. It is not surprising that in bodies so often racked with pain and disease, judgments may be distorted, and demagoguery may be heeded and followed.

The available health statistics on these and other underdeveloped countries are woefully deficient. But they do reveal a tragic picture.

For example, the very eyes with which the people of Egypt or the people of Iraq or other lands view man's problems are, in literally hundreds of thousands of cases, racked with the disease of trachoma, which can lead to blindness. In some places—for instance in some villages in Egypt—the trachoma rate is over 90 percent.

So we would do well to remind the peoples of Egypt and their leaders that we are prepared to wage war against the disease of trachoma, and that our facilities for waging war against disease are even more efficient than are our capacity and our facilities to maintain military defense and to wage war, if need be, in behalf of our own freedom.

Approximately 1 out of every 5 persons in Iraq is suffering from trachoma or some other form of eye disease. In those two countries, the rate of malnutrition is appalling. Well over 50 percent of the entire population is underfed, the victims of hunger and malnutrition.

Egypt and Iraq are plagued by the snail-borne disease known as schistosomiasis, which goes on from generation to generation, racking and debilitating whole segments of the population.

In Syria, malaria is still a long way from conquest, with more than three-quarters of a million persons living in malarious areas.

In some areas of Jordan, 9 out of every 10 people are infected with intestinal worms and diseases.

I have seen those people; and I want to say that never in my life did I experience

such emotional pain as when I saw the hunger, the privation, and the disease of literally hundreds of thousands of people.

Is it any wonder they are in rebellion? Is it any wonder they are emotional? Is it any wonder they follow demagogues? Is it any wonder they kill? What do they have to live for? Our answer, all too often, has been more guns for ruling groups, rather than more food, medicine, teachers, and books for the people.

It is not as if we had no way of doing these things. We can work through the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. We can work through these great international organizations and give leadership and counsel against man's ancient enemies of ignorance, poverty, and disease. We can work through our great philanthropic foundations, our colleges, our churches, and our many private groups.

There is no doubt that we must maintain our armed strength in the current worldwide struggle. We would do well to maintain our shield of strength so that there could be no doubt as to our ability to defend ourselves and our allies; but we do not need to continuously shout about it—a little less talk and a little more doing. But this is, and can only be, a negative aspect of our foreign policy. The United States must demonstrate that Americans genuinely and unselfishly are interested in helping to alleviate deprivation and suffering of hundreds of millions in the underdeveloped nations.

There is only one way to win the cold war in those areas, and that is with a warm heart and a clear mind. I might add, a clear and clean mind—a mind that states our objectives and then represents a will to fulfill those objectives.

When are we going to start to act like this? When are we going to demonstrate to the world that our main interest is people, and not power; that our main interest is human welfare, and not just natural resources like oil? We refuse to really use the strength we have. No wonder we are in trouble. No wonder Khrushchev enjoys batting us from one end of the world to the other with his propaganda, because we play the Communists' game of power politics, when indeed we should be acting like ourselves, and being the compassionate, generous, kindly, considerate Americans that we are, and letting the banner of righteousness and doing the right thing be our flag and our shield.

Therefore, from the highest offices and councils of this Republic, from every political and civil and lay leader, let there come the desire, and the expressed desire, to mobilize the great human resources of the free world in an attack against ignorance, poverty, and disease. Indeed, the cost will be little compared to the fantastic costs of arms in which we have indulged ourselves year after year.

Sometimes I wonder where we are going. We voted for a \$40 billion defense budget in the Senate in less than 5 hours of debate. Yet we argued for days about \$1 billion of food under Public Law 480. Why, we have argued for hours about the extent to which we are willing to utilize our surplus foods to relieve human suffering. What is wrong with us?

This only spells disaster and doom. We are playing into the Communists' hands. We are acting like they act. We are using the tools they use. We cannot win that way. The only way to act is to be one's self, and not to be made over. There is no need to be vindictive; no need to be vituperative; there is a need only to be right; to be firm; to be ourselves. In that way we cannot help but mobilize tremendous popular support. As the great Abraham Lincoln said so beautifully and profoundly: "With malice

toward none; with charity for all; but with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

The mistakes of the past cannot be undone, but there may still be time to develop a new relationship with the peoples of the Middle East and other parts of the world. It should be a relationship expressed in terms of food, of education, of jobs, and of medical care.

Diseased bodies and empty stomachs produce warped minds, and indeed bitter hearts. We cannot find peace in a world which is afflicted with diseased bodies, empty stomachs, warped minds, and bitter hearts. These conditions are not conducive to reasoned political decisions. The sooner we begin to attack the fantastic problems of hunger and illness the sooner we are going to see sound political development.

It is not only, in my mind, un-Christian and immoral, but it is positively dangerous to remain smugly content that we are the best fed, best housed, and healthiest people in the world. Until we recognize the brute facts of suffering among other peoples, and put our tremendous resources of food and medicine to work for others, we are simply going to find ourselves ever more isolated in a rising sea of hostility.

But we always think in terms of military aid. We can spend millions of dollars to move tanks to Lebanon. But I ask the question, How much medicine have we moved to the sick? I ask the question, How many teachers have we sent to the illiterate? I ask the question, How much of our abundance of food have we given to the hungry?

Not enough—indeed, not enough. But these are the tools which we must use. These are the wonder drugs, so to speak—the food, the teachers, the technicians, and the schools—the real "wonder drugs" to cure some of man's diseases: diseases of body, of mind, of spirit, and of will. These are the wonder drugs we can use to combat the virus of Communist totalitarianism.

College for Five—It's Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post of January 30, 1960, there is an article written by Oscar Kiessling entitled "College for Five—It's Murder." This is a well written, personal analysis of the problem facing a family trying to finance the college education of several of its children. It is a problem which, I am sure, faces a great many families throughout the length and breadth of this land and one which, to my mind, cries aloud for some form of remedial action.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulties of this day and age call for effort on behalf of education on a greater scale than at any time in the past. As I have said before, the cost of attending college is increasing rapidly, and all signs point to continuation of this increase. A U.S. Office of Education study of tuition and fees in 196 representative institutions of higher education, accounting for 55 percent of the Nation's total undergraduates, indicates that these charges increased 32.6 per-

cent between 1954 and 1958 in public institutions and 39 percent in private institutions. In the same period the cost of living index, which has a direct bearing on room, board, and other costs borne by college students and their families, increased by some 8 percent. The average cost of sending a student to college has now risen to \$1,500 annually in our public institutions of higher education and \$2,000 in private institutions. Since increases in college enrollments are coming more and more from families of modest means, this increase in costs constitutes a serious burden for many of our citizens.

It was because of these facts that a year ago, I again reintroduced my bill, H.R. 7105, providing for tax relief for educational expense. This proposed legislation would permit a taxpayer to deduct from his gross income, expenditures for tuition and other educational expenses. There is a limit set that such deduction shall not exceed \$1,500 for any one individual in any one taxable year. The taxpayer could make the deduction for his own expenses or for those of his spouse or any of his dependents. In addition to tuition expenses, other deductible charges could be for books, fees, uniforms, board, lodging and other expenses necessarily incurred in or incident to the effective pursuit of an education.

I doubt if anyone will disagree with me when I say that in the face of the present high cost of living, many families are hard pressed to finance their children's higher education. I know that in my State of Rhode Island, there are many such families who are forced to make more than reasonable sacrifices in order to provide a college education for their children. They are certainly to be commended for their efforts in this regard but in my opinion something more than commendation should be offered—some affirmative help should be given them in their laudable endeavor. I believe that my bill will do just that. It will give such needed assistance by permitting them to claim as an income tax deduction moneys expended for education. I believe that it will also benefit the entire field of education for it will serve as an incentive for families to send their children to college who presently find it impossible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article written by Oscar Kiessling entitled "College for Five—It's Murder":

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Jan. 30 1960]

COLLEGE FOR FIVE—IT'S MURDER

(By Oscar Kiessling)

"Isn't she wonderful," Alice whispered to me fondly as our eldest child, Julie, marched across the high school auditorium stage with her classmates to get her diploma. Despite the oppressiveness of the humid June night, our other four children, strung out like stair-steps beyond Alice, beamed with family pride. "Yes," I whispered just as fondly, but with a trace of pessimism, "and when she gets her college diploma, she'll be miraculous."

My pessimism stemmed from no scholastic shortcomings on Julie's part. Our parental hearts swelled a few moments later when her name was read among those on the scholastic honor roll. But my recent experience with

the scholarship mirage had convinced me that for parents of moderate means, putting five children through college was going to be a formidable, nip-and-tuck proposition, even for an economist with a doctor's degree like myself, accustomed to juggling millions of dollars—other people's money, of course.

Until a few weeks before, I had naively supposed that a virtually painless solution to my college problem lay in the scholarships available for bright and needy students. I had been reading about them for years. Certainly Julie was bright; a practically straight-A average showed that. Pete, 2 years younger, was going great guns in science, especially chemistry; and Brenda, 2 years younger than Pete, had just won a junior-high spelloid and was in the top echelon of her class. Deborah, then nearly 10, and Douglas, 3 years her junior, were still in elementary school, but in the fast track—the advanced learner groups—of their classes. As for proving need, I certainly held all the cards. Where, I would ask, is there a family of moderate circumstances with five children that isn't automatically in need?

Well, that was 6 years ago, and I know better—or worse—now. In fact, what amazes me most is how a parent as realistic as I thought I was could goof so on the scholarship business. It was soon painfully apparent that colleges were not knocking on our door with attractive propositions, and so I began making a few discreet inquiries myself. I found that some scholarships, ranging up to \$1,500 a year or more for 4 years at colleges of the students' own choice, were available to high school graduates. But there were not many of them, and they were sparingly distributed among relatively few high schools throughout the country to a few top students in the genius or near-genius category. Our youngsters were all in the upper 20 percent of their classes, which is not bad in the egghead counties around Washington. Because of the concentration of universities and governmental offices here, there are probably more Ph. D. families per square mile than in any other area in the United States. But none of our kids is in whatever category leads to those super scholarships, and we moved on to the next line of attack, applying for grants on the basis of need. For anyone who has never had this experience, let me say that applying for a scholarship on the basis of need is a course in education by itself.

This process started with a parental headache hereinafter called the form, a 3- or 4-page questionnaire, detailed, intricate and tricky sometimes calling for information a parent wouldn't ordinarily keep and can't easily calculate. Its purpose was obviously to give college officials a comprehensive inventory of a family's real and personal possessions, assets, actual and potential earnings, resources, and debt. I am not challenging the propriety or necessity for the information requested, but whatever adeptness I had acquired in 30 years of filling out forms as a Government economist was taxed to the limit. The Form requires specifics down to the model year of the family automobile and amount and number of installments due. Julie was applying at four schools, which meant four versions of the form, each different enough from the others to make it a separate project.

Since then many of the private schools have got together and arranged for an original form to be filed with the college scholarship service at Princeton, N.J., an activity of the college entrance examination board. The board furnishes copies at \$2 each to colleges which the applicant may specify. This arrangement aims not only at efficiency but also at discouraging parents from filing varying financial statements with different schools in order to determine by trial and error just what degree of poverty to plead to trap a scholarship. Even State universi-

ties are coming to this central-agency arrangement, although some schools still require supplementary information.

Perhaps I am not such a good form-filler-outer as I thought I was. It may have been that I didn't show enough relative need; my \$11,800 salary at the U.S. Tariff Commission with seven exemptions left me \$9,783.98 take-home pay. Conceivably some college administrators might have harbored a subconscious hostility to Federal bureaucrats like myself. At any rate, only one school gave any encouragement. A college in the Midwest wrote for more information; but since the amount of money it suggested might be available would cover only the cost of transportation to and from school, we passed that up. All our other efforts fell flat. We never learned definitely what the criteria were, and they probably vary from one college to another and between students in different geographical areas.

The more I looked into the scholarship question—with four children to go I couldn't stop with Julie's case—the more I was convinced that the opportunities were highly overrated. That isn't sour grapes. We had no right to expect better-than-average treatment, and are not complaining now. But despite rosy reviews, scholarship grants were and still are relatively small, even insignificant, compared to zooming college costs. Comprehensive statistics are not easy to come by, but those at the U.S. Office of Education indicate that of the 3,600,000 students attending colleges and universities in 1958-59, about 300,000 received grants approximating \$100 million, perhaps a little more. The most liberal were those offered by business firms and corporations—the National Merit Scholarships for example—but there were only about 28,000 of them in 1957-58 for a total of \$18 million—an average of \$643 a year. Most scholarships were given out by or through the schools themselves. In 1955-56, the latest year for which detailed figures are available, some 1,500 colleges and universities awarded 237,000 grants totaling nearly \$66 million. That made the average scholarship worth only \$278, and the median was even lower—\$229. In public institutions one-half—and in private schools one-fourth—of the grants were for less than \$125. That's not very much when it costs a student \$1,500 a year at a public school and \$2,500 at a private institution. That means the bulk of the students below the very top rungs of the scholastic totem pole are not getting much financial help.

With scholarships out of the picture, Alice and I turned to what was then gaining increasing public attention and is currently being touted as a cure-all—long-term educational loans. For decades parents have been borrowing on their life insurance, homes and other assets to finance their children's college educations. In the past several years banks have gone in for financing education as an investment, which it certainly is, with steady parental employment as collateral. Following passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Treasury Department dished out \$30 million for loans the first year and is allowing an increase for fiscal 1960 for students to borrow against their future employment. They can borrow as much as \$5,000 and repay it over a 10-year period starting a year after graduation. But loans didn't seem a proper or desirable way to meet college expenses, especially for us. Alice and I are in our 50's and expect the expense of a large family to continue for another 10 years. We could hardly take on a debt of \$20,000 or \$30,000 that would help temporarily, but would have to be paid back after our earning power was greatly reduced or terminated.

The children could borrow the money individually, of course, and there seems to be a trend in that direction. But the prospect

of a diploma with a c.o.d. tag for \$5,000 somehow repelled me. "A fine graduation present," I said to Alice, "that has to be paid for when the kids will be getting married and need all their dough for furniture, obstetrical fees and baby food." Alice nodded and added, possibly with three daughters in mind, "What a dowry a \$5,000 I O U would be for a prospective husband." So we ruled out student loans except as a last resort.

At the risk of seeming to be somewhat on the soft side, I'll go further and say we didn't want to borrow or have the children borrow for their college education. We didn't even want them to work their way any more than was absolutely necessary, at least during the school year. Don't tell me about all the students who have gone to college with 30 cents in their pockets and, by dint of hard work, earned all expenses and finished cum laude. I know one guy personally who did all that and finished cum money in the bank. But they are the exception, and they also missed a lot of the things they'll never again have a chance to get.

The labor market is overcrowded in most college towns, and a student has to work so many hours he can't assimilate the knowledge or training he came for, let alone develop the personal associations that should be an integral part of a college education. Even without their working part time, college has been no picnic for our children. Not only is there more to learn than when I went to school 30 years ago but the standards of performance are much tougher than most parents realize. If my youngsters had time on their hands, I'd prefer they take additional courses to broaden their backgrounds.

But when scholarships, loans, and part-time jobs were ruled out, all that seemed to be left for us was some sort of pay-as-you-go, do-it-yourself plan. That wouldn't mean any drastic change in our living pattern. Our circumstances had always been moderate and actually have changed little since the beginning of our college program, except that my salary of \$11,800 in 1954, Julie's first year in college, has increased to \$14,400. Alice is a psychiatrist and contributes by her practice; but under our setup she is a mother first and a doctor afterward, and we all share the household responsibilities.

Our home—a large frame house—is paid for, but old enough to need maintenance constantly. The expense of rearing a large family on a moderate income precluded the accumulation of what might be called an investment portfolio. But we have a few securities and moderate reserves in savings and the cash or loan value of insurance policies to provide a last line of defense in case of emergency. Our situation may be more or less fortunate than that of other large families with the same educational problem. But it was from this conglomeration that the wherewithal must come to finance the children's college educations—with the accent on the plural.

Making out a college budget for a large family comes under the heading of serious business, and even if you're wellheeled financially it is surprisingly big business. Our present costs are about \$2,500 a year per child, which covers only the essentials without frills or fat spending allowances. Thus the cost of a 4-year college course comes to \$10,000. "That," I observed impressively at the dinner table one evening, "puts it in the price range of high-powered luxury limousines, to give you a rough idea." The cost at publicly controlled colleges within our own State would be lower, possibly as much as 25 percent, but at several big-name colleges would be higher. Although Alice was graduated from Cornell, and I from Wisconsin, we did not try to influence the children. Their choice was governed by the

courses offered, a desire to go where their friends were going or by other personal considerations most parents would consider valid. Simple arithmetic put the family's higher education bill tentatively at \$50,000.

While that \$50,000 figure sounded formidable enough, it was soon obvious that it would have to be adjusted upward because of two additional factors. The cost of both tuition and living at private and publicly supported colleges was even then mounting rapidly. We estimated that the annual expense would rise to at least \$3,000 before the last of the Kiesslings finished. We added a flat \$7,500 to the total bill as a rough approximation. The second factor was graduate study. None of the children is committed so far to law or medical school, but the trend toward graduate work even for a public schoolteacher career, such as Julie was working toward, seemed to warrant adding another \$2,500 apiece—which times five is \$12,500—for a grand total of \$70,000. That's after taxes, of course; and Alice and I figured that to net that much under Federal and Virginia tax laws we'd have to gross \$105,000.

The figure was downright frightening. The only consolation was that it might have been larger if any of the children had professional ambitions—say, even to be an economist like the old man. Another consolation was that it could be divided by the number of calendar years the children would be in college—in our case, 16. The \$70,000 total net thus averaged out to about \$4,500 a year, although actual annual payments varied widely. For the first 2 years, starting with the fall term in 1954, Julie was at Oberlin College in Ohio at a mere \$2,500 a year. During the next 2 years while she was still at Oberlin, Pete attended St. Lawrence University at Canton, N.Y., raising the tab to a stiffer \$5,000. For one peak year, 1958-59, when Brenda was a freshman at Oberlin, Pete was a junior at St. Lawrence and Julie was taking graduate work at George Washington University in Washington, a maximum of \$7,500 was spent for one rigorous annum I'll long remember. But our worst year is over, and from now on things should be getting better until Douglas finishes in 1969. We have less than 10 years to go. Being a Federal employee, I don't have to retire until I'm 70. It's going to be a photo-finish.

Our first attack on this \$4,500 annual nut began with economies in housing and automobiles; it's remarkable how much you can save by living with outmoded versions of both. Our old house is built on locust posts, has a primitive heating system and doesn't remotely resemble the ramblers and split levels you see advertised on the real-estate pages. We need and should have better housing, but it was one of the things we realized we could do without, and so we put it aside. The car of tomorrow doesn't darken our driveway either. We have two cars because Alice needs one in her practice, but they were bought secondhand and have kept us rolling without breaking the bank. Maintenance on the house is kept to a minimum and is largely do-it-yourself; even the girls are handy with a monkey wrench or hacksaw. Clothing budgets get a careful going over, and the family understands that costly recreation, extensive vacations and travel are simply out.

Shrinking expenses, of course, has practical limits. Bills for utilities, taxes, insurance and medical and dental services don't bend much, if at all. Fortunately the habit of eating is one on which we haven't had to economize overly. We live on an 8-acre tract on the edge of Washington's suburbia, where it's still lawful to keep a cow, chickens and even goats. It's cheaper these days to buy poultry and eggs than for a small operator to raise them, and I gave up chickens a couple of years ago. But we have fruit trees and nut trees and a vege-

table garden that, with judicious shopping at the supermarket for meat and staples, keeps the Kiessling table pretty well supplied. Altogether, saving effected by economizing add up to about one-third of our \$4,500 college budget.

Since that isn't enough, we have to increase earnings somehow, and there are several ways of doing that. Properly steered into summer jobs, student labor can turn up a second third of the necessary shekels, we've found. Steering consists of shopping early for jobs, preferably jobs that last through the summer. The two youngest, Deborah and Douglas, belong to 4-H Clubs and have already started their college bank accounts with money they've made selling surplus garden truck and raising goats. Alice and I bat in the cleanup spot in the extra-earnings lineup, taking on occasional special assignments in our respective callings to make up that last one-third and balance our collegiate books.

What our college project is making us do isn't hurting us, at least not much. Sure, there are things we'd like to have that we don't have, and once in a while neighborhood explanations seem called for. After getting an earful from a playmate about his father's air-conditioned sedan, young Douglas snapped scornfully, "Oh, we've got big cars, too, three of 'em; but they're all away at college." My remark about college educations costing like limousines must have sunk in.

But we're all well nourished and reasonably well dressed. And the kids have discovered many interesting and worthwhile activities that are priceless, yet practically costless too. For example, they've built a sizable swimming pool with filter for about \$120. When a road-construction crew was working nearby a couple of years ago, they wangled some sort of barter deal—it left us short of vegetables for a month—for a bulldozer to scoop out the general contour. They shaped it up themselves, laid strips of tarpaper crisscross over the bottom and sides and tarred the cracks so it would hold water. With the filter, that's all there is to it. I believe they have recovered their original investment over the years by giving bargain-rate swimming lessons to small fry in the neighborhood. Julie, Pete, and Brenda are all Red Cross lifesaving instructors and would prefer spending the summer in the water if it were practicable. And so while we would prefer reading or strumming the guitar, painting, or just playing with the dogs to working during our spare time, and though we might get more benefit in the long run, we realize that not all is sweetness yet on this planet and that you take the bad with the good.

If the financial tribulations of the Kiesslings were my only theme, the story might end about here. But what worries me, and should worry many more people than it does, is the fact that despite our basementless house and 4-year-old cars, Alice and I are in that favored financial stratum, the 10 percent of the Nation's families with an income of more than \$10,000 a year. If you are among those who have been dealing with some of the problems I've been describing, consider how much harder a time the 41 percent of the families with incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000 are having sending their children to college. And what are the 49 percent of the families with incomes of less than \$5,000 able to do about it? Too many of them are doing what you might expect—not sending them.

Surveys by several private and Government agencies indicate that at least 100,000 and perhaps as many as 200,000 high-school graduates in the top quarter of their classes don't go to college because they lack the necessary funds. That number represents only part of the real loss, because in most high schools, students who finish in the top

half of the class—sometimes an even larger segment—are considered good college material. And this has been going on for years.

That's a terrific waste at a time when the country needs more and better brain power than ever before. It's also undemocratic to make higher education a class privilege. A recent scholarship analysis mentioned an eastern factory city where less than 20 percent of the high-school graduates went to college, while in a residential suburb 10 miles away the proportion was 80 percent. And if wasteful and undemocratic don't move you, let me add it's lousy economics. Everybody knows that the more education you have, the better job you can get at higher pay, which means higher income taxes to Federal and State Governments. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, an agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, puts out money and advice to handicapped people to restore or upgrade their earning power. Comprehensive statistics show this Federal-State program returns not dollar-for-dollar, but \$10 in income taxes over the years for every \$1 spent. We invested about \$15 billion in GI education after World War II—on many who didn't even have a high-school diploma—and the estimate now is that we are collecting \$1 billion a year in higher income taxes as a result.

I think we're being nickel and dime foolish in our niggardly approach to developing our youthful brain power. Greatly augmenting our scholarship program will help some, but doubling or quadrupling it is not apt to make the difference between college or no college for those 200,000 or 400,000 high school graduates in the top half of their classes who just don't have enough money. Loans may have a place in emergency or hardship cases, but they're not the real solution. In the long run parents bear the brunt of the financial burden of college education. It seems to me the best way to get more youngsters to go to college, to stay there longer or to have more time to absorb the knowledge they came for would be to give the parents some help in the form of income tax deductions. Any income taxes lost temporarily while the student is in college will be recovered manifold after he gets out.

Even Congress has begun to see the merit in this approach, and more than twenty bills have been introduced to mitigate the plight of the student or his parents by helping in various ways. A typical bill introduced by Rep. JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY of Rhode Island would allow a deduction of up to \$1500 for expenses actually incurred for each dependent in college. This deduction would be in addition to the \$600 deduction for the same student as a dependent. Another bill would allow a second \$600 deduction—a total of \$1,200—while a dependent attends college. But these bills and others like them have one common deficiency—they involve a revision of the present tax laws and are therefore referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. There they stand in line awaiting the next tax cut, if any, or general revision of the Nation's tax structure, if ever. No hearings were held on these bills at the first session of the present Congress, and none appears to be in prospect in the 1960 election year—at least unless parents become much more articulate than they have been.

It won't help any for Uncle Sam to shake his finger and say the Kiesslings knew the facts of life and, having brought five prospective students to the college gates, they should not now ask special favors to get them through. First, if that's going to be Uncle Sam's attitude, he'd better tell everybody right away because the Bureau of the Census reports that things are getting worse—families are getting bigger instead of smaller. In the last 8 years the number of families with no children or with only one child has been

decreasing relatively, while families with two children have increased 20 percent, families with three children 50 percent, and families with four or more children have increased 60 percent. There will be more, not fewer, families with my college problem in the years ahead.

Second, looking on college students as a liability, for which parents shall be held strictly accountable except where gaunt need can be proved, seems to me to be looking through the wrong end of the telescope. The country should be as glad to have these youngsters as the parents are and should make it easy, not difficult, to contribute to their best abilities. I'm not for imitating the Russians just because they hit the moon first, although a little imitating here and there might not hurt. But according to the recent report of the first official U.S. education mission to the U.S.S.R., we're competing against a system that doesn't charge anything for tuition at any college or university and actually pays 80 percent of the students who attend—the higher the grades the higher the pay—instead of having them wait on tables or wash dishes. Incidentally, the remaining 20 percent who have to pay their own living expenses are the scions of rich parents, such as—ho, ho—teachers, writers, and the like who are in the highest income brackets. What a topsy-turvy world we live in.

Whether the Klessing family gets the benefit of higher income-tax deductions is a personal matter of no great moment. Our five children will probably muddle through to bachelor's or master's degrees sooner or later regardless. But a lot of families won't be able to manage as well unless something is done to ease the financial load. This is a big country. If our economy is to continue to grow as it should, we will need a one-third increase in our managerial, proprietorial, and technical positions in the years immediately ahead. We need more than a few Einsteins, Oppenheims, and Tellers, as well as some near-geniuses. We need the broadest kind of program to upgrade the general educational level of the whole country. One way to start is to take college education out of the luxury-limousine class.

Loyalty Oath—National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a number of editorials which have appeared in student newspapers regarding the affidavit provision in the National Defense Education Act. These editorials disclose considerable student opposition to the affidavit provision. The editorials represent the views of the following institutions: Cornell University, Upsala Gazette, Smith College Sophian, Pembroke Record, Oberlin Review, and Queens College, the Phoenix.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Pembroke College Record, Jan. 13, 1960]

LOYALTY IN EDUCATION

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 represents the Federal Government's first general program of aid to higher education. One of the provisions of this act is the granting of Federal funds to colleges and universities to be used for low-interest student loans. For every \$9 of Federal funds granted, the institutions must add \$1 of their own. In the administration of these grants, schools are required to give primary consideration to students pursuing study in science, math, engineering, or foreign languages, or who are preparing to enter elementary or secondary school teaching. Those who enter the teaching profession are required only to return one-half of the money borrowed.

Under section 1001(f) of the act, to receive a loan a student must sign: (1) A disclaimer affidavit that he does not support any organization which believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force, violence, or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. (2) A loyalty oath in which he affirms that he will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic. Fraudulent statements made by a student are subject to a maximum fine of \$10,000, maximum imprisonment of 5 years, or both.

I affirm belief in the desirability and necessity of Federal aid to higher education. However, I believe that the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit provisions of the NDEA are objectionable, and I urge their repeal for the following reasons:

1. Both represent an affront to freedom of belief and conscience:

(a) The affidavit proscribes certain beliefs and actions.

(b) The loyalty oath commits one to certain future actions.

2. Both discriminate against college students. Farmers and manufacturers who receive Federal aid in the form of tariffs or subsidies are not required to sign an affidavit or oath.

3. Both represent a serious threat to academic freedom:

(a) Refusal to sign on principle incurs suspicion of disloyalty.

(b) As precedents, they may serve as a basis for more restrictive legislation in the use of Federal funds for education.

(c) They reverse American jurisprudence implying guilt before trial, calling into question and undermining the basic loyalty of American students.

(d) They must be administered by the school for the Government in return for the school's own money.

4. Neither protect the United States against supervision. Section 1001(f) in no way provides for the exposure or taxation of subversives.

5. Both are terminologically unclear, (e.g., the words "defend," in the loyalty oath; and "believe in," "supports" and "illegal methods" in the affidavit) leaving a wide area for interpretation and possible resultant expansion of their meanings.

As students, this issue affects us directly. We have a responsibility as individuals to study the NDEA and section 1001(f), take our stand and make it known to our Senators and Representatives. Only with the help of student protest will the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions be removed. Your SGA district representatives have considered the question and have written their Congressmen urging the repeal of these pro-

visions. I sincerely ask each of you to do the same.

NANCY WOLANS,
NSA Coordinator.

[From the Upsala College Gazette, Jan. 8, 1960]

NDEA CONTROVERSY

Less than a year after the Soviet's first sputnik, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. The money allocated by this bill was supposed to "strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and insure the intellectual eminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designated to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines."

According to the conditions of the act, the funds supplied by the Federal Government are granted to accredited institutions of higher learning for low-interest student loans. Recipients of the loan who intend to teach are forgiven up to half of their borrowings, and thus, receive a partial scholarship. A net sum of \$295 million for the loan program was authorized by Congress over a period of 4 years ending June 30, 1962. For each \$9 of Federal loan money an institution receives, it must add \$1 of its own.

The NDEA is the Government's first general program of aid to higher education and sets a precedent for future action. Recently, however, there have been many protests from academic circles concerning the affidavit and oath requirements. A student is not eligible for the loan unless he (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

This provision of the act has caused several prominent and highly rated schools to refuse the loan. Recently three others, Oberlin, Harvard, and Yale reconsidered their participation and returned the funds that had been granted them to make a total of 15 institutions which are dissatisfied with the program.

There are many reasons for educators and students to object to the "loyalty provision" but it is the affidavit not the oath that most of the dissenters are opposed to. Many doubt the constitutionality of the affidavit because it may infringe upon the first amendment's protection of freedom of belief and association. Some say the affidavit is not only "superfluous and discriminatory," but "imposes an impossible burden upon our educational institutions to interpret the section, for each school may have a different concept of what is necessary to prove a 'belief' in an organization which 'believes' in the overthrow of the U.S. Government by 'unconstitutional methods'."

Others resent the bill because it singles out only students who are going to school and as JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican of Kentucky, stated: "You must prove your loyalty to the United States of America." He continues, "The very essence of our system is that it is free—freedom of ideas, freedom of search for truth. We must believe that the free system of education will win

out over conformity—the conformity of communism.”

Why should the Government single out students and educators for a loyalty provision when other Federal loan programs, housing and bank loans, do not require a statement? This, of course, does not mean an affidavit should be required for the others, rather the educational disclaimer should be dropped. After all, if a Communist or subversive character wants a loan, signing an affidavit or taking an oath is not going to bother him in the least.

The question of the loyalty provision has been debated in Congress and a bill was introduced to remove the highly controversial section. However, the bill was shelved and recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The vote for recommitment was 19-42. Although it is difficult to account for the shelving, there are several key factors.

One is the fact that only seven (at that time) of the 1,227 colleges taking part had withdrawn in protest of the loyalty provision. Other opponents of the bill depicted college presidents as “well meaning, but impractical eggheads, far removed from the harsh realities of life.”

At present there are many institutions who are against the disclaimer, however, they are not financially able to withdraw. Upsala is a participant in the NDEA but it would be foolish to suggest its withdrawal, since the money received is badly needed. It is possible, however, to register a protest and still stay within the program so as not to lose any of its student loan money.

[From Smith College, the Sophian, Dec. 8, 1959]

TO END THE AFFIDAVIT

The faculty of Smith along with Mr. Men-denhall decided unanimously to take a definite position against the disclaimer affidavit of the National Defense Education Act. In taking this position the faculty has drawn the line between the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit. This is contrary to the view taken by the House of Representatives last spring. The House of Representatives felt that both the oath and the affidavit should be withdrawn from the act.

There is a case to be made for the right of the Federal Government to require an oath of loyalty from persons who are to receive Federal aid. It does not seem logical that the Government needs to grant aid to persons who are admittedly disloyal. We might point out, however, that farmers and businessmen who are subsidized do not have to sign any oath, neither do those claiming social security benefits.

The stand against the affidavit is wholly warranted and justified . . . “a fundamental concept of democratic government is the assumption that a citizen, insofar as crime is concerned, is innocent until proven guilty; that, insofar as his general behavior as a citizen is concerned, the assumption must also be that he is loyal until it has been proved that he is other than loyal. The assumption of the affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act is just the reverse of this.” (The Nation, December 5, 1959, “Oathism” on the Campus.) A proof of innocence in terms of a signed statement is not only illogical, but also ineffective, as many critics of the affidavit have pointed out.

The affidavit discriminates against students, as has been repeatedly pointed out by all of the protesters. The editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of November 26, states the affidavit represents “the singling out of needy students as a group who must be specially challenged on their loyalty to free institutions.”

A further implication of the affidavit is that “by requiring students to swear that

they do not believe in any organization that believes in overthrowing the Government by unconstitutional means, the required oath goes far beyond any disavowal of active participation in a conspiracy.” “It enters directly,” the Tribune editorial continues, “into the realm of conscience, requiring the student to declare not only his actions but what may be his innermost thoughts. Certainly no necessity exists today to justify such an invasion of the privacy of the mind.”

Among the other objections that have been raised is that the Government is injecting political screening into the educational process. This could effectively put a damper on the right to freedom of academic inquiry.

Whereas in the oath, the Government has a case, we firmly believe that the existence of the affidavit is endangering the existence of certain basic freedoms of the individual and of academic life.

We feel that the stand taken by the faculty is the most practical stand that a college can take which needs Federal aid, as Smith does, and yet finds the affidavit odious. Federal aid has meant an 80 percent increase in all the loans given out to Smith students; therefore, it would be financially detrimental to return the funds. In view of this it might be reasonable to follow the protest to its logical conclusion, refusal of future funds, if the law is not changed.

S. A.

[From the Oberlin Review-Nov. 20, 1959]

SIGNIFICANT SACRIFICE

The board of trustees' action last Saturday of making official and final the college's withdrawal from the NDEA loan program, so long as signing of a loyalty affidavit is required of participating students, concludes for Oberlin the first phase of higher education's fight against disclaimer affidavit requirements. Last November and December the American Association of University Professors and the Swarthmore College Student Council took the first strong stand against the loyalty provisions of the Education Act and communicated their opinions to faculty and student groups across the country. Now, 11 months later, legislative efforts to remove both the oath and affidavit provisions have not succeeded, but about 15 other colleges have joined Swarthmore in withdrawing from the NDEA program and many others have expressed alarm at the offensive section 1001(f).

By renouncing the present program, Oberlin and the other colleges are expressing their opposition to the loyalty requirements in the most significant and effective manner. Congressmen will be less likely to trifle with complaints about the act's incursions upon academic freedom of inquiry and thought, when they see the clichéd idealists taking a stand which may mean material sacrifice.

The next phase for the college in the fight against the section 1001(f) must include encouragement of other colleges to take a clear position on the offensive provisions, and continued expositions to Congressmen on the necessity of removing the affidavit requirement. We have stuck by our idealism—students, faculty, trustees, and all. Now we should hope to see our ideals take the form of “remodified legislation.”

T.T.

[From the Phoenix, Nov. 4, 1959]

FIGHT FIERCELY, HARVARD

At last an institution of higher learning has taken an enlightened stand on the loyalty oath provision of the 1958 National Defense Education Act.

Harvard University has announced that it will hold the funds received under this act in escrow until a referendum has been taken among the students to determine

whether or not they wish to accept funds, regardless of the stipulation that all recipients of loans must sign an oath swearing fidelity to the United States and disclaiming membership in any “subversive” organizations.

Harvard has taken into account the position of those students who claim that although individuals may demonstrate disdain for the loyalty oath provision by not applying for loans, outright acceptance of these funds implies, at worst, approval of this clause and, at best, indifference, when the price is right, to individual dignity and freedom of inquiry.

We have discussed the reasons against the security provision of this act in past issues of the Phoenix. Briefly, the most cogent arguments are that it discriminates against students by singling them out for suspicion; that it serves no real purpose, since any subversive would not hesitate to sign it; that it violates the first and fifth amendments; that it limits freedom of opinion and inquiry; in short, that it is an insult to the integrity of the American student.

We are pleased to note that there is one university in the Nation which shows respect for its students, their maturity, and their ability to make decisions for themselves. Harvard's treatment of this issue is especially judicious when contrasted with Queen's College's actions on student problems. Here the administration has shown almost total disregard for student opinion, as exemplified by its banning of John Gates' speech 2 years ago, by its termination of Crown and Rampart last semester, by its discontinuance of February graduations, and by the recent acceptance of Federal funds without consulting and considering student opinion.

Last year, when Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, unsuccessfully attempted to have this provision removed from the bill, he stated that through political maneuvering, the loyalty oath provision was added in such a manner that there was no time for students to dissent. Those at Harvard now have the opportunity to demonstrate their disapproval of the loyalty requirement, a piece of legislation that accentuates the lack of respect in this country for the student and the scholar.

[From the Cornell Daily Sun, November 1959]

LOYALTY OATH—TWO QUESTIONS

In the midst of the debate over the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Education Act, two distinct facets of the problem which demand separation and detachment from each other have been so closely interrelated as to confuse and obscure much of the essence of the decision which a university must face in determining its own policy toward Federal aid.

The first and most essential aspect of the question involves whether or not the loyalty oath provision is at all desirable or necessary, and whether or not it fulfills any worthwhile function. The second involves the university much more directly, and that is whether or not, given the fact of the legislation, the university is justified in issuing a blanket refusal to accept Federal aid in protest over the loyalty oath, thus depriving the student of the opportunity not only to enjoy financial aid but also to make any significant decision concerning the oath himself.

The act requires a student applying for a loan to swear that he does not believe in, belong to, or support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Some advocates of the provision argue that the Federal Government has the right, if not the obligation, to prevent the use of its funds by any individual who believes in

the illegal overthrow of the Government. On the surface this argument seems reasonable enough.

With regard specifically to the National Defense Education Act, however, this argument becomes invalid and ineffective. The purpose of the act, apparently, is to maintain the national security and the American way of life. Yet the loyalty oath may well be said to violate in spirit, if not fact, one of the essentials of our way of life: the protection afforded to an individual by the first amendment to the Constitution.

The further consequence of this violation is that the act cannot fulfill its objective. Anyone capable of working toward the overthrow of the Government is clearly capable of perjuring himself in signing a loyalty oath enabling him to receive Federal aid. On the other hand, the act denies Federal aid to the many idealists who will not sign the oath solely because it violates, in their minds, their constitutional rights. These individuals are further subject to the opprobrium of a society which often refuses to differentiate between the loyal objector and the disloyal one.

The loyalty affidavit, then, is unnecessary and self-defeating. But this fact does not make the decision a university must make a great deal easier. For most universities must face another fact: that they do not have sufficient funds to provide financial aid to all the students who need and deserve it.

Cornell provides an excellent example of the university which in fact cannot afford to dismiss lightly the approximately \$150,000 it receives annually under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. We do not have the financial capacity of a Harvard or Yale. We cannot meet the justifiable demands of all the students who request financial aid each year.

Faced with this dilemma, there seems to be but one alternative which can effectively balance the financial needs of the students against the need of a university to maintain its integrity. The university must oppose the loyalty affidavit in the strongest terms, working toward the eventual elimination of this unfortunate legislation. But unless the university can provide all its students with sufficient financial aid, it must continue to accept Federal aid, leaving the moral decision to the students themselves. This is the decision which Cornell has made. It is essentially a wise one, one of which there is no reason to be ashamed.

[From the Cornell Daily Sun, November 1959]

DISCLAIMER OATH—POSITION REAFFIRMED

President Malott has reaffirmed his position with regard to the disclaimer oath provision of the National Defense Education Act. In a statement to the Alumni News, Mr. Malott has once again gone on record as being vigorously opposed to the disclaimer oath. And he has reaffirmed his intention to maintain Cornell's participation in the program of Federal aid to education.

Mr. Malott's attitude toward the oath provision has not changed since his initial statement concerning that legislation. His objection is based on the "fact that beliefs are not subject to legislative control" and that the disclaimer oath is "superfluous." There is no question but that his objections to the oath are valid ones. A number of major universities throughout the country have adopted this position, some refusing to take part in the program at all.

As for Cornell's continued participation in the program, we must again agree with Mr. Malott. At present, Cornell students are receiving some \$150,000 annually from the Federal Government as part of the program established under the legislation of 1958. This year, because the Federal funds arrived

too late last year to be put to any use, Cornellians will be sharing in some \$300,000.

The university cannot afford to refuse this money, for the reasons cited by President Malott. First, students should be given the opportunity to share in these funds, if they, as individuals, are willing to sign the disclaimer oath. The university does not have available sufficient funds to cover all student applications for aid. If it did, the entire situation would be different. But given the existing deficiency, the student must be given the choice.

One item in the president's statement must not be overlooked. He has unmistakably made clear that for any student who cannot, as a matter of principle carry out the provisions of the act, the university will make every effort to obtain funds from sources other than the Federal Government.

To date, some 150 students have applied for aid under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. Not one has voiced any protest over the loyalty oath provision. This fact may not be terribly significant. Nevertheless, it is of the utmost importance that no student be deprived of financial aid on the basis of his principles. And the university must make this perfectly clear to any student applying for such aid.

One of the major objections to Cornell's continued participation in the loan program is that in order to effect the repeal of the legislation a united front of major universities refusing to accept any funds under these provisions must be presented to the legislature for its consideration. Undoubtedly, this action would prove most effective in any attempt to demand the repeal of the disclaimer oath.

But if the university's financial status demands our continued participation, there still remain other methods of expressing our disapproval, both student and administrative. The university's position has been made clear by the President's statement and by his letter to Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But the student voice has as yet not been heard from, at least, not the official voice of the undergraduate student body as expressed by the executive board. Ultimately, the issue of the disclaimer oath affects the student body. It must be the choice of each individual student either to accept the provisions of the act or object to them. But vigorous criticism of the entire program cannot be confined to those students applying for aid, if anything is to be done about the legislation. We feel it is the obligation of the executive board to consider the issue and to add the voice of the Cornell student body to the many others which have already been enlisted in the struggle to repeal the disclaimer oath.

Government Interest Rate Ceiling and Adequate Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Home Builders of the United States in its Washington Letter has expressed support of H.R. 10590, as recently reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It will be recalled that this legislation represents a step in the direction of giving to the Secretary of the Treasury greater flex-

bility in the management of the public debt by alleviating the stringency of the existing 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

While most individuals who are students of monetary and fiscal affairs would have preferred that the legislation provide for outright repeal of this archaic 4¼ percent ceiling, it is generally recognized that the bill H.R. 10590 will at least help the Treasury Department in the foreseeable future in its debt management responsibilities. The Washington Letter of the National Association of Home Builders points out that in the absence of legislation of this sort "the Treasury will be forced to go into market this year to refinance some \$80 billion worth of securities. If it can only go into the short-term market, we are bound to suffer severely."

While I do not concur with the views expressed in this letter in its allegations with respect to tight money, I will place the entire letter in the RECORD so as to not take any of it out of context. I would observe on the subject of so-called tight money that the best answer to this problem is for the Federal Government to take less in taxes of the net national product of our citizens and thereby leave more to them for savings and investment. If the Government will spend less, the American people will be able to save, invest, and spend more.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the National Association of Home Builders Washington Letter of March 11, 1960, as follows:

WASHINGTON LETTER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 11, 1960

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

"We must support H.R. 10590. . . . It will permit the Treasury to refinance the Government debt without unduly invading mortgage funds. . . . Passage will make possible a more stabilized debt management to the benefit of home buyers, builders, and the general public. . . . Defeat could well mean tighter mortgage money and higher interest rates. . . . Your help needed at once."

Your national officers, executive committee, regional vice presidents, and several NAHB past presidents attending meetings just concluded in Washington agreed unanimously that NAHB and the homebuilding industry have no choice but to endorse the bipartisan effort in the bill (H.R. 10590) recommended February 29 by the House Ways and Means Committee to aid the Government in its financing without repealing the statutory 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds having a maturity in excess of 5 years. We urge your strong support for passage by Congress of H.R. 10590 at the earliest possible date.

This bill has been urged by leaders in both parties as the most effective means of aiding the Treasury in its debt management under the existing statutory ceiling. Previously, President Eisenhower had called for removal of the ceiling as imperative and fully consistent with the public interest. If partisan politics is permitted to defeat H.R. 10590, the supply of funds for the homebuilding industry is bound to be affected adversely and severely. The purpose of this letter is to tell you briefly what H.R. 10590 would do and why it is so very important to us.

PROVISIONS OF H.R. 10590

First, the bill provides a series of limited adjustments to the 4¼-percent ceiling which

will permit the Treasury to issue bonds in excess of 5 years and thus avoid future high-interest, short-term issues such as the "magic 5's" issue of last December which effectively took away large sums of mortgage money from savings banks, savings and loans and other mortgage lenders.

Second, without removing the 4½-percent ceiling, the bill is designed to give the Secretary of the Treasury more flexibility in managing the public debt. It should enable him to economize in interest charges to the Government; to lessen the competition of Government financing with certain areas of private credit, and to cut down the inflationary effects of public borrowing. Needless to say, if he succeeds in all of these purposes it will greatly benefit mortgage financing and homebuilding.

Specifically, H.R. 10590 will provide the following:

(1) Permit the Treasury to refund outstanding bonds in advance of their maturity by exchanging them for new bonds with longer terms. This is called "advance refunding" and is especially important in refinancing currently outstanding long-term Government bonds which will mature in the next few years. Under H.R. 10590, any discount at which the new bonds might be issued will not be counted in applying the 4½ percent limit.

(2) Upon a finding by the President of the United States that the national interest requires financing above the 4½ percent limit, the bill also would permit the Treasury in any fiscal year to issue new bonds up to a total of 2 percent of the public debt. This, in effect, is an "escape valve" for the whole Government financing structure. To the extent the authority is not used during fiscal 1961, it would be carried forward for use during the next 2 fiscal years.

(3) Also upon a finding by the President that the national interest requires the action, the bill would authorize the Treasury to provide special issues of U.S. securities to Government trust funds and also savings bonds at rates in excess of the 4½ percent limit. This provision is expected to be non-controversial.

THE BILL HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Influential Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives urge passage of this bill as an effective way of meeting the urgent request of President Eisenhower and the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill was reported favorably in a bipartisan 18 to 7 vote from the House Ways and Means Committee. It should be on the House floor for debate and voting within the next 2 weeks. This is the crucial time therefore to advise your Congressmen.

Although the Treasury and the President have asked for complete removal of the bond interest rate ceiling, the Secretary of the Treasury has testified that the financing permitted by this bill "is adequate" to provide for the Treasury's needs in the foreseeable future.

The Ways and Means Committee report emphasized that "retaining the interest rate ceiling without modification would not reduce the level of interest rates either for the Government or for private borrowers. However, not to modify the interest rate ceiling would raise the cost of financing the public debt and, at the same time, would make the management of the debt more difficult."

Despite these well considered conclusions, it is clear that the proposed legislation faces rough sledding in the House and perhaps later in the Senate. It will be attacked on a partisan basis and by many who strongly protest, as do we, the tight money and high interest rate policies of the Federal Reserve and other monetary authorities. We are convinced such an attack will be ill-founded;

yet the vote is bound to be close and the bill will need our complete support if it is to pass the Congress.

WHY THE BILL IS IMPORTANT TO NAHBS

Certainly in our own interests as homebuilders, we should realize fully the significance of this legislation to our industry. Expressed very simply, the tight money policy and the resulting high level of interest rates have put the Treasury in a position where it must do virtually all of its financing in the short-term market. The rates it has been paying (and unless H.R. 10590 is passed, the rates it will probably have to pay in the future) are so high that the Treasury's unavoidable financing activities are draining money out of the very institutions on which we must rely for mortgage credit.

When short-term Treasury bonds are issued at an interest rate of 5 percent it is not difficult to understand why thousands of depositors in savings banks, savings and loans and banks line up to withdraw their deposits in order to buy short-term Government bonds which will net them more than the interest they have been getting on their deposits. If this trend continues it is bound to create serious problems for all builders, and particularly for a great number of our membership who rely on conventional loans for their mortgage commitments. Passage of H.R. 10590 will prevent this.

The bill's provisions will permit the Treasury to negotiate with these same financial institutions and exchange new long-term issues for bonds which will be maturing shortly. Further, the President's budget for the next fiscal year contemplates a surplus. This means the Treasury will not be in the market for new funds. In fact, for the first time in a long while the Treasury may be able to pay off some of the public debt. It is in the interest of the homebuilding industry that the Treasury be able to manage the public debt in a way which will not disrupt the long-term investment market in which we have so great a stake. Only passage of H.R. 10590 can make this possible.

The Treasury will be forced to go into the market this year to refinance some \$80 billion worth of securities. If it can only go into the short-term market, we are bound to suffer severely. For this reason alone, all of us who have studied this admittedly complicated matter are convinced that we have no choice except to support the bipartisan effort in Congress to pass the Ways and Means Committee bill, H.R. 10590.

I should like to emphasize as strongly as I can that this conclusion in no way changes the basic policy position of this association in opposition to tight money and high interest rates. We deplore the disproportionate reliance of monetary authorities upon tight money and higher interest rates as primary means of combating inflation. It has been carried to the point where even the U.S. Treasury cannot manage the public debt on a sound and businesslike basis because of a statutory interest rate ceiling.

We shall do everything we can to convince the monetary and fiscal authorities in Government that the policies they have been pursuing for a number of years are responsible not only for our financing problems but for those of the Treasury as well. At the very least we hope to bring about a change in basic attitude on this matter. In the meantime, the current crisis facing the Treasury must be relieved soon by passage of H.R. 10590. Otherwise, the Treasury's problems will make even more difficult the efforts of homebuilders to obtain the funds they need, at prices buyers and builders can afford, to finance the volume of homebuilding needed in this country.

CONGRESS MUST KNOW YOUR VIEWS

Every one of your elected Representatives and Senators finds himself in a difficult po-

sition on this legislation. Your views will be of vital importance to him in arriving at his decision to support or oppose this bill, H.R. 10590. Therefore, I urge you to communicate at once with your Representatives and Senators upon your receipt of this letter.

Your Congressmen should know that you and your industry support the passage of H.R. 10590 at the earliest possible date. Our reasons are simple. They are:

The Treasury's hands must be untied if we are to prevent an excessive drain of small depositors' funds out of the pool of mortgage money which supports our industry and into Treasury short-term obligations. Passage of H.R. 10590 will accomplish this.

Mortgage lenders must be able to plan their future commitments to builders with greater certainty of having funds available and without fear of being raided by Treasury financing. Passage of H.R. 10590 will contribute substantially to this.

Stability in the mortgage market requires stability in the general long-term investment market, which will be aided substantially if the Treasury is permitted to refund outstanding debt with new and longer term securities. Passage of H.R. 10590 will authorize this.

Congressional and administration leaders are convinced the public interest now demands that the Treasury be given greater flexibility in management of the public debt without removal of the statutory ceiling and congressional control over maximum Government bond rates. We concur in this view.

The bill, H.R. 10590, is a sincere, well-considered bipartisan effort to accomplish this objective in the national interest. It should be supported with the full vigor of the homebuilding industry. I urge that you advise your Congressmen at once of your views.

Sincerely,

MARTIN L. BARTLING, Jr.,
President.

Sacramento Host to Foreign Olympic Athletes on People-to-People Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have all heard a lot about the winter Olympics and about the fact that the United States is, at least, closing the ice hockey gap with the Soviet Union, but what has been relatively unpublicized is a post-Olympics event of real significance.

I refer specifically now to a commentary by the respected and well informed Edward P. Morgan over the American Broadcasting Co. on March 4 in which he describes how the people around Sacramento, Calif., started a blossoming people-to-people movement of their own.

Hundreds of Californians offered to host the Olympic athletes in their homes, and more than 300 of the 850 competitors were able to accept, despite the short notice. The participants included Russians, Poles, East Germans, and Hungarians. I, for one, think that those from the Communist countries are going to be a bit more hesitant to believe virulent anti-American propaganda, after having experienced gracious hospitality in the average American home.

I quote Mr. Morgan's concluding paragraph:

Herr Doktor Alois Lugger, the mayor of Innsbruck, Austria, which will be the site of the 1964 winter Olympic games, was one of the guests and he was treated just like plain folks. He was thrilled with the whole operation and is on his way home with his head swimming happily with plans for similar hospitality with a Tyrolean twist. It would be good if he could stop off at Geneva and give the disarmament boys a fill-in on how disarming ordinary people can be when they get a chance.

I ask unanimous consent that Edward P. Morgan's commentary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MARCH 4, 1960

Ordinarily, the first place you'd expect to breathe the bracing air of good fellowship would be at the Olympic games. Billed as the inspirational flame of international sportsmanship, these festivities can rival an atomic howitzer as the source of carnage. There were plenty of squabbles at Squaw Valley before the winter Olympics ended last week and these were all duly headlined. But in their dutiful pursuit of petulant prima donnas, contention, and bad blood, the intrepid, earmuffed journalists on the scene missed the most astonishing story of the whole shebang—at least I saw nothing of it in this world capital—and it's a story which could, in its own homespun way, shake the entire technique of international understanding right down to its frustrated foundations.

The scenario starts with an earnest little group of Californians and a simple—even hackneyed—idea. They wanted to sample some of this people-to-people contact stuff that governments have talked pompously about. They decided to invite visiting foreign athletes and officials into their homes to stay a night or two after their respective events were over, trade borscht and hamburger recipes and get acquainted, like. The response to the idea, spawned in Sacramento, the State capital, was staggering. One hundred and fifty citizens, speaking 19 languages, volunteered as interpreters. The State fair grounds were leased for \$1 as a welcoming center. The Greyhound people donated 34 buses to haul the guests down from Squaw Valley, 110 miles away, and for San Francisco sightseeing. Mrs. William Campbell, ex-president of the Sacramento League of Women Voters, mobilized a staff of 80 to find host families. Local broadcasts gave time for announcements. Six hundred homes were offered the first day.

To keep the operation tidy but devoid of diplomatic redtape and formality and strictly on a local level, the group incorporated; the Sacramento Bar Association took care of all the legal niceties for free. Officers of the corporation included a jet plant space researcher; a German war bride, wife of a Sacramento high school teacher; the executive director of the city YMCA and the president of a frozen foods outfit. On the board were a lumberman, a banker, the head of the California State Employees Association, and the top legislative counselor to the State legislature.

Today they seem to have a dazzling success on their hands. Their total corporate expenditures, \$600. Of 850 foreign athletes and officials at Squaw Valley, more than 300 visited Sacramento homes, 2 to a household. Many of the rest were genuinely bereaved their rigid schedules prevented their visiting too. The routine: sightseeing, much

talk, drives around town, visits to friends and neighbors. Participants: Russians, Poles, East Germans, Hungarians, West Europeans, Koreans, Japanese. Untoward incidents: none.

The American families had been advised not to talk politics with Communist countrymen. One night at dinner after a visit to a high school one East German boy remarked to his host out of the blue, "You know, nobody wants another war." On a drive near the Governor's mansion, an English-speaking Russian athlete spied a sign reading, "This way to shelter." Told what it meant, he said, "You do not need these because of us."

Each host family was encouraged to give each guest a little parting gift, cost limit, \$3, usually invested in lipsticks, nylons, et cetera. Two Korean boys were embarrassed because they had no gift in return. When their Sacramento family drove them to their homebound plane, they pressed upon their hosts the Korean Olympic emblems stitched to their blazers.

Herr Doktor Alois Lugger, the mayor of Innsbruck, Austria, which will be the site of the 1964 Winter Olympic Games, was one of the guests and he was treated just like plain folks. He was thrilled with the whole operation and is on his way home with his head swimming happily with plans for similar hospitality with a Tyrolean twist. It would be nice if he could stop off at Geneva and give the disarmament boys a fill-in on how disarming ordinary people can be when they get a chance.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

The Late Walter S. Steele

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as the years roll on there disappear from the Washington scene many men of high stature. Some of these top quality men are defeated for high office, some voluntarily retire, some are called to their final home by the unseen hand of Him who controls all things.

Recently there passed from our national scene one of the most dedicated and most sincere patriots whom it has been my pleasure and good fortune to know since coming to Washington some 14 years ago.

Walter S. Steele, editor and general manager of the National Republic, a magazine of basic and fundamental Americanism, died on March 2, 1960. America and freedom-loving Americans will always be indebted for his advocacy and his burning desire to protect the basic doctrines of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Walter Steele was unrelenting in his attack on any cause or principle that tended in any way to undermine the institutions of this Republic. It was always to be noted in his endeavors to teach Americans their basic rights that the word "democracy" was little used. He well knew that our U.S. Constitution does not use the word "democracy." This document states our Government is a Republic and guaran-

tees to each State a Republican form of Government. Walter Steele well understood the difference.

Back in 1918, some 42 years ago, a group of farsighted and patriotic Americans saw the necessity of assembling and pointing out some dangers that were beginning to appear—dangers to the well-being of America. This group did not go out parading up and down the street waving the flag to the tune of brass bands. They started out with the quiet purpose of collecting documentary and other reliable facts for presentation to the American public on the dangers of subversion and collectivism within the structure of our own Government.

Walter Steele many years ago became convinced that the American Government would not be destroyed from without, that the real danger was subversion from within our own borders. The sole purpose of his group and the National Republic was to try to get every patriotic citizen to share some of the responsibility for our national security. He well knew and this publication has through the years tried to point out that mere denunciation will not achieve the desired ends—that only through constant endeavor, constant research, constant attention to the ways of "the enemy within" could America be properly made to understand its danger.

Walter Steele was no mere propagandist. He knew the ways and means of the Collectivist, Socialist, Communist, and front organization. He knew their pattern and method of operation. His basic belief was if patriotic Americans could keep American workers, American youth well taught in the principles which made this Nation great, the Communists and Collectivists would have a hard time destroying America from within. Walter Steele knew that the story of why America occupies its present position must be repeated and repeated constantly.

He also knew what apparently is unknown to many, that communism and collectivism is in general a disease of the mind and not a disease of the stomach as many international do-gooders, one-worlders, and demagogues are always proclaiming.

Over the years Walter Steele and his great organization, through their office, maintained a most thorough library on subversive activities in the United States. This National Republic has done more to unmask and expose Red front organizations and Communists at work than any other private organization in America.

It is also a well-known fact that Government security agents check the files of the National Republic as a first source of information. Over 100 front organizations were first exposed by the National Republic which were later placed on the Department of Justice's subversive organizations list.

It is not commonly known that this organization—National Republic—has a card index file of 400,000 names of Communists and their front carrying agents. This work and the large index of subversive members and organizations is a product of planning and work

by patriotic Americans with very little pay and no acclaim from the American public at large. This National Republic organization has carried on as the squawkers, the pinks, internationalists, one worlders seem to become more active and deadly in their attacks on our ancient time-proven American principles.

The American people know very little of the service this National Republic has rendered under the guidance of Walter Steele. He never lost courage although many dark clouds appeared. He never compromised his principles for expediency. He lighted his lamp only by the desire to serve his God and country. Certainly, the life of Walter Steele exemplifies the motto for "God and country" to the highest degree.

A great many Americans know full well the debt that is owed to this man. There is genuine sorrow in the ranks of patriots at his passing. The only smiles, no doubt, are those of the Communists and their sympathizers, because they full well know that their best informed enemy of their ways and designs has passed away.

It will be difficult to find another American eagle to sit in his place as one of the guardians of our American heritage. Walter Steele full well realized, in the words of Capt. Tom Gibson of Friars Point, Miss., who has so aptly said, "The American eagle can't fly much longer on two left wings."

The Forthcoming Disarmament Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a considerable number of the members of the faculty of Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College have released a statement on the forthcoming disarmament conference. It deals with their views in regard to the importance of a cessation of nuclear testing. I ask unanimous consent that their statement, together with a list of signers, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
The Department of State,
Washington, D.C.:

The forthcoming disarmament conference at Geneva impels us, members of the faculties of the John Hopkins University and Goucher College, to make the following statement which represents our personal views:

"Never have the peoples of the world spent so much on armament in time of peace and never have they been so insecure. During the past year the arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union has become more intense than ever. The

continuing spread of nuclear weapons to an enlarging circle of nations increases the danger of war and makes disarmament ever more difficult. The survival of civilization requires the control of armaments of unlimited power and their eventual elimination as instruments of national policy.

"The Soviets in disarmament negotiations have shown suspicion of American proposals for inspection and control, and our own representatives have been reluctant to consider any scheme that would not eliminate every risk of deception. But every alternative open to the United States involves risk. Insistence upon a perfect system only insures that there will be no inspection and no control; the result must be an unrestricted arms race which sooner or later will almost certainly bring about unrestricted nuclear war. The present impasse must be broken.

"Serious as are the conflicting interests between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both countries, we believe, have been too preoccupied with their differences and not enough concerned with their common goals. Americans need not shed all their scepticism about Soviet words and actions; successful international agreements are based more on mutual advantage than on trust. Although the prevailing attitude of distrust has made agreement difficult, the American and Soviet positions on a test ban are now very close as a result of mutual concessions. Any resolution of the remaining differences is preferable to the dangers which would follow a breakdown of negotiations.

"The United States and the Soviet Union have a strong common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, which appears inevitable without an agreement to stop testing. Recent administration suggestions that such weapons be furnished to American allies would, if carried out, jeopardize further negotiations to end the arms race.

"We believe that the test ban is an essential first step toward comprehensive arms control. In view of the gravity of the present situation we are convinced that the United States should if necessary accept considerable risks to achieve the goal of general disarmament in order to avoid the far greater risks attendant upon continuing the arms race."

IDENTIFICATION OF SIGNERS

The Johns Hopkins University faculty members: D. C. Allen, professor of English; Donald H. Andrews, professor of chemistry; Charles A. Barker, professor of history; Ernst Cloos, professor of geology; Leighton E. Cluff, associate professor of medicine; Elliott Coleman, associate professor of English writing; Fred F. Converse, instructor of psychiatry; Richard T. Cox, professor of physics; J. D. H. Donnay, professor of crystallography and mineralogy; Nathan Edelman, professor of romance languages; Leon Eisenberg, associate professor of psychiatry and pediatrics; A. Murray Fisher, associate professor of medicine; Jerome D. Frank, professor of psychiatry; John Freccero, assistant professor of romance languages; Palmer H. Futcher, associate professor of medicine and assistant dean of the school of medicine; Olcott Gates, assistant professor of geology; Hans Gatzke, professor of history; H. Bentley Glass, professor of biology; J. L. Gossman, assistant professor of romance languages; Richard H. Green, assistant professor of English; Carola B. Guttmacher, instructor of psychiatry and pediatrics; Albert L. Hammond, associate professor of philosophy; Thomas R. Hart, Jr., assistant professor of romance languages; C. A. Hopson, assistant professor of geology; Stanley D. Imber, associate professor of medical psychiatry; Julius R. Krevans, assistant professor of medicine; Simon Kuznets, professor of political economy; W. G. Lambert, associate professor of oriental seminary;

Frederic C. Lane, professor of history; Louis Lasagna, associate professor of medicine; Victor G. Laties, instructor of medicine; Owen Lattimore, lecturer in history; Allan H. Levy, instructor of microbiology; Victor Lowe, associate professor of philosophy; Fritz Machlup, professor of political economy; A. J. Mandy, instructor of psychiatry; William H. McClain, associate professor of German; Clara P. McMahon, assistant professor of education; Eugene Meyer, associate professor of medicine; G. H. Mudge, professor of pharmacology and experimental therapeutics; Earl H. Nash, Jr., instructor of psychiatry; Helen Nash, instructor of medical psychiatry; Abraham G. Osler, associate professor of medicine; Lee C. Park, assistant professor of psychiatry; E. T. Penrose, lecturer in political economy; F. J. Pettijohn, professor of geology; Kingsley Price, associate professor in philosophy and education; Herbert J. Rapp, assistant professor of microbiology; Jerzy E. Rose, associate professor of physiology; Lawrence J. Ross, assistant professor of English; Francis E. Rourke, associate professor of political science; Regina Slaughter, instructor of psychiatry; F. Wilson Smith, assistant professor of history; Lex B. Smith, instructor of psychiatry; David Spring, associate professor of history; Joseph H. Stephens, instructor of psychiatry; Anthony R. Stone, instructor of psychiatry; Wolfgang Thormann, assistant professor of romance languages; Robert W. Tucker, associate professor of political science; Robert R. Wagner, associate professor of microbiology and assistant dean of the school of medicine; Esther Walcott, inspector of psychiatry; John Walton, associate professor of education; Bruce Wardropper, professor of romance languages; Earl R. Wassermann, professor of English; Bernard Weiss, instructor of medicine; William D. Wheat, instructor of psychiatry; Frances Williams, instructor of psychiatry; M. S. Wilson, instructor of medicine; C. Vann Woodward, professor of history; Kenneth R. Zierler, associate professor of medicine; and Frank Albrecht, secretary.

Goucher College faculty members: Sherodd Albritton, assistant professor of music; John V. Chamberlain, assistant professor of religion; Virginia Canfield, associate professor of English; Lester G. Crocker, professor of modern language; Sara deFord, professor of English; Rhoda M. Dorsey, assistant professor of history; George A. Foote, assistant professor of history; Elliott W. Galkin, assistant professor of music; William L. Hedges, assistant professor of English; Lincoln F. Johnson, Jr., associate professor of fine arts; K. Lems, assistant professor of biological sciences; John I. Lodge, associate professor of physics; Jane Morrell, assistant professor of education; Walter M. Morris, associate professor of religion; William R. Mueller, associate professor of English; Rolf Muuss, associate professor of education; William L. Neumann, professor of history; Enrique Noble, associate professor modern languages; Clifford R. Noll, Jr., assistant professor of chemistry; Sonia F. Osler, associate professor of psychology; Brooke Peirce, assistant professor of English; Olive Westbrook Quinn, associate professor of sociology; Norma K. Raffel, assistant professor of biological sciences; Donald Risley, instructor of fine arts; Frederick G. Reuss, professor of economics and sociology; Marion Robinson, associate professor of English; Alice J. Reynolds, assistant dean; Annelles A. Rose, professor of psychology; Peter J. Rose, instructor of economics and sociology; James P. Scanlan, assistant professor of philosophy; T. Guthrie Speers, chaplain and adjunct professor of religion; Martha Taber, assistant professor of economics; Richard Waldehlich, assistant professor of English; Kenneth O. Walker, professor of history; and John C. Williams, assistant professor of classics.

The People of the First Congressional District of Nebraska Are Asked To Give Their Opinions on Basic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today mailing out to a number of my constituents my regular legislative report and annual questionnaire.

I have made it a practice since coming to Congress to seek the advice and counsel of my constituents on many of the basic problems and issues of the day. To me, this sounding out of public opinion is the very essence of representative government.

I am including in the RECORD both my report and the questions I have asked:

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1960.—When new Government programs are mentioned, they're always talked about in terms of billions of dollars. The figures are always so big that they're hard to understand and comprehend.

What, exactly, is a billion dollars?

As 1 of the 44 million American families struggling with a household budget, it's \$22 you can't spend for food or for shoes for the youngsters.

What I would like to do in this report is relate Government spending and—more important—fiscal honesty and responsibility to you, your dinner table, and your family clothing budget.

This approach seems to me necessary because there has been too much of the "something for nothing" philosophy in Washington over the past quarter-century when the spenders in Congress, after Congress have launched into new and bigger programs of giving the Nation something. When the Federal Government is writing the checks it seems so far away, so easy. Let the Government do it.

But pause just a moment.

What will that school construction program the Senate passed a few weeks ago and which is now pending before the House mean to you?

If you are part of an American family, then it means a dress and a pair of shoes for mother, nearly 2 weeks of groceries for the whole family, half a month's payment on a new Buick or Mercury, or just about half a month's payment if you're buying a new home.

Or how about urban renewal which is being pushed so hard?

A new suit for Dad—3 weeks of pretty good eating for the family—a year's school clothes for the grade-school youngster.

So, when someone tells you that the school-construction program only costs \$1.8 billion, or urban renewal just costs \$3 billion, associate them with yourself, your family.

There is no such thing as "something for nothing" even when Uncle Sam is footing the bill. You are paying for it with hamburger instead of roast beef, with a second-hand car instead of a new one, by living in an apartment instead of buying a new home.

Take another look at this business of fiscal responsibility.

What does that \$290 billion national debt mean to you?

It means that your family owes \$6,380.

How about the total obligation written onto the lawbooks by the recent Congresses

of the present majority party totaling \$680 billion?

Your family owes \$14,960.

Can you afford to keep on paying for the luxury of getting "something for nothing?"

MONEY SAVED

The business of saving tax dollars belongs to the House Committee on Appropriations. Our job is to weigh each request for budget money, to measure the needs against the ability to pay for them.

Each bill, and there are 15 major money measures, is first carefully and thoroughly examined by a subcommittee. This takes weeks of testimony. Then it is analyzed dollar-by-dollar and the final bill written. The full Appropriations Committee then reexamines the bill in detail, and votes it to the floor of the House where once again it is carefully gone over.

This is the normal process—the way it should be done. But the spenders have found ways around our committee.

Back door raiding: Tricky methods have been worked out to give some agencies direct access to the Treasury without going through Congress. These back door deals or earmarked funds deny to the Congress, and therefore the people, constitutional controls over the purse strings.

A new method was worked out last year when the Tennessee Valley Authority was given permission to issue its own bonds in competition with the U.S. Treasury without regard to the national debt ceiling.

Regardless of the merits of TVA itself, this new proposal permits a bureaucracy to perpetuate itself without any controls by the people.

So far we on the Appropriations Committee have trimmed Federal spending by \$800 million, and we have considered only six bills. It is my firm belief that when we are through we can save up to \$2 billion—and I shall most certainly work toward this goal—without impairing our strength or those essentials which tend to help our free economic growth rather than hinder it.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

A great political smokescreen has been launched concerning our national defense posture primarily by a group of men running for the Presidential nomination who are willing to substitute doubt and fear for facts.

For 15 months I have listened to a long series of witnesses and, on assignment by the committee chairman, I have personally looked into our military programs. Our job has been to get the full facts on defense. The man responsible for bringing out these facts is one of the most honored men in Congress—GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, a responsible, hard-working Democrat who has studied the problems of national defense since World War II days.

What does Mr. MAHON have to say about the confusion of charges made by certain Senators, charges that we are lagging behind the Soviet Union, that we are becoming a second-rate power, and that the missile gap means disaster?

Mr. MAHON spoke out recently on a TV program. Here's what he had to say:

"We have a greater overall striking ability than the Soviet Union. * * * This Nation is stronger than any nation in the world today."

Ours is a balanced defense system leaning heavily at present on our bomber fleets capable of delivering a nuclear punch anywhere. Slowly these fleets will be augmented by Atlas and Titan ICBM's, and supplemented by Polaris submarine-launched missiles capable of striking at the heart of the Soviet Empire.

With the span of a few years a much cheaper, equally potent missile, Minuteman, will come into operation. Minuteman is mobile and less expensive than the Titan and Atlas weapons.

Along with this growing arsenal of deterrent weapons we are concentrating on an antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus for protection against a potential missile attack upon America.

The question is not whether we match Russia missile for missile, or whether we have one or 100,000 ICBM's. The question is: Do we have enough striking power to deter the Russians from attacking us or the free world?

Mr. MAHON's answer to that is: "We have greater overall striking ability than the Soviet Union."

Mr. MAHON has also expressed his opinion against so-called crash programs to build vast arsenals of soon-to-be outmoded ICBM's. He says it may take slightly more money for some parts of the Defense budget than the President requested but that this money can be "recouped by making reductions in low-priority items."

This is an altogether different estimate than the one we hear from Senator SYMINGTON and others of his group who are attempting to build near-hysteria for political advantage. This statement from GEORGE MAHON is by a responsible man of SYMINGTON's own political party who knows as much about defense perhaps as any civilian in Government today.

QUESTIONNAIRE

To measure the attitude of the people of the First Congressional District is the very essence of representative government. Each year since being elected your Congressman I have asked you to assist me by expressing your personal opinion on various public questions. I must assume full responsibility for my votes. However, in doing this I must carefully weigh the views of those whom I am elected to represent. Your individual opinions therefore, will be extremely helpful.

You need not sign this form.

Your further comments are welcome and will be helpful.

If you have such comments to make, please feel free to do so.

1. The President has predicted a \$4.1 billion surplus this year.

Do you favor using this money for:

A. Reduction of the national debt _____.

B. Reduction of taxes _____.

C. A combination of both _____.

D. Using this money for further expansion of Government programs _____.

2. Do you feel the President is best qualified to know what money is necessary to provide a strong, flexible defense posture? Yes _____; no _____.

3. Do you favor matching Russia missile-for-missile in an all-out arms race? Yes _____; no _____.

4. If your answer to No. 3 is "Yes," would you favor financing such an arms race by:

A. Increased taxes _____.

B. Increased public debt _____.

Please fill out the above and return to Congressman PHIL WEAVER, Box 1550, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Thank you for your cooperation and guidance.

Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the American Legion posts in my district recently passed a resolution which supports the principle of loyalty oaths

for students receiving Federal loans or grants. This is a resolution which I also support as a Legionnaire.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the resolution as passed by the Earl Winehart Post No. 96 of Snohomish, Wash.

Whereas every member of this American Legion post has a great measure of faith and pride in this country; and

Whereas these members were willing to make the supreme sacrifice in the service of that country and for its ideals; and

Whereas no person who claims the benefits of this wonderful land which has been preserved throughout its entire history by the sacrifices of many, will tolerate interference of their liberty; and

Whereas these same men feel that no person who enjoys this life of peace, liberty and plenty should have any objection whatsoever to signing any oath of loyalty at any time for any cause: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 276 members of Earl Winehart Post No. 96, American Legion, That this post go on record in favor of any person, including students who get Federal aid, taking the loyalty oath or forfeiting his or her right to such aid; be it further

Resolved, That this post is on record as admonishing Congress to continue its stand of insisting of such loyalty oaths which this post feels would be gladly given by any person who loves his land; and be it further

Resolved, That this post favors laws by Congress which will not allow loans, payments or aid of any kind to any person who refuses to give an oath of loyalty to the U.S. Government.

EARL WINEHART,
AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 96.

REA Co-ops and the Interest Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, The able manager of the Minnesota Electric Cooperative, Mrs. Genevieve A. Kelley, has taken issue with the U.S. Budget Director's insistence that the Federal Government discontinue making rural electrification loans at 2 percent interest.

Mrs. Kelley also has pointed out that Budget Director Stans is in error in his claim that electrification of this Nation's farms has been completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by St. Paul Pioneer Press staff writer, Alfred Stedman, reporting Mrs. Kelley's penetrating analysis of the needs and opportunities of rural electrification, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, March 8, 1960]

STATE CO-OP SPOKESMAN DEFENDS 2 PERCENT LOAN RATE

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Assertions by Budget Director Maurice H. Stans that the U.S. Government should stop making rural electrification loans at 2 percent interest were challenged in St. Paul Monday by Genevieve A. Kelley, manager of

the Minnesota Electric cooperative. Stans had expressed himself in an interview when in Minneapolis last week to address the annual farm forum there.

Mrs. Kelley contended the Budget Director is mistaken in his view that electrification of the Nation's farms is now virtually complete. She also disputed his contention that the 2-percent loans are subsidizing the rural co-ops to cut into business of private power companies. And she said that special legal requirements for service on the co-ops would make it unfair to require them to go to the money market for their loans as the Budget Chief had advocated.

"The farmer is using 10 times more electricity now than when the REA program came into being," Mrs. Kelley argued in a letter. "There is much work to be done in keeping up with this ever-increasing demand. New substations have to be built (and) facilities have to be expanded."

As to competition with the utilities, she contended that rural electric co-ops produce only a minor part of the power they distribute and therefore must buy most of it from the private power companies. For instance, in 1951, the co-ops thus purchased \$43 million worth, she said. "We have not taken away a market from them," she said. "We have given them a market."

Rural co-op members buy a billion dollars worth of appliances and equipment a year and have bought \$14 billion worth thus far, greatly assisting business, she argued.

Tied to the 2-percent loans is a requirement that rural electric co-ops provide services to all regardless of economic feasibility, she said. They "average two consumers per mile of line while the national average for the private utility is 26," she contended. These she described as among the circumstances justifying continuance of the 2-percent rate. Mrs. Kelley argued that through tax writeoffs, accelerated amortization, and other aid, other business including private power has received much more Government help than the rural electric co-ops.

Dennis Baker, of Winchester, Mass.,
Science Talent Search Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, among the 40 top winners in the 19th annual science talent search, the major science scholarship competition of the Nation's secondary schools was, I am very proud to say, a high-school senior from my congressional district, Dennis Graham Baker, 17, of Winchester High School, Winchester, Mass. These 40 boys and girls were selected from 29,402 high school seniors to be invited to Washington to attend the Science Talent Institute March 3 through 7, and to be judged for the Westinghouse science talent search scholarships and awards in the final phase of the science talent search conducted by Science Clubs of America. I had the pleasure of being Dennis' guest at the Science Clubs of America dinner on Friday, March 4, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

There were 9 girls and 31 boys in this group of winners, who excel in such qualities as creative curiosity, independ-

ent reasoning, scholarship, and strong drive to explore untried areas of knowledge. They were picked by the judges from among the 29,402 contestants, after having completed their entries by taking a science aptitude examination, obtaining recommendations, and writing a report on "My Scientific Project."

Dennis Baker's project was a 4-year program in meteorology, representing 4 years of weather reporting at his weather station at home. In his project report, he discussed data he collected on five different weather elements: climatological observations; semidiurnal pressure change; local thunderstorms; precipitation totals; and photography of cloud types. When he finishes at Winchester High School, Dennis says he will go on to Harvard College and study physics. Meteorology is his first choice for a life occupation, and physics is a possible second. He has taken second and third prizes at his high school's science fairs. He plays French horn in the orchestra. He is continuing his weather observations "to improve the accuracy of the climatological results" and will keep his camera handy to photograph any unusual cloud types that pass over this station.

Dennis is the son of Dr. and Mrs. James G. Baker. Dr. Baker, an optical physicist and associate research astronomer, is the inventor and designer of the Baker-Schmidt telescope at Harvard University.

Dennis Baker's mother is also an eminent scientist.

Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and
Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicin-
ity—Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicinity was founded in 1908 and it is one of the outstanding independent labor organizations of the in the city of Chicago and vicinity. In conforming with the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 they have made public their yearly financial statement, which is certified by a leading firm of certified public accountants. Their statement has been published in the four daily newspapers of Chicago as well as the Wall Street Journal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include their financial statement which appeared in the Chicago newspapers on Friday, March 11, 1960, and which I will present in three consecutive issues of the proceedings—the first one today covering the health and welfare fund, and those of the pension fund and union funds to follow in that order.

The article referred to follows:

CHICAGO TRUCK DRIVERS, CHAUFFEURS, AND HELPERS UNION OF CHICAGO AND VICINITY—INDEPENDENT

To Our Members, Employees, and the Public:

Pursuant to our past practices and in conformity with the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, we present herewith financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1959. These statements have been certified after audit by Peter M. Shannon & Co., certified public accountants. Copies of the full text of these audit reports, including subsidiary schedules, are available upon request by letter or telephone.

ED FENNER.

STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION FOR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1959—HEALTH AND WELFARE FUND

The health and welfare fund is operated under rules and regulations adopted by its trustees. The purpose of the fund is to provide medical and surgical benefits and compensation and death benefits to union members and their dependents.

Balance sheet, Dec. 31, 1959

Current assets:	
Mid-City National Bank—checking account	\$174,246.09
Mid-City National Bank—savings account	270,805.79
Petty cash	200.00

Total 445,251.88

Fixed assets:	
Office furniture and fixtures	5,573.38

Grand total 450,825.26

Liabilities:	
Death benefit certificates issued	16,000.00
Less death benefits advanced	5,000.00
Total	11,000.00

Net worth:	
Surplus	439,825.26

Grand total 450,825.26

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959

Cash receipts:	
Contributions received from employers	\$1,671,035.75
Contributions received from members	43,994.32
Interest income	6,366.54
Total	1,721,396.61

Cash disbursements:	
Benefits:	
Death benefits	155,564.00
Compensation benefits	396,136.76
Hospitalization	507,593.24
Professional services:	
Nonaffiliated medical doctors	227,065.61
Advances on death benefits	1,460.00
First aid and ambulance	7,227.62
X-ray and laboratory	15,222.24
Clinical services:	
North Avenue Medical Center	136,690.99
Kildare Clinic	81,840.50
Specialists	44,977.25
Total	1,573,778.21

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959—Continued

Cash disbursements—Con.

Administrative:	
Salaries—office personnel	\$72,129.69
Trust fund contributions for employees	2,955.06
Payroll taxes	4,025.78
Office supplies	3,920.08
Utilities (rent, electricity, telephone and telegraph)	6,091.06
Postage, printing and stationery	7,376.24
Insurance	1,203.25
Legal	2,405.10
Auditing	10,000.00
Publication of financial statements	5,490.34
Medical consultant	7,500.00
Trustee fee—public member	7,500.00
Grand total	1,704,374.81

Cash receipts in excess of disbursements	17,021.80
--	-----------

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. DIXON,
Arthur Dixon Transfer Co.,
Employer Trustee.

ED FENNER, Union Trustee,
JOHN C. FITZGERALD,
Loyola University Law School,
Public Trustee.

WILLIAM B. CRAWFORD,
Alternate Union Member
and General Counsel.

Political Preservation of Peasantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the respected Secretary of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Carleton I. Pickett:

POLITICAL PRESERVATION OF PEASANTRY
(By Carleton I. Pickett)

Somebody wrote a story about the "Magnificent Decline of Agriculture" the other day. It strikes us that all the tears wept over our vanishing farm are tears of nostalgia and that the political furor over solving the farm problem is good campaign material but hardly sound economics.

The decline of numbers in farming is accompanied with the growth of agriculture as a whole, the increase of productivity, and a better profit and loss statement for those who can meet the challenge of change.

This kind of philosophy can get rocks thrown at you if expressed at most farm gatherings. The farmer is the only individual on earth who is not proud of making money. In fact, no matter how much he makes he will conceal it and gripe about the money he didn't make.

Thousands of farmers are working for a bare subsistence while others do well; under the best of conditions some farmers lose

money and some cling to the farm long after they should have entered better paid jobs.

No political formula will ever be found to remedy a situation when society seems to want to keep farms in existence just to retain the pastoral scene of the country side.

The Swiss, the Germans, the French, and the British have each tried by law to make peasantry profitable. Their agricultural law predates the American and is far more sophisticated and regimented than Americans would stand for. Canada is a few jumps ahead of us.

Why it is that good old moss-backed conservatives who will fight socialistic or governmental devices in everything else will fall for political promises of a more socialized agriculture in the United States will always be the most curious political paradox of the last half of the 20th century.

Yet there it stands—a political record in agriculture that not only makes the poor on farms poorer but puts off the day when agriculture must readjust itself to producing what is needed for markets in places where it can be profitably produced.

Farm organizations can do much and are doing much to keep some of the thousands in business where only economic conditions, unjust taxation, improper zoning, burdensome administrative regulation, and so on, cut just enough from net income to make profit too low. This Farm Bureau works at every day of the year.

It is equally possible that Farm Bureau can provide farmers with bargaining associations. This we have started. In addition, the farmer can be organized to receive business services which up to now have been played at by some public agencies.

There is a future for agriculture that is not all dark clouds by any means. The surest way for agriculture to not succumb to the blandishments of political help in a political year.

Price supports must be done away with over the next few years. Surpluses in Government storage must never come on the American market in competition with the American producer. The practice of paying farmers for doing things that make the land more productive must be reexamined. Some land, like some farmers, ought to be otherwise employed.

These are controversial views. They are views that deserve a little thought by all those truly concerned with the farmer. I want to see the farmer enjoy as good a home as any business executive. I want to see him take his family on the vacation to which they are entitled. I want to see him build an estate sufficient to care for his own emergencies and old age. I want to see it a part of the modern age, an occupation with dignity to which some sons may look forward to returning from college.

This can be. But neither subsidy nor political cure-all will bring it about. Only the farmer can—unhindered by governmental intervention—use his talents best for a prosperous future. May the Lord save us from political preservation of peasantry.

Parliamentarian Role Calls for Calmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Thursday, March 10, 1960:

PARLIAMENTARIAN ROLE CALLS FOR CALMNESS

Full name: Lewis Deschler.

Claim to fame: Parliamentarian of the House.

Home: 101 Lucas Lane, Bethesda, Md.

Birthday: March 3, 1905. Born, Chillicothe, Ohio.

Education: Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1922-25; George Washington University, 1925, National University, Washington, master of patent law and doctor of jurisprudence degrees, 1932; doctor of laws, honorary degree, 1947.

Jobs: Timekeeper for Speaker of the House, December 1925 to January 1927; Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, January 1927 to January 1928, Parliamentarian of the House, January 1928 to present.

Family: Married Miss Virginia A. Cole, January 18, 1931. Children: Lewis Deschler II, and Jean Mari (Mrs. William B. Eddy).

Hobbies: Fishing and reading history and biography.

A man who towers 6 feet 3 inches tall and weighs 250 pounds will be one of the biggest figures in the House civil rights debate which gets underway today.

Unobtrusive nonpartisan, and mild mannered, he is not even a House Member. Yet he literally is the man closest to the Speaker's ear, and what he says usually goes, in situations that are taut and intricate.

Lewis Deschler, the House Parliamentarian, has devoted more than 34 of his 55 years to service to the House. On his birthday, March 3, he was praised by Democratic and Republican leaders for his ability, fairness, helpfulness, and patience. Many other Members took the floor to not only commend him, but to congratulate Congress on having him to smooth its parliamentary path so decisively and quietly.

Representative HOFFMAN of Michigan, Republican, who often adds to Mr. Deschler's task of untangling parliamentary tangles, pulled out all the stops and perhaps broke a congressional record for infinitive splitting when he declared:

"Very, very few in the world have the ability to—while clearly pointing out your error—send you away satisfied and sometimes delighted with the new knowledge as does our Parliamentarian."

EXPECTS A WORKOUT

The civil rights debate and the prospect of a parliamentary field day by opponents of the bill during the next 6 or 7 days hold no terrors for Mr. Deschler. He, nevertheless, concedes it will be one of his more troublesome workouts.

"It won't be mainly a problem of parliamentary decisions," he explains. "It will be the tension. This is an emotional issue, and the situation will be very tense. I suppose the Parliamentarian will need calmness and good humor."

From all accounts, "Lew" Deschler has those qualities in plentiful supply for making trigger-quick decisions, calling the shots as he sees them and remaining completely impartial and as inconspicuous as possible.

SIDE READING GOT JOB

Mr. Deschler practically read himself into his present position. While a junior at Miami University in his native Ohio he decided to study for the Foreign Service. He came to George Washington University for that purpose in 1925. In December of that year he got a House job as timekeeper at the Speaker's desk.

"I had time on my hands during long speeches," he recalls, "and generally picked up the House manual and other rulebooks for reading. The then Speaker, Nicholas Longworth, must have noticed my interest in the subject. He asked me if I would be

interested in a position as Assistant Parliamentarian.

"I was on the verge of not taking it. But I thought I might as well, because if I didn't make good, they would soon find out and fire me. So the job of Assistant Parliamentarian was created by act of Congress and I took it in 1927. In January, 1928, I became Parliamentarian, and here I am."

He has been Parliamentarian longer than any other in House history. He has served with Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes, Bankhead, Martin, and Rayburn. Only five Members still in the House were there when Mr. Deschler began as timekeeper.

Sitting near the Speaker and staying on the alert to provide information and advice on a multitude of parliamentary problems is only part of his work. When the House is not meeting he has plenty to do as editor of the House manual on rules. He keeps up a multi-volume library of House precedents, standard reference works on parliamentary law and procedure and compilations of decisions of former Speakers. He is at the call of House committee and individual Members for answers and suggestions. He often receives requests to help outside organizations in all parts of the country.

"When I started in this job," he says, "I used to keep a notebook at my bedside to write down parliamentary questions that occurred to me. The next morning I would try to find the answers."

While becoming proficient as Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler studied law at National University here. He was admitted to the District bar in 1934. He belongs to various parliamentary groups, writes for professional publications, and has been active in national and international gatherings of parliamentary experts.

Unlike many veteran officials at the Capitol, he is not especially fond of reminiscing, particularly about the more ticklish and critical occasions of past years. He maintains "it probably is best to forget them and do the job immediately at hand."

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8601 has my support, not only because it is aimed at a vast area of demonstrated need, but because it will help eliminate a grave injustice which is obvious to all who have read the facts concerning this highly controversial issue.

Thousands of good Americans are being disenfranchised regularly for no other reason than that they are members of the Negro race. Official reports indicate that this is an established fact.

It is axiomatic that legislation cannot effectively thrust on the people, or a segment of the people a mandate unacceptable to them. But today time and winds move swiftly and there seems no other alternative than that of passing legislation to accomplish the desired end that freemen can act as freemen and exercise their lawful prerogative. No man should be denied the right to vote.

The bill has other features regarding fugitive felons; bombing of schools and

churches, and so forth, but in essence it is aimed at protecting the right to vote.

With the world watching the outcome of the controversy, it is high time we faced up to the crux of the problem by passing H.R. 8601.

Fee Charged for Visiting the Washington Monument Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from one of my constituents expressing his amazement that there should be a charge for visiting the Washington Monument. In view of the inspiration which students and other citizens from over the country receive from visiting Washington Monument, this constituent does not understand why there should be a charge to visit this inspiring national shrine.

I think there is much to be said in that the monument is not in the category of national parks and other places where charges are made, especially since it was built in part by public funds and the remaining by Government funds, and is operated by the Government for the public.

My constituent prefers that his name not be used.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is a request that you take such steps as are necessary to bring about the freeing of the Washington Monument.

I have been embarrassed many times in the past by the reaction of friends and relatives visiting Washington for the first time, when they learned they had to pay a dime to ride the elevator to the top of the monument.

After viewing the majestic Capitol, admiring the beautiful tree-lined Mall, and the quiet dignity of the many Federal buildings comprising the Federal Triangle, the clean crisp lines of the White House, the awe-inspiring size of the Pentagon, the restful atmosphere of the Arlington Cemetery, respectfully viewing with bated breath the quiet precision of the ceremony changing the guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, visiting the Lincoln Memorial and having a lump form in their throat as they gaze upon the calm, sad features of the statue of President Lincoln, visiting the many breathtaking views of the parks and gardens, they always turn to the landmark by which they keep their bearings, that magnificent architectural accomplishment, the obelisk pointing to the heavens, erected in memory of the Father of our Country, our first President and greatest citizen.

Of course, they anxiously await the experience of riding to the top and viewing the matchless panorama of the Nation's Capital. This is the time I have learned to dread. When they get in line and eventually reach the man who so efficiently makes the change and collects the dimes they invariably register surprise and disillusionment. I have had them turn astonished and say "Do they really charge for this—I thought it belonged to the Government."

My feeble attempts to explain away their shock and amazement by telling them that former Secretary of the Interior Ickes placed the charge upon riding the elevator to help pay the cost of maintaining and operating the monument meets with indifferent success. The usual reaction is "But all the others are free, why of all things, do they charge to go up in Washington's Monument?"

The reaction of many after visiting Washington's Monument is that, after all, the things they have seen are false fronts, tinsel and glitter, and Washington is somewhat like Coney Island except that the elevator ride in the monument is less expensive than some of the rides at the island.

I'm sure many people have had the same experience and feel the same as I. The charge for Washington's Monument seems to be a rude and deliberate attempt to give a commercialized atmosphere to our beautiful Capital, in which all our citizens should feel proud. I'm confident the annual receipts from the dimes collected from visitors to ride up the monument is small after the cost of collecting and accounting for the money is deducted. It is especially small when compared to the effect it has on the feelings of our visitors. If the money is so badly needed, why not free Washington's Monument and place a charge on the Smithsonian Institution, or the Zoo, or the Capitol Building, or even Arlington National Cemetery?

I hope you can, somehow, bring about the freedom of the Washington Monument, and the return of it to the citizens of the United States of America.

If the Shoe Fits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly every Member of this body has been serious concerned over what has been happening to America's share of world trade as a result of our unexpected success in aiding underdeveloped nations to modernize their productive facilities and the economic offensive mounted by the Communist bloc.

The congressional district I am privileged to represent is a true cross section of America. It is both industrial and agricultural. Its products are many and varied, but one of the most important thereof has been footwear. Shoe imports from nations having much lower living standards than ours have been steadily rising and have now reached a point where relief may be vital.

I am deeply worried. However, I still cling to the belief that a solution for this and allied problems cannot be found behind high tariff walls or quota barriers that will, in the long run, solve nothing. I have felt it would be better for American industry to sharpen their pencils once again and to apply what we have always heretofore believed to be our acknowledged ingenuity in finding better ways of production, modernizing plant facilities, diversifying products and so on. In such an attempt, the Federal

Government certainly has a part to play by giving American industry the incentive to do these things, and enacting legislative reforms that will permit easier capital formation and encourage research and technological advances. Our antiquated and patchwork corporate tax structure is hardly conducive to these things at the present time.

It may also be that what we are now experiencing is only a transitional period, naturally difficult to undergo, in which other nations, friendly to us, are coming into their full economic flower and that, as their people finally begin to enjoy a standard of living approaching that of our own, vast opportunities for new American markets abroad may open up. In other words, although the pattern of world trade is changing and will change continuously, total trade and new American opportunities should also increase.

Thus, growing world industrialization may be a threat to us only if American industry, business, labor, and government react to it defensively and with hostility. On the other hand, if we can somehow regard it as the challenge that it is, and go forth confidently to meet it, it could offer an opportunity beyond measure to promote and safeguard freedom by building better lives for freemen everywhere.

So it was that I was pleased to read the following account by the syndicated columnist, Sylvia Porter, as published in the Binghamton Press of Binghamton, N.Y., on March 8, 1960, which has special reference to one segment of the American shoe industry:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—SHOE FIRM DECIDES
MADE IN UNITED STATES BEST

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—Last year, when imports of foreign shoes to our country registered a towering 1,000 percent increase over 1948, one of America's manufacturers of footwear entered negotiations with the powerful Tang family of Hong Kong for a partnership deal on a shoe plant in that exotic city.

The aim of the U.S. corporation was obvious. It figured that if it could use the enormous supply of low-cost labor available in Hong Kong, it could produce low-priced women's flats there which would compete with the flood of budget-priced imports from such countries as Japan and, possibly, India and Italy.

The anxiety of the U.S. company was equally obvious: It feared that it couldn't make competitively priced, comparable shoes in its Mississippi plants with employees getting hourly wages more than 10 times the Hong Kong level, and thus, it decided it was wiser to join than to fight the competition.

Plans for the shoe plant have now been abandoned.

Genesco—the U.S. company which distributes over 30 million pairs of shoes annually under such famed brand names as Delman, I. Miller, Mademoiselle, Johnston & Murphy, Jarman & Flagg Brothers—and the Tang family have concluded that despite the huge spread in wage costs, Genesco's streamlined plants in Mississippi can turn out attractive, durable shoes so cheaply that Japan and Hong Kong can't compete.

This is a wondrously inspiring story with a vital message at this moment when scare talk continues to spread that America's higher wage levels will price us out of the world's markets and invite any low-wage na-

tion to beat our industrialists on our own home grounds.

Know-how, made-in-the-U.S. imagination, advanced technology and techniques, hard selling—these are the weapons with which Genesco is sure it not only can meet but also discourage cutthroat competition from foreign producers.

With these weapons—and not with any retreat in our living standards—just about any American industry can compete successfully in the broadening global markets of this new epoch.

Let us have no illusions about the upsurge in foreign shoe sales and the mounting protests of both shoe manufacturers and unionized shoe employees against the imports.

Imports of footwear (other than rubber) from producers in Canada, Britain, Spain, Italy, and West Germany totaled almost 22,300,000 pairs last year, up 18 percent over 1958, and comparing with next to zero a few years back. Imports from Japan alone totaled almost 8,900,000 pairs on top of 12 million pairs the year before. And this has been in the face of tariffs ranging from 5 to 20 percent.

As chilling as any statistics are the comparisons in costs:

The average price per imported pair of shoes is 47 cents from Japan, 62 cents from Hong Kong, less than \$2 from all countries. The average U.S. factory price per pair \$3.78.

But now comes Genesco's cold decision that its new, efficient shoemaking machinery, techniques, and factory setup at its Fulton, Miss., plants have made it more than competitive with budget-priced imports. And the company claims that there have been no layoffs due to automation; workers simply have been transferred to new jobs at equal or better pay.

In view of the conditions which make this tale top news, it is a pleasure to pass on the comment of Genesco's chairman, W. Maxey Jarman, that "this is an indication of how determination and ingenuity can reduce labor costs here so that in spite of our far higher hourly wage rates, foreigners find it difficult to compete with us."

Surely any defeatist about our Nation's ability to compete with cheap-labor imports should ponder this message well.

The Illusion of Soviet Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the gloomy warnings that the Soviet Union's economy is expanding far more rapidly than is our economy, and the Soviets will overtake us in production before too many years. These questionable claims form the basis for constant demands that the Federal Government intervene more actively in the Nation's economy with more so-called pump-priming measures.

There is a great deal of evidence which refutes all these contentions, and a prominent British economist has recently gathered and published the evidence in a book, "The Real Productivity of the Soviet Union." He points out that the supposedly rapid Soviet economic growth is an illusion, based upon comparisons with the immediate postwar

period when Russia's economy was drastically reduced by the war. In truth, Soviet economic gains are mediocre, he concludes; not up to ours. And what we should never lose sight of, even these mediocre results have been attained at the expense of personal liberty, national traditions, and religious worship.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a newspaper article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 12, 1960, which reviews this situation in detail:

RED GROWTH RATE FOUND LAGGING—ECONOMIST FINDS SOVIET PERFORMANCE MEDIOCRE

(By Frank C. Porter)

The specter of burgeoning Russian productivity has caused considerable consternation in the United States.

Politicians, businessmen, economists, and scientists have pointed to figures showing an annual Russian growth rate of 6 percent or more against our 3.5 percent average.

Some have called for extraordinary measures to close the gap, to protect the U.S. productive superiority, to give the lie to Khrushchev's boast that the Soviet's real national product will match or top ours in a decade or so—a boast which many Americans seem to fear may prove only too true.

Almost alone is a British economist who, in effect, calls the whole thesis tripe.

"Like so many other things which everybody knows, this supposed growth trend of the Soviet economy is an illusion," writes Colin Clark, Oxford University economist and research director of the Econometrica Institute. Fortune magazine has printed the main conclusions of Clark's forthcoming book, "The Real Productivity of Soviet Russia," in its current issue.

The illusion arose, Clark says, through expectations that a spurt in Russian productivity, reflected in data for the period 1948-53, will continue indefinitely. He chides fellow economists for overlooking a commonplace: After a war or other disaster which has drastically reduced its productivity, a nation will go through a period of rapid growth followed by gradual deceleration of this rate "as productivity approaches that position on its normal trend line which it might have been expected to reach had the war not occurred."

"The information for the years after 1953 shows in actuality the rate of (Russian) growth slowing down," he points out.

Clark likens neurosis over Russian growth to the prognosis of a physician who, finding that a child recovering from a serious illness shows a rapid gain in weight for 2 successive weeks, plots the figures on a logarithmic diagram and tells the parents that in a year the child will weigh more than the father.

As for Clark's own figures, he finds the annual rate of Soviet growth per man-hour to be only 1.2 percent over the period 1913-56. Reckoned from 1928, the average is 1.7; from 1939, only 1.6 percent.

Against this, the average rate of growth per man-hour in the United States has been 2.3 percent a year from the 1890's, Clark says.

Since population increase is also a factor in growth of the total national product, Clark takes some pains to show that the Soviet Union falls far behind the United States in this category as well.

Russia's rate of population growth has been 1.5 percent and possibly is now decreasing while the U.S. rate stands at 1.8 percent and is increasing, Clark claims.

The British economist comes to a political and moral conclusion: "Governed by fanatical materialists, the Russian people have been called upon to sacrifice their personal liberties, their national traditions, and their religion for the sake of material progress;

and all that they have received in return is a rate of material progress far below that of most other countries. . . . It should be made clear how very mediocre the economic results of communism have, in fact, been.

Landrum-Griffin Act Works for Rank and File

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, slowly, but surely and effectively, the Landrum-Griffin Reform Act passed last year is proving to be wholesome and beneficial as an influence on the union movement. Attesting to that statement is the article by Walter Pincus which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of March 13, 1960. The article, reprinted below, is typical of many news stories appearing since the effective date of the new law:

LABOR ACT WORKS—SLOW BUT FIRM

(By Walter Pincus)

The Federal Government is quietly but forcefully moving to put into operation the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

The Labor Department has turned over to the Justice Department for investigation and possible prosecution the case of Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union which has refused to give information to the department with regard to alleged Communist affiliation of union officers. Section 504 of the act prohibits Communist Party members from holding office in a labor organization and makes it a crime for unions to willfully employ party members if they have knowledge of such affiliation.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been requested by the Justice Department to check the backgrounds of 492 members of one union, believed to be Bridges' ILWU, for possible Communist affiliation.

The Bureau, at the request of Justice's Internal Security Division, has begun a wide-scale review of all labor unions in the country with the aim of turning up Communist membership of union officials.

The Justice Department's Criminal Division has requested FBI investigation of more than 92 individuals for possible violation of a section 504 provision which prohibits former felons from holding union office within 5 years after conviction or following the end of their imprisonment.

FUNDS' MISUSE ALLEGED

The Labor Department has forwarded to Justice for further investigation about a dozen cases involving alleged misuse of union assets, violence in union activities, and fraud in local union elections.

The Compliance Division of Labor's new Bureau of Labor Management Reports has begun its own investigation of a number of labor relations consultants who failed to file reports of their activities as required under the act. Only 12 have done so.

The division has received some 200 complaints monthly, most of which come from rank-and-file union members who request investigation of some alleged violation of the act by local officials. A large number of these cannot be prosecuted, because the alleged incidents took place prior to enact-

ment of the bill into law September 14, last year. The Department already has closed 194 cases after determining it did not have jurisdiction.

However, as of January 31 this year, more than 400 complaints had progressed to cases under active investigation by Labor Department agents in the field.

In the area of union reporting, more than 50,000 charters, constitutions, and bylaws have flooded the Labor Department for review and filing. More than half of these, Department officials report, had to be returned for correction, a majority showing minor discrepancies such as unsigned documents and improper completion of forms. In a number of cases, however, unions were informed that in order to conform with provisions of the law, some basic changes were required. A number of locals had to include provisions for secret ballots during elections, and in some cases the requirement for elections themselves had to be written into the rules.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Union financial statements, which do not have to be filed until the close of the fiscal year, have been coming in more slowly. The Department has created a review process with the aid of the General Accounting Office. Statements to undergo the closest scrutiny will be those containing information on union loans to officers and outside business enterprises along with salaries and other miscellaneous disbursements.

Under the act, employers are also required to file statements if they lend money to union officials or spend money to influence union activities. Up to January 27, only 6 employers had filed such reports although some 10,000 are expected eventually to comply.

Employers are understood to be balking at the extent and type of information the Labor Department is requesting them to file.

Union officials who maintain personal financial dealings with employers, such as stock in companies or association in other enterprises, are also required to file under the act. Through the end of January only 12 such reports were received although estimates on the number who may file have run as high as 100,000.

The main thrust of the act, according to Justice Department officials is found in these reporting sections and legal action stemming from any false reports won't be initiated for many months as the reports are closely reviewed and compared after their receipt.

To date, however, the act has had significant effects on the Nation's unions.

LOCALS' SELF-GOVERNMENT

Faced with the requirement of filing extensive information on locals in trusteeship, parent unions dissolved 94 of them, giving self-government to the locals involved. Some 503 trusteeships, however, still remain.

James Hoffa, Teamster president, announced publicly following the President's signing of the act that he had sent telegrams to his locals removing from office the ex-convicts who fell under section 504 of the law. A private Department of Labor report indicated that more than 100 Teamster officials were suspended by the Hoffa telegram although the Teamsters themselves will admit to only 5.

A 14,000-member Illinois local has been forced by its rank-and-file members to publish all that transpires in what were formerly closed leadership meetings. Attendance at the union meetings themselves has so increased that a larger meeting hall had to be selected.

Says a Labor Department official charged with putting the act into operation, "Our impact on unions will be tremendous—but in the long run it will be the best thing that could have happened to them."

This Day of Ours Is Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this House took cognizance of the fact that this date, March 14, was celebrated by the Slovaks as their Independence Day.

We all know that Slovaks in the free world, and especially those of these United States take great pride in the history of their country and are deeply concerned with the enslavement by Communists.

The Rev. J. Dragos-Alzabetincan, a Canadian-Slovak priest, in commemoration of this important date has penned a beautiful tribute, headed "This Day of Ours Is Beautiful."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Reverend J. Dragos-Alzabetincan be made a part of the Record of the Congress:

THIS DAY OF OURS IS BEAUTIFUL

(By Rev. J. Dragos-Alzabetincan)

One day in the year is outstandingly beautiful. It is March 14, 1939. It is a day beautiful as the heavens. A day to be remembered; a king among other days in the year. A day which a just God hath made. A day on which heaven stooped to nestle in our country, on which God granted freedom to the Slovaks. The day on which the Lord came to visit us. A day which remains a beacon light to Slovakia.

This day of ours is beautiful as the heavens. It is the day on which our Parliament unanimously declared, that it is a new independent Slovak State; and we proudly sang "Hej Slováci." The day on which our nation rose from a dark grave. The day which is like a glorious Easter and on which truth rose again. The day on which the eyes of our brothers were alight with joy. The day on which, after a thousand years, our Slovak land began again to breathe freely to live, and our Slovak President, our Slovak representatives in a Slovak Parliament began to function unhampered.

This day of ours is beautiful as the heavens. Never before did we have a day like this. A day really Slovak, holy, and blessed. A day on which a horrible curse fell from the nation. A day of deliverance from agony and shame. A day, on which the dark, heavy, horrible storm clouds, hovering over the Tatry, have been dispersed. A day when from the lips of old and young rushed forth the cry: We are free, Lord. The day on which tyranny over the country ceased and the yearnings of generations were fulfilled. A day, unique in our history. A day which lifted our people from slavery to glory.

This day of ours is beautiful as the heavens. It saw the triumph at last of the right to a free life; the triumph of the goal toward which generations of our ancestors strove unceasingly. And what they endured and suffered—no tongue can express. It marked the waving of white, blue, and red flags over a new Slovakia. And bells rang out joyously throughout our cities, our villages, and our towns. It led the whole country and all its people to church to thank God at the altar. Forever the Slovaks will hallow and cherish this day of freedom. Freedom like that of the enchanting spring when all things seem to come back to life after the cold, cruel winter.

This day of ours is beautiful as the heavens. A day on which from our meadows, cottages, and palaces, from fields, lands, and plains, from chapels and churches, grateful voices rose heavenward. A day that shed a fragrance like a rosebush in a meadow. A day which saw great rejoicing in town, city, and hamlet; when joy and brightness gave a solo; a day which saw no fading twilight. A day on which a whole country sang to God; when the Tatry lifted their heads proudly; when plants, flowers, opened to sun; when the birds, too, rejoiced in song. It is a day on which Slovak elements pulsed for the first time in the nation and foreign elements were banished. The day on which brotherhood, harmony, and mutual love were triumphant, when we encountered forgiveness everywhere.

This day of ours is beautiful as heavens. Whatever in life is good, beautiful and humane—suppressed until now—was revived. A day on which magnanimity, honor, and love of peace—a Slovak trait—again prevailed. When the name of our beloved Slovakia—after a lengthy era—was put on the map; a day on which the Slovak became his own master, and no foreigner would again overstep his rights. The day on which our nation determined to march forward; the day on which it brilliantly passed a test of maturity and demonstrated to the world its ability to govern itself in justice.

This day of ours is beautiful as the heavens. The day on which Slovak became the official language and took its rightful place in the schools. The day on which the defense of free Slovak country was placed in the hands of our own Slovak soldiers for the first time. The day on which the Slovak people were given preference in schools, in offices, business and other undertakings. The day which brought to Tatry lands support from trade and tax funds. A day, that was given to me, to see and experience. It is etched forever in my soul; its echoes I hear even here in exile. A day bright and real; it was not a dream.

This day is beautiful as the heavens. A day most commemorated among the Slovaks. My pen has described but little of the beauty of this day—Independence Day—and what joy stirred our hearts that day.

For the time being March 14 rests quietly. But we shall rouse it again—for day must follow the night.

The 41st Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1919 some 463 officers and enlisted men, representing the combat divisions and major units of the Services of Supply of the American Expeditionary Force, met in Paris. One of the moving spirits was Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., son of the great President; another was Bennett Champ Clark, son of the then Speaker of the House of Representatives, a future Senator and judge. The one was a Republican; the other, a Democrat. At this meeting the American Legion was born. From this initial gathering sprang the meeting at St.

Louis on the following May 10, when the Legion came formally into being. To the constitution adopted for their organization the veterans of World War I affixed the following preamble:

For God and country we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

From these original 463 men, the Legion has grown to number 2,702,992 in 1959 and 2,026,637 members, as of the 4th of February of this year.

I am proud indeed to be a member of the Adam Plewacki American Legion Post No. 799, Buffalo, N.Y. It is with no small satisfaction that ours is not only the largest post in the State of New York, with 3,862 members, as recorded last year, but actually the seventh largest in the Nation. On January 19, our post had 3,900 members with still 10 months to go.

Since the Legion was founded, 41 years ago, its members have passed through a record World War. We pray that there may never be another; but whatever befalls, as we enter upon the fourth decade of our existence, we rededicate ourselves "For God and Country," bound to another in a tie which shall not be broken.

Farm Facts for the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives the following unvarnished facts concerning the farm program that had been legislated by the Congress. Mr. McFarland's article appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 23, 1960, and I include it herewith:

MONSTROUS TROUBLE IS SEEN FOR CURRENT FARM PROGRAM

(By Kermit McFarland)

Our so-called farm program has the Government in a squeeze which can mean nothing but monstrous trouble, no matter what's done about it.

The program got its real push in World War II, as an incentive to farmers to produce for war needs. It worked.

But the politicians decided if it was good for war, it was good for peace. They kept it going when the war was over—to prop up the farmers' prices.

As a result, the Government accumulated mountains of surpluses, market prices

sagged, the farmer was subjected to a strait-jacket of controls and the taxpayer was soaked for many billions in losses.

The surpluses became so unmanageable, the sheer cost of storing so staggering that the Government desperately hunted for ways to get rid of them.

BIG DISPOSAL PROGRAM

As a result, we now have a tremendous disposal program—we sell the stuff abroad where we can, we barter it away, we give it away at home and overseas. What's sold overseas is sold for foreign currencies, and we spend the money in the country where we get it—for our own purposes, for grants and loans to the same country.

So what we now have is not only a farm program, but a half-dozen disposal programs all started to overcome the disastrous results of the farm program.

Since 1954, we have sold grains, fats and oils, beans, milk, rice and raw cotton abroad—all out of these surpluses—having an export value of more than \$4.1 billion. But these commodities cost the Government nearly \$5.8 billion. The difference was an outright loss to the taxpayers.

Since 1954, we have given away nearly \$1.8 billion in these commodities. Most of this went overseas, and most of it went to peoples in dire need, to victims of floods, famines, droughts, typhoons, crop disasters and just plain needy—all over the world.

This phase of the program is strictly humanitarian—although motivated by the necessity of getting rid of these mountains of surpluses. It probably is the greatest producer of good will toward America in the whole foreign aid undertaking.

Yet, with all this tremendous disposal program, the Government still owns more than \$9.5 billion in surplus crops, an all-time high. The storage costs alone are running \$1.7 million a day.

A MAJOR OBSTACLE

And the vast disposal program, ironically, has become a major obstacle to achieving the very thing it was designed to do—eliminate the surpluses. Sixty million persons in 92 countries have come to depend on this free food. If the surpluses are wiped out, the free food stops. The immense good will created by the food is erased.

Moreover, 14 million schoolchildren in this country get free lunches out of this program, and another 5.4 million needy get allotments of the surplus foods. What happens to them if the surpluses are eliminated?

The Government is caught in a monumental trap of its own making. If the farm subsidy program continues as is, the cost to the taxpayers and farmers will be even more staggering than now—if, in fact, the program doesn't collapse of its own complexity. If the program is stopped, the humanitarian and charitable programs here and around the world collapse—with suffering to the people who now count on them and serious damage to the Nation's standing as a benefactor.

Pellmell Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, certain labor bosses and other architects of the welfare state are directing a massive effort to sell America on a program constitut-

ing a major step in the direction of socialized medicine administered by a Government bureaucracy.

The paternalistic welfare state advocated by these gentlemen would pay the medical and hospital care cost of a selected group of Americans at the expense of all Americans in payroll taxes and inflation; it would tend to fill our already over-crowded hospitals with individuals not requiring professional hospital care; and it would threaten the breakdown of our entire social security system. These are not the dire predictions of an alarmist but are instead reasonable observations based on experience with socialized medicine as operated in other countries.

In their desperate bid to sell their program to the American public and to distract attention from the lack of the true merit in the proposal, the well-organized and well-financed proponents of this step toward socialized medicine have printed cards urging support of their proposal which bear a verse taken from the 71st Psalm which reads:

Cast me not off in time of old age; for-sake me not when my strength faileth.

This verse from the Psalms is tragically taken out of context and put to distorted use. Read in context, this verse from the 71st Psalm is indeed a prayer to God and manifests faith in His bounty. This is evident from the first verse in the 71st Psalm which reads:

In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust; let me never be put to confusion.

The Forand bill proponents presumably would have us transfer our faith to the materialism of paternalistic government.

The advocates of a governmental medical care program have never succeeded in establishing the need for a Federal program to undertake sole responsibility for the cost of providing for the health of our citizens. Their indifference to this basic question suggests shortsighted political motivation that carries with it inherent dangers to our free enterprise system. The average American family of any age pays more annually for housing, food, and transportation than it pays for medical care. If those who want socialized medicine really wanted to do something for the American people, perhaps they should advocate programs providing for free housing, free food, and free transportation. I submit that before America is ready to embark on an ill-considered program that would lead inevitably to socialized medicine, we must first demonstrate the existence of a national need and a national desire for such a step. The present advocates of this step are unable to demonstrate either such need or such desire.

In the March 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post the lead editorial is captioned "A Race in Welfare Programs Is Just What We Don't Need." This editorial comments on the legislation pending before the Congress to provide Government sponsored health and medical services under the social security program. The editorial states that this proposal "could trigger a can-you-top-this competition in welfare promises." The

editorial characterizes legislation on this subject as constituting "the longest breakthrough yet toward socialized medicine in the United States."

The editorial properly points out deficiencies in our existing social security program that should be corrected before we embark on an entirely new aspect of socialized endeavor.

So that the contents of this Saturday Evening Post editorial can be available to my colleagues, I will include it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

A RACE IN WELFARE PROGRAMS IS JUST WHAT WE DON'T NEED

Renewed controversy over socialized medicine and allied subjects is promised by consideration in Congress of the Forand bill and its running mate in the Senate, the Kennedy bill, both of which provide broad health and medical services for those covered by the social security program. This could trigger a can-you-top-this competition in welfare promises. Politicians seldom accept the truth of a remark by D. W. Brogan in the New Leader: "People are less grateful for benefits than irritated by minor annoyances accompanying the benefits."

Indeed, the necessary increase in social security taxes on workers and employers—estimated at around \$2,100 million—would outweigh in many minds the attractiveness of the additional hospital, medical, nursing and clinical services provided in both these bills. Both bills are under heavy attack as constituting the longest "breakthrough" yet toward socialized medicine in the United States.

The above comments do not mean that the social security systems is perfect. For one thing, there is no reason why 50 should remain the minimum age at which workers are eligible for disability benefits. The age limit was put into the bill in 1956 as a concession to Members of Congress who feared that the disability provisions would bankrupt the plan. Although chronic illnesses occur more frequently in older people, men and women under 50 also become disabled, and it is difficult to see why their troubles should be ignored on the theory that they are too young to have troubles.

Another reform is one we have urged before—namely, the removal of the limitation on the earnings of social security annuitants between ages 65 and 70. This limitation is widely regarded as unfair and discriminatory. It produces a sense of frustration in men who are often upset by retirement from routine employment, besides denying them the opportunity to offset to some extent the effect of inflation on their social security checks. It is doubtful that this change would add greatly to the cost of social security as an appreciable part of the earnings of annuitants would be recouped in income tax.

Another possible shoring up of the disability provisions lies in the field of administration. Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, of West Virginia, reports complaints of inconsistent rulings by social security officials on applications for disability allowances. He cited one case of a man who had been described as totally disabled by a life insurance company, but was turned down for disability allowances as not disabled within the meaning of the social security law. Congress might well setup uniform standards to govern these procedures.

In any event, there is no virtue in jumping headfirst into State medical care without attempting to smooth out the bulges in the existing system. Neither the Forand bill nor the Kennedy bill seems to take account of the existence of hundreds of public, private and mixed hospital and health plans all over the country. Stimulated by threats of Government health programs, the private insur-

ance business has come up with all sorts of new security devices. The insurance information office of Pennsylvania is authority for the statement that 123,038,000 Americans are already protected for medical and hospital care—including 40 percent of all persons over 65.

This awakening might well have occurred earlier. It is true that an insurance company is required by law to maintain reserves against emergencies, while the Government, if faced with an insolvent insurance plan, need only increase the tax. Nevertheless, a little intrusion of political prescience into the actuarial calculation might avert the trend toward welfare socialism in this country.

As President Eisenhower has said, "The Federal Government alone cannot and should not undertake to meet all these needs. Where assistance is needed, much of the initiative is rightly being taken by the States and communities, by families, employers, labor organizations, voluntary groups and religious bodies throughout the Nation."

If anything could weaken the determination of such groups to take care of their own—not to mention the desire of individuals to provide for their own rainy days—it would be the news that everything was being taken care of by the welfare state.

Ireland's Future Related in St. Patrick's Story by William James Conlon of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent article on Ireland and St. Patrick by my constituent, William James Conlon of Lynn, Mass., a man well versed on this subject, a lifelong student and well-known writer on this matter which is of course close to the hearts of all Irishmen:

IRELAND'S FUTURE RELATED IN ST. PATRICK'S STORY BY CONLON

(By William James Conlon)

In the course of my 40-odd years, I have attended a great many St. Patrick's Day celebrations—listened to a great many speeches in praise of St. Patrick in particular and the Irish, God love 'em, in general. I have even made a few myself. Looking back on them now—my own included—I think they may have been bad speeches, although they went over big. They were pretty much the same. They recounted the glorious history of St. Patrick, followed up with the accounts of the Irish heroes of history and their heroic deeds and then the speaker sat down with his audience emotionally charged and cheering.

I think now that those speeches may have been bad. Not because they were not oratorical masterpieces, nor because they were not true—but because they dwelt too much on the glories of the past and said nothing constructive about the future in which we and our children and their children must live.

Now I do not intend to ignore St. Patrick—he wasn't the kind of man you can ignore. Neither do I intend to forget the countless other Irish heroes, saintly or warlike or both. What I want to do is to place

those ancestors of ours in the context of our times and to say what I think they would say about the future of Ireland and the world and Ireland's place in the present crisis and the future struggle.

The age in which Saint Patrick lived was one in which the ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigned in men's minds. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it the political structure of the civilized world. Fear and uncertainty were everywhere in that chaotic time. Into this part of that world—into Ireland Saint Patrick brought two great and related ideas—faith and freedom. He was first and foremost an apostle of the Catholic faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland, but he made the country dominantly Christian and so thoroughly that Ireland became for the next several hundred years a center of learning and a center of missionary activity. It remained so in fact until the energies of the people were consumed in fighting off the attempts of their neighboring island to conquer them and they had no more left for teaching their arts and ethics to others. Up until that time Irish missionaries had gone to Scotland, to northern and central Europe and Ireland was a kind of headquarters of culture and religion for Western Europe. As well as being an apostle of faith and quite as logically, Saint Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been a slave.

He endeavored to make people free. He challenged the royal authority of the pagan chieftains, protested and opposed raids by British bands, who carried Irish captives off into slavery and raised money from the ransoming of these captives. Ladies and gentlemen, the story of Saint Patrick has peculiar relevance today because we live in a chaotic age when the old structures, political and otherwise, on which humanity rested, are breaking down under the force of wars and history. Fear and uncertainty reign in many places and in many minds. Moreover, there is a great and powerful concerted attack on just the things for which Saint Patrick stood. The specter of Soviet Communism which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time the denial of human freedom. (Communism is godless.) It is also a system of slavery, based on contempt for and oppression of the common man.

But there are weapons which will defeat Stalinism and Khrushchevism. They are same weapons as those wielded by Saint Patrick in his fight against false gods and inhuman men. On the one hand he held to his faith in God. On the other to his faith in human freedom and the human will to be free. These are indestructible and when we cling to them we are indestructible, too. That is the lesson of Saint Patrick for this year, 1959. We know how these weapons served the Irish people—helped along, it is true, by other weapons which Irish courage saw fit to use—in the long struggle against domination, a struggle not yet completely won from the three O'Neills to the days of the immortal Wolfe Tone, from O'Connell and Parnell to the immortal Terence McSwiney.

The Irish have kept their faith and freedom of spirit and their fists alive to fight against religious persecution and foreign control. The present government in Dublin is only a hindrance to complete freedom of all Ireland as advocated by the immortal Wolfe Tone and the united Irishmen of his time. Though the illegal wall built by the English stooges and partitioners is a scourge inflicted upon the Irish by the puppet stooges known as the Stormont clique and dictated to by England temporarily casts a gloom over Ireland. But the Almighty God never put a dividing line around the six northern counties.

Therefore it must definitely be wiped out. The coming generation of Irish youth will take care of and see to it that the six northern counties will be part and parcel of an all Ireland. As the immortal Mohart Emmett and Wolfe Tone advocated that it should be. There we will have a sovereign Irish state as the Almighty God left it by his own hands. The Irish have not fought for freedom in Ireland alone. The United States can count an endless number of heroes of Irish birth or descent. Charles Carroll, founder of the State of Maryland, was one of these and it was in Maryland that religious freedom was really born in this country. Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish.

Eleven Irish generals of the Revolutionary Army, including a Sullivan and a Conway. The American Navy's Barry and McDonough and thousands of others who either of Irish birth or descent, who fought to set this country free from British tyranny and domination. Andrew Jackson, great defender of democracy was of Irish descent. The list goes on through General Phil Sheridan to Alfred Emanuel Smith, ex-Governor of the great State of New York, and the many Irish heroes of World Wars I and II including General McAuliffe who said "Nuts" to the Germans at Bastogne. Cohen Kelley, who gave us renewed courage after Pearl Harbor and the five Sullivan brothers who gave up their lives when the cruiser *Juneau* was sunk by the Japanese in the Pacific. Now the achievements of these men were remarkable but they did not achieve what they did simply by sitting in admiration of St. Patrick. They followed the old precept of (go thou and do likewise). The glory of St. Patrick was reflected in their deeds but they also infused something of their own spirit. They took the god saint's principles and they fitted them to their own hour and their own need.

There is a lesson in that for we Irish, both here in America, in Ireland, and throughout the world. Ireland and God knows our hearts are with her is now in what may be hoped are the last stages of the fight to end the pernicious partition and to become what Cardinal O'Connell referred to as "Ireland, one and indivisible, though the heavens fall. The opposition to partition—the fight for a united Ireland—are in the very best of Irish tradition. It has been a bitter war marked by British deceit and brutality and by typical Irish courage and patriotism.

It should not be forgotten nor should it be shelved. The world today has great need for the courage and faith in God and His principles that Saint Patrick gave to the Irish. The whole world is now lined up in a cold war in which the issues are clear. The choice is between Western democracy and man's right to his belief in his God, on the one hand, and godless communism on the other. A world conflagration may break out at any moment.

In such a situation, I have no doubt at to what St. Patrick would do or say. He would be in the vanguard of forces for freedom and Christianity leading the drive to rid the world of the serpent of communism. St. Patrick did not do his fighting from the sidelines, he led the way. It may be a bitter pill for the people of Ireland and for its leaders to realize that while the United Nations with the United States in the lead, are throwing the weight of the Western world into the battle in Korea, in an effort to throw out a foreign power occupying a part of the nation and to end the partition if possible. Ireland herself suffers under a no less unjustifiable occupation and partition and the rest of the world does nothing about it. England is left to work her will in the six stolen countries against the over-

whelming majority of the Irish people in all Ireland.

In spite of this, we of Irish blood cannot afford to ignore our obligations to the principles laid down by St. Patrick, the principle that faith and freedom must be fought for if they are to be won and held. Communism has made fewer converts in Eire than anywhere else in the civilized world in proportion to population. It is up to Ireland to beat down the English threat which faces it and please, ladies and gentlemen, believe me, very sincerely, this won't be accomplished by the tactics of the present Dublin government in power. DeValera and his spineless crew in the Dail in Dublin are holding young Irishmen in the Curragh internment camps in County Kildare without a trial. This is the exact same thing that Khrushchev is doing in Hungary and England is doing the selfsame thing in the six counties of Northern Ireland.

And remember, ladies and gentlemen, DeValera fought side by side with those young men he is holding in the internment camps in the Curragh camps in Kildare. It means just one thing, that DeValera and England are working in conjunction with each other to keep Ireland a mutilated nation as she stands today and to think of what the Easter week martyrs died for.

The late Gen. Michael Collins was shot in his own native County Cork for signing the so-called Free State which split Ireland into two parts because England wanted it that way. The mutilated portion of Ireland now known as Eire has a delegate sitting in the United Nations for the past 6 or 7 years, and he never opened his mouth about what England is doing in the six stolen counties. This delegate is just a dummy in the United Nations. He is not telling us what the Government is doing in the 26 counties. Frank Aiken, Minister of External Affairs in the Dublin government, came to the United Nations in New York and officially voted for the admission of Red Communist China into the United Nations, and all this was taking place.

When His Eminence John Cardinal Dalton and Eamon De Valera were in Vatican City, Rome, Italy, having an audience with the late Pope Pius XII, and when Eamon De Valera returned to Dublin, he stood up in the Dail and defended Frank Aiken's un-American and un-Irish tactics in the United Nations. So both De Valera and Aiken are looked down on in this country. Ireland and the Irish all over the world are disgusted and disgraced with this un-American and un-Irish job in the U.N.

Both Aiken and De Valera have lost all their millions of friends in these United States. In the city of New York, where De Valera was born, he has lost all of his hordes of friends over this matter. It's high time we had a new election in Eire and let De Valera retire to private life, and the members of the Dail government should retire also. The present government is doing nothing, only England's police work in Ireland. Their activities are a disgrace to the memory of the Easter Week martyrs of 1916 who were executed by the British Government because they represented a free and independent Ireland. We have been thrilled by the details of the battle around Dublin Castle and the heroism of the martyrs of Easter Week. We have grieved over those who died in the uprising, or were executed afterward.

We know that though the uprising failed of its immediate purpose, it lit fires in the hearts of Irishmen everywhere which have not yet been extinguished. For 2 years thereafter the civil conflict continued, with the Sinn Feins leading the way and leading the Irish people in their resistance to British rule. Eventually, in December of 1918, a general election was ordered for the

whole of Ireland, supposedly to settle once and for all the question of independence for Ireland.

The costly attempt to maintain control by force and the weight of world opinion as varied in the proclamation of the right to self-determination by the victorious democracies in World War I, had forced England to this step. Despite the fact that the election was carried out while a British Army occupied the whole island, the result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Out of 105 electoral divisions 79 voted for independence and only 26 against. The popular vote was over 80 percent in favor of complete independence. In response to this expression of the national will the elected representatives of the people of Ireland assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, and declared Ireland an independent nation and established a government and the Dail Eireann the national legislature.

The English going back on their promises refused to recognize this action and thus a virtual state of war broke out between the Irish Republic and Great Britain. The British sent in their black and tan's imposed martial law and tried to force Ireland to give up her national independence. Ireland, of course, continued the battle. Finally as a last resort the British Parliament on December 23, 1920, without an Irishman voting, passed a Government of Ireland Act—the act of partition—whereby the six stolen counties were cut off (from the homeland) by England, of course, without a political mandate of the people of Ireland.

The Irish people rightfully refused to accept this settlement. The Sinn Feinn again led the war against the black and tans that constituted the British occupation forces and the attempt to force the acceptance of the British was wholly (unsuccessful) in the greater part of Ireland. Despite the fact that a Northern Ireland Parliament was set up in Belfast, even this was the will of the English Government only and was opposed by the majority in the six stolen counties cut off by England. It was during this period that the heroic hunger strikes took place and Terence MacSwiney in giving up his life, brought world sympathy to the Irish cause.

In the partition election of May 1931, intended to put the Government of Ireland into effect, out of a total of 186 seats in both the north and the south parliaments, 140 were won by the Republicans. Thus Ireland as a whole, repudiated the act. The British again set up martial law and bitter fighting again took place. Finally, on December 6, 1921, after 6 months of negotiations between the leaders of Sinn Feinn and the British, a treaty was signed establishing the Irish Free State and partition became an absolute fact. Even with this, the English deceit was not ended. Since the treaty called for raising the boundary between Northern Ireland and the Free State to free some of the Irish Republicans who form a majority in four of the six stolen counties, and this was never done.

England's latest act, intended to cement her position in Northern Ireland, was to pass the so-called Ireland bill in May of 1949. In this bill they presumed to declare that Northern Ireland would never cease to be a part of the United Kingdom, without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

Incidentally this is a fine time for England to begin to worry about obtaining the consent of her northern subject government, when questions of how they are to be ruled came up. This Ireland bill has served to keep Ireland out of participation in the North Atlantic Defense Treaty. Since one of the purposes of that treaty is to preserve the territorial integrity of participating nations and Ireland fears that her adherence to

the pact would be interpreted as recognizing England's claim, that Northern Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom.

That is where the matter stands today. Despite protest after protest, the English have refused to concede that by any standard Ireland should be one and united. Irishmen in either north or south consider themselves as Irish and not English or British, or anything but Irish. The population is homogeneous. The island is one geographic unit. Her history and traditions are distinctly national and even her churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, are organized on a national, all-Ireland basis. Her learned bodies and her sports organizations are nationwide. Ireland is divided only in the minds of the Government of England and in measures England has forced on that gallant little nation. What can we here do to end this intolerable situation?

It is true that our State Department has said that we should be concerned. But I say that is no more internal than South Korea and we are certainly involved there. It is no more right that the island of Ireland should be divided than that the Korean Peninsula should be.

Fortunately we Americans of Irish descent or birth do have a program for putting the great moral weight of the United States behind the fight to end partition in Ireland and to end English rule there for evermore. In April of last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives held hearings on a number of resolutions which had been introduced in the House and which would have put the United States solidly on record as favoring the unification of Ireland. Some of these resolutions provided means for our active participation in action leading to unification. Those resolutions had been introduced by members of Congress of Irish descent and received strong support in the hearings on the subject. Unfortunately the Foreign Affairs Committee did not see fit to report any of them to the floor of the House. You may be sure, however, that this program will not be allowed to die and we hope that the U.S. Congress will eventually take action, placing this country in the fight to end partition and leading this fight as it should. Ireland has made great contributions in culture and leadership to the United States. She has given the same strong support to democratic ideals. It is high time that the United States do something to help Ireland gain her complete freedom.

We of Irish blood in Congress did something else last year to open the eyes of the English to how strong the feeling in this country is in opposition to the partition of Ireland by England.

On March 29 of last year, or I should say 2 years ago, when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1959 was under consideration by the House, an amendment was introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, and was accepted. This amendment was designed to withhold assistance to the United Kingdom until partition in Ireland was ended. Although the amendment was later stricken from the bill, it did awaken England to some consciousness of American and world feeling on the matter. As a matter of fact, there was much scurrying about the Capitol and the State Department by worried British diplomats during the period of debate on the bill.

These sections have forced England to take a new look at her policy in Ireland, you may be sure, and all the other Congressmen who have engaged in this fight until England does more than simply take a new look. We want her to take positive action and get out of Ireland and we will not be satisfied until she does so. If Irish people everywhere get behind this program

of pressure on England from the United States, we may be able to write a new page in Irish history for our grandchildren to read. The story of how the English were finally driven out of Ireland, knowing this history of persistent courage and remarkable leadership on the part of the Irish people, who can doubt that their full participation in the titanic world struggle now shaping up would provide inspiration for the rest of the democratic world—inspiration, which might spell the difference between victory and defeat?

I realize, however, quoting an official Irish Government memorandum, that although "Ireland is earnestly desirous of playing her full part in protecting Christian obligation and the democratic way of life . . . [She] is faced with grave difficulties from the strategic and political points of view." This is true, both because the continued partition of Ireland is naturally and bitterly resented by the Irish people and because without a single integrated authority either the defense or the effective utilization of the island's capacities are impossible.

Therefore, call upon the Irish people at home to stop hobnobbing with the enemy (England) and come out for a general election. Clean out the present government of De Valera, Alken & Co., Ltd. Liberate the Irish Freedom Fighters in the internment camps and let nature take its course. You cannot stop the onward march of any nation that wants to be free. Sinn Fein and the IRA won a complete victory in the 26 counties. Now, for God's sake, stop quibbling with England in the six stolen counties. The only language that England understands is the language of the IRA. But before this is done the Irish people will have to elect a government in Dublin with a determination to be absolutely free and let them recall their delegate in the United Nations who represents a mutilated Ireland and not a nation (as such). Then when this is done the millions of Irish in the United States and all over the world will be with them to a man. And by this constructive change in policy you will make the soul of our immortal St. Patrick happy in heaven forever afterward.

Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following prize-winning essay by Miss Barbara Maier, senior student at White Haven (Pa.) High School, which appeared in the Hazleton-Plain Speaker on Wednesday, March 9, 1960: WHITE HAVEN SENIOR WINS ESSAY CONTEST

First-prize-winning essay written by Barbara Maier, senior in White Haven High School, for the national contest conducted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped is published below.

The local phase of this contest was promoted by the Tri-County Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. Therese Zogby, chairman. Rev. Harry A. Bump is chairman of the subcommittee on contests.

Barbara's essay was judged best by a committee of staff members at Hazleton campus of the Pennsylvania State University. The judging was accomplished anonymously.

Each high school judges its own compositions, sending the best to the tri-county committee. One each from the participating high schools is entered in the final local competition. The White Haven High School entry was finally selected as best of the 316 written in this area.

Second prize was taken by Arlene Butala of McAdoo High School and third prize went to Caryll Ann Gallagher, St. Gabriel's High School.

The topic, on which all essays were written, is "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity."

Here is the winning essay:

"Just think of the number of great men who would have been lost to the world if they had to pass a rigid physical examination to hold the jobs that they had. Certainly Franklin Delano Roosevelt would have failed to pass such a test after being crippled by polio. Beethoven would never have had a chance to write his greatest symphonies. His deafness would have disqualified him.

"The world would have been a poorer place without such great men as Edison who was deaf, the Greek poet Homer who was blind, the hunchback Steinmetz, an engineering wizard, club-footed Lord Byron, and tubercular John Keats. So too, in our everyday life the business world will be a poorer place if it rejects the men and women whose ability in one area more than compensates for a disability in another area.

"SENSE OF PURPOSE

"Physically handicapped employees have a sense of purpose and usefulness in their work. The dignity of self-support is new to them. They have great enthusiasms for their work, show great initiative and they have unusual loyalty to the job. In many cases statistics have shown that the performance of the physically handicapped is strikingly better than that of the non-handicapped worker.

"While industry can be proud of its record in fostering rehabilitation of these people and in providing jobs for the handicapped, full credit must be given the handicapped themselves who in their day-by-day performance on the job more than justified their employers' confidence in them. Given the opportunity the handicapped made good.

"We are now entering into an era in which the handicapped will be welcomed not only as citizens deserving an even break with able-bodied workers, but as badly needed participants in the production of vital goods and services. They will be helping themselves to gain confidence and a place in the sun, but also they will be helping to sustain the Nation's economic strength and our continued climb toward better lives for all of us.

"USEFUL CITIZENS

"The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped works to make useful citizens out of people who at one time in our civilization were considered to be a drag upon society. In changing them into useful citizens, giving them the feeling of oneness with the rest of us, they are satisfying the human longing to be part of something, to contribute to something that is worthwhile so they can get satisfaction out of saying 'I helped to build.'

"Employers should not pamper or make special berths for the handicapped. They don't want it. They want to take the rightful place side by side with other employees according to their abilities. We should open the door of opportunity to them and invite them in.

"Opening the doors to the physically handicapped does something to them beyond the powers of medical science. It makes the difference between a life of despair and a life of useful fulfillment.

"The Federal Security Agency provides a program of work training for persons who are physically rehabilitating themselves. So, it is in the community where he will find his job, live his life. The handicapped person is not a national statistic, he is a human being with roots in his home town or city, with friends, neighbors, and family with his own place to make through his own efforts and abilities.

"The rehabilitation of the physically handicapped is a humanitarian work that builds a stronger America. We have the obligation of giving the physically handicapped every opportunity to restore themselves to positions of independent and useful citizens so they may obtain the full benefits of society in which all men are free and in which each has a full opportunity to develop himself to the limit which his abilities and talents will permit and achieve for himself the kind of life to which he aspires.

"NEED A CHANCE

"Abilities, Inc., is a factory run by and for the disabled to prove that they can help themselves if people will only give them a chance. It was started in 1952 with one paralyzed worker in a grimy, unfurnished garage. Within 5 years it had grown to a million dollar business with 300 employees. Everyone there is unemployable by almost any other standards.

"Its low accident rate has led other employers to reexamine their own hiring policies. All over the world, organizations patterned after Abilities, Inc., were formed. Corporations like this enable men and women to rebuild a human life from ruins and restore their dignity.

"The inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which the founders of this Nation set forth in the Declaration of Independence, are not qualified or conditioned by race, color, creed, economic condition of birth, or by physical handicap. And to fail to provide the physically handicapped with every possible opportunity to achieve dignity, independence, and profitable employment, is to deny in part the high principles upon which our Nation was founded.

"We think so much of the dignity of every individual that we take the least among us, the most helpless cripples, and give them medical restoration, rehabilitation, vocational training, and finally put them in a job so that they may regain their self-respect and have their dignity be respected by all. Hiring the handicapped is truly the passport to the dignity of these individuals."

Small Independent Business and Professional Men Vote Overwhelmingly for 25-Percent Cut in Business and Agricultural Subsidies to Big Businessmen and Big Farmers in Poll Conducted Among Its 150,000 Members by the National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, of 150,000 small independent business and professional men polled recently by the National Federation of Independent

Business, 89 percent voted "for the reduction by not less than 25 percent of all business and agricultural subsidies."

The nationwide poll was made on my House Resolution 361.

George J. Burger, first vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, today notified me of the results of the poll. Only 8 percent voted against the measure I have sponsored, with 3 percent not voting.

My resolution requests President Eisenhower to prepare and transmit to the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations "which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore" provided, which would not only prevent further increases in Federal expenditures but actually reduce them.

Business and agricultural subsidies to big businessmen and to big farmers, including but not limited to direct grants, disguised grants in the form of nonrepayable loans, postal subsidies, shipping and airline subsidies, although perhaps—desirable as a means of assisting special groups to retain their relative positions in the economy, should now be reexamined in the light of the overall need for rigid control and a sizable reduction of Federal expenditures.

I have sponsored a number of bills in the Congress to assist small businessmen, farmers, and veterans but there is more interest in this particular bill to reduce subsidies to big businessmen and big farmers than in almost any other bill that I am familiar with.

The National Federation of Independent Business has approximately 500 members in the State of Delaware alone.

It polls each month its national membership of 150,000 small independent business and professional men on 5 legislative and economic issues affecting small business with the purpose of determining their views on these matters.

The National Federation of Independent Business conducts its polls with complete fairness, without bias, and without attempting to lead its members to any predetermined conclusions.

The 16-year-old National Federation of Independent Business is highly thought of by leading Republican and Democratic Members of the Congress.

By invitation in 1948, 1952, and 1956, George J. Burger, first vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, has appeared before the platform committees of both the Democratic and Republican conventions on behalf of small business.

I have found that many informed people competent to judge these issues consider the polls taken by the National Federation of Independent Business to be at least as accurate and honest as those better known polls which report regularly to the mass media on matters of general interest to the public.

The argument for my House Resolution 361 was stated this way in ballot 254 of the Mandate, published by the National Federation of Independent Business:

BALLOT 254

Make these fellows stand on their own two feet—that's the aim of this bill. Their profits are running at, or near, all-time highs. There's no need for them to continue dipping their arms into the public till. By enacting this bill, Congress could save upward of \$5 billion yearly, and cut this out of spending. This would go a long way toward keeping Government finances in balance, and would relieve all our people of the constant pressure for higher and higher taxes. It could result in some cuts.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my House Resolution 361 for the information of my colleagues:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that in view of the increase in the Federal debt by \$19 billion in the past six years, and the increase in the cost of interest on the Federal debt from \$5,800 million to \$8 billion during the same period, there is a pressing need for substantial reductions in Federal expenditures in order to reduce the staggering burden of our ever-increasing Federal debt with its constantly rising interest and refinancing charges and resulting dangerous inflation. The House finds that business and agricultural subsidies to big businessmen and to big farmers, including but not limited to direct grants, disguised grants in the form of nonrepayable loans, postal subsidies, shipping and airline subsidies of various kinds, accelerated tax amortization programs, and indirect grants through long-term, low-interest-rate loans and other methods and programs, although desirable as a means of assisting these special groups to retain their relative positions in the economy, should be reexamined in the light of the overall need for rigid control and a sizable reduction of Federal expenditures.

SEC. 2. In view of the foregoing, the President is requested to prepare and transmit to the Congress, by January 1960, advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore, to provide (1) for the reduction by not less than 25 per centum of all business and agricultural subsidies, together with such other specific proposals, including specific legislative recommendations, as he may deem advisable in order not only to prevent further increases in Federal expenditures but to actually reduce them, and (2) for the reduction of Federal income taxes in aggregate amounts equal to the total of the reductions in subsidies effected for the taxable years involved pursuant to such legislative recommendations.

Outstanding Physicians Endorse the Forand Bill, H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's outstanding physicians are among the many doctors who have heartily endorsed the Forand bill—H.R. 4700—extending the social security system to provide health benefits to retired workers.

With their permission I am inserting in the Record the text of letters from Dr. Basil C. MacLean, who recently retired as president of the National Blue Cross Association, and Dr. E. M. Blue-

stone, hospital administration professor at Columbia and New York Universities, backing his bill.

I am extremely impressed by the fact that Dr. MacLean, a man who has crowned a brilliant career with several years at the helm of America's largest voluntary nonprofit health insurance plan, the Blue Cross, should write me of his conviction that the health costs of the aged cannot be met by existing health plans, and that the social security system should be used.

Both Dr. MacLean and Dr. Bluestone have spent their lives in active efforts to meet the problems of financing and providing high quality medical and hospital care. Dr. MacLean is a past president of the American Hospital Association, was commissioner of hospitals in New York City from 1954 to 1957, and was hospital superintendent and director of three outstanding hospitals for 27 years prior to that.

It is also significant that in the face of the usual closed-mind opposition of the American Medical Association, two distinguished doctors, closely acquainted with the problem, take an opposite view.

I quote from Dr. MacLean's letter:

A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged.

And from Dr. Bluestone's letter:

For whatever you may think my opinion worth, may I respectfully suggest that the sheer humanity of those who are in approval far outweighs the arguments of those who, motivated largely by professional self-protection (which I consider misguided and ill-advised) are in disapproval. Passage of this bill into law would be a boon for the great majority of our elderly population who have the right to look to our legislators for relief at a time in their lives when they may need it most. It has all the wholesome earmarks of voluntary prepaid medical care insurance with the added advantage of Government partnership to see to it that no citizen is neglected in the late time of his trouble.

The two letters indicate that corporate medicine, as represented by the AMA, does not speak for doctors who really know the problem.

I think it is a tragedy that the general public should get the impression that doctors as a whole are opposed to health protection for the aged.

This is simply not true. Unfortunately, a great many doctors, overworked as they are, simply parrot the AMA position without examining the facts.

The Forand bill is awaiting action by the House Ways and Means Committee. Hearings were concluded last year.

The text of the letters from Drs. MacLean and Bluestone, together with brief biographies follows:

BASIL C. MAC LEAN, M.D., M.P.H., NEW YORK CITY
Medical superintendent, Montreal General Hospital, 1927-30; hospital superintendent, Touro Infirmary, New Orleans, 1930-35; di-

rector, Strong Memorial Hospital and professor of hospital administration, University of Rochester, 1935-54; commissioner of hospitals, New York City, 1954-57; president, National Blue Cross Association, 1957, until his recent retirement; charter fellow and onetime president, American College of Hospital Administrators; director, Companion Life Insurance Co.; award of merit, 1953, American Hospital Association; president, American Hospital Association, 1941; and chairman, Commission on Hospital Service, AHA, 1936-41.

FEBRUARY 29, 1960.

HON. AIME FORAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORAND: As an individual I want to add my voice in support of your bill which would provide health benefits to aged persons under the social security mechanism. The good sense of this measure and the urgent need that created it recommend its passage without delay.

I will not detail the special problems of the aged with regard to meeting the costs of health care at a time of life when income is reduced and need expanded. The facts have been quite adequately drawn in the material before you now, in the hearings on the bill, in the report of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and in the proceedings of Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged. Financing health benefits for the aged by means of the payroll tax provides a way of dealing with the question with dignity and effectiveness.

I have been in close contact with the problem for many years and in many capacities. As a physician, I have had an intimate look at the special and personal health needs of the aged. As a hospital administrator, I have seen that need reflected as a burden of obligatory and uncompensated service that acted as a constant drag upon the hospital's economic support and growth. As New York City commissioner of hospitals, I have seen these problems further translated into financial and social deficit for the entire community. As a president of the National Blue Cross Association, I participated firsthand in the attempt to meet some of these problems through existing voluntary prepayment organizations.

A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged.

As an individual I favor legislation so drafted that it would permit the Government to utilize voluntary nonprofit plans such as Blue Cross. In my personal opinion Blue Cross would thus be helped in its efforts as a community plan to serve all economic groups; but Blue Cross cannot, of course, include a large high-cost group like the aged without raising its rates to everybody. When Social Security funds pay for the aged, everybody else would benefit also. I do not believe that commercial insurance companies should be recognized as intermediaries. It does not make sense to try to insure on a business basis persons whose incomes are not far from the subsistence level. Legislation along the lines of the Forand bill offers a means of settling an area of difficulty and relieving the voluntary prepayment mechanism to concentrate on better programs within its areas of demonstrated competence. Surely, if OASDI health benefits are "contracted out" voluntary prepayment will be thereby strengthened and its programs will rest upon sounder economic footing.

For hospitals, the measure will provide, for the first time, adequate payment for services rendered to aged patients, relief from an unnecessary burden of long standing, and the kind of dependable financial support that produces growth and vitality for the community's health facilities.

You may make this letter public if you wish. I have sent a similar letter to the Honorable WILEY MILLS, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL C. MACLEAN, M.D., M.P.H.

E. M. BLUESTONE, M.D., NEW YORK CITY
Assistant professor of hospital administration, Columbia University School of Public Health; professor of public administration, New York University; director (1928-51), now consultant, Montefiore Hospital, New York.

MARCH 2, 1960.

The Honorable AIME J. FORAND,
U.S. House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a longtime student and teacher of medical care, and particularly geriatric care, I am taking the liberty of writing to you about the bill bearing your good name which the Ways and Means Committee now has under consideration. I have taken great interest in this bill from the beginning, having awaited its advent with eager anticipation; discussed it in class and in various conferences; and have listened attentively to those who have expressed opposition to it. For whatever you may think my opinion worth, may I respectfully suggest that the sheer humanity of those who are in approval far outweighs the arguments of those who, motivated largely by professional self-protection (which I consider misguided and ill-advised) are in disapproval. Passage of this bill into law would be a boon for the great majority of our elderly population who have the right to look to our legislators for relief at a time in their lives when they may need it most. It has all the wholesome earmarks of voluntary prepaid medical care insurance with the added advantage of Government partnership to see to it that no citizen is neglected in the late time of his trouble.

I earnestly hope that the Congress will follow your lead and pass this humanitarian bill, thus writing a new and comforting chapter in the history of modern geriatrics.

Respectfully yours,

E. M. BLUESTONE, M.D.

N.B.—I shall be glad to see you use this letter at your discretion as a personal opinion on my part.

Resolution of the Omaha Woman's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter in the RECORD a resolution adopted on March 7, 1960, by a unanimous vote of the Omaha Woman's Club.

A copy of this resolution has been sent to other clubs in the State of Nebraska, and I am sure that a full discussion of the problems covered in this resolution will cause other civic-minded and community-minded groups to join the Oma-

ha Woman's Club in their recommendations.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, MRS. FORREST J. AUSTIN, TO THE OMAHA WOMAN'S CLUB AND ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL MEMBERS PRESENT

Whereas the recent Supreme Court decisions have weakened our law concerning Communist subversive activities in our defense plants, Government position and other activities where Communists may influence or undermine the defense efforts and Government control of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the Omaha Woman's Club and a member of the GFWC, does hereby urge the President of the United States and the Congress to enact legislation to correct the Supreme Court decisions; be it further

Resolved, That control of the issuance of passports be the responsibility of the State Department and that the practice of denying passports to known Communists and Communist organizers be reinstated and that other laws be passed for the protection of the national security against communism in the United States of America.

The Zoo and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the educational features of the great city of Philadelphia is the Philadelphia Zoological Garden, which is over 100 years old. Its Penrose Research Laboratory has won recognition for its pioneering studies of the proper feeding and control of diseases in captive animals, and it is now aided by U.S. Government agencies in its research on diseases common to animals and mankind. I submit for the RECORD the condensation of remarks by the president of the Zoological Society of Philadelphia, Mr. Radcliffe Cheston, Jr., and the director of the Philadelphia Zoological Garden, Mr. Freeman M. Shelly, at the February 5, 1960, meeting of the citizens council on city planning. This should be of interest to many Members of Congress:

THE ZOO AND YOU

Mr. Radcliffe Cheston, Jr., president of the Zoological Society of Philadelphia, reviewed the history, needs and future plans of the zoo. The society was granted its charter by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on March 21, 1859. Although it was not opened to the public until 1874, due to the intervention of the Civil War, the Philadelphia Zoo was America's first zoo.

The zoo was an immediate success, and within a few years several major exhibition buildings had been constructed with the use of private funds. By 1930, however, it was evident that virtually the entire plant was outmoded, unsanitary by modern standards, and some buildings, since replaced, had become unsafe.

To alleviate this problem to some extent, all available society funds were used to construct a service building, a new elephant house, and to completely remodel the birdhouse. At this point the zoo exhausted its private capital. With mounting taxes and

living costs, it was no longer possible to obtain large sums from private sources, and the zoo had to turn to the city of Philadelphia and to public funds for assistance.

City funds have been made available by city council for construction of a new lion house, opened in 1951, and to improve the main entrance to the garden.

The zoo has considered the feasibility of increasing the admission charges. It has decided that it is not possible to charge enough to completely finance the zoo, since any substantial increase in admission price would substantially reduce attendance. It has found an additional source of revenue, however, in the operation of all souvenir and refreshment stands in the zoo. Mr. Cheston mentioned parenthetically that through a provision in its charter, the zoo is not allowed to increase its earnings by training animals for show purposes.

Both the zoo and the society have earned an international reputation. The zoo's centennial last year was greeted with congratulatory messages from the world over. The zoo is an important educational asset to Philadelphia, and its Penrose Research Laboratory, established in 1901, has won recognition for its pioneering studies of the proper feeding and control of disease in captive animals. It is now aided by U.S. Government agencies in its research on diseases common to animals and mankind.

Mr. Cheston stressed that only with the help of continued capital funds from the city can the zoo maintain its first rank. Proposed improvement plans for the zoo's future include the following:

- (a) Construction of a new rare mammal house on the site of the old lion house which is now vacant.
- (b) Modernization of the reptile and small mammal houses.
- (c) A new giraffe and antelope house.
- (d) A new penguin house on the site of the present obsolete antelope house.
- (e) An African plains exhibit.
- (f) New bear grottos and wolf dens.
- (g) A new kangaroo house.
- (h) Completion of modernization of the present primate house and new refreshment stands.
- (i) New administration building and an auditorium to be used by school classes and other groups.

Funds are now scheduled in the 1960-65 capital program for the first two of these projects.

Mr. Cheston expressed the zoo's gratitude for the interest and encouragement shown in its program by Mayor Dilworth, the city council, the city planning commission, and the citizens' council on city planning.

Mr. Freeman M. Shelly, director of the Philadelphia Zoological Garden, spoke of the visitors to the zoo and of its animals. He described the long process which must be followed when a new animal is acquired from its native habitat. Although the zoo never sends expeditions into the field to obtain the animals, each of the three curators has at some time escorted some rarity to Philadelphia from a foreign land or from another zoo.

Some animals, especially native ones, are donated to the zoo but the zoological society itself supplies most of the exhibits. Friends and members of the zoo have given or willed money expressly for the purchase of animals. All animals are bought with private funds; public funds are never expended for this purpose.

Mr. Shelly noted that the large species are expensive. Indian rhinos cost \$10,000 each, reticulated giraffes \$7,500 a pair, gorillas \$5,000 each, and ostriches \$1,200 a pair.

Although the Philadelphia Zoo does not have the greatest number of exhibits of any zoo, it does have a thorough and representative cross-section of the animal kingdom.

The Philadelphia Zoo holds many records for longevity of animals in captivity.

Through the research of the Penrose Laboratory, tuberculosis has been eliminated from the collection of apes and monkeys, and outstanding advances have been made in discovering proper animal diets. The work of the laboratory has attracted international attention. Students have come from all over the world to work and learn in the Philadelphia Zoo.

Mr. Shelly believed that probably the most important measure of a zoo's success is its acceptance by the public. Although the Philadelphia Zoo charges admission, three quarters of a million people have visited it in each of several recent years. It attracts more visitors than any other cultural institution in Philadelphia. In fact, from the standpoint of attendance, it is exceeded only by the Phillies Baseball Club.

An important fact is that most visitors come to the zoo in couples or family groups. The children's zoo is particularly popular, for the children come into close contact with young, tame animals. The zoo is making an important contribution to education for all age groups in the Philadelphia area. Some 137,000 children came to the zoo during 1959 in school classes and other organized groups. The zoo is used also by art and college students, and certain curricula in natural history courses are related directly to zoo exhibits.

The zoo has become one of the largest and most important "bureaus of information" in the city; and is continually deluged with questions about animals. It also has several educational radio and television programs.

The Philadelphia Zoo's slogan is "America's First Zoo." It has the first zoological society, the first zoo laboratory, the first children's zoo. It was the first to test and quarantine primates and exhibit them behind glass, and the first to study diets on a wide scale and feed animals scientifically.

Mr. Shelly concluded his remarks by pointing out that although the Philadelphia Zoological Garden has established an enviable record, it needs assistance in replacing or modernizing its older buildings in order to continue to enjoy its first rank in America.

The U.S. Comptroller General Says, Regarding Patents Derived From Federal Research and Development Programs, "The Government Should Retain the Property Rights Thereto"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] in offering legislation which would establish an overall U.S. patent policy. Other countries, among them Great Britain and the Soviet Union, have overall patent policies which clearly have advanced, not impeded, research and development.

At the present time there is no overall Federal Government policy on patents. Since many contracts with the Federal Government cut across several Federal departments and agencies, the contractor may be forced to deal with half a dozen patent policies on a single project. There is a growing recognition of the

fact that U.S. Government patent policies are "a mess." With the Federal Government now footing the cost of more than half the research in the United States, agitation for a general overhaul of the system is increasing both in the Congress and elsewhere.

Government funds devoted to research have grown rapidly in recent years, and the National Science Foundation estimates the total obligations for scientific research and development of all Federal departments and agencies for 1960 at the stupendous sum of \$8,148 million. How well this vast amount of money is spent must become a matter of the utmost importance to the Federal Government, as it is already a subject of growing concern to U.S. taxpayers.

Many people today are asking why the United States does not at least recoup its research costs by taking a cut of the commercial royalties. The British Government has been doing this for over 50 years. The Vickers Viscount, developed under government contract, has returned enough to the British treasury to pay off the original research cost and yield a profit. Jet engines have proved to be a profitable investment for the British Government.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, in his official report of March 10, 1960, on the bill I have cosponsored with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] declared:

An examination made by us of the operations of a major defense contractor disclosed that 218 invention disclosures arose from work financed under Government contracts. Of these, 62 patent applications had been filed, 33 applications were approved for filing, 57 disclosures were under evaluation, 3 were awaiting evaluation, and the remaining 62 disclosures were in an inactive status. Two disclosures were combined in a simple patent application. Most of these disclosures for which patent applications were filed or approved for filing were classified by the contractor as having commercial value. The circumstances that the work was sponsored and financed by the Government and performed for the express purpose of accomplishing research and development in the particular field seem to afford persuasive reasons for urging that, in addition to the right to the free use of any inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom, the Government should retain the property rights thereto, including any patents that might be granted therefor.

Under the Thompson-McDowell bill—H.R. 5448 and H.R. 7705, 86th Congress—the Government would share in patent royalties on inventions resulting from Federal research contracts, and small business would be given tangible assistance in the form of Government contracts instead of the lipservice which this administration gives to the 4 million small businessmen of our Nation. The present strong monopolistic trend which today dominates the \$8 billion Federal research and development program would be halted if the Thompson-McDowell bill was enacted into law.

The magazine Product Engineering, published by McGraw-Hill says:

Excessive channeling of research contracts into big business is causing considerable worry. Big business (over 500 employees) gets at least 95 percent of the Government

research, and 100 firms get 85 percent among them. The top 14 companies getting contracts between 1954-1956 were all big electric and aircraft companies. The Attorney General has warned that channeling all this patent potential into big business is just building up the monopoly trend.

The House Small Business Committee recently spoke of the ominous shadow cast on the future with the monopoly of technology by big business.

The House Small Business Committee insists that since the Nation's 4 million small businessmen help to pay the staggering costs of the Federal Government's research and development programs through taxes they should at least have access to the patents developed at the taxpayers' expense.

There is a growing awareness in the Congress of the importance of a Government-wide patent policy. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, held some very important hearings on the patent policies of departments and agencies of the Federal Government on December 8, 9, and 10. Important results are expected to ensue.

More recently, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY introduced S. 3156, a bill "to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in basic research with respect to patent rights arising from research conducted under projects financed by the United States."

In introducing his bill, S. 3156, Senator O'MAHONEY said, in part:

The Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights was authorized in the 85th Congress by Senate Resolution 236 to conduct a series of studies on the practices of the various Government agencies. So much divergence among the various Government agencies was discovered that there is every indication that the subcommittee should give immediate attention to establishing a uniform policy among the various agencies.

Senator O'MAHONEY went on to point out that—

The Government's basic research should be promoted and protected because it is growing clearer every day that the comparable positions of Soviet Russia and this country will depend upon the success and proper conduct of this program and the successful establishment of a uniform and sound Government policy.

As usual, when the present administration ought to be moving decisively in a matter of this gravity it has established yet another committee to study the matter. In accordance with the administration's usual practice of postponing difficult decisions, it has established an interagency committee composed of representatives of the major agencies having an interest in patent policy. The Honorable Robert C. Watson, Commissioner of Patents, is serving as chairman.

After initial examination of the subject, the new interagency committee felt that more factual information should be secured. The interagency committee passed the "hot potato" along by entering into a contract with the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation of the George Washington University providing for the development of "fac-

tual information reflecting both Government and private industry experience under practices heretofore followed," according to a report on the Thompson-McDowell bill by the General Services Administration.

This matter has been under study for more than 13 years by the Federal Government. In 1947 Justice Tom C. Clark, former Attorney General, after intensive study, recommended that the Government should take title to all inventions produced in the performance of research contracts with the Federal Government except in special cases approved by the Government Patents Administrator, an office which he also recommended should be established, and the heads of the agencies involved in making the contract.

On November 9, 1956, former Attorney General Herbert Brownell submitted a report to Congress as required by the Defense Production Act of 1950 in which he found that present patent policy "may be one of the major factors tending to concentrate economic power."

Yet, despite the repeated recommendations by the Attorney Generals of both Democratic and Republic administrations, here we go again on another study, a study which can be only for the purposes of postponement and obfuscation since the factual information already available is voluminous and detailed.

If there had to be another study, why wasn't the Attorney General, who has some competence in the matter, placed in charge of it?

I include as part of my remarks a section of the report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the bill which I have cosponsored with my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 10, 1960.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of September 2, 1959, requesting a report on H.R. 5448, 86th Congress, 1st session. "A bill to amend chapter 27 of title 35 of the United States Code with respect to the rights of the United States in certain patents."

It seems quite evident from the reports on the studies made thus far that there are many divergent views on the subject. The basic problem is whether the Government should take title to patents developed by private concerns under research and development contracts; or whether, in the light of present-day circumstances, the Government's interests may be sufficiently protected by retaining a royalty-free license covering all governmental uses. The former is basic policy under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. The latter has been the prevailing practice in the administration of research and development contracts entered into by the military agencies.

Despite the divergent views on the subject, we believe there can be little disagreement as to the need for uniformity where contracts are being performed in the same or similar research and development areas. For example, the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency sometimes contract with the same contractor on similar types of research and develop-

ment work, but with entirely different contract provisions on patent rights. Under the Defense contract, the contractor obtains the patent and the Government receives a royalty-free nonexclusive license to practice or have practiced any inventions conceived in the course of the work. Under the NASA contract, all inventions become the property of the Government unless the Administrator determines that the public interest is better served by a waiver of the rights.

As illustrative of the position of the Government, an examination made by us of the operations of a major defense contractor disclosed that 218 invention disclosures arose from work financed under Government contracts. Of these, 62 patent applications had been filed, 33 applications were approved for filing, 57 disclosures were under evaluation, 3 were awaiting evaluation, and the remaining 62 disclosures were in an inactive status. Two disclosures were combined in a simple patent application. Most of these disclosures for which patent applications were filed or approved for filing were classified by the contractor as having commercial value. The circumstances that the work was sponsored and financed by the Government and performed for the express purpose of accomplishing research and development in the particular field seem to afford persuasive reasons for urging that, in addition to the right to the free use of any inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom, the Government should retain the property rights thereto, including any patents that might be granted therefor. Cf. *United States v. Houghton* (D.C. Md., 1927, 20 F. 2d 434), affirmed by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 1928 (23 F. 2d 385), holding that where an employee of the Public Health Service made a discovery or invention while employed to conduct experiments for the purpose of making it, his invention was the property of his employer, the United States; and *Ordnance Engineering Corp. v. U.S.* ((1929) 68 C. Cls. 301, cert. denied, 302 U.S. 708), where the court was of the view that a Government contractor may occupy the same position as a Government employee with respect to rights in an invention made at the Government's direction and expense. We recognize, however, that persuasive reasons, particularly incentive on the part of the contractor, can be advanced for allowing the contractor patent rights to inventions, improvements, or discoveries made during the performance of a research and development contract with the Government.

In considering the provisions proposed by the bill a number of significant differences may be noted between its provisions and those of comparatively recent enactments dealing with specific Government agencies; for example, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, 42 U.S.C. 2457; Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 42 U.S.C. 2181-2190; and the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 42 U.S.C. 1871. These differences seem to indicate that the provisions proposed by the bill need clarification so as to minimize the possibility of conflicting interpretations, some of which may be illustrated, as follows:

1. The laws governing patent rights under certain AEC and NASA contracts provide basically that inventions shall become the property of the United States, except that the rights of the United States may be waived under proper conditions. H.R. 5448 states only that the United States shall have a royalty-free, nonexclusive license to practice or have practiced such inventions, improvement, or discovery.

2. The language in H.R. 5448 which describes the circumstances under which the United States shall have an interest in an invention differs from corresponding language in existing law.

3. A provision of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 stated: "Each such waiver made with respect to any invention,

shall be subject to the reservation by the Administrator of an irrevocable, non-exclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license for the practice of such invention throughout the world or by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States." The language of H.R. 5448 does not provide the United States the right to assign royalty-free use of an invention to a foreign government pursuant to treaty.

The following general considerations are submitted with respect to the specific provisions of the bill:

1. The relationships between the provisions of the bill and those of existing statutes relating to specific agencies should be set out.

2. H.R. 5448 contains a provision that "Each research or development contract hereafter awarded by the United States shall provide that in the case of any patent covered by the preceding sentence, the United States shall receive a percentage, determined by negotiation as provided in the contract, of the income from the commercial utilization of the invention, improvement, or discovery patented." Some situations might be encountered where it would be impractical to determine or make a reasonable estimate of the income, gross or net, derived from commercial utilization. An example would be where the invention conceived under a research and development contract is used by the contractor as an integral part of the production of his commercial products. It might also be impractical to determine on a reasonable basis what part of the income could be attributed to the conception of a given device as opposed to its engineering development.

3. The income provisions of the bill would be made applicable only to contracts "hereafter awarded." Contracts for services and use of facilities for research and development may be in force for many years, subject to the availability of appropriations. It appears that where long-term contracts are already in existence, the contractors involved would be in a preferential position. It might, therefore, be appropriate to amend the language to cover these situations.

4. The bill does not include provisions for application to subcontracts, and clarification of this aspect seems desirable.

5. The proposed new subsection 35 U.S.C. 268(a) apparently would apply only to research and development contracts or the performance of any prior experimental, developmental, or research work done upon the understanding that a contract (whether or not a research and development contract) would be awarded. It would not seem to include a contract not considered to be primarily a research and development contract but which would have as one of its purposes experimental, research or development work, except in a case of performance of prior experimental, developmental, or research work done upon an understanding that a contract would be awarded. An appropriate amendment to clearly establish the intent is suggested.

6. Consideration might be given to the inclusion of a provision in the bill similar to 42 U.S.C. 2182 to provide full disclosure of any invention, improvement, or discovery conceived or actually reduced to practice in the performance of any research and development contract, etc.

7. Provisions with respect to the effect of an omission of the contract terms specified would seem desirable as an enforcement aid and to fix the validity of contracts not in conformance with the requirements.

8. The proposed requirements relating to the inclusion of specific provisions in Government contracts might be appropriately included under title 41 U.S.C. dealing expressly with "public contracts."

It is apparent there is a need for the establishment by Congress of basic policies for the determination of patent rights derived from Government research and development programs. Whether the policies should provide for retention by the Government of patent rights, or for the granting of those rights to contractors with royalty-free licenses for Government use in the manner provided by H.R. 5448 is a matter which is for determination by the Congress. However, we are of the opinion that thorough consideration of all the various aspects and divergent views concerning this matter is warranted before legislation is enacted establishing a general policy of retaining royalty-free licenses with waiver of such property rights as it might have or acquire in patents arising out of the prosecution of its many extensive research and development projects, as proposed by the bill.

It is suggested that, in lieu of establishing one uniform policy governing patent rights under research and development contracts, consideration might be given to legislation which would give recognition to the functions and problems peculiar to the activities of individual agencies, as well as the differences in the types of research and development being contracted for by the Government. Such legislation might appropriately set forth broad general policies, including basic principles, guidelines, and criteria, permitting a measure of flexibility in administration where circumstances so dictate, and might embrace some features of the present administrative practices and methods. We believe such legislation could give full regard to all considerations designed to serve and protect the national interest, the Government, and contractors. Legislation along these lines would facilitate improved methods and practices for administering and carrying out our extensive research and development programs and bring about a degree of standardization in the handling of patent rights, with substantial benefits to all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted to the House a bill, H.R. 11138, which I hope will provide some direction of a new approach in our relationship with Cuba.

H.R. 11138 was the product of my concern with the folly of automatically renewing the present Sugar Act in view of Mr. Castro's charges that this act was enslaving the Cuban people. Similar was my concern that if we eliminated Cuba from the Sugar Act we may be creating additional hardship for the Cuban people, which is not the desire of anyone in the United States.

H.R. 11138 would extend the present act for an additional 4 years when it expires on December 31, 1960. The renewal would, however, be amended with a flexibility permitting the President to adjust or eliminate the Cuban sugar

quota at any time during the life of the bill if he deemed it necessary to protect the national interest.

I feel we must adopt a realistic attitude in view of the new challenges presented to us by the irresponsible conduct and policies of Mr. Castro. Sugar quota and sugar price levels are vital factors in dealing with the Castro regime. I therefore feel that control with flexibility should be given to the President, who has the responsibility for dealing with foreign nations. I sincerely hope that the President never has cause to use this authorization. The bill authorizes the President to increase the quota of other sugar producers covered in the act pro rata in the event the Cuban quota must be decreased. Further, H.R. 11138 has a retroactive provision which would create this flexibility in that part of the present act which is unexpired.

Sugar accounts for 76 percent of total Cuban exports. Cuban sugar production accounts for roughly 20 percent of the total world production, and a little over 50 percent of this is sold to the United States.

Cuba, because of its natural advantages as a sugar producer, has a large excess capacity and must therefore regulate its own production. In addition to providing an assured market for over half of its annual production, the U.S. quota for Cuban sugar also allows Cuba to benefit from the higher U.S. price on the commodity. In 1958 this differential amounted to 1.91 per pound which gave a total premium to Cuba of \$132 million. In addition, Cuba enjoys a tariff preference of 12.5 cents per hundred pounds which in the same year provided a total additional return of \$9 million.

I believe that we have demonstrated great patience toward the outrageous accusations made by Mr. Castro against the United States. The United States has acted with dignity and maturity in this very difficult situation. I believe, however, that we must show our friends and those not so friendly that we can act with dignity, maturity, patience, and at the same time with firmness.

I do not believe that merely because we are a great and powerful Nation that we cannot possess a feeling of patriotic pride and self-respect. I do not feel that merely because we are strong and powerful we must constantly assume a bovine posture when some irresponsible leader of a smaller nation challenges our national integrity.

Because we are a great freedom-loving Nation we have greater responsibilities and obligations in the exercise of patience and understanding toward the less fortunate. This, however, should not be allowed to become the basic premise of every hostile planner seeking to undermine the prestige or power of the United States, for they interpret this as a hole in our armor rather than a virtue in our national character. We should not allow our enmity to become a greater advantage than our friendship.

We have secured liberty and maintained our freedom because American leadership was guided by a sense of

justice and an adherence to conscience. This should be our guiding principle to the new challenges of our times. The opinion of our enemies whether voiced directly or indirectly should never outweigh our own good sense of doing what we think is right.

Dependent on our sense of right is the real hope for freedom everywhere.

The Four Chaplains of the "Dorchester"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Passaic County American Legion presented a "Back to God" program honoring the four chaplains. I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the stirring speech delivered at that time by the Reverend William J. Hayes, O.F.M., pastor of Assumption Church, Wood Ridge.

Other speakers at the affair were Dave Sadewitz, Passaic County Legion commander; Mrs. Cecilia Johnson, Legion Auxiliary president; Walter Porter, Jr., State department vice president, and myself.

The Reverend Anthony J. O'Driscoll, O.F.M., county chaplain, offered the prayer of dedication; the Reverend George H. Talbot, D.D., First Presbyterian Church, Passaic, offered the invocation and Rabbi Eugene Markovitz, Clifton Jewish Community Center spiritual leader, the benediction.

Following is the speech of Reverend Hayes on February 28, 1960, in the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, Paterson:

This is the story of four brave chaplains and their men. Only God knows how their actions have affected and will affect the generations to come.

It was an Arctic night in 1943. The troopship *Dorchester*, filled to the hull with 900 American soldiers, was chugging through icy, broken slush toward Greenland. After a month at sea, the soldiers were not only weary at heart of the constant cold, but homesick and filled with foreboding about submarines that were following. On board were four chaplains: two Protestant ministers, Rev. George Fox and Clark Poling; a Jewish rabbi, Rev. Alexander Goode; and a Catholic priest, Father John Washington.

The chaplains did not know that this was to be the last night for the *Dorchester*. Neither did the soldiers. But according to their practice all this long month at sea, before the men retired, the chaplains tried to say something to each of them. It was nothing seemingly very important. Maybe a cheery good night. Or if a man were in a mood to talk about his children at home and show pictures, Rabbi Goode would sit down and listen to him, because he had four children of his own. The two ministers were warm and understanding about the throes of homesickness, too, for they had each left wives and children behind to make this long trip with the men on the *Dorchester*. Or if a man wanted to go to confession, he could go to Father John Washington even in the desolate and remote reaches of the Atlantic. The chaplains made the rounds as usual that

night, not knowing that out of every little gathering of three men to whom they gave counsel, two of those three would die. The chaplains said what their calling trained them to say—and well they did for out of every three on board two were going to meet their God sometime that night, side by side with the chaplains.

In one way or another, all of the men had been spoken to that night before the torpedo from a Nazi U-boat struck. Perhaps they did not hear words on religion itself. I do not know. But when the men saw the chaplains, even though the name of God was not spoken, they could not help but think of God. For these were men of God, who had given their lives to His service. Whenever they appeared on deck or in the oily-smelling cabins, a little of the peace they carried within them, some of their certitude entered into the hearts of the men.

Looking back on these men on the doomed ship, our first impulse is to pity them. Our hearts wrench at the thought of their last night on earth, thinking of them trying to sleep with the winds lashing the side of the old troopship. But if we try to see this last night in a broader perspective, if we try to remember that all of us have to get ready to face death, that no one is excused from that hard task from the greatest general down to the humblest cabin boy, we will see that these men on the *Dorchester* were not so utterly unfortunate after all. How many of you during the last month God gives you to live will see each day of that month four chaplains, walking in your midst, listening to your troubles, consoling you—not once a week, or once a month, or on some state occasion of a wedding or a funeral, but every day as a matter of common occurrence? Do you realize that each day that those men saw the chaplains, no matter what the topic of conversation was, they could not help but think of God? And think of God in His tranquility, His strength, His love for common man? Three of the chaplains had left wives and children and hearthside to bring this thought of God to embittered, questioning men. In his turn, Chaplain Washington had given up all expectancy of family life when he took his solemn vows so that he could be there, albeit unknowingly, with 600 men who at the end of that month were going to meet their Maker.

When soldiers saw these men of God, they were more willing to say "So be it" to the sacrifices they had to make in their own lives. And this was very important in the homesickness, deprivation, and questioning they had to suffer in their slow progress through dangerous waters of the north. Those who did not know how to pray when they went to sleep that night, who had never prayed perhaps in their whole lives, could not lie there long without a thought of one of the chaplains flickering through their minds—and, with that thought, a momentary thought of God who had called forth these men to represent Him—and perhaps it was that momentary thought of God before the torpedo struck that was all they needed to earn their passage into heaven that night. For this cause, the chaplains had left behind the comforts of home. And, because the men saw that the chaplains were men among men, they respected them—and respected the God they served. Yes, the *Dorchester* was old and small and smelling of oil—but because of four men who were aboard her that last month it was as though she contained four cathedrals, temples; and these were visited every day—because men did not have to come to the cathedrals—the cathedrals came to them in the person of Father Washington, Chaplains Fox and Poling, and Rabbi Goode.

When the torpedo struck after midnight that night, many died before boarding the lifeboats. The chaplains helped the men

board the boats that were not washed away and gave their lifejackets to those who had none. Of the 900 men on that boat, over 200 reached shore safely. The last they saw of the chaplains, they were standing arm in arm, knee deep in water, going down with the *Dorchester*. The men who had to die on that cold, Arctic night found the strength to die well from the chaplains. Somehow, we can still see the flare of moonlight that lit up the forms of those four men, standing together on the deck. Why? Is it their togetherness that haunts us, that makes us want to be kinder to our fellow man no matter who he is, knowing we all have a common Father in heaven?

Or is it that we are struck with the sense that here are four men who can say to God, "We have done the task You have given us to do. We have finished the work You have set before us. We, too, are now ready to meet You face to face—our work for our brother done."

The 600 men who died that night could have died at home, at the factory, on the highway—if God so willed. But by dying on the *Dorchester*, the whole history of their last month on earth had changed. If they had died on shore at work, would they have talked every day of their last month with four chaplains? It is the mercy of God that He takes each one of us when we have attained the greatest possible grace in our lives. It is very possible to believe that those men on the *Dorchester* attained greater grace through their daily contacts with the chaplains than they would if they had spent that month on land.

But no man need be less rich, less ready than those fortunate 600 men on the *Dorchester* with the many churches there are in every town and city of our land. We don't have to walk a slanting deck with a presentiment of a submarine following us to visit our churches. Even on a sunny day, when everything is going fine, God likes to have someone drop into the quiet of a church and thank Him for the blessings he has received.

The choppy, uncertain waters around the *Dorchester* are no different than the uncertainties of hydrogen bomb warfare that strike a chill at the heart of man in the cities. Like the men in the *Dorchester*, the only way we can meet the challenges and tensions of the present day is to spend a part of every day thinking of God. We don't know who the four men are who wore the lifejackets of the four chaplains of the *Dorchester*—but in a sense, the chaplains flung those lifejackets to us—to you and to me—to wear to safety in the choppy waters of today's tensions. We must wear them well, knowing from whom we have received them. And wearing them, we must not neglect to put our arm around our fellowman, no matter who he be, in understanding brotherhood, with compassion and forbearance. And why? Because God, our common Father, measures our stature in the next world by the measure of love we have given to our fellow man in need, whether that need be great or small. America was founded upon the principle of brotherhood and upon a strong, personal love for Almighty God, who has given us not only our first hour on earth but also, with all its trials and tremendous potentialities for sanctity, our last hour on earth. Not everyone's last hour will come as suddenly upon him as it did upon the soldiers and four chaplains upon the *Dorchester*. Searching as we have the hearts and the vocations of the four chaplains, we have a comforting conviction that no matter how sudden that hour was for the soldiers aboard, they were spiritually prepared. Perhaps this is the lesson of the four chaplains; the indelible words written upon the lifejackets they have tossed across the seas to modern, fear-ridden men: "God awaits you. Be prepared."

**Statement by G. Russell Clark, New York
State Superintendent of Banks**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement by G. Russell Clark, New York State superintendent of banks, before the joint legislative committee to revise the banking law, senate chamber, Albany, N.Y., on February 25, 1960:

**STATEMENT BY G. RUSSELL CLARK, NEW YORK
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF BANKS**

My name is G. Russell Clark; I am superintendent of banks of the State of New York. I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before the members of the joint legislative committee to revise the banking law to state my views on the various proposals, presently being considered by your committee, regarding the banking structure of this State.

The bills being considered by your committee deal with problems that have been pending for at least 5 years. There have been many attempts made to deal with these problems and many solutions suggested. No solution, however, has as yet been achieved. Last summer, in the hope that it might be possible to obtain some basis of agreement between the various segments of the banking industry of this State, the members of your committee and I conducted a series of informal meetings throughout the State to solicit the views of representatives of all segments of the banking industry of this State. Not one iota of progress, however, was made in regard to obtaining some basis of common agreement between the various components of the industry. It is my sincere belief that the failure to achieve agreement may be attributed primarily to the selfish economic desires and ambitions of many of the participants at the meetings.

At these meetings your chairman, Senator John Cooke and, upon other occasions, the majority leader of the senate, Walter Mahoney, and other members of both the senate and the assembly, stated unequivocally that if some agreement could not be obtained among the various segments of the banking industry, it would then become incumbent upon the members of the legislature to pass a bill which would effect the long-range solution to our problems, a bill which would be fair, a bill which would not give each segment of the industry everything it wanted, but above all, a bill which would be in the public interest and to the long-range economic benefit of the State of New York and of its people.

I am certain that you have heard in the past, and will hear today, many arguments, but when these are analyzed, they have one common genesis, namely, the fear that any change in the present banking structure of this State will result in reduced profits or put an end to ambitions or facts of dominance in a particular community. I believe that your committee will not be misled by such arguments but rather will consider whether any proposed change will benefit the public and the long-range economic interests of our State. If we assume that the economy of the State of New York is going to become moribund, then there is no need to consider any change in our banking structure. If we assume that the public will not benefit from increased competition or a wider choice of

banking facilities, there should be no change in the banking structure. If we assume that any alteration in the law in regard to holding companies and branch banking will inevitably result in diminution of services presently enjoyed by the public, then I repeat there should be no change in our banking structure. And lastly, if by our actions we are content to allow this great State of New York, the leading banking State in the country, containing the greatest financial center of the world, to become a follower, instead of its traditional role of banking leader, then it seems to me that we have failed to face up to our responsibilities to the people of the State.

I do not intend to take this committee's time by discussing all the bills now before you. Instead, I wish to indicated my unequivocal support of one of these bills, Senate Introductory No. 3503, which, I believe, will lead to increased competition and afford the public wider choice of banking facilities without denying to the public any of the services of which they now receive the benefit—a result which is in the interest of the people of this State and will aid the long-range expansion of the economy of this State.

First, Senate Introductory No. 3503 permits the formation of holding companies in this State, but provides that no holding company may cross traditional district lines without the approval of the banking board. In considering such an application, the banking board is required to follow the definitive criteria specified in the bill. This proposal is consistent with the views expressed by the New York State Bankers Association through its executive committee.

Second, this bill would put an end to the statutory monopoly now granted to the one large holding company in this State. In meetings last summer, I was most impressed by the favorable comments of many of the independent bankers who are in competition with subsidiaries of the one statewide holding company in New York. Based upon their experience, I think it is safe to assume that the competition afforded to the independent banks by holding companies, unequivocally demonstrates that the independent banker should have nothing to fear from the formation and expansion of other holding companies. Indeed, the proposed bill contains sufficient safeguards in the criteria which must be considered by the banking board which will serve to prevent the commercial banks from being swallowed up by a few large holding companies. In addition, any holding company formation and expansion will be subject to the further approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and will at all times be subject to the standards of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, as enforced by the Department of Justice. Consequently, dominance over commercial banking in this State by a few of the larger institutions in New York City cannot be achieved.

Moreover, from the supervisory standpoint, holding companies are often desirable. There are many instances in which a small independent bank may be inefficiently operated or may not be in a position to offer comprehensive service or in which, although efficiently operated, there may be an inability to raise sufficient capital, or a problem of management succession, which has unfortunately, and to the great detriment of independent banking, been the motivating factor in altogether too many mergers in recent years. Acquisition of the stock of such banks by a holding company has often achieved an eminently desirable consequence for the people in the community in which such bank is located. In addition, in certain areas of the State such as Nassau County and the Buffalo area, formation of bank holding companies should help to reduce the problem of an undue concentration of commercial banking assets by affording the pub-

lic the benefits of more stringent competition. Another consideration of many who advocate statewide holding companies is the opportunity for the large stockholders and executive officers to have their bank acquired by a holding company which acquisition will result, perhaps, in increased salaries, broader pension benefits, and increased marketability of the stock acquired as the result of such acquisition. I, however, assessed no importance to this in reaching my conclusions.

I firmly believe, however, that the principal argument in favor of permitting the formation and expansion of statewide holding companies, subject to the safeguards and criteria contained in the bill I am supporting, is that it can both be geared to, and become a motivating force in, the expansion of the economy of our State. The services which can be offered by banking subsidiaries of holding companies, both qualitatively and quantitatively, cannot help but be in the public interest. If comprehensive services are being offered by an independent bank, it should have nothing to fear from competition from a subsidiary of a bank holding company. If adequate services are not now being offered, this competition will at least insure that such services will become available. In addition, not one unit bank will be forced to sell but will be able to continue in business under the umbrella of the statutory monopoly now granted to it by law.

As I stated, I do not intend to discuss the other bills before this committee, but I would like to briefly mention that another suggestion is to let the freeze expire and to do nothing further. The danger in this is that all control over holding company expansion in New York State would then be in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington. While I am certain that they would perform their responsibilities conscientiously, we should attempt to retain some power over decisions regarding holding company expansion in this State within the hands of New York State officials who are in the best position to know local conditions and evaluate banking and economic circumstances within the State, even though Federal Reserve approval would still be required. In addition, an increased centralization of powers over activities of commercial banks and holding companies in Washington, together with an absence of power in New York, will inevitably lead to an end to the dual banking system. As to another alternative—continuing the freeze—I have grave doubts about the constitutionality of any protracted freeze, be it indefinitely or on a year-to-year basis for any great length of time in the future where the effect is to grant a statutory monopoly to the one statewide holding company.

There have also been other bills submitted, two of which would make no changes in branch powers of either commercial or savings institutions. It would not be desirable to permit holding company expansion while blocking any change in branch banking laws. For reasons I will discuss, it seems to me that the public interest requires a broadening of branch powers of savings institutions and of New York City commercial banks. These changes should, in my opinion, be made together with changes in the holding company law.

Turning now to the branching provisions of this bill, it would permit New York City commercial banks to branch either by merger or by de novo branches into counties with over 700,000 population adjoining New York City, meaning Nassau and Westchester, while banks in these two counties could branch into New York.

What would these changes in the banking law mean for the businessman and the general public? First, wider branch powers for New York City commercial banks will serve to enhance competition in the highly

populated suburban communities around New York. I would call your attention to the results of a recent study financed by the Nassau-Suffolk Financial Council which indicated that rates on both short-term business loans and business installment loans were lower at New York City commercial banks than on Long Island. I attribute this to the high degree of competition which exists within New York City, a degree of competition which can and should be extended to these newer areas, thereby reducing borrowing costs for the small businessman and borrower. In fact, the study that I have just cited indicates that rates are also lower at New York City banks for home improvement, personal installment, and automobile loans. Thus, the consumer who wishes to obtain a loan for improvement of his home or for various types of consumer needs would thereby be able to obtain such loans at lower cost from branches of New York City banks located in the suburbs. Second, wider branch powers would broaden the degree of choice which the public may exercise as regards the institutions in which it wishes to place its funds.

You may possibly hear other witnesses today who will deny that loan rates are any lower at New York City banks. Such a denial, if made, would indeed be strange since the facts I have cited come from a study financed not by the New York City commercial or savings banks, but by Long Island institutions themselves. Other studies have also shown that loan rates are lower in New York City. Perhaps it will be argued, however, that even though rates are higher on Long Island, this is more than offset by the fact that local banks are willing and able to make types of loans, particularly to small business, that New York City banks would not make. If this is the case, I would suggest that the local banks need not be concerned about the entry of the New York City institutions. If the New York City banks fail to provide the needed or required services, it stands to reason that they will not have much success in obtaining the banking loyalty of the residents of those areas. Again, I say, let competition determine where the patronage of the public will be directed. Such competition can only lead to better and more efficient services and to more competitive rates, which will redound to the public's advantage.

In addition, the efficiently operated independent bank should have nothing to fear since home office protection is not only maintained but strengthened. As a practical matter, the New York City banks are not going to be able to open branches all over Long Island or Westchester, nor will they be able to enter any city or village where a Long Island or Westchester bank has a principal office. What do these banks have to fear? If they are doing the job as efficiently as possible, why should they be afraid of competition? No one is forcing them to become part of a holding company or to merge. Perhaps a few banks are not doing the job they should. If so, those banks which are unable to compete or, as may more probably be the case, will not desire to compete, can either merge with other local banks, with New York City banks or become part of a holding company.

Nor do I place great credence in the fears of stockholders of such banks that their stock will be less valuable if New York City banks are permitted to branch into Westchester or Nassau. On the contrary, it seems to me that there will be extensive bidding for the shares of those banks which do not wish to remain independent or cannot compete, and I expect that one of my principal supervisory problems will be to insure that the premiums paid for the stock are not unreasonably high. Indeed, it was for this reason that the department has not been

completely in favor of permitting mergers between New York City banks and those in Westchester nor Nassau. However, the department has conferred with the comptroller of the currency and agrees, under existing law, that in the event of a merger in which a national bank is the receiving bank, it may continue to operate any branch in any area in which a branch could be lawfully operated by a State bank with its principal office in the same place as the receiving national bank, regardless of whether State banks similarly located could merge. As a result, we are of the opinion that State banks and trust companies, so located, must be permitted to merge in order not to place them at a competitive disadvantage relative to national banks.

Another factor deserves emphasis. Before a branch can be obtained by a State-chartered institution, it must indicate to the complete satisfaction of the department and the banking board that such a branch will further the public convenience and advantage in the area proposed, that it has a reasonable assurance of successful operation within a relatively short time, and that the impact on nearby institutions will not be adverse. The burden of such proof is upon the applying bank. The department carefully evaluates the evidence presented, analyzes the area concerned, and considers all possible aspects before coming to a decision. A favorable decision is further subject to review by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Similar investigations are made by the comptroller of the currency in the case of national banks. Let me assure you, as well as all bankers, that the stringent standards and criteria which we have developed over the years will continue to be applied, and that changes in the banking law to permit wider branch powers will not be allowed to result in a disorderly creation of new branch offices. Each such application will be carefully analyzed in light of the above-mentioned criteria before any new branches are authorized.

In regard to branch powers for savings banks, the bill proposed permits New York City savings banks to branch anywhere in New York City, thereby enabling them to expand into parts of the city which can and should be serviced by branches of savings banks. This bill would also permit New York City savings banks to have no more than one branch each in Nassau County. There is now only one savings bank in Nassau, and I can see no valid reason why the people of that county should not have access to and be served by other such institutions. New York City savings banks would, however, be barred from Westchester, where there are now 11 savings banks. Based upon the present population of that county, I believe that it is being adequately served by the local savings banks now in existence there. Upstate, the only new branch power granted to savings banks is for those located in Rochester, Syracuse, and Buffalo, all major urban communities. Even then, this additional branch power is limited to one branch within 5 miles of the city limits. State savings and loan associations are also given additional branch privileges, for the most part restricted to the city or village in which their principal office is located. What, then, do the upstate commercial bankers have to fear? It has been argued that to permit the expansion of savings institutions or New York City commercial banks into suburban areas would harm existing institutions. This emotion-laden claim is simply not supported by evidence or by dispassionate analysis. Let me point out, as regards the competitive impact of savings banks, that in all 59 communities in New York State in which there are savings banks, commercial banks today exist and prosper side by side with them. But, some may say, in these cases they have grown together over many years, while the

presently proposed changes in branch powers would suddenly upset the banking picture in these communities. My reply to this would be, first, the expansion that is being proposed is into suburban areas which are rapidly growing. In such communities, I do not believe that anyone would be hurt by branch expansion. On the contrary, competition would be enhanced and all types of financial institutions would share in the growth of these areas. Second, as already indicated, branch applications would have to meet the approval of the superintendent and the banking board, and I have yet to hear of any banker in this State complaining that the banking department was too lax in its branch approvals. I am convinced that no superintendent of banks and no member of the banking board would approve of any such branch request where there was any danger of harm to the continued well-being of existing banks.

Furthermore, to those who are concerned about the dangers to smaller, independent banks from the competition of larger commercial banks, again let me stress that branches would continue to be barred from communities where the head office of a commercial bank is located. In addition, we have made studies of the question as to whether a small independent bank can compete effectively against branches of larger institutions, having recently completed a study of postwar mergers involving situations in which a chain bank absorbed one of the small banks in a local community, leaving one or more other small independent banks. We sought to determine whether the remaining independent bank in that community was placed at such a competitive disadvantage as to adversely affect its present or future prospects. We found conclusively that in the great majority of cases, neither the growth nor the earnings of the remaining independent bank was adversely affected by competition from the large chain bank. In other words, our studies indicated that the small independent bank is usually able to compete effectively against the branch of a large institution. Furthermore, several years ago the Comptroller of the Currency made a similar analysis on a nationwide basis and arrived at similar conclusions which were publicly reported. In view of these findings, I suggest that some of the fears frequently expressed that small banks cannot compete effectively against large chain banks are simply not supported by the available evidence.

I think it bears mentioning in this connection that my two predecessors as superintendents of banks of New York State—men representing both political parties—favored wider branch powers in highly populated suburban areas as being in the public interest. I would ask those who fear the effects of such legislation to consider whether three superintendents of banks, including myself, would favor such legislation if its effect could really be expected to harm our existing institutions, either small or large.

Another major argument is that before any changes in the branch banking laws for mutual savings institutions should be permitted, they must first be subjected to Federal income tax treatment similar to that of commercial banks. Until this occurs, it is maintained, they should not be permitted any broader branch powers. This argument implies two things which I do not believe are supported by careful analysis. First, it means that changes which may be desirable from the standpoint of the people of this State should not be permitted until the U.S. Congress makes changes in tax laws. It does not seem to me that State policy can properly be forced to wait upon actions by the Congress, actions which may or may not occur in the near future. Furthermore, suppose that Congress does alter the tax laws with regard to mutual institutions, but not

to the extent that many commercial bankers favor. What then? Is the Legislature of New York State to have its hands tied until the tax laws are made to coincide with the wishes of certain elements in the banking industry? It would seem to me that the question answers itself. If a policy of wider branch powers is in the public interest, this is so regardless of the status of the Federal income tax laws.

Further, for many commercial banks whose improvements in earnings in recent years warrant and permit the paying of rates more competitive with those now paid by mutual savings institutions, they are held back by the existing ceiling of the Federal Reserve Board. Here is another instance where I do not believe it is justifiable to ask the State legislature not to make any changes in State branch laws which are necessary and desirable, while we await the actions of a Federal agency.

Second, this tax argument tends to sell short the vigor of our commercial banking system by implying that they would be unable to meet effectively the competition for savings without tax law changes. It disregards the advantages which commercial banks have over all other type of institutions in being able to offer one-stop banking service, a literal department store of banking in which every conceivable type of service may be offered. I might say that the commercial banks have become increasingly astute in their advertising of this to the public, and, as they continue to do so, they should become increasingly successful in attracting savings deposits, even though they may not be able to match the rates paid by other types of savings institutions.

Finally, let me stress that we are operating today under both a dual commercial banking system as well as a dual savings system. Even if the commercial bankers who are afraid of the competition which may be offered by mutual thrift institutions were able to prevent additional branching for savings banks and State savings and loan associations, they could not prevent the formation and expansion of Federal savings and loan associations. I personally believe that the public will place their thrift deposits in whatever institution pays the highest rate and affords the traditional safety through insurance. When people in other parts of the State are receiving higher interest rates, those who are not will also want to receive those rates. All that the opponents of additional branch powers for State savings institutions are achieving is the rapid placement of the savings of the people of this State in the hands of Federal institutions. To illustrate, since 1951, there have been 14 savings and loan associations in New York State which have converted from State charter to Federal charter. Ten years ago, about 46 percent of the assets of all savings and loan associations in New York State were under State supervision. Today, that percentage has declined to 36 percent. Why has this happened? Largely because the Federal Home Loan Bank Board refuses to follow State policy in regard to branch privileges for Federal savings and loan associations, because they consider the State law to be unrealistic. The home loan bank board, despite repeated requests of your banking department for the exercise of moderation in granting branches to Federal associations in areas where New York State laws prohibit State-chartered associations to establish branches, has continued to authorize such branches. This ridiculous situation is further compounded when spokesmen for Federal associations protest against the right of the State to prescribe the rules of the game under which State associations must operate, preferring that the State laws not be changed, thereby giving Federal associations a competitive advantage over State-chartered associations. It should also be noted that serious proposals have been made

to authorize Federal charters for savings banks, a step which could remove these institutions from State supervision.

It can be argued that savings banks and savings and loan associations should be given even wider branch powers. However, we must be realists. Savings banks and savings and loan associations cannot be granted the full branching powers which not they, but the people of this State who are deprived of their choice of institutions in which to place their thrift deposits, deserve. Not everyone can get all he wants. And let me add that because he gets less this year, does not mean that he can expect to get a little more next year and the year after and the year after. We are here today, hopefully, to discuss the merits of a bill which will endure for years to come. I have heard the argument that to grant a little this year will be to grant a little more the following year. Such an argument is an insult to the members of this committee, who have, in good faith, stated that it was their intention to propose a bill that would endure, not a temporary expedient for the year 1960. I believe that if this bill is enacted, there should be no change in the banking structure of this State for quite a few years. There should be a respite from the controversy and bitterness which has permeated the air in the last few years. This should provide ample time for those opponents of additional branch banking powers for savings institutions of this State to reassess their function in the economy of our State, and, I hope, to come to the conclusion that the best interests of the public should at all times be served and then to decide on new ways to serve the public. At the same time, the savings institutions of this State would do well also to reassess their function and not try to become commercial banks, but work rather to fulfill the needs of the people of this State. I might add the State has a duty to see that such needs are fulfilled without the imposition of provincial or arbitrary barriers.

If we look at this from a long-range point of view, it is essential that the power and authority of the New York State Legislature in the banking field not be eroded. I am certain that the legislature does not wish, nor do I wish, to preside over the liquidation of State authority in the banking field, yet this may well be the longrun result unless we attempt to keep our banking law up to date and consistent with changing economic circumstances. I believe that the bill I have been discussing would adequately meet these objectives. There are more than adequate legal and administrative safeguards surrounding such expansion to eliminate any fears that destructive or unwholesome competition might result, to the detriment of any existing institutions. And most importantly, it is my sincere belief that the furtherance of the public interest would be enhanced by a broadening of branch powers and by State control over holding company expansion by increasing both quantitatively and qualitatively the services being offered and by reducing costs to the public.

Thank you.

Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTERS and his great Committee on Un-

American Activities should receive the gratitude of every real Christian. In exposing the antichrist forces of communism and how they operate this committee is rendering outstanding service to the cause of Christianity.

The following article by David Lawrence is timely and worthy of our earnest attention:

TESTIMONY ON MANUAL RELEASED—AF PASSES ON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, RIGHT TO KNOW BACKED AT HEARING

(By David Lawrence)

Are the American people getting a fair report on what the Air Force Reserve training manual said about the "people's right to know" and about communistic activity in the churches? Many Members of Congress think not.

The best way perhaps to give the viewpoint of those Members of Congress is to present some of the testimony, originally heard in executive session, when the Air Force Secretary, Dudley C. Sharp, testified. This now has been released for publication.

First of all, it's necessary to read in full text the paragraphs in the Air Force manual dealing with the "right to know" controversy. Here they are:

"When a newspaper prints some so-called secret data, it merely means the Government no longer considers that particular data secret—it does not mean we have no secrets left. Or it could mean that clever newsmen took pieces of unclassified information which they were authorized to have, put them together and came up with the right answer. However, because such accounts may have given the correct information does not mean that the information is no longer classified. Newspapers are not official—and until the Government declassifies security information, it remains classified."

"Another rather foolish remark often heard is that Americans have a right to know what's going on. Most people realize the foolhardiness of such a suggestion. If a football team should start telling the other side the plays it planned to use, their opponents would sweep them off the field. It's the same in war—hot or cold; if we tell our secrets, we are likely to be beaten, and beaten badly."

Immediately after this quotation in the printed testimony there occurs this exchange between Richard Arends, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Sharp:

"Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Secretary, the whole import of that language is that the military is entitled to protect secrets, is it not?"

"Secretary SHARP. Yes, I would think so, sir."

"Mr. ARENDS. It is not intended, as you read the two paragraphs in entire context, to convey the impression that the American people as such are not entitled to know in general what is going on; isn't that correct?"

"Secretary SHARP. That certainly is correct; yes, sir."

At another point in the same executive session, Mr. Arends took up the section dealing with Communist infiltration in the churches and read again from the manual which declared that the Communist Party in this country had instructed many of its members to infiltrate the churches. The manual had made this comment:

"Again, to stop Communists we must be careful not to attack the majority of faithful ministers and churchgoers. We must merely search out those who back Moscow right down the line."

Mr. Arends said to the committee: "In view of the Secretary's repudiation of the information conveyed respecting the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, the chairman (Representative

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania) issued a statement to the effect that the leadership of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America had hundreds, or at least over one hundred, affiliations with Communist fronts and causes. Since then we have made careful, but yet incomplete checks, and it is a complete understatement.

"Thus far of the leadership of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, we have found over 100 persons in leadership capacity with either Communist-front records or records of service to Communist causes. The aggregate of affiliations of the leadership, instead of being in the hundreds as the chairman first indicated, is now, according to our latest count, into the thousands, and we have yet to complete our check, which would certainly suggest, on the basis of the authoritative sources of this committee, that the statement that there is infiltration of fellow travelers in churches and educational institutions is a complete understatement."

Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican of California, a member of the same committee, charged that some newspapers last Friday twisted the words of Cardinal Spellman, of New York into a defense of those who had criticized the Air Force manual. The cardinal, in his statement referring to protestant chaplains with whom he was associated in wartime, said he would "deplore it if any unfair deductions from general accusations were interpreted to reflect in any way on their loyalty to our country or on the loyalty of the general body of ministers whom they represent."

Representative JACKSON called Cardinal Spellman's attention to the misinterpretation of his statement as a defense of those who had criticized the Air Force manual. He received from Cardinal Spellman a telegram in reply which said:

"I cannot understand how some of the press distorted my statement. I respect the fact that Congressman WALTER, you and other members of your committee have rendered outstanding service in exposing Communist activities."

It is indeed on the whole an unfortunate controversy, and maybe the clergymen who aired it publicly in the first place would have been better advised if they had written privately to the Defense Department and called attention to ambiguous paragraphs or to those which might better have been omitted.

Peace on Earth Controlled From Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the consideration of all Members the excellent article on why space is important militarily.

I can suggest, herein are excellent answers to those who say we have no business in space.

The article follows:

[From Space Digest, March 1960]

PEACE ON EARTH CONTROLLED FROM SPACE

(By James H. Straubel)

"The far side of the earth—the not the far side of the moon—represents the immediate and appalling threat to peace and freedom . . . the threat of surprise attack.

"Only in space—with our new line of sight—can we employ an electronic alarm system."

In these waking hours of the space age we are fascinated with the new worlds that emerge out of the morning mist.

We plunge into the outer regions—into the unknown—while at our feet is a world that revolves around an axis of age-old problems.

It is a world where people reach high levels of technical achievement, while remaining crude in their relations with one another; of people who seek peace with freedom, but cannot prosper without enforcing rules for law and order.

In our conquest of space, our first goal must be peace with freedom—through control—on planet earth.

The great reaches of the universe offer—not only new worlds to conquer—but a new line of sight to scan the earth as never before.

Space flight has opened the door to a revolutionary era in electronics and communications. That is the first great discovery of the space age.

As a result, space becomes more than a propaganda medium for exploring national prestige—more than a wilderness to explore for exploration's sake—more than a new arena for military operations.

The so-called space race with Russia—more of an Olympics than a race—is a scientific crusade for military, political, cultural, and economic objectives.

To date in the electronic revolution, the marriage of human intelligence and mechanical brains has produced an offspring made for terror and destruction. This first-born—the big ballistic missile—is as yet the only consistent user of space.

What of the countless manmade objects that will use space in the months and years to come?

Here we find the great challenge: To use space in the pursuit of goals that will benefit—rather than destroy—all of mankind.

These are goals to be pursued with both hard realism and shining vision.

Man's natural desire to explore the heavens must not compromise his fundamental responsibility to insure the survival of his species on earth.

Shooting for the moon—like disarmament—must be a means to an end—not an end in itself. It cannot be pursued at the expense of shooting for information on the other side of our own planet.

The far side of the earth—not the far side of the moon—represents the immediate and appalling threat to peace and freedom.

It is the threat of surprise attack.

Our earthbound and airbound methods for detecting surprise attack must be continued and improved—but at best these are only expedients. We continue to live under the gun.

Only in space—with our new line of sight—can we employ an electronic alarm system to effectively warn against surprise attack.

The job can be done with our present knowledge of electronics—and with our present rockets and boosters. We need not wait. The job can be done.

In recent weeks the space warning mission has been given new support by Government leaders—support that is late but welcome.

Still to come is a broad space program leading to "controlled peace."

This program would center in advanced space systems for warning, reconnaissance, and communications, backed by a strategic attack system kept modernized at all times.

A space-borne warning patrol would greatly strengthen our ability to deter aggression. However, it could play an even greater role.

It could lead to the establishment of a global warning network for all nations, with international direction and participation.

Our strategic attack system—alerted by space warning—would be prepared for fast and commanding action against would-be breakers of the peace.

The next step could well be the pooling of the world's strategic attack forces into an international enforcement agency, geared to the global warning network, directed by the United Nations.

With all the world alerted against aggressive action, the need for huge national attack forces would deteriorate, and voluntary reduction of armaments would be encouraged.

In reducing the threat of surprise attack, the program could eventually justify the curtailment of arms to minimum levels.

This is the great utilitarian mission to be found in space.

We must—while we explore the moon—give this broader mission our highest priority—and full public support.

In the new world of the Space Age, "controlled peace" must be our legacy to future generations.

Non-Service-Connected Pension Legislation Program of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the national junior vice commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Mr. George M. Leary, in his capacity as chairman of the national legislative committee, has outlined legislative objectives of that organization and his report follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE M. LEARY, NATIONAL JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER AND CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1960, REGARDING THE NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, may I preface my remarks by giving you a little of my personal background. I am a veteran of World War I, having enlisted April 25, 1916, serving on the Mexican Border and in Mexico; then later in France in the American Expeditionary Forces with the 26th Infantry Division, 103d Infantry. I was gassed and wounded in action.

I am a charter member of the American Legion, in which organization I have held many elective and appointive offices, including membership on the important National Rehabilitation Committee.

I am also a charter member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Yankee Division Association.

I am presently the National Junior Vice Commander of the Veterans of World War I.

As a service-connected disabled veteran, I believe that my experience in veterans' organizations, and in the service, qualifies me to speak for the veteran of World War I.

The justification for a separate and liberalized pension for the veteran of World War I goes back to the days of the early

history of our country, when George Washington, in his Farewell Address, said:

"We hold that the legislature has the right to pass such laws as those here in question upon the theory that it is not, indeed, consistent with reason or justice, to expect that one set of men should make a sacrifice of property, domestic ease and happiness, encounter the rigors of the field, the perils and vicissitudes of war, to obtain those blessings which every citizen will enjoy, in common with them, without some adequate compensation. It must also be a comfortless reflection to any man, that after he may have contributed to securing the rights of his country at the risk of his life and the ruin of his fortune, there would be no provision made to prevent himself from sinking into indigence and wretchedness in his old age."

May I refresh your memory with a few statistics. The total enlisted or inducted men in World War I was 4,791,000, of which number, and in accordance with the best statistics available, 3 percent served less than 90 days, leaving approximately 4,648,000 who served more than 90 days during World War I. Of this number, 118,000 were killed in action. From statistics compiled by the Veterans' Administration, there are an estimated 2,749,000 living today. Breaking this figure down in age groups, their report shows 8,887 between the ages of 50 and 59; 987,617 between the ages of 60 and 64; 1,268,811 between the ages of 65 and 69; 438,380 between the ages of 70 and 74; 35,146 between the ages of 75 and 79; 8,901 between the ages of 80 and 84; 1,200 between the ages of 85 and 89; and 64 between the ages of 90 and 94. Their report further shows that there will be one man living in 1996.

It has been estimated by reliable statistics that these men are now dying at the approximate rate of 120,000 per year. We may assume for all practical purposes that the above figures are estimates only, and that there are alive today approximately 2,500,000 veterans of World War I, and taking the 3 percent, or 75,000, from that number, we find 2,425,000 who served more than 90 days. From that figure, we must take the approximate 300,000 figure of service-connected cases who would not come under the provisions of this bill, leaving a figure of 2,125,000. From this figure, we must consider that there are now approximately 800,000 receiving a non-service-connected disability pension in the amount of \$66.15, or \$78.75, depending on the age and degree of disability. Therefore, based on our research and the best statistics available, we find only the approximate figure of 1,250,000 veterans of World War I who would benefit were our bill H.R. 9336 to be enacted into law, from which it can be seen that the payment of a pension to a veteran of World War I, in accordance with the provisions of our bill, is not the major problem as would appear from casual study, nor does the cost of payment reach the astronomical figures that some reports indicate.

We must also, at the present date, take the statistics which are available which show that the following number of non-service-connected veterans, and as quoted in the recent Veterans' Administration Annual Report, are on the rolls in the amount of \$66.15 per month, and the additional number herein quoted are on the rolls at the present date in the amount of \$78.75, which we must evaluate as not to be included in the total cost estimates at \$100 per month for this group of pensioners.

From a study of all available documents which we have been able to find with reference to the old World War I veterans of today, it is our firm belief that if this legislation as now before your committee, were to become law, it would affect not more than 1,250,000 veterans who would meet the requirements contained in this bill, in accordance with title 38, United States Code.

We must at this time lend our thinking to the period in which the men of World War I rendered their service in defense of the Nation. Unlike our comrades of World War II and Korea, medical and service records were not considered important. They were not complete and accurate, leaving many thousands of veterans of World War I unable to establish service-connected disabilities upon application for disability allowances, notwithstanding the fact that many rating boards throughout the country were established to determine these cases, and study shows many unjust and doubtful decisions were adopted which became quite detrimental to this group of worthy veterans. The fact that this condition exists and is recognized is confirmed by the fact that the chairman of this great committee has seen fit to introduce legislation to create a separate court with jurisdiction over all such disputed claims.

We must remember that the veteran of World War I, when he returned from service, barely had time to establish himself when the great depression hit this country, which further left such an impact on their lives that they have never entirely recovered, and after a few short years, World War II began. Then the veteran of World War I took the leadership in the enactment of legislation known as the GI bill of rights, which made it possible for his sons, daughters, and grandchildren to reestablish themselves, on their return from service, to their rightful places in their communities without the great sacrifices experienced by the veteran of World War I, and in so doing, self was forgotten and only in recent years has the veteran of World War I come to the realization that he put his efforts in the interests of his later comrade to find, because of lack of experience and knowledge as to the workings and the needs of the veteran of World War I, the veteran of World War I had become the "forgotten man." We are the martyred generation of veterans.

In this connection I wish to refer briefly to the effect of social security legislation and payments provided under this law. The veterans of World War I had little time, due to the depression, to build up a sizable account under the social security law. As a matter of fact, the first deductions made under this law were as of January 1, 1937, and a large group of veterans of World War I who were engaged in the pursuit of agriculture were not covered until 1955; likewise the self-employed.

Think, if you please, what the legislation you now have pending before you would do to the economy of America in relieving local, State, city, town, and governmental agencies of the responsibility for providing relief to the men and their families for whom we are now asking your most sincere consideration, and who are in that age group in which the President, in his creation of the Commission on the Aged, said to the Congress that the time has come when we must begin to consider the aging citizen of America.

You must further realize that if these men were in receipt of a pension free of conditions, the impact it would have on their everyday life, because it would make them feel that they were able to stand out in their own communities as economically free Americans.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, I know and I feel, as a taxpaying citizen, that you, in your deliberations in your executive sessions, will trend your thinking back to fit the era in which these men fought the first great World War to make the world safe for democracy, and did just that, and served in the hope that they had fought the war to end all wars. We ask that you, the members of this committee, and your colleagues of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, will write in

the history of America that you, too, showed by your actions that you believe, as did our Founding Fathers, that we must never forget those who bore the battle, and that our pension bill will be favorably reported to the House for consideration of the Members of the Congress.

On behalf of the national membership of our organization, the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, I thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Address by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, Before New York State Waterways Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on February 19, of this year, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] made an address before the New York State Waterways Association in New York City. In that speech, which I think is worthy of the attention of every Member of the Senate—and I think we ought to keep in mind that the Senator from Oklahoma is chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources—the distinguished Senator had the following to say:

The Nation as a whole will require 2½ times as much municipal water in 1980 as we used 5 years ago. The six major water-using industries will use 3½ times more water in 1980 than they were using in 1954. The electric power generating facilities will require 4½ times as much water for cooling purposes.

Water is more than a natural resource. It is a necessity of life. It is the priceless ingredient for continuing increase in population and growth in industrial and agricultural production. The necessities and uses of water in modern society are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1960

I was happy when your fine president, Mr. David A. Wright, invited me to address you. I am especially honored to have a part in your program as you observe your 50th anniversary.

New York City and State have always possessed a strange fascination for me. I am thrilled each time I visit this city, the greatest upon the earth.

New York City is not only the largest center of population in the world; it is more than that. It is a symbol of progress, of the most powerful of all nations. The heartbeat and pulse of American industry, trade and commerce, growth and development, are here in this wonderful metropolis. All America shares your pride in this city and all America has a part in your success.

We, out in the middle prairies—all of the people between the two great mountain ranges, and those beyond the rugged western Rockies—have an interest in your further progress and development.

We see the mystic beauty of your skyline, unequaled in the realm of architecture; the sweep of your harbors; fleets of commerce sailing from every corner of the seven seas; the hum of your industries, unparalleled in the annals of time. All of these we have seen and heard. We have felt that this is a picture, not only of your progress but also of the Nation's development, of the strength of all the people, North, East, South and West. For truly, New York City is an expression of the production that takes place throughout the Nation and around the world.

And your city is but a part of the great Empire State. One of the countless assets of your State and one of its greatest is a man of rugged character and manner, and of tremendous ability and vision—Robert Moses.

I wish we had one such human dynamo and leader in each of the 50 States. It has been my privilege to watch and feel his drive, not only in connection with the St. Lawrence power project, but also the Niagara power project as well. I led the fight to give the State of New York the right to build the Niagara hydroelectric power project—one of the greatest in the world. You are now building it. You are bonding your own assets to finance it.

I led the fight to enable you to consume most of the power to be generated by it for domestic and industrial use within your own State.

That power is a necessity for the continued operation, the growth and expansion of domestic consumption and your thriving industrial economy. That great project and Robert Moses, who did so much to get it underway are, however, but symbolic of the building of the Empire State.

It was in the early dawn of our Nation's history when the pressure for a transportation route to the West induced New York to build the Erie Canal. Its promotion and building are now history, but it has long been a monument to the vision, daring and courage of the people of your State.

To me, however, its greatest significance is in what it has meant to the Nation and what it symbolizes as we think of the future.

The Federal Government long since took a leaf from your book and launched its own program of improvement of rivers and harbors, building of inland waterways, dams for flood control, hydroelectric power, and irrigation.

Attracted by these improvements, people by the uncounted millions have migrated to the improved areas to play their part in the enjoyment of the benefits and building the economy in the areas where the Federal Government has thus far spent great sums of Federal tax money. Efforts of people everywhere have increased to an intensity never before known to expand the Federal Government's program of development of our natural resources, primarily soil and water.

We in Oklahoma are working with the zeal of crusaders for such projects. We know that their development will determine what opportunity we can have in building an industrial economy in which our State and its people can grow, increase and prosper.

Now, the people of New York pay more income taxes to the Federal Government than those of any other State. We know that you are keenly aware of this fact. Yes, even painfully aware of it. I hope that your feeling in this regard is helped to some degree by the knowledge and assurance I now give you that we, in Oklahoma, are really grateful to you for the tremendous sums of Federal taxes you pay. In fact, and I say this in all reverence, we hope and even pray that you may live long and prosper more and more and accordingly pay more and more Federal taxes in order to make it possible for us to expedite the building of projects in Oklahoma.

We, too, pay vast sums in Federal taxes, and when we have developed our soil and water potentialities, we will pay much more. We know that this will be of benefit to our country, and also to your State which has the largest volume of trade and commerce of any State in the Union.

And, then I want to make this clear to you that while we are more interested personally in the development of the soil and water resources of Oklahoma, we will work just as diligently for the development of your soil and water resources as is appropriately possible.

Your navigable waterways have been of inestimable value in the development of your industrial economy. If it conforms with your wishes, their improvement, enlargement, extension and operation should be paid for by the Federal Government as are those throughout the Nation.

Yours are a part of the 23,000 miles of improved inland waterways which have been developed since the building of the Erie Canal. It was the forerunner of barge transportation in America. The mighty St. Lawrence Seaway with its international identity and its enormous potential for growth and progress, not only along its shores, but for the Nation, is a product of the same impetus that produced the Erie Canal.

I am not one who regards the expenditure of Federal funds for such projects as "pork barrel." I know of no national and domestic responsibility of government more worthy and more important than that of conservation of the water resources and the development of the waterways in our country. The need for more and wider and deeper harbors and waterways is illustrated by the experience of the first big trans-Atlantic steamer, *The Great Eastern*, which came to our shores a century ago. She required a channel 30 feet deep. Thus Portland, Maine, was the only harbor on the Atlantic sea coast she could use. New York Harbor was then only 23 feet deep. *The Great Eastern* failed commercially because she was too big for her day. She did make history though, and earned undying fame for making possible the laying of the Atlantic cable where smaller craft had failed. And, also, she pointed the way to the development of harbors and waterways which could handle ships not only of her tonnage and draft, but also those of the superspecifications of today.

Transportation today is one of the largest business operations in America. The public spends about \$65 billion a year for transportation facilities, equipment, and service. This is about one-sixth of our national income. Yet the transportation business is

one of the fastest growing in our economy. Its traffic grew from 544 billion ton-miles in 1939 to 1½ trillion ton-miles in 1957. Only an integrated system of highways, airways, railroads, waterways, and pipelines has made possible an increase in industrial production similar to the increase in transportation. It amounts to more than two and one-half times what it was 20 years ago. Each type of transportation has its place in the pattern. Each complements the other, and all are necessary. A significant fact about the industrial development in the past 10 years has been the growth of new industrial plants, facilities, and capacities along our navigable waterways. In 10 years we have seen a \$15 billion expansion of industrial plants in the Ohio Valley. At the same time, we have seen tremendous developments along the Mississippi River and its navigable tributaries, as well as on the gulf coast. This expanded industry along our navigable waterways not only enables our country to grow more rapidly than would otherwise be possible, it feeds a constantly increasing volume of business to the entire Nation, including all other forms of transportation. It is especially noteworthy that some of our most prosperous railroads today are those which parallel the tremendous industrial developments along our water routes.

When I see New York City and State of today in relation to the Nation of today, I wonder what tomorrow will bring. Let's lift the curtain of the golden sixties and the fabulous decades beyond and inspect their entrancing possibilities. We are aware that it has taken 352 years to achieve a population of 180 million Americans. Yet Census Bureau experts assure us that the number will double in 40 years. Our mighty agricultural and industrial economy is now producing at the rate of \$500 billion gross products per year. Authoritative engineers assure us that this production will double in 20 years. By 1980, they say the value of our gross national production will be \$1 trillion per year based on the value of the 1959 dollar. It seems very probable that in that year our population will exceed 240 million.

Where will the agricultural production occur? Where will the enlarged and new industrial workshops be located? And, now for the \$64 billion question, Will New York State achieve for herself the same relative position in the America of the eighties that she now claims as her own? The answer can be found in the quality and quantity of your water resources. Look to your inland waterways; look to your deep channels and enlarged harbors; look to your industrial, agricultural, and municipal water supplies.

The Nation as a whole will require 2½ times as much municipal water in 1980 as we used 5 years ago. The six major water-using industries will use 3½ times more water in 1980 than they were using in 1954. The electric power generating facilities will require 4½ times as much water for cooling purposes.

Water is more than a natural resource. It is a necessity of life. It is the priceless ingredient for continuing increase in population and growth in industrial and agricultural production. The necessities and uses of water in modern society are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination. The Department of Commerce tells us that the cities and towns in America must invest \$80 billion in the next 20 years to keep abreast of the requirements for domestic and industrial water. Four years ago the Army Chief of Engineers reported that many areas even at that time were "constantly going through the ceiling of available average water supply." Even on the basis of our present national population, a U.S. Geological Survey hydrologist finds that most water which is immediately available, and inexpensive at each individual point, is already in use.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not regard these problems as burdens, but as op-

portunities. They are burdens for men of little mind and limited vision and inadequate initiative or resourcefulness. They are the source of nearly as much worry to the pessimist as the pessimists are to a growing, thriving, prosperous America.

I am reminded of an incident that took place in Congress soon after the turn of the century. Members then complained of the burden of bureaucracy to the Government. People at home were demanding the elimination of any nonessential in Government. As a result a bill was introduced to eliminate the Patent Office. Its sponsors made the argument that since no more inventions could possibly be made, why keep a bunch of Government employees sitting around a Patent Office with nothing to do?

I once heard the story of an old grandfather who possessed most of the family wealth. He was urged by one of his daughters to provide the money to send her son, his grandson, through the necessary college and postgraduate work to become a doctor. The old man indicated his purpose to refuse—complained of the extravagance, low rated the young man's choice—and finally with a frown on his face demanded to know of his grandson what field of medicine he intended to pursue. "Obstetrics," the young man replied. "Yeah," the old man growled, "that's about what I thought—you spend 10 years and \$20,000 getting ready to do it—by that time they will have a cure for it, and you'll starve to death trying to practice it."

Even the President of the United States twice vetoed the water resources appropriation bill last year, complaining that it contained provision for some 60 new starts which his Budget Bureau had not approved. He reminded Congress that he had declared a policy of "no new starts." Imagine if you can what America would have been at any point in her glorious history had she been shackled by an effective policy of "no new starts." There would have been no Government of the United States of America had King George's policy of "no new starts" prevailed. And then, upon the founding of a government with 13 States—that would have been it.

America has reached the greatest heights of wealth, power, industrial, production, growth and prosperity of any nation in all history because its people believed in and practiced "new starts." I'm glad my father believed in new starts—else the log cabin in which I was born would never have been built. And then, tragedy of tragedies, had he practiced no new starts, I would not now be enjoying this blessed privilege of speaking to you here today.

The America of 1980 with its 240 plus million people and its gross annual national production in excess of \$1 trillion will be the product of "new starts" of today and tomorrow.

I told you a moment ago of the estimate that our cities and towns must invest \$80 billion in the next 20 years to keep abreast of requirements for domestic and industrial water. Add the presently projected Federal program to these figures and we learn that the total cost of all water development projects during the next 20 years will require in excess of \$180 billion.

This program is an absolute necessity for the population, economy, and way of life in our country two short decades from now. It is an absolute necessity if we are to maintain and develop the military strength and power required for our survival in this modern world. It is an absolute necessity to meet the challenge of the Soviet rulers whose spokesman, Mr. Khrushchev, now says that he will not need to engage in military conflict to win the cold war or humble and subdue the free world. He has declared that Soviet Russia will achieve its aims of world domination through economic development and power. We stand today appalled at the sight of a godless nation

and a pagan philosophy daring the free world to meet it in competition for economic growth and progress.

Undaunted and unafraid, America will answer this challenge. I know that the Empire State of New York and her proud people demand that we accept this challenge. They will cooperate in meeting it. To meet this challenge, we will plan ahead, and then work our plans, to adequately conserve our water resources and develop them as the prime necessity in reaching our goal. This we must do to achieve the agriculture production required. This we must do to build the industrial workshops our people will require. This we will do to improve and provide the recreational facilities for the teeming millions of Americans of today and tomorrow, who in their increasing periods of leisure will need them. Man who is made in the image of God feels an irresistible urge and necessity to spend increasing amounts of time in nature's environment as God made it. He yearns for the murmur of flowing water from pure mountain streams. He yearns to see the glint of the sunshine from the surface of reservoirs, large and small. Man is renewed when he walks within the arches of the cathedrals among the trees of God's forests.

A stronger, nobler America will be built as its people are permitted to enjoy the recreational facilities of a natural environment as nearly as we can keep it like the Creator fashioned it.

The people of the world respect you of the Empire State. The people of the Nation envy you with your natural resources, and unlimited quantities of water. They glory in the opportunity which is yours to play such a great role in the building of the America of tomorrow.

To contemplate the phenomenon which is the Empire State not only strains our powers of perception, it staggers the imagination. Nothing like it has ever existed before. But mark these words: Your fabulous economy has been possible under God, but is man made. And God is no respecter of persons. What man has done here, men are now doing elsewhere. Listen. Are you listening? If you are, you can hear the thunderous roar of the proud and mighty production machines in which the men and women of other States are even now threatening to catch and surpass you.

I know they cannot do so, except by your permission. Does their youth and vigor make you relatively old and feeble? Not at all. Do you possess a boldness and a daring which you once had but now have lost? Never. Yours is the tradition and glory of leadership. It is written in your factories and mills. It is attested on your farms and meadows. It is certified in your giant financial institutions which have achieved not only nationwide but worldwide leadership.

All of these are fortified by the abundance of your soil and water resources; by your vast forest and mineral wealth; by the wisdom of your leaders; by the daring of your men and women; by the courage and fidelity in the souls of your sons and daughters.

Injustice Cannot Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights debate has occupied this Chamber for only the past week. It has occupied the other body for a good deal longer,

and it has occupied the minds of men and the pages of newspapers for even a greater length of time.

In the 19th District of Pennsylvania there has been a unanimity of opinion on the matter. Every newspaper in the district has spoken its mind on the subject and spoken its words to say that there shall be no such thing as second-class citizenship, or any other than one class of citizenship, whether for color or any other reason.

I submit the following examples of editorial opinion to those who would deny voting rights or any rights to any citizen as but 2 of 20 editorials that must have appeared within the past 10 weeks on the subject. The first, "Injustice Cannot Endure," is from the York (Pa.) Dispatch. The second, "Politics and People," is from the West Shore Times of Lemoyne, Pa. The editorials follow:

[From the York Dispatch, Mar. 14, 1960]

INJUSTICE CANNOT ENDURE

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These words, blazing forth from the Declaration of Independence, rallied colonial Americans against the injustices of the mother country, Britain. It is well to recall them now, for the Nation, and particularly the Southland, is deeply troubled again. Negroes are rebelling against practices which have made them second-class citizens in many places. In short, they are rallying against injustices.

Sitdown strikes at lunch counters, student demonstrations, martyrs' cries of "Let us fill the jails," a near lynching in Texas, are grim signs of the unrest that abounds. Even in the august U.S. Senate itself, a filibuster drones on over the simple issue of Negro voting rights.

What do Negroes really want? Why are they rising up and voicing their demands as never before?

Nowhere have we seen their desires better stated than was done a number of years ago by a Negro nun, Mother Philomena, of the Oblate Sisters of Providence.

"As regards equality," she wrote, "the colored want to be treated as human beings. Segregation must go. By segregation, we mean discrimination against Negroes solely on the ground of their color. They want to feel free to act as any white person can act legitimately in the framework of society. The colored want to feel free to enter movies, restaurants, stadiums, public parks, facilities, and public conveyances. If they qualify in skill, in intelligence, in deportment, and in wealth, they want to be able to go wherever and do whatever such privileges entitle equally gifted Caucasians. They want no other questions asked of them than are asked of people with blond or red hair."

Racial barriers in the United States have been crumbling with increasing rapidity in recent years. To be sure, much remains to be done before the day comes when every American will recognize a Negro for what he is, and not what color he is.

In the process, selfish bigotry on the part of whites is to be deplored, just as are taunting parades or demonstrations by Negro groups. There is always the danger that such demonstrations, however peacefully they start, can be turned into unruly mob scenes and resulting bitter memories, by radical elements.

It remains for conscientious Negroes and whites alike to melt the mental and physical barriers that separate some Americans.

Hard work, tact, and patience will succeed, while violence fails.

[From the Lemoyne (Pa.) West Shore Times]

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By John Phillips)

The great power of the southern Democrats is responsible for a big problem within the Democratic Party.

Because of their seniorities, in both Houses of Congress, by reason of their one-party rule, the proliberal Democrats of the North and West are at irreconcilable odds with their members south of the "y'all" line.

The civil rights fight now raging in the U.S. Senate is embarrassing the proponents of integration who happen to bear the Democratic label. It is possible that the first crack has appeared in the so far impenetrable defense of southern legislators. Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON is completely in favor of passing this bill, or a watered-down version.

BIG BLOC

However, there is little reason to believe that he has completely divorced himself from the "big bloc." Aside from the purely political motivation on JOHNSON's part with regard to the present civil rights bill, the battle, while self-limiting and controlled, has serious portents.

The wisest move to make, it is believed, and quite probably the one that will eventually be taken, is for the national Democratic organization to disassociate the main body of liberal-type, multi-raced Democrats, from their all-white, stodgily conservative southern counterparts.

Such a move is long overdue. From the moment the Supreme Court handed down its decision on total and complete integration of public schools, time has been running out on the last stronghold of white supremacy. The finale is sounding for a disgusting era of American politics of everlasting reelection by virtue of a disenfranchised Negro population.

SOUTHERN PARADOX

This is not a unique observation on the part of this writer. Obviously the time was to come when the political value of a burgeoning Negro vote would form the focal point of a campaign to split the paradox that is "Dixie."

The ethnic complexity which is the South has never happened before in the history of modern man. Slave civilization in other periods have inevitably been freed and accepted by the host society. The color of the Negro's skin served as an easily perceived stigma and provided for the foundation for a one-party control which has existed for more than three-quarters of a century.

It has, inadvertently, allowed a political state to develop which has the shameful collusion of racial discrimination for its cornerstone. Eventually, perhaps within the next decade, the shoddy facade that presently exists will crumble and a new, healthy two-party system will evolve "down yonder." We are spectators on the opening scenes of a social and political drama long awaited.

Our Vice Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it seems evident that, barring some major

and unpredictable upset, Vice President Nixon will be the Republican candidate for President. In this respect Mr. Nixon will take his place in the select company of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson as one of the three Vice Presidents to succeed to a presidential candidacy through normal political processes without the intervening death of an incumbent Chief Executive.

In an address delivered on March 4, 1960, before the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va., one of the finest service clubs in our State, my good friend, Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, offered much interesting information concerning these and other Vice Presidents of the United States.

Dr. Wilson, who was making his 11th appearance before the Rotary Club of Charleston, is a noted authority on this subject, as on the subject of the Chief Executives of our Nation, and I comment his highly informative address to the attention of my colleagues.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VICE PRESIDENTS

For the third time in American history a Vice President, Mr. NIXON, California, is slated by the party in power, to succeed his chief.

John Adams for 8 years Vice President under Washington and Van Buren for 4 years under Jackson, were the other two.

Jefferson, Vice President under John Adams, succeeded him as President though he belonged to a rival party. Adams, like Jefferson a signer of the Declaration of Independence, defeated Jefferson by only 3 electoral votes. These two Presidents, Adams and Jefferson, have had over 2,000 descendants.

Mr. NIXON, California, is the fifth Vice President to serve for two successive terms. The other four were John Adams, Massachusetts, Vice President under Washington (1789-97); Tompkins, New York, Vice President under Monroe (1817-25); Marshall, Indiana, Vice President under Wilson (1913-21); and Garner, Texas, Vice President under F. D. Roosevelt (1933-41). George Clinton, New York was twice elected Vice President, but did not live to complete his second term.

Most people will agree that the American people have not been as careful in choosing their Vice Presidents as they have been in choosing their Presidents. This is a bit alarming when we remember that 7 of all our 36 Vice Presidents thus far elected have through the death of their chiefs been elevated to the presidency.

The seven so elevated were Tyler, Virginia, Fillmore, New York, Johnson, Tennessee, Arthur, New York, T. Roosevelt, New York, Coolidge, Massachusetts, and Truman, Missouri. It is fair to say that Theodore Roosevelt alone of all this group had ever been seriously considered as a future President before his sudden elevation to that high post.

By a strange turn of fate, exactly the same number of Vice Presidents as Presidents, have died in office. The seven were: Clinton, New York, Gerry, Massachusetts, King, Alabama, Wilson, Massachusetts, Hendricks, Indiana, Hobart, New Jersey, and Sherman, New York.

Clinton and Gerry both served under Madison, King of Alabama never served one day as Vice President, dying in Alabama be-

fore reaching Washington after being sworn in by special act of Congress in Cuba.

New York State has furnished 10 of our 36 Vice Presidents, three of these, Fillmore, Arthur, and Roosevelt, later became Presidents, by accident. Indiana and Massachusetts have each furnished four Vice Presidents. Two of those from Massachusetts (Gerry and Wilson) died in office. Eleven States have furnished one Vice President each. John C. Calhoun of South Carolina who was Vice President under both John Quincy Adams and Jackson resigned his office, and became a Senator, the only President or Vice President who ever resigned.

Kentucky has had three of its sons in the Vice President's chair. Colonel Johnson, Breckinridge, and Barkley. The first was chosen by the Senate. The second was our youngest Vice President (36). The third, our oldest one (71), at the time of election. Two States, Virginia and Illinois, have each furnished two Vice Presidents: Jefferson and Tyler, (Virginia), and Stevenson and Dawes, (Illinois). Levi P. Morton of New York, Vice President under B. Harrison, (1889-93), the oldest of all Presidents or Vice Presidents at death, died on his 96th birthday.

Two Vice Presidents, Stevenson of Illinois (1893-97) and Fairbanks of Indiana (1905-09) later were defeated for Vice President; the first went down with Bryan in 1900 and the second with Hughes in 1916.

Five Vice Presidents served later as Senators. They were Calhoun, South Carolina, Breckinridge, Kentucky, Hamlin, Maine, Johnson, Tennessee, and Barkley, Kentucky. Our three living ex-Vice Presidents, Garner, Wallace, and Truman all served under F. D. Roosevelt.

Many of the names of Vice Presidents are now all but forgotten. Who was Wm. A. Wheeler? It is certain that in the future the men chosen as candidate for Vice President will be more carefully selected than at some periods in our history.

St. Patrick's Story: Splendor and Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Sun of March 16, 1960:

ST. PATRICK'S STORY: SPLENDOR AND PARADOX—AND IRISH HISTORY IS FULL OF BOTH—ALL ARE SONS OF ERIN ON ITS HOLIDAY

(By John D. Hackett)

"Ireland is a country where the probable never happens and the impossible always occurs."—John Pentland Mahaffy, provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

Thousands of Irish will cross over the border of predominantly Catholic Eire into "Protestant" North Ireland tomorrow to attend a pontifical Mass in the Cathedral of Armagh, seat of the Roman Catholic primate of all Ireland.

The Mass commemorates the death of St. Patrick, apostle to Ireland, who died on March 17, 465. He is buried in nearby County Down, another of the six counties in North Ireland.

At the same time, services will be held in the Anglican Cathedral of St. Patrick in the

capital of the Irish Free State, Dublin, which has no Catholic cathedral.

In Baltimore, the Irish, Irish-American and "adopted Irish" celebrate St. Patrick's Day with religious devotions, parade, banquets and dances.

HIRERNIAN PARADE

They marched Sunday in the Ancient Order of Hibernians parade behind the skirl of bagpipes and saluted the clergy and public officials on the reviewing stand outside the Pratt Library on Cathedral street.

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick jammed their annual luncheon last Saturday and an overflow crowd is expected tomorrow at the Hibernian Society of Baltimore banquet in the Emerson Hotel.

Throughout the world the Irish celebrate March 17 for a man who was not Irish, a man who came to the Emerald Isle as a lowly slave, escaped, and returned to become one of the greatest apostles in Christendom.

CAST OUT PAGANISM, SNAKES

He converted the whole of Ireland to a new faith. He cast out the pagan beliefs of the Druids as he did the poisonous snakes from Irish ground.

He dared to light the Paschal fire on Easter Eve, 433, on the summit of the Hill of Slane above the valley of Tara in contempt of the Druid Ard-Righ Leoghaire, supreme monarch of all Ireland.

He appeared before the convened Druid chieftains dressed in the rich fabrics of a Christian bishop carrying a gold crozier. But, beneath this splendor he wore the coarse hair shirt of the ascetic who slept on a hard rock bed.

St. Patrick struck the earth with his crozier and started an earthquake. The frightened Leoghaire gave him permission to travel and preach. And seeing the marvels performed by St. Patrick, he asked to be baptized.

SMASHED PAGAN IDOLS

St. Patrick, at Magh-Slecht in Connaught, marched into the pagan rites to the chief idol Crom-Cruach and smashed the gold and silver covered stone pillar with his crozier. Crom-Cruach and the 12 minor idols crumbled to dust.

It was then that, in 1 day, 12,000 Irish "became docile to the faith."

St. Patrick, an extreme ascetic, lived a penitential life and often retreated to the island of Lough Dergh, the St. Patrick's Purgatory, where he fasted for extended periods.

It is to Lough Dergh that more than 50,000 pilgrims come each year on June 26 to observe a strict discipline which includes going barefoot on the rocky island and staying foodless for 3 days.

"WRESTLED WITH GOD"

Perhaps the greatest achievement of St. Patrick is his victory when he "wrestled with God" atop a stately mountain cone some 400 feet above the districts of Westport and Aghagower in Connaught in western Ireland. It is now called St. Patrick's Mountain.

It was here, the story says, that St. Patrick fasted for 40 days and 40 nights while he prayed that God bestow special blessings and mercy on his Irish people. He was attacked by the demons of hell and chased them with his holy bell.

MORE CONCESSIONS

An angel told St. Patrick that his fidelity, penance and prayer had won him the right to bring as many Irish into Heaven as would cover the land and the sea as far as he could see from the cone. He refused the boon and continued his prayer and fasting.

More concessions were made but the stubborn St. Patrick refused. At last, the angel envoy said all his wishes had been granted

and he came down from the mountain to give the Irish the "Promises of St. Patrick."

The angel, tradition says, told St. Patrick: 1. That many souls would be freed from purgatory through his intercession.

2. That whoever, in a spirit of penance, would recite his hymn before death would attain the heavenly reward.

3. That barbarian hordes would never obtain sway in his church.

4. That 7 years before the judgment day, the sea would spread over Ireland and save its people from the temptation and terrors of the anti-Christ, and.

5. That, greatest of all, Patrick himself would be deputized to judge the whole Irish race on the last day.

MORE THAN PROMISES

St. Patrick gave more to the Irish, and to Western civilization, than his promises. An uneducated slave, he returned as a learned priest who built schools and churches side by side throughout Ireland.

Learning flourished in Ireland while Europe slipped into the Dark Ages. Irish clergy were to carry classical learning back to the continent.

His Ireland has produced poets and prelates, authors and artists, barristers and balladeers, mayors and mystics, prizefighters, and politicians, soldiers and saints.

The paradox of Patrick runs through the Irish race and Irish history.

The Emerald Isle has produced world renowned scholars in a land where education for years had been suppressed. A country of 4,500,000 people, it has populated the world and given England such names as Swift, Moore, Goldsmith, Shaw, Sheridan, Congreve, Berkeley, Yeats, and Calvert.

NO IRISH UNIFORM

Scots regiments are encouraged to wear kilts and play the pipes, but no Irish regiment was ever permitted a distinctive uniform despite the great military records of the Dublin, Munster, or Enniskillen Fusiliers.

In some 700 years under British rule the Irish got used to seeing that evidence of their nationality was never encouraged.

This could well explain why the Irish are assertive, pugnacious and individualistic. At the same time, they are the saddest and gladdest of people, carefree, yet a people with a hard core of determination.

The Gaelic tongue, now heard more than often in Eire, is the only Celtic language with its own alphabet. There is no "V."

Which raises a question. How does an Irishman write DeValera in Gaelic?

LEADER OF MODERN IRISH

The great leader of the modern Irish, paradox again, is Eamon DeValera, born in New York City of a Spanish father. Ireland's greatest advocate for home rule was Disraeli, an English Jew. The presidents of Catholic Eire have been predominately Protestant.

The Far Down Irishman, or Orangeman, lives far up in the north of Ireland.

In only one section of Ulster do Orangemen on July 12 mark themselves off from all other Irish to celebrate the victory of William of Orange over James II at the Battle of the Boyne.

ANTI-PAPIST SPEECHES

They take this victory as license to indulge in anti-papist speeches and demonstrations.

Yet, historical fact shows the defeat of James II meant the defeat of Louis XIV of France and Pope Alexander VIII and the Holy Roman Emperor, Leopold of Austria, were elated at the victory of Orange at the Boyne.

In Ireland, the island of St. Patrick, these paradoxes continue.

Is it any wonder then, that in all the countries of the world and in Baltimore, the impossible occurs on March 17.

It's a fact:

Everybody is Irish on St. Patrick's Day.

Congressional Travel Is a Sound U.S. Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of the question of congressional travel. I should like to contribute to that discussion a very thoughtful editorial which was printed in the Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald on March 4. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL IS A SOUND U.S. INVESTMENT

There is no doubt that on occasion Members of the Congress have abused their privileges of travel abroad, but any rational appraisal of the realities will show that it is important for Congressmen to go to other countries. The penalties of ignorance and narrow views and parochialism are too severe to be suffered without a struggle to remedy such blind spots. Congressmen must pass on matters that affect their constituents' interests many times when the constituents don't even realize their interests are involved. Our worldwide commitments in military and economic activities cannot be policed by our representatives with any degree of judgment unless they know something firsthand of the countries, peoples, and problems involved.

We will cite the case of Waco's BOB POAGE, who has traveled the world during his long congressional tenure. POAGE knows as much about farm conditions and problems in Asia, South America, and Europe as he does about the conditions in his own central Texas. He also knows considerable about other matters abroad, as witness his series of articles in the Waco News-Tribune last fall reporting on his journey around the world in September-October. POAGE is a much better Congressman for central Texas by reason of his observations and education through international travel. An alert, conservative, serious-minded person of POAGE's type can learn and can grow through travel experiences.

This country can afford to encourage the members of its Government to get about the world. There ought to be more of this activity than there is now. And the trend is in that direction.

During 1959 at least 190 Senators and Representatives from the 50 States of the Union fanned out to points all over the globe on missions of all kinds. Some traveled with large delegations to widely publicized conferences in London, Warsaw, or Paris. Others traveled singly or in pairs to such out-of-the-way spots as Saigon, Vientiane, or Djakarta.

Most of the trips were financed at least in part by the U.S. Government. Some were paid for by foreign governments or by non-governmental international organizations, such as the American Council on Germany. A handful were covered by the congressional tourists' personal funds.

The record shows that 51 Senators, sufficient for a quorum, and 139 Representatives, traveled out of the United States during 1959. Past surveys show that 159 Congressmen took foreign trips during 1958 and 222 lawmakers traveled abroad in 1957.

None of these trips were made at the same time, so the work of Congress was able to keep going.

The leading attractions for junketing Congressmen were found in Western Europe. The area was visited by 102 lawmakers during the 12-month period. Exactly half as many Members traveled to the Far East during the year.

The biggest gathering of U.S. lawmakers outside Washington was for the September meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Warsaw. The annual meeting of this body, which claims the membership of legislators from every country in the world, drew 17 U.S. Congressmen—4 Senators and 13 Representatives—most of whom made the trip to and from by special military aircraft.

Thirty-one Members of Congress traveled behind the Iron Curtain in 1959 compared to only six in the previous year.

Controller Levitt Saves Millions on State Bond Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article which appeared in the New York Times of March 3, 1960, and which describes the fiscal astuteness of the highest Democratic elected official in the State of New York, Controller Arthur Levitt. The Democratic Party and the people of the State of New York are proud of the service this dedicated public official is rendering in a difficult area of State and local bond financing.

The article follows:

TOP SECOND-GUESSESS—LEVITT RISKS RECORD AS MONEY MANAGER IN DELAYING ISSUE

When Arthur Levitt became controller of New York State in 1955, his associates realized that the New York Bar was losing a zealous lawyer. But few people would have predicted that Albany was making room for a mastermind of the bond market.

The controller's repeated successful hunches about when to sell and when not to sell bonds have served the State well thus far in terms of borrowing cost. The business is fraught with risk, because the more the controller comes out ahead, the more the law of averages is against him.

That he is still willing to take a chance on outguessing the market was shown yesterday in his decision to call off a scheduled sale of \$50 million of bonds that would complete the State's full-faith-and-credit backing for the thruway.

It was only a few weeks ago that an impressive rally in the market had led the controller to plan to raise \$50 million of long-term money while conditions were favorable. He changed his mind just as abruptly when the marketing climate turned heavy last week.

When Controller Levitt took office, \$550 million of the cost of the \$1 billion thruway had been financed permanently through the sale of bonds.

In his efforts to finance the \$450 million balance of the cost on terms most advantageous to the State, Controller Levitt has seen fit to reject bids three times on issues of bonds totaling \$225 million, and to postpone the sale of two issues aggregating \$100

million in advance of the bidding deadline.

Four of these five decisions were vindicated by subsequent turns in the market. Whether the controller's newest market hunch will likewise pay off in a lower borrowing cost to the State remains to be seen.

Controller Levitt first challenged the market in July 1955, in rejecting bids submitted for \$125 million of State-guaranteed thruway bonds. The indicated cost at that time was 2.789 percent. Subsequently the controller broke the big borrowing up into three parts and succeeded, within 6 months, in selling \$150 million of full-faith-and-credit bonds at costs ranging from 2.418 to 2.737 percent.

Six months later, the State's top money man decided to postpone a scheduled sale of \$50 million of State-guaranteed bonds. He tried to raise this money in November of the following year, but he rejected the best bid—3.449 percent interest cost—as excessive. Three months later he readvertised the bonds and sold them at a cost of 3.123 percent.

The controller's latest successful outguessing of the market was in 1959. He refused to go along with the sale of \$50 million of thruway bonds secured by service revenues at a cost of 4.3029 percent. Three months later he sold the issue at a cost of 4.1995 percent.

The controller explained yesterday that the risk involved in yesterday's postponement of the sale of \$50 million of State-guaranteed bonds was not great. The money was to be used to pay off a short-term issue of notes due on April 15. This short-term loan is costing the State 2.15 percent.

Civil Rights, North and South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 15, 1960, the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News carried an editorial entitled "Civil Rights, North and South," which paid a well deserved compliment to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for his amendment to the first section of the Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS, NORTH AND SOUTH

Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, handled one phase of the civil rights debate better than any Dixie Congressman could.

He told the Senate that one section of the Dirksen bill had an "indefensible weakness." That section would have made it a Federal crime to interfere with court-ordered school desegregation. The Senator from Ohio noted that this provision would penalize civil disobedience "in only one section of the country." Why, he asked, shouldn't this protection of Federal court orders be extended to all similar situations?

The Senator's question was a good one. The answer he provided—to penalize interference with any Federal court order, whether

It involved segregation or labor dispute or any kind of civil commotion—changed the whole atmosphere of the civil rights debate. Senator LAUSCHE's amendment gored an ox of the abolitionists. They were heartily in favor of applying full Federal interference to the school desegregation controversy in the South; they heartily opposed extending that same interference to labor disputes which, while they might infringe on somebody's civil rights, could not be interpreted as a protection devoutly to be desired by liberals.

Thus some of the sham of the civil rights debate was cleared away. In an election year northern and western liberals were not anxious to incur the wrath of their labor union supporters. When the battle of civil rights came back to their own doorsteps, one of the leaders, Senator WAYNE MORSE, arose with a motion to table the whole section. His motion carried, creating for a moment a strange alliance—the abolitionists who wanted no curbs on labor and the Dixiecrats who wanted no Federal interference with desegregation.

Thus the Senate debate on civil rights rolled on toward an inevitable climax: Enactment of some kind of bill to guard against racial disenfranchisement. Such a bill will likely and should be accepted both in the House and Senate.

President Leads Hoosiers in Tribute to Representative Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 10, hundreds of fellow Indians and Government notables of both political parties joined to pay tribute to our colleague CHARLIE HALLECK for his distinguished service of more than 25 years in the Congress and of the great honor which he has brought to his native State. "Hoosier of the Year" was the designation bestowed on the Congressman from Rensselaer and Republican leader.

A list of all the notables and distinguished guests who gathered for this gala dinner would be a very long one indeed, headed by the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Most of the Indiana congressional delegation were there and more than half a hundred other House colleagues. The great number of Hoosiers who journeyed to Washington for this occasion were led by Governor and Mrs. Handley.

The Indiana State Society of Washington issued a scroll honoring the second district Congressman. After he responded with words of gratitude the remainder of the evening was given over to entertainment with a truly Indiana flavor. A vocal quartet from Indiana University sang a variety of numbers including, of course, "Back Home in Indiana." World-famed Hoagy Carmichael performed some of his top hits, concluding with the song he said now belongs to everyone, "Stardust."

Herb Shriner, who has tickled the Nation's funnybone with Hoosier humor for

the past many years, ended the evening by leaving everyone laughing in the best show-business tradition. To people in other parts of the country Herb's local mannerisms and stories seem completely fictitious but to those familiar with the Indiana scene his stories are very much of the same type that you will hear on street corners in hundreds of Indiana communities.

All in all it was truly "A Night to Remember" which was the theme chosen by the Indiana State Society for this event. I am sure CHARLIE will cherish memories of the evening, and especially the remarks of President Eisenhower which I now submit in full:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE INDIANA STATE SOCIETY DINNER IN HONOR OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES HALLECK AT THE SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. HALLECK, Mr. SAM, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am just sort of a wanderer that just dropped in on this party.

First of all, I am not from Indiana. Actually, I was born in the district of my friend here, Mr. SAM. And all of these years he has allowed me to call myself his vicarious constituent to this moment.

I understand that about two-thirds of Indiana is here—the other third is probably snowbound.

As I understand it, they call today "Charlie Halleck Day," because he is Indiana's Man of the Year. I would like to say that for me, during a session at least, every day is "Charlie Halleck Day."

He once pleased me mightily. He said: "Mr. President, this is going to cost me a lot of votes, but I'll do it." That kind of loyalty to a leader of the party and to an administration is priceless. I know it. Everybody in the executive department knows it.

Indeed, I think that some of my very distinguished members of the opposition, of whom the chief one is here, knows it, too. For that reason he not only has a great affection for CHARLIE but he respects him mightily.

A political party should stand for something. If the issues of our country are to be debated intelligently and properly, it is only proper that Americans just as good as we are should have political views that do not coincide with our own. That's why we have two major parties.

Among them both CHARLIE and I claim many, many friends—personal friends—no matter how much we may battle them in those factors and those subjects where are properly partisan or political.

I think it is only proper that I should say on CHARLIE's behalf—and my own—when it comes to matters that extend beyond the water's edge, we have had the cooperation and we have sought the cooperation of the opposition, which I think has been most effective for our country.

So as I come here—not to praise CHARLIE, because he doesn't need it—but merely to recognize what he has done, and to be one of you in sharing a great privilege of saying, "Thank you, Mr. HALLECK." I think it's a very good thing for us to realize that the politics in Washington should be—and I think most frequently is—a means by which we promote the welfare of America, not merely to satisfy the ambitions of any particular individual or any particular party, much as all of us are partisans.

I leave you with this thought: CHARLIE is doing a job not just for Republicans but above all and first of all for the United States of America. I am quite sure that my first Congressman would join with me in tribute to this very topflight, fighting, tough little Hoosier.

God bless you, CHARLIE—and goodbye.

Urgent Need for Foreign Aid Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a great public service has been rendered by the special study mission of the House Committee on Foreign Relations which made an around-the-world investigation of foreign aid last fall. Headed by Georgia's able and respected Congressman, J. L. PILCHER, the mission has just released its report which deals harshly with the waste and inefficiency which characterizes the foreign aid program as presently administered and which calls for a complete revision of the entire program. The mission warned that unless foreign aid is restored to its proper perspective as an instrument for helping little people help themselves it is doomed to ultimate failure.

The findings of the Pilcher mission were lauded and endorsed by the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal in its editorial of March 14, 1960, entitled "A Bureaucratic Monster?" I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of that editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUREAUCRATIC MONSTER?

Now when the Congress considers foreign aid measures, it will have a massive reference book, the first-hand findings of six representatives who probed deeply into this Nation's economic assistance abroad. Georgia's Representative J. L. PILCHER headed the bipartisan group.

To the surprise of few, the report of the committee is largely critical of the administration of foreign aid. It called for a reappraisal and revision of the entire program. It is doubtful that such will be forthcoming from the Congress in a presidential election year.

To do so, honestly and searchingly, would mean dislodging some sensitive vested interests that could rock the political boat of either party.

The committee found a strikingly dangerous gap between "grandiose projects at the top and the millions of human beings still starving, still untaught who have neither the stamina to undertake nor the capacity to understand self-government."

It urged that primary attention be focused on food production and teaching at least elementary knowledge.

The Pilcher committee catalogued instances of maladministration of American economic assistance. It pointed to the big boondoggles—costly power projects, bridges and super-roads in lightly motorized countries and the relative neglect of health, nutrition, and education work.

Anybody who expresses opposition to any aspect of foreign aid invites a lecture on humanitarianism and the worldwide Communist threat. But we are only asking that it be handled with more purpose and commonsense.

For all the unquestionable good it accomplishes, for all its contribution to world peace, foreign aid is in danger of becoming a bureaucratic monster with a characteristically voracious appetite for taxpayers' money.

A Freedom Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the Record a letter to the New York Times written by my good friend, Arthur G. McDowell, executive secretary and treasurer of the Council Against Communist Aggression.

Mr. McDowell is referring to my bill to set up a Freedom Academy to train men and women in the free world in counteraction to the Communist conspiracy:

The letter follows:

MARCH 2, 1960.

The Editor,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to take a slight caveat to the complaisance of your editorial of February 28 on Moscow's new university.

In your comment you beam with pleasure to announce that at last you have found something in the ideological field in which we are ahead of the Russians, namely, foreign students already drawn here for technical, professional and general education in our colleges and universities. Because this invaluable influx of foreign students is so impressive in size, you fail to dip below the surface to inquire what the results of this attendance is upon these students who have grown to such a great stream, almost in a fit of absentmindedness on the part of America. I would suspect that whatever absentmindedness may have contributed to the building of the British Empire, it has contributed very little to the political success of these United States as world leader in the struggle for men's minds with the Soviet.

How many of these students, left to their own devices with no appreciation of their importance and impact on their return to their homelands have gone back to turn the tools we have given them and sharpened them to attack the free order of society? I submit that in no country of the world did the United States expend as much idealistic endeavor, religious, educational, medical, etc., as in the Republic of China. There was probably no country, outside of the English speaking world, where as many Americans made the effort to learn the language and do all those things, minus of course any political purpose, which we did in China before 1949. Nevertheless, it was the Russian Soviet politically trained Chinese personnel who staffed the Communist movement which today rules mainland China in the name of anti-Americanism and communism.

We can look at this vast undifferentiated, undirected army of 50,000 foreign students and take all the complaisant pride which your editorial talks about being ahead of the Russians "on this particular front." But for nearly 40 years and up to and including this moment the Russians have been training foreign personnel for every continent in political training schools, of which the United States and all its free world allies have not one comparable or matching institution. Last year Congressmen Judd and Herlong introduced in the House and Paul Douglas of Illinois and Karl Mundt of South Dakota introduced in the Senate a bill for

a freedom academy, which would for the first time start training private citizens in all levels of activity to for the first time begin to match the hundreds and thousands of students that have been pouring out of the Soviet training schools for the last generation and a half with such fantastic success in political conquest, from China to Cuba.

It would seem to me that the Times would serve its thoughtful audience better, not by complaisance over the 50,000 foreign students who may have not only little or no effect in the balance of the political decision of their countries, but may indeed for various reasons cast their balance on the wrong side because they were neglected and misunderstood. When Senators as wide ranging in the political spectrum as Senators Mundt and Douglas join in a piece of legislation, when witnesses appear ranging all the way from a conservative public leader such as General Sarnoff to the AFL-CIO to support that legislation before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security, it would seem to me to be great news. But checking last June's newspapers when it happened, it seems that the Times did not consider it fit to print, while the fact that Moscow opens a new foreign conventional university gets both front page space and editorial notice, although, as I note above, that editorial notice only lulls those already less than vigilant readers into a deeper sleep of complaisance, while the Russian tortoise makes for the finish line, not in overall quantity of televisions but in such selective things as missiles, space exploration and the training of political cadres of students and not just the exposure of multiple thousands to Moscow's skyline and show places.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR G. MACDOWELL,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Success in Latin America Means Followup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a world of fast changing events, we recognize that, as a Nation, we face challenges in maintaining up-to-date policies to deal with the widely differing problems in areas of the world.

As we know, President Eisenhower just recently completed a successful mission to Latin America.

The big question now is: Just what kind of followup program should be undertaken to further cement relations with our Latin American neighbors.

Despite the overwhelming favorable impact of the President's trip, its long-range success can be assured only if practical steps are taken to improve trade, social, and cultural interchanges, greater political cooperation, and generally expanding efforts to find beneficial solutions to problems confronting us.

Recently, the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune published a constructive editorial entitled "Success in Latin America Means Followup."

Reflecting the need for an effective action program to deal effectively with some of the real problems in the Western Hemisphere—if United States-Latin American relations are really to be improved and the security of the Americas strengthened—I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUCCESS IN LATIN AMERICA MEANS FOLLOWUP

President Eisenhower has had a considerable success in his effort to show Latin Americans that the United States is just as interested in them as in other underdeveloped peoples, but the final evaluation of his visit will depend heavily on how quickly something is done.

It is a developing situation, in which some of the development—such as organization of the Inter-American Development Fund—began before the President planned his trip.

Discussion of the operation of this fund went on at lower levels while the President conferred with chiefs of government. The President therefore continues to speak in generalities.

These generalities already have led to predictions in the United States that there will be no real followthrough. They undoubtedly will produce an undercurrent of disappointment in Latin America until there is a factual display of action.

One feature of the situation calculated to contribute to uncertainty in Latin America during the period of gestation is the concrete planning of aid for the rest of the world which began Wednesday in Washington.

At that conference nine of the wealthier nations hope to work out a coordinated program for the have-nots, primarily in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. This is in answer to the demand from the United States last year that aid be increased at the same time the load is better shared.

Such a conference is bound to keep alive Latin America's feeling of being left out until something happens in that sphere.

One of the most important products of the President's trip has been the kindling in the United States of a greater awareness of the problems of the southern continent.

The Cuban situation is a strong lesson in what can happen through lack of interest and inert policies.

These they set before the apostles, and they prayed and laid their hands upon them.—Acts 6: 6.

Southerners' Decisions Saved United States From Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therewith an excellent article by O. L. Warr who is a resident of a farming community in my State of South Carolina, called Quietude.

I believe Mr. Warr's article, entitled "Southerners' Decisions Saved United States From Hitler," is most timely for

insertion in the RECORD in view of the attacks against the South now being voiced on the floors of both bodies. Mr. Warr writes a farm column for the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C.; his keen observations and acumen are worth taking note of:

THE FARMER FROM QUIETUDE—SOUTHERNERS' DECISIONS SAVED UNITED STATES FROM HITLER

(By O. L. Warr)

"It is excellent to have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous to use it as a giant."

The hindsight of history reveals in the life of each nation and of each civilization of the past the certain decisions which proved decisive, first in their upbuilding and later in their downfall, to their existence for varying periods and to their ultimate decline and passage from the scene.

I think that it is reasonable to say that the United States would be, with the rest of the world, under the heel of Hitler today except for a series of congressional decisions taken in 1940 and 1941. Even as it was, the outcome was a fairly near thing, entirely too close for comfort. Not to be forgotten by any man who lived through them were those days of 1942 when the Germans were in sight of the Volga and in reach of the Suez, when the Japs were scouring the Pacific and dropping bombs as far from their home as Australia.

Upon what legislative prewar decisions did the immediate fate of this Nation hang? They were four: The repeal of the ill-conceived Neutrality Act, the passage of the Draft Act, its renewal upon its expiration at the end of its first year, and the adoption of the misnamed Lend-Lease program.

Without these measures the peoples who were later to become our desperately needed allies would have had neither courage nor means to continue in the conflict. Without these allies and without trained men of our own we could not have withstood the blows of our enemies. We prepared, even if incompletely, for war. In the unfolding of the course of events those preparations proved vital and decisive in our military victory and in our national survival to this time.

It was the Senators and the Representatives from the South who had the realistic foresight and the political courage to enact those essential measures. A heavy majority of all the Members of Congress from the North and West opposed the passage of every one of them. Only the fact that the southerners were almost unanimous in their active support saved this legislation from defeat. Who can forget that on a day when Hitler's forces were already running rampant over all of Europe, the life of the Draft Act was extended in our House of Representatives by a majority of only one vote, even with almost all the southerners voting in its favor.

It is fair to ask why it was, in a day when sense and foresight were matters of life and death, that Southern Congressmen exhibited such superior possession of those attributes. It was because the electorates to which they were responsive had not since 1876 suffered the fatal dilution of intelligence that has rendered the remainder of this Nation politically incapable of making such basic decisions as are necessary to national self-preservation.

Southerners have always nodded politely toward the theory of democracy, but they have had too much hard commonsense and too much awareness of the harsh realities of existence to suffer the affliction of such a fatal practice. That and that alone is why they were able, 20 years ago, to save the rest of this Nation from its self-inflicted shortsightedness.

Should the plans and the programs of our undiscerning domestic enemies prevail, the South will not in the future be in position

to provide its traditional haven of political intelligence as a redeeming counterbalance to the collective electoral folly that elsewhere in the United States prevails.

Already its steady and stabilizing and strengthening influence has been notably weakened by the imposition, against its will and judgment, of a dilution of its electoral intelligence—and the real and destructive impact of that imposition is as yet barely in its infancy.

Destroying Dignity and Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I received from Mr. Kirk Railsback, a constituent who lives at Shreveport, La., a most timely and very interesting editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times in its issue of Sunday, March 13, 1960, entitled "Destroying Dignity and Respect."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTROYING DIGNITY AND RESPECT

True Negro leadership, in its quest for various things it lists as rights or liberty or opportunity or equality, always has held that its major objective for the Negro as an individual and as a race is dignity and respect; recognition that the dignity of man is not determined by the color of skin and that all people may earn the respect of all others regardless of color.

These are things which in their purpose transcend such matters as seats in schools or on buses, use of public recreation facilities, service in restaurants or limitation as to residence. True Negro leadership has been joined often and in many places by true white leadership in this quest. Where each showed itself as worthy of the respect of the other, there has been success.

All of this is being undermined, perhaps destroyed, by sitdown demonstrations by Negroes in various Southern States.

Dignity cannot be demonstrated by forcing one's self into places where one is not desired—and where no law has opened the door.

Respect cannot be gained by physical action which erases the opportunity for respect.

Neither respect nor dignity can be had for the asking or the grasping, or through legislation or deliberate disturbance of others. They must be earned by the conduct of the individual. With a race, they must be earned by the conduct of the race as a whole; particularly by its dominant leadership. That is as true in any one race as in any other.

Taking over seats in eating places in which they are not wanted—and from which they are prohibited by the owners, who have both statutory law and moral right on their side—does not demonstrate worthiness as a citizen or ability to be a worthy citizen.

It does just the opposite.

It offers no argument for any sort of liberty or freedom or right, actual or imaginary.

In these sitdown cases, right is entirely on the side of the proprietors of the eating places. Any person has a right, if he wishes,

to set up a store, an eating place, or any other place of commerce or barter, and limit his customers to one-armed Baptists or red-headed Episcopalians, or in any other way.

He has a right, if he wishes, to refuse to serve anyone not falling in such categories and to bar them from admission to his place of operation.

No court ever has ruled otherwise that we know of. The Fourth Federal Circuit Court specifically has ruled in the case of an interstate chain restaurant serving interstate travelers in Virginia that it did not have to serve Negroes if it did not wish to do so—that it could limit its customers in any way it wished. In effect the court held that the restaurant could bar any person it wished to bar, with or without reason.

What makes the sitdown demonstrations especially harmful to the Negro race itself is that the demonstrators seem to be almost entirely college students—Negroes who presumably are receiving education comparable to that available to those of other colors, and chiefly at the expense of members of the race they seek to annoy; white taxpayers where the institution is State operated and white donors where it is endowed.

These Negroes should know that they are blocking their own progress toward that objective of dignity and respect which is always the inherent desire of all worthwhile people, regardless of color.

Whether the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People instigated the sitdown demonstrations is not especially material. It has picked them up as one of its causes, urged additional demonstrations, supported all that were held, given its encouragement in every way. Thus, the NAACP has in this case—as it has in many instances—guided the demonstrating Negroes in a direction far more harmful to the Negro race than to anyone else.

Secretary Roy Wilkins of the NAACP says that the demonstrations are a case of Negroes "fighting for their rights." There has been fighting, and it has come dangerously close to ignition of mass violence in some instances. But there is no issue of Negro rights. Rights, in such instances, rest morally, legally, and logically with the proprietors of the eating places.

The Negro race cannot gain anything by these demonstrations.

It already has lost a lot.

It will lose a lot more if they continue.

Each new demonstration is a step backward.

Such demonstrating has nothing to do with Negro voting rights as spelled out in the Federal Constitution, or with the Supreme Court rulings on desegregation of schools and other public facilities.

That is the lesson that Negroes themselves should learn from the sitdown demonstrations.

Federation of Homemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, many of the women in my district, as well as all over the country, have become increasingly concerned with the problem of color additive control, particularly in that product almost universally used by women and girls from their earliest teens to the grave—lipstick.

This concern was shown by a nationwide organization of women, the Federation of Homemakers, in a recent statement before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the hearing examiner of the Food and Drug Administration, and since this testimony concerns so many of our citizens, I hereby submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

**STATEMENT OF FEDERATION OF HOMEMAKERS—
PUBLIC HEARING ON OBJECTIONS TO FINAL
ORDER DELISTING CERTAIN D. & C. COAL-TAR
COLORS FROM THE LIST SUBJECT TO CERTIFI-
CATION**

Mr. Examiner and gentlemen, I am Ruth Desmond, secretary of the Federation of Homemakers, a group which consists of housewives residing in this area and in many of our States. We also have junior members attending local colleges. Our federation is most appreciative of being afforded this opportunity to express the views of its members regarding colors used in lipsticks.

First, we wish to commend the Food and Drug Administration personnel as a whole for their efforts to protect the well-being of consumers, and especially to commend the scientists of this Agency, who are highly regarded in their professional fields. The present testimony has disclosed that these FDA scientists have made numerous contributions to scientific literature. We wish to state that our members have confidence in the ability, responsibility and integrity of these FDA scientists to make competent decisions in their respective fields.

Last spring before our federation was formed, an interested group (now charter members of our organization) inspected certain of the laboratory facilities of FDA. We were impressed with the dedicated attitude of the scientific staff, but disturbed that these scientists were carrying out their experiments in cramped, congested quarters not even their own. We hope that this present session of Congress will remedy this deplorable situation by an appropriation for the construction of the building recommended for this Agency by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 1955.

Here, I would like to note that the late Sir Edward Mellanby in his Sanderson-Well lecture on "The Chemical Manipulation of Food," delivered at the Middlesex Hospital, May 4, 1951, which appears in the British Medical Journal of Saturday, October 13, 1951, praises the experimental work carried out by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the official inquiries held by this Agency on specific matters of interest. Sir Mellanby expressed regret that at that time there was no such competent agency in this country carrying on this important work.

We also wish to compliment the cosmetic industry for its continuous efforts over a long period of time to furnish completely wholesome cosmetic preparations to the public. Their good record proves the effectiveness of this diligence.

It is appropriate to remind you here that in 1939 American housewives, through their various organizations and clubs, went on record at hearings conducted by the Federal Security Agency that they wished only colors certified as absolutely safe used in their foods and cosmetics. If today's housewives were consulted about this problem of colors added to foods and cosmetics, our federation feels confident they, too, would go on record as wishing safety of the product to be paramount.

Now that American women are accustomed to the brightness which lipsticks give to their faces and the lift to their spirits, they would be loath to forgo their addiction to them—but our members do plead that only harmless dyes be used in their lipsticks. Members of our sex start using lipsticks these days at the age of 12 or thereabouts and

continue their use till they depart this existence. Because of such universal and continuous use of lipsticks by all ages of our female population, cumulative effect of the dyes must be seriously considered. (Our members are positive they ingest a certain amount of their lipsticks and feel that the method of applying lipsticks determines the quantity ingested. Those users who blot their lipsticks do not ingest as much as those who prefer a moist effect and apply their colors liberally and do not blot.) It must also be noted that lipsticks are used by young girls whose cells are still dividing rapidly. Such dyes may have a different effect on these young persons than on mature individuals. Lipsticks are also applied by expectant mothers, whose bodies undergo many drastic changes during the stress and strain of pregnancy. Then consideration of the possible effects upon the elderly, who may be taking medication for chronic illness is suggested. May we point out that the seriously ill use lipstick to conceal the ravages of disease. In fact hospital staffs encourage women patients to primp, feeling morale will be improved by improvement of appearance. Yet concern should be expressed, we feel, to the fact that while morale of the ill is being bolstered by application of cosmetics, damage might possibly be sustained from synergistic reactions of medicines with impurities, however minute, of cosmetic dyes.

It is our understanding that in carrying out tests to determine the harmlessness of these lipstick colors, now being considered, all the animals selected were healthy, both controls and test animals alike. These animals obtained a balanced diet, the only difference being the addition of color to the diet of the test animals. It is our understanding also that rats are not as sensitive to dyes as humans and dogs. With humans we do not always have such an advantage of both good health and correct diets. Numerous surveys conducted by responsible nutritional and medical groups have revealed that our American young girls (both at high school and college levels) have poor food habits. These authorities deplore this revelation as they feel this is a time when our young girls should be receiving adequate, balanced diets to prepare them to be healthy mothers later. These same adolescents use lipstick generously and frequently.

Modern conditions of living force the human system to cope with air pollution and water pollution as well as the products of atomic fallout. We ingest traces of pesticide residues, food additives and dyes. Therefore, it seems especially needful that discretion and caution should be observed in the choice of dyes to be used in our lipsticks. We feel that total impact of all of these elements and substances on the human system must be taken into consideration in permitting certain colors to be used in the manufacture of lipsticks. Dr. W. Coda Martin, testifying before the House Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, during the recent food additives hearings, stated on page 279 of the printed report as follows:

"The first line of defense must be to protect the health of the consumer; otherwise, the long-range 'calculated risk' is that this country will become a nation of invalids, weak in body and mind."

Dr. Morton L. Levin, assistant commissioner, Division of Medical Services, State Department of Health, Albany, N.Y., stated after remarking that cancer is regarded as a common disease, at page 355 of the printed hearings:

"In the presence of a common disease, of which most cases are of unknown causation, I think you can understand the sensitivity of physicians and public health authorities to the possibility that substances which we do not suspect today may be causative of cancer."

Sir Edward Mellanby, discussing the effect of chemicals on the human system, warns in his lecture mentioned previously: "Even when such chemical substances have passed through a battery of tests from the point of view of toxicology, unexpected harmful results have often ultimately been demonstrated."

"Medical science often cannot give adequate answers to questions of toxicological action, not only as regards new compounds but even in the case of substances long in use. Indeed, to the medical man unpleasant surprises are constantly being revealed, in the case both of drugs and of chemicals used in food preparation."

It seems to our members that simply because it may take years to recognize the damage done to the body cells and function by certain pesticides, additives and dyes, discretion and caution should not be abandoned and their use permitted in our foods and cosmetics. We feel that the old adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" applied to this particular problem.

I thank you gentlemen for granting me this opportunity to convey the opinion of our members.

Southern Side on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Southern Side on Civil Rights: Talmadge Remarks on TV Interview Called Masterful Presentation," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1960.

Mr. Lawrence is one of the ablest writers in this country. He has written an excellent article, which I hope Senators will take the time to read.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] was an able, progressive Governor of his State. He has made an outstanding record in the Senate. He is a member of that school which believes that the Constitution says what it means and means what it says. Senator TALMADGE is a strong exponent of constitutional government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTHERN SIDE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—TALMADGE REMARKS ON TV INTERVIEW CALLED MASTERFUL PRESENTATION

(By David Lawrence)

Much has been heard lately from the so-called liberal side about the need for balanced programming on television, but something happened the other day which indicates that maybe the broadcasters are doing better than the press in the balancing technique.

Just a week ago Sunday, for example, many persons heard a dramatic and informative debate on Meet the Press over the National Broadcasting Co.'s TV network and watched Senator HERMAN TALMADGE of Georgia, Democrat, do a masterful job in presenting his viewpoint on the civil rights issue. But how much of it was printed in most

metropolitan papers of the North? Virtually nothing.

The Georgia Senator made some good points which still are news to many readers. What he said represents the other side of the controversy, and most Americans like to hear or read both sides. Asked what could be done to insure the right to vote, Senator TALMADGE held up a sheaf of papers and said in part:

"Here are 17 pages of Federal laws that guarantee every citizen in America the right to vote. . . ."

"Now, in my own State we have approximately 175,000 to 185,000 Negroes who are registered and who do vote. They have elected officials within my State. Frequently, they are the balance of power in mayors' races and local races of all kinds. The Negroes in Georgia do vote in very substantial numbers. In some counties in Georgia we have a greater percentage of Negroes registered than we have of the white population. In three counties in Georgia we have more Negroes registered and voting than there are white people"

"All citizens who are qualified have been encouraged to vote. We can't help it if some citizens don't exercise that right. My colleague, Senator RUSSELL, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this past week a statement by the leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Cleveland, Ohio, which stated that only 25 percent of the Negroes in Cleveland were registered, and of that 25 or 26 percent only about 25 or 26 percent of them voted. Now, we have a much higher percentage than that who are registered in Georgia and a far higher percentage vote in Georgia."

The Georgia Senator was then reminded that, according to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, there were 22 Georgia counties where less than 5 percent of the Negro population believed to be eligible was registered. He replied that there were adequate remedies and added:

"First, any citizen who thinks that he is being illegally deprived of the vote can go into the Federal court, he can get an injunction, he can recover damages against the registrar."

"Second, there is a criminal law. He (the registrar) can be indicted, he can be convicted and sentenced to the Federal penitentiary and fined. And, thirdly, there is the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that authorizes this group to have the Attorney General of the United States of America file a suit in the name of the United States of America as their tax-paid private lawyer to enforce their rights. Now, if those remedies aren't sufficient, there are no laws on the face of the earth that will be."

Then why did the Attorney General write a letter this week urging the House of Representatives to restore the section of the civil rights bill that was voted down by the Senate a few days ago? The answer is that politics is back of it all.

The moment Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio, a courageous Democrat, proposed that the principle of equal justice under law be applied so as to provide criminal penalties, not just for violations of court orders on school desegregation, but also for violations of court orders relating to picketing and violence in labor disputes, a northern group of Senators promptly voted against it. They were plainly afraid of the reprisals from the labor union vote.

The Attorney General, moreover, in his latest communication to Congress, writes that while the right to vote is of fundamental importance to the Negro, "this thought should not lull anyone into forgetting that, meanwhile, the Federal Government has a responsibility in other civil rights matters, including the duty to enforce court orders in school desegregation cases."

The Attorney General then makes an unhappy reference to what happened at Little Rock in 1957, and declares that the section deleted by the Senate and now up for passage in the House is designed to prevent a recurrence of the situation which, he says, required the use of Federal troops. He adds:

"At the present time, when State officials fail to maintain law and order, the Federal Government, as a practical matter, has no certain or very effective way to deal with mob violence except by the use of Federal troops."

Is this really so? The State of Arkansas did order its militia to maintain order and prevent mob violence, but the Federal Government obtained a court injunction which ordered the Governor to withdraw the militia. Then mob violence did ensue.

What the Attorney General is saying about the need to enforce court orders on school desegregation would be received with more enthusiasm if the Department of Justice had not remained strangely inactive in recent months when labor union pickets were refusing in many strikes in Northern States to allow nonunion workers and management personnel to enter plants where they wanted to work. So long as there are these examples of hypocrisy in Government, there will be little tendency to regard the present ruckus about enforcing court orders in civil rights cases as little else than a brazen attempt to win an election by wooing Negro votes in the North.

Legion 41 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and World War I comrade, Mr. Charles A. Lenge, of the Prospect Park (N.J.) Memorial Post 240, has written the following article appearing in the Paterson Evening News of March 14, 1960, relative to the American Legion's birthday anniversary:

LEGION 41 YEARS OLD

(By Charles A. Lenge)

March 15, 16, and 17 mark the 41st anniversary of the founding of the world's greatest veteran organization, the American Legion, its birth conceived with the troops stationed in France and Germany in 1919.

More than 600 members of the A.E.F. representing every rank of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in World War I, met in Paris and founded the American Legion, an organization with unselfish and patriotic purposes in mind. These purposes were to weld that great body of men, soon to be released from service in arms, into one vast organization whose aim would be to exhibit charity to comrades and their dependents, loyalty to the Nation, support law and order, without which neither peace nor progress would be possible. Former rank and social prestige were ignored in the formation of the new organization.

The second caucus convened in St. Louis, Mo., May 8, 9, and 10, 1919 and set up plans for the first national convention to be held in Minneapolis, Minn., November 10-12, 1919, with Franklin D'Olier, of Pennsylvania, elected its first commander. He was later president of the Prudential Insurance Co.

Jerseyites who attended the Paris caucus were: John W. Maseker, first sergeant, 29th Division, Paterson; Harold P. Barker, second

lieutenant, 26th Division, South Orange; Bert Betterson, captain, 29th Division, Newark; Carle D. Cella, of Ridgewood; Milton Conover, second lieutenant, 29th Division, Harrisonville; John S. Cooke, major, 29th Division, Paterson; George F. Fleming, sergeant, 29th Division, Trenton; Charles S. Gaskill, lieutenant colonel, SOS, Moorestown; Charles C. Goodrich, lieutenant colonel, Ordinance, Orange; E. O. Howell Jr., major, 80th Division, Cape May Court House; Gordon MacDonald, lieutenant colonel, 81st Division, Morristown; Amos J. Peaslee, major, Paris Command, Clarksboro; E. B. Rommel, sergeant, 29th Division, Trenton; Dr. Absolum Wescoat, major, Atlantic City; James I. Wyckoff, major, 79th Division, Leonia; Russell E. Young, sergeant major, 29th Division, Newark; the Rev. Fred M. Adams, Trinity Cathedral, Trenton; Charles E. Sommers, sergeant, 29th Division, Trenton, and Fred A. Snyder, colonel, 28th Division, West Orange.

The preamble to the constitution of the American Legion is as follows: "For God and Country we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the great war; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

Membership in the American Legion is open to those who served their country in time of war, honorably discharged, men and women of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Air Corps. Eligibility dates are: World War I; April 6, 1917, and Nov. 11, 1918, World War II; Dec. 7, 1941 to Sept. 2, 1945 and the Korean War; June 25, 1950 to July 27, 1953, the date of cessation as determined by the U.S. Government. Three million ex-servicemen of America's three wars are members of the thousands of American Legion posts throughout the world carrying on the program of service to the community, State and the Nation, to the sick and disabled and the widows and orphans of their departed comrades.

Mike and Pat Goode, of New Haven, Conn., Enrich St. Patrick's Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, St. Patrick's Day, which we celebrate tomorrow, has in a sense become a national holiday in America. Americans of all nationality and racial backgrounds share in the enthusiastic annual celebration in honor of the patron saint of Ireland. The day is marked with religious observances, parades, and speeches coupled with great merriment as Irishmen, in fact and in spirit, join together in celebration.

The State of Connecticut has thousands of Irish-Americans who have contributed much to the development and growth of our small but great State. In honoring all those of Irish extraction, I should like to call attention to two men who exemplify the characteristic Irish temperament, drive, and humor which are so famous. Purely by coincidence, these men are named "Mike and Pat." They are Michael J. and Patrick J. Goode, of New Haven, Conn.

Mike and Pat Goode are two of the most famous "Irishmen" in our State. They came from Ireland, as youngsters, with their parents, after the Irish rebellion in the late 1830's. Mike has passed his 82d birthday, and his brother Pat is approaching his 80th birthday. Both men have had outstanding careers in their respective fields of endeavor—Mike as a newspaperman and commentator, and Pat in diversified activities which included secretary to a Congressman, postmaster, work in real estate, and work in the broadcasting industry.

Mike and Pat have become somewhat of a legend in their home town of New Haven. Mike, who has remained a bachelor, is perhaps best known for his People's Lobby radio and television broadcasts of political activities on the local, State, and national scenes.

Pat has a sense of well-reserved pride in speaking about his family. His son, Col. James P. Goode, is Air Force Deputy for Manpower, Personnel, and Organization. A daughter, Mrs. Mary Rogan, became one of the first women attorneys in the State; and another daughter, Mrs. Eleanor Sanders, is the wife of Connecticut's Commissioner of Education.

A feature article on the Goode brothers, published in the New Haven Register on March 13, concluded with the following statement:

The flight of the Goode family from Ireland has been New Haven's gain—one of the key reasons that St. Patrick's Day has become "everybody's holiday" as Pat and Mike proclaim for all to hear.

Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in that statement, and make one additional comment: The flight of millions of Irishmen to the United States has been our country's gain and has brought about an enrichment of our society through the spirit, talents, and good humor of the Irish.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE WERE THESE TWO IRISHMEN, PAT AND MIKE—AND THEY WENT ON TO BECOME FAMOUS NEW HAVENERS—GOODE BROTHERS. RECALL ERIN ON EVE OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY. "Mike," said Pat, "you're an amazing man. I don't know how you do it."

"Pat," said Mike, "you're going pretty well yourself, for a young fellow."

The "amazing" Mike and the "young" Pat are two of New Haven's most prominent Irish-born residents who will be celebrating St. Patrick's Day this week—"everybody's holiday," Mike claims. Mike is Michael J. Goode, a spy, active ex-newspaperman and commentator, who will chalk up 83 years next September, and Pat is Patrick J. Goode,

former postmaster, waiting his 80th birthday shortly after St. Patrick's Day.

Both men, sons of a public works department foreman who fled Erin as an aftermath of the Irish rebellion in the late 1800's, started work here at long hours and low pay and have achieved enviable positions of eminence in the community.

They have seen the development of the electric light, the automobile, the telephone, the coming and departure of the electric trolley cars and pioneered the broadcasting mediums of radio and television in the area. And they have dabbled in politics, starting in the "fighting neighborhood" of the old fifth, sixth, and seventh wards up through major party conventions.

Mike took one fling at State office, running against Col. (then Major) John Q. Tilson for the State Legislature, but lost by 700 votes, 3,500 less than his party's standard bearer 2 years before.

"That was enough for me," Mike grins, sparkling Irish eyes bespeaking latent wit behind a ruddy face topped by a crop of white hair. "Pat and some of the boys engineered my nomination in 1906, but then I lost the election and I decided to be an observer."

This role was strictly adhered to through the years as a newspaperman in Lynn, Mass., Stamford, and Stratford before Mike began a remarkable string of over 1,200 "People's Lobby" radio and television broadcasts on political activities on the local, State and national scene.

Pat came up from a factory shipping clerk to work as a mail carrier, secretary to a Congressman and a postmaster, aid to famed theater magnate Sylvester Z. Poli, head of the New Haven Post Office and founder of broadcasting organizations. Both men still maintain an active interest in the medium, as well as a number of fraternal and fundraising activities that would tax the resources of much younger individuals, even those of rugged Irish stock.

A GREAT INSTITUTION

With Mike, it is plain to see that politics rates his full attention. "Politics is a great social institution," he will tell a listener in his famed, husky voice. "I still take an active interest. It is good mental exercise and keeps me busy. I have found politics to be the greatest game in the world, and the poorest business."

A bachelor, he is at home walking through the halls of the State Capitol in Hartford, or meandering and greeting friends in Washington. "Mike," says Pat, "thinks nothing of hopping a train and heading for Washington, any time of the year."

"You know," says Mike, "I've traveled on the New Haven Railroad longer and more often than anyone I know. My first trip was on the train from Boston to New Haven on May 6, 1884, when we arrived from Ireland."

FATHER CAME FIRST

"We" included mother Goode, Mike, Pat and two brothers and a sister, William, Tom and Della. The father had preceded the family by 2 years, joining friends here from Galway, Ireland, to find employment with the city where he supervised, among other projects, the construction of Howard and Kimberly Avenues.

The father's success in America was short-lived. He died in 1897, followed in death a year later by Mrs. Goode. The burden of raising the family fell on the older children, William, who became a fireman and was sexton of St. Aedan's Church after his retirement; and Della. Tom served a term as tax collector for the city, and was in the real estate and insurance business. Only Pat and Mike survive the hard-working, ambitious family that has contributed so much to the rich Irish background of the community.

Pat, who is an honorary marshal for the annual St. Patrick's parades and thoroughly enjoys meeting old friends at the many events that mark the observance, is proud of two of the many awards he has received during an active lifetime. Both presentations grace the living room of his home at 27 Rubinger Street—a framed citation from the Hibernians and a shillelagh.

His multitude of friends, acquired over years of service, is evident as he thumbs through voluminous scrapbooks with photos of top civic, fraternal and political associates, reminders of organizations to which he has contributed time, devotion, and loyalty.

PRIDE IN FAMILY

Mention of his family brings a glow of well-deserved pride to the sparkling face of the usually reserved Pat. A son, Col. James P. Goode, is Deputy Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Air Force. His daughters include Mrs. Mary Rogan, one of the first women attorneys in the State, now a resident of Burbank, Calif.; and Mrs. Eleanor Sanders, wife of Connecticut's commissioner of education, William Sanders.

These children have made Pat 11 times a proud grandfather.

Pat's career has spanned six decades. During the period he served as private secretary to Congressman Thomas L. Rully, of Meriden; secretary to Philip Troup, then postmaster, from 1910 to 1915; and was in charge of the Poli Theater real estate department from 1920 until 1934 when he organized the first of his two radio stations. He served as postmaster from 1936 until retirement a decade ago at the age of 70.

The flight of the Goode family from Ireland has been New Haven's gain—one of the key reasons that St. Patrick's Day has become everybody's holiday, as Pat and Mike proudly proclaim for all to hear.

A Bill for the Relief of the Shrimp Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to offer an editorial from the St. Augustine (Fla.) Record of Wednesday, March 9.

This editorial refers to my original bill, H.R. 8769, which has been revised and renumbered H.R. 10961, which is for the relief of the shrimp industry of the United States. St. Augustine was the cradle of the American shrimp industry, and it is still an important factor in it.

The editorial follows:

BILL ON SHRIMP IMPORTS ENDORSED

Of importance to the economy of St. Johns County is a congressional bill (H.R. 8769) which would place restrictions on shrimp imports in this country.

Not only does this bill affect this county but the entire shrimp industry of the United States and its allied businesses.

The shrimp industry is the No. 1 seafood industry of the Nation and it represents a very substantial investment in St. Johns County such as boats, shore installations, boat building yards and other allied business. It was from the port of St. Augustine that the shrimp industry in Florida spawned.

The unprecedented influx of foreign shrimp from new countries has caused a market glut which is hurting shrimp producers and processors alike. A survey shows that the total annual imports from approximately 50 foreign countries is in excess of 1 million pounds of shrimp. This is more than half of all the shrimp consumed in the United States.

The consumer demand for shrimp in the United States cannot be met entirely with domestic production. Some imports are required to meet the demand and to maintain an orderly market which will not permit the price of raw shrimp to go too high. Up through the year 1957 this delicate balance was fairly well maintained. The principal imports came from well-established fisheries in Mexico, Panama, and Ecuador, where modern shrimp trawlers are used, and where costs of production (production plus freight) compare favorably with the United States. Shrimp are found in many parts of the world, equatorial to arctic. Countries which had been indifferent producers now eyed the U.S. shrimp market and tooled up for heavy production which would increase the flow of U.S. dollars to them.

With all facts available and a valuable U.S. fishery facing ruin, all segments of the domestic shrimp industry met to study the situation and to attempt to evolve a solution. They did not want to go to Government for dole or subsidy. Preliminary talks with responsible Government officials indicated that normally bankruptcy must come first then assistance would be forthcoming. But the industry bill, H.R. 8769 looks for preventive medicine now rather than surgery later. This bill has the overwhelming approval and support of all segments of the domestic industry and is a fair approach to the problem, nationally and internationally. It provides for an increasing supply of imports, based upon historic quotas. It would help to stabilize the foreign producer as well as the domestic producer, because it would provide an orderly and stable market in the United States, the chief consumer of shrimp.

We wish to join with the shrimp industry in urging Congress to pass the pending bill and for its enactment into law in order to save the shrimp industry from economic disaster.

The Forand Bill To Add Health Benefits to the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues I have received a great deal of mail pro and con the Forand bill to add health benefits to the social security program. Since the Ways and Means Committee is currently holding executive sessions to discuss social security amendments, and the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging—on which I serve—will soon resume hearings on health problems of the aging, increased public attention is bound to be focused on the Forand bill and similar proposals.

Some of the mail that has come into my office on this subject has shed more heat than light, but I am delighted to say that much of it has been so thought-

ful and reasonable that the exchange of views has educated both my constituents and me. I have been especially heartened by the correspondence I have had with Mr. Jay Lavenson, Jr., president of the Denson Insurance Agency, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa. I ask unanimous consent to include our exchange of correspondence in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., December 18, 1959.

Re the Forand bill (H.R. 4700).

Hon. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK,

U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Regarding the captioned bill which I understand is now pending I would like to ask your consideration in voting against it.

It is my personal feeling that this legislation would result in unnecessary tax burden upon the citizens of the country and produce only quasi-desirable results.

Your corporation in soliciting and working on behalf of those who are opposed to this measure would be very much appreciated.

Cordially,

JAY LAVENSON, JR.

JANUARY 8, 1960.

Mr. JAY LAVENSON, JR.,

President, Denson Insurance Agency, Inc.,

First Federal Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. LAVENSON: I have your recent letter opposing the Forand bill.

While I am not committed to the specific provisions of that bill, I believe action is urgently needed in this field. During recent hearings of the Subcommittee on the Aging, of which I am a member, elderly people in every part of the country testified that their most frightening financial problem is that of meeting hospital and medical bills. They are most subject to catastrophic illness at a time when they earn the least (in 1958, 60 percent of those over 65 had less than \$1,000 a year income) and when about two-thirds are not covered by private hospitalization plans, either because of cost or age limitations.

So far, nobody has come forward with any solution along other lines that shows promise of being effective, and I am not satisfied that this major human problem should continue to drift along without solution.

Rather than hurting private hospitals and hospitalization plans, the inclusion of some of these benefits under social security would be of great assistance to them in dealing with increasingly complex financial problems. (May I refer you to an article entitled, "Can Blue Cross Survive Its Own Success?" in the October 29, 1959, issue of Reporter magazine, for an illuminating discussion of these problems. And may I also refer you to the forthcoming report of our subcommittee.)

Since there is a good chance that the Forand bill will be considered in this session of Congress, I appreciate having your views. I hope you will also give serious consideration to the points I make above.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

DENSON INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,
First Federal Building,

Philadelphia, Pa., February 9, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I was particularly pleased to receive yours of January 8 in reply to my letter asking you to oppose the Forand bill. I was particularly pleased at

the fairness of your answer, your obvious complete awareness of the situation, and your open mind.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Mr. Harold G. Evans, president of the American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. In addition, identical letters went to: Mr. James Powell, vice president, Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Mr. James S. Kemper, chairman of the board, Kemper Insurance Group, Kemper Building, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. David Kilgour, president, Great-West Life Assurance Co., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; Mr. V. J. Skutt, president, Mutual of Omaha, Omaha, Neb.; Mr. Frank V. McCullough, vice president, Continental Casualty Co., Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Neville Pilling, U.S. manager, Zurich Insurance Co., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Again many thanks for your prompt and courteous response.

Cordially,

DENSON INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,

JAY LAVENSON, JR.,

President.

DENSON INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,

First Federal Building,

Philadelphia 9, 1960.

Mr. HAROLD G. EVANS,
President, American Casualty Co.,
Reading, Pa.

DEAR MR. EVANS: I am writing to the chief officer of every company with which our office holds an agency contract engaged in the writing of accident and sickness insurance and to a few additional companies we know as being extremely active in the accident and sickness field although we may not represent them at this moment.

We, as most other agencies, have received a flood of literature and letters from a number of insurance companies asking us to contact our Senators and Representatives to take a stand against the Forand bill. The brochures and letters we have received all quite directly criticize the Forand bill as being inadequate, encroachment in the sanctuary of private industry, and as a threat to the future of our social security system. In addition, we have been led to believe that the evil of the Forand bill is far-reaching in its effect on future taxation costs, deterioration of individual initiative and independence, and the possibility of excessive use of our present hospital facilities.

As a good and loyal agent, I took up the cudgel of the insurance companies and wrote a letter to my Senator, JOSEPH S. CLARK, asking him to oppose the Forand bill. Mr. CLARK promptly replied in a manner that makes me proud to have him be my representative in our Federal Government. A copy of his reply is enclosed and I would like to call your attention to a few pertinent remarks.

First of all he reminds us that the problem of medical expenses for older persons is not only a financial but a human problem; second, and in my opinion a most valid observation, is the fact that apparently no one has as yet come forward with any solution better than the Forand bill.

Certainly we all are keenly aware that this problem is not a new one, and we have known for years that something would have to be done about it ultimately. Only a handful of insurance companies active in the field of hospitalization and medical expense insurance have done anything in the way of designing or affording any type of coverage for the older individual, particularly if the individual is not in good health when he initially applies for insurance.

We can't avoid the problem any longer; it's here—it's going to stay and undoubtedly become enlarged. If we of the insurance fraternity are going to be constructive and do the job we are certainly equipped to do,

the time is now to design a standardized program of adequate coverage for the aged to be underwritten by the private companies, handled by the private companies, and supervised by the industry rather than the Government.

The only way we will effectively keep the Government out of the insurance business is to do such a damn good and effective job that it won't have any reason to come into our field. By spending our time designing literature of criticism for a job we have not been able to do ourselves, we are merely spinning our wheels, and we're being passed by the governmental machinery with its chains on.

Cordially,

DENSON INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,
JAY LAVENSON, Jr., President.

Speech by Representative James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, on the Floor of the House of Representatives, March 16, 1960, in Support of the Van Zandt Bill, H.R. 6483, To Construct 100 Nuclear-Powered Attack Submarines at the Rate of 20 Vessels per Fiscal Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, during the 85th Congress, and again in this Congress I introduced legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines.

My bill, which is H.R. 6483, would direct the Secretary of the Navy to construct the 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines at the rate of 20 per fiscal year, starting with the present fiscal year which expires June 30, 1960.

H.R. 6483 would authorize to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums not to exceed \$4 billion as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of such an act.

In urging that immediate attention be directed to the necessity of constructing 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines over a 5-year period, I wish to make it clear that I am not criticizing the present posture of our national defense.

In my opinion we have an adequate national defense. Moreover, I am convinced that the vast majority of Americans are in accord with President Eisenhower's reassuring statement that we have a strong defense system.

The one disturbing factor, however, is that everyone seems to be concerned solely with the need of concentrating on building more Polaris missile-firing submarines. Thus, in doing so we tend to neglect to recognize the imperative need of also increasing the fleet of nuclear-powered attack submarines which have a greater all-around capability as an arm of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that all of our alliances and our ability to maintain the integrity of the free world are dependent upon keeping open the sealanes. And, in that respect, I am convinced that the most serious threat to the ability of the Navy to control the seas is the large Soviet submarine fleet already in being and the nuclear fleet now under construction by the Soviets.

Then too, Mr. Speaker, we must realize that a few of these Soviet submarines now equipped to fire missiles can place our coastal cities in danger of being destroyed in the event of war. Speaking frankly, many believe there is little doubt that the Soviets are capable of effecting their own marriage of the IRBM to the nuclear-powered submarine, as we are doing with the Polaris type submarine.

At the same time, the Soviets are advanced in the missile field and are known to be building nuclear-powered submarines. In this connection, over a period of years they have long pointed out the vulnerability of the United States to such attacks. In short, missile launching submarines are the Soviet equivalent to our overseas air and missile bases.

Mr. Speaker, no longer is the ocean our protector. In fact, the ocean now becomes the hiding place, the breeding ground, and the potential battlefield of the most serious threat to our safety.

Frankly, the Navy must expedite all efforts to cope with this threat, sacrificing if necessary other functions of lesser importance.

In analyzing our position today, it is well to recall that at the outbreak of World War II, Germany had 57 submarines of which 22 were ocean going. Before the war was over, 14 million tons of allied shipping went to the bottom of the sea. It took us four long years to gain control over the German submarine menace.

In this age of atomic power and missile, the submarine is even a more powerful and more versatile weapon. The knowledge that the Russian submarine fleet is nearly nine times as large as was the German submarine force at the outbreak of World War II should stir us to action now, rather than waiting for destruction. For survival we not only must be able to control the air above and the surface of the sea but also the waters beneath.

Fortunately, we have in our arsenal the nuclear-powered attack submarine—a superior weapon which, if produced in sufficient numbers, could defeat the large Soviet submarine fleet.

With that thought in mind, it is pertinent to review the following tables showing the estimated maximum numbers of combat submarines we now have on hand and will have from now until 1966.

ESTIMATED MAXIMUM NUMBERS OF COMBAT SUBMARINES

TABLE I.—Attack type less than 20 years old

	Now	Late 1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Nuclear.....	7	13	16	23	27	30	33	36
Conventional.....	87	87	87	87	84	59	23	19
Total.....	94	100	103	110	111	89	56	55

TABLE II.—Missile types less than 20 years old

	Now	Late 1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Nuclear-Polaris.....	1	5	7	9	12	15	18	21
Nuclear-Regulus.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Conventional-Regulus.....	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2
Total.....	6	10	12	14	17	19	21	24

TABLE III

	Now	Late 1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Nuclear total of table I and table II.....	9	19	24	33	40	46	52	58

BASIS FOR TABLE

First. Submarines have a maximum useful life of 20 years. This is due to two factors: (a) Hull deterioration becomes so pronounced that the ships become unsafe to operate except at very shallow depths. Repairs to the hull become prohibitively expensive. (b) Space and arrangement restrictions make it impossible to install the later types of equipment needed to keep the submarine militarily effective. Modern submarines require more and more electronic devices.

These cannot be installed in World War II hulls without unacceptable infringements on habitability.

Second. Nuclear attack submarines will continue to be authorized at the present rate of about three per year.

Third. Nuclear Polaris type submarines will continue to be authorized at the present rate of about three per year.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of scientists and tacticians agree that the best way to hunt down and destroy a submarine is with another submarine. When deal-

ing with the threat of Soviet submarines with nuclear power this naval fact becomes intensely significant. An atomic submarine is an extremely durable, elusive craft and is immune to many of the search and attack techniques effective against conventional submarines.

Further, as demonstrated by the cruises to the North Pole by the *Nautilus*, the *Skate*, and the *Sargo*, a whole new strategic area of the world has been opened. No longer can we comfort ourselves with the protection afforded the most northern boundaries of our continent by the Arctic ice cap. Nuclear submarines of any nation will be free to militarily exploit the Arctic Basin.

Only a strong force of nuclear attack submarines will provide us with the ability to check missile-firing submarine threats from that area.

Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know that the United States is for the present ahead of Russia in the development of nuclear submarines by a significant if not commanding margin. However, as Rear Adm. Hyman Rickover testified a considerable time ago, if the Soviets build their nuclear-powered submarines at even a fraction of the rate they have been building conventional submarines we could very soon lose our present lead in submarine nuclear propulsion.

No one will deny that it would be devastating and nothing short of criminal for us to let this happen.

The dramatic successes of our nuclear-powered submarines have captured the imagination and the admiration of all Americans and millions of people throughout the world. To these people these splendid ships are a modern symbol of America's capacity for progress and leadership in the field of science and exploration. If we permit the Russians to surpass us we not only invite destruction but we destroy this world-wide image. In a few words, it is an accepted fact that we now possess an actual weapon superiority and a psychological supremacy of incalculable value in the nuclear submarine. Frankly, we must retain it.

We should be mindful, too, of the fact that our current submarine fleet is composed mainly of ships built during World War II which was clearly demonstrated by the tables called to your attention a moment ago. These ships are rapidly becoming obsolete and overage. Therefore, as the tables show, if we are to have anything more than a token attack submarine fleet, we must immediately increase our submarine construction program.

Let me submit one further point for your consideration.

The Navy has been quick to point out that fighting Russian submarines is not a numbers matching game. The Navy has said that the usefulness of the nuclear-powered attack submarine best accrues when we are able to take advantage of its unique characteristics in conjunction with other tools which supplement it.

I do not deny this, but I am very much concerned that if we continue the construction of attack submarines at the present rate we very soon will not even

have enough submarines to run target for these other tools of antisubmarine warfare.

Of all the elements of the U.S. Navy the nuclear-powered attack submarine will probably be the last to become obsolete. Even the *Polaris* submarine, now being developed so vigorously, will undoubtedly give way to improved deterrent systems utilizing the nuclear underwater concept.

As my bill, H.R. 6483 provides, I again urge that we immediately build large numbers of attack submarines that have the capacity to sink Russian submarines. My bill proposes that the Congress authorize, for construction in the next 5 years, 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines.

To get started on this effort now, I propose that we immediately authorize in the fiscal year 1961 supplemental budget \$500 million for the construction this year of 10 additional attack submarines. If we start now I am confident that these ships could be completed in 1964 and 1965. If we build them on an accelerated basis, with top priority, and I propose that we do so, I am confident they can all be completed before the end of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, from my own investigations I have determined that these 10 ships could be built without constructing new facilities. In other words, no retooling would be required.

Failure to immediately start constructing these attack submarines is a national admission that we do not intend to protect the lead we now have in the nuclear submarine field.

To make my position crystal clear, I heartily support all efforts in the anti-submarine warfare program.

In addition, I recognize the urgency of ship construction, including new carriers, *Polaris* submarine, amphibious ships or vessels, and all the other elements involved in establishing and maintaining sea power.

I also recognize that ICBM missiles encased in hardened sites or moving around the countryside on flat cars, also play an important role in our defense structure.

But when all is said and done, considering the present state of the art, we have high hope of being able to at least briefly anticipate ICBM's by tracking devices as they travel through thousands of miles of space.

We have reason to hope that we will have enough advance notice to detect and intercept such missiles.

But no one has yet found a way to overcome the natural cover of billions of tons of sea water particularly under conditions of variable temperature.

Commonsense, therefore, would seem to indicate that this natural protection for our submarines is also our greatest danger.

Thus, that weapon which can seek out and destroy a submarine underwater is the weapon we should accelerate.

That weapon, Mr. Speaker, is the nuclear attack submarine.

It is the weapon that will destroy the ballistic missile submarine that would

otherwise be able to fire its lethal load practically undetected.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding these remarks, I urge that we give immediate consideration to the construction of 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines as provided for in my bill, H.R. 6483, pending since April 16, 1959, before the House Armed Services Committee.

Tight-Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Frederic Inter-County Leader is one of Wisconsin's outstanding weekly newspapers.

In these days of very hard times for weekly newspapers throughout America, days in which the weekly newspaper population is constantly diminishing, this fine Frederic paper stands out as a vigorous, widely read and mighty successful spokesman for the people of northwestern Wisconsin.

Mr. President, recently the Inter-County Leader published an editorial in which they discuss the tight-money policy with remarkable thoughtfulness and perception. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Record as follows:

TIGHT-MONEY POLICY

In a speech before the U.S. Senate, February 4, which is now part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE of Wisconsin revealed that the new tight-money policy is costing the schools an additional \$675 million each year. The speech followed the passage by the Senate of a \$913 million school assistance bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE said, "I would agree that this is a bright, not a dark, hour in the history of the Senate. I can think of nothing more important, nothing which is more desperately needed, than assistance for American education in this year of challenge."

But, at the same time, Senator PROXMIRE brought to the attention of the public that the direct action of the Federal Government agency, the Federal Reserve Board, has cost the schools a full two-thirds of the value of the bill passed. Between 1952 and 1960, interest rates have increased for school bonds from 2.19 percent to 4.19 percent.

According to standard figures for the Nation, an average elementary school costs about \$500,000. The interest rate on such a project in 1952, carried for 30 years would reach \$164,000. On this same basis the interest cost in 1960 has risen to \$314,000, an increase of \$150,000. In other words, the interest rate related to the construction cost of a school has gone up 30 percent. The total cost including interest and construction has gone up more than 22 percent.

Senator PROXMIRE said, "Many will say that the increase in the interest rates is not the responsibility of any individual, of any group, or of any government agency; it is simply something which has happened in our economy."

"This is not the case. The interest rate is a direct function of the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product. As the money supply is increased by the Federal Reserve Board, the gross national product remaining constant, the interest rate falls. As the Federal Reserve Board fails to increase the money supply in relation to the gross national product, or reduces the money supply, the interest rate goes up."

Between 1952 and 1953, the money supply was held almost constant by the Federal Reserve System. It increased only \$1.5 billion. During the same year the gross national product increased by approximately \$18 billion. The result was that the money supply, as a percentage of the gross national product, dropped; so the inevitable happened, interest rates for schools rose from 2.19 percent to 2.72 percent. The same has been true for the years that followed.

Last year the Federal Reserve Board reduced the money supply sharply. They took \$4 billion out of circulation, and the gross national product increased very sharply—nearly \$40 billion. The result was that the ratio between the money supply and gross national product dropped to the lowest in 30 years—29 percent. With the drop, interest rates increased to their highest level in 30 years. Interest rates on school bonds rose to a punishing 3.90 percent. This trend is continuing, and already in 1960 the squeeze becomes tighter and the cost of money for schools has increased to 4.19 percent.

According to the Senator, the Federal Reserve Board is directly responsible for the level of the cost of school bonds. He pointed out that not a single dollar of that \$675 million of the additional costs, the 22 percent increase in costs, goes to any working man, none of it goes for higher construction wages, or in profits to any of the school building contractors, who are generally small business people. Every penny of it goes to the money lenders, and comes from the property taxes of hard-pressed local citizens.

Free Asia Opposes U.S. Recognition of Red China, Farley Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reported by James A. Farley:

FREE ASIA OPPOSES U.S. RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA, FARLEY REPORTS

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., March 2.—Free Asia is overwhelmingly in agreement on one thing, inflexible opposition to U.S. recognition of Red China, James A. Farley, world-famous Democratic leader and board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., reported here today on his return from a 6-week business trip to the South Pacific and Far East.

"Leaders throughout Free Asia pointed out to me on my recent trip," Farley asserted, "that in the face of Communist China's action in Tibet, its invasion of Indian territory, its subversive efforts against its neighbors, and its refusal to renounce the use of force, it would be a great error to reward Communist China by recognizing it or supporting its entry into the United Nations."

"They maintained that until Communist China by its actions gives proof that it wishes to live in peace with its neighbors and is willing to cease its effort to undermine their hard-won independence, nothing should be done to enhance the position or prestige of a Communist China regime, since this would simply increase Communist China's ability to increase its subversive action."

Free Berlin and the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a recent statement made in Milwaukee, Wis., on March 6, 1960, I briefly summarized my assessment of the situation 10 weeks before the Geneva summit conference, with particular reference to the critical problem of Berlin. I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of my remarks on the Berlin crisis.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Big and dramatic events are on their way. It is only 10 weeks until the opening of the summit conference at Geneva. It is 16 months since Khrushchev launched his ultimatum against the freedom-loving city of free Berlin, and he is losing no opportunity to show his impatience—his toughness.

He very badly wants to push the West—and freedom—out of Berlin.

Even during his recent junket to Indonesia, he took time to threaten Berlin again. He demanded that the Western Powers sign peace treaties with both Germanies—West Germany and East Germany.

If they did not, he threatened to sign his own treaty with East Germany, and to snuff out the legal rights of the occupying powers in Berlin.

"West Berlin," he said, "is on the territory of East Germany."

The 1958 ultimatum has already yielded big dividends to Khrushchev—two foreign ministers' conferences, his visit to America, and an invitation to a series of summit meetings. But the appetite grows with eating, and he wants more and more.

At his press conference last month, our Secretary of State Herter acknowledged that the tough Soviet talk on Berlin has him worried. He attributed this tough Communist talk to the lead the Soviet Union now holds over the United States in intercontinental missiles—the so-called missile gap.

This raises a very grave question—what have we done with the 16 months since Khrushchev launched his warning?

One thing we certainly cannot complain of—the attitude of the free people of West Berlin. Under the leadership of their gallant mayor, Willy Brandt—a man whom I am proud to number among my close friends—they have remained steadfast in the face of a long series of threats.

I was in Europe in 1958 when the Khrushchev ultimatum was delivered, and I went direct to Berlin to assure its mayor and people that the American people backed them to the hilt.

I remember, as if it were yesterday how warmly Mayor Brandt welcomed me and with what pride he showed me his half of the

city—from its bustling shops and factories to its modern housing for workers.

In long and frank talks as we drove about the city, he shared with me the grave problems in maintaining this little island of freedom in a totalitarian sea.

At the heart of the city, by famous Brandenburg Gate, we stood together on the very frontier between freedom and slavery.

I was deeply moved as he told me of the hardships of the first Berlin blockade, and expressed the gratitude of his people for the allied airlift which kept the city alive. The people of Berlin have put up a beautiful memorial directly in front of Tempelhof Airport to the 38 flyers who lost their lives in the course of the airlift, and I was privileged to lay a wreath before it.

I spoke to many Berliners, and asked them how their nerves were standing up under the strain. They told me: "Don't worry about our nerves, and we won't worry about yours."

I don't worry about our nerves—but I do worry about the yawning gaps in our readiness to meet a crisis which may burst upon us in 10 weeks time—or even sooner.

I am concerned, as many well-informed observers are, about the space gap and the missile gap.

Soviet sputniks and luniks are blazing out into space with a magnitude of thrust which, even now—2 years after the first sputnik—we are unable to match.

I am alarmed by the prospect that, within the next 2 or 3 years, the Russians may have a 3-to-1 advantage over us in missiles—but I am even more alarmed that the administration reacts to this appalling prospect as if it were nothing more than the Russian victory in the winter Olympics.

It is the "complacency gap" which troubles me even more than the missile gap.

We have been warned—again and again and again. But all the administration does is to administer us another tranquilizing pill.

There is another huge gap that bothers me—what I call the "testimony gap," the gap between what we are told and what we uncomfortably suspect to be the painful truth.

Recently we were told, in an official manual that shall remain nameless—and, in fact, unsanctified—that the idea of Americans having a right to know what's going on is, and I quote: "Another foolish remark often heard."

The manual has been shot down, but the malady lingers on. Only a few days ago the President blasted two of our most responsible newspapers—the New York Times and the Washington Post—for printing perfectly accurate reports of the testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett—a Republican, by the way.

I for one shall keep repeating this so-called foolish remark until someone up there hears and heeds—and lets the American people know what's going on.

Who are we fooling, anyway? Maybe our own people—but not, by Secretary Herter's admission, the Soviets.

Then there is a third threatening gap—the "moral gap," the gap between what we preach and what we practice.

Almost 6 years have passed since the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregated schools. Yet the administration and Congress still shirk their share of responsibility for enforcing that decision.

We haven't even heard from the White House what we have every right to expect—a clear and unequivocal affirmation of the moral rightness of that historic decision.

We talk of our prosperous society—and yet we leave over 20 million of our people languishing in poverty: the aged, the sick, and those marooned in the depressed areas which pockmark our country.

Khrushchev doesn't need a "seeing eye" satellite to spy out our weaknesses.

As he sees it, ours is a dying system—and his hands are itching for the spade so that he can "bury" us—to quote his own blunt word.

There isn't any quizmaster who can slip us, under the table, the answers to the grave questions which hang over us. There isn't any "payola" that will ensure our prestige in the world, unless we earn it by deeds as well as words.

I have made a careful study of Soviet strategy.

There is no day-to-day fumbling in their policy, as there too often is in ours. They think in terms of years and of decades. They weigh future trends as well as present facts.

They will have one kind of policy if they think America is rising in the world—a policy of respect and carefulness. They will have another, and much more unpleasant one, if they see we are sinking.

They will be watching what we do, listening to what we say, in the coming weeks. They will form their own shrewd judgment about whether we will continue sleepwalking into the limbo of second-class powers—or whether we will, at long last, wake up and rally our great energies and capabilities for the crisis that lies ahead.

It is good that we—Democrats and Republicans alike—have said in one united voice that we will stand firm on Berlin. But we must do more than say the right words—much more. We must move to close the gaps that cloud with doubt the firmness of our purpose.

I have just heard that Mayor Brandt of free Berlin has cancelled plans to visit America and put the case of his beleaguered city before us—because of the renewed gravity of the situation there.

He wants to be on the job 24 hours a day, to meet and to cope with whatever may come. Oh, how I wish that our own Government had been on the job 24 hours a day for all these recent 7 years.

For myself, I shall continue to blow the bugle, sound the warning, seek to awaken the American people to the peril in which they stand. Given the full facts and alert, on-the-job leadership, we shall—I am utterly confident—surmount this coming crisis.

Extended Debate Justifies Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a very timely and well-written editorial from the Columbia Record of March 14, 1960, entitled "Extended Debate Justifies Itself." The Record has as its editor one of the soundest and most able writers in this country, Mr. Henry Cauthen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENDED DEBATE JUSTIFIES ITSELF

The value of extended debate has just been historically proved in the Senate of the United States.

Not all of the prospective advantages for the country which have come into vision through doors opened by this debate will be realized, but already there have accrued some benefits. It has been extremely healthy for the order and fairness of this Nation.

True resolve, tireless enterprise and the harnessing of mentalities, under inspiration, are elements not to be denied. These are the qualities which the southern Senators have brought to the filibuster.

And it has been the experience of men that the use of such qualities not only brings stated goals or quests closer, but often leads into unexpected areas of discovery and achievement. Almost any energetic newspaper reporter can narrate cases in which he, seeking a specific story for his paper, finds his enterprise has led him to another. Salesmen can tell of many a similar experience. So can scientific researchers.

And so it has been in the extended debate over so-called civil rights legislation in the Senate. Who, for example, would have imagined that during this debate northern and western liberal Senators would suddenly have been forced to join southerners to defeat one of the sections of the bill in contention?

In the bill was a provision making it a Federal crime to interfere with Federal court orders in desegregation cases. This, of course, was aimed directly and exclusively at the South. Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, a conservative Democrat, had proposed the broadening of the provision to include court injunctions in labor cases and all other Federal court orders.

This brought outraged liberals immediately into action, and, under fear of the labor unions, they joined southerners in voting to kill the whole provision. The vote was 65 to 19 to eliminate that section of the bill.

Southerners, of course, opposed the original section all along. And in voting with the strange companionship of the liberals they were consistent. The southerners were acting to protect their area of the country and the northerners and westerners to retain the trade-union vote.

Had the southerners in the beginning, in a spirit of hopelessness, decided to abstain from extended debate over civil rights, there would never have been any such development as the elimination of the section. In the circumstances, the scorned Lausche amendment made sense; it applied section 1, if there was to be such a section, to all court orders and removed the discrimination from the South, if not removing southern objection.

But the circumstances changed. The northerners and westerners did not want laborite resistance to court orders affecting labor to be a crime. So fearful were these liberals of the unions that they went back on the Negroes by killing that section of the bill designed favorably to affect desegregation.

In protecting the unions, the northern and western Senators were compelled to let what purported to be protection of southern Negroes go by the boards.

Here was one of the miracles, and doubtless unexpected, coming out of the enterprise of extended debate and helping justify what outside the South is regarded as a most iniquitous device—the filibuster.

To Our Negro Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the agitation current in the Southern

States between races, I should like to incorporate in the RECORD the following editorial from the Orlando Sentinel, Tuesday morning, March 8:

TO OUR NEGRO FRIENDS

Agitators from the Negro and white races are stirring up a new kind of trouble in the South: The lunch counter sitdown strike.

This useless nonsense started in Virginia and North Carolina a few weeks ago. College students of both races, perhaps intent more upon attracting attention to themselves rather than sincerely protesting segregated eating, succeeded in setting off a wave of trouble which could become serious.

The NAACP, an organization noted in recent years for creating dissension between the races rather than trying to find a realistic solution to the differences of opinion, was quick to give the sit-down strikes its blessing and encouragement.

So today we find new racial tensions existing in parts of the South where the question had not even come up.

We want to point out to our Negro friends in central Florida that the motive behind this attempt to destroy harmony between the races is purely political.

Item 1: The Senate is arguing the matter of civil rights. It is not unreasonable to suppose that sit-down demonstrations are being promoted to provide ammunition for the supporters of punitive "civil rights" measures for the South.

Item 2: A presidential election is coming up. Attempts will be made to solidify the Negro vote on an emotional basis. Also, attempts will be made to repudiate any southern candidate such as Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

Before central Florida Negroes allow themselves to be persuaded to participate in lunch counter demonstrations they should ask themselves three questions:

1. Do I really want to eat in a white lunchroom?
2. Am I helping the cause of my race by insisting that custom be reversed?
3. Wouldn't racial harmony and understanding be achieved more quickly if my race worked with, rather than against, other races?

Expert Support for the Establishment of a "Know Your Government Office"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I introduced S. 3096 which would establish a Know Your Government Office in the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration.

Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government and Public Administration in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, has written me a very informative and thoughtful letter commenting on this proposal. Dr. Galloway, who is one of the Nation's leading experts on governmental reform, indicates that he is in agreement with this proposal and in a most interesting fashion describes a similar office which existed from 1934 to 1948.

I feel that Dr. Galloway's letter contains much useful background material

with reference to the idea of establishing a Know Your Government Office. For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the text of S. 3096 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

Washington, D.C., March 2, 1960.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have examined with much interest your bill (S. 3096) and supporting statement for establishing a "Know Your Government Office."

It seems to me that this is an excellent proposal for at least two reasons: (1) It would establish a central clearinghouse for informing the public on the organization and operation of the Federal Government; and (2) it might well reduce the workload on congressional offices created by constituent inquiries for such information.

The proposal to locate the new office in the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration seems appropriate since that is where the U.S. Government Organization Manual is prepared.

An alternative title of the new Office might be the "Government Information Service."

It is pertinent to recall that such an agency as you now suggest actually existed in Washington from March 1934, to June 30, 1948. In March 1934, a "U.S. Information Service" was established as a division of the National Emergency Council, to function as a central clearinghouse for information on all phases of governmental activity. It continued as a division of the Office of Government Reports when that agency succeeded to the functions of the National Emergency Council pursuant to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, effective July 1, 1939. It was transferred and consolidated, along with other functions of the Office of Government Reports, into the Office of War Information by Executive Order 9182 of June 13, 1942, where it functioned as the Division of Public Inquiries within the Bureau of Special Services. Executive Order 9608, of August 31, 1945, transferred the Bureau of Special Services to the Bureau of the Budget where it functioned as the Government Information Service. Upon the reestablishment of the Office of Government Reports by Executive Order 9809, December 12, 1946, the service again became a unit of this office. Subsequent to the enactment of the act approved July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 588), the functions of the OGR were restricted and liquidation of the OGR was completed on June 30, 1948.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Senior Specialist in American Govern-
ment and Public Administration.

S. 3096

A bill to establish in the General Services Administration an office to disseminate general information concerning the organization of the Federal Government.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to achieve a better public understanding of the organization of the Federal Government, and the operation of its various agencies, the Administrator of General Services shall establish in the National Archives and Records Service an office, to be located in Washington, District of Columbia, and to be known as the "Know Your Government Office" (hereinafter referred to as the "Office").

(b) The functions of the Office shall include—

(1) the dissemination of general information concerning the functions of the various departments and agencies of the Government;

(2) providing students and other interested persons with information concerning the organization of the Government;

(3) the furnishing of information upon request concerning the officer or agency to be contacted for specific inquiries bearing upon the activities of a particular agency of the Government; and

(4) enhancing by an educational program public interest in and understanding of the structure and operations of the Government.

SEC. 2. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Educate the Whole Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the great debate about our educational deficiencies that has been going on throughout the country for the past several years, the fact that education consists of more than academic learning is often overlooked. This point is well developed in a letter written recently to the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. William Ashley, principal, Freeport High School, Freeport, N.Y. I believe Mr. Ashley's comments will be of interest to my colleagues and to all in the country who are concerned about and responsible for the education of our young people. Mr. Ashley's letter follows:

EDUCATE THE WHOLE CHILD

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

Recently scare headlines appeared in your paper about the evils of athletics in junior high schools.

As one who has spent many years in both the academic and athletic phases of our public education system, I greatly deplore unscientific generalizations that are made by people who know only one side of the story. These statements of opinion become gospel to many readers.

I, of course, refer to Dr. Conant's study of the junior high school system. Not all athletic programs are equally good, any more than the math or science courses in all schools compare favorably. However, by and large, this field is the last bastion in many a school for the perpetuation of the ideals and discipline so needed and often so lacking in our American culture.

Would you propose that it is better to encourage a furthering of the ever-increasing habits of smoking, drinking, partying and "corner hanging out" by our 12- and 13-year-olds rather than have them on the playing fields where at least an effort at social training is being made? If Dr. Conant was in this field of public education, he would soon find that it is quite an effort to encourage our young people into the field of athletic endeavor. It costs too much in sweat and effort, as opposed to gossiping in the corner drugstore.

Again I say, it will be a sad day when you convince the American public that the elim-

ination of an athletic program is desirable. This has already been done to a great extent by TV and the movies.

Certainly those who realize that education is a total process do not wish to be added to the deteriorating process already too far underway in our public schools. The great city of New York is a fine example of what happens to a school system that has canceled the educational value of an athletic program.

There is no conflict between intellectual development of our youngsters and the social training provided for by a good athletic program. Education in America is not deficient only on the scholastic level, as studies such as Dr. Conant's indicate, but far more so on the moral and social side of the problem.

I am sure that we all give at least lip-service to the idea that we cannot separate the physical from the intellectual, the social from the emotional. Therefore, total behavior must be the concern of the educational process.

How can this be done by eliminating that part of the process which best appeals to these various aspects of total development?

WILLIAM ASHLEY,

Principal, Freeport High School.

FREEPORT, N.Y.

The House by the Side of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on a hot summer afternoon, many years ago, a traveler walked along a country road. He was a stranger to the countryside, and he became hungry and thirsty and tired, but he saw no welcome farmstead to which he might retire for succor and refreshment. As the warm summer sun beat down upon him, he came to a bend in the dusty road and he saw a path winding its way over the hill into a shady, sylvan spot. He walked down the path and came to a little spring beneath the protecting trees, and beside the spring was a cup and a bowl of ripe, luscious fruit. Looking about him, he noted that the ground had been cleared and that a little table had been erected, surrounded by benches for the comfort of those who might pause to rest. After he had drunk from the cool, clear, refreshing water of the spring, and after he had renewed his strength by resting under the trees and by eating the fruit, he decided to look for his benefactor, the person who had made the recent pleasures possible. Consequently, he followed the path as it delved deeper into the forest until at last he came to a humble cottage. Knocking upon the door, he was greeted cheerfully by a kind man, bent with the weight of years. The traveler inquired as to the identity of the individual who kept the spring clean and the fruit fresh, and the old gentleman replied that it was he, but he refused to give his name. He was content to have the traveler know of his desire to remain anonymous and of his pleasure in making life a bit

happier for those who toil along the road.

The kind old man's name will never be known, but his kind acts inspired the traveler to write a poem that has been read by the youth of every race and repeated from the lips of men around the earth. The traveler was Sam Walter Foss; the poem, "The House by the Side of the Road." I ask unanimous consent that this poem be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

There are hermit souls that live withdrawn
In the peace of their self-content;
There are souls like stars, that dwell apart,
In a fellowless firmament;
There are pioneer souls that blaze their paths
Where highways never ran—
But let me live by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

Let me live in a house by the side of the road,
Where the race of men go by—
The men who are good and the men who are bad,

As good and as bad as I.
I would not sit in the scorner's seat,
Or hurl the cynic's ban—
Let me live in a house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

I see from my house by the side of the road,
By the side of the highway of life,
The men who press with the ardor of hope,
The men who are faint with the strife.
But I turn not away from their smiles nor their tears,

Both parts of an infinite plan—
Let me live in my house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

I know there are brook-gladdened meadows ahead,
And mountains of wearisome height;
That the road passes on through the long afternoon

And stretches away to the night.
But still I rejoice when the travelers rejoice,
And weep with the strangers that moan,
Nor live in my house by the side of the road
Like a man who dwells alone.

Let me live in my house by the side of the road,

Where the race of men go by—
They are good, they are bad, they are weak,
they are strong,

Wise, foolish—so am I;
Then why should I sit in the scorner's seat,
Or hurl the cynic's ban?

Let me live in my house by the side of the road
And be a friend to man.

Attorney General's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a

timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, as follows:

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PLEA

Attorney General Rogers has appealed indirectly to the House to retain in its version of a civil rights bill the provision making it a Federal crime willfully to use force or threats of force to obstruct Federal court orders in school desegregation cases. The language used by the Attorney General is somewhat surprising, especially in the light of the debate in the Senate last Friday.

Essentially this same provision was contained in section 1 of the administration bill submitted to the Senate. This section was killed, however, after the Senate, by vote of 65 to 19, had accepted the Lausche amendment which made it a crime to obstruct any Federal court order, not merely orders issued in school desegregation cases.

Why did the Senate adopt the Lausche amendment by an overwhelming vote, and then move on to kill all of section 1 after the Lausche amendment had been added to it? In many respects, we think, this was purely a political performance. But some very persuasive arguments were advanced against section 1 as originally proposed by the administration.

Chief among these was the contention that it would be unjust, as a matter of principle, to legislate with respect to one—and only one—class of cases. In this view, if it is wrong to obstruct court orders in school desegregation cases it is equally wrong to obstruct court orders in other types of cases. And if such obstruction is to be made a crime, the law should apply evenly to all obstructions, not to just one kind of obstruction. The political hitch is that organized labor would bitterly oppose the application of the Lausche doctrine to court orders in labor disputes. As a matter of principle, however, it seems to us that the argument in support of the Lausche proposal cannot be successfully answered.

The Senate vote (49 to 35) to strike all of section 1 came after the labor lobbyists had been heard from. But this action was not entirely a result of labor pressure. Senator Morse, for example, argued strongly, and we thought persuasively, to the effect that the new criminal provision in section 1 is not needed. He thought that existing law plus the power of a Federal judge to punish for contempt is sufficient.

The Attorney General does not think that these remedies are adequate. He believes that the criminal provision is needed. If he is right in this, however, it is surprising to us that, in effect, he would be urging the House to ignore the sentiment of the Senate as expressed in the 65-to-19 vote on the Lausche amendment. The Attorney General, of course, did not say this in so many words. But his appeal was strictly and repeatedly limited to school desegregation cases, and he even tried, not very successfully, to draw a distinction between court orders in school cases and court orders in other cases. Yet, according to Senator Morse, the Attorney General testified earlier before a Senate committee that "if Congress feels there are other situations where there is a similar need for this (section 1) statute, we obviously would have no objection."

As of this date, however, Mr. Rogers apparently wants a criminal sanction applicable only to school desegregation cases. We think that this, as a matter of principle, is wrong, and we do not see how the 65 Senators who voted for the Lausche amendment can be expected to accept, in the House bill, the very same discriminatory provision which the Lausche proposal was designed to remedy.

Reuben B. Robertson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 15, 1960, the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen carried an editorial relating to former Deputy Secretary of Defense Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., who was a native of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REUBEN B. ROBERTSON, JR.

The death of Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., president of the Champion Paper & Fiber Co. and former Deputy Secretary of Defense, in a highway accident in Cincinnati, brought pain and sorrow to the Champion family and to his great many friends in western North Carolina and elsewhere in the Nation.

He was an industrial and public figure of national stature. His passing is a loss that the Nation can ill afford.

A vigorous and able man of friendly, outgoing personality, he was much interested in people and their welfare and he had a deep appreciation of the importance of proper human relations in industry.

Mr. Robertson, the son of Reuben B. Robertson, Sr., of Asheville, Champion board chairman, and of the late Mrs. Robertson, was born in Asheville in 1903.

After graduating from Asheville school, he won a degree in chemical engineering at Yale in 1930 after which he studied forestry in Europe before joining the Champion company at Canton.

He held numerous positions of responsibility in the company before his election to the presidency in 1950. He made his home in Cincinnati while directing the vast operations of Champion at Hamilton, Ohio, Canton, and Pasadena, Tex.

After making his home in Cincinnati, Mr. Robertson maintained his close family, social and business ties with western North Carolina. He was the third generation of the family with Champion, founded in 1893 in Hamilton by his grandfather, Peter G. Thomson.

As Champion president, Mr. Robertson earned a reputation as one of the Nation's top industrial executives. In 1957 he was named "Man of the Year" in the paper industry for outstanding service to his country. Previously, in 1953, the National Association of Manufacturers named him "Man of the Year" for his work as head of a group of businessmen sent abroad by President Eisenhower to evaluate the U.S. security program.

Other governmental services of Mr. Robertson included the vice chairmanship of a committee that studied the Defense Department's business setup for the Hoover Commission on Governmental Organization. In 1950-51 he was on the Wage Stabilization Board and in 1942 he served on the War Production Board before entering the Army in World War II as a captain. He rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. Robertson came into greater national prominence as Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1955-57. He exhibited patriotic devotion and

worked earnestly and ably in behalf of America's security.

After returning to private life, he maintained close contact with defense matters and staunchly upheld the defense policies of the administration. Only last month one of his last speeches, if not the last, was on the subject of defense. It was prepared for the meeting of the chamber of commerce in Waynesville.

Though a busy corporation head and a director of several other corporations, Mr. Robertson found time for active participation in such causes as education, conservation, the Red Cross, the YMCA, and the community chest, both while at Canton and in Cincinnati. He was also a vestryman.

Mr. Robertson will be remembered for his many fine accomplishments in business and civic life and for his devoted service to the Nation and its security.

Baring Letter Exchange on Bureau of Public Roads False Technical Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD information on an exchange of letters between Mr. Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President, and me. On January 27, 1960, I addressed a letter to Mr. Merriam which was substantially identical to a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Commerce on the same date, now appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1960, pages A963 and A964. In that letter to Mr. Mueller I showed conclusively that the Bureau of Public Roads did falsify pertinent technical information in presenting its side of the picture to the John A. Blatnik Special Committee investigating the selection of the routing of the Interstate Freeway System from the California State line through Reno and Sparks to Vista, Nev. I now wish to insert in the RECORD the unusual answer Mr. Merriam sent on February 16, 1960, and the letter I addressed to Mr. Merriam on March 4, 1960, in which I showed that the responsibility for disciplining the Bureau of Public Roads on account of its issuance of false technical data to the John A. Blatnik Special Committee rests with the President of the United States in the exercise of his executive power in accordance with article II, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States. The letters follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 16, 1960.

The Honorable WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I wish to thank you for your letters of January 26 and January 27 with their further information regarding the National Defense Highway program for the Reno area.

There is very little I can add to my letter of September 22, 1959, to you.

Your two recent letters are mostly concerned with statements made in the Blatnik

subcommittee report with which I was acquainted when I wrote my letter of September 22. It appears advisable at this time for you to discuss questions of interpretation of information contained in this report directly with the subcommittee. In this direct manner the problem of the third party is not produced.

While it would appear that the questions you have recently raised regarding the data furnished the subcommittee by the Bureau of Public Roads should be taken up with the subcommittee, I am requesting the Department of Commerce to furnish me with an analysis and interpretation of the comments in your letters with respect to the benefit cost data.

I am sure we are all interested in insuring that the information furnished public bodies shall be as accurate and complete as possible, and your interest on this occasion is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
Deputy Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MERRIAM: This will acknowledge your letter of February 16. In my letter to you dated January 27 I told you, that the Bureau of Public Roads' testimony before the John A. Blatnik subcommittee that the benefit-cost ratio of the Reno-Sparks Third Street Route would be 4.6 is false.

As all the affected constituted authorities as they reached their decisions were using essentially the same false data, their decisions, although possibly in agreement, are unsupported by technical fact and are, therefore, valueless. The Blatnik subcommittee, page 17 of its House Report No. 292, did "attach no sinister motives to the action of the Bureau in the above regard."

Now that the Blatnik subcommittee members know through unrefuted charges that the Bureau of Public Roads has presented false technical information to it at the Reno hearings, it may wish to reexamine its attachment of "no sinister motives to the action of the Bureau in the above regard."

The Blatnik subcommittee may wish to reexamine its conclusions and recommendations, report, page 17:

(a) The record contains falsely high benefit-cost ratio figures for a downtown highway through Reno.

When the record has been purged and factual technical data supplied, the record may well support charges that Federal participation in financing the construction of a downtown interstate highway through Reno would be a wasteful expenditure of Federal moneys.

(b) Line J—Verdi: Coercion and pressure. Report, page 17, shows there was not technical compliance by State officials with Federal statutory requirements on public hearings. It shows that the Bureau of Public Roads colluded with the State officials in violating the statutory requirements.

The record shows that the citizens of Reno, who live near and have full knowledge of the line J—Verdi infamy, received ample communication from the State to support their commonsense appraisal of the outrages being perpetrated upon them by the State, Federal, and county authorities. The citizens may well demand a house cleaning, rather than a justification and whitewash.

(c) Possible guidelines and paperwork in the "consideration of economic effects" by the Bureau of Public Roads would be an insult to the citizens as long as the Bureau of Public Roads can serve false information to the Congress of the United States and to the public with impunity.

(d) A falsifying Bureau of Public Roads does not need its "investigative func-

tion . . . strengthened." The Bureau of Public Roads needs to be investigated.

Nothing in your letter of September 22, 1959, bears on the infamy of the interstate highway program scandal in Reno.

We are not discussing "questions of interpretation of information contained in this (Blatnik) report." We are discussing false testimony presented to Members of the Congress of the United States as they were properly exercising their legislative powers in accordance with article I, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States by the Bureau of Public Roads which is a Bureau of an executive department acting under the Executive power of the President of the United States and answerable to him in accordance with article II, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no third party; the President of the United States is the first party where a bureau responsible to him presents false testimony.

We are more than "interested in insuring that the information furnished public bodies shall be as accurate and complete as possible."

The continuing viability of the United States of America depends on the furnishing of accurate technical and economic fact to public bodies by constituted authorities and their consultants.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

America's Crisis in Open Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in facing the future, we need to provide realistic programs for preserving our out-of-door heritage for an ever-expanding Nation. Population-wise, for example, the present total of 180 million is expected to increase to 240 million by 1975—60 million more than today.

In addition to more people, the average citizen today is living longer. In 1885, the life span was 40 years; today, it is about 70. Changes in the pattern of living—including increased leisure time for our citizens—also put ever-greater demands upon our open lands.

All of these factors emphasize the need for preservation of our basic resources—soil, forests, and water—if these invaluable assets are to be retained in sufficient volume for future generations.

As we know, the present technological, industrial, urban-expansion revolution now being experienced by the country has the effect of eradicating, acre by acre, more and more of the open land of this great country.

As a Nation blessed with tremendously rich land and natural resources, we need to design ever-improved constructive programs for nonwaste utilization, as well as replenishment—so far as possible—of these resources. If we fail, we will be doing a disservice to ourselves and to future generations who deserve—along with a progressing technological, scientific inheritance—a preservation of

an outdoor heritage—significant to man's existence.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article on this topic entitled "America's Crisis in Open Land."

Reflecting upon a serious problem with which we in Congress, as well as others throughout the country need to be deeply concerned, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S CRISIS IN OPEN LAND

(Condensed from a booklet published by the American Institute of Park Executives, as the result of a park workshop conducted at Michigan State University.)

Man needs open spaces. We do not know why the sight of the open sky, the soothing quiet of woodland, the breath of a fresh sea breeze or the first view of a majestic natural landscape fills emotional needs which no amount of manmade comforts and conveniences can satisfy.

We do know that, in order to maintain physical and mental health, we must continually renew our contact with nature.

The spilling over of population from the crowded centers of our cities into the suburbs, the vaulting over those suburbs into the open country beyond, reflects man's eternal reaching out for open space.

CROWDING AND OUTER SPACE

Our insistence on an urban existence is not a matter of free choice. To an ever greater degree our economy is centered in our cities. The feeling of being crowded—of people and things pressing in on us from all sides—has crept up on us gradually. It causes some of us to behave irrationally, even self-destructively.

The rapid increase in degenerative disease, in mental disease, crime, and juvenile delinquency are among its overt symptoms. It leads to rivalries, tensions, and hatreds between individuals, races, nationalities, communities, and even nations. To love and appreciate our fellow man as our conscience tells us we should, we need elbow room and breathing space.

This increasing crowdedness is the psychological cause of the space age. But most of us will still have to work out our life problems right here on earth. That crowded feeling—that growing sensation of suffocation—could easily become more and more painful until we reach the point where we can no longer deal with its social consequences. That would mean a breakdown of our social structure.

We must do what we can to prevent that. Open land is fast disappearing in the very places where it is most needed. We are facing a genuine crisis that does not affect all areas equally. It is most acute in the areas where population is growing fastest.

A hundred years ago opportunities for outdoor activity were abundant, for 85 percent of our population then lived in the country. Now nearly 70 percent of us live in urban areas and only about 30 percent in the country.

Meantime the urban dweller spends more and more of his working, studying, eating, visiting and even travel hours in shells of wood, masonry, metal, and plastic. Consequently, the greater is his need to relieve his accumulated emotional and nervous tensions.

MORE IDLE DAYS IN LIFE

And while this need grows, the remaining open land available for the tonic of outdoor activity moves constantly farther away and harder to reach. He seeks sub-

stitute satisfactions in outdoor adventure stories and western movies, his teenaged children drive aimlessly about hoping to bump into some excitement and his younger ones try to escape monotony through TV shows or comic books.

Sooner or later we are bored by these substitute satisfactions because the amount of leisure time at our disposal is rapidly increasing. Since the beginning of the century the standard workweek has been cut by one-third. Vacations are also longer and there are more paid holidays and leaves.

Meanwhile, the lengthened span of human life adds more idle days to the average lifetime. In 1885 the average lifespan was 40 years. Today it is well above 70. The average American male above 65 years of age enjoys (or suffers) an average of 10 waking hours of leisure per day. His wife has 14 such hours (although she might dispute it).

Seventy-five years ago the average man spent 5.6 percent of his total lifetime in school, 26 percent working and had only 7.8 percent left for leisure. Today a man spends about 4 percent of his lifetime at school, only about 15 percent at work and has about 21 percent left for leisure.

Add to these changes the many things which are shortening the time required by housework and our personal needs, and the need for leisure time outlets becomes ever more intense. Here is one of the knottiest social problems of our age. How shall we dispose of these mounting surpluses of idle time?

If it cannot be used constructively, it must inevitably be used destructively.

In any metropolitan community a well planned system of parks and protected open areas offers more different solutions to these problems than any other single factor. Parks open up an unlimited range of healthful and emotionally satisfying experiences to people of all ages.

"BEST REMEDY WE KNOW"

Protected natural areas provide that renewed contact with nature which is the best remedy we know for the mounting tensions of urban life.

The factor that makes the leisure time problem so acute is the "explosion" of population in our metropolitan areas. This explosion in the form of new suburb after suburb spreading far out into the open country increases the need by destroying the very open spaces we must have to satisfy it.

As Europe's cities grew slowly most of them reserved enough open space to maintain the unhurried, pleasant, balanced community living they had known as mere villages. Europeans never accepted the industrial revolution without reservation. They doubted it held the answer to every human need. Thus they were able to preserve essential life values which we, in our hurry to increase our material prosperity, tended to shrug off as unnecessary luxuries.

Paris is remembered with intense pleasure and affection by almost every visitor. Perhaps the chief reason why the French capital is so beautiful and so pleasant to live in is that there are, in the city and the area immediately surrounding it, no less than 385,000 acres of publicly and privately owned park lands open to all the people.

No American city has felt it needed or could afford a proportion of open space to population compared with what many European cities have achieved. Our spreading metropolitan areas ate up open land at a rate far higher than their populations grew. The farther out people moved, the more private living space they wanted around them. A hundred years ago the typical building lot was only 20 feet wide. Today it is 80-100 feet. A century ago, a population increase of 1,000 people required 10 acres. Today it calls for 100-200 acres.

The central portions of most of our older cities can absorb more population only through slow, costly processes of urban redevelopment. Most of the growth must take place on the fringes of the metropolitan area, in what yesterday was open country.

By 1975 about 60 million more people will have been added to our metropolitan population. Of these only 10 million will be absorbed by our central cities. Fifty million will help to swell suburbia. And of these 26 million will be living in what today is still open country.

By the year 2,000 what is now open land will in itself be supporting between 58 and 75 million souls.

AUTOMOBILES MULTIPLY FASTER THAN PEOPLE

Automobiles multiply even faster than people. Besides providing the rocket power behind metropolitan sprawl, our automobiles themselves are space eating destroyers of open land. Our present crop of motor vehicles (about 70 million) would cover 600,000 acres if parked bumper to bumper. In actuality, they are tying up at least double that amount of space.

When completed, our new Federal Interstate System of Highways alone will occupy 1,500,000 acres. (This would be an area almost 10 times that of Milwaukee County.) More millions of acres are tied up in inadequate networks of streets, roads, and thoroughways.

Our growing system of air transport, too, is draining away more of our open land. The growth of cities requires not only much larger airports, but more of them.

Some of our cities and metropolitan regions have park programs which are to some degree expanding proportionally with increasing population. Few if any of our park programs have dared to hope to acquire and maintain more than about one acre of park land to every 100 population. That ratio was determined as a standard for wholesome community living half a century ago.

Today the standard of one acre of park space to 100 people is outmoded. But judged even by outdated standards, it is doubtful whether 10 percent of our metropolitan areas have acquired enough open land. Almost none has a program massive or aggressive enough to meet the requirements of the next 10 or 20 years.

Not only are they failing to acquire new lands fast enough. Many cannot even hold what they already have. Cleveland is trying to make up its collective mind whether to give away a piece of its 50-year-old mall to the owner of a chain of hotels. Westchester County (New York) may sell a big piece of a park to a manufacturer. Murfreesboro, Tenn., recently traded its only park for a new industry, while Andalusia, Ala. was turning its only open land into a parking lot. In Portland, Ore., a new highway will cut across 21 parks; Wilmington, Del. will lose 40 acres of park to a new expressway.

By comparison with other public services, well planned park programs cost little. Many a fine park will repay its initial cost by raising the values of adjacent properties, increasing the community's tax revenues. Central Park in New York City is a classic example.

TOMORROW TOO LATE TO SAVE LAND

Because the crisis permits no time to be lost, the park battle must be waged on several fronts. Regional coordination in widespread metropolitan areas where there are many political subdivisions is essential.

In congested parts of cities it is very costly to create open spaces. But larger parks and reserved natural areas can be quite accessible even miles from the city center.

Action to meet the open land crises in our metropolitan communities must move fast. Tomorrow will be too late.

Well-Known Postal Union Officer Going Strong After 60 Years in Organizational Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Harry Spiegel, executive vice president of Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, in which he pays tribute to a distinguished public servant, Andrew T. Walker, president, on the occasion of 60 years of dedicated service to the rank and file in the Post Office Department.

The statement follows:

WELL-KNOWN POSTAL UNION OFFICER GOING STRONG AFTER 60 YEARS IN ORGANIZATIONAL WORK

(By Harry Spiegel)

Every individual of accomplishment has a trademark. A cigar in his mouth, carrying a particular kind of paper case, perhaps a cane, or a genial smile. The ready smile is the one associated with one of New York post office's most distinguished individual, Andrew T. Walker, president of Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen—a fluent and able employee representative basing his knowledge of civil service matters on 60 years of personal experience. Andrew T. Walker whose wit and wisdom have sharpened with age is approaching his 80th birthday. At the four-score mark Andy Walker looks remarkably spry for an elderly gentleman, there is the same impish twinkle in his eye when he was called that fresh blond-haired kid from the West Side. In fact his one trouble is a limp as a result of a fractured hip some years back which happened during a dance "bump-and-daisy" at a convention.

Andy continues his vigorous activity each day as president of Branch 1, UNAPOC, at 225 West 34th Street, in the center of midtown New York, rounding out a daily pattern of meetings with postal officials or representing members as disciplinary or appeal hearings. Keeping in touch with over 250 station delegates by phone in his suite of offices on the 13th floor.

The name of Andy Walker is not new in Washington or in many congressional offices and his concern for the aggrieved has earned him the admiration and respect of not alone the 39,000 New York postal men and women but throughout the State of New York and the Nation as well.

Branch 1, of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen amended its bylaws some years back to permit Andy to continue on as president when he reached the mandatory retirement age of 70 and, in a few weeks, I will be happy to present his name once again in nomination for the office of president. An office he has filled with distinction for many, many years.

When I joined branch 1 almost 30 years ago my delegate at that time Belle van Zandt volunteered a bit of advice which has never failed me. She said, "If you ever have a problem in connection with the job or what to do, talk with Andy Walker." That is as true today as it was over half century ago.

Time and again I have had occasion to realize how much Andy Walker meant to the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen because he had the answers and

the heartfelt willingness to help one and all, regardless if they belong to our association.

This is the Andy who has served our branch ever since he became an officer of our organization. Quietly, efficiently and unselfishly he has been the friend of all and enemy of none. I have never heard a disparaging comment about him.

In 60 years of service he has earned the confidence, friendship and gratitude of postal officials both here in New York City and in Washington and also the friendship of members of the House and Senate. He has labored long and hard in behalf of branch 1 and even now in the twilight years is working at a job that represents to him a purpose in living.

Dedication is a rare quality indeed and commands respect whenever or wherever it shows itself. Andy Walker has truly dedicated himself and still dedicating himself for the betterment of his fellow man and has in that effort passed up many a service promotion to better his personal self and gain. 1960 will mark the 80th birthday of Andrew T. Walker and his 60th birthday of organizational activity and from coast to coast will come the sort of messages to a grand old guy to make his heart and spirit just as young as his first day when he took his postal oath of duty.

Grain Storage Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been conducting hearings in recent weeks on the grain storage program of the Department of Agriculture. Under the leadership of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] the subcommittee has scrutinized the strikingly high profits earned by many warehouses which store Government grain. On March 1, 1960, the Des Moines Register carried an editorial which is a careful, thorough, and accurate description of the grain storage situation as revealed by the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN STORAGE COSTS

The Department of Agriculture is negotiating new storage fees for its mountainous grain surpluses stored in commercial warehouses. The current fee for corn is 16.5 cents per bushel per year.

A study by the Department published some time ago indicated that the average direct annual operating cost of warehousemen for grain storage was 9.5 cents per bushel per year. This does not include income taxes, quality and quantity deterioration, and margin for return on investment. But, making liberal allowance for these costs, it is clear that many commercial warehouses, including farmers' cooperatives, have been earning large profits from storing Government grain.

Now the Department has revised its estimates of the average cost to adjust to a lower

depreciation cost. The Department accountants were criticized by congressional investigators for accepting rapid depreciation—quick writeoff under the tax laws to encourage construction of storage space. With a lower cost of depreciation the average direct operating cost came out at 8.4 cents instead of 9.5.

These cost figures can be argued back and forth incessantly. Some of the smaller and less efficient operators of course have higher costs. With any average, firms handling about half the total storage would have costs above the average and about half below the average. So it is incorrect to say that all commercial warehouses are making huge profits from storage of Government grain.

Also, it should be recognized that some of the grain is stored by farmers themselves, and they also get the 16.5 cents. Since the programs are intended to support farm income, some subsidy in this grain storage fee to farmers could be defended. Also, the profits of the farmers' co-ops presumably are returned to farmers.

But after all the qualifications are made, it still is apparent that the Government has been spending far too much money for storing the grain surpluses.

These costs could be lowered substantially. At the very minimum, the Government could use all the Government-owned space available, for which costs are lower, before contracting more commercial space.

In negotiation of new storage fees, lower rates should be established. If necessary, the Government could buy some new bins in order to have a lever to get lower commercial fees.

Plainly, the Government is going to be in the business of storing grain for some years to come.

The grain crops for 1960 probably will be as large, and perhaps larger, than in 1959. There is no production control program in sight that will reduce the additions to storage—let alone permit any reduction in stocks. The Government ought to handle this storage matter as cheaply as possible.

But let no one be misled into thinking that this will reduce total farm price support expenditures very much. These can be reduced only in two ways—(1) cut the price supports much farther and let farm income slide, or (2) establish an effective production control program, with quotas in bushels.

The latter alternative would be difficult to manage. But it is the only way to reduce Government farm subsidies and give farmers higher income in the marketplace. More and more farm groups are coming to the conclusion that some restriction on output or marketing should be made a condition of eligibility for Government subsidy.

The present program which encourages unlimited production at a guaranteed price is extremely costly. The profits in grain storage operations have created large vested interests in continuing the program just as it is. But it is in the interest of farmers to get the costs of Government farm programs down—without reducing farm income.

California, Midwest and Eastern Editors Regret United States "No" to Dutch Airline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following editorials from

newspapers in California, in the Middle West, and on the eastern seaboard, all regretting the refusal this month by the U.S. State Department of the request of Netherlands Government to allow KLM Royal Dutch Airlines to land planes at Los Angeles International Airport and thus provide rapid jet service between our west coast and Amsterdam, via Canada.

On the dates shown, these papers published their views under the following headings:

Pasadena Independent Star-News, February 14, "Denial of Air Rights to Dutch Ill-Advised."

Los Angeles Herald-Express, February 22, "Socking Our Good Friends."

Los Angeles Enterprise, February 5, "Discriminatory Decision—State Department Denies Los Angeles Landing Rights to Royal Dutch Airlines."

Detroit News, February 13, "Wounding the Dutch."

Los Angeles Mirror-News, February 22, "KLM Should Fly Into Los Angeles."

Long Beach Independent, February 17, "A Provincial Decision."

Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 14, "A Harsh Decision."

Baltimore Sun, February 18, "Offending a Friend."

Detroit Free Press, February 20, "In One Easy Lesson, How To Lose a Good Friend."

USLA Daily Bruin, February 11, "Air Trouble."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the State Department's own background statement concerning the negotiations last month between the two governments on the Netherlands request was published in the Senate proceedings reported in the RECORD February 25. On page 2963 the State Department's summary includes this sentence:

International airline traffic rights are subject to bargaining on the basis of an equitable overall exchange of economic benefits for the airlines of each country.

It has been my impression, Mr. Speaker, that international agreements properly are based on a much broader consideration than a single segment of the economy of either country, such as the airlines.

The State of California, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the Los Angeles area, are the fastest growing sections of our country. The recent tremendous increase in the population of the Los Angeles area and the estimates of its continuing phenomenal growth, as well as the importance of the industry and agriculture of the area, justify the belief that it has the potential of becoming one of the world's most important air traffic centers. On the basis of this belief, the Los Angeles community is investing \$46 million in a new international airport. Yet, today, only three lines operate between Los Angeles and Europe: Pan American, TVA, and SAS. Even with the addition of two proposed services, those of Air France and BOAC, only five air carriers will provide transatlantic services out of Los Angeles, the largest urban center in Western America, as compared with 16 out of New York.

If Los Angeles is to develop into the important international air traffic center, which it could become in the absence of artificial restrictions, then addi-

tional carriers must be allowed to provide direct service from Los Angeles to other foreign centers of air traffic. These additional services could provide not only a volume of transportation which is needed, but also the stimulus to improve quality of service which added competition would afford. They could also foster and promote the development of additional industrial and trading relationships with other foreign areas.

Specifically the grant of the KLM route would support and bolster the already existing strong and profitable trade relations between California and the Netherlands which is an important purchaser of agricultural and manufactured products, particularly aircraft and fruits and vegetables from the Southern California area. It could also strengthen KLM, which is one of Southern California's best customers. KLM's fleet is almost entirely American built. It has spent over the years approximately \$200 million for planes and equipment, mostly of Douglas manufacture, and at the present time it has commitments in an amount of over \$100 million for additional Douglas and Lockheed planes. I am told that these amounts are two and a half times the revenue from traffic to and from the United States which KLM has enjoyed.

For all these reasons, the Southern California community has manifested its strong desire for additional carriers and specifically its desire to have KLM accorded the new route. The city council of Los Angeles, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the California Contract Cities Organization, the International Association of Machinists, the Southern California local of the International Union of United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, and the Sunkist Growers are among those organizations which have accorded their official support of the Dutch request.

I am, of course, aware of the fact that it is an objective of American policy, in negotiating route agreements with foreign countries, to seek an equal exchange of economic benefits. However, I disagree with any contention that in weighing the exchange of economic benefits our Government should restrict its consideration to the narrow question of economic effects on the carriers involved. Rather, the Government should consider the economic benefits to the broad public interest which are to be derived from any proposed agreement. On this basis, the economic benefits to the Los Angeles community and the State of California which I have mentioned above must be given the most serious attention. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, I was disturbed to read the Baltimore Sun headline "Russia Fans United States-Dutch Airline Row—Quotes Netherlands Press Protests on Route Refusal."

Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD that news report on how Moscow's propaganda apparatus is moving to make anti-American capital by disseminating throughout Europe excerpts

from Dutch newspaper editorials berating the U.S. Government for its February 3 rejection of the Netherlands Government's plea that KLM, the Royal Dutch Airlines, be given a chance to compete with British, French, German, and Swedish as well as American airlines for transatlantic air traffic originating on the West Coast.

There being no objection, the news article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Sun, Baltimore, Feb. 13, 1960]

RUSSIA FANS U.S.-DUTCH AIRLINE ROW—
QUOTES NETHERLANDS PRESS PROTESTS ON
ROUTE REFUSAL

(By Paul W. Ward)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Moscow's propaganda apparatus is moving to make anti-American capital out of the current rift between the United States and the Netherlands, one of its NATO allies.

Both the Kremlin's radio and Tass, its official news agency, were found today to be disseminating throughout Europe excerpts from Dutch newspaper editorials berating the U.S. Government for its February 3 rejection of the Netherlands Government's plea that KLM, the Royal Dutch Airlines, be given "a chance to compete" with British, French, German, and Swedish as well as American airlines for transatlantic air traffic originating on the west coast.

QUOTES NONCOMMUNIST PRESS

The Soviet exploitation of that development speaks of it as "bitterly resented" in the Netherlands as "an act of discrimination prompted by disregard for the interests of a small country."

It then elaborates the point with quotations from such notably non-Communist Dutch dailies as De Maasbode (Catholic), Het Parool (Independent Labor), and All-Gemeen Handelsblad (Liberal Conservative).

They speak of the United States as "a nation which pays lip service to the principle of free trade but shows itself to be ultra-protectionist as soon as interests of U.S. companies are involved."

RESERVATION IS SEEN

They assert that "if Washington again starts to advertise the advantages of pulling down trade barriers, people in Holland will at least know that Washington will be doing this with a reservation: 'Listen to what I say but don't look at what I do.'"

The quotations selected by Tass and the Kremlin's broadcasters appear to reflect fairly the current mood of the Netherlands, a country little larger in area than Maryland but with a population of 11,200,000.

Only yesterday leaders of the Netherlands Veterans Legion notified Philip Young, U.S. Ambassador at The Hague, that, to demonstrate their resentment of his Government's action in the KLM case, they were rejecting his invitation to an American Embassy party on March 7.

NEGATION OF FREEDOM

Two days earlier the Dutch equivalent of the House of Representatives—the Second Chamber of the States-General—adopted unanimously a resolution expressing "deep disappointment at the attitude taken by the Government of the United States, which is a negation of freedom of aviation and of the principles of sound competition and which, furthermore, discriminates against the Netherlands' national interest."

Adding that Washington's February 3 decision was "incompatible with existing relations between the United States and the Netherlands as allies," the resolution concluded with a request that the Dutch Government "take new steps to obtain reconsideration of the American decision."

REDS JOIN IN SUPPORT

Introduced in the names of the Catholic Party, which has 49 seats, the Labor Party (47), the Anti-Revolutionary Party (14), the Freedom and Democracy Party (19), and the Christian Historical Union (12), the resolution also enlisted the supporting votes of the Chamber's three Communist, two Pacific Socialist and three Reformed Party members.

Adoption of the resolution followed a speech by Joseph M. A. H. Luns, the Netherlands Foreign Minister, who said the Chamber never before had taken such action in respect to an allied power.

Referring to the United States as "our greatest ally," Luns said its Government's February 3 action was "aimed plainly and undisguisedly at the most complete protection of the short-range interests of the American aviation companies."

CONCENTRATION OF SERVICE

These companies apparently are not interested in developing air traffic between Los Angeles and Amsterdam, he added, but in the interest of higher profits, are concentrating their own transatlantic services on a few big European centers.

"Are we to conclude that a powerful country such as the United States, always proclaiming its belief in free enterprise, wants to hamper the natural growth of traffic," he asked before asserting that American companies now have a 60- to 70-percent share of the world potential air traffic and suggesting that its anti-KLM action may generate forces that will reduce that share in future.

CONTRACT CANCELLATION URGED

From editors and other shapers of Dutch public opinion the government Luns represents is getting advice to stop paying its contributions to NATO; to withdraw from arrangements to equip its Air Force with American Starfighters, and adopt a French jet, the Mirage, instead; and to cancel the orders for \$108 million worth of passenger planes that KLM has placed with American manufacturers.

According to Luns, however, the Dutch Government has no intention of acting on any of that advice. Instead, according to Hilversum, the Dutch Government's radio, he has "requested the U.S. Ambassador to once again make known to the U.S. Government his Government's disappointment" and "expressed the hope that this attitude will be speedily changed."

E. G. Stijkel, State Secretary for Transport and Waterways, who was the Netherlands' chief representative in the negotiations that began here January 7, refused at their breakdown on February 3 to regard them as conclusive and reserved a right to press for their renewal at a later date.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent Star-News, Feb. 14, 1960]

DENIAL OF AIR RIGHTS TO DUTCH ILL ADVISED

The denial by the State Department of west coast (that is, Los Angeles) landing rights to KLM Royal Dutch Airlines smacks of the kind of narrow protectionism the United States has been assiduously discouraging by both precept and example in other areas of international commerce.

The principal opponents of the grant, as was to be expected, were the domestic airlines, who can hardly be criticized for protecting their own interests as best they can in a competitive field.

But otherwise, there was all but unanimous approval of the Dutch petition. The rosters of supporters included local governmental bodies, industry, and labor.

U.S. policy in these matters is based on a congressional enactment to the effect that this country should not freely give away landing rights, but should exact a quid pro quo.

The Dutch position is that not only have they given all they have to give, but U.S. interests have not even taken advantage of what has been given. Thus, under an earlier agreement, the Dutch granted landing rights to U.S. carriers to and beyond every point in the Netherlands themselves, the Netherlands Antilles, and Surinam. In exchange, the Dutch received the right to fly to New York, Miami, and Houston, but not beyond.

No American carrier flies to the Netherlands, for the reason that Paris and London are close enough to serve their purposes. The Dutch hold that economic benefits beyond those strictly connected with air transport should be taken into account. They cite the fact that KLM buys nearly all its planes from American manufacturers and does a large volume of other trade with the United States.

The decision against KLM appears to be unfair in the light of decisions that have favored the applications of other foreign carriers for landing rights. It is understood that France was heading for the same kind of denial the Dutch received, until the French made it clear that landing rights for American planes in Paris could easily be withdrawn.

Political considerations are believed to have entered into the favorable decision for the West German Lufthansa airline. The Dutch, unfortunately, have no such lever as the French do, for American lines are not now using the landing rights they have in Holland. Nor is Holland as important to our international position as West Germany.

The situation of SAS, the Scandinavian airline, is somewhat analogous, in outline, to that of KLM. The Scandinavian countries are small, and lack any particular leverage. But they emerged from World War II with a going airline concern, and got in on the ground floor.

Observers of these matters are closely watching a pending application by Italia, the Italian airline, for west coast landing rights. It is expected to be granted. Why? Italy has the power of life or death over American landing rights in Rome.

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express, Feb. 22, 1960]

SOCKING OUR GOOD FRIENDS

The people and the Government of Holland are deeply shocked by the refusal of the American Government to grant west coast landing rights to the Royal Dutch Airlines, better known publicly as KLM.

The proposed west coast landings on the flight from Amsterdam were to be at Los Angeles International Airport, and the rank turn-down by Washington bureaucracy also has amazed and shocked the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and other civic and business interests of this city.

The word "why" becomes a big "why" when one seeks the reason for this drastic and eminently unfair discrimination against one of America's staunchest longtime friends.

The State Department's policy is to see an equitable exchange of economic benefits primarily in terms of air traffic between the United States and Holland.

The Dutch Government and the Royal Dutch Airlines have argued that as far as trade advantages are concerned, the ratio in trade between the United States and Holland is 3-1 in favor of the United States.

Aircraft and aircraft parts purchases by KLM from southern California manufacturers amounted to \$273 million from 1946 to 1959; in fact, all their aircraft purchases are made in this country.

Currently being purchased are \$108 million worth of Douglas DC-8's and Lockheed Electras for KLM, and the Dutch air force is being equipped with Lockheed-designed F-104 Starfighters.

Holland has purchased \$13 million* in southern California citrus fruit and \$13.2 million in cotton in the last 3 years.

The Dutch are naturally concerned that while their permit to fly from Holland to Los Angeles is denied, similar privileges have been granted to their European competitors, Air France, British Overseas, Lufthansa, the German carrier, and SAS, the Scandinavian carrier.

Not only Los Angeles, but other cities throughout the United States, including Chicago, Washington, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, and Denver, have expressed indignant editorial displeasure over this decision from the Nation's Capital.

The Detroit News, in an editorial, says that "seldom has the Washington bureaucracy gone so far out of its way to antagonize a warm friend." The Cleveland Plaindealer calls it a "strange way to treat a good friend and a loyal ally."

[From the Los Angeles Enterprise, Feb. 5, 1960]

STATE DEPARTMENT DENIES LOS ANGELES LANDING RIGHTS TO ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES—DISCRIMINATORY DECISION

Another tragic payoff to big business cronies has resulted in a U.S. Government decision to deny KLM Royal Dutch Airlines the right to serve Los Angeles.

The only excuse the State Department could give in a feeble effort to justify its discrimination against the Netherlands was that the Dutch are better businessmen than their counterparts in America.

One of those shrewd Dutchmen, President I. A. Aler of KLM, summed up the stupidity and unfairness of the American decision in these words:

"The decision of the Government of the United States to again refuse permission for the operation of a fast Dutch air service between California and Europe is a reality which is difficult to accept."

"Once more it is evident that American air policy is inspired by protectionism, which is entirely alien to the general endeavor of the United States of America to promote freedom of economic relations and to do justice to the principle of free competition."

"When Holland's request for landing rights on the west coast of the United States was refused in 1957 the reasonableness of that decision was already incomprehensible, but now that refusal also assumes the nature of discrimination against the Netherlands because, as is well known, many other airlines have been granted rights on the west coast. The refusal of rights to the Netherlands can only be interpreted as a penalty for the fact that, from a geographical point of view, this is a small country."

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands follows an absolutely liberal air policy. All American airlines can cover Dutch territory with their services, but in this respect the Netherlands offers less possibilities than the United States."

In view of the fact that in general the rendering of services, and in this case the rendering of services in the field of air transport, is a typical Dutch activity, the attitude of the U.S. Government forms a particularly serious threat to our traditional economic activities. Furthermore, it constitutes a severe handicap to the free development of air transport and is thus detrimental to the interests of the traveling public.

"The regrettable outcome of the discussions in Washington by no means implies that KLM meekly submits in regard to the rights on the west coast of America. The arguments so clearly and strongly presented by the Dutch delegation in Washington led by the Minister of State, E. C. Stijkel, as well as the complete reasonableness of these arguments, cannot fail to convince the U.S. Government in the near future."

"KLM feels sure that, just as has happened in the past, the Netherlands Government will support this aspiration of KLM with all the arguments which are necessary in conducting such negotiations.

"It must therefore be expected that the Government of the United States will realize how greatly the political and economic relations between the two countries are harmed and public opinion in the Netherlands aroused by the rejection of the request, the granting of which is of vital importance for KLM, while its refusal does not yield any apparent benefit to the United States of America.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 13, 1960]

WOUNDING THE DUTCH

There is this to be said about the storm in the Netherlands where public anger is boiling against the United States. Seldom has the Washington bureaucracy gone so far out of its way to antagonize a warm friend as in the ruling which again denies landing rights on our Pacific coast to KLM, the Royal Dutch Airlines.

Holland needs that kind of accommodation because her state of living depends on being able to sell services, and there was every reason in fairplay and commonsense, why we should have listened favorably to her petition.

Let us look at a few of them. British Overseas Airways, Scandinavian Airlines, and Air France already operate from our Pacific coast in direct flight to Europe, and the Dutch merely wanted an equal chance at this traffic.

Their case for getting it is extraordinary. The Dutch import annually from the United States approximately double the value of the goods they sell us annually. In balance of trade, no European state favors us more. All of KLM's planes are bought here, the company is 30 percent American owned; many of the pilots are Americans.

But these and other large considerations were tossed aside and the decision was made largely on a technical point. Now the Netherlands press is fuming and urging that The Hague take such reprisals against the United States as getting out of NATO, canceling all orders now standing for the purchase of jet airliners from U.S. industry and substituting French military aircraft for American Starfighters about to be purchased.

Can we blame them? Does any part of our action have that golden rule ring by which we hold friends and influence peoples to believe that Americans deal square?

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 29, 1960]

IN DUTCH WITH THE DUTCH

There is a good deal of indignation in the Netherlands over our State Department's recent refusal to allow KLM, the Royal Dutch Airlines, to fly between California and Europe.

The people are angry because we have authorized British, French, German, and Swedish lines to fly this route, because we have been preaching free trade, especially where it will benefit us, and because the Netherlands has been one of our most loyal friends and customers. KLM is the oldest of the international airlines and is one of the few which is not Government subsidized. In addition, it buys nearly all of its equipment from the United States.

What seems particularly indefensible, in retrospect, is the State Department's explanation that we could not grant the permit because the Netherlands is unable to grant us an equivalent favor. It is a small country, and our airlines already have permission to fly to Amsterdam.

If the Netherlands were still in control of the East Indies, the situation might be different, and she would be able to grant favors to American lines in the Orient. But the Netherlands let the islands go in 1949 after several years of warfare and at the insistence of the United States. Her presence as a colonial power was thought to be damaging to American influence in southeast Asia. There were even threats from State Department officials and others to withhold Marshall plan aid from the Netherlands if she refused.

The Dutch were right to give in at that time, and would have had to sooner or later anyway. But in view of our position at the time, it seems odd that we, as the self-appointed champion of small countries, should base our rejection on the fact that the Netherlands is no longer large enough to do us an equivalent favor.

[From the Los Angeles Evening Mirror News, Feb. 22, 1960]

KLM SHOULD FLY INTO LOS ANGELES

The State Department has denied the application of KLM, the Royal Dutch Airlines, for landing rights in Los Angeles to complete a Los Angeles-Amsterdam route.

The reasoning advanced by the State Department in denying the application seems highly questionable. Holland has been completely cooperative in granting reciprocal rights to U.S. air carriers, and the present ruling is an undeserved slap at a loyal NATO ally.

Holland ceded landing rights to U.S. carriers in the Netherlands, Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and points beyond in 1957. In return, limited landing rights were granted Dutch carriers in Houston, Miami and New York.

In denying the KLM petition for Los Angeles landings, the State Department badly notes that "The Netherlands, as a small country, has given all its air rights, and can make no further concessions to U.S. carriers."

In short, we've got everything we could from the Dutch, so they can go roll a hoop.

The convenience of Los Angeles air travelers, and fairness to the Dutch who have been cooperative in granting us landing rights, would seem to dictate a review of a decision that appears entirely out of line.

[From the Long Beach Independent, Feb. 17, 1960]

A PROVINCIAL DECISION

Although the United States spends billions every year in foreign aid in a cosmopolitan effort to make friends throughout the world, the State Department has assumed a rather unfriendly and provincial attitude toward the Royal Dutch Airlines.

The Dutch Government negotiated with the State Department on an application by the Dutch airlines for landing rights at Los Angeles International Airport. Since Los Angeles has only 4 foreign air lines connected with it (New York has 23), and since more international air travel originates in California than in any State except New York, the Dutch request to market transportation here appeared worthy.

But the State Department has rejected it with the statement that The Netherlands has nothing to give in return. It's unsurprising that the Dutch Parliament now expresses deep disappointment, charges discrimination against Dutch interests, and states that the decision is not in keeping with the relations of good allies.

We'd like to point out, as we did once before, that the Dutch Royal Airlines has quite a bit to offer in return. Of the airline's 90 planes, 81 were made in southern California, and the airline is buying \$72 million worth of DC-8 jetliners made in America by Americans. The State Department's provincial decision hurts at home as well as in Holland.

By the way, did you see that dandy little item the other day about plans for the marketing of compact Russian-made autos in the United States?

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 14, 1960]

A HARSH DECISION

Refusal by the American Government to grant west-coast landing rights to the Royal Dutch Air Lines, better known as KLM, is a matter of deep disappointment because the decision seems to be a strange way to treat a good friend and loyal ally.

Here is rank discrimination, as the United States says "No" to the Dutch, but "Yes" to British, West German, Scandinavian, and French lines. American reasoning that there must be an "equitable exchange of economic benefit" is a bit difficult to follow in view of policy, or lack of policy, in other fields.

Why pick on the Netherlands, which is one of our best customers and closest collaborators. Some better explanations should be given before the U.S. alibi sounds convincing.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Feb. 20, 1960]
HOW TO LOSE A GOOD FRIEND IN ONE EASY LESSON

Indignation would run high in this country if Americans were to pick up their newspapers and read that the Netherlands Government had banned U.S. shipping from its principal ports on the grounds that British, Scandinavian, and Russian vessels could handle Dutch foreign trade.

Yet that is precisely the sort of treatment which we have accorded the Dutch by denying KLM-Royal Dutch Airlines landing rights at Los Angeles.

For 3 years KLM has been petitioning the United States for the same landing rights at Los Angeles which are enjoyed by its competitors—Scandinavian Air Service, British Overseas Airways Corp., and Air France. Each time the petition has been turned down by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the last time within the past few weeks.

The result is the same kind of indignation and resentment on the part of the Dutch—our friends and allies—which we in this country would feel if the situation was reversed.

The Dutch House of Representatives adopted a resolution stating that the attitude of the United States "does not fit into the relations between allies."

Never before, it is said, has that Parliament issued such a pointed criticism of the actions of a friendly country.

The Dutch resolution charged the United States with disregarding the freedom of the air; disregarding the principles of healthy competition, and discriminating against Dutch national interests.

The Netherlands Government may not stop with only sharp words. Recommendations are being made that the Dutch cancel contracts with American manufacturers for millions of dollars worth of jetplanes.

Up to this time, all KLM planes have been American made. There also have been proposals within the Netherlands Government to withdraw arrangements to equip its air force with American Starfighters, and buy French equipment instead.

The CAB and State Department policy toward the Netherlands in this matter is extremely shortsighted. As has been pointed out before, the Dutch are among our best overseas customers. Moreover, they receive virtually no U.S. foreign aid.

At the same time they rely upon us for a fair competitive shake in their efforts to maintain an economy that is self-sufficient. If the United States does anything to interfere with the self-sufficiency of its allies—as has been done in the KLM case—we might as well accept the probability of having to substitute direct financial aid.

Maybe that explains the reason President Eisenhower felt it necessary to ask Congress

the other day for a recordbreaking foreign aid appropriation of \$4.175 billion.

[From the Sun, Baltimore, Md., Feb. 18, 1960]

OFFENDING A FRIEND

The Netherlands Ambassador has informed the United States of widespread disappointment in his country over our refusal to grant west coast landing rights to KLM, Royal Dutch Airlines, to permit it to make direct flights between Los Angeles and Amsterdam. A resolution to the same effect as the Ambassador's complaint has been passed by the Dutch Parliament in what is described as unprecedented action.

Landing rights now are enjoyed by Scandinavian Airlines, Lufthansa, Air France, Japanese Airlines, Qantas, and BOAC. Officials of the State Department have explained that today granting or refusing flying rights is a matter of "horse trade." That is to say they are granted for something in return. The Netherlands being a small country has no facilities that are particularly needed by an American airline.

The Dutch request, which has been a matter of negotiation since early in January, has been opposed by KLM's American competitors. On the other hand it has had the support of farm, labor, industrial and political groups on the west coast.

In answer to the Dutch charge of discrimination it is pointed out that KLM enjoys landing rights on the east coast that tie in with a number of valuable air routes. No doubt other extenuating circumstances stand in the way of granting the request. But the Dutch are particularly sensitive to flying rights since it is on providing transportation services to the world that they have survived. KLM is one of the nation's greatest resources, bringing in a reputed income of \$120 million a year.

However, cogent the reasons for refusing the Dutch request the fact remains that our policy, while pleasing our own airlines, has offended a country that is one of our staunchest friends.

As for "horse trading," their continued friendship is worth more than any privilege they might offer to one of our airlines. The Netherlands Government's official warning of its displeasure forbids its being dismissed as merely something stirred up by KLM.

[From the UCLA Daily Bruin, Feb. 11, 1960]

AIR TROUBLE

Administrative agencies of the Federal Government today have more power to influence American foreign relations than ever before. Abuse of this power or shortsighted decisions can wreak havoc upon our alliances.

Such an undiscerning decision was made last week by the Bureau of Transport, when this agency refused to grant Los Angeles landing rights to KLM Royal Dutch Airlines.

Reason for the refusal, which climaxed weeks of heated debate, was given as "American policy not to grant commercial rights to foreign businesses unless similar rights are granted abroad to Americans."

This meant that if American Airlines can't land in Rotterdam, KLM can't land in Los Angeles.

This Smoot-Hawleyism has already caused an international incident. Dutch Foreign Minister Joseph Luns told his people in a nationwide TV broadcast that Holland was being "punished" by the United States for having what he called a "small and insignificant" Communist Party.

Americans, asserted Luns, feel they can treat Holland with less consideration than other countries, "which have to enjoy certain benefits from the United States to prevent a political attitude which might be unpleasant to the United States." The Dutch

Parliament passed a measure Tuesday protesting U.S. action.

Arbitrary protectionism will get us nowhere. Only mature decisions and willingness to go more than halfway to win the world's good will can insure eventual American triumph in this public relations war we are waging.

The KLM rejection has damaged Los Angeles, which has lost a potential means of distributing her products to the world. It has damaged Holland. It has damaged the United States.

The Bureau of Transport can reconsider. We urge it to do so at once.

The Plight of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the president of Minnesota Farmers Union, Mr. Edwin Christianson, recently submitted a statement to the House Agriculture Committee on needed farm legislation. Mr. Christianson's concise and lucid statement merits the attention of all of us. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL TEST OF FARM LEGISLATION

(Statement relating to needed farm legislation submitted to House Agriculture Committee, Monday, February 29, 1960, by Edwin Christianson, president, Minnesota Farmers Union)

We wish to commend the members of the Agriculture Committee for their concern regarding the economic situation in agriculture.

The \$2 billion decline in net income in 1959 and the prospect that conditions will become progressively worse under a full application of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy, make it imperative that Congress proceed with a legislative program which will face up to the major problems existing in agriculture.

We feel that it is particularly important that the agricultural leaders in the House committee and in the House, as a whole, have based their program upon the broad foundation of what is needed, rather than upon the narrow and superficial foundation of what is politically feasible or smart.

There are three conditions in agriculture of such serious importance that action cannot be safely delayed. They are:

1. The farm income crisis.
2. The continuous build-up of farm surplus.
3. The excessive expenditures for measures which are of only limited help to farmers.

We submit that it would simplify the discussion of farm legislation considerably if every proposal were put to the test of whether or not it will make any significant contribution to solving each of the three points listed above.

By putting the administration proposals to the test suggested above, the committee can in good conscience at once reject them since they can only result in heavier farm production, greater Government sur-

pluses, larger costs to the taxpayer and greater financial difficulty for agriculture.

There is no shortage of sound and workable proposals to improve or replace the current farm legislation. Many of the members of this committee are identified with proposals which would, if adopted, achieve a major improvement in farm conditions.

There are several workable comprehensive farm proposals and there are numerous single commodity bills which would be effective and practicable.

It is not our purpose in the submission of this statement, to say that any particular general farm bill or single-commodity bill is necessarily the only or the best answer.

We believe that decision on the choice of a certain bill or bills must depend upon the best judgment of leaders in the Congress, such as yourselves.

In making such a choice, of course, there occurs some indecision upon whether the strategy ought to take the form of commodity bills or package bills.

Comprehensive farm legislation is desirable. In fact, it is important because it is difficult to design commodity legislation except on a short-range basis without taking into account the relationships to other farm commodities.

It appears to us that both short- and long-range actions will be necessary. Much of the effect of the general farm bills, particularly of the enabling-act type, would not be felt for many months because of the time lag in development and placing into operation such marketing orders or stabilization plans. Many of these plans envisioned in the enabling-act farm bill would not become operative at the earliest until some time next year.

Meanwhile, however, we have a triple-crisis in agriculture which will continue and become progressively more severe month by month. These crises constitute a national emergency and do not permit a year's delay.

Therefore, in our opinion, it appears to be necessary both to proceed with a comprehensive farm bill, such as H.R. 10355, the plan sponsored by the able vice chairman of this committee and other farm statesmen in this committee and in this House, and at the same time, move forward with short-range bills dealing with the most critical of the commodity problems which can still in some measure be remedied during this growing or production season.

We believe it would be important to act on such commodities where an important influence could still be exerted on 1960 market price levels.

This short-range action should include measures relating to dairy products, hogs, eggs, peanuts, tobacco, and such commodities of which producers are advocating program improvements for 1960.

We would suggest the following actions as being important to producers in our area which would be of significant help yet this year:

(a) To direct the Secretary by congressional resolution for the balance of the current dairy marketing year to peg the parity value of manufacturing milk at 90 percent of the parity for all milk wholesale. This would result in a support level for the balance of this year of about \$3.36 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk. This would help tide the dairymen over until they could initiate their own type of a stabilization program under authorization of such legislation as the Poage bill.

(b) To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to offer incentive payments of \$1 to \$3 per hundredweight on all hogs marketed at 200 pounds or less through the end of the year. This would give producers time to develop their own stabilization program while at the same time avoiding the unfavorable effects

of excessive marketings which otherwise will be unavoidable next fall and winter.

(c) To direct the Secretary of Agriculture in 1960 to use section 32 funds in direct payments to egg producers to reestablish their purchasing power.

In regard to the long-range picture, we believe that a comprehensive measure such as Representative Poage's Family Farm Income Act of 1960, has special merit.

Here is a bill that will cut back on production, avoid any further accumulation of Government surpluses, reduce present Government stocks, substantially reduce the cost of agricultural programs to the taxpayer, and at the same time, and most importantly, reverse the downturn in farm income and purchasing power.

According to our calculations, the application of the Poage bill to the major commodities produced by Minnesota farmers would result in a price and income gain in a year's time of about \$400 million, which would be of tremendous benefit to the individual farmer, to his community and to the economy of the State, as a whole.

The particular aspects of the Poage bill which we feel should merit the consideration of all people seriously searching for a better agricultural program include:

1. Retention of parity as the goal and the basis for support measures.
2. Opportunity for the family farm to continue as the basic pattern in American agriculture.
3. Opportunity for producers themselves to have a voice in developing stabilization programs.
4. Provision for a variety of support methods and tools.
5. Opportunity for farmers to limit marketings in commodities where production is in excess of all possible needs and all reasonable reserves.
6. Retention of present programs until such time as producers initiate their own programs.
7. Limitation of supports for each producer to a reasonable level.
8. Limitation of costs to the taxpayer.
9. Expansion of consumption of food by needy and low-income consumers here and abroad.
10. Provision for this authority to continue through December 31, 1965.

We respectfully urge that the committee proceed as expeditiously as possible in the approval of a farm income improvement bill.

Konrad Adenauer—Leader in the Revival of West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting on the occasion of the visit of the distinguished Chancellor of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, to review the record of West Germany's economic revival, its return from a position of collapse to the important and vital position it now holds in the economic strength of the free world.

Less than 15 years ago Germany was in desolation. The collapse of the monetary system had reduced exchange in the country to a barter system. The

effects of defeat and destruction had sapped the physical and moral strength of the country and the economy had reverted to an unhappy subsistence level. Today we see in West Germany a strong and growing industrial plant and an economy that offers to its workers, managers and citizens the immense benefits of productive free enterprise.

In the decade from 1948 to 1958 West Germany's annual rate of growth in its gross national product was 8 percent, in its real per capita gross national product 6.9 percent. During this same time, there was a seven percent increase in consumer prices, an increase at the rate of a mere eight-tenths of 1 percent per year. From these figures can be drawn a picture of substantial economic growth coupled with great success in preventing rising price levels from taking the benefits of this growth from the people. This is an expression of the vitality of the free enterprise system in providing economic growth and welfare.

A large measure of the credit for this growth must be given to the leader of West Germany, its Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer. His strength of character and strength of purpose have given the country a leadership under which it has risen from the desolate days of 1945 to its present position of economic prosperity.

Statement by Mr. Andrew T. Walker, President of Branch 1, United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Andrew T. Walker, president of branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, has sent me a strong statement about the need for legislative action to provide assistance to retired Federal employees. As a cosponsor of S. 2575, to provide a health benefits program for certain retired Government workers, I am glad to have this informed endorsement, and hope it will help speed action on this important proposal.

At Mr. Walker's request, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAX RELIEF FOR OUR ELDER AGERS

(By Andrew T. Walker, president, branch 1, UNAPOC)

With each passing month additional annuitants are being added to the retirement rolls. Retirees coming from every governmental agency, and with their coming comes the added responsibility for the Congress and State legislature to see that the retiree's pension is adequate by lessening the

tax burden on these elder agers. With today's increasing longevity this problem piles problem upon problem in all areas of the United States.

During the past few years a voice for these thousands of retired public servants has sounded a rallying call to band together and further the equitable requests demanded of by the times. That voice is the National Association of Retired Civil Employees with a membership of over 100,000. The New York chapter, headed by John Gillen, former Post Office Department official in charge of foreign mails, is rapidly gaining prominence by its active legislative work. Assisting Mr. Gillen are many UNAPOC's and notably among them is Maxwell Licker, secretary, George Yorke, Belle Van Zandt, Belle Cangro, Marjorie McLynch, and ever so many more. John Sheehan, former acting New York postmaster, is the legislative representative.

At the regular January monthly meeting branch 1 adopted a resolution endorsing the Conklin-Marano bill, which would exempt Federal civil service retirees from the New York State income tax. The NARCE has been foremost in the fight to get this bill through the New York State Legislature. Branch 1, UNAPOC, is happy to lend its assistance.

I have recently sent a letter relative to this resolution to the Governor of the State of New York and to leading legislators of the State assembly and senate.

Not alone is the UNAPOC striving for tax exemption for retirees on a State level but on the Federal level as well. Strong support is developing for our annuitants in the Congress for ample health coverage, tax exemption and for additional annuity increase whenever Federal and postal employees receive upward revisions of salaries.

Keeping shoulder to shoulder with tax-exemption legislation is the desperate need for health insurance. Soaring costs of medical care is of vital concern to governmental retirees and of the country's elder population as well. This subject should command the attention of the Congress from this very minute on despite the hue and cry of budget control. Several million elderly retired persons live in constant fear of illness that may deplete their precious life savings or force them to apply for public assistance. How far will a pension go at a time of illness? About 70 percent of the entire population is covered by health insurance but less than half of the persons over 65 have such protection. Congress should note that older persons are ineligible for most regular hospital and surgical insurance.

On July 1, 1960, a long-awaited health insurance act will come into being for those on the active Federal and postal rolls. Congress after considerable debate and legislative procedures finally adopted the measure. The bill had started out with language which included both the active worker and the retired governmental employee, and well-intended employee leaders and legislators were content to fight for the enactment of such a measure but administrative spokesmen, both on the legislative floor and in executive offices fought the inclusion of retired people. When the amendments were offered excluding the retirees assurances were given that separate legislation would be offered later to provide such health insurance protection for annuitants. Senator JOHNSTON and Senator NEUBERGER promised to lead the fight for such a bill. They have kept this promise and in addition 24 Senators have cosponsored the measure.

This truly is reasonableness and the Government as the recipient of long and faithful service from these former employees should meet reasonableness with reasonableness. It remains for the Congress to meet the challenge.

Recognition of the Order of the Knights of Pythias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, ever since Biblical times the question has been asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We are told to love one another and to practice friendship, charity, and benevolence.

While we have our churches, synagogues, and other places of worship, it is an acknowledge fact that it is through the medium of the various fraternal organizations that the great lessons of brotherly love are more firmly inculcated and friendships among men promoted.

In order to help heal the wounds allay the ill-feelings engendered by the Civil War, the Order of the Knights of Pythias was founded in 1864. This great fraternal order, which bases its lessons and builds its ritual largely on the familiar story of the friendship of Damon and Pythias, has grown to such an extent that it now embraces more than 3,000 subordinate lodges in the United States and Canada with occasional lodges having been formed elsewhere.

No doubt, it will interest my colleagues in the Congress that when President Abraham Lincoln was advised of the teachings of the Order of the Knights of Pythias he said in part:

The purposes of your organization are most wonderful. If we could but bring its spirit to all our citizens, what a wonderful thing it would be. . . . I would suggest that these great principles be perpetuated and that you go to the Congress of the United States and ask for a charter.

The suggestion made by President Lincoln was adopted, and the Order of the Knights of Pythias was the first fraternal order chartered by an act of the Congress.

In recognition of its truly wonderful charitable and benevolent accomplishments, His Excellency J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, has proclaimed the week of March 13-19, 1960, as Pythian Week. The Governor's proclamation is as follows:

Whereas the Order of the Knights of Pythias is a great brotherhood with high principles based on the virtues of friendship, charity, and benevolence; and

Whereas it had its conception and takes its inspiration from the ancient friendship of Damon and Pythias; and

Whereas when the Pythagorean philosopher Damon was sentenced to death, he asked for a leave of absence to settle his affairs, and his friend, Pythias, pledged to give his own life if Damon did not return; and

Whereas such friendship and loyalty are the ingredients of true brotherhood—the great need of the world today,

Now, therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, in recognition of the Pythians' fine accomplishments and in tribute to the order's magnificent principles, do hereby proclaim March 13-19, 1960, as Pythian Week throughout the great State of Maryland.

It is altogether fitting that we pause in our deliberations today and join in this tribute to the Order of the Knights of Pythias. In these days that try men's souls, when we know not what an hour may bring, it is both a comfort and an inspiration to know that organizations such as this are ever striving to bring about true friendship and charity among men.

Commission on National Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently a distinguished Minnesotan, Mrs. Charles Hymes, of Minneapolis, who is president of the National Council of Jewish Women, made a wise and thoughtful comment on a number of urgent public problems. I was also struck by her forthright call for the appointment of women to the President's Commission on National Goals.

I surely support this suggestion, and I urge the President to take action immediately to include on this important Commission a number of representative women leaders. Mrs. Hymes' comments on the need to protect public health, to provide hospital and medical assistance for the aged, increase in social security benefits, for a revision of the immigration laws, and her emphasis on the need to move forward in the field of antijuvenile delinquency, are all squarely in line with my own thinking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts of a news release dated February 17, 1960, covering Mrs. Hymes' remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN URGES APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO EISENHOWER'S COMMISSION ON NATIONAL GOALS—MRS. CHARLES HYMES, PRESIDENT, SCORES OMISSION OF WOMEN FROM PRESIDENT'S GROUP FOR SOCIAL WELFARE—EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL HEARS DEFENSE OF FLEMMING FOR INSPECTION OF DRUGS IN FOOD—CALLS FOR REVISION OF RACIST IMMIGRATION LAWS

NEW YORK, February 17, 1960.—A call for the appointment of women to President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, coupled with a defense of Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, against criticism by industry of his efforts in the field of food and drugs, were made today by the head of the National Council of Jewish Women, 66-year-old community service and education organization, with a nationwide membership of 110,000.

Addressing a meeting of the executive committee of the council at its national headquarters, 1 West 47th Street, New York City, Mrs. Charles Hymes, of Minneapolis, president of the organization, pointed out that "not a single woman's name was included in the published lists of President Eisenhower's appointments to the Commission" which is headed by Dr. Henry M. Wriston.

The Commission was appointed early this month for the purpose of developing broad national objectives and programs for the next decade. Emphasizing needs for progress in education, welfare, and civil rights to enable large numbers of American citizens to realize their full potentialities, Mrs. Hymes declared that the omission was made "in spite of the eminent roles of women and of their organizations in the fields of social welfare."

"Women, who are entrusted with the responsibility of rearing children, should likewise be entrusted with the responsibility of helping to formulate the social goals for our generations. I urge that the President enlarge the Commission on National Goals by appointing several well-qualified women to it," Mrs. Hymes said.

Attended by members from all parts of the country, the meeting of the Council's Executive Committee dealt with major aspects of the organization's program in the fields of civil rights, housing, juvenile delinquency, aid to aged, mental health, and education.

Special attention was given to plans for financing a \$500,000 construction program for the housing of the model high school of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Mrs. Hymes and Miss Hannah Stein, executive director of the council, recently returned from Jerusalem after concluding an agreement there for the selection of the site and erection of the buildings.

In her statement Mrs. Hymes took note of the criticism levelled against Secretary Flemming in regard to his efforts and those of the Federal Food and Drug Administration to protect public health against any potential health menace that may exist in the growing use of chemicals in food production.

The speaker said that "as women, we are particularly interested in recent investigations of foods and drugs." She urged Secretary Flemming and the Federal Food and Drug Administration "to continue to put the protection of the consumer above special pleading by industry," adding that "it is also vitally important that the Food and Drug Administration be provided with sufficient funds to carry out its responsibilities effectively."

In her report, Mrs. Hymes assailed both proposed and existing residence requirements for persons applying for public assistance. She pointed out that with the exception of New York such restrictions are in existence in all States of the Union. Most of these restrictions require a person or family in need of help to have lived in the State for at least a year before that State will provide assistance. She asserted that it is not unusual for a family, or a child without a family, to lose residence in one State before establishing it in another and that assistance is denied, delayed, or provided only on emergency basis.

Calling for the abolition of such residence restrictions, Mrs. Hymes pointed to the situation of the State of New York where no such restrictions prevail. "The fact is that less than 2 percent of New York State's public assistance funds are now distributed to nonresidents. Experts in this State have testified that the cost of applying a residence restriction would approximately equal the cost of giving the assistance."

In assailing the proposed legislation to introduce residence restriction requirements also in New York, Mrs. Hymes declared that such residence restrictions "work cruel hardships and they do not make the problems of the needy disappear. In actual fact, they shift the financial burden to local governments and private agencies."

"There are no frontiers where help to the needy and service to the sick and homeless are concerned. There must be no passport requirements for those in need of help," Mrs. Hymes said.

Dealing with what she termed the tragic social problem of the aged, Mrs. Hymes asserted that most of the 15½ million persons in the United States over the age of 65 "are hardly able to subsist on their incomes, much less to pay for medical and hospital care." She urged the expansion of social security benefits to include payment of hospital expenses for persons over 65. She asserted that most of the needy aged suffer an acute need for hospital and medical attention but generally cannot afford it.

The speaker further termed the financial situation of the over-65 population as shocking.

"Eighty percent of them live on incomes of less than \$2,000 a year; 60 percent on less than \$1,000 a year." She continued.

"Perhaps the condition is clearest in the case of those living alone. Half of the total number of persons living alone have incomes of less than \$900 a year. Half of the elderly couples living alone have incomes less than \$2,000 a year."

She also pointed out that since the average social security benefit to a retired worker is less than \$900 a year, "it is time for social security benefits to be substantially increased. The Government needs to compare these benefits with its charts of today's prices."

Turning to the existing immigration laws of the United States, Mrs. Hymes charged that under these laws the Government "still doles out national immigration quotas on a racist basis."

"The major contribution which the United States can make to World Refugee Year is a revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, not only to permit the admission of refugees uprooted by crises, but also to eliminate racial and national discrimination. The liberalization of the racist McCarran-Walter law would be the most powerful and significant gesture the United States could make in the wake of world racist outbursts," she said.

In reviewing the recent eruption of anti-Semitic vandalism, the women's leader urged that while these acts have subsided they "should not be relegated to the limbo of forgotten events."

"There are very important lessons," she said, "to be learned from the fact that the overwhelming majority of the culprits caught defacing houses of worship and daubing swastikas on buildings were teenagers or youths in their early twenties." She urged that the White House Conference on Children and Youth, which will convene in Washington, D.C., on March 23, include this problem in its discussions of the causes and prevention of juvenile misbehavior.

Death of a Great Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 29, 1960, Rex Brasher, the Audubon of Connecticut, died at his home in Gaylordsville, New Milford, Conn. Mr. Brasher was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., on July 31, 1869, the son of Philip Marston Brasher, a prominent amateur ornithologist and taxidermist, who gave his valuable collection of mounted birds to Yale University.

Rex Brasher turned to art when still a young man, more than half a century

ago, and set out to paint all the birds of North America. His wanderings across the country in search of every species of birds took him 15 years and resulted in a collection of 874 pictures depicting more than 1,200 birds against their natural backgrounds. It is a collection combining scientific observation and distinctive artistry. I am happy to say that the State of Connecticut now owns this priceless collection and houses them in the mansion at the Harkness Memorial in Waterford, Conn., where they may be seen by the public.

The Brasher paintings are regarded as second to none in the world today—equal, if not superior, to those of Fuertes and Agassiz, and more realistic than those of the famous John James Audubon. They represent the meticulous labor of more than half a century for he started painting when he was about 20 and did not consider his work completed until he was 70.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials titled "Rex Brasher," one from the Waterbury American of March 7, 1960, and the other from the New Haven Register of March 2, 1960:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Mar. 7, 1960]

REX BRASHER

The name of Rex Brasher is nowhere near as familiar to American lovers of art as that of a great many other artists.

But Rex Brasher, who died last week at his secluded home in the Chickadee Valley section of Gaylordsville, was an artist with a special bent and a special talent. Just how he developed this particular interest in birds is not certain, but he did—and he has left behind a marvelous collection of paintings for the enjoyment of the public.

Nearly 20 years ago, the State of Connecticut purchased the bulk of Mr. Brasher's works for \$75,000. For several years they lay carefully crated in the basement of the State Capitol in Hartford, for lack of a place to display them.

When the State acquired the Harkness estate in Waterford, and turned it into one of the lesser known but more beautiful State parks, it was decided to use the Harkness mansion as a gallery for the Brasher paintings.

Today visitors to the Waterford park can spend hours browsing through the lovely gardens and hours more inspecting Mr. Brasher's works. Mr. Brasher is believed to have painted some 1,200 species and subspecies of American birds, of which the State owns about 1,000. Even the huge Harkness mansion is not large enough to display them all at once, so that the pictures are rotated about every 60 days with about 200 on display at one time.

Mr. Brasher painted birds in the swamps of the Everglades, on the rock coasts of New England, on beaches, on the broad deserts and plains of the West, on mountain peaks—in fact everywhere there were birds to be found.

He continued to paint until about 2 years ago, when his eyesight failed.

Often referred to as a 20th century Audubon, Mr. Brasher is believed by some art critics and naturalists to have been even more exacting in detail than was Audubon himself.

At any rate Mr. Brasher has left a great art treasure to the world and Connecticut is fortunate to own the bulk of that treasure and to have a place where it can be displayed for public enjoyment.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Mar. 2, 1960]

REX BRASHER

Rex Brasher is a name that Connecticut will long remember, and perhaps someday come to value more than the man and his work were openly valued during life. For the 91-year-old artist who died this week in Kent shared with Audubon and Agassiz and a very few others the dedicated pursuit of North America's birds and their devoted recording in sketch and painting. In Brasher's case, his legacy is a massive collection of many thousands of field paintings of more than 1,200 species and subspecies of this continent's birds.

The Brasher paintings are now owned by the State of Connecticut and they are housed in the mansion at the Harkness Memorial in Waterford. They are, in themselves, a treasure. As the lifetime work of Rex Brasher they represent also a testimonial to individual perseverance and to a self-sufficiency which may no longer be possible in most of the quiet places to which Rex Brasher hiked and canoed and otherwise made his solitary, watchful way in search of birds whose lives went undisturbed as he captured them forever in his sketchbook.

When he was in his twenties, Rex Brasher set out to paint all the birds of North America. He was in his seventies when the job was finished. There were sketches that he would have improved upon, birds that he longed to see for a few fleeting moments more. But what a life he led—and what a memorial he leaves.

The Dawn of a New Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are all deeply concerned over the directions and trends inherent in our world's recent history, knowing full well that no less than the survival of our civilization is now in question. In the January 1960 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists there is published a superb editorial by Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch, the editor, which is highly worthy of serious attention from every Member of this body and every thoughtful American.

Dr. Rabinowitch has written provocative thoughts which are at the same time hopefully optimistic and soundly realistic. I am grateful to Mr. Carl Pemble, of River Falls, Wis., for his suggestion that this editorial be given the wider circulation and attention that it so definitely merits.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAWN OF A NEW DECADE

THREE REVOLUTIONS OF OUR TIME

January 1, 1960, marked the end of a decade. Looking back on the 10 years which are now history, one is seized by a breathtaking thought: perhaps we have lived through a great turning point in the affairs of mankind.

In the January 1955 issue of the Bulletin, the years 1945-55 were called "Ten Years

"That Shook the World." Another 5 years have passed, and vague outlines of a new world have begun to emerge from the anguish and confusion spread over the old world by the blasts that leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In 1921 the Russian poet Alexander Blok said, as he lay dying, that he could hear "the stormwinds of history" blowing over his head. The stormwinds of history have been blowing ever since 1914; by now, they have risen to a hurricane.

Several major developments have reached their climax in our time: the revolution of underprivileged classes against societies which failed to soften their social injustices; the revolution of underprivileged nations against empires which did not transform themselves fast enough into commonwealths of free nations; and—lending terrible urgency to these two upheavals—the great scientific and technological revolution, which has endowed mankind with an unheard-of capacity to destroy itself—or to reach out for new heights of material welfare everywhere.

On the day when the existence of the atom bomb was made known to the world, Robert Hutchins, then chancellor of the University of Chicago, declared, "The atom bomb calls for world government," and appointed a committee to write a world constitution.

The constitution, elaborated at Hutchins' behest by Professor Borgese and his associates, is now all but forgotten; other elaborate plans for world reorganization (such as that described by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, to name but one among many) have left equally little imprint on world events. Even the much less ambitious "foot in the door" plan for international ownership and management of atomic energy, accepted in 1948 by all U.N. members, except the Soviet Union, now seems like a dream which only unworried scientists could ever have taken seriously.

It seems that mankind is as far as ever from stable peace. The danger of war lurks around many corners. The dominant political passion of many peoples still is hatred for other peoples, desire for the fall of their political or economic systems, for the reduction of their territories, or for their outright destruction—desires which cannot be realized except by war.

Does this mean that practical men have been proved right—men who smugly asserted in 1945 (as some still assert now, although less smugly) that bomb or no bomb, human history will remain the history of contests for power; and that wars have always been, and will always remain, the inevitable climax of these contests?

Much contemporary evidence supports this skeptical view. The world scene is still ominously dark. Several countries of Eastern Europe remain under alien military rule, exercised through native ideological minorities, but no less abhorrent for that to the majorities of these peoples. The minority that lost the civil war in China is still supported by outside powers in its hope of regaining the control of the country, where another minority that won the civil war has successfully established its domination. Armistice, and not peace, still rules in divided Korea and Vietnam; and not even an official cease-fire exists in the sea around Taiwan. And yet, whenever one of these smoldering power conflicts has flamed up in the last decade, the eruption has been quenched and the original situation—however patently absurd—has been reestablished. The world map has been frozen by the universal fear of a great war. The Suez expedition was called off after the fighting was well underway—in fact, when it was almost over—although vital interests of two great powers had to be sacrificed. The troops

that landed in Lebanon reembarked; the threatened assault on Quemoy never went beyond an artillery barrage; the showdown around Berlin is being delayed indefinitely, despite the obvious local military superiority of one side.

This repeated frustration illuminated the decadence, in our time, of a diplomatic technique which had been successfully used in the past when threats of war carried conviction. Now, war threats and counter-threats have become bluffs and counter-bluffs. Even if this change is for the better, it is not without new dangers. A power, threatened with a loss of face, may resort to force if its bluff is called—even if it did not seriously intend to do so in the first place. However, in the past decade, major powers have shown considerable caution in keeping the paths of retreat open for themselves and for their adversaries. We can hope that they will be even more cautious in the age of intercontinental missiles and missile-launching submarines—since these weapons make the possibility of a last-minute halt precarious and thus call for abstention from all practice of "brinkmanship."

These are signs of the changing world—evidences of the impotence, in our time, of the diplomacy of the mailed fist, of gunboat demonstrations and Marine landings, of the brandishing of ICBM's or atomic bomb-carrying airplanes. They are gratifying, but not too reassuring. After all, one can say, abortive conflicts also occurred before the First and the Second World War.

Little more reassurance can be derived from the decade of coat-tail diplomacy—from the dreary bargaining in London, Warsaw, and Geneva, or from the easy triumphs (and occasional fiascos) of the peregrinations of VIP's—be it Premier Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin (Remember these two garlanded with roses in India?), Vice president Nixon, Premier Macmillan, or—most recently and most triumphantly—President Eisenhower. Nor are the evanescent exhilarations of the "spirits" of Geneva or Camp David to be taken seriously as signs of a new age. Equally dramatic was the encounter of Napoleon and Alexander I on a float on the Niemen, which was followed, a few years later, by Napoleon's invasion of Russia—not to stir up the painful memories of the summit meetings in Munich, Berchtesgaden, Yalta, and Potsdam. Relaxation of international tensions, softening of the long-rigid policies of Moscow and Washington—all this is for the good and should be eagerly fostered; but all these things have happened before, in past power conflicts—and never meant peace for more than a few years.

Where can we see, then, real signs of a new turn in human affairs? In the treaty for the demilitarization of the Antarctic and its permanent reservation for cooperative international research; in the resounding success of the International Geophysical Year, which pressed into service not only the full scientific resources of all nations, but also their warships and rockets; in plans for other cooperative scientific efforts, particularly first steps toward worldwide pooling of space exploration; in the International Atomic Energy Agency; in the vigor lately displayed by specialized agencies of the United Nations devoted to worldwide relief and reconstruction—WHO and WFA, UNESCO and UNICEF, and the new U.N. Special Fund; in the work of various agencies of the United States and of the British Commonwealth in the rehabilitation of underdeveloped areas in Asia and Africa; in conversations between world scientists on the problems of war and peace, such as the several "Pugwash" meetings; in the obvious urge of peoples, in all parts of the world, to work together irrespective of ideological

antagonisms and power conflicts between their governments. A new world of international cooperation is being to take shape under the frozen crust of the old world of self-centered nations deadlocked in power conflicts.

If this new spirit is fanned by those aware of the stake mankind has in its preservation; if the governments of the world will permit it to grow; then the trend of history may truly take a new direction in our time. Future generations may then come to see, in the years which now appear as an era of darkness, confusion, desperation, and deadly danger, the time when a break was first made with the age-long divisive tradition of mankind; when world community began to become a reality.

LOST BELIEFS IN WAR AND RULE OF FORCE

Three broad changes in man's awareness of human relations are pushing us in this hopeful direction: a change in man's relation to war; a change in man's attitude toward the rule of force; and a growing feeling of personal and national responsibility for the security and prosperity of mankind as a whole, and not only of one's own country.

A generation ago, the belief in the naturalness of war, in the glory of victorious battles, in the rationality of the use of military power as tool of national policy, was universal. In a Russian student calendar which I used to buy every year before the First World War, there was a table showing the numbers of battles each country had fought in its history with the comment, "France, the most civilized of all countries, has also engaged in the greatest number of battles." This attitude toward war is now dead. What was once the faith of a few exalted religious leaders and the reasoned conclusion of a few humanist philosophers—that war is evil, and that the establishment of permanent peace must be the considered aim of mankind—has now become a common, everyday belief of men and women all over the world.

The same change has occurred in man's attitude toward the rule of force. The use of force in the maintenance of national strength was taken for granted as legitimate since the dawn of history. All empires have been founded on conquest; even now, while the historical empires of the European nations in Asia and Africa are crumbling, an attempt is being made in Eastern Europe to stabilize a new empire, intended to be held together by a bond of common ideology, but founded, like all empires before it, on military conquest. There is, however, a significant difference. In the past, no ideological justification was needed; the right of the stronger nations to rule over the weaker ones—England over Ireland or India, Russia over Poland, Austria over Italy, Japan over Manchuria, to take only the most recent examples—was not questioned and empires built on such conquest confidently hoped to last forever. Nobody believes now in the legitimacy or viability of the rule of powerful nations over weaker ones. If the Soviet rulers do not succeed soon in converting the East Germans, the Poles, the Hungarians, into loyal Communists, their domination of these countries will not last long—and the same is true of France's hope of making North Africans into loyal members of the French Commonwealth. We cannot fortify, in every given case, how the rule of force will be broken, if it does not gain popular support; but we are now certain that no institution can survive for long if it is not accepted by men as natural and legitimate.

War and the rule of force always went together in the minds of men. Acquiescence in the recurrence of one and the permanence of the other has now disappeared from human minds—and this change has occurred in the short span of 30 years, between 1918 and 1948.

AWAKENING OF WORLD COMMUNITY

Each war in history has had its special cause, its aggressors and its victims, its heroes and its villains. Yet, there has been one common underlying cause of all wars—the existence of groups of mankind within which individuals have abandoned some of their power for the benefit of the community, while no ethical or legal restraints were imposed on their relations to other similar groups. The purpose of each community was to assure for its members the greatest possible share of the limited wealth available on earth. In this, its interests were naturally opposed to the interests of other communities. One nation could not be rich except by others being poor, powerful except by others being weak.

Mankind still largely exists in this traditional framework. It still consists of self-centered factions, pursuing their fractional interest as the summum bonum; but behind the continuing reality of a world divided into contending factions, into mutually hating and distrusting national, religious, and ideological units, there has begun to grow another reality—that of a humanity conscious of mutual involvement and responsibility of everybody for everybody, one for all, all for one.

Much too slowly—and yet, how rapidly, if considered in the context of history—the realization is spreading in America that assistance to less fortunate nations is the moral obligation of an economically strong country. Americans are beginning to understand that no nation has either a moral right, or the objective possibility, of surviving indefinitely as an island of prosperity in a sea of want. What was once the opinion of small groups of peculiar people, such as the Quakers, or of idealistic individuals, such as Albert Schweitzer, whom nobody took seriously, is becoming in our time, a common belief.

Vice President Nixon suggests that the United States should accept the jurisdiction of a world court in its future international treaties. Mr. Khrushchev, as well as President Eisenhower and General DeGaulle, cautiously mentions the possibility of all advanced nations pooling their resources to assist the underdeveloped parts of the world. These words are not deeds, but they are portents. In the most cynical interpretation, the words of politicians suggest what they believe the public wants to hear—and only a few years ago such utterances would have meant the death by ridicule of an unwary American politician. Remember how Henry Wallace was accused of wanting to provide milk for Hottentot children? Was it not on that occasion that Mrs. Luce coined the ignominious term "globaloney"; and is it not 10 years later, a Republican president, elected to put an end to such nonsense, who proclaims in New Delhi a "world war against hunger?"

In recent months, the U.S. Government has begun to exercise pressure on its European allies to make them accept their share of the responsibility to aid underdeveloped nations; and if many in Europe think that this is none of their business, they hesitate to say so, because this is not a proper thing to say in our time.

ETHICAL AND SELFISH CONCERNS

Of course, the abhorrence of war and the broadening feeling of responsibility for the well-being of all men are not due simply to the moral growth of the human race. As always in history, virtue is the child of necessity. In the past, devotion to one's people and country, renunciation of unlimited pursuit of selfish interests for the benefit of a racial or national community, could only become a general code of conduct when it was realized that by subjecting himself to this code, an individual would improve his own chances for survival and the safety of his progeny.

In our time, the survival and prosperity of

any individual or group is becoming more and more obviously tied up with the well-being and security of mankind as a whole. The selfish interests of these groups now call for the recognition of new ethical principles, encompassing the whole of mankind. It is not a disparagement of the value of moral ideas in history to say that these ideas, always latent, and expressed, from the earliest ages, by exceptional individuals, become powerful influences in social life when their immanent virtue and justice find expression in their practical importance for the well-being of men.

CONSTRUCTION VS. DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION

In the last year or two, while the arms race continued unabated, the contest between the West and the East has shifted to a new arena: to competition for the allegiance of the uncommitted parts of the world, gained by increasing production and by using this increase for world political aims. This is significant progress. Even if the immediate motive of political leadership is engaging in this new competition is the old quest for power, the idealistic ingredient in this effort (without which no national effort can succeed) is new. Competition in the development of military power is, by the nature of things, directed against somebody. The only aim of military power is to be able to destroy the military power of others. Competition in bring about improvements in the well-being of other nations has a common positive aim, and can easily become a step to cooperation. Three steel mills are being built in India, one by America, one by Germany, and one by the Soviet Union; in an even more drastic case, in one town in Central Asia, an electric power station has been built by one great power and a street-car system by another one. The logic of the situation calls for these efforts to become cooperative; and the most hopeful sign of our time is that this logic is beginning to prevail against the traditionalist blindness of those in the East who refuse to see in Western assistance programs anything but a drive for the enslavement of new nations by capitalist exploitation, and of those in the West who see in Soviet assistance nothing but a particularly reprehensible technique of Communist subversion.

THE VIENNA DECLARATION

When, 16 months ago, at Vienna, a declaration was adopted by scientists of all countries calling not only for an end to wars, but also for the cooperation of all nations, irrespective of their political and economic structure, in technological assistance to the less well-developed nations, this may have seemed a quixotic idea which only men with no understanding of reality could cherish. Since then, this concept has started popping up in public discussions, including the pronouncements of responsible national leaders. It is not boundless optimism to hope that a few years from now, the concepts of worldwide cooperation in the technical advancement of the underdeveloped parts of the world will be widely accepted.

The development of science and technology is rapidly changing the realities of human existence; one does not need to be a Marxist to say that this change in existence must entail changes in consciousness. The progress of scientific technology has given to fractions of mankind the capacity to destroy each other utterly, and thus made the historical concepts of international struggle for power obsolete; but human consciousness needs time to adjust itself to this new state of affairs, in which no security exists for any one nation except in the security of all of them. The same progress in scientific technology is converting a world of limited wealth, in which each nation (and each class within a nation) could be prosperous only at the expense of other nations or other social classes, into a world in

which prosperity is available for all, if science and technology are pressed into the service of creating wealth; but the past experience of strict limitation of wealth, and the struggle for this wealth between nations and classes, is but slowly forgotten. When Premier Khrushchev was in America, he admitted that "The slaves of capitalism live well;" in other words, that the capitalist system (which he believes to be inferior in effectiveness to a planned Communist economy) can produce enough wealth to keep everybody fairly prosperous. This is the kind of enlightenment that may permit a softening of the power conflict between the Soviet Union and the West, now exacerbated by exaggerated belief on both sides in the decisive importance for prosperity of this or that system of production and distribution of wealth.

SETTING THE MINUTE HAND BACK

These are the signs that a turning away from the path of traditional power policy is becoming psychologically possible. We do not doubt that, as of now, the mainstream of political events is still dominated by traditional thinking and by the inertia of established institutions. The outlines of a new world community are but vaguely discernible behind the traditional structure of divided humanity. Nevertheless, in recognition of these new hopeful elements in the world picture, we are moving the "clock of doom" on the Bulletin's cover a few minutes back from midnight. In doing so, we are not succumbing to a facile optimism, engendered by a change in the climate of our diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, or to the exhilaration engendered by the personal contacts of the leaders of the great powers and their visits to different countries of the world. We want to express in this move our belief that a new cohesive force has entered the interplay of forces shaping the fate of mankind, and is making the future of man a little less foreboding.

When, in the past, the Bulletin clock was moved forward closer to midnight, it was on the occasion of events—the first Soviet atom bomb, the first hydrogen bomb—symbolic of mankind's drift toward the abyss of a nuclear war. The recent advent of intercontinental missiles is another stage of the same drift; the forthcoming test of a French nuclear bomb in Sahara, symbolic as it is of the beginning of the worldwide spread of nuclear weapons, will be another. No similar landmark can be pointed out indicating progress on the road to world community, but there has been, in recent years, an accumulation of facts and words which suggest that this hopeful trend is gathering force. The feeling seems justified that a turn of the road may have been reached, that mankind may have begun moving, however hesitantly, away from the dead end of its history; and so, with a hesitant hand, we are setting back the Bulletin's clock.—E.R.

Air Force Manual Is Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 4, 1960]

AIR FORCE MANUAL IS FINE

An educational training manual of the U.S. Air Force Reserve recently was strongly denounced by many powerful liberal groups

in Washington. It was said that the manual was unfair and insulting to the Christian churches and to the National Council of Churches in particular.

The manual, so we are told, had recklessly accused the National Council of Churches of harboring pro-Communists in its midst. Public indignation against this Air Force manual was so great that the appropriate authorities in the Defense Department in Washington felt compelled to withdraw it from circulation, and offered full apologies to its critics.

We have studied the full text of the manual very thoroughly and we cannot understand why it was withdrawn. Nor can we understand the reasons of those Washington VIP's who saw fit to apologize for it. Maybe their utter ignorance concerning Communist problems is their excuse. We find the manual a very timely, a very reasonable, and a very admirable document. We see nothing wrong in the fact that it was used as textbook material for Reserve training courses by the U.S. Air Force. Quite on the contrary—we think the Educational Department of the U.S. Air Force should be congratulated for having done such an excellent job in exposing the underground Communist activities in the U.S. churches.

In the first place, the manual warns all Air Force personnel of the dangers of Communist spying activities, giving actual examples of the successful—for the Communists—work done by very skillful Communist agents. The manual then discussed the Communist technique of confusing gullible people with well-sounding words and phrases about peace, democracy, social justice, international trade and the like, which mean different things to the Communists. Democracy, for example, in Communist phraseology, means the dictatorship of the Communist one-party regime. Peace means an international settlement on Communist terms. Social justice means the Communist system of injustice, discrimination and terror. What's wrong in pointing out these very obvious—but oftentimes forgotten—truths concerning the deceitful ways with which Communist propagandists work?

The manual then gives concrete and documentary evidence proving that many ministers of the church, including a lot of prominent members of the National Council of Churches, have sponsored and supported—and continue to sponsor and support—both open Communist political groups and drives, and so-called Communist front organizations. The manual quotes prominent U.S. Christian ministers arguing that Jesus Christ was, in fact, a Communist, and that the Soviet Union today follows Christ's teaching of brotherhood, equality and justice. Considering the Communist slave labor camps, in which tens of millions of innocent human beings have perished, considering the Communist police terror system—the most cruel system known to man, it is indeed breathtaking to see preachers of the Gospel of Christ praise the Red murderers as humanitarian social workers and saint-like missionaries. Yet such preachers exist in America today. What's wrong if an Air Force manual names them and quotes their fantastic, not to say blasphemous hymns of praise to the most sinister killers and torturers in history?

The manual ends with a simple, but well-defined and beautifully phrased definition of the American way of life, and in contrast, of the Communist political purpose—to subjugate all human activities, all economics, all morality, all religion to the iron will and discipline of the Communist state.

Our only regret is that the controversial Air Force manual has not been distributed outside the personnel of the Air Force Reserve. We think it should be read by all Americans, from all walks of life, of all professions, all religions and all political affiliations.

The manual can displease or anger only people who know nothing about communism, or who consciously or unconsciously serve the Communist cause.

Youth Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, public support for my proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps, authorized in S. 812 and sent to the House of Representatives last year continues to mount. In my travels throughout the country, and particularly in the great States of the Middle West and Northwest, there is the most intense interest and anticipation of the possibilities for good of such a corps of young men. I am deeply hopeful that we shall yet have hearings and action on the bill in the House before the end of the current session.

In an article which I prepared for the January issue of *Sports Afield*, I described the Youth Conservation Corps in some detail, and outlined the legislative situation with respect to S. 812. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article, entitled "Youth Conservation Corps" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

On August 13, 1959, the forces of conservation in America squeaked through a surprise victory in the Senate, with the passage (47 to 45) of S. 812, a bill creating a youth conservation corps to consist eventually of 150,000 young men, trained to attack the major problems of resource conservation which have plagued our Nation since the onset of World War II.

It was a victory in which conservationists shared the glory with educators, judges, and youth authorities—sickened by the constant substitution of brave words for any meaningful action to deal with the growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

It was a victory, but the Youth Conservation Corps is not yet a reality.

Between now and next January, the infantry of conservation and those enlisted in the struggle against delinquency must move up into the line of battle. If the YCC bill cannot be passed by the House in 1960, any significant action on the conservation needs in our national forests and parks, our wildlife refuges and our other Federal-owned lands will inevitably be postponed until well into 1961.

Opposition to the proposal has been almost entirely underground, except for a blunt statement of opposition from the Bureau of the Budget. During the extensive hearings on the bill, no organization came to testify against it. Indeed, not one of the opponents of the bill in the Senate even attended a single hearing on the bill. The word was simply passed: "Kill the bill." And the forces that have always fought against any meaningful regulation of the public

lands in the public interest, who have always tried to block any significant investment in conservation, quietly went to work. They have failed in their first attempt, but they will not give up with one defeat.

The outdoorsmen of America have better cause than most of their fellow-Americans to remember the Civilian Conservation Corps. They know that before the old CCC was thrown into the breach in 1933, only the most token efforts had been made to carry out the dreams of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt and their friends who succeeded in setting aside great tracts of the public lands for the benefit of future generations. The hunter and the fisherman, the family camper, the wilderness rider, the just plain nature-lover, each of these Americans every year can afford to say a word of thanks for those 3 million raw young men who were sent into the woods during the 1930's with no plans, no training, no preparation—just willing brain and muscle during a time when society seemed unable to offer men jobs in industry. The cleared camping area, the second-growth grove of trees, the stabilized streambank, the wilderness trail, the upstream reservoir, the handsome retaining wall, the still-sturdy but now rundown recreational facilities in the national forests and parks constitute a gift from one generation of boys to the next—and from one enlightened group of leaders to the sportsmen and outdoor-lovers of the next 500 years.

In 9 years the CCC boys—averaging more than 300,000 of them a year scattered throughout the country—built into our public land holdings almost incalculable values, in terms of timber and water and soil and recreational opportunities.

There were many harsh words said about some of the bold experiments of the New Deal, but there was virtually unanimous agreement that the CCC was a resounding success.

What happened to the CCC? It was one of the first casualties of World War II. The boys who had been volunteering for the corps by the tens of thousands suddenly were swept up by an even more urgent call to arms. The manpower—or boypower—of the CCC just went to war.

And, strangely enough, when the last shot was fired, and the last GI returned to the United States, the country was just not in the mood to buckle down. We wanted to produce and consume all those goods we had been doing without for 5 years. We wanted to have fun, to get postponed families started, to buy that new car, the new house we had been dreaming about, the new gun, the new boat.

We hit a tremendous production stride. And to the surprise and consternation of all the population experts, we also began to produce what now looks like a virtual population explosion.

Conservationists soon began to have bad dreams about the available soil and water and timber resources for this mushrooming population, and the pressure on the outdoor recreational areas of the country began to get out of hand. In the national forests alone, there were 68.5 million visitors last year. By 1969 there will be 130 million.

Even the conservative Secretary of Agriculture of an administration publicly committed to a balanced budget at all costs was finally persuaded to sign his name to a report that outlined a vast new investment program for the national forests that would, he said, produce \$245 million annually in new revenues from the sale of timber in the national forests by the year 2000. (P.S.—He did not ask Congress for the money.)

Conservationists outside the Government, unhampered by the wraps of the Budget Bureau and with long professional experience under previous Federal administrations, estimated the "conservation gap" in 1958 at \$3 billion in needed investment over the next

10 years to put our forests into adequate productive shape. (There are 560,000 acres needing reforestation, 11 million acres that require thinning, pruning and other remedial action.) An investment of \$4.5 billion is needed to halt the loss of our topsoil and to protect our vital watersheds. (At least 1.3 million acres of national forest lands need erosion control, and 535 flood prevention structures should be built. About \$1 billion is needed to stabilize the soils and increase the forage yields on our western range lands. (Four million acres of national forest range lands needed revegetation.) There should be an investment of \$2 billion over the next decade to upgrade and expand the areas of outdoor recreational facilities, and another \$1 billion to improve wildlife refuges. Planned, detailed projects, adding up to these 10-year investment figures, the conservationists pointed out, are waiting in the files of the major Federal agencies concerned with the management of our public lands.

And while conservationists were worrying about the population pressure on our natural resources, a second and even uglier problem was developing in American cities.

From the files of police authorities and juvenile court judges an ugly and disturbing story has been brought to light—of boys dropping out of school and finding no jobs, of gang-formation and violence, of arrests and convictions on a scale so unprecedented that the FBI Director has felt himself compelled to call it to public attention. The Navy reports that one out of four of its recruits has a record of arrest for a nontraffic violation of the law. Police forces have been augmented, juvenile court dockets saturated and reformatories jammed.

With slum clearance moving at a snail's pace, school construction lagging and automation making it increasingly difficult for boys just out of school to find satisfactory jobs, youths from underprivileged families are turning to dark and desperate roads in increasing numbers.

During the hearings on S. 812, we heard witness after witness from the great metropolitan areas tell of the tremendous burden being placed on the police and the courts, and of the rising curve of costs to deal with delinquency. There was general agreement that a figure of \$25,000 was a good estimate of the cost to the taxpayer for every juvenile delinquent who went the police-courts-reformatory road. The sickening waste of human lives was being accompanied by a staggering rise in costs. Worst of all, what was being spent apparently was not doing anything to solve the problem.

I particularly recall the comment of the warden of the Oklahoma State Reformatory, who wrote me: "The solution to our crime situation is not more jails, reformatories, and penitentiaries, but some educational program which will prevent boys from coming to our penal institutions." And Warden Joe Harp concluded, "It is so very hard to rehabilitate a boy behind prison walls."

The problem of juvenile delinquency is acute now, at a time when employment is at record heights, and before the great population bulge resulting from the marriages during and after World War II has hit its peak. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that the rate of unemployment of young people between 16 and 19 is almost three times the national average for all workers. Furthermore, as Katherine Oettinger of the U.S. Children's Bureau points out, "It is all too easy to step from low pay or unemployment into delinquent behavior. . . ." And Ewan Clague of the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts very firmly that by 1965 the number of persons in the work force under the age of 20 will increase by 40 percent. Where we now have about 9 million boys and girls between ages 18 and 21, by 1965 there will be

more than 12 million, and by 1975 more than 16 million.

Unless we succeed in bringing down the rate of delinquency, the figures on delinquency are going to leap also.

It all adds up to trouble—big trouble—a shocking waste of young lives and a scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money in fruitless efforts to seal off nonrehabilitable boys from society.

When I first proposed the Youth Conservation Corps I tried to make it crystal clear that we were not proposing a panacea for the cancer of juvenile delinquency, but we were trying to save some boys who would otherwise go wrong. And we could point to the experience of hundreds of thousands of CCC boys who had been encouraged to lead a constructive life, who had been given both physical and mental health by their few months in hard, well-led work on the land.

Putting boys on the land, putting them to work on projects that needed to be done, on patriotic undertakings to build for the future of America, this I am ever more convinced would do more for America in terms of our Nation's mental health and physical fitness than even the important resource-conservation work.

We are creating no new agency, no make-work boondoggles, but a simple and direct way to channel the creative energies of American boys into the planned projects of our Federal conservation agencies—under the direct supervision and leadership of our splendid forest and park rangers, wildlife management specialists, and soil conservationists.

Although the Youth Conservation Corps will not be a "new CCC," it can proudly and rightfully draw upon the invaluable experience gained from that notable experiment in government. It has the vast successes and the minor mistakes of the CCC to guide the new corps. One has only to look at the record to know that what the YCC can do for America is not a matter of theory, but of proved practice.

Here is an opportunity to take action in a sea of words, to move purposefully and swiftly to deal with the two apparently unrelated problems of resource wastage and the wastage of youth, in one great forward step. Boys on the land in a Youth Conservation Corps—this can become a reality if every American who understands the wholesome and healing nature of the great outdoors will make it a personal project to express to his Congressman, and to his President, his support of S. 812.

Need Permanent Judgeship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a rather poignant editorial appeared in one of Tennessee's great newspapers, Nashville Tennessean, a day or two ago. It calls attention to the distressing need for an additional permanent Federal judge for the middle district of Tennessee. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has recommended an additional judge for the district on a temporary basis. This is, of course, an unrealistic approach to a problem existing at Nashville for about 3 years. We had

two district judges for several years. One of them was a temporary judgeship. A very capable judge died and since that time we have struggled along with one judge. This splendid editorial points up the unrealistic approach to this pressing problem. The editorial follows:

NEED PERMANENT JUDGESHIP

At long last, it appears an omnibus bill providing new Federal district judges throughout the Nation will clear Congress. But the kinks with respect to a proposed judgeship serving middle Tennessee have not been sufficiently removed.

As things now stand, a House subcommittee is recommending a temporary judge to relieve the caseload piled up on District Judge William E. Miller's docket. The Senate Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which would provide a roving judge for west and middle Tennessee.

Despite these recommendations, Representative J. CARLTON LOSER says he is confident that the final action of Congress will give middle Tennessee a second and permanent district jurist. Congressman Loser, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, feels the full committee will override the suggestion of its subgroup and recommend permanent tenure for the middle district. We hope his confidence is well founded.

Certainly, the history of the judgeship situation in middle Tennessee should be given some weight by Congress. That history is this: Judge Miller was appointed with permanent tenure at a time when Congress correctly assumed that such was justified by the heavy backlog then existing in the middle district judge's court, which operates from Columbia and Cookeville, as well as Nashville.

But terms of the bill creating this second court contained a quirkish provision which had the effect of abolishing the second permanent judgeship upon the retirement or death of either middle district jurist. The provision, which was never justified, was to have been eliminated by Congress in the next upcoming session, but before it could be done, Judge Elmer Davies, Sr. died.

Two permanent judges in middle Tennessee are needed if only two circumstances are considered:

1. The tremendous number of land condemnation cases centering in Nashville because the U.S. Corps of Engineers' district office is situated here, and,

2. The heavier-than-normal income tax caseload created by the presence in Nashville of the Collector of Internal Revenue's district office, which serves the entire State.

Add to this the number of lawsuits which arise in the middle district because Nashville is a State capital city and the problem is thrice underscored, as to need.

Port of New York Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today is being celebrated in New York City as Port of New York Day. It is a well-merited tribute to the port which has welcomed so many fine newcomers to our shores and which serves as a hub of America's booming international trade activities.

Today's New York Times contains an excellent editorial on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1960]

PORT OF NEW YORK DAY

Today has been proclaimed Port of New York Day in New York City by Mayor Wagner. Most New Yorkers, unfortunately, are only dimly aware of their city's position as a center of international trade, but it is as a port that New York has climbed to eminence.

The port, which the city shares with its neighboring New Jersey communities, is able to berth 396 vessels at one time along 833 miles of waterfront. In 1958 it processed almost 38 million long tons of ocean-borne foreign trade cargo to a value of \$8,500 million. At the same time its airports moved over 13½ million people.

And these figures are only the beginning of the story, for without the magnet of the city's magnificent port facilities New York would be just another coastal town. Because of the port's easy accessibility people came here from all over the world, bringing their cultures with them, and in the millions funneled through the city to swell the nation to the strength it now possesses.

Many of these immigrants remained here, where their feet first touched American soil, so that now almost one-fourth of the city's over 8 million population is foreign-born. What other city can boast of publishing 57 foreign-language newspapers? With all its richly endowed museums the city itself is the largest and best museum of the world's cultures.

New York's color and content change, its ever-upward movement, its mosaic of the world, are the city's living tribute to its port facilities.

Mobility Held Defense Key

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article "Mobility Held Defense Key" appearing in the San Diego Evening Tribune of February 20, 1960. The author of this article is the distinguished military writer, Maj. George Fielding Elliot, whose column appears in numerous newspapers in this country and is also widely read in Europe.

This article is particularly timely in that it explains the great danger of placing overemphasis upon U.S.-based long-range missiles, and points up, in turn, the inherent advantages that stem from a diversified and mobile arsenal of deterrents. I recommend this article to Members of this House because it sets forth the essential strategic thought which in large measure underlines the present defense policy of the United States which seeks—and has achieved—deterrent superiority over the Soviet Union through emphasis upon diversity and mobility of our strategic weapons system.

As Major Elliot so clearly points out—

and this is something which is too often overlooked by those critics in this country who equate deterrents with only missiles—the United States has "in the weaponry and know-how of global, mobile warfare, the time lead—not Mr. K., and we are vastly favored by geography."

This article underlines the sound logic of our current policy which has chosen a deterrent system based upon mobility, versatility, and diversity, instead of following the disastrous path of placing our total dependence upon only the highly publicized intercontinental ballistic missile.

The article follows:

MOBILITY HELD DEFENSE KEY

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following analysis of the U.S. military position is written by Maj. George Fielding Elliot, USA, ret. A veteran of two wars, Elliot has gained fame for his books and articles on national defense. His books include "If War Comes," "The Ramparts We Watch," and "If Russia Strikes."

(By George Fielding Elliot)

The overwhelming issue of the coming campaign, says Vice President Nixon, is the national security.

Doubtless many citizens are ready to agree. But what then? A daily diet of discordant headlines, adorned with the names of statesmen and military leaders, has bred more confusion than assurance. The years just ahead seem dark with peril.

The weapons on which the Nation is asked to rely for safety are for the most part unproven in battle. Yet the nubbin of the debate now in progress isn't beyond the grasp of plain Yankee commonsense.

For the layman, a handy rule of thumb in judging the split-second weaponry of the dawning missile age might go like this:

If you can't keep it on the move, you can't protect it. And if you can't protect it, you can't depend on it to protect you.

Apply this rule to every weapon and military argument you hear of during the coming year and you won't be far off base.

National security is indeed the overwhelming issue of our times. And the overwhelming military requirement of American national security is to safeguard our freedom of action—freedom to carry forward the American mission of preserving human liberty against the Communist challenge.

We require powerful nuclear striking forces to deter the Soviets from depriving us of freedom of action forever by a surprise nuclear assault.

We also require non-nuclear forces—ground, sea, and air—to be able to intervene with enough of the right kind of power to deal with Communist aggressions of threats against specific parts of the free world. But freedom of action to do that—as we did recently in Lebanon and the Formosa Straits, as we may have to do at Berlin one day—depends on the power of our nuclear deterrent to protect us from Soviet nuclear counterblows.

Thus our deterrent forces must continue to be so armed and disposed that they cannot be knocked out by any surprise attack which the Soviet Union has the means to deliver. Otherwise we shall find our future freedom of action increasingly shackled by Soviet rocket threats.

Nothing that our military leaders are saying disagrees in principle with this central need to protect our freedom of action, nor with the proposition that our freedom of action can only be secure if our nuclear striking power is secure from surprise destruction.

When Adm. Arleigh Burke, for example, asks for more sea-based Polaris missiles and another aircraft carrier, he is asking for deterrent missile and air forces which cannot

be destroyed by Soviet ICBM's, these being useless against moving targets. He is looking forward to the wider use of the ocean spaces for the deployment of mobile nuclear deterrent forces of the future, which may include such systems as nuclear-powered seaplanes.

When Gen. Thomas S. Power insists that a substantial portion of his Strategic Air Command's planes be kept constantly in the air, he too is seeking some measure of security against surprise missile attack through applying the same principle of mobility on which Admiral Burke relies. And he looks to a future in which airborne weapons systems of far greater flexibility and endurance than his B-52's with their Hound Dog missiles may be available to us.

Meanwhile, it becomes more and more difficult for the advocates of massive fixed-base missiles, installed here in America, to reconcile the inherently static character of such weapons with the overwhelming American military requirement for global freedom of action, and with the fact that the main Soviet armament is specifically designed to attack fixed targets but has little value against moving targets.

Here is the real issue which is beginning to take shape amid all the present confusion of military debate.

It is a fundamental issue which any citizen can understand.

It is an issue between those who realize that security from surprise attack by missile weapons, against which there is no present defense and zero warning, can be sought only in mobility, and those who assert that we can hope to pile up enough concrete here in our homeland to resist multimegaton blows—though no sufficient tests have yet been made to support this theory.

The advocates of mobility seek to avoid the political and psychological paralysis of our national freedom of action which could result from basing deterrent weapons in our bosom.

SIMPLE YARDSTICK AVOIDANCE SOUGHT

Also they don't want Nikita Khrushchev to be able to measure the risk of war by the simple yardstick of so many megatons to smash so many fixed targets with a precalculated percentage of hits. Mobile deterrent forces he will have to go look for.

If found, they can be attacked only by such means as submarines or aircraft, against which there will be both warning and defense. Hence his calculated risk must include a much bigger question mark.

Finally, in the weaponry and know-how of global mobile warfare we have the time lead, not Mr. K., and we are vastly favored by geography.

An American strategy which chooses mobile weapons in order to preserve our freedom of action and restrict that of our opponents will deny the Soviets any reliable calculation of a surprise knockout and any credible basis for nuclear blackmail.

In the current arms debate, the inescapable logic of such a strategy is beginning to appeal to many minds. Yankee horseshoe may yet make nonsense of Mr. K.'s rocket-supported hopes.

One Hundred and Twelfth Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in marking this somber anniversary. For more than a cen-

tury, the people of Hungary have fought and dreamed of independence and freedom as we have known and loved it in this country.

We can hardly appreciate what freedom means to people who are enslaved by the Soviet military rule, their every institution and activity subject to controls ordered from the Kremlin. Yet we know the yearning these people have for self-government, for true justice in the courts, for freedom of opportunity and individual liberty.

This anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848 is an appropriate time to pledge our friendship and offer our best wishes to the people of Hungary. Let us hope that the forthcoming meeting of the heads of states will be one at which important blows may be struck for the freedom of the Hungarian people.

Commentary on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to all of the debate on H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill, for the past 5 days. I have listened to the explanation of the provisions of the bill by the proponents and the opponents. I have heard recitals in detail of the differences between the referee and the registrar plan of supervision of elections. I have heard repeated references to the voting rights of American citizens under the Lindsay amendment, the McCulloch amendment, the Meader amendment, and the Kastenmeier amendment, and on sober reflection, considering the provisions of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, it does not seem possible that we, the Members of this great deliberative body, must at this late date in the history of our Republic consider these things.

Starting with the famous phrase in the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal," and considering the supreme law of the land embodied in the Constitution, which guarantees to all people the blessings of liberty, due process and equal protection of the laws, it just does not seem possible that we must legislate on civil rights, year after year after year.

Further, the Constitution has conferred upon all native born and naturalized citizens, not only citizenship in the State where the individual resides, but citizenship of the United States as well, and this is an unqualified right, regardless of race, creed, or color. Therefore, I submit under these basic truths forming the foundation of our way of life in these United States of America, there would appear to be no rhyme or reason why there should be any dispute, disagreement, or distinction in the enjoyment of these things by every citizen of the United States. It is, indeed, unfor-

tunate that so much litigation has been necessary to both define and enforce these rights within the past several years. Even so, the U.S. Supreme Court, the court of last resort of our judicial system, has had to say and reiterate that racial discrimination in publicly supported schools must be eliminated. It has directed that school desegregation shall be accomplished with "all deliberate speed" locally through Federal district courts.

I find the consideration of the need for this type of accomplishment difficult to comprehend, coming from the State of New Jersey, where we have enjoyed integration in our school system for years. In fact, I recall in my grammar and high school days in Atlantic City, the white and colored children not only studied and worked together, but formed friendships which have lasted throughout my lifetime—friendships for which I have the sincerest and deepest regard. I see no reason why the same mingling of the races cannot be affected in every State of the Union, the same as it has been in New Jersey for many years. It grieves me to think that it is necessary, as it is, to formulate and to act on legislation on these things, which are so fundamental in this life.

I naturally am in favor of this bill, the civil rights bill, and will support any amendment which gives it strength and simplicity to effect its purpose. I can only hope and pray that we are making true progress, and that we will eventually obtain through understanding and good will the ideal of equality before the law, regardless of race, creed, or color.

The Facts About Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written pro and con on the status of our national defense that the American people have a right to be justifiably confused. A series of discerning and objective articles written by the Cleveland Plain Dealer's most capable military reporter, Phil G. Goulding, thoroughly discuss our defense posture and clarifies many of the points in dispute.

As a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, I have heard daily many of the facts that Mr. Goulding recites and can vouch for their authenticity.

I trust that the American people will benefit from the reading of these articles, along with a subsequent editorial: [From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 6, 1960]

HERE'S WHY IKE BELIEVES UNITED STATES IS STRONG ENOUGH

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON.—What if the world knew that America could respond to any sudden

attack with certain delivery of a single superbomb powerful enough to eliminate the attacking nation?

The problem of deterring all-out war would be solved.

It would not matter whether a potential enemy had 100 times the manned bombers, 1,000 times the intercontinental ballistic missiles or a 3-to-1 edge in flotillas of space ships.

Economic, psychological, and brushfire warfare would demand other forms of strength. But no sane opponent would risk inevitable destruction by pushing the button which would force the United States to deliver that bomb.

That is a simple statement of the administration's position on the missile-gap controversy.

President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Defense are confident that America now has and will continue to have the equivalent of the one-shot superbomb—more than enough nuclear explosives to do the same job and ample means of applying them.

If they are right, there would obviously be no military advantage in spending \$1 billion or \$11.69 merely to buy one U.S. ICBM for each Soviet ICBM.

If they are wrong, we should obviously lay out as many billions as necessary to expedite production of intercontinental missiles, 2,000-mile-an-hour B-70 bombers, crossbows, poisoned darts, and all other required articles of all-out combat.

What are the destructive capabilities of the United States today and how will they change over the next few years?

All informed parties in the missile-gap debate stipulate two basic facts.

The first is that neither nation now possesses significant numbers of long-range ballistic missiles. America has 3 which are battle ready; Russia is credited with about 10.

All-out war today would be fought with manned bombers. Soviet bomber strength is considerable, but even the most severe critics of Eisenhower defense policies concede that the United States stands supreme in March 1960.

The second stipulation is that the mid-1960's will be the period of missile plenty. By that time, the 6,000-mile solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM will be in the arsenal. Precise force levels have not been established. There have been suggestions in Capitol Hill testimony that the Minuteman will be deployed in thousands.

In itself, the missile gap cannot possibly make this Nation "forever a second-class power," as some have contended. It is a temporary issue, dealing neither with today nor with the period beyond 1964. It is concerned only with the intervening years when Russia is due to have a substantial supply of ICBMs and a substantial numerical superiority—1961 to 1964.

STRENGTH BASED ON VARIED WEAPONS

Between the 1960 day of unquestioned thermonuclear supremacy via manned bombers and the 1964-65 day of unquestioned thermonuclear equality via the Minuteman, U.S. ability to prevent or fight all-out war will rest upon these weapons systems:

Planes of the Strategic Air Command—the 600-mile-per-hour B-47 medium jet bomber, the slightly faster B-52 heavy bomber and the supersonic B-58 medium bomber.

Intercontinental ballistic missiles of SAC—the huge liquid-fueled Atlas now available in small numbers, the companion liquid-fueled Titan due to become operational next year and the mobile Minuteman, scheduled to begin to appear in quantity in 1963.

Fifteen-hundred-mile Thor and Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles in England, Italy and Turkey.

Aircraft based on the 14 attack carriers of the Navy—and capable of handling hydrogen weapons.

Fighter-bombers assigned to the Tactical Air Command in this country and to our theater commanders overseas. These can also deliver nuclear bombs.

Atomic-powered Polaris submarines. Each will be armed with 16 1,200-mile (later 1,500-mile) ballistic missiles that can be launched from hidden positions far below the surface.

An assortment of other nuclear-tipped nonballistic missiles: The Air Force intercontinental air-breathing Snark; the tactical Matador pilotless plane; its successor, the 1,100-mile Mace, and the old Navy Regulus.

BACKBONE OF SAC IS 480 B-52 BOMBERS

Backbone of SAC today is the B-52, which is not the outmoded flying machine that Mr. Khrushchev would have the world believe.

It operates from 24 dispersed bases. They are in Puerto Rico and 14 States, from Maine on one coast to Washington on the other.

Some 704 B-52's have been financed. Crashes have taken several, training units have others, research and development teams operate a few. The active force, ready to go today, numbers 480. New models are currently being delivered.

A large percentage are on ground-alert—prepared to be en route to the target within 15 minutes. The number on this status has increased fourfold over the last year.

Modifications have tremendously improved the B-52 since the first production plane. The G-series, now being accepted by operational units, boosted the range from 6,000 to 9,000 miles, chiefly through using the space within the wing for additional fuel.

Funds for 40 B-52 H-models are requested in the new budget. Turbofan engines on these will yield another 15 percent increase in efficiency. The advantages: More range, better acceleration on takeoff, superior performance at low altitudes.

AIRBORNE MISSILES TO SHOOT 500 MILES

The big bomber also will have a new brain and a new set of hands to help punch its way to the target.

Each B-52 will carry two Hound Dog missiles which it can launch against surface targets while it is still more than 500 miles away. They travel at supersonic speeds and are armed with large atomic warheads. SAC accepted the first battle-ready Hound Dog in December. The first B-52 test launch of both its missiles, held this week, was highly successful.

Two B-52 squadrons will be equipped with Hound Dogs by midyear; all 14 wings by the end of 1962.

The missile is extremely difficult to pick up on radar. Enemy air defenses will not easily intercept it.

Another helper for the B-52, the Quail decoy missile, will also become available this year. It will be launched from the bomber to confuse antiaircraft radar.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED B-47'S BACK UP B-52'S AT HOME, ABROAD

Partner of the B-52 in SAC is the shorter-range medium B-47 bomber.

America has 1,400 of them. No longer in production and approaching obsolescence, their number, bomb-carrying capacity and deployment still make them a potent force.

B-47's perch on 20 bases in the United States. These are sprinkled in 14 States, from New York to California, from New Hampshire to Florida. Range of the aircraft is 3,000 miles, but this is extended by aerial refueling.

Overseas, units of B-47's stand on runways of Operation Reflex. Chews are nearby, always together, always ready. The second hand of your watch will not complete many cycles before these aircraft can be airborne.

There is a "Reflex" unit at Guam. Others are on three bases in Spain, five in England,

three in Morocco. One SAC base in Alaska harbors B-47's and another maintains tankers. Goose Bay in Labrador and Harmon Air Force Base in Newfoundland are primarily for tankers, but B-47's are frequently there for a week or two en route to other sites.

Additional B-47's operate from two bases in Greenland. The aircraft and all of the equipment which makes it into a weapons system can function at temperatures far below zero and far above 100 degrees. Flying near the speed of sound, the plane can move from Arctic to desert between breakfast and dinner.

B-58 ON BOMB RUN TO FLY 1,300 M.P.H.

The third manned bomber of SAC is the B-58, which makes its bomb run at more than 1,300 miles per hour. The first duty-ready plane was accepted by SAC a couple of months ago; the first unit will soon be operational. Three wings are contemplated in the present program, or a total of 116 aircraft.

Two wings of B-47's will be dropped for each new wing of B-52's and B-58's.

Ballistic missiles traveling 16,000 miles per hour have obvious advantages over the airplane. But the airplane also has many advantages, beyond the human factor of recall after a false alert and flexibility of target selection.

HOUND DOG'S BITE SWALLOWS UP CITIES

It is almost impossible for the human mind to accept the destructive power packed into one bomber.

The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT, or 20 kilotons. It killed or injured 150,000 persons; it destroyed or damaged 75 percent of the city's buildings.

This was a firecracker.

Atomic weapons now go into hundreds of kilotons.

When one thinks of the Hound Dog as a means of merely paying the way for the B-52, he must think in new terms. "Paving the way" conjures up mental pictures of a battleship's 16-inch guns softening an enemy beach prior to an amphibious landing.

Such World War II images are deceptive. When a "little" Hound Dog paves the way, it blasts the city.

Yet these are also firecrackers, compared to the large thermonuclear, or hydrogen, bombs.

The Mike H-bomb shot of November 7, 1952, caused a small island to disappear and left an underwater crater 1 mile across and 175 feet deep. Its fireball was 3½ miles wide—against one-sixth of a mile for the Hiroshima atom bomb.

This was "only" a 5-megaton device; 5 million tons of TNT equivalent; 250 times the Hiroshima explosion.

A 10-megaton bomb would cause total destruction of all buildings within a 7-mile radius. It would kill 75 percent of the people. In a large city, this would be many times the 330,000 who died in Germany from all World War II raids.

Yet the Rockefeller committee reported that a 20-megaton bomb, twice as powerful, was by no means the largest available.

CARRIER PLANES CARRY H-BOMB, TOO

This unthinkable power can also be applied by naval bombers based on aircraft carriers.

Two attack carriers (as distinguished from smaller antisubmarine carriers) are always on duty with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Three are assigned to the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific.

More than 200 attack aircraft are available to those two fleets. They can also deliver hydrogen bombs. While there are arguments as to whether the 6th Fleet could survive in the Mediterranean, admirals are certain the planes could get off for an initial strike.

The Mediterranean is 196,000 square miles of water. The moving carrier is virtually invulnerable to ballistic missile attack; the decks can be cleared of aircraft in minutes.

Biggest naval plant is the 600- to 700-mile-per-hour A-3D with an unrefueled range of 2,000-plus miles.

The lighter A-4D Skyhawk and the A-3J Vigilante, which flies twice the speed of sound, can travel some 1,200 miles without refueling.

Both of the first two planes are in the fleet in large numbers, together with the lumbering old propeller-driven bombers. Money for the last 42 Vigilantes is sought in the new budget. The supersonic Vigilante is undergoing its second evaluation tests, but is not yet battle ready.

Eight new twin-engine A-2F turboprop attack planes, still under development, are also requested in the new budget.

There are 14 attack carriers now in service. The number of attack aircraft remains fairly constant—there will be 1,300 at the end of 1961. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has told Congress that these planes, under certain circumstances, could deliver more bruising blows more quickly than the SAC bombers.

Most of their targets, however, would be of a different type.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 7, 1960]

PLANES NOT OBSOLETE TO SAC CHIEF

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON.—Is it valid to predict that multistage weapons delivered by manned aircraft will continue to be a major military asset over the next 4 years?

Many critics of existing defense policies concentrate on intercontinental ballistic missiles and imply that bombers are rapidly becoming obsolete pieces of equipment which a sentimental Air Force retains as the Army did its cavalry.

Among them is not the four-starred head of the Strategic Air Command, Gen. Thomas S. Power, who has operational control of both strategic bombers and ICBM's.

WANTS 6 MORE WINGS

Power is confident that the B-52 heavy bomber, assisted by the Hound Dog and Quail missiles it will carry, will remain an effective weapon for years. So is his boss—Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff.

Both the B-52 and the medium B-47 bomber, they say, will maintain a "high probability of penetration success" through the mid-sixties, at least.

Power, in fact, wants six more wings of new B-52's than the Department of Defense will let him have.

The bomb load of a single B-52 is many, many times the size of the biggest warhead in the most powerful intercontinental ballistic missile. This is one of the reasons why the chief of staff of the Army and the chief of naval operations both opposed a decision a few months ago to increase planned squadrons of Atlas and Titan ICBM's to 27.

They argued that the United States had achieved an "overkill" in thermonuclear power which would last through the "missile gap" period.

The amount of destruction potential of various weapons systems is often disregarded in defense debates.

Of the three American ICBM's being developed, the liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan missiles will be able to toss much greater weights across the ocean than the solid-fueled Minuteman. This means bigger warheads—and more bang.

Congress has been told that Atlas has four times the payload capability of Minuteman; Titan eight times.

While the payload sizes are highly classified, all three are believed to be in the low

megaton range—50 times the Hiroshima atom bomb, but far below the multimegaton B-52 load.

For enemy targets that are dug in and protected by concrete, the bigger warheads of the liquid missiles will be needed. There are no thoughts of discarding Atlases and Titans, even after Minuteman joins the inventory.

Minuteman will have other advantages. It can be left unattended in a hole in the ground. Several, miles apart, will be fired by pushbutton from one central post. They will react immediately. The cost will be \$1,500,000 per missile and launcher, or little more than 10 percent of an Atlas with its launcher.

Because of its smaller size and the stability of its fuel, Minuteman can also be flitting around the country on special railroad trains, impossible targets for opposition ICBM's.

Development is on schedule and moving as rapidly as possible. No additional dollars are needed. This is the Nation's most important weapons system for the future.

But it is for the future. In the interim will come the Atlas and Titan.

The pacing factor in more Atlas and Titan missiles is not production of the weapons themselves. Convair, makers of the Atlas, could double its present rate without building new facilities. The missile, however, is worthless without trained personnel and without launchers.

TWENTY-EIGHT MONTHS NEEDED TO BUILD KBM BASE

Site survey for an ICBM launching base takes 3 months, specific design 5, contract bidding and awards 6 weeks, brick-and-mortar construction 13 months. Another 10 months are required for installing ground equipment and final checkout. Then the crew needs 3 to become familiar with the particular base.

Favorable weather can cut this schedule a little. Advantage can be taken of some overlap. But the cycle cannot be shaved down below about 28 months, even with the 7-day, 24-hour operation. That is the opinion of Air Research and Development officers assigned to the task and of their chief, Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever.

America plans 13 squadrons of Atlases. There will be 14 of Titans, a more advanced weapon but still in the flight-test stage. Except for the first two Atlas squadrons, each will have nine missiles on launchers and one spare weapon.

This will mean 111 Atlas and 126 Titan launchers—a total of 237 American liquid-fueled "first generation" ICBM's ready to be fired. It will take more than 3 years to get them all.

The forecast, calculated for the end of each year:

Nineteen hundred and sixty—Nine. All Atlas. Three (now ready) at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.; six at Cheyenne, Wyo. Another three will be at Vandenberg by December, but for training rather than war plans.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-one—54. Additional Atlases at Cheyenne, Omaha, Spokane, and Topeka. The first two Titan squadrons, both at Denver.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-two—163. Conclusion of Atlas, with a third squadron at Cheyenne and others at Salina, Kans., Lincoln, Nebr., Plattsburgh, N.Y., Abilene, Tex., Roswell, N. Mex., and Altus, Okla. New Titan bases at Rapid City, S. Dak., Moses Lake, Wash., Marysville, Calif., and Mountain Home, Idaho.

Locations for eight remaining Titan squadrons have not been announced. Most of their 72 missile-loaded launchers will be ready by the end of 1963.

The first Minuteman will have appeared in late 1962, the first squadron the following spring.

Important differences will be built into early and later Atlas and Titan bases, resulting from modifications of the missiles themselves.

Vandenberg Atlases stand bare, without protection against enemy attack. The next 24 will be stored horizontally in boxlike structures prior to launch, then 27 in semi-hardened below-ground coffins. The final 54 will be in deep silos, built to withstand tremendous pressures. Missiles will be raised by elevators for firing.

Titans will also change. The last eight squadrons will be launched from within their silo. Their fuel, while still liquid, will be storable within the weapons. Firing time and exposure will be lessened.

Several hundred feet will separate launchers in the early ICBM squadrons and 18 or more miles in the later versions.

Since the whole point of the "missile gap" controversy is the ability of the United States to survive a surprise attack with enough power to strike a devastating counterblow, all of these facts must be cranked into the discussion.

Estimating reliability, accuracy, and warhead of Soviet ICBM's, the head of SAC figures that it would take three Russian missiles to knock out each "soft" U.S. site. Several times as many would be required to destroy a semi-hardened launcher—and three more times as many for the silo variety.

MISSILES OVERSEAS BOOST U.S. MIGHT

Thor and Jupiter 1,500-mile intermediate range ballistic missiles yield additional power.

Three Thor squadrons, with 15 missiles each, are now operational in England. A fourth will soon be ready. Work is progressing on two Jupiter squadrons in Italy and a third in Turkey. These launchers will build up gradually over the next 2 years.

The ICBM's will add another 105 H-bomb warheads to the arsenal.

No other ICBM's are planned by the United States. England is developing the Blue Streak, a cross between our 1,500- and 6,000-mile weapons. There is also an unresolved decision on a solid-fuel ICBM for NATO—possibly an offshoot of the Navy's Polaris fleet ballistic missile.

In advance of these, however, the Polaris itself will be ready for action.

Four nuclear-powered submarines built to carry and fire the Polaris have been launched. Two will be in the fleet by the end of this year, each hidden somewhere at sea and able to blast off 16 ballistic weapons.

A new submarine, equipped with missiles, will be ready for war every 4 months thereafter. Including 3 in the new budget and head-start items for 3 more, there are 15 in the current program.

Without acceleration, there will be 32 Polaris missiles at the end of this year, 80 at the end of 1961, 128 in 1962, and 176 in 1963.

Final decisions on the ultimate size of the program have not been made. The Navy is shooting for 40 to 45 submarines—640 to 720 missiles.

SUB-A-MONTH PACE PREDICTED BY 1963

Once the weapon proves itself out in a few months, the Department of Defense may OK Navy plans for three more submarines and early-start items on another six. Admirals are confident that they can turn out the atomic-powered ships on a one-a-month basis by 1963.

They also propose installing the Polaris missiles on merchant ships of 5,000 to 7,000 tons and on cruisers. Space has been reserved on 18 heavy cruisers and 6 light cruisers—each handling 16 weapons.

America reaps more nuclear strength from the less glamorous "airbreathing" missiles

which fly at airplane speeds and altitudes, in contrast to 16,000-mile-per-hour ICBM's.

The Air Force has one wing of Matador surface-to-surface pilotless planes in West Germany, a unit in Formosa, and another in Korea. European Matadors have been bolstered by a successor, the Mace, which is faster and has better range and guidance.

Two hundred Maces have been produced. An advanced model, the "B," is now being tested at Cape Canaveral. Both versions fly just under the speed of sound. The range is 650 miles for one, 1,100 for the other.

By the end of 1961, two squadrons of the newer Mace will be battle ready in Europe and another two at Okinawa.

At Presque Isle, Maine, is an operational wing of jet-powered Snark intercontinental missiles. The Snark program was ended because of incoming ballistic weapons. While slower by far than the ICBM's, the Snark has magnificent accuracy and carries a tremendous warhead.

FIGHTER-BOMBER A NUCLEAR THREAT

Tactical fighter bombers are not designed as "strategic" weapons systems, lack the unrefueled range of the bigger aircraft and pack a lighter punch.

Again, however, "lighter" is a misleading word. Nuclear capability of the fighter bomber spreads across the atomic-hydrogen spectrum.

Under the Tactical Air Command in the United States are seven wings of faster-than-sound fighter bombers. Each wing has three 25-plane squadrons.

Two wings of F-100's, first American supersonic combat aircraft, are based in New Mexico. One wing is in Louisiana, one in South Carolina, and one in California. In California, too, is a wing of F-104's. North Carolina has a wing of F-105's.

Both of the latter planes fly twice the speed of sound. The F-105 was designed and developed to deliver nuclear weapons, heavy loads of conventional bombs and rockets at high speeds over extremely long ranges. It is the only fighter-bomber with an internal bomb bay.

The composite air strike force draws upon these 375 aircraft and their spares, supporting wings of reconnaissance planes and tankers were reacting to such overseas crises as Lebanon and Formosa.

Because of the increased performance of the latest tactical fighters and their air refueling capability, this force can be deployed within hours. TAC, as a command, keeps at least one squadron of fighter-bombers at Aviano, Italy, on a rotation basis. Other overseas fighters are under theater commanders.

In Europe, three wings of F-100's previously located in France have been transferred to bases in England and West Germany. There are three more F-100's wings in West Germany, one in Holland, and one in England. All of these can deliver nuclear weapons; many are on the edge of the Iron Curtain.

At other bases in the United Kingdom are one wing of supersonic F-101A Voodoo fighter-bombers and one of B-56B Destroyer light bombers. These, too, have nuclear capabilities.

European-based wings of troop carriers, fighter interceptors and reconnaissance planes are not included in this rundown. Nor are any aircraft of U.S. allies.

The estimated buildup of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles has been deliberately avoided in this story. So have a dozen other controversial issues of current U.S. defense policy, from the development rate of the B-70 bomber and the Army's desired acceleration of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile to the Nation's ability to fight limited wars.

The objective of the story has been simply to pull together all of the nuclear potential of this country—and to suggest that 6,200-mile ballistic missiles will be only a portion of that potential for some years to come.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 9, 1960]

THE STATE OF OUR DEFENSES

In two articles which appeared in the Plain Dealer Sunday and Monday Phil Goulding of our Washington bureau presented what we believe to be the most comprehensive survey of the U.S. military might, as it now exists and as it has been planned for the immediate future, to be published to date.

The survey was appropriate at this time in view of the extensive hearings conducted by congressional committees which have given critics of the administration an opportunity to express their fears that the United States will be vulnerable to a Soviet attack or ultimatum unless we do more than we are doing now, or have planned to do in the next 4 years, to catch up with the Russians.

In a presidential election year it is inevitable some of these criticisms, no matter how sincere the critics are, will have a political tinge. As a result, it is difficult for a layman to understand the real situation. Goulding's articles, we believe, will clear up some of the misunderstandings and doubts.

To begin with, there is the situation today. The sources Goulding consulted believe that any all-out war today would be fought principally with manned bombers, a field in which the United States is supreme.

Next comes the period of the so-called missile gap, from 1961 to 1964, during which it is admitted that the Soviet Union will have more intercontinental ballistic missiles than we will have. After 1964 we will have "caught up" with the Russians and will have achieved missile equality.

The issue, then, is whether permitting the missile gap to exist will endanger the security of the United States. According to Goulding's information it will not.

During this period the ability of the United States to prevent or to fight a war will rest on a number of deterrents. These include the Strategic Air Command, with B-47, B-52 and B-58 bombers, some able to throw a 500-mile punch with the Hound Dog missiles; intercontinental missiles, such as Atlas, Titan and the Minuteman; intermediate range missiles such as Thor and Jupiter; carrier-based Navy attack aircraft; fighter bombers of the Tactical Air Command; atomic-powered, Polaris-equipped submarines; and other missiles, such as Snark, Matador, Mace, and Regulus.

Moreover, our attack could be mounted from bases that girdle the globe, from Greenland to Guam, from Spain to Alaska, and from the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean or from the 7th Fleet in the Pacific.

According to Goulding, the chief of staff of the Army and the chief of naval operations believed we achieved an "over-kill," that is, more power than we need to accomplish any conceivable objective, and that this over-kill will last through the missile-gap period.

In other words, our striking power and our nuclear potential are adequate for the present and will remain so for the foreseeable future.

We trust that Goulding's articles will contribute some light on an issue which is bound to become distorted the more it is injected into the presidential campaign.

Red China, a Formidable Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of the Province of Ontario, Canada, is Mr. James S. Duncan, C.M.G., LL.D. In April 1959 Mr. Duncan visited Red China as a guest of the Government at the invitation of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade.

Saturday, December 5, 1959, Mr. Duncan told members of the City Club of Cleveland, Ohio, about his visit to mainland China. The subject of his remarks was "Red China, a Formidable Reality." A copy of his remarks was made available to me last month by Mr. Thomas Kerr of the Kerr Grain Corp. of Portland, Ore.

I want to cite a few of observer Duncan's astute remarks. The whole of his speech will then follow under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

He says:

There are no grays in China, all is either black or it is white. If you belong to the Western World, then you are an imperialist; if you are a landowner, then you are an exploiter of the people; if you live in Korea or Formosa, you are a running dog; if you are an American, you are an imperialist and a paper tiger to boot; if you differ from the party line, in the most minor detail, you are a reactionary and a deviationist.

There must be many among the older people who have known a better life, many who are spending their days in suffering, in hopelessness, and in despair, but these are not vocal. They are the anonymous ones, they are not identifiable. They are caught up in a mass movement from which there is no escape.

Besides, the Government is not interested in the middle aged or the old—these are expendable. All their thoughts, all their hopes and their planning are centered around the young, whose pliable minds they are carefully indoctrinating into the ways of communism, and into whose eager hands they intend in due course to pass on the torch. From what I have seen of these bright-eyed, enthusiastic, hard-working and dedicated young men and women, they will not disappoint the hopes and aspirations of their teachers.

They are supremely ignorant of the outer world. They have learned but one side of every question: as the French saying goes, "Having listened to but one bell, they have heard but one sound."

Mr. Duncan describes the grim living conditions within the communes. He details the failure to meet predicted agricultural production but notes that even in failure China experiences a 25-percent improvement in total agricultural production in 1 year is still a remarkable performance. He points out that living conditions are unbelievably low everywhere but adds:

Be all this as it may—and much as we deprecate the methods used—China of 1959 is a formidable reality. The authority of her Government is not being effectively challenged by any rival group. Its control over the masses is such that, providing China's Government can insure a modest yearly improvement in the living standard of her docile and disciplined people—and from what I have seen, I believe she probably can—the Communist government will remain in power for many years to come.

Later in his speech, Mr. Duncan says:

The opinions I am expressing are merely those of a businessman and a private citizen and have consequently no official connotation. If I am dealing with this delicate subject at all it is because I feel strongly that the events which are taking place in China today could so intimately affect the lives of each one of us that no opportunity should be lost to place the facts as I see them before as wide an audience as possible.

I doubt if anyone who has visited China in recent years still believes in the fiction of the successful subjugation of the mainland by Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang.

The \$64,000 question is what can be done about it. How do we emerge from the present impasse? The first thing which must be understood is that China is no longer prepared to accept renewal of diplomatic relations with any country which recognizes the National Government of Formosa, which she considers as part of her national territory. The recognition of China, therefore, implies the abandonment of Formosa, and insofar as the United States and certain other Western countries are concerned (including our own) the disavowal of treaties freely entered into.

There are many who feel strongly that the nonrecognition of China by the United States and Canada in 1949 was unrealistic and regrettable. I share that point of view. It would be an oversimplification, however, to conclude that if nonrecognition was a mistake, early recognition, without a change of heart and policy by China, is the necessary answer.

Near the close of his remarks, Dr. Duncan notes:

Many Asiatic nations, who claim to be allergic to American imperialism, are in reality looking toward the United States to hold in check the expansionist tendencies of Red China. Their real concern is not American, but Chinese, imperialism.

He says:

The United States of America should continue, therefore, her policy of containment. Weakness and compromise have never advanced the cause of peace, and it is eminently desirable that both Soviet Russia and China should know the limits beyond which the Western World will not go.

Drawing on his observations, Mr. Duncan adds:

But the continuation of the status quo ante does not make sense either. The formidable reality of Red China cannot be indefinitely ignored. Operating, therefore, from her position of strength (and her strength in the Pacific is still unquestioned), the United States should embark in all sincerity upon a policy of rapprochement with China, carrying with it no immediate recognition but acknowledgment and respect for China's position as a great world power.

To implement this policy of detente, China should be given to understand by the

United States that the broadest possible exchange of visitors, as is the case with Russia, would be welcome. Representatives of the Chinese press should be invited to travel widely throughout the United States on a reciprocal basis. All forms of cultural exchanges should be promoted, including especially an exchange of students.

The American embargo on exports should be reduced to an absolute minimum. These trade restrictions, which are treated with ridicule in China, have not seriously hindered her development. They have, however, driven her closer to Russia.

The mutual exchange of trade delegations, the display of goods at trade fairs and international exhibitions should be encouraged. None of this implies approval of the Chinese form of government, any more than our reception of the leaders of the Soviet Union implies approval of theirs.

There are those who say that these conciliatory moves might be rebuffed, but I am inclined to doubt it. Those guiding China's affairs are subtle and farsighted men and it might well be that, their present hostile attitude notwithstanding, China would welcome a gradual rapprochement with the United States and a correspondingly lesser dependence upon Russia.

Commenting on China's military strength, Mr. Duncan finds:

Rapid and spectacular as her progress has been, China is in no position at the present time to challenge the United States. Many a year will go by before China will qualify industrially or militarily as a really great power. She has too many roads to build, men and women to train, houses to erect, people to educate, mouths to feed, factories and power projects to construct.

But the handwriting is on the wall, plain for everyone to read. Any nation which can do what China had done in 10 years, even if the facts as given to us are greatly exaggerated, has the potential of a great industrial power; and, with approximately one fourth of the world's population to draw from, of a great military power also.

I think these observations by Dr. Duncan are realistic and reported as accurately as possible. I would call to the attention of every person interested in the survival of our Government as we know it—and want to keep it—Mr. Duncan's one sentence summation near the end of his speech.

He said:

One cannot oppose awesome dedication and self-denial by comfortable complacency and hope to come out on top.

The full text of his address follows:

RED CHINA, A FORMIDABLE REALITY

Mr. President, honored guests, and gentlemen, during a trip to Soviet Russia 4 years ago I noticed important numbers of bright-eyed, keen-looking young Chinese workers in every manufacturing plant which I visited. The invariable answer to my questions was that these young workers were in training for the future industrialization of China.

It was then that I decided to visit Red China at the earliest opportunity. I was impressed by the thought that if China, with its 650 million people would become educated and industrialized as rapidly as the Russians had, the Western World would be faced with a challenge the like of which they have never been called upon to measure up to before; and that the sooner my fellow Canadians learned what was shaping up behind the Bamboo Curtain the better and the healthier it would be for all of us.

Three and one-half years elapsed before a suitable opportunity arose. Last April, however, the China Council for the Promo-

tion of International Trade invited me officially to visit their country as a guest of the Government.

It was a rewarding experience, if in some respects an alarming one. Red China is indeed a formidable reality. Having benefited by the experience, the mistakes and the massive aid of Soviet Russia, the Chinese progress since their revolution has been much more rapid than that of their guide and mentor.

It is upon the tempo of their progress, the success of their revolution, and the outpacing of Soviet Russia that their intransigence, their unshakable faith in the future and their distressing arrogance are based. During the past two decades China has indeed sprung from a semifederal, semi-colonial state, foreign-dominated, weak, and torn by internal strife, into a position of world power and one of growing leadership in Asia.

It is perhaps even still more remarkable that "the great leap forward" (to use Chinese phraseology) which carried this problem child of Asia to a position of strength and unity, has been accomplished since the Communist government took over power just 10 years ago. The Communist leaders point with pride to the things which have been accomplished in this short period of time—and indeed there is a lot to be proud about.

They do not mention, however, that the chaotic conditions of the Chinese economy in 1949 were due in no small measure to 20-odd years of civil war, heralded in by the Communist Party in 1927 (when they seceded from the Nationalist government at Wuhan); and, with the strong moral support of Soviet Russia, announced a program which called for all-out class struggle and a crusade against what (in their Communist jargon) they describe as all reactionary forces and foreign imperialists.

Be all this as it may, the Communist government is now strongly entrenched. It is probably the most dynamic, the most dedicated, and the most powerful which has ever controlled the destiny of China.

Whereas their leaders have risen to power frequently through cruel deception and subterfuge, and the heartless elimination of those who opposed their ambitions, it must be said of them in all fairness, that once they reached the summit they set an example of austerity, of endless toil, of dedication, and (according to their standards) of personal integrity, which has not only left its stamp upon the people, but has made more bearable the ruthless disciplinary measures imposed upon those who fail to live up to their exacting standards.

Opium smoking, alcoholism, prostitution, gambling have been practically stamped out. Bribery—and even tipping—have been eliminated.

To what degree this new puritanism is attributable to indoctrination or to the fear of retribution is a matter of speculation. Both have no doubt played their part, but I strongly suspect that fear was the predominating factor.

Wherever one's travels take one in China, unbelievable activity and material progress are in evidence everywhere. Factories, the building trades, basic industries operate around the clock on a three, 8-hour shift basis every day of the year, excepting the days of "national rejoicing," which are six in number.

In the city of Peiping alone, more building has taken place in the last 7 years than since the beginning of the Ch'ing dynasty in 1644. Everywhere new factories are being constructed. Public buildings, apartment houses, schools, universities are rising from their foundations with amazing rapidity. Railway lines are being laid down; airports and sewage systems are being built. More food is being grown, more goods are being

produced, more children and young people are being educated, and the specter of starvation no longer stalks the land.

It is perhaps, therefore, explainable that the great masses—illiterate, docile, inured to hardship, and unaccustomed as they have always been to freedom as we know it in the West—are prepared to put up with the endless toil and sacrifice which is being imposed upon them. Firstly, because they have no alternative; and secondly, because of the belief and hope, which is being drilled into them every hour of the day, by every known method of indoctrination, that they are laying the foundation for a better and more abundant life. They are being taught to suffer now without complaint so that their children, and their children's children, will suffer less in the future.

The people as a whole are polite, friendly, hospitable. They are remarkably resourceful, unbelievably hard working, and indoctrinated to a degree which precludes individual judgment and causes them to reject the most obvious truths. They are puritanical to the point of boredom.

By 9:30 they are ready for bed; by 5:30 in the morning they are preparing for the day's work. Their most exciting topic of conversation is the great leap forward in pig iron production or the additional bushels of wheat per acre produced in 1958 over 1957.

They wear their faith like a badge of honor and proclaim it much more vigorously than the Russians. They display an almost pathological reluctance to express any personal opinions on ideological questions or to deviate in the least little bit from the party line.

There are no grays in China, all is either black or it is white. If you belong to the Western World, then you are an imperialist; if you are a landowner, then you are an exploiter of the people; if you live in Korea or Formosa, you are a running dog; if you are an American, you are an imperialist and a paper tiger to boot; if you differ from the party line, in the most minor detail, you are a reactionary and deviationist.

There must be many among the older people who have known a better life, many who are spending their days in suffering, in hopelessness, and in despair, but these are not vocal. They are the anonymous ones, they are not identifiable. They are caught up in a mass movement from which there is no escape.

Besides, the Government is not interested in the middle-aged or the old—these are expendable. All their thoughts, all their hopes and their planning are centered around the young, whose pliable minds they are carefully indoctrinating into the ways of communism, and into whose eager hands they intend in due course to pass on the torch. From what I have seen of these bright-eyed, enthusiastic, hard-working, and dedicated young men and women, they will not disappoint the hopes and aspirations of their teachers.

They are supremely ignorant of the outer world. They have learned but one side of every question: as the French saying goes, "Having listened to but one bell, they have heard but one sound."

They are fanatically convinced that communism is the only road, and they are all looking forward with infectious enthusiasm to the bright new world in which they expect to play their important part.

I have seen no evidence whatsoever of the weakening of the Sino-Soviet ties, so hopefully forecast by Western wishful thinkers. That there are cracks in the Sino-Soviet walls is fairly evident. That their present relationship will deteriorate in the course of time is highly probable—but this day has not yet dawned. The two partners holding sway, as they do, over a territory stretching from West Germany to the China Seas, and

controlling the destiny of one-third of the world's population, are bound together for the time being by ties of mutual interest, of common faith, and of similar objectives, and I predict that until China grows a lot stronger than she is now, the cracks in the wall will be plastered over as they arise.

The spectacular growth of China's infant industry has only been made possible by the massive aid of the U.S.S.R.—all of which, by the way, is paid for by China through shipment of foodstuffs and raw materials to Russia. The Soviets have not only cooperated in the overall planning of China's industrialization, but they have designed their factories, supplied the machine tools and equipment, sent teams to supervise their installation and get the plants started; in addition to which, they have trained tens of thousands of young Chinese in corresponding plants in Russia.

One of the most astonishing features of China's growing industry, the output of which is increasing very rapidly, is that it is manned exclusively by young people, whose average age does not exceed 25 and in many plants does not exceed 22.

The upsurge of Communist education has kept pace with that of the economy as a whole. Before the revolution, probably 90 percent of the population of China was illiterate. Today the percentage is still high but primary education has now become obligatory.

There are 83 million children in the primary schools, 12 million in the secondary schools, and 660,000 in institutions of higher learning.

In the early days of the revolution, Chairman Mao Tse-tung was not slow to recognize that the path to power in China lay not through the proletariat, as in Soviet Russia, but through the teeming masses of hard-pressed peasantry, for whom (in the opinion of many) any change could only be for the better. Mao Tse-tung became the leader of the peasants, who supplied not only the economic sinews of the revolution, but the voluntary manpower for the Red army.

Eighty percent of all the agriculture land of China was owned by the landlords and wealthy farmers. That this should be taken from them without compensation, and distributed gratis among the land-hungry peasants was the bait which rallied them to the cause of the Communist revolution.

Land reform (because so it was called), was, however, but a gigantic hoax, a calculated deception of unprecedented proportions. And although it was implemented in 1951-52, at was never the intention of the Government to create a permanent land-owning peasantry. Just as soon as they felt themselves sufficiently entrenched, the Government moved forward with relentless and unrelenting purpose toward their original objective of becoming the sole owners of all the land in China and of turning the peasants into a disciplined, militarized, captive and regimented labor force.

Time does not permit me to describe the steps which were successively taken, but by the end of October 1958, the Government's purpose was achieved and 26,000 communes sprang into existence in a short period of 3 months.

From November 1958, no peasant in China owned any land at all, and all of them, men and women, became overworked and regimented members of labor brigades detailed to tasks alternately upon the land, in small factories, on building projects, or for any other purpose which the commune manager and his committee (all young, and all active members of the Communist Party), deemed to be in the interests, not of the peasants and their families, but of greater productivity.

Living conditions in the communes are bleak and starkly utilitarian. All the peas-

ants eat together unbelievably modest rations of ground corn or rice, with an occasional sprinkling of bits of dried fish, in unbelievably drab communal dining halls. They report to work in the fields or the local factories at 5:30 in the morning in the summertime, and are there until 6:30 at night, with rest periods during the day.

It must be pointed out, however, that from the point of view of increasing agricultural production, and thus reducing the danger of starvation, the commune system, which disposes of large working forces, has a lot of merit. What is missing in the picture is the fulfillment of a pledge, and the well-being, the individual freedom and the human dignity, of the peasants themselves.

I reject the thought that this form of mass slavery was the only avenue open to the Government by which national production could be increased and starvation held at arms' length. Those of us who believe in the free enterprise system and the productivity of farms which operate under it, know that this is not so. From a political point of view, however, it was undoubtedly the best way to control the lives of 520 million peasants.

That all is not well in the commune system is startlingly illustrated by the fact that Chou En-lai, in an official speech before the People's Congress, when we were in China in May, stated that total agricultural production in 1958 had risen by 64 percent over 1957, and that by 1959, as a result of the communes, it would reach the enormous figure of 122 billion yuans. On September 1, 4 months afterward, he announced that these estimates had been overoptimistic and that the 64 percent increase was reduced to a 25-percent increase, and that the 1959 estimate was reduced from 122 billion yuans to 67 billion yuans. The great leap forward proved to be a medium size leap only; but even so, a 25-percent improvement in total agricultural production in 1 year is still a remarkable performance.

Although the living conditions are very much worse in the communes than in the cities, they are unbelievably low everywhere. A large proportion of all the freight in China is transported by human effort, and one is moved to pity at the sight of tired and sad-faced women, 8 or 10 of them together, struggling to push or to pull heavy carts laden with steel girders, or bags of cement or material of all kinds, knowing that all that is in store for them at the end of a long and weary day is to share a miserable room, and no doubt a common bed, with 5 or 6 other people, and to eat a bowl of rice or ground corn, or occasionally noodles, for their evening meal.

Be all this as it may (and much as we deprecate the methods used), China of 1959 is a formidable reality. The authority of her Government is not being effectively challenged by any rival group. Its control over the masses is such that, providing China's Government can insure a modest yearly improvement in the living standard of her docile and disciplined people (and from what I have seen, I believe she probably can), the Communist government will remain in power for many years to come.

Under these circumstances it is fairly generally agreed that recognition of the People's Republic of China must someday become an accomplished fact. Six hundred and fifty million people (1 billion by 1980), whose population is increasing every 12½ years by a number equal to the 1958 population of the United States of America, cannot be indefinitely ignored.

Before I proceed to outline the conclusions I have reached as a result of my visit to China I should like to make quite clear that, as a guest in your great country, the last thing I would wish to do is to appear to advise you concerning what your foreign policy should, or should not be, in relation to

China. These are matters which you and your Government alone can properly decide.

The opinions I am expressing are merely those of a businessman and a private citizen and have consequently no official connotation. If I am dealing with this delicate subject at all it is because I feel strongly that the events which are taking place in China today could so intimately affect the lives of each one of us that no opportunity should be lost to place the facts as I see them before as wide an audience as possible.

I doubt if anyone who has visited China in recent years still believes in the fiction of the successful subjugation of the mainland by Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang.

The \$64,000 question is what can be done about it. How do we emerge from the present impasse? The first thing which must be understood is that China is no longer prepared to accept renewal of diplomatic relations with any country which recognizes the national government of Formosa, which she considers as part of her national territory. The recognition of China, therefore, implies the abandonment of Formosa, and insofar as the United States and certain other Western countries are concerned (including our own) the disavowal of treaties freely entered into.

There are many who feel strongly that the nonrecognition of China by the United States and Canada in 1949 was unrealistic and regrettable. I share that point of view. It would be an oversimplification, however, to conclude that if nonrecognition was a mistake, early recognition, without a change of heart and policy by China, is the necessary answer.

Such a reversal by the United States of America of a policy which has been pursued with uncompromising determination for 10 years, would be looked upon by China as a sign of Western weakness and compromise and would be acclaimed by the Communist world as a victory of unparalleled proportions.

In addition, many well-informed people, while critical of the United States early non-recognition policy, believe that if she now reversed herself, China, intoxicated by such a signal victory, might well look upon the abandonment of Formosa as a stepping-stone to further and more important demands. These might well include the relinquishing of America's zone of influence in the Pacific and this would involve Japan, Okinawa, South Korea, and the Philippines.

Furthermore, the abandonment by the United States of America of Formosa, and the repudiation of her treaty obligations, would weaken the position of the Asiatic nations who are resisting Communist infiltration and shake their faith in the value of American support. Many Asiatic nations, who claim to be allergic to American imperialism, are in reality looking toward the United States to hold in check the expansionist tendencies of Red China. Their real concern is not American, but Chinese, imperialism.

They do not forget, nor should we either, that one of the tenets of Chinese, as well as Soviet, communism is world revolution; and China so far has certainly not shown herself to be free of expansionist tendencies.

The United States of America should continue, therefore, her policy of containment. Weakness and compromise have never advanced the cause of peace, and it is eminently desirable that both Soviet Russia and China should know the limits beyond which the Western World will not go.

But the continuation of the status quo ante does not make sense either. The formidable reality of Red China cannot be indefinitely ignored. Operating, therefore, from her position of strength (and her strength in the Pacific is still unquestioned), the United States should embark in all sin-

cerity upon a policy of rapprochement with China, carrying with it no immediate recognition but acknowledgment and respect for China's position as a great world power.

To implement this policy of detente, China should be given to understand by the United States that the broadest possible exchange of visitors, as is the case with Russia, would be welcome. Representatives of the Chinese press should be invited to travel widely throughout the United States on a reciprocal basis. All forms of cultural exchanges should be promoted, including especially an exchange of students.

The American embargo on exports should be reduced to an absolute minimum. These trade restrictions, which are treated with ridicule in China, have not seriously hindered her development. They have, however, driven her closer to Russia.

The mutual exchange of trade delegations, the display of goods at trade fairs and international exhibitions should be encouraged. None of this implies approval of the Chinese form of government, any more than our reception of the leaders of the Soviet Union implies approval of theirs.

There are those who say that these conciliatory moves might be rebuffed, but I am inclined to doubt it. Those guiding China's affairs are subtle and farsighted men and it might well be that, their present hostile attitude notwithstanding, China, would welcome a gradual rapprochement with the United States and a correspondingly lesser dependence upon Russia.

I am well aware of the fact that no measure of understanding and no amount of trade will fully satisfy China until her international status is accepted. She knows, and we know, that she cannot be indefinitely ignored, but she must be brought to realize that this status cannot be achieved by threat or by force. In other words, China cannot shoot her way into recognition.

Precipitate action and repudiation of treaties are thus not the answer. The cure might prove worse than the disease. China must work her passage toward a settlement in which all parties concerned, including Korea and Formosa and the uncommitted countries of Asia, would take part and the interests of each be safeguarded.

None of this will be easy but it will be much less difficult if China is offered the olive branch. The United States is powerful enough and generous enough to be able to do so without loss of prestige. Some say that the situation is too explosive for gradual settlement—that a cure-all must be found now. I doubt this, providing always that the West remains united and the United States of America firm and strong.

Rapid and spectacular as her progress has been, China is in no position at the present time to challenge the United States. Many a year will go by before China will qualify industrially or militarily as a really great power. She has too many roads to build, men and women to train, house to erect, people to educate, mouths to feed, factories and power projects to construct.

But the handwriting is on the wall, plain for everyone to read. Any nation which can do what China had done in 10 years, even if the facts as given to us are greatly exaggerated, has the potential of a great industrial power; and, with approximately one-fourth of the world's population to draw from, of a great military power also.

Like her Communist partner, China will restrict her production of consumer goods and devote her major resources to the expansion of her basic industries. Just as the indoctrinated Russians have accepted the sacrifices in comfort and well-being which this policy involves, the indoctrinated Chinese will do likewise.

China today is shipping vast quantities of

foodstuffs to Russia, which her own people so badly need, in order to pay for new plants and services. So will she in the immediate years to come ship goods, which her people can ill do without, to foreign countries at prices which even Japan cannot compete with, for the purpose of obtaining essential exchange or of destroying the markets of other nations.

Increases in Soviet Russia's industrial production over the past 10 years have been estimated at 12 percent yearly, compared with 3½ percent in the United States of America. She is catching up quickly.

China has still a long way to go, but she will follow in Russia's footsteps, and unless I misread the situation, she will get there much more rapidly.

These are unpleasant but formidable realities which the Western World, and the United States as their leader, cannot afford to ignore. Such realities will not be overcome by indifference, or complacency. Our danger today, vis a vis the gathering economic onslaught of the Communist bloc, springs in no small measure from the ironical fact that these splendid qualities of self-reliance, thrift, self-denial, hard work, and discipline, upon which the greatness of both our nations was built, are tending to wither away in the soft climate of our unparalleled success.

Until each one of us comes to realize that the leadership of the West is being challenged today, and that we are in grave danger of losing it, we will not face up to the measures of self-denial which are essential to preserve it. The comfortable assurance that because we have been unchallenged leaders in technical skills and mass production we will automatically retain this position in the future—the much discussed 36-hour week—more leisure—production costs which are pricing us out of our foreign markets—featherbedding—more gadgets, more superfluities, more luxuries—long strikes which ravage our economy—these, gentlemen, are certainly not the weapons which will help us win the cold war. One cannot oppose awesome dedication and self-denial by comfortable complacency and hope to come out on top.

All of us, not only by any means the workers only, must be prepared to make greater efforts, to practice thrift, self-denial, and discipline, and if necessary, to do all these things for lesser rewards. One doesn't have to be an expert at crystal gazing to see that if we do not voluntarily make the sacrifices, and take the kind of action, which this challenging situation demands, the gradual encroachment of the Communist bloc, representing one-third of the world's population, will force a reduced standard of living upon the Western nations, with political consequences which none of us will wish to contemplate.

What we are up against is nothing new. It is the time-honored law of the jungle—the survival of the fittest.

One can lose a cold war just as surely as a hot one, if one is insufficiently equipped for it, and unprepared to make the necessary sacrifices in order to win it.

The more one sees of the long-suffering, toiling masses of China, controlled, indoctrinated, and directed by an authoritarian government toward the objectives of building a powerful state with small regard for the comfort, dignity, or well-being of the people, the more one should be thankful for, and appreciative of, a form of government and a way of life which have brought us all so many blessings.

But to be thankful is not enough. We must be prepared to defend our heritage, not only on the military but on the economic front, and unless I am greatly mistaken, it is in this latter area that the battle is about to be joined.

Methodist Women Endorse Murray-Metcalf Bill—Urge Federal Funds for Building Classrooms and Improving Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House Education and Labor Committee on March 15, 1960 in approving a bill to provide for the use of Federal funds for education brings closer to reality an important step in meeting the serious need in our country for more schools.

I believe that Members of Congress will find of great interest a resolution adopted by the Woman's Division of the Department of Christian Social Relations of the Methodist Church on January 16, 1960, at a conference at Buck Hill Falls, Pa. This resolution endorses the principles set forth in H.R. 22, the Murray-Metcalf bill, which provides direct Federal grants to the States to be used for either classroom construction and/or improving teachers' salaries. This is, of course, the same principle represented by the McNamara-Clark-Monroney bill, which was passed by an overwhelming vote by the U.S. Senate last month.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING PRINCIPLES OF THE MURRAY-METCALF BILL, ADOPTED ON JANUARY 16, 1960, BY THE WOMAN'S DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

The education of our children in proper conditions and with qualified teachers is one of the primary tasks of our country. We believe the time has come when Federal aid for public schools is necessary to bring the number of classrooms to adequacy for our children and to secure adequate salaries for our teachers.

The Department of Christian Social Relations recommends to the Woman's Division that it call on Methodist women across the Nation to work for the speedy enactment into law of the principles embodied in the 1959 School Support Act. This bill, the Murray-Metcalf, was not brought out of either House or Senate in the first half of the 86th Congress. It is expected to appear on the congressional calendar early in 1960.

As the Woman's Division continues to support the principle of State control of such funds, it is further recommended that Methodist women be urged to work in their States for the allocation of both Federal and State funds on a basis of nondiscrimination because of race and in compliance with the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

As steps toward these ends the following suggestions are made:

1. Contact Congressmen and Senators by letter or in person and urge the enactment of legislation for this Federal aid to education.

2. In local communities contacts with local boards of education should be made. PTA's may be enlisted in planning citizenship brunches to which members of boards of education may be invited for discussion. Letters to local newspapers, contacts with local radio and TV stations and special in-

terpretation and discussion of this issue within our own organization may have value. Cooperate with other like-minded community agencies working toward these ends.

All but Incredible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the CAB has been conducting hearings which vitally affect the flow of air traffic between the new State of Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest. In opposition to a CAB examiner's recommendation that Pan American World Airways should no longer be allowed to fly between Hawaii and the Northwest, the entire Northwest congressional delegation plus the chief executives of the State of Oregon and of Washington, have expressed grave concern should a giant step backward be taken along the path of progress.

Since the time 10 years ago when the CAB granted temporary certificates to two carriers to fly between the Northwest and Hawaii the growth of traffic between the two points has kept steady pace with the expansion and development of these areas. This interest in Hawaii has been further enhanced by the statehood which was granted to the islands last year. Now, for some unknown reason, it has been recommended that an airline be given a monopoly over the route and that Pan American cease to service the area.

I join with my colleagues in their unanimous opposition to this recommendation and, under unanimous consent, I ask that an article from the San Francisco Daily Commercial News dated March 7, 1960, be included in the RECORD in support of this position:

ALL BUT INCREDIBLE

We live in the jet age of worldwide air transportation—but, apparently, some of our regulatory policies and attitudes stem from the tri-motor Ford era.

The Portland Oregonian has devoted an editorial to one such instance. It writes: "In the category of sure things, along with death, taxes, and the daily appearance of the sun, one surely can include the continuing growth of air travel between the Pacific Northwest and the new State of Hawaii. That the Civil Aeronautics Board should give serious consideration to the cutting off of one of the two airlines serving this route is, under the circumstances all but incredible."

Here's the story. A CAB examiner has recommended that Pan American World Airways should not be allowed to fly the route, even though it has demonstrated its faith in the route's potentialities by putting on pure jets of the latest and fastest type. If the examiner should have his way, another airline, which won't be employing the pure jets for another year, will be given a monopoly. The entire CAB board has been holding hearings on the matter.

This might be of limited importance if only the Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route were at stake. But in instance after instance rulings and regulations prevent our interna-

tional airlines from providing the best and most expeditious service, particularly on the Pacific route complex. In other instances, foreign lines have been heavily and unduly favored at the expense of our own. Here's a form of horse-and-buggy regulation that the country can't afford in the jet age.

The Honorable George Huddleston, Sr.— A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to speak of my late good friend, the Honorable George Huddleston, of Alabama, without bringing to the surface of my mind and my feelings recollections that have for decades endeared me to him and that will remain in my memory for the rest of my life. He was of course the Representative in this House from Alabama's 9th district for 22 years. Here, if I may permit myself a personal note, was a man from Alabama who appealed enormously to a man from Texas. He had my respect and my admiration through the years because he was what I like to call a fighting man who so highly prized his honor and his personal dignity that he felt obliged, if need be, to defend them in personal combat. For me, for all that it implies, a fact like that about a man's life is more important than such chronological data as the statistic that he was born on a farm near Lebanon, Tenn., that he studied law at Cumberland University, that he served as a private in the Spanish-American War, and that he was elected to the 64th and to the 10 succeeding Congresses serving in this House from 1915 to 1937. As a legislator he belongs well up in the category of men who made an impact on his time. He was progressive enough in his thinking to sponsor legislation for a Federal home loan system. He fought for the principle of the honest label on materials produced by child and prison labor. In fact it was his promotion of the idea for the Federal development of electrical energy at Niagara Falls that may be said to have fathered the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is good to reflect that when after a good and a successful life he died at 90 years of age in Birmingham last February 29, he knew that the people of his district, of his State, and of the country, and his old colleagues here in the House, held him in the highest esteem. And with that esteem went a warm and profound affection. Not the least of the contributions which the late George Huddleston, Sr., made to his country, is his young and brilliant son, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., who is now serving the same district in this House that his father served before him and who has been with us I am glad to note since 1955. Two Huddlestons so to speak in a single era capable of such distinguished service to

their time is a special kind of favor conferred upon the Congress and the country. This Nation has an enormous strength in its people and the image of that strength is dramatically presented to us in the life and personality of such men as my late dear friend, George Huddleston.

Ethiopia Overcrowded by 400 U.S. Families—Many Called Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert C. Ruark which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of March 6, 1960, describing various U.S. operations in Ethiopia. This article was sent to me by a constituent who expressed his shock at the activities described in the article, a feeling which I am sure will be shared by all who read it.

The article follows:

**ETHIOPIA OVERCROWDED BY 400 U.S. FAMILIES—
MANY CALLED UNNECESSARY**
(By Robert C. Ruark)

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, March 5.—There are about 400 American families in Ethiopia today. Many could be classed as unnecessary, either to the benefit of Ethiopia, or to our own prestige here.

We have MAG—the military assistance people—and we have the International Co-operation Administration (ICA) the foreign aid group. We have the Ethiopian Airline people, who more than justify their presence, and we have the U.S. Information Agency.

I get the feeling that when a man can't get steady work back home he hooks up with either the foreign aid people or with the information service, with certain exceptions always allowable.

I quote an efficient man, a business executive.

VERY ENTERTAINING

"It seems to me most of ICA's functions here is entertaining each other. You take people out of their former environment and set up false standards of rich living. Maybe these people couldn't make it back home, but here they can hobnob with the upper crust on a living scale they never dreamed of."

"It costs the American Government about \$25,000 to bring a family out here. They bring cars, refrigerators, all the household gear—the lot. I bring my people out here for about \$2,500."

"What I can't understand is why it takes so many people to do so few things. You've got a director, a deputy director, an assistant deputy director, and in the final analysis all they've got to direct is one stenographer and a couple of bearers."

"We are selling long-term prestige projects instead of immediate efficiency. We are trying to sell them Greenbelt, Md., while they are still punching holes in the ground with sharp sticks."

"We are establishing bad habits of inefficiency instead of preaching efficiency. These people really don't know what they need. We're supposed to move in and sell them on what they need now—not 20 years from now."

HOUSING WRECKED

"But what do they see? They see the ICA's taking all the American holidays as well as all the Coptic church holidays. They see the secretarial staff being driven to and from the office for lunch in Government vehicles. And we have wrecked the housing situation."

The foreign assistance people are given a \$200 to \$250 monthly housing allowance. Unless they spend it, they don't get it. So they spend it, thereby driving up rental values. This is not only true of Ethiopia, but of Somalia. It has placed such a false value on rental property that an employee, say, of Ethiopian Airlines, cannot really afford to rent a decent place unless he arrived before the aid program.

"The one thing," my friend of 10 years says, "is that the locals don't understand efficient management. We are not showing them efficient management. We are showing them bureaucratic overlap, and that's one thing they already know about. We also are showing them how to spend American funds on other people's products."

I noticed myself that there were only two Chevrolet police cars in Addis Ababa. Everything else is German Taunus, Opel, or Volkswagen. Yet we have plowed \$100 million in outright aid, plus heaven knows how much in maintenance money, into assistance here. I took this one to Vic Harrells, who runs the profitable Ethiopian Airlines.

"Look," said the blunt Mr. Harrells, who has been around for about 12 years. "You will notice that the point 4 (foreign aid) people use British Landrovers to haul the help back and forth. We have flatly priced ourselves out of a market, and on our own dough. I don't like to see the Landrovers, on our money, when it should be jeeps, but what are you going to do?"

FOREIGN STEEL CHEAPER

"We are going to build a new hangar. I can save 30 percent of a quarter-million dollars by buying German or Italian steel—about \$75,000. The steel's just as good. But the Germans work for about 50 cents an hour and our people get \$2.20. We are in business to make money for the Ethiopians, and you have to head for the best market."

"What we need here is a businessman's point 4," Mr. Harrells said. "If they gave us a little money for technical training of the locals we wouldn't need a director at \$15,000 a year, with an assistant director, and an administrative staff as the ICA does with its National Airlines training program. We have the direction already built in. I might say that we lost 18 top accountants, trained on the spot, to the Government last year."

"If" (Not by Kipling)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following poem, written by Mr. Argus Durwood Smith, postmaster, Godley, Tex., concerning U.S. mail service. I think it is excellent and would like to commend it to my colleagues:

"If" (Not by Kipling)

(By Argus D. Smith)

If it's worth mailing, it's
Worth sending first class.
When placed in this category
It arrives first, not last.

If it should be rushed, then
Why not fly it by Air?
As a matter of time or distance
Our Airlines will get it there.

If it's of value to you
We suggest Registered Mail
Insurance can also be secured
By a nominal stamp sale.

If it's of no great value
Yet of importance to you,
Certified Service will assure
Safe prompt delivery too.

If you should have a complaint
See your Postmaster today.
Attention to such matters, prevents
Unnecessary and undue delay.

If you have a friend in need
By illness or sorrow feeling,
Never underestimate the value
Of a card of friendly greeting.

If you're a lover of color
Our commemorative stamps seek.
There's a pretty new one out
Just about every week.

If it's banking you must do, then
Break that traffic barrier.
Endorse and address it, and let
Uncle Sam be your carrier.

If you have-a-de Xmas card
To send-a-de friend today.
For de goodness sake my friend
Getta de card on-a-de way.

If by chance you're worried
About the mail volume cost,
Let's pay as we go, then our
Postal Deficit will be lost.

If as your public servants
Our service we can expand
With economy and speed combined
We're trying the Metro-Plan.

If it's new methods you want
Listen then while I say
Your wish is our command, and
Missile Mail is on it's way.

Freedom Day—A Monument to the
Hungarian Nation

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAU

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. RABAU. Mr. Speaker, the memory of the valiant freedom fighters of the Hungarian revolt of recent years is still vivid in the minds of all. The heroic efforts of the Hungarian people in the face of the completely overwhelming odds represented by the Russian Army will long live as an inspiration to freedom loving people everywhere. Indeed the love of freedom has long been a basic characteristic of the Hungarian people. Today, Mr. Speaker, marks the 112th anniversary of the first realization

of true freedom by the Hungarian people. It was on March 15 in 1848 that the demands of freedom-seeking Hungarian nationalists were acceded to by King Ferdinand II.

The history of 19th century Europe has been characterized as age of liberalism and nationalism. At the opening of the century the fall of Napoleon tolled the death knell of the liberal-thinking, democracy-seeking ideals that had arisen by then. The Congress of Vienna that met in 1815 to decide the future of post-Napoleonic Europe was dominated by the Austrian Prime Minister Metternich and culminated in a return to the harshly restrictive conservatism of the absolutist era. This policy, seated in Vienna and backed by the might of the Austrian Army, had the effect of repressing individual freedom and subjugating it to the interests of strong central monarchs. The struggle against this trend and the assertion once more of the basic human liberties implicit in self-government took place in every European country for most of the balance of the 19th century. This struggle was certainly the case in Hungary. The key year in this struggle of the Hungarian people was 1848. In this year the freedom seeking nationalists, led by such men as Louis Kossuth, were fully prepared to stage a revolution to gain their ends. Happily such a revolution with all its usual bloodshed and terror proved unnecessary. For the tidings of the successful French revolutionary effort came from Paris and the demands of the dedicated Hungarian liberty-lovers were acceded to in a bloodless manner.

And so on this March 15, over a century later, I take great pleasure in saluting the Hungarian people on the 112th anniversary of the freedom day of the Hungarian nation. And I close, Mr. Speaker, with the heartfelt wish and fervent prayer that before another March 15 passes, we here, and indeed the whole world, may witness and rejoice in a rebirth of that eternal freedom that the Hungarian people have always sought.

A Tribute to Purim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. TOLL. The triumph of righteousness over outrage, and decency over wickedness, has been the goal of mankind, from the beginning, as witness the everlasting popularity of the David and Goliath story and the destruction of the walls of Jericho. Indeed, no news so delights the general public as that describing the comeuppance of some villain, for in this we all can sense the influence of eternal justice.

Such an event in history is annually celebrated by the Jewish people at this

season of the year, to honor the deliverance of their ancestors from destruction at the hands of despotism. The occasion is called Purim, the Festival of Lots, and, in the manner of all holidays, is now principally a time for festivity. But its history is awe-inspiring and worthy of review on this occasion.

In ancient days it was the manner of kings to select their wives on a basis of beauty, and so it came about that Ahasuerus, ruler of the Medes and Persians, took to wife one Esther, a Jewish maiden and daughter of Mordacai, an humble servant at the royal gate. Fearing the effects of prejudice, Mordacai forbade his daughter to reveal who her people were or her family, and proceeded to maintain his humble station, unhonored and unsung. Yet, in this capacity, he was soon to uncover a plot against the king's life, and relaying the news through Esther, prevented its execution.

Soon after this there arose in the court of King Ahasuerus an arrogant nobleman named Haman, who issued an order that all the king's servants should bow before him. Enraged by the refusal of Mordacai the Jew to meet this preposterous requirement, Haman vindictively conceived the destruction of all the Jews in the kingdom—a policy to be inaugurated through the hanging of Mordacai upon a gallows 75 feet high, especially constructed for the purpose. But here Queen Esther intervened, advising the king both as to her true identity, and Mordacai's efforts in his behalf, and accusing Haman of plotting the extermination of her people. Enraged, Ahasuerus ordered Haman's arrest and hanged him on his own gallows. The king then appointed Mordacai as one of his advisers and canceled Haman's program of mass extermination.

The Jews of Media and Persia were thereby gladdened in spirit, and in every city throughout the land they celebrated in joy of their deliverance.

On the 14th and 15th days of the month of Adar they rested and devoted their efforts to feasting and rejoicing. And so the holiday has come down through the ages as a Jewish custom. Since Haman had cast pur, that is to say, lots, to destroy them, the Jews designated the holiday as Purim, the Festival of Lots, and so it is known to this day.

Few holidays so specifically represent opposition to the tyrant; a policy as essential to the happiness of the world today as in the world of ancient times. In truth, its celebration stands as testimony by the Jewish people that their influence will ever serve the cause of freedom and justice, so long as mankind remains upon the earth.

Marylander President of National Audubon Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article from the New Yorker, January 16, 1960, about the new president of the National Audubon Society, Mr. Carl W. Buchheister, a native of Prince Georges County, Md.:

NEW PRESIDENT

If you want your boy to grow up to be president of the National Audubon Society, take him on country walks when he is very young and point out not only the beauties but the interesting things of nature. That is the message we received from Mr. Carl W. Buchheister, the society's new president with whom we recently lunched at the Peachtree Restaurant, on Madison Avenue, almost within binocular range of the Audubon headquarters, which are in the old Harrison Williams house, at 1130 Fifth Avenue. "My father, who was in the tobacco-export business in Maryland, had the old-fashioned idea of taking his children—there were six of us—on a walk every Sunday morning," he told us. "He had a kind of cultural interest in nature, and it rubbed off on me. We lived in Prince Georges County, in beautiful rural surroundings, and at 11 or 12 I began to explore on my own. I was excited about birds, snakes, and animals, and I was a passionate reader of Ernest Thompson Seton and other natural-history writers. My mother saw to it that I got all the books of that sort I wanted. During my teens, this interest was in abeyance—as it often is at that age. First, I wanted to be a doctor, but when I was 14 I developed a heart murmur, and the family physician said that I shouldn't go in for anything as strenuous as medicine. So I decided to become a teacher of the classics—I was doing well in Latin and Greek—and went to Johns Hopkins."

Mr. Buchheister, a tall, impressive man who is a year younger than the century, finished a martini and shook his head. "The biological laboratories at Hopkins beckoned me—I smelled the formaldehyde—but I went dutifully on to prepare myself in Latin and Greek," he said. He took his A.B. in 1923, and then, after 2 years in the graduate school, being newly married and anxious to earn a living, he began to teach Latin—first at the Park School, in Baltimore, and then, in 1926, at the Lawrence School in Hewlett, Long Island, where after 9 years the Audubon call came to him. "Lawrence is a day school in the country, and my interest in nature led me to take the kids on bird walks," he said. "They'd get up at 5 in the morning, in spite of their parents' protests, and we'd comb the countryside looking for birds and birds' nests before settling down to Caesar. A nature club grew from this, and it branched out from birds to all forms of nature; it became the school's most active and successful extracurricular activity, and it attracted the attention of the Audubon Society. In 1935, John H. Baker, the society's executive director—he later became its president—invited me to direct a camp for teachers that it planned to open the next year on Hog Island, Maine. I had been running a summer camp for boys in New Hampshire, and I gave it up for the Audubon one, which I directed until 1958. We now have three others—in Connecticut, Wisconsin, and California—all modeled on it."

In 1936, Mr. Buchheister also gave up schoolteaching, to become executive secretary of the Massachusetts Audubon Society; after he had spent 3 years there, Mr. Baker asked him to come to New York as his assistant director. "The Massachusetts society antedates the national society, and we had a lovely old Bulfinch house in Hingham, but I decided I would rather be a small frog in a big puddle than a big frog in a small puddle," he said. "I named Bartram Cadbury to succeed me as director of the Maine camp in 1958, when the society's trustees, looking ahead, selected me to take over the presidency on Mr. Baker's retirement, which occurred a few weeks ago. We have had 5,000 people at that camp since it started. Any-

one over 18 may attend, and about 70 percent of the campers have been teachers. Our camps are educational, not recreational. They are not bird camps, although we do have a marvelous gull-nesting island off the Maine coast. The Audubon is a conservation organization, concerned with soil, water, plants, and wildlife. We have 31,000 members and 300 affiliates and branches, and we patrol 2 million acres of land and water."

Mr. B. has three married daughters, two of them married to men they met at Hog Island. "One of my sons-in-law, who was something of a sportsman at the time he was courting my daughter, was tried in a Federal court around then for shooting more than his limit of ducks in South Carolina," he told us. "Judge, that isn't the worst of it, my son-in-law said, 'I'm engaged to the daughter of an officer of the Audubon Society.' The judge fined him, and my wife made him join the society. She's a daughter of the late Strickland Gillilan, an old chautauqua circuit speaker and writer. He wrote 'Finnigun.' You know, the bit of light verse containing the line 'Off agin, on agin, gone agin—Finnigun.' I met my wife when we were both taking a night course in archeology at Hopkins. She was 17 then. Now we have 11 grandchildren."

Philippine Sugar Quota May Be Increased Under the Provisions of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a widespread misconception to the effect that since the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 specifies a fixed quota for Philippine sugar imports to the United States, nothing can be done by Congress to revise this figure upward. This is not true. The Trade Revision Act, article II, paragraph I, specifically provides that the establishment of a limitation on the amounts of Philippine sugar which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouses in the United States for consumption shall not prejudice any increases which the Congress of the United States may from time to time allocate to the Philippines.

On this subject a leading editorial in the Manila Bulletin of March 11, 1960, is relevant and persuasive.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include this editorial as follows:

[From the Manila Bulletin, Mar. 11, 1960]

OUR SUGAR QUOTA

The U.S. Congress appears sympathetic to an increase of the Philippine sugar quota beyond the 980,000 tons annually to which we have been limited for many years. This is mere peanuts beside the 3½ million tons Cuba has been furnishing under the same sugar legislation, now up for extension.

The Philippines has friends who have been speaking for us. Former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN went to bat this week with facts and figures supporting an urgent plea for a bigger Philippine share. Yesterday Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING put a statement into the RECORD noting that Cuba, which enjoys the largest quota in the pre-

mium-priced U.S. sugar market, has just made a deal to supply Russia with a million tons. The time is ripe, he said, for the Philippines to share in the rather large consumption increase which has given all foreign suppliers but the Philippines a nice break.

Last month Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a long statement laced with figures showing the disadvantage to the Philippines of having its quota fixed by law at 980,000 short tons. In the year 1958 there were no less than 10 additional allotments of sugar consumption increases prorated among foreign and domestic suppliers, in none of which the Philippines shared.

In that year Cuba went from just over 3 million tons to 3,437,000. Domestic beet and cane producers were boosted several hundred thousand tons. Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands all shared. Manila allocations remained the same.

"Many methods of helping the Philippines have been and will continue to be suggested and considered," said MCCORMACK. "I am addressing myself to one form of help which will cost American taxpayers nothing and which indeed may be considered the fulfillment of a moral obligation." He went into the background of the fixed-quota position of the Philippines as regards U.S. sugar imports.

Many have thought that because the sugar quota is fixed in the Philippine trade agreement as revised by the Laurel-Langley document, nothing can be done about it. This is not true. There is a provision in the agreement taking care of that. It states that the establishment of quota limitations on sugar "shall be without prejudice to any increases which the U.S. Congress might allocate to the Philippines in the future."

Riding the Rails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Secretary of Commerce, as all of us have, a copy of the new Cabinet report on transportation problems. I have looked through it, and I intend to give it close study, because I have been extremely interested in this subject.

I have not determined, however, from my initial study, what emphasis the report places on the quality of service provided by the railroads. This is something the passenger notices very much. In evidence, I offer a column from the Hartford Courant, written by an able reporter, Jack Zaiman, regarding the service he recently encountered.

Many have argued that the public relations of railroads has been especially bad. But this goes beyond public relations. It is service, pure and simple, which has hampered the hopes of the roads to acquire more business. In the drive to secure more profitable freight service, the quality of passenger service has continued to go down. I commend this article to the attention of all our readers:

RIDING THE RAILS

(By Jack Zaiman)

Through a set of unforeseen circumstances recently, I traveled to and from Florida by railroad, a total distance of perhaps 3,000 miles. Total travel time was close to 70 hours, coming and going. It was coach travel, since it seemed to me that prices for a pullman berth or a sleeperette, if that's the proper name, were far too much for vacation travel.

With all this time on my hands, I had an excellent opportunity to observe the operation of a number of railroads, especially as they affected the passenger. I am sorry to report that I came away with an extremely unfavorable impression of most of the operation, so distasteful that I'm beginning to wonder if these railroads really appreciated their passengers.

I am firmly in favor of private enterprise, so long as private enterprise does the job. But I have traveled railroads in Great Britain, in France, and in Italy, where the railroads are operated by the government, and found service there much better than my family and I received on our recent railroad adventures. My sympathies are now completely with the people who have to ride the railroads daily to and from work. From my short experience with rail travel, I can understand now what they are beefing about when they scream about railroad service.

I got the idea, from my exposure to rail travel, that the railroads would just as soon get rid of their passenger service. Not a single thing is put forward for the comfort and welfare of the passengers, beyond the basic supplying of the railroad coach. Indeed, I seemed to find an impression that the railroads may be trying to make it tough for the passenger. I found not a single person who was happy with his rail travel or who complimented the railroad. Everyone I talked with complained, some bitterly.

Not a single train I was on either started or came in on time. On a supposedly 26-hour run from New York to Miami, the train was nearly 6 hours late, and there was no weather problem involved. On our return, the train was about 2 hours late coming into New York. The New Haven, from New York to Hartford, was nearly 3 hours late in arriving.

I found railroad employees, in some cases, discourteous and abrupt. Passengers hungered for food at times. There was no explanation for delays, which sometimes extended unbearably. There were bad delays in Pennsylvania Station in New York, coming and going. The waiting room of this station is as cold as the outdoors; anyone not feeling well or exhausted from travel just sits and shivers. I found discourtesy from information personnel in Penn Station.

I found an incredible situation in getting on the New Haven at Penn Station. The train apparently was so long that the coaches were attached to the part of the train that did not rest near the platform. Hundreds of exhausted persons, carrying tons of baggage, were directed aboard a pullman car, and then led through about five other pullmans, with their narrow corridors, to where the coaches were.

Luckily, I had sent my heavier luggage through the railroad baggage facilities from Florida to Hartford. When I went to pick up the bags a day after my return home, I found one of them open, and tied together with string. So far as I know nothing was taken, but the zipper was broken and the contents of the bag exposed.

But the thing that shook me most was the apparent attitude of the railroad authorities that the passenger has to shift for himself. I have frequently been impressed with the excellent public relations attitude of the airlines toward the passenger. There is an effort at friendliness here, both before

and during the ride. The airlines give you a feeling that they are trying to give you service, an approach I did not find, except in isolated instances, on the railroads.

I can stand inconvenience and delay, which is a major part of transportation. But I do object to what almost seems to be a hostile attitude by a public utility toward its customers. I have no knowledge of the intricacies of railroad bookkeeping and financing, but it seems to me incredible that a long-distance train has to change engines every time it passes over the tracks of another line, even for a 2-hour run.

It seems to me to be small potatoes to charge a passenger 35 cents for a small pillow to rest his head on. It is outrageous public relations to go into restrooms on the coaches and find no paper towels to wipe your hands, messy floor conditions, and piles of rubbish. The Mrs., who likes to smoke, complained she couldn't even find an ashtray in the women's restrooms.

What a field is here for a public-relations job by the railroads. They complain bitterly about the loss of passengers. Why, they are simply driving them away with the policy I observed. I've heard people say they would rather drive to Florida than take the train, and driving is a 3- or 4-day operation.

What is needed, it seems, is a change of attitude. Somebody should be on the train to make the passenger feel he is wanted. It could be a hostess, as they have on the airlines. A free pillow would make a passenger happier. A bit of information here and there, perhaps some music in the railroad coach, some complimentary hot coffee, a kind word or two, a clean restroom—all these little things and others would help to bring the railroads into better repute. It may cost a trifle more, but the roads would get it back in more traffic.

The railroads desperately need a selling job.

New Disarmament Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times, of March 16, 1960, entitled "New Disarmament Conference":

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1960]

NEW DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The new disarmament conference at Geneva has begun with expressions of good will, including a pledge of cooperation from Premier Khrushchev. But the opening speeches show that despite a dozen years of talk the basic differences between East and West remain.

In point of fact, the new conference can deal with only one aspect of a problem whose roots lie deep in unresolved political conflicts. The age that produced the ultimate weapon has also polarized these conflicts between two camps, for which reason disarmament must go hand in hand with political solutions.

Because of this double aspect of the problem, the basic decisions in both disarmament and the political field will have to go to the summit meeting. But just as the foreign ministers' conference prepared the political ground for that meeting, so the

disarmament conference, at least in its first phase, can prepare the ground in its field. And despite all the difficulties involved there is at least one ray of hope. For both sides, including the Soviets, appear to have come to the conclusion that as long as a balance of power—or a "balance of terror"—exists, war is no longer a feasible means of national policy, and that therefore such a balance might well be reduced, to less dangerous, less costly levels until other means are found to keep the peace.

But even assuming agreement on this basic premise, the rival plans submitted by East and West clearly reveal their divergent purposes. Both plans envisage an ultimate total disarmament. But the Western plan approaches this goal through a realistic and flexible program of progressive and balanced armament reduction, with special emphasis on the disarmament of the atom and outer space, and with each step put under effective control by a new International Disarmament Organization (IDO), associated with the United Nations, that would ultimately also control an international police force enforcing international law against any aggressor. This program is so sweeping and cuts so deeply into vital national interests that it rightly proposes a careful study of the problems involved.

The Soviets, on the other hand, not only reject this approach but also present anew Premier Khrushchev's utopian program for total disarmament within 4 years, with effective controls only at the end of it. The renewed Soviet complaints that the West continues to put control ahead of disarmament shows that the Soviets still seek to maneuver the West into a paper agreement—self-enforcing in the West but a scrap of paper behind the Iron Curtain.

Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicinity—Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks which appear in the RECORD on Tuesday, March 15, I ask that the second part of the financial statement of the Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicinity—covering the pension fund—be published herewith.

The article referred to follows:

CHICAGO TRUCK DRIVERS, CHAUFFEURS AND HELPERS UNION OF CHICAGO AND VICINITY—INDEPENDENT

To Our Members, Employees, and the Public:
Pursuant to our past practices and in conformity with the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, we present herewith financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1959. These statements have been certified after audit by Peter M. Shannon & Co., certified public accountants. Copies of the full text of these audit reports, including subsidiary schedules, are available upon request by letter or telephone.

ED FENNER.

PENSION FUND

The pension fund is operated under rules and regulations adopted by its trustees. The purpose of the fund is to provide retirement benefits for union members.

Balance sheet, Dec. 31, 1959

Current assets:	
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.	\$42,512.47
Petty cash	25.00
Total	42,537.47
Investments:	
Stocks	918,363.49
Bonds:	
U.S. Government bonds	192,131.90
Industrial bonds	1,097,561.68
Public utility bonds	652,095.99
Foreign bonds	95,951.75
Total	2,037,741.32
Temporary Investment—U.S. Treasury bills	99,183.05
Total	3,055,287.86
Receivables:	
Interest—Bonds	26,359.72
Dividends	2,193.13
Total	28,552.85
Grand total	3,126,378.18
Liabilities:	
Reserve for possible liability to members making voluntary contributions	139,775.35
Net worth:	
Surplus available for future pension payments to qualified members	2,986,602.83
Grand total	3,126,378.18

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959

Cash receipts:	
Contributions:	
Received from employers	\$693,119.68
Received from members to maintain eligibility	15,814.56
Received from members for voluntary participation	29,939.90
Total	738,874.14
Security transactions:	
Proceeds—Sales of securities	228,860.71
Interest received	71,089.21
Dividends received	30,076.12
Total	330,026.04
Grand total	1,068,900.18
Cash disbursements:	
Benefits:	
Pension payments	125,375.00
Security transactions:	
Purchase of securities	916,036.12
Purchase—Accrued interest bonds	180.56
Total	916,216.68
Refunds:	
Issued to members withdrawing from voluntary participation	7,782.75
Administrative:	
Salaries of office personnel	26,603.00
Trust fund contributions for employees	971.88
Payroll taxes	939.39
Office supplies	2,578.11

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959—Continued

Cash disbursements—Continued	
Administrative—Continued	
Utilities (rent, electricity, telephone, and telegraph)	\$4,280.23
Postage, printing, and stationery	3,719.15
Insurance	1,131.65
Miscellaneous	28.32
Auditing	10,000.00
Publication of financial statements	3,858.07
Actuarial services	3,165.00
Trustee fee—public member	7,500.00
Trust agency fees	7,682.11
Total	72,436.91
Grand total	1,121,811.34

Cash disbursements in excess of cash receipts 52,911.16

Respectfully submitted,
WALTER MULLADY,
Rogers Cartage Co. Employer Trustee,
ED FENNER,
Union Trustee.
HAROLD C. HAVIGHURST,
Northwestern University Law School
Public Trustee.
WILLIAM B. CRAWFORD,
Alternate Union Member and General Counsel.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Program for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with all the talk about prosperity, with all the self-congratulations going on about the state of the economy, I hope that we shall none of us forget that for literally millions of Americans, prosperity is only a phrase in a newspaper headline. For farm families in general, for the families who live in areas of chronic unemployment, and for the elderly who are trying to get along in their years of retirement on small incomes, there is no real prosperity.

Recently, Mr. President, I set forth my thoughts on what we must do in the Federal Government to see to it that this last group—our senior citizens—can spend their years in dignity and comfort. I did so in a radio address to my Minnesota constituents during the week of March 7 this year, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Democrat, of Minnesota)

We often hear the word "crisis" thrown about these days. It is a word which is used all too often to describe problems of all types.

Today I want to talk with you about a problem which is truly critical. It is a problem which cannot wait for more talk and more study. It is the crisis faced by our Nation's senior citizens.

Let me first give you an idea of the immensity and growth of this crisis. In the year 1900 there were only 3 million Americans over the age of 65. Today there are nearly 16 million. In 10 years there will be more than 20 million.

But these are just figures. They do not tell the pathetic story of the needs of our senior citizens in terms which all of us can understand.

They do not tell the story of the elderly widow whose income is so low her day begins and ends with a sense of hunger.

They do not tell the story of the elderly man who needs, but cannot afford, hospital or nursing-home care for illness or disease.

They do not tell the story of the elderly couple who live each day in fear of losing the roof over their heads.

We hear noble talk about "the golden years." But more and more people are finding that these are years of despair and anxiety. This is a disgrace for a nation with our wealth and luxury.

I'm not just talking about a few isolated cases. Millions of Americans, through no fault of their own, are existing without ade-

quate incomes, health care, or housing, and without a recognized role in the community.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that it costs at least \$2,800 a year for a couple to live by themselves in modest fashion.

But the average retired couple on social security receives only about \$1,440 a year.

And 60 percent of the individuals retired on social security have less than \$1,000 a year in money income.

Even more desperate is the crisis facing the 1,300,000 aging widows who now receive an annual social security benefit of \$56 a month.

I ask you: Is this what our mothers and fathers deserve? Do these fine citizens deserve a shabby rented room and a diet of bread and soup in their final years?

There are selfish and narrow-thinking persons who say the problem is not theirs. They say: "It's every individual for himself." They say every individual has total responsibility to plan for retirement.

I agree that we should all plan on an individual basis to provide for our future needs. But the best plans and preparations of all men can be crushed by forces beyond their control. Disease, economic fluctuations, and just plain bad luck can make a mockery of even the wisest investments and preparations.

What we need is a new dedication to end the crisis facing our senior citizens. What we need is a government with heart and understanding. And what we need right now is action on a program to allow our senior citizens to live with dignity, security, and a sense of usefulness.

Let me specify six steps which are vital to such a program:

1. Increase social security benefits to keep pace with living costs.
2. Increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 the amount which individuals may earn without losing social security benefits.
3. Extend the social security system to cover costs of hospital and nursing-home care for senior citizens.
4. Establish minimum Federal standards which States must meet for old-age-assistance programs.
5. Provide effective Federal assistance for specialized housing programs for the aged.
6. Allow a tax-credit incentive to encourage hiring of older workers.

I have sponsored legislation for these purposes in the Senate and will continue to fight hard for favorable action. This is no sudden effort on my part. I have never forgotten—and I will never forget—the crisis facing our senior citizens. We must let them know they are not alone.

Who Leads in Space Race?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent accomplishments of our scientists, as evidenced in the flight of Pioneer V,

indicate that the United States is still very much in the space race. In this connection, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very good editorial on this subject which appeared in the March 14, 1960, issue of the Evening Chronicle, a newspaper of Allentown, Pa.:

Because Russia got there fastest with the biggest, there has been a tendency to underestimate U.S. space accomplishments.

The latest news in this field definitely calls for a reevaluation of the entire picture. It projects the United States farther out into space than any nation ever has gone before.

The flight of the Pioneer V toward an orbit around the Sun between the paths of Earth and Venus has been highly successful and gratifying. The news represents more than a major scientific breakthrough. It also is a stimulant to the confidence of American people who have been treated to a heavy dose of propaganda in the light of Russian achievements in the space race.

Actually, the claims of Soviet superiority always have been open to question. We heard only of Russian successes, nothing of Russian failures. Meanwhile, our own efforts have been conducted under fishbowl conditions, with every dud shot heard around the world.

While the hardware lofted into space by the Russians has generally been larger than our own, we have had more artificial satellites in orbit and most of what we sent way out there accumulated and relayed to earth scientific data that is vital to preparations for our first venture in that direction in manned equipment.

Furthermore, there is strong scientific reason to question authenticity of published pictures purporting to be photographs of the dark side of the moon taken by a Soviet satellite and sent back to earth. If, as many experts believe, these pictures are fakes, there must be reason to suspect exaggeration of some other Russian claims in the missile and satellite field.

Our failures notwithstanding, our successes—especially Pioneer V—prove rather conclusively that the space race will not be conceded to the Soviet Union by default.

Who Is Responsible for TV's "Ugly America"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Who Is Responsible for TV's 'Ugly America'?" written by Clare Boothe Luce, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my remarks.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office the article would make approximately 2 1/4 pages, at a cost of \$182.25. Therefore, under the rule, I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed, the cost notwithstanding.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TV'S "UGLY AMERICA"?

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

Last winter, with the heat of public exposure upon it, the television industry dropped the fraudulent quiz shows. The thud was heard around the world. Congressional inquiry revealed that the collusion and corruption involved in the quiz shows had been long suspected, even perhaps known, not only to the industry itself, but also to the Federal Communications Commission—the Government's own agency for overseeing the industry. Public indignation exploded, in the press, on the platform, in the pulpit, and in the Halls of Congress. Whereupon, public opinion demanded that both Government and the industry render an account—a long-overdue account—of their three decades of trusteeship of the Nation's airwaves. The public insisted on knowing the answer to a number of questions: Who was to be held accountable for such malpractices as kickbacks, payola, shills, plugging for advertisers' products during the programs, and phony ad claims in the commercials? But, above all, the public wanted to know who—in Government or in the industry—could be held accountable for the image of the "ugly America" that appeared on the screen itself.

The main inquisitors comprised a highly articulate section of the country, among whom were many of America's most respected expounders of the public philosophy. The press and its greatest political pundits, like Walter Lippmann; the top TV critics, like Harriet van Horne and John Crosby; important religious and educational leaders, psychiatrists, doctors, sociological-research and civic-minded groups, even a number of businessmen of high caliber appointed themselves the quiz masters. In the name of Mr. and Mrs. America and their children. Whatever their line of approach to the question, significantly they all agreed on three things:

First. That while TV presented many programs ranging from harmless to excellent, the overall image of America that emerged from the majority of TV programs was at best shoddy, stupid, and materialistic and at worst, brutal, sadistic, and criminal.

Second. That this image, if projected for another decade, was bound to debase the American character and invite the contempt or fear of other nations, thus weakening America's democracy.

Third. That the responsibility for changing this ugly America image must be clearly fixed somewhere—either in Government or in the industry.

Thus the dropping of the quiz programs set the stage for the greatest of all television quiz programs.

But this time, the men of the industry themselves were in the isolation box. They are still there, where—unlike Charles van Doren—they are honestly sweating. Already they have given a good many answers to the questions concerning malpractices within the industry. And between their own promises of self-regulation and self-reform, and the probable passage of some Federal legislation that will help them keep their promises, there is some reason to believe that corruption in the industry will soon be brought under reasonable control.

But the big question, the 64-million-dollar question—"Who in the industry, what segment of the industry, is responsible for and therefore accountable for what appears on the screen?"—remains unanswered, except as the industry (this time, like Charles van Doren) gives the same old rigged

answer: "The public is responsible. We are just giving the public what it wants . . . which is democracy. Isn't it?" (Oddly enough, this was Charles van Doren's main and only defense for what he had done.)

Nevertheless, this question of accountability is one that every thoughtful and patriotic American must insist be pursued to the end. For until it is answered, no American can have any certainty that the TV screens of the Nation will not continue to be used, in large part, to debase the moral and intellectual fiber of the country.

We must remember that the present orgy of mea culpa breast beating and tua culpa finger pointing, which both the FCC and the industry are indulging in, to the accompaniment of loud and vague promises to try to do better programming in the future, are no guarantee to the millions of American TV family viewers that they will be any better even a year from now. As one Madison Avenue advertising agent put it to a client who was experiencing qualms about showing an especially brutal "whodunit" series he had just bought: "This is just the present climate. It will soon blow over. Things will get back to normal in 6 months."

If the men in the isolation booth today cannot, or will not, answer the question of accountability and where it should be fixed, what can you and I as American citizens do about it?

The first thing we can do, as the ultimate quizzers, the public, is ask the right questions and know, ourselves, the right answers. In other words, we must try to understand the structure of the television industry in order to know whether there is, today, any answer to the \$94 million question.

The first and most important question to ask the men in the isolation booth is: Who owns the television air waves? There is only one answer to that one: The air waves of the Nation belong to the American people. They are the property not of a majority (even a large majority); they are the property of all the citizens. They belong to you and me and our families—and to all American families. Let us never lose sight of that basic fact, if for no other reason than that it is the very one currently being lost sight of by most people.

In 1927, the people, by an act of Congress, granted the use of the air waves to private enterprise. The act set up the Federal Radio Commission, which has since been superseded by the Federal Communications Commission. This is a body of seven men, appointed by the President.

What is the responsibility of the Government, through the FCC, for television? The FCC (which is the public's trustee of its television property, the air waves) has the right to issue licenses to TV stations, allocate frequency bands, and oversee the industry. It also has the right—and, indeed, the duty—to refuse to renew the license of any station which, in its opinion, fails to live up to the basic requirement of the Communications Act, which is to "act in the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

Since the FCC first started parceling out licenses in 1934, it has never revoked or refused to renew a single license because a station failed to fulfill these requirements.

Oddly enough, the first important TV figure in the isolation booth in the great American quiz was the Chairman of the FCC, Mr. John Doerfer. He stepped into it when he faced a U.S. News & World Report quizzer (Oct. 26, 1959, issue). In that interview, Mr. Doerfer made it abundantly clear that the FCC has no control of any kind at all over the content of programming, and that any effort on his part to exercise such control, even by an act of informal persuasion, would—in his view—constitute a failure to comply with the provisions of the section of the act which is a direct proscription against censorship or interference with

free speech. Furthermore, in his view, as action is not required—is indeed forbidden by law—the FCC is not even morally responsible for analyzing or studying the content of the programs shown on the Nation's screens. As the public's trustee for television, Mr. Doerfer seemed to feel that an abysmal ignorance of program content, even of its overall quality, was what the public expected of him. As the interview showed, he did not disappoint this imagined expectation.

While Mr. Doerfer had little or no idea of the general quality of TV programs, we can evaluate the quality of the Chairman's mind—and his general intellectual fitness to oversee the vast television industry—by the following exchange between himself and the U.S. News & World Report interviewer:

"Question. Do you have any record of the overall programming which will show what percentage [of the programs] was spent on crime?"

"Answer. No."

"Question. Then how can you judge the overall program content, if you have no records?"

"Answer. First of all, how could you possibly categorize programs into whether or not they involved crime? . . . Many people don't like and disapprove of the shootings and the murders that go on in the Who-dunits. . . . But, when Hamlet comes on, where there are about six murders and one suicide, for some reason or other that becomes high dramatic art. Now, I agree there certainly is a difference between the quality of the two, but how can I write a definition or a standard which I can give to a clerk who can apply some sort of sanction against the one and not against the other?"

The fact that the Government has no legal control over programming of the Nation's screens, and therefore no responsibility for it, is plainly a great relief to Mr. Doerfer. And so long as the FCC is chaired by a man who is not able to state (or even find an educated ghost writer to help him state) the difference between the lowest form of sadistic trash and the highest form of tragic poetic art, it may also be viewed as a relief to the public.

The FCC Chairman was even unable to state where today the responsibility for better programming does lie. In the same interview, he suggested that perhaps it was with the advertiser, or sponsor, who generally determined what appears on the networks. But "the public will gravitate to those stations showing programs that it wants, and it's all based on the sponsor . . . all based on advertising revenues." On the other hand, the Chairman thought, perhaps the "broadcaster should have full control of all program production. Then he will be more responsive to his responsibilities."

On the other hand (once more), Mr. Doerfer did not think that those responsibilities should be fixed on the broadcaster by legislation "until we know precisely where we are going; until we know definitely what evils there are." But, according to the wonderfully ambidextrous Chairman, "I don't think there's much wrong with TV. It's an infant industry, and it's going through growing pains."

The conclusion the citizen must reach is that today Government has no responsibility for what appears over your airwaves on your machine, doesn't believe it can or should be fixed inside the industry, and doesn't believe that fixing it is important or necessary, since, Mr. Doerfer says, TV is giving people what they want.

Plainly, the question of the Government's moral responsibility for maintaining a decent overall standard of programming is a long way from being thrashed out. Only one thing is clear: The present Chairman of the FCC is one of the most unlikely characters in Government to aid the industry or the Con-

gress in any enlightened or intelligent debate on the subject.

We must, therefore, in our search to fix responsibility for the moral, aesthetic, religious, educational, ethical, and artistic content of TV, pursue our own examination of the industry.

What are the networks? The big names are, as every TV-viewer knows, National Broadcasting Co. (210 stations), Columbia Broadcasting Co. (210 stations), and American Broadcasting Co. (217 stations). For the most part, the networks are essentially gigantic bundles of telephone wires, which the broadcasting companies lease from another gigantic network, the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. The big TV networks produce few programs themselves. NBC produces only a handful of shows and news summaries a week. CBS produces about 30 percent of the programs it carries on its wires. ABC produces almost none.

The networks, or broadcasting companies, are largely middlemen who re-lease their leased wires, along with their facilities and stations, to the advertisers who sponsor the vast bulk of the programs carried on our air waves. (Where the advertiser, in turn, gets his packages, we shall see presently.)

The point can be made—has, in fact, been frequently made by the president of one of the big networks, Mr. Kintner of NBC—that the networks have no more moral responsibility for what is carried every day over their leased wires onto the screens than the A.T. & T. has for the conversations that go on all over America, around the clock, over its wires.

A review of the public statements and speeches made by numerous network officials and executives during the past decade shows that the majority of them take the same view on responsibility for the content of programs they do not themselves produce as the FCC takes—they have none. Moreover, to interfere in the programming field would involve not only censorship, but with their present facilities, financial hardship. Monitoring, analyzing, reviewing, editing, or censoring the Nation's programs would involve hundreds upon hundreds of scripts and films. Such an effort, personnel-wise, would be tremendously costly and might indeed alter the very character of their business, which is largely the business (the highly profitable billion-dollar business) of leasing the wires granted to them gratis by the American people. (A network may charge an advertiser as much as \$100,000 an hour for a prime evening time.) And, in truth, in the absence of any law fixing responsibility on the networks for program reviewing, this view is reasonable. Such responsibility as the networks now show for good programming is altogether voluntary.

In defense of the big broadcasting companies (especially of CBS), the fact must be noted, and should be noted for the public promise and hope that lies in it, that the quality of many of the shows the big networks do produce—compared with the many banalities, vulgarities, brutalities, and even obscenities that characterize the programs they do not produce—are generally good. Many of them are among TV's best. Nevertheless, the networks do not accept, and do not wish to accept, any fixed responsibility for the overall quality of TV. Moreover, they point out, the bulk of the "ugly America" programs are handed to them, sight unseen, by the sponsors. If responsibility, or blame, for the creation of this image is to be fixed, it should go where it belongs—on the sponsor.

What is the sponsor's role in TV? Let us follow this finger of scorn as it seems to point to the sponsor—that famous (though rapidly becoming infamous) "kingpin of the industry." The networks are stating no more than the facts when they say that the advertiser presents over 75 percent of the programs that come into America's homes.

There can be no question but that the advertiser has something to say about the quality, the character, the moral, artistic, or educational worth of the program he seeks to sandwich between his ads. And it is indeed a notable and happy fact that the greater the prestige and esteem in which the advertiser's company is held by the general public, the better the caliber of the show he sponsors is likely to be. Great companies—for example, Ford Motors (Startime) and Standard Oil (The Play of the Week)—cannot afford to besmirch their own "public image" by sponsoring shows that affront racial or religious groups, outrage ordinary mothers and fathers, or arouse antagonism among organized pressure groups, such as the Parent-Teacher Association.

There are also some less affluent or less prestigious sponsors who conscientiously exercise a sense of responsibility toward the character of the public entertainment presented by their companies.

But again, the sponsor's assumption of responsibility, where it exists, is purely voluntary. No public law, beyond those relating to the dissemination of certain obscenities, indecencies, and so on, which prevail for newspaper, book, and magazine publishers, requires him to maintain—no less raise—the moral or artistic level of the program he shows.

Moreover—and this is an important point—the sponsor and his company, like the networks, receive their programs sight unseen. The sponsor buys them from his advertising agent. If his agency provides him with a "lemon" or a "turkey," which fails to hold his advertising audience, or if the program (however popular) creates a false image of his company in public circles where his company (for ultimate reasons of profits) needs to be thought well of, the sponsor shows where he thinks the responsibility lies: He fires his advertising agent.

What is the responsibility of the advertising agency? When television came on the scene, radio was already booming, and the pattern of the program paid for by the advertiser was already fixed. The agency is the real power in TV, as it was in radio. The agency, working on a commission basis, supplies the advertiser with the program. His responsibility for the program might be demonstrated if he produced it. But he does not. The agency, like the broadcaster, is largely a middleman.

He buys his TV "package" for his client (the sponsor) from a packager. He is guided in his purchase by only one criterion: How many people will tune in on the program?

For the more people who watch the program, the more will see his sponsor's ad, the greater (presumably) will be the sponsor's profits, and, consequently, the more secure the agency's future commissions from the client. Like the networks and the sponsor, very often the advertising agency does not see—until it appears on the screen—the entire program it buys. An agency, for example, may purchase a series of 39 episodes on the basis of a pilot film. Can the agency be held morally responsible if, after the acceptance of the pilot film, the subsequent 38 episodes run downhill, begin to feature increasingly base, vulgar, or brutal material, start to flood the livingroom floors of the Nation with gore, break the decibel record for shrieks and groans? Plainly, he says, if responsibility for the quality of the program lies anywhere, it lies with the program's creator, the packager.

What is the responsibility of the packager? Perhaps 85 percent of the nationally telecast evening shows are from packagers (Screen Gems, Four Star Films, Revue Productions, Desilu among the foremost). Just as the sponsor can have something to say about the program, so can the agency. But in the end, after he has shopped for his pilot film and

the overall theme of the series, he has to trust to the skill, talent, and taste of the producer. The producer, or packager, provides the studio, stars, scripts, ideas, talent, and films; he makes the programs.

But the packager, like networks, like sponsors, like agencies, heatedly denies responsibility. He is not in business to maintain—no less elevate—public taste, and there is no law requiring him to do so. Like the A. T. & T., like the networks, like the sponsors, like the advertising agencies, like the talent agencies, he is in business to make as much money as possible.

He cannot make money unless the package he makes and sells will, in the end, get an audience and hold it for the sponsor. Personally, the packager might prefer to produce fine classical dramas, ballets, documentaries, and original scripts of a high order. But what happens to his revenue if these fine programs can't find a sponsor or don't click with the masses?

We have already seen that Mr. Doerfer, chairman of the FCC, felt that the government has no responsibility for maintaining or elevating the over-all quality of TV shows and that, all the way down the line, the networks, sponsors, agencies, and packagers agree they have no such responsibility, either, except on a voluntary basis. There is also common agreement among them on one other question: Such responsibility as they have to the public, whose air waves they use (and grow rich on), is simply this—to give the public what it wants.

Now we come to an all-important question: How do the networks and the sponsor, advertising agency, and packager know what the public wants? They check it with the ratings.

What are the ratings? The rating services are firms whose job it is to determine how many people at any given hour in any given area are watching any given show coming to them over their own wave lengths. Nielsen and Trendex (to name a couple) have various ways of sampling the numbers of people tuned in on any given program.

Let us take an example: A rating service finds that, on the 7 to 8 p.m. hour, "Joe Gutter, Private Eye" or "Dead Gulch Yarns" is being "watched" by 80 percent of the viewers, while "Studio Super" (a highly exciting and original effort in live drama) and a symphony orchestra, on at the same hour, are drawing only 20 percent of that night's TV audience. This "fact" is reported to every interested sector of the industry. The agent who sold the symphony hour or "Studio Super" to its sponsors scrapes, as best he can, the egg off his face—and the "eggheads" who watched those programs out of his hair. He promises his sponsor it will never happen again. The next time, he asks for—and gets from the packager—a program featuring their common denominator, brutality, blood, and bullets. The sponsor then has the double satisfaction of giving the public what it wants and getting a far larger audience for his commercial.

And so we end—or almost end—our quiz program. No one, unless it is the American public, seems to be responsible for TV's image of "ugly America."

Can we accept this answer? You and I cannot. And in order to see why we cannot, we must now return to our original and basic fact: The air waves belong to all the people.

Do they cease to belong to the 20 percent who want to see "Studio Super" or the symphony orchestra simply because 80 percent prefer "Joe Gutter, Private Eye"? To agree to this proposition is to agree that only a majority of the people have any rights over the wavelengths. Such an admission is to deny the assumption of American democracy. It is to say that a minority must relinquish its property rights over the wavelengths any time the sponsors (for reasons

of profits) choose to usurp them. In other words, the present situation in television is that the sponsor's right to make the largest possible profits is given precedence over the rights of a minority of our citizens. That is to say, certain programs, which the ratings themselves show there is an audience for, are canceled in favor of programs, and imitations of programs, that get a majority rating.

The great question that has not yet been debated by the Congress of the United States is the question of the minority's right, based on the ratings themselves, to get what they want over the wavelengths.

A system that permits advertisers and the networks to throw off the air programs the ratings prove several million people enjoy, simply because there are more profits to be made by showing worse programs to more people, is the suppression of freedom of speech for a minority. It is also the worst and least defensible form of censorship—dollar censorship.

We now come to the practical question of what you, as a private citizen who wants better television, can do to get it. You can do the following things:

First. Write your Senator or Congressman, and demand that the Government take cognizance of the minority's rights in the airwaves and their preferences for getting good programs over them—as expressed by the ratings themselves. Insist, in your letter, that the Congress firmly take one of two courses: fix responsibility on the networks for balanced programs based on the ratings; or, if this cannot be done by the networks, insist that the Government itself provide a channel for decent, intelligent entertainment that reflects minority interest.

If the networks and advertisers cannot raise a standard of entertainment to which the intelligent and thoughtful can repair, then it is Government's duty to do so.

Second. Contact your priest, pastor, PTA, or any civic group in whose integrity you have faith, and ask them to write your Senator.

Third. Telephone your local station whenever a program offends your sense of decency or morals, and raise a row with whoever answers the phone. Telephone to praise a program that pleases you. Your local station is very sensitive to such calls.

Fourth. Organize, with other families in your blocks, "tune-out strikes" against offensive programs, and also notify the local station you have done so, informing it, at the same time, that you do not intend to buy the products advertised on these offensive hours.

Above all: Remind yourself and your neighbors that you—and not the networks or the advertisers—are the ones who own the wavelengths, and that the profits they are making out of your property do not justify the image of the ugly America they are projecting. It is your right and duty to protest it. It is the Government's duty to change it, so long as the industry itself, in all its sectors, refuses to accept any fixed responsibility for changing it.

Forces of World Revolution Seen in Sitdown Protest in South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., March 15, 1960:

FORCES OF WORLD REVOLUTION SEEN IN SITDOWN PROTESTS IN SOUTH

Sitdown demonstrations that threaten the public peace may be symptoms of a worldwide conspiracy against law and order. They are more than stunts by idealistic students. The sitdowns are planned by agitators with ample experience in troublemaking. Consider the unrest fomented in Nashville, Tenn. Sitdowns in that city, led by the Reverend James Morris Lawson, Jr., admittedly were planned for more than a year. They were an invitation to race riot.

The Nashville Banner said that "imported techniques of local harassment" were used to create disorder. "In that inflammatory role, and out Kaspering Kasper as the ramrod of strife directed from the outside, is the Reverend James Lawson. His capacity for mischief shows in the crisis he has brought on race relations not only in this city, but at other points in the South which he has visited in that mission of incitement."

The Banner was referring to Lawson's participation in the Montgomery bus boycott. But that was only one chapter in this agitator's career. He spent 3 years, from 1953 to 1956, in India. Asked if he was trained in Indian methods of passive resistance to force social change, he refused to answer directly. What is clear is that he and others like him are roving agents of social revolution. The law means nothing to them, except when it promotes their cause.

Lawson's attitude was revealed in his remark that "the law has been a gimmick to manipulate the Negro." Even after he was arrested, he continued to advise his followers to violate the law.

Good Americans should be disturbed at the use of colleges and universities as bases of operation for agitators inciting riots. Vanderbilt University was right in expelling Lawson for his leadership of sitdown activities. But radical sympathizers used the university's name in organizing a "Lawson Defense Fund." At Princeton University last Sunday, the university chapel was made available to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., a leading social revolutionist, who used the pulpit to attack the South.

The basing of agitators on the campus and the activities of radical university groups, many of them masked as religious movements like Lawson's Fellowship of Christian Reconciliation, reminds us of political techniques in Cuba and other Latin lands. In those countries, universities often serve as bases for so-called students, who usually are mature revolutionists aiming at overthrow of a government by subversion.

One of our readers, who has intimate knowledge of events in Castro's Communist-ridden Cuba, urges us to consider the relationship between the sitdown demonstrations and the leftist revolution in that country. He says that radical student groups at Havana University are greatly interested in the sitdown demonstrators. It is well to remember that the leftist revolution in Cuba also is a color revolution. Dark-skinned Cubans rallied to Castro's cause, and are enjoying property seized from middle and upper class whites in Cuba. One wonders if the U.S. Government sought to determine whether any ties exist between the radicals leading the sitdowns and radical student groups across the Florida Straits.

Because revolution is a worldwide activity, directed from Moscow, the possibility that sitdowns are inspired by subversives cannot be overlooked. The success of the Communist world revolution has been built on enlisting "liberal" dupes who mistakenly believe they are advancing human rights. This kind of Communist manipulation of forces of conscience may be taking place in our country today.

Address of Mr. Charles E. Ingersoll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Charles E. Ingersoll, chairman of the board, Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co., Midland Valley Railroad Co., Oklahoma City—ADA—Atoka Railway Co., before the Arkansas Basin Development Association, on March 11, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have kinsmen on the program this afternoon, both of whom are in the transportation industry—myself in the railroad business, my esteemed cousin, Capt. A. C. Ingersoll is president of the Federal Barge Lines. You also, no doubt, are aware of the traditional animosity between the railroad industry and the barge industry. Add to these items that an aim of the ABDA is to provide barge transportation in our railroads' territories and you would be entitled to feel you are to witness a family scrap.

If such is your anticipation you will be disappointed, as there will be no family blood spilled.

Our railroads are in favor of the Arkansas program and especially that facet of the program that will provide a 9-foot channel on the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers, a channel suitable for barge transportation from the confluence of the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers to Catoosa, Okla.—for all practical purposes, to this great city of Tulsa.

It will be my endeavor this afternoon to explain to you the way in which our management arrived at such an heretical position that in effect says that the presence of waterborne transportation in the area served by the railroads we manage will lead to increased prosperity for these railroads.

But, first and briefly, the area we serve should be delineated. Specifically, the Midland Valley serves the rich coal fields of western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma, after a job into Fort Smith the road runs northwesterly across Oklahoma through Pabana, Muskogee, Tulsa, Pawhuska and Arkansas City to Wichita. The K.O. & G. runs on a north-south axis from Baxter Springs, Kans., through Miami, Muskogee, Henryetta and Durant, all in Oklahoma, to Denison, Tex. The O.C.A.A. runs from Tupelo, a point on the K.O. & G. south of Henryetta, northwesterly through Ada and Shawnee to Oklahoma City. Our general offices are in Muskogee where the Midland Valley and K.O. & G. intersect. Parenthetically, we are the only railroads serving the great State of Oklahoma whose general offices are in Oklahoma.

With your knowledge of the country through which these roads run, you can appreciate that, due to availability of natural resources, water and labor, presence of recreational facilities and proximity to markets, the area generally referred to as northeast Oklahoma holds the most promise for us. Northeastern Oklahoma is, of course, traversed by the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers.

Having said this area holds the most promise for us, the question then becomes "Promise of what?" The answer is what all American businessmen are constantly striving for—"more business." For freight hauling railroads, such as ours, this desire for more

business can be realized by the industrialization of the area served.

Now, on this matter of industrialization—you have many excellent efforts continuously in being to lure new industry into Oklahoma and particularly into northeastern Oklahoma. These efforts are excellent and due to the many assets northeast Oklahoma has, should be very fruitful. But, until a basic disadvantage inherent to the area is eliminated, the effort may be likened to a prize fighter entering the ring with one arm tied behind his back. The odds are quite against his chance of KO'ing his two-armed opponent.

Before discussing this basic disadvantage, how it came about and its cure, let me give an example of it in operation.

My files indicate that some 3 years ago and as a result of the effort Oklahoma is making toward industrialization, it was learned that a major heavy industry was considering the location of a plant in either the Southeast or the Southwest. An industrial team of men from Oklahoma went to work on this report and were able to have Muskogee included among the 13 areas the company selected for intensive study. As a result of the study of significant cost factors for this company, Muskogee was rated most favorable of the 13 in the cost of electricity, gas, labor, water, and land, but the transportation cost of raw material in and finished products out for this company at Muskogee were so high as to eliminate Muskogee from further consideration. The company engineer in charge of this study had this to say in a letter:

"If the proposed barging facilities of the Arkansas River were now a reality, our finding might be different, but the existing spread between rail and waterborne freight is so great that these other factors in your favor are more than neutralized."

The great handicap northeastern Oklahoma carries in its fight to industrialization then is high transportation costs.

Now, I am not an expert rate man and it would seem to me that if our area is to be industrialized, common sense dictates that rail rates should be reduced. As I say, I am no rate expert and I cannot give you the argument as to why the rail carriers will not voluntarily, by majority vote or independent action, reduce rail rates to stimulate volume business, but the fact is that it has not happened in the area under discussion.

In other nearby areas of the country rail rates have come down. To find a clue as to what compelled these rail rates down, let's look at the situation in the Southwest. Again I am no rate expert, but I think you would find rail rates to and from points on the gulf coast are relatively low; moving inland and I am thinking mainly of a north-south axis, the natural traffic flow due to existing plant and market locations, moving inland, the rates rise for a while but, as Missouri River points are approached, the rates start dropping, reaching the lowest levels at points right on the river.

If this rate pattern is graphed, there would be a steady rise in the graph from the gulf to a plateau midway between the gulf and the Missouri River with the chart then descending to a low on that river. Interpreting the graph geographically leads to the not-surprising conclusion that the plateau of high rate level represents the situation here in Oklahoma.

Further and final analysis of our graph raises the question—Is there a common factor at both ends of the chart where rail rates are the lowest and what, if any, relation does this common factor have to these low levels?

There is, of course, a common factor and it is waterborne transportation. To the south, at the gulf ports, both intercoastal and

barge carriers provide service and on the Missouri River, to the north, water carriage is by barge only.

As to the cause and effect between the presence of water transportation and low rail rates, there is a real and undisputed relationship. The accumulation of each item of cost in providing transportation results in a sum of costs considerably favoring barge operation over the railroads. Parenthetically, in these items of cost to the barge operators, we feel there are certain inequalities that unduly penalize the rails in favor of the barges, but that is another subject.

The fact is that the barge operator can provide service at less cost than can the rail. This being so, he can make a profit on a rate charged to the shipping public lower than the average rail rate. The rails, on the other hand, do not want to lose business to the barges and thus, to protect themselves, must establish rates to and from water points lower than their average rates and in competition with barge rates—all things considered.

The casual relationship is then established and these lower rail rates at water point are known, in technical parlance, as "water-compelled rates."

If northeastern Oklahoma is to eliminate the bar to industrialization in the form of high transportation costs to industry, it appears then in theory that water-compelled rates must prevail in the area. Navigation on the Arkansas would provide the vehicle to achieving these types of rates.

But let us examine the experience in other areas of the country in order to see if our theoretical industrialization really does occur on the waterways.

In the past decade, the Ohio Valley alone has seen expansion of industry at a rate of \$1.3 billion annually, or a total expended of \$13 billion.

Since World War II, there has been a steady increase in industrial expansion in the Mississippi Basin and there seems to be no end in sight. In 1958 there was a total of 488 waterside industrial plants either built or expanded, a figure which was exceeded only in 1956 when the total was 565. The 1958 figure is very impressive when it is remembered that this was a year of recession with plant expansion at a depressed rate during much of the year.

During the first quarter of 1959, the American Waterways Operators were able to report construction or expansion had been started at 77 industrial sites on navigable waterways and the final figures for 1959, when available, will certainly be impressive.

You people in the Arkansas basin area do not need statistics on the growth to the south of you on the lower Mississippi and the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas. Most of you have probably seen it with your own eyes and felt its impact on your day-to-day lives.

And so it goes. It is impossible to categorically state that the new plants would not have been built and the expansions to existing plants would not have taken place if there had been no water transportation available, but the fact cannot be ignored that availability of water transportation was a factor in determining the choice of location for the new plant or expansion of the old.

The next aspect of the problem our management had to study was: granted waterways lead to industrialization, but does it follow that industrialization in connection with waterways create profitable business for railroads that are nearby?

It is, of course, axiomatic that water-compelled rates will lead to a diminution of the revenue to be earned on each car handled by railroads in the area of such rates. Then if the carloads handled remain constant, the local railroads will be in a bad way. But you will recall my telling you of the plant

Muskogee did not get—the rates on the in and out bound material that plant would have used are presently quite high, which sounds fine. The fact is, however, that we would be better off handling business for that plant at low rates than we are now since high rates in the tariffs do not move a pound of freight. In effect then, we feel the railroads in the area of water-compelled rates will lose in per-car earnings but this loss will be, in our considered opinion, more than offset by increased volume generated in the area by the new industry attracted by water-compelled rates.

Let us look then to see what support we can give to the proposition that these new industries will produce a vast volume of business for nearby railroads.

As a generality, it is safe to say that any industry creates business for all forms of transportation. But it is possible to be more specific and understood why the types of industry which seek water transportation will produce transportation demands on other types of carriers.

The prime requisite for utilizing the efficiencies of barge shipment is consolidation of a massive volume of freight at one point. Barge lines have minimum tenders of 500 to 1,000 tons. In other words, for a shipper to obtain the cheapest rate possible by barge, he must ship in very large volume. This requirement of such large minimums restricts barge service to limited range of products—mostly industrial raw materials and fuels. These raw materials are processed and the fuel consumed at the water-served plantsite, resulting in a finished or semifinished product not eligible for large shipment or not likely to be shipped by barge from the plant because of service requirements. Thus, the output of the plant will move by plane, truck, or rail. Any service offers ultra-high-speed movement with emphasis on value of the cargo and limitation on size of package. These criteria are not generally found in the end product of a plant which consumes huge volumes of raw material and fuel.

The trucking industry offers service for small units requiring individual treatment and great flexibility in handling. High speed, door to door delivery and frequent schedules are its sales points. There is no doubt that the type of plant under discussion will avail itself to some extent of this type of transportation service.

But it seems fairly obvious that a plant consuming huge amounts of raw materials and the energy will produce the type of product which the rails are most aptly suited to handle. Railroad transport offers relative low cost fairly rapid movement of goods to thousands of different points throughout the Nation. The efficiencies of trail haul stem from the economics of mass transportation—low rates on minimum carloads of 12 to 15 tons or more—minimums in excess of either planes or trucks and tailored to suit the output of the industrial plant located on the waterway.

Not to be overlooked, is the fact that industrialization means increased employment for the community and concomitant increased business activity requiring increased transportation services. The rails will get their share of this increased transportation.

The discussion of whether industrialization in connection with waterways is helpful to nearby railroads has, up to this point, been theoretical. Let's move from theory and look at some actual experience. Taking the eight major railroads of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys (B. & O., C. & O., N. & W., L. & N., in the Ohio Valley and G.M. & O., I. C., M. P. and St. L. S. F. in the Mississippi Valley), the ton miles of revenue freight they moved in 1957 were 23 percent higher than in 1946 while that of all class I railroads in the United States were up only 4 percent.

Moreover, the dollar freight revenues of the Ohio Valley railroads were up by 76 percent, of the Mississippi Valley railroads, by 73 percent, and of the eight Valley railroads combined, by 75 percent, while the national average increased only 54 percent.

The cause and effect are too apparent here that these major lines paralleling the rivers have benefited therefrom to be mere coincidence and we are driven to the conclusion that industrialization in connection with waterways is good for railroads nearby.

So far, as I have exposed our thinking to you, we have dealt with industrialization in general. Briefly, let us look at a specific industry. In western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma are large deposits of high quality caking coal. This coal is currently being mined in moderate volume and is being shipped, by rail, mainly to steel mills in Colorado, Utah, and California. Because of the existing rate structure, the present market for this coal to the east of the fields is limited. The laid-down price of this coal at the western mills is quite high. The advent of navigation on the Arkansas would open new markets, particularly on the lower reaches of the Mississippi to the Oklahoma and Arkansas coal producers. These new markets would not produce a pound of freight for the railroads of the territory. But to the extent that these new markets enabled the mine producer to achieve greater efficiency and lower costs through volume production, those same railroads would receive the benefit of a continuous market for this coal to the West, which is uncertain at this time due to the relatively low volume presently produced in the area.

There are other specifics which could be analyzed. Oklahoma is an agricultural State to which superphosphate fertilizer is shipped, but the volume consumed is influenced by its price laid down in Oklahoma. Move the raw materials, phosphate rock and sulphur, into the area, by cheap barge transport, combine the products into the finished fertilizer and, as a result of lower costs, its price will drop and larger amounts will be consumed. Such a product will move relatively short distances by rail, witness the movement of cement by rail in Oklahoma today, and the rails will benefit from the increased volume.

Further examples of specific industries and products could be cited, but to do so would be redundant and I think it is time we rested our case.

Our decision as railroad managers to support the Arkansas program was indeed heretical. Traditional postures must bow to the inevitable and, as we studied the situation, as I hope I have expressed to you, the lesson of the past few decades is simply that the presence of water navigation leads to industrial development and expansion in the given territory and that this industrial activity is more beneficial than harmful to the railroads serving that territory.

There is no doubt that the railroad industry was right in fighting the development of modern waterways 30-odd years ago, when the idea was new. Public policy has clearly overruled the railroads' position and through congressional appropriations a waterways system of thousands of miles is an existing fact. With that has come industrialization along the waterways. We whose investments are in landlocked areas cannot put our heads in the sand and ignore the problem which water transportation creates for us as we bid for our share of the Nation's industrial expansion. In our geographical situation, we must conclude that we can't eliminate the Nation's waterways and if we can't beat 'em, we better join 'em.

Before I sit down I feel it is incumbent upon me to comment on the pamphlet recently issued by the Association of American Railroads, of which our roads are dues-paying members. This pamphlet urges Congress to

deauthorize the project and "particularly its navigation features until such time change in economic conditions suggest the need for a restudy."

Basically, the three professors who prepared the AAR study take exception to findings of the Corps of Engineers as to the projected tonnage of barge traffic on the Arkansas River, based on the corps' 1954 re-evaluation of its original study of the matter. The Corps of Engineers' projection is 13,221,171 tons annually over the period of amortization. The professors claim this is overly optimistic by 11,284,247 tons. That discrepancy is quite a charge to level at the Engineers who, after all, have had some experience in this business of projecting tonnage figures.

But let's look at the record and see if the corps may justly be accused of being overly optimistic in its traffic forecasts. The upper Mississippi Waterway project was authorized in 1936 with a traffic forecast of 9 million tons; by 1950 this figure was exceeded by more than 2 million tons. The gulf inter-coastal project was authorized in 1945 with 7 million tons of traffic projected; the 1950 actual performance was 18,971 tons. The Illinois Waterways was authorized in 1933 and within 17 years the projected tonnage had more than doubled.

Further examples could be cited proving that Corps of Engineers project tonnage estimates are conservative, but I think the point is clearly made. Equally clear is the fact that when these early projections were made, they were subject to the same type of criticism now embodied in the AAR attack on the Arkansas program. With respect to this present attack—one can only say of it the fact that time has proved the Corps of Engineers right and the earlier critics wrong does not seem to have exerted any deterrent effect on later critics.

Thank you.

Budge Raps Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to honor my colleague, HAMER H. BUDGE, by inserting in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the November 8, 1959, edition of the Times-News, published at Twin Falls, Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult to find words to adequately express the diligence, effectiveness, and complete political honesty of my good friend from Idaho.

It is my opinion that the Times-News editorial comes as close as possible to doing just that, and I wish to add my voice to that of the writer of the editorial in praise of Mr. BUDGE for his dedicated service to his State and our Nation.

The editorial follows:

BUDGE RAPS FOREIGN AID

It should be gratifying to the people of Idaho that we have a Representative in Washington like Congressman HAMER BUDGE.

From a purely partisan standpoint, of course, there are those who would not support him politically, but he serves as an outstanding example, nevertheless, of the type

of representation this country needs in the Nation's Capital.

Some of our readers may feel the Times-News goes too far in its repeated praise of Congressman BUDGE. But this newspaper regards it as highly important that he be given continued recognition and encouragement for his record in Washington.

This country would be far better off if we had a majority of such men in Congress—level-headed thinkers with the courage of their convictions, men who put the welfare of their State and country above everything else.

Congressman BUDGE has demonstrated his solidarity many times in pursuing a course that would not appear politically expedient. It's to his credit that the people of his district have recognized his ability and sincerity by continuing to have him represent them in Washington.

That was demonstrated during the last election when the AFL-CIO political action committee poured money into the Idaho campaign in an all-out effort to defeat him.

He will face such a test again and it will remain for the people of his district to decide whether he should continue to be rewarded for his courageous thinking.

Only a few days ago Jimmy Hoffa, chief of the powerful Teamsters Union, served notice that he will organize a political action group aimed at defeating all Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill.

Congressman BUDGE would be well toward the top of any such list of Hoffa's intended victims, because there is no doubt in anyone's mind where Representative BUDGE stands when it comes to sizing up the racketeers in labor.

While visiting in Twin Falls this past week, Congressman BUDGE elaborated on his thinking as regards foreign aid—another issue on which he has taken a firm stand.

Speaking at the annual Twin Falls County Farm Bureau banquet, he charged that the "anti-American demonstrations in Panama prove the U.S. foreign aid program has been a dismal failure in nonmilitary areas."

With good logic, he called for immediate restriction of the foreign aid program to military aid, and then only to those countries who can and will serve as military allies.

In this connection, the Congressman was referring particularly to the recent troubles in Panama.

"If it were not for the American dollars that have been poured into the Republic of Panama during the last half century," he emphasized, "Panama would be nothing but a jungle and the people would be living off uncultivated banana trees."

"But in spite of our continuous support of Panama over that long period of time, we have less friends than if we had not attempted to support the people in the grand manner to which they have been accustomed."

He called to the Farm Bureau members' particular attention that Americans, through foreign aid, have lost their export market for most of their produce from farms and factories.

"The only export market on which we are thriving," said BUDGE, "is the export of American dollars to other countries so they can compete with our own products."

This thinking on foreign aid is nothing new with Congressman BUDGE. He has called our attention time and time again to examples of ridiculous spending at the American taxpayers' expense—examples of extravagance that insult our intelligence.

What many Idahoans might not understand about Congressman BUDGE is his mild-manneredness. It's outstandingly to his credit that he's not a publicity seeker, nor is he campaigning for reelection every day he is in office. But let no one mistake all that for ineffectiveness.

In Washington, Congressman Budge is influential and highly respected. That he serves on some of the most important congressional committees is recognition of his ability.

Whether we all realize it or not, he is among the stalwarts of a courageous and dedicated minority that is holding out firmly against those destructive influences which would lead this country into socialism.

That's why the Times-News continues to sing its praises of Congressman Budge. May we suggest that all who share this thinking join in giving him a full measure of support.

Let's never let him wonder for a moment whether he is out of tune with public thinking in his own district.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a most intriguing and excellent plan for assistance by this country to the people of India has been fashioned by a distinguished agricultural leader of my State, Mr. Jonathan Garst. Mr. Garst, over the last several months and years, has fashioned a careful plan for the construction in India of great nitrogen plants which could produce fertilizer to enrich the soil of India and to raise agricultural produce and which, in his view, would bring nearer the elimination of the poverty which all too often strikes the teeming millions of people who inhabit that free country.

Mr. Garst spent some time in Washington several days ago, and, together with our able colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], formerly our distinguished American Ambassador to India, I accompanied Mr. Garst to a meeting at the State Department in which he outlined his plan to Under Secretary of State Dillon. Mr. Dillon was considerably impressed, and the plan will receive official study.

What is involved in the plan is the topic of an interesting article by Mr. Marquis Childs which was published in the Washington Post of yesterday, entitled "Is Fertilizer a Key to India's Future?" which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS FERTILIZER KEY TO INDIA'S FUTURE?

(By Marquis Childs)

For 3½ years America's surplus grain has fed 10 million hungry people in India and under an expansion of the surplus food program this may go to 20 million. What disturbs many policymakers and others who are all for this program is that, as India struggles vainly to keep ahead of her swiftly expanding population, she may come to rely permanently on these surpluses.

That is one reason an idea being generated here has stirred so much interest. It is for a big-scale program of fertilizer plants for India that could expand food production beyond the needs of the foreseeable future.

That, at any rate, is the claim of the author of the plan, Jonathan Garst, an agricultural specialist from Berkeley, Calif., and a member of the remarkable Iowa family that has done so much pioneering in the revolution in agriculture. It is this revolution in machinery and chemical fertilizers that has increased production anywhere from 30 to 50 percent in a short span of time. One brother is Roswell Garst of Coon Rapids, Iowa, who last September showed Premier Khrushchev what a combination of hybrid seed, machines and fertilizer could do.

In brief, what Garst proposes is that India build one 100,000-ton nitrogen-urea plant per month for 36 months to produce a total of 3.6 million tons of nitrogen a year. Because these plants would be standardized throughout, Garst believes the whole job could be done for about \$600 million. In India's upcoming third 5-year plan it is proposed to spend \$622 million for fertilizer plants but this would mean less than a million tons of nitrogen capacity.

The plan would be financed on an international basis, with the United States putting up about one-fourth of the total. This last could come to less than the cost of handling and shipping the grain surpluses under the current program.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, who has taken a lively and constructive interest in India and the underdeveloped countries since he was Ambassador to New Delhi, immediately saw the potentialities in the Garst plan. With Senator THOMAS KUCHEL of California, he took Garst down for a conference with Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon. Dillon, too, is said to have seen the dramatic possibilities of ending the threat of hunger that hangs over India's 400 million people.

But bureaucracies move slowly and ponderously. India must first ask for a mission that would later make a formal recommendation for such a program. Working out the international financing would in itself be no small undertaking.

What makes the plan so appealing is the effect it would have in dramatizing the technological progress of the West. Its propaganda value in all of Asia would be almost as great as the practical value of making India virtually self-sufficient in food.

The agricultural surpluses that have piled up in a huge multi-billion-dollar mountain in this country are an advertisement of the American revolution in agriculture, albeit an embarrassing advertisement. Under Public Law 480 the mountain has been somewhat chipped away, with surplus foods sent to various countries and sold for local currencies which have also accumulated with some embarrassing consequences.

India has paid the equivalent of \$676.7 million in rupees for shipments of grain up to last September. But the net cost to the U.S. Government has been \$946 million because of the difference between support prices here and the world price.

Farm State Members of Congress might oppose any program to use American aid to create self-sufficiency in agriculture. But, on the other hand there is a general realization that somehow the fantastic accumulation must be brought under control, since it depresses the agricultural economy and is a constant drain on the Treasury.

You merely have to ask a question that has occurred to more and more officials here to see why there should be keen interest in plans to reduce the need for sending American surplus food abroad. What if in the next 3 or 4 years a way can be found to bring production in this country in balance with demand? Would we then abruptly stop shipments to countries such as India and risk widespread famine? To build up anything like a permanent dependence on a lifeline from the United States is to risk just such an eventuality.

St. Catherine's High School Plays in the Knights of Columbus Invitational National Basketball Tournament at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, St. Catherine's High School of Racine, Wis., a former girls' academy became a coeducational Catholic high school in 1924. It serves the city of Racine, Wis., and has an enrollment of approximately 1,350 boys and girls. Its enrollment continues to increase and is limited only by the physical capacity of the school to accept more students. The school is under the management of the Sisters of St. Dominic, who maintain a convent at Racine. The president of the school is Rt. Rev. Mnsgr. S. B. Witkowiak who has done an admirable job in inaugurating a program designed to secure the greatest effort from every individual student. His plan is being studied carefully.

The school has always had an excellent record scholastically. Its athletic teams have enjoyed recognition for their ability and for winning many championships on both a city, district, and State level. The athletic director for the school is Rev. Anthony Zukaitis and the basketball team has been coached for the last several years by John McGuire. His talents and fame, as a coach in Wisconsin, are legend. He has the ability to get the most from a boy and has a record of wins that would do credit to the most famous coach of our day. His teams have won the last two Wisconsin State Catholic basketball championships and, for the second time, have been invited to play in the Knights of Columbus Invitational National Basketball Tournament at Georgetown University. Last year, St. Catherine's won the consolation championship.

The students of St. Catherine's High School staged a fundraising drive and raised the money necessary to send their team to Washington. Over 100 students will accompany the team by train and there will be, at least, that many adults coming to Washington from Racine for the basketball tournament this weekend.

The 1959-60 team averaged 61 points per game. Their opponents averaged 34 points per game. They have long been known by the nickname of Angels. Their colors are black and white. The players on this year's team are: James Hesse, Joseph Gamell, Charles Wood, Tom Schilke, Jim Poulson, Bob Letsch, Rocky Calvelli, Todd Pettit, Tom Cramer, David Koenings, Tom Donovan, Donald Hartig, Roger DeMark, Edward Evenson, Brian Verhagen. The managers of the team are: Robert Olley, David Dudor, and Jef Miller.

The players who will participate in the national tournament play are: Joseph

Gamell, Charles Wood, Tom Schilke, Jim Poulson, Bob Letsch, James Hesse, Rocke Calvelli, Todd Pettit, David Koenings, Tom Cramer and Donald Hartig.

The tallest man on the team is Tom Schilke; he is 6 feet 8 inches tall. The high-point man for the year has been the so-called eagle-eyed Chuck Wood. Three of his teammates were picked on the all-city team for Racine, Wis., to wit: Tom Schilke, Chuck Wood and Jim Poulson. Jim Poulson and Chuck Wood were picked for the all-Catholic conference team for the State of Wisconsin.

The team will arrive in Washington, D.C., at Union Station on Thursday March 17, at 8:40 a.m. and will stay at the Roger Smith Hotel while in Washington.

It is with great pride that I am able to report the arrival of St. Catherine's High School basketball team to Washington, D.C. St. Catherine's is the alma mater of both my wife and myself and it is indeed a true and real pleasure to see this group of splendid young men, whom I have watched play on several occasions, come to Washington with the enthusiastic backing of their schoolmates and the adult population of the entire city of Racine. The spirit of teamplay has permeated their actions during the entire year and I predict that they will leave Washington Sunday evening as the winners of the tournament and with the 1960 trophy tucked away in their luggage.

I believe that St. Catherine's High School should be congratulated for its consistent ability to develop such fine athletic teams and for its dedication to the development of manhood in those participating in its athletic programs.

Panorama Editor Focuses on Texas Labor; University of Texas Paper Details Antilabor Climate in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in my State, as in many other States, the newspapers generally characterize organized workingmen as a massively powerful group that utterly controls the political destinies of the people. Nothing is further from the truth, so far as Texas is concerned. Labor has been paralyzed by a flood of crippling laws and a uniformly hostile press, and is so weak politically that it has been made a political whipping boy.

An extremely interesting and informative editorial on this subject recently was written by Mary Beth Coniglio, one of the editors of the Daily Texan—the nationally known and respected student newspaper at the University of Texas. This type of accurate reporting will bring new credit to the Daily Texan.

Miss Coniglio has done a particularly outstanding journalistic job on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD her article from the Sunday, March 6, 1960, issue of the Daily Texan, entitled "Texas Labor: Still Feared."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS LABOR STILL FEARED

"The workmen desire to get as much as possible, the masters to give as little as possible. The former are disposed to combine in order to raise, the latter in order to lower the wages of labor."—Adam Smith

It's no different in Texas. Texas workmen have had a hard time getting as much as possible, or even as much as is necessary. And it's simply because legislators have been opposed to letting a big organized labor force develop here.

They have been successful. It hasn't developed here. There is no big organized labor. Only 400,000 workers out of a total Texas labor force of 3,530,000 belong to unions.

MINIMUM WAGE KILLED

Not only has the Texas legislature been unfriendly to organized labor, it has been reluctant to give any benefits to the labor force as a whole. As recently as May 1959, attempts to require a 50 cent minimum wage bill for Texas workers were blocked in the Texas House of Representatives. Texas has no industrial safety law for all Texas places of work, and ranks 49th among the 50 States in per capita expenditures for the restoration of hurt workers to usefulness.

And according to J. J. Brown, head of the vocational rehabilitation section of the Texas Education Agency, "We are rehabilitating 2,000 a year now—we ought to be rehabilitating 10,000."

With the opposition of the State legislature, militant antiunion newspapers of the State, and the abiding Texas fear of anything un-Texan in origin, labor unions have been much slower in developing here than in other parts of the Nation.

LABEL IN DISREPUTE

The union tag or label evokes a bad taste in the mouths of many Texas citizens who still consider organized labor alien, perhaps even seditious, in spite of the fact that unions have been part of the American scene for more than 90 years.

In fact, Texas did not even become particularly conscious of organized labor until the heavy industrialization caused by World War II began to take effect. In general this consciousness took the form of antagonism toward unions—Texas has done just about everything but outlaw them.

As early as 1943, the legislature began passing major pieces of legislation regulating the activities of labor unions, their officers, agents, and organizers. One of the first of these, the Manford Act, prohibited an alien or one convicted of a felony from serving as a labor union officer or organizer; it prohibited unions from making financial contributions to a political party or individual candidate for public office; and it required unions to file an annual report with the secretary of State showing the name and address of any State, National, or international organizations with which they are affiliated, a statement concerning property owned by the union, and a copy of the union constitution. Collection of fees, assessments, etc., by a labor union as a prerequisite for work is unlawful; and an itemized account of all receipts and expenditures must be kept by unions and made available to any union member at any time, as a result of this act.

The bulk of antiunion legislation came in the 1947 session of the legislature when nine

labor laws were passed as part of nationwide reaction against unions after a series of labor strikes in 1946.

ANTI-PICKET LAWS

An anti-closed-shop law (the so-called right-to-work law) passed during that session. Under this law, employees cannot be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. The closed shop is prohibited, and violations by employers or labor unions are considered conspiracies in restraint of trade, thus violations of the State's antitrust laws. Fines up to \$1,500 a day can be inflicted against any person or group violating the act.

Legislators also passed an anticheckoff law which prohibits contracts permitting checkoffs, or deduction, of an employee's wages to pay union dues or assessments except upon the individual employee's written consent.

Placing more than two pickets within 50 feet of the entrance of the picketed business or within 50 feet of another picket is a violation of antismass picketing law. Picketing which does not violate the provisions of this statute may be considered peaceful, although peaceful picketing may still be prohibited by the Secondary Boycott Act, the utility antipicketing law, or the Union Antitrust Act.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

The public employees loyalty law prohibits a labor union from being recognized as the collective bargaining agent for public employees. Public employees may not engage in strikes against the State or any of its political subdivisions. Although a union cardholder may work for the State, the activities of his union are severely limited under this law.

Picketing the plant, premises, or property of a water, gas, or electric utility if intended to interrupt utility service or its maintenance is a violation of the utility antipicketing law.

Under the equal responsibility law, if a union should call a strike before the termination of its contract and the company suffers a loss, the union would then be liable for the full amount of the loss if the courts found that the union had breached its contract.

RIGHT TO WORK

These laws have held union activities in check for years, but the sharpest thorns in organized labor's lean flesh are the 1955 Parkhouse-Spiman Acts which restate what has come to be regarded as a Texas public policy—the right to work regardless of membership or nonmembership in a union.

These acts also declared striking or picketing in order to cause an employer to bargain with a labor union which does not represent a majority in the place of business a violation of the right-to-work policy.

And this legislation has had the desired effect on curtailing union activity in certain areas of the State. Marcus Loftis, president of the State association of electrical workers, said that the right to work "has had a tremendous effect on the contracting business. In Austin from 25 to 30 percent more construction is nonunion than right after the war, and this holds true roughly for the rest of the State except for two or three unionized areas."

It is difficult to say how many members right-to-work has cost Texas unions, but Jerry Holleman, president of the Texas AFL-CIO, said that "We have not been able to do anything in Texas, largely because of right of work, with retail trades, office employees, hotel and restaurant workers—that category. Potentially, in Texas, there are half a million in this category in intrastate trade."

NONUNIONIST BENEFITS

Under the right-to-work statutes which are law in 17 other States now, nonunion

employees can profit from any pay raises and improvements in working conditions the union wins, without paying union dues.

In trying to cripple union activity, Texas, along with many of the less industrialized States, has failed to distinguish between the closed and the union shop, and has prohibited agreements that make union membership a condition for holding a job. But this is the law in Texas, and Don Ellinger, AFL-CIO director of political education for Texas and five other States, characterized it as "the right-to-work—for less."

And Holleman says, "I do not believe any man becomes a better or more virtuous person by becoming 'organized.' He simply becomes more effective."

CHEAP FORCE

Since World War II Texas has made a concentrated effort to bring industry, and the fruit of industry—prosperity—to its borders. And the policy to attract industry, friends of organized labor say, seems to be with a cheap and unorganized labor force. But few of the great industrial States of the country are antiunion, and Texas hopes to become a great industrial State.

It would appear that if Texas is to become the industrial giant it desires to be, an adequate mass purchasing power among its people has to be established. And this will be hard to accomplish as long as the one effective voice of the total labor force—unions—are viewed with fear and alarm.

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, there is a continuing tendency among many people to look in the direction of Washington for funds whether or not the problem in question should be met entirely as the responsibility of the individual States. The current agitation for Federal aid to education is an example of this tendency. I am therefore pleased to include with my remarks an excellent editorial on Federal aid which appeared in the March 12, 1960, issue of the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News. The editorial follows:

ABOUT FEDERAL AID

When the paid representative of an organization pleads a cause to which his group is dedicated, the public in general is not expecting an objective presentation.

Instead it is assumed the statement will point out the affirmative side, leaving the people to conclude that there is another side to be told by someone else.

Paul Dalager, executive secretary of the North Dakota Education Association does just that kind of a job in a statement published this week in the News.

When comparisons are made in salaries of one group of citizens it might be well to broaden out and blanket a few more.

Statistics, whether compiled by Government bureaus or the education association, mean nothing in themselves unless they are studied and analyzed by unbiased researchers who dig into the background for explanations.

Mr. Dalager points to the fact North Dakota is eighth from the bottom of States in salaries paid teachers. That sounds pretty bad, but it might be fair to state that there

are other factors in education besides salaries.

Now about comparisons.

Attorneys in New York City, Washington, and other similar points charge from two to five times legal fees collected in North Dakota.

Plumbers and electricians receive from two to three times the scale paid in Minot. We could go on and on.

Here are factors that throw averages out of balance and make them useless.

Looking at the financial condition of the State of North Dakota we reach the conclusion that this State is well able to meet every problem involved in education.

Of course the easy way is to rush to Washington and seek to get back a fraction of the money that goes through the hands of our national spendthrifts.

The only possible justification is that every other State and community is doing just that. Those with the largest shovels and sharpest political "pull" are the ones that come out on top.

There is ample evidence of vicious waste in every project operated by the Federal Government, all unneeded in our school system.

One thing should be made crystal clear. No one tricked Mr. Dalager or anyone else into the professions they are making their lifework.

Medical Care and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minnesota Union Advocate of March 10, 1960, contained an excellent column on the needs and opportunities for providing medical care for our aged citizens who find such care a crushing financial burden.

The column presents evidence in support of Congressman FORAND's measure and my similar proposal as advanced by several private groups—the American Hospital Association, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, the Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council, and the Jewish Family and Children's Service of Detroit, as well as the Senate Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON WINDOW—MEDICAL CARE AND THE AGED

If any early relief from the crushing burden of medical expenses is in the cards for our aged citizens this year—a presidential election year—1960 provides the best hope.

A number of bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate, but expectation is that primary attention will be centered on a measure introduced in the House by Representative ALME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

The Forand bill is an insurance plan to help retired people pay their hospital and surgical bills through our social security system. It will pay for surgery performed in

a hospital by the patient's own surgeon, hospital care in a semiprivate room up to 60 days, and convalescence in a nursing home.

The measure provides that the program financed by an increase in social security taxes for both workers and employers. Each will pay an additional one-fourth of 1 percent. No one will pay more than 25 cents a week.

The growing support for some type of legislation along the lines of the Forand bill has become increasingly evident. It received an additional shot in the arm recently in the report of the Senate Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging under Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, which recommended medical care for retirees.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on the problem and gathered some 300 replies from experts and organizations. The committee concluded that retired older people face three major obstacles to adequate medical care:

An increase in medical needs for the aged; The aged, the committee concluded, are far more likely to have chronic illnesses which require more visits to the doctors or home calls by physicians. There is greater need for professional nursing care in the home. Older people spend at least twice as many days per capita in general hospitals as do persons of all ages.

Increased needs compounded by rising cost of medical care: Living costs from the 1947-49 period have risen about 25 percent while the cost of medical care has risen about 50 percent; hospital costs alone about 100 percent.

A nationwide study by McGraw-Hill in 1956 showed that our elderly citizens pay approximately 50 percent more in medical care than do persons of all ages.

Inability to finance medical care: The majority of the aged—about 60 percent—are not covered by hospital insurance. Those with the most serious illnesses are the least likely to be covered.

Older persons usually find that they are considered poor risks by insurance companies and are either denied protection or have to pay enormously high premium rates. Also, private insurance companies drop many of them when they consider the risks too great.

A survey by the Health Information Foundation that 47 percent of the aged had only one type of asset (such as a home or piece of real estate, life insurance, savings, stocks or bonds, or the help of relatives) or no such assets at all to pay a medical bill of \$500 or more.

The subcommittee, in its majority report, declared: "Most groups recommend that the principle of prepaid health insurance with Government assistance—and not socialized medicine which means a system of Government-owned facilities and Government-employed personnel—is a sensible, practical answer to the problem."

As might be expected, despite such evidence of need, the American Medical Association remains unmoved in its opposition to such a prepaid health insurance program. But forward-looking medical and social service organizations are taking more reasonable views. Here are a few representatives quotes:

"We are convinced by all evidence we have seen that the problem of health care and its financing is one of the most serious facing the nonindigent aged, and one of the greatest threats to their economic security." American Hospital Association.

"Sickness in the aged is being covered to some extent by health insurance, but health insurance does not solve the problem completely. Any real chronic cannot be adequately taken care of by present-day health insurance agencies."—Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

"A No. 1 priority should be adequate provision for medical care, especially for those who are living on social security alone. * * * Existing agencies are, therefore, providing only a partial answer to the main problem."—Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia.

"One of the most serious sources of anxiety which we see in our aged clients, as well as their adult children, is that of anticipated incapacity and inability to meet the future costs of medical care."—Jewish Family and Children's Service, Detroit.

This live issue cannot be ignored much longer.

The Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the uniqueness of the present relationships of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with the United States gives rise at times to misunderstandings, as illustrated by a letter which I include at the end of these remarks, together with a letter in reply, both recently published in the New York Times.

In this connection, it may be enlightening to recall certain aspects of the historical development of the Federal system of the United States. In the growth of the United States from the Thirteen Original States to the present 50, new States were formed in areas which were ceded to the United States by the original States, and admitted into the Union. Although the formation of those States and their admission have been simultaneous, the formation of a State by the people of a territory is a political act separate and distinct from the act of admission by Congress. In fact, the ordinance of 1784 of the Continental Congress, drafted and reported by a committee presided over by Thomas Jefferson, provided for the formation of the State to precede its later admission.

The ordinance of 1784 provided that—

The settlers of the territory * * * either on their own petition or on the order of Congress receive authority from them with appointment of time and place for the free males of full age to meet together for the purpose of establishing a temporary government to adopt the constitution and laws of any one of these States.

That such temporary government shall only continue in force in any State until it shall have acquired 20,000 free inhabitants when, given the proof thereof to Congress, they shall receive from them authority with appointment of time and place to call a convention of representatives to establish a permanent constitution and government for themselves; provided that both the temporary and permanent governments be established on these principles as their basis: (1) That they shall ever remain a part of the United States; (2) that in their persons, property, and territory they shall be subject to the Government of the United States in Congress assembled and to the Articles of Confederation, in all those cases in which the original States shall be so subject.

That whensoever any of the said States shall have of free inhabitants as many as

shall then be in any one of the least numerous of the Thirteen Original States, such State shall be admitted by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the said original States. * * * Until such admission by their delegates into Congress, any of the said States, after the establishment of their temporary government, shall have authority to keep a sitting member in Congress with the right of debating but not of voting.

That all the preceding articles shall be formed into a charter of compact; shall be duly executed by the President of the United States in Congress assembled under his hand and the seal of the United States; shall be promulgated and shall stand as fundamental conditions between the Thirteen Original States and these newly described, unalterable but by joint consent of the United States, in Congress assembled, and of the particular State within which such alteration is proposed to be made.

The similarity between the provisions and the philosophy of the 1784 ordinance and Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress, under which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created, is striking.

As provided in the ordinance of 1784 for States to be formed in the western territory, the people of Puerto Rico received, under Public Law 600, 81st Congress, authority from the Congress to adopt a constitution and to form their own government. They did so and they organized the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. As provided under the ordinance of 1784 for the States formed under it, Public Law 600 (sec. 9 of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act) provides that the laws of the United States, with some exceptions, have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States. The ordinance provided that States to be formed in the western territory would have, until admitted, a nonvoting Delegate in Congress; the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act provides that Puerto Rico be represented in the United States by a Resident Commissioner who has been accorded the privileges of a nonvoting Member of the House of Representatives. The ordinance provided that the articles thereof be formed into a charter of compact; Public Law 600 was enacted "in the nature of a compact," to become effective upon its acceptance by the people of Puerto Rico.

The conclusion is inescapable that, under the terms of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico occupies a position parallel to that envisioned for such States as might have been formed under the ordinance of 1784, except for the absence of an explicit or implied promise or commitment for admission. Puerto Rico was not an incorporated territory.

It was not until the ordinance of 1784 was repealed, with the adoption of the 1787 Ordinance of the Northwest, that the territorial form of government was originated.

That the thinking of the men of 1950 may have so closely paralleled the thinking of the men of the glorious founding years, is clear proof that time may pass, circumstances may change, but the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was founded are never obsolete and never change; they are always current and, indeed, eternal.

The letters follow:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1959]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES—PUERTO RICO'S STATUS—ISLAND DECLARED AN AUTONOMOUS TERRITORY, NOT A COMMONWEALTH

(The writer of the following letter is Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ponce.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your lead editorial of February 28 on the status of Puerto Rico is misleading and far from the reality.

Puerto Rico was a possession of the United States from the signing of the Treaty of Paris to 1952 and during most of that time was governed by an act of Congress known as the Organic Act.

About 1948 Congress consented to a modification of the Organic Act of 1917, permitting it to be modified by a constitution drawn up and voted upon by the people of Puerto Rico. However, a necessary condition for the acceptance of the new constitution by Congress was the retention of the "Federal relationship" established by the old Organic Act of 1917. This is clear from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 30, 1950, wherein Congressman JAVITS expressed his opposition to the bill for the reason that it did not give Puerto Rico the opportunity to vote for independence or statehood, but only the opportunity to vote for a new constitution within the structure of the old Organic Act.

It was this new constitution (which modified but did not abolish the Organic Act and therefore did not abolish or change the territorial status of Puerto Rico) which was approved by Congress in 1952.

GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT

In 1953 Mason Sears, an official of the U.S. Government, declared before the United Nations Commission for Nonautonomous Territories that the United States would no longer report to this Commission in regard to Puerto Rico, which by law 600 of 1952 had ceased to be a nonautonomous territory. Presuming that a change from nonautonomous to autonomous was the same as a change from a territorial status to one of independence, Governor Muñoz-Marín began to proclaim publicly that the law 600 of 1952 had somehow given independence to Puerto Rico, which then, in its turn and by the same law, freely united itself to the United States in a bond of "permanent association."

This is not what the law 600 did. It maintained the organic act as the basic law for Puerto Rico and by the organic act Puerto Rico is and remains a possession of the United States. In fact one of the necessary conditions for acceptance of the new constitution of Puerto Rico by the Congress was the retention of the Federal relations established by the Organic Act of 1917.

The result of the confusion being spread by Governor Muñoz-Marín is that the New York Times and even the President of the United States are speaking as though Puerto Rico has been given its independence and is now independent but voluntarily associated with the United States. It is for the sake of continuing this thinking that Governor Muñoz-Marín is now requesting the Congress of the United States (Fernós-Murray bill) to change the terminology of law 600 of 1952 so that the words "Federal relations" will no longer appear and that they be substituted by the words "articles of permanent association."

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

This may continue the confusion. But it will not change the reality, which is that only Congress can give independence to Puerto Rico. There is no evidence that that has been the intention of Congress, and the recent congressional investigation regarding the Fernós-Murray bill made that quite clear.

When the Times states that "Puerto Rico does not belong to the United States" and

"Puerto Ricans themselves have chosen the commonwealth status and are equally free to choose independence or ask for statehood," and when Governor Muñoz-Marín states, "We are happy to say that Puerto Rico is a proud, free, self-governing commonwealth, joined to the United States by her own choice"—these are all statements which do not square with the legal realities, and which usurp the powers of Congress over territories or possessions of the United States.

Puerto Rico up to 1952 had been a non-autonomous territory or possession of the United States. In 1952 Congress made it an autonomous territory.

If we are ashamed to have colonies, and we should be, then let us get rid of them in a legal way and in a way in which there will be no room for doubt by anyone. The people of our colonies should be given a fair opportunity to choose between independence or statehood. If independence is not wanted and statehood is not practical at the time, there is still the possibility of legislation by Congress that will make our territories that do not want independence a definite and integral part of the United States with the assurance of statehood if the conditions warrant it.

But let this be done by act of Congress after consulting with those concerned.

The present condition in Puerto Rico is that Governor Muñoz-Marín is, by his own will, imposing upon the people of Puerto Rico and on the Congress of the United States, an independence which was never granted and a voluntary association which is absurd unless independence has been granted.

JAMES MC MANUS.

PONCE, P.R., February 24, 1960.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1960]
LETTER TO THE TIMES—PUERTO RICO'S STATUS—BOTH FEDERAL AND COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENTS SAID TO EXIST

(The writer of the following letter is Resident Commissioner, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The letter published on March 10 and signed by the Bishop of Ponce, P.R., interprets Public Law 600, 81st Congress (in accordance with which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created), as a mere grant by the Congress of its consent to a modification of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. With all due respect to Bishop McManus' point of view, I must disagree as to the interpretation of the facts involved.

Public Law 600, entitled "an act to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico" states: "That fully recognizing the principle of government by consent, this act is now adopted in the nature of a compact so that the people of Puerto Rico may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption."

It also states: "This act shall be submitted to the qualified voters of Puerto Rico for acceptance or rejection through an island-wide referendum to be held in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico. Upon the approval of this act by a majority of the voters participating in such referendum, the legislature of Puerto Rico is authorized to call a constitutional convention to draft a constitution for the said island of Puerto Rico. . . ."

"Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States is authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he finds that such constitu-

tion conforms with the applicable provisions of this act and of the Constitution of the United States.

"Upon approval by the Congress, the constitution shall become effective in accordance with its terms."

OTHER PROVISIONS

Certainly this goes far beyond mere consent to a modification of an organic act. Moreover, sections 4 and 5 of Public Law 600 provided that when the constitution of Puerto Rico became effective all but 21 of the 58 sections of the Organic Act would be repealed. The continued sections were to be cited thereafter as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reporting on what is now Public Law 447, to approve the Constitution of Puerto Rico (enacted July 3, 1952), stated: "The provisions of the present Organic Act which will remain in force and effect as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, however, relate to matters affecting not the internal affairs of Puerto Rico but the relationship of Puerto Rico to the United States Applicable provisions of the U.S. Constitution and the Federal Relations Act will have the same effect as the Constitution of the United States has with respect to State constitution or State laws."

Furthermore, the Constitution of Puerto Rico provides: "Article I, section 1: The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is hereby constituted. Its political power emanates from the people and shall be exercised in accordance with their will within the terms of the compact agreed upon between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States of America."

"Section 2. The Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be republican in form and its legislative, judicial, and executive branches as established by this constitution shall be equally subordinate to the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico."

POWERS OF PEOPLE

Territorial status has always been interpreted to mean the status of an area which is subject to the plenary authority of Congress. Whatever political authority is exercised by the people of the area is delegated to them by Congress. The political powers now exercised by the people of Puerto Rico emanate from themselves. Therefore, since the proclamation of the Commonwealth, two governments operate and coexist in Puerto Rico similarly as in the States of the Union—namely, the Federal and the Commonwealth Governments, each within its respective sphere. To hold that the status of Puerto Rico continues to be territorial is to ignore the true meaning of territorial status and give the term a new meaning.

Neither Governor Muñoz Marín nor anyone who has had any significant part in the advent of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has ever claimed that commonwealth is independence, for it is not separation but rather it is freedom in association.

It is unfortunate that because commonwealth status, as created for Puerto Rico, has no precedent in the United States political system, it is not always properly comprehended. For this reason the recognition given to the Commonwealth by the President in his recent address in San Juan was not only enlightening but extremely valuable, while editorials such as yours of February 23 are most helpful and commendable.

A. FERNÁNDEZ-ÍÑIG.

WASHINGTON, March 10, 1960.

Milwaukee Has Earned Worldwide Acclaim as Nation's Best Governed City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as our country progresses, we find a growing trend toward urbanization.

One hundred years ago, 85 percent of our population lived in the country. Now, nearly 70 percent of us live in urban areas and only 30 percent in rural communities.

With this great farm-to-city migration has come a wide variety of serious, complex problems.

To find needed solutions, we need constructive, creative efforts to provide adequate public services, housing, transportation and other programs, as well as to establish coordinated planning upon which to promote business, industrial and residential patterns of progress for the future.

Currently, *Torch*, published by the outstanding Milwaukee Advertising Club, is publishing a series of articles on Milwaukee, Wis.—one of the finest cities in the country and the world.

The February issue contains a particularly informative article by Gerald P. Caffrey entitled "Your Milwaukee—It Has Earned Worldwide Acclaim as Nation's Best Governed City."

Among the highlights of the article, Mr. Caffrey points out the following factors:

Over the years Milwaukee has achieved a significant reputation as one of the best governed cities in the Nation.

Anyone who has lived in Milwaukee more than a year takes honesty so much for granted that he forgets that in other cities conditions can sometimes be very different.

Milwaukee tax bills are not low, but the services rendered for those taxes are of superior quality that can bear comparison to those of any city in the country.

Milwaukee is one of the only three major cities having a triple-A credit rating. This means that when Milwaukee needs money for capital improvements she gets it at the lowest interest rates the market will allow.

Reflective of the kind of constructive programs that are helping to promote progress in our great cities, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOUR MILWAUKEE—IT HAS EARNED WORLDWIDE ACCLAIM AS NATION'S BEST GOVERNED CITY

(By Gerald P. Caffrey)

What makes Milwaukee great?

Its people, of course. Its great manufacturing firms which employ those people and which owe their existence to the organizing brains and the working skills of those people are another source of Milwaukee's greatness. Then there are the independent

craftsmen, the artists, the writers, the professional people, all of whose combined lives and efforts here in the southeast part of Wisconsin add to the vitality of the Milwaukee area.

But, in sharper focus, what makes Milwaukee really great as a city?

Here, we must again give first credit to the people, since in a democratic society, however imperfect it be, it is the people's attitudes and expressed wishes that determine the kind of government the city will have.

That's a real compliment to you and you and you. For over the years Milwaukee has achieved a significant reputation as one of the best governed cities in the Nation.

Why?

The answer lies in a combination of factors, but these can best be appraised by dividing the question in two. Any city has two aspects in its government, the political or administrative, and the service aspect.

Does Milwaukee provide good services and is the city government honest? Is there integrity or skullduggery in city hall?

Anyone who has lived here more than a year knows the answer, and anyone who has lived here much longer takes honesty so much for granted that he forgets that in other cities conditions can sometimes be very different.

Not long ago a businessman from the west coast was driving down a Milwaukee street and became involved in an accident. In the process his car knocked down and damaged a parking meter. Since he was going to be in the city only a short time, and since city property had been damaged, the police took him to the city attorney's office to arrange for payment.

The assistant city attorney who handled the matter requested the usual deposit for this type of damage, \$60, and explained to the visitor that when the meter was repaired the city would deduct the cost of repair and return to balance to him.

Having been through this sort of thing before in other places, the man mentally kissed the \$60 goodbye and left. His work kept him in Milwaukee for several days, so that before he left town he received a phone call.

It was a clerk in the city attorney's office telling him the meter repair had amounted to only \$7 and he could pick up his \$53 at the office.

Flabbergasted, he called on the same assistant city attorney, congratulated him, and told him what an unexpected pleasure it was to do business with such an honest city. To show his appreciation he urged a \$10 bill on the attorney—told him to "take your wife or secretary out to dinner." When the city official would have none of it, he asked if he couldn't donate it to charity. "Suit yourself," the attorney replied, "but don't give it to me."

The visitor again thanked him and soon left marveling at this latter-day paragon of municipal integrity. Everything he'd heard about Milwaukee was true. There's no payola here.

Yet somehow our Western friend didn't quite believe it. In fact, he wasn't completely sold until he got home to California. In his mailbox was a city of Milwaukee check made out to the same assistant city attorney and endorsed over to the westerner. It was the return of a \$10 bill he had slipped under a book on the attorney's desk when the official wasn't looking.

THEY ALSO SERVE

So much for integrity. What about city services? After all, that is what a city government is for. Were it not for the great variety of services required by people living in an urban area there'd be little need for that legal entity called a city. A 1958 report on Milwaukee listed 1,350 functions or

services which are performed for the general public.

Because of the drama inherent in their work everybody knows about our police and fire departments. The fame of these well-run city divisions goes before each like a siren. Related to these and also well known is Milwaukee's great reputation in the field of safety. Birthplace of the National Safety Council, Milwaukee has won safety prizes with monotonous regularity. It's the sort of monotony that our city thrives on, for again she was in either first or second place in traffic safety all during the first 10 months of 1959.

PUBLIC WORKS

Less spectacular, but important especially to the taxpayer, is the city's performance in other fields—public works for example. Milwaukee tax bills are not low, but the services rendered for those taxes are of a superior quality that can bear comparison to those of any city in the country. Milwaukee is the only large city that still sends its workers into basements to bring out rubbish. It is the hope of some city officials that this special service can eventually be discontinued except for hardship cases, as the cost of such complete rubbish removal is not economical. It is a luxury that Milwaukeeans have become used to but one that they might well do without in an era when fewer and fewer homes are accumulating heavy baskets of ashes, that require the strong arms of city laborers to remove. Almost equal in nuisance value from the city worker's point of view is the concrete ash vault. Most large cities prohibit them, but Milwaukee permits them to remain even in this post-ash era because many householders consider them convenient.

In public works construction whether you are thinking of public buildings, bridges, or streets and sewers, sound engineering is at the base. The city maintains a large, well organized engineering staff, around some 150 graduate engineers. Even for new areas the city does most of the engineering work, whereas in many cities this is done by the subdividers. By having the city do the engineering, higher and more consistent standards of work and materials are maintained. Only for very large projects, such as some bridges and larger buildings, does the city have the engineering let out on bids to consulting firms. This goes too far water feeder mains and paving and sewer overloads.

MIDWINTER NIGHTMARE

While we're on the subject of public works services, what about snowplowing in Milwaukee? One hears a lot of complaining about it. Is it justified?

Aside from the general tendency of most of us who drive cars to be impatient with any delay, and somehow to be experts on all phases of traffic management, there is little reason for criticizing Milwaukee's street clearing program during snow emergencies.

A few facts should be kept in mind. Milwaukee is a northern city. It's in the snow belt. Snowstorms can do a Pearl Harbor sneak attack (like the one just before Christmas) when every weather forecaster, including the private service to which the city subscribes, predicts only rain. Timing is all important, for unless streets can be plowed when cars are not on them they can't be cleared.

Milwaukee has 1,200 miles of streets. It plows all of them when a snowfall exceeds 3 inches. Canadian cities do not touch side streets unless the fall exceeds 6 inches. Small towns clear business streets only, and very few cities of any size can afford general removal of snow, as distinct from plowing.

A businessman sometimes asks that "all that blankety blank white stuff" be removed from in front of his store. He should

realize that it can't be done by the city unless it is also removed from in front of every other business place. As a taxpayer he should remember that snowplowing is costly enough—from \$30 to \$50 per mile. Snow removal can cost from \$1,800 to \$2,500 per mile. Does he want the city's new IBM machines to include that when they make up the tax rolls?

Bad snowstorms are tough, whenever they strike, but Milwaukee's public works officials think it's better to roll with the punches. Milwaukee traffic has moved well during the last 5 or 6 winters thanks to the increasing use of ice control. Many drivers think the city streets are clear of snow and ice just because it melted, due to warm weather. They seem to think that, even though the temperature might be in the twenties for many days. But the street sanitation department knows better. It knows that without the tons of salt, sand and chemicals it spreads on the streets, we would have the ice ridges and ruts that were a regular thing on our streets in the winters of a decade ago.

Today's greatly increased traffic demands movement. Milwaukee's traffic engineering department applies its best brains to giving Milwaukee's cars a higher average speed than in many other cities, and it does that with maximum safety, as records will prove. In bad weather, therefore, this movement is kept up as close as possible to the average speed, only by a well planned and consistent ice-control program.

TEAMWORK

In the various battles against Old Man Winter, not only the men of the street sanitation department, but workers in forestry, street maintenance, and garbage collection are mobilized for the fight. Where does this army of men get its equipment?

Besides 170 police and 130 fire department vehicles, the city owns 1,900 pieces of mobile equipment. These, from small pumps to 15-ton cranes, are all under the control of the bureau of municipal equipment. By centralizing ownership and maintenance (as Milwaukee has done since 1924) many advantages are realized. For example, insurance and depreciation, both of which are continuing factors, can be put to best use by keeping trucks working as much of the time as possible. This could not be done if trucks belonged to a particular bureau since then they would only be used when the special tasks of that bureau required it.

Figures also show that the accident ratio per miles traveled is lower on equipment driven by bureau drivers than it is on city passenger cars and pickup trucks, which are driven by other employees.

After 8,000 miles of use the bureau gives each car a thorough checkup and makes small repairs before they get to be big ones. Various price advantages are realized from quantity buying of parts and from fleet discounts on tires. Equipment is kept moving by the use of four radio-controlled repair trucks.

All work is done on a businesslike basis between the bureau and the departments using the equipment. The bureau maintains three repair shops and seven service stations. Heavy maintenance of squad cars, regular repair of all other equipment, and biweekly washing of cars and trucks, is done by some 140 bureau personnel, for an annual billing of \$4.5 million in 1958 and \$4.75 million in 1959.

PROTECTIVE SERIES

In addition to the excellent work of the police and fire departments, assurance of safety is given to Milwaukee citizens by other city departments. We live in safe houses, see plays in safe theaters, and attend other public events in safety because of the careful work of our building inspection department. One occasionally hears complaints

about Milwaukee's antedated building code. These usually come from some impatient purveyor of new building materials who can't wait to sell them to eager builders who are making the most of the current housebuilding boom. While this may be sincere and admirable from a strictly business point of view, government must, of necessity, move more slowly. Her responsibility for the safety of her citizens must be (and is, in Milwaukee) taken very seriously. A person who dies because of the failure of a structural element is dead for a long time. City officials, from inspectors to lawmakers try to keep that fact in mind. Although it is not always easy to do so under pressure from persons who do not feel the same responsibility.

Another example of the city's protection, developed in spite of efforts to the contrary, is the fluoridation of Milwaukee's drinking water. Only those who attended the many public hearings on this subject, know how hysterically the aldermen and the health commissioner were scolded and threatened if they would dare to put this "rat poison" in the water. It was easy to see why the council hesitated, and who knows how many growing children were deprived of better teeth because of the delay. But as soon as the verdict was clear—that fluoridation was a benefit, not a danger—the council acted. A recent survey of the results in the 6 years of fluoridation show a very noticeable reduction in tooth decay with evidence that eventual results will be as much or more than originally promised. The survey also showed that the cost of this protection is only 5.5 cents per person per year compared to costs of 8 to 15 cents in most communities, according to the State board of health.

PROTECTING YOUR POCKETBOOK

An article in Life magazine last November highlighted a New York City conspiracy between dishonest butchers and city inspectors. This "high-weight robber," as Life called it, was traced right to the door of the City Sealer of Weights and Measures. Some inspectors were shaking down butchers for as much as \$60 a month.

Could this happen in Milwaukee? The answer is "Yes," provided there is widespread dishonesty on both sides, that is, among the merchants and the inspectors. But there isn't. Also, citizens are quick to report any possible cheating to the City Sealer, who encourages this reporting. He advises citizens in doubt to reweigh packages at home, and he tells us that some people even pour milk from cartons into glass bottles to compare measure.

Both merchants and the public are protected. The former are saved from unfair competition and the latter from being cheated, even inadvertently. For just one example, city inspectors reweigh every year more than 20,000 prepacked items in supermarkets to assure correct weight. This has an extra advantage. Contents are fresher, because the merchants dare not pack too far in advance, lest the packages shrink before the inspector arrives.

SOUND MONEY POLICIES

One frequently hears of Milwaukee's financial stability, her fine credit rating and her generally good reputation in the municipal bond market. Since 1950, when Milwaukee again embarked on a borrowing program, city finance officers have had frequent opportunities to learn in what high esteem Milwaukee's credit is held. Today, with \$120 million in debt outstanding, Milwaukee is one of only three major cities having a triple-A credit rating. But practically speaking, what does this mean to us taxpayers? It means that when Milwaukee needs money for capital improvements she gets it at the lowest interest rates the market will allow. A study of

what's happened in the last few years shows that Milwaukee has obtained interest rates 0.53 percent below the average for large cities. This represents a saving of \$636,000 a year at present rates. If we would limit our comparison only to 20 cities having a double-A credit rating, Milwaukee's superiority diminishes to only a 0.39-percent lower interest. That means we are saving only \$468,000 a year, thanks to sound government and sound financing.

WHO DOES THE WORK?

Just as the city in general is only as good as its people, so the local government is only as good as its officials and employees. The good people see to it that the right officials are elected, but what about the thousands of city employees who provide all the service we have described?

For 65 years or more, Milwaukee has depended on the principle of civil service to get the best employees it can. The city service commission and the fire and police commission have both used an approach to this problem that over the years has provided honest, competent, well-trained workers to give Milwaukee its fine reputation in so many fields.

None of this just happens. For example, with the current emphasis on construction, our city service commission goes to great efforts to hire good civil engineers. In the past year it has recruited some 25 or more by doing just as big industry does—visiting colleges to get the best, at a cost to the city of about \$100 per hired engineer.

The commission also conducts nationwide examinations where necessary, particularly for high echelon positions, as it did recently for museum director, city forester, assistant purchasing agent, and the like. In such cases, thousands of preliminary announcements are mailed out to selective lists, such as professional organization member lists, or lists of attendants at certain conventions. In this way, the cream of prospective employees are apprised of vacancies on the staff of the best governed big city in America. They apply; they are hired, and help to keep Milwaukee's great reputation.

No, sir. It doesn't just happen.

Shorter Presidential Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in still further support of my bill for shorter presidential campaigns (H.R. 9584), under unanimous consent, I append herewith a thoughtful editorial on this subject which appeared in the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, on March 8, 1960:

LONG CAMPAIGNS NO LONGER NEEDED

Just why a presidential campaign should stretch out 4 or 5 months after the nominations are achieved is something difficult of explanation. One year this was reduced by a month or so and the innovation seemed to be highly popular with the public.

Reversion to extended campaigns after a taste of the abbreviated format apparently was dictated by politicians although some vigorous voices are being raised against the decision in political circles. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut, has urged a 60-day limit in these words:

"It is becoming more and more obvious that this 4-month period serves no useful purpose. It brings the candidates to phys-

ical prostration. It causes the unnecessary expenditure of large sums of money, and it carries the voting public to a condition of apathy.

"I honestly believe that the time has come to reduce the campaigning period of our national elections. . . . A shorter campaign in this country would prevent wear and tear on the candidates, save millions of dollars and preserve the voter's interest in the candidates and the election."

Constantly improving transportation and communication provide candidates with the means to get themselves and their views before the public more quickly and on a much broader basis than in the past.

Dr. George I. Sanchez, Good Neighbor at Home—A Leader for Understanding at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. George I. Sanchez, University of Texas professor of Latin American education, has resigned as chairman of the history and philosophy of education department, but will continue full-time teaching duties.

Dr. Sanchez' decision to remain at the University of Texas is good news for us, for the University of Texas, for the country, and for all Latin Americans on both sides of the Rio Grande del Norte. Dr. Sanchez has been a beacon light of progress in the growth of friendship and understanding and mutual advancement of Americans of both Anglo and Latin descent in both his native New Mexico and his adopted Texas home.

More than that, he has been an active and dynamic force for good government and progress in the entire State of Texas. Boldly he placed his shoulder to the wheel for integrity and honesty in the State government when millions who wanted the same objectives were too timid to help. He is a genuine leader in the best sense of our democratic way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the American Statesman of Sunday, March 13, 1960, entitled "Colleagues To Honor Educator."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLLEAGUES TO HONOR EDUCATOR

Dr. George I. Sanchez, University of Texas professor of Latin American education, will be honored by his colleagues and friends at a reception here Sunday afternoon.

The reception will be held in the home of Dr. William E. Drake, 5806 Trailridge Circle. Dr. Drake succeeded Dr. Sanchez as chairman of the history and philosophy of education department. Dr. Sanchez was chairman from 1951 until he resigned last fall. He continues full-time teaching duties.

A large portrait of Dr. Sanchez will be presented at the reception and will be hung in the departmental office in Sutton Hall, along-

side portraits of previous chairman, Dr. Fredrick Eby and the late Dr. Charles F. Arrowood.

Dr. Sanchez began his career as a rural schoolteacher, principal and supervisor in Bernalillo County, N. Mex. He served with the New Mexico State Department of Education as information and statistics division director. He was New Mexico State Educational Association president, 1934-35, and Julius Rosenwald Fund research associate, 1935-37.

He joined the University of Texas faculty in 1940 as professor and consultant in Latin American education.

Dr. Sanchez has directed several studies of Spanish-speaking people and has conducted research in Latin American countries, notably Mexico and Venezuela. In Venezuela in 1937-38 he was adviser to the National Ministry of Education and director of the National Institute of Pedagogy.

He has been consultant to various U.S. Government agencies, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior Department, and Office of Civilian Defense.

Dr. Sanchez is the author of "The People, a Study of the Navajos," "Forgotten People," and "Mexico—A Revolution by Education." He also has contributed chapters and sections to more than 20 other books, including "Comparative Education," a widely used college and university textbook. His articles have appeared in scholarly journals in the United States and abroad.

He delivered the principal lecture of an education seminar at a Festival of the Americas, held last August in Chicago in connection with the Pan American games. He will teach next summer at the University of Alaska. He will soon undertake a national study of bilingualism.

Dr. Sanchez was born in New Mexico and is a graduate of the University of New Mexico. His master's degree is from the University of Texas, and his doctoral degree from the University of California.

"Bill Langer—As I Knew Him," by Usher L. Burdick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. QUENTIN BURDICK OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the matter which I include in these remarks constitutes not only a eulogy and a biography, but a piece of American history. William Langer, Usher L. Burdick, William Lemke, Lynn J. Frazier, and A. C. Townley were actors on the North Dakota political stage during a very colorful period and their influence was felt far beyond the borders of North Dakota. All of these men have now departed this earthly existence except my father, Usher L. Burdick, who is remembered by my colleagues as an able and effective legislator with a warm and infectious sense of humor.

Senator Langer and my father followed the same liberal course, and both found themselves voting more often with the Democrats than with the Republicans. I know of no one more qualified than Usher L. Burdick to recount the events of the period and to portray the life of "Bill" Langer.

Upon my graduation from law school in 1932, I became associated with Senator Langer through the Nonpartisan League, and this association continued for almost a quarter of a century. During that time we shared the same political platform many times and spent many hours together traveling the roads of North Dakota. From my personal association with "Bill" Langer and from my participation in the Nonpartisan League I, too, recall many of the events recounted by my father, and I share his same regard for the late Senator. I am, therefore, happy to include the following comments of my father, Usher L. Burdick, entitled "Bill Langer—As I Knew Him."

William Langer was born in Everest Township, N. Dak., September 30, 1886, the son of Frank J. and Mary Langer. He received his high school education at Casselton and his university course at Columbia University in New York. He graduated from Columbia as valedictorian in 1910, and immediately started his professional career as a lawyer at Mandan, Morton County, N. Dak.

On his way home from Columbia, he stopped to visit William Lemke of Fargo who was at that time looking after the interests of himself and associates in a ranching venture in Mexico. Several friends of William Lemke's had organized a large cattle ranch in Mexico and it was here that Langer came to visit Lemke. The proposition looked good to Langer and, through the arguments put up by Lemke, Langer invested in capital stock of this land company. Here was the beginning of a feud between the two that lasted until death.

It is not generally known why Langer and Lemke were such uncompromising enemies but, since they have both now crossed the Great Divide, and because both were my close friends always and under all circumstances, I presume it will not be out of place to relate the story.

A few days after Langer had invested in this ranch, he rode around the domain examining the cattle herd of some 800 head and the clearing of brush on the lands they intended for an orchard. He learned that the revolution then going on in Mexico was headed directly for this ranch and, knowing that Lemke was in good standing with the Mexican Government, Langer had visions that they would be taken prisoner and their property confiscated. He notified Lemke of his discovery and pleaded with him to accompany him back to the United States instantly. Mrs. Lemke was at the ranch at that time, and Langer concluded that all three would be saved if they got out of there at once and before the revolutionary forces arrived.

Lemke didn't propose to abdicate so suddenly, and remarked to Langer, "I will stop all the bullets that come this way." Langer had put all of his cash into stock and had no funds with which to finance himself back to the United States. Lemke handed back to Langer \$1,000 of his money, and Langer lost no time in starting out. He started walking toward the border, but about the time he was completely tired out, two Mexicans in an open Ford car, who had deserted the revolution, caught up with him. Langer asked them to let him ride with them, which they consented to, and the three drove on. The facts were that these two men in the Ford were fleeing themselves, but Langer was not informed of this or where they were headed, nor did he care as long as they were going in the direction of the United States.

The Mexican Government forces soon caught up with this Ford car and all three were captured and securely lodged in jail

at the nearest town. A court martial convened immediately and all three were condemned to be shot the next morning at sunrise. Langer bewailed his fate and always thought that if Lemke had immediately started out with him at the time Langer first notified him, all would have escaped.

Before concluding what happened to Langer, we will see how Lemke and his wife were progressing. The revolutionary forces struck the ranch just as Langer had predicted. The house was shot up, but Lemke and his wife defended it with all the means they had. The cattle and all personal property were confiscated. Finally the attack on the house ceased and the forces moved on. Lemke and his wife made their way back to the border without mishap.

We left Langer in jail and about to be executed. Langer got in touch with Washington and, after two or three postponements of the execution were obtained, Langer was freed but his two companions were shot. The U.S. Government obtained Langer's free and unmolested passage to the border.

As time went on, Langer claimed his near execution was due to Lemke's long delay in getting away from the Revolution, and Lemke claimed Langer had deserted him and his wife in their perilous situation. Nothing I could do, and I was friendly to both men, could patch up this deep-seated feud. This was the beginning of their life's resentment, and all through their political careers this ill feeling persisted. Both were loyal public servants with great ability. Not only that, but they had the same philosophy of bending their efforts to help the underdog. Both Langer and Lemke went ahead in their careers, both becoming outstanding public servants, both having the confidence of the people, and both were unbeatable in elections.

Langer had a hectic career from the very beginning. His first office was that of State's attorney of Morton County, where he determined to clean out the bootleggers and booze vendors. This was something new for the once Wild West. In his successful campaign against the liquor elements, he built up a mass of friends and some enemies, but the people generally applauded an honest crime prosecutor.

His next office was that of Attorney General, being elected by the Nonpartisan League faction of the Republican Party. While acting in this capacity, he discovered that some of the leaders of the Nonpartisan League were carrying on illegal practices in banking and other financial deals. Langer stuck to his guns to enforce the law. He broke with the A. C. Townley control of the league and became a candidate for Governor on the ticket opposing the Townley supporters. He lost the election but the campaign he made convinced the people that he was right.

There was no job too big for Langer. He started right in to reorganize the old Nonpartisan League, became a candidate for Governor and was elected. The opposition was so wrought up over his election that they started in on a desperate program of propaganda against him. Before his term ended, the Supreme Court of North Dakota rendered a decision that ousted him from office. The Federal Government arrested him for interfering with the WPA program, charging that he had caused to be solicited from workers on WPA for contributions to support the Nonpartisan League newspaper, which Langer had established. Through the unjust conduct of the trial by the judge, who was Langer's enemy, Langer was found guilty by the jury, and the judge sentenced him to Federal prison.

Having now brought about the verdict of guilty, the supreme court in a court action decided that under the State constitution and laws the Governor was ineligible to hold the office. The legal phrase pertaining

to the Governor recites that upon conviction of a crime the occupant becomes ineligible. The supreme court was confused, for there is never a conviction until the defendant has had his final day in court. Langer had appealed his Federal case at the time he was removed from office and actually he had never been found guilty since his appeal was pending. He won his case in the U.S. Circuit Court and was, therefore, never found guilty. But the supreme court had put him out of office. Langer, therefore, became the Nonpartisan League candidate for Governor and was elected again with a "hoop."

His next try was for the U.S. Senate. Here it might be well to say that Langer didn't want the nomination; he insisted that I be nominated. The convention thought otherwise and Langer became the candidate and was elected. In the meantime he had been arrested for various crimes, but that didn't stick. So when he presented himself for a seat in the Senate, his enemies were right on hand to oppose his seating, although all legal charges against Langer had been aired but the people overwhelmingly had elected him Senator, having before them all the charges and complaints offered by the opposition. Langer was seated and became a Member of the U.S. Senate; his next election was much easier and he went back to the Senate for a second time.

In the meantime, the nonpartisan league faction of the Republican Party, and the ROC faction (leader of the opposition to the league), decided to join forces. But no sooner had this marriage taken place when the convention endorsing candidates decided to turn on Langer and defeat him. It refused to nominate him. This fired up the old league members again and they discovered that their marriage with the ROC was not what it was thought to be.

Langer, therefore, entered his name on the Republican primary ballot, and carried every county of the 53 counties in North Dakota. No one before had ever won such a victory. This was his last political victory, however. His charming wife died in August 1959 and, while Langer could respond from political reverses, he could not respond from the death of his wife, and before the year closed, he joined her in death.

His record still lives, and in it the people can find that in him they had an able Senator, a loyal friend of the poor, and one who stood up to be counted in the Senate, although he might be the only one to stand. He probably will never be replaced in the hearts of the people, but they will do their best to send someone to the U.S. Senate who does not forget the record of their beloved Senator Langer.

Langer was a prodigious worker. No request from people back home, whether they were Nonpartisan League or not, was ignored by Langer. He attended to more details than any man I ever knew. He rushed to the side of people in trouble, and these people would stand up and fight anyone who made disparaging remarks about him. I drove with him one time, and we were 100 miles from our scheduled destination. It was dark, as we had just left a meeting. All at once Langer remembered that some rancher living down in the Badlands had wanted to see him, so we drove 80 miles out of our way to see this man. Langer had done a favor for this man, and he merely wanted to thank Langer. While this man was a staunch Republican, he jumped the traces and fought for Langer. Thousands had been helped by Langer, and those he helped paid him back with their support, no matter what party or faction they were affiliated with.

Langer was arrested or sued, he said, 32 times, and won every case. He took great delight in putting away his enemies, but after the complaint had been settled, Langer

made no reprisals. He always said to me, "I don't blame this man for bringing this suit or signing that complaint; somebody is behind it, and this man is being used."

As the years rolled on, Langer became politically stronger. His last election to the U.S. Senate wasn't an election; it was a complete rout. His death was a stunning blow to the thousands in North Dakota, and the principles for which he fought will live on even with generations not yet born. He once said, "Burdick, those prosecutions and unfounded charges I can take in stride, but when at school the students say, there is Langer's daughter, he has been sentenced, that is hard to take."

Mrs. Langer was a delightful woman and a real fighter, being a descendant of the patriots of '76. She stood like the Rock of Gibraltar in all these trying experiences. Their daughters, too, were fighters and held their chins up in adversity. They can be proud of their parents, who were united in marriage, in life, and now in death.

Merle Peters: Outstanding Individual Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL OF KANSAS

Thursday, March 17, 1960

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, Mr. Merle Peters of Geuda Springs, Kans., recently was awarded a plaque by Henry Ford II in recognition of his outstanding achievement as an individual farmer. He was one of 12 recipients so honored at a banquet in Dearborn, Mich., attended by about 200 farmers.

On March 20, Mr. Peters will leave on a 4-week trip to the Far East as a guest of the Ford Motor Co.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article about Mr. Peters which appeared in the 1960 Ford Almanac under the main heading "High Dollar Wheat Award."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG WHEAT YIELDS MEAN HIGH PROFITS

Merle Peters is a Kansas wheatgrower who fertilizes, conserves moisture, uses the best varieties, and treats his seed. His reward is a good yield that returns almost \$1 per bushel profit, figuring \$1.82 supports.

Cost of growing wheat on this farm near Geuda Springs, Kans., is 46 cents per bushel for fertilizer, seed, seed treatment, labor, fuel, and depreciation. That's on a 40-bushel yield, and last year Peters averaged 41 bushels on 260 acres of wheat.

When you figure a land charge of \$15 per acre, the cost jumps 37 cents to a total of 84 cents.

These figures show why it takes big yields to make high profit on wheat. Using a \$15 land charge, Peters' costs are \$33.40 per acre. At 40 bushels, the cost is 84 cents per bushel; 30 bushels costs \$1.11; and 20 bushels costs \$1.67—close to the break-even point.

Peters plants the Triumph variety. He has a test plot where he grows the 10 varieties that Kansas State recommends. Triumph is the one that does best in the Arkansas City area.

On ground that has been cropped continuously, Peters uses from 70 to 100 pounds of 16-48-0 applied at seeding time. If there's

plenty of moisture in the spring, he top-dresses with additional fertilizer. Wheat following sweet clover or a legume gets 100 pounds of 45 percent phosphate.

Peters never burns straw. He follows the combine with disc or one-way. Then as soon as volunteer sprouts, he uses a mold-board plow. He continues to work the ground after each rain with a springtooth.

Peters thinks crop rotation would be most helpful in boosting yields for the average wheat grower. He also feels that plowing under all straw and working the ground after each rain to control moisture and kill weeds are important too.

Peters has 1,100 acres, half in grass and half cultivated. He has a beef herd and feeds out steers and 150 hogs. Last year he was voted the outstanding young farmer of the area by the Arkansas City Chamber of Commerce.

High dollar wheat award

	Yield	Cost per bushel	Profit per bushel
	Bushels		
Peters' record	41	\$0.84	\$0.98
Almanac goal	40	1.00	.82

James L. Kilgallen, Famous Newspaper Reporter, Honored Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 13, 1960:

FRIENDLY SONS WILL PAY HONOR TO OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPERMAN

James L. Kilgallen, one of the top reporters in the United States and an employee of United Press International, will be honored at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Pittston on Thursday. It has been a custom over the years for the local organization to honor a native of the area at the annual dinner to be held this year in the Mayfair Supper Club, Yatesville.

Mr. Kilgallen started reporting the news at the age of 17 and has been writing for over 50 years. A reporter for the International News Service for 35 years, he ran the gamut of news jobs—reporter, copy reader, makeup man, managing editor, editor-in-chief. He once owned his own daily newspaper.

RUNYON TRIBUTE

Damon Runyon once said of Kilgallen: "No man alive has greater determination or pertinacity in the pursuit of news, no man is faster getting it, and no man is even half as speedy getting it out." Kilgallen has covered everything and everybody from Al Capone to the Pope. During World War II he was a war correspondent with both the Navy in the Pacific and the Army in north Africa, Italy, France, and the final drive into Germany.

Typical of his experiences, Kilgallen was in the death chamber that night in Trenton, N.J., when Bruno Richard Hauptmann was executed. He saw Ruth Snyder die in the Sing Sing death chamber.

He was at the ringside in Chicago when Jack Dempsey dropped Gene Tunney for the now-famous "long count." He was in the press box when Grover Cleveland struck out Tony Lazzeri with the bases loaded during the 1926 world series.

KNOW THE GREATS

The great names he has interviewed include the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, John L. Lewis, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford.

He covered the Hindenburg disaster; the Michigan sit-down strikes; the extradition of the late Samuel Insull, the former multimillionaire Chicago utilities king; and many famous trials. He has covered important meetings at the United Nations and atom bomb tests in the Pacific. In 1948 he won the George R. Holmes Memorial Award for his coverage of the indictment of Alger Hiss by the New York Federal grand jury.

Born in Pittston, Kilgallen is a graduate of the old Chicago school of newspapering, and was with the Chicago Tribune, the Associated Press, and Indianapolis Times. He is married and has two daughters, the elder of whom is Mrs. Richard Kollmar, better known as Dorothy Kilgallen, Broadway columnist and television panelist.

World Understanding Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the miracles of science and technology bring the nations and peoples of the world closer together, we recognize that there is a great need for more understanding and cooperation if there is to be an ultimate peace.

Over the years, Congress has endorsed and supported a variety of programs for mutual cooperation on military, economic, cultural, educational, and other levels, to establish a better framework within which to resolve world problems and to meet the challenges of the future.

Recognizing the tremendous burden that already is placed upon the shoulders of Uncle Sam, however, I am always deeply gratified by voluntarily sponsored efforts of individuals and organizations to engage in such broadscope programs that serve our national interest.

During March 20-26, 1960, the Rotary International, a splendid service organization, is undertaking a constructive effort to promote "World Understanding Week," through its international organizations, at home and abroad.

This splendid endeavor represents an attempt to "bridge the gap" of understanding between ourselves and the people of other nations—to promote greater friendship and to increase understanding of international problems. Particularly, they stress the human side of "getting to know our neighbors" in a world shrunken by science and technology.

Reflecting the kind of practical action needed to promote greater human understanding, I ask unanimous consent to have a 15-step practical program, en-

dorsed in past efforts by the Rotary, designed to make World Understanding Week a success, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTEEN WAYS YOU CAN HELP MAKE THE WEEK A SUCCESS

1. Join some of your fellow members in a panel discussion of a major world issue.
2. Put your personal acquaintanceships on a round-the-world basis by writing to clubs in different countries.
3. Exchange books and magazines with clubs in other countries.
4. Arrange a window display of publications received from other countries. Also, discuss the publications at fireside and club meetings.
5. Inform local clergymen, newspaper editors, and radio and television stations about the week. Tell them how your Rotary Club intends to observe it.
6. Is your community near a college? If it is, arrange to entertain a group of students from overseas.
7. Build a club program—a panel discussion, quiz, or a talk—around an International Service article taken from a recent issue of this magazine.
8. Get plans underway for an international youth exchange for this coming summer, or for the next school year.
9. Promote the week in local schools by sponsoring an essay contest on world understanding.
10. Do you have some new citizens in your town? Invite them to a club meeting; perhaps they might participate in a panel discussion on an international subject.
11. If your club is near a national border, meet with a club on the other side.
12. Publish a special issue of your club bulletin, theming it to world understanding and good will.
13. Highlight the week with a community-wide gathering to hear a speaker from another country, possibly a consular official.
14. Set out to learn all you can about one single world problem that stands today as a threat to peace. Let your interest be known as a means of encouraging others to begin a search for global knowledge.
15. Hold the first meeting of an international conference at which local groups will represent countries other than their own.

Are the Postal and Federal Employees Entitled to a Pay Raise? William Doherty Explains This Fully in His Analysis of Postal Employees and Federal Employees Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, hearings were begun by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Legislation to make a proper adjustment in the salaries of postal and other Federal employees. The first witness was the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. William C. Doherty. He was accompanied by his able staff, Mr. Jerome Keating, vice president, Mr.

Peter J. Cahill, secretary-treasurer, and Mr. Reuben B. Kremers, assistant secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Doherty's remarks were directed primarily toward the provisions of H.R. 9883, a bill which I introduced and in which I have been joined by 65 Members of the House.

In view of the widespread interest in this legislation, both in the House and on the part of postal and Federal employees generally, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the entire text of Mr. Doherty's statement, as well as the charts which were the basis for the statement of Mr. Keating.

In submitting this material for the RECORD, I want to state that this was one of the finest presentations, covering a very complicated subject, ever made before our committee.

The statement and charts follow:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS ON H.R. 9883 AND RELATED BILLS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1960

(By William C. Doherty)

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO. Our headquarters are located in Washington at 100 Indiana Avenue NW. We represent a membership of approximately 124,000 letter carriers located in each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

With me are our vice president, Mr. Jerome J. Keating; our secretary-treasurer, Mr. Peter J. Cahill; and our assistant secretary-treasurer, Mr. R. B. Kremers.

Our organization greatly appreciates the decision of this committee to hold public hearings on pending salary legislation. At the same time, we acknowledge with appreciation this opportunity to present testimony reflecting the position of the letter carriers of the United States.

Before beginning our testimony, I would like to pay tribute, in behalf of the National Association of Letter Carriers, to the unwavering fairness and consideration that we have always received at the hands of this committee. We have many happy memories of working with you on our problems and we are grateful for the treatment we have always received from you, ladies and gentlemen, who serve as the board of directors of the Postal Establishment.

We are here today to support and urge approval of H.R. 9883, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]. At the same time we want to thank the sponsors of the 60 or more similar bills before this committee, including those introduced by several members of the committee: Mrs. GRANAHAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HARMON, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. OLIVER. We know and appreciate, too, Mr. Chairman, that you and others on the committee including Mr. DAVIS, Mr. REES, Mr. CORBETT, and Mr. GROSS, have sponsored bills to make permanent the current 2.5 percent temporary increase.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

H.R. 9883 has three separate titles. Title I provides for an adjustment in the rates of basic compensation for postal personnel. Title II provides similar treatment for employees paid under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Title III provides for miscellaneous provisions, including an effective date of January 1, 1960.

The testimony of our organization will be confined to titles I and III and only as they apply to letter carriers. We most definitely are in favor of title II. However, we feel

that representatives of employees covered by that section, who are also scheduled to appear before this committee, are better qualified to discuss the aims and purposes of title II.

Title I, as you know, proposes to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended. The bill would provide the following for letter carriers:

1. Advance employees in the lower pay levels by one level.
2. Eliminate the first pay step and place all employees in the same numerical pay step they are in at the present time.
3. Twelve-percent pay increase.
4. Increase the number of longevity steps from three to four.
5. Increase the amount of the longevity increment from \$100 to \$200.

Thus, the number of pay levels in the postal field service schedule would be reduced from 20 to 19. Numerically, letter carriers would remain in level 4, but the pay grades would be as follows:

Step 1	\$4,900
Step 2	5,145
Step 3	5,300
Step 4	5,455
Step 5	5,610
Step 6	5,765

The proposed four longevity steps would be given after 10, 15, 20, and 25 years' service.

A new schedule comparable to the above would be provided for rural carriers.

Title III authorizes the expenditure of the necessary funds to carry out the intent of the bill. It also provides for an effective date to be the first pay period after January 1, 1960.

PLACEMENT OF LETTER CARRIERS

The official job description of the postal employees we represent is city delivery letter carriers.

As this job title indicates, the majority of our members are concentrated in and around the Nation's metropolitan areas. They work in 3,727 post offices of the first-class, and 1,788 offices of the second-class. We serve 38.7 million families, or approximately 150 million people every working day of the year. The number of families served, incidentally, is an increase of 3.1 percent over last year.

In addition, our members serve 3.4 million business establishments of all kinds and sizes. This figure, also, has gone up by 2.7 percent during the past 12 months.

I think it is quite apparent from these figures that city delivery service constitutes the heart and core of the postal establishment. And, as the population trend continues to flow from rural to urban and suburban areas, its importance is growing.

According to figures supplied by the Post Office Department, the average annual salary of all letter carriers today is \$4,640. This means an average monthly wage of \$370; an average weekly wage of \$89.23, and an average hourly rate of \$2.23.

All these figures are in gross amounts.

As I have said, the vast majority of our members work in the metropolitan areas of the country. This means they live and shop in those areas, which have, by and large, the highest cost of living rates in the Nation.

As an aside, I would like to point out that our members do not necessarily live and shop in the same metropolitan area in which they work. There are a number of communities in the United States in which the cost of living is higher than a letter carrier can afford and he must therefore commute each day between his home and his office. I can cite as an example of this some of the communities in Westchester County, N.Y., where the letter carriers are commuting from Manhattan to their jobs while their patrons are commuting in the opposite direction.

I mention the geographical distribution of our membership because, to acquire an accurate appraisal of their economic situation, one must compare their earnings with those of other workers in the densely populated and generally highly industrialized areas in which letter carriers must work, live, and educate their children.

GROSS EARNINGS OF PRODUCTION WORKERS

The U.S. Department of Labor publishes, as most of you know, a monthly report on the Nation's labor force under the title "Employment and Earnings."

In the February 1960 issue of this publication, there is listed (table C-7, p. 39) the "gross earnings of production workers in manufacturing by State and selected areas." The selected areas are the larger cities within the various States.

We have made a comparison between the average weekly salary of all city delivery letter carriers with the salaries of production workers as listed in this official Government publication. For example, in 89 out of the 112 communities under comparison, the average gross earnings of a letter carrier are lower than the average of all production workers.

In the six States for which only an overall average was given, with no breakdown by communities, the letter carrier was lower in five instances.

And, of course, the overall averages presented by the U.S. Department of Labor are weighted down considerably by the heavy preponderance of unskilled or migratory jobs in many production industries.

I might add that these figures I have been citing are the latest available. They are for December 1959. I am reliably informed that the figures for the succeeding month of January 1960, will show even greater economic discrimination against letter carriers.

Traditionally, every postal worker has always been engaged in the frustrating task of chasing that elusive will-of-the-wisp, the cost of living index. He has never caught up with it. He must pay the same prices for the things he buys as do his higher paid brethren in private industry. He gets no special breaks in the consumer market, nor has he ever encountered a merchant who would accept a day's annual leave, or any other fringe benefit in exchange for hamburger meat or a pair of children's shoes.

So, I would like now to compare the average weekly earnings of \$89.23 which a letter carrier receives with the earnings of some of his neighbors who pay the same relative prices in the same shops that he patronizes.

In the January 1960 issue of the Labor Force, (a publication of the U.S. Department of Labor), the following average weekly earnings are listed for production workers in major industry groups. I would like to quote the figures listed for workers in comparable industries.

Industry group	Average weekly earnings
Transportation equipment	\$118.13
Petroleum and coal products	116.11
Primary metal industries	116.00
Ordinance and accessories	108.05
Printing and publishing	105.49
Machinery	105.41
Chemicals and allied products	101.84
Fabricated metal products	100.84
Rubber products	100.44
Instruments and rated products	94.30
Paper and allied products	94.30
Electrical machinery	92.84
Stone, clay and glass products	91.30

I have not included those few industries where the standard workweek is less than 40 hours and in which the pay is geared to the shorter hours pertaining in these industries.

As is easily apparent, the average in each of these industries is higher than the \$89.23 average weekly salary of the letter carrier.

The overall average of these 13 industries cited is a little more than \$104 a week. This is an average of \$15 a week, or \$780 a year, more than the earnings of a letter carrier.

I would like to point out that the same sources I have been quoting show that the national average weekly wage for workers in the mining industry is \$114.24. This national average is \$25 a week more than the average wage of a letter carrier. This comes to \$1,300 a year in excess of a letter carrier's wages.

Again, the Labor Force lists the average weekly earnings of workers in the construction industry as \$117.81, or \$28.60 a week more than a letter carrier's pay.

FRINGE BENEFITS

But, whenever we bring up the subject of letter carriers' salaries there are always some individuals who refer somewhat vaguely to our "fringe benefits" and infer that these are equal to thousands of dollars additional pay.

I do not want to give the impression that I underestimate the value of our fringe benefits. However, since they are taking on more and more prominence at the bargaining table, I think it is very necessary that we do not become mesmerized by exaggerations when we discuss their relative importance.

As I have said, fringe benefits are not considered negotiable by bill collectors and, when discussing their value to employees, since accurate official figures are chronically unavailable, we are asked to place our reliance on estimates which all too often turn out to be mere guesswork.

The last published official information on fringe benefits for all Federal employees, so far as we know, was contained in the Cordier report which was released in late 1957. We shall take up some of the findings of the report later in this statement.

For the moment we wish to refer to an estimate supplied by Postmaster General Summerfield during the hearings before the House Subcommittee on the Post Office Department's current appropriations request. I quote from the published hearings:

"Mr. STEED. How do you feel about the proposition as to the comparison of the pay scales of the people working in the postal service with other wage earners in the country?"

"General SUMMERFIELD. Of course, I think it compares very favorably, particularly when you consider all of the benefits that postal employees, if not all Government employees, enjoy over that of the accepted privileges that prevail in industry generally. I believe our costs for fringe benefits, for instance, this year will approach 31 percent of the total amount."

"Mr. GILLETTE. \$678 million."

"General SUMMERFIELD. \$678 million is the cost per year of the fringe benefits alone. I think you will find that other departments of the Government are less than that total—I think in the area of 29 percent. You will find that industry generally is about 27 percent, as against 31 percent in the Post Office Department."

"And, let's face it. Whatever you pay out in fringe benefits is chargeable to Federal salaries and wages, just like salary itself, because you have taken that burden from personal payrolls and put it on Federal payrolls, so it becomes a part of it. Off the record, please."

(Discussion off the record.)

"Mr. STEED. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman."

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Postmaster General could be exactly right in his figures or he could be quite inaccurate. Our figures indicate the average cost of fringe benefits for letter carriers is less than 25 percent.

But we do submit that the Postmaster General did not tell the whole story. He

did not indicate whether or not his educated guess of 31 percent reflected the cost of straight-time salaries, with retirement benefits valued at their normal cost to the Government or at normal cost plus the interest on the unfunded liability. The Cordiner report showed that a cost rise from 21.5 percent to 27.2 percent was attributed solely to the inclusion of the cost of this unfunded liability.

The Postmaster General may also be correct in his estimate of 31 percent of total costs for his agency of Government as against an estimated cost of 29 percent for other departments. If we were inclined to be genuinely critical of his guesswork, we might suggest that the difference could be found in the presence of more "chiefs" in relation to "Indians" in the postal establishment than in most other departments of Government. Counting every level of supervision in the field service, and excluding those in the departmental headquarters, there is one supervisor to about every eight rank-and-file employees.

The most significant omission in Mr. Summerfield's remarks was his failure to say how much postal employees pay for their fringe benefits. On this report I quote the Cordiner report:

"They (Federal employees) are required to contribute slightly more than 7.2 percent of their pay for these benefits, whereas employees in the 356 companies (studied by the Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc.) are paying an average of 4.5 percent, and in the 1,000 companies (studied by the chamber of commerce) 3.5 percent."

It is also interesting to note another comment of the Cordiner report on fringe benefits. This certainly casts considerable doubt as to the validity of the Postmaster General's position:

"The Federal Government has lost the advantage it once enjoyed in the area of fringe benefits. In brief, the magnet of interesting work and public service is no longer strong enough to overcome the pull of higher salaries in non-Federal employment."

As many of you are aware, Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, who headed the study referred to, is chairman of the board of General Electric Co. A recent news item in the Burlington (Vt.) Daily News quotes Mr. Cordiner as saying that the average 1959 compensation per employee of GE, including fringe benefits, rose to a record of \$7,226 a year. The letter carriers in Burlington, Vt. received an average of \$4,640 during that same year. Add 25 percent for fringe benefits and the average letter carrier still receives only \$5,800, or \$1,426 a year less than the average GE employee.

So, we are perhaps conceding some ground in our argument if we agree that our fringe benefits are equal to those enjoyed in private industry. We do not and shall not concede ground to the extent of agreeing that our fringe benefits are greater than those granted in private industry. If anything they are below the average pertaining outside of Government service.

WAGE SCALES OF POLICEMEN AND FIREFIGHTERS

At this point, I should like to present additional salary data to underscore the inadequacy of letter carrier wages.

Like postal workers, policemen and firemen are valued public servants. Their wages and conditions of employment, like those of postal employees, are determined in large measure by appropriations of public funds.

Neither policemen and firemen nor postal workers have ever been overpaid. Certainly neither group is overpaid today. Yet it was not too many years ago that both groups were receiving approximately the same pay in most of our larger cities. In fact, in many communities, the postal workers were paid slightly better than were firemen and policemen.

That is not the case today. In fact, the exact opposite is true. And we hasten to say, in presenting the following comparative salary scales, that it is not our intention or purpose to make an odious comparison. We are glad that the organizations representing our uniformed colleagues in the police and fire departments of our cities have been able to raise the wages of these able and conscientious public servants. So, we are not jealous of their comparative good fortune. We are merely eager to enjoy the same kind of good fortune that they enjoy.

We offer as evidence a few of the salary scales that have been made available to us simply to show that letter carrier wages also trail behind a group of workers who have been traditionally in the lower wage bracket and, unfortunately, have been traditionally underpaid.

By way of preface to these figures, may I again remind the Committee that the salary spread for a letter carrier is from \$4,035 at the entrance rate to \$4,875 7 years later at the top automatic grade. The data for policemen and firemen do not reflect longevity wages.

Arlington, Va., our neighbors in Congressman BROYHILL's district; the entrance rate is \$4,400 and goes up to \$5,560.

In Ridgewood, N.J., the scale is from \$4,688 to \$6,000.

In St. Paul, Minn., \$4,968 to \$5,928 (incidentally, a "sanitation laborer" or street cleaner in St. Paul receives \$2.75 per hour, or 52 cents an hour more than the average letter carrier, and 26 cents an hour more than a letter carrier with 25 years' service.)

Across the river in the city of Minneapolis, the range for police and firefighters is from \$5,544 to \$6,264.

For Sacramento, Calif., the scale is from \$5,520 to \$6,600. This represents a 35 percent increase since 1955. I should also add that the position of dogcatcher in Sacramento pays \$5,040 annually—only \$100 less than the wage of a 25-year veteran in the postal service.

My own home city of Cincinnati, Ohio, is doing its part to enable their policemen and firemen to meet today's high cost of living. The range of pay is from \$5,048 to \$5,382.

An example of another Ohio city is Cleveland; the scale is \$4,704 to \$5,502.

New York City pays \$4,800 to \$6,181.

Boston, \$4,880 to \$5,500.

St. Louis, \$4,365 to \$5,305.

Seattle, \$4,920 to \$5,640.

Denver, \$4,716 to \$5,616.

In Riverside, Calif., the scale is \$4,920 to \$6,000. (Our information from that city also indicates that women assigned to checking parking meters, called meter maids, start at \$410 a month, or \$74 more than the entrance wage in the Post Office Department. These meter maids do even better in nearby Los Angeles, where the monthly rate is \$489, or \$153 more than a letter carrier receives.)

In Milwaukee, Wis., policemen and firemen start at \$4,938 and go up to \$5,726.

For San Francisco, the scale is \$6,228 to \$6,828.

In Chicago, \$4,800 to \$5,640.

In Portland, Oreg., \$4,692 to \$5,580.

In Oakland, Calif., \$6,396 to \$6,828.

In Detroit, \$5,356 to \$5,938.

Ahy and all of these figures could be dramatized by reducing the annual rates given to weekly or even hourly figures. For example, take the Detroit scale. When the employee reaches the top automatic grade of \$5,938 after 3 years' service, he's receiving 51 cents an hour more than a letter carrier can get after 7 years on the job.

Perhaps all of us ought to seek employment in Congressman LESINSKI's area. I suggest that because I received a news clipping the other day, taken from the classified ad section of a Detroit newspaper. It seems as if city hall is looking for janitors. This is the advertisement:

"Wanted—Janitor for city hall. Examples of work: Sweep, mop, scrub, and polish floors. Clean and maintain laboratories. Replace light bulbs. Starting salary—\$4,450; \$5,050 after 2 years."

It takes a letter carrier 18 years to reach that last figure.

And, finally, I should like to cite the scale of a private in the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia. He starts at \$4,800 per year; at the end of 5 years his base salary is \$5,440. If he is still a private after 19 years, his base pay is \$6,840, or \$765 a year more than a letter carrier with the same amount of service.

GOVERNMENT HELPS OTHER WAGE EARNERS

I would like, now, to draw two comparisons with which we are all familiar because of the widespread publicity they were given during recent months.

The first of these involves a situation very close to home.

About a month ago we all witnessed a strike in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Involved were the meatcutters and retail clerks in chainstores.

Under date of February 18, 1960, the U.S. Department of Labor made a routine report on the termination of this strike. Working with the representatives of management and the unions, Government mediators had worked out a settlement calling for a weekly wage of \$103 for meatcutters and a weekly wage of \$97 for clerks.

Thus, as a result of mediation by the U.S. Government, meatcutters are now receiving \$14 a week more than letter carriers are receiving, and clerks are receiving \$8 a week more than are letter carriers.

We certainly are not suggesting that the Government's mediation facilities be injected into our salary situation. But letter carriers cannot be blamed if they wonder why our Federal Government can use its power, prestige, and good offices to improve the wages and working conditions of practically every type of worker, except the men and women who work for Uncle Sam.

The second recent example is the steel strike. According to the press and other news media, Vice President Nixon and Labor Secretary Mitchell had a great deal to do with the settlement of that controversy. We are delighted that the steelworkers won their strike. We would like to point out, however, that according to Mr. Roger Blough, spokesman for the steel industry, steelworkers were getting \$3.11 an hour before the strike. Under the provisions of the bills introduced by Mr. MORRISON and 63 of his colleagues, a letter carrier after 20 years' service would receive only \$3.06 per hour. And, as I have previously pointed out, the average hourly wage of a letter carrier is only \$2.23, or 88 cents an hour less than the average steelworker was getting before he struck for higher wages.

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, I think there is no need of my drawing further comparisons between the wages of a letter carrier and those of other workers, both in the private and public employ. I am confident that the parallels I have quoted present a picture of economic discrimination which is unchallengeable.

FEDERAL WAGES LAG FAR BEHIND

Perhaps our entire case could rest on one single comparison.

The late and distinguished Sumner H. Slichter, professor of economics at Harvard University, in May of last year, addressed the 15th session of the American Assembly. This forum is conducted under the auspices of Columbia University. Participating in last year's meeting were about 60 Americans from business, labor, government (including Labor Secretary Mitchell), agriculture, education, communications, and the clerical, legal and military professions.

In his formal presentation, Dr. Slichter noted the changes in compensation of employees in private industry during the period 1948-58.

He told the Assembly:

"For the entire period the rise in compensation per man-hour was 63.3 percent."

He also cited this fact:

"In every one of the past 10 years without exception average hourly compensation of all employees in private industry rose more than the Consumer Price Index."

May I say that in 1948 the top-grade letter carrier, that is, the man in the top longevity step—a 25-year veteran—received \$3,850 per year, of \$1.85 per hour. Today he receives \$5,175, or \$2.49 an hour. In other words, there has been a 34.5 percent increase in his hourly wage, as compared to the 63.3 percent increase reported by Dr. Slichter's findings for workers in private industry.

ARE COMPARISONS VALED AND MATERIAL

But, there are those who say that we should disregard comparisons. They argue that we should not concern ourselves with what others are receiving, but should confine ourselves only to the adequacy or inadequacy of our own wages.

Of course, I disagree with this argument. The wages that other workers receive are only a reflection of the overall need of such wages; they are a reflection of the skyrocketing inflation which has left the letter carriers so far behind in their struggle for economic equality.

Naturally we deeply resent the oft-repeated inference that we are a cause of monetary inflation. Since, historically and traditionally we have been engaged in a continuing and sometimes frantic effort to catch up with the economic parade, we have been the perennial victims of inflation, not the causes.

We have traditionally been the last segment of the economy to be given the economic assistance needed to give us parity with our brothers in labor, and, when we have been given such assistance we have found ourselves in the position of receiving a bare living wage, and never a saving wage.

So, disregarding for the time being the entire subject of comparative wages, the salary of a letter carrier is still completely inadequate for present day living.

Under the economic conditions existing today, an average salary of \$4,640 a year, or \$370 per month, or \$89.23 a week, or \$2.23 an hour is simply insufficient for a man who has to support an average-size family in the year of our Lord 1960.

HELLER COMMITTEE BUDGETS

In support of this contention I would like to include as part of my statement at this point reprints of two budgets for wage earners. They were prepared recently by the completely independent Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics for the University of California.

It will be helpful to the committee, I think, in its interpretation of these budgets, to say a word about the purpose and concept of the Heller budgets.

Their purpose is to measure the cost of maintaining the commonly accepted standards of living of families in two different occupational groups: a salaried junior professional or executive worker, and a wage earner. In both instances the family consists of a man, wife, boy of 13 and girl of 8 years.

The concept of the Heller committee is to attempt to describe the commonly accepted standard of living as the sum of those goods and services that public opinion currently recognizes as necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living. The term "necessary" as used includes more than merely a minimum of physical needs. It represents what men commonly expect to enjoy. In the words of one noted economist, Dr. J. S.

Davis, it represents what "is urgently desired and striven for, special gratification attending substantial success and substantial failure yielding bitter frustration."

In brief, this concept recognizes the need for looking beyond the rigid confines of the cost-of-living index in fixing wages. We concede that the BLS Index is one of several valid benchmarks in determining wages. But we do not concede that it should be the sole determining factor; nor do we confer on it a badge of omniscience or infallibility. To admit all these would be to concede that letter carriers are entitled to nothing more than a bare living wage. We submit that we are entitled to more. Specifically, we think we are just as much entitled to a saving wage as any other workers in the United States. Certainly we should not be expected always to be teetering on the brink of financial disaster. What gratification can there be in a lifetime of being in debt?

The Heller budget we are submitting is for the family of a wage earner, not that for the professional worker or executive.

If you will notice, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the Heller committee, after lengthy and exhaustive research and interviews suggests that, for normal living with reasonable security, a wage earner who owns his own home feels that he must be paid \$6,638 a year. A wage earner who rents his home requires \$6,271. And, I might add, under this budget the wage earner who rents his home would be doing so at a rate of \$65 a month. I suggest that the areas where a working man and his family can rent a decent house or apartment for \$65 a month are relatively scarce, and particularly so in those areas of highly concentrated population in which letter carriers must live, work, and rear their families.

I think, as you read these two budgets you will not find many areas of extravagance. As a matter of fact, if there are some items which seem high, they are counterbalanced by others which seem low. Thus, if the suggested expenditure for alcoholic beverages seems extravagant, the suggested expenditure for education seems parsimonious.

The figures presented in these budgets speak for themselves. And, once again I would like to point out that they are based on wages in excess of the amounts provided for in Mr. MORRISON's bill.

LETTER CARRIERS AND FHA

There is a further, and even more compelling argument which proves the inadequacy of letter carrier salaries under the present postal wage structure.

One of the fundamental needs of mankind is housing. And this is a subject which, presumably, will be given considerable consideration by the 86th Congress before it adjourns.

A letter carrier's salary today is too low to qualify him under the rules of the Federal Housing Authority for a loan on even a very reasonable and modest home.

Certainly, in today's market, a \$15,000 home must be considered at least reasonably modest. But, to buy a \$15,000 house through the FHA a buyer needs a \$650 down payment and a \$14,350 loan. This calls for monthly payments of \$89.74. To guarantee that amount, the FHA requires an annual salary of at least \$5,384. Not a single letter carrier in the United States is making a postal salary in that amount.

As a result, a program designed to put home ownership within the financial reach of workers with moderate income is meaningless for letter carriers. By FHA standards our income is not moderate; it is immoderately low.

Along this same line we have a report from our branch in St. Louis. A top-grade letter carrier in that city applied for a credit card with a nationwide organization. His application was returned with the notation:

"Our credit standards include a minimum income requirement. Based on the information available to us, this requirement has not been met."

Here we have a case of a Federal Government employee who from time immemorial has been classified as an excellent credit risk being denied credit. The organization involved has long been noted for its liberal credit policy. But, because of his present inadequate postal income, the letter carrier has been denied a credit card. It is like being denied acceptance in the human race to be refused a credit card these days.

PRODUCTIVITY

And finally, we come down to the basic question of whether the laborer is worthy of his hire. This boils down to a question of productivity.

We willingly concede that some relationship must be demonstrated between increased productivity and a request for a wage adjustment. Having said that, we also submit that once an increase in productivity is shown, there is a responsibility for management to reward those who contributed to the increased efficiency. That has been and is an American tradition. But it has not always been the case in Government.

It seems apropos, too, to point up the nature of the Postal Service. It is just that—a service. It is a great many other things to most Americans, but basically it is service to all Americans.

Unlike a product coming off an assembly line, which can be measured for costs from the raw material down to the finished product, "service" is in itself an unmarketable commodity. It has only one real measurement. Either it is good, or it is bad.

We believe the postal service today is doing a good job. It could be better and it will continue to improve as long as Congress provides the tools, a little prodding and leadership and, above all else, wages and conditions of work that will attract the caliber of dedicated men required to operate and maintain a swift and certain system of communications.

Wherever it can be measured accurately, it can be demonstrated that the productivity of postal workers has been going up with each succeeding year. My understanding is that the rate of increased productivity is an approximate one percent each year over the past few years.

During the hearings on the fiscal 1961 appropriation for the Post Office Department, spokesmen for the agency told the subcommittee:

"In the last 6 fiscal years our volume increase has been 20.2 percent, our manpower increase has been only 7.6 percent, and excluding a 24 percent increase in city delivery service due to expanding areas, the increase in manpower was only 2.2. In other words, 20.2 against 2.2."

As automation and increased mechanization takes place in postal operations, additional spurts in productivity can be expected. Take for example the recent introduction of mailsters in the city delivery service. Whether or not we like mailsters, it is an undeniable fact that the Department can operate the delivery service with 3.1 percent increase in man-years to handle a 5.5 percent increase in possible stops.

Since it takes human hands and eyes and better than average intelligence to operate this equipment, some credit for the increased efficiency must be attributed to the operator.

During the same hearings the Post Office Department also told the subcommittee:

"In 1958, for example, the average number of pieces handled per clerk man-year was 239,223. That increased in 1959 to 241,530. Our estimated 1960 productivity is 243,231, and our estimate for 1961 is based

upon a further increase in productivity to 245,568 pieces per clerk man-year."

The Department correctly described this jump from 239,223 to 245,568 as "quite an increase in production."

Every category of mail and every type of special service rendered by the Post Office Department, with exception of parcel post and postal savings, is expected to increase during the next fiscal year. All in all, the Department has told the Congress that the estimated increase in volume is 5.21 percent, as compared with a 3.2 percent increase in man-years.

So, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I feel that there can be no valid argument against the productivity of postal workers. It is good. It gets progressively better with each passing year. Above and beyond all else, its rate of increase easily outstrips the postal employees' rate of increase in pay.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman and member of the committee, we submit that in this argument we have shown that:

1. Letter carriers are grossly underpaid in comparison with both workers in private industry and workers in comparable positions on State and civic payrolls;

2. Letter carriers are grossly underpaid in relation to the generally accepted national standard of living; and,

3. Letter carriers are underpaid according to all recognized standards of productivity. If, in other words, the Post Office Department contends that letter carriers were reasonably compensated as a result of the passage of pay legislation in 1958, then it must admit that, by virtue of its own figures regarding increased productivity, letter carriers are being underpaid today.

I am aware that the cry will be raised to the effect that the U.S. Government cannot afford to pay its postal employees any more than it is paying them right now.

I submit, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this is nonsense. The U.S. Government has got to be able to afford to pay its dedicated and devoted civil servants a decent living wage.

We feel that as a nation we can afford to send our treasure to the distant corners of the earth in the form of foreign military and economic assistance.

We feel that as a nation we can invest billions of dollars in our agricultural program.

We feel that as a nation we can afford to pour billions of dollars into slum clearance, urban renewal, dam construction, and highway programs.

We can afford, so we are told, the cost of sending rockets to the moon and bathyspheres to the lowest depths of the ocean.

I have no intention of discussing the relative wisdom or unwisdom of the multitudinous programs which are financed with the taxpayers' money. I merely insist that if we, as a nation, can afford all these things then we certainly can afford to pay a living wage to the devoted men who carry the Nation's mail.

Postal administrations consistently claim that the postal establishment should be run as a business or, if you will, as a public utility. It so happens that the National Association of Letter Carriers disagrees with this view. We believe that the Postal Service should be exactly what the name implies, a service to the people of this country. But—If, for the sake of argument, we do momentarily accept this concept of the postal establishment—what kind of business is it that seeks to justify the cost of its operation by maintaining its employees at wages of pay far below the generally accepted levels of reasonable subsistence? If the postal establishment really were a business, rather than a service monopoly, it could never survive if it attempted to perpetuate a state of economic peonage among its workers. In the United States of America it is fundamental that, if a business cannot pay its employees a decent wage then it has no business being in business. Postal administrations always want to operate as a business at the top management level, and as a service at the employee level. They consistently show a touching solicitude for the postal budget and no solicitude whatsoever for the budgets of its employees.

It is an old saying that a shoemaker's children must always go without shoes.

I suggest that this has always been true of postal employees in the past and is true today. We are told that the Nation must afford thousands of programs involving the expenditure of billions of dollars in every corner of the earth but, when it comes to paying the men and women who operate and maintain our mail service a wage consistent with their value, their effort, and their just deserts, then we are told that this is something the United States cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am sure you will agree with me when I say that we in the United States are richly blessed by Almighty God. Our good earth produces undreamed-of treasure; our natural resources are the comfort and delight of our allies and the envy and despair of our enemies. We are by all odds the strongest and wealthiest nation in the history of civilized man. We are the hope and the support of free men everywhere. Can all this be true—and, can it still be true that we cannot pay our civil servants enough money to permit them to rear their families in dignity and reasonable security?

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message last January said, and I quote: "1960 promises to be the most prosperous in our history."

Specifically his economists see a year of higher production, higher employment, slowly rising prices, about a 2-percent increase of the Consumers Price Index, a continued rise in profits and dividends, higher wages and salaries.

All this does add up to prosperity—and lots of it. But—for whom? For everyone in the United States except the Federal employees? We hope not.

It adds up to prosperity for the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker. But it will not add up to anything except misery for a letter carrier who is receiving an average of \$4,640 a year, or \$370 a month, or \$89.23 a week, or \$2.23 an hour. For him there can be no share in the great national prosperity unless his wages are increased significantly to a point where he cannot only share in the national prosperity but add to it through an increase in his substandard purchasing power. To deny him that is to make of him a second-class citizen. Economically he is a second-class citizen today. We are asking the Congress to elevate him to a place of economic equality with his brethren.

Once again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for your patience and your consideration in hearing us out on this matter. We are grateful for your understanding.

And now, in order to fortify and expand our arguments somewhat I would like your permission to turn over the presentation of the rest of our case to the vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. Jerome J. Keating.

BUDGET FOR WAGE EARNER

1A. Total budget for homeowner (including sales tax)

Item	Annual cost	Percentages	Item	Annual cost	Percentages
Total cost.....	\$46,638.28	100.0	Total without taxes—continued		
Income taxes ¹	638.75	9.6	Transportation.....	586.95	8.9
Federal.....	624.49	9.4	Automobile.....	\$569.33	8.6
State.....	14.26	.2	Curlfare.....	17.62	.3
Total without taxes.....	5,999.53	90.4	Medical and dental care.....	527.25	7.9
Food.....	1,757.01	26.4	Personal insurance.....	269.08	4.1
At home.....	1,721.65	25.9	Commercial life insurance.....	119.08	1.8
Away from home.....	35.36	.5	Federal old-age and survivors insurance.....	120.00	1.8
Alcoholic beverages.....	56.94	.9	California disability insurance.....	30.00	.5
Housing.....	1,110.95	16.7	Personal care (barber and beauty service, supplies).....	115.47	1.7
Household operation (utilities, laundry supplies, etc.).....	297.47	4.5	Recreation (paid admissions, TV, vacation, etc.).....	232.43	3.5
Household furnishings (furniture, appliances, etc.).....	222.65	3.4	Tobacco.....	118.56	1.8
Clothing and upkeep.....	488.67	7.4	Reading.....	36.46	.5
Man.....	130.48	2.0	Education (school dues, supplies, etc.).....	8.34	.1
Woman.....	142.54	2.2	Union dues.....	63.38	1.1
Boy of 13.....	115.02	1.7	Gifts and contributions.....	91.40	1.4
Girl of 8.....	100.63	1.5	Miscellaneous.....	16.50	.2

¹ Income taxes are calculated on the total cost of the budget using the method of computation resulting in the lowest taxes. For the wage earner homeowner, in 1959 this meant using either joint or separate returns (the latter under community prop-

erty provisions) and itemizing deductions for both Federal and State taxes. The owner paid lower taxes than the renter, even though the cost of his budget was higher, because his itemized deduction included real estate taxes and mortgage interest.

1B. Total budget for home renter (including sales tax)

Item	Annual cost	Percentages	Item	Annual cost	Percentages
Total cost.....	\$6,271.10	100.0	Total without taxes—Continued		
Income taxes ¹	661.46	10.5	Transportation.....	\$586.95	9.4
Federal.....	646.00	10.3	Automobile.....	569.33	9.1
State.....	15.46	.2	Carfare.....	17.62	.3
Total without taxes.....	5,609.64	89.5	Medical and dental care.....	527.25	8.4
Food.....	1,757.01	28.0	Personal insurance.....	269.08	4.3
At home.....	1,721.65	27.4	Commercial life insurance.....	119.08	1.9
Away from home.....	35.36	.6	Federal old-age and survivors insurance.....	120.00	1.9
Alcoholic beverages.....	56.94	.9	California disability insurance.....	30.00	.5
Housing.....	780.00	12.4	Personal care (barber and beauty service, sup- plies).....	115.47	1.8
Household operation (utilities, laundry sup- plies, etc.).....	238.53	3.8	Recreation (paid admissions, TV, vacation, etc.).....	232.45	3.7
Household furnishings (furniture, appliances, etc.).....	222.65	3.6	Tobacco.....	118.56	1.9
Clothing and upkeep.....	488.67	7.8	Reading.....	36.46	.6
Man.....	130.48	2.1	Education (school dues, supplies, etc.).....	8.34	.1
Woman.....	142.54	2.3	Union dues.....	63.38	1.0
Boy of 13.....	115.02	1.8	Gifts and contributions.....	91.40	1.5
Girl of 8.....	100.63	1.6	Miscellaneous.....	16.50	.3

¹ For 1959, the method of calculation providing the lowest taxes for the wage earner renter was to file separate returns using standard deductions for the Federal tax, and either joint or separate returns using the optional tax table for the State tax.

What has happened to postal pay? Too few raises, raises too small, too many vetoes

	Top auto- matic step, letter carriers hourly rate	Jackson, Miss., tele- phone lineman	Portland, Oreg., building laborer	Bath, Maine, iron- workers	Denver, Colo., firemen, police- men	Mem- phis, Tenn., Fire- stone Tire	Phila- delphia, Pa., inside carpen- ter	Phila- delphia, Pa., outside carpen- ter	Battle Creek, Mich., Easton Manu- factur- ing Co.	Kansas City, Mo., Western Electric installers	Spring- field, Ill., local 1027, UAW-CIO	Des Moines, Iowa, tele- phone cable- men	Sioux Falls, S. Dak., butchers	Baton Rouge, La., carpen- ter, Stand- ard Oil
1949.....	\$1.815	\$1.45	\$1.70	\$1.53	\$1.80	\$2.325	\$1.80	\$2.40	\$1.43	\$1.8325		\$1.725	\$1.70	
1950.....	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1.57	(¹)	(¹)	1.90	{ 2.525 2.65 }	1.485	2.0525	\$1.54	1.8125	1.92	\$2.305
1951.....	2.015	1.925	1.75	{ 1.67 1.75 }	1.98	2.445	1.98	(¹)	1.535	2.1725	1.63	1.90	2.12	2.39
1952.....	(¹)	2.025	1.85	1.84	(¹)	2.775	2.08	2.90	1.695	2.2925	1.71	2.225	2.18	2.565
1953.....	(¹)	(¹)	2.00	{ 1.94 2.03 }	2.19	2.875	2.20	3.10	1.815	2.4125	1.75	2.30	{ 2.22 2.27 }	2.67
1954.....	(¹)	(¹)	2.17	2.08	(¹)	3.005	2.25	3.20	1.875	2.5325	1.79	2.35	2.32	(¹)
1955.....	{ 2.19 2.25 }	2.25	2.23	2.23	(¹)	3.07	2.35	3.30	2.005	2.6525	2.05	2.4625	2.46	2.77
1956.....	(¹)	2.375	2.25	2.36	2.44	3.19	2.45	3.385	2.447	2.7725	2.11	2.60	2.67	2.935
1957.....	(¹)	2.487	2.35	2.46	(¹)	3.25	2.55	3.535	2.497	2.8925	2.17	2.7125	{ 2.69 2.72 }	3.11
1958.....	2.34	2.537	2.55	2.56	2.92	3.40	2.65	3.635	2.68	3.0125	2.23	(¹)	{ 2.835 2.875 }	(¹)
1959.....	(¹)	2.65	2.67	2.65	(¹)	3.48	2.80	3.785	2.74	(¹)	2.44	2.8125	2.95	3.27
1960.....	(²)							3.885					3.045	
Total increase.....	.525	1.20	.97	1.12	1.12	1.1475	1.00	1.485	1.31	1.18	.90	1.0875	1.345	.965
Hourly rate increase over and above that re- ceived by letter carriers.....		.675	.445	.595	.595	.6225	.475	.96	.785	.655	.375	.5625	.82	.44

¹ No increase.

² May.

³ November.

⁴ Pay veto.

What has happened to postal pay? Too few raises, raises too small, too many vetoes—Compare the number of pay increases in the past 11 years for letter carriers with those in 13 other occupations located in every section of the United States

	Number of pay increases	Cum- ulative increase over 11 years	Amount of increase above that received by letter carrier		Number of pay increases	Cum- ulative increase over 11 years	Amount of increase above that received by letter carrier
Letter carrier.....	4	\$1,062		Philadelphia, Pa., outside carpenter.....	12	\$3,088	\$1,996
Jackson, Miss., telephone lineman.....	8	2,496	\$1,404	Battle Creek, Mich., Easton manufacturing.....	11	2,724	1,632
Portland, Oreg., building laborer.....	10	2,017	925	Kansas City, Mo., Western Electric installer.....	10	2,454	1,362
Bath, Maine, iron worker.....	13	2,329	1,237	Springfield, Ill., Local 1027, UAW-CIO.....	10	1,872	780
Denver, Colo., firemen, policemen.....	5	2,329	1,237	Des Moines, Iowa, telephone cableman.....	10	2,262	1,170
Memphis, Tenn., Firestone tire.....	10	2,386	1,294	Sioux Falls, S. Dak., butchers.....	16	2,797	1,705
Philadelphia, Pa., inside carpenter.....	11	2,080	988	Baton Rouge, La., carpenter, Standard Oil.....	8	2,007	915

With every year the letter carrier has fallen behind in his struggle for economic equality.

What's happened to letter carriers' salaries? Too few pay increases, too many vetoes—Comparison over 11 years (1949–1960) letter carriers' pay increases compared to increases in 13 other occupations

Jackson, Miss., telephone lineman	\$2,496
Portland, Oreg., building laborer	2,017
Bath, Maine, ironmonger	2,329
Denver, Colo., policemen and firemen	2,329
Memphis, Tenn., tire manufacturer	2,386
Philadelphia, Pa., inside carpenter	2,080
Philadelphia, Pa., outside carpenter	3,088
Sioux City, S. Dak., butchers	2,797
Battle Creek, Mich., Easton manufacturing	2,724
Kansas City, Mo., installer, Western Electric	2,454
Springfield, Ill., UAW-CIO	1,872
Des Moines, Iowa, telephone linemen	2,262
Baton Rouge, La., carpenter, Standard Oil	2,007
Letter carriers	1,092

Each year the letter carriers have fallen behind in their struggle for economic equality.

What has happened to postal pay? Too few raises, too small raises—The St. Paul pay story—Comparison of the hourly pay of letter carriers with the hourly pay of workers in St. Paul, Minn.

	1936	1943	1958	1959	1960
Letter carrier (top automatic)	\$1.00	\$1.15	\$2.34	\$2.34	(?)
Bricklayer	1.10	1.80	3.73	3.87	\$3.88

Letter carriers lag in pay increases

	Pay of step 7 letter carrier	Construction ironworkers, San Antonio, Tex.	Parchment papermill machine-tender, Kalamazoo, Mich.	Sheet metal workers, Waterloo, Iowa	Firemen, New York City
1949	\$1,815	\$2.25	\$1.76	\$1.85	\$1,737
1950	(1)	2.50	(1)	2.00	(1)
1951	2,015	(1)	2.00	2.10	1,842
1952	(1)	2.65	(1)	2.25	2,001
1953	(1)	2.75	2.35	2.40	2,182
1954	(1)	2.875	(1)	2.55	2,326
1955	2,19	3.00	2.56	2.70	2,381
1956	(1)	3.125	2.66	2.85	2,548
1957	(1)	3.25	2.74	2.95	2,610
1958	2,34	3.375	2.80	3.025	2,685
1959	(1)	3.50	2.87	3.075	2,776
Number of increases	4	10	8	11	10
Amount of increase above letter carrier increase		\$0.725	\$0.585	\$0.70	\$0.514

1 No increase.

2 Veto.

The Waste in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, over one-half of our annual budget is spent on national defense. This is the greatest area of spending and this is where we should have the greatest efficiency. I fear, though, that there is a tremendous amount of waste in the expenditure of defense funds. The Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, one of the outstanding papers of my State, recently had an excellent editorial on this. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the

What has happened to postal pay? Too few raises, too small raises—The St. Paul pay story—Comparison of the hourly pay of letter carriers with the hourly pay of workers in St. Paul, Minn.—Continued

	1936	1943	1958	1959	1960
Carpenter	1.00	1.38	3.30	3.45	3.45
Electrician	1.00	1.50	3.38	3.50	3.65
Engineer (crane)	1.00	1.20	3.47	3.62	3.62
Lathers	1.25	1.50	3.25	3.40	3.40
Painters	1.00	1.35	3.15	3.30	(?)
Plasterers	1.25	1.62	3.40	3.45	(?)
Plumbers	1.20	1.50	3.22	3.42	3.79
Sheetmetal	1.10	1.50	3.15	3.35	3.50
Steamfitters	1.20	1.50	3.40	3.62	3.79
Structural ironworkers	1.20	1.50	3.47	3.62	(?)
Building laborers	.55	.93	2.55	2.70	(?)

Each year the letter carrier has fallen further behind in his struggle for economic equality.

What has happened to postal pay? Too few raises. Raises too small. Too many vetoes.

Average number of pay increases in past 11 years for 13 other occupations, 10.

Number of pay increases for letter carriers, 4.

In past 11 years 13 other occupations have received average increases of \$1,280 more than have letter carriers.

During past 11 years, average increase in pay, 13 other occupations, \$2,372; letter carriers' increase, \$1,092.

Each year the letter carrier has fallen further behind in his struggle for economic equality.

They see what a vast, sprawling, jerry-built, messed-up thing the defense organization is.

It does not show much evidence of the American genius for brilliant planning and execution.

There are geniuses in defense but they are hampered by redtape, by divided authority, by obsolete ideas, and by the pulling and hauling of rival authorities.

The people have begun to see that they are not getting their money's worth out of the vast sum spent for defense.

The Pentagon is too big, too clumsy, too divided, too snowed under by its paperwork to think and act quickly and effectively.

There is need of immediate reform and reorganization.

The time and money and the security of the Nation are being wasted by this confusion and delay.

The present administration in Washington has had more than 7 years to correct this bad situation. It has not done so. There is no reason to believe that it can or will do the job which is needed during the few months which remain to it.

The defense issue has become a burning issue.

The people of this country are unhappy about the whole situation.

More money is not the answer. More money would only mean more waste.

The answer is plain.

There must be more harmony, more energy, more commonsense, more inspired planning, and dynamic action in the defense set-up from top to bottom.

We cannot tolerate having the adequate defense of the Nation lost in the confusion and redtape of the Pentagon.

The American people must build a hot fire of public opinion under those who are responsible for national defense.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the sons of Erin once again salute the sons of Erin and wish to one another and to all the world liberty and peace.

Each year St. Patrick's Day, March 17, is celebrated as a national holiday in Ireland.

We Americans, of whatever national descent, join the Irish in doing honor to that great apostle, bishop, and patron saint of Ireland. Saint Patrick, like his Ireland, stands before the world as the symbol of indomitable resistance to tyranny and oppression.

According to his own account, Saint Patrick was born in Britain, at a place called Bannavem Taberniae. There is no general agreement as to the location of that place, but scholars now favor the Severn valley as the most probable region. His father, Calpornius, seems to have been a man of some influence in the community, a member of the municipal council and apparently a friend of the Romans.

Somewhere around the year 400 Irish invaders came in several score of ships and landed in the rich west country.

Appendix of the RECORD so that my colleagues will have the opportunity of reading it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASTE IN DEFENSE

The Government of the United States spends one-half its annual budget on national defense.

This would indicate that the Government believes defense is the most important matter with which it has to deal.

If that is true, then national defense needs far more competent and effective administration than it is getting today.

It should have the most competent administration that any department of the Government has ever had.

It does not have that kind of management today, and the Nation is suffering as the consequence.

The American people are beginning to understand this.

The Twentieth Legion, which for 350 years had been stationed at Chester, had been recalled to defend the home provinces of Rome against the barbarians. The Britons, weakened by prosperity and comfort, fell easy prey to the raiders. Patrick, along with other captives, was carried off to the land that was called Antrim, where he became the slave of a lord who owned land on the slopes of Slemish.

After 6 years of slavery he made his escape to western France and finally found refuge in the Monastery of Lérins, on an island off the west coast of Provence. After some years he returned to his own folk in Britain. They pleaded with him to remain with them, but he felt a call to go as an apostle of Christianity to the Irish. The love of Ireland and the nostalgic memory of the hills of Antrim were in his heart.

To prepare for his mission he returned to Auxerre in Gaul where, after a period of study, he was ordained a priest. In 432 he was consecrated a bishop and then sailed for Ireland.

The task of the new bishop was not only to minister to the Christian communities in the southern and western parts of Ireland, but also to gain the good will of the various local kings and to convert them and their subjects. His knowledge of the Irish language and his insight into the character of the people, gained during his 6 years in the country as a slave, served him well. His enthusiasm, his tireless energy, his ability as an organizer, and his success in dealing with kings and princes, all contributed to his achievements for Christianity. It is said that he founded 360 churches, baptized with his own hand 12,000 converts, and ordained many priests. At the conclusion of his work he had dealt a death blow to druidism in Ireland.

Surely it is appropriate that the memory of such a man should remain forever green among us. A symbol of peace, courage, and freedom, brought to America by the Irish. St. Patrick now belongs to all of us.

Comment on Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. Alan F. Westin, associate professor of public law and government at Columbia University, recently wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times which I feel merits the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. It quotes the splendid statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from California on the subject of attacks which have been made on the Supreme Court during the civil rights debate. I ask unanimous consent that Professor

Westin's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT ON SUPREME COURT NOTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the quite appropriate concentration of the Times on the tactics of the current filibuster in the Senate, prospects for compromise legislation, and the more extreme statements of the southern orators against desegregation measures of the Federal executive and judiciary, a very meaningful and eloquent comment has gone unreported. On March 1 Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, arose and declared:

"Somewhere, somehow, during the course of this debate, Mr. President, some of us, I think the great majority of us, who object to the continual vilification of the U.S. Supreme Court during the long sessions ought, one by one, to spread on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD our vigorous opposition to that calumny and our bitter resentment at the manner in which the members of the U.S. Supreme Court have been mistreated during this debate and on some other ugly occasions."

"So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I have said on this floor before, and I repeat now, that the great majority of the American people have the highest respect for the courage and the independence and the devotion to duty of the U.S. Supreme Court. It is the unflinching defender of liberty so far as human freedom under the American Constitution is concerned. It will live in history long after this debate is forgotten."

Those of us who would not deny the Southerners the emotional catharsis with which to accept their coming defeat but are, nevertheless, concerned about the campaign of slander against the Supreme Court, are deeply grateful to Senator KUCHEL for his declaration. It is dangerous to assume that great lies are best met by embarrassed silences.

ALAN F. WESTIN.

Associate Professor of Public Law and Government, Columbia University.

New York, March 3, 1960.

Civil Liberties and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a joint press release issued by my able colleague of New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and myself regarding a measure which we recently introduced. In addition, I place in the RECORD a copy of the proposal, introduced on March 14.

The release, issued on the following day, explains that the legislation would amend the "Administrative Procedure Act to guarantee protection of certain basic civil liberties for the employees and agents of contractors with the United States, as well as for Federal employees."

I might add that as this body engages in historic debate in the area of civil rights we should always keep in

mind that a closely allied matter—that of civil liberties—should also be a constant concern of Congress.

My colleague and I sincerely hope and trust that the Members of this body will give all due consideration to our proposal. We would be pleased, of course, to have others join us in sponsorship of the bill.

The press release and text of the measure follow:

JOINT RELEASE BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ROOSEVELT, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, AND REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, MARCH 15, 1960

Legislation to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to guarantee protection of certain basic civil liberties for the employees and agents of contractors with the United States, as well as for Federal employees, was introduced jointly yesterday, March 14, 1960 by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

The new Roosevelt-Thompson civil liberties bill, only one paragraph long, amends section 12 of the Administrative Procedure Act by adding at the end thereof a new subsection which reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the decision or adjudication by any agency as to its officers, employees, and agents in the course of the administration of any Federal employee loyalty or security program or law and as to officers, employees and agents of any contractor with the United States in the course of the administration of any industrial security review program or law shall be made on the record as contemplated by this act and shall be subject to all other provisions of this act."

President Eisenhower issued, on February 20, 1960, a new Executive order revising industrial security procedures despite insistent AFL-CIO requests for an opportunity to discuss the new program before it was instituted. The AFL-CIO News, commenting on the President's Executive order, said on March 12, 1960 that—

"The Executive order sets forth as a principle the right of persons accused of being security risks to face and cross-examine their accusers, but leaves areas of exception. These areas appear capable of administrative contraction or expansion to the point where the principle might become meaningless."

AFL-CIO President George Meany called revision of the confrontations element, as laid down in President Eisenhower's new Executive order, a "welcome liberalization." "However," Mr. Meany wrote Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Stephen S. Jackson, "the Executive order likewise contains broad authorizations for the denial of these safeguards in particular cases, so that whether the new program will in actual operation utilize fairer procedures than the old will depend on how the order is effectuated through regulation and in actual operation."

President Meany noted that the AFL-CIO in the past has voiced three major objections to the way the industrial security program operated. These objections were:

1. The fact that the testimony of absent witnesses was allowed to stand without the accused being given the chance to break it down by questioning.

2. The fact that clearance board members did not face the accusers or know their identities, but usually were forced to rely on the summary report of an investigator without even examining the investigator.

3. The practice of permitting employers to clear workers for access to confidential (as distinguished from secret or top secret) data, a power AFL-CIO President Meany said "is

obviously susceptible of anti-union or other abuse" by persons with scant qualifications for such a function.

President Eisenhower's new Executive order revising industrial security procedures has run into a barrage of criticism from other quarters.

The New York Times said editorially (Feb. 23) regarding President Eisenhower's order—"We can't yet say that an accurately just balance has been reached between private and public security. However, some progress has been made, and if necessary the Supreme Court can still pass on the basic constitutional issue of a confrontation. Sooner or later we must ask ourselves what security is—that is, whether it consists in the liberties of the citizen or in the smooth functioning of the agencies of government."

The Washington (D.C.) Post, commenting on President Eisenhower's new executive order, said (Feb. 22) editorially—"the second category of exception seems to us much more serious—and especially because it embraces the bulk of the sources of information in security cases. In special circumstances, statements of so-called casual informants—neighbors, coworkers, servants, and other such acquaintances of an accused employee—could be used without requiring the informant to appear in person and submit to cross-examination, if the head of the department handling the security case excused him on account of death, severe illness or some other good and sufficient cause. That phrase, good and sufficient cause has an otiose, catchall quality that is disquieting. Casual informants ought not to be used at all unless their allegations can be tested by cross-examination. Cross-examination protects the Government no less than an accused individual. For it safeguards justice. It ought to be given full application in the Federal employee security program as well as in the industrial security program."

TEXT OF ROOSEVELT-THOMPSON BILLS—H.R. 11151 AND H.R. 11155

A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to guarantee protection of certain basic civil liberties for the employees and agents of contractors with the United States and other United States citizens.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1011) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 12," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the decision or adjudication by any agency as to its officers, employees and agents in the course of the administration of any Federal employee loyalty or security program or law and as to officers, employees, and agents of any contractor with the United States in the course of the administration of any industrial security review program or law shall be made on the record as contemplated by this Act and shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act."

Resolutions of Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted at the State convention of the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, held on January 10, 11, and 12, 1960.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOUND SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM ON OUR FARMS WILL KEEP US IN BUSINESS

Since the resolutions adopted at our State conventions determine the policy of OASWCD, I think it important that each soil conservation district board have a copy of the resolutions adopted at our last State convention, January 10, 11, and 12, 1960. They are here reproduced in the language adopted:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the conservation, use and management of soil and water resources for present and future generations is a major objective of the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts; and

Whereas this association recognizes that good land treatment, flood prevention, and multi-purpose runoff water management structures are essential in a progressive watershed protection and development program; and

Whereas the Oklahoma association recognizes an urgent need for a greatly intensified research program on the soil and water conservation problems in our State; and

Whereas the working committee appointed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recognized a high-priority need for a watershed protection research program emphasizing research on land treatment practices in the southern Great Plains in the Washita River watershed, a national research laboratory on the engineering design of conservation structures, and a national research laboratory on moisture conservation for the Great Plains, as outlined in Senate Document No. 59, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Facility Needs—Soil and Water Conservation Research"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts go on record strongly endorsing the soil and water conservation research program proposed in Senate Document No. 59, with particular emphasis on the proposals listed above having a direct relation to the conservation problems in our State; furthermore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be given to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in the U.S. Congress, and to members of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in both the House and Senate of the Congress, and officers and directors of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas in the development of the upstream flood prevention projects in the State of Oklahoma, it is necessary in some instances to inundate county roads or portions thereof; and

Whereas the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma has ruled that a board of county commissioners does not have authority to grant to a soil conservation district the right to close or inundate a county road or highway; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts sponsor appropriate legislation before the next Oklahoma legislature which will authorize boards of county commissioners of the State of Oklahoma to grant a soil conservation district the right to close or inundate county roads or county highways.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, as amended) provides that the contracting for

the works of improvement in projects constructed under said act shall be the responsibility of the local organizations; and

Whereas most of the local organizations in Public Law 566 projects in Oklahoma have experienced difficulty in providing the necessary finances and personnel to properly award and administer contracts resulting in a hardship on such organizations; and

Whereas H.R. 4866, 86th Congress, was introduced by the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, amending Public Law 566, and is now before the U.S. Congress for passage authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service to award and administer contracts for works of improvement in Public Law 566 projects when requested to do so by the local organizations; and

Whereas the Soil Conservation Service has been the contracting authority on all contracts for the Washita River watershed and that said authority has been exercised to the satisfaction of the local organizations involved in said projects: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts endorse and seek the enactment of H.R. 4866, 86th Congress, amending Public Law 566, now pending before the U.S. Congress. Further, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable WILBUR MILLS and to all members of the congressional delegation from Oklahoma. Also, that this resolution be submitted to the 1960 Convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts for adoption.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the conservation and beneficial use of water resources is of paramount importance to the continued growth and prosperity of agriculture in Oklahoma; and

Whereas the existing laws now in effect in the State of Oklahoma regulating the use of water are conflicting, confusing, and inadequate for the proper development of our water resources; and

Whereas the 26th Oklahoma Legislature enacted House Joint Resolution No. 502, adopting a statement of basic principles of a proposed water policy for the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas there has been no specific legislation enacted to implement said policies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, That the Oklahoma Legislature be requested to study the need for water legislation and prepare a water code, implementing House Joint Resolution No. 502 of the 26th Oklahoma Legislature.

RESOLUTION 5

We propose that a program, implementing and supplementing the small watersheds program of the Department of Agriculture, be instituted through the normal operations of soil conservation personnel assisting the soil conservation district, in that: When a location for a stock water dam may be enlarged and complemented with a flood storage reservoir, drawdown tube, and/or other appurtenances as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service technicians, and where flood-control benefits will justify the additional cost, that the Federal Government, under an expanded agriculture conservation program, shall stand the full cost of the construction over and above the 70 percent ACP participation and 30 percent contributed by the landowner for normal stock water requirements.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the youth of the State of Oklahoma is the most important product and resource of our State; and

Whereas the continued development and use of our soil and water resources is dependent upon the knowledge and interest of our youth; and

Whereas there is at present no organized effort to educate and inform our youth in general about soil and water conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, That the association sponsor and carry on an educational and informational program among all the youth of the State of Oklahoma.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the utilization and conservation of our soil and water resources through the upstream flood prevention program has proven to be a proper type of cooperative effort by the local people, our State government and the Federal Government; and Whereas the roads and highways of Oklahoma receive tremendous benefits from the installation of upstream flood prevention projects; and

Whereas the area in the rights-of-way of our roads and highways are in need of proper soil and water conservation practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, That the association seek the enactment, by the Oklahoma Legislature, of legislation authorizing the department of highways of the State and the boards of county commissioners in the counties of the State to cooperate with the soil conservation districts and expend funds for the installation of erosion control practices and measures on the rights-of-way of the county and State roads and highways: Furthermore be it

Resolved, That said legislation authorize the Oklahoma State Department of Highways and the boards of county commissioners to cooperate in the development of upstream flood prevention projects by expending State or county funds to acquire lands, easements or rights-of-way needed for works of improvement in said watershed projects, where a direct benefit will result to a State or county highway as a result of the installation of said works of improvement.

RESOLUTION 8

Whereas the 27th Oklahoma Legislature appropriated in senate bill No. 10 \$100,000 to the small watersheds flood control fund (revolving fund); and

Whereas said act contained the provision that none of said funds were to be expended in a watershed until 90 percent of all the necessary easements were acquired; and

Whereas this provision has resulted in a restriction of the development of the watersheds in the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, That the association sponsor legislation to reduce the percentage of easements that must be acquired to 75 percent of the necessary easements in a watershed.

RESOLUTION 9

Be it resolved, That this practice be included in ACP conservation practices; wheatland terraces are channel type and are generally constructed level, but may be graded if conditions indicate they should be. They are constructed on the high plains area and on large fields where small grain or grain sorghums are the principal crops. They are usually constructed in rainfall areas of less than 28 inches. The ends may be closed or left on land slopes of 5 percent or less but may be constructed on slopes up to 8 percent. The vertical interval will be indicated in Specification No. OK-1. Emergency spillways should be provided for closed-end terraces so that end enclosures can be opened in case drainage of the channel becomes necessary. The minimum distance from the back toe to the top of the ridge will be 12 feet. The minimum width of the bottom of the channel will be 12 feet.

Outlet protection will be indicated on Specifications Nos OK-1 and OK-2. The wheatland terrace may be built from the back

side on permeable soils with a land slope of 3 percent or less, but the terrace height will then be indicated as to table 3 of Specifications No. OK-1; be it further

Resolved, That 70 percent of cost be paid by the ACP, but not in excess of \$3.50 per 100-linear feet.

RESOLUTION 10

Be it resolved, That recommendation be made by OASWCD to the Soil Conservation Service that all recurring practices be reported each year, if and when reapplied by district cooperators in accordance with their district conservation plan, and/or Soil Conservation Service technicians.

RESOLUTION 11

Be it resolved, That recommendation be sent to the legislative committee at the State soil conservation district meeting for a complete study of the geographical location of the area lines, especially pertaining to area II which extends from the Texas to the Kansas border.

RESOLUTION 12

Be it resolved, That the State association work out an awards program for soil conservation districts having the highest percentage of attendance at their regular and special meetings during the year. In case of a tie, awards to be made to both districts.

RESOLUTION 13

Be it resolved, That the OASWCD recommend that the State ASC committee approve the following proposed practices to meet special county conservation needs:

The control of weeds and competitive shrubs in permanent tame pastures by the use of chemicals and/or mechanical means to aid and maintain desirable pasture plants, and at the same time permit the use of the pasture during the period of treatment.

Minimum rate of cost-sharing: 50 percent of the actual cost, not to exceed \$4 per acre.

(a) Initial treatment (chemical)—50 percent of the cost, not to exceed \$2 per acre.

(b) Second treatment (chemical and/or mechanical means)—50 percent of the cost not to exceed \$2 per acre.

Technical recommendations: Recommendations of the experiment stations with respect to rates of application, formulation, and time of application should be followed.

Performance: If the average infestation is less than 10 percent, the area is not eligible for cost-sharing. The percent of infestation shall be determined as the area of land occupied by destructive plants in relation to the total area on which the practice is to be performed. The methods and operations performed in the control of undesirable plants shall be such that they will normally insure against the future growth and development of these plants on the area. The county committee will not approve cost-sharing for the initial treatment unless the producer agrees in writing to carry out a subsequent treatment the next year after the initial treatment. Do not report on any acreage from which the growth has been mowed and used for feed, for threshing, for seed, or sold for any purpose. This practice will not be approved for areas on which it is determined that the area should be treated under practice 9.

RESOLUTION 14

Be it resolved by the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, That said association go on record as favoring increased appropriations for planning and construction of upstream flood prevention projects in the United States.

Upon motion of Harrall Allen, all resolutions heretofore adopted by the OASWCD were unanimously reaffirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

LAVERN FISHEL,
President, OASWCD.

General Klein Urges Firm Stand on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Julius Klein, widely known and respected public relations counsel, journalist, and Army officer, one of our most patriotic citizens, discussed the meaning of brotherhood at a B'nai B'rith Brotherhood celebration, in Scranton, Pa., on March 6. He urged the United States to take a strong stand on the Berlin problem in the forthcoming summit conference.

Under unanimous consent I ask permission to reprint General Klein's lucid address in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, OF CHICAGO, BROTHERHOOD WEEK, B'NAI B'RITH LODGE, SCRANTON, PA.

The opportunity to revisit Scranton and renew old friendships is deeply gratifying.

I am indebted to Mr. Parker and my good friend, Congressman Flood, for having asked me to join with you in honoring a fine young leader of this community who has made an outstanding contribution to the service of our country.

Your city has many pleasant associations for me. I had the privilege of coming here on a number of occasions when I was national commander of the Jewish War Veterans. Each time, I was greatly impressed by the outstanding pattern of community relations that exists here. This dinner tonight is an example of the continuing attention this community gives to the advancement of sound human relations in the best traditions of American democracy.

The measure of a community is the type of leadership it produces.

The pursuit of the ideal of genuine brotherhood among men has suffered some rude setbacks in recent weeks. Men of good will on both sides of the Atlantic were shocked by the episodes that began in Cologne, Germany, on Christmas Eve and spread with epidemic speed to our own and other countries. The deep emotional reaction to these incidents is understandable. But I found one significant fact missing from the thousands of columns of news and editorial comment about this ugly phenomenon. The missing fact was that an act of blind hatred by two sick young men had exploded the complacency of a country which had come to accept the idea that the miracle of its economic recovery from the ashes of World War II was enough to insure the safety and stability of its formal structure of political democracy. In the long run, it may well turn out that two lost young men performed an unwitting service for the cause of brotherhood by shocking the young democracy of Germany, and older democracies such as ours, into a reexamination of their national consciences.

I like to think that these unhappy episodes produced an ultimate good. Certainly, they brought out the best in thoughtful, responsible men here and in Europe.

My old and good friend, the great past president of B'nai B'rith, Phil Klutznick, was among the first to warn against applying emotional standards in judging the causes of these outbreaks in Germany. B'nai B'rith, as an international organization, has approached this problem with a sense of re-

sponsibility and an analytical sense that should be a matter of pride to all Americans. It was the first to point out that, by no stretch of the imagination, could the Germany of Adenauer be considered in the same light as the Germany of Hitler. It reminded the world that if there are shortcomings in the German educational system, there are equal deficiencies in the schools of the older Western democracies. And it reminded us that the trend of education in Western Germany was set by the Western occupying powers at a time when it was within their means to have established the reforms about whose lack we now complain. Very much to the point, too, was Phil Klutznick's reminder that democracy in West Germany is only 10 years old. Political democracy has had a brief and fitful life in Germany. The Weimar Republic came into being after World War I and went down in ruins in one short decade, a victim of economic hardships and human frustrations that brought on the long dark night of Hitlerism. Germany has given the world men of genius in philosophy, science, poetry, music. The hope now must be that its contributions of a Beethoven, a Koch, a Goethe, will be matched in future generations by German Washingtons, Lincolns, and Jeffersons.

The encouraging thing is that much the same sentiments are to be found among responsible leaders in every walk of German life. One of the most eloquent expressions I have seen on this subject was an address by the owner of the largest newspaper chain in Germany and, for that matter, on the Continent, Mr. Axel Springer. With your permission I should like to quote from his speech to a World Brotherhood Conference in Berne, Switzerland, a year ago—before a sudden act of violence made it necessary for any leading German to comment on either his country's past or its future. These are Mr. Springer's words:

"Wantonly, my people unleashed a catastrophe. In the end this catastrophe almost destroyed the German nation. My country has burdened itself with terrible guilt. It has become guilty of terrible crimes against humanity, against other nations, above all, against the Jews. I am a member of this guilty nation. I am exerting what influence I have to see to it that this guilt is being atoned for. That the monstrous wrongs that have been done are being compensated for as far as one can undo wrongs of this kind.

"Thirteen years have passed since the end of the war. Today I am facing you also as a representative of what has been called Wirtschaftswunder—the German economic miracle. My own house is not much older than 10 years. It is part of this miracle. What, actually, is this economic miracle? I cannot say that it is the achievement of the German nation. The German nation did not exist any more after 1945. It had lost contact with its history. It also lost its faith. It continued to exist only as a conglomeration of individual beings, millions of them. Within each and every one of these millions amongst the rabble and the ruins the desire developed to once more have a roof over his head, a warm room for himself, food in his stomach and clothes to wear. For these aims all the German people have worked as hardy ever in history human beings have worked. The German economic miracle is the sum of these millions of individual determinations to rebuild the very means of existence. It did not arise from the idealism of a nation, it was fostered by materialistic aims and, it may be said, by the egotism of the individuals.

"That may be a negative view although this miracle has become visible in the form of new factories and skyscrapers of concrete and glass.

"I frankly express these things because I also have positive things to say about my

people. All of you have been able to see how reluctantly these people consider playing at soldiers again. You have been able to see how passionately these people have taken a stand against nuclear arms. The many recent trials, such as those of Ulm and Bayreuth, may serve you as evidence that today we bring to court those who were guilty in the past, so that guilt may be atoned for and justice done. I am especially satisfied that material compensation for the Jewish nation has been enacted and is being carried through. Western Germany has no radical right wing and no radical left wing any more; there is no radicalism in Germany. We want to live peacefully in partnership with other nations.

"It is not possible for a people to live for any length of time in the materialism of the economic miracle alone. That alone cannot satisfy its hunger. To work and to make money, to eat and to drink, to buy clothes and furniture, to build homes and to travel, all this will serve its purpose for a limited time only; one day it will fail to do so. A nation has its history and it cannot live without history.

"The German people have learned their lesson, and do not believe in nationalism any more. Nationalism is madness in a world in which continents are getting closer together every day. We believe in large federations. For our part, we believe in an all-European federation which we want to join as a serving, helping member, and also as a member doing its very best to compensate for past wrongs. We want to join this federation lock, stock and barrel. But we should be an empty and dangerous nothing, open to all dangerous influences, if we belonged to such a federation divided and without history, carrying with us nothing but our materialistic achievements."

The outlook and philosophy of so distinguished a German as Axel Springer does much to explain why the people of Germany—particularly the young student and intellectual classes—were quick and vigorous in their public condemnation of the anti-Semitic incidents.

Yet I share fully the wise and considered judgment of Phil Klutznick and his distinguished successor, Label Katz, when they echoed the appeal of responsible Germans themselves. That appeal was for understanding, and cooperation from our side of the Atlantic to help in the building of a democratic future for Germany. There is a great deal we can do. We can and should expand our cultural, educational and scientific exchanges with Germany. There may be some limited profits in our exchange programs with the Soviets. But, it's time we paid greater attention to those whose friendship for us is a lot clearer than anything we have seen from the Soviets. As a former newspaperman, I can understand why our press reserves its large displays of type and pictures for visitors from Russia. It's news when Khrushchev or any of his underlings has a kind word to say for us these days. But it seems to me that our public information media can make a useful contribution to strengthening ties with our friends by increasing coverage of those of our friends who are fighting the battle of democracy in the free world.

I should like now to report to you briefly some of the anxieties I found among our friends in Europe during a 2-months visit from which I returned this week. I had the privilege of talking with a number of the leading military and diplomatic personalities in NATO. Almost without exception, they are concerned over the possibility that we Americans are so occupied with Soviet missile gains that we may be overlooking dangerous Russian gains in another direction. They are concerned that the Russians may be palming off the fiction that Nikita Khrushchev is prepared to abandon

some, if not all, of the Marxist-Leninist doctrines for achieving Communist world dominion.

I found on all sides a good deal of anxiety over Soviet successes in exploiting the peaceful coexistence propaganda theme to persuade world opinion that the Communists are really interested in arriving at an equitable formula for reducing world armaments and establishing firm and workable atomic controls.

Many European leaders were specially troubled over the after effects of the Khrushchev visit to the United States. They are troubled by the possibility that this visit may have lulled American public opinion into an unjustified sense of assurance over the Soviets' readiness to relax their tough stand on the Berlin problem.

Let me say that I am the first to hope I will be proven completely wrong when I predict that no agreement will have been reached on effective disarmament and atomic control and inspection by the time the East-West summit conference convenes in May. But the facts about Soviet behavior in Geneva until now speak for themselves. This behavior has made it plain that any concessions in these areas by the Soviets will be tied to demands that the Western Powers capitulate on the issues of Berlin and German reunification.

After my talks in Europe, I am more convinced than ever that the decisive issues of the summit talks will be the preservation of Berlin's freedom and the start of realistic steps toward a solution of the problem of a divided Germany. We must stand fast by the Eisenhower-Dulles-Adenauer policy on Berlin. We must remember the lessons of Munich, Teheran, and Yalta. The freedom of Berlin is an essential underpinning in the security of the free world. If we yield an inch, we will surrender the last shred of our victory in World War II. The Korean war, too, will have been fought in vain. Above all, we will have surrendered our chance to leave a real legacy of freedom to future generations of mankind. I am confident that President Eisenhower understands better than anyone else that the maintenance of a strong and united Western alliance hinges on the exercise of firm U.S. leadership in standing by the Western commitment to preserve Berlin's freedom. But there can be no question that the task before him is a hard one. Khrushchev's repeated threats to turn over Russian controls in Berlin to the Communist puppets in East Germany hold no promise for a useful outcome of the Geneva meetings.

Certainly, we have gone out of our way to ease East-West tensions. We have met the Soviets more than halfway in the various exchange programs. Now we are being pressured for an expansion of trade. I have the feeling that we would be wise to follow a go-slow policy in this area—particularly at a time when, on the one hand, the Soviets complain about our refusal to grant them long-term credits, while, on the other hand, they boast of ample capital resources to permit them to extend long-term, low-interest loans to countries they have singled out for economic and political penetration. It would seem to me to be suicidal to take a course that would make available American dollars to underwrite the unshakable aims of Soviet imperialism.

A far better use of our money, it seems to me, would be to expand our people-to-people programs with non-Communist countries. We ought to pay more attention than we have to students and intellectuals of the Asian, African, and Latin American nations.

From their ranks have come many of the leaders of the newly emerging sovereignties. It is these classes that have been special targets of the Soviets for many years. The answer is to demonstrate through our educational and cultural exchange programs

that we are far more interested in advancing the welfare and dignity of the individual than in getting into political popularity contests with the Russians.

Here is a field that deserves increased attention to the part that the local community can play in broadening the effectiveness of people-to-people programs with an occasion such as the one that brings us together tonight can speak the essence of America with telling effect to any foreign visitor who has a chance to see it for himself. It is the kind of continuing process in community relations that takes place in hometowns throughout America. It can give foreign visitors the perspective they need to understand the essential values of our free society.

I thank you for the privilege of permitting me to join you in paying tribute to a young American who has given fine service to our Department of State and who represents so splendidly the future leadership of our communities and our country.

Above all I thank you for this chance to participate in another of the programs that has given the city of Scranton a unique status as a community where the ideals of brotherhood are translated into the fabric of daily living.

Who Will Be Next, After Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial reprinted from the Indianapolis Star for March 15, 1960:

WHO WILL BE NEXT, AFTER CASTRO?

The Castro government of Cuba has now seized four American-owned properties, three sugar mills and a railroad. Its so-called intervention of these properties is the prelude to outright nationalization. Under present Cuban law the Government can repay the American investors with 20-year bonds at 4½ percent—bonds which no doubt will be worthless.

This is only the latest of indignities heaped upon the U.S. Government and American citizens by this Communist led, Communist controlled government installed just 40 miles from our coast. Our Government has been falsely accused of bombing Cuban cities and canefields, of exploiting the Cuban people, of blowing up an ammunition ship, of every sort of heinous crime Castro and his Red henchmen can think up. We have been insulted, laughed at and threatened by this pipsqueak dictator.

Yet the Eisenhower administration still stands helplessly by, looking like a big, fat, and sloppy Uncle Sam while these attacks and depredations against us and our people continue. Our country has been made to look like a cowardly fool who can be abused and kicked at by any little bully boy that happens in the neighborhood.

It is clear that it will not be long before Castro, encouraged by the pusillanimous and inept policies of the President and Secretary of State, will soon demand the ouster of the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay. At the same time Castro is certain to go even further along the dangerous road of Soviet-Cuban political, diplomatic, and even military cooperation. Soviet diplomats are experts on secret international agreements, and a Soviet-Cuban friendship pact could well

have been signed during the recent Havana visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan.

This would be a direct violation of the American Monroe Doctrine which has been successful for over 100 years in keeping foreign domination away from this hemisphere. It will be a direct threat to the military security of this country. For should we lose the base at Guantanamo, and should a Soviet-Cuban cooperation agreement be a reality, the Soviet Union will have a fully equipped naval base at its disposal right under the shadow of our shores.

If the Government of the United States permits this situation to deteriorate any further the consequences will be the seizure of American property from Cuba to Argentina. Who will be next? The leftwing governments in Colombia and Venezuela are just waiting to see whether Castro can succeed before taking their turn at making the eagle squeak. If Castro gets away with his insults, his seizures of American property, his ousting of American business from Cuba, it will be only a matter of time before Venezuela and Colombia follow by seizing American oil which constitutes one of the largest oil reserves in the world, mostly developed by American investors.

It is long past time for the President to get up off of his easy chair and take a stand against this bush-faced dictator. His first move should be to reinforce the American naval base at Guantanamo with U.S. Marines. Second, he should tell Castro in plain words that the United States will look upon any co-operation agreement with the Soviet Union as a direct threat to the security of the United States and will take any necessary moves to prevent it. He should make it clear that this Government will use any measures in its power, military if necessary, economic or political, to insure the rights of American citizens in Cuba or American investors in Cuba. Diplomatic relations with the Cuban Government should be severed until the demands of American security are fulfilled. At the same time subsidy payments on sugar to the Castro government should be abolished forthwith.

This is a real and present danger to the people of the United States. It should be met with firmness and speed. Appeals to the Organization of American States for intervention are as fruitless as the Hungarian appeals to the United Nations for help. But we need no help. We have the power. The danger exists. It must be met and met now—before it is too late.

One Hundred and Twelfth Anniversary of Hungarian Revolution

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 15 marked the 112th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. It is fitting that we join with Americans of Hungarian descent and with freedom loving peoples everywhere in commemorating this date and in assuring those suffering behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten.

The brave people of Hungary have kept alive the spirit of freedom through the years of Communist oppression and enslavement. Their strong national feelings and their love of liberty, were dem-

onstrated clearly during the October 1956 revolution. Their spirit will not be broken in spite of the reign of terror which still prevails in their homeland.

The people of Hungary must not lose their determination to regain their independence, and their hope in the eventual liberation of their nation. Our Nation will continue to work toward this end through every peaceful means, and we hope that our efforts to this end will bring added courage to the Hungarian people and to the peoples of other Communist-dominated nations.

At Bat for Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 last I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial regarding the preservation of Gettysburg Battlefield as a national shrine, and as a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, which handles these appropriations, I made some clarifying statements regarding the present situation at Gettysburg.

There has been some very fine and complimentary reaction to my interest in perpetuating Gettysburg Battlefield in the best traditions of our American history, and to prevent commercial encroachment at this historic spot.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article from the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican, from the "Editorial Musings" of Mr. Walter S. Farquhar widely read columnist who is an authority on the history of Gettysburg and who has lectured many times on the subject. Mr. Farquhar's article follows:

AT BAT FOR GETTYSBURG

It was gratifying to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that our old friend, Dr. Ivor FENTON, is going to bat for Gettysburg.

Congressman FENTON, in urging against commercial encroachment, is acting in sympathy with many of his constituents in Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties. He might be surprised to know how much interest there is in Pottsville, Shenandoah, Mahanoy City, and other places.

This column, having read of desecration of the hallowed ground, was agreeably surprised to find, last November, that the trouble wasn't as bad as had been feared, though eternal vigilance may be necessary to prevent permanent defacement.

One of the bones of contention was a grade school built on the first day's battlefield, not far from Barlow's Knoll. It is on the battlefield, all right, but is small and does not change the aspect of 1863 greatly. Nearby is the Poor District building, just as it stood before the battle. That should be preserved.

We needed a guide to point out the automobile dump, after falling to find it. It is on Powers' Hill, considerably behind the Union battle line on Cemetery Ridge. There was no fighting on the site but it definitely is on

the battlefield and is of considerable historic value. It was there General Meade was forced to establish his headquarters, after being driven from two other sites by the Confederate cannonade which preceded Pickett's Charge. Meade, first was in the cottage of Lydia Leister, only about 200 yards back of the Union line. When the cottage became untenable he went back a little way to a barn, where his staff tried to carry on its work. But he soon had to vacate his new location, deciding to join Gen. Henry Slocum, commander of the 12th Corps, where the latter had established headquarters on Powers' Hill.

That is why Powers' Hill is historic. It marks one of the few times when a general commanding a whole army was forced to seek new headquarters, twice, because of the fierceness of artillery fire. The auto dump, not too large, ought to be moved from there.

In his speech, in the House of Representatives, Dr. FENTON brought out the fact that Gettysburg had lost an appropriation of \$450,000 because Adams County politicians were arguing about some aspects of the situation. The appropriation, then, was allocated to Bull Run, a place where the original appearance has been altered so greatly, it hardly can be recognized today, while Gettysburg retains its original appearance to a wonderful degree—for which reason it is the finest battlefield park in the world. It is something in which Pennsylvanians have reason to take pride.

Dr. FENTON states that the United States has spent \$3 million on Gettysburg in the last 10 years and proposes to allocate \$2,415,000 more, for the acquisition of 691 more acres, which will be expended as soon as Adams County officials set up adequate zoning regulations. He says, too, the Government is willing to trade some of its property for battlefield real estate which is of greater historical significance. He notes, too, that the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association is proceeding with a fund-raising plan to purchase additional land. The association appears to be a private one which has done a great deal for the historic site.

Gettysburg is the classic battle of the world because it offers more illustrative situations for study of military tactics than does any other site, for which reason even its approaches are of great value. One of the main strategic considerations was the excellent concentration of the Union Army, most of its units being below the Mason-Dixon Line when the battle was joined. For that reason the terrain is historic as far as Pipe Creek, in Maryland.

Present encroachment is not great, but commercialism always is rampant and often triumphant. If allowed to go unchecked, it may deface what every loyal American views as hallowed ground.

Pay for the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention that we must increase postal rates if we are to improve postal services and put the Department on a self-supporting basis. If users would pay their proper share it would benefit taxpayers, reduce our national debt, promote modernization, and help postal employees. I am inserting in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in last night's Washington Evening Star:

PAY FOR THE MAIL

Congress should forget its election-year coyness and authorize the postal rate increases recommended by President Eisenhower.

Failure to do so, in the face of an estimated \$554 million postal service deficit in fiscal 1961 under existing rates, would be completely irresponsible and an affront to budgetary good sense. Furthermore, it would amount to a violation of policy which Congress itself spelled out in 1958 to the effect that "rates should be adjusted whenever necessary to recover postal expenses."

The longtime failure, and it is primarily the fault of Congress, to put the Nation's postal service on something approaching a self-supporting basis has been a costly one to the taxpayers. As the President pointed out in his budget message, and again in his special message to the Congress last week, the cumulative postal deficit for 13 postwar years totaled \$6.8 billion—almost half the increase in the Federal debt during that same period. Interest charges alone on this \$6.8 billion fragment of the debt amount to \$200 million yearly.

Economies and improved efficiency in postal operations during the postwar years have been more than offset by two factors. One has been the vast increase in volume of mail. The other has been the steady rise in cost of virtually everything the Post Office Department uses or buys. Revenue-producing rates have not kept pace. Increases recommended at this time would apply to virtually every category of mail, but would raise by only 1 cent the basic charges on first class and airmail. The Department estimates that this increase on first-class letters, for example, would cost the average family only about \$1.80 yearly. In the long run, perpetuation of the deficit habit is apt to cost more—either in money or in deterioration of the service.

The Philippine Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. R. L. Pagula, Administrator, Sugar Quota Administration, Department of Commerce and Industry, Manila, Philippine Islands:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND
INDUSTRY, SUGAR QUOTA ADMINISTRATION,
Manila, March 10, 1960.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the sugarcane planters, millers and exporters of sugar from the Philippines to the United States, allow me to express my heartfelt appreciation for the inclusion in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, March 1, 1960, as an extension of your remarks, taking the cudgels for the Philippine sugar industry.

As you already know, the Sugar Quota Administration is the Government agency in

the Philippines charged with the duty of promoting and enhancing not only the interests and welfare of the Philippine sugar industry but more importantly the larger interests of the country as a whole. That is why, while our sugar industry will doubtless directly benefit from a share in the increased sugar consumption in the United States annually, the larger beneficiaries will ultimately be the people of my country through expanding employment opportunities, strengthening of our dollar reserves and stabilizing the general economic situation of the Philippines.

Based on the latest information at hand, we estimate that we will have available at the end of this crop year a surplus of about 400,000 short tons of sugar after meeting our regular export requirements in the United States and the world market as well as our domestic consumption. You can therefore see that the Philippines could supply any emergency need of the U.S. market to the extent of 400,000 short tons this year.

We have read with a great deal of interest the editorial appearing in the Journal of Commerce of New York, for February 17, 1960, entitled "Castro Shows the Way" as quoted in your extension of remarks. Since all the right thinking people anywhere will not feel glad over the fulminations of Dr. Castro against the U.S. Government, we as Christians cannot feel happy either when our neighbors go wrong. That is why, notwithstanding the current developments engendered by Dr. Castro's regime in Cuba, we hope the pleasant and States and Cuba in the past will eventually be restored. The Philippines only would want to receive from the United States what in justice belongs to it or to which it may be entitled. We do not like to be opportunistic nor rejoice over other people's misfortune, such as is now seemingly the lot of the Cuban people.

We are always cognizant of the unique relations that have existed between the United States and the Philippines for the past 60 years and are certainly glad to know that we can count on your friendship and support in time of our need. We hope that you will continue to bestow upon the Philippines your invaluable help in obtaining for our country its just share in the increased sugar consumption of the United States or at least in placing our country on an equal footing with the other foreign sugar suppliers in the United States.

Yours very truly,

R. L. PAGULA,
Administrator.

Purifying Democracy for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the key to all civil rights. The right of full and free expression through the ballot is long overdue on the American scene. The Congress has been debating the merits of the Celler bill, H.R. 8601, to enforce a citizen's constitutional rights. The Nation is deeply concerned with the progress of this all important bill. We are trying to bridge the gap between the pronouncements of our Declaration of Independence which declared that all

men are created equal and the practices of our everyday life which display discrimination and inequality.

Religious leaders have also spoken out on this very important subject. One of my constituents, Dr. Zev Zahavy, rabbi of the Congregation Zichron Ephraim, located at 163 East 67th Street, New York City, delivered a sermon on March 5, 1960, entitled "Purifying Democracy for Action." This sermon is a clear expression of viewpoint and a cogent call to action. I am certain that the readers will profit from its reading. The sermon follows:

The fate of a democracy is presumably in the hands of the voters. Through the free ballot, a majority may indicate its choice. Yet, one cannot help but wonder at the paradoxical nature of American democracy. There are certain inequities which defy the full expression of democracy on the American scene. These inequities exist above and below the surface of the American sociological fabric. Their religious significance and racial overtones call for analysis from the pulpit.

The right of full and free expression through the ballot is long overdue on the American scene. The time has come for a purification of American democracy. Biased practices now contaminating the American election process should be eliminated once and for all.

This noble Nation boasts of more than nine score years of democracy's heritage. Strange enough, though we have passed the halfway mark in an enlightened 20th century, the outmoded prejudices of the early Founding Fathers still await correction. In an era of advanced science and technology, American citizens going to the polls are still denied the right of direct ballot. The old-fashioned electoral system with its many potential inequities prevents Americans in this democracy of the United States from voting directly for the national candidate of their choice. Under the present system, it is even possible for a presidential candidate to receive a plurality of votes and yet suffer defeat at the hands of the electoral college.

The electoral system in national elections should be abolished immediately. It is a dangerous contaminating factor and only its complete elimination will help to purify American democracy. Present-day citizens are certainly mature enough to exercise their will at the polls through a direct vote.

The poll-tax system in some States is a blight upon the concept of democracy. Every citizen deserves the right to exercise a free indiscriminate vote. The poll tax, with its clearly racial designs, has contaminated American democracy long enough. Its elimination is vital if this Nation desires to claim the highest refinement of democracy before the court of world opinion.

Are candidates for public office to be selected on the basis of their qualifications alone? The time is at hand when an individual should have the right to seek office regardless of sex, race, or creed. The undercurrent of popular prejudice in connection with the election of a President of these United States is a blemish on our democracy. There is no reason why a woman should be barred from this high office, simply because it is unprecedented for a member of the female sex to occupy the presidency. Neither should religious prejudice bar an able candidate from election. If a Roman Catholic seeks the presidency, he should be judged on the basis of his record, qualifications, and policies, not on the basis of religion.

Similarly, if an able American citizen of another race indicates the ability to hold public office, his election should not be prejudiced because of his color.

The unwritten law of politicians demanding that an American presidential candidate be a white, male, Protestant Mason, should be repealed in the minds of Americans who seek to strengthen and purify the fabric of this democracy. By refining the impurities and by removing the contaminating factors, American democracy may become the model to inspire all nations in a promising free world.

The State Versus Alice Marie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, are there any practical limits to the absurdities which will be undertaken in the name of officialdom? Some of us who wonder periodically about this question were again discouraged by a recent story of an adoption case in New Jersey.

I believe the column by John Ackelmire, which follows as it appeared in the Indianapolis News on March 12, reflects the feelings of so many Americans who have seen theories replace feelings and regulations supersede hearts as government activity has become more and more entangling. We have been encouraged to learn in the meantime that little Alice Marie will be able to stay in the home which love has made for her and which will surely be a better stimulus for her exceptional intelligence than the greatest of libraries and museums pervaded by an antiseptic chill.

The article follows:

THE STATE VERSUS ALICE MARIE—A TEST CASE FOR 1984?

(By John Ackelmire)

I am not a member of any organized political party; I am a Sorehead. In nearly four decades of varying degrees of political awareness, I often have felt like the lady who said of the 1948 presidential election: "Thank God, only one of them can win."

But if I were a political candidate, or a political manager, or a political manipulator, I should take the case of Alice Marie Combs and squeeze every last drop of vote-getting advantage out of it.

Here is a case made to order for the human heart. At the same time it presents in understandable everyday terms the epic struggle of our age—the struggle of the individual and the family unit against Mass Man, that mythical beneficiary of the ugly, faceless superstate.

Most readers are aware of the case of Alice Marie. At 4 she is the central figure in a deeply significant legal tussle now in the hands of a three-judge superior court panel in Trenton, N.J.

Alice is a foster child technically under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Board of Child Welfare. But since infancy she has been in all but a biological and legalistic sense the very real daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Combs, of Old Bridge, N.J.

This drama of the individual versus the superstate reached its denouement after the Combses sought to adopt Alice.

The board said no. It said the Combses are not fit culturally or financially to develop the child's abilities.

Although she does not know it in her innocent joy and the security of a happy home with loving foster parents, Alice has a near-genius intelligence-quotient rating.

The board's social workers, psychologists and assorted worrywarts do not claim there is anything really wrong with the Combses. They are decent, honorable citizens. He earns about \$120 a week, and they have a \$17,000 home.

But, a board report states, the couple appears "to have little cultural interests." Too much television, not enough books.

A sociologists said Alice's superior mind "unfolding in a process of maturation requires a wealthy educational environment and cultural predilections so that she can profit from these experiences."

In short, jerk the child from the home she knows and loves, place her with some rich strangers, and maybe she can learn to talk the same sort of mumbo-jumbo as that sociologist. She may not be happy but she will be glib.

The board evidently is not too concerned about the emotional warp that might result from such a move; it simply wants Alice to have better blue gowns and more culture.

So here it is. The State of New Jersey versus Alice Marie Combs, age 4. A sort of test case for the all-powerful Big Brotherhood foreseen, too prophetically, I fear, by George Orwell in his famous novel, "1984."

The individual means nothing; the family unit means nothing; love and warm sentiment mean nothing.

The state—ah, the state means everything. Bow down to the State, you craven nobodies, you nothings, you expendable ants of shared labor.

Yes, if I were an antistatist politician, I'd try to make something of the Alice Marie Combs case.

One might start out by checking into the cultural and financial credentials of quite a few Americans who served their country, their world and their God far above and beyond the capacity of most persons with inherited wealth and silverspoon educations. Abe Lincoln and Tom Edison come swiftly to mind. The list could be expanded indefinitely.

And, then, there was a Man whose parents, by all accounts, were miserably poor and probably lagged shockingly in the cultural attainments that seem so important to the New Jersey Board of Child Welfare.

Before the Roman superstate washed its hands and the mob lynched this Man, He spoke often to the multitudes of love and of little children—but never, so far as is known, of IQ ratings.

Prayers for Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Friday, March 11, 1960:

PRAYERS FOR SLOVAKIA

On March 14, 1939, Slovakia was proclaimed an independent state under the tremendous pressures and confusion prevailing in that troubled era. In anticipation of the 21st anniversary of this declaration of independence, Americans of Slovak extraction in northeastern Pennsylvania and

in many sections of the country will offer prayers and supplications at special masses in their churches on Sunday, asking God to deliver the land of their forefathers from the Red tyranny and to grant those who are carrying on in the old country under the most difficult circumstances the grace of perseverance until their suffering comes to an end.

It is understandable that in Luzerne County, where the first Slovak Roman Catholic church in America was established and where such an outstanding churchman as the late Reverend Joseph Murgas labored, the observance of this milestone should take on a religious flavor.

With the demise of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in 1939, Slovakia declared its independence. For 6 short years, it maintained a precarious existence and then it was overrun by the Soviet Union which formally set up a Communist "republic" in 1948.

So the Iron Curtain was rung down on Slovakia with incredible hardships and privations for the 4 million natives, persisting to this day. The outside world can only guess at what has happened there, but obviously these persecuted people, harrassed on so many sides, have suffered a great deal. When it will end is anybody's guess, but many will share the hopes of some 50,000 Americans of Slovak extraction locally that the liberation of the land of their forefathers and the restoration of peace with liberty and justice will not be postponed too long.

The Rosemary Johnson Case and the Governor of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on February 29 I brought to the attention of the Members the shocking story of the Rosemary Johnson case and the part played in it by the Governor of West Virginia. I am now inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mr. V. L. Martin, of Mount Hope, W. Va., to the editor of the Beckley Post Herald, giving Mr. Martin's views on the Governor's reaction to my remarks:

OUR READERS SPEAK

V. L. MARTIN.

Mount Hope, W. Va., March 2, 1960.

EDITOR, BECKLEY POST HERALD,
Beckley, W. Va.

DEAR EDITOR: Referring to the news item "Underwood Scores Lawmaker Critical of Rosemary Case," in which Gov. Cecil H. Underwood suggested that the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, should tend to the business of representing his constituents and leave West Virginia affairs alone, of course that is Mr. Underwood's own private opinion, however, as a citizen of West Virginia and knowing that thousands of our West Virginians owe their very existence to the economic progressiveness of the State of Ohio and having full knowledge of the desperate situation in West Virginia it would appear that the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS would have time to spare from his constituents and certainly West Virginia stands in need of outside help.

In his public expression the Governor emphasized that because Representative

HAYS did not see eye-to-eye with the Governor in the Rosemary case, that the Representative is a demagog. It should be pointed out to the Governor that by this measure multiplied thousands of his West Virginia citizens are demagog and the Governor may be looking to these "demagog" for his support to the office of U.S. Senator.

Yours very truly,

V. L. MARTIN.

Baring Calls on Secretary of Commerce To Cause Resignation of Those Who Are Responsible for Issuance of False Technical Data by the Bureau of Public Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an extract of a certain document dated October 16, 1959, and certain relevant letters of a subsequent exchange between Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, and me. These letters previously have not been released. These items studied in context reveal more clearly the gravity of the highway program scandal, the fact that parties ranking the Bureau of Public Roads know about the unrefuted charge of issuance of false technical data by the Bureau of Public Roads in the Reno matter and have not acted to cause resignation from office of those officials and engineers who are responsible for the falsification, the magnitude of the task which must be accomplished by the John A. Blatnik Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, and the degree to which the interstate highway program administration has eroded the moral fiber of the American people. I now wish to insert in the RECORD the relevant extract of a document signed by Walter S. BARING, Congressman for Nevada, dated October 16, 1959, and sent on October 22, 1959, to Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, and acknowledged by the Secretary, and the letter of November 4, 1959, from Frederick H. Mueller which dates the acknowledgement. Continuing the letter exchange, on January 27, 1960, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Commerce now appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1960, pages A963 and A964. In that letter to Mr. Mueller I showed conclusively that the Bureau of Public Roads did falsify pertinent technical information in presenting its side of the picture to the John A. Blatnik special subcommittee investigating the selection of the routing of the interstate freeway system from the California State line through Reno and Sparks to Vista, Nev. I now wish to insert in the RECORD the unresponsive answer Mr. Mueller sent me on February 18, 1960, and the letter

I addressed to Mr. Mueller on March 9, 1960, in which I set forth that it appears incumbent on the Secretary of Commerce to cause the resignation from office of those officials and engineers who are responsible for the falsification of technical and economic fact. The extract of document and letters follow:

RELEVANT EXTRACT OF A DOCUMENT SIGNED BY
WALTER S. BARING, CONGRESSMAN FOR NEVADA, DATED OCTOBER 16, 1959, AND SENT ON OCTOBER 22, 1959, TO FREDERICK H. MUELLER, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, AND ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE SECRETARY
NEVADA

The President, the Members of Congress, my constituents, and the American public at large know that for more than 2 years I have been opposing efforts by the Bureau of Public Roads and the methods employed by it to bisect downtown Reno with a Third Street interstate route which would cause irreparable damage to Reno's industrial growth.

The people of Reno sense that the planning and geometric design standards demanded by the Bureau of Public Roads for the Third Street route will permanently injure Reno, yet these people and the Congress of the United States have been confronted with the presentation of false data by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Public resentment against the Third Street route caused the House Subcommittee on the Reno Interstate Highway to hold hearings in Reno on February 24, 25, and 26, 1959, as reported in "House Report No. 292," April 23, 1959.

As shown on page 10 of that report, the Bureau of Public Roads submitted a 4.6 benefit-cost ratio for the Third Street route and only a 1.1 benefit-cost ratio for the North Rim route.

The North Rim route is important because the people of Reno believe it would spare their city and they have asked its adoption as opposed to the Third Street route.

Analysis of the data on page 10 of the report, on the map in the report, and in "Road User Benefit Analyses for Highway Improvements," American Association of State Highway Officials, reprinted April 1957, reveals that the 4.6 benefit-cost ratio for the Third Street route is false, as it derives from a necessarily implied assumption that operating costs on the present streets and Highway Route 40 exceed 18.8 cents per mile, which is false.

The Bureau of Public Roads, by its presentation of this false information before the House subcommittee in favor of the Third Street route which the Bureau had approved, has influenced the judgment of the Congress of the United States in a manner to deprive the people of Reno of the effectiveness of their constitutional right for a redress of grievances.

Elsewhere than in Nevada I learn the citizens have found the Bureau of Public Roads at work with State highway departments and their consultants to force unwarranted highway construction upon the public.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., November 4, 1959.
HON. WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I have received your note of October 22, 1959, and the accompanying papers. We have discussed the materials with the Federal Highway Administrator and will consider them in our future administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

With respect to the situation in Reno, we have approved the Third Street Route

as requested by State officials. It is our belief that the initiative for any change lies with the State government.

I appreciate very much your courtesy in sending me the materials on the administration of the highway program.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1960.
Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: This is in reply to your two communications dated January 27 and February 3 concerning the location of the interstate route in the Reno-Sparks area in Nevada.

The Bureau of Public Roads has authorized the State of Nevada to acquire the right-of-way on the section of this interstate route extending from the California State line eastward to Lawton, Nev. One parcel was authorized on November 7, 1958, and the remainder on October 30, 1959.

In your letter of January 27 you discuss the calculation of the benefit-cost ratio used in justifying the Third Street Route. This ratio was computed on the basis of standard procedures which have been developed by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the States, and which are published and available to any interested person. The factors developed in the Reno case are not substantially different from those in many other urban route studies in all parts of the country.

The benefit-cost ratio is used as an objective guide to engineering judgment, but was not the sole basis for the decision on the Third Street Route. There was in addition to considerable volume of engineering and traffic studies which took into account local conditions. All of this material was available to the State highway department, and the county and city governing bodies in their decision to recommend this route to the Bureau of Public Roads, after consultation in detail with the Bureau on the same basis as is done on other projects throughout the country.

All of the pertinent materials and records were made available to the Blatnik subcommittee and evaluated by that group. In all our highway work we deal with objective data which are developed and presented to us by State officials, who in turn deal with local governing bodies. In the Reno case all the responsible governing bodies have been informed and have participated in the interstate route location, and the decision that was made has not been changed by them.

We have been requested by the House Public Works Committee to express our views on your bill, H.R. 9802, which would prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds on the Third Street routing. We shall present our views to the committee in the near future. Generally, this Department does not favor legislation dealing with specific routes, believing that such matters should be handled through the authorities of the States acting in cooperation with the Federal Government as provided in the present law.

We realize that in matters of individual route location there is room for disagreement. We feel that our policy of using objective criteria and continued cooperation with the duly constituted State and local authorities will provide the best means of appraising the issues involved in route location.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1960.
Re issuance of false technical data by the Bureau of Public Roads.
Mr. FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge your letter of February 18, 1960.

Thank you for the information that the Bureau of Public Roads—a bureau of your Department—"has authorized the State of Nevada to acquire (the remainder on October 30, 1959 of) the right-of-way on the section of this interstate route extending from the California State line eastward to Lawton, Nev."

The Bureau of Public Roads made this authorization after I sent to you on October 22, 1959, in a document dated October 16, 1959, a charge that the Bureau of Public Roads did falsify pertinent technical information in presenting its side of the picture to the John A. Blatnik subcommittee investigating the selection of the routing of the Interstate Freeway System from the California State line through Reno and Sparks to Vista, Nev.

This matter is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 4, 1960, pages A963, A964.

To date, my charge has been accepted without objection.

I am not discussing whether the 4.6 benefit-cost ratio assigned by the Bureau of Public Roads to the Third Street Route in Reno "was computed on the basis of standard procedures which have been developed by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the States, and which are published and available to any interested person."

I am not now discussing the issue of route location.

I am discussing the issuance of false technical data by the Bureau of Public Roads.

If my charge remains unrefuted, it appears incumbent upon you to cause the resignation from office of those officials and engineers who are responsible for the falsification of technical and economic fact.

On February 4, 1960, I wrote a letter to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-aid highway program, which contained the following paragraphs:

"Misstatement of technical or economic fact is almost invariably a necessary first step to collusion and fraud.

"Do you believe payment of Federal appropriation or aid funds should be withheld from any agency at any level of Federal, State, county, or local administration as long as any revealed falsifier continues to hold office in the agency or continues to advise the agency as a consultant?"

The continuing viability of the United States of America depends on the furnishing of accurate technical and economic fact to public bodies by constituted authorities and their consultants.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

A Canadian Looks at Our Growth Mania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor from the Wall Street Journal of February 29, 1960:

CURB ON GOVERNMENT

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your excellent editorial in the February 11 issue, "How To Play 'Grow'," reminded me of the cartoon you carried some weeks ago. This showed two Senators back-dropped by the Capitol with one Senator saying to the other, "Honestly now, wouldn't you sooner be President than right?" I think that deep down all the members of the "growth-by-Government" club would sooner be President than right.

Reduced to fundamentals, the idea of growth-by-Government is absurd. It is self-evident that the Government can only give what it has already taken away. That is to treat it with magnanimity. In practical reality the Government can only give a great deal less than what it has already taken away due to the immense burden of the national debt and other costs of Government. Thus the Government takes from the economy purchasing power equal to the total tax collected and returns to it an amount which has been reduced by the interest on the national debt and the other costs of Government administration. The thing I can't see is how that can possibly cause any overall growth. Industrial and administrative productivity and market demand would seem to me to be more fundamental to growth and yet such words are never mentioned by our learned friends.

History itself proves that growth-by-Government is nonsense. Roosevelt's "spend ourselves rich" presidential campaign was nothing but a vote-getting gimmick, albeit mighty successful as a vote getter. Although much humanitarian legislation was passed in the hungry thirties during Roosevelt's Presidency it was certainly not the Government spending which brought the country back to prosperity. Prosperity returned because of the underlying economic forces and the world crisis of World War II.

The best thing the Government can do to spur economic growth is to leave the purchasing power and the money where it rightfully belongs, in the pocket of the American citizen.

R. G. ROSE.

WILLOWDALE, ONTARIO.

Duncan C. Taylor, Top Executive in Eberhard Faber Pencil Co., Promoted to Rank of Colonel in U.S. Marine Corps Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Wednesday, March 9, 1960:

COLONEL TAYLOR'S PROMOTION

Promotion of Duncan C. Taylor, an executive of the Eberhard Faber Pencil Co. at Mountaintop and a resident of White Haven, to the rank of colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve is impressive recognition for a man who has served his country with distinction in peace and war.

Colonel Taylor emerged from the Second World War with an outstanding record of service in the Pacific where the corps wrote many stirring chapters in its brilliant history, spanning almost two centuries. It is easier to understand the achievements of the Marine Corps in the conflict against Japan when the service of men with the background, resolution, courage and qualities of leadership Colonel Taylor possesses is considered.

Colonel Taylor, despite the demands upon him by Eberhard Faber and the United States Trademark Association, of which he also is director and member of the executive committee, still devotes considerable time to the Marine Corps as administrative officer for a volunteer training unit under the jurisdiction of the Fourth Marine Corps Reserve with headquarters in Philadelphia. It is reassuring to his fellow countrymen to know that men of Colonel Taylor's caliber continue to share their talents with a branch of the service that is a part of our first line of defense.

Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a statement by Mr. Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

Mr. Heinkel is head of one of the largest State farm cooperatives and is one of the ablest farm leaders in the Nation.

In stressing the need for sound and effective farm legislation at this session of Congress he explains:

Long-range farm legislation is highly desirable and should have urgent attention but unless emergency legislation is enacted now, applying to 1960, and becomes effective at an early date, many farmers will not be around to participate in a long-range program.

Many farmers are facing bankruptcy. Many others have taken or are seeking off-the-farm jobs for which they are unsuited, untrained, and unskilled. Many farm wives have been forced into urban employment to the neglect of their homes and families. As the economic crisis deepens throughout rural America not only farmers but many small businessmen and small rural communities, who also depend directly upon farm income for their support, are losing hope for the future.

Provisions spending bills for the disposal of present Government stocks, and long-term objectives for the commodities covered would in my opinion be very desirable for the future welfare of American agriculture. However, I do not believe they provide the pricing help needed now.

The proposals in effect provide that by agreement the farmer to reduce his production of feed units for 1960, 1961, and 1962 not to exceed 33 1/4 percent for any one year, would receive from Government stock feed units equivalent to such reduction.

The farmer's incentive for this reduction would be about 33 1/4 percent of his production without production cost. However, for the 3 years 1960, 1961, and 1962 there would be available for marketing or feeding ap-

proximately the same tonnage of feed grains as produced over the past 5 years. Therefore, prices received by farmers could be expected to decline even further for this period.

From reports I am receiving daily from farmers, bankers, production credit associations and others, I am genuinely concerned that very few farmers can stand even 1 or 2 more years of our present price situation in agriculture.

If such proposals could be amended to provide for deficiency payments for the transition period of 1960, 1961, and 1962, with such payments on all farm products and being based on previous years' average market prices in each case, it could be the basis for solving our long-range problems in agriculture and saving thousands of family farmers from bankruptcy in the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, my office is receiving from day to day an unprecedented number of letters from farmers who, due to the low price of farm products and the high price of everything entering into their cost of production, are unable to meet their bills and who can not borrow from the local bank, or the Farm and Home Administration or the local production credit association enough money to put in their crops and feed their livestock during the coming spring.

It is to be hoped that, as Mr. Heinkel proposes, prompt action can be taken at this session of Congress to meet this pressing situation.

Time is running out.

Why not spend a little less time on politics and do something for the farmer and the country?

Air Force Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this morning the U.S. Air Force honored the Committee on Science and Astronautics by presenting it with the official Air Force flag. The presentation was made by Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in the presence of committee members and Air Force Under Secretary Joseph V. Charyk. I should like at this point to include my remarks, made in acceptance of the flag on behalf of the committee:

Mr. Secretary, General White, distinguished guests, and members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I want to thank you, and each of you, and the Air Force generally, for this beautiful official flag of the U.S. Air Force. It is a gift to the committee and will stand in its proper place in a proud position here in this committee room throughout the long, and I believe, glorious, career of this new standing committee of the Congress of the United States.

The Air Force is the youngest department of the Department of Defense. In a few short years, however, it has built for itself an enviable position in the minds of the people of the United States and a glorious

history because of its fine accomplishments and outstanding achievements.

I can recall when the Air Force was a part of the Signal Corps. Later on, it expanded the bonds which held the Air Force tightly within the confines of the Signal Corps and it became the Air Corps, with its own organization and with its own command. The day came when those with imagination conceived the idea that the Air Force should be a coequal part of the armed services along with the Army and the Navy—brothers in arms in joint defense of the United States. This seemed a simple matter to most of us but others in Congress did not agree. A bitter fight ensued, but out of the smoke of battle and out of the travail of our efforts came this great patriotic and defense organization known as the Air Force.

This fact alone did not make the Air Force a coequal branch in the Defense Department. On the contrary, the Army and the Navy both had academies to teach their young officers all the routine and the knowledge of their own branches. The Air Force had none. I am proud to say, Mr. Secretary and Members, that I was one of those who introduced a bill to establish an Air Force Academy. True, Mr. Secretary, I had in mind that the Academy would be located in Louisiana—that is really the best place for it—but instead it went to Colorado and it is now performing its appointed task of turning out graduates for commissions in the Air Force. At this time, there are other jobs to be done—not major ones, but minor fringe-types to round out the Air Force into a well-ordered, well-organized, coequal branch of the Department of Defense. I am not going to go into that matter here. It is not the proper place, it is not the proper time for a presentation of such a discussion. In the final analysis, the Air Force can continue to function in a manner which is the pride of the people of the United States.

Since World War I almost on every field of battle, members of the Air Force have actively participated and by their gallantry brought glory to this banner. They have been rugged, vigorous, brave, and patriotic persons who have been willing to die—and many have died—in the defense of this banner.

Of course, therefore, Mr. Secretary and General White, we are proud of this flag—proud that it will belong to this committee and will have a proper place in this committee room where all who come to help us in the work of legislating within our jurisdiction may see it and glory in the fact that men like you and others have given unstintingly of their time and talent in their efforts to help this committee chart a direct course in this new field, so that that banner may be held aloft with pride and conviction.

Let me again thank you, Mr. Secretary and General White, that your kindness has brought you here this morning and for your interest in our committee and for your patriotism and devotion to our membership.

The Blessing of Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every student, parent, and educator in the United States should read

the following address by Hon. Sam Pettengill:

[From the Vermont Academy Bulletin, June 1957]

THE BLESSING OF STRUGGLE

(By the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, V.A., 1904, delivered at the ceremony of induction of new members of the cum laude society, Sunday evening, May 24, 1957)

When I got through Vermont Academy, college and law school, I played a good deal of chess while waiting for clients who were bold enough to let me practice on them.

Chess, as some of you know, is the most difficult of all games. The combinations and permutations on the chessboard run into the octillions and no man ever has, or ever will completely master it.

Chess masters are relative only to other players. Nevertheless they are remarkable men. One of several I got to know was Emmanuel Lasker, of Berlin, Germany, who had been world's champion for 24 years. He was not a mental freak. He had a doctor of philosophy in mathematics and wrote a profound book on philosophy. In addition, he was a kind and gentle man—then in his sixties.

We got him to come to my hometown of South Bend to put on an exhibition match with some 30 local players. At supper that night, we asked this grand master why he had given so much of his life to chess.

He said: "The chessboard is a symbol of life—of all life. The essence of life is struggle. Take struggle out of chess, or out of life, and what is left? In chess I have found happiness."

That was 35 years ago. I have never forgotten his words and have often said to young parents, "Don't take struggle out of your children's lives."

The instinct of fathers and mothers is to do just that—to make life easier for my boy than it was to me. It is interesting to note that youth is sounder in this matter than age. Youth revels in competitive sport, whether to do something better than his fellows, or to beat some previous record.

Even small children, when they invent games of their own, always put struggle into them.

Struggle is a blessing to be sought for, not an evil to be avoided.

We have met tonight to honor those who have won the honor of a cum laude student. But honors are silly toys, unimportant in themselves, important only as evidence of something well done. Those of you who did not win had the struggle as well as the winners—which is the thing that counts.

So I congratulate both the winners and those who tried but did not win. I know who is going to get the big rewards of life.

In recent years, society has gone nuts on the pusillanimous cult of security, guaranteed by Government; in short, a nation of parasites. The illusion of the age is that people can vote themselves rich. It is a superstition that social security depends on the promises of politicians; not on the character, competence, and courage of men. It is a fable and a fraud that the output of society can be greater than the input of individuals.

It is a universal complaint that nobody wants to work any more, or only enough to get by. Employers are frantic for dependable employees. Labor unions have the laudable desire to improve the position of their members, but they overplay this hand when they say "Stretch it out." Take it easy. Do no more than enough to stay on the payroll.

When young people apply for their first job, they ask, "When will I begin to draw a pension? How many coffee breaks in a

day? How many holidays? How long and frequent are the paid vacations? And if I work more than 40 hours in the 144 hours in 6 days, do I get time and a half?"

The young men who ask none of these questions are sure to get and hold a job. In fact, this sort of young men have a golden age ahead of them. They will have less competition than that kind of men have ever had—and greater rewards.

When I was at Vermont Academy, Theodore Roosevelt was President. He attracted national attention when he said: "I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life." He said of himself, let me wear out, not rust out. He told young men to hit the line hard. He told women not to shirk their prime function to bear children. He said this at a time when any woman who had more than two children was considered subhuman, if not a little indecent.

Theodore Roosevelt dreamed nobly of his country, and by the fire of his example, lit other fires in millions of homes. It was said that Washington founded the Nation, Lincoln saved it, and T. R. revitalized it. He appealed to the strong side of men as is now done chiefly by marine sergeants and the coaches of athletics like my old friend, Knute Rockne.

"Rock" had no use for "lounge lizards" or "tea hounds" on a college campus. Youth liked that. They flocked to Notre Dame to play under Rockne, and when his players were behind at the end of the first half, they proceeded to pull the game out of the fire because "we can't let 'Rock' down."

A century ago, Italy was under foreign rule. It was then that Mazzini, or was it his fellow patriot, Garibaldi? appealed to the strong side of men with these words: "Young men of Italy, I offer you nothing but the water of the streams as your drink. I offer you nothing but black bread as your food, and nothing but the blue canopy of heaven and the lights of the eternal stars as your covering at night. But if you follow me, young men of Italy, you and I will be free."

They followed and Italy became a republic.

But today, the general appeal is to the soft side of men—envy, self-pity, covetousness, class hatred. Our elections have become auctions in which rival politicians of both the old parties out-bid each other by opening the door of the treasury in exchange for votes.

"Could and get it" is the slogan as people become the vandals of their own country and "bread and circuses" the formula for political advancement.

In the educational field, men like John Dewey have tried to eliminate struggle from the classroom. No required subjects! No examinations. They develop inferiority complexes, rather than the challenge to do better. Never punish a child. Children should be wholly free. And so forth. With the result that employers despair because Johnny can't read and Mabel can't spell.

So we have cities with few citizens, but many who wish to share the blessings of liberty, but shirk its burdens.

This is not the spirit of 1776, nor of the great chess master, nor of Theodore Roosevelt. America needs a rebirth of "the strenuous life" and I know I am talking to young men who will take their part in it.

It was said of those who crossed the Appalachians down into the valleys of the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Missouri and pushed the frontiers of freedom to the Pacific shore that the cowards never started and the weak never arrived. With no capital save courage and no resource except resourcefulness they built the American empire.

Here are the hundreds of miles of stone walls of Vermont—every stone dug from the ground and moved to where it now lies by ox power and human muscle alone. We think

of the pyramids of Egypt, and the tens of thousands of slaves who dragged the huge stones across the desert under the whips of their masters. It is my guess that the stone walls of Vermont represent more toil than the pyramids. But the walls were laid by the free choice of freemen. They scorned delights and lived laborious days.

It is good to have a school for young men in sight of those stone walls.

Avoid struggle, and life becomes sterile, vapid, and meaningless. Our mental hospitals are being filled with thousands of neurotics, many of whom feel inadequate to meet life because they were protected from taking the bumps in childhood.

No man was ever greater than the difficulties he overcame. Great difficulties, great men. Small difficulties, small men. From struggle comes strength, and physical and mental health.

It is only struggle that calls forth hidden powers we do not know we have. The great psychologist, William James, said the average person does not put forth more than 10 percent of his potential.

Let me tell you a story of my great grandfather Peter Pettengill, who came to Vermont in 1787. One time his hired man was chopping down trees in the virgin forest and did not come to the house at noon for lunch. My great grandfather went to see what was wrong. He found that a tree had fallen on the hired man and killed him. With nothing but the strength of his own powerful body, Peter lifted the tree off the dead man and carried him to the house.

Whence came his strength to do that? From the challenge before him. That tree was never cut into timber or firewood. It lay where it fell. Other strong men in the neighborhood came and tried to lift the tree. They could not. Why? Because they did not have the incentive that Peter had. Nor could Peter himself ever lift the tree again. The incentive was gone.

You have all seen athletes at times play over their heads. Why? Because of the challenge and its acceptance.

It is men who have counted struggle as a blessing who get the big rewards of life. As Emerson said, God keeps an honest account with men.

The hard surgical cases, where life hangs on a heartbeat, do not go to the dilettante surgeon. The tough engineering problem, like building a bridge across a mighty river, does not go to the engineer who has always looked for the easy jobs. And the same for lawyers, and top executives in business.

If at times you feel that you did not have the same chance that others have, ask yourself what chance did Abraham Lincoln have? Remember that "it is not so much the size of the dog in the fight that counts, but the size of the fight in the dog."

You young men face a time of struggle with an enemy of your country more dangerous than King George III in 1776—the godless Caesars of atheistic communism. Face up to it. Lick it. Put it and all its teaching out of our schools, churches, public affairs, and private life. What our fathers bequeathed us is still the last best hope of earth. Save it for your boys and girls.

Remember robust Robert Browning: "I count life just a stuff to try the soul's strength on, educe the man."

Remember Tennyson's "Ulysses" and the old Greeks "who ever with a frolic welcome took the thunder and the sunshine"—the hard hours with the same zest as the pleasant ones.

Remember the poem of the frontier:

"I dream no dream of a nursemaid state,
That spoons me out my food.

No, the stout heart sings in its strife with fate,
For the toil and the sweat are good."

Adenauer Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this visit of Chancellor Adenauer to President Eisenhower, it would seem appropriate to express the great satisfaction that we all feel on the continuing close cooperation between the people of West Germany and the people of the United States. It is a source of satisfaction to realize that both countries have been able to change from former enmity of a few years ago to the firm friendship which now exists. Today West Germany is the keystone of the North Atlantic Alliance on the continent of Europe. During the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held in Washington last fall, to which I was a delegate representing the United States, it was a heartwarming and satisfying experience to participate with the West German delegates in our deliberations. West Germany is a pillar of strength to the allies in their uncompromising stand against communism. On the freedom of West Berlin, Chancellor Adenauer sets the tone for the whole free world. We honor him for his leadership and his heroic stand.

West Germany has taken a prominent lead in the new European economic groupings which are resulting in freer trade and greater economic prosperity to Western Europe.

To a country which had just suffered the greatest devastation in her history, the achievement of such a prosperity as she has never before known is largely due to the inspired leadership of this great Chancellor.

America has many historical ties with Germany. The first large unit of German settlers, who arrived in America in 1683, under the leadership of Franz Pastorius founded Germantown, Pa. To this body belongs the honor of having published the first formal protest in this country against slavery.

Among the recent great of our Nation of German ancestry, Generals Wedemeyer, Stratemyer, Kreuger, Spaatz, and Admiral Nimitz come to mind. One of the founders of our country was General Von Steuben who offered his services to General Washington as a volunteer during the War of Independence. He served as Inspector-General of the Continental Army and trained the colonial troops at Valley Forge. Of all the foreign officers who served in the Continental Army, he alone remained to become an American citizen. In his honor a great society exists today which bears his name. The members of the Steuben Society of America are American Citizens of Germanic origin dedicated to the principles of duty, justice, charity, and tolerance. It endeavors to instruct its members in their rights, duties, and obli-

gations as citizens so that they may exercise their right to vote with intelligence, and symbolizes the bond that exists between the people of the United States and the people of West Germany.

Highway Research Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following informative address by Mr. Fred Burggraf, director, Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

HIGHWAY RESEARCH ACTIVITIES¹

(By Fred Burggraf)

This is a most opportune time to give you a review of highway research activities, as just last Friday we concluded the largest and most successful annual meeting in the 39-year history of the board. The attendance at this meeting was approximately 2,600 with representatives from practically every State in the Union, from many of the Provinces of Canada and from over a score of other foreign countries. There were a total of 222 formal technical papers and reports presented along with 49 informal papers at 55 sessions during the week. I could easily devote the time allotted me on this program to reviewing briefly the highlights of this annual meeting, but outside of referring later in the paper to some of the presented items of special interest to this group I will now discuss the broad concept of the increasing rate that highway research is playing in highway transportation affairs.

Highway transportation has become a part of the American way of life. Our economic structure is dependent on it and it is interwoven into the fabric of our society.

Highway transportation has played a great role in making possible the high level of economic activity and the social and cultural benefits the Nation now enjoys, but with it have come problems of great magnitude and far-reaching effects. Some have been or are being solved; others demand solution now, or are still emerging. Their solution will come through research, just as research in the past has developed the policies and practices we now accept as routine.

In pursuance of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the highway research board, a special committee on highway research priorities was established during the past year. To aid the committee in its assigned task of reviewing research needs, estimating costs and establishing priorities, it first sought the advice and recommendations of all project and special committees of the highway research board. These committees include highway officials and engineers and representatives of industry, universities, and associations. Each committee was requested to supply in uniform manner a description of the research problem in its area of interest that it felt deserved highest priority of attention, and to estimate its cost. Over 100 carefully considered proposals were received in a most gratifying response.

¹ Presented at the 15th annual convention, National Limestone Institute, Inc., Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 19-21, 1960.

These proposals fall within the following fields of interest:

1. Economics, finance, and administration	25
2. Design	18
3. Materials and construction	21
4. Maintenance	3
5. Traffic and operations	17
6. Soils, geology, and foundations	11
7. Urban research	3
8. Night visibility	2
9. Electronics	1
Total	101

The committee after careful review of the problem statements submitted decided it was not feasible to set a numerical rating for individual projects. Instead, the committee selected 19 broad areas of research which would embrace the most important and urgent of those proposals from the viewpoint of administration and management of the highway program and thus of nationwide interest.

These specific areas of needed research are: (These are areas and not specific research projects; and the order of listing in no way indicates relative urgency or importance).

1. Controlling development of land in vicinity of freeway interchanges.
2. Design, traffic control, and spacing of ramps and interchanges.
3. Intensive investigation of accidents.
4. Comprehensive study of passenger transportation in metropolitan areas.
5. Comprehensive study of freight transportation by motor vehicle in rural and urban areas.
6. Translation of the results of the AASHO road test in Illinois to conditions in other States.
7. Snow and ice removal treatment.
8. Improvement of highway maintenance.
9. Improvement of knowledge of aggregates and soils.

Of importance to this group is the following statement under this project:

"The accelerating demand for roadbuilding materials and the diminishing supply of aggregates of desired quality makes a better understanding of the performance of aggregates of various characteristics in concrete and bituminous pavements most urgent. Tests to determine in advance the probable performance in service are needed to permit classifying aggregates in terms of appropriate use. Means of improving poor quality aggregates through various processes of beneficiation must be developed. Possibly nuclear energy may transform undesirable materials into useful aggregates. In short increasing demands for more and better materials whose performance can be forecast with confidence require renewed study in one of the oldest fields of highway research, employing to the fullest, new sources and techniques now available."

10. Improvement of techniques for forecasting traffic and revenues.
11. Sharpening of figures of tangible road-user benefits and development of method for appraising benefits now called intangible.
12. Conceptual study of nonuser and community benefits of highway construction in relation to user benefits.
13. Warrants for lighting freeways.
14. Standards for secondary and local roads.
15. Development of driving simulator.
16. Electronic control of vehicles.
17. Analysis of the interactions of road and vehicle.
18. Simulation of traffic flow.
19. Improvement of motor-vehicle administration.

The total estimated cost of the research described in the 19 areas listed above is \$34 million. The committee believes that it

represents a practicable approach to a 4- or 5-year program in areas in which new knowledge is most urgently needed, a program that will quickly produce the most needed answers and permit the completion of usable portions of research activity that is broader in scope or of longer duration than can reasonably be accomplished in this period.

AN ANALYSIS OF FISCAL SUPPORT

The latest survey of the highway research expenditures in the United States was made by the Board during the past year and it covers the calendar year 1958. The survey included the highway departments of 48 States and the District of Columbia.

The survey was extended to cover 62 of the engineering colleges. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads supplied figures for highway research financed from both the 1½ percent funds, and from the administrative funds. The expenditures for the AASHO Road Test are prorated on an annual basis.

A summary of the expenditures shows a grand total of 17.7 million dollars spent for highway research in 1958 by the above-mentioned agencies. The amount expended by each is as follows:

[Millions of dollars]	
Source:	Expenditure
1. State funds alone.....	4.9
2. 1½ percent funds.....	4.7
3. U.S. Bureau of Public Roads (administrative funds).....	2.3
4. State educational institutions.....	1.5
5. AASHO road test (prorated).....	4.3
Total.....	17.7

In the case of 1.5 million expended by State educational institutions about .5 million came from industry.

A comparison of the relative amounts spent for research as related to disbursement for State administration of highways reveals that only 2 mills of each total road dollar was spent for highway research in 1958 (\$17,700,000 ÷ \$9,927,000,000). This is only about 10 percent of the rate of expenditure by industry for research.

APPLICATIONS OF HIGHWAY RESEARCH FINDINGS

The central objective of this staff project was to obtain material evidence of benefits of research which would bring reassurance regarding the justification of additional research as an integral component of the increased highway program. The staff engineers obtained through personal visits to 48 States and the District of Columbia, citations of the utilization of highway research findings. A total of 348 citations of the application of research findings were obtained. The following summary shows the number of examples received by broad areas:

Economics, finance, and administration.....	29
Design.....	100
Materials and construction.....	116
Maintenance.....	9
Traffic and operations.....	56
Soils, geology, and foundations.....	38
Total.....	348

To the same extent that these acknowledged improvements are the dividends of the past investments in research, so will the research expenditures of today be the dividends of better operations and techniques of tomorrow.

In assessing the benefits derived from research, a net gain or saving in out-of-pocket costs may not always be found, but an increase in knowledge and understanding of basic principles and truths will usually lead to the avoidance of error. This can bring benefits in convenience, conservation, satisfaction, service, and welfare which are not

recorded in statistics. In fact, the application of newly found truth to highway standards may actually result in greater out-of-pocket cost but may fulfill the demands for greater convenience, safety, and service which are supportable from a resulting increase in general economy. For example, the cost of reducing accidents may increase but the resulting social and economic benefits will apply to offset these costs.

The three reports which I have very briefly reviewed—(1) Research Needs in the United States, (2) An Analysis of Fiscal Support of Highway Research in 1958, and (3) Application of Highway Research Findings—will be published in a bulletin by the board later in the winter.

Just a further word on application of research: The complete research program includes not only programming, operating, and reporting but also the application of findings. The research organization itself often completes its role with the report of findings. There often follows a considerable timelag before the results are put into practice.

In all cases the problem of application resolves itself into three elements—communication of findings to proper authority, evaluation of findings for propriety of utilization, and administrative authorization for their use. No standard pattern has evolved for translating findings into practice, but the proper inclusion of the three elements above noted will expedite the utilization of research findings.

THE AASHO ROAD TEST

At this time last year when Mr. Ward, the assistant director of the board, appeared before you, the research being conducted at the AASHO road test had been underway for only a few weeks.

During the ensuing 12 months, the research has moved steadily toward its goals. A huge mass of data has been collected and summarized. Programs for analysis of this data are constantly being produced, reviewed, improved, and put into use. The staff research engineers have many interesting facts before them to study and appraise.

The road test, as you know, consists of three separate major experiments: one involving rigid pavements, one involving flexible pavements, and one involving certain types of bridge spans. It appears that all three experiments will produce findings that will be invaluable to the Nation's legislators, highway administrators, and engineers.

One facet of the research work during the past year should be mentioned here. The project staff, aided by an advisory panel, has completed the development of a method of pavement rating which holds great promise as a worthwhile tool for the State highway departments. A detailed description of the concepts involved was given in a paper presented last week at our annual meeting.

The research phase of the AASHO road test has now been under way for approximately 14 months. The present schedule contemplates the end of the regular test traffic phase next July 1. Thus, in terms of time, the test is 70 percent completed.

Following the test traffic phase, an estimated 3 months will be devoted to special tests which will include the operation of certain types of military vehicles over the test pavements and bridges. An additional 6 to 7 months will be required for data analysis and report writing as well as disposing of the physical plant and equipment. The goal for ending all activity at the test site is April 30, 1961, and the final reports on the research should be in print within a short time thereafter.

More important than the time schedule is the rate of application of axle loads to the test pavements and bridges.

Last week the project began the addition of 48 test vehicles to the fleet of 78 previously operated on the test loops. This in-

crease in traffic is in accordance with the wishes of the American Association of State Highway Officials, sponsor of the project, and was recommended by a special subcommittee appointed by AASHO at its Boston meeting last October.

On the project's 4 main test loops, this means an increase from 6 to 10 vehicles per traffic lane. On the smaller traffic loop, carrying light trucks, one lane increases from 4 to 6 vehicles and the other from 8 to 12. Additional standby units will also be available for each traffic lane. The traffic is now rolling 7 days a week and over 6 million miles of test traffic have been accumulated to date.

This expanded operation, which is being supported by the U.S. Army Transportation Corps Road Test Support Activity, is aimed at increasing the number of axle load applications between now and July 1. At present, each section of pavement still in test has received approximately 400,000 applications of a specific axle load. The goal by next July 1 is 650,000 applications.

Of course, this expansion has necessitated an increase in the project's budget. Other budget items also have increased during the past year, and the total estimated cost of the project now stands at \$25 million.

The extensive worldwide interest in this outstanding research activity is amply demonstrated by the following fact: To date slightly over 10,000 registered visitors have visited the project including engineers from 57 different foreign countries.

Since crushed stone was used as a base type on many of the bituminous pavements and also on some of the special base type wedge section studies, I am sure many of you will be very much interested in the final report of this project.

RECENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

During the past year there has been much activity in highway research as the Board alone has published over 6,000 pages of reports. Many of these deal with aggregates and as such are of interest to this group. I would like to mention very briefly just four of these reports: (1) "Report on Cooperative Freezing and Thawing Tests of Concrete." This is a report on a program of cooperative freezing and thawing tests of concrete conducted by 13 laboratories using the four ASTM Tentative Methods of Tests. (2) "Relationship of Concrete Strength to Maximum Size of Aggregate." This investigation indicates that changes in maximum size of coarse aggregate involve two opposing influences on strength. For increases in size up to about three-fourths of 1 inch the effect of reduced water predominates and strength increases. Beyond this point the advantage of reduced water is more than offset by the large pieces of aggregate which in themselves cause strength reduction. (3) "Skid Prevention Research." Many road surface factors affect skid resistance including type of aggregate. Almost all aggregates will become polished under intense traffic, some, however, much sooner than others. The relative polishing characteristics of bituminous mixtures composed of 22 different mineral aggregates are given. Also the use of vibrating anti-skid aggregate into the surface of concrete pavements during construction is advocated. (4) "Lime and Lime-Fly Ash as Soil Stabilizers." This should be of general interest to this group.

There were also some papers and reports given at our meeting last week which I believe you should know about and I will give only their title:

1. Economic Blending of Aggregate for Various Types of Concrete.
2. Service Behavior and Laboratory Evaluation of Aggregates.
3. Characteristics of Kingston Carbonate Rock Reaction.

4. Effect of Illitic Clay on the Chemical Stability of Carbonate Aggregates.

5. Recent Soil-Lime Research at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY

The impact of the expanded and accelerated program has already made itself felt in many ways. In the highway department, for example, many old problems have acquired a new significance and many new problems have arisen. The program has brought problems and questions for which there are no ready answers to every division of the highway department.

There is strong evidence that the accelerated highway program has greatly increased research activity. Based on the number of papers and reports presented at the annual meetings of the highway research board and the attendance at these meetings, there has been an increase of approximately 80 percent in these categories during the past 4 years.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

While these comments have necessarily been very general, I have attempted to give you a glimpse of some of the broad areas in which stepped-up research activities are needed as well as some of the current fields of special interest to this group.

I think a good description of the combined efforts in this field of highway research activities is contained in the following inscription on the front of our National Academy of Sciences Building here in Washington:

"The search for truth is in one way hard and another easy. For it is evident that no one can master it fully nor miss it wholly. But each adds a little to our knowledge of nature, and from all the facts assembled there arises a certain grandeur."

Increasing the Minimum Wage to \$1.25 Per Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following report to the City Council of the City of New York by the Special Committee To Investigate the Causes of Low Wages in the City of New York and the Feasibility of Establishing an Adequate Minimum Wage together with two resolutions adopted by the council with respect to this important subject:

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

M-275—REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CAUSES OF LOW WAGES IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK AND THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING AN ADEQUATE MINIMUM WAGE

To the City Council of the City of New York:

Report of the Special Committee To Investigate the Causes of Low Wages in the City of New York and the Feasibility of Establishing an Adequate Minimum Wage, created pursuant to the council's resolution of December 22, 1959.

The committee held public hearings on February 18, 23, 26, and March 2, 1960. The

mayor and other representatives of city government, trade union officials, representatives of business and industry, and the privately supported social service, civic and welfare groups were invited to attend and testify.

In all, 45 witnesses appeared and testified. The committee also sought and secured written statements from the heads of city agencies affected, studies relating to the subjects under investigation, and available statistics. Other documents relevant to the subject were also scrutinized. Appendix A of this report is a schedule of the material and testimony considered by your committee.

The committee's analysis of the studies and statistics available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, the New York State Department of Labor, the New York City Department of Labor, and those of private agencies established that there are no comprehensive studies available which adequately cover all of the problems which the committee has under consideration and investigation. It was therefore necessary for the committee to reach its conclusions after a study of the material available, the testimony adduced at the hearings, and the various statements, statistics, and documents listed in appendix A, as well as upon the personal general knowledge of the members of the committee on conditions in the community.

Initially, it was evident that many of the workers of our city and their families are living under substandard conditions. The primary cause is low wages.

THE FEDERAL LAW AND EXCLUSIONS THEREUNDER

Thousands of wage earners and heads of families in New York City are being paid for their work at rates of less than \$1 per hour.

This condition exists and is possible under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, which requires payment of a minimum wage of \$1 an hour, because the act excludes from coverage many employed in a great variety of occupations. Excluded from the benefits of the law are employees of any retail or service establishment making more than 50 percent of its annual dollar sales of goods or services within the State in which it is located. Employees in the fields of laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing, or fabrics, with limited qualifications as to the amount of intrastate business, are excluded. Employees of firms of purely local nature are not covered thereunder. Many others are excluded. These exclusions leave uncovered and unprotected millions of workers who are probably in greater need of protection than many of those who are provided for in the law.

THE STATE LAW

The laws of New York State provide that minimum wage rates in certain fields of employment may be set by the State industrial commissioner by order on the basis of recommendations, after public hearings, by tripartite wage boards. The wage order promulgated by the State industrial commission in 1952, and still in effect, covering confectionery workers set a minimum of 75 cents per hour and in the amusement and recreation field, rates from 75 cents to \$1 per hour are established for straight time workers and those whose rates are not established on piecework or per event basis by an order. In some of the other minimum wage orders promulgated by the State industrial commissioner, we find the minimums established for laundries at \$1 per hour, beauty services at \$1.05 an hour, cleaning and dyeing at \$1 per hour, and retail establishments at \$1 per hour. In all there are nine such orders affecting limited fields now in effect. A tenth is inoperative because of pending litigation.

Clearly, the State of New York has not filled in the gaps left in the Federal law

and, in some instances, where it has undertaken to do so it has established rates below the \$1 per hour minimum. As a result of exclusions from the Federal law, and the extremely limited character of the State law, both resulting in narrow coverage, there remain large pockets of workers not only in this city, but in the State and throughout the Nation, who are wholly unprotected and are being paid at rates of less than \$1 per hour. The New York State Department of Labor estimates that about 700,000 employees at present are not covered by State or Federal minimum wage provisions.

FAMILY BUDGETS

Even the rate of \$1 per hour, if applied to all, is wholly inadequate in New York City to afford to a family the absolute necessities of life.

In October 1959, the Community Council of Greater New York set a budget for a family of four at \$93.12 per week. It included provisions for Federal and State taxes. A family breadwinner, on that basis, would have to earn more than \$2 per hour to earn the budget requirement. The State labor department found in 1956 that a working woman in New York City required \$51.23 per week to support herself adequately.

As modest as are the standards of living represented in these budgets, we do realize that at this time they are not attainable for all in our city.

We have been compelled to consider a lower standard and, therefore, went to the welfare department of the city in an effort to ascertain what is a minimum budget for health and safety. The city welfare department, under mandate from and in cooperation with the State department of social welfare, determines the cost of items of living at minimal standards of health and safety in New York City. The degree of need varies with the size of family, age, sex of the children, and the rent paid. In the interests of simplification, we considered only families of two, of three, and of four. So limiting the family size, the great variable left is that of rent. This widely inconstant figure renders it difficult to set in practice an accurate figure as to what would constitute an appropriate minimum relief budget for health and safety of a family of two, of three, and of four. Probably the most reliable amounts for minimum budgets of such relief families is found in a table prepared by the city department of welfare and which is used in determining eligibility for the free school lunch. Under a minimum budget for health and safety, a family of two would require \$52 a week; a family of three, \$63 a week; and a family of four, \$74 a week to live according to minimal welfare standards in the city of New York. These standards are accepted by the State department of social welfare as the basis for authorizing reimbursement.

Based upon the requirements of these minimum budgets, a wage earner in a family of two, presently earning \$1 per hour for a 40-hour week, received \$12 less than the amount required under minimal welfare standards; for a family of three, \$23 less; and for a family of four, \$34 less.

COST TO THE CITY

It is estimated that there are at least 375,000 people in New York City today whose incomes are below public assistance allowance levels.

At the present time, the wages of 44.3 percent of the families on home relief in the city include wage earners whose incomes are being supplemented by the department of welfare. These payments represent a subsidy which is paid out of tax money.

The cost to operate the city department of hospitals for 1958-59 was \$161,996,776.54. Collections from all sources amounted to \$38,424,261.57. Of all cases investigated

during 1958, 55 percent were potentially nonrevenue producing. Of the remaining 45 percent, only 6.2 percent were considered able to pay in full or in part. The other 38.8 percent were covered by Blue Cross, hospital insurance, workmen's compensation, or were cases on which reimbursement by the State or Federal Government were in prospect.

The department's records are not maintained on a basis which shows what part of the budget is used for those which we are considering, but it is not an unfair assumption that a substantial amount is used for hospital care of very low-paid workers and their families.

The city department of health has a budget for 1959-60 of \$26 million of which \$13 million are expended for the maintenance of health stations in slum areas, child care, and similar services. Some part of this service is for the low-paid workers and their families.

Another item of the city's current budget is payment to charitable institutions including private and voluntary hospitals. The total required thereunder is \$72,246,909 of which \$48,241,063 is paid out of tax levy funds, \$22,895,846 by the State, and \$1,110,000 reimbursement received from parents or from legally responsible relatives. The amount allocated for care, maintenance, and treatment of sick and infirm in hospitals and sanatoriums is \$30,857,907. Some part of this budget item must be attributed to the low-paid workers and their families.

There are other city services, all requiring the expenditure of large sums of money, which are in part required for those that we are here considering.

COST OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The voluntary agencies of the city, charitable, social service, hospital, and others, expend great sums, exceeding \$200 million per year and there is little question but that low-paid workers and their families are among the beneficiaries of these expenditures.

OVERALL COST

Although it appears impossible to determine accurately the actual amount which is paid out of tax funds and by the voluntary organizations to and for the underpaid earner and his family, there is no doubt it runs into millions of dollars each year.

A REQUIRED MINIMUM WAGE

The businesses and industries which have been utilizing the labor of these workers at rates of pay that do not enable them to support their families on even relief standards must be required to assume greater responsibility toward the support of those who work for them.

An essential of any solution of this grave condition is the establishment promptly of a minimum wage which is truly a minimum and which has a broad base.

The privilege of doing business carries with it the responsibility of paying wages sufficient to enable the workers to live on a standard which is at least a minimum adequate for health and safety. It is morally wrong for a business or industry to enjoy the services of workers who are able to exist only as a result of subsidies granted by public and private agencies to them and their families.

The \$1.25-per-hour minimum wage would be a step in the direction of bringing the workers of our city, State, and the Nation toward the dignity of supporting themselves and their families on such a minimum basis. True, a \$50-per-week minimum for a 40-hour week would still be \$2 less income than required by a minimum budget for a family of two, \$13 less than required for a family of three, and \$24 less than the sum required by a family of four; but it would bring most \$10 or more per week closer to the goal of minimum self-sufficiency. In terms of relief

to the taxpayers, it was estimated—very conservatively, we believe, by the commissioner of the department of welfare that such an increase in minimum wages would result in a reduction of \$1 million a year in relief costs, or approximately 5 percent of the annual expenditures for home relief. There would also be reductions in the demands upon the department of hospitals, department of health, the city through aid to private hospitals, other city services, and the private voluntary charitable, social service and hospital groups.

We have not touched upon the price that poverty exacts in terms of crime, disease, juvenile delinquency, and the loss of sense of human dignity. This is one price that we are paying which is known to all of us. Independent of the relief which such an increased minimum wage would give to the taxpayers and to the private voluntary organizations, the value of a step forward in this area in establishing a minimum wage would be incalculable.

VIEWS OF WITNESSES

While there was unanimity of opinion expressed by representatives of the public, the social agencies and the labor representatives who testified in support of an increase to a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour with a substantially broader coverage—a view which most of the employers shared a few representatives of management spoke against an increase. They urged delay and recommended that further detailed studies be made before any action be taken. We find little merit in the objections made. If the immediate goal were \$1.50 or more per hour, the delay for the studies would be justified—but when we are considering a minimum rate of \$1.25 per hour—a rate which even the most optimistic can only describe as one which will barely meet the necessities of life, we cannot support such a position.

No convincing argument has been advanced to warrant support for the continuance and increase (as is inevitable with rising living costs) of the great public and private subsidies now being paid the workers of these low-paying employers.

None of the employers who testified pay employees less than \$1.25 per hour; many of them pay wages substantially in excess of that figure. Some members of employer associations, representing the great majority in their industries, testified that they are competing with a few employers within the city and State, and some in other States, who are paying less than \$1.25 per hour. This is a problem for them but, nevertheless, they prefer, as businessmen with a sense of responsibility, to continue paying the higher wages rather than to follow the callous course of their unfair competitors. They are convinced that the higher wages paid by them bring greater productivity and encourage their workers to acquire higher skills. It is to these factors that they attribute their ability to successfully compete with the few in their industries who pay extremely low wages. Some also stated that wherever substandard wages are paid the turnover in employment is great and that as wages improve, the turnover correspondingly decreases with resulting economies.

Most of these businessmen are convinced that a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour, if promulgated even in the State alone, will not result in removal of business from the city or State, but, rather, believe that those who would be affected will adjust themselves to the requirements and continue here on a \$1.25 per hour minimum rate. This they attribute to the fact that the substandard wage-paying employer needs the labor available to him here and knows that a fairer wage will result in greater productivity. Another and a most important element is that the city is the greatest market for his products and he must stay in his market.

It was also developed that most of the industries, which in effect are excluded from coverage under the Federal law, are service industries dependent upon the market in which they exist for their continuance. For example, the retail trades, amusement and recreation, beauty service, cleaning and dyeing, laundry, restaurants and hotels, all render services in the areas in which they exist. They are dependent on the people of the city and those who visit for their patronage. The opinion was expressed that it is virtually impossible for these businesses to pick up and move out of the city or the State.

A representative of an employer association stated that one large manufacturing concern had moved from the city to another State and mentioned the possibility of another concern doing likewise. Upon inquiry, it developed that in both instances the firms involved were paying their employees in excess of \$1.25 per hour, and it was acknowledged that the establishment of a \$1.25 minimum rate would not have had any effect on their decisions.

In one or possibly two instances, it was said that an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour would automatically result in increases to those being paid in excess of that rate. We are inclined to reject the view that this would automatically occur. We believe it would have no effect on those receiving good wages. As to those in a limited marginal area, above the \$1.25 rate, it may have some effect but, in our opinion, this would be of a minor character. There are a great many elements to prevent this, such as, existing collective bargaining agreements which would not be affected by such a minimum wage. We do not look upon this as a valid argument against the establishment of a \$1.25 minimum rate of wage.

In one area we found substantial unanimity—that there should be Federal and State legislation establishing a \$1.25 minimum on a broad basis. Others, although desiring joint action by the Congress and State legislature, would consider it a step forward, Congress failing to act, if the State adopted the \$1.25 minimum on a broad basis.

There is general recognition that a wage of less than \$1.25 per hour begets poverty and all of the health and social problems which follow poverty, that there is an obligation on the part of business and industry to pay a living wage, and that it is wrong for the taxpayers and the private charitable organizations to be required to subsidize any business in this manner.

NONPROFIT AGENCIES

The committee has discussed and heard the opinions of witnesses on the question of whether or not minimum wage laws enacted should cover regular nonprofessional employees of nonprofit agencies such as hospitals. We believe they should. The employees of such agencies are confronted with exactly the same problems as those of employees of industry. They can, no better than the employees of industry, meet the expenses of living and supporting families on substandard wages. To the committee it seems of the utmost importance that these workers in hospitals who, directly or indirectly, serve our sick or injured must live at least in modest decency if they are to be able to properly perform these essential services.

There is no doubt and we recognize that such coverage poses a serious financial problem. However, it is one which can and should be met in common by the hospitals, by those served where possible, by the generous supporters of these institutions as well as by the city of New York. It is a cause in which we all must join and hear the resulting costs.

OTHER AIDS TO A SOLUTION

The city of New York is preparing a master industrial development plan. It has for its

purpose the encouragement of new industries to establish themselves in the city and the expansion of existing industries. The city has a great deal in its favor in this effort—available manpower and the fact that it is the center of the largest metropolitan market area in this country. Success in this effort will mean more jobs with decent wages and conditions.

Another undertaking of the city has been the establishment of the mayor's committee on exploitation of workers. The committee is composed of leaders of industry and labor, city agencies and community groups. It has for its immediate purpose an educational training program to improve the job skills, the productivity, and the earning power of the low-waged workers of the city. Progress in this area will lend material aid in advancing the industrial development plan.

These programs are important to the welfare of the city and to the well-being of its people. Every effort should be made by the administration to press forward on these programs and to intensify activities therein. The public should be made better acquainted with the programs and their support enlisted in aid of them.

It is interesting to note that the city government is taking a position of leadership in the establishment of a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour. The committee received a communication from the city department of labor which includes the following statement:

"The city of New York has already established as a matter of city policy that no employee of the city government be employed at less than \$1.25 an hour. At present, except for some few titles involving part-time seasonal, or student positions, all employees receive wages not less than \$1.25 per hour. Even in the exceptional situations, studies are underway to insure that there is no violation of the minimum wage standard of \$1.25 per hour."

ESTABLISHING MINIMUM WAGES BY WAGE BOARDS

The committee has given consideration to the procedures prescribed in the New York State law for the establishment of minimum wages. The State industrial commissioner, by order, on the basis of recommendations of tripartite wage boards, after public hearings, may presently provide a minimum wage rate in a specified industry or field. The committee seriously questions the usefulness and effectiveness of wage board procedures. They are involved, long drawn out, costly, and, in the end, only affect but a comparatively small segment of those who need relief. In our opinion, the only truly effective course which should be followed, is to forthrightly establish a minimum wage upon a broad base with but few clearly defined and necessary exceptions thereto.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of its studies, the committee finds that a serious emergency situation exists which requires action by both our Federal and State Governments.

Therefore, we recommend that this council call upon the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of New York to enact laws without delay, which will establish at the earliest feasible date, a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for a 40-hour workweek, with appropriate premium overtime thereafter, the same to apply to employees in all businesses and industries and to regular nonprofessional employees of voluntary nonprofit organizations such as hospitals.

Practices existing in industry of computing tips, board and lodging or other considerations of actual value as part of wages may be permitted to continue, but the real value of such allowances must be such as assures receipt by the employee of at least the minimum wages prescribed.

Exceptions in these broad laws should be narrowly limited to carefully defined areas as similarly should be the discretion of the Secretary of Labor and the Industrial Commissioner to grant exceptions.

Dated, New York, N.Y., March 7, 1960.

Respectfully submitted, Earl Brown, chairman; John J. Merli, vice chairman; James F. Dulligan, David Ross, Thomas J. Cuite, Edward V. Curry, Stanley M. Isaacs, Joseph T. Sharkey, ex officio; Edward C. Maguire, counsel to the special committee.

Appendix to the Report of the Special Committee of the New York City Council To Investigate the Causes of Low Wages in the City of New York and the Feasibility of Establishing an Adequate Minimum Wage.

1. Transcript of hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the Causes of Low Wages in the City of New York:

(a) Transcript of hearings, Thursday, February 18, 1960.

(b) Transcript of hearings, Tuesday, February 23, 1960.

(c) Transcript of hearings, Friday, February 26, 1960.

(d) Transcript of hearings, Wednesday, March 2, 1960.

2. Names and organizations of persons invited to testify:

(a) Representatives of the New York City government.

(b) Representatives of labor organizations.

(c) Representatives of employers and employer organizations.

(d) Representatives of community and welfare organizations.

3. Communications:

(a) Harold A. Felix, commissioner of New York City Department of Labor, re minimum wage rates for city workers.

(b) Leona Baumgartner, commissioner, New York City Department of Health, re expenditures of department of health for medically indigent.

(c) Morris Jacobs, commissioner, New York City Department of Hospitals, re expenditures of department of hospitals, with enclosures.

(d) Ralph Gross, general manager, Commerce and Industry, re absence from hearing of representatives of various industries.

4. Books and pamphlets:

(a) Wages in the Metropolitan—Segal, Martin. Vol. IV. Study for the Regional Plan Association, Inc. Harvard Univ. Press. Cambridge, Mass. 1960, pages 1-211.

(b) Occupational Wage Survey, New York, N.Y., April 1959, Bulletin No. 1240-17. Bureau of Labor Statistics, pages 1-27.

(c) Wages and Related Benefits. 20 Labor Markets 1958-1959. Bulletin No. 1240-22. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, pages 1-92.

(d) Wage Structure Men's and Boys' Suits and Coats, March 1958. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, pages 1-55.

(e) Factory Workers' Earnings, May 1958. Bulletin No. 1252. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, pages 1-63.

(f) Comparison of Wages in New York City with Other Areas. New York City Department of Labor, pages 1-22, tables I-XXIII.

(g) Wages of Janitorial Employees in One-Man Residential Buildings, New York State, 1958. New York State Department of Labor, pages 1-22.

(h) Wages and Hours Building Service, New York State, 1956. New York State Department of Labor, pages 1-165.

(i) Wages, Hours and Working Conditions in Selected Miscellaneous Personal Service Industries, 1953. New York State Department of Labor, pages 1-79.

¹Persons who appeared and testified are shown together with transcript of each hearing.

(j) Annual Price Survey and Family Budget Costs, October 1959. The Community Council of Greater New York, pages 1-47.

(k) Social Welfare Expenditures and Their Financing: New York City. Research Department, the Community Council of Greater New York, pages 1-136.

(l) Weekly Legislative Digest of Labor and Related Bills Introduced in the New York State Legislature. "Minimum Wage," page 36. February 23, 1960, pages 1-42.

(m) Collective Bargaining Agreement Between Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., and New York Hotel Trades Council, AFL-CIO, July 8, 1959, pages 1-56.

(n) Statement of the Cost of Maintaining and Operating the Department of Hospitals. Year ended December 31, 1958. The City of New York. A1-A12, pages 1-23.

(o) The Negro Wage Earner and Apprenticeship Training Programs. Labor Department. NAACP, pages 1-60.

(p) Wage Rates of Building Service Employees Under Contracts with Realty Advisory Boards on Labor Relations Current to December 31, 1959.

5. Statistical tables:

(a) Total Employment and Production Worker Hours and Earnings by Industries, New York City. April 1956.

(b) Earnings Data for Selected New York City Industries.

(c) Hourly Earnings in Restaurants, Including Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Group and by Area, January 1956, New York City—All Workers.

(d) Hourly Earnings in Restaurants, Including Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Group and by Area, January 1956, New York City—Women.

(e) Hourly Earnings in Restaurants Other Than Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Group and by Area, January 1956—Women.

(f) Hourly Earnings in Restaurants, Including Employee Cafeterias by Receipt of Tips and by Area, January 1956—All Workers.

(g) Hourly Earnings in Restaurants, Including Employee Cafeterias by Receipt of Tips and by Area, January 1956—Women.

(h) Hourly Earnings in Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Groups and by Area, January 1956—All Workers.

(i) Hourly Earnings in Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Groups and by Area, January 1956—Women.

(j) Weekly Earnings in Restaurants Including Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Group and by Area, January 1956—All Workers.

(k) Weekly Earnings in Restaurants Including Employee Cafeterias by Occupational Group and by Area, January 1956—Women.

(l) Earnings of Building Service Employees in New York City, November 1956.

(m) Average Straight-Time Hourly Earnings for Custodial and Material Movement Occupations, New York City, April 1959.

(n) Straight-Time Hourly Earnings for Selected Occupations in Auto Repair Shops, New York City, May 1958.

(o) Straight-Time Hourly Earnings for all Production Workers and Selected Occupations in Men's and Boys' Suits and Coats Industry, New York City, March 1958.

(p) Straight-Time Hourly Earnings for Selected Occupations of the Machinery Industries, New York City, February 1959.

(q) Wages and Fringe Benefits, Average Hourly Wages in Construction and Services in Selected Cities as a Percentage of New York City, 1955.

(r) Summary of Minimum Wage Orders, New York State, May 1959.

(s) Summary Analysis of S. 1046 as Reported From Subcommittee on Labor.

In connection herewith the following resolution was read.

RESOLUTION 865

Resolution requesting the city council to adopt the report of the special committee to investigate the causes of low wages in the city of New York and the feasibility of establishing an adequate minimum wage (By Messrs. Brown, Merli, Dulligan, Ross, Cuite, Curry, Isaacs, and Sharkey.)

Whereas the special committee to investigate the causes of low wages in the city of New York and the feasibility of establishing an adequate minimum wage has made its report, findings, and recommendations to the council: Now, therefore, and after due consideration thereof, it is

Resolved, That members of the council adopt the report of the committee, its findings and recommendations and concur therein.

Adopted.

RESOLUTION 866

Resolution urging the New York State Legislature to enact a minimum wage law of \$1.25 per hour

(By the special committee to investigate the causes of low wages (Messrs. Brown, Merli, Dulligan, Ross, Cuite, Curry, Isaacs, and Sharkey).)

Whereas the Council of the City of New York, through its special committee to investigate the causes of low wages in the city of New York and the feasibility of establishing an adequate minimum wage, undertook a study which had amongst its purposes the ascertainment of the causes of low wages in the city of New York, the extent to which low wages have increased the cost of services provided by the city of New York to those workers who receive low wages, and ways and means of remedying this serious basic problem; and

Whereas the study included analysis of available statistics and other pertinent material, as well as public hearings to which representatives of the city government, trade unions, industry and business and privately supported social service, civic and welfare groups were invited and were heard; and

Whereas it was found that many thousands of families in the city of New York are subsisting under substandard living conditions primarily because the low wages paid to wage earners of the families, that this constitutes a social and economic danger to the welfare of our city, the State and the Nation, that this condition with living costs mounting, has resulted in great demands for, and expenditure of many millions of dollars annually by the city of New York and by private voluntary social services, hospitals and charitable organizations in an effort to alleviate these conditions; and

Whereas under present conditions, unless remedied, such needs and expenditures may mount to a point where they cannot be met; and

Whereas this problem is not unique to the city of New York but exists to a greater or lesser degree in every community throughout the State of New York and the United States; and

Whereas these vast expenditures constitute subsidies by the taxpayers and contributions by business and industry, which are neither morally nor economically justifiable; and

Whereas the immediate means of affording some relief to the low paid workers and to the local governments and charitable organizations, already too heavily burdened, is by the establishment of a minimum wage which comes closer to meeting actual needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York most urgently petitions the Legislature of the State of New York to enact a law, without delay, which will establish, at the earliest possible date, a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for a 40-hour work-

week, with appropriate premium overtime thereafter, the same to apply to employees in all businesses and industries and to regular nonprofessional employees of voluntary nonprofit organizations such as hospitals. Practices existing in industries of computing tips, board and lodging or other considerations of actual value as part of wages may be permitted to continue, but the real value of such allowances must be such as assures receipt by the employees of at least the minimum wages prescribed. Exceptions in the law should be narrowly limited in carefully defined areas as similarly should be the discretion of the Industrial Commissioner to grant exceptions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York enact such a law without waiting for action which may be taken by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the council is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to: the Governor of the State of New York, the Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York, the majority leader of the senate, the minority leader of the senate, the speaker of the assembly, the majority leader of the assembly, the minority leader of the assembly, to each member of the senate and assembly whose district is in the city of New York and to the industrial commissioner of the State.

Adopted.

Freedom of Captive Nations Should Be on Agenda of Summit Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14, 1960, the representatives of the Polish American Congress—Charles Rozmarek, president of the organization; Rev. Valerian S. Karcz, general secretary and Stanley P. Turkiewicz, treasurer; presented a memorandum to the Department of State requesting that the freedom of captive nations be placed on the agenda of the forthcoming meeting.

This is an important expression of the Americans of Polish descent and should deserve favorable consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the text of the memorandum which is as follows:

In a speech delivered in Novosibirsk, on October 10, 1959, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, commenting on the supposed end of the cold war and the beginning of a peaceful coexistence between the East and the West declared:

"Coexistence is the extension of the struggle of two social systems . . . we believe, this is an economic, political and ideological struggle, but not a military struggle."

This definition of the meaning of peaceful coexistence is tantamount to a declaration of political war, which, according to Khrushchev's many utterances, is to bring the world under Communist rule. One of the elements of this political warfare is the relentless Soviet drive aimed at forcing the United States and other Western Powers to recognize the present status quo in Eastern Europe, i.e., to accept the Soviet rule over Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain. This, in effect, would enable Soviet Russia to consolidate her conquests.

In view of this, the forthcoming summit conference scheduled for May 16, 1960 in Paris, should be analyzed from the perspective of the Soviet political aims, enunciated by Khrushchev in his Novosibirsk speech. We must bear in mind that for the Soviet Premier the summit conference means only a field of one battle which he is determined to win. One of the strategic moves in this conflict will be his insistence that the status quo in Eastern Europe be recognized. This demand should not only be rejected, but at the same time the West should seize the initiative ahead of the Soviet move.

The following considerations are virtually compelling American diplomacy to take such a step in the pursuit of a just and durable world peace:

(a) Limiting the summit conference to the Berlin issue, with the exclusion of all European questions, could result in a psychological defeat for the West and corresponding adverse reactions. In 1939 for instance, there were some people in Western Europe loudly proclaiming that they were not going to die for Gdansk. Possibly, there are some people today in the United States, as well as in other Western Powers, who might say that they are not going to take any serious risk for the sake of Berlin.

Bold and imaginative measures should be applied to convince these people that Berlin is only a part of much larger problems involved in, and inexorably linked with German reunification and the liberation from the Soviet yoke of central and East Europe, within the framework of an international settlement.

Not only the division of Germany and the present status of Berlin belong to the abnormalities caused by the war. These abnormalities are compounded in the enslavement by the Soviet imperialism of 10 formerly independent states in Eastern Europe with a total population of nearly a hundred million. These problems are closely linked together, and the solving of only one of them separately will not bring us closer to a durable peace. The world will not know peace so long as Europe remains half free and half enslaved.

(b) Nations of Eastern Europe hate Communist dictatorship forced on them by Soviet Russia in Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, and Rumania, and are demanding restoration of their independence, freedom, and democracy. The spirit of independence and the psychological resistance against communism are amazingly strong in the lands behind the Iron Curtain. Thus, the West has behind the Iron Curtain a hundred million allies who are ready to sacrifice even their lives for the cause of independence and freedom. This has been proved by the Poznan revolt of June 1956, by the Hungarian uprising of October 1956, and the "October Revolution" in Poland in 1956. And the reception accorded by hundreds of thousands of Poles to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON in Warsaw on August 2, 1959, speaks dramatically and eloquently of the friendship the Poles cherish toward the United States and all it represents. Due to this attitude, the nations behind the Iron Curtain constitute an Achilles heel in the makeup of Soviet Russia, and at the same time represent for the West a significant force in the political warfare. This force should be kept alive. It could, however, be lost without bold and imaginative diplomacy from the West, particularly in view of the fact that Khrushchev is trying to convince the countries behind the Iron Curtain that they have been forsaken forever by the West and must accept Soviet supremacy. But the mere rejection of the status quo is not sufficient to bolster and to perpetuate the spirit of resistance of nearly a hundred million people in Eastern Europe. In order to achieve this goal it is necessary to demand that Russia restore independence to these peoples. The propiti-

ous movement for this type of political offensive will lend itself to the West at the summit conference May 16. The Western initiative in this matter could prove to be far reaching and beneficial for the free world in the political warfare.

(c) In the event the Western Powers would not take such an initiative at the summit conference, they could find themselves in a disadvantageous position of demanding liberation of the satellite states only as a countermove to Russia's call for the recognition of the status quo. Taking only a defensive position in the East European problems and using the idea of liberation only as an argument against Russian demands would cut the political value of such a move in half.

(d) It is within the realm of probability, that the placement of East European problems on the summit conference agenda will be rejected by Russia, under the pretext that these problems are internal matters of the states behind the Iron Curtain. However, the attempt to place the East European problems on the summit program of deliberation would convince the subjugated peoples that the European situation is still in the state of flux, subject to international decisions, and that the United States and its associated nations regard it as an open question which must be solved, and not as an internal problem of Soviet Russia.

(e) In the present military situation, often described as a nuclear stalemate, the spirit of resistance among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain is an invaluable factor in the deterrent power against the Soviet Union, and as such represents strong elements of military values. As long as this spirit of resistance is alive, the Soviet Union cannot rely on the satellite armies in its military planning, and must consider dangers to its line of communications passing through the satellite countries. As a result of this situation, the satellite countries are forcing now, and will do so in the future—commitments of certain Soviet military forces.

(f) The rights of Poland and of other nations behind the Iron Curtain to free and independent existence is based not only on the commonly accepted principle of self-determination, but is also based on the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, later incorporated in the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942, and the United Nations Charter of June 10, 1945, article 1. In addition it is founded on the following international pronouncements:

(1) President Eisenhower's speech of April 16, 1953, proclaiming that: "This free community and the full independence of the East European nations could mean the end of the present unnatural division of Europe."

(2) Bermuda Declaration of December 8, 1953, which reads: "We cannot accept as justified or permanent the present division of Europe. Our hope is that in due course peaceful means will be found to enable the countries of Eastern Europe again to play their part as free nations in a free Europe."

(3) The Potomac Declaration of June 29, 1954 which reads: "We will not be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign states of Central and Eastern Europe, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R."

(g) Among all the nations behind the Iron Curtain, the Polish people have exhibited the greatest determination in the fight for restoration of their freedom and the principles of democracy. These people likewise have wrung from Russia and its Communist Warsaw regime great concessions for themselves in personal freedom, which they still hold to a certain degree today. In only one aspect has Russia been able to identify her interests with the vital national interest of the Poles. This unity

of interests arises from the fact, that Russia had recognized the present German-Polish boundary, in defense of which all Poles are unanimous; and, mindful of the German attack on Poland in 1939, are justifiably apprehensive of the remilitarization of the German Federal Republic, which refuses to recognize this boundary. In order to dispel these fears and to create better atmosphere between the German Federal Republic and Poland, and at the same time to build a political counterweight against Russia, it is vitally necessary that the United States, proposing discussions and settlements for Eastern Europe, declare unequivocally that Poland is considered as a state with its western boundary running along the Oder-Neisse Rivers.

For these reasons, we appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, to demand from Russia at the forthcoming summit conference of May 16, 1960 that she withdraw the Soviet army and agents from Poland and other East European countries; and that she agree to free and unfettered elections in those countries under an international supervision, to enable these people to choose the form of government under which they desire to live.

Respectfully,
POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
CHARLES ROZMARSK, President.
REV. VALERIAN S. KACRZ, General Secretary.
STANLEY P. TURKIEWICZ, Treasurer.

Human Resources Key to Local Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard, written by the editor, Arnold Goldberg. This is a very heartening article to me. Mr. Goldberg tells how the community of Uniontown, which is in my congressional district, has been pulling itself up from economic and industrial depression by its own bootstraps. This community has suffered from chronic unemployment for quite a number of years caused primarily by the decline of employment in the coal industry. Efforts to rehabilitate the community were initiated by local groups, who held industry-promotion campaigns, fundraising campaigns, plant-building programs and other self-help activities. While the job is far from done, much commendation is due these groups who have achieved creditable results from their efforts thus far. The article follows:

HUMAN RESOURCES KEY TO LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following account of the Uniontown district's efforts toward industrial development and economic recovery was written by Arnold Goldberg, editor of the Evening Standard, for the "Community Bootstrap" series by AP member newspapers. It was sent via wire, as below,

for use today in all AP newspapers in the State.)

(By Arnold Goldberg)

Uniontown's future glows brighter today. On the skids a decade ago, facing economic strangulation, the one-time soft coal capital of southwestern Pennsylvania is making a courageous comeback.

Like many other districts with large natural resources, the greater Uniontown area had its boom, years ago. Surrounded by the world's finest coking coal, the city and its residents became wealthy.

Billions of tons of coal were mined from the huge Pittsburgh seam. The supply seemed inexhaustible.

Suddenly the coal was depleted. In the few mines still operating, automation moved in.

Jobs were lost. Older folks were laid off. Young people, out of school, could not find employment. Many packed up their families and moved to Ohio, to California, to Michigan.

The battle to survive economically and industrially began.

The community, headed by a stalwart band of citizen leaders, looked up one day and decided it did not want to become a ghost city. It wanted to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, to share in the national prosperity.

In 1945, 14,500 were employed in the coal mining industry in Fayette County. Last year 2,500 miners were employed.

Unemployment reached the alarming figure of 12,300 or approximately 25 percent of the employable population of the county.

The county population dropped from 201,000 in 1940 to an estimated 175,000. In Uniontown the population declined from 21,000 to an estimated 18,000.

"It was either to slip backward forever or grab hold of ourselves and go forward," Tom Bundy, the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce, said.

A greater Uniontown industrial fund composed of business and professional people was organized in 1952.

Its members contributed \$80,000 to finance itself and to buy and develop land. The fund also sold \$130,000 in bonds to finance 15 percent of the construction of the W. F. Rockwell Meters Co. plant which covers 80,000 square feet and employs 300 persons.

Two years ago the Rockwell plant added 30,000 square feet to its building.

Twenty-five thousand dollars more was contributed by the fund to construct a knitting mill that employed 150 persons.

This was not enough, the fund leaders decided to take care of the great influx of unemployed.

A \$400,000 industrial campaign was begun one evening in April 1956. It was appropriately called the "5-in-4 drive," or five factories for Uniontown in the next 4 years.

Enthusiastic volunteers drew up battlelines for the attack on the city's economic ailments.

Attorney Herman M. Buck, then president of the fund and now its counsel, gave the keynote address.

"All of us must put faith in this program," he said. "It is our salvation."

A flying squad of Uniontown business leaders traveled around the country at their own expense interviewing possible industrial prospects.

The money came in. Some Uniontowners contributed in the thousands, others gave 50 cents per month in payroll deductions.

Within 3 months the \$400,000 was pledged, to be paid over a 4-year period.

The money was not a loan. It was contributed for the good of the city.

"The day when coal was king is past," said Don Sweeney, now president of the fund. "We need help and we can get it from nobody but ourselves."

Working in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority,

the industrial fund has taken a gigantic stride toward its five new plants since that first meeting 4 years ago.

Under the PIDA program with which the fund works, 50 percent of the cost of construction of a plant is provided in bank loans, 30 percent in low-interest PIDA loans, and the fund kicks in with the other 20 percent.

First of the new factories was the Steel Scaffolding Co., a plant of 60,000 square feet that employs 100 men. The industrial fund's share was \$106,000.

Next, when the M. Berkowitz Co., a pajama manufacturer, needed additional warehouse space, the fund constructed a building of 30,000 square feet making jobs available for 50 more persons.

The fund purchased the Rheem Manufacturing Co. building for \$100,000 and divided it into small industrial units. New industry there employs 100 persons.

It bought 90 acres for an industrial district along busy Route 119, 4 miles from the city. Another 44 acres for an industrial district was purchased along Route 51, the highway to Pittsburgh.

Last March a blitz campaign was started to obtain \$250,000 for two more plants.

In one night \$103,000 from 43 firms and individuals was pledged.

Today construction is ready to begin on buildings for three new industries.

A Midwest steel fabricating firm that will employ 300 persons will construct a plant of 150,000 square feet, costing \$1,250,000. The fund will spend \$250,000.

Steam cleaning equipment will be manufactured in another new plant, costing \$300,000, with 36,000 square feet. It will employ 50 persons. The fund's contribution is \$60,000.

Construction has started on a "speculative" building of 56,000 square feet by an Ohio real estate developer. He became so interested in the Uniontown program he was willing to invest the necessary funds in a "shell" building. The industrial fund made the land available, fully developed, as its share of the project.

To keep the program rolling the industrial fund leaders plan to seek \$100,000 more in low-interest bonds.

The battle is not over. The new industries offer only 1,100 jobs, not enough to fulfill needs.

With \$700,000 already contributed by the city people, more money will have to be sought.

The city has spruced up in other ways.

A master plan has been adopted by a community planning commission for a long-range program to make the city one of the standouts in the State.

A \$300,000 bond issue was approved by the city voters for redevelopment purposes. Slums are being cleared. City tax money has been added to Federal and State funds for development projects that will bring parks and parking, commercial sites and playgrounds to the community.

Uniontown is constantly on the move.

It discovered, not too late, that when its natural resources played out its own human resourcefulness was the best replacement.

there are very many which have as their standard bearer a patron saint. In most cases this patron saint is a person who brought to the people concerned the living word of the Lord and a vivid awareness of and love for their God and His doctrine. In all the history of the world, Mr. Speaker, no such patron saint is so widely renowned or so widely loved and remembered as good St. Patrick, patron saint of the Irish people. And indeed, also, Mr. Speaker, no group, no people in all the world is so dedicated to their patron saint as are the Irish people to St. Patrick. In fact a most prominent characteristic of the Irish people has always been their intense and unswerving devotion to their God and their faith. This lasting dedication may be traced to St. Patrick and his untiring efforts in bringing to the people of Ireland the word of the Lord and in so inspiring those people with the faith that they have never swerved from their devotion nor ceased their efforts to promote the growth of that faith throughout the world. On this St. Patrick's Day, Mr. Speaker, may I salute the Irish people and nation and may I also take this opportunity to deliver a brief testimonial to the great Irish patron saint.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

More than 14 centuries ago an old bearded man, about whom we know so little, departed from this earth; yet each year his memory is venerated on the 17th day of March. This is his day, St. Patrick's Day. He was born in western England about A.D. 389. At the age of 16, he was seized by Irish raiders, and the Christian youth was enslaved in a pagan Ireland. Here he was, a boy, a slave from Britain, guarding swine on the snowy sides of Slemish, dreaming that he would one day bring Rome and Christianity to the ends of the earth. Patrick's dreams were realized. He escaped to the Continent, entered the Holy Orders, and about 432 returned to Ireland as a missionary. There he labored with notable zeal until his death. He earned and fully deserves his title of "Apostle of Ireland."

The spirit of St. Patrick was an early immigrant to the New World. Like many other notable Irish, the "Apostle of Ireland" became a part of our culture in the first half of the 18th century. He was brought to these shores along with his people who were seeking freedom and a new way of life. The earliest American celebration of St. Patrick's Day, of which a written record has been found, took place in 1737. On March 17, of that year, the Charitable Irish Society was organized in Boston, Mass., by a number of leading Irish citizens. The preamble adopted by the founders reads, in part, as follows:

Whereas several gentlemen, merchants, and others, of the Irish nation residing in Boston in New England, from an affectionate and compassionate concern for their countrymen in these parts, who may be reduced by sickness, shipwreck, old age, and other infirmities and unforeseen accidents, have thought fit to form themselves into a charitable society, for the relief of such of their poor and indigent countrymen, without any design of not contributing toward the provision of the town poor in general as usual.

Even though the Charitable Irish Society was comprised of a single nationality and faith, and their foremost purpose was to help their Irish brethren, the "in general" phrase in the preamble was all inclusive and enveloping. Thus it was, St. Patrick had arrived in America.

There are many early records of St. Patrick's Day celebration in the early history of our Nation. St. Patrick traveled with the Irish immigrant but was readily adopted by all settlers. On March 17, 1757, a celebration of the day was held at Fort William Henry, at that time the most northerly outpost of Great Britain in America. The fort was built by Sir William Johnson, an Irishman by birth. On the evening of March 16, 1757, it was recorded that an extra ration of grog was distributed to the Irish troops in the fort, in which to "drown the shamrock." In 1763, St. Patrick's Day was celebrated at Fort Pitt. Captain Ecuyer, in command at the fort, wrote to Colonel Bouquet, and in the course of his communication said:

We had St. Patrick fetes in every manner.

St. Patrick's Day was enthusiastically observed in the ranks of the American Army during the Revolution. The British evacuated Boston on St. Patrick's Day, 1776, and the Americans marched victoriously into the city to take possession. General Washington, in the camp at Cambridge, authorized the password of the day to be "Boston" and the countersign to be "St. Patrick." Again, in 1778, March 17 was recognized by George Washington and his men at Valley Forge. It was on this occasion that Washington is alleged to have said, "I, too, am a lover of St. Patrick's Day." An extra issue of grog was poured out to the troops "and thus all made merrie and were good friends."

From the earliest period of our country's history until the present time, St. Patrick's Day has become an integral part of our way of life. Brought to America's shore by the Irish, St. Patrick is shared by all. From few celebrations in the mid-18th century, the observation of St. Patrick's Day has become a fixed institution in most American cities and towns. Every community gives welcome and honor to the Irish patron saint's anniversary. From north, south, east and west, bits of green are worn on March 17 by all races, religions, and creeds. To America, the green, the shamrocks, the harps, these are the symbols of Ireland's patron saint. A saint who, from slavery, became a symbol of peace, Christianity, and freedom to all of Ireland and all of America.

Ireland's Patron Saint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the day of Patrick, the patron saint of

Begorrah, 'Tis St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, of all the many various ethnic and national groups

Ireland. And if from such a grand event some seem to draw forth merely gaiety and mirth, let us recall that this in no way precludes reverence; for, indeed, the Irish are a deeply reverent clan.

Admittedly the day is one of great rejoicing, devoted to the wearing of the green, the singing of songs, and general celebration. But all too often the real meaning of St. Patrick appears to the observer lost beneath such artificial trappings. And yet, in fact, it is not lost but burns eternally in the Irish heart.

For nothing is more clear to the Irish than the serious nature of St. Patrick. In centuries past when foreign sentries stalked the land and the people lay crushed beneath the hand of foreign rule, what but Patrick's steadfast influence carried them through to victory and freedom. Nor is it likely that the Irish today will soon forget the fact, which plays so vital a part in their everyday lives.

True to the optimistic traditions of democracy, the Irish are a happy clan and true to the devout nature of Western civilization they stand by Christian principles.

No wonder that the rest of the free world responds today to the sound of their rejoicing. For in these sounds one senses the hope—indeed, the faith—of God and the future, so typical of the Irish nature; so admirable in the eyes of all.

The free world joins today in paying respect to St. Patrick, the patron of a noble race and sponsor of a mighty dream. Long may his influence prevail.

The Christian Science Monitor Says "The Nation's Capital Is Probably the Busiest Party-Going City in the Land"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor is one of the truly outstanding newspapers in the world. It has an office in Washington, D.C., and it is the organ of a great religious organization with numerous churches and thousands of members in the Nation's Capital. Obviously, it is in close and intimate contact with thousands of people of substance in the Federal city.

These facts give added significance to an editorial of March 11, 1960, in the Christian Science Monitor which was critical of the cultural status of the Nation's Capital, or lack of cultural status.

"Almost every night," according to the Christian Science Monitor, "there are hundreds of parties going on all over Washington. For the Nation's Capital is probably the busiest party-going city in the land."

Various proposals in the Congress to advance American culture and educa-

tion generally, the Christian Science Monitor says, "constitute a drive which is rapidly gaining momentum." This drive, in the view of this great national newspaper, will "give Washington parties some competition by the development of a cultural center in the Nation's Capital."

Perhaps the time is not far distant when the Nation's Capital can move on to more serious things than cocktail parties. Obviously, a more serious view is essential in this cold war period of increasingly serious competition from the Soviet Union.

I include as part of my remarks the editorial of the Christian Science Monitor to which I have referred, as well as letters I have received from Science Service and the American Federation of Musicians in support of the legislation which the editorial discusses:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Mar. 11, 1960]

THE NEED FOR A CULTURAL CENTER

(By Josephine Ripley)

Almost every night there are hundreds of parties going on all over Washington. For the Nation's Capital is probably the busiest party-going city in the land.

There's a reason for this. Parties may be fun, but for the majority of Washingtonians they are something more. From small, intimate dinners to huge receptions, they are part of the never-ending business of politics.

They provide the means of communication—between politicians and the press; between diplomats and the press; between diplomats and politicians, and so on.

All this tends to make Washington different from other cities, lacking in the usual diversity of interests and activity.

It has few night clubs. It has only two theaters, the National Theater, and the small theater-in-the-round, the Arena Stage.

Despite the Capital's magnificent National Gallery of Art, its beautiful buildings and historic memorials, it is not a cultural center.

This troubles many people. They feel that the Nation's Capital should foster and feature the performing arts; that money should be provided to build a cultural center to attract the country's finest and most promising talent.

To point up the way in which other cities support the arts, Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Democrat, of Delaware, asked the Library of Congress to make a survey. The Library came up with these facts: that Baltimore provides \$448,588 to support the fine arts; Philadelphia, \$789,760; St. Louis, \$320,007; San Francisco, \$817,256; and New York, \$4,718,824.

Washington, which Mr. McDOWELL notes is both larger and richer, per capita, than San Francisco, gives only \$16,000 to the fine arts.

Representative McDOWELL is a cosponsor with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, of a bill to provide 1 mill out of each dollar of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be set aside to defray, in part, the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Washington Opera Society, and other nonprofit art and cultural programs of the Nation's Capital.

At the present time the arts are supported by the Federal Government or by private benefactors. "Such a situation would be unthinkable in any European capital city, or, indeed, even in any large provincial city in Europe or the U.S.S.R.," says Mr. McDOWELL.

Indeed, there are many vocal and persistent boosters for the arts, including Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Demo-

crat, of New Jersey, who along with others has repeatedly called for the creation of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

In addition, several Members of Congress have introduced bills to establish what they call a national showcase of the arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, featuring a biennial international olympiad of the arts and sciences.

Its purpose would be to encourage competition among talented young people from all over the world, similar to the competition in Moscow from which Van Cliburn rose to fame.

In line with the encouragement of national talent, Mr. McDOWELL has proposed that college and university music and drama groups be included in the cultural exchange program.

This proposal is receiving the serious consideration of the State Department. At present some 20 college and university music and drama groups are sent abroad each year by the Defense Department to entertain American troops. It is Mr. McDOWELL's idea that this program be expanded so that these groups may have contact with the young people of other countries.

These various proposals constitute a drive which is rapidly gaining momentum to support the arts and particularly to give Washington parties some competition by the development of a cultural center in the Nation's Capital.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in commenting editorially on the difference between Washington and other cities in providing for the arts, put it this way: "There are reasons for this contrast. More than in other cities, politics predominates locally, and this tends to crowd out the arts in a city overdedicated to government. Lack of home rule helps to stifle civic initiative and community enterprise here. More than other cities, Washington is populated by transients who donate their efforts (and endowments) elsewhere."

"But even when these limitations are acknowledged, Washington can and should do more to provide a better balanced cultural program worthy of a capital and more representative of the Nation."

SCIENCE SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., March 15, 1960.

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.,
U.S. Representative from Delaware,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: We were very please to have been sent a copy of H.R. 9503 by your legislative assistant, Mr. George Frain.

As you probably know, Science Service is responsible for the operation of three distinct youth programs which have made a great impact on the development of young scientists in this country. These activities are:

1. The Science Clubs of America: More than 600,000 students are members of the some 25,000 science clubs throughout the United States and in several foreign countries.

2. The Science talent search: This is the first nationwide effort to identify young scientists. The current search represented the 19th such effort. Tens of thousands of boys and girls have found great incentive for studying science because of the Westinghouse scholarships offered to the top winners of this search.

3. The National Science Fair—International: This year marks the 11th National Science Fair held under the auspices of Science Service. Some 200 regional fairs which, in turn are fed by some 5,000 to 6,000 school and local fairs, will send their two top winners to Indianapolis where the fair is to be held from May 11 to 14.

In recent years this has begun to take on an international aspect with the National

Science Fair of Japan sending its winner, and there also being included winners from Canada and the Armed Forces schools in Europe. This year Thailand is also scheduled to send winners from its national fair.

Obviously Science Service has a backlog of experience which could be very helpful in furthering this bill. In conversation with Mr. Frain, he suggested that it might be a good idea for some of us to have a short conference with you in which we could work out some areas of future cooperation.

Enclosed is an announcement of the 11th National Science Fair, a copy of the list of 40 top winners of the science talent search and list of the 400 students in the honors group, and a copy the sponsor handbook which is distributed to all 25,000 science clubs. Perhaps you will have a chance to glance through these before our meeting. I shall get in touch with your office on Thursday to see whether or not we could arrange a conference for some time soon.

We feel you are to be congratulated for pushing such legislation as this, and because of our contacts throughout the Nation with thousands interested in science development, we believe that we may be able to be of help. We shall look forward to a meeting with you.

With warm regards,

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERICK A. INDORF,
Education Director.

FEBRUARY 27, 1960.

The Honorable HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write to commend you for your continuing efforts in support of legislation to elevate the cultural standards and activities in the District of Columbia. I am very close to the serious problems of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department.

An appropriation to the National Symphony would surely alleviate the strain of a hard-working fund-raising group that even now is out soliciting nickels and dimes so that this great orchestra can exist. The season is short and the weekly pay is inadequate to the extent that the symphony musician, in most cases, is forced to drive a cab, work in a department store or other type of work for 20 weeks out of the year in an effort to approximate a livable annual income.

The Opera Society is wonderful but it just can't get off the ground. It needs help—now.

The only way the District of Columbia Recreation Department has been able to provide a semblance of free cultural programs has been through the cooperation of this organization which has matched its \$10,000 dollar for dollar in an effort to sustain the Watergate concerts. Unfortunately, new agreements between the recording industry and the American Federation of Musicians that provides this fund indicate that the amount available to us will be sharply reduced and our cooperation with the District of Columbia Recreation Department will suffer proportionately and eventually this worthwhile project will have to rely solely on the meager appropriation of the District of Columbia which will spell the end to free music in the Greater Washington Area.

If my personal testimony should in the near future prove of any value, please call on me at any time. I have already met with Mr. Carson Fralley, president of the National Symphony Association, Mr. Herman Williams of the Corcoran Gallery and Messrs. Christiansen and Price of the District of Columbia Recreation Department. We are all highly enthusiastic about the prospects of doing

a better job which can only be done through passage of your cultural bill.

Reassuring you of our great interest and with repeated thanks, I am,

Most sincerely,

SAM JACK KAUFMAN,
President, Local 161, A.F. of M.

America's World Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, Pablo Casals needs no introduction to the American people. For more years than many of us know, we have listened enraptured as he helped us to see more deeply and clearly the beauties of the great music of the world. But, Senor Casals is more than a musician. He is a scholar, a humanitarian, and a keen observer of the world around him. For these reasons, I believe that his letter to the New York Times this morning ought to become a permanent part of the RECORD of this body.

I commend the letter, which follows, to the careful attention of my colleagues:

AMERICA'S WORLD POSITION—DEMOCRATIC PARTY VICTORY DECLARED IN INTEREST OF PEACE

(The writer of the following letter is the famous cellist who has lived in exile since the fall of the Spanish Republic.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the last 4 years I have lived in Puerto Rico, close to the American people and within the sphere of direct influence of your system of government. This has made it possible for me to study and evaluate, with better elements of judgment, some of the traits of the U.S. Government which perhaps might escape the observation of a European living in Europe.

Such an analysis might be of interest to the average citizen of the United States. Particularly if it came from a European who is both a liberal and a Democrat, who loves your people and admires your institutions.

For I hold the conviction and the faith that the United States has the material and spiritual capabilities to establish the principles of freedom and justice that will insure a lasting peace on this restless and turbulent world of ours.

INTEGRITY OF IDEALS

In all fairness I must say that, in general, in my analysis there is a favorable balance for your system on the basis of the integrity of your ideals and the sincerity with which you strive to realize them.

I am, however, aware of the fact that despite the good intentions and the good will of your leaders, the desirable action does not always go hand in hand with the ideals that inspire it.

In my judgment, that has been the case, as a general rule, under the traditionally orthodox conservatism of the National Republican Party. This conservative attitude of the Republican leadership has been promptly reflected in the foreign policy of the United States and in the world reaction following the implementation of the policy. I strongly feel that this is the source of the misunderstandings and the resentments that frustrate the desire of the United States to

live fraternally and in peace with the other peoples of the world community.

This Republican attitude is in sharp contrast with the wise, reasonable, and moderate liberalism which has enabled the Democrats to win over the friendship and cooperation of other peoples professing the same ideology, whenever they have ruled and promoted the basic democratic ideals of your people in the foreign field.

FAITH IN PRINCIPLES

I should like to reaffirm my faith in the lofty principles of freedom and justice which inspire the American credo of life. I am convinced that these principles, placed at the service of mankind with liberality and nobility, would bring about in the world the welfare and the peace to which all men of good will aspire.

All this can be accomplished through clearly democratic policy and behavior, a position devoid of insincerity and of the ambiguities which today erode the foreign policy of the United States.

This is why the free peoples of the world, and those who aspire for freedom, have pinned their hopes on the victory of the Democratic Party of the United States. For that victory will strengthen world confidence in the expectation that there shall be no more vacillations and delays in the attainment of peace supported upon the immovable pillars of liberty and the solidarity of man.

PABLO CASALS.

SANTURCE, P.R., February 21, 1960.

Casavina's Dream Realized—From Erin to Italy to America, Irish Marble Coming for Important Edifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkable story of how a Paterson businessman is promoting the Irish marble industry with the help of Italian craftsmen and American consumers. The story—particularly fitting on St. Patrick's Day—appeared in the March 14, 1960, issue of the Paterson Evening News:

CASAVINA'S DREAM REALIZED—FROM ERIN TO ITALY TO AMERICA, IRISH MARBLE COMING FOR IMPORTANT EDIFICES

A one-man, three-way point 4 program aimed at creating jobs for Irish and Italian marble workers and a cultural heritage for America is being developed by a Paterson industrialist.

He is Paul R. Casavina, dedicated backer of the Forward Paterson movement, owner of the Casavan Carrara Marble Co. of Paterson and Ridgefield Park, and head of the Casavan Industries, whose products range all the way from thermonuclear metals for atomic warheads to mosaic marble.

The firm's Paterson plant is located in the former Barbour Flax Mills, in the old Dublin section of the city. A new, modern office building is being constructed at the Ridgefield Park location to provide for the expanding operations in its marble division.

Casavina is a unique combination of hardheaded businessman and deep-dyed idealist. He came out of World War II a

full colonel at age 26 (he enlisted as a buck private) with his ideals intact and the deeply embedded conviction that if ever the goal of universal peace is to be achieved, it will come not through pious pronouncements and pageantry, but the increasingly horrendous mass slaughter men call war.

SAYS FULL STOMACH WAR DETERRENT

"When people have enough food in their stomachs, when they have work in which they can take pride and can know the joy of creating, then we will have people too busy and too happy to think about war," he says. Toward that end he has been working since his return to civilian life.

His marble quarries in Carrara, Italy, have provided jobs for some 3,000 workers, who have been taught to merge the age-old skills handed down to them through the generations with modern production techniques. Up until a few months ago these quarries provided all of the marble used by the Casavina firm in its extensive American enterprise.

Recently he was able to complete negotiations to take over the operations of Irish Marble, Ltd., whose home office is on O'Connell Street, Limerick, Ireland, with quarries in such poetic sounding places as Connemara, Galway, Limerick, and Marlin Park.

Last Thursday, Casavina visited the Irish consulate in New York by invitation of John Conway, Minister Plenipotentiary, Consul General of Ireland, to talk over his plans for developing the Irish marble industry. He presented ashtrays made of green Irish marble to the members of the consular staff. He was warmly welcomed by the Government officials who see this linking of the two nations doing much to benefit the Irish economy and further deepening friendships between the people of both lands.

As might be expected, green marble comes greenest and fairest from the Emerald Isle, but according to Casavina, the Irish Republic has been unable to make any great progress in commercializing this industry. What exports do leave the country amount to only small shipments of the marble which usually end up as bookends or paperweights.

TO TEACH IRISH CRAFTSMEN

Under this new arrangement, modern production methods will be introduced to the Irish marble industry. Italian craftsmen will be brought from Carrara to teach the Irish workers the techniques employed by their craft that cannot be replaced by 20th century technology. In addition to providing jobs, this bringing together of artisans from two countries, to work and live together will serve as an effective program for bettering international relations, Casavina believes. Initially he expects to be able to provide some 3,000 to 4,000 jobs for Irishmen in his Irish quarries: eventually up to 10,000. In an agricultural nation like Ireland, where the bulk of the income is derived from small family farms, the impact of such an operation should serve as a powerful shot in the arm to the national economy, he says.

The Irish Government is greeting the project with enthusiasm. One of the handicaps preventing the full exploitation of the Irish marble industry has been the lack of modern transportation facilities that would permit bringing out marble in bulk quantities. Now, the Government has agreed to construct a hardtop road from the quarries to the nearest port, over which Casavina's heavy equipment will be able to bring the big marble blocks out for bulk shipment.

FIRST AMERICAN IRISH MARBLE ALTAR

The raw marble will be sent from Ireland to Italy for processing at Casavina's Carrara works and then to America where it will go into church altars, statuary and building mosaics installed by American workmen.

The first project in which it will be used is on the high altar of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Closter.

The altar is estimated to cost about \$13,000 to \$14,000, and the church itself \$340,000, according to the Rev. Kevin Cahill, pastor, a native of County Kerry.

The shipment of Irish marble from which St. Mary's altar will be carved consists of 200 cubic foot blocks, weighing a total of 35 tons. These blocks will be carved and sawed into 27 pieces.

George Vuinovich, church architect of Englewood Cliffs, says the altar will be in contrasting shades of green and black marble. The Irish marble will be used on the main altar, two side altars, the altar rails, lectern and sanctuary floor. The church is expected to be completed by Easter, Father Cahill says.

Casavina sees this three-way jobs-across-the-sea program as making an important contribution toward cementing the already warm friendships and developing greater understanding between the peoples of Italy, Ireland and America. At the same time he believes it will do much to raise the standards of living in the two European nations.

DIGNITY OF WORK

"By giving people honest work, and the chance to earn a fair wage we can accomplish far more for democracy than with all of the handouts we might be able to distribute among the depressed areas of the world," he says.

But he is quick to point out that work alone is not the answer.

"A man must find dignity in his work. He must be able to feel that he is working with and not for his employer. He must be given fair compensation, a chance to know that he is an appreciated member of the team, that he is creating something of value and that through his work, his life has been given meaning and purpose."

Statement of Federation of Homemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the National Federation of Homemakers presented by Mrs. Ruth G. Desmond before a hearing examiner of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with the order delisting certain food and cosmetic coal tar colors.

Mrs. Desmond expresses very well the reason for concern of American housewives and women over coloring substances going into food and cosmetics.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF FEDERATION OF HOMEMAKERS—PUBLIC HEARING ON OBJECTIONS TO FINAL ORDER DELISTING CERTAIN D. & C. COAL-TAR COLORS FROM THE LIST SUBJECT TO CERTIFICATION

Mr. Examiner and gentlemen, I am Ruth Desmond, secretary of the Federation of Homemakers, a group which consists of housewives residing in this area and in many of our States. We also have junior members attending local colleges. Our federation is most appreciative of being afforded this opportunity to express the views

of its members regarding colors used in lipsticks.

First, we wish to commend the Food and Drug Administration personnel as a whole for their efforts to protect the well-being of consumers, and especially to commend the scientists of this agency, who are highly regarded in their professional fields. The present testimony has disclosed that these FDA scientists have made numerous contributions to scientific literature. We wish to state that our members have confidence in the ability, responsibility, and integrity of these FDA scientists to make competent decisions in their respective fields.

Last spring before our federation was formed, an interested group (now charter members of our organization) inspected certain of the laboratory facilities of FDA. We were impressed with the dedicated attitude of the scientific staff, but disturbed that these scientists were carrying out their experiments in cramped, congested quarters not even their own. We hope that this present session of Congress will remedy this deplorable situation by an appropriation for the construction of the building recommended for this agency by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 1955.

Here, I would like to note that the late Sir Edward Mellanby in his Sanderson-Well Lecture on "The Chemical Manipulation of Food," delivered at the Middlesex Hospital, May 4, 1951, which appears in the British Medical Journal of Saturday, October 13, 1951, praises the experimental work carried out by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the official inquiries held by this agency on specific matters of interest. Sir Mellanby expressed regret that at that time there was no such competent agency in his country carrying on this important work.

We also wish to compliment the cosmetic industry for its continuous efforts over a long period of time to furnish completely wholesome cosmetic preparations to the public. Their good record proves the effectiveness of this diligence.

It is appropriate to remind you here that in 1939 American housewives, through their various organizations and clubs, went on record at hearings conducted by the Federal Security Agency that they wished only colors certified as absolutely safe used in their foods and cosmetics. If today's housewives were consulted about this problem of colors added to foods and cosmetics, our federation feels confident they, too, would go on record as wishing safety of the product to be paramount.

Now that American women are accustomed to the brightness which lipsticks give to their faces and the lift to their spirits they would be loath to forgo their addiction to them—but our members to plead that only harmless dyes be used in their lipsticks. Members of our sex start using lipsticks these days at the age of 12 or thereabouts and continue their use till they depart this existence. Because of such universal and continuous use of lipsticks by all ages of our female population, cumulative effect of the dyes must be seriously considered. (Our members are positive they ingest a certain amount of their lipsticks and feel that the method of applying lipsticks determines the quantity ingested. Those users who blot their lipsticks do not ingest as much as those who prefer a moist effect and apply their colors liberally and do not blot.) It must also be noted that lipsticks are used by young girls whose cells are still dividing rapidly. Such dyes may have a different effect on these young persons than on mature individuals. Lipsticks are also applied by expectant mothers, whose bodies undergo many drastic changes during the stress and strain of pregnancy. Then consideration of the possible effects upon the elderly, who may be taking medication for

chronic illness is suggested. May we point out that the seriously ill use lipstick to conceal the ravages of disease. In fact hospital staffs encourage women patients to primp, feeling morale will be improved by improvement of appearance. Yet concern should be expressed, we feel, to the fact that while morale of the ill is being bolstered by application of cosmetics, damage might possibly be sustained from synergistic reactions of medicines with impurities, however minute, of cosmetic dyes.

It is our understanding that in carrying out tests to determine the harmlessness of these lipstick colors, now being considered, all the animals selected were healthy, both controls and test animals alike. These animals obtained a balanced diet, the only difference being the addition of color to the diet of the test animals. It is our understanding also that rats are not as sensitive to dyes as humans and dogs. With humans we do not always have such an advantage of both good health and correct diets. Numerous surveys conducted by responsible nutritional and medical groups have revealed that our American young girls (both at high school and college levels) have poor food habits. These authorities deplore this revelation as they feel this is a time when our young girls should be receiving adequate, balanced diets to prepare them to be healthy mothers later. These same adolescents use lipstick generously and frequently.

Modern conditions of living force the human system to cope with air pollution and water pollution as well as the products of atomic fallout. We ingest traces of pesticide residues, food additives and dyes. Therefore, it seems especially needful that discretion and caution should be observed in the choice of dyes to be used in our lipsticks. We feel that total impact of all of these elements and substances on the human system must be taken into consideration in permitting certain colors to be used in the manufacture of lipsticks. Dr. W. Coda Martin, testifying before the House Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, during the recent food additives hearings, stated on page 279 of the printed report as follows:

"The first line of defense must be to protect the health of the consumer; otherwise, the long-range 'calculated risk' is that this country will become a Nation of invalids, weak in body and mind."

Dr. Morton L. Levin, assistant commissioner, Division of Medical Services, State Department of Health, Albany, N.Y., stated after remarking that cancer is regarded as a common disease, at page 355 of the printed hearings:

"In the presence of a common disease, of which most cases are of unknown causation, I think you can understand the sensitivity of physicians and public health authorities to the possibility that substances which we do not suspect today may be causative of cancer."

Sir Edward Mellanby, discussing the effect of chemicals on the human system, warns in his lecture mentioned previously:

"Even when such chemical substances have passed through a battery of tests from the point of view of toxicology, unexpected harmful results have often ultimately been demonstrated."

"Medical science often cannot give adequate answers to questions of toxicological action, not only as regards new compounds but even in the case of substances long in use. Indeed, to the medical man unpleasant surprises are constantly being revealed, in the case both of drugs and of chemicals used in food preparation."

It seems to our members that simply because it may take years to recognize the damage done to the body cells and function by certain pesticides, additives and dyes, dis-

cretion and caution should not be abandoned and their use permitted in our foods and cosmetics. We feel that the old adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" applies to this particular problem.

I thank you gentlemen for granting me this opportunity to convey the opinion of our members.

Italian Labor Leaders Tour Springfield, Mass., Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, three representatives of Italy's democratic labor unions, visiting in the United States under a State Department-sponsored program, are spending 1 week in my home city of Springfield, Mass., to get a first-hand impression and knowledge of labor-management relations and industrial training in this country.

I welcome these representatives of free Italian labor organizations to my city and know that they will absorb much during their tour through Springfield industries, conferences with Springfield labor officials and management officials and with members of the Springfield Trade School faculty.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix a news story published in the Springfield Daily News on Tuesday, March 15, 1960, concerning the visit of these Italian labor leaders:

ITALIAN LABOR LEADERS TOUR PLANTS—THREE UNION MEN SEE UNITED STATES UNDER INVITATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Representatives of Italy's democratic labor unions Monday toured a Springfield manufacturing plant and Springfield Trade School to get ideas on labor-management relations and industrial training in the United States.

Guests of the Western Massachusetts CIO Council, the three men were given a tour of the Springfield plant of Chain Belt Co. where they watched the entire manufacturing process that goes into the local firm's power trains.

Guglielmo Volpi, Ettore Foschi, and Gaetano Montanari are spending a week in Springfield as part of a program sponsored by the State Department.

One of the things which impressed them most was Springfield Trade School, where youths are prepared for positions in the production phase of industry.

NEEDED ABROAD

"This is something we need in Italy," said Mr. Volpi. "We have schools to train doctors and lawyers, but none to train workers."

He added that in many cases, workers in the trades are trained on an apprenticeship basis, studying under an experienced workman, and that technical training is rare.

Mr. Montanari, unofficial interpreter for the group, all of whom spoke English, said that about 60 to 65 percent of Italian labor is unionized, with the Communists holding a large portion of the workers. There are, he said, two democratic and one Communist union in Italy.

A great difference was noted, too, in the status of the laborer in the two countries.

In a quick exchange of comments, Mr. Foschi said that Italian labor was not protected by law as is American labor. He said that there are neither provisions nor requirements for collective bargaining between labor and management in that country.

Each individual trade, he said, made a national contract, which the company may or may not follow. There is no law requiring the company to adhere to the contract. "Our labor unions are divided and weak," he said, and noted that efforts were being made in Italy to unify labor and labor unions to get a better bargaining position.

Comparing standards of living, Mr. Montanari said:

CAN'T COMPARE

"You cannot compare them on a wage basis, but on what the wage can buy. In the United States a worker can buy a package of cigarettes for one-eighth of an hour's pay. In Italy, a package of cigarettes costs the worker an hour to an hour and a half's pay."

The Italian worker, he said, works a 48-hour, 6-day week.

An interesting look into the recent collapse of the Segni government in Italy was provided by Mr. Montanari, who said that a labor battle was one of the causes. "The Liberal Party wanted labor laws," he said, "and the others did not." The ensuing quarrel between parties, he said, helped to split and weaken the government and cause its eventual collapse.

All three looked toward unification and new industries as the key to bettering the Italian worker's lot. Unification, they agreed, needed no explanation, but was simply necessary to improve labor's position for negotiation. And they pointed to the electric, synthetic, crude oil, and petrochemical industries growing up in the south of Italy as examples of the country's expanding industrial development and a possible key to improving the labor picture there.

To Buttress Argument—Political Polls Being Used in "Numbers Game"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have asked me how things are shaping up for the Wisconsin primary on April 5. Ron May, Washington correspondent for the Capital Times in Madison, Wis., has analyzed the situation in an article in the March 14 Capital Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that article in the RECORD:

TO BUTTRESS ARGUMENT—POLITICAL POLLS BEING USED IN "NUMBERS GAME"

(By Ron May)

WASHINGTON.—Public opinion polls are still being used in a questionable numbers game in connection with the Wisconsin primary.

This column previously reported that in January Gov. Gaylord Nelson was told by a representative of Senator JOHN KENNEDY that a private poll showed the latter leading Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY by 63-37, in percentages. The Governor was being pressured by leading KENNEDY partisans to endorse the Massachusetts Senator.

Nelson refused to join the "sure winner." After this became clear, the Senator's

brother, Robert, reversed the tack and told reporters at a New Hampshire press conference that he had advised JOHN not to enter Wisconsin because he was an "underdog" there.

A few days later columnist Joseph Alsop took up the "underdog" theme in a big way and reported that KENNEDY's private pollster, Lou Harris, put KENNEDY ahead by only 53-47. This somewhat bolstered the underdog claim, but—if true—still far from supported it.

Told by this column of the discrepancy between the two polls, Alsop conceded that he had got his figures from KENNEDY, and promised to check them—presumably with Harris, who is a close friend. Alsop reported back that he was sure his figures were authentic.

But the leaks of poll "results" did not stop. This column, which a year earlier had "bit" on an inconsistent Harris poll on Pennsylvania, taken from KENNEDY's file, got another one 2 weeks ago, allegedly from the same source.

While this reporter was still checking the authenticity of the latest leak, pertaining to Wisconsin, it was presented as genuine in a syndicated column by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. Scott told this reporter that he was sure the new report was real.

But the third "poll" is different from either of the other two. It shows KENNEDY with 57 percent—not 63 or 53. However, its heading would seem to indicate that, like the first two, it had a specific political purpose—a message to "sell." The data is titled "The Wisconsin Vote Steal."

The report says its contents are based on "present polls." Dated February 1, this would mean it was drawn up only a few days after both the 63-percent and 53-percent figures were circulated and was presumably based upon the results of the same early January questioning by Harris agents.

The district-by-district estimates add up to KENNEDY winning 4 of the 10 congressional districts (for 10 delegates) and the statewide count (for 5 delegates), while HUMPHREY takes 6 districts (for 15 delegates). The report argues that, under the figures given, KENNEDY would get the same number of delegates as HUMPHREY—15—but would have more votes.

The listed statewide totals are 323,000 for KENNEDY and 242,000 for HUMPHREY.

But the clear intent of amassing the figures to buttress an argument, rather than to report the truth, discredits the "results."

The ratio of votes between KENNEDY and HUMPHREY in the various districts would appear to be credible, from other sources. For example, KENNEDY hopes to pile up his winning margin Milwaukee's two districts). In the fourth and fifth (represented by Democrats CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and HENRY REUSS) the report gives KENNEDY 150,000 votes to only 60,000 for HUMPHREY, or a majority of 90,000. His statewide majority is given as 81,000.

The other districts claimed for KENNEDY are the eight (Green Bay), with 15,000 majority and the sixth (Fox River Valley), with 20,000 majority.

The Plight of Small Store Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the serious plight of the small businessman

grows worse every day due to the increasing tempo of mergers, consolidations, and unfair trade practices on the part of big business. The small retail merchants are often compelled to close their doors and go out of business. As a direct result, stores are vacated and remain unoccupied, thereby causing further loss to the owners of the properties and to city tax officials who are deeply concerned about revenues to operate the many and varied functions of municipal governments. In the city of Baltimore alone, there are now over 255 vacant stores.

Fortunately, however, Baltimore has such civic leaders as Herman Katlow, president of the Affiliated Neighborhood Merchants Association; William Boucher, III, executive director of the Greater Baltimore Committee; George E. Thomas, director of the Independent Grocers Association; and Sidney Hollander, Jr., marketing analyst, who are now studying this particular problem.

The Baltimore Sun of March 16, 1960, reported the problems of the small store owners. I recommend that it be carefully read by my colleagues in the Congress as it focuses attention to this pressing matter. It is as follows:

SMALL STORE OWNERS MEET—DISCUSS MUTUAL PROBLEMS IN AUTO-SHOPPING CENTER AGE

About 60 of Baltimore's small store owners met at the Enoch Pratt Free Library last night to discuss mutual problems in the age of the automobile and the shopping center.

The question before them was: "Is the Neighborhood Merchant Obsolete?"

The consensus seemed to be that the small merchant is not obsolete, but he may soon become so unless he does something to help himself.

WARNING GIVEN

Herman Katlow, president of the Affiliated Neighborhood Merchants Association which represents more than 1,000 retail stores, warned that the number of vacant stores in Baltimore has about doubled in the last 2 years.

There are now 255 vacant stores in the city, which presents a problem not only for merchants but for city officials worrying about tax revenues, Mr. Katlow said.

He suggested neighborhood organizations of retail men who would seek to solve mutual problems with mutually sponsored sales programs.

Mr. Katlow also said that "the time has come to call a halt to the haphazard spread of shopping centers."

YOU MUST ORGANIZE

William Boucher 3d, executive director of the Greater Baltimore Committee, took somewhat the same tact.

"You must organize yourselves to solve your own problems," Mr. Boucher said.

He told the merchants that metropolitan Baltimore's population is now 1,600,000 and that it will increase by 1 million in the next 20 years.

"If you're going to survive, you must attract to your doors a higher percentage of the million people," he said.

George E. Thomas, director of the Independent Grocers Association, told the merchants they could avoid obsolescence by moving to a good location in a new area and offering the little extra services to customers that big stores do not provide.

Mr. Thomas suggested that small merchants be allowed to move their stores into new housing developments.

Sydney Hollander, Jr., marketing analyst, said shopping centers now account for about

16 percent of retail sales in Baltimore, compared with only 2 percent in 1948. He noted, however, that total retail sales have increased in that period from \$1,017,600,000 in 1948 to about \$1,392,500,000 today.

"Ben-Hur," by Gen. Lew Wallace, Hoosier Soldier, Statesman, Diplomat, and Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1960, I had the distinct pleasure of viewing the premiere Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer performance of "Ben-Hur," based on the epic novel written by the Hoosier soldier, statesman, diplomat, and author, Gen. Lew Wallace.

I am quite proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that Indiana-born General Wallace was a longtime resident of Crawfordsville, Ind., which lies within the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

On April 4, 1960, an election will be held in which I and every other Indian, I am sure, have a keen interest. This election, however, will have nothing whatsoever to do with politics. I refer to the academy award voting now under way within the motion picture industry.

Twelve of the nominations for "Oscar" awards are of direct interest to Indiana because they are award nominations based on MGM's "Ben-Hur."

The following short history and list of little-known facts about "Ben-Hur" will, I believe, be of interest to all:

"Ben-Hur," as a novel, became the leading best seller of its day.

For more than 20 years it topped the list in popularity and to date is believed to have sold more copies than any book ever published, with the exception of the Bible.

It has been translated into every language throughout the world, been as popular abroad as in America, and is still widely read today. More than a dozen different pocket editions have been on the bookstands since the author's copyright expired in the mid-thirties.

Gen. Lew Wallace, soldier, statesman, and diplomat, wrote his story in part as an answer to Col. Robert Ingersoll, a famous agnostic of the 1870's. The two men had met on a train and engaged in a lengthy discussion on the subject of religion.

It was Ingersoll's contention that the existence of a God or a hereafter is open to considerable speculation. Wallace, who for some time had been planning a book set in the early days of Christianity, determined to make the novel an answer to Ingersoll's challenge.

He spent 7 years writing it. During some of this time he was serving as Governor of the Territory of New Mexico. It was published by Harper Brothers in 1880, and literary historians record that its inspirational and richly dramatic story caught the public's fancy at once. Within 8 years an unprecedented half a million copies had been sold and the demand was just beginning.

Soon the name Ben-Hur was everywhere. Or so it seemed. There were Ben-Hur commercial products on every storecounter. Sunday schools and churches staged Ben-Hur pageants. Ben-Hur chariot races were held at county fairs; Ben-Hur marches were played by John Philip Sousa and his band. Even today there are a number of commercial items that bear the name Ben-Hur, and it has been given to an insurance company as well as a popular fraternal lodge.

In 1900 the name achieved even wider fame when the book was adapted into a play and presented on the stage of New York's old Broadway Theater by the firm of Klaw & Erlanger. It immediately became as big a hit in the theater as it had been as a novel.

William S. Hart, later to become a famous film cowboy star, was the original Messala. William Farnum, also destined for fame in the movies, took over the role of Ben-Hur in 1901 from Edward J. Morgan, who created it, and played it for 2 years. Two chariots, operating on treadmills, were a sensation of the stage presentation. Within 6 years the number of chariots had increased to eight.

The play ran continuously somewhere in the United States for the next 17 years. It was also performed with great success in London, Paris, Copenhagen, Berlin, and other cities throughout the world.

In 1907, when motion pictures were in their infancy, it was made as a one-reel film by the old Kalem Co., of New York. The 16 magnificent scenes had been filmed at Pain's Fireworks Show, Manhattan Beach, with costumes from the Metropolitan Opera House.

The chariot race was performed by the 3d Battery of the Brooklyn Fire Department. This film had to be withdrawn when the Wallace heirs sued the producers on ground no permission had been obtained for the filming. The case was fought through to the U.S. Supreme Court with a decision handed down against the Kalem Co. It was a suit that vindicated the legal right of authors in a new and extensive field—motion pictures.

Through 45 years every American within reach of print and pictures, and most foreigners, must at least have heard of Ben-Hur. Most came to know it and remember it; thousands upon thousands read the book, saw the play, enacted it themselves.

Then, in the mid-1920's, MGM produced a film version which has become one of the great classics of the silent screen.

A new generation became even more familiar with Ben-Hur, Messala, Esther, Quintus Arrius and the other colorful characters in the story.

Today, as MGM launches its spectacular new entertainment, millions upon millions more will now thrill to the adventures of this most exciting of all fictional heroes.

General Wallace wrote the "Ben-Hur" manuscript in longhand in purple ink.

Soon after the book's publication a deluxe two volume edition sold for \$30, unheard of at that time.

The first stage presentation cost an unprecedented \$75,000; boasted a company of 400.

At the London opening first nighters included A. Conan Doyle, Marie Tempest, and Sir Henry Irving, England's King Edward and Queen Alexandra watched from a special box built in center of the pit.

Barnum and Bailey staged a chariot race in their circus in competition with the one in the play.

William S. Hart, the original Messala, claimed the Roman did win once (1901) at a Boston performance when a treadmill failed.

In San Francisco the play took in \$128,000, a record in those days, and the railroads ran special "Ben-Hur" trains to the city.

Aviation Week Editor Questions Effectiveness of U.S. Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Aviation Week magazine. Editor Robert Hotz' views on "The Defense Debate" are worthy of our attention and belong in the record of the administration's handling of the defense problem.

The editorial follows:

THE DEFENSE DEBATE

(By Robert Hotz)

The running 4-year debate over the effectiveness of the U.S. defense program in relation to that of the Soviet Union has reached an incandescent glow on Capitol Hill that indicates it may be a major issue in the fall elections as well as a matter of vital interest to American citizens concerned with the survival of our country and its democratic institutions. One of the main difficulties in assessing the merits of the conflicting viewpoints in this bitter debate is that all contenders are basing their cases on a different time period.

For example, the administration spokesmen in the White House, Senate, and Pentagon who are assuring Americans that all is well, are talking about our military position today. This is, of course, completely irrelevant to the principal issue of the defense debate which is: Are we making the correct decisions today to insure that our military superiority will continue for the predictable future? As Lt. Gen. Bernard Schriever, Chief of the Air Research and Development Command, testified before the Senate, the decisions made in 1960 will irrevocably determine our military strength in 1984 just as the fateful economy decisions of 1958 and 1959 have made inevitable the potentially dangerous missile gap of 1961-64.

There are several strong indications that the administration is finding it increasingly difficult to defend its military policy in the face of evidence of Soviet capability in aircraft, missile and space areas which it tried so hard to ignore and denigrate for so long. First, it has been forced to yield to critics' demands in a number of vital areas, although most of these actions are coming about a year later than they should to achieve maximum results. These retreats by the administration include:

Expansion of the Atlas ICBM program demanded by congressional and public critics a year ago when the fiscal 1960 budget was being debated. The administration increase in the Atlas program, however, merely tacks on more production at the end of the original schedule and does not accelerate the current production rates to provide additional capability during the critical years of the missile gap.

Provision of initial, though inadequate, funds to begin preparation for an airborne alert for Strategic Air Command bombers during the period when they will be forced to operate without any certain warning of a Soviet missile attack.

Increased funding of the Saturn space booster program after a year of fumbling and administrative indecision over whether this program was vital and over which agency should develop the rocket cluster.

Increased Polaris missile-launching submarine program, where congressional pressure has added two-thirds of the present program size to the original budget request.

Another major crack in the administration defense policy has come from increasing evidence that the channels through which defense information flows to the White House often deliver incomplete, distorted and inadequate facts to the Commander in Chief. It is evident that the intelligence data on which the President and his chief military informants—Defense Secretary Thomas Gates and Gen. Nathan Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—are basing their position, differs considerably from the data presented to the Senate by Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, concerning the Soviet missile threat.

Although the President is, in effect, the direct Commander in Chief of Strategic Air Command and has some pronounced views on the operation of SAC, he has, as far as we have been able to determine, talked directly with the present SAC commander only once in the 3 years he has held this vital post. It must be somewhat of a shock to the American public which still has great faith in the President's military capability to find that he has just paid his first visit to the Cape Canaveral Missile Test Center during his 7 years as President. He apparently spent about as much time inspecting this key installation as it normally takes for an 18-hole round of golf.

The numerous technical inaccuracies that appeared in his two postspatnik television speeches on defense, the incredible episode of Trevor Gardner's 10-minute attempt to brief him on the ICBM development program several years ago and the Turkish radar incident all provide further indications that the flow of current defense information to the President leaves considerable to be desired. Another indication of the gravity of the defense issue is the administration's desperate attempts to defend its own position by blackening the character and impugning the motives of any who dare to criticize it.

Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder, who functions as an appendage of White House Press Secretary James Hagerty, has been quoted by Life magazine and Drew Pearson, without any public denial, as ordering defense officials to "kick in the teeth" of reporters who question administration defense policies and to impugn their patriotism. General Twining, in a statement that would be unbelievable if it were not part of the printed record of Senate hearings, accused defense critics of being defeatists who "would rather be red than dead." It must be obvious to General Twining that defense critics want more effective defense, not less, and are urging this country to improve its position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union—not lay down and open the door to communism. This statement of General Twining's must cast serious doubts on the validity of any other testimony he may provide on this crucial issue.

The basic issues involved in this defense debate are simple and clear, despite the obfuscations aimed at screening them. They are:

First, are we utilizing the full technical, industrial, military, and economic capacity of this country to attain a military posture of unquestionable and undebatable superiority that will enable us to continue to provide world leadership? To this we regrettably conclude the answer at present is "No."

Second, are we organizing our defense program around the basic requirements for continued survival as a free nation in the face of the Communist challenge or are we organizing it around arbitrary fiscal limits? Again the answer appears to be a sad "No."

These are the questions the American people should continue to ask their leaders and those who aspire to leadership.

Religion in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. A. Russell Stevenson in which he describes teaching the ABC's of bumper crop farming at a Christian Service outpost in Pakistan. In his assignment as program director for Church World Service, Dr. Stevenson's duties take him into every part of the free world where projects supported by American churches bring both promise and realization of a better life to millions of the world's neediest.

In this article he tells the story of a practical Christian agricultural missionary who, working side by side with the impoverished villagers, is helping them to help themselves.

The article follows:

David Stockley is a tall, heavy-set redhead in his early thirties. He looks like a British farmer—set him down anywhere from Dorset to Northumberland and he would seem to have grown out of the soil.

But David Stockley's present farm is a long way from his ancestral England. It is in Khulna, 40 miles from the city of Jessore in east Pakistan.

To get to Khulna from Jessore you travel 4 hours on one of the slowest railroads in the world. Then you walk along a crowded, dirty street amid the seething confusion of men, animals, and vehicles, past a Baptist mission church, and you come to the edge of Stockley's project. It is called the Khulna Agricultural and Village Uplift Center. And it is working a modern-day miracle.

The farm at the Khulna Agricultural and Village Uplift Center, as farms in England or America go, is small in size—only 8 acres.

But as the loaves and fishes, which were only seven—being five and two—were multiplied until "the multitude * * * did eat and were filled," the fruits of David Stockley's labors at Khulna too are multiplied many thousandfold and because of them hungry multitudes of Pakistani are fed.

A missionary of the British Baptist Board, it is sobering to realize that David Stockley is the only agricultural missionary in all of east Pakistan, a country whose 40 million people live mainly in tiny villages and whose entire and precarious subsistence must be wrested from the soil.

I went to Khulna in November during a 2-month journey for Church World Service, a journey that took me to 15 countries in the Middle East and Asia. Through such appeals as the "One Great Hour of Sharing," our churches provide Stockley with leverage money, the funds over and above his mission board's appropriation which allows the leeway to experiment and to invest in a wide variety of projects that build for the future even as they serve the present.

I found him in his usual dress, a pair of old trousers rolled up to the knees, a shirt with an open collar that had seen lots of wear, and bare feet.

Bengali villagers don't wear shoes to wade into their rice paddies, and David Stockley lives the life of a Bengali villager. He spends days at a time with villagers, eating their food, speaking their language, and working beside them in their fields.

The chief difference between them is that David has a degree in agricultural science from an English university, has mastered the proper ways to plant, cultivate, and harvest rice, and—what is most important—knows how to pass this on to Pakistanis who still are doing things in centuries-old ways.

The Khulna Center's purpose is to become the very best farm in the country, and to encourage individual farmers to come and see for themselves the difference that is made by modern methods of cultivation under natural conditions identical to those of their own fields.

Stockley gets his message across by farming his own 8 acres, cut down a few years ago from 30 by a governmental requisition of the land for building purposes. The result of patient experimentation and of improved methods of planting seed, preparation of the soil, fertilizers, better ploughing, and other "new" ideas is a bumper rice crop.

It is there for everyone to see and copy. The villagers' eyes grow wide with wonder when they see for themselves what is happening at Khulna. Invariably the question is planted in their minds, "If it can be done here, why can't I do it?"

Stockley is an effective teacher. He is blunt and to the point. He hasn't time for diplomatic phrases. Sometimes he loses patience with villagers who have ignored his advice.

"I showed you what to do but you didn't do it," he will say in effect. "Now don't complain to me." His village friends respect his forthrightness.

Stockley explained why the rice yield in East Pakistan is so uncertain and so low.

The area has possibly the heaviest rainfall in the world, as much as 300 inches a year. Seed improperly planted washes away. In times of drought, there is inadequate irrigation.

The villagers still use wooden ploughs which penetrate only a few inches. Seed selection is unknown; there is no pest or disease control; harvesting is by archaic methods.

The staff at Khulna is proving that practically all these things can be overcome with a modest amount of knowledge, careful methods, and with inexpensive but improved tools.

In addition to rice and other field crops, the Khulna farm has begun to experiment with fruit trees—banana, mango, guava, fig, coconut.

A poultry project was started 5 years ago with flocks of Rhode Island Reds and white leghorns. Eggs, three times the size of the eggs available in the villages, and chicks are now available for village distribution and use.

Efforts are also being made to improve the strain of cattle. The result will be better cows for the villages and a milk yield of gallons per day instead of a few pints.

Other things are going on at Khulna.

Stockley and his staff are persuading a growing number of villagers to invest in shares for a small cooperative, they are experimenting with designs for a rice thresher patterned after a Japanese model but only half as expensive.

Hand drawn charts are prepared for village teaching. Joyce Stockley works with village women and demonstrates easier and healthier ways of homemaking. One unemployed man is being taught to make wooden toys.

Wherever there is need, wherever—among people living on the very margin of life—a small assist can be a mighty help, the Stock-

leys and their staff try to do something about it. Practical, versatile, persevering, they have achieved a high percentage of successes.

The center at Khulna is not an end in itself. It is a beginning.

It serves the people in a way and on a level they can understand.

Nothing is forced. Nothing in free. The villager has to make the effort and give of himself. Once he is willing to do that there is help available to put him, his family, and his community on the road to better economic health. This is technical assistance at its highest level of effectiveness.

Through such devoted people abroad, the American churches are reinforcing ecumenical ventures in many places, of which not the least is Khulna.

In all of them Christian understanding and Christian effort, only seeking unselfishly to help, are generating freedom from want, building the dignities and liberties that ensue, and making a witness in deed as well as in words.

H.R. 10385

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10385, to provide a much-needed salary increase for postal employees and those paid under the Classification Act schedule.

In sponsoring this bill, I am pleased to associate myself with more than 50 of my colleagues from this body who have introduced similar pay measures. Particularly am I pleased to note that this is a bipartisan effort to give a modicum of financial relief to these public servants; both Democrat and Republican Members have joined in sponsoring more than 50 pay bills thus far in the current session.

Unfortunately, this effort to grant a measure of economic equality to these workers has not found favor in the White House or with the Postmaster General. Both the President and Mr. Summerfield have been quoted in strong opposition to any pay bill this year.

In his most recent budget message, President Eisenhower said that a wage increase now was "unwarranted." Instead, he suggested that we "study" the problem. The Postmaster General has suggested that postal wages compare very favorably, particularly when one considers the fringe benefits Congress has approved for employees over the years.

If an increase in Federal salaries is unwarranted then I think our Republican friends in high places in the executive department owe it to Congress and the employees to explain one thing. I would like an explanation of why Vice President Nixon and Labor Secretary Mitchell considered it all right to urge the steel industry to grant better wages—and the steelworkers had my complete sympathy in their wage de-

mands—while at the same time ignoring the plight of our own civil servants.

According to Mr. Roger Blough, spokesman for the steel industry, steelworkers were getting \$3.11 per hour before the recent strike. Under the terms of my bill, a postal worker with 20 years' service would still be paid only \$3.06 per hour.

In reply to Mr. Summerfield's suggestion that fringe benefits take the place of hard, cold cash in the marketplace, I should like to read an excerpt from a letter recently received from one of my constituents.

He is a letter carrier, 43 years of age. He is married and has a wife and two children to support on an annual gross postal salary of \$5,075.

This is his story:

As for Mr. Summerfield, I haven't found a grocer, butcher, or baker yet who will take a day of my leave, sick or annual, for the groceries, meats, etc., that I buy.

Mr. Speaker, the committee to which my pay bill has been referred, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has a well-deserved reputation for its interest in legislation affecting Government employees. I, along with the million and one-half workers covered by my bill, have complete confidence in the continued interest and concern of that committee. It is my earnest hope that it will forthwith schedule hearings on this vital subject and that we will have an opportunity in the near future to consider the recommendations of the committee here on the floor.

Auto Smog Can Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, automobile exhaust is a major cause of air pollution in Los Angeles and southern California causing excessive smog to the detriment of the health and well-being of all our citizens in that area.

It is time that effective action be taken to eliminate this cause of smog at its source, the automobile engine. The automotive industry in Detroit has the knowhow to produce either an effective exhaust for automobiles which will eliminate any substance which would pollute the atmosphere, or an automobile engine designed to completely combust fuel within the cylinder.

If the automotive industry fails to act to eliminate the source of air pollution from the automobile engine, then the State and National Governments will be called upon to enact legislative measures to require smog-control devices on all automobiles.

Such legislative measures are already under consideration in the Congress, and

are being brought to the attention of the California State Legislature.

I introduced a bill to require smog-control devices on all automobiles last year, and my bill, H.R. 1297, is currently pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It is inevitable that smog will be controlled, and that necessary smog-control devices be equipped or installed in all motor vehicles in the process of their manufacture. It is only a question of whether the automotive industry shall accept the responsibility for this improvement in the automobile engine, or whether the smog-control device on all automobiles must be required under Federal or State law.

The following article, "Smog Isn't Inevitable," by Kimmis Hendrick, appeared in the March 15 issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 15, 1960]

SMOG ISN'T INEVITABLE

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—Why doesn't the American auto industry win the gratitude of all Americans, and Californians in particular, by getting rid of smog production before the new cars leave Detroit?

This question is more and more pushing itself into people's thought here as they contemplate what it means that California is on the verge of building a great State bureaucracy to stamp out smog. Reasonable assurances keep coming from respected auto engineers that nothing of the kind is necessary. Detroit, they say, could do it. But Detroit doesn't.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Fleming said in Washington the other day that if the industry doesn't take the initiative, Congress will have to. The problem of air pollution is becoming rapidly nationwide. It seems bound to increase. It can be ameliorated, experts know, if auto exhausts are kept from exuding smog-triggering pollutants into the atmosphere.

For Los Angeles, the city Henry Ford made, this is a consideration of the utmost urgency. The smog attacks get more frequent. The autos get longer, faster, in some respects more handsome. And they make more smog. The upshot? Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown is putting on a special legislative session call, an elaborate proposal for a State program to inspect, approve, and require antismog devices on all autos, to enforce the law, and to monitor the air.

It can be intelligently argued that this is a reasonable prerogative of State government. California holds itself responsible for numerous health standards, and omitting the pollution of the atmosphere seems far too important to leave off the list. But it is going to cost money. It is going to take new bureaucrats. It is going to take new bureaucrats.

None of this would be in itself bad, necessarily, if this were the only answer. But Americans have had a long experience leading them to imagine that where products are concerned, as in this case, industry can make a better product, and that a better product is more desirable than rules and bureaus to control the bad ones.

Bad? Have you ever stood in the Baldwin Hills of a fine bright morning and looked across this city toward the old Hollywood sign? The sky above is good enough for the Mediterranean. The Santa Monica Mountains are etched so clearly against the west you can see the firebreaks and even some of the houses. But city hall? It is lost in a dirty haze, and all the way along Wilshire Boulevard hangs a brown veil made

by traffic. Mt. Washington? Where did it go?

And this is a middling day—not a day when the nearest view is the market down the hill and the handsome Prudential Building might just as well never have been built. Pasadena has vanished quicker than the Cheshire cat. Other cities have smog like this sometimes, even San Francisco with its breeze, and even where smog isn't spectacular it is an undesirable intruder, often the partner of industry but more often now the trail of growing dependence on automobiles. And the worst thing, in the Los Angeles view, is that the smog isn't necessary.

Air pollution has numerous causes but here auto fumes rank first. It is now well established in public testimony that the auto industry could put devices on all new cars that would eliminate or greatly curtail the fuel emissions leading to smog. Governor Brown's central program is to make this the driver's responsibility. Secretary Flemming wants to see it made the industry's. If it's good for California, he argues, it's good for the Nation, and every American car should be sold with smog-control devices, not as optional equipment, but built in.

An automotive parts engineer, veteran in the industry and responsible for many improvements, J. A. McIntosh, of Detroit, says the industry can do better than that. It can design engines that completely combust their fuel within the cylinder, Mr. McIntosh says. This won't cost any more, he insists, and it will give better performance. Better with maybe one minor exception—start-off power. Today's engines are made for get-away, and they make smog. Mr. McIntosh, who knows California well and engines better, says they can be built for high efficient overall performance and clean air.

What's the catch? Sometimes it looks as though private-enterprise people talk a lot against big government, but when it comes to the draw, they leave the job to Uncle Sam—or in California's case, to Pat.

But Mr. McIntosh suggests the catch may lie with an unthinking public. "It is only the demand of a given district that is required of the sales department," he insists, "to have this new type of car supplied." Is the public too bemused by fins and speed? Or too busy writing checks for monthly payments? Or thinking that maybe the foreign cars will give the answer? In California, the public will get a shock in the tax bill unless someone takes a lead.

Dead Cities in the Desert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the Record an article appearing in the Washington, D.C., Star of March 14, 1960, entitled "Dead Cities in the Desert":

DEAD CITIES IN THE DESERT—CHANGES IN ONCE DESOLATE PLACES STIR INTEREST OF SOJOURNERS

(By Ralph McGill)

The earth is the Lord's and we are but sojourners on it. It says that somewhere in Holy Writ. And it is true.

A nation, troubled by ever-increasing summer drought and the need for more and more water, and disturbed by the disappearance

of forests and the ruthless attempts to take over national conservation areas and parks, might well remember we are but travelers on a journey, sojourning here for awhile.

Others will come after us.

They will witness what we have done during our sojourn.

In the ancient places on the earth, where man first was, and where recorded history first began, that which brings a sense of awe and excitement to the traveler is the sight of cities dead now for thousands of years. There is a stirring of the mind, too, in seeing their ruins in deserts, knowing that once there were fields and vineyards there, wells, aqueducts, and irrigation streams * * * that once caravans came laden with spices and foods—that once children ran and played where now are ruins and desert.

One can find them—the filled-in wells, stretches of painstakingly made aqueducts bringing water from distant slopes, deep-dug cisterns, and old terraces where once crops grew.

Flying over the reaches of Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, North Africa—one can see the remains of irrigation patterns.

One can drive southward out of Israel's Beersheba and find ruins of cities which once flourished as bustling urban centers on the great caravan routes.

The Romans were great colonists, irrigationists, and builders of roads and cities. (Standing on a stretch of road built a few hundred years before Christ, one meditates that a really honest road perhaps hasn't been built since the time of the Romans.)

Nothing strikes the traveler more forcibly than the fact that vast amounts of land, now desert, once were fertile, cultivated.

In Syria and the Lebanon the Romans cultivated land inland for 150 miles which today is desert. So abundant was its production of small grains, or corn, that much of it annually was exported to feed crowded, always hungry Rome.

"What happened?" I asked an archaeologist.

"They cut the trees," he said, "and they began early. You recall Solomon sending men to cut the Cedars of Lebanon. He sent three sets of 10,000 men each.

"Ancient Egypt had thousands of woodcutters on the Lebanon mountains and carried on a huge lumber export business 5,000 years ago," he said.

"Cedars of Lebanon went into Solomon's Temple on Jerusalem's high hills. And Cedars of Lebanon were built into the palaces of kings in Persopolis, a thousand miles from where they were cut. The Romans continued the destruction. Their chief lumber port was Baniyas (or Banias). Even in their time the trade declined to nothing because all the timber within reach of it had been cut * * * oh, how the ancients cut trees * * * and they never planted a seedling.

"And then," he said, "the winds came and blew the treeless soil. And the seasonal rains washed the soil from the slopes and tore great canyons in the valleys and the goats and sheep came, with their cutting feet * * * and when the land about the cities was dead the cities died."

"We haven't learned yet," he said.

And, of course, we have not.

In great, rich, surplus America, where vast amounts of wheat, corn, rye, and oats are stored in Government granaries; which we have too much butter, too many potatoes; too much cotton—even here we have not been shaken out of our complacency.

Great cities tremble and see that if pollution of streams isn't halted there will not be enough water to drink. More and more farmland is given over to industry and the pressure grows on what is left.

Suddenly, in the midst of too much, a fear begins to gnaw.

The 112th Anniversary of Hungarian War of Independence of 1848

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD my address delivered to the United Hungarians Societies of Cleveland, on Sunday, March 13, on the 112th anniversary of the Hungarian War of Independence of 1848:

Hungary has a proud record of more than 1,000 years of history. In my judgment, the outstanding chapters in this long history point up the unbroken record of dedication by the Hungarian people to human values and the dignity of man. These same values are the foundation of all our liberties and freedom and the high road to national independence.

King Stephen, who reigned in the 10th century, set these goals for the Hungarian people. Down through the ages the Hungarian people have remained staunch defenders of these ideals and basic spiritual values. The long history of Hungary in world affairs is replete with heroic chapters of sacrifice in support of these ideals. This record of deeds by the Hungarian people has earned for their nation the merited accolade of "defender of the West."

It is little wonder then that King Stephen is the patron saint of Hungary and a great saint known and revered by all the Christian world.

The war of independence of 1848 led by Louis Kossuth was based on the historic ideals of the Hungarian people. But Louis Kossuth also received much stimulation from the events which had taken place here, beginning with the American Revolutionary War. Kossuth knew well the ideals and methods of the new American experiment in representative government.

Kossuth was aware that we were pledged to constitutional government and that our Constitution was a guarantee for government of, by, and for the people.

Kossuth also knew that our form of government under law, which took its authority from the consent of the governed, was in sharp contrast with government by the whims and fancy of the few—whether that few be a hereditary aristocracy or an imposed autocracy.

Kossuth felt the powerful stimulation of the meaning of national independence of all Americans, and saw in it the answer to the strivings of his people for complete self-government.

In our times we have seen the Hungarian nation realize the full flower of its national independence. We have also seen that national independence snuffed out by the new colonialism, the new imperialism of the Russian despots. Hungary was a victim of World War II—a victim of profound ignorance on the part of the leaders of the Western World concerning the true nature and intent of imperial Russian communism. This profound ignorance led our leaders to believe that the Russian Communists were our allies and that they would support the pledges of the Atlantic Charter. What a price we paid to dispel that ignorance. Hungary, along with Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, were subjected to the nightmare of Russian occupation which today plagues all those once independent nations.

It is tragic that the leaders of the Western World failed to realize that the Soviet Union was nothing more than a prison of nations, that is, non-Russian nations. It is equally tragic that they failed to understand that these captive non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union desire their national independence just as much as any subjugated nation of the world. Had the leaders of the Western World understood these basic facts, the world of our times would be quite different than we find it today.

All the world knows that Hungary, true to her long and rich traditions, rose up in total political revolution against Russian occupation in October 1956. The people, from small children to aged grandmothers, rose up spontaneously against the organized tyranny of the Russians. That is why I call the Hungarian freedom revolution a total political revolution. In 5 days the Red Army, which had been publicized as an unbeatable force, was completely defeated and driven from Hungarian soil; and I repeat, this was done by the Hungarian people without any assistance from the outside world. Then, for 5 historic days, the Hungarian people were free of alien rule and on the road to reconstructing their national independence and restoring freedom to all the people.

The events which followed are known equally well to all the people of the world. In the absence of any support from the free world—even words of encouragement from the heads of any Western nation—the Russian despots reinvaded Hungary to crush the provisional government and to smother all liberty and freedom. Here again the leaders of the Western World, particularly the United States, as leaders of the free world coalition, maintained a strange silence. The many pleas for assistance from the Hungarian patriots in their hour of greatest need went unanswered.

In these circumstances, I telegraphed President Eisenhower requesting that he take the lead in supporting the cause of the freedom fighters. Allow me to read to you from my telegram to the President—which I sent to him before the revolution was 3 days old, and 9 days before the Russians reinvaded Hungary:

"I urge you instruct our Ambassador to the United Nations to take necessary steps to bring about emergency session of the United Nations Security Council in order to take positive measures to support the brave people of Poland and Hungary in their great struggle to throw off Russian occupation of their homelands. The cruel acts of aggression committed by the Russian armies against these brave people stand as a serious and imminent threat to the peace of the world. We cannot help but aid the cause of human freedom and dignity throughout the world by taking this step. Our many millions of allies behind the Iron Curtain look to the United States to take the lead at this critical hour in history."

I received no answer from President Eisenhower to my appeal for the Hungarian patriots. The State Department, however, provided an answer to my appeal and the appeal of millions of other Americans to act in support of freedoms cause. Forty-eight hours before the Russians reinvaded Hungary the State Department sent a cable message to the Dictator Tito informing him that "the Government of the United States did not favor governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union." This message was sent in the certain knowledge that Tito would relay this good news for communism to his cronies in the Russian Kremlin. This message stands as clear and precise notice to the Russian tyrants that our Government would not intervene in any action taken by them to crush the freedom revolution then taking place in Hungary.

Within 48 hours after the message was sent by our State Department to Tito, the Russians reinvaded Hungary—in the certain knowledge that they could do so without fear of provoking a counteraction by the United States.

I am confident that if this message had not been sent to Tito the Russians would not have dared to reinvade and today Hungary would be free.

Long after the Russians had reinvaded Hungary and when they were in the process of carrying out mass terror and reprisals against the people, then and only then did the United Nations General Assembly take up the cause of human freedom in Hungary. The wave of public indignation which swept the world forced this action.

You and I know that the General Assembly of the United Nations, after a long and bitter debate, adopted a resolution which condemned the Russians for their aggression against Hungary and called for the immediate and complete removal of all Red army elements on Hungarian soil. The only votes against the resolution in the General Assembly came from the Russian delegation and their trained seals who have been put up as alleged representatives of seven of their captive nations. The record is clear that the Russian imperialists have since not only ignored this resolution, but have exposed it to contemptuous attack.

As of this late date, almost 4 years after the action taken by the United Nations, nothing whatever has been accomplished to support the purposes of the resolution. Recognizing the danger of this situation, the dangers to the cause of peace when one member of the United Nations completely disregards a resolution to prevent war, I have carried on a campaign, the objective of which is to cause the Russians to adhere to the United Nations Resolution on Hungary or be ejected from membership in the United Nations.

The most powerful sanction the United Nations has against aggression is the denial of membership in that body to an aggressor nation. Nothing would harm the cause of the Russian Communists more than to be ejected from membership in the United Nations for nonconformance with the resolution on Hungary. This would be not only a severe blow to Russian prestige, but it would also serve notice to the hundreds of millions of captive peoples and the many submerged nations under Russian control that the nations of the free world were determined to make the United Nations an effective organ of peace with justice. I shall continue my efforts to bring about Russian conformity with the United Nations Resolution on Hungary and I invite you to join with me in this effort.

One of the major considerations which caused me to be one of the original sponsors of the Captive Nations Week resolution was my concern for the growing ignorance of the nature of Russian Communist imperialism in the Eisenhower administration. The present trend toward appeasement of the Russians, which I am sure is well known to all of you here, is the certain course to war. Two world wars in my lifetime were started because of appeasement of the dictators. No thinking person can deny that the more the dictator is appeased, the greater becomes his appetite for more conquest. The only way we can prevent war is to stand up against the dictator and to be firm in our support of the right of all people and all nations to self-government and free political institutions.

The people of the world were uplifted by the action taken in Congress to memorialize the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. The stirring words of this resolution brought a message of hope not only to the hundreds of millions of people who yearn for freedom behind the Iron Curtain, but

also to the people in the some 20-odd countries of the free world which have won their national independence since the end of World War II, and those now struggling for this goal on the African continent. This was the clarion call of freedom's cause, and it was received as such by the multitudes of the world who had been awaiting positive political leadership from the Government of the United States. To the common man the world over, the Captive Nations Week resolution stands as a denouncement of any efforts to appease the Russian dictators.

The people of the United States were shocked when, a few days after Congress enacted the Captive Nations Week resolution and it became the law of the land as Public Law 86-90, President Eisenhower announced that he had invited the bloody handed Russian leader Khrushchev to make a state visit to the United States. This shock resulted from the inability of the common man the world over to reconcile our Government issuing a universal declaration of national independence, and a few days later witnessing our President embracing the leader of the most brutal tyranny known in the long history of mankind. It is little wonder that people the world over are losing faith in our word when the actions of our President belie that word.

I do not know what caused President Eisenhower to invite the new Russian Czar Khrushchev to the United States, although several reasons have been advanced for this strange behavior. Some people hold that the Khrushchev tour of the United States, accompanied as it was with complete access by him to all our mass media of communication, particularly television, was part of the "mirage of peace" concocted by the Madison Avenue soap salesmen. This was intended to be a 1960 political special in which the "mirage of peace" would be used to justify the Republican campaign slogans of peace, prosperity, and progress. Fortunately for the cause of peace with justice, the "mirage of peace" has now been exposed as a fraud and a massive deception of the American people.

For those who innocently believe that by allowing Khrushchev to see first hand the great industrial power of the United States, he would be dissuaded from his evil ways and would, practically overnight, give up the Communist objective of world conquest, the evidence is overriding to the contrary. Khrushchev has interpreted his visit to the United States as a sure sign of the triumph of communism in the world, as an indication of weakness on the part of the United States, as reason to believe that the policy of appeasement guides our foreign policy. Our allies in NATO and SEATO have begun to wonder whether the United States has wearied in its task of leading the cause of human freedom. The uncommitted peoples of the world are showing dangerous signs of looking toward Moscow and its claims to represent the wave of the future. The people of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain are surely wondering whether the United States is being led down the road to associating the destiny of our Nation with the Russian despots in a common effort to hold the slave empire of communism together. This, my friends, is the Pandora's box in the field of world affairs which President Eisenhower's invitation to Khrushchev has opened up.

But there is a brighter side to life than that which results from the Khrushchev visit to the United States. There are evergrowing signs that the people of the United States are becoming restless and dissatisfied with the failure of leadership by the Eisenhower administration. The American people will not long suffer at being second best, too little, too late, and a national posture of passivity in circumstances of opportunity calling for dynamic action. Here is what I mean by

circumstances of opportunity calling for dynamic political action:

1. The second summit meeting: President Eisenhower must challenge the Russians on the Captive Nations Week resolution. He should make certain that the Russians understand that we mean business by the terms of this resolution. He can seize the initiative by challenging the Russians to permit free and unfettered elections in all of the captive nations listed in Public Law 86-90, now the Captive Nations Week resolution, such elections to be under United Nations supervision.

2. President Eisenhower should challenge the Russians to either live up to the terms of the United Nations Resolution on Hungary or face action by the United States to strip them of their membership in the United Nations.

3. President Eisenhower should demand that the Russians live up to their 1955 summit conference pledges for a free and united Germany. A free and united Germany, attained by unfettered elections under United Nations supervision, would automatically eliminate the Berlin crisis.

If the President fails to take action on these three points it will be fair and proper for the American people to say that the second summit conference was nothing more than a part of the Republican "mirage of peace" and a further step along the road of appeasement.

I share with you the glorious memory of the ages long struggle of the Hungarians to win and maintain their national independence. Like you, I am convinced that the cause of justice among and between nations must be made the foundation stone of our foreign policy. The Captive Nations Week resolution, now Public Law 86-90, proclaims that the aspirations of the people of the captive non-Russian nations for their national independence and freedom, is a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace.

I am completely convinced of the truth of this statement and shall continue to support this cause with all the strength and vigor at my command.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote has been described as the very heart of our democratic way of life, and I know of no one in or out of public service who would take issue with this proposition. Given that right, men and women immediately acquire dignity and status. Take it away and you open the door to the totalitarian philosophy.

At this very moment we are engaged in a consuming debate on a bill designed to put teeth into the guarantee against the deprivation of our right to vote, contained in our Constitution, and it is my impression that we will enact into law in this session some form of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, responsible leaders of Government, however, need to do more than just to make certain that qualified persons are not denied this constitutional right. We must perforce, as such leaders, do everything within our power

to enlighten and inform our citizenry that this fundamental right carries with it the crucial responsibility that it must be exercised if we are to enjoy the fruits of a full and free society. Too often have we read statistics that reflect an abundance of apathy on the part of our citizens in the exercise of this great right. Too often have I, as a Member of Congress, been approached by postal workers and civil service employees who advise me that they have been given little or insufficient time to get to the election polls on the basis of economy and efficiency.

In a democratic government, I submit that this kind of thinking is narrowminded and shortsighted. Economy does not just mean saving money; it means spending it wisely and in the public interest. On election day we cannot afford to save this kind of money. Our postal workers, our civil service employees, yes, Mr. Speaker, all our citizens, are entitled to dedicate their thinking and to cast their votes on election day without the pressure of knowing that they must return quickly to work. With this in mind, I am today introducing a joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday.

This resolution if enacted will give national recognition to the great importance of the exercise by our citizens of their right to vote, and will result in sparking even greater interest in Government participation by all.

In 37 of our States the importance of this day has already been recognized and election day is a full holiday. So it would appear that about three-quarters of the States have already attested to the need for this resolution on a national basis.

I do hope that my colleagues will support me in this effort.

More Evidence of the Need for a New China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our China policy must be changed. This demand is being voiced by many thoughtful persons in the United States and elsewhere. Mrs. Evelyn Isom recently sent me a copy of a letter she had written to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which indicates the careful consideration given to this question by the Pendleton branch of the American Association of University Women.

Under a consent previously granted I am including the text of Mrs. Isom's letter:

ECHO, OREG., February 16, 1960.
Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: At a recent meeting of the Pendleton branch of the American Association of University Women a "buzz session"

type of program was put on that covered several phases of the Far East. Afterward it was voted that the results of the thinking at this meeting be mailed to you in order to help you assess the opinions of your constituents. Please let it be understood that the following are the opinions of the majority of individuals at the meeting. This is not sent as an opinion in the name of the Pendleton, Oreg., branch itself.

The meeting was divided into seven sessions. Each session discussed a different question and then presented the conclusion before the whole group.

First session: Do you think Moscow and Peiping will split? Can there be peaceful coexistence; e.g., between Russia-United States-Red China? Answer: Self-interest clearly dictates that Moscow and Peiping support each other in their mutual conflicts with the non-Communist world. And if we cannot have coexistence with Russia and Red China then war will be the answer. Perhaps our best contribution toward this would be in relaxing the pressures we exert which keep the Sino-Soviet alliance sealed and which also keep the United States as the No. 1 bogey.

Second. Should we recognize Red China? How do you feel about admitting Red China to the United Nations? The answer the session group gave: Yes, we should recognize her, but we should do a bit of bargaining with her in exchange for the recognition; i.e., have her drop her aggression in Formosa, North Korea, etc. The first need is for more knowledge of actual conditions in Communist China. Also it is very necessary that U.S. Government representatives be trained in their language and their social, cultural and economic life. Our past policy hasn't been a success and recognition would permit more exchange of knowledge of conditions there and here. This is needed to further understanding. We cannot continue to ignore Red China's existence. As for admitting Red China to the U.N.: it was noted that events seem to be pointing to the fact that the United States may soon be outvoted and Red China will be admitted over our protest, so to "save face" perhaps we should make an effort regarding this; e.g., to get them to come in under the same agreements the other nations joined and include a nonaggression clause.

Members of the audience challenged the above and it seems to the writer that the above questions need more publicity both pro and con to the general public; however, the majority of this group seemed to side with the opinions given above.

Third. Do you think Eisenhower's Asian trip achieved anything? Answer: Yes. His trip has been beneficial in Asia for the United States. He listened to their problems and in return received an insight on the magnitude of the Asiatic problems. Also his tour made Americans more aware of Asia and what it means to us.

Fourth. Should we give aid to a country not in our defense alliance, such as India and how can we aid her? Answer: Yes, because it finally will act as a definite benefit to us—India especially, because India is the only hope of democracy in Asia. We need her. We can do it through a combined loan from the United States, the British Commonwealth and Western Europe based on one-sixth of 1 percent of their combined national income.

Fifth. Should we continue support of Nationalist China? Would it be an improvement if Nationalist China won back the mainland? How do you feel about the offshore island problem? Answer: To discontinue our support as soon as gracefully possible to its contention of regaining the mainland, since Nationalist China probably would fall to solve the mainland problems now, and too, it is not worth another war. Nor should we uphold their offshore island

policy, since internationally these islands are considered a part of mainland China.

Sixth. Why do you think Communist China embarked on aggression when she was liked in Asia? Answer: Difficulties and failure of solving some of their internal problems, such as the peasant problem, has caused popular support for the regime to be at its lowest ebb since 1949, so as to break this the regime turned to the field of foreign policy in the form of aggression. This is the common pattern of all dictator-type governments.

Seventh. Should we pull out of Asia? Answer: No, definitely no. How Asia goes politically and economically means the answer to our way of life in the United States and, more materialistically, its potentials for trade with us is limitless.

I hope that you have found this letter both interesting and helpful in regards to the opinion of a segment of eastern Oregonians.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. EVELYN ISOM,
International Relations Chairman, Pendleton, Oreg. Branch, American Association of University Women.

Address by Boyd E. Wolff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was honored to be guest of a group of Pennsylvania farmers.

At this dinner I heard some fine speakers who covered the farm situation in a way that made it easily understandable to any Member of Congress interested in this serious and vexing problem.

One of the speakers from my district, Boyd E. Wolff, of New Alexandria, Pa., made a pointed and informative talk that should be read by every Member of Congress.

It gives me a feeling of personal pride to be permitted to present Boyd Wolff's talk to the U.S. House of Representatives, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honorable Congressmen, guests, and members of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, when asked to talk with you this evening on the dairyman's view of the farm problem, I was anxious, if I might use that word, to do so for principally two reasons. The first of these being that we are concerned over recent articles concerning the farm problem in national magazines such as Time, Life, and Newsweek, as well as many daily newspapers. These articles tend to picture the farmer as having his hand out constantly asking for free donations from the Government. This is certainly not the case, and continued publicity of this sort will in time jeopardize many beneficial farm programs of the Government such as soil conservation, research, and the work of the agricultural colleges and extension associations. Another reason for my wanting to talk with you is that, as a Pennsylvania dairyman, I have been alarmed with talk about cow or milk production quotas which are being proposed.

Since I did not know when Government first entered the farm picture, I thought I should do a little research. Briefly, here are some of the things I found.

The first talk of Government aiding farmers came after World War I. In 1922, Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, Sr., called a conference of farm leaders. It is said that most of the plans tried since then originated with this conference. In 1929, Congress set up the Agricultural Marketing Act which created the Federal Farm Board. This had two purposes. The first being to encourage the development of farm cooperatives owned and controlled by the producers. The second purpose was to stabilize farm prices. The attempt to organize farm cooperatives was apparently successful because we have many cooperatives today serving the farmers of the Nation. This early effort to stabilize farm prices, however, apparently was not overly successful and the \$500 million allotted for this purpose were soon gone.

In 1933 the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed. The object of this act was to reestablish the ratio between prices of things farmers sold and the things they bought based on a 1910 to 1914 relationship. This is what we know as parity. From then until 1939 the Federal Government tried different plans to bring this about. But none were too successful.

Then, during the war, the Government switched from price boosts to price guarantees. But these had no great effect on the economy because prices were often above the price guarantee, due to the great demand. In fact, prices were often held down by price ceilings.

Since World War II these high supports have been continued and must be at least partially at blame for the huge surpluses we have today.

I think you will agree with me that these various plans tried in the past to solve the farm problem have not been successful, although some, like the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve, have undoubtedly helped.

These problems are best exemplified, I think, by wheat. Wheat is the only thing that most of our city cousins think of when they hear of the farm problem. Why is this so?

For the year beginning July 1, 1959, we had the biggest stockpile of wheat in the history of our country—almost two and a half billion bushels. This is enough wheat to supply our domestic and foreign needs for two and three-tenths years. As of November 30, 1959, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or CCC, had almost \$3½ million invested in wheat. This was 36 percent of CCC's commodity investment as of November, while wheat represented only 6.2 percent of the total farm receipts from 1954 to 1958.

Why have these huge surpluses built up? The major reasons, I think, are these.

Under present legislation the national wheat allotment cannot be reduced under 55 million acres.

Any farmer is allowed to grow up to 15 acres of wheat and this brought many farmers to grow wheat outside the traditional wheat belt.

Also the per acre yield of wheat is going up, particularly in the moist regions such as Pennsylvania, and in areas where irrigation is practiced.

The domestic consumption of wheat remained constant for several years. Actually per capita consumption is declining, but this has been offset by the population increase.

Another reason why the surplus has been built up, is that exports have been holding constant. Actually our exports would have gone down if they were not subsidized by the Government at a high cost to the taxpayer.

And finally, in recent years the price gap between wheat and corn has widened so that wheat has been priced out of the domestic feed market.

To reverse this build up of surpluses and to return to the farmers the decisions that

are rightfully theirs, the American Farm Bureau Federation adopted a 4-point plan at their 41st annual meeting in Chicago last December.

These four major objectives are:

1. To encourage expansion of the wheat market.

2. To reduce production incentives by lower price supports.

3. To minimize economic hardships on wheatgrowers while adjustment is made.

4. To avoid shifting the burden of adjustment onto producers of other farm commodities.

To achieve this 4-point plan we recommend the enactment of four specific provisions. They are:

Eliminate all acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat effective with the 1961 crop. This would permit each grower to determine for himself the acreage of wheat he could grow on his farm which would make the most effective use of his land, labor, and capital. This would help the traditional wheatgrower to produce wheat at his lowest possible cost of production.

The second point is to establish price supports for wheat on the support level for corn with adjustments being made for differences in weight, nutritive value and buyer preference. This would also begin in 1961 and the price for that year would not be less than 120 percent of corn. Under the current corn program the price is either 90 percent of the last 3 year's market price or 65 percent of parity—which ever is higher.

This price support policy would do several things.

First and probably the most important, it would expand the use of wheat for livestock feed without creating unfair subsidized competition for producers of corn and other feed grains. From 1930 to 1949, excluding the war years, 15 percent of the wheat produced was fed to livestock as it averaged only 28 percent higher in cost than corn. But from 1955 to 1959 only 4.9 percent of the wheat grown was fed to livestock because the cost was 58 percent higher than corn.

Basically we can do only four things with wheat. We can eat it—but I have already mentioned that per capita consumption of wheat is going down. We can export it—but this is limited by international demand and competition. We can store it—but this has proved too costly. Or we can feed it—and this appears to be the best way to increase utilization of wheat. However this only can be done if the price of wheat is not out of line with corn and other feed grains.

The third thing this price-support policy would do is remove the incentive for further expansion of wheat on humid and irrigated areas which are also suited for other crops.

It would greatly reduce the incentive for increasing yields through heavy use of fertilizer.

It would permit growers in traditional wheat-producing areas to return to the practices that offer the greatest efficiency and thus lower production costs.

This price-support plan would also provide a basis for greatly reducing the high costs of wheat exports. Under the present conditions our Government is forced to pay much more for our wheat than for what it sells for on the world market.

And finally it would reduce the criticism of the U.S. export policies by other countries that compete with us on the world wheat market.

The third of the four specific provisions proposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation would be to provide adequate protection for all farmers from the accumulated wheat stocks held by CCC. This would be done by providing that no wheat leave CCC storage for less than 150 percent of current wheat prices. Over several years wheat stor-

age could be used domestically or exported without competing with current wheat production. The wheatgrowers need this 150-percent price protection so that wheat produced in the future without price supports would not have its price depressed by these accumulated supplies.

The last specific provision would cushion the effect on producers of wheat and other grain feeds caused by the reduction in the support level and elimination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. This would be done through a substantial increase of the conservation reserve program.

How does all this affect me as a Pennsylvania dairyman? Mainly it would reduce the cost of the feed I buy by bringing the price of wheat down to its true relationship with corn and other grains.

The members of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association strongly recommend immediate action toward this solution to end the wheat crisis. I feel the only true test of a farm program is that it be in the long range interest of the public. And I hope you will agree that this four-point plan is that.

Also as I stated earlier, of deep concern to myself and the many dairymen in the over 10,000 membership of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, is talk of production quotas and direct payments to dairymen. Both the American Farm Bureau and the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association have repeatedly voiced their strong opposition to production quotas and direct payments to producers. Rather we favor less interference from the Government in the marketing system so that this system would be freer to operate effectively and efficiently.

If we can judge by what happened to other commodities when under strict production and price controls those things would happen to the dairy industry.

Exemptions from the production quotas would be inevitable. This is comparable to the 15-acre exemption of wheat production whereby many farmers who could not economically produce wheat did so. Applying this to the dairy industry it would mean that many small, inefficient dairy operations would spring up. Also areas of our country which are better suited to other types of agriculture would enter the dairy picture. These new dairy farms, by production restrictions, would be small and inefficient. In a long run this would remove the incentive for efficient operation and would eventually mean a higher cost of dairy products which would be paid by tax money rather than by the consumer at the store.

Another effect of production quotas would be that farmers now making their living by dairying, like myself, would have their quotas reduced. This is clearly demonstrated by the burley tobacco industry, which shows where production controls ultimately lead. Since the minimum allotment per farm is one-half acre, cuts in allotments had to come from the larger producers. In 1955, 60 percent of the burley tobacco producers had the minimum quota of one-half acre. This does not leave an operation large enough to be efficient or allow the producer to make an adequate living. It is foreseeable that the same thing could happen to the dairy industry.

Also these quotas would make it much harder for a young farmer to get started in the dairy industry. He would either have to inherit or buy a quota which would add to the already costly task of getting started dairying.

I realize that there are always some requests for the Government to step into agriculture and guarantee a high price. Some of these people, I'm sure, don't realize that production quotas must follow guaranteed prices. I also wonder what the background is of those who make these requests. Are all of them full-time farmers?

I have a neighbor back home who is constantly asking for subsidies and controls. Let's briefly examine his background.

Although he had little farm background or experience, he bought a farm during the war expecting to make a quick financial "killing."

He works in an industrial plant in Pittsburgh at something over \$3 per hour, which is all well and good. However, due to the small amount of time he can devote to the farm it is a small operation. It is also inefficient. At one time last year his 17 milking cows were producing 24 gallons of milk a day instead of the 85 to 100 gallons that should be expected of that many cows.

This man constantly complains that his farm is not profitable because, as he reasons, it is not subsidized by the Government as are some farms of our economy.

Let's compare this man with my other neighbors and many members of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association. They are constantly striving to adapt their dairy enterprises to meet changing conditions. They are trying to be more efficient through the use of labor-saving machinery such as gutter cleaners, silo unloaders, pipeline milkers, and improved tillage and harvesting equipment. From observing these people I am not worried about the family farm's future in America, for these farms are still managed and often operated only by the farmer and his family. They are not complaining about the lack of Government help nor did the farmers of our 13 Colonies who showed the world the price they were willing to pay to be free from orders and unfair treatment.

Along with the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation membership, I would much, much rather face the future producing milk, or any other agriculture product, in an economy controlled by the balance of supply and demand rather than in an economy controlled by the Government.

Tight-Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to enter into the RECORD a resolution passed recently by the board of directors of the American Public Power Association. This resolution indicates, I think, the growing feeling of concern across the country with regard to the tight-money policy and in opposition to the proposal of H.R. 10590 to lift the ceiling on interest rates in particular. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

Whereas the electric power industry requires an unusually high amount of capital investment per dollar of revenue; and

Whereas much of this investment by local publicly owned electric utilities is financed by long-term borrowing; and

Whereas the interest rates which apply to this borrowing therefore have a substantial effect upon the ability of these local publicly owned electric systems to supply an abundance of low-cost power to their consumers; and

Whereas the interest rate on public agency borrowing has recently approached the high-

est level in a quarter of a century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the American Public Power Association, a service organization which represents more than 1,000 local publicly owned electric systems throughout the United States, urges the Congress to support policies favorable to low interest rates, and to oppose legislation such as H.R. 10590, which would breach the traditional ceiling on long-term Federal borrowing and would adversely affect the interest rates on bonds issued by local publicly owned electric systems.

White Rose Organization Fights Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a statement of the White Rose Organization which is fighting for a free and democratic Cuba and against the dictatorship of Fidel Castro. This is a very worthwhile statement and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues and the American people.

The statement follows:

FIDEL CASTRO JEOPARDIZES THE SAFETY OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE ENTIRE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Fidel Castro's recent pact with the Soviet Union, after an 8-year severance of Cuban-Soviet diplomatic relations, threatens the physical safety of the United States, and all Americans of the Western Hemisphere. As a result of Fidel's "sweet" deal, he will be paid off in Soviet aircraft for his sugar. Since no Cubans can either fly or service these Migs, Soviet air and ground crews will man these enemy airbases. Migs have already been delivered from Czechoslovakia, Raul Castro's old stamping grounds.

Missile bases now under construction deep in the Cuban interior round out an entire enemy striking force only 90 miles from our southern coast. Ninety miles. That's the distance between New York and Philadelphia. A little less than the distance from Washington to Richmond or Cleveland to Cincinnati. Let that filter into your thinking. Not much comfort in knowing the enemy is encamped minutes away by jet and missiles. How much of a warning can you get from that quarter?

Bases from which the enemy can strike without warning are now primary facts of life for Americans if they continue to tolerate that two-bit Hitler in Havana.

Fidel, the muddled messiah, has surpassed Hitler in sheer disrespect of other nations and their rights. Castro has demonstrated his disregard of decency and fairplay in his dealings with the United States, historically Cuba's friend and ally. Not only has he seized American property in Cuba without payment, and has exposed Americans to direct Soviet attack, but he violates the most elementary international relationships by sending his henchmen to encroach upon American liberties in American cities. Castro gangsterism is rampant in New York and Miami.

American rights of free speech and lawful assembly were eliminated by Castro & Co. on January 28, 1960, in New York when a group of Cubans and American citizens, in-

cluding women and children, and their police escort were attacked by a large, armed and howling mob of fidelistas. Central Park South was turned into a riotous battlefield because the White Rose Organization, anti-Castro Cubans, meeting to honor Cuba's liberator, Marti, were going to say things that little Fidel wouldn't like to have said. New York's shrine to Marti, Cuba's White Rose freedom fighter, was desecrated. The organization's wreath of white roses was flown to Havana's Central Park where it was triumphantly burned by "victorious" fidelistas. Our Bill of Rights bit the dust. This staged riot was really an aborted assassination attempt directed at White Rose leaders. Masterminded by Fidel and engineered by Havana hoods, it was led by a convicted cop killer and pimp. Reaching a new low in exploiting basic diplomatic courtesies, Castro fixed up this unsavory character with diplomatic credentials to fly to New York on an airborne mission of assassination. New York police were helpless to deny entry to this known criminal because of "diplomatic immunity," and American citizens were endangered as a result.

That same evening of January 28 Fidel's followers picked a New York hotel meeting of the White Rose Organization. Scores of police protected the area where quasi-uniformed Castro gangsters set up skirmish lines. On this occasion, the only blood shed was that of a young Brooklyn high school graduate who gave them no "provocation" other than the white flower in his school prom dinner jacket. Any white flower makes Fidel and friends see red.

These were not the first breaches of peace in New York City by 26th of July movement gangsters. Assaults on persons expressing opinions critical of Castro are not uncommon in New York City's Spanish-speaking areas by roving bands of fidelistas. Fidel's well-known hypersensitivity to criticism has rubbed off on his bellicose followers. Assaults on other persons, robbery of their homes, patrolling of streets by Castro auto patrols are weekly events as Castro's hatchmen continue their rampage. Miami has been the scene of street battles, attempted assassinations, and attempted kidnappings. Forays by fidelistas in the United States are played up in the Havana press to encourage their bully boys. Where will they stop? Even the Gestapo never had it so good in "the good old U.S.A."

MEET THE WHITE ROSE ORGANIZATION

In the tradition of Jose Marti, the "George Washington of Cuba," who formed an organization for Cuban freedom himself in New York City in the 1890's, the White Rose Organization is striving to free Cuba from her present mid-twentieth century bondage and Soviet domination. The White Rose Organization is not affiliated with, nor does it sympathize with, the former dictator, Batista. As an independent organization, it has neither contact nor commitment with Trujillo or the Cubans who are wasting their time expecting help from the Dominican dictator in liberating Cuba from Castro. Do not be misled. Our enemies distort the truth by alleging a tie between the late and unlamented Batista regime and the White Rose, this is false and misleading. The White Rose Organization is independent. The White Rose is "clean."

In the tradition of Marti, whose humanitarian principles are milestones in Cuban history, the White Rose Organization preaches a gospel of brotherly love. "Cuba sin odio"—Cuba without hate—Cuba without vengeance—Cuba without blood baths. Fidel's fate when he is overthrown by the White Rose will not be that of a Mussolini. A nice quiet place in the country will be reserved for this "Little Boy Lost" who has yet to find himself but who has done much damage to Cuba and America by his ruthless opportunism. Nor will his followers shed

their blood in what should be a bloodless change of government. Capital punishment will be outlawed in Cuba.

When democracy is restored in Cuba, landowners whose lands have been subjected to uncompensated confiscation will receive immediate and equitable adjustment.

Many attempts at social reform were tried during past regimes. What social reforms have been initiated will be continued with respect to justice for all parties concerned. Confiscated properties honestly acquired by the original owners and which were under production will be restored to them. Confiscated properties which were lying fallow will be purchased from their owners in order to make operable a program designed to raise the standards and the way of life for farmers and workers according to the principles of Cuba's democratic constitution of 1940.

Most important to Americans is the White Rose's unalterable stand against communism in Cuba. Castro's apparent indifference to communism is due to his being a rebel without a cause, except the cause of Castro the Righteous. (His telethons are symptomatic.) In effect Castro has compromised Cuba to communism and threatens the security and solidarity of this hemisphere against Soviet military attack. Communists in Cuba are not going to serve Cuba but their Soviet masters.

Americans have a tendency to forget that the Soviets are fighting a sworn ideological warfare against our way of life. They, the Soviets, have not stopped fighting since 1917 and will not stop fighting until the world is sovietized. In Cuba, 90 miles south of Florida, they have gained a tremendous tactical advantage in capturing, courtesy of Castro, an advance outpost, minutes by jet and missile away from the United States. The White Rose Organization stands for:

1. Restoration of a liberal, democratic government in Cuba and removal of any dictator in a bloodless change of government. No executions. No torture.
2. Elimination of Communists from Cuba; outlawing of communism in Cuba again; abrogation of Iron Curtain country treaties; destruction of Soviet bases in Cuba.
3. Land reform with justice for all. Property seizures adjusted.
4. Renewed confidence of foreign investors in Cuba with new investment opportunities in free enterprises.
5. Renewal of historical bonds of friendship between the United States of America and Cuba.

The White Rose Organization with the help of American friends will eliminate the threat to our mutual security.

Since the White Rose Organization embodies the best of Cuban and American ideals and principles, it already has hundreds of thousands of organized adherents in Cuba fighting in the underground, waiting for support of their plan to remove Fidel Castro from power.

It is the purpose of the White Rose Organization to direct these Cubans and by every means to help them overthrow the Castro Red regime. The White Rose Organization will work until Cuba is liberated and a liberal democratic government exists in Cuba, through free supervised elections.

The White Rose calls out Cubans and friends of Cuba. The White Rose, formed by Cubans and Americans, summons all Cubans and friends of Cuba to strive for the overthrow of Castro and the Communists. Everyone, if sincerely pro-Cuban and anti-Communists, is welcome to be integrated into this fight for democracy and dignity, adherence to the principles of Christ, Marti, and Lincoln, "With malice toward none and charity for all," is the only membership requirement.

Statement by Hon. Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made before the Foreign Affairs Committee by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, on March 3, 1960. The statement deals with the impact of the mutual security program on the state of our gold holdings and on the U.S. balance of payments. This is one of the best statements I have read on the subject. It is clear, concise, enlightening, and informative.

The statement follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I understand that you would also like me to address myself to the impact of the mutual security program on both the U.S. balance of payments and the state of our gold holdings.

The only impact which can be measured even approximately is the amount of mutual security program expenditures made directly in the United States as compared with the amount expended in foreign countries. We have attempted such an estimate for fiscal year 1959. Total expenditures under the mutual security program were \$3,863 million; of this amount about \$2,860 million was expended within the United States. The remainder, about \$1 billion, was spent to purchase goods and services in foreign countries. This \$1 billion, amounting to slightly more than a fourth of total mutual security program expenditures, may be called the direct effect of the mutual security program on the balance of payments in fiscal year 1959.

However, it would be misleading to conclude that this measurable direct effect tells the whole story. In fact, the \$1 billion spent abroad affects the U.S. balance of payments only to the extent that these funds are not used for purchases in the United States. The recipient countries may spend them to make purchases in the United States or they may spend them in third countries which in turn make purchases in the United States. To the extent that such dollars do return to the United States, the balance of payments impact is reduced accordingly. Under the conditions prevailing 10 years ago, virtually all such expenditures were eventually spent in the United States. Even in recent years when the reserves of some foreign countries have increased substantially, many other countries remain so short of foreign exchange that any increase in receipts is likely to be converted directly into increased expenditures for imports.

A rounded judgment of the overall impact of the mutual security program on our balance of payments must look further. Thus, over the past 3 years sales for dollars of military equipment under the mutual security sales program have averaged \$372 million a year. These sales are closely related to grants of military equipment in earlier years to countries now able to pay for all or part of their replacement and maintenance needs.

Moreover, the level of economic activity and the consequent purchases of U.S. goods

by countries which received mutual security program assistance in prior years would undoubtedly be substantially lower at the present time if such aid had not been extended.

These indirect effects are not susceptible to measurement. It is impossible to estimate what the balance of payments of the United States would have been in 1959 had there been no mutual security program in the preceding years.

Similarly, it is very difficult to predict the effect of drastic reductions in the mutual security program proposed for fiscal year 1961 on the U.S. balance of payments. I am not at all sure that any improvement would result; if it did its magnitude would certainly be small.

Expenditures under the mutual security program are now running about a third lower than they were between 1953 and 1955 when our balance of payments situation was much more favorable than last year's results. The deterioration which subsequently set in occurred in spite of the reduction in mutual security program expenditures, not because of any increase in such expenditures. It resulted primarily from a decline in our exports at a time when our demand for imports was rising. Some of the factors in this situation were of a temporary nature and have since been corrected. It is through the encouragement of U.S. exports that we can and should look for improvements in our balance of payments. This we are doing. We have moved energetically and successfully during the past year to obtain the removal of remaining restrictions against our dollar exports. The January figures on our commercial exports and imports which have just become available are most heartening. Our January commercial export surplus amounted to \$354 million compared to \$94 million in January last year. While 1 month does not make a year it is worth noting that the improvement in the one month of January alone amounted to \$260 million. This clearly indicates that a very substantial improvement in our overall balance of payments picture can be expected in 1960.

If the mutual security program were to be reduced out of concern for our balance of payments, we would have no assurance that a significant improvement would result. On the other hand, the adverse economic and political effects in those foreign countries that look to us for help would be substantial. Our national security would be seriously impaired. It is these effects that we cannot risk; it is these effects that we cannot afford.

Representative Gilbert Elected To Serve on House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to be elected to serve on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I am very happy to have the honor to serve on this important committee, whose work directly affects the lives of all of us. It will give me an opportunity to be of special service to our post office and classified Federal employees, as well

as to work for the best interests of all the people of our Nation in all matters under the jurisdiction of our Post Office Department.

The Disarmament Carousel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the constant barrage of phony Soviet propaganda that has spread throughout the world, the danger develops that their diabolical smokescreen might distort peoples' thinking from the issue facing us in the cold war. It is always a source of gratification to me when an outstanding newspaper presents a penetrating analysis of our diplomatic struggle with the Soviets.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, well known to all, carried the following editorial in a recent issue, which I am including in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

THE DISARMAMENT CAROUSEL

The Soviet Union barely bothered to glance at the latest comprehensive scheme for disarmament submitted by the United States and all its Western allies at Geneva before turning it down.

The details are of no great consequence. It can be said that the scheme would probably work if all the nations were intent on disarmament. As much could be said for most of the other Western proposals which have been tendered to the Reds during the last 14 years.

So the Communist reaction was awaited with no great suspense and when it came was no surprise. Soviet spokesmen always have resorted to one formula or another in saying the Western plan won't do. Either they flatly say no, or they engage in such prolonged haggling that the outlines of the plan get lost in a fog of technical objections.

Of late the Soviet tactic is to stand on Premier Khrushchev's argument last year before the United Nations that there is no trick to disarming. According to him, everybody would simply disarm within 4 years and there would need to be no inspection or control. You would just trust old Khrush.

That is not good enough for America and its allies. They feel that the thing has to be foolproof; so the latest approach provided for full policing of all parties. There would be ground inspections, aerial inspections, radar systems, advance notice of all flights of aircraft, etc. The Soviet reply to this sort of arrangement invariably has been that Russia cannot suffer the indignity of being spied upon.

Furthermore, the Western plan, if carried to its goal, would create an international policing agency with more force than any nation individually possessed. We cannot conceive that the Soviet Union would ever agree to that, and we are not sure that it would even be a good thing if the United States were to subordinate itself to any independent force which would enjoy mastery.

The whole issue of disarmament is out of focus. It serves the Soviet purpose of creating propaganda, in which the Communists are represented as having a monopoly on peaceful intentions. Disarmament will re-

main a practical impossibility as long as the Soviet Union harbors the hope of gobbling up the world, and as long as the subject peoples hope that some day the Reds can be evicted from their satellite empire.

The United Nations originally came into being as an instrument for preserving the status quo among "the great powers" at war's end. Some of those powers soon found they were no longer great. They became dependent on the military umbrella provided by the United States. But the Soviet Union quickly demonstrated that the military occupations at the end of the war were not temporary. Russia had come to stay. More than that, as aggressive feelers in various directions and the subversion of Hungary and Czechoslovakia proved, Russia was intent on reaching out.

As long as that ambition exists, Russia is not going to disarm and the West cannot afford to. It still requires coinciding interests to make for peace.

"What Goals for Africa's New Leaders" Topic of Raymond J. Smyke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Africa is one of the areas of the world that presents many challenges today, challenges to both Americans and the African leadership of the emerging and newly independent countries in that continent.

The majority of today's African political leaders came from the teaching profession, as have many Members of Congress and other political leaders in the United States at the municipal, State, and national levels of Government.

Mr. Raymond J. Smyke, of Washington, D.C., the special assistant for Africa for the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, an international nongovernmental organization of professional teachers' associations whose secretariat is also in Washington, delivered a most interesting and enlightening speech Tuesday night on the subject "What Goals for Africa's New Leaders."

The address deals specifically with the teaching profession in Africa and the role that African teachers have played in the development and political leadership of African countries. Mr. Smyke, who is a graduate of Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and has a masters degree in African studies from Boston University, spoke at Baltimore Junior College before public school faculty members in the "Great Decisions Program," sponsored jointly by the Foreign Policy Association and the United Nations Association of Maryland. His address was carried over WJBC-FM radio. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Smyke's address with my remarks, as follows:

Mr. Moderator (Mr. Dukert), distinguished guests, fellow teachers, I would like to take a few minutes before launching into the subject of tonight's discussion and introduce two African guests who will assist in answer-

ing some of the difficult questions I know you will pose at the close of the lecture.

Mr. Thomas Odongo-Okelo is a graduate student at Howard University from Kenya, East Africa. Tom has been studying in this country for several years, and more recently has been lecturing at Howard prior to completing final arrangements for his return home. In addition to lecturing and his heavy course work at American University, Tom is executive secretary of the All African Students Union of the Americas, which has its headquarters at Africa House in Washington.

Next to Tom is Chinaka Essiaba, a graduate student in biology at George Washington University; his home is Nigeria. Chinaka is studying to be a teacher. Some of the difficulties and hardships these men faced to secure their education go beyond what we ordinarily think of as working your way through college. Both are married—Tom to an American wife who will return to Kenya with him. Chinaka's wife was with him during the first year and a half. Now she is the only American trained half-dresser in the large city of Aba, Nigeria.

One more point—these men do not know what I'm going to talk about, there is no prearrangement to agree or disagree, but they have known me for some years and I have known them and I believe we understand each other's values and beliefs and ideas on Africa. We are also on a common ground because we are basically teachers.

Since I've been asked to explain what WCOTP is, I'll do so briefly. The World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession is an international nongovernmental organization of professional teachers' associations. This says a lot, but let me explain. WCOTP has in its membership 161 national and associate teachers' organizations in 61 countries throughout the world. Although there are no individual members belonging to it, the total number of teachers represented is almost 4 million. The Secretariat is in Washington with offices in London, Paris, and New Delhi. The Paris office deals largely with Unesco and acts as a liaison with European teachers' organizations, while the New Delhi office serves Asia. An office will soon be established in Africa. WCOTP is governed by an annual assembly and executive committee. Since its founding in Copenhagen in 1952, annual delegate assemblies have taken place in Oxford, Oslo, Istanbul, Manila, Frankfurt, Rome, Washington. This year the World Assembly will be held in Amsterdam, with three regional conferences in Malaya, Uganda, and Costa Rica. Simply stated, the purpose of WCOTP is to enable members of the teaching profession at all stages of education to exert an influence corresponding to the importance of their social function. It may surprise you to know that many of you are members of WCOTP through your affiliation with the National Education Association in the United States, a member of WCOTP. The Secretary General of WCOTP and the man very instrumental in its founding is William G. Carr, whom many of you know.

How does Africa come into this picture? Well, there are 11 WCOTP member organizations in Africa representing over 200,000 teachers. The WCOTP program for Africa and its links with teachers the world over plus the development of truly professional organizations of teachers there, is my specific responsibility within the framework of WCOTP.

Now all this is going to taint my comments tonight because I look at everything in Africa in the light of educational development there. As a member of the secretariat of an international nongovernmental organization, my comments will be a political without stress on any one country's achievements or lack of achievements in Africa.

Perhaps this is where my two colleagues will be most helpful.

Being teachers, you may be interested to know that the new leaders, whose role we are discussing tonight, are in the clear majority former teachers. Let's run down the list quickly. I am here referring to those men who are either recognized as nominated or elected leaders of a party, government, or state as well as to those who are popularly the leaders in their own country or area. In some areas of the French community and the Congo it is difficult to discern who the real leaders at this time are. Nevertheless, let's begin with Ethiopia in the northeast and work around the map. While Haile Selassie is not a teacher—he is the only chief of state, anywhere in the world, who holds the ministerial portfolio of education—indicating the extent of his interest in education for his country. Neither General Abboud of the Sudan, a military man, nor Premier Abdullah Issa of Somalia were teachers. However, the first Sudanese Prime Minister after independence in 1955 was a distinguished teacher. In Uganda there seems to be no definable national African leadership. In Kenya while Tom Mboya, whose name is most closely associated with African advancement was never a teacher, other equally important people like Kikomo Kiamo, who received his Ph. D. from the University of California and Ronald Ngala, who was a co-leader in the recent London Constitutional Conference, are both teachers. Dr. Kioko is presently lecturing at Royal Technical College in Nairobi. In Tanganyika Julius Nyerere who is presently in the United States on a leadership grant and who without doubt will be the first Prime Minister in Tanganyika—was both teacher and headmaster for many years. In northern Rhodesia Harry Nkumbula, longtime leader of the African National Congress, was a teacher; in Nyasaland Orton Chirwa, head of the Malawi Congress Party, was a teacher and college lecturer. African political activity in southern Rhodesia is in ascent. In the high commission territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland, while advancing economically, remain politically quiet. In the Union of South Africa there are no Union-wide parties as such. Although an African or Bantu National Congress operates, it has no influence on the basic decisions taken in the management of South African affairs. A more recent development in the area of southern Africa is the formation of two political parties in the disputed territory called South West Africa. The territorywide group, the Southwest Africa National Union, known as SWANU, is led by Willy Kalkuete, who trained to become a teacher at the University of Capetown. The other party, the Ovamboland People's Organization, though larger, is confined to members of the Ovambo Tribe. In the Portuguese territories of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea, and Cabinda there is virtually no political activity or emerging indigenous leaders. It is safe to say that none of the identifiable leaders in the Congo were teachers. Up until 1954 there was no provision for higher education or professional training for the Congolese. It was not until 3 years ago that a Congolese could leave the country for anything except seminary training.

Thus today it is reliably reported there is not one Congolese doctor or lawyer in the Congo. In the Cameroons, which became independent on January 1, this year, Prime Minister Ahijo as far as I could determine, was not a teacher. In Nigeria the Federal Prime Minister Alhaji Abubakar was a teacher for many years, as was the Premier of the northern region, Al Hadji Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sardauna of Sokoto. Dr. Azikiwe, former Premier of the eastern region and now President of the Federal Senate, taught school in the United States after finishing his education here. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah,

of Ghana, trained as a teacher, but never taught. In about half of the 12 French Community countries the leaders were former teachers.

This brief survey is significant for several reasons. In addition to the popular leaders who were formerly teachers are the countless supporting officials in elective and public service posts, in such numbers that it is safe to say the present and foreseeable future African leadership are and will be in the majority from the teaching profession. Now this statement usually brings smiles to American colleagues who think about any of the scholarly studies on the general subject of "Why the Teacher Leaves the Profession."

Very briefly, if I may offer my own interpretation, in many parts of Africa the only connection that indigenous people had with the written word was through local teachers. Add to this the teacher's ability to speak the white man's language as well as his tribal tongue and you have a natural leader in any group. For many, many years the only access to further education for many Africans was through the teacher training center, not a college or institution of higher education, but merely a different kind of secondary school. The early west African elite so often written about, the sons of first families from the Gold Coast and other areas who went to England around the turn of the century, returned to the leisurely life they were accustomed to. Since there was then really no arena for politics as it is known today, the elites entered the professions—only rarely did they go into teaching. So Africa's sons who became her leading educationists were in every sense homegrown. The contribution of Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone to education in west Africa is significant, even though graduates were in extremely limited numbers. It was an entirely natural involvement for teachers, dissatisfied with the pace of political development after the war and urged on by less literate, urbanized countrymen, to lead local organizations which in many cases led to national prominence. This is a brief and simplified picture of one of the results of several decades of ferment. But, in the final analysis, who were best prepared, the only prepared people to assume the leadership role foisted upon them by their own people? In retrospect it is providential for Africa that its leaders, with supporting cadres, were from the ranks of teachers who brought to their new calling the basic characteristics so briefly summed up in the descriptive term—a good teacher—and all that this implies.

Placing the so-called new leaders in perspective, we must yet discuss their roles. The organizers of the "Great Decisions" program chose an apt title for the African discussion, leaving just enough rope at the end for any lecturer to hang himself if he so wishes.

It would appear that Africa's new leaders have both general and specific goals to deal with. For convenience these may be placed in several rather general categories.

GENERAL GOALS

1. Independence—for those who have not yet attained it.
2. Rapid economic development.
3. Rapid educational development.
4. Consolidation of position of leadership.
5. Interregional cooperation.

SOME SPECIFIC OF SHORT-TERM GOALS

1. Africanization of the public service.
 2. Attraction of foreign capital.
 3. Development of natural resources.
- There are other goals, with somewhat different emphasis, but in my estimation it all boils down to those just mentioned. Let's go into each one briefly.

INDEPENDENCE

This requires, perhaps, least comment of all. The fact sheet prepared for this discussion is excellent and if you all did your

homework, you will know that the surge of nationalism throughout Africa culminating in independence is and has been the primary objective of all African States since the end of the war. The exceptions of course, are such independent countries as Liberia, the Union of South Africa, and Ethiopia, which has been independent for all but 5 of its 3,000-year history. This is not the forum to discuss the many aspects of nationalism and the drive for independence which are facts of the mid-20th century which the family of nations must adjust to. My only comment here is that we are extremely fortunate to have such a viable and accommodating United Nations Organization which can receive these new nations on equal terms and with equal respect of all nations. The leaders in dependent territories today are leaders because they champion and strive for independence harder than the next man. Conversely, it is difficult to conceive of an African leader who is cautioning his people to go slow and wait until everything is ready.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

After independence the African leader today must carry on in a business-as-usual basis with reduced or altogether withdrawn grants from the mother country. Thus the need, even before independence, to cultivate a climate for investment and technological aid. He must show that under the new regime there will be stability and ancillary supports for an economic complex, including transport and banking facilities, but perhaps most important—a pool of trained workers, not technically trained, for many companies prefer to do this themselves, but merely the qualified clerks, secretaries, accountants, machine operators to carry on the day-to-day business operation. This is a problem which is tied up very closely with general goal No. 3, rapid educational development.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Most if not all the dependent and recently independent countries have inherited their educational systems from the mother country. In the British and former British areas, for example, the system of primary, middle, and secondary school education was styled to train an elite to man the services of government under expatriate direction. While the Colonial Office was able to keep pace with changing constitutional demands for most of the territories, the educational system was not so flexible. Any expansion of the system with the shortage of trained teachers and already strained educational budgets implies a lowering or at least compromising of the previously high academic standards. African parents are likewise leery of any system of education that may not lead to the university. There is the very real problem of African students, who read for the arts at the university, because manual labor or a skill developed with the hands has never been held in high regard; thus students in engineering, agriculture, animal husbandry, and forestry, for example, are relatively few compared to those in the arts. The leaders must strike a balance encompassing rapid increase in the number of places for school children at all levels, with an increasing number of pupils in mechanical and manual arts, and in teacher training institutes, while not diluting the quality of the country's education—all this on limited budgets, with minimum outside help.

I place consolidation of position of leadership No. 4 because it is generally a year or two after independence that threats to leadership arise; in the interim developments under 3 and 4 above, take place during the honeymoon period of a new country. Consolidation of leadership is brought about in several days. Since we cannot expect new countries to operate as full-fledged constitutional democracies, strong central leadership must emerge. In a constitutional

democracy, when a loyal opposition has full play, that opposition must be able not only to criticize and bring about the fall of the government of the day, but it must itself be in a position to assume responsible leadership after it has brought about the fall of a government. In no case, to my knowledge, is an opposition in a new country able to carry out this mission. The alternative is a consolidation of leadership in one person, and generally one party, or chaos and perhaps violence. Consolidation of leadership is going on now in Ghana, Guinea, and Cameroon. One of the manifestations of consolidation of leadership is goal No. 5, interregional cooperation.

INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION

There are, of course, many reasons for such pacts as the Ghana-Guinea Union, the Mali Federation, the proposed link up of the two Cameroons, and the greater Somalia movement. Among the reasons are economic advantage, greater prestige at home and abroad, and the transfer of aspects of leadership consolidation at home to an exterior arena.

All of the five long-range goals I have mentioned go on somewhat before and after independence. They become a part of the fabric of everyday life and the work necessary for reaching the goals is one of the binding factors in keeping the new country together. The specific or short-term goals may be termed the visible aspects of the country's life—those that you see when you are there.

Africanization of the public service means exactly that—the striving on the part of leaders and their governments to replace European or white civil servants with trained indigenous people. There are several reasons for this: First, it is much cheaper to have your own people on a unified salary scale than to pay premium salaries for expatriate staff; second, it is a mark of responsibility and progress when the public or civil service is entirely African; third, it makes for fewer areas of friction in the running of the machinery of government. Africanization is closely tied with education and economic development. The newer countries realize that for some time to come they will need to have European experts to advise on technological development—experts from such international bodies as the U.N., WHO, and FAO, some even from the former mother country. But expatriate staff to run the common services of government is what Africanization is designed to replace. It is carried out by crash programs such as the emergency science training scheme in Lagos, Nigeria, by large numbers of students attending schools abroad; and by building up the facilities of local institutions of higher learning.

THE ATTRACTION OF FOREIGN CAPITAL

In most cases after independence the largest grants from the mother country, while not completely withdrawn as in the case of Guinea, are sharply curtailed. Into the breach must come loans and grants for day-to-day obligations from public and private international lending agencies. Most important, however, for the exploitation of a country's natural resources, either agricultural or mineral, is private or corporate investment capital. There must be a climate for investment and the leader of the new country is his own weatherman in this case. He is in control of the various factors which either attract or deter corporate capital, and if his country goes about it on a businesslike basis, there is always investment capital to be found. Last, but closely linked to the attraction of foreign capital, is the development of natural resources. As long as a quarter of a century ago when few Americans were seriously interested in Africa, Prof. William Leo Hansberry, the noted African archeologist and prehistorian from Howard University, was showing graphically that Africa was nature's favored continent, from almost every conceivable aspect:

mineral wealth, including the largest deposits of the world's most strategic metals; water power; spoils; agriculture potential, including cocoa, rubber, and forestry products; labor supply; rainfall, comparative absence of nature's disturbances, such as cyclones, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes; and recently petroleum. These resources and combinations of them exist in almost every territory of Africa. The leaders realize that of themselves they cannot muster the capital and means of production to exploit these resources; nor are they of any value in the ground. Thus the quickest road to financial solvency and independence from outside grants-in-aid is to develop whatever you have in your own backyard. This is a high priority on the timetable of practically all African leaders, because with economic independence comes the prosperity long overdue to the people of Africa.

In concluding I want to emphasize again the importance of teachers and the teaching profession in every aspect of African life, in and out of the classroom. These dedicated servants are shaping the future generation of leaders just as you are doing. Moreover, they must give themselves to the present leadership of their country, not only in the exalted positions of premier or prime minister, but in the subordinate cadres that perform the all-important function of making the government run. How many countless teachers, some of whom are my dearest friends, struggle within themselves and decide to leave the profession, the classroom, the children—all that they truly love, to fill a gap in a hard pressed newly forming government civil service—these people are Africa's leaders. Thank you.

Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs & Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicinity—Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my remarks which appear in the RECORD on Tuesday, March 15, 1960, I ask that the final part of the financial statement of the Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs & Helpers Union of Chicago and Vicinity—covering the union fund—be published herewith.

The article referred to follows:

CHICAGO TRUCK DRIVERS, CHAUFFEURS & HELPERS UNION OF CHICAGO AND VICINITY—INDEPENDENT

To Our Members, Employees, and the Public:

Pursuant to our past practices and in conformity with the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, we present herewith financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1959. These statements have been certified after audit by Peter M. Shannon & Co., certified public accountants. Copies of the full text of these audit reports, including subsidiary schedules, are available upon request by letter or telephone.

ED FENNER.

UNION FUND

The principal purpose of the Union Fund is to serve the individual and collective employment interests and rights of its mem-

bers. The secondary purpose is to introduce the benefits of collective bargaining and also its trade union philosophy to others.

Balance sheet, Dec. 31, 1959

Current assets:

Mid-City National Bank, checking account.....	\$40,221.46
Michigan Avenue National Bank, savings account.....	416,370.20
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., savings account.....	367,978.27
Petty cash.....	50.00
Total.....	824,619.93

Investments:

U.S. Treasury bonds (\$2,500 par value deposited with the clerk of municipal court of Chicago).....	2,448.10
Fixed assets: Office furniture and fixtures.....	27,212.01
Total.....	854,280.04
Net worth: Surplus.....	854,280.04

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959

Cash receipts:

Membership dues.....	\$866,894.07
Application fees.....	69,422.15
Per capita tax.....	1,638.00
Interest income.....	18,315.70
Total.....	956,269.92

Cash disbursements:

Administrative:	
Salaries and expense allowances—officers and field personnel.....	448,593.00
Salaries of office personnel.....	59,649.11
Trust fund contributions for employees.....	8,061.06
Payroll taxes.....	4,269.12
Office supplies.....	11,835.88
Utilities (rent, electricity, telephone, telegraph).....	17,679.94
Postage, printing, and stationery.....	10,850.36
Decorating and remodeling.....	10,326.61
Insurance.....	3,616.69
Compensation for services of union stewards—members.....	41,472.64
Payments to retired personnel and their survivors.....	8,320.00
Redemption of bond certificates.....	5,494.00
Miscellaneous.....	447.62
Total.....	630,616.03

Professional:

Legal.....	49,655.47
Auditing.....	10,000.00
Medical.....	1,000.00
Total.....	60,655.47

Labor-management relations:

New organizational work.....	565.00
Labor-management conferences.....	10,357.50
Convention.....	650.00
Total.....	11,572.50

Public relations:

Publication of financial statements.....	5,490.34
Advertising.....	1,150.00
Public relations and surveys.....	18,949.36
Contributions to various incorporated tax-exempt educational and philanthropic organizations and religious institutions.....	4,300.00

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended Dec. 31, 1959—Continued

Cash disbursements—Con.	
Public relations—Con.	
Contributions to other organizations.....	\$490.00
Scholarship awards.....	4,255.00
Flowers for hospitalized members and dependents.....	7,345.02
Contributions for recreational activities of member groups.....	1,566.70
Participation in intramural recreational activities.....	2,642.50
Publication of quarterly magazine.....	764.50
Total.....	46,953.42
Grand total.....	749,797.42
Cash receipts in excess of disbursements.....	206,472.50
Respectfully submitted.	ED FENNER.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee)". His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix, and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

What Are We Waiting For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address made by former Interstate Commerce Commissioner Mr. Anthony Arpaia, who recently asked that he not serve another term on the Commission. He has been a very valuable member of the Commission since 1952. In his address he sets forth some of his ideas and summarizes some of his views after serving a long time on the Commission.

I think his address is an excellent contribution to the whole field of transportation. He makes some pertinent suggestions as to what is wrong with the governmental regulation aspect of our transportation industry, with the administration of the ICC, and other agencies, as well as some suggestions as to the Administrative Procedure Act, and other matters pertaining to the role of governmental agencies in the problems of transportation that face the country. It is a very provoking speech and comes from one who, having left the Commission, is completely objective in what he feels as a result of his experience.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE WAITING FOR?

(Address of Anthony Arpaia, member, Interstate Commerce Commission, before the Chicago Chapter of ICC Practitioners, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Ill., March 11, 1960)

Because of my experience of only 2 months as a Commissioner, when I made my first talk before the New York Chapter of the Practitioners' Association on September 17, 1952, I chose to speak in the capacity of a dues-paying member of your association. Now I shall summarize some previously expressed views as a Commissioner. It will be my last occasion to talk in that capacity. Beginning next Wednesday, whenever I stay up until the wee hours of the morning, it will be because I am engaged in a hot game of cribbage, hearts, or gin rummy; and, if I work on weekends, it will be in my garden.

As I look back and review the past 8 years, it seems to me that substantially the same problems that were with us then are still with us. I won't catalog them. You know them as well as I do. First I shall ask: Hasn't the Government itself contributed to the exercise in frustration which characterizes some aspects of public transportation? If so, what can be done to help develop a system of public transportation in this country which serves the public and national interest?

I shall state some basic premises:

1. That transportation from a public aspect is a single problem although made up of many parts and it should be treated in a unified manner by the Government.

2. That the economic regulation of transportation by the Federal Government should be correlated so that there will be a single direction and policy by the major regulatory agencies. It is now divided principally between the ICC, the CAB, and the Maritime Board.

3. That all other Government nonregulatory activities affecting transportation, such as location and construction of facilities and other Federal assistance programs, should conform to a basic, overall, coordinated plan, whether applicable to air transportation, railroads, highways, rivers, and harbors.

4. That the responsibility and action in the various committees of the Congress should be likewise correlated.

5. That the collection of data and statistics should be organized and centralized. One of the principal deficiencies to appropriate Government action at any level is lack of sufficient information. There is a vital need for research and statistics to provide the basic facts and figures so that the regulatory, planning, administrative, and enforcement job can be performed with a sense of direction and without waste. In this connection allow me to point out that, at present, at least 40 different Government agencies are engaged in some kind of transportation research and compilation of data and we still don't have all the facts and statistics which are needed.

6. That the structure and procedures of the independent agencies affecting transportation should be reformed so that they can perform their proper functions with consistency, efficiency, and expedition.

7. That the cost to the taxpayer, to support such amorphous, confusing, ineffectual, and duplicative Government activities, and the direct expense to individual parties who must deal with the present conglomeration of agencies, should be reduced without delay by grouping these activities into three separate agencies with the scope of their activities and jurisdiction clearly defined: (1) planning, (2) economic regulation, and (3) administrative or executive.

8. That the functions of Government in the economic regulatory area properly belong to the Congress and should be exercised through an independent instrumentality which would continue to report directly to the Congress without executive interference and influence. As Justice Holmes pointed out, ratemaking is legislative in kind.

There may be some who will disagree with these general propositions, but I doubt that they are familiar or close to the contemporary problems of transportation. If I had time I could again document each one of them in more detail. However, within the limits of time available to me, I will develop as far as I can the general thesis that, to the extent that Government participation may be necessary, transportation should be treated as a unified whole. The present methods obviously have proved to be wasteful and ineffectual.

A good place to start is with the Interstate Commerce Act itself, which covers the large field of surface transport since, in my opinion, the structure of the law as presently

constituted may be partly responsible for the divisive forces which weaken transportation. I don't mean by this that the act has not been changed in an attempt to meet new developments as they arose. In fact, it has been amended about 200 times since its origin. Nevertheless, the Interstate Commerce Act as it is now constituted resembles a patchwork quilt. The reason is that, in the last 40 years, practically every amendment has been made under the stress of emergency. Pieces were added to meet the problems of the moment with little regard for consistency, uniformity, and harmony. There was no opportunity for the development of a congruous plan of legislation.

This was not true in the beginning. To use a simile—a structure was engineered in the 1880's to fit the conditions which existed at that time. After several years of careful evaluation of conditions, circumstances, and needs of the public, a plan of regulation was devised. The shell of the structure was finally erected in 1887. It was perfected by subsequent legislation, without disturbing the original design, up until the First World War.

Since 1920, a job of patching has been performed, when changed conditions required. The present law, therefore, is a bizarre accumulation of additions to the structure. As you know, the law now consists of five parts, four of which separately treat a major segment of transportation. Some parts don't fit the original design at all. A few pieces are modern and useful, others have become obsolete and unnecessary. I think the lack of a single basic uniform law has heightened the difficulties facing public transportation ever since competitive forms of transportation were brought under regulation. If there was justification for separate treatment then, times have changed.

Some of the inequalities in the law are not of major consequence. Nevertheless, they psychologically operate to create a feeling of unfairness, part real, and part fancied. There are other inconsistencies and inequalities which are more fundamental and which do not foster the public purposes of regulation. I won't list them but will give a ready example or two insofar as they unequally affect the public: It is difficult to justify affording no redress to a shipper for past unlawful charges merely because he uses a motor carrier, while giving a rail shipper the right of reparation for unreasonable charges on past shipments; or to permit a motor carrier to be free to route traffic on interline movements over a more expensive route, contrary to shipper's routing instructions, while a rail carrier who does not follow routing instructions of a shipper does so at his peril.

We talk about integration or coordination of the various kinds of transportation, but a prerequisite is the integration of the laws affecting them. I think the time is overdue for a comprehensive overhaul of the act. Transportation in all of its form is a single fabric and presents but a major single problem.

The entire law should be reviewed and rewritten with an eye to formulating a practical and workable scheme for the regulation of all transportation, including air. There may still be sound reasons for some separate treatment of each form, but each such deviation should be justified. The present parts of the law are unrelated to the other. They

were written almost as if the other forms of transportation did not exist. Realities of the transportation requirements of our economy do not permit regulating transportation in isolation, and that is what we have now.

There are many worshippers of the status quo. They will not concede that in the long run they and the country and the economy might be better off with some reorientation of the Government's role in transportation. They insist that established patterns are safe. Safe for whom? Those who resist any improvement or change resort to the convenient escape: "In spite of defects, things are not too bad—freight and people are being moved and the economy of the country has not suffered." The need for improvement becomes obscured by the attitude of self-interest groups, competitive tensions, and political pressures against a background of public apathy.

But Government action in the field of regulation, if it is to be continued at all, is serious business and has a vital purpose.

The fact that the use of public transportation is not proportionate to the quantity of freight moved in this country is a danger sign for all forms of regulated transportation. To the extent that the law is responsible, however slightly, it ought to be corrected if we are to preserve and encourage economic stability for public transportation as one of the basic segments of our economy.

Government interest is not intended to comfort the afflicted or afflict the comfortable. It is to provide an efficient and economical transportation system to meet the commercial and defense needs in this country. Perhaps an ideally perfect law will not result but the force of commonsense could supplement its inadequacies as time goes on. Unless the beginning is made soon, the deterioration of public transportation may become so aggravated that more drastic measures will follow.

The present attitude of the carrier industry toward competition is truly unique. It is fostered by the law itself. The big central problem is hidden by the emotional and spontaneous outcries of self-interest which the law itself engenders. Competition normally means that one tries to develop a service or a product which is better than that of its competitor at the lowest possible price. The normal aim is to obtain consumer satisfaction and to produce a profit. In transportation, competitors, following the alignment they are given in the law, have placed less emphasis on improving service and more emphasis on impeding, obstructing and defeating any such purpose or ambition on the part of a competitor. It is unnecessary to point out that such obstructionism has proved to be of no productive value to either the participants, the general public, or the economy.

There should be competition because it is necessary for progress and is in the public interest. But the competition must be such as to preserve competitors, not efface them. The millennium will come when one combination of services of various forms will compete with another such combination. I was hoping to see this happen before I left the Commission, but I have been disappointed.

At present the problem has always struck me as a curious and explosive mixture of unscientific economics and human relations. Any step which can eliminate frictions and dissension should be undertaken. Setting up an appropriate governmental structure to handle the several aspects of the problem, as I shall point out later, and creating more perspective by means of a basic law affecting all of them equally to the extent possible will help.

Regardless of whether or how soon the law is restated and reformed, the machinery of

regulation should be improved as soon as possible.

As far back as 1941, the Commission, in its annual report said:

"So great is the volume of business to be transacted by a Federal administrative agency like the Commission that extensive delegation of authority is an obvious necessity. * * * More and more it is becoming difficult for members of the Commission to avoid becoming buried in an avalanche of detail and to find time for the thorough study and constructive thought which ought to be given to the major issues which come before it."

I only ask: How many times greater is the mass of detail borne by Commissioners today?

The Commission's organization should be geared to handle the economic problems of transportation expeditiously and well. To do so Commissioners must be relieved of trivia, in addition to duties which are inconsistent with the performance of the Commission's real mission as stated in the national transportation policy. It should stop treating every matter, however insignificant, with the same time-consuming formalism which it should accord only to matters of policy and major importance. There are several procedural changes which can be made to decrease delay. These are now and have been under study. The practitioners, through their advisory council, can give them a push.

Furthermore, many more specific functions could be delegated to boards of employees, or even to single employees if section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act were amended to so provide. Besides staff processing, Commissioners and their examiners now give time and attention to many matters which can have no perceptible impact on the economics of transportation.

Let me give only a couple of extreme examples. Almost 20 years after the Commission had warned that its growing volume of business made extensive delegation of authority a necessity, even such things as the simple withdrawal of a complaint or application still requires the preparation of the draft of an order of dismissal by a bureau, a recommendation in an accompanying memorandum, and approval by a Commissioner. A voluntary request by a carrier for revocation of his authority makes the rounds the same way and must be acted upon by Division I. With the burning problems before the Commission, this paper shuffling and waste of time and manpower is inexcusable.

In the same year in which the Commission's annual report called attention to the need for more delegation of authority, former Commissioner Aitchison, speaking before the ICC Practitioners' annual meeting in New York, said: "The members of the Commission daily are confronted with an enormous volume of administrative detail which insistently demands from them a wholly disproportionate part of their time, attention, interest and energy."

Experience has shown that when authority and responsibility for performance of administrative duties are divided among several coequal executives, inefficiency, waste, delays, poor coordination and poor programming result. This can be cured by separating from the ICC such functions as policing, enforcement, safety, education, collection of statistics and accounting.

I don't know what Commissioner Aitchison included when he referred to administrative duties, but let me emphasize that when I talk about administrative matters, I am not talking about housekeeping. Every organization needs a housekeeper to take care of budget, personnel, space; to furnish the pencils or paper clips, so to speak. I am talking about substantial and important

administrative functions. These are sometimes called executive functions. They are not suitably performed by a board-type organization. The contribution men of the stature of commissioners can make, individually and collectively, is by the exercise of independence of thought and expertness of judgment in the decision of matters involving substantial economic problems affecting the welfare of the public and the carriers.

The separation of administrative from quasi-judicial functions also will have an important bearing on the effectiveness of economic regulation. Let me give you an example: The Commission has developed the strict judicial approach. Some think that it has been overdone. Nevertheless, it usually waits for parties to come in and decides each matter on a record, good or bad, without regard to its effects on the public or on transportation. When it does institute an investigation on the theory that the situation involved is important and critical, it simply sets the matter down for a hearing and depends on shippers, carriers, and other interested parties to furnish the facts. Often the investigation flops not because the basis for the investigation has evanesced but merely because an unsatisfactory record is made. Yet, the act places an affirmative duty upon the Commission to protect the public interest and keep transportation sound.

The fault is not entirely that of the Commission. Under the Administrative Procedure Act, it cannot and should not play the role of party and arbiter at the same time. To authorize its own employees to take a position in the case would come close to doing so. It has no public counsel. Therefore, the best it could do is to place in the record official statistics and information under the doctrine of official notice. This might require further hearing and more delay since the record has already been made before the matter reaches the Commissioners.

If the administrative functions were separated, the Administrator could come in as a party and the making of an adequate record would be assured. It is for this reason that the assignment to the Administrator should include what is now the entire operations of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and the Bureau of Accounts, including its Section of Cost Finding, so that he will be equipped to make a record.

In conclusion, let me say a word about a planning agency. Planning, especially when it is fostered by Government, is sometimes considered a dirty word. Its connotation is that we are dealing with a socialized state. On the other hand, without intelligent planning, disorganization, overlapping and confusion follow. Public transportation has now reached a turning point. A growing America needs a completely modern transportation network by rail, motor, water, and air.

Highways and airports are being constructed without relation to each other or to existing facilities whether water or rail. Operating authority is being granted in a vacuum. There is no overall plan—just a churning out of grants piece by piece with insufficient knowledge of the existing pattern or of their relationship to the whole transport picture. Railways, highways, waterways, airways, pipelines and other means of transportation underway or still to be devised are now being constructed and located as separate entities. They all should fit into an overall scheme in which each form of transportation efficiently and economically supplements, complements and supports the other.

The planning now is distributed among several agencies of the Government. It should be centralized in order to provide a sound and orderly growth of all public trans-

portation in the public interest. The programs for airport location, river and harbor improvements, highway location and construction, and rail assistance should be coordinated and related to the present use and prospective demand. Before they are undertaken, there should be a unified and comprehensive appraisal of how each will fit into the total public welfare and thereby produce a substantial contribution to the national good. Proper coordination and adaptation of the various services will come about more readily with such correlation.

It will require real strength of purpose and real moral courage by all concerned with the project, but, in my judgment, only if steps such as I have outlined in a general fashion are taken can expensive duplication of services and wasteful competition be subordinated to the ultimate benefit of all users of transportation and to the national defense. When this has been accomplished, we will no longer have the transportation problem which now faces the Nation. Then we can look forward more confidently to the adequacy of public transportation for a flourishing and expanding economy.

The True Philosophy of Public Housing and Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, no man in public life has done more to carry out housing and urban renewal concepts in terms of local community growth than Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania. A pioneer in this field when he was mayor of Pittsburgh, Governor Lawrence took the occasion of a recent meeting in Pittsburgh to take a broad look at the true philosophy of housing as reflected in the growing alliance between public action and private enterprise. Here, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the remarks of Governor Lawrence and commend their reading to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE NATIONAL ACTION, INC., AND ACTION-HOUSING, INC., PITTSBURGH HILTON, JANUARY 27, 1960

Most of us here today know housing and redevelopment in terms of the great physical changes that have come to our city in the past 15 years. These are the results that have ultimately brought these projects the great public support they deserve—and that they must have if they are to succeed, and if we are to advance in the future as we have in the past.

Equally important as the physical results of the housing and redevelopment programs in Pittsburgh is the great innovation in public philosophy which these results represent. They were achieved through an alliance of public action and private enterprise.

The theme of your meeting is "Innovations To Achieve Good Housing in Good Neighborhoods." Sometimes, it seems, the brief history of American housing programs has been one long series of innovations.

In many respects, we are just now leaving the experimental stage. We have just begun to accumulate enough legal and political tools to do a thorough and respectable job of rebuilding our cities.

The solutions proposed and the tools de-

vised, so far, have been varied and ingenious. We have come up with zoning and planning commissions, redevelopment and housing agencies, and various enforcement units. Still, the most striking innovation—one which should have occurred to us a long, long time ago—is represented by our guests here today, from Action, Inc.

A national citizens' committee drawn from all economic and political interests in the country, they have set themselves the task of solving our great American problem—the problem of our cities. Action, Inc.—like Pittsburgh's Action-Housing—obliterates the imaginary boundary between public action and private enterprise—between what government must and should do, and what is required from the body of the community itself.

Projects of great magnitude, like the revitalization of our cities, will never succeed unless they get active support at the citizens' level.

Government, in this country at least, cannot—nor does it want to—tackle such problems alone.

I like to think—and I hope my bias is excusable—that this new alliance of private and public action was born in Pittsburgh in 1943, when leadership from all walks of life formed the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. Before the united, cooperative spirit engendered by this organization, Pittsburgh was fast fading.

Today, all around us, we see examples of innovations in housing and redevelopment that have prompted a national pattern for the improvement of blighted neighborhoods. The renewal of the area in which this hotel is located prepared the way for Federal title I legislation in 1954—a major boon for other American cities fighting the same battle.

This entire concept brought new life to Pittsburgh. For 25 years, there were no major new private investments. Since redevelopment first began in Pittsburgh, \$197,500,000 in private funds have been invested in eight projects of the redevelopment authority alone. And both the Gateway and Lower Hill projects inspired an additional \$75 million in private investment beyond their boundaries.

And perhaps more remarkable yet, because of the heavy reliance upon private investment, the rebuilding of Pittsburgh has so far cost each citizen of Pittsburgh about \$1.40 per year.

And as a result of this investment, the city now taxes \$175 million in new property values.

The redevelopment of Pittsburgh and other Pennsylvania cities has been an inspiration.

But without the substantial help of the Federal Government, with its enormous resources, the cities are fighting a rearguard action.

Local financial capabilities are already strained to the utmost.

The Nation's new growth patterns, tax practices, governmental organization—all are sapping the vitality of our cities. Yet the cities generate the overwhelming bulk of the national economy, and they are home for the great majority of Americans, and indications are that even more people will be urban dwellers in the coming decades.

It is people, after all—not factories, buildings, and real estate—that we are talking about. Since the earliest days of civilization, the city has been the wellspring of culture and manufacture. But only because of the men who lived in them.

In all of our discussion here today, we are concerned with the continuing development of a philosophy of citizen understanding in the accomplishments of the past and participation in the great work that lies ahead.

There is a task for each of us, if the job is to proceed. And as our talks go on this afternoon, I would urge each of you to participate with the object of finding where you may best lend your talents to the reshaping of your city.

Our Dwindling Sea Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, over the years the New York Journal of Commerce has been a staunch supporter of the U.S. merchant marine. As a leading business publication, it has fully appreciated both the value of foreign trade to our Nation's economy and the necessity for maintaining a merchant marine under the American flag adequate to service our foreign trade.

An editorial in the March 3 issue of the Journal, entitled "Our Dwindling Sea Routes," calls for serious thought on the part of both Government and labor, "before it is too late," to halt the continuing erosion of our merchant fleet. The editorial merits the attention and consideration of every Member of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR DWINDLING SEA ROUTES

The decision by the only two subsidized American flag shipping lines using the St. Lawrence Seaway to reconsider their long range plans for building a sea route from the Great Lakes is another example of how the American merchant marine is being forced to entrench at a time when it should be planning to expand.

The situation is common not only to the seaway but extends into the coastal and intercoastal trades where rising operational costs have virtually pushed U.S. shipping out of business.

It is no secret in the trade that several American flag lines which last year were pushing the Maritime Administration for subsidies for inland routes have cooled on the recently opened multimillion dollar seaway.

The situation which has arisen is in no way the fault of the seaway or the men who operate it. Instead, it's the old bogey . . . very little cargo and too high handling costs for what is offered.

Both American flag lines lost heavily last year on their seaway services and there is a reluctance on the part of their directors to cover the books with more red ink at a time when some of their other routes could hardly be called healthy. The same applies to the coastal and intercoastal lines.

The rate cutting on Great Lakes shipments as well as coastal and intercoastal trades by the eastern railroads has had an adverse effect on the operations of American flag lines on these routes by making it more attractive to use the rail lines than the ships.

Many prospective midwest shippers have been reluctant to change old established shipping practices calling for shipping via the ocean ports. And the railroads' willingness to help by keeping rates to the seaboard low enough to wipe out some of the seaway savings has done nothing to shake their disinterested attitude toward using the seaway.

But these are only incidental factors in the cutbacks in U.S. shipping trades. The big factor has been the rising costs of U.S.-flag operations both ashore and afloat.

The time has come . . . and we hope it is not too late . . . for the Government

and the labor unions to take a fresh look at what is happening to this country's merchant marine and how its previously considered-vital trade routes are rapidly passing into the hands of its competitors.

It was hoped that the introduction of containerized cargo-handling methods would supply at least part of the answer toward assisting the merchant marine battle for survival. But up to now it has given the industry only a partial lift.

The companies themselves admit they don't know all the answers for survival of the U.S. merchant marine. However, they are in common agreement that an assist from the Government in the way of greater aid and some realistic thinking by labor could solve many of the ills.

Before it is too late and the trade routes have either disappeared or have been gobbled up by the competing countries, some real soul-searching appears to be in order.

An Open Letter to a Congressman on the Need for a Fair Increase in Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, March 13, in my home city of Schenectady the local branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers, under the able leadership of Robert Le Gere, held a pay rally to enlist support for an increase in postal pay in line with the provisions of H.R. 9383, the so-called Morrison bill. The rally was attended by the mayor of Schenectady, the assemblyman from Schenectady County, the supervisor of the town of Rotterdam, and a large number of outstanding citizens, labor leaders, and rank and file letter carriers. It was, I am sure, most successful in presenting the case for the increased pay and in enlisting support for it from the people of our community.

The rally developed, for example, that postal employees' pay after 7 years is computed at the rate of only \$2.34 an hour or some \$4,700 per year. This rate is lower than the rate for many other Federal employees, even though the letter carrier is the most direct day-to-day ambassador of the Federal Government to its millions of citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an "Open Letter to a Congressman" which was presented to me at this rally:

OPEN LETTER TO A CONGRESSMAN

Congressman SAM STRATTON.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that you are in our corner, for which I am grateful and thankful.

There are a few things I think that you should know about a postal employee's job, and maybe find us an answer.

In the early thirties, when I came into the postal service, the job had many advantages that other employees of industry did not have.

A postal job gave:

1. Security.

2. You became a top-grade employee in 5 years.

3. The pay was \$1,700 to \$2,100, a top grade, which was higher than most trades in industry in our area.

4. Now a postal employee starts at \$1.94 an hour and after 7 years gets \$2.34, compared to a union laborer starting at \$2.61. A truck-driver starts at \$2.57 and has benefits.

A postal employee did not have to have a second job, neither did his wife have to work.

Now he must get a second job and sometimes his wife must get a part-time job or a full-time job.

A three-bedroom home then cost \$3,500 to \$4,500. Now it is \$13,000 to \$17,000. The taxes then were \$40 to \$60 a year. Now they are \$290 to \$500 a year.

Since then the Wagner Act was passed and labor has the right to organize. Since labor has organized they have gotten all these benefits and have received pay increases, with Government backing, far surpassing the postal employee.

How come the Government backs organized labor, but does not back its own employees?

Postal employees have to first go and beg the public, then the Congress of the United States, and if all agree it goes to the President of the United States. If he does not like the program, he vetoes it, and another year is gone by.

There are many postal employees who would like to know why they have been left by the roadside.

CONFUSED POSTAL EMPLOYEE.

The Fear for Thee, My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Great Wall of China required many years to build. We are told that it was breached, not by battering from without but by bribing the men who sat at the gates. Abraham Lincoln said that if this country were ever destroyed it would be destroyed not from without but from within. I think Edwin Markham gave us a glimpse of the same prophetic warning when he wrote "The Fear for Thee, My Country." I commend its reading to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that Markham's poem may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lines were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In storied Venice, where the night repeats
The heaven of stars down all her rippling
streets,

Stood the great Bell Tower, fronting seas
and skies—

Fronting the ages, drawing all men's eyes;
Rooted like Teneriffe, aloft and proud,
Taunting the lightning, tearing the flying
cloud.

It marked the hours for Venice: all men said
Time cannot reach to bow that lofty head;
Time, that shall touch all else with ruin,
must

Forbear to make this shaft confess its dust,
Yet all the while, in secret, without sound,
The fat worms gnawed the timbers under-
ground.

The twisting worm, whose epoch is an hour,
Caverned his way into the mighty tower;
Till suddenly it shook, it swayed, it broke,
And fell in darkening thunder at one stroke.
The strong shaft, with an angel on the crown,
Fell ruining: a thousand years went down.

And so I fear, my country, not the hand
That shall hurl night and whirlwind on the
land;

I fear not Titan traitors who shall rise
To stride like Brocken shadows on our skies;
These we can face in open fight, withstand
With reddening rampart and the sworded
hand.

I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and citadel and school and shrine—
The Worm of Greed, the fatted Worm of Ease,
And all the crawling progeny of these—
The vermin that shall honeycomb the towers
And walls of state in unsuspecting hours.

Community Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, a speech was given before the Florida Telephone Association's 52d annual convention in Jacksonville, Fla., on November 30, 1959, by Mr. Claud J. Yates.

Mr. Yates is a native of Trenton, Tenn., which is in our congressional district. A copy of this speech was printed in the Herald-Register, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in Tennessee, on Thursday, March 10. I think this speech is very appropriate.

Mr. Yates is the vice president and general manager of the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co. in Florida. He is very able and capable and has done an outstanding job for his company throughout the years. His speech follows:

COMMUNITY LIVING

(By C. J. Yates)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following speech by Mr. Yates, which was delivered before the Florida Telephone Association's 52d annual convention in Jacksonville on November 30, 1959, was so highly regarded by company officials that they included it in their management bulletin for February. Mr. Yates is a native of Trenton, son of Mr. H. C. Yates of this city.)

I am pleased that you have asked me to talk with you today. I am especially pleased that you left me the choice of a subject because this gives me an opportunity to discuss with you some of the things which I feel are of importance to the telephone industry in this great State of ours.

The subject which I have chosen, as you will note from your programs, is, "Community Living." At the start of my brief remarks today, perhaps we should have an understanding of what is community living. How are we living—you and I—in the communities in which we operate? What representation do we have in our respective communities? Are our companies—our employees—a vital part of every community in which we operate?

Many of the communities in which we operate are much bigger than they were several years ago. The important question

for you and me to ask ourselves is—even though these communities are much larger, are they better communities? What contribution has the telephone industry made to build a bigger and better community?

You and I have shared in the rewards of Florida's growth in the communities in which we operate, and we must continue to share in responsibilities that go along with that growth. We—as businessmen and women and as a society, will continue to have the problem associated with growth. The solution will require a greater knowledge of a wider range of subjects and more energy, patience and vision than ever before. The proper solution will surely lead to further growth and all of us want that growth to be healthy and stable with a high degree of permanency.

We, in Florida, have experienced a larger proportionate increase in demand for service in the past several years than any other part of the country. We are also familiar with the problems as a result of this heavy demand for service. These problems in a growing economy have been lessened to a degree by the business climate in the communities and at the State level.

In conducting our operations in a growing State, I feel that we, too often overlook some of the vital and important fundamentals which have made our State what it is today. Florida, being one of the fastest growing States in our Nation, did not, in my opinion, just happen, but is a direct result of plans made by men with vision, resources and confidence in the future. Stating it another way, I feel that we are enjoying a business climate which is a direct result of community living on the part of a number of people, both at the local and State level.

You know that the problems that confront us as a result of high demand for telephone service will remain with us in the future. While they might be different, from what they have been in the past, we must continue to find ways and means of solving these problems regardless of what they might be.

If we are to retain our business climate in the years ahead—we must—as practical business people, give serious consideration to what we, as individuals, can do. What the entire organization of our respective companies can do—and what our company as an organization, can do to make our communities a better place in which to live and do business.

In the final analysis, we, as all other business people, must depend upon the initiative of man, motivated and encouraged to our form of society by freedom of economic enterprise. Today—we know how to make more things for more people and we have more ways to be of service to each other than ever before. There seems to be no limit to the possibilities, in the future, for us—provided—we have the foresight and courage to keep our system of free enterprise in balance and on a realistic basis.

TAKING MORE INTEREST

I have noted with considerable interest, as I am sure you have, that since our last national election in 1958, many business organizations, some national in scope, have been aroused to the necessity of more interest in public affairs. Some of these organizations have labeled their programs in various ways—some, "business and politics," others, "political action." To me, these programs are closely associated with a better job of community living on the part of business firms as well as the managers of the businesses.

We hear statements made that business should throw off the past restriction and "get into politics." I feel that business could make no bigger mistake than to get into partisan politics. You are all familiar with the extent to which unions have gotten into politics in the past several years. Let

me quote from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, a recent statement—"We soon found out that if we got any more victories like we had in 1958, that victory might ruin us."

In the long run, I feel that if business would attempt to get candidates nominated and elected, this approach would fail, even though they might, in some instances, result in some immediate success. The reason I feel it would be a failure is, at any time the American people decide that their representatives have been maneuvered into office by a particular group, be it organized business or organized labor, they will and should—vote them out of office.

WHAT TO DO?

You might well ask these questions—what should we in business be doing about these things? How can we bring about a better relation between ourselves and our representatives in government? What is our proper responsibility in public affairs? How can we increase public understanding of the problems of business and industry and establish confidence in our ability to serve the public interest?

We, who are engaged in the public utility business, must realize that we are a highly regulated business, regulated by the legislature at Tallahassee, as well as the Congress in Washington, "that we exist through public trust." On the other hand, we must realize that we play an important and vital role in the communities in which we operate, through the service we render, as an employer, as a taxpayer—and as a community contributor.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

1. I would put at the head of the list the rendering of the best possible telephone service to the people in the communities in which we operate. We must realize that good telephone service yesterday is not necessarily good enough today and will not be acceptable by the public tomorrow. We must be known in our respective communities as an organization which takes an active leading role in all worthwhile community programs and contributes substantially to the success of such programs.

2. We must tell our story and tell it convincingly. We must see that the public really knows us and that the public representatives in government are directly, fully, and honestly informed about what we are trying to do.

In those instances in which we are given treatment that we honestly believe to be wrong, we must say so and why, and never stop working until we get the situation corrected. On the other hand, when we secure encouragement, then we must work to the limit to justify this encouragement.

3. We must get over the habit of going to people in public office when we need something and ignoring them when we have nothing to ask for. Let's recognize that we are in the public utility business and that we have an obligation to all public officials both at the local and State level and we should invite them on all suitable occasions to review with us the progress that we are making and explain to them our plans for the future to the extent we can foresee them. We should make a sincere effort to increase our understanding of their problems and be hopeful that they will gain new insight into ours. If we in business are the kind of people we ought to be, then it should be good for people in government to know us as we are. In addition, this relationship should foster more interest in government on the part of more people in our business.

4. I do not want to convey the impression that I feel that people connected with the telephone company should run for public office, as I think it might be difficult, for example, to be the mayor of a city and at the same time manager for a local telephone

exchange. On the other hand, there will be situations where there is no possible conflict of interest where we can serve our respective communities.

5. Public officials should constantly be informed that the telephone industry more than meets its share of taxation in the State of Florida. As you know, the telephone industry in the State of Florida is the State's largest taxpayer, having paid some \$12 million in taxation to the counties, cities, and State during 1958.

We take pride in paying our share of taxes, but the payment of this tax is one thing and the securing of proper credit from the public and public officials is another. This is an item that we can continuously bring to the attention of the public in our community living programs.

6. This subject of increased importance of Government requires our study and understanding. It can involve not only our business, but those who depend on it for our services and those who are supported by us. The well-being of businesses in general and the welfare of all citizens are too closely tied together for business, and those who exercise control over business to ever work at cross-purposes.

Sound business operations are imperative to a sound economy. Because of this, businessmen must not only keep themselves informed about our intricate economy, and problems of Government, but must see that those in Government are well informed about the problems of business. This is important to everyone and it is particularly important in the telephone industry.

A good business manager of today—as never before—must keep himself informed of the problems of society, and of how he and his business fit into these problems. He must prepare himself to participate in their solution by keeping himself informed of the technological advancement, trade regulations, legal decisions, legislative proposals and a host of other matters which he does not control but in which he may find himself involved.

BASIC OBJECTIVE

Let me review briefly what I see as our basic objective in community living.

First, we should take part in the worthwhile community programs and encourage other people in our organizations to do likewise. I do not mean that we should join every type of organization that exists in our communities, but I feel that we should select those, which in our opinion, have objectives that are worthwhile for our respective communities. As an example, I would like to cite you an instance that recently occurred when a young man desired to be transferred in our organization to Florida, and the individual who was trying to sell him to me stated that this young man had associated himself with 13 different organizations in the community in which he lived. I was somewhat interested up to that point. I do not think that any individual can do justice to the objectives of 13 different organizations. What I would like to see is more young men associating themselves with one, two or three organizations and then making some real contribution to their objectives.

KNOW OFFICEHOLDERS

Second, we should get acquainted with the people in public office in our respective communities. They might not be the ones which we feel are the best qualified for the office which they hold, but they are our representatives—they are our city commissioner, our mayor, our county officials and our representatives at the State and national level. They are yours and mine and so long as they hold that office they are entitled to our interest and support. But above all, they are entitled to be kept informed with reference to our business,

They are entitled to know the progress we are making, the problems which we are confronted with as well as our views on the important items that are involved in the running of our cities, counties and State government.

Third, this problem of community living cannot be performed by commercial managers alone. It should rest squarely on the shoulders of all management people, regardless of department.

Fourth, we have a responsibility of keeping not only our management people informed relative to our business, but we must keep all of our employees fully informed with reference to our particular business operation. This job is a team job and everyone on the payroll should be on the team.

PREPARE PLAN

I should like to leave one challenge with you—that all of us should prepare a comprehensive plan or community living program—that we should give our plan careful thought and continual guidance and direction from the top level.

We shouldn't expect immediate success. This is a job that must be done every day throughout each year by everyone on the team.

It must be done because it is the right thing to do and serves the most worthwhile purpose for the community and for the employees and for the company—not for selfish gain or reward.

Community living is different than getting into politics. The businessman should be actively and sincerely interested in public affairs and should provide the leadership and the climate that is conducive to better government.

In closing, let me say that we should never forget that a healthy economic climate depends upon the political climate that the voters and only the voters establish.

Intensive Study of Food Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the very necessary factors in this country's production of both the quantity and quality of food is the growing importance of good, effective, and safe to use chemicals, pesticides, additives, and other productive mechanisms.

Senator will recall that last year at my suggestion the Senate included an item in the agriculture appropriations bill providing \$500,000 for research into alternate methods of pesticide and disease control which would not retain in the finished product any harmful residue.

Unfortunately, this item was not retained in the conference and was not in the final agricultural appropriations bill.

In view of subsequent developments, I some time ago indicated my concern on this subject to both the Department of Agriculture and the leaders of the livestock industry, and I would, at this time, like to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter to Mr. G. R. Milburn, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

I would also like to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a clipping from today's New York Times on this subject entitled "Intensive Study of Food Urged" and testimony offered yesterday before a committee of the other body by Aled P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, and J. C. Wetzler, a cattle feeder from Phoenix, Ariz., representing the American National Cattlemen's Association.

These documents clearly show that the responsibility which rests on the Federal Government to proceed to face up to this problem which is a problem of agriculture and consumers is of major national importance.

There being no objection, the letter, article, and statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1959.

Mr. G. R. MILBURN,

President American National Cattlemen's Association, Grass Range, Mont.

DEAR Mr. MILBURN: Earlier this year when the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, was considering various appropriations I had a visit with Dr. M. R. Clarkson, Deputy Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, concerning certain problems involved in the use of pesticides and insecticides. As a result of our conversation Dr. Clarkson appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee supporting proposals sponsored by me and others for greatly increased research funds to find substitutes for the present pesticides which would be completely free of any side effects as are now sometimes obtained with pesticides and the like which are not properly used. We were able to obtain \$500,000 in additional research funds to further this program. Even this was lost, however, in conference with the House.

The cranberry situation, I think, has emphasized the need for far greater research to develop nonchemical methods such as biological control agents or other pesticides which would leave absolutely no residue whatever regardless of how they are used. It seems to me that we will need a crash research program involving from \$5 to \$7 million to accomplish the necessary research. This must be done before we who are interested in the meat business find ourselves in the same trouble that the cranberry people did just a short time ago.

Should the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare make similar charges against the contamination of meat as he did cranberries, as the result of certain pesticide uses, meat prices with the present heavy supplies would undoubtedly drop drastically. Such price declines could cost producers hundreds of millions of dollars. Whether or not the accusations were well-founded would make little difference. The slightest suspicion on the part of consumers would be enough to materially affect consumer purchases.

I know of no industry that has done more to make sure that they have a pure, wholesome product than the meat producers, particularly the cattle industry. Millions of pounds of meat are destroyed each year through our inspection service in order to meet the high standards that have been set. This has received little publicity. I am sure you will agree with me that it would be highly desirable to develop the kind of chemical or biological control agent the use of which could never be questioned.

Already proposals have been made to greatly increase funds for the Food and Drug Administration to carry on substantially this type of research work. My own feeling, and I am sure you will concur, is

that this is work that should continue to be done by the Department of Agriculture. Our agriculture research people have done superb work with the very limited funds they have had in the past. I would greatly appreciate having your views as to the plan of action set forth in this letter.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1960]

INTENSIVE STUDY OF FOOD IS URGED—PACKERS CALL FOR RISE IN FUND TO DEVELOP NEW MEANS TO PREVENT CONTAMINATION

WASHINGTON, March 27.—The American Meat Institute called on Congress today to create a program of intensive research to develop new chemicals and biological measures to eliminate the dangers of food contamination.

In a surprise action, the packers' group urged Congress to increase by 8 to 10 times the \$1,500,000 requested by the administration in the new budget for such research.

The national trade organization of the meat packing industry laid its proposal before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in executive session.

The administration has been studying the problem. Its request for a \$1,500,000 program in the budget for the fiscal year starting July 1 compares with \$500,000 proposed last year. The \$500,000 request was denied by the House subcommittee.

The meat industry's concern stems from the widespread use of chemicals and synthetic hormones in cattle production and meat processing.

Alex P. Davies, vice president of the meat institute, told the House subcommittee that one-third of whatever amount of Federal funds was appropriated for the chemical research program should be set aside in the first year for a modern laboratory and equipment.

In this laboratory, he said, teams of the best scientists can be brought to work on the problem of getting new tools to avoid the "hazards of residues."

"The problem calls for effort on the part of Government producers of agriculture products and processors of agricultural products, in the national welfare," he asserted.

The Department of Agriculture is "doing far too little on chemicals in agriculture because of lack of funds," he said. Its scientists, he went on, have "many leads for new developments, but they have not been able to follow through" on possibilities of combating pests and diseases without leaving harmful residues.

"This is not to say the chemical industry has not done a good job," he added. "However, in areas where residues in food and feed are critical consideration, the Department must take the lead in new developments which will maintain consumer confidence in the products of agriculture."

Mr. Davies presented the institute's proposal after testifying in support of a slight increase in funds for the Department's meat inspection service, which approves all meat and poultry in packing plants to assure its purity.

STATEMENT BY J. C. WETZLER BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

My name is J. C. Wetzler, a cattle feeder from Phoenix, Ariz. I am speaking as a member of the Legislative Committee of the American National Cattlemen's Association. This association has a membership which includes 138 State, local, and regional cattlemen's and cattle feeder associations and thousands of individual cattlemen and cattle feeder members from throughout the United States.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee in overall support of the 1961 budget request for the Agricultural Research Service. Singling out two items from the overall request, it is our desire to emphasize the importance of the request as related to Federal meat inspection in the amount of \$21,324,900 and the increase asked for to carry on intensive research to develop chemicals and biological measures for use in agriculture for the purpose of eliminating or avoiding pesticide residues amounting to \$1,502,800.

The American National Cattlemen's Association has long stood for an adequate appropriation of funds in order to carry on the very efficient and effective function of Federal meat inspection. It is felt that the high degree of confidence on the part of the general public in their daily beef supply, largely, can be attributed to the activities carried on over the years by the Meat Inspection Division. This, coupled with the desire on the part of cattle producers and feeders to make available to the public a wholesome beef product, has instilled a confidence that must be maintained.

The recent publicity on the subject of agricultural chemicals emphasizes the importance of the function and services provided by the Meat Inspection Division and the need for appropriating adequate funds for its continuance.

Mention of agricultural chemicals leads into the next portion of this statement. It has become quite evident that we probably will be confronted in the future with more problems from the standpoint of chemical residues in our food supply. This affects us as producers and feeders of the beef supply of the Nation, because it is the sincere desire of the beef industry to continue to produce the most wholesome beef supply for the consuming public. It is mandatory to develop through experimentation and research, chemicals and biological measures for use in agriculture which will eliminate any chance for harmful residues in the food products eaten by the consuming public. The research funds requested this year are, in our opinion, a bare requirement of those which will be needed in the future for this purpose.

Agricultural producers are reliant on certain chemicals to produce the food supply of the Nation. As more refined methods for detecting these chemical residues are developed, the problem becomes more acute, so it further necessitates new approaches for the control of certain diseases and pests as well as find new methods for the more economical production and feeding of beef cattle. As a consequence, private research money of those firms presently developing and manufacturing certain agricultural pesticides and feed additives may be withdrawn. This would put more pressure against the Government, in this case the Agricultural Research Service, to absorb this function previously carried by private money.

For these reasons, we urge this committee to approve the funds requested for 1961.

TESTIMONY BY ALED P. DAVIES BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

My name is Aled P. Davies. I am vice president of the American Meat Institute, national trade association of the meat packing industry. I greatly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee in support of the 1961 budget request for Federal meat inspection. This request is in the amount of \$21,562,700. While it represents a slight increase over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year—\$21,324,900—it is our understanding that because of in-grade promotions and Government health program expense the amount actually available for meat inspection will

be less than during the current year. It has been estimated that even with the amount of the budget request the Meat Inspection Division will find it necessary to reduce its inspection force by 30.

The American Meat Institute believes that as a very minimum the amount of the budget request should be provided for Federal meat inspection. Actually it isn't quite enough, and while we feel that additional funds ought to be provided, we recognize the necessity for cutting the Federal budget in all departments of the Government to the absolute minimum.

Witnesses from the Department of Agriculture already have given you figures to show the way in which Federal meat inspection is growing. Its increasing significance is not only an outgrowth of population increase and changing patterns of meat distribution, but it is also a tribute to the Government agency—the Meat Inspection Division—which is responsible for the administration of this program. Over the period of 53 years during which compulsory Federal meat inspection has been in effect, the MID, as it is popularly known, has developed and maintained a reputation for absolute integrity, a reputation which is equalled by few other Government agencies and surpassed by none. There have been times when the meat packing industry and individual companies in it have not agreed with the MID, but no one questions its integrity and its dedication to the public interest.

There is no other food which gets the kind of scrutiny which is routine for meat and meat food products under Federal meat inspection. For many years, it was the only continuous food inspection conducted by the Federal Government. Now poultry is under the same type of inspection. One of the responsibilities of the MID under the Meat Inspection Act is to examine the products of the meat industry for the presence of harmful chemicals. Actually the MID over the past half century has been exercising the same type of control over additives used in meat which is being employed for the first time by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to other foods. However, it is being enforced in a more effective sort of way since the MID inspects every animal and every carcass which goes through a federally inspected plant, and does not have to rely simply on spot checks. Every ingredient going into a meat product must first pass the scrutiny of MID, whether or not it might be technically classified as a "food additive," and every label which is employed on such products must have the prior approval of the Division. Without such prior approval, the product cannot bear the mark of Federal inspection. I must confess that this requirement of prior approval at times has caused the industry some problems, for believe me, the MID takes its responsibility to the public very seriously, and at times we have thought its restrictions were too severe.

I mention this simply to emphasize the high degree of protection which Federal meat inspection provides to consumers and to underline the obvious fact that the cost of inspection is a small price to pay for a public service of this character. Interest in chemicals employed in foods is running high these days, and while we feel the Food and Drug Administration does an admirable job considering the broad field it has to cover and the limited tools with which it works, we are convinced that Federal meat inspection fills a need which cannot be supplied in any other way. It is not general knowledge, but it is a fact that the MID through its continuous inspection system condemns 1 million pounds of meat and meat food products every working day, thereby preventing unfit products from ever reaching the market.

If the emphasis placed on the MID's im-

portant function in the field of chemical additives tends to give the impression that this is its only or even its principal responsibility, that point should be cleared up. Quoting from the Division's most recent annual report, following is an enumeration of its activities during the past year:

"(1) Examination of food animals, including cattle, calves, sheep, swine, goats, and horses prior to slaughter to eliminate those animals found to be affected with diseases or other unwholesome conditions; (2) a thorough postmortem examination of each carcass at time of slaughter to detect and eliminate diseased and otherwise unfit meat; (3) destruction for food purposes of all diseased, unsound or otherwise unwholesome meat and meat food products; (4) supervision of the preparation of meat and meat food products to assure their cleanliness and wholesomeness during their preparation into articles of food; (5) guarding against the use of harmful preservatives and other deleterious ingredients; (6) supervision of the application of marks to meat and meat food products to show that they are 'U.S. Inspected and Passed'; (7) supervision of the application of informative labeling and prevention of the use of false and deceptive labeling on meat and meat food products; (8) certification of meat and meat food products for export; (9) inspection of meat and meat food products offered for importation into this country; (10) examination of meat and meat food products for compliance with specification requirements of governmental purchasing agents; (11) such investigations as are necessary to insure the accuracy and effectiveness of the inspection procedures; (12) supervision of the manufacture and labeling of process or renovated butter; (13) guarding against residues in meat resulting from ingestion, treatment with or exposure to such substances as pesticides, growth-promoting substances, drugs or biologicals; and (14) developing and determining acceptable methods for humane slaughter of meat animals."

Another function of the MID, although a byproduct of its major activities, is the statistical reporting which it does. The figures which are generated in this division measuring the volume of slaughtering and processing of federally inspected plants are the most accurate we have on the livestock and meat industry. I mention this as a 15th point because of the dependence which we all have on these MID figures; therefore, we need to recognize this function of the division in any consideration of its appropriations.

It is remarkable actually that a service of this scope and thoroughness can be conducted with the modest appropriation which is provided. Just one incident of the cranberry-type occurring in the meat industry could cost the public more than the whole year's meat inspection appropriation, and the public can consider itself fortunate that this inspection program is in the hands of such a dedicated group of professionals as Dr. A. R. Miller and his associates.

Mr. Chairman, I have long been convinced that the money spent by the Government on Federal meat inspection was money wisely invested. Sometimes I have felt frustrated because I was not sure that others appreciated the significance of this service. If the public furor over chemicals has done nothing else, it has given new emphasis to the essential work being done by the Meat Inspection Division and to the importance of providing adequate funds for its support. The American Meat Institute most earnestly urges that you approve the amount of the budget request to cover Federal meat inspection for the 1961 fiscal year.

Now I would like to discuss a less publicized but extremely important activity of the Department of Agriculture, i.e., its Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

As you are well aware, U.S. agriculture is going through a virtual revolution both in the technology of production and in its economic organization. The hog industry is no exception in this respect. Fewer farmers are raising hogs and there is an increase in the number of hogs raised per farm. Along with this trend in greater production per farm has been a shift to the practice of multiple farrowings and a change in the seasonal production of pork. For example, in the early 1930's, 14 percent of the spring farrowings were in the months of December, January, and February. For the 1959 crop, it was 38 percent. In addition, the Southeastern States have expanded greatly in hog and other livestock production. Hogs reach marketable age earlier today than in the past.

These changes multiply greatly the problems of estimating crop and livestock production. Specific procedures for continually evaluating these revolutionary changes would seem to be a necessary part of the Department of Agriculture estimates program.

If my memory is correct, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that several years ago you requested the USDA's recommendation for an immediate and long-range program for the development and improvement of the agricultural estimating work of the Department. This report was made to your committee in 1957. However, to my knowledge, there has been limited progress in the modernizing of the procedures or techniques developed for improving the accuracy of the pig crop estimates as we have moved through this revolutionary period in hog raising.

Basically, the pig crop reports are and have been good, but the present reporting program is not adequately filling present-day requirements.

For example, hog prices have advanced markedly since the first of the year, and currently there is a very lively discussion going on in the swine industry as to whether or not producers have changed their breeding intentions for 1960. A partial answer to this important question will be provided by the quarterly survey released today.

However, a full fledged estimate of the 1960 spring crop will not be released until June 21. By that time some pigs from this crop already will be on their way to market. The absence of specific knowledge as to what is happening to hog production in the meantime will make it difficult for any part of the swine industry to adjust to these changes. Our livestock economy does a better job for both producers and consumers when it can avoid radical changes that occur when actual production trends are not known.

We understand that the Department has a plan which seems very feasible. This would expand the quarterly pig crop from the present 10 States to 16 States: including 12 North Central States, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. These 16 States accounted for 85 percent of the U.S. pig crop in 1959. These figures would show the number of hogs on farms, the number of sows farrowed and pigs saved during the preceding quarter, the number of sows farrowed by months, the farrowing intentions for the following 6-month period by quarters, and revisions as needed in inventory and farrowing estimates for previous quarters. These details are the same as now published in the 10 States quarterly report except that the present reports do not include estimates of pigs saved, they do not include estimates of sows farrowed by months, and they do not include revisions for prior quarters.

The Institute isn't trying to unnecessarily enlarge the agricultural budget but it feels

that of the large quantity requested for research, some of this sum could be wisely earmarked for improvement of the livestock estimating procedures and reports.

An improvement in the pig crop data would be beneficial to all segments of the industry, including producers, transportation agencies, processors, retailers, and consumers.

The Department of Agriculture is doing far too little research on chemicals for agriculture. Chemicals are an essential part of the production of good food. They always have been. The complexity of consumer demands for variety and quality in the food supply make the use of safe chemicals even more important today.

Everyone is concerned, and rightly so, that only safe chemicals be used. We in the meatpacking industry have adhered closely to this philosophy for more than half a century under the careful control of the Department's Meat Inspection Service.

The producer, especially the producer of livestock and dairy products, needs improved methods for dealing with the multitude of diseases and pests that threaten every day to destroy and contaminate his products. The Department should take the lead in developing new chemicals and biological methods for dealing with these diseases and pests without leaving any questionable residues.

The Department's scientists have many leads for developments of this kind, but have not been able to follow through on them. Such things as the use of powerful lures that will attract insects for long distances to commit suicide in specially designed traps and the use of special chemicals which affect the reproductive capacity of the insects in such a way as to bring about insect rate suicide should be vigorously developed. These things can be done without any harmful effect to man or other warmblooded animals if we just put a real effort into it.

This is not to say the chemical industry have not done a good job. They have and they can be expected to continue to do so. However, in areas where residues in food or feed are a critical consideration, the Department must take the lead in new developments which will maintain consumer confidence in the products of agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the American Meat Institute is especially glad to see that the Department has requested one and a half million dollars for intensive research to develop new chemicals and biological measures for use in agriculture to avoid hazards from residues. Our only quarrel with this request is that it is in our opinion not nearly enough when we consider that private industry requires a million to a million and a half dollars to develop just one chemical for the market. We think this amount should be increased to at least 8 or 10 times, with one-third of whatever the amount in the first year set aside for a modern laboratory and equipment where teams of the best scientists can be brought to work on this problem.

It is the considered judgment of the American Meat Institute, which has been actively concerned with this problem for several years, that expenditures of Federal funds in this area are essential, wise and in the public interest. It is an area in which the meatpacking industry and the American Meat Institute have and are spending considerable amount of research funds. This problem calls for effort on the part of Government, producers of agricultural products and the processors of food, in the national welfare.

Thank you.

The Businessman's True Interest in Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I spoke of the true philosophy of housing as reflected in the growing alliance between public action and private enterprise. An outstanding example of this alliance and its benefits was offered at a recent meeting in Pittsburgh when Mr. Richard K. Mellon, financial leader and philanthropist, discussed the interrelationship of interests and responsibilities of businessmen and their employees in urban America. Here, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Mellon's comments:

REMARKS BY RICHARD K. MELLON, PRESIDENT, T. MELLON & SONS, MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ACTION-HOUSING, INC.

Mr. Chairman, Governor Lawrence, county commissioners, Mayor Barr, members of city council, fellow members of ACTION-Housing, Inc., and of national ACTION, and guests, as a board member of Pittsburgh's ACTION-Housing, Inc., and national ACTION of New York, I warmly greet all of you. To those from out of town, welcome to a city dedicated to rebuilding itself. To those from Pittsburgh, thank you for coming.

It is most encouraging to look out over this very large audience and see so much interest and enthusiasm for tackling our overwhelming housing problem. To see public officials and citizen leaders from almost every area of our community life is evidence of a growing momentum.

It is especially gratifying to find so many businessmen here indicating that they have come to realize that their interests, the interests of their employees, and their responsibility to urban America, are all tied together.

Just 3 years ago, I attended a small luncheon here in the city and listened as Jim Lash, national ACTION's able executive vice president, related the shocking facts about Pittsburgh's deplorable housing and the failure of Pittsburgh to provide good neighborhoods for its people.

ACTION-Housing, Inc., has accomplished much in a very short time. More than anything else, it has begun to assemble the parts of the solution. But we have only scratched the surface; much remains to be done in some of our neighborhoods.

Three years ago, the solution was a jigsaw puzzle, spread all over the place. The pieces were people and various agencies. But no unity, no direction was evident. ACTION-Housing has started to put the pieces together. It has developed a comprehensive program.

Now Pittsburgh has what my friends in the housing and planning fields tell me no other American city has: the overall plan, the total approach, a completeness that can accomplish what the pieces could not.

I have been proud to serve on ACTION-Housing's board since its inception. And I am proud to serve on that board today.

ACTION-Housing is doing an outstanding job. It is moving forward with a program

that will bring housing and neighborhoods up to the high standards of our renaissance. I believe an urban center, such as Pittsburgh, does not achieve true greatness until its people are well-housed—regardless of how many new office towers, expressways, and industrial plants are built. I hope our business and industrial leaders will be as productive in the housing phase of the renaissance as they were in the commercial and industrial phases.

ACTION-Housing has justified the faith of all who have supported it. Now it has a great new project in its Pittsburgh development fund. The Mellon Foundations have felt it worth supporting. We are confident that large Pittsburgh corporations will evidence the same faith.

Businessmen all over the Nation are showing increased interest in urban problems. Evidence of this are the many cities represented at this conference, as well as the attention devoted by business publications to urban renewal.

Recently, one of the Nation's outstanding weekly business letters, read by hundreds of thousands of businessmen and industrialists, published one entire letter on housing and urban renewal. It expressed the businessman's stake admirably and pointed out that housing and urban renewal are good business, and there is something in it for almost everybody. It is very much like a new industry and has a pronounced effect on the national economy for decades ahead. The letter also pointed out that while the Government pays a good share of the cost, private capital is essential for the completion of most projects.

It is my belief that Pittsburgh is now organized to do a real job in the housing field, although we admit that we have much to learn. However, it is my fervent hope that when those of you from out of town return here in a few years, we will be able to show you some real progress in the field of housing which is as dramatic as our gateway center development.

Hypocrisy in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial from the March 17, 1960, issue of the Ridge Citizen of Johnston, S.C., which is entitled "Hypocrisy in Civil Rights."

The Ridge Citizen is very ably edited and published by Mr. J. Luther Aull, one of South Carolina's most talented and respected newsmen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY IN CIVIL RIGHTS

The hypocrisy of the proponents of the iniquitous force bill proposals at present being extensively debated in the Senate was never more clear than it was during last week when an amendment of Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio was added on to the portion of the bill that would make resistance to the Supreme Court's desegregation decision a crime. Senator LAUSCHE's amendment would have extended the provisions to labor cases also.

This of course brought forth yelps from the liberal proponents of the force bills as being discrimination against labor. That is of course unthinkable to this particular element. Discrimination against the Southern States, however, is quite the order of the day.

What, though, is the difference in the resistance to Court orders or decisions whether they have to do with labor cases or segregation cases? Why, it depends on whose ox is gored, of course.

The entire section was killed, as it should have been. Personally, it seems to us perfectly proper to resist any decision or Court order by any legal means available. Any other course is tyranny.

Number of Farm Auctions Soar in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article appeared in the Topeka Capital-Journal on Sunday, March 13, providing further proof that more people are leaving their farms for economic reasons. I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to this article, which shows that farmers are leaving the land because they no longer find farming profitable. The article is as follows:

NUMBER OF FARM AUCTIONS SOAR IN KANSAS (By Charles Pratt)

The cry of the auctioneer is being heard increasingly at farm sales over Kansas this year. In some sections of the State the number of auction sales of personal farm property has tripled over those of preceding years.

The reason is an economic one. Farmers—especially small ones—are leaving the land because they no longer find farming profitable. Some of the oldsters are retiring from the farm but many are taking jobs in cities and towns.

In northern and western Kansas counties, especially, the number of farm auction sales has increased, says C. E. Sandeffer, Topeka, secretary-treasurer of the Kansas Auctioneers' Association. In the immediate area about Topeka the number remains stable but in Marshall County there are three times as many as in recent years.

Two large farm sales are advertised within the next 10 days in Dickinson County. And in the upper Ar-Kansas Valley extending from western Kansas into Colorado, farm sales of personal property are reported on the increase.

Some of the sales are big ones, grossing in excess of \$30,000. Most of those in the immediate Topeka area, however, are averaging from \$5,000 to \$10,000, Sandeffer says. Twenty years ago a gross of \$3,000 on the average was considered good.

The size of sales varies, of course, with the amount of livestock and machinery offered. Big farming equipment runs the total high, even though farm machinery is going at less in farm sales this year than in former years.

Dairy cow prices the holding up better at farm sales than most livestock, he said. At Marysville, Byron Guise, editor of the Marshall County Advocate, says good dairy cows are selling from \$250 to \$300 each.

Farm sales down through the years always have been well attended and current auction

sales are no exception, Sandeffer has found. Attendance is good and buying generally brisk.

Farm sales move more rapidly now than in the past and Sandeffer says it's because the auctioneer has become a professional.

"He operates at a faster tempo," he says. "At most farm sales, he tries to have everything sold by 4 p.m. so those in attendance will have plenty of time to get home. In years past, it was no uncommon thing for a sale to continue after dark."

More young men are entering the auctioneering field as a profession, Sandeffer says. There are now 20 professional auctioneering schools in the United States. The Kansas Auctioneers' Association has about 100 members.

Today's auctioneer is becoming more of a specialist, too. Sandeffer cites Joe Rains of Maple Hill as specializing in the selling of cattle. Kenneth Crews of Topeka is the third generation of his family functioning at farm sales.

At Hutchinson, Gene Walker is a pure bred cattle auctioneer and Wes Harris of Holton combines auctioneering at farm sales with his work at his sales pavillion. Jim Wilson of Osage City is a general auctioneer.

In the Marysville area E. M. Fisher and Raleigh Breeding serve at many farm auctions.

Sandeffer sees the increasing number of farm auction sales as evidence that auctioneering is the best and quickest way to liquidate an operation. Nothing has been found better than competitive bidding, he says. The farm auction sale always has been popular and will continue to be.

Voice of Democracy Speech by Philip J. Smith of Cordova, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently, in the Voice of Democracy contest, in which 51 young men and women from the 50 States and the District of Columbia participated, the representative of Alaska, Mr. Philip J. Smith, of Cordova, was one of the 4 semifinalists chosen from the 51 from whom the overall winner was selected.

I ask unanimous consent that his address on the subject "I Speak for Democracy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Philip J. Smith, Cordova, Alaska, one of four finalists 1960)

I speak for democracy—from the bottom of my heart, I speak for the form and the essence of democracy as it is typified and practiced in the United States of America. I speak for the lazy summer afternoons spent fishing for catfish in a broad muddy river. That is part of America. I speak for the squalor and filth of another "catfish"—the Catfish Row that is also part of our America and of our democracy. I speak for the elegance and splendor of Fifth Avenue and the

tree-shaded serenity of a country town or an equally tranquil fishing village nestled at the foot of towering mountains in the winter-time—waiting for Christmas. I speak for the happiness of the country doctor who is called out early in the morning to take care of one of his townspeople and the equal happiness of the scientist who has perfected a new life-saving antibiotic. I speak for the farmer and the fisherman who have their seasonal duties to perform—and the storeowner whose duties are never completed. I speak for a muddy, boggy road leading to a farmer's fields—and for the broad super highways leading to a different kind of happiness—and sometimes oblivion. I speak for the congressman who guides his country's destiny, and for the councilman who shapes the future of his town. For the harried business executive—and the humpbacked newsboy who hands him a daily newspaper he doesn't have time to read. I speak for the young toughs on the corners of dirty city streets and for the healthy youths who scamper in the snow and ice of a clean, fresh, star-studded winter eve.

But perhaps you ask why I speak for the unhappiness, the filth, the degradation in America? I speak for it because it, too, is part of America, part of our democracy. A portion of the life we ourselves lead—part of the reason we exist. If we had nothing low and base to overcome in our lives, there would be no reason to alleviate these conditions. Our lives would be pointless, and the ultimate achievement—the achievement of excellence—would go unrewarded. There would be no ideals to uphold, no goals to strive for, and no personal glow of a job well done.

Democracy is humanity in action. The expression of the will of the majority—the amazing willingness with which the minority complies with this will. Democracy is all the imperfections, the perversions, and the degradation to which fallen man is subject. But to a much larger extent—it is the nobility and dignity of the true democracy which towers over our fallen man.

We have established the fact that man is subject to various shortcomings. If he can do nothing about them, he is lost. His life has lost its purpose. In America's democracy, he can do something about his shortcomings. There are no political restrictions on selfdevelopment—in fact aid is given those who require and desire it. The individual and his ideals are respected as under no other form of government. Our country doctor—harried businessman—our farmer and fisherman—all are democracy in its truest sense. You too, and I, a mere student, are democracy.

Therefore, I speak for the college student, studying beneath a massive oak on campus or lost in the hysteria of Saturday afternoon's football game. And for the blind saxophonist playing for pennies on a crowded street—and the concert pianist, performing for a crowded hall. For the clear-eyed country lad who grew to be the leader of the greatest nation on earth, and for the wealthy son of a wealthy father who was a bum at the age of 21. I speak for a sleek ballistic missile hurtling skyward, protecting our Nation—and for the two-bit popgun delighting the future scientist. And for the high school teacher delving into the intricacies of nuclear physics with his class—and the young mother teaching her child the equally intricate mechanics of his first words. I speak for democracy—its accomplishments, its present, and its future. I speak with the humility born of inherent pride, for I am of and for America's democracy—as America's democracy is of and for me.

New York State Assembly Shows the Way—Let's Put All Our Major National Nonreligious Holidays on Mondays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation, H.R. 8073, to fix four of our major, nonreligious national holidays—Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans Day—on Mondays rather than on fixed calendar dates. This, of course, is precisely what we now do in the case of another major, nonreligious national holiday—Labor Day, established uniformly on the first Monday in September. My proposal has the support of both employee and management groups since it would provide not only that observance of these holidays would involve a long weekend suitable for family travel and recreation, but would also greatly reduce absenteeism which inevitably results when holidays fall within the middle of the week.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly heartened last week to learn that on Monday, March 14, the assembly of the legislature of my great State of New York passed and sent to the State senate a bill designed to accomplish the purposes outlined in my bill with respect to Memorial Day, making it fall, in New York State, on the last Monday of May rather than on May 30.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the State senate and the Governor of New York will join with the assembly in supporting this sound and beneficial State legislation. If it does become law in New York then it will surely follow—if the observances of our great national holidays are to be in harmony throughout the several States, as, of course, they should be—that corresponding action, along the lines of the Stratton bill, H.R. 8073, must be taken by this Congress. For this reason the recent action at the State capitol at Albany, N.Y., represents the first major breakthrough for this legislation of mine and I am hopeful that Members of the House will now soon give their attention and support to this important matter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a news release on this subject which I have issued today:

Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, yesterday hailed the action of the New York State Assembly, which last Monday adopted a bill to establish Memorial Day as the last Monday in May rather than on May 30, as "the first major breakthrough for my bill, H.R. 8073, which would provide for the observance of all nonreligious national holidays on Mondays."

The New York State legislation passed the assembly by a vote of 114 and was sent to

the Senate where it reportedly "has a good chance of passage." The legislation is sponsored jointly by Assemblyman Richard J. Bartlett, Republican, of Glens Falls, and Senator Gilbert T. Seelye, Republican, of Burnt Hills. Actually, May 30 falls on the last Monday in May this year.

Congressman STRATTON, in similar communications to Assemblyman Bartlett and Senator Seelye, praised them for their action and told them, "adoption of this provision by New York State will undoubtedly lead quickly to recognizing the wisdom of designating such other holidays as Washington's birthday, Independence Day and Veterans Day also on Mondays." The Congressman urged the State legislators to "persuade their colleagues to memorialize Congress to support H.R. 8073 and thus bring the rest of the country into line with New York State." He expressed agreement with the views attributed to Assemblyman Bartlett that the bill would not only provide a long weekend for travel and recreation, but would also reduce absenteeism in industries.

The National Foundation Establishes New Institute Near La Jolla, Calif., To Combat All Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to report that the National Foundation has announced the founding, at La Jolla, Calif., near San Diego, of an institute to combat all the diseases and problems of man. This institute will be headed by Dr. Jonas E. Salk, and will be supported by March of Dimes funds. Financing for the actual construction of the study center will come from other sources. The institute should do much to further man's efforts to conquer the diseases of the mind and the body. I ask unanimous consent that the press release issued by the National Foundation, an accompanying statement by Dr. Salk, and a fact sheet on the institute be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., March 15.—The National Foundation today announced the founding, with Dr. Jonas E. Salk as director, of an institute of leading scientists from the United States and abroad to attack the complete range of ills and problems of man with every weapon of natural science.

The National Foundation, which is supported by the march of dimes, will initially commit \$2 million for the institute and will be a chief financial supporter in years to come, according to Basil O'Connor, the National Foundation president.

Financing for actual construction of the study center at nearby La Jolla, Calif., will come from other sources, however, Mr. O'Connor added.

"This is the world's first institute of such broad scope to be founded by a voluntary health agency," Mr. O'Connor said. "In this

and other countries either government or large philanthropies are the sole support for this type of activity."

The National Foundation support of the Institute would not, however, preclude other expected financial support, Mr. O'Connor added.

The Institute was envisioned by Dr. Salk as:

"A nonprofit facility devoted to the advancement of knowledge, relevant to the health and well-being of man, by research—including research in fundamental biology—in the cause, prevention, and cure of disease and in the conditions conducive to the fulfillment of man's potential."

The multimillion dollar institute, which is as yet unnamed, will be built on a 70-acre ocean shore site offered cost free by action today of the San Diego City Council, subject to voter approval in June 7, 1960, primary election.

Construction would begin immediately after such approval with the institute expected to open about September 1, 1961, Mr. O'Connor said.

The land adjoins a 1,000-acre area previously made available by the city for the proposed University of California community approximately 12 miles northwest of San Diego, according to the announcement.

Even though the National Foundation is a principal financial supporter, the institute will be completely independent and self-governing with its own board of trustees, Dr. Salk explained. Names of the trustees could not be revealed until a later date, he added.

Dr. Salk, Mr. O'Connor, and other national leaders have been formulating plans for a study center of this nature for nearly 3 years, it was said.

Dr. Salk, who is commonwealth professor of experimental medicine at the University of Pittsburgh, has been associated with that institution since 1947.

His intentions have been made known to University of Pittsburgh officials and by mutual agreement he will remain a faculty member until he assumes active directorship of the new institute, Dr. Salk explained.

The institute will have a permanent staff of scientists, he said. In addition, there will be facilities for visiting researchers from here and abroad to spend varying lengths of time at the institute. There will also be provision for young scientists, early in their careers, to come to the study center as fellows.

The National Foundation will contribute \$1 million a year up to a total of \$10 million for an endowment fund, Mr. O'Connor stated. An additional \$1 million a year will go to the institute to support annual activities and research, he added.

Dr. Salk emphasized that the work of the institute would be concerned with basic research and the practical implications of such investigations.

From these will flow studies that will have a bearing on such problems as cancer, virus diseases, immunologic disorders, genetic problems, and mental health, he predicted.

The nature of the research also promised significant developments in the fight of the National Foundation against birth defects, arthritis, and polio, Mr. O'Connor declared.

STATEMENT BY DR. JONAS SALK

For some time there has been under consideration the establishment of an institute broadly oriented and concerned with the problems of man as these can be approached by the methods of the natural sciences; an institute devoted to the advancement of knowledge, relevant to the health and well-being of men, through research in fundamental biology, in the means for prevention or cure of disease, and in the conditions that may be conducive to the fulfillment of man's potential.

The time seemed opportune to consider the possibility of establishing such a facility for persons from different disciplines and backgrounds who are interested in the organization and processes of life. The recent great advances in knowledge in some of the fundamental aspects of biology has created the basis for considering the possibility. Another reason derived from the increasing success of man's continuing search for control of the forces of nature which has brought further to the fore, questions of the meaning, the purpose, and the value of human life. Man is more than an organism that can be disordered or diseased; the spirit of man, as exemplified by his aspirations and achievements, is as much a part of him as his other attributes and problems.

The interested response to these thoughts by many diverse interests provided encouragement to pursue the feasibility of such an undertaking. It is self-evident that its character and success would be determined by the men who associate themselves with it.

It seems that it would be best to initiate the development of such an institute with a group engaged in studies upon some of the fundamentals of biology. This would provide the basis for deeper understanding of such biological processes as growth, development, and adaptation of living organisms. Not only would this then lead to new and fundamental areas for further exploration, but it is conceivable that from this would flow ideas for developing further means for contributing to the control of some of the many unsolved problems of disease.

In addition to permanent members with overlapping interests, it seemed desirable that there be as part of the institute a group of visiting members with more diversely spread interests, from this and other countries, who would spend a certain amount of time each year at the institute, and there would be related interests to others who would come for 1 or more years. An additional important part would be formed by young people who would spend a period of time at the start of their careers as fellows of the institute. It is hoped that in these various ways, freshness of spirit and vitality would be maintained and new ideas generated and exchanged.

Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation, together with whom these ideas were developed, expressed the desire and the willingness of the National Foundation to help found and support such an undertaking. The National Foundation has agreed to provide a minimum of \$1 million annually, for an indefinite period, and to contribute additionally toward an endowment fund, at least \$1 million per year until the National Foundation's contribution to this fund reaches \$10 million. While the support, to the extent indicated, will come from the National Foundation, the institute will not be precluded from receiving support from other sources, either for its annual activities, or for its capital or endowment funds.

It was clear at the outset that the institute, although self-governing, would thrive best in the vicinity of a major university in which strong intellectual associations would develop. This requirement is particularly well fulfilled in the San Diego area of California because of the possibility that the University of California might establish a major campus in the La Jolla area where there now exists the University Graduate School of Science and Engineering and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. This weighed heavily in the favorable consideration of this area.

Encouragement from the various other institutions in the area, gave further incentive for exploring the possibility that a desirable site could be found in the vicinity of this projected University of California campus.

When this interest became known to the officials of San Diego, discussion of sites ensued. This soon led to agreement in principle upon a site on the Torrey Pines Mesa. In making this site available, the officials of the city of San Diego conveyed their interest in establishment of the proposed institution by submitting the matter for consideration by the city council and the electorate.

In the event of a favorable response on the part of the city council and the electorate, detailed plans will be announced. This will include the names of trustees, the initial and visiting members, along with contemplated land use and architectural plans.

The availability of a sufficiently extensive land area for development that will inevitably arise will make it possible to consider, without the usual restrictions, undertakings that might not otherwise be possible. If the limits within which the institute functions can be set only by the limits of the imagination and ingenuity of those who compose it, then the purpose for which it is being created will have been realized.

FACT SHEET

PROJECT

To create a unique institute of eminent scientists from the United States and abroad concentrating on basic research to attack the ills and problems of man by every means the natural sciences can provide.

DIRECTOR

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, developer of the first effective vaccine against paralytic polio, currently commonwealth professor of experimental medicine at the University of Pittsburgh.

PERSONNEL

The institute will offer complete study and research facilities to scientists from many specialized fields who will be associated with the project in the following categories:

1. Permanent members of the institute.
2. Visiting members from this and other countries who would spend varying amounts of time at the institute.
3. Young scientists spending a period of time at the start of their careers as fellows of the institute.

LOCATION

The institute will be located near La Jolla, Calif., on Torrey Pines Mesa approximately 12 miles northwest of San Diego on a 70-acre tract offered cost-free by the city of San Diego. The institute will be adjacent to, but not part of, the new University of California community now in the planning stage. In the same general area are located the University Graduate School of Science and Engineering, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, as well as other important scientific installations. Conveyance of the land for the institute must be approved by the people of San Diego in a referendum to be held June 7.

BUILDINGS AND PHYSICAL DETAILS

The location and architecture of the buildings will be planned to conform with and enhance the terrain and atmosphere of the oceanside site. One major building will house the administrative and nonscientific facilities of the institute. Other buildings will be designed to meet the unique demands of the specific scientific projects to be carried out within them. Louis I. Kahn, Philadelphia, is consulting architect for the project. Mr. Kahn, a former professor of architecture at Yale University who now holds a similar post at the University of Pennsylvania, has designed the Yale University Art Gallery; the Medical Research Laboratories—biology building, zoology building, and service laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania—and was architect for the Mill Creek area redevelopment plan of Philadelphia.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

If land conveyance is approved by the voters June 7, work is expected to begin immediately with the anticipated opening date of the institute set for September 1, 1961.

FOUNDING AND SUPPORT

The national foundation, which is supported by the March of Dimes, has agreed to provide a minimum of \$1 million annually, for an indefinite period, and to contribute additionally toward an endowment fund at least \$1 million per year until the national foundation's contribution to this fund reaches \$10 million. Additional financial aid, primarily for construction of buildings, from sources to be announced later will be forthcoming. These other sources also will contribute to activities as well as the annual capital and endowment funds.

PURPOSE

Dr. Salk envisions the institute as: "A non-profit facility devoted to the advancement of knowledge, relevant to the health and well-being of man, by research—including research in fundamental biology—in the cause, prevention, and cure of disease and in the conditions conducive to the fulfillment of man's potential." Those working at the institute will not be restricted to any one field or disease. But from their broad studies will flow information bearing on such specific problems as birth defects, arthritis, polio and virus diseases—the current targets of the national foundation—as well as others like cancer, immunological disorders, genetic problems, and mental illness.

Imagination Needed To Meet Housing Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, ACTION, an organization which seeks to use private capital and private initiative in the fight against urban decay, is one of the groups working most effectively for a better urban America. At a recent meeting in Pittsburgh, Mr. Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the executive committee of ACTION, Inc., called for more initiative in meeting housing needs. Here, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Heiskell's comments:

GOOD HOUSING IN GOOD NEIGHBORHOODS—OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE FOR INNOVATION—THE NATIONAL DIMENSION

(Opening remarks by Andrew Heiskell, chairman, executive committee, ACTION, Inc., before ACTION's point-of-decision conference on innovations to achieve good housing in good neighborhoods)

Last year, the Nation set an all-time record in spending money to build new private housing. Some \$22 billion, according to the Census Bureau, went into the construction of new homes and apartments. These added up to 1,370,000 new housing units—not quite a record but the second biggest total in American history, second only to the all-time peak in 1950.

Even so, almost nobody seems to be satisfied with housing's performance. For too many people are still living in slums. Instead of the third of a Nation that Franklin Roosevelt complained of a generation ago

as ill housed, it is about a quarter of the Nation that is ill housed today. Most of this improvement seems to be recent. And it is still going on.

Yet dissatisfaction with our progress against blight is growing. Currently, we have the spectacle of local and Federal officials pointing accusatory fingers at each other. Local officials complain of Federal redtape which they say is slowing down their efforts at urban renewal. And Federal officials cry that local officials plan too long and build too little, and pay too little attention to keeping the good housing they already have in good shape. Some big redevelopers now say they fear "urban renewal is in danger of being killed by its friends."

Whoever is to blame, the record speaks for itself. In 10 years only \$225 million has been spent of the \$1.3 billion authorized for federally aided urban renewal. Only 26 projects are completed.

So much for the sick record of urban renewal so far. Of course, housing and its problems are not merely urban renewal and its problems. Any good new housing built in and around metropolitan areas where decayed housing should be demolished helps. But housing, like agriculture, is becoming more and more a creature of government. And we are working with a set of housing aids that began as an improvisation and have been patched and remodeled so many times since that not even the experts can remember what all the rules are. How many of you know what section 314 is and does? How many of you know the differences between FHA sections 220 and 221? All three of these are designed to help solve various facets of problems arising from efforts to get rid of slums, and none of them are being used anywhere near their potential. Take section 221 as an example. It is the program that was just made the subject of a booklet called "221: The Program Nobody Knows—What Is It?" In 1954 the Eisenhower administration conceived section 221 as one of the sharp new tools needed to hitch private lenders and builders to urban renewal. Section 221 offers something close to giveaway financing to displaced families who will buy an inexpensive house, new or used.

Well, 5½ years later, the program is still trying to get to first base. More than 1,000 cities have workable programs—prerequisite to participating in urban renewal, including 221. But only 120 have any housing built and financed with 221 loans.

Let's take a look at the other Federal housing aids. FHA—the Federal Housing Administration—was born of a depression and designed for an economy that no longer exists. When FHA was born, the problem was a depression freezeup of the first mortgage market all over the Nation. Bankers were afraid to lend. The private mortgage guarantee companies had gone broke. Some people couldn't even get a 30-percent loan renewed. The farmers of the FHA mutual mortgage insurance plan were trying to find an outlet for money. German refugee money was flowing into the United States. The Nation's economy was stagnant. Factories were not even using their amortization allowances to build new plants. There were no foreign loans. The big job was to find an outlet for savings.

Today, the situation is absolutely reversed on every count. We have a net flow of capital abroad, an expanding population, industry anxious to expand and plowing back depreciation plus additional borrowings. So the experts say if people don't save, we can't build. But fear of inflation is driving more and more people into the stock market instead of savings deposits. On top of that, the Government has been forced to become a competitor for savings. As lenders know only too well, last fall it clobbered many savings banks with its celebrated issue of "magic 5s"—the 5-percent bonds that led many

small savers to take their money out of the bank and put it into Government bonds. This was money much of which would otherwise have been used to finance homes.

So we have this setup: FHA, built on a 1934 situation and its basic tools are still the basic Federal aids to housing. And they are basically unchanged. They are almost the only ones that do not cost the taxpayer any money and thus command enormous popular support. But they reflect, as ACTION's researchers have pointed out, an absolute loyalty to the idea that houses will continue to be assembled at the site by skilled craftsmen directed by local contractors who buy from local distributors and put a myriad of little pieces together according to drawings and detailed specifications.

For 25 years, thus, the effect of Federal aids to housing credit has been to palliate housing problems such as high costs instead of getting at the real troubles like code waste, restrictive work rules and local technical standards that prevent industrial production. Federal programs have muffled big chances to raise housing standards and improve the industry's efficiency. Instead they lull us into inaction about the real problems. How much too much does housing cost? Well, between 1915 and 1957, according to the BLS index of residential construction costs, the price of building new housing rose 394 percent. By comparison, the BLS wholesale price index rose only 160 percent during the same timespan. The BLS consumer price index went up only 177 percent.

Of course, FHA has achieved some remarkable progress, just the same. Its mortgage insurance has turned out to be the big first step to create for the first time a truly national market for mortgages. But FHA has made only a modest contribution to the cost problem—by letting merchant builders operate on a large scale. Government has failed to get rid of the obsolete practices ossified in building codes. And it has done nothing at all to attack the problem of the high cost of land which is beginning to hamper them seriously, many builders say, at putting up the kind of one-family houses people expect and still keep them priced for the average pocketbook. What Government has done is to soften the impact of high costs by reducing downpayments and outlays for debt service by stretching out amortization. So, thriving on easy terms, the housing industry has had little incentive up to now to strive for technological advance and develop better marketing techniques.

On top of this, we are now entering an era when apparently we are going to have a chronically credit-short economy. To state it another way, there is serious doubt that there will be enough long-term funds available to do everything we have in mind.

This means that no matter how successful FHA (and VA) programs were at improving U.S. housing standards immediately after World War II they cannot be now.

There is no possibility of getting enough money out of Washington—in the midst of a cold war—to cope with slum problems our rising expectations say can and must be coped with. Neither, if we want to preserve our heritage of freedom, can we afford to abandon the traditional framework of powers divided between National and State Governments.

But the point here is not to debate the pros and cons of Federal housing and renewal laws. The point is what businessmen and other local citizens can do to make things move faster in their own backyards.

One thing businessmen might well do is consider some of the problems their very success as businessmen tends to create. Prosperity means jobs. Jobs mean people. And new people nowadays—in most big

cities—mean rural laborers and semi-skilled craftsmen who, because they are at the bottom of the economic ladder, tend to coagulate in the worst housing and often make it worse. In short, prosperity is spurring the growth of city slums instead of preventing their spread. Increasing migration from the South is causing many slums to spill out into once respectable neighborhoods as the middle-class packs up and moves into suburbia. Few knowledgeable people argue that slum-formation is a matter of race. It is a matter of the impoverished rural background of the immigrants. And it is, of course, absurd to expect such families with a long background of deprivation to develop middle-class standards of behavior overnight. Race is only a convenient tag that serves to obscure the real problem. Perhaps the real problem can be stated this way: Are businessmen shirking their responsibility by turning their backs on the housing conditions of their low-paid labor?

Progressive companies—more and more of them—do not ignore the housing problems of skilled, scarce, and talented help. IBM, for example, when it shifts engineers from plant to plant, not only pays moving expenses but pays the 5-percent realty commission on the sale of the old house and closing costs on the new house. And if the employee cannot find a buyer for his old house right away, the company helps him make temporary double-financing arrangements on two homes.

Why do companies do all this? One reason is that it is getting harder and harder to recruit scarce and talented help when they may have to live in housing so bad its bad environment has infected not just a few blocks, but whole areas of a city. The converse is easy to see. One reason such a magnificent complex of electronics industry has sprung up on the San Mateo Peninsula just south of San Francisco is that it is a delightful place to live. The ingredients? Some of them are: Clean cities, lots of trees, parks, graft-free local governments, good schools.

So businessmen have a personal stake in housing and urban renewal. Not only does the good environment that good housing creates make it easier to hire better employees, but as the biggest taxpayers in the locality, they have a financial interest in getting rid of the drain on municipal revenues that slums create.

I believe housing problems are largely going to be licked where they arise: in big cities. Or they won't be licked at all. The Federal Government can help, but it cannot do the whole job.

Yet, it is also clear that if the expectation of better housing is not met by private action in concert with local government, there will be attempts to meet it by Federal action. There is too much vote potential for politicians to ignore the problem.

The big danger in housing is that businessmen—ignoring civic responsibility and baffled by housing's complexity—will continue to turn their backs on the problem. Only when businessmen understand that this is their problem, as well as city hall's, and then go to work with city hall, will the city have a chance of becoming a desirable place to live in. From now on the businessman's future is tied to the health of his community. The greatest shortage in the sixties will be manpower which will flow to the communities that have the most to offer.

Finally, the most hopeful step forward will take place when businessmen in the housing industry bring to housing the initiative, managerial skills and production techniques that characterize the American economy. This is what you in Pittsburgh can do for our country. We at ACTION, and all of our guests, appreciate today's opportunity to learn of the pioneering experience of ACTION-Housing, Inc.

What Kind of President Do You Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few commentators on our National Government go so directly to the heart of our national problems as the head of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston.

In this morning's New York Times, Mr. Reston discusses the big question that confronts American citizens in the next 6 months: "What Kind of President Do You Want?"

Mr. President, I found this an exceedingly provocative and enlightening discussion of how the conscientious American citizen might organize his thoughts in deciding how to vote in 1960. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent commentary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF PRESIDENT DO YOU WANT?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—President Eisenhower's remarks yesterday about the lunch-counter controversy in the South tell a lot about his concept of the Presidency.

More important, they provide a specific incident by which the Nation can help decide the major political question of the day—namely, what qualities are needed in President Eisenhower's successor.

The President put a sharp limitation on what he regarded as his right to intervene to help the Negroes achieve equal status at the lunch counters in the South.

He dealt with the legalities of the problem but not the moralities. He supported the Negro's right of peaceful demonstration for equal rights. He deplored any use of violence on either side. He implied that the Negro had a constitutional right to eat alongside whites in public places operating under public charter, but not in privately owned establishments.

In sum, he gave his "understanding" of what was legal but not what he thought was right, and this raises some interesting questions for the future:

THE BASIC QUESTIONS

Is the President's obligation fulfilled when he meets the legal duty to "take care that the laws" are "faithfully executed," or is there also a moral obligation to speak out for the equality of all the people?

Which of the two historic conceptions of the Presidency do we need: a Presidency "active and reformist" or a Presidency protective of the established order?

What are the requirements of the sixties: for an assertive "reformist" President like Jackson, Wilson, and the two Roosevelts, or for the weaker Presidents of 1809-29 and 1865-85, or for something in between?

President Eisenhower has usually acted to protect the established order, as an honest conservative usually does, but he has not always refrained from taking the lead against powerful opposition. He led the debate against inflation, and swung his sickle in that "dread field" of foreign aid. But he has shied away from the moralities of the civil rights debate.

He landed the troops in Little Rock to meet what he regarded as his legal obliga-

tion, to enforce the Supreme Court's public school integration decision, but he has not said yet that he thinks the Court's decision was right. Why?

He said yesterday that he did not want to make any judgment about the lunch-counter demonstrations "because I'm not in a position to." Why isn't he?

"I know about these (lunch-counter demonstrations) as they come briefly to my attention," he added. Why briefly?

The reasons for these attitudes are not hard to find. President Eisenhower believes with great sincerity that the "active, reformist" concept of the Presidency has gone too far. As he told the reporters yesterday morning: "I am one of those who believe there is too much interference (by the Federal Government) in our private affairs. * * * I would like to diminish rather than increase it."

THE CONSEQUENCES

For this reason, he would leave the question of eating in private establishments in the South to the local authorities; he would leave the allocation of the Nation's resources primarily to private choice, rather than increase the flow of funds into education, hospitals and defense.

He would leave the development of Latin America primarily to private venture capital (which takes one look at Castro and flees) and avoid any direction of television, no matter what commercial television does to debase the national taste.

He believes in the noble theory which Jefferson proclaimed (and didn't always follow)—but will it work in the sixties? Will the local communities really make peace at the lunch counters, or vote the funds to provide the education necessary in this kind of world? Will private capital voluntarily develop the underdeveloped countries in freedom, or give us educational television?

There are a lot of people here who honestly think the answer to these questions is "No." They understand the conservative limitation of Presidential power in a period of consolidation. But they think the President, 100 years after Appomattox, ought to be willing to say at least a word for the Negro trying to eat a hamburger next to a white man in Atlanta, and they insist that the next President, whoever he is, will need to use all his powers to meet the problems of the sixties.

Dependable Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the last few weeks of atrocious weather have served one useful purpose; namely, that of pointing up the vulnerability of air and highway travel when roads and runways are under a mantle of snow.

As a consistent patron of the trains—I never fly—I have become used to being crowded out of my seat by the myriad of "snow birds" who descend upon the railroads when the skyways and byways are out of service. And the railroads, while hard put to come up quickly with the additional cars that are needed, have never failed them, whether it be commuter service or a transcontinental run.

What worries me—and should concern everyone who depends on the railroads—is what we will do when the subsidized

mediums of transportation have put the one dependable, year round, mode of travel out of business. Something certainly will have to be done and quickly if we are not to suffer the irreparable loss of a nationwide system for moving goods and people to those other types of travel that simply cannot cope with the vagaries of the weather, to say nothing of the unpredictable demands that would come with wartime.

This following is taken from a current paid advertisement and lends emphasis to my arguments in behalf of strengthening our railway system by emphasizing the part these carriers play in getting the mails through while their competitors are digging out:

HERE COMES YOUR AIRMAIL (AND YOUR HIGHWAY MAIL) TOO

Every year, the railroads are being squeezed out of more and more of the mail-carrying business. Mail once hauled by rail is being diverted, instead, to highway trucks and to the airlines.

But what happens when the weather gets ornery—when trucks bog down on snow-covered highways and planes are grounded?

You guessed it. Back to the railroads it comes in a veritable flood. Then the railroads get the mail—and get it through, too. All of it. Until the sun shines again.

The proven ability of the railroads to carry the mail under any conditions and in all kinds of weather didn't just happen. Railroad transportation is dependable transportation. And in their mail-handling equipment and facilities, railroads have an investment of about a billion dollars.

During the recent series of bad storms throughout the South, railroads were called upon many times and in many places to help carry on the postal tradition that the mails must go through—and it did.

But if diversions to other carriers continue, the day may come when railroads will not be able to move all mail at the drop of a snowflake. And if this ever happens, all America will be the loser.

American Legion Celebrates 41st Birthday

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, I rise to pay tribute to the American Legion and its members in recognition of its 41st birthday.

Established in 1919, the Legion has grown tremendously. Comprised of veterans of three wars, the Legion today has 17,000 community posts. Too, it has outposts in every land outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. In addition, it has now 14,000 auxiliary units.

During its 41-year lifetime, the Legion has had a significant impact on American life.

As a "voice of the veteran," the American Legion—along with other fine organizations in the field—has a notable record of supporting legislation, drives, and causes, not only in the interest of

the veterans, themselves, but also of the national interest.

Recently, the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune published an enlightening article on its growth, progress, and work entitled "American Legion To Mark 41st Birthday." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION TO MARK 41ST BIRTHDAY

The American Legion, world's largest veteran organization, celebrates the 41st anniversary of its birth Tuesday to Thursday.

Members of La Crosse's Roy L. Vingers Post 52 also are marking their 41st birthday.

The Legion was born at a caucus in Paris March 15 to 17, 1919, held by members of the first American Expeditionary Force. The meeting was in the Cirque de Paris, a building long ago torn down. A bronze plaque now marks the site.

The 1,000 delegates to the Paris caucus reached agreement on forming an organization of American veterans of World War I. They set up a committee of 100 to push plans for enrollment overseas and at home.

They left the completion of the new organization to a second caucus that was held in St. Louis May 8 to 10, 1919. That St. Louis caucus adopted a constitution and bylaws and selected Minneapolis for the first national convention of the American Legion November 10 to 12, 1919.

Historian Richard Seelye Jones wrote of the founding Paris caucus:

"The American Expeditionary Force dissolved. It left its dead in France. It left its record for history. It bequeathed the perpetuation of its memories, comradeships, and service ideals to the American Legion."

Today, its ranks are mostly filled by a younger generation of American veterans. The Legion is today a three-war organization. It has 17,000 community posts. It has outposts in every land outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It has an auxiliary with 14,000 community units.

The American Legion has had an impact on the American scene during the first 41 years of its life. This impact was registered through its major basic programs.

Through its fathering of the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans and its subsequent Korean GI bill, the American Legion has contributed to the raising of the educational level of the entire Nation. The same legislation also gave a tremendous boost to homeownership in the United States.

GI bill educated or trained veterans have a 15-percent greater earning power than non-veterans of the same age brackets, a complete reversal of the situation 13 years ago.

The American Legion has aided in bringing about modern concepts of child welfare and for streamlining laws, court procedures, and public services having to do with the care and protection of all American children. Adoption and probation laws have been brought up to date, uniform State laws on desertion have been enacted and juvenile court procedures have been revamped. These changes came about partly through American Legion sponsorship.

Since 1925 the Legion has spent more than \$148 million in emergency financial aid to children in need. Most of this money has gone for food, clothing, shelter, and medical treatments.

The Legion is financing, through grants from its National Child Welfare Foundation, research studies and surveys aimed at improved training and services for mentally retarded children, at helping partly blind youngsters, and at training police officers for careers in working with juveniles who have become delinquent.

National Teacher of the Year

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, all West Virginians can be proud of the selection of the beautiful and talented Mrs. Hazel Davenport of Beckley as national teacher of the year.

It is particularly gratifying to me that this honor should be bestowed upon a West Virginia teacher at a time when our State has been the recipient of so much unfair publicity. The selection of Mrs. Davenport as the teacher of the year will serve to remind the rest of the Nation that West Virginia has many outstanding assets, one of the most important of which is our young people who are now being trained as future leaders.

I am delighted that the National Education Association is honoring a classroom teacher each year.

Mrs. Davenport, and the previous winners, are typical of the thousands of men and women throughout the Nation who have dedicated their lives to teaching.

The teacher is one of the most important persons in our democratic society. Unfortunately, all of us have a tendency to take them for granted. It usually takes a crisis of some sort to force the public to earnestly concern itself with public education and with the men and women who operate our schools and teach our children.

It takes a tremendous amount of money to operate our schools. Many local areas are making real financial sacrifices to provide their children with the best possible education. Other areas find they simply do not have sufficient financial resources to build and maintain the type of school system which they need.

Because education is so important to a democratic society, I have long supported efforts in Congress to make financial assistance available to local school systems. At the same time I have insisted that any Federal assistance leave the sole responsibility of operating schools to local communities.

Federal control of the educational system would be abhorrent to our concepts of government. I firmly believe that our system of government is flexible enough to permit the Federal Government to help the States and localities with their educational problems without assuming control of education.

One other thing appears clear to me. No amount of Federal funds can insure a good educational program in every community. The primary responsibility rests with the local people. They have to determine what the schools should teach and how it is taught. They have to attract and hold good teachers.

Added revenue in the form of Federal assistance will enable many school districts to improve their school facilities, but unless the local people demonstrate

a deep and continuing interest in local school problems, they will never have the type of system to which the community is entitled.

In the final analysis, the Nation's school problems extend down to the local level where they must be solved.

Local people, working with dedicated teachers such as Mrs. Davenport, will, I am sure, provide the Nation with a school system that is capable of meeting any challenge.

Billboard Control Helps Hawaiian Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OREN E. LONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, my State of Hawaii has found that regulating billboards is good business.

Outside Honolulu, there are no roadside billboards in Hawaii. Tourists like the idea. Our scenic splendor is not marred by signs. The people of Hawaii are proud of their foresight in preventing the blighting of a lovely landscape by billboards. Businessmen find no reason to complain about the absence of such roadside advertising. Many believe highway posters would probably hurt more business than they would attract.

My departed friend, Senator Richard Neuberger, who championed the cause of billboard control, often noted that States where the tourist trade is important have a vital stake in regulation of signboards along their highways. In his own State of Oregon the tourist trade ranks third among all industries, bringing in an income of over \$175 million each year. He would point to Department of Commerce figures showing that if a community can attract a couple of dozen tourists a day throughout the year, it would be economically comparable to acquiring a new manufacturing industry with an annual payroll of \$100,000.

Recently, there appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar an article by Milton Britten headed "Hawaiians Have Enjoyed Billboard Ban 33 Years and Profited By It," and quoting the comments of my colleague [Mr. Fong] and myself on billboard control.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAIIANS HAVE ENJOYED BILLBOARD BAN 33 YEARS, AND PROFITED BY IT
(By Milton Britten)

WASHINGTON.—It has been nearly 2 years since the Federal billboard control law was passed.

Yet not a single State has come forward to accept the bonus offered for agreeing to abide by national standards for regulating signboards along the 41,000-mile interstate highway network.

This is a matter of bipartisan bafflement to Senators from our newest State, Hawaii, where strict controls have been on the books for 33 years and have proved both pleasant and profitable.

Says Democrat OREN LONG, former Governor of Hawaii: "If you drove from Honolulu all around the island of Oahu and back again, you wouldn't see a single billboard. This is widely discussed by tourists and a matter of pride among our people."

"Our territorial legislature back in 1927 passed a law restricting billboards to a closely defined area within the business district of Honolulu. Outside of this small area there just aren't any billboards to mar the beauties of our landscape."

"This not only pleases our own people, who enjoy their scenery, but is good for our tourist business. There have been a few feeble efforts to relax controls. But so far as I know our great business organization, the chamber of commerce, has never even slightly intimated they favored such efforts."

"The likelihood is that just as many products of any given make are sold in Hawaii as there would be if we had our roads cluttered with billboards."

GOOD BUSINESS

Republican HIRAM FONG, attorney and big businessman, agrees: "It's good business for Hawaii to control signboards. Their absence lends a lot of enchantment to our scenery, which tourists enjoy."

"Last year about a quarter million tourists came to Hawaii and spent \$90 million. By 1965 it is estimated we'll attract a million tourists, and by 1975 2½ million. By 1970, we estimate that our income from tourism will exceed the aggregate of our income from our sugar and pineapple industries."

"It would be a very good thing if billboards could be eliminated from highways all over our Nation. They distract motorists. How much better off America would be if every billboard could be taken down and a tree planted in its stead."

Both described as jarring to Hawaiians the contrast between billboard-cluttered mainland highways and their own unmarred scenic roadways.

Senator LONG says he thinks "the time will come when more careful consideration will be given" to applying on a national scale the strict controls Hawaii has enjoyed. He says he doubts this should be tried, however, until the present law has had a trial.

Latest Bureau of Public Roads survey indicates only three States—Connecticut, Wisconsin, and North Dakota—have already passed laws that would enable them to participate in the Federal program. Adequacy of a recent Maryland law is in dispute.

DEADLINE JUNE 30, 1961

A number of other States have tried or are trying to write enabling legislation. Deadline for signing up for the Federal bonus offer is June 30, 1961.

One reason for delay thus far has been the activity of the billboard lobby, which pressured Congress into watering down the Federal law and has since been working against it within the State legislatures.

The law provides that the Federal Government will contribute one-half of 1 percent more than its 90 percent share of interstate highway costs to States that agree to abide by minimum national standards of billboard control.

Communications Workers of America Support Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from J. A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America:

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: The purpose of this letter is to support the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) and other proposed legislation designed to furnish hospital, surgical, and medical benefits to those eligible for other social security benefits. The Communications Workers of America speaks for over 360,000 active members and about 22,000 retired persons. We believe that legislation of this kind is one of the most important matters before the Congress today.

The cost of supplying these benefits would require only a small increase in the social security tax structure. We are sure our members and all other American workers would be more than willing to pay a higher rate and to raise the annual earnings ceiling subject to social security tax in order to provide these most essential benefits for those now retired and for their own security and peace of mind at the time of retirement.

Private commercial health insurance is either too expensive or when provided within the limits of the ability to pay, the benefits are too inadequate to meet the needs.

Public assistance to the poverty stricken is necessary and worthy. It should be improved and extended. But public assistance is public relief. For it to be available in many States you must sell your possessions, exhaust your savings, and in fact, take a pauper's oath.

Some have said that children and grandchildren should step in and pay the hospital and doctor bills when the old folks are faced with costs beyond their ability to pay. No doubt millions of emergencies are solved this way. But a medical catastrophe to the parents is in most cases beyond the means of willing children. At best, such help is a sorry reward for pensioners who have earned their independence.

In America, it should not be necessary, after years of work, raising and educating a family and helping to build America and in fact, the world, to be faced with any of these alternatives.

We believe that the solution to this problem can be found in expansion and improvement of our social security system through the provisions of the proposed Forand bill.

After all the data are evaluated, one paramount consideration remains—this bill directly concerns a group of human beings who constitute a most valuable segment of our population; confronted upon retirement by drastically reduced income on one hand and higher costs of medical care on the other—after a lifetime of useful labor. These facts are the basic reason why the Communications Workers of America vigorously endorses this much needed and long overdue legislation.

Our first concern as a trade union is the welfare of people. This concern is not confined to representing our members while employed by the companies with whom we bargain, but encompasses also those who retire. We feel an equal concern for all of our elder citizens. No amount of statistics or argument, impressive as they are, so eloquently express the urgent need for this legislation as do the statements of pensioners themselves—contained in the many letters received urging our continued support of this bill.

Comments such as "Social security deduction of \$2.50 and Blue Cross and Shield \$8.95 left me with a Bell pension check of \$57.99 prior to April 1. My social security pension check for this month was in the amount of \$70.47, an increase of \$12.48. One reason why I am able to carry hospitalization so far—I have been able to work part time jobs." Or: "I have read for and against the bill (Forand bill). It would be a blessing for retired people, also take a heavy burden from the welfare departments as for expenses in help to lift the morale of those in need. At present there are two I know who are being cared for by the welfare department. Both have hospital and Blue Cross benefits which are not adequate for 65 plus. What a blessing the Forand bill would be if it were now a law for I am sure there are many more in the same condition."

These letters and many others, some poorly written, all attest to the tremendous need which exists for an expansion of our social security program—so as to provide health insurance benefits for those who, because of retirement, have limited incomes and are unable to secure adequate health insurance coverage from private sources.

The Communications Workers of America urges you to do everything within your power to secure the speedy consideration and enactment of this legislation. The tangible results of this legislation will be in providing adequate medical care and treatment for our older citizens. The intangible results are peace of mind; freedom from the nagging fear of disastrous economic consequences of illness. These intangibles will be even more rewarding to those benefited as well as a source of real satisfaction to you who are fortunate enough to be in a position to enact this kind of legislation.

Sincerely,

J. A. BEARNE, President.

Congress Disposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial from the Woodruff (S.C.) News of March 16, 1960, entitled "Congress Disposes." The editorial is very brief, but it makes a very important point about Government spending and socialism.

The Woodruff News, which always carries a good editorial page, is ably edited by Mr. Charles E. Smith.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS DISPOSES

The President has proposed a budget for the coming fiscal year which, he estimates, will result in a surplus of more than \$4 billion. It will be unfortunate indeed, however, if we assume that this will occur almost automatically.

To paraphrase the old saying, the President proposes but Congress disposes. And the Council of State Chambers of Commerce points out, "is already threatened with extinction." Reason: The strong inclination in Congress to boost expenditures substantially with new large spending measures covering Federal aid to education, housing, aid to depressed areas, readjustment benefits for peacetime veterans, and a depression-type youth work program.

In sum, if the let-the-Government-do-everything groups have their way, we'll have another deficit instead of a surplus. Then we'll have more inflation, more debt—and, in all probability, ultimately higher taxes. That grim prospect can be prevented only if the voting public lets Congress know that it wants economy wherever economy is possible—and that we can't afford any more welfare statism.

Equalization of Freight Rates at North Atlantic Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following memorandum from Mr. Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general of the State of New York, concerning the equalization of freight rates at North Atlantic ports.

Mr. Lefkowitz points out with clarity the impact which unequal freight rates have on New York City, the Port of New York Authority, New York railroads, and other interested parties.

The Interstate Commerce Commission examiner's recommendations, if sustained, would prejudice the welfare of New York citizens, and would have a depressing effect on the business, industry and commerce of that city.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM—EQUALIZATION OF FREIGHT RATES AT NORTH ATLANTIC PORTS FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In 1877 the railroads serving the North Atlantic ports (Baltimore to Portland, Maine) executed a voluntary agreement setting the rail rates to those ports. The ocean rates from Europe, principally England, to ports in the United States differed according to the port, the New York and Boston ocean freight rates being lower because they were closer than the southern ports. The agreement setting the rail rates was intended to adjust the combination of rail and ocean rates, so that the combination rate would be identical between inland cities and any one of the North Atlantic ports, to prevent rate wars, and to assure all railroads, and for that matter, all ports, an equal share of the import-export traffic. This rate schedule was adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

About 1920, the ocean rates were adjusted so that they were identical as between all of the Atlantic ports. Therefore, the port of New York, having a higher rail rate than the southern ports, came under a handicap.

PENDING MATTERS

The New York railroads and other northern railroads serving New York and Boston filed new tariff schedules with the Interstate Commerce Commission to equalize the northern line rates with those of the southern railroad lines serving Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Hampton Roads. The southern railroads objected to such new schedules. Hearings were held by an examiner of the Interstate Commerce Commission who, after the hearings, disapproved of the new tariff schedules as proposed by the New York railroads. Exceptions were taken to the decision of the hearing examiner by the New York railroads, the Port of New York Authority, the State of New York, the city of New York, and other interested parties.

The matter is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. No date has been set yet for an argument.

The State of New York deems it necessary to emphasize that the adoption of the examiner's recommendations by the Commission would prejudice the welfare of its citizens and would impair its business, industry, and commerce. The financial stability of the railroads operating within this State is a matter directly affecting the State's economy. Their future existence actually would be jeopardized by the Commission's adoption of the recommendations which would continue outmoded and discriminatory rate differentials, differentials that seriously impair the ability of the northern tier railroads to compete fairly with the southern tier railroads in the field of import-export freight traffic—a result that cannot be supported by reason or authority. The vital concern of this State is manifest by its participation in these proceedings and is expressed in the concurrent resolution adopted by its legislature on March 26, 1958, entitled "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense and desire of the legislature that the railroad differential rate system on export-import rail freight, now handicapping the trade and commerce of the port of New York and jeopardizing the economic well-being of the port of New York and the railroads serving it, be eliminated." The singular importance of this matter to the State of New York is evidenced by the fact that it is the only State of all those in the affected area which has participated in these proceedings.

The Late Senator Richard L. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, tributes to our late beloved colleague, Richard L. Neuberger, multiply on every hand. Alaskans are particularly appreciative of the services he rendered.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Fairbanks News-Miner, entitled "We've Lost a Friend," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'VE LOST A FRIEND

Alaska lost a staunch and capable friend early this morning with the death of U.S. Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon.

Just completing his first 6-year term as U.S. Senator, the young 47-year-old Democratic Senator from Oregon had earned the admiration and respect of his constituents of both major political parties since his election in 1954. Senator Neuberger's integrity and sincere devotion to public service was recognized by his colleagues in our Nation's highest legislative chambers, who liked and respected Dick Neuberger the man, and Senator Neuberger, a statesman in the finest tradition of our country.

Intrigued by Alaska when he was aide-de-camp to Gen. James A. O'Connor, construction chief of the Alaska Highway during World War II, Senator Neuberger was a true friend to both the territory and State of Alaska during his career as U.S. Senator. He fought hard and effectively in our behalf to give Alaskans full privileges of American citizenship. It was fitting that Senator Neuberger was presiding in the Senate chambers at 8 p.m. on June 30, 1958, when the Senate granted statehood to Alaska. We remember his look of satisfaction when he smilingly admonished the packed galleries to maintain order as spontaneous applause erupted with Senator Neuberger's announcement of the final vote.

Oregon has lost a fine U.S. Senator, our country has lost a great statesman, and Alaska has lost a true friend today.

Help for Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, it is important that the urban renewal program not be considered a temporary project, and I believe that it should be a continuing one until our great cities have been assisted to recover from urban blight and decay.

The editorial appearing in the New York, N.Y., Evening News of Wednesday, March 16, is pertinent to this point and I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read it:

HELP FOR CITIES

Congress and the President have always seemed to regard urban renewal as though it were not a permanent policy, but a sort of WPA project left over from the depression. Getting sufficient funds involves an annual struggle and uncertainty has discouraged many cities from undertaking the long-range planning they should be doing.

The National Housing Conference would change this attitude. It advocates the creation of a Housing and Urban Renewal Department of Cabinet rank and the adoption of a 10-year program that would provide \$6 billion in Federal aid. Then every city would have a better idea about what it could do.

As to where the money is coming from, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, New York Republican, offers what might be a clue. He says that agricultural representation in the Cabinet has produced imbalance between what the Federal Government does for farm dwellers and what it does for city dwellers.

"We spend more money to provide and maintain storage accommodations for wheat than we can't use than our housing accommodations for our city families," says Mr. LINDSAY.

It is a sound theory that city and State action in meeting local needs is the best and cheapest, but since the theory is not being applied to agriculture, urban areas can advance a strong claim for comparable consideration.

A reasonable farm program, aimed at helping family farms and curtailing the millions now paid out to big farm corporations, might produce more than enough savings to finance the housing conference's 10-year program.

Facts on the Race for Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, so many people have said so much about various aspects of our space programs that the facts tend to be obscured. Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Gannett News Service, in a recent interview with Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, made clear exactly where we stand in this important area of national progress.

This article is an excellent answer to those who are trying to make us believe we are so far behind that we may never get ahead of the Soviets in outer space. The actual situation, as I understand it, is that they are ahead only in the power of their space vehicles. Even in this one area, it becomes increasingly apparent that the Russians will not maintain their superiority for long if we continue to build up our capability.

So that a wide readership will be able to have a fuller understanding of the manner in which we are moving steadily ahead in the race for space, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Martin's fine article, which appeared in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle on March 6, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ISN'T BEHIND IN SPACE CONTEST
(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The Director of the new Federal space agency declared today, "We are really not behind the Russians in exploration of outer space."

He is Dr. T. Keith Glennan, former president of Case Institute of Technology at Cleveland. He previously served 2 years on the Atomic Energy Commission in 1950-52.

Glennan is a stocky, dynamic, straight-talking man who inspires confidence. He is a 54-year-old scientist and engineer.

Although the Soviets have made some spectacular space shots with bigger payloads, Glennan claims the U.S. has learned more about the environment of outer space.

"By making more shots with smaller payloads, we have been able to turn up a tremendous amount of information about the phenomena we are studying," he said.

"We are judged by the scientific community of the world to have discovered more information. At least, we have released more than the Russians."

REAL PAYOFF

The real payoff from the space business in the future, he contends, is going to come from methodical pursuit of knowledge through scientific exploration, not spectacular shots for propaganda purposes.

"Hitting the moon will be nothing," he said. "We are laying on the line the brains and money and effort to make something out of this. We are not trying space shots to be spectacular, with no other real effort behind it."

The greatest danger today, Glennan believes, is in the Soviets' propaganda effort to capitalize on their space program, not the realities of the U.S. position versus Russia in rockets and missiles.

Khrushchev is telling neutral and uncommitted nations that because the Russians hit the moon, it proves the Soviets are the world's greatest military power, and that communism is a superior system.

THE REAL HARM

"That's the real harm," Glennan said. "The Soviets have used their achievements in space to impress uninformed persons."

He is afraid some Americans may be falling for this line, while politicians, who spread the notion, are helping the Communists at their own game.

"We're making ourselves believe that we really are a second class power," Glennan said. "We don't seem to have faith in the capabilities of this Nation, which are tremendous and far superior to any other country in the world."

"I am proud of what our Nation has done in a relatively short period of time. That does not wash away the necessity for achieving the kind of rocket power necessary to lift payloads or make deep space probes."

Glennan pointed out that scientific space exploration and development of military missiles for national defense are two entirely different programs.

BOTH USE ROCKETS

They are related only because they both use rockets as propulsion units, and may use the same launching pads or similar guidance and control systems.

He emphasized that the Soviets are ahead of the United States in only one aspect of rocketry—the amount of thrust needed to propel large vehicles into outer space. He called it a weight-lifting problem.

"Our less powerful rockets when used as military missiles are just as effective in achieving their purpose as are the larger, more powerful rockets of the Soviet Union," he said. "In fact, it is probable that their rockets are more powerful than they now need for military weapons."

Does this mean that the Soviets have better scientists and engineers, or that their industry is superior?

"Not at all," Glennan replied. "The Russians have no superiority across the board. It probably indicates that they have concentrated a larger share of their resources on this particular job for a longer period of time."

TO STAY IN THE LEAD

Furthermore, Glennan believes that the Soviets will continue to lead in the rocket propulsion for the next 5 years, if they keep up their efforts. This view is shared by Dr. Herbert F. York, of Rochester, Director of Research for the Defense Department.

The reason is that the Soviets were laying the groundwork for space propulsion between 1945 and 1953, while the United States was relying on manned bombers as a delivery system for nuclear weapons.

Americans must be prepared to understand and accept it if the Russians make more

spectacular space shots during the 1960 political campaign, such as sending rockets to Mars or Venus.

Meanwhile, Glennan said, the United States will be pursuing an aggressive and versatile space program of its own. These are the kinds of things we might accomplish:

1. "We expect to be successful in a manned space flight from Cape Canaveral about 125 miles high and 200 miles downrange," Glennan said. "This probably will be as significant as anything which will be done in the space field this year, here or in Russia."

2. "We may attempt to put a payload into orbit around the moon. That is a really difficult task. The Russians have hit the moon, bypassed it, and sent a rocket halfway around the moon to get a partial picture on the far side. But they have never succeeded in putting a space vehicle into orbit around the moon. We have never tried to hit the moon."

Glennan claims that the United States has not fully exploited the amount of thrust which could be achieved from base boosters presently available for space shots or missiles.

"Within the next 12 to 18 months, we should begin launching rocket vehicle systems that will allow us to match and outmatch what the Soviet Union has done to date," he said.

This will result from better utilization of thrust from existing base boosters through properly designed upper stages.

At the same time, the space agency will be seeking to develop new base boosters in the million-pound thrust class, or approximately triple what the Soviets now have.

Labor Reform Legislation of 1959 and Its Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. LAFORE, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS, before the Delaware Valley Industrial Editors Association, March 16, 1960, at which time Representative KEARNS received the Delaware Valley Industrial Editors annual communications award for distinguished service in establishing more effective communications in the areas of his public interest. The 1958 recipient of this award was Gen. Alfred Gruenther and the 1959 recipient—Mayor Richardson Dilworth.

The speech follows:

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION OF 1959 AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Last year I had the opportunity to address the national convention of the American Association of Industrial Editors in Syracuse, N.Y. Your invitation this evening prompted me to review the remarks prepared at that time. It does not seem possible that so much has happened in the labor-management field in the 11 months since your Syracuse meeting.

My trip to Syracuse was a hurried one because the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am ranking minority member, was holding hearings on labor re-

form legislation. Similar hearings had been completed in the Senate but that body had not yet acted on any bill. It was generally accepted that only the weakest kind of a labor reform bill would pass—something which was completely acceptable to the union leaders.

The principle of a bill of rights for union members had been included in several measures introduced in the Congress but the likelihood of its being enacted into law seemed remote. The curtain had barely risen on the drama of the battle for the bill of rights and the swell of public opinion which gave rise to House approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill. The conference between the House and the Senate, the climactic scene, where the compromise which is the Labor Reform Act was hammered out, seemed too far in the future to be of any interest.

When I look back on the Syracuse meeting and think of the questions which you raised, I must admit to some sense of gratification for the events during the following months. At Syracuse we talked about the necessity for better performance by unions, by management, and by the government in carrying out their duties and responsibilities in the labor-management area. We talked about the importance of protecting individual workmen in their fundamental rights and I suggested that the law must cover the following points if a definite goal was to be accomplished:

1. True democracy within unions must be assured.
2. Honesty in union affairs must be guaranteed.
3. "Sweetheart" arrangements between dishonest employees and union officials must be eliminated.
4. Criminal elements must be eradicated from the union movement.
5. Innocent workmen and small employers must be protected against coercive picketing and secondary boycotts.

I am proud to say that the new Labor Reform Act is a tremendous stride forward in accomplishing every one of these goals. Its bill of rights and election provisions go a long way toward assuring democracy within unions and returning control of labor organizations to their members. Its reporting, disclosure, bonding, and fiduciary relationship provisions, together with the restrictions on trusteeships, should be of substantial help in meeting the problem of dishonesty within unions. Sound provisions for the elimination of "sweetheart" contracts and for the ousting of criminal elements from the union movement are included. And finally, important limitations on organizational and recognition picketing, on secondary boycotts, and on hot cargo contracts, provide immeasurable protection to employees, and small employers.

The Labor Reform Act is not perfect. It is impossible to write perfect legislation in a field as controversial as labor-management relations. Particularly when a legislative body is "loaded" in favor of unions, as is our present Congress, and a substantial part of its membership was doing its best to kill all needed reform legislation. But, regardless of its faults, we can be proud of the act which was finally passed and be grateful that the working men and women of our country will benefit from its added protection.

Because a major battle was won last fall, we cannot rest on our laurels. Already a serious attempt is being made to weaken these protections by authorizing secondary boycotts in the construction industry. I have said on many occasions that I believe the peculiar problems in that industry necessitate some special legislation. In fact, one such provision was included in the Labor Reform Act. But the bill which is presently before the committee, H.R. 9070, confuses rather than resolves the problem.

After listening to testimony on H.R. 9070, it is clear to me that there is sharp dis-

agreement as to its meaning. The Labor Reform Act is a technical, complicated law.

Passage of another amendment at this time, before the NLRB and the courts have had a chance to interpret what has already been done, will accomplish nothing. Not even its strongest supporters are sure what it means, and Congress would be derelict in its duty if it should foist such an ambiguous statute on the public.

A more fundamental battle than any attempt to pass weakening amendments is shaping up outside the halls of Congress, however. It presents, in my opinion, one of the most serious threats to our fundamental rights as free citizens that I have witnessed in many years. I refer to the brazen attempt of Jimmy Hoffa to dictate to the American people whom we are going to send to Congress.

Shortly after the labor reform law was enacted, Hoffa announced a list of 56 Members of Congress whom he has decreed must be purged. My name, with that of Congressman WILLIAM AYRES of Ohio, was placed at the top of the list. Hoffa has said openly that the full weight of the Teamsters Union, with its millions of dollars in financial backing, will be used to make certain we do not return to Congress.

You may well ask, "Is not Jimmy Hoffa entitled to take sides in political contests and support the men of his choice?" If that were the issue, the answer must, of course, be "Yes". He, too, is an American with freedom of choice as to his elected officials and if the members of the Teamsters Union want him as their president that is their affair. Under the new law I firmly believe they can get rid of him if they want to.

But the issue is not Hoffa's freedom of choice. He has carefully picked 56 Congressmen who come from evenly divided districts where the voting is always close. His plan is to use the teamster organization to concentrate on defeating the incumbents, whether they are Republican or Democrats. A ready-made organization with virtually unlimited funds is a tremendous factor in any political campaign.

Hoffa will take personal credit for defeating any of the 56 who fail to be reelected. Their opponents will obviously be hand-picked by Hoffa but the key point is his plan is successful will be his claim to have the power to defeat any Congressman of whom he disapproves.

Think for a moment what this means. Because of Hoffa, the Teamsters Union has been expelled from the AFL-CIO. If anything, expulsion has strengthened rather than weakened the Teamsters. Hoffa is slowly making behind-the-scenes deals or working arrangements with other unions. The one thing which stands in the way of Hoffa's ambition to take over the labor movement in this country is the 1959 Labor Reform Act. If Hoffa can take personal credit for defeating any Congressmen who oppose him, this act will have a short and discouraging life.

I am positive the American people do not want any special interest group to take over their Congress, particularly if the group is controlled by a man like Hoffa. But we cannot afford to sit back and hope it will not happen. Hoffa has the organization and he has the funds to carry out his threats. Men and women like yourselves, regardless of whether you have been active in politics, must share the burden of defeating Hoffa. We cannot afford to sit back and hope someone else will do the job for us.

To offset the Teamsters organization, a Committee To Reelect Hoffa-Threatened Congressmen has been formed. I asked Mr. Kenneth C. McGuinness, the national chairman of the committee, to accompany me this evening and tell you something about its activities.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the threat with which we are faced. I implore you to give it your serious consideration and to do your best to see that the voters rather than any union official select our Representatives.

Namesake Towns Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Namesake Towns Association is a volunteer organization devoted to the encouragement of cultural exchange visits and affiliation projects between towns and communities in different parts of the world usually, though not always, of identical names. This group is accredited to the United Nations as a nongovernmental organization, and its international president, Mrs. George Spencer of New York City, is a member of President Eisenhower's civic committee.

I am a strong advocate of vastly increased programs of international cultural exchange as a means of promoting understanding and world peace. Tourism and travel; exchanges in the fields of music, art, and drama; radio and television programs; sports and motion pictures; reciprocal visits of trade missions and other delegations—all these are vital and call for development. To meet the massive Soviet competition in the economic and cultural fields we must mount an effort commensurate with our objects and resources. We need to exploit every responsible project that helps to integrate the free world.

Recently Namesake Towns initiated an affiliation program between New York and Japan, and by a coincidence several weeks later a member of our Armed Forces stationed in Japan wrote to me indicating the reaction in Tokyo and offering his cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent that the description of Namesake Towns Association and an excerpt from the letter from Capt. David Heritch, of the U.S. Air Force, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAMESAKE TOWNS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

It is perhaps now, more important than ever before for the peoples of the world to get to know and understand one another even better. The NTA performs a very valuable service in helping promote international goodwill and understanding. As the work has expanded to many different countries, some towns who have no namesakes are co-operating as well.

Has your town done anything in connection with your sister city? If you haven't, now is a good time to start a project. If your town is already active, why not expand your program? In either case we will be delighted to help.

How the NTA operates: In the town the initiative is usually taken by the mayor. When a project is decided upon, it is ad-

visable to contact the NTA so that all efforts in the towns can be coordinated, and the initial contacts made. Official exchange of greetings usually start the program, the mayor is honorary chairman of the local committee on which are representatives from all groups, clubs, newspapers, radio, and TV, schools, etc., so that a real cross-section of the community is represented. Each town selects the type of project best suited to its own needs keeping the NTA informed of their activities. The NTA will cooperate fully and will suggest speakers, films, etc., and makes overseas contacts.

Projects: We have found the following ideas helpful in town-to-town projects. Art exchange exhibitions are arranged of paintings and photographs from the sister city. These can also be exhibited in their own town prior to departure, contests are arranged to choose material. Children's art work is always of great interest.

Chambers of commerce: Their interest and cooperation is invaluable in arranging for participation of businessmen and industrialists. Special shop displays can be planned; fairs and exhibitions arranged. A Namesake Town Week can be planned.

Churches: With the cooperation of the clergy simultaneous services can be given once a year, with perhaps a guest preacher from overseas. The date chosen can be a mutually satisfactory day. United Nations Day is one which we have found to be very popular. Children's Christmas services are a great success and a collection of toys can be made to be sent to children's wards in hospitals.

Garden clubs and horticultural societies: They find that exchange of seeds and information are of great value in promoting interest in local flower shows and conservation projects.

Historical societies: They are invaluable in helping to promote interest in historical events, setting up celebrations, and giving out information, arranging historic tours, and so forth.

Hospitals: Hospitals exchange of scrap-books and letters between long-term patients have been found to be of real value. Doctors and nurses also enjoy and profit by the exchange of medical information.

Magazines and books: They are always very much appreciated. A regular exchange with the sister city can be of great mutual interest.

Press: Reciprocal exchange of news is of great interest to both communities. Local papers can exchange feature stories at regular intervals; competitions can be arranged.

Schools: Our program is of great value to schools. Correspondence and exchange of scrap books have been found very popular. Real and lasting friendships are formed through pen pals. The preparation of a scrap book can be a class project. Much is learned in preparing the material as well as in reading the book received.

Service clubs: So many have international interests so that their cooperation is of enormous value, and a program on their sister city can be a great contribution. Worthwhile projects can be helped in both communities.

Tape recordings: These are fascinating and should be done as often as possible.

Youth organization: Their contribution can be most helpful and they can also have fun exchanging records, etc.

Special events: Namesake Town Day, we suggest that 1 day a year be set aside for a special exchange of greetings with your namesake town, during this day there could be special ceremonies at the town hall, special radio and TV programs, shop displays, etc. United Nations Day has been found a very good day to focus attention on the town to town project as well as to bring to the notice of all, the vital contribution to the cause of world peace made by the U.N.

Meetings: International and regional meetings are planned so that all will be given the opportunity to participate in valuable exchange of views and discuss future plans.

Namesake Town News: This newsletter can only be as interesting as the information it contains. For this information we rely on you, so please send us details of your communities activities, not only in connection with your sister city, but also items of topical or historical interest which other towns would like to know about.

What you can do: Find out what your community is doing. If there is no town affiliation program, try and get one started, and contact us. If your town is already active, find out if there are ways in which you could be of help; maybe the activities could be expanded; get more schools and service clubs interested, i.e., Rotary Clubs and women's organizations; see if there are possibilities for exchange students, teachers, clergy. In all these projects we could help you. Keep in touch with us at all times.

Travel Service: From so many lands come invitations to the citizens of their sister cities to visit them. Through these visits come greater understanding and friendship between the namesake towns.

This is a project we have always encouraged and we are delighted to cooperate in any way to help facilitate travel arrangements between namesake towns in all parts of the world and to make these visits as interesting as possible for official high ranking dignitaries as well as for the private tourist. Coordination of arrangements is essential for maximum benefit to all. A special travel department has been set up, and we are in a position to make all travel arrangements for you at no extra cost. Group travel has many financial and other benefits, and a charter flight can be arranged at a very low cost. All those taking part in the latter must be members of the NTA to qualify with the regulations. If you are interested in receiving further particulars would you kindly fill in and return the following questionnaire.

TO: NAMESAKE TOWNS ASSOCIATION
91 Central Park West,
New York City 23, N.Y.

I (we) are interested in visiting our sister city in ----- I will form a group in my town ----- We wish to leave on ----- by air/ship/returning on ----- visiting the following countries ----- We are interested in ----- As members of the NTA we would like to take advantage of the charter flight. From our town there should be ----- Should you be interested, prior to your trip, we can make available to you a film presentation of the country you wish to visit. This might be the opportunity for calling a meeting in your community.

(In the United Kingdom, please send travel inquiries to Miss Erna Low, 47 Old Brompton Road, London SW 7, England.)

MARCH 8, 1960.

Hon. Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Much talk is going on here in Japan about New York City becoming the sister city of Tokyo, Japan.

If I am out of order please do not hesitate and throw this missive in file 13.

I have lived all my life in New York City until called to service in 1941. My voting address 602 W. 188th Street, N.Y. County Serial No. C74206, in the 56 ED, 15 AD, and I have a paid up dues card.

This is my third tour in this part of the world. I first arrived in 1945 and became a member of the occupation forces, assigned to SCAP, ESS, after recall in 1950, sent to Clark AFB, Philippines, in 1956 returned to Japan and presently stationed at Tachikawa Air Force Base.

With your permission sir; if I can be of some small assistance to the program of the sister city program please do not hesitate and call on me. If you or our Honorable Mayor Wagner feel that I am out of order, I do understand.

Thank you for your time and interest.
Respectfully,

DAVID HERITICH,
Captain, U.S. Air Force.

Family Farm Income Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to add my comments to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHELL] on the so-called Family Farm Income Act of 1960 because I believe this bill is in direct contradiction to the thinking of a majority of the farm operators in my part of South Dakota and, I believe, of the Nation generally.

I am just in the throes of completing the tabulations on a questionnaire which I sent out to all boxholders in my district a month ago. I have not had an opportunity to check this proposition percentage-wise, but I believe, from having gone over each returned questionnaire and having read the comments which were made, that 75 percent of the farmers and the farmer-ranchers have told me that the farm program should be junked. They have told me over and over again that the present support program has simply made the large farmers larger and the small farmers smaller.

You can imagine my interest, Mr. Chairman, in studying the so-called farm bill introduced in the House by some 20 of my colleagues, most of whom are inclined to lean just a little toward the idea of regulating and controlling the lives of the American people. This bill would completely regulate, completely control, and completely place into a straitjacket all of agriculture. As it has been described on the floor of this House, the family farm income bills offer the farmers of this country only payments, permits, and peasantry.

The present farm program has more or less control over some 21 crops; this proposed farm bill would add regulations, permits, and controls to some 250 farm products, including cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, turkeys, eggs, and everything else. In fact, everything that is produced on the farm will come under strict regulation and control. Someone in Washington will decide how many head of beef may be placed on the market each year, and then the distribution will be handed down from here to the States, to the counties, to the farmer, and he will be given an allotment. If he has been running 300 cattle, he will be allowed to run 250. If he has been raising 10, he will be cut to 7½ head.

This is not bad. On his croplands, he must give up 10 percent without any

compensation and then, in addition, he can give up another 30 percent for which he will receive payment in kind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us remember this: We can take 10 or 30 percent from the large operator and we have not hurt him much, but take 10 or 30 percent from the small operator without any compensation and he is forced out of business. This is not a small farmer bill—it is a big farmer bill. It freezes a man's operations and then reduces that operation by from 10 to 40 percent.

Young farmers write to me constantly and demand the repeal of the present law which freezes the acreage of wheat. They tell me that the big operator overplants, pays his penalty, and soon obtains additional acreage allotment, while the small operator cannot afford this route. He is forced to operate the small acreage he is allowed and must turn to production of some other product in order to increase his income, to meet rising costs resulting from New Deal spending inflation. A young man cannot start now—what would it be like if everything his area produces is frozen into a production straitjacket?

This bill is intended to simply further regiment the farmer. As I have said so many times before, there is no farm problem. The problem is one of foreign policy—the problem is one of foreign imports. What we are doing is importing the food that goes onto our tables and the fiber which goes onto our backs, and the production of the acreage supplanted by these imports must go somewhere, so we call upon the Federal Government to purchase this production. This production is not surplus to American needs, it is simply supplemental. Supplemental, that is, to these agricultural imports.

Last year we imported more than two million head of beef. Across the Nation generally it requires the annual production of an average of 20 acres to produce a beef. It also requires an average of 2 years to put that beef on the market. The beef imports last year alone supplanted the production of more than 80 million acres. These 80 million acres had to be used for some other purpose, and the production is branded by this Congress and the Nation as surplus.

This production is not surplus, Mr. Speaker, it is supplanted.

This so-called Family Farm Income Act of 1960 makes no pretense of getting at the root of the evil. The evil is imports. Agricultural imports is the cancer that is eating away the life of the great agricultural industry in America. This so-called farm bill is not a farm bill—it is simply another import subsidy bill. It is just another patch, if you please, placed upon the open sore where the import cancer is draining.

If Congress is interested in doing something for agriculture, it will operate and remove the cancer. Covering the sores where the cancer is draining is only a subterfuge. It is only admitting that Congress does not have sufficient intestinal fortitude to go to the root of the evil, which evil is agricultural imports.

Instead of trying to stop the evil, this Congress passed a law reducing tariffs, and beef, lamb, mutton, pork, feed grains, sugar, wool, and processed woolen

goods, and everything else that domestic agriculture should be producing comes rolling across our borders in ever-increasing amounts, and the American farmer is asked to reduce his acreage and his production to make room for it.

Mr. Speaker, we have no farm problem—we are blighted with only an import problem. All that these so-called farm bills do is to further put the farmer out of business, force him to cut down his production in order to make room for more imports, and to further shackle him with regulations, controls, payments, permits, and peasantry.

My suggestion for a Family Farm Income Act of 1960, Mr. Speaker, is to pass the Bailey-Mason bill, which would return the regulation and control of tariffs and quotas to the Tariff Commission, an arm of the Congress, which would limit these agricultural imports. Then we should freeze all of the so-called surpluses, taking them off the market completely and then remove all regulations, controls, and shackles from agriculture and put it completely on a free-enterprise, supply-and-demand basis.

If this were done today, Mr. Speaker, the Tariff Commission would find that it would be necessary to allow substantial imports to come into this country, as we do not have sufficient acres in this country to produce the food and fiber needed by the people of this Nation.

Remove the cancer. Let the patient get well. Give the youth of America an opportunity to live on the farm, expand and grow according to his own ability. Prove to the world that America is still the land of the free and the home of unshackled free enterprise.

The choice, Mr. Speaker, is between that and payments, permits, and peasantry.

Commemorative Stamp for Poland's Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, the Post Office, through issuance of special stamps, has depicted, in miniature, the Nation's famous men and women; great events in history; and outstanding organizations, industries, and national wonders.

In a special "champions of liberty" series, too, we have honored leaders and fighters for freedom of foreign lands.

As we know, November 6, 1960, marks the 100th anniversary of Ignace Paderewski's birth—Poland's famous musical artist, statesman, soldier, and freedom fighter.

Among the great men of foreign lands—who have staunchly fought for freedom—Paderewski ranks high in the esteem of his countrymen, and freedom-loving people throughout the world.

In recognition of his outstanding contribution as an artist, soldier and states-

man, I believe that the issuance of a special commemorative stamp in the "champion of liberty" series honoring his life and work is indeed merited.

Overall, I believe it would accomplish two objectives:

First, pay just tribute to the life and deeds of a great man who made an outstanding contribution to his beloved homeland, Poland, and to the world in the fields of music, politics, and as a relentless fighter for freedom in peace and war; and

Second, by so honoring Paderewski, to pay homage to the many "sons of Poland" who keep alive the fires of liberty in their own Communist-subjugated land, as well as contribute constructively as strong creative citizens of many lands to progress and peace in the world.

Believing that the inclusion of Paderewski in the "champion of liberty" series is merited, I have contacted the Postmaster General to urge that this be done as soon as possible.

Recently, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish American Congress, a fine letter in support of the idea of issuing a commemorative stamp honoring Paderewski. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MR. DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The U.S. Post Office Department is now issuing special stamps in the "champion of liberty" series honoring heroes and great men of other lands who have worked and fought for the freedom of man.

It seems to us that such a stamp honoring Ignace J. Paderewski on the 100th anniversary of his birth (Nov. 6, 1860) should be issued by our Post Office Department.

Ignace J. Paderewski was in a true sense a champion of liberty. He was not only a great artist and humanitarian but also a statesman who throughout his life worked, fought, and pleaded for the freedom of man.

During the First World War he interrupted his artistic career and worked for the independence of Poland. He was instrumental in organizing an independent Polish army in France recruited in 1917-18 in the United States, Canada, South America, and Western Europe. This army fought at the side of the allies on the Western front.

He was chairman of the Polish delegation to the peace conference in Versailles and on behalf of Poland signed the peace treaty by which Poland regained her independence.

He assisted in organizing the Polish Republic in 1918 and 1919, and was the first Polish delegate to the Council of Ambassadors at the League of Nations in 1920.

When the Second World War broke out and Poland was overrun by Soviet Russia and Germany, Paderewski, for the second time in his life, interrupted his career and set himself the task of laboring for the liberation of his native Poland.

He was instrumental in forming the Polish Government in Exile in 1939 and was Chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland functioning in France and later in England.

In 1940 on his 80th birthday, aged and weary but spiritually valiant, Paderewski arrived in the United States to work for the

independence of his distressed homeland. He died in New York on June 29, 1941, and by special authorization of President Franklin D. Roosevelt is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

It seems to us that a stamp honoring this great man, this true champion of liberty, Ignace J. Paderewski, should be issued by our Post Office Department in the series of stamps honoring "champions of liberty" of other lands.

This matter is now under consideration by the Postmaster General who advises us that the name of Ignace J. Paderewski is still being considered. Your intervention with the Postmaster General would be greatly helpful and deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish
American Congress.

Final Plans for the 1960 Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I would like to inform my colleagues that the Director of the Bureau of the Census has made a final report regarding the taking of the 1960 census. Dr. Robert W. Burgess, Director of the Bureau of the Census, testified at the hearing before our subcommittee this morning. He was accompanied by his able staff, Dr. A. Ross Eckler, Deputy Director; Dr. Henry Sheldon, Chief, Demographic Statistics Branch; Mr. Morris H. Hansen, Assistant Director, Statistical Standards; and Mr. Walter Kehres, Assistant Director for Administration.

Dr. Burgess' remarks were directed primarily to a number of questions which I submitted to the Bureau of the Census in advance of the hearing.

In view of the widespread interest in the taking of the 1960 census, both in the House and on the part of the public generally, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the entire text of Dr. Burgess' statement.

In submitting this material for the RECORD, I want to state that I was most favorably impressed by the way the Bureau of the Census has prepared for this great undertaking. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. BURGESS, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS OF THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, ON MARCH 18, 1960

I am pleased to appear before this subcommittee for a further review of the Census Bureau's plans for the taking of the 1960 census. Thanks to the establishment of this subcommittee, we have had the benefit of the active interest of more Members of the Congress than is usual during the period of planning a major census. It was distinctly beneficial to the morale of our organization that a number of the members of this subcommittee visited our operation some months

ago in order to review our plans and examine some of the equipment being put into final shape for the 1960 census operations.

I will now turn, Mr. Chairman, to consideration of the specific questions included in your letter of March 1, 1960. Naturally, my colleagues and I are prepared to discuss any of the questions in greater detail if the comparatively brief answers furnished are not sufficient for your needs.

1. What significant changes in the 1960 census plans have occurred since you reported to us on April 8, 1959?

The significant changes in our plans since our previous hearing are relatively few, since "dress rehearsal" had already been conducted at that time. Five points may have enough special interest, however, to warrant their being mentioned:

(a) The question on mother tongue, which was discussed (point 6) at our previous hearing, has definitely been included on the final questionnaire, where it will apply to all the foreign born. After a careful canvass of the items that might be excluded to make way for this, we decided that the elimination of citizenship would involve the smallest loss, since the annual registration of aliens provides a substantial amount of information on noncitizens and since our current population survey makes it possible for us to measure their characteristics at relatively small cost. However, citizenship information is secured in New York State at its expense to meet requirements of that State for legislative apportionment.

(b) On the housing questionnaire, three items carried as sample inquiries in the North Carolina test census (water supply, bath and flush toilet) have been changed to 100 percent inquiries.

(c) The decision has been reached to attempt to get information on all Americans living outside the United States and its outlying areas. In previous censuses enumeration of persons overseas had been confined to members of the Armed Forces and employees of Government agencies, but in 1960 we are attempting to cover other Americans working abroad, as well as those outside the country for other reasons.

(d) We have firmed up the extent of use of the single stage (or traditional) method of enumeration. This procedure will be followed in areas characterized by relatively low density of population and less prevalence of all weather roads. Included in such areas are most of the mountain and western plains States, the north woods areas of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and Maine and extensive rural areas in Southern States. About 18 percent of the population will be enumerated by this method.

(e) In addition, two personnel changes of some significance have been made in the field organization. These include the establishment of a technical officer for most of our district offices and of a field reviewer for most crew leader districts. The technical officers, practically all of whom had four years or more of college training, will have the task of training the crew leaders and supervising the quality control operations of the field and office reviewers. The field reviewers will assist the crew leaders in the inspection of the early returns prepared by each enumerator and the operation of the quality control procedures, on the basis of which unsatisfactory enumerators will either be retrained or replaced.

2. Do you foresee any particular difficulties in carrying out your plans?

The major difficulties anticipated in connection with the decennial census involve the supply of workers in certain geographic locations or with certain key skills. Specifically, it is anticipated that it may be difficult to get enough enumerators in a number of the large cities. With the possible exception noted under question 3 below we expect to be able to carry out our present plans.

Special steps are being taken, however, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, to meet the possibility that an insufficient number of applicants may be referred through normal channels.

A second problem relates to the supply of programmers for our electronic equipment which was inspected by a number of the members of this committee a few months ago. Advertisements in Washington papers have called attention to the opportunities offered in California and elsewhere for persons trained in programming for our specific type of electronic equipment. Even though the tasks for which the persons are being recruited are often in connection with Federal programs, the salaries offered are substantially above our own, since the work is being done on a contract basis, freeing the agencies involved of the specific regulations under which we must operate. As a result, we have lost a number of persons after a year or two of training and we must adopt the costly procedure of training new people at a late date for work for which we thought we had already made adequate provision.

3. What is the anticipated cost of the census? How does it compare with the cost of the 1950 census?

The anticipated cost of the 18th decennial census, including agriculture, population and housing, is still \$118 million, as discussed in answer to question 3 in the April 8, 1959, hearing record. The appropriation for the 1950 census was \$90,618,000. To repeat the 1950 census in 1960, taking into account the growth in population and the increases in all costs since 1950, would cost approximately \$131 million.

While plans have been made on the basis of \$118 million, it is only fair to note that the heavy expenses of field collection are affected by such factors as weather, our ability to recruit field personnel in time, and the ability to retain personnel at the rates we have set. The field costs, which occur in April, May, and June of this year, are such a large part of the total costs of the census that we shall not know exactly where we stand overall until that work has been completed. A small percentage error here can increase the overall cost of the census by several million dollars. Should the experience with the field collection of the schedules be less favorable than expected it may be necessary to request supplemental funds or delay the completion of the census. However, if conditions are favorable, our estimated total should permit us to complete the job. The field collection for the census of agriculture was done within the budget that had been established for that work.

4. What is the prospective timing of the major phases of the census? How will the timing be improved over past censuses?

In areas where the two-stage approach of enumeration is used (as described in previous hearings before the subcommittee) we believe that the initial canvass of the population will be virtually complete in about 2 weeks. The remaining canvass, involving the collection of the sample information from one household in four, will take another 4 weeks. In the other areas of the country where all the items are collected in the course of a single visit, it is estimated that the bulk of the work will be completed in 4 to 6 weeks. It is to be noted, however, that in both the single-stage and two-stage areas there will be a number of small places where unusual delays occur, and the clean-up work may not be completed until more than 2 months after the starting date of the census.

The prospective timing of the tabulations and publications is about as indicated in the April hearings, namely, the determination and issuance of State population figures in November 1960 and completion of all planned tabulations by December 1962. On the whole, results will be forthcoming 12 to 18 months

earlier than the dates of corresponding parts of the 1950 Census. The great speedup is, of course, due to a combination of factors, including the greater use of sampling and of electronic equipment.

5. What steps are you taking to improve the quality of the census results?

Steps to improve the quality of the census results include:

(a) More effective quality control procedures in the data collection operations in the field will be carried out through a formal statistical quality control procedure involving a careful review of enumerators' work on a sample basis.

(b) As we stated in our earlier hearings, we are separating the census into two stages (for about four-fifths of the population) so that fuller attention can be given to obtaining adequate coverage of the population in the first stage of the census, and fuller attention can be given to obtaining acceptable responses to the various questions asked of sample households in the second stage of the census.

(c) More effective training of crew leaders and enumerators, and supervising their work, made possible by the personnel changes described in 1(e) above. The improvement here results in part from concentration on one stage of the canvass at a time.

(d) As previously reported, provision is made, for the first time, to leave questionnaires to be filled out by the respondents. This allows respondents more time for joint consideration of answers among family members, and for checking with records.

(e) Separation of the canvass for the census of agriculture from the canvass for the censuses of population and housing. This makes it possible to collect the agriculture census information in the fall near the end of the crop year and before tenant farmers have moved. It should improve the censuses of population and housing by simplifying the highly complex operations that the enumerator was supposed to understand and carry out when all censuses were taken simultaneously.

6. What is being done to keep the burden on respondents to a minimum? How long will it take, on the average, for a household to fill out the advance forms and to be interviewed?

The considerable extension in the use of sampling is the major feature of the Bureau's program to reduce the burden on the average respondent. In the case of the great bulk of the questions for individuals and for housing units, the reporting requirements have been eliminated for three families out of four.

It is estimated that a household would need on the average not more than 10 minutes to fill out the advance census report, and not more than 4 or 5 minutes to do its share in discussing the report with the enumerator. In addition, the one household in four that will be asked to fill out a sample household schedule and mail it to the local census office normally would not require more than 20 to 30 minutes for this. Because of the use of sampling, this additional time will not be required of three-fourths of the households.

7. What are the numbers and kinds of personnel to be employed in taking and processing the census?

The number of people who will be employed in taking the census will be about 160,000 enumerators, about 10,000 crew leaders, 405 district supervisors, and several thousand technical assistants, field reviewers, and temporary editing and control clerks. In processing the census, that is to say, carrying through subsequent operations, some 3,000 employees will be required, most of them for periods varying from 3 to 18 months.

8. How is the Post Office Department cooperating in the census procedures?

The Post Office Department is cooperating very effectively with the Census Bureau in distributing the Advance Forms to all households, in assigning geographic locations to reallocated forms of persons enumerated away from home, in handling the mail return of the sample household questionnaires, and in forwarding promptly all mailing matter from and to census offices.

9. Has the public been effectively informed of the character and importance of the forthcoming census?

The public information program for the 1960 census of population and housing will be in its 1,000th day when this census opens on Friday, April 1. The purpose of this information campaign has been to pass the word on to as many of the 180 million persons in the United States as might be reached by press, radio, television, and word of mouth. Without the helpful participation of every household in the United States, the big census job could not be done.

The 1960 census is one of the big news stories of the year. This is evidenced by the fact that each day's mail brings to the Census Bureau's Public Information Office hundreds of clippings from newspapers all over the country. These clippings, as well as the large number of local radio and TV presentations, have been based very largely upon local releases from our regional and district offices. This week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an article about "The Big Count." The February Reader's Digest presented a fine digest of an excellent article which the National Geographic magazine published last November. "The Things They Tell the Census Taker" was presented in the March issue of Family Circle magazine. Scores of other magazines have carried similar stories.

One of the most helpful aids to the census public information program is the work done by the advertising council. With the Cleveland advertising firm of Meldrum and Fewsmith serving as volunteer agency, kits were prepared for distribution to newspapers, radio stations, and television stations. The returns from the Advertising Council's program literally have been overwhelming.

The National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters and the staff organization of American Women in Radio and Television have given excellent support to the informational program.

As a public service project, the Remington-Rand Corp. produced a 15-minute film called "Census 60." We obtained 400 copies of this film for distribution to television stations through our census district offices. From all over the country the census district offices report that the film is being used extensively.

The National Educational Television and Radio Center produced nine 30-minute shows dealing with various phases of the census and the use of census statistics which are being presented in weekly series over all educational television stations of the country. The Georgetown University Forum produced a 30-minute radio tape for presentation over the 150 stations affiliated with this program and copies have gone to all our 400 regional and district supervisors for offering to other radio stations.

Because we know that most of those who will supply the answers when the census takers call will be housewives, we have directed special efforts to get the word to them. We have sent special kits of information for study and discussion programs to 125,000 women's clubs throughout the country. With these kits went letters from the heads of their respective national organizations pointing up the importance of cooperation in the census. Incidentally, we expect that the great majority of the census takers will be women and many of these will come from the ranks of those who have already studied the subject of the 1960 census.

Through the cooperation of the Scholastic Magazines Corp. in New York and the American Education Publications of Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., the word about the 1960 census has been passed into the schools all over the country.

Many Members of Congress have helped by discussing the census in their newsletters and in radio and television reports to their constituents.

10. What are the most important new questions to be included in the 1960 census?

The most important new questions included in the 1960 census are those calling for place of work and method of transportation to work and for additional housing equipment items, including home food freezers, washing machines and dryers, air conditioning units, fuel for water heating, number of bathrooms and number of passenger automobiles, and concerning source of water and facilities for sewerage disposal outside cities of 50,000. In addition, some of the questions previously used have additional subdivisions in 1960. Thus, the report on school attendance will distinguish those attending private and public schools and the report on housing condition will show three categories (sound, deteriorating, and dilapidated) rather than two.

11. What are the likely changes in congressional apportionment resulting from the 1960 census?

The census leaflet of March 26, 1959, presented changes in congressional apportionment which would result from 1960 State populations as then estimated. It showed that 5 States were expected to gain and 13 States to lose Representatives. I should like to repeat the warning against placing too much dependence upon the specific gains or losses shown for individual States in these preliminary estimates. While this release is serviceable as giving a general pattern of the kinds of changes to be expected it is not a dependable guide to the precise States which will be affected nor to their exact number of seats after reapportionment.

12. What are some of the other important population and housing developments the census will measure?

The census will provide data on such subjects as:

(a) The population and number of housing units in every community, township, county and State.

(b) The characteristics of the population and housing of each area, including the population of congressional districts.

(c) The relative growth of cities and metropolitan areas in comparison with rural and other areas.

(d) Changes in the educational level.

(e) Changes in the number of households and in the size of households.

(f) Changes in the numbers of owned and rented homes, and in the condition of homes.

(g) The numbers and proportions of households with relatively low and those with relatively high incomes.

(h) The occupations in which people in different parts of the country are engaged.

(i) The number and proportion of housing units that are below accepted standards.

(j) The distribution of various ethnic and racial groups in our population.

(k) The distribution of some of the conveniences of modern life, such as television, air conditioning, home food freezers, etc.

(l) The numbers of persons who travel into or out of specified counties to go to work and the means of transportation they use.

(m) The characteristics of part-time and full-time workers.

(n) The occupations being followed by persons in the older age groups.

(o) The continued migration from rural to urban areas.

13. In the past, the census of agriculture was taken together with population and

housing. This time, you have split it off and conducted it during the fall of 1959. Does it appear that this separation will make your operations more efficient?

The separation of the census of agriculture from the census of population and housing has several advantages, some of which were noted in the answer to question 5:

(a) The reports on the production of each farm are secured from the operators who were on those farms during the preceding year, since they were collected before many of them had moved.

(b) The enumeration for Population and Housing in rural areas is speeded up since enumerators are not required to fill in a census of agriculture form at the same time.

(c) By reducing the burden on the enumerator and the respondent, a more effective job will be done in each of the censuses.

**Prize-Winning Essay by Donald Owens,
Winner Over 3,500 Entries in Los Angeles Examiner's Bill of Rights Essay Contest, Resident of the Great 23d District, California**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am please to present to you and all the other Members of this distinguished body the first prize winning essay in the recent Los Angeles Examiner's Bill of Rights contest. There were over 3,500 entries in this very appropriate and significant and timely contest sponsored by this great metropolitan newspaper. I am very proud that one of my young congressional constituents: to wit, Donald Owens of 12827 Clovis Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., took the first prize. Miss Elizabeth Bryan, whom I have had the pleasure of personally knowing, is his very able English teacher, and Mr. Sam Zackheim, whom I also personally know, is the principal of the very splendid high school attended by Donald Owens: to wit, Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.

Donald won a \$200 savings bond and recently there was a very appropriate dinner honoring the winners held at the Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., at which time the parents and teachers of the winners were in attendance, and former Los Angeles school superintendent, Dr. Vierling Kersey, was master of ceremonies.

I am also naturally very proud to relate that the winner of the second prize and recipient of a \$100 savings bond was Miss Margaret Campbell, 7527 East 4th Place, Downey, Calif. She being one of the student leaders in the Downey North Junior High School, said school also being in the great 23d Congressional District of my native State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and all the others who read this significant essay join with me in congratulations to the winner, and to the other winners for

the reason that they are important young American citizens.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

The Bill of Rights is the first violin of that great orchestra whose music is the symphony of American life. It produces perfect harmony, for its makers—Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison—carved this instrument out of the desires and needs of their countrymen. This harmony of right and privileges established by the Bill of Rights inspires us in our daily lives.

The making of this perfect instrument was not accomplished in a day. Its creators had to make sure they had constructed a strong instrument that would last through the ages to come. They had to pick the strongest woods, tough like the fibers of bravery and industry found in the hearts and souls of our American ancestors. This newly constructed instrument had to undergo strenuous test. On December 15, in the year 1791, it had passed the final test. Many States had found it good and had ratified it.

Like the master's violin, the four strings established these basic tones: The right to freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. If one of these strings breaks the violin can no longer produce perfect harmony. An appreciation of the first ten amendments should sing in the hearts of every American, in order to keep the song of America growing greater and more harmonious.

At times in our country's history the melody had almost been broken, through wars and depression. Now we are threatened by a complete muting of America's song by communistic ideologies which threaten us. Because of this ever-present threat, we, the players, must learn how important each one of us is to the entire orchestra. Each one of us—you, I, and every American—must keep his own instrument in tune.

Tribute to Late Senator Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have received this week a letter from Mr. Morris Biller, president of the Postal Union of Manhattan-Bronx Clerks, one of the largest and most progressive unions of postal employees in the country. The postal union is most anxious to join in the many tributes which have been paid to Senator Neuberger by his friends all over the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Biller's letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POSTAL UNION OF MANHATTAN-BRONX CLERKS,
New York, March 14, 1960.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the 9,000 members of this local I wish to pay tribute to the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon, for his friendship toward postal employees and his tireless efforts in their behalf.

He will be especially remembered as the author of the Health Benefits Act which is a milestone in Federal Employee legislation

in giving health benefits coverage to all Federal employees.

He will be greatly missed by all of us.

Sincerely,

MORRIS BILLER,
President.

AMVETS' 1960 Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold T. Berc, national commander, AMVETS, presented the 1960 legislative program of that organization to our committee on March 10. It is a highly interesting program and unusually well developed. Under unanimous consent I commend it to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD T. BERG, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AMVETS' 1960 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, MARCH 10, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to present for your consideration and information the highlights of AMVETS' 1960 legislative program. The constructive efforts of this committee under the guidance of its distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, to perfect a sound structure of benefits for the Nation's veterans have earned the approbation of all Americans.

We of AMVETS are especially grateful for your successful action in providing a realistic non-service connected pension law for veterans of all wars. Thousands of World War II and Korean widows and children can now qualify for pension as the result of your efforts during the first session of this 86th Congress. To express AMVETS' sincere thanks, I have been commissioned to bring the following resolution, unanimously adopted by the most recent AMVETS National Convention, to your attention.

Whereas the Congress of the United States passed and the President approved Public Law 86-211, a bill to modify the pension programs for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict and their widows and children, and

Whereas AMVETS has long advocated the philosophy contained in this law—that of more realistically relating the amount of monthly pension payments to the degree of financial need that exists, and

Whereas this measure eliminates a long-standing inequity by making World War II and Korean conflict widows and children eligible for pension on the same basis as the survivors of World War I veterans: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, be highly commended for introducing and causing to be enacted into law the sound and equitable pension program contained in Public Law 86-211.

I should like to add my personal thanks for this outstanding contribution to the benefit structure.

AMVETS, as you know, is an organization made up exclusively of World War II and Korean conflict veterans. We were organized in 1944 and granted a congressional charter in 1947. During our brief existence, we have attempted to pursue a sensible and reason-

able course in our legislative objectives. We have practiced and will continue to advocate the philosophy that the benefit program for veterans must necessarily merit the respect and approval of the American people. AMVETS have never been reluctant to oppose those benefits that were not in the best interests of the Nation. By the same token, we have defended and will continue to defend the hard core of legitimate veterans benefits.

Basically, the program should include (1) adequate compensation payments for men disabled in service and the survivors of those who died as the result of service-connected disabilities, (2) hospitalization and medical treatment for service-connected disabilities, (3) adequate opportunity for readjustment to civil life following military service, (4) hospitalization for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities when financial need is apparent and a bed is available, (5) non-service-connected pensions with need, unemployment and disability as the fundamental tests to be met and (6) special assistance, including existing priorities and preferences, in obtaining suitable, gainful employment. Within this general framework, there are certain specifics that require further attention.

COMPENSATION

We of AMVETS believe that much remains to be accomplished in the area of service-connected compensation. Our primary concern is for the special needs of the seriously disabled. The Congress has on occasion recognized these needs by passing appropriate legislation. H.R. 268 and H.R. 283, passed by the House of Representatives and awaiting action by the Senate Finance Committee, are prime examples. H.R. 268 authorizes a statutory award of \$47 monthly for bilateral deafness. H.R. 283 would grant to a veteran who has lost an eye as well as an arm or leg a \$47 statutory allowance for each such loss. The present law limits payment to one monthly statutory award of \$47 for this combination of disabilities.

Further recognition of the seriously disabled veterans' special needs have been given by this committee in reporting H.R. 7211 in the first session of this Congress. This measure establishes a new statutory rate of compensation of \$265 monthly for those who are totally disabled and are "permanently housebound" as the result of the service-connected disabilities. The proposal recognizes that there are differing degrees of incapacity even among the totally disabled.

Now, these bills that I have mentioned certainly represent steps in the right direction and we hope this committee will continue its efforts to obtain favorable action on them. In relation to the overall problem, however, they merely scratch the surface.

There is a great need for more information of the effect of specific disabling conditions upon life expectancy. Can the veteran rated at 60 percent for diabetes expect to live as long as the veteran rated at 60 percent for a stomach ulcer? If not, should he be compensated for the loss of life expectancy? Do extra expenses occasioned by the needs of certain disabilities, such as special diets, merit extra compensation? Is the industrial handicap of some disabling conditions such as epilepsy, greater than that of other disabilities that are similarly compensated? These are but a few of the questions that can be answered by a survey of the special needs of the seriously disabled.

A resolution adopted by the most recent AMVETS national convention in August 1959, urges the Congress to undertake a study and investigation of this nature with a view to improving the system of compensation for disabled veterans. It is our understanding that both this committee and the Veterans' Administration are now conducting such a study. I have directed my staff to cooperate

with this committee and the Veterans' Administration in finding the solution to this weighty problem.

DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE

In 1948, the 80th Congress passed legislation granting an allowance for dependents to those veterans whose service-connected disabilities were rated 60 percent or more. In 1949, the 60-percent requirement was lowered to 50 percent where it has remained since. It is the view of AMVETS that this arbitrary line for entitlement to dependency allowance creates inequities not contemplated by the Congress. It is difficult to say that an individual rated at 40 percent is better able to pursue full-time employment and support his family than the person rated at 50 percent. Many disabilities rated at less than 50 percent produce a decided impairment in earning power. In the interests of equity, we urge that the 50-percent requirement be eliminated in determining entitlement to dependency allowance.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

A matter of great interest to AMVETS is the creation of an independent court or board outside the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration for the review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with respect to service-connected disability and death-compensation claims. Under the present system of adjudication, the Board of Veterans' Appeals, acting for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, renders a decision that is final in all respects and not subject to review by the judiciary.

This situation gives cause for just criticism by veterans whose claims have been denied. It is the opinion of AMVETS that an agency completely independent of the agency that makes the original decision should be established.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

AMVETS views on the Veterans' Administration hospital system have already been presented to your subcommittee on hospitals. I should like to comment briefly, however, on several matters of import to AMVETS. Medical care for our aging population is a matter of increasing concern to the Federal Government. Other committees of the Congress are now considering this problem as it relates to the entire population. Our primary concern, of course, is the veteran.

At the present time, the VA hospital system operates under a ceiling of 125,000 beds. This appears to be adequate to meet present needs. The average age of World War I veterans, however, is 65 years. The World War II veteran's average age is 40. As the veteran population ages, and their medical needs grow, there will be increasing demands for hospital beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

A particular problem in accommodating the aged veteran is the great need for facilities to provide intermediate or long-term care for chronic disabilities. Persons in this category usually do not require the same degree of active medical care given the more acute cases, and yet they do not meet the requirements for domiciliary care. In short, the need for special facilities to accommodate the chronic, long-term patient will increase.

Unless legislation is enacted to create special facilities for this rapidly growing class of patient, hospital facilities presently designed for active medical care will be greatly overtaxed. AMVETS, recognizing the problem eventually facing us, adopted a resolution at the most recent national convention urging the Congress and the Veterans' Administration to immediately convert any unused facilities to the care and treatment of the long-term chronic patient, and further, to develop long-range plans to permit the Veterans' Administration to more adequately

discharge its responsibility to this class of veteran.

Hospital construction

Undoubtedly, the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program represents the greatest single medical project undertaken by any government in the world. It has often been referred to as a "second to none" medical program. To continue enjoying that fine reputation, however, it is necessary that adequate funds be provided each year. This is particularly true in the case of the continuing program of replacement, repair, and modernization. Hospitals that are outmoded or badly in need of repair or renovation cannot be operated economically or without unnecessary cost. We are pleased to note that the 1961 Veterans' Administration budget request contains funds to permit the launching of a 12-year hospital construction and revitalization program. Much of the credit for the increase in the tempo of this program rightfully belongs to this committee. We urge that you continue your vigilance and make every effort to see that sufficient funds are appropriated to complete this commendable program in even less time than the proposed 12-year span.

Outpatient treatment

Considerable discussion in recent years has centered upon the subject of hospitalization for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities. Those who oppose non-service-connected hospitalization point to abuses in the program by those seeking admission to a VA hospital when they can well afford to pay for the treatment. AMVETS subscribe wholeheartedly to the theory that veterans should be treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals for non-service-connected disabilities provided they cannot assume the cost of hospitalization and a bed is available. Notwithstanding our support of non-service-connected hospitalization, however, I wish to make it clear that AMVETS will not condone abuses in this program. If a veteran can afford to pay for his non-service-connected hospitalization, he should not occupy a bed at the Federal Government's expense. We believe that abuses of this nature have been held to a minimum in recent years.

Insurance

We of AMVETS were pleased to learn that the insurance subcommittee of this committee will soon hold hearings on bills relating to Government life insurance now pending before this committee. A longstanding resolution of AMVETS that was reaffirmed at the last national convention recommends that veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict be given the right to purchase National Service Life Insurance for 2 years. The act of April 25, 1951, which terminated the right to purchase National Service Life Insurance was effective immediately upon its enactment. Thus, many veterans who had planned to purchase this insurance at a future date had no opportunity to do so. Reopening the door to the possibility of purchasing this insurance will help the many veterans who are now clamoring for low-cost insurance coverage.

LOAN GUARANTEE

Although the Veterans' Administration guaranteed loan program has been in effect since 1944, veterans of World War II, in recent years, have had little opportunity to avail themselves of this benefit. The lack of mortgage capital for the World War II loan guarantee program during many of these years has interfered with the home-buying plans of veterans. During this period we have supported all reasonable proposals designed to increase the availability of mortgage financing.

The program for World War II veterans is scheduled to expire July 25, 1960. In the hope that more World War II veterans will have a better opportunity to purchase homes

in the foreseeable future, AMVETS recommend a 2-year extension of the loan guarantee program for World War II veterans. We are aware that this committee has already favorably reported H.R. 7903 which will extend the World War II program to July 25, 1962. We respectfully urge that you lend your support to obtaining approval by the House of Representatives of this measure.

Additionally, AMVETS have adopted a resolution asking that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be given the same authority with respect to VA loans as that given the FHA Commissioner on the establishing of interest rates for FHA loans. This would permit the Veterans' Administration to establish an interest rate on GI loans that is competitive in today's market. We are hopeful that this action will attract mortgage capital into the VA loan program at a fair rate of interest.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

I have noted that your committee is nearing the end of several weeks of consideration of measures to provide benefits to veterans who served after January 31, 1955. Representatives of AMVETS testified last week in support of H.R. 2259. This measure will provide a program of education and training with benefits based upon the formula of 1 day of education for each day of military service as well as a program of vocational rehabilitation for persons with service-connected disabilities.

We have no vested interest in this legislation as our membership is not eligible for benefits contained in this bill. We have always taken great pride in the fact that we have been both reasonable and sensible in our legislative objectives. Our primary interest in a program of this nature is its value to the Nation. More than 25 percent of the World War II veterans who studied in colleges and universities under the GI bill became scientists and engineers. There is every reason to believe that the same ratio will prevail under the new program. The resultant addition to our trained manpower potential plus the increased income taxes that will be realized from the higher salaries of recipients of this benefit, will far outweigh the costs of the measure. As you deliberate this question in executive session, we hope that you will keep these considerations in mind and report a bill providing both educational benefits and vocational rehabilitation for the post-Korean veteran.

APPROPRIATIONS

On behalf of AMVETS I want to express our appreciation for the manner in which this committee has interested itself in assuring the appropriation of adequate funds to operate the veterans program administered by the Veterans' Administration. We have always maintained that the best rehabilitation or readjustment to civil life following military service is incomplete unless it includes productive, gainful employment. To facilitate this readjustment, it is essential that agencies responsible for the employment security of veterans be provided adequate funds to carry out this important function. While it is not within the jurisdiction of this committee, the appropriations bills for agencies administering these programs will soon be on the floor of the House of Representatives. We respectfully suggest that you individually support the appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the several agencies so charged to continue rendering their valuable services to veterans.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, these are the highlights of our recommendations in the field of veterans affairs. With your permission, sir, I wish to submit a digest of the resolutions adopted in August 1959, by the 15th annual national convention of AMVETS. In closing, I want to convey to you my sincere thanks for the

many courtesies you and the committee and its fine staff have extended to representatives of AMVETS during the year. Like this committee, AMVETS are dedicated to promoting the welfare of the veteran and his dependents. We pledge to you our cooperation and objective thinking in arriving at our mutual objectives.

Thank you.

A Decade of Destiny—The 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include excerpts from a sermon delivered recently at the morning worship service at the First Baptist Church, Jackson, Miss., by Dr. W. Douglas Hudgins, pastor. Dr. Hudgins' sermon is in my opinion outstanding, and indeed presents a challenge for the 1960's:

A DECADE OF DESTINY—THE 1960's

(By W. Douglas Hudgins)

(A sermon preached at the morning worship service at the First Baptist Church, Jackson, Miss., Jan. 24, 1960.)

Time's newest decade is just beginning to dawn. Humanity at this moment is beginning to see the first gray streaks in history's eastern sky as a new and dazzling decade is at hand. The 1960's are here. The soaring sixties, someone has said. In God's provident gift of time to His creatures the calendar has turned all too silently to a new 10-year cycle in human existence. The 1960's, a decade of destiny.

What is achieved, or not achieved, by the people of God in this 10-year period immediately ahead of us will determine, in my judgment, the continuation of our Christian witness to a needy world, or the deterioration and decay of our citizenship as a Nation. Christians, in and out of their churches; on Sunday, but especially on the 6 other days of the week; in their habits of worship and in their everyday walks of life; in their prayers and in their pleasures; in their confessions and in their characters; have resting upon them in this decade the most solemn responsibilities any generation has faced. Some trends must be stopped, some directions reversed. New departures must be made, new ventures must be launched. Apathy and indifference must be shelved; courage and conviction must return to life. Comfortable respectability in a casually Christian community that winks at idolatry and evil must give way to a Christian concept of moral integrity that not only sets the individual soul in harmonious fellowship with a redeeming God but also becomes the leavening force that provides the solution to our rapidly increasing economic, political, and social problems. If we believe, as we profess, that sin is a heinous reality and men are lost because of it, there must be a more urgent note in our preaching and a more constant effort in our witnessing day by day. For 30 years our Lord's churches have had time to think, to consider, to evaluate, to plan; now it is time to act.

What are some of the problems facing the thinking Christian as this decade begins?

What are some of the weaknesses in our present social structure? If there are signs of crumbling in the foundation of our Nation what are they? If there are significant indications that a malignancy is suspected in our national body where shall we look for them? Well might we look for such signs, for great nations and civilizations of the past have fallen—not because of attack from without—but because of decay and disintegration within. The rule of Rome; the triumph of the Turk; the splendor of Spain; the supremacy of the Czars; the despotism of the dictator countries; where are they now? Fallen, crumbled, defeated, forgotten. Not so much because of the military might that defeated them in battle, but because they rotted away at the heart. When this Nation of ours became a reality in 1789 less than 3 million God-fearing, hard-working, freedom-loving men and women began to transform the thinking of an entire world. Nation after nation began to emulate this infant country in a gradual discard of rule by king for the exercise of individual choice. And, mind you, without great force of arms, advertisement, or a program of financial aid to the "have-nots" of the earth. Faith in God, sacrificial hard work, and a passionate desire for individual freedom changed the face of the whole world. What have we accumulated in these succeeding years that have caused us to lose our place of leadership in the world and made us to be suspect of most of the peoples of the earth? Have we time simply to mention some of our problems?

It would seem indisputable that we might classify our plethora of confusion under seven categories—population, politics, economics, education, morality, science, and religion.

The problem of population is the problem of people. Just people! Have you ever realized the problem of the world's people? Staggering, isn't it, to realize that the world's population increases 68,000 every day. Here in our own Nation our population increases by 2½ million every year. Each 12 months, enough additional people in these United States to make up the population of a State the size of Oklahoma. By 1970, we are told, we will have a minimum of 210 million citizens of this country. Most of these are gravitating toward the great cities. Areas as large as 300 miles in length give evidence of being linked into one continuous metropolis. The unusually large number of babies born in the war years of 1944-46 will, in this decade, reach marriageable age and will make their own new homes. The age span is lengthening. People are growing older. Retirement age is dropping. How will the new adults make a living? How will the older citizens live out their days? Immigrants of all cultures and colors cast their lot upon these shores as possibilities arise. Living conditions are undergoing vast change and peaceful communities of cooperative citizenship are beginning to feel the manipulative pressures of a kind of socialistic idealism that would subvert all personal choice and force a mass pattern of mere existence. People! People in this Nation and throughout the world—souls without a knowledge of God and possessed with no vestige of the Divine estimate of human personality. People—lost people—and we take our Christianity calmly.

Politics. This is a political year—a year of national elections—but it is not about that narrow view that we are concerned. It is our manner of government. Our way of ruling ourselves. No one but a moron could fail to see the insidious trend in the last 30 years toward a continuous centralization of government. Powers gradually have been taken from the people, the States, and the courts. We have unconsciously allowed ourselves to shrink from many of the harsh problems of individual, community, and State life and turn expectantly to the

Federal Government for help. To provide such help—aid for the farmer; aid for the unemployed; aid for the dependent; aid for the aged; aid for communication, transportation, and power; insurance from sickness and security for retirement—to say nothing of a free education or a subsidy for our business—government has grown to gigantic proportion. Fear of war, or the necessity of preserving our armed might that the world might be kept in peace, takes more than half our national expenditure, and our politicians seem constantly to be fussing over that. Communism infiltrates our national fabric and he who warns against it or seeks to repel it is besmirched and ridiculed as one who deprecates and violates the privileges of personal freedom. Long established and deeply cherished convictions as to the absolute necessity of the separation of the church and the state are weakening and there are those who say they cherish a free government and at the same time profess to believe that there is no danger in electing to office individuals who admittedly acknowledge allegiance to an institution or a power outside of and differing in kind to our beloved country. The sad and sorry spectacle of legislative maneuvering and sidestepping so evident in some quarters in recent times gives the thoughtful citizen the feeling that political expediency has taken precedence over statesmanship and recent events in the world of business and economics demonstrate the lengths to which wisdom and fair-dealing can be sacrificed to political force or personal ambition. Minority groups—and there are many of them—with shrewd planning and political pressure, thrust their wills upon the great majority and those of us who do not wish so to be manipulated are maligned, caricatured, and despised. The will and welfare of the mass of Americans seem to be forgotten by the Powercrats on the Potomac because the wild and socialistic fanaticism of a frantic few holds out the promise of being the margin of victory for a little group of ambitious politicians. Politically we are in danger—and we go about our daily lives without concern.

Our economic situation cannot be ignored. Inflation continues to harass us and there seems to be no cessation in the demands of many for continued deficit spending. The President anticipates a slight surplus in a fiscal year and instead of applying it on our staggering debt, liberals of all kinds clamor for more Federal subsidies. Business was not allowed to hold the line in the recent steel strike and the spiral continues on its upward way. Some wages have kept pace, but the middle class, so-called white collar employee and small businessman, keeps being squeezed because his income has not increased proportionately. Gold pours out of the country; demand for luxury goods climbs; agricultural subsidies add to our taxes and the farmer is not better off; business and Government battle each other; competition and lower prices from foreign competition which our money and machinery have created take away much of our business; labor drums for a shorter work week; Government relief and welfare grow uncontrolled and the total tax load borne by the average citizen has increased to such proportion that it is almost unbearable. Our entire economic philosophy seems to reflect the feeling on the part of the individual that the Nation owes him a living whether he is willing to work or not. In this atmosphere of economy Christianity lives, and now is struggling for its breath.

Educationally, the picture of this decade is fulsome and foreboding. Where a high school education was sufficient 30 years ago, a college degree is commonplace now. By 1970 the number of college students will increase from the present 3.4 million to 5.8 million. Religious overtones to edu-

cation are rapidly disappearing and those church-related institutions that seek to impart the Christian element in learning face almost insurmountable financial problems. Educators are tempted to turn to the Federal Government for assistance without seeming to realize the dangers involved. The demand for scientists and technicians seems to have outweighed the necessity for developing the social and spiritual sides of life, and an innocuous spirit of secularization fills the average classroom or laboratory. Even schools of religious education and theological seminaries have a difficult task in superseding the pervading spirit of materialism in the average student's quest for knowledge. The Christian community of our decade knows the value of a trained mind—but not all of us are conscious of the necessity of a fixed soul. Education, somehow, must feel again the impact of the One Great Teacher who put paramount importance on the soul. Morally, alarm fills many a heart. Teenage gangsterism, adult and juvenile delinquency quiz show scandals, payola, cheating on examinations, manifestations of perjury, shocking crimes, and blatant disregard for law reveal moral disease somewhere. Our jails are overcrowded; mental institutions cannot care for the emotionally wrecked; one out of less than four marriages ends in divorce; a million illegitimates born every year; 18,000 suicides in a 12-month period; more bar maids in America than college girls; more for bubble gum than many denominations give to missions; more money spent for dog food than for Christian education; plumbers making more money than school teachers, and some coaches making more than college presidents. Alcoholism has reached a staggering proportion; narcotic addiction and the use of barbiturates damn thousands of potentially useful lives; honesty is a word many think they have outgrown; standards of moral purity have been dragged in the mire of sexual promiscuity; much of the Nation has forgotten entirely the reverence of the Lord's Day; and millions of people appear to be jet-propelled on some quest for selfish pleasure. Drunkenness, profanity, gambling, and moral compromise characterize the routine existence of millions who enjoy a community respectability. Christians who hold convictions against such types of moral conduct appear to be growing fewer in number. Our churches, alas, are filled with members whose conduct from one worship service on Sunday to another is not devoid of compromising worldliness and blatant sin. Can America really be called Christian if this situation is not changed?

What about science? Is it a problem? Or is our lack of achievement in that realm our problem? I heard a prominent physician say publicly the other day, "Medicine has made more progress in the last 10 years than in the previous 500 years." I would not know—but we all are conscious of the fact that scientific discovery and achievement in the last quarter of a century have been phenomenal. And, if we can believe what we are told, we are just on the threshold of wonders and wizardry that are unbelievable. In what has developed to be our almost worshipful attitude toward materialistic accomplishment we have all but forgotten the declaration of some scientists themselves when, at the close of the Second World War, they stated plainly that unless we caught up spiritually, we faced inevitable doom. But, Christians occasionally remember the prophecy of the genius Steinmetz when he said, a short while before his death, "The greatest discoveries of the next generation will be spiritual." In all our materialistic triumphs and conquests we who call ourselves Christian must recognize the primacy of the spiritual.

In all this have we no religion? Do we start this decade spiritually orphans? Do

We not have great churches, great denominations, great programs? Indeed we do, thank God. Over a hundred million citizens of this Nation alone hold membership in some church or religious body. Our property runs into the billions, our activities are incessant. This condition, however, may be part of our problem. Religion has never been as popular as it is now. But, on the other hand, has it ever been as powerless? We are cursed, even in our relation to our churches with the spirit of convenience. Many join a particular church because it is the most convenient. Attendance upon services of worship is exercised by many only when it is convenient. Participation in a kingdom enterprise is given if it is convenient. Giving occurs only when it is convenient. Individuals exercise the privilege of prayer and devotion when it is convenient. Self-denial and sacrificial devotion have all but departed from the casual Christian. Half the average evangelical church membership seldom or never attend the services of its fellowship. A third of the average congregation give nothing regularly to the work and program of the church. Far less than half ever attend an evening service and less than 10 percent of the average church ever are present at a prayer meeting. Outside of the pastor, seldom more than 1 percent of the average evangelical church ever win another to personal faith in Jesus Christ, and no one ever does all he or she could do for the church's Lord.

Yes, Christians face a confusing situation as this new decade begins. The matter of making a mere living crowds out the possibility of developing a great life. Fear of time's end because of the imminence of nuclear catastrophe causes us to seek some way to protect our possessions—it is not sending us to our knees in confession and repentance saying, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" Much of America is actually pagan and hundreds of millions of the earth who have never heard of the deliverance that is imparted by our blessed Lord look and long for some sense of direction and deliverance. America must be Christian if the world in this decade is to know emancipation from sin's bondage and the power to live at peace—each man with his neighbor.

Let us return again to Amos. Thundering in severity were his denunciations and incisive, indeed, were his insights into the fabric of the culture of his day. His message was primarily to God's people. And, it was crystal clear in its conclusion—"Seek me and ye shall live, saith the God of hosts."

Limited indeed is the physician who can proffer a diagnosis but cannot prescribe a remedy. Little will it profit if we become aware of evils about us and have no solution to suggest. A number of things appear obvious as the Christian heart seeks wisdom in these determinative days.

In affairs civic and political Christian voters in this Nation of ours must place and keep men in office and positions of leadership who are men of character and integrity. Politics itself is not dirty—or even dusty. Sordid men and women—selfish and scheming manipulators, make politics grimy. Mere expediency must be supplanted with statesmanship; and vote-swapping puppets, more interested in popularity and power than in the common good, must be replaced with men who can stand on their own convictions of moral right no matter what the odds. Industry, thrift, and some sense of financial wisdom must be compelled and individual demands for economic security from the cradle to the grave must be replaced by a dedication to the old-fashioned custom of hard work and self-denial.

A new concept of education must appear in all phases of our quest for knowledge. A positive Christianity must, in some way, dissipate the impression that for one to be

scholarly and mentally equipped one must be materialistic and utterly devoid of any simplicity of faith in things divine. Basic standards of honesty, truthfulness, integrity, and fair dealing must return to our everyday activities of life. Our standard of morals must be lifted; our social conduct must be elevated. Spiritual values in life must regain their rightful place and everyday living must be regarded as a God-given stewardship of responsibility. Pompous "piousities" must be discarded and individuals must act and live in line with the Christian professions we so loudly proclaim. Christianity must become vital, not casual; aggressive, not apologetic; dynamic, not apathetic.

If our assertion is correct—if ours is a decade of destiny—the responsibility rests upon those of us who are Christians—members of our Lord's churches. Only, as we assert a stupendous Christian faith and exert an unprecedented effort in Christian living will we see the tide of paganized materialism checked and a new and different concept of living emerge. To us, then, as children of God through the Lord Jesus Christ, is given this "date with destiny."

How shall this be accomplished? It seems to me that there must be a genuine and unprecedented proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the remedy for man's ills and assurance for the future. Passion and power must return to the pew as it descends on the pulpit. Without exhortation, but without favor, sinning man must be made aware of the peril and penalty of evil. Sin must be set forth for what it is. Man must be made aware of his temporal and spiritual peril as the reality of evil is exposed and its paralysis delineated. Men must be admonished to look to God for salvation—not to philosophy, education, science, or culture.

A new concept of God must arise in men's hearts. His provident control over the universe, His holiness, His justice, His righteousness, His sovereignty, His concern, and His redemptive purpose must again fill men's hearts. A redeeming Christ, who, as a suffering savior, died on a cross, must find acceptance in human hearts as God's only means of soul security and spiritual hope. Life must be transformed by His regenerative grace and under the guidance of His Holy Spirit must we walk together as brethren in accomplishment of His will for mankind.

This is a decade of destiny, and in it perhaps our last full chance to merit God's bestowal of opportunity to point the Nation and the world to a way up and out. If we fail what can keep us from rotting and crumbling into discard and decay? God help us to be aware of our responsibilities in the 1960's.

Birthday of the Merit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including a speech delivered by the Honorable Sumner G. Whittier, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, at a dinner meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees commemorating the 77th anniversary of civil service. The meeting was held at the Willard Hotel on January 16, 1960.

Mr. Whittier is one of the highly respected and capable administrators in our Government. I am sure Members of Congress, as well as others, will be interested in reading his statement:

SPEECH BY MR. WHITTIER, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, 77TH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 16, 1960

It happened nearly 80 years ago, here in the city of Washington.

The sharp crack of a pistol shot raised ugly echoes in the city's railroad station. A man fell fatally wounded. Two months later he died of his wounds. He was no ordinary American. He was James Garfield, President of the United States.

The embittered, unbalanced man who shot President Garfield was a disappointed job hunter. He had helped a great deal—or so he thought—to win the election for Garfield. He felt he was entitled to a good job in the new government. Was he competent? Who cared? Everybody knew that "to the victor belongs the spoils." That was reason enough for poor crack-brained Charles Guiteau.

But James Garfield, newly elected President of the United States, did not believe in the cynical system of party spoils. He had taken a strong stand against it.

To the spoils system he said "no". And it cost him his life.

It is fair to call President James Garfield one of the patron saints of the Civil Service. Less than three years after his senseless murder, an aroused American people forced the adoption of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883.

That was exactly 77 years ago. Today, you and I are helping to celebrate one of the happiest birthdays in the entire history of our American Government. The birthday of the merit system—two words of tremendous import to the proper running of the business of this Nation.

Looking back over the span of 77 years, some of us might be tempted to believe that the efficient civil service system, as we know it today, just came naturally.

It did not. It had to be hammered into shape, and molded, and remolded and refined. The ship of state, back before the turn of the century, was well encrusted with barnacles.

It took years to shape the fine system we know today. It took enlightened management policies. It took bold imagination, merely to break loose from the shackles of "this is the way we've always done it, and this is the way we're always going to do it." Above all, it took thousands upon thousands of dedicated men and women.

And let us not overlook the fact that it took as well the unions—the American Federation of Government Employees—on the scene for more than a quarter of a century.

I have had more than a little experience with civil service and with the part unions have been playing to keep the merit system strong.

For 10 years in the Massachusetts State Senate, I was chairman of a joint senate and house committee on civil service. I was a member of many special commissions to improve and strengthen the civil service of my Bay State.

I don't have to tell you that my Commonwealth of Massachusetts is heavily industrialized and heavily unionized. My home city of Everett is a community of working men and women—less than 3 square miles in area, but including General Electric, Standard Oil, and many another union plant.

Most of the members of my family and my wife's family are union members. My brother was not only a member of a local, but legislative agent as well.

When I first came to Washington, and dignified and jolly Colonel Franke came around with an application blank, I was pleased to

become a member of the AFGE. It was one of the first things I did in this city. I attended meetings and was made a member of the executive committee.

Later I was promoted to administrator. Some fine telegrams came from your union to the President—and for that support, I thank you. However, there is a belief that if you are administrator, you represent management. But I am still a card-carrying member of this union. I am not sure whether that's honorary or not. I do know they still come around to collect my dues.

It was only natural, then, that when I became administrator, I wanted VA's record of employee-management relations to be the best in Government—second to none.

The emphasis on human dignity; upon the importance of each individual. These were our goals; these were the ideals of the Civil Service Commission; what's more, these were the marching orders from the President of the United States, in the statement of policy sent to all heads of Government agencies by the White House.

"The economical and efficient operation of the Federal Government depends upon the quality of its employees, their interest and their devotion to their work, their working environment and the effectiveness of their leadership.

"Agency personnel policies (must) provide for the solicitation and consideration of the views of supervisors and employees—including employee organizations—in the formulation and adjustment of personnel policy.

"Protecting the rights of employees to organize, join, or refrain from joining lawful organizations of their choice, and cooperation with employee groups whose interests are identifiable with those of the agency."

There were many other parts to that now-familiar order signed by Rocco Siciliano when he was Special Assistant to the President, for Personnel Management, and carried out so admirably now by his successor Eugene Lyons.

But he said something more:

"Practical machinery exists generally, but unless there is a genuine and positive interest by the highest authority in a Government agency . . . the machinery can become a vehicle for obstruction. If the head of the agency is known for his interest in a good labor-management relationship, this attitude permeates throughout the organization, and the machinery becomes a vital, meaningful instrument."

When VA received that order, we did not file it under W for White House or P for personnel policies. VA reproduced it and sent it out to all levels of management throughout the agency.

A year later, we had a birthday party of our own. On the first anniversary of that order, we sent another memo to all VA supervisors, reminding them of the White House order, and urging once again that they live up not only to its letter but to the spirit as well. And we are still following up. That order will never collect dust in VA files.

Only this month I sent a memo to all supervisors, as another reminder. Listen to these highlights:

"Every supervisor should give thought and take time—

"To give wide credit to superior work accomplishments of employees in his unit.

"To help employees make careers in the VA, to develop their skills, their experience, their knowledge of the VA's mission and their part in it.

"To listen to their views on matters that affect them, and to encourage their participation in employee meetings and other organizational activity."

This is not lipservice. This a way of life at the VA. Emphasis on human dignity; the importance of each individual—these

are motivating forces at VA, from the top on down.

We turned the generalities into important specifics. For example, the attitude survey VA conducted some months ago, and also our survey of secretaries' likes and dislikes about their bosses and their jobs. Our associates are participants in the VA, not merely employees.

We wanted their views, not just out of curiosity, but so that we could spot our weak points and correct them. And so we have acted on the basis of our findings. Our blueprint is the voice of the employee. For example, we instituted after-hours college courses right in the VA building; we began to post job vacancies on our bulletin boards; we started a training program for our supervisors; we began holding general employee meetings to give our people a clearer picture of the VA.

When we decided to change our working hours at the VA, it was because we polled our employees. "What working hours would you prefer?" we asked them. And we have abided by the wishes of the majority.

I have tried to visit as many members of the VA family at their desks as I possibly could. And so have all of my top staff members—Brad Morse, Bob Lamphere, Al Monk, and others. Recently we returned their hospitality. Every member of the VA family in the Washington area—and there are 3,700 of them—has been to my office. We chatted. We exchanged views. We asked questions of one another.

Our people met all department heads and deputies, received a full explanation of our chart room and other reporting devices used to understand VA's vast and diverse programs.

Somebody called it Operation Handshake, and I think the title fitted.

But we have done more in the area of communications. We hold welcome parties for all new employees, to give them the feeling of belonging when they come aboard; to let them know that VA is a good and friendly place to work; to impart to them some idea of our precious mission. Union representatives speak at these indoctrination receptions.

When someone retires, we make much of it. After all, if a man or woman has worked for VA for 30 or 40 years, isn't that the least we can do? Our retirees have formed an alumni group to carry on VA's fine tradition.

Somehow, this Christmas when I saw the Christmas decorations that our people had put up outside the building, I thought that it expressed truly the warmth of the VA.

Yes, we have tried to keep communications open from top to bottom.

If we have to close an office, our people should know that it is for a sound reason. They should know what is going to happen to them and their families.

The VA has its problems. We are no different from any other agency. For example, automation is coming to VA—as it is all over the Nation, in government and in private industry.

In the VA we are determined that we shall worship no machine. We know that the electronic computer is no different from the typewriter or the automobile or the adding machine—bigger and more complex, yes; but only a way, in the long run, to make the job easier.

We know that just as the carriage makers had to be displaced to make way for the automobile with its wider job horizons, in the long run men and women will have more jobs, more pay, more leisure.

But we are keenly aware that any such change affects people, people to whom the VA has an obligation.

We began these changes with a letter to all VA department and staff heads: "I consider it essential that special attention be

given to the human factors that will be involved in the conversion to electronic data processing equipment."

Every level of management was directed to show "maximum consideration for and use of all VA employees" in converting to ADP.

Training programs were set up to prepare people whose jobs might be affected for other jobs needed to operate ADP, as well as for other jobs in the agency.

Whenever better positions came about through ADP, our present people were to be given first consideration.

Any reassignment actions were to take place far enough in advance so that nobody, but nobody would be caught short without plenty of opportunity to be placed elsewhere.

A number of other steps were outlined as well—all designed to protect the individual; to place the needs of the individual first, ahead of any machine.

Every VA employee was kept up to date on the progress of ADP. One letter reminded them: "The successful conversion to our new equipment will depend on you, the employees who will be needed to support the operation of that equipment."

Remember Carl Sandburg's poem, "The People, Yes?" Ours is "The People First."

When there is a problem affecting our people, we tell them just as quickly as management arrives at a decision. We tell them before they read it in the newspapers; or before the rumor mill has distorted the story.

Why shouldn't they know first? They are members of the VA family. It is their lives that are affected.

We believe we must be frank and honest with our people. If we are not, they would not believe us twice.

We believe that the best way to lick the wild rumor, the uncertainty, is to inform the people affected, promptly and fully.

We believe our people should know why management makes a decision.

We do all this, but there is another side of the coin. Union heads must be responsible, must be willing to understand management's problems, must be willing to work with us and confer with us to hammer out solutions and agreements in a climate of mutual respect and understanding. Effective communication requires responsible management; but it also requires responsible union leadership and mutual respect.

Jim Campbell comes to lunch occasionally. And so do the members of the local, Bernard Kurcias, John Cronkite, and the other officials.

In the VA, we are rather proud of Jim Campbell, who claims our agency as his alma mater. Placement officer in one of our regional offices, Chief of the Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, Assistant Manager—an outstanding performer in all jobs, so it is only natural that he makes an outstanding AFGE president.

Gracious Esther Johnson has been everywhere. I still prize a photograph that she and I had taken together.

VA has 76 active AFGE lodges, with representation at all levels. In Philadelphia, the largest local of all, I was there when President Campbell presented an award to the VA manager for human relations. And I read with great interest the report in your fine paper, the Standard, of the activities of the Philadelphia regional office manager, Gordon Elliott.

I am pleased that the VA is strongly represented here tonight, and that it is strongly represented at AFGE conventions, as it was a year ago in San Diego. Ed Silberman spoke there at your invitation, and meetings were held with union delegates from VA lodges all over the Nation. Discussions were candid and open, and recommendations for local improvements were acted upon promptly.

So you see, we do work closely together. We do give serious consideration to your recommendations and suggestions. And we shall continue to do so, in a climate of mutual regard.

For we in VA believe firmly in the rights of our people to organize without restraint, without interference.

We in VA believe firmly in the rights of the union to be informed promptly of any changes in personnel policies or regulations which might affect employees.

We in VA believe firmly in the rights of the union to consult freely with top representatives of VA management, and to make constructive suggestions for improvements.

We in VA believe firmly in management's responsibility to listen to you carefully, to give serious weight to your words.

I believe firmly in the policy of the "open door." From top to bottom, the doors at the VA are open to you, and will remain wide open.

Underlying it all is my belief—and yours, too—in the sacred rights of the individual, his innate human dignity. In his freedom to act and think like an individual. He is man, and you cannot trample upon man.

What are we in government but public servants of our fellow man? How can we serve his needs as an individual if we, in our personnel practice, negate our own individuality? How could we in the VA serve the veterans of America, their widows and orphans, if human dignity were lacking?

Last summer a veteran died. His name was John Burke; his age, 71.

John Burke was a native of Ireland. He had come to America and had become a naturalized citizen. When World War I broke out, John Burke fought under the Stars and Stripes.

But time keeps marching on. John Burke grew old. He had to enter a VA hospital. He spent 2 long years in the hospital. And last summer he died. Before he died, he took the time to make his will. This is what John Burke said in his last will and testament:

"Being an ex-serviceman and grateful for the medical treatment I have received from the veterans hospital, I will and bequeath all my property to the United States of America."

I do not know whether John Burke left an estate of \$5 or \$5,000. But I do know this:

VA employees—civil service workers—many, no doubt, union members—did something so fine, so warm, so human, that it made that sick and aged veteran want to bequeath all he had to the United States of America.

This desire to serve is the end product of a policy of human dignity. We emphasize the individual because he is right, because it is Christian, because it helps us serve America—to serve still better the individual American like John Burke.

Deductibility of Educational Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Internal Revenue Service issued TD 6291 to clarify the deductibility of educational expenses for teachers and other professionals. At the time, there were assurances that my

bill H.R. 4662—and a number of companion bills then pending before the Congress—would not be necessary and that teachers would enjoy more equitable treatment on the deductibility of educational expenses incurred by them.

It was my pleasure to work with the National Education Association to seek to relieve this unfortunate situation and all of us were happy to note that a good deal of progress resulted from it.

On March 14 of this year, the Internal Revenue Service issued further clarification to TD 6291; these clarifications are known as revenue ruling 60-97, published in the Internal Revenue bulletin 1960-11, March 14, 1960.

Members of the staff of the National Education Association were consulted in the preparation of this new ruling and it is my understanding that a list of key questions to be used in determining the deductibility of educational expenses should be helpful to teachers. Similarly, there are 10 examples specifically applicable to teachers. With the thought that these examples will be most helpful if they achieve widespread dissemination, I insert, Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of revenue ruling 60-97:

[From Sec. 162, Trade or Business Expenses, 26 CFR 1.62-5, Expenses for education, Rev. Rul. 60-97]

GUIDES CONCERNING THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED BY TAXPAYERS FOR EDUCATION

Advice has been requested concerning the Federal income tax treatment of expenses incurred by taxpayers for education.

The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 here pertinent are found in section 162(a) which states that in computing taxable income, there shall be allowed as a deduction "all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business." Among the items representing business expenses are "traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business."

Section 262 of the Code provides, however, with exceptions not here material, that no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses.

Regulations (sec. 1.162-5) were promulgated under section 162 of the Code in order to differentiate between expenditures for education which constitute ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on a business activity and those which are personal in nature. The regulations also removed the uncertainties as to the deductibility of educational expenses by employees as distinguished from self-employed persons. They make it clear that both employees and self-employed individuals can deduct educational expenses which qualify as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

The regulations provide that expenditures made by a taxpayer for his education are deductible if they are for education undertaken primarily for the purposes of (1) maintaining or improving skills required by the taxpayer in his employment or other trade or business, or (2) meeting the express requirements of a taxpayer's employer, or the requirements of applicable law or regulations, imposed as a condition to the retention by the taxpayer of his salary, status or employment. Taxpayers are entitled to deductions only if they are engaged in a trade or business (whether self-employed or engaged in the performance of services as an employee) and have met at least the mini-

mum requirements for qualification or establishment in that trade or business. In determining what the minimum requirements of a taxpayer's trade or business are, consideration must be given to such factors as the requirements of the taxpayer's employer (either present or prospective), the laws and regulations of the particular jurisdiction, and the standards of professional, trade and business groups.

A taxpayer who is not currently employed or is not otherwise actively engaged in a trade or business is not entitled to a deduction for the expenses of any education undertaken during such period of unemployment or inactivity. Therefore, if a taxpayer who has ceased to engage in employment or other business subsequently undertakes education or training preparatory to resuming engagement in such employment or other business, the cost of such education is not deductible. A taxpayer will not be considered to have ceased to engage in his employment or other business during an off-duty season, when he is on vacation, or when he is on temporary leave of absence. Thus, a teacher will not be considered to have ceased to engage in his employment during the period between one school term in which he was employed and the next consecutive school term regardless of whether he was under a contract of employment during such intervening period.

Whether expenditures are for education undertaken primarily for the purpose of "maintaining or improving skills" required by the taxpayer in his employment or other trade or business must be determined upon the basis of all the facts involved. The tests of the regulations are framed to fit a wide variety of situations. In order to satisfy any of these tests, if called upon to do so in connection with the audit of a return or claim for refund, it is not enough to assert or deny the purpose of the taxpayer in general terms. Rather, it is necessary that the taxpayer show his purpose through specific facts. In this connection it will be necessary for him to establish that the education does maintain or improve skills required in his employment or other business. The skills "required" by the taxpayer in his employment or other trade or business are those which are appropriate, helpful, or needed.

If it is customary for other established members of the taxpayer's trade or business occupying positions similar to that of the taxpayer to undertake education of the type pursued by the taxpayer, the taxpayer will be considered to have undertaken such education for the purpose of maintaining or improving skills. The further and overriding rule which must be applied in every case is that even if the education maintains or improves skills required by the taxpayer in his trade or business, the cost thereof will not be deductible if the education is required of the taxpayer in order to meet the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended trade or business or specialty therein. The expense of such education is not deductible because it is personal in nature.

Once a taxpayer has met minimum requirements for establishment in his intended trade or business, the cost of education undertaken primarily for meeting the express requirements of a taxpayer's employer (or the requirements of applicable law or regulations) imposed as a condition to retention of the taxpayer's salary, status or employment is deductible. Generally, this is true even though a new position, a substantial advancement, or qualification in a new field may result. (See, however, the subdivision of this Revenue Ruling entitled, "Complete course of study leading to qualification or establishment," beginning on p. 14.) However, the deduction of expenses incurred for this purpose is limited to expenses for the minimum education re-

quired as a condition to the retention of the taxpayer's salary, status, or employment. Expenses for education in excess of that necessary to retain the taxpayer's salary, status, or employment may be deducted only if such excess education is undertaken primarily for the purpose of maintaining or improving skills required in the taxpayer's employment or other trade or business.

The regulations prohibit the deduction of expenditures made by a taxpayer for his education if they are for education undertaken primarily for the purpose of obtaining a new position or substantial advancement in position, or primarily for the purpose of fulfilling the general educational aspirations or other personal purposes of the taxpayer. The fact that the education undertaken meets express requirements for the new position or substantial advancement in position is an important factor indicating that the education is undertaken primarily for those purposes. If education is not necessary to retention of position and it meets express requirements for a new position or substantial advancement in position, the taxpayer must show that his primary purpose in acquiring the education is to maintain or improve skills required in his present employment or other business. The taxpayer will be considered to have made such showing if it is customary for other established members of the taxpayer's trade or business occupying positions similar to that of the taxpayer to undertake such education.

Summarizing, therefore, it may be said that expenses voluntarily undertaken primarily for the purpose of maintaining or improving skills required by a taxpayer in his employment or other trade or business are deductible as well as those incurred primarily because required as a condition to retention of his salary, status or employment; that expenses incurred primarily for either of these two purposes are deductible whether the taxpayer is self-employed or is engaged in the performance of services as an employee; and the fact that academic credit, a degree, a new job, or advancement may result does not preclude a deduction so long as the education is primarily undertaken for one of the two purposes specified in the regulations as causing the expenses to qualify for deduction.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION OR ESTABLISHMENT

Section 1.162-5(b) of the regulations specifically provides that "if education is required of the taxpayer in order to meet the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended trade or business or specialty therein, the expense of such education is personal in nature and therefore is not deductible." It therefore is necessary to determine in every case whether a taxpayer has met these minimum requirements.

The following is a description of the application of this minimum requirement rule to teachers and school administrators. These taxpayers must meet both local and State requirements.

The State's minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended position have been met by a teacher or school administrator when he has acquired the education necessary to hold a continuing certificate in that position. For the purposes of this Revenue ruling, a continuing certificate is one which need not be renewed, is renewable or convertible on the basis of experience only, or is renewable indefinitely by acquiring education which is not directed toward required conversion to another type of certificate. In other words, a teacher has met the State's minimum requirements when he is eligible for a certificate and is not required to take additional education showing progress toward the attainment of another type of certificate. The

name or term applied to a certificate is not controlling.

If a teacher who has a continuing certificate is required by his employer, whether local board, district or school (public or private), to meet other educational requirements for employment in his position, he must meet these requirements before he will be considered to be qualified or established in his position. A change of employers, therefore, may require teachers as well as other taxpayers to meet different minimum requirements. (See the subdivision of this Revenue ruling entitled "Increased Requirements—Changed Duties," beginning on p. 13.)

Whether university and college faculty members have met the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in their intended positions must be determined in the light of the governing regulations of the various institutions. A university or college faculty member has met the minimum requirements for establishment in his position when higher educational attainments are not required of him as a condition of continuing with the institution as a faculty member. (See discussion below, however, relative to increased requirements.) If such a faculty member undertakes additional education which he is not required to take in order to remain on the faculty, he will be entitled to deductions provided the education was undertaken for the purpose of maintaining or improving skills required by the taxpayer in his position.

The regulations of universities and colleges often require faculty members to attain certain levels of education either prior to appointment or within a specified period of time after appointment. If an individual is employed with the understanding that he must obtain certain additional education within a specified period of time in order to remain on the staff, expenses incurred for such education represent expenses incurred in meeting minimum requirements for establishment in the taxpayer's intended position and are not deductible. Thus, for example, if an individual is appointed as an instructor in a college having a policy that within 5 years he must acquire a master's degree and thus qualify as an assistant professor in order to remain on the faculty of the institution, the expenses incurred in earning the master's degree represent expenses incurred in acquiring the minimum qualifications for establishment in his intended position and are not deductible.

SUBSTANTIAL ADVANCEMENT

The regulations provide that expenditures made by a taxpayer for his education are not deductible if they are for education undertaken primarily for the purpose of obtaining a substantial advancement in position. Example (6) contained in section 1.162-5(e) of the regulations makes it clear that in the case of teachers an in-grade increase in salary pursuant to a salary schedule does not constitute a substantial advancement in position. A teacher who incurs expenses for education which are otherwise deductible and, as a result, receives an in-grade increase in salary need not show that the education was not undertaken primarily for the purpose of obtaining the in-grade increase. An "in grade" increase is an automatic step in a salary schedule for a specified level of education. A shift from one step in a salary schedule for a specified level of education (such as a bachelor's degree) to the corresponding, or next higher step, in a salary schedule for the next higher level of education (i.e. a master's degree) will be treated as an in-grade increase in salary and will not constitute a substantial advancement in position.

INCREASED REQUIREMENTS—CHANGED DUTIES

Once a taxpayer has met the minimum requirements for establishment in his in-

tended position, expenses incurred in meeting increased requirements thereafter established for that position are deductible, provided the increased requirements are imposed primarily for a bona fide business purpose of the employer. See the next subdivision of this Revenue ruling for an application of this rule.

Also, in the case of an established taxpayer, expenses of additional education necessitated by a change of duties with the same employer (whether at the request of the taxpayer or his employer) are deductible provided the new duties do not constitute a new position and the cost of the education otherwise qualifies for deduction under the regulations. For example, if the new duties do not constitute a new position and the taxpayer receives a substantial increase in salary as a result of taking the additional education, the cost of such education will be deductible provided the taxpayer can show his primary purpose was to retain his position or improve required skills. In the case of an established teacher, a change of duties with the same school district or other employer will not constitute a new position if the duties involve the same general type of work (for example, teaching as distinguished from administrative duties) and if the teacher is not required to obtain a different type of certificate (such as a change from an elementary certificate to a secondary certificate).

COMPLETE COURSE OF STUDY LEADING TO QUALIFICATION OR ESTABLISHMENT

The regulations provide that if education is required of the taxpayer in order to meet the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended trade or business or specialty therein, the expense of such education is personal in nature and therefore is not deductible. If a taxpayer who is established in his position undertakes education which is a part of a complete course of study that the taxpayer intends to pursue, such as that required to obtain a bachelor of laws degree, and such complete course of study will lead to qualifying the taxpayer in a new trade or business or specialty therein, it will be considered, for purposes of this Revenue ruling, that such education was undertaken to qualify the taxpayer in such new trade or business or specialty. Accordingly, the cost of such education will not be deductible. See example 10 below. However, a taxpayer may deduct the cost of courses in a new field or specialty if they meet the tests of deductibility provided in the regulations and provided they are not intended to be combined with other courses so as to lead to qualification in that field or specialty.

Except as provided in the next sentence, if an employee is established in his position and thereafter he is required by his employer, for a bona fide business purpose, to undertake additional education in order to retain his position, the cost of such education will be deductible. However, if the education required by the employer represents a complete course of study which will lead to qualifying the taxpayer in a new trade or business or specialty therein, it will be considered, for purposes of this Revenue ruling, that the requirement was imposed primarily for the benefit of the employee and not primarily for a bona fide business reason of the employer and, accordingly, the cost of such education will not be deductible.

KEY QUESTIONS

The following is the suggested order in which questions should be resolved in determining the deductibility of expenses incurred for education:

Has the taxpayer met the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended position?

If "no," no deductions are allowable.

If "yes," is education undertaken primarily to meet employer requirements to retain taxpayer's position?

If "yes," the taxpayer is entitled to deductions unless (1) the education leads to qualifying the taxpayer in his intended trade or business and taxpayer knew of this employer requirement before assuming his position with his employer, or (2) the employer's requirement is imposed primarily for the benefit of the taxpayer and not primarily for a bona fide business purpose.

If "no," is it customary for other established members of taxpayer's trade or business occupying positions similar to that of the taxpayer to undertake education of the type pursued by the taxpayer?

If "yes," the taxpayer is considered to have undertaken education for the purpose of maintaining or improving needed skills and is entitled to deductions.

If "no," the taxpayer must show by other means that his primary purpose was to maintain or improve needed skills. If the education undertaken meets express requirements for a new position or substantial advancement, the taxpayer must show that the education was not undertaken primarily for the purpose of meeting those requirements.

WHERE DEDUCTION IS REPORTED ON RETURN

The rules applicable to the deduction of business expenses in general apply to expenses for education which qualify as business expenses.

Under section 62 of the Code, expenses incurred by a self-employed taxpayer for education are deductible on page 1 of Form 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, in computing his adjusted gross income, if they meet the tests set forth above.

In the case of an employee, however, the nature of such expenses will determine whether they are deductible on page 1 or page 2 of Form 1040. An employee's traveling expenses (including the cost of meals and lodging) while away from home overnight, and transportation expenses (excluding the cost of meals and lodging) not involving overnight travel, incurred in pursuing educational activities, the expenses of which are deductible, may be claimed on page 1 of Form 1040 in computing adjusted gross income. An employee's expenses for tuition, books, laboratory fees, and similar items incurred in pursuing similar education activities are likewise deductible in computing his adjusted gross income to the extent his employer reimburses him for such expenses and provided he reflects the amount of such reimbursement in his gross income. See section 1.162-17 of the Income Tax Regulations relating to the reporting and substantiation of employees' expenses. His unreimbursed expenditures for such tuition, books, laboratory fees, and similar items are deductible on page 2 of the return, provided, of course, the standard deduction is not claimed and the optional tax table is not used.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

The following are the general rules for the deductibility of travel and transportation expenses: (1) Commuting from a taxpayer's place of abode to any business post situated within the area which constitutes his principal or regular business location constitutes a personal expense; (2) expenses of transportation incurred between business posts within the same area or incurred in daily round trips between the general area which constitutes his principal or regular business location and a minor or temporary post of duty situated beyond that general area are deductible; and (3) overnight traveling expenses (including the cost of meals and lodging) necessarily incurred while carrying on a business activity at a minor or temporary post of duty in a more distant location where it is reasonably or economically impractical to live at "home" constitute

deductible traveling expenses. Rev. Rul. 190, C.B. 1953-2, 303; Rev. Rel. 55-109, C.B. 1955-1, 261.

In determining the deductibility of traveling and transportation expenses incurred in connection with acquiring education at an educational institution, the taxpayer may select the institution which best serves his needs and he will not be denied a deduction solely because attendance at the institution of his choice resulted in greater expenditures than he would have made if he had attended another institution. This is true whether foreign or local universities are attended. A factual determination must be made as to whether the travel away from home was primarily to obtain education the expenses of which are deductible or whether the travel was primarily for personal reasons. See section 1.162-5(d) of the Income Tax Regulations. If the relative amount of time devoted to personal activities or some other factor suggests a trip is made primarily for personal purposes, the taxpayer must be able to show that, notwithstanding this fact, the travel was primarily to obtain the education.

A taxpayer undertaking education during an off-duty period or temporary leave of absence may deduct his expenses of travel, meals and lodging in addition to tuition costs, fees, cost of books, etc., if the expenses otherwise qualify for deduction and if there is a firm understanding or obligation that the taxpayer will return to his employment at the end of the off-duty period or the temporary leave of absence.

In this connection, anticipated or actual presence for more than a year at a particular location strongly tends to indicate "indefinite" as distinguished from "temporary" presence there. In the event a taxpayer undertakes education requiring absence from his duties and business post for an indefinite period, he will not be considered as traveling away from "home" so as to be entitled to deduct expenses incurred for travel, meals and lodging. However, tuition fees, costs of books, and other necessary items may be deductible, provided the education is of the type giving rise to deductions.

The following examples demonstrate the application of the rules contained in this Revenue ruling:

Example 1: A fifth-grade teacher has had 4 years of college study which for many years has been the minimum State requirement for a continuing certificate for such teachers. The State changes its requirements for such certificate. New fifth-grade teachers are required to have 5 years of college study when hired and fifth-grade teachers already employed are given 5 years within which to acquire the fifth year of college study. Fifth-grade teachers already employed who had previously met the requirements for a continuing certificate are entitled to deductions for expenses incurred in meeting the increased requirements.

Example 2: Mr. B is a teacher in the seventh grade of a school system organized on the 8-4 plan (8 years elementary and 4 years high school). He has a continuing elementary certificate. The system is reorganized to the 6-3-3 plan (6 years elementary, 3 years junior high, and 3 years senior high school). Mrs. B is to continue to teach seventh-grade pupils who will now be attending junior high school in the reorganized system, but he must obtain a secondary certificate. He must obtain additional courses to qualify for such certificate. Mr. B's expenses incurred in obtaining this additional education are deductible even though he obtains a different type of certificate, because he is merely meeting increased educational requirements imposed by his employer for the same position.

Example 3: Miss D, a first-grade teacher in school district X wishes to become a sixth-grade teacher in the same school district.

This school district requires all elementary school teachers to have a certain number of college credits and an elementary certificate. A sixth-grade teacher must have certain courses not required of a first-grade teacher. Miss D takes the three additional courses specifically required to qualify her as a sixth-grade teacher and is transferred. No new certificate is involved. Since Miss D has the same employer, her duties involve the same general type of work, and no new type of certificate is involved, she is entitled to deduct the cost of the additional courses.

Example 4: A taxpayer engaged in teaching second grade does not possess a degree but has a teacher's certificate which, under State law, is renewable indefinitely by periodic acquisition of a specified number of academic credits without progressing toward the attainment of another type of certificate. Such a certificate is a continuing certificate and indicates for purposes of this revenue ruling that the taxpayer has met the State's minimum requirements for qualification in his position. No further local requirements are imposed on the taxpayer. In addition to undertaking study required for renewal of his certificate, the taxpayer, primarily for maintaining or improving needed skills, pursues study which leads to a degree. The taxpayer is entitled to deduct the cost of the voluntary education—which leads to a degree—as well as that required to renew his certificate.

Example 5: A high school teacher of mathematics who has a continuing high school certificate is advised by his employer that he must transfer to fill a vacancy in the science department and that this transfer will necessitate his taking two specified courses in science. The teacher takes these two courses and receives another continuing high school certificate reflecting this fact (or his certificate is endorsed to show this fact). This case represents a change of duties in the same position and does not represent qualifying for a new position. Therefore, the expenses for the two courses are deductible. In the case of such a transfer at the request of the teacher, the expenses are, for the same reasons also deductible.

Example 6: School District A in State Y requires that seventh-grade teachers have at least a bachelor's degree. Miss S, with a bachelor's degree, is employed by this school district. She accepts employment as a seventh-grade teacher in the same State but in School District C which requires its seventh-grade teachers to have at least a master's degree. Miss S is given 2 years within which to acquire a master's degree. In undertaking the required education, Miss S is meeting minimum requirements for qualification in a new position. The expenses of such education are, accordingly, not deductible.

Example 7: A fourth-grade teacher in school district W undertakes education which maintains and improves his skills as a fourth-grade teacher and also meets the express educational requirements to qualify him as a principal in that school district. The education is not required as a condition to the retention of his salary, status or employment and is not of a type customarily undertaken by other established fourth-grade teachers. Since the education meets the express requirements for a new position, the taxpayer will be entitled to a deduction only if he can show that the education was undertaken primarily for the purpose of maintaining or improving skills required in his position and not primarily to secure the new position.

Example 8: A fifth-grade teacher holding a continuing certificate in State Y accepts employment as a fifth-grade teacher in State Z. State Z requires fifth-grade teachers to have a fifth year of college study in order to be eligible for a continuing certificate whereas State Y required only 4 years of college

study for such a certificate. Since the teacher has only 4 years of college study, she is given a certificate by State Z which is renewable annually for 5 years, at the end of which time she must be eligible for the continuing certificate. She undertakes a fifth year of college work. Expenses incurred in acquiring the education necessary for the continuing certificate in State Z are incurred in meeting the minimum requirements for qualification in a new position and are not deductible.

Example 9: Mr. G is employed as an instructor in a college where instructors and assistant professors are appointed annually or for a specified period not to exceed 3 years. A person is not permitted to be retained by the college at the rank of instructor for more than 5 years. An individual may continue as a faculty member without progressing beyond the rank of assistant professor. Mr. G undertakes education which will enable him to qualify as an assistant professor. The expenses of such education are incurred in meeting minimum requirements for establishment in his intended position and are, accordingly, not deductible.

Example 10: A trust officer in a bank undertakes to study law. The knowledge of the law will be helpful in discharging his duties. His employer does not require him to engage in such studies. He registers for the entire regular curriculum leading to a bachelor of laws degree. Since the taxpayer is pursuing a complete course of education in law which will lead toward qualifying him in that field, in which he has not previously qualified, his expenses for such education are considered to have been incurred for the purpose of qualifying in that new field and are, therefore, not deductible. Also, if the bank imposes upon the taxpayer, as a condition to the continued retention of his position with it, the requirement that he pursue a complete law course, the cost of such education is not deductible because the requirement is considered to be imposed primarily for the employee's benefit and not primarily for a bona fide business purpose of the employer.

Example 11: A teacher who lives in city R teaches school in city T. During the summer he undertakes in city R education the expenses of which qualify for deduction. The teacher regularly spends his summers at his residence and would be there regardless of whether he attends school. His expenditures for meals or lodging are not deductible because they constitute personal living expenses. His expenses incurred for transportation between his residence and the school attended are in the nature of commuting expenses and also are not deductible. Expenditures for tuition, books, fees, etc., are deductible as education expenses to the extent provided in the regulations.

in a time of nuclear advances, missiles, urban blight and automation it is by no means an anachronism to speak of ancient forests. Our remaining wilderness is becoming an increasingly important resource for America's expanding population.

The so-called wilderness bill, S. 1123, would help save America's remaining wilderness for future generations by placing under statutory protection a portion of this wilderness land.

As one deeply interested in broad conservation measures, I support this bill.

An editorial appearing recently in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph and other Hearst newspapers caught the spirit of the bill very well. Here, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the editorial which, in a few succinct paragraphs, states the need perhaps as Thoreau would have stated it were he to write again today:

THE WILDERNESS BILL

More than 100 years ago, Henry David Thoreau wrote from his sylvan sanctuary at Walden Pond: "I have my horizon bounded by woods * * * I have as it were my own sun and moon and stars, and a little world all to myself."

The unspoiled places were life itself to Thoreau, never ceasing to enchant him.

But America's wilderness areas began giving way to the Nation's explosive growth. Encroachment was inevitable, and it is fortunate that some of the untrammelled lands were spared, largely due to the vision of the men who founded the national park system.

The predatory lumberman has all but disappeared, replaced by a responsible breed dedicated to restorative planting and cutting. But the pressures are heavy to exploit, for various purposes, what few wild areas remain in our country.

They must be preserved soon, or be lost to us and the millions who are added to our population each year.

The wilderness bill, S. 1123, is before the Senate Committee on Interior Areas, supported by conservationists everywhere, as it has been in the past. It gives clear statutory protection from exploitation to 55 million acres (2.2 percent of the Nation's area), much of it already included in federally controlled lands.

This Congress should enact it as a work of statesmanship in behalf of future generations. There has been enough costly delay.

ing legislation relating to the deduction of expenditures for legislative purposes and in connection with measures submitted to the electorate.

One of the pending bills which is the subject of the reports is H.R. 7123 which I introduced. In view of the general interest in this subject and for the assistance of members who have inquired about it, I include at this point the press release and accompanying reports of the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce:

CHAIRMAN WILBUR D. MILLS, DEMOCRAT, OF ARKANSAS, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, RELEASES DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON PENDING LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE DEDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES AND IN CONNECTION WITH MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE ELECTORATE

Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, today released the report of the Treasury Department on H.R. 5193 (Mr. FORAND), H.R. 5251 (Mr. KING of California), H.R. 5579 (Mr. KARSTEN), and H.R. 6376 (Mr. PELL), identical bills which would amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) by providing that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions, and the reports of the Commerce and Treasury Departments on H.R. 7123 (Mr. Boggs), which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income. This legislation relates to deductions for so-called lobbying activities expenditures.

Chairman MILLS stated that due to the interest in this legislation, he deemed it advisable to release for the information of the public the comments of the Commerce and Treasury Departments on the legislation. He pointed out that the committee, due to the fact that its presently established agenda will run some time into the future, had not yet determined whether or when consideration will be given to this legislation.

The reports follow:

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 26, 1960.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to a request for the views of this Department on H.R. 5193, H.R. 5251, and H.R. 5579, identical bills, introduced by Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING, and Mr. KARSTEN, respectively, "To amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions."

1. EXPLANATION OF THE BILLS

The bills would amend section 162 of the 1954 Code relating to trade or business expenses to provide that an expenditure which otherwise qualifies as an ordinary and necessary business expense shall not be disallowed as a deduction because incurred in opposing or advocating measures duly submitted to an electorate upon any issue affecting the business of the taxpayer. Although phrased negatively, the bills would have the positive intent to allow such expenses as business deductions. The practical effect of the bills would be to reverse the recent holding of the Supreme Court in the Cammarano and Strauss cases that expenditures by businessmen aimed at defeating proposed initiative or referendum measures are

The Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, often in this Chamber we hear stressed the importance of preserving our heritage from an earlier America, that heritage or legacy which is composed of ideas as well as that part which is composed of more material things.

The remaining American wilderness is surely part of our physical legacy. Even

Treasury and Commerce Departments Reports on H.R. 7123

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include for the information of the interested public a press release which was issued by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, in which he released the departmental comments on pend-

not deductible. The bills contain no specific provision with respect to the effective date.

2. SIMILAR BILLS

H.R. 6376, introduced by Mr. Pelly, is an identical bill. Mr. Boggs has introduced H.R. 7123, a bill much broader in scope, which would permit the deduction of expenses lawfully incurred in supporting, opposing, or otherwise influencing legislation in a legislative body, or in any submission of proposed legislation to the voters.

3. PRESENT LAW AND ITS BACKGROUND

The established rule under present law is that ordinary and necessary business expenses are deductible unless they "frustrate sharply defined national or State policies." This doctrine was set forth in some detail by the Supreme Court in 1952 in *Lilly v. Commissioner* (343 U.S. 90), and has been reaffirmed by the Court several times within the past 2 years.

While there can be no question that the legislative process often directly affects both business and labor, the law is well settled that expenditures to influence legislation are not deductible under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense. For more than 40 years Treasury regulations have barred the deduction as a business expense of "sums of money expended for lobbying purposes, the promotion or defeat of legislation, the exploitation of propaganda, including advertising other than trade advertising * * *". The validity of these regulations has been sustained on many occasions by the Tax Court and the courts of appeals and by two decisions of the Supreme Court.

In 1941 in *Textile Mills Securities Corp. v. Commissioner* (314 U.S. 326), the so-called lobbying expense regulation was directly challenged in a case involving publicity activities designed to affect the passage of legislation. In upholding the regulation, the Supreme Court stated in *Textile Mills*:

"The words 'ordinary and necessary' are not so clear and unambiguous in their meaning and application as to leave no room for an interpretative regulation. * * * Nor has the administrative agency usurped the legislative function by carrying out this special group of expenses and making them nondeductible. We fail to find any indication that such a course contravened any congressional policy. Contracts to spread such insidious influences through legislative halls have long been condemned. *Trist v. Child* (21 Wall. 441, 22 L. Ed. 623); *Hazell v. Scheckels* (202 U.S. 71, 26 S. Ct. 567, 50 L. Ed. 939, 6 Ann. Cas. 217). Whether the precise arrangement here in question would violate the rule of those cases is not material. The point is that the general policy indicated by those cases need not be disregarded by the rule-making authority in its segregation of nondeductible expenses. There is no reason why, in absence of clear congressional action to the contrary, the rule-making authority cannot employ that general policy in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction. The exclusion of the latter from 'ordinary and necessary' expenses certainly does no violence to the statutory language. The general policy being clear it is not for us to say that the line was too strictly drawn."

Last year the regulatory provisions relating to the "promotion or defeat of legislation" were again before the Supreme Court in *Cammarano et al. v. United States*, and *F. Strauss & Sons, Inc. v. Commissioner* (358 U.S. 498). There the question was whether the regulations rendered nondeductible amounts paid by the taxpayers to organizations which expended them in extensive publicity programs designed to persuade the voters to cast their ballots against State initiative measures where passage of such measures

would have seriously affected or destroyed the taxpayers' businesses. In sustaining both the validity of the regulations and their applicability to the taxpayers' expenditures, the Supreme Court, referring to the repeated reenactment by Congress of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which underlie the regulations, stated "we think that the regulations have acquired the force of law." The Court went on to say:

"This is not a case where the Government seeks to cloak an interpretative regulation with immunity from judicial examination as to conformity with the statute on which it is based simply because Congress has for some period failed affirmatively to act to change the interpretation which the regulation gives to an otherwise unambiguous statute. Cf. *Jones v. Liberty Glass Co.* (332 U.S. 524). Nor is it a case where no reliable inference as to Congress' intent can be drawn from reenactment of a statute because of a conflict between administrative and judicial interpretation of the statute at the time of its reenactment. Cf. *Commissioner v. Glen-shaw Glass Co.* (348 U.S. 426, 431). Here we have unambiguous regulatory language, adopted by the Commissioner in the early days of Federal income tax legislation, in continuous existence since that time, and consistently construed and applied by the courts on many occasions to deny deduction of sums expended in efforts to persuade the electorate, even when a clear business motive for the expenditure has been demonstrated."

In its concluding remarks, the Supreme Court in the *Cammarano* case observed that the taxpayers "are simply being required to pay for those activities entirely out of their own pockets, as everyone else engaging in similar activities is required to do under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code."

It should be noted that the Treasury regulations which have been repeatedly applied by the courts forbid without qualification the deduction of all expenditures to influence legislation. This rule applied whether the expenditures may be characterized as "good" or "bad" and without regard to whether the activities involved relate to direct dealings with legislators or to publicity or grassroots pressure campaigns designed to create a climate of public opinion to influence the legislators. In *Cammarano*, for example, the Supreme Court said, "We cannot accept petitioner's argument that *Textile Mills* should be read as limiting [the regulatory] provisions to direct dealings with legislators, insidious or otherwise." Thus, under lobbying regulations expenditures for the following purposes have been disallowed: Legal fees incurred in connection with appearances before the House Ways and Means Committee, *Delaware Steeplechase and Race Association* (9 TCM 893 (1950)); the cost of assembling facts and arguments for presentation to the legislature, *Mary E. Beldengrath* (46 BTA 89); expenditures for publicity designed to influence the opinions of the general public in connection with legislation pending before Congress, *Textile Mills*, supra; expenses incurred for publicity in combating initiative measures, *Cammarano* and *Strauss*, supra.

4. REGULATIONS AND CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

In sustaining the lobbying expense regulations in *Textile Mills*, the Supreme Court found that the regulations contravened no congressional policy, and that they represented a valid exercise of rulemaking power because of well-established public policy. In reaffirming the validity of the regulations in *Cammarano* and *Strauss* the Supreme Court stated that the regulations themselves "constitute an expression of a sharply defined national policy * * *".

This policy, according to the Court, is that those engaging in political pressure activities to influence legislation "are * * * required to pay for those activities entirely out of

their own pockets * * *". Such a policy, the Court found, is "further evidenced by the treatment given by Congress to the tax status of organizations otherwise qualified for exemption as organized exclusively for 'religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes,' which engage in activities designed to promote or defeat legislation."

The conclusion of the Court as to the existence of an established congressional policy in the lobbying expense area is aptly summed up by the Court in the closing sentence of Justice Harlan's opinion in *Cammarano* and *Strauss* as follows: " * * * it [the regulation] appears to us to express a determination by Congress that since purchased publicity can influence the fate of legislation which will affect, directly or indirectly, all of the community, everyone in the community should stand on the same footing as regards its purchase so far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned."

5. NEW REGULATIONS

New lobbying expense regulations were promulgated by the Treasury on December 28, 1959.

The old regulations which were in effect for some 40 years and which have just been superseded, provide as follows:

"Sums of money expended for lobbying purposes, the promotion or defeat of legislation, the exploitation of propaganda, including advertising other than trade advertising, and contributions for campaign expenses, are not deductible from gross income."

The new regulations, which are somewhat more complete and definitive than the old regulations, are reproduced in the appendix to this report.

The new regulations, while in proposed form, were subjected to severe criticism by trade associations, labor unions, Congressmen, and others, with some objecting that the regulations were far too liberal from the standpoint of taxpayers, and others taking the position that they were both punitive and unfair to taxpayers. Essentially, the major objections voiced were:

(a) Lobbying activities, for which deduction is to be denied, should be limited to direct dealings with legislators, i.e., to that type of lobbying covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act;

(b) Expenses incurred in attempting to promote or defeat initiative and referendum proposals should be deductible;

(c) Expenses connected with the preparation and presentation of testimony before, or communications to, committees of Congress or other legislative bodies should not be treated as lobbying;

(d) Dues paid to trade associations, labor unions, and similar organizations should be deductible unless the primary purpose of the organization is influencing legislation; and

(e) The rules involving institutional advertising should be liberalized to permit the deduction of expenditures in this area without regard to whether the advertising is aimed at influencing legislation. In the alternative, the rules should be tightened to bar the deduction of expenditures for advertising which presents views on economic, financial, social or other subjects of a general nature which are of current public concern. Each of the above comments, while ostensibly directed to the new regulations, actually relates to the long-established rules in the lobbying expense area which have "acquired the force of law." It is believed that material changes in this area, which may well be appropriate, should be based on congressional action.

6. COMMENTS ON THE BILLS

(a) Taxpayers affected

The bills would potentially affect all corporate and unincorporated business income

taxpayers. Since initiative and referendum procedures of consequence to at least some business taxpayers occur every year, there would be a considerable but varying number of businesses to which the bills would extend additional income-tax deductions. Since these items have not been allowed in the past, there are no available data from income-tax returns on their frequency or amounts.

(b) Revenue effects

The revenue impact of legislation in this area depends on its scope. Legislation limited to initiatives and referendums may have immediately modest impact but could result in more far-reaching effect either by encouraging resort to such methods in light of more favorable tax treatment or as precedent for general legislation. General reversal of policy relating to the deductibility of legislative activities could result in considerable decreases in revenues, but estimates are necessarily tempered by difficult appraisal of the extent of hidden deductions in advertising, promotional, legal, and like expenditures which may incorporate lobbying activities. In the posture of existing law and generally broad accounting practices, the difficulties of isolating so-called lobbying activities from generally accepted business expenditures are formidable, not only from the point of view of generally acceptable principles of morality but also from the standpoint of efficient and uniform tax administration.

(c) Policy considerations

The bills to reverse the Cammarano and Strauss decisions (H.R. 5193, H.R. 5251, and H.R. 5579), as well as the broader measure (H.R. 7123) to permit the deduction of all lobbying expenses which are not illegal and which otherwise qualify as ordinary and necessary business expenses, raise this question: To what extent, if at all, should expenditures to influence legislation be deductible as a business expense?

With the growing impact of Government at all levels upon individuals and upon all segments of our society, businessmen, and organizations representing their interests, farm groups, labor organizations, and the like, have often found it necessary or desirable to make large expenditures for the purpose of influencing legislation. The proper treatment of such expenditures is important to the equity and fairness of the income tax. Their tax treatment in turn is relevant to sound governmental policy in a modern democracy.

With the needs of an informed public and legislature in mind, it is sometimes urged that lobbying of the direct and open variety should be encouraged. Moreover, it is held that if the public and legislatures know what interests are lending financial support to educational or propaganda campaigns, this in itself gives better perspective to users of such information and helps lobbying to serve its legitimate purposes. These considerations suggest that if legitimate lobbying expenditures are given status as tax deductions consideration should be given to making clear identification of the source of the expenditures a condition for their deductibility.

Your committee is aware, I am sure, of other problems of definition if an attempt is to be made to distinguish the good from the bad in the lobbying area. The limitation of the proposed deduction to expenses incurred in connection with initiatives and referendums would not in itself necessarily draw an appropriate line in this difficult area. Indeed, it may be contended that since publicity on initiative and referendum measures would, in large part, be directed to the voting public, it might tend to take the form of a one-sided presentation of the issues and make the presentation more deceptive than informative.

Such an approach would leave unresolved some of the most difficult and pressing questions in the whole area of lobbying expenses. It is not clear that there is greater justification for more liberal tax treatment of lobbying expenditures in the case of initiative and referendum procedures than in the case of other forms of expenses incurred in persuading the public and the legislatures. All accomplish basically the same ends and should presumably be governed by similar rules.

Particular attention has been given to expenses incurred in connection with direct appearances before legislative bodies. It has been argued persuasively that reasonable expenditures for this purpose not only provide invaluable assistance to the Congress and other legislatures but do not differ materially from those involved in presenting legal and economic arguments to courts or administrative agencies which are now ordinarily deductible. The American Bar Association, for example, has specifically recommended that an exception be made to the present lobbying expense rules in the area of appearances before legislative bodies, such as your committee. The proposed bills dealing only with referendum and initiative measures would do nothing about this type of expenditure, which has high priority in any reexamination of the treatment of lobbying expenses.

In modifying the present lobbying expense rule, a basic question is raised whether the allowance of deductions in this area would create an unequal situation as between different types of taxpayers or as between business taxpayers and other members of the public. It is frequently said that the present blanket nondeductibility of lobbying expenses is meritorious because it treats all citizens and pressure groups alike when they attempt to influence legislation. Under the existing rule, all such expenses must be paid out of after-tax income.

On the other hand, many assert that the theory that there now exists a uniform rule denying deductions for all persons and interested groups breaks down in practice because of special tax provisions applicable to certain organizations which in many cases are able to carry on lobbying activities free of possible tax considerations. Fully taxable entities point out that they are at a distinct disadvantage as compared with such organizations.¹

Liberalizing legislation in the lobbying expense area should not be adopted without careful consideration of the need for proper safeguards. Such safeguards are not automatically provided by merely limiting the deduction to initiative or referendum measures. Safeguards which the Congress might want to consider would include definitions of the type of expenditures which would be deductible, possible limitation on the amount of the deduction based on the taxpayer's income or other appropriate standard, and possible requirements as to disclosure.

(d) Administrative aspects

Legislative reappraisal of the present law and the proposed legislation will necessarily take account both of the practical admin-

istrative problems which now exist in this area as well as those which might develop under the proposed modification. Present law, particularly as it relates to the dues paid to trade associations, institutional advertising, and the grass roots type of lobbying expenditure, is difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to administer. It is difficult, if not impossible, for the Internal Revenue Service, with its present manpower, to censor or monitor lobbying of the advertising or grass roots variety. Indeed, it has been the general position of the Internal Revenue Service that it is not only impracticable but undesirable to attempt to substitute the judgment of the tax collector for that of the businessman in determining the character of the advertising appropriate for the business as long as it may reasonably be expected to increase the patronage of the business.

It is only realistic to recognize that many of the expenditures in these areas which have passed the permissible borderline under the existing regulations have doubtless escaped detection in the audit of tax returns. Unless the Internal Revenue Service were to devote disproportionate manpower from its basic collection function to policing this difficult and controversial area, it would seem that uniform enforcement would be an unattainable goal. If there were to be a modification or relaxation of the existing rules, therefore, it would appear to be a desirable objective that it should help reduce rather than aggravate the practical administrative problems which are inherent in this area, and at the same time reduce to a minimum whatever inequalities among some taxpayers result from unavoidable imperfections in the administration of the law.

The specific bills, H.R. 5193, H.R. 5251, and H.R. 5579, would, if enacted in their present form, create definite administrative problems. A question immediately arises as to when a measure is "duly submitted to an electorate." Are expenses incurred prior to submission of the measure to the electorate to be considered nondeductible? Does the reference to measures "submitted to the electorate" limit the proposal to initiative or referendum measures submitted directly to the people on State or Federal ballots, or would it embrace still other procedures or campaigns? Until such questions were fully resolved, either by a statutory redefinition or judicial clarification, it would seem that the proposed legislation would result in a new range of administrative problems and controversies.

7. POSITION OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The proposed legislation and the broader question to which it is addressed merit consideration by your committee. Existing law as developed has frozen concepts relating to expenditures in the area of legislative process which are quite distinct from generally accepted attitudes in regard to expenditures related to fields of administrative and judicial processes. It appears to many anomalous that no expenditures involving legislation, without regard to their character, are deductible, while similar activities before administrative and judicial bodies are clearly deductible if they otherwise constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses.

The present rules have created problems of enforcement since it is difficult to police advertising campaigns and expenditures by unions or trade associations in an effort to identify degrees of attempts to influence legislation and, with respect to taxpayers generally, it is difficult to make certain that expenditures definitely in the lobbying area are not in fact deducted in the guise of legal expenses, advertising, or the like.

Alternative proposals seeking to deal with this problem have been advanced by responsible business and professional organizations.

¹ Such organizations either enjoy special treatment under the tax law which results in little or no tax liability or are exempt or partially exempt from taxation under sec. 501(c) and other sections of the code, not including sec. 501(c)(3). Sec. 501(c)(3) deals with charitable, religious, and educational organizations and contains an express requirement for exempt status that no substantial part of the activities is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. Lobbying activities do not ordinarily affect the status of other exempt organizations but may affect the deductibility of members' dues.

The proposed legislation in H.R. 5193, H.R. 5251, and H.R. 5579 deals with initiatives and referendums. H.R. 7123 would permit the deduction of "expenses lawfully incurred in supporting or opposing or otherwise influencing legislation in the Congress or in a State legislature or in the legislative body of a county or other local governmental agency or in any submission of proposed legislation to the voters."

The American Bar Association recommended in the general revenue revision hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means in February of 1958 that reasonable expenses incurred by a taxpayer in connection with appearances before, or submission of statements to, the committees of Congress or of any legislative body of a State, a territory, or a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, shall be deductible from gross income if the expenditures for such purposes otherwise qualify as deductions under either section 162 or section 212.

A reasonable approach which should not lend itself to abuse would be the allowance of deduction of reasonable expenses directly connected with appearances and submissions at public hearing before committees of Congress or of any other comparable legislative body if such expenses otherwise satisfy the requirements of deductibility in the code. Broader legislation may well be indicated but should be examined in light of the policy considerations outlined in this report and in the light of possible need for safeguards or limitations. The Treasury recommends early consideration by the Congress of the various proposals designed to modify the bar to deductibility of expenditures in connection with the legislative process.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. SCRIBNER, JR.,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

APPENDIX

(Regulations under sec. 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to lobbying expenditures)

"(c)(1) Expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes (including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office), or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) related to any of the foregoing purposes are not deductible from gross income. For example, the cost of advertising to promote or defeat legislation or to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation is not deductible as a business expense, even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business. On the other hand, expenditures for institutional or goodwill advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public are generally deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses provided the expenditures are related to the patronage the taxpayer might reasonably expect in the future. For example, a deduction will ordinarily be allowed for the cost of advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public in connection with encouraging contributions to such organizations as the Red Cross, the purchase of U.S. savings bonds, or participation in similar causes. In like fashion, expenditures for advertising which present views on economic, financial, social, or other subjects of a general nature but which do not involve any of the activities specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph are deductible if they otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162.

"(2) Dues and other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, which otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162, are deductible in full unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consists of one or more of those specified in the first sentence of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. If a substantial part of the activities of the organization consists of one or more of those so specified, deduction will be allowed only for such portion of such dues and other payments as the taxpayer can clearly establish is attributable to activities other than those so specified. The determination as to whether such specified activities constitute a substantial part of an organization's activities shall be based on all the facts and circumstances. In no event shall special assessments or similar payments (including an increase in dues) made to any organization for any such specified purposes be deductible.

"(3) Expenditures for the promotion or the defeat of legislation include, but shall not be limited to, expenditures for the purpose of attempting to—

"(i) Influence members of a legislative body directly or indirectly, by urging or encouraging the public to contact such members for the purpose of proposing, supporting, or opposing legislation, or

"(ii) Influence the public to approve or reject a measure in a referendum, initiative, vote on a constitutional amendment, or similar procedure."

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1960.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 1, 1960, with respect to H.R. 7123, a bill "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income."

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of this legislation or enactment of legislation which would accomplish the same general objectives.

For many years the Treasury Department has disallowed deductions from gross income of expenditures made for the purpose of influencing legislation. This rule was first upheld by the Supreme Court in *Textile Mills v. Commissioner* (314 U.S. 326 (1941)). Early last year the Supreme Court again considered the question in *Cammarano v. United States* (358 U.S. 489 (1959)), and again upheld the Treasury Department position. In *Cammarano* the Court relied on the continuous existence of the rule over a 40-year period, its consistent construction and application by the courts to attempts to persuade the electorate, and repeated reenactment by Congress of the statutory section which the regulation interpreted.

The provision of the Internal Revenue Code involved (sec. 162) states that there shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business. As illustrations of deductible items the section lists compensation for personal services, traveling expenses and rental payments. The Treasury Department has amplified deductible and nondeductible items in detailed regulations.

On September 19, 1959, the Treasury Department published a notice of proposed rule-making dealing with so-called lobbying expenditures. These proposed rules were considered during public hearings held in November and became effective in the latter part of 1959 (24 F.R. 10901, Dec. 29, 1959). The newly issued regulation (sec. 1.162-15(c)

(1)) provides that expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes, or for carrying on propaganda related to any of the foregoing are not deductible from gross income. The regulation further provides that dues or other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, are deductible unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consist of one or more of those for which deductions from gross income are not allowed. In passing, it might be noted that the term "a substantial part" creates serious problems of interpretation.

Considerable concern has been expressed, both at the November hearings and since promulgation of the new regulation, by businessmen, labor organizations and trade associations over its possible impairment of necessary, useful and legitimate expressions of opinion. It appears to be completely unrealistic, for example, to disallow under the statutory "ordinary and necessary" test expenditures by a business enterprise whose very existence may be threatened by the passage of a proposed bill.

Legislative bodies need openly expressed opinions in order to properly carry out their functions. Frequently these expressions are made by the business community at the request of legislatures.

It is our view that lawful expenditures by business enterprises to support or oppose legislation at all levels of government, when involving the interests of their particular businesses, should be deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses. The impact of government has become so pervasive that businessmen and the organizations which represent their interests often find it necessary to convey to legislative bodies and to the public their views regarding existing or proposed legislation. Freedom of expression is an essential element of a free economy.

It appears that a realistic solution to the problem will be found only in appropriate legislative changes. We feel that the sound policy would be to permit full deduction for all lawful expenditures that are related to the business of the taxpayer. H.R. 7123 is designed to accomplish this objective and we favor its enactment or the enactment of similar remedial legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hudson County Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

MR. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House an editorial which appeared in the *Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J.*, March 15, 1960. It cites the recognition by the President of the United States of the great work that has been accomplished with our youth by William Flanagan, the sheriff of Hudson County, N.J.

Sheriff Flanagan is a modest gentleman of exceptional ability who has brought a new dimension into preparing our youth to meet tomorrow's challenges

of citizenship. In Hudson County, the initials J.D. do not stand for juvenile delinquency, they stand for junior deputy.

Sheriff Flanagan has emphasized the meaning of law and order through good citizenship upon thousands of our county's youth who he has sworn in as a junior deputy. I believe it to be of immense interest to the rest of our country.

I add my congratulations and join with President Eisenhower in recommending this type of approach to the White House Conference on Children and Youth. We can make no better investment in our future than that of creating an awareness of citizenship and patriotism in our youth. For they are the real answer to the challenge of communism in the days to come. I congratulate Sheriff Flanagan for bringing great honor to our State and commend President Eisenhower for wanting the country to hear more about the junior deputy program through his White House Conference on Children and Youth.

I am including the aforementioned editorial as part of my remarks:

HUDSON RECOGNIZED

Hudson County's preventive fight against juvenile delinquency is beginning to win national attention. President Eisenhower has invited Sheriff William Flanagan to participate in the annual White House Conference on Children and Youth.

To Flanagan, the initials J.D. stand for "junior deputy," not juvenile delinquency.

The junior deputy program consists of inviting Hudson County boys and girls to the administration building and courthouse, instructing them on the dangers of handling weapons, giving them tips on detection of criminals, showing them the routine a criminal goes through and what jail is like compared to the youngster's home. Then they are inducted as junior deputy sheriffs. The program is a continuous one in that each of the youngsters is put on the mailing list for the junior deputy, the publication which continually reminds them of their status and responsibilities as young citizens.

This program and the equally worthy ones sponsored by churches, Scouts, Y's and boys clubs, are preventive: They do not wait for juvenile delinquency to occur and then try to root it out; rather, they offer activities and ideas which healthfully fill a youngster's life. It is the absence of such things that creates a vacuum filled by juvenile delinquency.

Hudson County has had notable success with these programs. Maybe Sheriff Flanagan's participation in the White House Conference will help to spread their use to other communities.

One Million Philadelphians Sign Petitions Delivered to Speaker Rayburn Urging Tighter Laws Against Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mrs. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my personal appreciation for your graciousness and encouragement in the drive against pornogra-

phy demonstrated on Tuesday of this week when you accepted and commented so forcefully upon petitions signed by 1 million Philadelphians directed against pornography in the mails and in other means of communication.

Under the sponsorship of the Catholic War Veterans of Philadelphia County, these petitions were devised to enlist widespread support for legislation already passed by the House to deal with the scourge of pornography.

YOUNGSTERS PRESENT PETITIONS TO SPEAKER

Miss Rosemary Hess, 13, of 8042 Elberon Avenue, and Daniel O'Leary, 14, of Darby, who helped in having the petitions signed in a door-to-door canvass, made impressive talks in presenting the petitions to the Speaker. They did beautifully in stating the reasons to Speaker RAYBURN for a youth's concern over this problem.

Miss Hess stated:

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to deliver these petitions to you and to ask you to do all in your power to help abolish the immoral and obscene motion pictures, photographs, and magazines which are crowding the newsstands of our country today.

It is discouraging to see the many teenagers who purchase just this type of literature which contributes so much to the high rate of crime and juvenile delinquency in our country today.

In behalf of the citizens of the United States, and especially in the best interest of my fellow teenagers, I ask that you do all that you can to promote a bill that would curtail the obscene literature and indecent motion pictures. I am confident that this is the only way to remedy this evil and thus make better citizens of today's youth.

Daniel O'Leary then stated:

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged as a youth to present to you and this august body of adult lawmakers these petitions signed by the adults of eastern Pennsylvania, numbering 1 million signatures collected by the boys of the seventh and eighth grades of the parochial schools of the archdiocese of Philadelphia.

We call on you, our adult representatives, this day to pass into law legislation that will prohibit the sale and the distribution of all indecent and immoral literature, magazines, photographs, and any other form of pornographic material that will tend to corrupt the morals of our generation and the generations who will follow us.

We respectfully remind you of your responsibility not only to the present voting citizen but to us the future citizens and possible defenders of this great Nation of ours.

We point out to you a most important fact: In the past our Armed Forces comprised men and women who were physically and morally fit to defend our land. How can we, or those to follow us, be expected to defend this land if you, our adults, permit the youthful minds to be subjected to such a vile menace that will eventually destroy us physically and morally?

Gentlemen, there is nothing more important to America than the protection of its youth. Please make this demand for strong legislation your chief concern. Thank you, and may God enlighten your minds to the danger facing our youth.

ARTICLE BY NICHOLAS GREGORY IN
PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. Speaker, excellent news report on the presentation of the petitions was written for the Philadelphia Inquirer of

Wednesday, March 16, by Washington Correspondent Nicholas P. Gregory which I submit at this point for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CATHOLIC WAR VETS ENLIST RAYBURN IN BATTLE ON MAIL FILTH

(By Nicholas P. Gregory)

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN pledged his support Tuesday in Washington to the Catholic War Veterans of Philadelphia County in their drive to ban salacious material from the mails.

RAYBURN spoke in a ceremony in his office off the House floor at which the Philadelphia veterans and Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH, Democrat, Pennsylvania, showed the Texan two small truckloads of 1 million signatures gathered by Catholic schoolchildren in Philadelphia protesting filth that moves through the mails.

"We want the youth of the country to read clean literature," he said in the televised ceremony. "I want to congratulate the supporters of this drive and their efforts."

BILL FAILS IN SENATE

"We must do everything to help Mrs. GRANAHAH stop the flow of filth," he said.

Rosemary Hess, 13, of 8042 Elberon Avenue, and Daniel O'Leary, 14, of Darby, who helped get the signatures, both urged the Speaker to back legislation for stiffer postal laws to bar salacious materials from the mails.

It is now estimated that distributors of obscene motion pictures, books, and comics are doing \$500 million in business yearly. A bill offered by Mrs. GRANAHAH to strengthen the postal laws was approved by the House last year, but failed to get approval in the Senate.

The veterans and other Catholics in the archdiocese of Philadelphia participated with the seventh and eighth grade students in the signature drive.

ACTION ON BILL DUE

The veterans were led by Francis Lamlein, of 123 Fern Street, Darby, adjutant. Others were Jerry Clauss, of 113 Stanwood Street, and William Sheridan, of 7108 Greenwood Avenue, Upper Darby.

The Reverend William C. Strahan, pastor of the church of the Blessed Sacrament, spiritual adviser to the 9,000 Catholic veterans in the Philadelphia archdiocese, was also present.

A drive to pass the Granahan bill is expected to get underway after the civil rights legislation is adopted. Hearings on the measure have been held. Objections raised by some Senators regarding the possibility of censorship sidetracked the Granahan bill.

An Old Hand's Views on Latin American Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a letter from a constituent who in recent years has served abroad both in Europe and Latin America with the ICA. I am reliably informed that this man made major contributions to America's foreign-aid program during his service, and I know that he has unusual insight into the problems faced by

the people of the underdeveloped countries.

His perceptive letter contains many frank comments regarding our aid program, and singles out some of the serious shortcomings in present foreign-aid programs. For obvious reasons, I have withheld the name of my constituent. His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: You may be interested in my opinions regarding the Latin American portion of America's foreign aid program. The way things are going distresses me.

To understand this one must have lived down there, and have lived close to not only the whites or blancos, but also the mestizos and the Indians. He should know something of historical Spanish land policy, and something of the philosophy of people generally in power in these countries.

In the Spanish New World the conquistador came and conquered, and the Spanish court gave great areas of land to them and to friends of the court. The Indians were enslaved. In some areas, virtual slavery still exists—as in the *colono* system in Peru.

The Spanish system developed a landed gentry at the top and a slave or peon group at the bottom, with little or no middle class. In contrast, our own system of homestead laws developed a great middle class of farmers operating their own lands—a middle class wherein lies much of the strength of America.

The Latin American peons, often hungry and sick and illiterate, want food for themselves and their families, better health, and education for their children. They are ready to follow the leader who promises a better deal.

Their aspirations have been opposed in many cases by dictators quite well supplied with American arms furnished in the name of hemispheric defense. In those cases where these peons rise up and win, after seeing many of their people killed by weapons from this country, they have a reason to hate us.

We are reaping the harvest of providing arms to these nations. I heard a wise old South American hand say one night, after the revolution of April 9 in Bolivia, something like this:

"We make a great mistake when we send modern arms to these people. They could fight revolutions with sticks and stones and bows and arrows, and accomplish the same results with a lot fewer casualties."

I have no doubt but what there are organized Communists in every country of Latin America. Communists thrive on disorder, and they sell their theory best to illiterate people who are cold and hungry and sick and uneducated. They attach themselves to such revolutions and if the revolution is successful they try to get positions where they can influence policy.

In Bolivia the party that won the revolution was the MNR, or Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario. It was made up, to a certain extent, of minor splinter parties. One of these was the PIR, or Partido Izquierda Revolucionario. I think that the Communists actually made up a small part of this minor splinter party.

I recently read that there were 600,000 rural families in Cuba, of which only a few thousand over 100,000 had land. Many of those landless people are struggling for just a little interest in Cuba, and they are following Castro. We should not forget that they are where they are because of the original Spanish land policy that I have mentioned.

Castro has moved too fast with land reform. Wise policy would have dictated that he appoint a land reform commission, and that the commission study the land reform decrees of Guatemala, Bolivia, Mexico, and other countries. That would have given

everyone a breathing spell and certainly would have strengthened Castro's hand.

Such revolutions as the Bolivian revolution, or the Castro revolution, originate among the exilados, or people of the other side exiled by the government in power. If we had been on the ball we would have had people who had worked themselves into positions of trust when these revolutionary groups were perfecting their organization and plans. Such might be called an extra-curricular Embassy activity, or perhaps it is something for CIA to handle in cooperation with the Department of State. It wouldn't be hard to do.

In Cuba we have a situation where our Ambassador can't even get an appointment with Castro. If it had been handled right—if we had propped up the roof before it fell on us, we would have people that could talk to Castro, and perhaps give him some of the facts of life.

I wasn't there, of course, but I can wager that practically 100 percent of the Cubans who were invited to American Embassy parties before the flight of Batista are now exiles, in jail, or expecting to be put in jail almost any minute. If we are to build a cooperative spirit of mutual friendliness and relationship now I would ask—with whom do we start?

I have mentioned that the *colono* system, where Indians still give 3 free days work a week to the landlord, still exists in the highlands of Peru. Those colonos have struck, and the strikes have been put down by the military. Sometime, and not in the too distant future, a leader, perhaps a Castro, will unite the peons of the coast, the poor of the cities, and the colonos of the highlands, and overthrow the Peruvian Government.

When that comes, will we have established friendly contacts among the leadership of the revolutionary movement—contacts which may help to direct the new movement in the direction of these principles of democracy which we hold so dear? Or will our then Ambassador find it impossible to even get an appointment with the new leadership?

We should be doing a lot of thinking about this.

President Eisenhower has asked for around \$4 billion in foreign aid. I, of course, am no specialist in military aid, and no doubt quite a large part of this sum is necessary. But I do say that military aid is not necessary, in my judgment, any place in Latin America.

Certain amounts of economic aid are necessary as a step to military objectives. I don't know just where such funds can be best used, but I do know that such aid to Latin American countries should require careful accounting and a sense of responsibility on the part of their governments.

I would expand technical aid, and staff it with dedicated men and women willing to go out into the country and help people to help themselves. I want to emphasize that—help people to help themselves. If a technician can't or won't do that kind of a job he or she should be eliminated. I would, if you please, have a staff of "ugly Americans" in the field. And I would replace cocktail diplomacy with grassroots diplomacy.

If you read the "Ugly American" you remember that he got out into the villages and met the folks, and he learned their language. He looked about for a simple problem that concerned most people, and he found it. Their staff of life was rice, and during the dry season it suffered from drought even though next to most plantings were waterways. He found that most people had bicycles, and he developed a frame to hold the bicycle, from which was removed the back tire. He then developed a simple pump driven by belt with manpower sitting on the bicycle, powering a pump which irri-

gated the rice and carried it through the droughty period.

The ugly American started with the bicycle which almost everyone had. The USOM Bolivia started with a paid American engineering firm which as I recall received \$10,000 for their report.

The ugly American helped a native mechanic develop a little factory to make the bicycle-driven pumps. When the Bolivian project was curtailed after partial completion, roughly \$400,000 worth of pumps, generators, and other machinery and equipment was on hand, some of it installed in concrete. One piece of heavy equipment, valued at over \$47,000, had been idle for several years. Other equipment was missing.

Isn't there something we can learn from this comparison?

Through technical aid I saw little farmers grow enough food so they and their families could have a breakfast instead of half a breakfast. I saw illiterate people with their own hands build schools at practically no cost other than their labor, and I saw a small technical aid group helping in the training of hundreds of teachers to go out and teach in those schools. And I saw clinics with personnel in part trained by doctors, sanitarians, and nurses of our mission ministering to people who otherwise would have had no medical attention whatsoever.

Such technical aid must at times be strengthened with economic aid. It does little good to demonstrate to a farmer how to use DDT to kill thrip on his onions, if he cannot go into the market and buy DDT and put into practice that which he has learned. Such products may be imported, duty free by agreement, and sold at a price something below cost. We can hope, as demand is built, that private capital will cause to be built factories which will manufacture the product on a basis of local labor and other costs.

Such programs can reach not hundreds or thousands but hundreds of thousands and even millions of people. If we do our job well, when these people strike aside their feudal lords or dictators, the people with whom we have worked will remember us as friends, and it will take a lot of fast talk by Communists to make them believe that we are Yanqui Imperialists intent on sacking their country of its riches.

We can even hope that when that change comes they will turn our way in the great struggle between communism and freedom.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld.)

The Puerto Rican People Censure President Eisenhower for Mixing in Local Politics—Pablo Casals Says Victory of the Democratic Party Is in the Interest of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Puerto Rican Senate has joined the House of Representatives in a resolution censuring President Eisenhower for his expression of support for the Republican candidate for Governor of Puerto Rico.

The freedom-loving people of Puerto Rico are deeply interested in democracy

and have consistently set an example which has given encouragement to all of the peoples of the Americas and of the world.

Pablo Casals, writing in the letters column of the New York Times, says truly that "the free peoples of the world, and those who aspire for freedom, have pinned their hopes on the victory of the Democratic Party of the United States. For that victory will strengthen world confidence in the expectation that there shall be no more vacillations and delays in the attainment of peace supported upon the immovable pillars of liberty and the solidarity of man."

I include as part of my remarks an article from the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 18, 1960:

PUERTO RICO SENATE JOINS SLAP AT IKE

SAN JUAN, March 17.—The Puerto Rican Senate today joined the House of Representatives in a resolution censuring President Eisenhower's expression of support for the Republican candidate for Governor of the Island Commonwealth.

The senate voted 18 to 9 in favor of the resolution after a 16½-hour debate. The house adopted the resolution 47 to 17 yesterday. Both houses are dominated by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín's Popular Democratic Party, which are independent of the mainland Democrats.

Mr. Eisenhower on his way back from his South American tour took Luis Ferré, the island's Republican leader, to Washington with him.

White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty predicted at the time that Mr. Eisenhower would back Ferré against Muñoz-Marín in the November election.

Ferré advocates statehood for Puerto Rico, a hot local issue. Muñoz-Marín contends the island should remain a Commonwealth.

A Message to Government Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the following was addressed to me by Mary Smith, a fine citizen and distinguished lawyer, residing at Rexburg, Idaho.

It relates my successful efforts on behalf of the dependents of an American serviceman stationed abroad.

I join with the author of the letter in the sincere hope that the message it contains will reach a substantial number of those people in the Government who are in close daily contact with our citizens, and whose only reason for being in the Government is to serve our citizens, in order that the welfare of the individual citizen of this great country may always be paramount.

The letter follows:

REXBURG, IDAHO, March 16, 1960.

HON. HAMER BUDGE,
Congressman from Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAMER: You made Faye Hendricks Gilman and her family so happy that they cried for joy, and I mean real tears. She called me from Hill Field and said that they

had arranged to have her attended by a lady and three men who devoted almost their entire time in her behalf to see that she got off on the plane. At Travis Air Force Base she received the same consideration. Her mother also called me and was crying for joy.

I know, HAMER, that you appreciate the whole situation and you appreciate, too, that the redtape of our Government and the inefficiency and inhumanity is causing the people to lose confidence in their own Government. Imagine, this man serving his country in Japan and having the trouble that we have had to get his family to him. Where do you think Americans would be if we didn't have a Congressman like you to plead for us?

I wish you could get it over to some of the bureaus in some fashion that they are destroying America and the respect the people should have for their country through not using some commonsense. This isn't the only case where you have had to intervene and get some commonsense. These bureaus think they are the Government and you have to approach them on bended knees before they will speak to you unless you have a Congressman or Senator to back you up. If they put some of these bureaucrats over in Japan like this boy, serving their country, maybe they would be a little more human.

I do appreciate the work that you are doing as our Congressman. The people should return you and keep you in Congress as long as you live. You have demonstrated you have not lost the common touch and the human feelings of our people. It must be a pleasure for you to look back on the many acts that you have performed to protect the people against destruction by their own Government.

I am sending an extra copy of this letter and you might send it to the proper branch of the Government. I would also suggest that it be published in the Record. If it is published in the Record there may be someone in the bureaus who is human enough to read it. I am sounding the warning and unless it is heeded, this dictatorship of bureaus will destroy our country. If you do put it in the Record, I would appreciate it if you would let me have a copy.

I would be happy to circulate your petition again this year.

Best regards.

MARY SMITH.

Edward J. Cassell Recipient of National Good Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that Mr. Edward J. Cassell, of Glen Burnie, Md., has received a National Good Citizenship Award from the National Association of Food Chains for his outstanding record of service to his community, which is described in the following manner by Food Fair Stores, Inc.:

Edward J. Cassell, 106 South Meadow Drive, Glen Burnie, Md., has won a National Good Citizenship Award from the National Association of Food Chains for his outstanding record of service to his community.

Mr. Cassell, manager of the Food Fair supermarket in the Harundale Mall, Glen Burnie, Md., is one of seven national winners, and the only winner from the State of Maryland. The winners were selected from among 6,000 supermarket managers, who took part in the nationwide competition.

A look at some of Mr. Cassell's activities will give an indication as to why he won the national award.

He takes an active and sincere interest in the activities of his church; has instituted measures and supported others to alleviate traffic and parking problems; has assisted local police in providing emergency assistance (food, etc.) for the needy of the area; is active in numerous charity drives, civil defense, parent-teachers' groups, Boy Scouts, and little leagues. He is an honorary citizen of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town, an honor awarded him for his work in fund raising.

While the civic work for which Mr. Cassell is being honored includes a wide range of organizations and activities, he feels the most gratifying are his efforts on behalf of the young people of his community. He has been a leader in the Marley Area Little League since its inception in 1956, not only obtaining the sponsorship of his own company for a team, but assisting in selling the idea to other businesses. His supermarket is used as a classroom for many youth groups and he is known for his willingness to make store display space available to worthy charity organizations.

As the father of four children, Mr. Cassell firmly believes that "providing normal healthy outlets for youthful energy is one of the most effective deterrents to juvenile delinquency."

Mr. Cassell will receive his award at a special banquet in Washington on March 21. Plans already are underway in Glen Burnie for community recognition following the award presentation.

Nationwide Renown for Independent Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my rare privilege to have in my district an independent daily newspaper, the Chicago Daily Calumet, which is unique in two ways. First, it is the only daily community newspaper in the country, and second, it is gaining nationwide renown for the vigor of its editorial policy.

I would like to submit for the RECORD two recent editorials, which follow:

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet, Mar. 9, 1960]

FAT-HEADED EGGSHEADS

We commend the East Side Lions Club and many other local individuals and groups who have rallied against the attempt by eggheaded Congressmen to repeal the Connally reservation that gives the United States the final say-so on jurisdiction of the World Court.

Led by Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota's screwball candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, this faction of fatheaded eggheads would turn over to the Communist world the power to handle domestic cases of the United States.

The only apparent reason given for this obvious sell-out of America's sovereignty by

our State Department is that "there is no difference between domestic and foreign affairs."

Unless the people of the Midwest who have their feet on the ground and their heads on their shoulders make themselves heard in our Nation's Capital, there's a strong chance the liberal international set will succeed in selling out our Nation.

We strongly recommend our readers and civic groups to join the fight to retain the Connally reservation. Letters of protest against its repeal should be addressed to your Congressmen in Washington.

Remember, this is not a political issue. The fact is that the Communist bloc dominates the World Court. Yet no Communist nation is willing to jeopardize its national sovereignty by giving the Court jurisdiction over its internal affairs. Only we are stupid enough to make this mistake—and make it we will unless the people rise up and prevent it.

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet, Mar. 12, 1960]

— IDEOLOGICAL WARFARE

Many persons in this country fear the destruction that world war III will bring. Falling bombs, guided missiles from Russia and her satellites, and radiation fallout are easy for them to comprehend. And while these people clamor for our officials to speed up our war program, the enemy is outsmarting us and is not using the weapons we expect him to use.

Instead he is using the most deadly tool of all to defeat us. He is waging an ideological war against us. The Communists don't intend to destroy our civilization and our wealth unless they have to. So far, they feel they are doing all right without sending atom bombs to blast us.

It is the spirit of God-fearing men they would first try to undermine and destroy. A nation without the will or moral fiber—the deep spiritual fortitude to stand firmly in defense of what is right—is doomed to see its freedoms lost.

The Communists know that without the spirit there is no will. The corrupt man is a defenseless man whom the enemy knows how to corrupt, how to poison, and how to defile. He has done it to 900 million already. The Communists know that we Americans will resist violence with violence. That is why they are so busy fighting an ideological war.

The Communist ideology stems from a conviction that wrong is right and that hate is stronger than love. It is a code that condones treachery, terror, immorality, cruelty, and untruth as legitimate means to an illegitimate end.

You can only fight an ideology with another ideology. The only ideology diametrically opposed to communism, whose effectiveness is so strongly feared by the Communists is moral rearmament.

MRA (moral rearmament) is rooted in the conviction that absolute honesty, morality, unselfishness, and love are the eternal verities. MRA rejects all compromise with evil. MRA believes that God's pattern for the perfect life cannot be distorted or destroyed if men will be guided by God's will. This is the ideology of MRA.

At Mackinac Island, Mich., a group of dedicated men from many countries of the world are building a program and strategy to combat communism with their ideology. Let us hope and pray that the millions of men and dollars needed will find their way to MRA to make the battle successful.

Needed Continuation of Air Service Between the Pacific Northwest and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the progressive State of Washington, as befits a growing community and one mindful of its tourism potentialities, is concerning itself with attracting more frequent visits of Hawaiians to its shores. It has long been recognized that the Hawaiian Islands are a vacation mecca to the would-be traveler and each year thousands leave the Northwest for the beautiful sun-drenched Pacific Isles. Hawaii does not hold priority on beauty however, and many an islander has expressed a desire to see the rugged mountain grandeur, the lush green forests, along with the sweeping grainfields and powerful rivers, of the diverse Northwest. Those who have seen it have been delighted and it is our wish to open further the gates of welcome to our island neighbors so that many, many more may visit us to enjoy our friendship and hospitality.

It seems incongruous then, that at the exact time when we are striving hardest to strengthen our bond with these island neighbors and stimulate travel which will familiarize these people with our bountiful land, a CAB examiner should recommend that one of the two airlines operating between Hawaii and the Northwest should cease to service the area.

For several months now, Mr. Speaker, hearings have been conducted before the CAB to determine whether the examiner's notion, that one airline should be allowed to monopolize the route and that Pan American should no longer fly, is valid. Pan American, which operates the only jet aircraft on the route, has flown the route for 10 years and is showing its faith in further growth of air traffic along this route by continuing to add more jet aircraft and increasing schedules, all of which means cutting in half the flight time formerly required by piston aircraft.

As pointed out in a recent editorial in the Argus, a Seattle periodical dated March 11, 1960, Washington State has a long way to go before it can compare with the transportation advantages enjoyed by our neighbors in California. We wish to advance forward, not backward. I strongly urge the CAB to closely consider the hardships that would be involved in discontinuing this valuable service.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Argus, Mar. 11, 1960]

Washington State sends many tourists to Hawaii, but only a trickle of visitors comes from the 50th State to the Pacific Northwest. Currently about 12,000 persons from

Washington visit Hawaii every year, spending some \$8 million on lodging, food, clothing, gifts, and personal services. This is a substantial sum of money that our citizens leave in Hawaii.

Figures are unavailable as to how many Hawaiians come to the Northwest, but it is estimated that the number is less than 1,000 a year. Why can't we attract more to Seattle and the Northwest?

There are several reasons, most of which might be overcome. In the first place, many people in the islands know little about the Northwest, so the area needs more promotion by the various agencies involved. Secondly, Hawaiians should be advised to visit the Northwest in the summer months, preferably July and August. Living as they do in a most equitable climate, they cannot imagine how disagreeable our weather can be, particularly to those acclimated to nearly continual sunshine. Too many of them have come to the Pacific Northwest in the late fall or very early spring, and have returned to tell tales of rain, clouds, fog, and snow which have chilled the enthusiasm of anyone who might have been contemplating a trip to see our mountains and water. However, Hawaiians like the cooler, clear weather we have in summer, and they should be frankly advised to come during that season.

A third disadvantage we must overcome is transportation. Hawaii is served from California by many fast direct jet airliners. This month there will be 41 jet flights to Los Angeles and San Francisco, as compared with 16 between Seattle and the islands. Seattle jet flights must still stop in Portland, which is time consuming and irritating to today's traveler. California also offers frequent luxury-liner service to Hawaii, a service Seattle completely lacks.

The increase in two-way tourist traffic between Washington and Hawaii should be our long-range program. Many more Washingtonians will want to visit the islands, but we should lend every encouragement for Hawaiians to return our calls.

By attracting more visitors to the Pacific Northwest, we could anticipate more business from the islands, as today most pleasure trips are combined with business excursions. We will secure double benefits from a well thought out promotional program.

Mrs. Martha A. Lyons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD a moving tribute to Mrs. Martha A. Lyons, editor and publisher of the Spotlight, that appeared in the Jersey Parade of March 11, written by Mr. M. Martin Turpanjian, the editor.

Mrs. Lyons, who has been associated with Spotlight, the picture news weekly published in Newark, for 26 years, is chairman of the board of directors of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., of which Mr. Turpanjian is the president. The league is composed of over 500 weekly newspapers in the State. Its selection of Mrs. Lyons as the Magazine Editor of the Year is a fitting recognition of her outstanding record.

Mr. Turpanjian's tribute follows:

I take great pride in announcing that Mrs. Arthur A. Lyons, of Asbury Park, editor and publisher of *Spotlight*, America's picture news weekly, of 116 Market Street, Newark, N.J., has been proclaimed by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., as the "Magazine Editor of the Year."

Perhaps no other woman in New Jersey is better known to the masses and the classes than Mrs. Lyons and she knows more people in New Jersey than any other man or woman of the Garden State. This is no exaggeration but true fact.

American womanhood had a noble origin. It was conceived and nurtured in the very cradle of adventure and opportunity. The vast continent of North America in its 18th century period was alive with the magic atmosphere of prospecting and all manners of prospectors and settlers had the entire expanse of 48 States to explore, prospect, and establish desirable settlements.

And the women of America met this tremendous challenge. They did not falter. They did not hesitate with senseless timidity and idle fear. They braved the perils of the American Indians. They rode the old covered wagons and with their husbands, sons, and daughters established their settlements as well as their colonies and laid the solid foundations for the great American empire that was to be the United States of America.

So when we consider the marvelous achievements of Mrs. Lyons, affectionately known as "Conrad" Lyons to millions of people, as editor, publisher, and a veritable mental giantess of knowledge, we can understand and fully appraise her enormous intellectual ability in this historic challenging background of the courageous female pioneers of our early self-sacrificing strenuous civilization.

Mrs. Lyons embodies in her radiant, personality all the outstanding characteristics of the true American rugged individualism. She is indeed an individualist who has the philosophical star of the first magnitude. She is no dreamy visionary obsessed with utopian delusions of grandeur. She has no impractical inflexible ideas molden in the cast of orthodoxy. She is fearless and courageous, possessing that rare sense of mental audaciousness to back up her ideal with her articulate convictions.

The literary style of Mrs. Lyons' writing is unique in its captivating crystalline clarity and verbal coherence. She does not tire her readers with a long protracted prolix verbosity of empty theoretical phrases. She is direct and her logic is so clear and objective that it could be understood at once by the most elementary mind. She does not write to confuse. She does not write to befuddle or bewilder the magazine-reading devotee. Her primary objective is to inspire, elevate and unconsciously educate the readers for in the last analysis the purpose of her editorial commentaries is not to display a sense of pontifical knowledge but to elevate and enrich the mental status of the many subscribers of her progressive militant magazine by being simply understood.

As a matter of fact it would not be in reality a rhetoric figure of speech to call Mrs. Lyons an animated walking encyclopedia or one of the world's modern seven wonders and yet with all these intellectual faculties operating with high-powered efficiency, she has a serene sense of modesty and a humility of spirit that permeates her personality incessantly. It is this friendly affable social democratic approach that creates in her character a sense of fragrant magnetism. It can be said with a sense of perfect serenity and positive composure that Mrs. Lyons has glorified and elevated the status of American womanhood. Her life has been so consistently in tune with the infinite divine law of ethical righteousness that she has become a living example of the

Golden Rule of the eternal moralist she has dramatized into drama of everyday living the ethical concepts of the ideals of cooperation, good will and understanding.

This is the monumental achievement of Mrs. Lyons. This is her contribution to great American way of life. This is her precious gift to society:

OUR MRS. SPOTLIGHT

(Dedicated to "Conrad" Lyons By M. Martin Turpanjian)

This is Mrs. Lyons' life,
Far above all the strife,
With vision always keen,
With a heart radiantly clean.
And her smiles always blend,
To create a new friend;
Always giving good hope,
To those who daily grope;
In the darkness seeking light,
Her master mind guides them right;
And to those bent in sorrow,
She shows the better tomorrow;
And with the light of her soul
She can speak with courage bold.
Of the supreme divine Truth above
That can only come from love.
"Conrad" Lyons' deeds always impart
Genuine illumination in human heart
And so live on and on, great and noble soul
And let thy Goodwill message unfold
To the aged and the youth,
Thy admonitions of Eternal Truth.

Proposal To Amend Social Security Act To Provide Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among the proposals to amend the Social Security Act, being considered in executive session of the Committee on Ways and Means, is that of our colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], who would add a medical and hospital section.

That our physicians are also concerned with the problem of medical care for those who cannot afford it is demonstrated in an article in the March 7, 1960, issue of the *AMA News*, published by the American Medical Association.

Some Montana physicians share this concern. With unusual frankness, one of them sat down on March 5, 1960, and wrote me a letter in opposition to the Forand bill. I call your attention to paragraph No. 3 of his letter below.

The article follows:

[From the *AMA News*, Mar. 7, 1960]

M.D.'s GUARANTEE SERVICE TO AGED UNABLE TO PAY

No person, regardless of age, needs to forgo a physician's service because of inability to pay. Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the American Medical Association, said today.

In a strongly worded statement, the Orlando, Fla., urologist asserted that "backers of the Forand bill, which proposes Federal purchase of certain health care services for social security beneficiaries, would lead us to believe there are many Americans who are denied medical care because they cannot afford to pay for it."

"As a practicing physician who has traveled throughout the Nation as an officer

of the AMA, I am convinced this generally is not true."

PRIME CONCERN

Dr. Orr emphasized that "the prime concern of the medical profession is, and always has been, to serve humanity regardless of reward or financial gain."

Since time immemorial, he said, physicians have given their services to the indigent without compensation.

He added that as early as 1934, the judicial council of the AMA stated:

"One of the strongest holds of the profession on public approbation and support has been the age-old professional ideal of medical service to all, whether able to pay or not. That ideal is basic in our ethics."

FREE TREATMENT

Every year, Dr. Orr said, physicians have given free millions of dollars worth of medical treatment to the indigent.

"Many county medical societies have even publicized through paid advertisements in newspapers their programs 'guaranteeing the services of a physician to all who need him,'" Dr. Orr declared. "I am certain that every other county medical society also will answer the need for a physician."

The AMA president further stated that "if there are isolated cases of persons with a legitimate need for a doctor's services who are not receiving those services, they have not explored the facilities available to them."

"As physicians, our greatest concern is the best possible quality of health care for all the people. That is why the medical profession is opposed to the Forand bill or any other type of Federal compulsory health insurance."

"We oppose any control of medicine by Government because we are convinced that any such control would endanger the continued high quality of care we can provide."

SERVING THE AGED

Dr. Orr said the interests of the aged could best be served by encouraging further development of voluntary health insurance; by replacing compulsory retirement and age discrimination in employment with more realistic and flexible systems; by curbing inflation; by encouraging construction of nursing homes and other facilities designed to care for the long-term patient efficiently and economically, and by increasing reimbursement of hospitals by local and State governments for care of the needy of any age.

The letter referred to above follows:

MARCH 5, 1960.

HON. LEE METCALF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am strongly opposed to the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) for the following reasons:

1. We must halt further socialism and socialization. Unless we do our Nation is a "has been great."

2. Once more we must teach our younger generation to care for their oldsters on a family basis. "Grassroots" family unity is the main strength of any great nation.

3. As a physician I must admit that I give less than wholehearted care to patients who are "clinic" or "charity" cases. Forand recipients would be charity cases in my opinion. Thus, good care of our aging, which is the prime target, would be entirely a lost cause under socialism such as Forand type of provisions.

4. Once more let us place freedom to be generous and charitable to patients just where it belongs—in the hands of "the physician on the case." Physicians, just as anyone else, hate to be told where they must be generous. Hence, the doctor's "generosity" becomes a grudging and hateful thing when forced upon him.

I appeal to you, honorable sir, to do all in your power to defeat H.R. 4700 and any similar type of bill.

Respectfully yours,

_____, M.D.

Three Winning Student Essays on the Vital Subject "Jobs for the Handicapped" Contest in the Great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of the three winning essays in the recent annually held essay contest sponsored by the legislative committee of the Disabled American Veterans' Auxiliary in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif. It has been my pleasure on several occasions to be present at the annual award dinner when winners of this significant essay contest were presented their awards; this year, however, I was unable to have the pleasure of attending the annual dinner.

This significant contest has entries therein from various high schools in the southeastern district of Los Angeles County. The texts of these essays were furnished me by a distinguished veteran of the Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary, Mrs. Lillian M. Karnes.

The award dinner was held February 19, 1960, at Compton, Calif. The judges of the contest were as follows: Del Clawson, mayor of Compton; Jack Cleland, managing editor of the Compton Herald American; Guy Warner, manager, California department of employment, Compton; Wayne Bowen, chairman, of the veterans' employment committee; Mrs. Lillian Karnes, chairman of the local employ the physically handicapped committee. The winners were Carol Martin, Paramount Senior High School, for the first place award of a \$50 bond; entry of Velda Kurtze of the Dominguez High School, second place winner of a \$25 bond; entry of Emma R. Smith, Centennial High School, third place winner of a \$25 bond.

Mr. Speaker, in and about this geographical area commonly known as the great 23d district I am pleased to state that through the cooperative efforts of the Veterans Employment Committee and Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the southeast district of that area various and many important manufacturers have specifically cooperated with the high purposes of these committees and have employed physically handicapped persons. On several occasions when I have been personally present at these annual dinners manufacturers have also been personally present and have publicly stated at the banquet table their great satisfaction and pleas-

ure with their employment of these distinguished veterans who were termed "physically handicapped." And, it has been my pleasure for many years to actively cooperate to the desirable end that employable, worthy handicapped persons should find dignified, available employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and all the other Members of this distinguished legislative body join with me in complimenting the committee which sponsors this annual contest. Also that you join with me in complimenting the winner and also the dozens of those who made honest, able endeavor in the contest but did not happen to be an award winner. They too should be complimented. Likewise, I know you join with me in complimenting the several and busy, prosperous manufacturing groups who have had the satisfaction of employing the physically handicapped fellow citizens. It is important for us to know the thinking of our successors in citizenship duties.

Following, then, are the text of the first-, second-, and third-place winners' essays.

"Jobs for the Handicapped—A Passport to Dignity" by Carol Martin, 11373 Pennsylvania, Hollywood, Calif., age 16, Paramount High School; teacher, Mr. John Myres:

"I cried because I had no shoes, until I met a man who had no feet." So very often this quotation has been repeated verbally, or in some form or another, mentally. The human race ejects sympathy for persons who have encountered physically handicapping misfortunes. People discuss and debate disabling accidents which have occurred. Charities and other financial relief organizations have been formed to aid these people. Yet, how many individuals actually assist these people in regaining their dignity and normalcy? What percentage of our population today can befriend and trust and enjoy the companionship of someone lacking an arm, a hand, or both? How many employers are willing to accept recommendations from rehabilitation offices? Who are the people that can ignore handicaps, and socialize with, as well as work with, these people?

A magazine article was once written by a woman who described herself as "a cripple with a misshapen body." This woman had wanted to enter the teaching field but was discouraged by associates. She was told that physical appearance greatly influences the success or failure of the teaching profession. Realizing the extent of her physical attractiveness, she commenced work in an office. After a short time, she began to feel subconscious tendencies in others to suspect her of potential breakdown and chronic inefficiency. She became overconscientious about overtime and the "small details that keep an office running smoothly." This led to decreased production in her work, and, eventually, dismissal. The mental attitude of this woman's friends was a stumble block in her road to happiness.

Disabled individuals often feel more social rejection than actually exists. They inflate the size of their disfigurement. This necessitates increased understanding and tolerance by family and friends as can be seen in the case of a man returning from World War I. He had received severe facial disfigurement while serving his country and, upon resuming life with his wife, rejected any social contacts other than family. He claimed that he couldn't stand the expression of distance and pity in the eyes of peo-

ple to whom he talked. The few friends that were permitted to enter the house stated that his misfortune was hardly noticeable after once being subjected to his warm and wonderful personality. Fortunately, he was a scholar at heart and he found pleasure in working in his library. This decreased his need for extensive social life.

The problem of employment is one that all physically handicapped persons encounter. Quite often they no longer feel that they are suited to any particular branch of work, or they become discouraged after repeated employment rejections.

In 1918 the veteran's bill was passed to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of wounded servicemen, under the direction of the Veterans' Bureau.

Between 1918 and 1920, 12 States passed laws for work concerning disabled civilians. In 1920 a Federal law was passed which set up an agency under the Federal Board for Vocational Education to promote civilian rehabilitation throughout the country. It also provided funds for the 12 States already possessing rehabilitation laws, and tentative funds for all other States meeting the necessary requirements.

The veterans' bill ceased in the late twenties upon the end of work by the Veterans' Bureau. From then until 1943 State offices carried on rehabilitation work with Federal supervision and financial assistance.

The civilian's bill was placed under laws of respective States in cooperation with the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

The first rehabilitation laws in the United States were passed in 1935. Although these measures aided many people financially and morally, they were somewhat inadequate. Though we realized our definite responsibilities for physically disabled fairly early, we still lagged behind Great Britain, Germany, and other industrially progressive countries.

Today, employment isn't the threat that it was. "The Operation Manual for Placement of Physically Handicapped" issued by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, lists over 2,000 jobs in accordance with particular handicaps.

Vocational guidance tests are available to anyone desiring them. They are helpful in that they reveal the true interests of an individual. They are evaluated by a competent outsider who gives the results to a guidance counselor. This person, in turn, seeks the suggested type of work.

Some people fail to use their rehabilitation offices. They search for work, only to find employers hesitant to hire handicapped workers.

Discouraged, they begin falling, as did Mr. B. Mr. B. returned from war with a nerve condition, which eventually paralyzed his legs quite badly. Work was not available for him. His marriage failed. Finally, he found work as a machinist. The paralysis in his legs seemed to spur the efficiency and craftsmanship of his hands. Life was looking brighter, and brighter yet after the beginning of a new and wonderful marriage. Then came the depression. He was relieved of his job because of his ability to get a pension. He and his wife moved to a lower cost area. The addition of two members to the family made relief a necessity. The war brought need of skilled men and Mr. B. was asked by the personnel department to come to work. Not only did he begin working full time, but soon they wanted everyone to work 12 hours a day. Fatigue decreased Mr. B's production and efficiency. He was excused after war supplies decreased in demand.

Unfortunately, many employers use examples like this to prove handicapped people incompetent. Also they refuse to hire disabled persons because of the possibilities of injury.

Statistics show that disabled people are quite often better workers than physically

fit persons. A survey made by the Western Electric Co. showed that 7 percent more physically fit workers were absent from work through illness than handicapped people. The accident rate of handicapped workers is generally less than that of coworkers.

Statistics prove that disabled persons are quite adaptable and responsible. Why, then, should their activities and opportunities be any less than those of unhandicapped individuals? God endowed all men with the same amount of self-respect and dignity. Never were these meant to decline or to be placed on levels according to physical fitness. If employers would aid these people through job opportunities, they would truly be giving them a passport to dignity.

"Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity," by Valda Kurtze, 1226 South Washington, Compton, Calif., Dominguez High School; teacher, Clarice M. Green:

Twelve hours a day, seven days a week, months in and years out, life brings happiness for most people. And why not? We have homes, families, and good-paying jobs. This is what we, the American citizens of today are bathing in, under God's sun we shower in happiness.

Our lives are exceptionally easy. We all have problems; the problems of keeping our homes and families together and the problem of keeping a good job.

To us, a job is more than a provider, more than just a trade. A job is our living, our life. How could life be without jobs?

Did you ever think to yourself that we are depriving thousands of people of an American right, the right to have a good job. Those whom you might think are not fit for that certain job or for that matter, any certain job. Those that I'm speaking of are the handicapped.

Just exactly what is the difference between them and you? Is it because you have both legs or your eyesight is better? Well this is a minor detail. Of course you're saying to yourself there is a difference especially in jobs. A job requires many talents, but does it necessarily require physical perfection such as arms, legs, sight, or hearing. A mind, a good clear pathway of thinking, any ideas are the essential parts of a job. Many gifted people are not working.

Why aren't these people working? Why aren't we giving them opportunities to make themselves useful?

Have you ever lain in bed with a cold? Don't you feel rather helpless or is it laziness?

I'll assure you right now that the handicapped are far from helpless or lazy. They are hard workers, you've got to try, and this is what they do. They put into their work everything they have; and because of their handicap they try even harder.

These people are good craftsmen, great mechanics, and intelligent, yes—even tricky executives. For an example, let's take an executive, a great man who suffered the loss of his legs. He was a great man who inspired all by his superior actions in time of war and peace. This man will long live in the hearts of Americans from generations to generations. It seems to have slipped our minds that Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt also had a handicap. He pulled through and so have many like him.

So why should we discriminate against those who must endure great hardship. We should admire them for their strength to carry on, yes to carry on with a heavier burden than most. Let us always lend a helping hand to these people, let us look up to them and remember to never turn away.

The handicapped must live the same as you and I. They also have families to take care of. There is no difference between us. It is a fact that most people don't realize what they're doing to these people. They are turning these people away; away from life and the rights of an American.

A job is important to us and is equally important to them. They are as qualified to serve on a job as others.

Why not help those who have had misfortune. Let's make the rest of their lives happy, successful, and thankful. But most of all let's make them feel wanted, that they, too are needed in this great country. God, in His wisdom, has placed a burden upon these people. They have learned forbearance which becomes a fountain of strength flowing over us when we need inspiration.

"Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity," by Emma Ruth Smith, 14020 South Hillford Avenue, Compton, Calif., age, 16, Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.; teacher, Elizabeth J. Bryan:

How would I feel if I were handicapped? What would I need as a handicapped person? My answer: Understanding. We can't put ourselves in the place of the handicapped, but we can understand their life and wants.

In this modern age, we may become a cripple at any time because of the hazards in our society. We may become crippled doing a job, walking across a street, or being engaged in a war. The majority of the cripples today are the results of World Wars I and II.

History shows us how humanitarians have interested themselves in men less fortunate than they. Men like Carden proved that ideas could be transferred to a deaf or mute person by written characters. Juan Bonet published a book on the "Education of the Deaf," which was later published in English by Bulwer. Organized groups were now taking an interest in these brave warriors fighting to overcome their handicaps. A school for the blind was built in Paris in 1784. Braille invented a system of reading and writing for the blind thus overcoming the most dreaded of all handicaps. The U.S. Government has set up under the Library of Congress a series of libraries for the blind where not only braille but talking books may also be borrowed. This gives them a new hope for leading a normal life. Senator Thomas Gore and poet John Milton are recognized throughout the world for their outstanding contributions to humanity in different centuries and different fields.

Helen Keller was deprived of her sight and hearing and soon became dumb within 2 years after her birth. Her eagerness to learn drew the attention of Miss Anne Sullivan who was formerly blind but was partially cured. Under Miss Sullivan's teaching, Helen struggled to master her handicapped situation. Her victory is shown through her work. She became world famous as an author, lecturer, and welfare worker. She organized the Helen Keller Foundation that started people toward helping the needy as well as the handicapped. Her courage and faith led her from a handicapped position into dignity.

We can't put ourselves in the position of the handicapped persons, but we are doing all we can to lessen the strain. We must realize that they are eager and willing to learn all they can. Their dignity is greater than ours because they know the value of life. A small girl unable to see her beautiful doll she received for Christmas must imagine and feel the doll's face and small body. A boy playing with his electric train, deaf to the sound of the whistle, will never know that world of sound of which he has been deprived. Eyes that can bring forth tears of joy and sorrow, but ones closed to the sight of their family and friends, must dream about their appearance.

Dignity is with the handicapped from the moment they achieve independence. Handicapped people have a bridge to cross. When they realize they are helpless the other side of the bridge begins to offer in abundance the life they wish they had. The outcome of

their struggle will be success or failure. At this point, a doctor can't help them. They must rely upon their strength and belief in themselves to cross the bridge whether it appears to be long or short. Many fall because their time of living is shortened too soon. Others have succeeded and are happy, living a normal life. Those who are on the bridge are the people we must help. We should give to them the passport to dignity.

Their family gives them in abundance love and patience with their eagerness to learn and accomplish things. When they take their first real step or see a flicker of light they can tell of their progress to their family. That one step gives them more encouragement than the pity they might receive from being handicapped.

At school they are continuously happy. Why? Simply because they themselves feel a part of a class discussion or a classroom situation. They are as good as their schoolmates, asking questions, knowing the answers, calling their friends on the telephone to check their answers, and attending the dances and sports—all part of the thrill of being in school and they are glad to be included. The number of handicapped boys and girls who attend public schools are limited. Many times they must seek private schools.

I am proud to say that we have organizations in our country to help these people. An outstanding source of help is the Department of Employment for the State of California. They help the handicapped organize telephone answering services and magazine subscription agencies as well as placing the unemployed in a variety of jobs. There are over 3,000 unemployed handicapped people in Los Angeles County; one-half of these handicapped people are employed. The Goodwill Industries is known for accepting a portion of these handicapped people yearly into their employment.

Handicapped people devote themselves to their jobs. They are prompt, efficient, alert, and correct in whatever they do. Employment agencies find jobs and schools of trade for them to enter. Some employers request the handicapped above other people. The employer is getting the best because the handicapped are giving their best. The ability to earn a living for themselves is the goal for which they have been reaching.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I delivered over Wisconsin radio stations an address in which I stated that our country has adequate anti-Communist deterrent power. I also outlined the defense timetable for the future, and said that our country will need a space academy; and I announced that publication of an updated internal security manual. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY—UNITED STATES HAS ADEQUATE ANTI-COMMUNIST DETERRENT POWER; OUTLINES DEFENSE TIMETABLE FOR FUTURE; SAYS UNITED STATES WILL NEED SPACE ACADEMY; ANNOUNCES PUBLICATION OF UPDATED INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL

Friends, I would like to discuss with you briefly a matter which is of deepest concern to all of us, namely, the challenge of providing adequate security—internal and external—for our country.

Today, the major threat to our security—communism—is real and formidable. Overall, the Communist strategy encompasses military, political, economic, psychological, and nearly all other fields of human endeavor.

To combat this multipronged effort by the Communists to extend their influence and control, we need to be constantly on the alert, ready and willing to dedicate the necessary manpower and resources to thwart their aims of world conquest.

WILEY SAYS: "PRESENT DEFENSE IS STRONG DETERRENT"

Question. Senator WILEY, in reviewing our defense posture, let me ask you point blank: Do you feel that our defense program is presently adequate to meet the challenge of communism?

Answer. Yes. Fortunately, the testimony before the joint hearings of the Space and Preparedness Committee found our experts in almost unanimous agreement that we have an adequate defense for the present.

According to Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, for example, we have nuclear weapons that exceed those of the U.S.S.R. by several times in destructive power; and long-range means of delivering that exceed theirs by several times in total carrying capacity.

In combination, these are considered by our experts able to bring destruction to anyone who would be so foolish to attack us.

Question. Are there any other deterrents?

Answer. Very definitely.

First, the nations allied with us in efforts of freedom to combat communism—economically, militarily, and morally—represent a tremendous force.

Second, we must not forget the nearly 1 billion people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. As human beings, a vast majority of them, I believe, would like—as much as we do—to have freedom and a voice in their government. Actually, only about 2 percent of the people in China, and 6 percent in the Soviet Union are hard-core members of the Communist Party.

Third, the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations in the world represent a tremendous economic, psychological and moral force that will eventually—I am confident—align themselves, for the most part, on the side of freedom.

NEEDED: "ON GUARD" INTERNAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Question. Now, Senator WILEY, what about the home front?

Answer. While we need to carry on effective programs to combat communism abroad, we must not "go to sleep" at home.

Instead, we need to be constantly "on guard" to strengthen our internal security programs. As a matter of fact, I believe that we need to take a "new look" at our laws to see if these can be further strengthened to prevent subversion, and if discovered, punish perpetrators of anti-U.S. activities.

PRESENT ARSENAL OF DEFENSE

Question. Now, to get down to specifics, Senator WILEY, let's take a look at our military deterrent. Would you outline what you feel is the adequacy of our defense program?

Answer. Yes. First of all, I want to stress that our military strength lies in a widely diversified striking power—that is, we have not put all our "eggs in one basket."

Overall, our military strength includes: long-range striking forces, deployed land, sea, and air forces, air defense forces, and our capability to support and maintain these forces as well as to mobilize quickly additional military power.

It also includes our technological and industrial capacity; the strength and resolution of our Allies; and by no means least, our moral and psychological capacity to resist and defeat any would-be aggressor. All of these capabilities collectively—and perhaps most important of all the knowledge on the part of the leaders of the Communist bloc that they do exist—constitute our defense strength.

Question. What are the major weapons in our deterrent arsenal, Senator?

Answer. Our present strategic retaliatory capability encompasses the following:

(1) Approximately 2,000 long-range strategic bombers. This force is highly trained, completely equipped and ready and maintained in varying stages of alert, down to a 15-minute ground alert. From its various bases in the continental United States and overseas areas, it is capable of delivering nuclear strikes into any part of the Communist bloc. Our long-range strategic bombers greatly outnumber Soviet bloc aircraft of comparable capability. This force is complemented by the Bomber Command of the British Royal Air Force, which also has extensive nuclear strike capability.

(2) Fourteen attack aircraft carriers. This force of floating airbases is also highly trained, fully equipped, and ready. From seas around the Communist periphery, the planes from our carriers can deliver nuclear strikes into almost any area of the Communist bloc. The aircraft in these carriers

alone outnumber the heavy bombers in the Soviet Union and their weapons are many times more powerful than the atomic bombs used in World War II.

(3) We also have an operational ICBM squadron equipped with Atlas missiles—a tested, effective, and accurate weapon. This force is trained, equipped, and in position ready to launch its missiles. It is capable of delivering, from bases in the continental United States, nuclear strikes on targets within all but a small area of the Communist bloc.

(4) An operational missile squadron is equipped with Snark long-range guided missiles. The Snark is an operational 5,500-mile, air missile with a very large payload capacity. It is capable of delivering from bases in the continental United States nuclear strikes against targets within all but a very small area of the Communist bloc.

(5) Hound Dog, air-to-surface missiles, also are capable of carrying nuclear warheads. These missiles greatly expand the flexibility and striking power of our long-range strategic bombers.

(6) Regulus I, surface-to-surface, ship-based missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, are operational. At the present time, two cruisers and five submarines are equipped with this mobile missile firepower.

(7) Four operational missile squadrons are equipped with a mix of Matador and Mace missiles. The Matador is a surface-to-surface missile capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The Mace is a similar type weapon with greatly improved capabilities in range, accuracy, and reliability. The Mace is being phased-in to replace the Matador.

(8) Three IRBM squadrons equipped with Thor missiles are in the hands of allied forces in the United Kingdom. These forces are fully trained, equipped, and ready to launch their missiles. The Thor is a tested and effective weapon. From bases in the United Kingdom, it is capable of delivering nuclear strikes on targets within the Communist bloc.

TIMETABLE OF DEFENSE PLANS FOR FUTURE

Question. Senator WILEY, this is a most impressive picture of our defense forces. Now, you recall that there have been differing views on our future needs for defense. For example, what is the timetable of defense plans for meeting the growing missile-nuclear power of the Communist bloc?

Answer. As you know, the military threat to the security of the United States posed by the Communist bloc extends across the entire spectrum of warfare—including general war, limited war, and the cold war. Our military power must be capable of dealing with all aspects of this threat. Thus, our defense plans and programs are designed to provide for continual across-the-board improvements.

Now, with specific regard to the missile-nuclear developments, our timetable of future defense plans encompasses the following:

Introduction of forces equipped with the B-58 supersonic bomber in 1960 with a progressive buildup to three wings in the succeeding years.

A progressive expansion of forces equipped with Atlas ICBMs to a total of 13 squadrons by 1963.

Introduction of forces equipped with the Titan ICBM in 1961, with a progressive build-up to 14 squadrons after 1963.

Introduction of forces equipped with the Minuteman ICBM in 1963 and a progressive expansion of this force on into the foreseeable future.

Four additional IREM squadrons equipped with Jupiter and Thor in the hands of allied forces in the United Kingdom, Italy and Turkey in the near future. The Jupiter, like the Thor, is a tested, effective missile. From these advanced locations these missiles are capable of delivering nuclear strikes on targets within the Communist bloc.

In addition to these new weapons systems for which we have an actual operational target date and progressive expansion program, a wide range of other weapons systems which will greatly enhance our strategic retaliatory capability are under research and development.

SPACE ACADEMY NEEDED FOR FUTURE

Question. In this rapidly advancing, scientific, technological age, we realize, of course, that there will be new discoveries that will affect not only our defense, but also our peaceful progress.

This is particularly true in the exploration of space. As a new frontier, we can expect the coming years to unveil more and more of the "mysteries and unknowns" of outer space. How can we best prepare for advances in this field, Senator?

Answer. In the light of this new challenge, we will need an ever-increasing number of engineers, scientists, and other technologists to man and carry forward our programs.

In addition, the United States will, I believe, ultimately need a space academy—similar to our present Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine Academies. Presently, there is, of course, only need for a very limited number of astronauts. We recall that Donald Slayton, of Sparta, Wis., is one of the seven young men being trained for space flight.

However, the promise of a wide variety of space activities—including travel—in the future will require a program for training individuals to cope with the unique problems in this field. Consequently, we will need an effective program to provide the large number of astronauts needed for the future.

STRONGER INTERNAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Question. Senator Wiley, you mentioned earlier, the need for a stronger internal security program. Would you elaborate on this?

Answer. Yes. We recognize, of course, that internal—as well as external—security continues to be a major challenge.

The oft-quoted adage "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance" is as meaningful—if not more so—in 1960 as in any other time in our history.

On the domestic front, communism—the deadly enemy of freedom—attempts to carry on clandestine activities behind many masks, including seemingly harmless and sometimes meritorious organizations, drives, and other movements. Not exclusively a military effort of kill off freedom, the anti-freedom activities include such fields as industry, agriculture, atomic energy, educational and cultural activities, and other areas to undermine our progress, spread the cancerous Communist ideology, and generally weaken our free way of life.

By designing a system of laws, regulations, and Federal orders, the United States attempted to prevent such actions, and, if discovered, punish the culprits.

You may recall that, in 1953, I sponsored the publication of an Internal Security Manual—an extremely valuable compendium of Federal statutes, executive orders, and congressional resolutions relating to the Inter-

nal Security of the United States. Over the years, it has been utilized by Government agencies, business firms, attorneys, teachers, writers, and many others concerned with the challenge of internal security.

Recognizing the need for an up-to-date book on laws and regulations of internal security, I requested the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to revise this handy, useful manual. The revision is now complete. Consequently, I plan to introduce a resolution in Congress authorizing the publication of 5,000 copies of the revised edition.

The availability of up-to-date manuals—for which there is a constant demand, even though the previous printings have long been exhausted—will, I believe, serve the overall public interest.

In conclusion, friends, I want to express my appreciation to you folks for the opportunity to discuss these internal and external security problems with you.

Thank you for listening.

Doctors Support Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the concerted opposition of the American Medical Association to the much-discussed Forand bill, it is noteworthy that many members of the medical profession are in favor of the bill. Inasmuch as the doctors of this country are so closely connected with the health of our elderly citizens, we should take due note of the opinions of those members of the medical profession who feel that the health needs of aged Americans cannot be adequately covered by voluntary insurance or prepayment plans. In the newspaper, *Government Standard*, dated today, March 18, 1960, there appears an article in this connection and I should like at this time to insert it in the *RECORD* for the information and perhaps inspiration of all those who are interested in the care of our elderly:

FORAND BILL BACKED BY MEDICAL EXPERTS

The drive for enactment of the Forand bill moved into high gear, picking up major support from within the medical profession as the House Ways and Means Committee neared a vote on the AFL-CIO-backed measure to provide medical care for the Nation's older citizens.

As committee action neared, Dr. Basil C. MacLean, former president of the National Blue Cross Association—largest group of voluntary nonprofit plans in the field—gave unqualified endorsement to the bill despite organized opposition mounted by the American Medical Association and the commercial insurance industry.

MacLean bluntly said that "the costs of care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment." He added that financing health benefits for the aged by means of social security payroll deductions, as called for in the Forand bill, "provides a way of dealing with the question with dignity and effectiveness."

"The good sense of this measure," the former Blue Cross head said in a letter to the bill's sponsor, Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island, "and the urgent

need that created it, recommend its passage without delay."

Joining in enthusiastic endorsement of the bill was Dr. E. M. Bluestone, professor of hospital administration at Columbia and New York Universities, who declared the sheer humanity of the bill far outweighs what he termed the misguided and ill-advised opposition of the AMA and the insurance industry. He charged that opponents were "motivated largely by professional self-protection."

The letters were made public by FORAND in a speech on the House floor. He said it was significant that "in the face of the usual closed-mind opposition of the AMA, two distinguished doctors closely acquainted with the problem" support the health insurance measure.

The two letters, the Rhode Island Democrat said, indicate that "corporate medicine, as represented by the AMA, does not speak for doctors who really know the problem."

The Case for 27½ Percent Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I have received an interesting article from a friend and former student of mine, Mr. Phil Flanagan, of Riverton, Wyo., entitled "The Case for 27½ Percent Depletion," which I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of it printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE CASE FOR 27½ PERCENT DEPLETION

Critics of the oil industry love to paint it as a fat man grown unduly rich through special tax privileges.

The greatest privilege, they say, is the depletion allowance. They argue: Eliminate or reduce it and you put petroleum on a fair footing with other industries.

This year Congress will consider two bills, introduced into both Houses, each calling for a reduction in percentage depletion on oil and gas.

It is no moderate reduction they seek. It is a slash, from 27½ percent to 15 percent.

Again and again in the past 33 years Congress has carefully reviewed its own laws on percentage depletion. It has always found them equitable, workable, and, above all, practical from the standpoint of national welfare.

But the issue is raised again. The present 27½ percent provision is needed today as never before. In fact, any tampering with his long-established pattern would create a serious threat to our national security.

Why? Because we have become almost completely dependent upon petroleum. An energetic, healthy oil industry is recognized as a critical factor in this Nation's military strength and in our present standard of living.

A cut in percentage depletion can only reduce our ability to find more oil and gas to replace that which we consume every day. And an inadequate search for new oil would lead to a domestic shortage, crippling our ability to fight a global war. It would drain the strength we must have to avoid a defensive war. It goes almost without saying that it would depress our standard of living, in peace or war.

These things the Journal believes. We also believe that most of the opposition to 27½ percent depletion stems from a lack of understanding of its objectives and its workings.

WHY THE ISSUE IS IMPORTANT

Oil is critically important to us today because our entire economy has become based on an extremely high use of energy.

One hundred years ago we depended almost completely on the muscles of men and animals. Today we see the picture reversed. We depend almost completely on the energy of machines, powered primarily by oil and gas.

This is an age of mobile engines fueled and lubricated by oil—in cars and trucks, in locomotives and aircraft, in sports boats and ships at sea. It is the age of convenience—of kitchen appliances and home workshops—and as we trace back to the original fuels that generate their energy, we find oil and gas dominating the scene.

Coal and water power also contribute to this energy system which gives every American the equivalent of 50 servants. But there is one basic difference between petroleum and these other sources.

Oil is the one form of energy that is irreplaceable by any other for many vital uses. There is no available substitute today for gasoline, or diesel fuel, or jet fuel. We cannot do without these commodities and maintain our way of life. From a military standpoint our dependence is even greater.

We do have today an excess of capacity for producing petroleum. But this excess exists only because we are importing oil. In the event of war, we would undoubtedly be cut off from all of these imports which originate outside our continent.

In past periods of international tension, our potential foes were "have-not" nations with respect to oil. But today our major differences are with a nation which not only has enough oil to energize a war machine but which is increasing its reserves each year.

Our military needs have grown by leaps and bounds. Jet planes consume roughly three times as much fuel as gasoline-powered craft. While we are entering an atomic age which will see some replacement of petroleum fuels, we are still far from independence. During World War II, two out of every three tons of supplies used in our military effort represented petroleum products. This ratio could well reach three out of four tons in any conflict in the next several years.

WHY PERCENTAGE DEPLETION?

What bearing does such a thing as percentage depletion have on national security? What is it and how has it worked?

In tax language, depletion is a deduction from operating income, provided by law to return to the owner the capital consumed in operating a mine, a quarry, or an oil or gas well.

The Constitution empowers Congress to tax income from capital, but not capital itself. In all cases where a business involves the use of capital, that capital is either worn out or depleted in producing income. So, the total returns it produces include some income and some capital.

Our tax laws take this into consideration with several types of tax-exempt deductions which can be subtracted from total returns. Some of them are depreciation, capital gains, cost depletion, and percentage depletion.

Depreciation allows the tax-free return of the cost of a piece of equipment, as that equipment is worn out in producing income. Each year its cost divided by its estimated life is "depreciated" as returned capital. By the time the equipment is worn out, the owner has been able to set aside its original cost tax-free so that the money can be reinvested in more equipment to produce more income.

In some cases, capital itself is sold outright either all at once or little by little. When the seller gets more than he paid for it in a single sale, the profit is subject to a special tax limited to 25 percent. This is known as capital gains.

Oil, gas, coal, and other minerals are considered to be capital in their original state in the ground. Sometimes these deposits are sold outright. In such cases the purchaser who may pay \$1.25 per barrel for the oil in place is entitled to deduct that amount tax-free from each barrel's income as it is brought to the surface and sold. This form of deduction is termed "cost depletion." During the life of the deposit, as his capital is sold little by little, the operator is returned the amount of his original capital investment, to permit him to reinvest the money in more oil reserves.

In all these cases a value has been set on the capital items involved. The value is based on what someone is willing to pay for it. That is, value is determined directly by cost.

But when a new reserve or deposit of oil or coal or metal is discovered in the first place, it has a value which is not necessarily related to the cost of finding it. When you are searching for oil, you are not assured of finding X dollars' worth of oil by spending X dollars looking for it. Sometimes you discover oil worth more than you spent, sometimes less. More often than not, you spend your money and find nothing.

WHAT OF OIL'S FUTURE?

The statistics of finding new oil, even under the present workable program, might appear to paint a grim picture of tomorrow's supply. 27½ percent depletion notwithstanding. But we are not running out of oil. And under a continuation of the historic incentive set up by Congress, we can look forward to a sufficient domestic supply for many years to come.

Geologists across the land are firm in the belief that as much oil remains to be discovered between depths of 5,000 and 10,000 feet as has already been found above 5,000 feet. By a wide margin, most of our oil today is produced from depths shallower than 5,000 feet. Our exploratory wells are being drilled deeper each year. Yet, the average depth of all such wildcats has still not reached 5,000 feet.

The deepest well in the world was drilled last year in Pecos County, Tex. It reached 25,340 feet and was a major milestone in oil history. Its cost has been estimated at more than \$2½ million.

This deeper drilling outlook emphasizes a cost structure peculiar to the oil industry. As drilling goes deeper, costs per foot balloon, and the rate of increase grows with each foot. Bigger equipment, more expensive supplies and materials, and extra services are needed.

Thus a 10,000-foot hole costs much more than twice as much as a 5,000-foot one. And a 20,000-foot hole may cost 10 times that of a 10,000-foot well.

Therefore, to achieve a 10,000-foot average drilling depth for exploration, the wildcatter must be given more incentive—even under present depletion provisions. Prices must rise or the increased costs of drilling—aside from inflation—will discourage his risking capital on a not-too-attractive venture.

To remove even part of his present incentive might prove disastrous. It could send this country galloping down the road to a "have-not" position in this vital energy source.

Given this assurance, the oil industry stands ready to deliver, as it has in the past. Oil finders are moving into virgin areas which show promise of oil and gas.

Billions of barrels undoubtedly lie waiting in stratigraphic traps which cannot now be found by any surface-exploration method.

But we may be on the threshold of a breakthrough on this important front. Given a technique to indicate the presence of these potentially prolific oil deposits, we could re-explore the entire Nation with renewed possibilities of discovery.

We have not yet explored all of our geographical area with the tools we now have. Obviously, we have looked first in the areas which are least costly to explore. But the waters of the gulf coast and the far reaches of Alaska serve as good examples of new oil provinces of considerable promise.

We need also to look deeper in our established oil provinces. The industry maintains an aggressive research program aimed at reaching these more remote sources of petroleum.

Our prospects for finding more oil here at home were summed up recently by Morgan J. Davis, president of Humble Oil & Refining Co. Here are some of his points:

"The United States is not poor in petroleum reserves or resources.

"Reserves are at an all-time high and we have an adequate working inventory for current needs.

"Our present reserve producing capacity of 3 million barrels per day can be sustained for many years if the industry continues its aggressive exploration and development program.

"We have sound basis for believing that discoveries and reserves of petroleum can keep pace with increasing domestic requirements for a long period.

"In the next 20 years, with little allowance for increased recovery due to improved techniques, we can add at least 70 billion barrels of supply to the 30 billion we now have.

"The industry can maintain the reasonable cost of domestic oil and gas compared with other energy sources, so long as it continues its technological progress and is assisted by regulatory agencies to be as efficient as it knows how to be."

He saves his biggest point for his last:

"The prospects for the domestic petroleum industry could be changed drastically, however, by unwise actions by State regulatory agencies, the Federal Government, or the industry itself, on such matters as conservation, percentage depletion, and import policy. It has taken a long time to build the present vigor of the domestic petroleum industry, and such vigor, once impaired, cannot quickly be restored."

The 19 and the 1,368

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit the following editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press of January 29, 1960, so that it will be more widely read:

THE 19 AND THE 1,368

There has been a lot of publicity recently about protests against the provision of the Federal law that requires students who want to finance their personal education with taxpayers' money in the name of national defense to pledge allegiance to the United States and declare they have no connection with any group advocating overthrow of the Federal Government by force.

The protesting colleges particularly don't like the required disclaimer of advocacy of violent overthrow of the Government. Its effect would be this: If someone obtained tax money by swearing falsely, as Communists might, he could be charged with perjury. It should be remembered that Alger Hiss was punished for his treason only on a perjury charge.

But the important sidelight is this: Loud though the protests have been against the loyalty provisions, only 19 schools, most of them in the Ivy League, have rejected the Federal program. Meanwhile, 1,368 other colleges and universities have accepted it.

We should not let the noisy 19 force a change in law which would be a concession to the Communist left.

Cuban Relations and Cessation of High Altitude Flights Over Berlin Corridor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Indianapolis Star of March 13, 1960, carried a front-page editorial discussing the administration's position with respect to Cuba and the cessation of high altitude flights over the Berlin corridor.

In view of the return of our Ambassador to Cuba, I believe that this editorial is particularly pertinent. Just how much truth is there to the charge that Castro's government is Communist dominated? Are we appeasing Castro? We know that Castro has permitted Cuba to enter into a trade agreement with Russia. We know he expects to receive arms and munitions from Russia. This poses a grave threat to the peace of this hemisphere, and I believe that the President should carefully evaluate his position with respect to the United States' relations with Castro.

The recent cessation of high altitude flights over the Berlin corridor has also raised questions in the minds of many as to whether or not we are appeasing Russia. The editorial says "Whether officials in Washington call it 'peaceful coexistence,' or 'relaxation of tensions,' or 'working for a better international climate,' this policy is producing the same results—concessions to Soviet viewpoints, retreats of U.S. diplomacy under Soviet pressure, surrender of important American political and ideological positions."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "What Goes On Here?" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

What's happened to American foreign policy? Have we completely lost our self-respect, our political judgment, our diplomatic skill? Have we thrown overboard our vigilant guard against the Communist menace? Where is the policy of "peaceful coexistence" with Moscow really leading us?

Are we going back to the World War II United States-Russian alliance, which brought us on the brink of national disaster?

These are important and disturbing questions which the American people have the right to ask especially in view of two very regrettable foreign-policy decisions made by the Eisenhower administration during the last few days. The first is sickening appeasement to the Communist-dominated Castro regime in Cuba, revealed in President Eisenhower's TV and radio speech on Latin America. The second is the cowardly retreat, announced by Secretary of State Christian Herter, on the question of American high-altitude flights over the Berlin corridor.

Castro's government, as it is known, has been mistreating American citizens and confiscating American property with a systematic brutality hardly seen since the days, some 12 years ago, when the Chinese Reds descended on the peaceful American communities on the Chinese mainland. Yet the United States proposes to do nothing about Castro. The United States even will go on paying the Castro regime a handsome sugar subsidy, as well as substantial military aid and other economic assistance. In his TV and radio speech, President Eisenhower, who didn't even dare mention Castro by name, only suggested that the Organization of American States might, perhaps in some distant future, deal collectively with the Cuban situation. This, of course, amounts to giving Castro the green light, and letting him know, officially, that he can go on indefinitely with his anti-American policy. For Castro is as afraid of the collective action of the Organization of American States as Russia's Nikita Khrushchev was afraid of the collective action of the United Nations during the 1956 Hungarian national revolution.

Instead of talking about the theoretical possibilities of future collective actions, President Eisenhower should have invoked the Monroe Doctrine under which the United States—and not any non-effective collective group of states—gives notice to all non-American powers not to intervene in any way in the internal affairs of the American continent. The Monroe Doctrine was effective for more than a hundred years because the world knew that the power of the United States stood behind it. In the face of Communist provocations in Cuba, the United States is more than justified to take steps, under the Monroe Doctrine, to defend its national interests.

Equally shocking is the case of the Berlin flights. The United States stopped its high-level flights through the Berlin corridor about a year ago, on Soviet demand. But the United States, Britain, and France, insisted that they could and would resume the flights any time they felt it necessary. This happened 2 weeks ago and United States officially served notice that it was resuming the flights. The Soviets immediately staged a hue-and-cry campaign, and accused the United States of aggressive intentions, etc. The West German Government of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer sent several urgent pleas to Washington warning that the Soviet protests should be ignored. But Secretary of State Herter announced that, after all, the allies had decided against the flights. He added that this has been a technical decision, not connected with the coming summit conference.

This is, of course, pure nonsense. To say the least, Secretary Herter is guilty not only of making a shamefully wrong foreign-policy decision, he is also guilty of telling untruths about it to the American people. The truth is that the Berlin flights are not to be resumed in deference to those Western foreign policy advisers—in London and Washington—who believe that the Red dictators should not be displeased in any way before

the summit conference. For the same reason the United States joined Britain a few weeks ago in vetoing a sensible German-Spanish military cooperation agreement. For the same reason U.S. delegates at the East-West disarmament conference, which starts in Geneva tomorrow have been instructed to show cool indifference toward the positions of the French delegation, which takes a sensible anti-Soviet stand.

In short, U.S. foreign policy is at present conducted under the guiding principle of appeasement to communism. Whether officials in Washington call it peaceful coexistence, or relaxation of tensions, or working for a better international climate, this policy is producing the same results—concessions to Soviet viewpoints, retreats of U.S. diplomacy under Soviet pressure, surrender of important American political and ideological positions. There is also no doubt that President Eisenhower is personally responsible for this situation. Since the tragic death of John Foster Dulles, Mr. Eisenhower has been his own Secretary of State and has conducted the foreign policy of the United States on the basis of his personal-diplomacy approach. Unfortunately, President Eisenhower's ardent ambition to prove himself the world's greatest peacemaker has blinded his political vision to such an extent that he doesn't see he might become the world's greatest appeaser of communism.

Regulation of the Price of Gas at the Wellhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letters.

Realizing the importance of the gas industry to our State and realizing the confusion that has existed in regard to the regulation of the price of gas at the wellhead by the Federal Power Commission, I wrote a letter to the President urging him to send a message to Congress concerning the gas situation. I herewith include as part of my remarks a copy of the letter which I wrote to the President and a copy of the letter the President sent to me.

FEBRUARY 5, 1960.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall that at the time you vetoed the gas bill that was passed by the Congress, I vigorously urged you to sign it, and it was a severe disappointment to a lot of my constituents when you vetoed it.

I have defended your veto on the ground that at the time that you were compelled to either sign or veto the bill, there were a lot of rumors floating around Washington as to bribes having been offered to other Members of the Senate. It developed that these rumors were unfounded. However, if you had signed the gas bill after the information that you had concerning Senator CASE and then a scandal had developed you would have been severely criticized. My people have accepted this defense. However, many

of them keep saying, "If the President is for a gas bill, why hasn't he said something about it since the veto?"

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to send some kind of a message to the Congress advocating the passage of a gas bill during this session. I am thoroughly convinced that justice demands a bill which removes the power from the Federal Power Commission to establish the price of gas at the wellhead. The only occasion for establishing the price of any commodity is that there is a monopoly granted to some industry, such as public utilities. There is no monopoly in the production of gas. There are over 8,000 producers competing with each other for the market. To say that these 8,000 have a monopoly at the same time that we say that 4 or 5 automobile companies that make all the automobiles don't have a monopoly is asinine.

There is not a commodity that doesn't deserve price fixing just as much as gas at the wellhead. Therefore until the time that we have complete price controls in this country, we shouldn't control the price of one commodity except on the basis of a monopoly.

I certainly hope that you will give this serious consideration.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PAGE BELCHER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1960.

HON. PAGE BELCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAGE: Your recent letter expressed the hope that I would send a message to Congress during this session advocating once again the passage of a gas bill. I feel sure that everyone clearly understands my position on this matter. I have strongly favored the elimination of public utility-type regulation of producers of natural gas. Both before and since the veto of the gas bill in 1956 I have advocated legislation to this end. I still favor such legislation.

In existing circumstances, however, a mere reiteration of my viewpoint on this matter would probably serve no useful purpose. I am ready and willing to support this legislation in this session with full vigor if those in control of Congress give some indication that they will join in this effort.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Tight Money Versus Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the steady drumbeat of signals that the economy can ill afford a further rise in interest rates continues. In the Washington Star of March 19 the real estate editor, Robert J. Lewis, writes:

Whatever merits the administration's tight-money policy may have, there is no denial that this policy is:

1. Having a severely adverse effect on the rate of home production.
2. Imposing an implicit downward pressure on the value of existing homes.
3. Making it impossible for many thousands of families to buy homes that they need.

On Thursday, March 17, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania demonstrated that the Treasury is perfectly well able to market its long-term obligations because prevailing yields on bonds are far enough below the 4 1/4-percent ceiling to make new issues attractive to investors.

At the present time approximately 4 million men and women, or 4.8 percent of the labor force, seasonally adjusted, continue to be unemployed. The number of new starts in house building continues to scrape along at low levels, compared with previous years. The number of new starts in the month of February was 288,000 below the corresponding period a year ago. In spite of the great growth of our country in the past 10 years, the fact is that we have not yet attained the level of housing starts we reached in 1950.

These facts point to the immense underemployment of the Nation's productive capacity. The tight-money high-interest-rate policy is restraining the growth of our economy at a time when growth is badly needed, not just to meet pressing needs in the fields of education, health, housing, and transportation, to name just a few, but also to make effective use of idle machinery and unemployed workers.

In his article Mr. Lewis describes the emergency home ownership bill recently reported favorably by the House Banking Committee. He draws on that committee's report to provide a firm underpinning to the undeniable conclusion that "there is ample evidence everywhere that the administration's tight-money policy has completely removed from the market a sizable group of prospective buyers." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lewis's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHT MONEY VERSUS HOMES—DEFLATIONARY IMPACT HITS HOUSING

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Whatever merits the administration's tight-money policy may have, there is no denial that this policy is:

1. Having a severely adverse effect on the rate of home production.
2. Imposing an implicit downward pressure on the value of existing homes.
3. Making it impossible for many thousands of families to buy homes that they need.

FAR BELOW YEAR AGO

Ever since October, there has been a month-to-month decline below year-ago levels in the seasonally adjusted rate of homes put under construction for private ownership.

The 5-month record of decline from the corresponding months of the previous year appears to be serious. Each month's drop in the number of homes started is as follows:

October—123,000.
November—217,000.
December—122,000.
January—154,000.
February—288,000.

If the rate of decline continues—and there is little to indicate, at the moment, that a reversal of the tight-money policy is contemplated—yearly production may soon dip to recession levels, observers believe.

PRESSURE EFFECTIVE

In any deflationary period, the value of things declines in relation to the dollar, and homes are no exception. While it would be difficult to measure the exact effect, so far, upon existing homes, there is no question that the downward pressure does exist and that it is effective, even though not upon all homes equally.

As for hampering sales of new and existing homes, there is ample evidence everywhere that the administration's tight-money policy has completely removed from the market a sizable group of prospective buyers.

Application of restrictive credit policies by the Federal Reserve Board has pushed mortgage interest rates to their highest level since the twenties. In this economic climate, lenders have become selective. The result is that many families needing homes have discovered that the income they have is now insufficient to qualify them for homes for which they easily would have been eligible before the latest episode transpired in the administration's long-term tight-money program.

REPORT FAVORABLE

With this background of evidence of a rapidly declining home-production rate, of downward pressure on the value of existing homes, and of neutralization of a sizable part of the potential demand, the House Banking Committee's favorable report this week of the emergency home ownership bill came as a welcome event for homebuilders.

The bill would provide an additional \$1 billion in mortgage-purchase authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association and make other changes designed to support housing production.

Among changes are provisions that would:

1. Allow FHA to insure home loans made by individuals as well as by institutional lenders.

2. Permit FHA to reduce its mortgage insurance premium from one-half of 1 percent to one-quarter of 1 percent.

3. Authorize FNMA to "aid in stabilization of the mortgage market" and thus exclude as a requirement that the agency lower the prices of the mortgages it sells to keep them "within the range of market prices."

4. Require FNMA to buy any FHA or VA mortgage offered to it, with certain exceptions, and to desist from refusing to buy on the basis that certain mortgages would not be marketable.

NO MORE EXCHANGES

5. Require FNMA to sell mortgages only for cash and at prices not less than FNMA originally paid. This would, as one of its effects, prevent repetition of the agency's action in exchanging mortgages for outstanding Government bonds.

6. Require anyone selling a mortgage to FNMA to buy only 1 percent of the agency's stock, instead of 2 percent as at present.

7. Authorize FNMA to purchase \$50 million in mortgages on new low-cost homes in outlying areas as a means of encouraging such construction.

8. Make changes designed to encourage construction of off-base defense housing, allow acquisition of housing at permanent military installations, and supply needed housing for certain employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The report has some harsh words to say about the tight-money policy as it has affected home production, interest rates, and financing methods.

POLICY HELD BALKED

It charges that the shortage of mortgage credit "has caused a costly upward spiral of interest rates, unconscionable discounts on FHA and VA mortgages, increased use of unsound and costly financing devices in the conventional loan sector, and a serious decline in home building."

The report continues:

"This has frustrated our national policy of improving housing conditions and encouraging home ownership on a sound basis. Moreover, the drop in residential construction which has taken place over the past year has resulted in a loss of more than half a million jobs.

"The experience of the 1957-58 recession proved that a downtrend in home building activity, if allowed to continue unchecked, can undermine the entire economy."

The report, which was submitted by Chairman Spence, was based on hearings held by the Housing Subcommittee headed by Chairman Rains, who introduced the bill.

The report made clear the committee was "convinced that the drop-off in new home construction, in the face of strong demand for housing, is the direct result of the restrictive monetary policies pursued by the monetary and fiscal authorities."

"The hearings held on this bill established conclusively that this tight-money policy has a particularly severe impact on residential construction," it said.

Referring to the present status of mortgage loan availability, the committee termed it "an artificially created credit shortage." The decline in homes put under construction, the report said, "could well" fall to a "dangerously low" level soon.

Occurrence of Unexpected Concurrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in my memory, the distinguished editor of the Iola Register, Angelo Scott, finds himself in agreement with me. The issue: my resolution, House Joint Resolution 601, which calls for a constitutional amendment to provide a 4-year term on a staggered basis for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am happy indeed, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Scott, who is of the opposite political persuasion, also feels that a staggered 4-year term in the House would be of benefit to the country in the long run. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that had this proposal been in effect during the past half century, many of the men who served with you in the House would have chosen to run for the Senate. Because of the important functions of the House, where revenue-raising and appropriation measures originate, it is of the utmost importance that more competent and experienced Representatives choose to remain in this body.

I request, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Scott's editorial be included in the extension of my remarks:

FOUR-YEAR TERMS

NEWELL GEORGE has introduced in Congress a joint resolution proposing amendment of the Constitution to provide a 4-year term on a staggered basis for Members of the House.

He frankly admits that "there is no probability that such an amendment could be adopted during my tenure in Congress." Maybe he did it just to give himself something to write home about in his letter to constituents. Nevertheless, it's a good idea.

The original purpose in electing House Members every 2 years was to bring to the Congress from the people a fresh viewpoint. And that's still a valid purpose.

But it doesn't need to be that fresh.

If half the Congressmen were elected each 2 years, the purpose would still be served. And the benefits of 4-year terms would be considerable—half as many political campaigns, twice as long, to be a statesman before having to become a campaigning politician again.

Actually, with Government and public affairs as complicated as they are these days, 2 years is scarcely long enough to get acquainted with congressional procedures, let alone influence them.

A freshman Congressman with only 2 years to go is a pretty poor thing except for his one lone vote. He is scarcely noticed by his conferees until he has proved that he can get reelected at least once.

They would have to notice him if he had 4 years to go from the very beginning. It would add a lot to the overall dignity and usefulness of the office.

Enhancement of Fishing Resources on Sacramento River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the unheralded benefits of the Central Valley project which the Federal Bureau of Reclamation has built and is operating in California is an enhancement of the fishery resources of the Sacramento River.

The Sacramento has become the major spawning stream in the State for salmon as the result of cold water releases from the depths of Lake Shasta through the turbines of the Shasta and Keswick hydroelectric plants.

A recent story in the Redding Record Searchlight relates another way in which operations at Lake Shasta, in the State from which I come, have protected the fish by diluting and flushing out the toxic pollution from old mine tailings in the Spring Creek watershed.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Redding Record Searchlight, Feb. 4, 1960]

KESWICK RELEASES DOUBLED TO SAVE FISH FROM POLLUTION

Water from Lake Shasta poured through the gates of Keswick Dam this week at a temporarily doubled rate of flow.

Bureau of Reclamation officials released the water in an effort to save fish in the Sacramento River from the polluted waters of Spring Creek.

Results have been good, because "We have not had a dead fish so far," says Felix Dashen, chief of operations at Shasta Dam.

But the Bureau may decide to stop releasing water, on the basis that future dilution of poisons washed into the river won't be necessary.

Tomorrow Bureau officials at regional headquarters in Sacramento will decide

whether it will be necessary to continue the dilution during the rest of the winter and spring. State and Federal fish and game representatives may also attend the meeting.

"The agreement may be changed," says Dashen. "We believe the first rains are what wash the poisons into the water. After that, a normal flow is enough to offset pollution."

"The less we release, the better off we are," he says. "They're getting more water down river now, and we should conserve water here for summer needs. Whatever is released at Keswick must be compensated by a release at Shasta."

Heavy rains flowing from the highly polluted Spring Creek watershed have increased the toxicity of the waters. Old mine tailings in the Spring Creek watershed cause the pollution.

By increasing the flow of water from Keswick Dam, officials hope to dilute the poisons from Spring Creek. Recent rains have given the Bureau the first good chance to test the plan since an agreement to release water was made last year by the State fish and game department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau.

Dilution began last November when the Spring Creek flow increased. The Bureau watches the flow, and when it hits dangerous toxicity, water from Keswick is released.

The antidote from Shasta's waters reached a flow Monday at Keswick of 8,100 cubic feet per second. Today it was 4,200 cubic feet per second. Normal flow is 3,500 cubic feet per second.

"It's the first year we've tried the plan," says James Stokes, State fish and game regional manager, "and we'll see how it affects pollution."

High waters in Spring Creek not only leach poison from the mine tailings, but build a delta of poison carried down river to be further washed into the Sacramento.

Another safeguard against pollution, Stokes says, is the reclamation plant at the active copper mine at Iron Mountain.

The mine was directed by the State water pollution control board to reclaim its copper tailings in a system of pipes and settling ponds. Two things are accomplished by this: marketable copper is saved and fish-killing toxicants are kept out of the river.

Communist Infiltration in American Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Republican Committee of One Hundred, Inc., New York, N.Y., March 8, 1960:

Whereas the Air Force manual describing Communist infiltration in certain American churches has been brought to the public's attention; and

Whereas the facts contained in this manual have been definitely established through findings of the House Un-American Activities Committee; and

Whereas reference has been made to frivolous material in the manuals undoubtedly publicized to divert attention from the true significance of the revealing statements in those manuals and to shield those very forces which should be exposed; and

Whereas it is of vital importance that servicemen be equipped to detect, understand, and counteract the forces of communism wherever they may be found; and

Whereas it is hoped that the majority of American churchmen are unalterably opposed to protecting such subversion: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Legislative Committee of the Republican Committee of One Hundred on March 8, 1960, express commendation to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, and the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for their important findings thus far in regard to the National Council of Churches and for their forthright stand in support of these findings; and be it further

Resolved, That Congressman WALTER be urged to continue these necessary investigations and to make these further findings available to the public.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIZABETH S. COWLES,
Chairman of Legislation.

Both Races in San Antonio Hail Integration of Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stimulating article that appeared in the New York Times of March 20, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOTH RACES IN SAN ANTONIO HAIL INTEGRATION OF STORES—BANQUET IS HIGH POINT IN WEEK OF PEACEFUL GAINS BY NEGROES

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 19.—An interracial, interfaith banquet last night was the high point of an eventful week in San Antonio, during which five downtown stores opened their lunch counters to all persons, regardless of color.

The banquet was scheduled 4 months ago by the Second Baptist Church and the St. Paul Methodist Church, both for Negroes. It is hoped that it will become an annual event, bringing to San Antonio national and international figures for a cultural event.

Negro leaders said the timing of the banquet was fortuitous in that it took place Friday night right after the peaceful integration of the downtown lunch counters.

San Antonians of all races have accepted the integration of the lunch counters. This is not surprising in view of the fact that public schools began integrating here in 1955 and a year later the city's recreational facilities, including golf courses and swimming pools, were integrated, all without incident.

HOW IT HAPPENED

About 4 weeks ago, as Negroes in the South began demonstrations for desegregated lunch counters, the Rev. C. Don Baugh, executive director of the San Antonio Council of Churches, began conferences aimed at opening the lunch counters to all.

Mr. Baugh, who is white, talked with pastors of all faiths and businessmen and leaders of the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce.

Meanwhile, on March 7 Mary Lillian Andrews, 17-year-old freshman at Our Lady of the Lake College here and president of the

San Antonio Youth Group of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, began sending letters to downtown stores.

She pointed out that youth of all races in San Antonio went to school, rode the buses and enjoyed municipal recreation facilities together, "but they cannot sit down and eat together."

In her letters she asked the stores to abide by the principles of the Bible and the U.S. Constitution and to "abolish this discriminatory practice in your store."

FIVE STORES AGREE

Although Miss Andrews gave no deadline for compliance in her letter, San Antonio Negroes held a meeting last Monday night. Mr. Baugh called an emergency meeting for last Tuesday of those he had been conferring with and told them that the Negroes had set a Thursday deadline for an answer.

It was feared that demonstrations might be staged at lunch counters here as they had at other places in the South.

Five of six downtown stores agreed to open their lunch counters. The sixth store, Joske's of Texas, said it had not had ample time to study the matter and requested 30 days to make its decision.

The stores that agreed to desegregate their lunch counters were Nelsens, F. W. Woolworth, S. H. Kress, H. L. Green, and McCrory's.

Few Negroes appeared at the lunch counters Wednesday. But as they requested service there was no incident. Whites accepted the new situation calmly.

Thursday night Negroes held a meeting at Mount Pleasant Baptist Church to hear their leaders discuss how they should conduct themselves in the desegregation.

LET'S BE NORMAL

Their youth leader, Miss Andrews, told them:

"You now have the privilege. Take it and use it, but don't be unusual. Let's be normal."

At Thursday night's meeting of the Negroes, Harry V. Burns, State youth director of the NAACP, read a letter prepared by a Negro elementary-school principal, Mrs. Balmer T. Oliver, and sent home to parents with the schoolchildren.

In her letter Mrs. Oliver cautioned Negro parents "to go in places calmly, to speak softly, avoid pushing, to await your turn, accept service graciously, to pay the posted price of food courteously, to use good manners at all times, to be neat in appearance, to avoid loud laughter and giggling, and to use the words 'thank you' and 'please' because they are valuable."

Referring to the meeting of church and business leaders that set up lunch-counter desegregation, the Reverend S. H. James, pastor of the Second Baptist Church, told the group Thursday night:

"This was a meeting in good faith. Everybody demonstrated good faith."

"There was a feeling that after the 30 days we would have something like an open city. He made it plain this was just an opening wedge. We felt we should move into everything—hotels, motels, restaurants, privately operated amusement parks."

"We want facilities available when we need them. We don't want overt demonstrations."

"We are proud of all the people of San Antonio, for we have here an oasis of privilege in a desert of racial unrest in the South."

ROBINSON PRAISES CITY

In a speech at the banquet Friday night, Jackie Robinson, the former baseball star, said San Antonians were setting examples for the whole Nation.

"It is a story that should be told around the world," he declared.

Comparing San Antonio's decision to integrate lunch counters with his own entry into major-league baseball, Mr. Robinson

said, "People have more fears than actual problems."

"We are not interested," he said, "in interracial marriage. It's not important. Of course, we are not opposed, but we know that love will conquer all, be the participants white, Mexican, or Negro."

White and Negro leaders in San Antonio believe that most lunch counters and restaurants here will be desegregated in another month.

A stranger in this city would not know that any unusual event had taken place here in the last week.

Police Chief George Bichsel has labeled the burning of a cross in a downtown park last Wednesday night as the work of cranks. This has been the only sign of disagreement with lunch-counter desegregation in San Antonio.

H.R. 9303, To Provide Crop Price Support Commodity Loans of Not More Than \$50,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the information on loans made under the 1959 crop price-support programs by the Commodity Stabilization Service of the Department of Agriculture just released vividly points up the importance of my bill, H.R. 9303, to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to provide that not more than \$50,000 price support shall be extended to any person in a year. The bill is pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The present law permits loans over \$50,000 but requires all such loans be repaid in money with interest. This limitation came about as an amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill and as a result it will expire at the end of this year, or December 31, 1960.

Without enactment of legislation of the nature I propose, it is reasonable to assume the Federal Government will be making similar gigantic loans again next year at a loss to the taxpayer. Without legislation, any size loan can be made and repayment is not required in money. It will be possible to make repayment by commodity, resulting in a loss of millions of dollars to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

As I said on the floor many times last year, the \$50,000 limitation is higher than desirable. In my opinion, it should be reduced to \$25,000 or less. However, in view of the formidable opposition to any limitation on the Democratic side of the aisle, the \$50,000 limitation is probably the most realistic limitation that can be enacted. The most important thing is that some limitation is enacted and thereby not increasing the cost of operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation by a continued Government subsidy to the big corporation farms. The legislative history of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorization does not suggest that such a subsidy was foreseen or anticipated by the Congress,

The following is the 1959 crop price support commodity loans of \$50,000 or more, by producer. This report covers only those commodities for which the loan-making period terminated on January 31, 1960; and the amounts shown represent loans made, without regard to whether the loans have been repaid or will be repaid before maturity:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

1959-crop price-support commodity loans of \$50,000 or more, by producer

BARLEY (BUSHELS)

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
ARIZONA				CALIFORNIA—continued			
Younger Farms	Buckeye, Ariz.	318,639	\$270,835.50	Giffen, Inc.	Huron, Calif.	1,049,990	\$923,991.20
Arlington Cattle Co.	Arlington, Ariz.	67,768	57,602.80	Employees Enterprises, Inc.	do.	494,371	435,046.48
CALIFORNIA				Price Giffen Ranch	Firebaugh, Calif.	299,025	263,142.00
Salzer Land Co.	Corcoran, Calif.	1,291,667	1,136,606.56	South Lake Farms	Corcoran, Calif.	187,292	164,816.64
Westlake Farms, Inc.	Stratford, Calif.	1,186,250	1,017,499.82	Five Points Ranch, Inc.	Five Points, Calif.	124,941	107,509.12
				Jack Harris, Inc.	do.	111,059	97,731.92

BEANS, DRY EDIBLE (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

CALIFORNIA	Address	Quantity	Amount	COLORADO	Address	Quantity	Amount
C. J. Segerstrom & Sons	Santa Ana, Calif.	11,200	\$98,672.00	Western Bean Growers Association	Denver, Colo.	14,400	\$69,732.00

GRAIN SORGHUM (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

NEBRASKA	Address	Quantity	Amount	TEXAS	Address	Quantity	Amount
Morrison & Quirk	Hastings, Nebr.	44,712	\$63,937.77	Massey & Harper	Robstown, Tex.	74,569	\$137,207.08
NEW MEXICO				Simmonds & Perry	do.	30,880	56,819.71
Williams & Sons	Clovis, N. Mex.	41,261	61,066.28	Gutersloh Ranch	Plains, Tex.	38,370	56,788.12
				Clarence Martin	Priona, Tex.	37,737	55,850.76
				Fred Blundell	Lockhart, Tex.	28,719	52,843.39
				Bert Williams	Farwell, Tex.	35,383	52,366.84
				Fred S. Pegel	Amarillo, Tex.	38,374	51,805.20

RICE (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

ARKANSAS	Address	Quantity	Amount	MISSISSIPPI	Address	Quantity	Amount
Arkansas Rice Growers Cooperative Association	Stuttgart, Ark.	2,431,595	\$12,430,371.87	C. S. Whittington Planting Co.	Greenwood, Miss.	18,012	\$75,176.77
Producer Rice Mills, Inc.	do.	392,631	2,081,058.44	J. & V. Aguzzi	Cleveland, Miss.	12,923	63,296.93
Craighead Rice Milling Co.	Jonesboro, Ark.	50,232	271,730.64	MISSOURI			
Redbud Farms, Inc.	Wahash, Ark.	27,436	134,536.52	H. W. Mahan	Farma, Mo.	11,090	55,227.20
W. B. Bynum Cooperative Co.	Dermott, Ark.	22,319	107,913.16	TEXAS			
Leon & Chester Rutledge, Albert Bullard	Newport, Ark.	18,945	87,303.47	E. J. Stoesser	Dayton, Tex.	23,910	125,438.65
Arkansas State Penitentiary	Grady, Ark.	17,415	81,640.10	Koop Bros.	Edna, Tex.	24,075	116,300.45
George Smith & Charles Currie	Dewitt, Ark.	13,584	70,683.84	Chocolate Bayou Rice & Canal Co.	Alvin, Tex.	18,233	78,109.45
R. C. Nicholson, George Smith estate	Brinkley, Ark.	14,005	69,480.91	L. Ranch Duncan & Cory	Canada, Tex.	16,719	75,234.42
J. M. Leach & Son	Marion, Ark.	12,570	63,638.18	A. L. Clark, G. A. Jennings, Bob McCann	Port Lavaca, Tex.	11,289	55,994.63
Dr. V. Pardo, John & Paul Flowers	Monroe, Ark.	11,637	60,550.89	Golden Red Corp.	El Campo, Tex.	12,300	55,077.63
James C. Cooper, S. J. Norsworth, T. L. Woffard	Weiner, Ark.	10,989	53,406.54	Nand M. Farinas, Ltd.	Anahua, Tex.	11,733	53,242.48
J. L. Cole & Son, Inc.	Cotton Plant, Ark.	11,707	51,216.29	Dugat Bros.	Winnie, Tex.	8,975	51,535.17
LOUISIANA							
Louisiana Rice Growers, Inc.	Crowley, La.	177,059	\$49,528.36				
Haumie Guidry	Oberlin, La.	10,256	53,752.11				

SOYBEANS (BUSHELS)

ARKANSAS	Address	Quantity	Amount	MISSISSIPPI	Address	Quantity	Amount
J. F. Twist Plantation	Twist, Ark.	54,385	\$98,942.84	Bledsoe Plantation	Greenwood, Miss.	41,221	\$73,613.67
Lee Wilson & Co.	Wilson, Ark.	48,966	91,077.19	MISSOURI			
Brooks Griffin	Ratio, Ark.	30,772	56,005.04	E. B. Gee	Blytheville, Ark.	144,000	270,180.00
				Story Farms, Inc.	Wolf Island, Mo.	27,561	50,436.01

WHEAT (BUSHELS)

ARIZONA	Address	Quantity	Amount	COLORADO	Address	Quantity	Amount
Rancho Tierra Prieta	Eloy, Ariz.	37,047	\$52,607.04	C. V. Cogburn	Walsh, Colo.	68,000	\$112,200.00
Theba Farms	Gila Bend, Ariz.	36,383	51,663.86	Clifford C. Hart	Holly, Colo.	53,955	92,073.60
CALIFORNIA				Rooney Farms	Garden City, Kans.	47,206	85,050.69
Heidrick Bros.	Woodland, Calif.	40,717	79,398.46	Iron Mueller, Inc. of Colorado	Bird City, Kans.	42,563	77,039.03
Employees Enterprises, Inc.	Huron, Calif.	39,909	77,478.11	Bartland Barth	Holly, Colo.	44,000	75,343.16
Jackson & Reinert	Paso Robles, Calif.	40,184	76,570.68	E. E. Foster & Sons	Nunn, Colo.	35,974	62,235.02
Gorindo & Brown	Lancaster, Calif.	35,873	70,311.08	Sprague Bros.	Holyoke, Colo.	37,863	61,716.97
E. L. Wallace & Sons	Woodland, Calif.	30,723	59,908.55	C. B. Hart	Holly, Colo.	34,343	58,382.25
Giffen, Inc.	Huron, Calif.	28,780	55,694.99	R. H. Garvey estate	Wichita, Kans.	33,982	50,749.10
E. L. Wallace	Woodland, Calif.	27,762	54,135.47	Edwin, Ernest & Ray Westoff	Boulder, Colo.	30,111	52,918.98
				Moffitt & Moffitt	Derby, Colo.	29,757	51,777.75
				Wayne E. Tallman	Brandon, Colo.	28,620	51,656.90

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—Continued

1959-crop price-support commodity loans of \$50,000 or more, by producer—Continued

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
IDAHO				OREGON—Continued			
W. T. Wagner & Sons	Lewiston, Idaho	89,399	\$145,820.22	R. G. Bafus	Colfax, Wash.	32,890	\$63,063.69
Leonard Schritter	Aberdeen, Idaho	67,801	121,160.96	L. S. & Glen Thorne	Pendleton, Oreg.	35,940	61,367.17
Meacham Land & Cattle Co.	Caldwell, Idaho	41,396	72,029.04	Conco Cab Co.	Condon, Oreg.	35,182	61,216.95
KANSAS				F. L. Watkins	Wasco, Oreg.	30,662	57,031.32
Dale Steele	Ford, Kans.	46,141	83,701.79	Amanda S. Duval	Heppner, Oreg.	28,621	52,376.43
W. T. Rooney, Jr.	Garden City, Kans.	42,196	74,549.42	Delbert Emert	Ione, Oreg.	28,704	52,241.28
John Kriss Farms	Colby, Kans.	40,125	71,422.50	Rosenberg Bros.	Pendleton, Oreg.	30,883	52,192.90
James S. Garvey	do	36,936	62,302.67	McCanse, Kaufman & Graham	North Powder, Oreg.	30,707	50,396.30
Benton Jones	Glasco, Kans.	32,208	59,270.02	TEXAS			
Ellsworth Sherman	Garden City, Kans.	33,669	58,625.76	Thomas L. Moran	Dumas, Tex.	122,296	219,327.03
Carl N. Brullier	Moscow, Kans.	32,499	57,523.81	Mrs. M. W. McClay & Sons	Morse, Tex.	36,632	63,373.93
Albert & Ronald Fralum	Colby, Kans.	32,446	57,104.96	C. J. Kuper	Dalhart, Tex.	36,467	62,397.18
Fred H. Schild	Goodland, Kans.	31,624	55,974.48	Ray L. Batman	Grain Valley, Mo.	33,840	57,866.11
Darrell Dikeman	Syracuse, Kans.	29,500	53,985.00	Claude Johnson	Dalhart, Tex.	33,109	56,255.39
Arnold Shields	Goodland, Kans.	29,048	52,286.99	R. C. Godwin	Hereford, Tex.	28,581	52,017.42
MONTANA				John C. Bergner	Stinnett, Tex.	28,050	51,612.00
Campbell Farming Corp.	Hardin, Mont.	77,632	123,616.04	WASHINGTON			
Sheffels Farms, Inc.	Great Falls, Mont.	67,375	109,776.98	Edgar W. Smith & Sons	Lancaster, Wash.	69,533	121,682.80
E. G. Onstad	Carter, Mont.	50,309	81,876.63	Virgil J. Feezell	Mabton, Wash.	59,091	107,911.37
Bill McCarter	Gulata, Mont.	42,669	70,827.82	Don Damon	Spokane, Wash.	50,220	89,629.67
McNutt Bros.	Eugene, Oreg.	38,071	61,917.62	J. G. Peyton Trust, H. F. Diedrich, Doerschlag Bros.	Sprague, Wash.	47,840	84,531.51
J. G. Robertson	Floweree, Mont.	36,183	58,810.03	Carl Boyd	Pullman, Wash.	48,147	84,216.11
R. K. Katzenberger	Highwood, Mont.	35,600	57,579.79	Owes & Belsby	Amber, Wash.	47,515	82,618.90
Formanack & Formanack	Lodge Grass, Mont.	35,112	56,881.44	Bl County Farms, Inc.	Prosser, Wash.	41,999	77,278.16
Leroy H. Anderson	Conrad, Mont.	34,500	55,840.52	R. L. Ferrell & Sons	Pomeroy, Wash.	43,814	73,169.80
NEBRASKA				Horrigan Investment Co.	Phoenix, Ariz.	39,635	72,135.70
Martha W. Jacobson	Alliance, Nebr.	41,395	73,269.15	L. C. Staley	Pullman, Wash.	41,289	71,000.52
Morrison & Quirk	Hastings, Nebr.	30,000	55,800.00	Higgenbotham Bros.	Hartline, Wash.	38,484	65,423.14
Grass Land & Cattle Co.	Lewellen, Nebr.	31,018	54,281.50	Merlen Phillips	Walla Walla, Wash.	36,161	65,089.80
John Hippen	Martin, S. Dak.	29,009	51,519.66	W. M. Boyd & Sons	Moscow, Idaho	36,444	63,534.72
NORTH DAKOTA				Charles V. Zuger	Prescott, Wash.	34,443	61,967.40
The Wittman Co.	Mohall, N. Dak.	34,903	60,033.16	Dick Young	Starbuck, Wash.	36,021	60,875.05
OREGON				Twain Bodmer	Walla Walla, Wash.	33,366	60,038.80
Ray S. Crum	Ione, Oreg.	80,292	146,934.36	Carl Moore	Kiona, Wash.	31,355	59,793.36
Key Bros.	Milton Freewater, Oreg.	54,972	99,224.27	McKenzie Bros.	Washburn, Wash.	33,084	55,581.81
King Ranches	Helix, Oreg.	49,703	89,962.43	Baumann Farm	do	31,578	54,724.73
B. L. Davis Ranch, Inc.	Adams, Oreg.	47,157	85,195.80	Russel Sieg	Hartline, Wash.	31,376	54,724.73
Kosmos & Georgaras	Pendleton, Oreg.	46,946	80,278.31	Jack and Emory Cloelius	Wattsburg, Wash.	31,358	53,049.42
Thompson Ranches	Athens, Oreg.	38,396	63,254.25	G. D. Brown & Sons	Pomeroy, Wash.	29,802	52,995.41
				Berton C. Lehn	Farmington, Wash.	29,754	51,834.02
				Leonard and Henry Franz	Lind, Wash.	30,831	61,757.82
				Joe A. Huddle	Washburn, Wash.	28,772	51,502.38
				John E. Hair	Walla Walla, Wash.	28,364	51,055.20

A Patriotic Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sumter Daily Item of March 16, 1960, entitled "A Patriotic Group." This editorial pays tribute to a great organization which has always fostered and promoted the principles of Americanism, the National Daughters of the American Revolution. I commend the DAR on its resolutions which are cited in this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PATRIOTIC GROUP

There is no more patriotic group in America than the National Daughters of the American Revolution. This group seeks to preserve this as the same sort of America that our Founding Fathers fought to establish and they oppose with all their might nearly all of the ideas advanced by liberals and modernists which would tend to change the complexion of our Government.

To give you some idea of the stand which this organization takes on current issues at its last continental congress it adopted some very strong affirmative resolutions on matters of great moment to the American people.

The resolutions adopted included the following:

For the Constitution of the United States, which is the expression of the faith of our fathers in the God-given rights of the individual citizen as opposed to any form of world government, socialism, totalitarianism or the welfare state.

For legislation to counteract the effect of decisions by the Supreme Court which have expanded the power of the Federal Government to the consequent limitation of the right conferred on both the Congress and the States, thus altering the intent of the Constitution by means of court decisions instead of by amendment.

For legislation to check inflation, curtail spending, balance the budget, reduce taxes, curtail foreign aid and enable Congress to recover its supervision over spending programs, since our freedom is dependent upon the financial solvency of this Nation.

For a more comprehensive loyalty program for all areas of government service with particular emphasis on those having to do with national security, and expressing our confidence in the integrity and effectiveness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Senate Internal Security Committee and their respective leaders.

For the support, preservation intact, and effective enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

For the preservation of the existing safeguard against intervention by the World Court in the domestic affairs of this Nation and for support of the principles of the Bricker amendment.

For urging our Government to continue its strong support of the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, and to regard this defense of equal importance with Berlin.

For opposition to Federal aid to education, such as grants-in-aid to schools, to States for educational TV channels, to libraries, and Federal scholarships, because State and local governments have the ability to know and meet their needs without Federal assistance.

For a study and analysis of UNICEF contributions, its program designed to promote the welfare state, and the selling of their Christmas cards devoid of the spirit of Christmas.

For legislation authorizing and directing the withholding of passports to U.S. citizens whose proposed international travel, in the judgment of the Department of State, would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States.

These resolutions deserve the study of all good Americans.

We need more militant American organizations like the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Dunn Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Rogers C. Dunn of McLean, Va., has spent a great deal of his time and effort in analyzing, summarizing, and explaining the results of national elections. In this field Dunn is an analyst par excellence. He has been "a voice crying in the wilderness" of political and partisan politics for many years. It is past time for the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to pay attention to his voice and heed his warnings.

For this reason I include in my remarks the latest warning of Rogers Dunn, entitled "The Popular Greed and Feed Line Versus the American People":

THE DUNN SURVEY—THE POPULAR GREED AND FEED LINE VERSUS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

This Nation is founded on popular acceptance of the belief that its citizens have the character, the ability, and the desire, for self-government. The Constitution and the institutions of government were designed to serve this belief.

This belief is the foundation of all that inspired the human, spiritual, and material achievements which made America a cherished land.

Destroy this belief and government necessarily becomes the supreme power, and the Constitution loses its position of bulwark for the people to become a tool of government.

Destroy this belief and no law, old or new, and no educational or political program, can "save America."

These are basic realities which few men have even considered.

DISCREDITED FOR 20 YEARS

For the past 20 years, virtually all leaders and organizations concerned with National Government, liberal, conservative, Republican, Democratic, have incessantly drummed into the public mind the view that great bodies of men and women no longer have the character, ability, or desire for self-government.

Farmers, workers, businessmen, and others have been portrayed to the Nation as organized groups of greedy and/or ignorant men determined to feed from the Government trough of money and special privilege regardless of vital harm to the Nation. Vast numbers of men have been pictured as desirous of being provided for by a welfare state. The vote of each group has been pictured as going to the bidder offering the most Government money or special privilege.

These representations have been accepted and parroted by a great part of the people.

This is destruction of the basic belief on which this Nation is founded, and on which rests the Constitution and its provisions for government and individual liberty.

With this breakdown of public respect for itself, even the more stalwart office seekers feel compelled to follow the greed and feed line, yield their beliefs, and bid higher for public support. Then comes the inevitable next round. Thus, there is now a snowballing action away from self-government into an all powerful state—call it socialism, welfare-state communism, or what you will.

Nothing can stop this movement from continuing as long as the people are led to

feel that their fellow citizens are incapable of, or unwilling to, exercise the qualities necessary for self-government. This has been demonstrated by the failure of all educational and political efforts to do more than put a drag on the movement.

These are realities which few men have even considered.

THE PEOPLE WERE ONCE TAUGHT TO BELIEVE THE WORLD WAS FLAT

It has been the say-so of leaders which has created and promoted the belief that the votes of a great and growing number of men and women have been won by the bidder offering the most Government money or special privilege—farmers, labor, etc.

The public has failed to note that it has never been offered substantial and exacting election facts which supported and justified these representations, and the resulting reflections against the character, or desires, of the people.

There have been no such facts. It is possible that there are communities affording isolated exceptions, but we have not seen the contention supported by exacting facts. There is a great abundance of facts upon which the issue could be determined, and there has been for years.

Nevertheless, wittingly and/or unwittingly, both "liberal" and conservative leaders have misled the people into abandoning and discrediting the one belief upon which is dependent the Constitution and its provisions for government and individual liberty—the belief that the people have the character, the ability, and the desire, for self-government.

If Communists were recognized as doing the same thing, conservatives, most liberals, and the Nation, would rise in effective wrath. As it is, Communists need only follow behind the crumbling belief on which America is founded and offer socialism—communism as a replacement—now called infiltration.

TO BREAK THROUGH THE OCTOPUS GRIP

The fundamental task is to rebuild public acceptance of the belief that their fellow citizens have the character, the ability, and the desire, for self-government, to the fullest extent justified. This includes exposing and destroying false representations of the vote which discredit the character, or desires, of the people.

Progress toward relighting the belief which is the foundation of America would release and make operational many actions which now appear to be beyond recovery. For instance:

It would discredit the excuse of "votes" used to explain why the two national party organizations compete in offering more and more government money and special privilege—packaged with more government controls and power.

It would release and stimulate open competition, between the two parties, over different concepts of government—instead of competition based on fleeting personalities, "Madison Avenue," and how much more government money to offer for votes.

It would force into open debate and determination by the people the issues of the small but powerful intellectual group versus the traditional American concepts held by the Joe and Jane Doaks on the farm, in labor, in business, and throughout the Nation.

No American could ask for more. Few Americans would shrink from pressing this opportunity once they are aware that most of their fellow citizens hold and cherish the same basic concepts.

Do the facts exist which justify this perspective and the great opportunity it affords? Yes. This report is largely a product of years of study of the actual vote.

MARCH 1960.

One-Day Delivery of Mail in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Post Office Department has been inaugurating what is known as the metro plan of postal delivery.

The plan calls for one-day delivery from place to place within a State.

The objective of the metro plan is to provide better, more efficient service. We recognize, of course, that with the inauguration of any such new systems, serious problems may often arise. Currently, a number of these have appeared in relation to the metro plan.

However, the Post Office reports that it is making a real effort to deal with these problems as effectively as possible.

The American public, I believe, is entitled to fast, efficient mail delivery.

The Department is to be commended for its efforts to provide such service.

I would hope, however—and will continue to so urge—that the problems arising out of the changeover in systems of mail delivery can be quickly and equitably resolved.

Recently, a fine Wisconsin newspaper, the Appleton Post-Crescent, published an informative article, entitled, "One-Day Delivery of Mail in Wisconsin." Reflecting on the operation of the new metro system in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-DAY DELIVERY OF MAIL IN WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin metro plan, which the Post Office Department is planning to put into effect in Wisconsin "will be the greatest improvement of service in the State in years," Clarence Knudson, regional operations director for the U.S. Postal Service at Minneapolis, told the Wisconsin postmasters at a meeting in Madison last Sunday.

The plan calls for 1-day delivery of first-class mail to any point in Wisconsin. That is, a letter posted before 5 p.m. will be delivered to any destination within the State the following day.

To accomplish this it is proposed to set up sectional offices in 13 cities. They are Green Bay, Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison, Marshfield, Milwaukee, New Lisbon, Oshkosh, Portage, Rhinelander, Sheboygan, Spooner, and Wausau. Only three trains will be used. They are a Soo Line train and a Milwaukee Road train running between Chicago and Minneapolis, and a Chicago & North Western train between Chicago and Green Bay. Most of the mail will be transported by chartered trucks on star routes and by highway post office mobile units connecting the sectional cities. The postal clerks aboard these units will work the mail en route just as it is worked in the mailcars on trains.

The plan calls for each sectional center to have its mail collected, including all letters dropped as late as 5 p.m., delivered to the center area and passed on to the appropriate outgoing trucks in time to reach their destination at about 4:45 a.m. to be de-

livered by the carriers that day. Success will depend upon careful scheduling of trucks and the handling of mail at the terminals to make certain that each letter is moved out on the right truck ready to be delivered to a connecting truckline or a post office.

However, the technicalities may safely be left to the Post Office Department. The plan was first used in New York beginning in 1958 but within about a year the Post Office Department set up 46 such area plans and the goal calls for 90 by August of 1960.

Mr. Knudson, the operations director for this area, says there probably will be no additional cost since, in Minneapolis, a similar plan actually resulted in a reduction in expenses. It is cheering news also that the metro plan is only a part of a nationwide mail speedup program that eventually will include air transportation of first-class mail between major cities. The Post Office Department has made some real progress in the handling of mail during the past few years. Under the direction of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, there has been an intelligent approach to the technical post office problems. Great progress has been made in spite of the opposition that has come from Congress.

Unfortunately it appears that too many Congressmen regard the Post Office Department as an important political instrument which can be used to help them get votes. If some magic means could be found to get Congress off the backs of the leaders of the Post Office Department tremendous progress would be possible to the great advantage of the people and probably at lower cost than the present service requires.

Would You Like To Do Something About World Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from F. O. Grissom, mayor of Kinmundy, Ill. His letter pertains to a project of the Kinmundy Woman's Club. The woman's club appeal for world peace is also attached to be included in the Record:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHIPLEY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which is a project of the Kinmundy Woman's Club. This letter is now being sent to every club in the United States, and to other similar organizations. I think it a very worthy project and worth passing along.

Kinmundy is a town of a thousand. This local club has a membership of 50, and I am sure they have undertaken a big project.

Respectfully,

F. O. GRISSOM, Mayor.

KINMUNDY WOMAN'S CLUB,
Kinmundy, Ill.

Would you like to do something about world peace?

Our woman's club president, Mrs. Lloyd Bailey, brought out in Sunday school class discussion that prayer is such a potent force we should use it more. She suggested we all pray for peace at noon every day and we do. We asked her to carry the thought to woman's club, which she did. There the motion was made we all pray exactly at noon, this prayer—"God grant us peace among all nations."

This has been taken to other community organizations and we feel it is of supreme importance. If we could take this to all clubs, to all councils, to all organizations, to all towns, to all cities, and finally to all countries, such a mighty prayer rising simultaneously might usher in the millennium without Armageddon.

Won't you help us carry this supremely important project to all the world? It could be the most important project of the century.

Homebuilders Support President's Position on Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee recently reported out a bill—H.R. 10590—which permits raising the interest rate on long-term Government bonds. President Eisenhower has for many months advocated the complete elimination of the existing arbitrary and unrealistic 4½-percent ceiling on these bonds. I agree fully with the President's position and have stated my views in this matter on a number of occasions.

Despite the fact that the bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee does not remove this ceiling completely and does not go quite as far as many of us would like; it does represent real progress. I sincerely hope that it will be handled as expeditiously as possible in the House and that the Congress will enact legislation in this field in the very near future.

I want to call attention this morning to the very sensible position taken by the National Association of Homebuilders on this issue. The association has indicated its full support for the measure reported out by the Ways and Means Committee. Calling it, "a sincere, well-considered bipartisan effort," the homebuilders urge that this bill be enacted as soon as possible.

It is well known that the homebuilding industry is affected greatly by changes in interest rates. An advance of a few points often has a wide impact on the housing and mortgage markets. Nonetheless, the American housing industry is not buying the line of those who oppose removing the interest rate ceiling and who claim that such action means tighter money for America.

This simply is not true. The interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds simply means that the Treasury must rely far too heavily on short-term notes. The result is a disproportionate and unhealthy pressure on short-term interest rates.

The editors of the Washington Star, in an excellent editorial praising the position on interest rates taken by the National Association of Homebuilders, noted that the interest rate issue has been, and I quote, "ambushed by partisan

politics." They commend the homebuilders for seeing through this muddle and supporting the President's request that the interest rate ceiling be removed.

I ask unanimous consent that the above referred to editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. President, I am pleased to announce the New York State chapter of the National Association of Homebuilders agrees with the position of their national association. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Jack Friedland, president of the New York State Homebuilders Association, also be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Mar. 19, 1960]

AN INDUSTRY SPEAKS UP

The Treasury Department has received a potentially powerful assist from the homebuilding industry in its fight to relax the 4.25 percent statutory interest rate ceiling on long-term Government financing. The National Association of Home Builders, representing a membership of approximately 43,000, has announced its vigorous support of legislation approved late last month by the House Ways and Means Committee. The association, closing ranks with others that are dominant and representative in the related building and mortgage fields, describes the legislation as "a sincere, well-considered bipartisan effort" and urges congressional enactment "at the earliest possible date."

In brief, the bill as approved by the committee would help in two respects to free the Treasury from being confined to costly and inflationary short-term (less than 5-year) financing of the gigantic public debt. It would, for example, permit the yearly marketing of long-term securities, without any arbitrary interest ceiling, up to a total face value of 2 percent of the debt. Currently, this would make salable to long-term investors about \$5.8 billion in Treasury bonds. It would also allow the Treasury to exchange on a face-value basis new bonds of longer maturities and higher interest rates, up to 4.25 percent, for outstanding securities bearing lower interest rates and currently selling below their face value.

In taking its present position, the association presents a sound and persuasive case both for the overall national interest and for the special interest of its own industry. It accepts, for example, the argument and the evidence that even limited adjustments in the 42-year-old ceiling would give the Treasury more flexibility in managing the public debt, would on the whole permit greater economy in interest charges to the Government, would lessen the competition of Government financing with certain areas of private credit, and would cut down the inflationary effects of public borrowing. For the related building and mortgage industries, it acknowledges that locking the Treasury into short-term financing actually forces interest rates higher (to 5 percent or above) with the net effect of "draining money" out of savings banks and other institutions which normally supply mortgage credit. Defeat of the pending legislation, the association concludes, "could well mean tighter mortgage money and higher money rates."

The association's reasoning is logical and accurate. It recognizes, too, that this is an issue that has been ambushed in partisan politics. The health and welfare of the homebuilding industry have broad impact on the national economy. It should be helpful that its trade association, its principal mouthpiece, is supporting the Treas-

ury on a problem that should be resolved entirely outside of narrow partisan considerations.

NEW YORK STATE.
HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Albany, N.Y., March 17, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This association of 3,000 members, representing the home-building industry in New York State, urgently requests your support of H.R. 10590.

This bill relates to interest rate restrictions on U.S. bonds and its failure to pass will force the Treasury to do its financing at the expense of the home mortgage market, thereby seriously affecting the production of housing.

Thank you for whatever assistance you may give to the passage of this bill.

Respectfully,

JACK FRIEDLAND,
President, New York State Home Builders Association, Inc.

The Challenge of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently at Wichita, Kans., there was delivered an address that has so much merit I desire to place it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

S. Keith Anderson, secretary of the Montana Taxpayers' Association, made this address before the Kansas Livestock Association. This address points out the necessity of a continuing campaign to try and point out to the taxpayers that "only people pay taxes."

This address merits close reading for many basic facts. Congress must assume its responsibility in the field of Federal taxation. As this address well points out—only Congress can balance the budget.

I commend this address most highly:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE SIXTIES

(Address of S. Keith Anderson, executive secretary, Montana Taxpayers' Association, before the Kansas Livestock Association, Wichita, Kans., March 11, 1960)

At this point I want to say that your Kansas Livestock Association is your No. 1 ace in the hole. If you are going to stay in business, and if you are going to make a profit, you must have a strong organization looking out for your interests. This is a double-bitted ax, because in order for the association to look after you, you must support fully, and be active in your association. I know how important this is. I run the Montana Taxpayers' Association, which is an organization supported by business in Montana. I am very pleased to tell you that we have real, fine support from the ranchers and farmers. We believe in the fundamental truth that every tax is first an expenditure. Real tax control can be achieved only by controlling expenditures. Therefore, much of our work is done at the local level with public officials. We work to keep our property taxes legal and our levies within reason as well as carrying on an aggressive program at the State level.

Government spending and taxing should concern each of us, because of their fast rate of growth in the past century and increas-

ingly large share of our dollar that is taken from us each year for public services. In the last 50 years, population in this Nation has increased 100 percent, while the gross national product or the physical volume of the Nation's output has increased 400 percent. However, in contrast to this, State and local government budgets have increased 2,000 percent and the Federal budget over 13,000 percent, in this last 50-year period. As a result, Government finances have exerted increasing influence on our economy and our individual businesses.

In 1940, the Federal Government had a tax income of \$4.9 billion and, in 1961, it is estimated that the tax income will be \$84 billion, an increase of 1,614 percent. We can well ask ourselves a question concerning this increase in Government income and spending. Taking defense into consideration, which, of course, is all important, what is the Government doing for me today that it did not do in 1940 that is worth this 1,614 percent increase in cost?

We see on the Federal, State, and local levels a persistent attempt to increase Government spending, irrespective of incoming revenue or normal economic state and national growth.

Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, a Democrat from Missouri, recently summed up the Federal situation in the following, unusually strong language. CANNON noted "that the Government has levied more taxes, has spent more money, has incurred the greatest national debt, has lost more gold, has incurred the greatest deficit, and is in the greatest financial distress than in any peacetime period in the history of the Nation. If there were any more records to break in reckless extravagance, we would break them."

Congressman CANNON continued, "although we are still levying war taxes in time of peace for the first time following any American war, and are enjoying the largest peacetime income ever received by any nation in any land, in any period of the world's history, we continue to spend more than we take in and are living so far above our income that today the national debt is billions and billions above the top of the debt of World War II."

The following quotation by one of our greatest living statesmen further exemplifies the distressing situation we are in at the Federal level.

"As I see it, the welfare state, about which we have been hearing so much in recent years, is that state of twilight in which the glow of democratic freedoms is fading beyond the horizon, leaving us to be swallowed in the blackness of socialism, or worse."

"In many Federal programs, we are chasing the mirage of easy money in the form of deficit dollars. Some of us have been duped into believing that the easy dollars handed down by the Federal Government are something for nothing, but, actually, these programs are adding to the public debt, are undermining the will of individuals, regimenting the production of agriculture and labor, controlling the practices of business, curtailing the solvency of the States, and destroying the self-determination privileges which are traditional in the local governments and domestic custom."

"Make no mistake; it is socialism which lies at the end of this rainbow and in this rainbow, the predominating color is the red of Federal deficit spending under which a whole new generation of Americans have grown and developed."

This statement, ladies and gentlemen, was made by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, from Virginia. I don't know about Kansas, but this statement by the great Senator BYRD can be aptly applied to our own State of Montana, which for 9 of the last 10 years, has operated in the red.

The mortgage on our present and future

generations is almost beyond belief. Maurice H. Stans, Director, U.S. Bureau of the Budget, recently elaborated on our national obligations. He brought out that our present national debt of \$290 billion does not include Federal liability for past services. Already, accrued liability for military retirement is about \$30 billion. Our unfunded present accrual for retirement benefits for civilian employees is \$27.5 billion. On top of that, future pensions and compensation to veterans will cost about \$300 billion. Now the \$290 billion of public debt plus \$350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus \$98 billion of c.o.d.'s adds to the almost incredible total of about \$750 billion. That my friends, is the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future, beyond the regular annual cost of defense, welfare, and commerce. This \$750 billion figure would amount to \$15,480 for every family in the United States.

Budget Director Stans further points out the pressures for new spending programs that are increasing in intensity. In the last session of Congress alone, there were 20 major spending bills introduced in the House, along with 20 others in the Senate, for new programs, which altogether price out to more than \$326 billion over an average period of 5 years. If these bills were passed as their sponsors want them, they would add \$50 billion a year to our present spending level of around \$79 billion.

The second session of the 86th Congress has convened, and without any doubt, the overriding issue confronting our lawmakers in Washington, will be that of solvent government and sound money versus deficit spending and continuing inflation. The Federal budget for fiscal 1961 submitted to Congress by President Eisenhower amounts to \$79.8 billion. On the basis of Tax Foundation's allocation formula, you folks in Kansas will have an estimated burden of Federal budget receipts for fiscal 1961 of \$831.6 million. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, and a report from your Tax Commission, \$443.7 million in property and other taxes was levied in this State in 1958-59. In other words, the Federal Government will take away from Kansas nearly twice the amount of money that Kansas will collect to run its State and local governments.

It is encouraging to note from the President's budget message, that there is an estimated surplus of \$4.2 billion at the end of the next fiscal year. The President very wisely recommended that this be applied to debt reduction. However, this conservative approach in handling the surplus, holds little appeal for many Senators and Congressmen, particularly in this election year. With the Federal Treasury pictured as literally brimming over with \$4 billion of unexpended funds, the real and present danger is that there will be so many helpers in spending this surplus, that it will be spent two or three times over.

Those of us who believe in the free-enterprise system should be concerned and alarmed with the attitudes of many of our public officials, and as a matter of fact our neighbors, who seem to believe that government spending and government authority is a solution for all of our problems on the local, State, Federal, and personal level.

We have a competitive market economy, where the Government is supposed to play a minor role. Employees, ranchers and businessmen are supposed to make their own decisions about how they want to live and work. We have always relied upon competition and incentives to direct our efforts toward useful and productive goals. In our society, the Government is supposed to do two things: first, it sets the rules of the game and sees that everyone competes fairly and respects others. Second, it furnishes services that cannot be provided by the private areas of our economy. National de-

fense, roads, postal services and veteran's benefits fall under this broad area of Government activity. Over the years however, the trend toward Government services has sharply increased. Back in the 1920's, Government services were limited and Government spending was no great problem. In 1929, taxes from all levels of Government came to less than 10 percent of our national output. Since 1945, this has risen to over 25 percent.

Now what has happened in the last 30 years, to create this spending and taxing problem? Perhaps the key reason is our desire to make Government responsive to people's demands without worrying about its ultimate responsibility. Let me explain what I mean by this. All this started in the 1930's when the Federal Government abandoned its traditional idea of limited government because of the depression. Then, a war came and of course made matters worse. As a result, many people soon discovered that the Federal Government developed great power to reward some groups at the expense of the general population. The trouble is, that responsible government must be limited, if it is to be responsible government. The theoretical needs for government funds are unlimited, but our resources obviously are not unlimited.

As a result, you have headlines like those that appeared in *Business Week*, February 13, 1960, "Old Age Gets Into Politics." The article goes on to say, "with the elderly asserting growing power at polls and raising their demands, the issue of what to do for them is getting a congressional airing and a run in 1960 elections." Here is a good example of the politicians buying themselves votes with your money by promising a rainbow to one segment of our population, regardless whether they want it or whether they need it.

Another good example is the Federal aid to education controversy. In a news conference, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming was asked by Senator DIRKSEN the following question, "How many school districts in the country are in trouble?" Flemming hesitated and then answered: "About 200." DIRKSEN then asked: "And how many districts are there altogether in the whole country?" Even more reluctantly, Flemming had to reply, "About 40,000." It happens that one-half of 1 percent of the school districts in this Nation are in trouble according to Secretary of Welfare Flemming. So what happens? The National Education Association, their allied organizations and certain Members of Congress want to foist on this Nation of ours legislation which would provide Federal aid to education in every State in the Union, whether they need it or not. This is a good gimmick for buying votes. The politicians can promise Kansas or Montana millions of dollars in Federal funds. It just happens however, that these Federal funds must first come from your pocket and be sent to Washington, and there, a service charge deducted before the money is sent back to you. A selling point used for Federal aid in Montana—and I suppose the same logic is used here in Kansas—is that we are going to get back more money than is taken from us. If this is true, it is certainly nothing to be proud of, because this means that we cannot face and solve our own problems and must go crawling to some other State for assistance.

I have not had the opportunity to talk to many of you concerning your tax problems or the fiscal situation in your State. According to the U.S. Census Bureau statistics, your tax burden is roughly comparable to that in Montana and I can tell you this as a fact, in Montana, we don't like it. I will tell you further that I think the people of Montana are going to do something about it.

According to figures from the U.S. Census Bureau, and your State Tax Commission,

State and local taxes have increased nearly 110 percent during the last 10 years in Kansas. While taxes have been increasing at this rapid rate, personal income in the State has only increased 73 percent. Statistics show that in 1948-49, the burden index for Kansas or the percentage of personal income that was spent for State and local services was 8.8 percent, and this last year it had increased to 10.5 percent. The latest U.S. Census Bureau statistics place Montana seventh in the Nation in tax burden and these same statistics place Kansas 10th. That means that both Kansas and Montana are right at the top of the heap in tax burden. It means that we have less money in our pockets to do the things we want, than people in other States. It means that it takes us longer to save for a car, a trip, or mama's new dress. Taxes are a very personal thing, because every dollar that the Government takes away from you is a dollar that you cannot spend for your family.

In Montana, we have a very heavy property tax. In fact, we run neck and neck with you people here in Kansas. While Montana ranked fourth in property taxes on a per capita basis, Kansas ranked fifth. This places an excessive burden upon agriculture. In Montana, it is not unusual for a ranch to pay out from 10 to 20 percent of their gross income in property taxes. This situation is certainly not conducive for risk capital or proper development of our ranching enterprises.

I have been talking a lot about the cost of government and its resulting high taxes on the cattleman. You people in Kansas went through the same times we did back in Montana during the early thirties. In those days, agriculture was a prime financier of Government services, just as it is today. The chief difference was that many outfits couldn't and didn't pay their property taxes. As a result, the State took over a lot of land, mortgages were picked up by banks, and many ranches were sold for taxes.

When I am working with local problems, it isn't difficult for me to recall those days of the \$30 cow. It seems that many people, especially out of agriculture, have short memories. They don't seem to be concerned about the large budgets that are adopted or the big bond issues that are floated. They don't recall those years of high tax delinquency, when the school districts and counties were operating on registered warrants, instead of cash. They laugh at you when you tell them that it could happen again. Like I say, we have short memories—it may happen again.

In Montana, everything that's loose or nailed down, is taxed by the property tax. Mill levies are placed against cattle and horses, equipment, buildings and land. While considerable progress has been made in Montana in keeping the valuations of cattle more fairly in line with cattle prices, the cattlemen are still hit hard, because of our high mill levies and the large amount of property necessary for a ranch. As I mentioned, it is still not uncommon for a ranch to pay from 10 to 20 percent of its gross in property taxes.

We are engaged in a reclassification and reappraisal program, as are most States. The theory behind it is good. If your property is on the tax rolls, then your neighbors should have his property on the tax rolls, too. If your property is on the tax rolls at full value, then it certainly isn't right for a truck or an industrial plant to be on at half value. The thing that concerns us is the number of people who plug for reclassification and reassessment, as a method of raising additional revenue. What they want is more valuation on the books, so that they can raise more money by maximum mill levies. They don't care about tax equality. We would have a lot less objection to reassessment programs in this country if everyone would play the

game square, and not use it as a money-raising gimmick. Theoretically, when the valuation goes up, the mill levies should go down. Usually this doesn't happen, and as a result, there is considerable opposition throughout the West to reappraisal. This opposition will not be removed until everyone plays the game according to the rules. We should make every effort to tell the story to the man on the street and to our legislators, because most of them know little about the ranching business.

Now I believe that there are two sides to the coin of responsibility. I believe that we have a responsibility as citizens to provide adequate money for operation for our schools, our custodial institutions and our local, State and Federal Government.

However, I think also, that those in public service have a responsibility to keep their programs geared to the general economy of our States and Nation, so that the taxpayers, year after year, won't be asked to shell out an additional percentage of their income.

Our legislatures have the responsibility of keeping our States from running in the red, by keeping spending within income. Our Congressmen and Senators have the responsibility of not only reducing Federal expenditures, but reducing the national debt.

The various boards and offices and bureaus in our counties, cities and State government, have the responsibility to the citizens to conduct a minimum operation to get their jobs done. After all, they are using tax funds and every dollar must come out of the pocket of some wage earner.

Responsibility in government also includes the preservation by our elected and appointed officials of our basic democratic concepts. It is noticeable that in our legislatures, there are constant efforts to remove voting provisions on whether or not levies should be imposed on property. One of the soundest principles of Government we have is to keep taxation and financial matters as close to the people as possible. That is something the bureaucrats are not interested in. They want permissive spending so that their schemes can be jammed down the throats of the citizens with no recourse.

The moral that can be drawn from the plight in which we find ourselves today, and really it is our fault, is that the average citizen is going to have to take a greater interest in government and who represents him in government if he is going to remain free and solvent to carry on his business in the traditional American way. There is obviously just one thing to do—that is, to jump with both feet into the affairs of our school districts, our cities and towns, our counties, our State and our Federal Government.

We operate under a democratic form of government. This government, be it good or be it bad, be it liberal or be it conservative, reflects the people we elect to office.

It is my opinion, that if we are to save this Nation and our States from insolvency and the ravages of inflation, we are going to have to resell some basic fundamental ideas. These ideas should not only be sold to our public officials, but to our children and our neighbors.

One is that government cannot give the people anything it has not first taken from them.

We must be more interested in keeping our freedom than in seeking security. Security means governmental protection and governmental protection means a diminishing of our freedoms.

We need to remember that government cannot nor should it, guarantee us a price or give us anything without controls.

You cannot legislate the poor into freedom and wealth by legislating the rich out of it, and what one man receives and does not work for—another man must work for and not receive.

We must remember that taxation, because it is necessary and because it is taken under constraint, is the principle danger to the maintenance of individual liberty in America.

We must remember that government can never guarantee us a standard of living and that big government spending, accompanied by inflation and deficit financing, has the power to destroy the standard of living we now enjoy.

And finally, that the free-enterprise system and the profit motive have fostered the greatest progress in this Nation the world has ever seen, while the record of socialism and communism has been one of mediocrity, corruption, poverty and terrorism.

The burden of government, whether we like it or not, is on the shoulders of all of us. Politics cannot be left to the professional politician. That is why it is imperative that you stockmen jump into public life. You have the business know-how and the experience to guide us to solvency and financial well-being.

My grandfather came from Norway when he was just a boy, and he came to Montana with a packtrain. He didn't ask the Federal Government for help, he wanted to carve something out of the West for himself—and he did. You folks in Kansas have the same heritage as Montana, your history is much the same. Independent, courageous men carved out of Kansas a civilization just as they did in Montana and they spilt considerable blood doing it. They did not ask for Federal aid. They did not ask for protection. When they needed roads, they built them. When they needed schools they built them, and they took care of their own law and order. Obviously, we cannot exist on this basis today, but the spirit should still be within us to preserve this country for our children so that they, too, can have the same opportunity that we have had, so that they can choose their own way of life, select their own careers and live without a yoke of governmental oppression and taxation around their necks.

What you have to gain by taking a vital interest in public affairs is solvency, the right to run your own affairs, and the guarantee that your children and grandchildren will live under a democratic form of government. Failure to be alive to the problems facing us today will mean continued devaluation of the dollar, additional governmental domination, less money in your pocket, and finally, a socialistic nation. The challenge of the sixties is before us. My talk can best be described as "A Case for Citizen Action in Government."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is squarely up to you.

Thank you for the honor of being here.

Loyalty Oath—National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article on S. 2929, to rescind section 1001(f) (1)—the affidavit section—of the National Defense Education Act. This article, taken from the February 1960 issue of News and Cues, published by the

Chamber of Commerce of the United States, highlights the major justification for the elimination of the affidavit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BILL INTRODUCED TO CONTINUE NDEA LOYALTY OATH BUT REPEAL NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT

In response to general disapproval of subsection 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has introduced a bill, S. 2929, to amend this section. At present, students who receive Federal loan funds under this act and teachers attending institutes must file a non-Communist affidavit with the U.S. Commissioner of Education and also take an oath of allegiance to the United States.

Sixty American colleges and universities and nine educational organizations have voiced opposition to the affidavit while approving the oath.

S. 2929 proposes to remove the requirement for filing a non-Communist affidavit (subsection 1001(f) (1)), but retain the requirement for the oath of allegiance (1001(f) (2)).

Another bill, H.R. 10182 (ASHLEY, Democrat of Ohio), has been introduced to strike out the entire subsection, both affidavit and oath.

PROVISIONS OF SECTION 1001(F) (1)

Section 1001(f) (1) states that no person shall receive funds under the act unless he has filed an affidavit certifying that he "has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Section 1001(f) (2) is simply an oath of allegiance to the United States and requires that no person shall receive funds under the act unless he "has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'"

S. 2929 is cosponsored by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and, by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York. It is endorsed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming who testified for last session's version of the Kennedy bill.

AFFIDAVIT OPPOSED WITH CAUSE

The affidavit of disbelief is opposed because:

It is unnecessary. All beneficiaries still would be required to take a standard loyalty oath of allegiance to the Government.

It is ineffective. No convinced Communist would hesitate to take either the oath or the affidavit.

It is discriminatory. Other groups who receive Federal loans or grants are not required to file such a non-Communist affidavit.

It defeats the purpose of the act. As Senator KENNEDY said:

"While the disloyal person would not hesitate to take it, some intelligent conscientious young people, of the very kind the act is designed to help, have refused to participate in the defense education program because of this requirement. A number of the finest institutions of higher education in the country, in all regions, public and private, sectarian and nonsectarian, have refused to accept any funds because of section 1001(f) (1), and the list is growing."

It is unnecessarily costly. It is causing a vast expanse of files at the U.S. Office of Education. These files and the personnel to maintain them are a futile waste of taxpayers' money.

Angry Young Man of 71

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, March 19, 1960, with reference to the distinguished and beloved dean of the New York delegation, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER.

ANGRY YOUNG MAN OF 71—EMANUEL CELLER

MAN IN THE NEWS

EMANUEL CELLER's capacity for righteous indignation knows no bounds. He is forever at war against monopoly, invasion of civil liberties, bias in all forms. The vigor of his attacks against conditions that to him are undemocratic belies his 71 years. Yet it helps explain why his constituency in southern Brooklyn and Queens keeps sending him back to the House of Representatives with bigger and bigger majorities.

Mr. CELLER is now serving his 38th year in the House. This fall he will be seeking election to a 20th consecutive term. Usually a winner by margins of 4 or 5 to 1, he seems sure of attaining his ambition.

He has discouraged opposition to a point where one potential rival at the polls observed:

"I guess the only thing I can attack him on is spending too much time in Washington."

Mr. CELLER's seniority in the House is topped only by that of two Southern Democrats, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas; and CARL VINSON, of Georgia. His long tenure carried the Brooklyn Democrat to the chairmanship of the House Judiciary Committee in 1949.

LEADS RIGHTS BATTLE

It is as judiciary chairman that he is leading the floor fight in the House for the passage of a strong civil rights bill.

Never one to hide his views, Mr. CELLER has kept a mimeograph machine in his office busy for years grinding out statements keyed to major domestic and world news developments. He warned of the rise of nazism, espoused freedom for India, denounced immigration curbs and battled his good friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, on court reform.

Excellent as was his news coverage, he early saw the value of radio and television for a man in public affairs. Since last fall, he has been a regular panelist on WNEW-TV program, "Metropolitan Probe." Only occasionally does he forget that he is the interrogator, not the guest.

His antitrust subcommittee has investigated industries as disparate as steel and newsprint, baseball and television. Among laws in this area that bear his name is one, passed a decade ago, to prevent mergers achieved by acquisition of assets that tend to lessen competition.

But for all the deadly earnestness with which he approaches public affairs, the Representative is a genial companion with an excellent sense of humor that he often turns on himself.

He tells the story, for example, of the Brooklyn woman who asked, after he had made a stem-winding, rather florid speech, whether the talk would be printed. He replied with a smile: "Possibly posthumously." And she, quite pleased, said she hoped that would be soon.

With children, Mr. Celler unbends even more. He turns linen napkins into white rabbits that jump, stuffs lighted cigarettes in his ear and has a host of other parlor tricks.

Born in Brooklyn on May 6, 1888, the Representative got his schooling at Boys High School, Columbia College and Columbia Law School. He was married in 1914 to Stella M. Baar. They have two daughters, Jane and Judith, and two grandchildren, daughters of Judith.

He is a member of the law firm of Weisman, Celler, Allen, Spett, and Sheinberg, but he is lucky to put in a day a week—usually Friday—at his New York office. Golf and tennis, too, have been put aside, but he continues to give much of his leisure time to reading and music. Biography, the classics, and opera are his favorites.

A supporter of New Deal and Fair Deal, Mr. Celler once again will be a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. But this time Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri, and not Adlai E. Stevenson, will be the man he is backing for the presidential nomination.

"I'm being practical," he says. "Others may have more appeal, but this man has a record, ability, and can win."

Disarmament and Nuclear-Weapon Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as you know, I strongly endorsed Adlai Stevenson's call for a nuclear test ban in 1956, and I have sponsored test-ban resolutions since 1957.

Recently, on the floor of the Senate, I made clear that, in my opinion, the United States and Russia should be brought to judgment before the United Nations in regard to the frantic, immoral armament race they are forcing upon mankind. I strongly believe that the United Nations has not been given the opportunity to exercise the jurisdiction available to it under the charter; and, again, I urge that the forthcoming summit conferences be held under the canopy of the United Nations, with the Secretary General of the United Nations presiding.

Not long ago I received from the Committee on World Peace, of the Oregon Conference of the Methodist Church, a communication giving me their views of that conference on the subjects of disarmament and nuclear-weapons testing. I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and all the people of America the intelligent, Christian position of this fine organization; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRINITY METHODIST CHURCH,
Toledo, Oreg., February 16, 1960.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As secretary of the Committee on World Peace of the Oregon Conference of the Methodist Church I have been instructed by said committee to write you concerning the position of the Oregon Conference of the Methodist Church on the subjects of disarmament and nuclear-weapon testing. This committee felt that these views are relevant to a number of issues which are before our Nation at the present time.

These views as adopted by the Oregon conference in May of 1959 are as follows:

"4. Disarmament: The United States should assume greater initiative toward bringing national armaments under U.N. inspection and control in a process directed toward their consequent reduction, limitation, and eventual abolition.

"5. Nuclear power: We are totally opposed to the resumption of nuclear-weapon testing under any circumstances. We take this stand for the following reasons:

Nuclear testing can continue only if we accept the proposition that some genetic and somatic damage from radiation is socially tolerable. We believe that Christian love means that any damage to any persons is socially intolerable. Particularly is this true when it appears that much of this damage would occur in persons who are not citizens of the testing nations. The argument that damage may occur to a small percentage (0.01 percent to 0.04 percent) of world population is irrelevant. Such a percentage means 125,000 to 4 million people, many of whom will suffer 100 to 200 years from now. To continue testing is to perpetrate a folly in thoughtlessness and in irresponsibility. (Source of statistical information: The U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation quoted in Consumers Report, March 1959, vol. 24, No. 3.)

"We are gratified by progress that is being made in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and urge its further development."

Sincerely,

VERNON A. GROVES,
Secretary of Committee on World
Peace, Oregon Conference of the
Methodist Church.

Where Defense Is Weak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, 1960:

WHERE DEFENSE IS WEAK

The Army Chief of Staff, General Lemnitzer, has made a compelling case before a House Armed Services Subcommittee for an adequate troop airlift. The lack of enough available planes to transport even one of the Army's present 14 divisions to a trouble spot quickly is a major deficiency in the country's limited war preparedness. Gen. Maxwell

Taylor has developed the point ably in his book, "The Uncertain Trumpet".

There is no assurance that a future emergency would permit so leisurely an approach as that in Lebanon, where the assemblage of Army personnel and equipment for peaceful police duty required many days. Under present circumstances it would take 25 or 30 days to move a division with equipment to a remote part of the world. The diversion of part of the present civil air fleet would not provide a suitable answer. There would be other military demands upon such aircraft; and any large diversion would cripple essential civil traffic.

What the Army would like is enough airlift to transport one battle group a day with equipment, up to a division, to any part of the world. This would permit the assembly of a division-strength force of 12,000 men with logistic support within a week. With present types of transport aircraft perhaps 500 of all varieties would be required on a standby basis in the assumption that more than one round trip could be made within a week. The expense would be substantial, but the risk of unpreparedness also is substantial.

Nor are the Army's airlift and weapons needs the only limited war deficiencies. The Marine Corps wants additional airlift; and 25,000 additional men for the present 175,000-man force would add a great deal of reassurance about the country's ability to respond quickly in limited war situations. Naval carrier aircraft, being purchased at a rate of about 650 a year, are not sufficient to replace the 700 that wear out or are destroyed in accidents—let alone to maintain the 12- or 14-carrier force that the country ought to have to serve the psychological purpose of a policeman on patrol in the Far East and Mediterranean.

With all the discussion of the missile program there is a danger that this essential aspect of defense needs may receive inadequate attention. That is why the hearings and report of the Rivers Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee can perform such an important service. Defense needs all down the line have been shorted or neglected; but the neglect in the limited war area has been, if anything, relatively the more serious.

The strategic forces, of which missiles form an increasingly important part, obviously are the first line of defense. But if the deterrent actually deters and establishes a sort of balance of retaliatory power, limited war becomes the more probable threat. To be forced to fight it with massive weapons for want of sufficient limited war forces and the airlift to transport them would be to face the unappealing dilemma of declining to respond or of inviting nuclear holocaust.

Medical Care for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Dr. Allan M. Butler, professor of pediatrics at the Harvard Medical School and chief of the children's medical service of the Burnham Memorial Hospital for Children of the Massachusetts General Hospital, discussing the bill I offered to amend the Social Security Act to provide medical care for our older citizens. It covers an

aspect of the problem that merits consideration. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL,
MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Boston, Mass., March 17, 1960.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I have read with interest your bill amending the Social Security Act so as to include certain aspects of medical, hospital, and nursing home care among the benefits of persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

The provision of insurance against the costs of diagnosis, ambulatory or outpatient clinical hospital care properly corrects the overemphasis of the Forand bill on surgical care. I can appreciate that the insurance against the cost of doctors' professional services was omitted to lessen the American Medical Association's opposition to the bill. This opposition, however, is voiced by the successful and older doctors who represent the dominant forces within our State medical societies and the AMA. They can glibly make the generous proposal that doctors reduce their fees to the medical indigent, as they contribute little to the care of the indigent aged and so will lose little income or incur little burden by their proposal. On the other hand, the young doctors, who have had relatively little voice in this AMA proposal, are the ones who provide most of the medical care for the majority of the present 15 million aged, who, unable to pay for private doctor care, come to our urban public and private charity hospitals. These young doctors can least afford to carry such a financial burden; particularly as the financial burden will almost inevitably increase as better medical care prolongs the average life span. Hence, one wonders if it is quite fair to the younger doctors of the country to omit provision of insurance against professional services.

The AMA has also not infrequently suggested providing cash indemnity instead of medical services. Ample experience shows that this is not an effective way to meet the cost of medical care. Too high a percentage of the patients involved have become accustomed to our charity tradition of medicine. They, therefore, if short of money, spend the cash benefits to satisfy other needs and fail to remunerate the doctor or pay the full hospital charges. I trust, therefore, that the Congress will not make this compromise in order to satisfy AMA objection.

In any legislation permitting the public to insure against the cost of almost inevitable illness in old age, consideration should be given to the quality of care thus purchased. In this connection I would like to suggest that the word "accredited" be considered as a substitute for the word "licensed" in referring to hospitals in this bill. There is, as you know, an official accrediting organization composed of representatives of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Physicians, and the American College of Surgeons, whose accrediting of hospitals is generally recognized by both the public and the profession as a desirable designation of standard. The use of this standard throughout the bill would lessen the possibility that the public's money is expended on care of poor quality in hospitals that do not meet the standards required by the accrediting board.

Quality of care would also be strengthened by specifically charging the advisory council with the responsibility of protecting the

quality of medical care and wording the bill to strengthen the advisory council's role in this respect.

If, at any time, you feel I, as a person, who has devoted 30 years of professional endeavor to trying to improve the quality of medical care, can possibly be of any help in this respect regarding the legislation concerning medical care of the aged, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Very sincerely,

ALLAN M. BUTLER, M.D.

Diversion of Water From the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

MR. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include two excellent editorials from leading newspapers in Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the diversion of water from the Great Lakes:

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Mar. 15, 1960]

LAKE DIVERSION FOES BOLSTER CASE

The longstanding resistance of New York State to Chicago's proposal to increase its diversion of water from the Great Lakes for sanitary purposes fortunately has more weight than ever before because of the State's development of Niagara power. With the Illinois city increasing its pressures with some success to obtain authorization for the diversion, opposition in other States presumably will need new forceful arguments to defeat the proposition.

The State power authority's Niagara power development should bolster the case against the diversion at Chicago. It should be evident that any reduction of the flow at Niagara will be a detriment to the power project and it ought not to be difficult to demonstrate that rates based on the present flow will be adversely affected if Chicago is allowed to cut into the water supply at this end of the Great Lakes system.

It already has been stated over and over for the record that diversion would be disadvantageous for navigation and would lower water levels at Great Lakes ports. Yet Chicago continues year after year to press its case and has succeeded several times in getting congressional authorization for further diversion. Presidential vetoes were necessary to head it off.

The State power authority was given the opportunity to present its case before a special master appointed by the Supreme Court at a hearing in Niagara Falls. The evidence adduced should be convincing enough to put an end for all time to Chicago's perennial effort to gain further advantage over other Great Lakes cities by increasing its take from the common water supply.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Mar. 16, 1960]

SAVE NIAGARA BEAUTY

Canada may seek a change in the 1950 Niagara treaty to permit a greater diversion of water from Niagara Falls for power purposes. Under that treaty no less than 100,000 cubic feet a second (about half the normal flow of the river) must go over the falls in daylight hours during the tourist season and no less than 50,000 cubic feet per second at other times. The proposal under study by Ontario

hydro officials would reduce the 100,000 cubic feet per second minimum to 80,000.

In the view of some Canadian officials, the additional diversion is feasible because of the great success of the \$12,500,000 remedial works built at the falls after the 1950 agreement. Those works, however, were designed to protect the scenic beauty of the falls from the diversion sanctioned by the original treaty, not to compensate in advance for any future diversions. Furthermore, the remedial works have done nothing for the lower river, between the cataracts and the point where the diverted water is returned to the river channel, near Lewiston.

It may be taken for granted that the power appetite on both sides of the river will continue to grow indefinitely. But the time has surely come to call a halt to any further diversions of Niagara water. Little enough water flows over the crests now. To reduce it again would only further impair the beauty and majesty of one of the world's great spectacles.

All agencies drawing water from the Great Lakes Basin are thankful for the blessings of this great body of water and have the courtesy to return the volume of water, after use, back into the same basin of water from which it was drawn.

Again I state that how well we care for the resources afforded us by the Great Lakes will depend the future happiness and prosperity of the people in the communities bordering these Great Lakes. The fresh water bodies of the Great Lakes are one of nature's generous gifts to America, and in no way can be considered as municipal in scope, to be exploited, polluted, or plundered, without due regard for the rights of everyone concerned.

The Food Additives Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 21, 1960

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article, published in Business Week, which gives a helpful and interesting account of the progress being made in the application of the 1958 food additives law.

I particularly call attention to the part of the article headed "FDA Overload." The problems faced by the Food and Drug Administration in the policing and enforcement of this new law should be borne in mind by the Congress in considering appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We must not let this statutory protection for consumers fall through lack of funds for enforcement.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT PESKY FOOD ADDITIVES LAW

The U.S. food industry entered a new era of regulation this week when a tough new food additives law went into effect.

Affected is the food industry itself plus those who supply it, including drug makers, fertilizer, and pesticide makers, the packaging industry, chemical producers—just about any industry whose products one way or another wind up directly in or next to food.

Actually, the changeover under the amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that was passed in 1958 hasn't caused any wholesale withdrawal of food products or even the additives used as flavoring, preservatives, or in packaging material. Food industry spokesmen had feared that a number of the 2,000 food additives now in use might suddenly be banned once the March 6 deadline passed. Actually, none has been banned so far and probably only a handful will be.

Confusion: The new law still has the food industry and its suppliers scrambling to get themselves into a position that meets its technical requirements. And this has set off a raft of testing programs and a good deal of confusion in industry.

The reason is that under the act, the burden of proving that any chemical added, directly or indirectly, to a food product is harmless when eaten now falls on the food company—whether or not the additive has been used before. Previously, a company could use a new additive or packaging material and it was up to the Food and Drug Administration to prove it was harmful under the conditions used. Now any time FDA becomes fearful of the 100 percent safety of the use of a given product, it can ban the product from the market and it's up to the companies to prove they are innocent.

Actually, within the last several years a number of products have been pulled off the market by FDA under the old law. For instance, an antibrowning agent for frozen peaches, caught in the first shipment of goods, was found to be highly toxic. A preservative widely used in the 1940's was found to be toxic in continued doses and was banned. A flour-aging compound used for years was found to cause fits in dogs. Under the new regulation, these products would presumably never have gotten on the market because they would have had to be cleared in advance, with the company submitting the test data to FDA.

Six hundred exceptions: The industry has been saved the expense of testing some 600 additives commonly recognized as safe by scientists—things like salt and pepper. These are on an approved "white list." Another 200 have been given extensions of time for running tests. Petitions for clearance, with supporting test data, have been submitted to FDA for several hundred more. On these, FDA has told producers they can go ahead using them under a year's extension of time until the agency gets around to careful examination of the petition and either sets a tolerance for the chemical or disallows it.

FDA officials figure that probably no more than a half a dozen chemicals now in use will have to be banned. A substance used in some soft drinks looks questionable; so does an ingredient of certain salad oils. Carbon black (for jelly beans, drug coatings, etc.), ultramarine blue, and oil of wintergreen were taken off proposed lists of exemptions because they are not obviously safe, but will probably be given a tolerance in due time.

Carcinogens: More difficulty creeps in where a compound is found to be capable of causing cancer. The new law flatly bans a chemical that is a carcinogenic agent in any amount whatsoever. Actually, FDA has always forbidden such agents, but under the old law they could be on the market for months or years before they were discovered. And it is this cancer ban that gives industry its greatest concern.

Newly refined testing methods are turning up traces of carcinogens where they were not discovered before. Companies fear they might pour a million dollars into research on a product, only to discover that it contains an almost imperceptible amount of a cancer agent. Makers of agricultural chemicals are particularly concerned, because it is often difficult to tell how much of a new pesticide used on apples will end up in the applesauce. The pesticide industry claims a number of research products are already being abandoned for just that reason. The shadow of the cranberry incident still hangs over the industry—a case where a weedkiller was misused before tests showed it to be a cancer-causing agent.

I. INDUSTRY'S VIEW

Food companies themselves aren't saying much openly about what the law means to their products—an obvious protective device because of the effect on sales. The industry believes it does a terrific job in delivering good, safe food to the public. But now, since the cranberry scare, consumers are peering at labels. A seafood processor got letters from consumers saying they noticed some funny chemical additive on the label. It has always been there, and happens to be safe. But people are watching.

Privately, though, the industry isn't happy with the law. One big manufacturer said the law poses no problems for the big companies, but that smaller outfits are hit directly. They don't have the equipment or the money to hire outside laboratory tests. One spice company says: "If we have to clear 'em a lot of 'em are going off the market. It's cheaper than clearance."

Survey results: According to a confidential survey made shortly before the new law came into effect by Food Engineering, a McGraw-Hill publication, 80 percent of the companies represented by 40 leading food executives do not have formal clearance on all their additives. About two-thirds of these companies plan to use substitutes for the noncleared additives, but only a third think that substitutes will be entirely satisfactory. What's more, a third of the companies may have to stop production of at least one item. They see some reduction in sales as a result of changes in additives and packages, and more than half think costs will increase. A common complaint, too, is the cancer clause, which they think unworkable and which should be rewritten to set some sort of tolerances.

String of demands: What is happening now is a massive chain reaction and this, probably as much as anything, has the entire food industry and its suppliers in a tizzy.

Already, big supermarket chains are beginning to demand guarantees that food products comply with the new regulation. Food companies themselves are pushing the packaging industry for conforming warranties; the packagers in turn are asking suppliers of chemical products and paperboard and other materials for guarantees.

In fact, according to the Packaging Institute, the new law has thrown a monkey wrench for the time being into buyer-seller relationships—everybody wants a continuing guarantee of compliance from his supplier. If he can't get it, he is reluctant to use the product since it is no defense to say, "I don't make the chemical; I'm not responsible." You are responsible if you use the chemical, unless the supplier guarantees clearance.

II. IN THE BAG

It's in the packaging field where complications are causing the most confusion. The industry thinks FDA finally realized that packaging under the law is more involved than was anticipated and numerous extensions have been requested and presum-

ably will be granted. One of the big tonnage items, polyethylene, which had been under question, apparently will be cleared. The industry working with FDA developed new ways of making the plastic to overcome certain objections. Though not formally approved, FDA is ready to give the material clearance.

As a result the industry thinks it is in pretty good shape. Associations—those for adhesives, petroleum products, and the like—have mounted jointly financed testing programs.

Oil industry: The oil industry, which may seem far removed from a food and drug law, was one of the earliest to recognize the effect the law would have on its business. Wax, for instance, is a major product used in packaging and an important one to the oil industry. This is especially true since the widespread use of paper milk containers, but also applies to waxed paper for wrapping, say, soda crackers.

John Tuttle, Esso Standard Oil Co. specialist, says the industry has been sitting up nights with its customers helping them read the law. Customers in turn are having to learn just how their products are used.

Question of wax: The oil industry, through the American Petroleum Institute, early in the game sponsored a \$150,000 a year testing program for wax products at the Chicago Medical School. As a result, it has been able to submit to the FDA a petition covering two classes of wax—API type 1 and API type 2—each of which comes from a different source. Specifications have been written for them. On type 1, the oil industry wants FDA to certify the wax as harmless. On the other, it is asking for an extension to continue tests. Researchers are almost certain the type 2 wax is harmless, but there just wasn't sufficient time to run the tests to their ultimate conclusion. The tests involved the feeding of wax to rats—and it took some doing to get the rats to eat the wax to the extent required. Finely powdered wax did the trick. Tuttle adds that they have a lab full of healthy rats out in Chicago.

Meantime, though, wax producers are being asked by some users of paper containers to assure them that the wax is approved. The industry can tell them only that the API petition has been filed and acknowledged.

Collective tests: Adhesive manufacturers, too, have pooled resources to provide the needed data for FDA clearance. Working with their suppliers on the tests, they have submitted a list of 195 chemicals used in food packaging adhesives, 4 of which were officially removed by FDA. The industry presumably will get an extension for 190 other chemicals, 19 of which are compounds and will have to be broken down into 35 basic chemicals before FDA signs the extension order. Some of the adhesive chemicals are on other lists, such as the paper and paperboard chemicals which have already received clearance.

Kenneth Loomis of the Adhesive Manufacturing Association says, "There is still a lot of work to be done and the FDA needs the extra 12 months as much as we do."

It is certainly true, though, that a lot of packaging companies failed to take heed soon enough of the full implications of the law. But the pressure from buyers on them now that the law is effective has waked them up. As late as last week, a New Jersey plastic subsidiary of a big company was scurrying around trying to find out what the law was all about because, it told one expert, it had already received four letters from customers wanting a continuing warranty that its packaging material had clearance. He had made no attempt to get clearance.

III. FDA OVERLOAD

Meantime, the FDA is bearing down hard on the stack of several hundred applications for tolerance and clearance that were filed in the last few weeks before the food additives law deadline passed. So far, only a half dozen—a pesticide, two antioxidants for animal feed, some antibiotic preservatives—have gotten formal clearance. But officials feel few in the pile will have to be turned down.

Coming up soon again is the sticky problem of lipstick. The ban on lipstick colors has been confusing. Coal-tar colors (including many reds) were found recently to cause liver damage when used in large amounts, although they are safe in small amounts. For technical legal reasons, these colors are not included in the new food additive law which permits FDA to set tolerances (except on cancer agents). Therefore, the colors had to be banned entirely. Now Congress is nearing completion of a color additives bill which, if enacted, will create coal-tar colors the same as other additives. The industry hopes the bill goes through before the ban on such colors becomes effective.

Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, early this year I introduced H.R. 9466 which provides payment of pensions to veterans of World War I. A number of other Members of Congress have introduced such proposals and interest in growing in providing such pensions. Recently the national junior vice commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., outlined the legislative objectives of this organization to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs which included monthly pensions. The question is shall these veterans of World War I receive an across-the-board monthly pension of \$100.

The truth is that the veterans of World War I are indeed a special and unique group of veterans but only in the sense that as of now the discrimination has been against them and not for them. They have not been treated on a par, in terms of veterans' benefits, with the veterans of other wars. In other words there is a residual debt owing to the veterans of World War I based on the fact that the Congress and this Government has shown greater—and I may say—wiser largesse for the veterans of World War II and the Korean war. There was no GI bill of rights for the veterans of World War I as there was for the veterans of the other two recent wars. Those who complain that an across-the-board pension for veterans of World War I would create an unfortunate precedent that would mean a similar across-the-board pension for the other veterans, are thus in error. It would create no such precedent. The reason simply is that this proposed pension is not for the purpose of giving the World War I veterans what other vet-

erans did not not receive, so that to be fair other veterans should also be entitled to it.

On the contrary this pension is intended to make up to the World War I veteran for the difference in benefits between what he received and what the World War II and the Korean veterans received. It does not bring the pension idea out of joint so that it will have later to be corrected in favor of veterans subsequent to World War I. Rather it brings into a relationship of justice the overall gratitude of the country toward the World War I veteran so that the benefits he receives will—at long last—be brought up as equal as may be to the immense and intelligently conceived benefits that have been accorded the veterans of our subsequent two wars.

The veteran who went soldiering in World War I lost a fixed value—so to speak—out of his life and his career. This he was never permitted to retrieve as the other and subsequent veterans were permitted to retrieve it through the GI bill of rights. They got some benefits to be sure but nothing in proportion to what the country gave the others. This proposed pension of \$100 a month corrects that inequality. Since it corrects the inequality it does not create a precedent.

The very justice of the World War I veterans' case should make it publicly acceptable and I hold the people of the United States generally would approve it. Moreover the statistics from a fiduciary standpoint show that such a pension is sound arithmetically and far from a burden to the Federal budget in relation to the results it would produce. There are, as of December 1959, 2,724,000 World War I veterans. The cost of the program therefore in the first year would come to about \$1.9 billion. This would be gradually but consistently reduced since the average age of World War I veterans is now 65.7 years. For example some 9,000 World War I veterans died in the 1 month preceding December 1959. For the second year the program would come, according to estimates from the Veterans' Bureau, to something less than \$1.780 billion. The third year it would be less even than \$1.7, and so on. The sum is formidable to be sure. But it is not by any means an insurmountable problem in a Nation with a gross national product now rapidly climbing to \$500 billion annually. The pension is acceptable to the American people not only because it is financially feasible but because it is morally right and corrects an injustice that cries to high heaven for judgment.

That Camel Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was published in the Lyons Progress of Lyons, Ga., on March 3. The editorial clearly points out the dangers inherent in the enactment of the so-called Forand bill:

THAT CAMEL AGAIN

Some years ago a proposed bill which would have fastened compulsory Government health insurance on the people of this country was in the headlines. The bill got nowhere for the plain reason that a majority of the American people didn't want it and were opposed to socialized medicine, Government-blessed medicine, and political medicine.

That particular bill is dead. But a relative is very much alive. It is found in the proposal to provide the 16 million people who are eligible for social security benefits with Government-paid medical, hospital and nursing home care.

On the surface, this has a humanitarian appeal. But the inescapable fact is that it would establish socialized medicine for a large segment of the population—and that, if history tells us anything, it would be limited only temporarily to that segment. The next inevitable step, once the precedent were established, would be to lower the age limit and broaden the field of coverage. It would be the old story of the camel which got its nose in the tent and moved on until it occupied the whole tent.

The cost would be enormous—\$2 billion a year to begin with, according to the estimates, and much more as time wore on. The expense would send the social security tax—already scheduled to reach 9 percent of the Nation's payroll—to outer-space limits.

Worst of all, medical authorities are convinced the bill would result in poorer, not better, health care for the American people. Medical care is not susceptible to production-line techniques—the kind of techniques that Government would certainly impose once it took over and started using the public's money to pay the bills.

Kennedy and Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the decisive vote in New Hampshire on Tuesday, March 8, seems to be an important step in indicating the identity of the presidential nominees of the major political parties. The tremendous vote accorded each indicates the high esteem in which Senator KENNEDY and the Vice President are held by members of their respective political parties.

The vote-getting ability of these two men was recognized in a recent editorial by Angelo Scott, editor and publisher of the Iola Register, and an astute political observer. Angelo Scott speaks frankly of the results of the New Hampshire presidential primary.

Mr. Speaker, by previous consent I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

[From the Iola (Kans.) Register]

PREVIEW

One swallow does not make a spring. (Don't we know that in Kansas this year.)

Neither does one primary make a nomination for president. But you just can't deny the impressive showing made by JOHN KENNEDY in New Hampshire this week.

It is true that he had only nominal opposition. But the number of votes he got is all the more impressive on that account.

More than twice as many people as had ever voted for a Democratic presidential candidate before took the trouble to cast their ballots for KENNEDY just as an expression of encouragement and good will. And that is a record you can't laugh off.

It means that the Democrats of New Hampshire, at least, are not concerned over the fact that KENNEDY is a Catholic, too young, too liberal or anything else. They like him and gave him a whopping endorsement. They proved what KENNEDY has always contended that if the people are given a chance, they will vote for him.

They will have another chance April 5 when the Wisconsin primaries are held and when KENNEDY and HUMPHREY will meet head on in a test of strength. And if they go for KENNEDY as enthusiastically there as they did in New Hampshire, that young man is going to be mighty hard to stop.

Incidentally, RICHARD NIXON made almost as impressive a showing in New Hampshire as KENNEDY did.

He had no opposition whatever, yet he pulled almost 10,000 votes more than the previous record high, established in 1956 by President Eisenhower.

You can't laugh off that kind of endorsement either. It certainly ought to put an end to the last remnants of the "Nixon can't win" talk. He obviously is as popular with New Hampshire Republicans as KENNEDY is with New Hampshire Democrats.

In fact, you may well have seen a preview this week of the two principals who will put on the big show next November.

Postal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which involves a timely issue of a postal rate increase that appeared in the Boston Daily Record on March 21, 1960:

Postal Facts

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which is easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence, the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore, mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the Post Office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in everyday fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

It is true it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal judi-

ciary system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted. But the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about \$2½ billion a year. No other Government department produces anywhere near as much revenue. But because the postal establishment costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Postal rates actually are a form of taxes. The Post Office does not keep the money it gets for selling stamps, but turns it into the Treasury. Thus, in urging a postal rate increase the administration is seeking an indirect tax increase.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense. Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska? Would a business operate branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, most of them losing money because of slight patronage? Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

We suggest Mr. Summerfield ought to stop proclaiming (and complaining) how much his Department has lost and concentrate on getting the mails delivered as speedily and economically as possible.

And Congress ought to ignore the request for another boost in rates.

Communist Infiltration in Certain American Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW YORK CITY COLONY,
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF
NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,
New York, N.Y., March 10, 1960.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Un-American Activities
Committee, House of Representatives
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: On behalf of the New York City Colony of the National Society of New England Women, I wish to commend you for your forthright stand with respect to the criticism that has arisen about the inclusion in an Air Force manual reference to Communist infiltration in certain of the American churches.

Unimpeachable evidence has been presented establishing the truth of such infiltration. This would only leave, therefore, as the only legitimate basis for criticism the question as to the relevancy and utility of the inclusion of this fact in a manual intended to alert servicemen to the realities of the Communist threat and the tactics of the Communist apparatus. In turn, then, the question is raised as to whether any of the thousands of servicemen will be better equipped to detect, understand and counteract the forces of communism as a result of

their knowledge of the insidious manner in which these forces reach into and subvert even the highly respected and trusted American pulpit.

The knowledge may be of considerable value to the servicemen, particularly, but not exclusively, those who are in direct contact with their churches. Without such knowledge it must be apparent that the subverted churchmen (whose humanitarian motives need not be dissected) may have an overwhelming influence on the unsuspecting serviceman.

Therefore there is but one question to be decided on this issue and that is whether or not the information is truthful and well-founded. The voluble attacks and all efforts made to distort the real significance of this question by reference to frivolous material which has apparently crept into certain manuals should be regarded as inimical to the real interests and efficiency of our services and are calculated to serve as a shield for forces which should be definitely exposed.

It would be hoped that the great majority of the American churchmen recognize the cancer which has developed in their own profession and are more anxious than other citizens to have the defections brought into the open.

Please investigate the situation immediately and thoroughly and make your findings available to the public.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH S. COWLES,
Chairman, National Defense.

Defying Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, of the many comments regarding President Eisenhower's 1960 farm message to the Congress, I find one of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking editorials appeared in the February 10 edition of the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel.

Because I believe this editorial aptly summarizes the problem facing wheat farmers and agriculture in general today, let alone the Members of Congress, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

DEFYING COMMONSENSE

Surplus crops are the farm problem. The price-support program built this overabundance. It continues as a strong financial incentive to produce more and more. This, says President Eisenhower, is a situation which "defies commonsense." That's stating it mildly.

In his special message to Congress yesterday, the President indicated his general preferences on reform but expressed a willingness to go along with anything within reason which Congress may suggest. Solemn regard for the Nation's welfare should prompt a comparable cooperative spirit among the lawmakers.

The wheat surplus properly was emphasized in the message. Wheat provides only 6 percent of the farm income. Yet the Government has \$3,500 million tied up in wheat—30 percent of the total currently in-

vested in farm support operations. And, if the present system is continued, that will only be the down payment.

Basically, President Eisenhower would start solving the problem by gradual withdrawal of subsidy incentives to overproduce. He would free the farmer of arbitrary controls by eliminating both acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat. Price supports would be continued but would be a percentage of recent average market prices, rather than a higher figure based on parity.

The effect of this system, long urged by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, would be to stop the marginal production of wheat at a guaranteed profit. At the same time, it would insure the efficient producer against disaster.

As further aids to retreat from overproduction the President would:

Gradually expand the conservation reserve program up to 60 million acres. This would more than double the amount of land now withheld from production by this program. In his budget message the President asked for 9 million additional acres in fiscal 1961, bringing the total to 37 million acres. Expanding population will require the use of this land years hence. Meanwhile its cultivation swamps the market.

Be willing to consider payments in kind reduction of surplus crop acreage. This is an interesting idea, advanced by farm groups. A wheat farmer, for instance, would stop growing wheat, temporarily, and draw the amount of his usual crop from Government storage. Properly managed, this scheme could reduce Government cash outlays, reduce surplus supplies, and cut storage costs.

The President's recent trip strengthened his belief in the food-for-peace program which uses surplus crops to feed hungry people abroad. He wants greater emphasis on research to find new uses for farm products, also more attention to the rural development program, finding new sources of income in depressed agricultural areas.

In none of this is there any quick cure for deep ills accumulating from generations of politically inspired tinkering with the fundamental laws of supply and demand. Reform will take a long time and objective consideration is admittedly difficult in a presidential election year. But, somewhere short of disaster for American agriculture, a start must be made. The President's suggestions are constructive to that end.

Ex-Presidents in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nunda News of Nunda, N.Y., which appeared on February 25, 1960:

James A. Farley, who has been recognized for 30 years as one of America's shrewdest political minds, writing in This Week magazine says, "We've got to stop wasting our country's best leadership." He wisely suggests a simple but highly important step be taken at the present session of Congress by passing a statutory law making all former Presidents lifetime, nonvoting Senators-at-Large—a sensible proposal that would strengthen our country in the critical days ahead.

Fiscal Planning Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced into the House a resolution establishing a Committee for Fiscal Planning. This committee would be made up of the ranking Democratic and Republican members of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees, plus one Member of Congress to be appointed by the Speaker.

This five-man committee would be directed to start a continuing study of the finances of the U.S. Government in order to coordinate our revenues and our expenses and to plan for the orderly reduction of the national debt. This committee is directed to report its recommendations regularly to the Congress and to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot claim that this is a completely original idea. Frankly, it is a variation of an idea introduced by my predecessor, the Honorable Louis Ludlow, in 1940 and again in 1943. Mr. Ludlow served for many years as a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee and was unquestionably an outstanding authority on the financial problems of the United States.

This is the second of a series of resolutions which I intend to introduce this year on government finances. The first resolution which I introduced on February 25 asked simply for a rollcall vote on every appropriation bill. That resolution was designed to let the taxpayers know how each Member votes on every money bill.

This current resolution is intended to establish a formal cooperation between the Congressional committee that spends our money and the committee that raises the money. As Mr. Ludlow put it "It is an attempt to make the tongue and buckle meet."

At current levels the United States will spend \$1 trillion in the next 10 to 12 years. During the administration of Franklin Roosevelt this Government spent \$374 billion in 12 years; under Harry Truman we spent \$395 billion in 8 years; and during the administration of President Eisenhower we spent \$490 billion in 7 years. This 27-year span marked a certain loss of control by the Congress over spending. But the responsibility for providing this money rests squarely on the House of Representatives. The Constitution clearly imposes this responsibility on the House and reflects the determination of Madison, Hamilton, Washington, Franklin, and their colleagues in the Constitutional Convention to keep the power to spend and the power to tax close to the people. This was their reason for limiting the term of Representatives to 2 years. If we get reckless with the peo-

ple's money, they could throw us out at the end of 2 years.

I came to the Congress with a background in finance. I have been deeply impressed with the debate on defense problems, on foreign affairs and civil rights. In all these instances the debate for and against the issue involved has been presented forcefully and intelligently. The opportunity to listen to the learned gentleman, who have debated these issues, has been the equivalent of a great education.

I have not been impressed with the financial debates. When we get around to talking about money, the air seems to be filled with advertising slogans rather than hard commonsense. "Unfeeling reactionary," "back door spending," "budget busting," "unsympathetic penny pinching," are wonderful expressions to use in a political campaign, but they are certainly not going to solve the financial problems of this Nation.

It seems to me that a basic reason for a lot of the confusion is the lack of coordination between the spending and taxing committees. When an appropriations bill is debated, I am interested in knowing not just "do we need it," but "how does this bill fit into our total financial picture?" If I vote for this bill because I think it is important, do I have to cut back on another bill?

When we debate a tax law, I want to know not only if it is just and reasonable, but I also want to know what effect will the bill have on our revenues. If I vote for a tax cut, will I have to cut an appropriation?

Is our tax structure adequate to cover our expenses and provide for an orderly reduction of our debt? Why does not some one of the financial committees come forward with a plan for debt reduction? All these are questions that bother me every time we have a money bill on the floor, and I never hear these questions debated with what I could call hard commonsense.

Sometimes I feel that we are acting like a family where the wife spends what she likes without bothering to find out how much money her husband is making.

I know that we can turn to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Secretary of the Treasury for answers to the questions I outlined. But to go back to my family story, that is like the wife asking her next door neighbor for spending advice. The place for the wife to turn is to her husband. The place for us to ask questions is from a committee of the Congress. The Constitution gives the President the right to tell the Congress what he would like to have. The Budget Bureau and the Secretary of the Treasury help him prepare a financial plan called the budget. This is fine, but there is nothing sacred about the President's budget. That is just his idea on the subject. We cannot duck the absolute responsibility the Constitution lays on the House of Representatives to make the final spending and taxing decisions.

I believe that a Committee on Fiscal Planning would enable us to meet this clear-cut responsibility. I believe that

it would establish a close cooperation between our spending and taxing committees. I believe it would give a Member of Congress a place to go for intelligent advice about the effect of every spending or taxing vote. I believe that it would give us a chance to take back from the President the control over spending which this body has practically surrendered.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorized the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, to meet jointly at the beginning of every session to study and report on the President's budget. This part of the law has been a failure and has been abandoned. I earnestly suggest that a new try be made on the lines I have suggested.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much confusion in the confusing statements made during the civil rights debate last week that I thought the enclosed editorial, which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News March 19, 1960, puts the issue in proper perspective, and I submit it herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

VOTING RIGHTS FIRST

After 5 weeks of waiting for the statesmen on Capitol Hill to get down to the business of writing a law to protect the constitutional rights of Negroes in the South, the administration has again entered the debate. It chose a time when the proposal for Federal voting referees was threatened by emasculation at the hands of the southern bloc in the House, and thus serves to spotlight the key point in the whole civil rights program.

The administration's intervention was timely and may well have saved the heart of its civil rights package. The southern raid was turned back in the House yesterday by a three vote margin.

The voting referees would see that qualified Negroes are permitted to vote and that their votes are counted. It simply enforces a franchise granted the Negro by the Federal Constitution, and its importance is ironically attested to by what has happened to the Negro without that protection at the polls.

The southern bloc would like to limit such protection to Federal elections. The administration, through Attorney General Rogers, correctly protests that this would in effect encourage a segregated election system for State offices, and would deny the Negro his constitutional rights.

Without an effective voting rights provision it would be folly to call anything that comes out of this windy session of Congress a civil rights law. The administration knows this; the southern bloc knows this; and most important, thanks to Mr. Rogers' protest on behalf of the administration, the public knows it, too.

Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunately true that many communities are blandly surrendering their rights and responsibilities to the power-hungry Federal Government.

A notable exception is the village of Niagara in my district which, although it has a population of only 2,300, has constructed within the last 3 years a \$100,000 sewage treatment plant, a \$35,000 municipal garage, a \$30,000 mercury vapor street-lighting system, a \$50,000 water well, and a ski tow worth \$12,000.

It is a proud record and I am submitting the following letter from the finance chairman of the village board as an example of what one community has done without looking for handouts:

NIAGARA, WIS., February 12, 1960.

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES: Received your memo of February 9 and am sorry to hear that Congress is being lured into making additional appropriations that appeal to the public. Some of the welfare proposals presently under consideration do have some merit, especially those affecting people on pensions and those that affect the handicapped or disabled. However, I personally do not think much of this proposal concerning sewage disposal plants. Maybe I am of a biased opinion because the village of Niagara built their disposal plant without any Federal or State aid or bond issues. It is my own personal belief that the sooner municipalities wake up and stop running to the Federal and State government every time they have a financial problem, the better off we would all be.

Several years ago the village of Niagara received a court order to construct a sewage disposal plant to digest all of the sanitary sewage being dumped into the Menominee River. We on the village board are quite proud of the fact that we constructed our sewage disposal plant without any financial assistance. It took us 3 years to complete the construction of the three lift stations, digesters, clarifier, and disposal plant at a cost of over \$100,000. This was paid for by local tax levies over this 3-year period. Niagara as you recall has a population of only 2,300. During this same period we also financed other major improvements; namely, a municipal garage, 50 feet by 110 feet for \$35,000, and a \$30,000 mercury vapor street-lighting system.

I have been on the village board for 8 years, during which time I have been finance chairman. All of us on the village board are quite proud of our village for its improvements and its financial status. Our bonded indebtedness is only \$30,000. This last year we incorporated a new well into our water system that cost us \$50,000. Our latest municipal project that you might be interested in is a ski tow within the village limits. This ski tow was constructed primarily by volunteer labor in the village. The actual cost to the village was only \$1,200, yet the installation is estimated to be worth \$12,000.

We in Niagara trust that you will continue to use your good judgment on the various issues as they arise.

Very truly yours,

HECTOR H. MAGNUSON.

**Secretary of State Christian A. Herter
Commended for His Protest to Red
China for Their Sentencing of Bishop
James Edward Walsh**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include a letter I have today written to the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, congratulating him on the prompt and forthright protest to the Communist government of Red China against the harsh and unreasonable sentencing of Bishop James Edward Walsh.

We are certainly aware of the fact that the Communists are not amenable to any suggestions we might make. However, we must stay with this protest and continue our efforts to effect the release of Bishop Walsh and others who have been the innocent victims of totalitarian thinking.

I would also like to include an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "Bishop Walsh's 'Crime'."

The letter to Secretary of State Herter, and the editorial follow:

MARCH 21, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very pleased to learn of your prompt, vigorous and entirely justified protest against the patently unfair sentences meted by the Red Chinese to Bishop James Edward Walsh, and many of his colleagues.

This new incident so vividly recalls many other instances relating to our fliers, Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Stepieniac, and numerous other political and religious persecutions perpetrated by the Communist countries.

We have learned from bitter experience that the Communists do not understand decency, and construe decency to be weakness. We have also learned from this experience that only by a continuing and firm stand can we ever accomplish anything with these totalitarian governments.

I accordingly urge that you continue your strong protests and bring every pressure possible to see to it that Bishop Walsh and his colleagues are promptly released.

I am sure you know that you have all the American people behind you in this effort.

With my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LESTER HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1960]

BISHOP WALSH'S "CRIME"

Bishop James Edward Walsh, of Cumberland, Md., may spend the rest of his life in a Chinese prison for offending the Red China Government. At 69, he has been a servant of the Chinese people and of his church for almost half a century. All of us, of whatever religion, can share in an admiration for Bishop Walsh and indignation for the cruel 20-year sentence inflicted upon him.

An associate, the Very Reverend John P. Donovan, vicar-general of the Maryknoll Fathers, said of him: "If love is a crime, then he is guilty; if opposition to a brutal and tyrannical regime is a crime, he is guilty; if allegiance to his church is a crime, then he is guilty." In the raw, bitter communism of mainland China most of the civilized virtues are crimes and the Sermon on the Mount is full of treason.

Secretary Herter's protest will carry little weight with a Government which charges our own Government with an "imperialistic scheme to subvert the Chinese people's democratic regime." But outrages such as this may well be remembered when somebody inquires why we do not want Red China in the United Nations or a Red Chinese Ambassador in Washington.

A Long-Range Look at the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. Earl M. Hughes, of Woodstock, Ill., to the House Committee on Agriculture on behalf of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, March 17, 1960.

Mr. Hughes has farmed all his life and has been active in farm organizational work at the State and local level for many years. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF EARL M. HUGHES, FOR THE ILLINOIS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 17, 1960

My name is Earl M. Hughes. I am a livestock and grain farmer, former Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service and former Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am presenting this statement on behalf of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, which is a statewide business organization with over 17,500 members in 412 communities in all parts of Illinois.

I have been a member of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce for several years and served as chairman of its agriculture-business relations committee the last 2 years. Included in the membership of this committee are 21 farmers. The businessmen on the committee are connected with firms having a close relationship with farmers and farm problems in all parts of Illinois.

This committee has for 17 years worked with farm people throughout the State to bring about a better understanding of mutual problems of agriculture and business. In the course of these efforts, the importance of a sound agriculture to the economy of our State and Nation has become readily apparent.

As an outgrowth of this close association with the farm leadership in Illinois on a State and local level, the recommendations discussed in this statement were formulated. The program offers no easy way out of our present dilemma—it presents an opportunity for lasting strength under our private enterprise system.

It is essential that the Government approach to the agricultural situation should be one that will enable a flexible, dynamic farm industry to adjust to the changing times and to take full advantage of the advances in techniques and technology which have and will become available to it. The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce believes that adoption of the recommendations outlined in a later section of this statement would provide a positive step in that direction.

GENERAL COMMENTS

First, I should like to make a few general comments about the farm situation as we see it in the Midwest.

Illinois representation on your committee

I hope you will not consider me presumptuous if I start by calling attention to the fact that we in Illinois have no representation on your committee. We would be most pleased if the House leadership would, at some early date, arrange for 1 of our 25 representatives to become a member of your committee. We are quite proud of the fact that Illinois consistently ranks third or fourth in the value of its farm production. It would seem that one of the representatives of our great agricultural State would make a valuable contribution to your committee's deliberations.

Taxes, labor, and the cost-price squeeze

While we will confine our remarks today to what is generally classed as "farm legislation," it seems appropriate that I mention in passing two closely related problems which are of great concern to farmers today—monopoly pricing of labor by unions and the increasing tax burden. When we analyze the "cost-price squeeze in agriculture" it becomes obvious that high taxes, rising cost of marketing farm commodities and increased costs of equipment and other farm needs are contributing a heavy additional burden on the Nation's farmers.

With regard to taxes, it seems logical that expenditures must be cut before we can expect to have any tax relief. I urge you, then, to watch Government spending and make sure that every tax dollar we spend buys a maximum of goods and service and represents a sound expenditure of public funds. Further, we hope that you will look with disfavor on new, unwarranted spending proposals and carefully reexamine with a view to reducing certain nonessential spending legislation already on the books.

Rising costs in the things needed by farmers and increased costs involved in marketing farm commodities have been brought about largely by the wage increases granted without a corresponding increase in productivity. Take a tractor or any other piece of equipment required by the farmer as an example. The farmer is the one who ultimately pays the price for the equipment, and reflected in that price is the continuous upward spiral of labor costs forced on manufacturers by a virtual monopoly possessed by giant unions today. We farmers bear this cost in the ever rising price of equipment and supplies.

It is true enough that every businessman must necessarily pay higher prices for the equipment he needs to conduct his business, but that increased cost is taken into consideration in the price of the product or service that he merchandises. This is where the farmer is in a bind by comparison. It is for these reasons that the farmer is undoubtedly one of the major victims of union monopoly power.

This, we think, indicates a need for greater attention to the monopoly power of labor. Sooner or later Congress must face up to the problem of labor union "lead-pipe-clinch bargaining." Labor unions must be subjected to the same type of antimonopoly restraints that now apply to business but do not apply to unions. The Labor Management Act of 1959 was a step in the right direction and we commend your action on this measure. As a farmer, I strongly feel the need for further curbing the unbridled power of labor to practically "write its own ticket." Some means must be found to check this serious threat of union monopoly power to our economy.

TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND ITS EFFECT ON FARM INCOME

In any discussion of farm legislation, the tremendous changes which have taken place in agriculture over the past 30 years must be constantly kept in mind. Not only have these advances in farm techniques and technology resulted in greater production per acre, but they have enabled a cash grain farmer to farm much more land than formerly. Farms are increasing in size, but many farmers today have the labor and equipment to run a much larger unit than they do. Thus, many are actually part-time farmers and earn considerable additional income in other jobs during the balance of the year. Good roads and an expanding economy have enabled us to be less dependent on our farm income than we used to be. You are, of course, aware that farmers actually made half as much from off-farm sources in 1959 as they did from farming. Too many who discuss national farm income figures tend to forget this. I, for one, am not ready to concede that we farmers are in as dismal financial straits as some individuals would have us believe. Farm assets continue to set new all-time highs each year.

In the 12 months ending in March 1959 there were only 6,600 distress transfers of farm real estate. By comparison, in the calendar year 1958 there were 14,964 business failures and in the first 11 months of 1959 there were 12,973 business failures. It is said that other industries are prosperous because they adjust production to meet demand. The coal-mining industry and automobile manufacturers are frequently cited as examples. When we look at the coal industry, we find that the number of coal-mining jobs was reduced more than 50 percent from 1950 to 1958. And over 90 percent of the corporations that manufactured automobiles in this country have either failed or were forced to go into some other business. Farmers, then, are not the only ones who must change with the times.

Effects of 1958 Agricultural Act not yet felt

I feel compelled to disagree with those who are saying that the increased production of corn last year discredits the feed grain program provided by the Agricultural Act of 1958. The increased production is cited to prove that lower supports result in greater production.

There is more to this story than this, however. In reality, price supports for about 90 percent of the Nation's growers were actually higher in 1959 than they were in 1958. The national average support price in 1959 was \$1.12 per bushel for all growers. In 1958, however, farmers who did not comply with their corn acreage allotments received an average of only \$1.06 per bushel in the commercial areas and \$1.02 in the noncommercial area. Only about 12 percent of the corn produced in the commercial area was eligible for the compliance rate of \$1.36. Since the commercial area accounted for about 82 percent of the total crop, less than 10 percent of the 1958 crop was eligible for support at a rate in excess of \$1.06. By far the largest proportion of growers enjoyed a support

price 6 to 10 cents higher in 1959 than in the preceding year.

Other reasons why more corn was grown in 1959 than in 1958 include the following: (1) Certain land previously taken out of production by the acreage reserve of the soil bank was returned to corn, (2) weather conditions were generally exceptionally good, (3) corn supports were still too high, (4) support for other crops which compete with corn for acreage were reduced substantially in 1959, thus causing farmers to plant more corn, (5) many farmers are afraid that acreage allotments will be restored and so keep up high corn production because they want a good base. All these factors must be accounted for in explaining why farmers grew more corn in 1959 than they did in 1958. The reason which is not valid is the one which claims lower supports caused it. It's interesting to note also the increased disappearance of corn this year, which indicates that more corn can be consumed than some of us might think. Total disappearance of corn during the marketing year ending last October 1 was 371 million bushels more than the previous record set the year before. No one really knows how much we might use if supports were lowered further.

CRITICISMS OF OUR CURRENT FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

During my service as administrative head of the U.S. farm price stabilization program, I witnessed firsthand the problems created by holding a price umbrella over farm commodities which added new inventory to Government warehouses while we worked desperately to get rid of the already existing boards of surplus commodities.

I am now living on and operating a grain and livestock farm in northern Illinois. All of my income comes from this operation. As an operating farmer, I feel that individual opportunity and an efficient agriculture are possible over the long run only if government retreats from its current price support and production control program. I have two boys who are interested in farming. I have told them that before they commit themselves to a lifetime of hard work and a heavy debt, they should determine to their own satisfaction whether they or the Government will manage their farms. No Government official at a desk in Washington can better manage the farms of the Nation than the men who work these farms and who have their life savings tied up in them.

The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce is fearful for the course of a free agriculture if the present trend is continued. We foresee the possibility of an ever-growing series of controls which would extend to all farm commodities and pose a threat to the freedom of the farmer to operate his farm according to his own best judgment.

If price supports are to be continued and controls over agricultural production are to be made effective, government will have to institute more rigid production restrictions. If Congress is really serious about the need and desirability of controlling agricultural production, it must impose restrictions not only on land use but also on the other items used in agriculture production, such as fertilizer, machinery, irrigation, pesticides, and insecticides, and must limit the introduction of new techniques and high yielding seeds. The Illinois State chamber and Illinois farmers stand firmly opposed to such a bold encroachment on the rights of individual farmers.

We also have observed with growing apprehension the trend toward State trading and the nationalization of our Nation's marketing machinery. Unless the volume of Government acquisition and selling of farm commodities is reduced, our efficient private marketing system will suffer irreparable damage. The tremendous accumulation of commodities in the hands of the

Commodity Credit Corporation presents an ever present danger to private holders and serves as a price depressant.

As taxpayers and consumers, we are more and more concerned with the tremendous costs of the program. When spending for price stabilization programs skyrocket to present levels, something is certainly basically wrong with the system. When the housewife and the low income city dweller ask why spending for farm price stabilization is so high, it becomes extremely difficult to explain. If the present program is continued, I can only see a growing revulsion to this waste with the result that the general public will dictate an abrupt and disastrous end to all price stabilization programs. The potato fiasco of a few years ago may well be duplicated on a far grander scale unless a basic change is made.

Effective solution to the farm problem might be expected from these tremendously expensive programs. Actually, the truth is quite to the contrary. Government holdings of price depressing surpluses are now greater than ever before. The value of this hoard of commodities has reached the staggering total of \$9.2 billion and will probably exceed \$10 billion later this year.

While it would seem inconceivable that the Federal Government would engage in programs which actually contribute further to this farm dilemma, this is exactly what is happening. The Department of the Interior's land reclamation program presents a striking example of this practice. The Department's efforts have resulted in annual additions of hundreds of thousands of acres to the Nation's farm land—1 million acres in the 6-year period ending in 1960 alone. This has been taking place at the same time that millions of taxpayer's dollars were being spent to take land out of production.

The agricultural conservation program offers another example of one farm program working at cross purposes with others. Financial assistance is made available under this program to farmers for conservation measures on individual farms. Eighty percent of the ACP payments in Illinois are made to pay farmers to apply lime and phosphate to their farmland. Few would question that this addition of fertilizer results in anything but increased crop yields. Nearly 70,000 Illinois farmers benefited from this windfall during the fiscal year 1958 at a direct cost of nearly \$7 million to the taxpayer.

A vast bureaucracy is building up in agriculture which is necessary to administer the farm programs which Congress has created. In Illinois alone, the number of people required to handle the price stabilization and related programs on a State and local level has grown to large proportions. Several million dollars is spent each year to pay the salaries of hundreds of employees needed to carry out the program in the State.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The public responsibility in agriculture's problems is often misunderstood. The importance of this biggest of all industries to the well-being of the Nation cannot be underestimated. The fact that the prosperity of more than 20 million persons living on farms is tied directly to the fortunes of agriculture is ample reason for its problems to be of concern to all.

Public interest and responsibility by no means extend to a guarantee of a fixed price for farm commodities, a fixed return on capital investment in farms or a fixed wage to farm workers, however.

Because of the unusual nature of agriculture, there is a role which the public—through the Government—should assume. This role consists of continuing such traditional and successful functions as establishing grades and standards, disease pre-

vention and eradication, crop production and market reporting, helping to find new uses and new markets for farm commodities, basic research and certain educational and advisory activity. These programs serve the best interest of society generally as well as farmers specifically.

In order to help insure long-range solution of current farm difficulties, existing programs which attempt to fix prices or control production should be terminated as soon as possible and no new farm programs for any commodity inaugurated. Experience of more than a quarter of a century strongly suggest that programs which are economically sound are usually politically unacceptable.

It is essential that the Government approach to the agricultural situation be one that will enable a flexible, dynamic farm industry to adjust to changing times and to take full advantage of the advances in techniques and technology which have and will become available to it. The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce believes that implementation of the recommendations outlined in the following paragraphs would provide a positive step in that direction.

With the foregoing comments in mind, then, we urgently recommend that the following changes be made in our farm program and earnestly urge your support of them.

Price support adjustment

The Agricultural Act of 1958 provided transitional price-support programs for feed grains, cotton, and rice. On the basis of 1 year's experience with these new programs and appraisal of the longer range provisions of the law it appears that producers of these commodities are moving toward firmer economic footing. The operation of this law should be observed closely to determine the advisability of future changes. The price-support programs affecting several farm commodities are still virtually unchanged from those that have been in operation over the last several years during which production has outrun market growth. As a result, serious surpluses have accumulated and are continuing to mount.

We, therefore, recommend that programs affecting all price-supported commodities other than those included in the Agricultural Act of 1958 be replaced by new programs that will provide for:

(a) Termination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

(b) Price-support levels which will move current output into use through normal channels of trade without reference to parity formulas.

We further recommend that definite dates be set forth for the eventual termination of all farm commodity price supports. During the transition period to a free market price, it is recommended that price support be made available through the use of purchase agreements and recourse, interest bearing loans.

Freeze existing surplus stocks

To make possible the transition to a free market economy, isolate the existing Government surplus stocks from the market while providing for their orderly disposal over a period of time by means which will not unduly disrupt markets.

Make effective use of the soil bank

Tighten up the conservation reserve program of the soil bank and expand it as a means of facilitating resource adjustment in agriculture.

Stop stimulation of surplus production

Coordinate the interrelated functions of Federal agencies responsible for management of Government-owned land, price-support activities, soil conservation work and land reclamation and development projects.

Discontinue Federal financing of power and irrigation projects.

Sharply curtail spending for the agricultural conservation program and limit it to conservation measures which reduce physical destruction of soil, including such measures as reforestation of watershed areas.

Encouraging development of new markets

Continue public and private efforts to expand markets for farm products at home and abroad on a sound economic basis.

Continue emergency programs for disposal of surplus commodities in foreign countries until surpluses are reduced, but reexamine them with a view to improving their effectiveness and reducing their cost.

Reorient research, education, and extension programs

Expand and encourage public and private agricultural research and educational programs to reduce production and marketing costs, to develop new uses and new markets, and to assist in other ways in the long-range improvement of agriculture.

Encourage and help farmers with limited opportunities to move into more rewarding pursuits so as to better their level of living.

Governmental loan programs

Set interest rates on Rural Electrification Administration loans and all other governmental loan projects at levels reflecting current capital costs.

Put REA on a businesslike basis

Provide for patron ownership of the REA cooperatives.

SUMMARY

Adoption of the chamber's recommendations would result in immediate and long-range savings of billions of dollars in tax funds. Further, it would effectively accomplish the following ends:

Stop Government programs which actually contribute to the farm problem.

Lower the prices paid for food and fiber by the consumer.

Give farmers greater freedom to farm efficiently.

Enable farmers to adjust to the changed conditions with a minimum of hardship.

Establish a sound base for agricultural growth and prosperity through initiative, resourcefulness, and self-reliance.

Halt the trend toward socialization of the Nation's farms and regulation of the Nation's farmers.

WHY WE ARE OPPOSED TO H.R. 10358 (FAMILY FARM INCOME ACT OF 1960) AND SIMILAR BILLS

Up to this point we have criticized existing programs and given you our views on the course future legislation in this field should take. I should like to make a few brief comments about a course of action to which we strenuously object.

We are aware of the intense interest this committee has shown in H.R. 10358 and several similar House bills which have been introduced at this session of Congress. The course of action outlined in these bills, as we understand them, is not in the best interests of the American farmer, taxpayer, wage earner, consumer, or businessman. Here are some of the reasons for our views:

1. The proposed legislation, as we read it, is replete with controls and provides for further intervention into the operation of our farms. This, we believe, is inherently distasteful to farmers and is diametrically opposed to the traditional concepts of our free enterprise system. Establishing quotas for every producer, as provided in the proposed act, is repugnant to me and most other farmers I know.

2. Parity price is labeled as a "fair price" in this bill. The State Chamber urges discontinuing use of the outmoded, inflexible parity concept of supporting prices. Parity is based on relationships which existed almost half a century ago. It does not take into account the tremendous technological

advances which have taken place in agriculture, the prices which buyers are willing to pay for farm commodities or the cost of supporting prices at high levels. If the parity price is accepted as standard, this means that wheat would be supported at about \$2.37 a bushel or around \$1.15 above the world market price. The effects of setting such a price on our export market would be disastrous. This is only a sample of what would happen in one commodity.

3. Adoption of this legislation will result in drastic reduction in the number of jobs in certain agricultural industries. If our guess is correct, to achieve parity for hogs would take a reduction in production of between 30 and 40 percent. Have you traced the effect on the 30 to 40 percent on the Nation's packinghouse workers who would no longer be needed to process this meat? What will the effects be on the transportation industry, retail meatcutters, and others? Will such 30 or 40 percent cut in production mean that the American consumer is going to be eating 30 to 40 percent less pork?

4. Prices to the consumer are obviously going to be higher if this approach is adopted. If the farmer receives an artificially high price for his commodities, this increase must eventually find its way into the price which the housewife pays for her food at the grocery store. This poses an additional burden on the consumer and would further restrict the market for food.

5. The program, as outlined in the proposed bill, would seem to call for a whole new army of Government employees to administer it.

As I read the bill, I can visualize the need for hundreds of new office workers, administrators and others from the local to the national levels and a whole raft of directives to implement the program.

We are unalterably opposed to this legislation and urge you to reject it.

CLOSING REMARKS

On behalf of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and myself, I express our sincere appreciation to you for this opportunity to present to you today the views of this organization on the very important matter of Federal farm legislation.

Thank you.

Free Asia Opposes U.S. Recognition of Red China, Farley Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with Hon. James A. Farley held in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 2, 1960:

FREE ASIA OPPOSES U.S. RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA, FARLEY REPORTS

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., March 2.—Free Asia is overwhelmingly in agreement on one thing, inflexible opposition to U.S. recognition of Red China, James A. Farley, world famous Democratic leader and board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., reported here today on his return from a 6-week business trip to the South Pacific and Far East.

"Leaders throughout free Asia pointed out to me on my recent trip," Farley asserted, "that in the face of Communist China's action in Tibet, its invasion of Indian territory,

its subversive efforts against its neighbors, and its refusal to renounce the use of force, it would be a great error to reward Communist China by recognizing it or supporting its entry into the United Nations.

"They maintained that until Communist China by its actions gives proof that it wishes to live in peace with its neighbors and is willing to cease its effort to undermine their hard-won independence, nothing should be done to enhance the position or prestige of a Communist China regime, since this would simply increase Communist China's ability to increase its subversive action."

Pointing to the steady growth of the Coca-Cola business abroad, Farley reported that there are now 671 authorized Coca-Cola bottlers in 110 foreign countries. "Around the world, more Coca-Cola is consumed than all of the other international drinks combined," he said. "Additional plants are continuously being authorized to keep pace with the increasing demand in foreign markets."

Voting Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have in Kansas City a very outstanding newspaper published by and in the interest of the Negro race. The Kansas City Call is an advocate of high ideals and good government.

In an editorial which appeared in that publication on March 18, 1960, the laxity of the American people in exercising their right to vote was called to the attention of its readers. In all segments of American life, Mr. Speaker, people do not take the interest in their Government that they should. This applies to national elections as well as State and local. Often those who do not vote complain the loudest. The editor of the Call points out that all races neglect this important responsibility.

I request, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial be included as part of my remarks:

WE DON'T USE WHAT WE HAVE

While Congress argues over voting rights for Negroes in the South, Negroes in the North, where there are no restrictions, need to set about to use the voting rights that they already have.

Up North, where we can vote, we don't. And down South, where they are denied the vote, Negro citizens are clamoring for it. Perhaps the Negro people in northern and border States would have greater respect for their voting rights and would use the ballot more regularly and more judiciously if they could be transplanted to the South for a few months, a few weeks or even a few days. Maybe if the Negroes up North could go down South and see how really important the ballot is, they would use it up here where it is free and open to everyone with no strings attached.

For some reason, people in the North, white as well as Negroes, just do not go to the polls in their full strength.

Take the last election held in Kansas City—the election on the annexation of four new territories. Although the issue was of vital importance to the future of Kansas City and its citizens, only 13 percent of the

voters took the time and trouble to register their opinions.

Negroes are not the only ones who stay at home on election day, but Negroes, of all people, should appreciate the value of the vote. Citizens of color have been deprived of their rights in many areas of American life. They can correct many of the evils which beset them by wise use of the ballot. Instead, they play the ballot cheap and stay at home on election day.

We are glad to see local organizations taking steps to increase the voter registration among Negro citizens. No more worthwhile community enterprise could be undertaken at this point.

Honor Degree Will Be Given Paul Flowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am attaching an article written by George Sisler, which appeared in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal on February 2, and which discloses that Paul Flowers, outstanding man of letters, will have conferred upon him by Erskine College at Due West, S.C., the honorary degree of doctor of literature.

Mr. Flowers has long been recognized as an outstanding newspaperman. His daily column, which appears in the influential Midsouth Commercial Appeal, is read by thousands of people daily. He is truly a man of great ability, and upon the recommendation of Dr. L. H. McDaniel, of Tyronza, Ark., and others, the board of trustees selected Mr. Flowers for this very high honor. Dr. McDaniel is known over the country as the country physician at Tyronza, Ark. He has made famous an annual meeting of doctors and others interested in medicine in his so-called "clinic in the cotton patch."

The article follows:

HONOR DEGREE WILL BE GIVEN TO COLUMNIST
(By George Sisler)

For whatever reason you've followed Paul Flowers' "Greenhouse" column on the daily editorial page of the Commercial Appeal, you are now assured that what you've enjoyed is literature.

One of the Nation's leading colleges will prove it in May.

That's when Erskine College at Due West, S.C., will confer upon the long-time "Greenhouse" columnist and book editor the honorary degree of doctor of literature.

Announcement was made yesterday by Dr. L. H. McDaniel of Tyronza, Ark., himself an alumnus of Erskine College and member of the institution's board of trustees. Dr. McDaniel, whose country-physician office in Tyronza was long since made famous in the "Greenhouse" as the "Clinic in the Cotton Patch," said Erskine officials approved his nomination of Mr. Flowers for the honorary degree last Friday.

ENDORSED BY MANY

The columnist's nomination was endorsed by more than 30 civic, business and profes-

sional leaders, Dr. McDaniel said. Among those adding their recommendations to Dr. McDaniel's nomination were Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee, former Gov. J. P. Coleman of Mississippi, Senators John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi and Albert Gore, Democrat of Tennessee, Representative Clifford Davis, Democrat of Tennessee, Mayor Henry Loeb of Memphis, and presidents of at least a dozen leading colleges and universities.

"Erskine College officials based their decision on Paul Flowers' 'Greenhouse' column and other writings submitted to them," Dr. McDaniel said. The degree will be conferred as part of the college's commencement exercises May 30. Erskine is owned and operated by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church.

BORN IN TRENTON

Born at Trenton, Tenn., Mr. Flowers began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Lake Charles, La., American Press in 1924 and served on newspapers at Alexandria and Shreveport, La., and Birmingham before a first brief stint on the Commercial Appeal in 1929. He moved on to the El Paso (Tex.) Times, returned to Birmingham and then went to the Ohio State Journal at Columbus as telegraph editor, while earning his bachelor and master degrees at Ohio State University.

He then taught journalism at West Virginia State University before coming home to the Commercial Appeal as "Greenhouse" columnist, his first piece of literature appearing under its now famous heading October 8, 1943.

Spirit of Brotherly Love Continues To Make Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the following citation issued by Philadelphia's greatest mayor, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, to my very good friend, Mr. Peter M. Del Borrello, 1431 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, Pa., whose wonderful work in the promotion of peace and brotherly love throughout the world is inspiring.

I am indeed fortunate, to have Mr. Del Borrello as a friend and as a constituent:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
October 23, 1959.

MR. PETER M. DEL BORRELLO,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. DEL BORRELLO: I want to take this opportunity to join with your many friends and colleagues in extending good wishes on your retirement from the Navy.

I have read and heard accounts of your wonderful work in making friends for Philadelphia and for the Navy through your many personal contacts with foreign visitors to our city, by inviting them to your home and affording them hospitality in the true Philadelphia tradition.

It is a source of great pride to me, as mayor, to have such fine citizens as yourself who live in Philadelphia, and who, by their deeds, communicate the real spirit of brotherly love.

I wish you and your family the best of luck in the years ahead. I know they will be fruitful and rewarding years.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger penned by his friend, and mine, J. W. Forrester, Jr., editor of the Pendleton East Oregonian. I can think of no more stirring tribute to Dick Neuberger:

[From the East Oregonian, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

It isn't going to be easy to write this. It never is easy to write of a friend who has been taken by death. This is so very difficult because my friendship with Dick Neuberger goes back to the days when we were kids learning to be newspapermen. It was a friendship that came, over the years, to mean more to me than I can express to you.

Dick Neuberger's death is a tragedy for so many people, not alone his friends. There was so much ahead for him to do, tasks that no one else in Oregon could do as well.

Before he went to the U.S. Senate he was established as a writer whose stories on any subject were sought by all the best magazines and by such great newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In less than 6 years in the U.S. Senate he became a statesman who was admired and respected by men on both sides of the aisle for his intellect, his capacity to serve the people of his State and his fairness and tolerance.

Because of the respect Members of both parties had for him, he was getting more and more done for Oregon. He worked as effectively with many Republicans as he did with Democrats in the Senate. Members of the Republican Party in Oregon knew that he would unfailingly place the interests of all citizens of Oregon ahead of any other consideration. They knew that they need not hesitate about going to him with their problems.

A few days ago he told me he intended to serve (if Oregonians desired that he should) one more term in the Senate. He wanted to do that because there was a lot of unfinished business in the Senate he wanted to have a hand in. He had become so effective in the Senate in his first term that he most certainly would have accomplished much in the second.

Another term and then he was coming home to Oregon to spend the rest of his years writing and enjoying life with close friends.

Dick Neuberger had an almost unbelievable capacity for work. He fulfilled his duties as Senator as well as any man Oregon has sent to Washington. But he also found time to write for magazines and newspapers, to carry on personal correspondence that would have kept most men busy had they nothing else to do, to make a great number of speeches, and to read every week more than most of us get to in a month.

His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always were in his thoughts. He wrote to them and sent them gifts. So many letters to parents on important matters contained special messages for their children.

He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. What was his first choice? To appoint a Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding graduates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark Expedition was a bestseller.

His devotion to the preservation of natural resources was deep rooted. He paid the wonders and beauties of nature more than lip service, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed even more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable days I've had was spent with the Neubergeres on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times thereafter.

Dick could have done so much for this State and its citizens in the years ahead. But there is nothing to be gained now in speculating upon that. Let us speak instead of the high place he has in the history of this State because of all he accomplished in 47 years, as a writer, State legislator, and U.S. Senator, and in countless other ways. Those who knew him intimately saw early a man of great stature, a stature that others recognized later. When he was elected to the U.S. Senate, I said to some who had doubts, "Dick Neuberger will be a fine Senator. Just give him time. He has all the qualities that a man needs to be a great Senator." That he measured up was so well recognized throughout Oregon that it was conceded by almost all the politicians that he would be reelected by the biggest margin ever given a candidate for the Senate from this State.

I could write much, much more about Dick Neuberger. But much of it would be personal and this is not the place for that. I shall close by saying that no man will pass this way whom I shall think better of.—J. W. F.

Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, among the resolutions adopted by the 65th State conference of the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution is one of special interest at this time. It urges the President to take such steps as are necessary to secure our interest in the continent of Antarctica.

Inasmuch as a treaty measure is pending before the other body, it is appropriate that serious consideration be given to protection of our legitimate interests in this vital area.

The full text of Resolution 9 follows:

ANTARCTICA

Whereas American citizens have discovered more of the south polar continent than all other nations combined; and

Whereas Antarctic's potential is in mineral wealth and strategic bases in the coming age of ballistic missiles; and

Whereas there is no reason to dispose of Antarctic territories to other than the eight nations that earned them: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution opposes ratification in the U.S. Senate of the Antarctic Treaty signed December 1, 1959, with the U.S.S.R. and 10 other nations which would internationalize the Antarctic; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to proclaim the sovereignty of the United States over her rightful territories in the Antarctic at once and, as already proposed in Congress, negotiate promptly with the seven other claimants to settle boundaries, thus retaining the Antarctic in Western hands.

Soviet Is Backing Cuba Against United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Max Frankel which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 13, 1960:

SOVIET IS BACKING CUBA AGAINST UNITED STATES—PRES AND RADIO SUPPORTING CASTRO'S ATTACKS OVER SHIP EXPLOSION

(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, March 12.—The Soviet Government lent moral support this week to Premier Fidel Castro's assaults on the U.S. Government.

Moscow has followed the Cuban leader's line, letting Havana choose the interpretations of events and the charges against Washington and then making available the Soviet press and radio for their dissemination.

The picture of crisis in the Western Hemisphere has been so sharp that no Soviet reader this week would be surprised tomorrow if he were to learn of a U.S. military assault on Cuba or a break in diplomatic relations.

The Soviet Union's support of Cuban attacks on the United States came less than a month after the signing of Soviet-Cuban economic and political agreement. It is believed to be notice to all countries having difficulties with Washington that they can look to Moscow for aid and comfort.

MIKOYAN VISIT RECALLED

During a visit of First Deputy Premier Anatas I. Mikoyan to Havana last month the Soviet Union lent Cuba \$100 million for 12 years at 2.5 percent and agreed to buy 5 million tons of sugar in 5 years.

This week's campaign in Moscow focused on Cuba's charges that the United States had a part in explosions aboard a munition-laden French vessel in Havana harbor last Saturday.

The explosion was first described by Tass, the official press agency, in a brief dispatch that appeared last Sunday in Izvestia, the Government paper. Pravda, the nation's leading paper, did not take note of the event until Tuesday, when it had become clear that the Cuban Government intended to

make an issue of the explosion in its campaign against the United States.

Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko sent a message of sympathy to Foreign Minister Raul Roa, of Cuba. Pravda printed long quotations from Dr. Castro's speech at the funeral of victims of the explosions in which the Premier implied U.S. involvement.

REPORTS DESCRIBE OUTRAGE

Since then daily Tass dispatches from Havana have described the popular outrage against the United States. Tass reports from New York have described press demands that Cuba be "punished."

On Wednesday Moscow papers published a reply by Foreign Minister Roa to Mr. Gromyko's condolences. The papers headlined the following sentence of the reply: "Thanks for such a clear demonstration of solidarity."

This morning Pravda published a Tass article dated Tuesday to report that Secretary of State Christian A. Herter had "made rude onslaughts" against the Cuban Government.

This was an allusion to Havana's charge that Mr. Herter had insulted the Cuban representative in Washington in protesting against Dr. Castro's funeral oration. Pravda has also reported anti-U.S. editorials in Revolution, semiofficial Havana newspaper.

Tass cites quotations from U.S. newspapers to show that military economic and diplomatic action against Cuba is imminent.

The Soviet press and radio describe the Castro government as revolutionary, picture all criticism of it as counterrevolutionary, call Cuban police forces the people's militia, and otherwise apply terms invested with sympathetic meaning in Soviet society.

Observers here expect the establishment soon of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Havana. Recent dealings have been handled in Havana by Soviet officials normally assigned to Mexico City.

CHINESE REDS BACK CUBA

The Chinese Communist press and radio have been vigorously supporting Premier Fidel Castro's charges of U.S. responsibility for the Havana explosion.

The Kwangming Daily last week said the explosion "is another barbarous crime perpetrated by U.S. imperialism after its recent bombing of Cuba's urban and rural areas" and "the people of the world stand on the side of the Cuban people and are against the U.S. interventionists."

Hard Worker for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two articles from the New York Times of March 21, 1960:

HARD WORKER FOR AGED: AIME JOSEPH FORAND

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The Forand bill is known from coast to coast. But its author, Representative AIME JOSEPH FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, remains almost anonymous in comparison with the political issue he has raised. This is whether there should be a law to provide for medical care to the aged under the social security system. Mr. FORAND, a slightly bald, round, cigar-smoking man of medium size and somewhat lackluster manner, is an authentic example of a tradi-

tional type of American—the self-made success. He never got past the 7th grade in school—but on the now-defunct Providence News he edited the copy of newspapermen who were college graduates. He has been a Member of Congress for 22 years. Well versed in State and local politics he first came to Washington with the idea of learning the national scene and becoming a political commentator.

He found the national scene satisfying, and became part of it. An observer says he is a "putty character" who ducks a hot fight on unpopular issues.

Many who have conversed with him about legislation have paid him the compliment of believing him to be a learned lawyer. But his law degree is an honorary LL.D. from Providence College.

"My father became totally blind from cataracts over both eyes when I was 12 years old," he says when explaining his lack of formal education.

"He was totally blind for a year. There were eight children around our table, and one daughter was bringing home \$8 a week. I had to go to work."

"From that time on it was home study for me—a la Lincoln."

"I took a bookkeeping course sold by Sears-Roebuck. I went to night school and took shorthand until I could write 100 words a minute. I then was working in a cotton mill. I put an ad in the paper asking for office work, saying salary was no object to me, experience was my goal. I got a job with a sheet metal and roofing outfit at \$3 a week. In 2 months the bookkeeper quit, and I took his work on too—my salary was raised to \$5 a week."

Mr. FORAND sometimes amuses himself by trying to name all the jobs he held on his way up—and finishes off by saying it would be easier to name the jobs he didn't hold.

He worked for a wholesale baking company for 4 years before and 4 years after his service in World War I. He was in charge of 25 delivery routes for baked goods, rising at 2 a.m. to walk 4 miles to work. He has driven a dump truck, worked with pick and shovel. He has worked in a grocery store, sold lubricating oils. He has serviced radio sets. He has served as a private chauffeur to two different families.

But always his evenings were spent in study. He says it paid off.

From 1923 to 1927, Mr. FORAND was a member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives. After service as secretary to two Members of Congress in Washington, he was made chief of the Rhode Island State division of soldiers' relief and commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers' Home.

Mr. FORAND says it was this first-hand experience with the medical needs of the aged that prompted his introduction of the Forand bill in 1957.

"The needy will never again be just statistics to anybody who has to deal with their personal problems," he says. But he never fails to add: "If anybody has a better solution on medical care to the aged than I have, let them come up with it."

Of the American Medical Association, which vigorously opposes the Forand bill, its author repeatedly remarks: "I thank the A.M.A. It has done far more to publicize my bill than I could possibly do."

A joiner, Mr. FORAND belongs to Elks, Eagles, Lions Club, Knights of Columbus (fourth degree), French-American organizations—he comes from French stock—Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was born at Fall River, Mass., on May 23, 1895, and moved as a child to Rhode Island. He married Gertrude Bedard in 1931. They have no children.

He has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee since January, 1943, and now ranks second on the Democratic side.

FORAND BILL MAIL FLOODS CONGRESS—JAVITS GETS 700 LETTERS IN 2 WEEKS—WRITERS ARE 2 TO 1 BEHIND AID TO AGED

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The name of a Member of Congress from the smallest State in the Union far and away tops those mentioned in the incoming mail of the senior Senator from New York.

This phenomenon is more or less repeated throughout Senate and House Office Buildings as Members of Congress struggle with the issue of medical care for the aged—now simply dubbed from coast to coast the Forand bill.

Briefly, this is a plan promulgated by Representative AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, whereby the social security payroll tax would be raised for employers and employees to pay for medical care for old-age and survivor insurance beneficiaries.

Introduced a few days before the close of Congress in 1957, the Forand bill gained momentum in 1958 and 1959 and is going strong in this election year of 1960.

In the office of New York's Senator JACOB K. JAVITS mail mentioning the Forand bill by name has doubled in the last 4 weeks.

This mail has become "uncontested first" among the 100 topics on which the Senator's staff keeps tally. In January and February Forand letters ran around 400 a month. Between March 1 and March 15 the tally jumped to more than 700 letters.

MAIL FAVORS MEASURE

The March mail has been running 2 to 1 in favor of the Forand bill. The "for" mail comes mostly from labor unions, clubs of retired persons, and retired individuals who have chronic illnesses or have had operations.

The "against" mail is preponderantly from physicians, but also voices the views of insurance companies, pharmaceutical houses and businessmen objecting to a rise in the payroll tax. When the aged speak for themselves, they are spunky.

Excerpts from a few representative letters follow:

FOR FORAND BILL

"I am 80 years old, 64 years in industry; sickness has taken my home, insurance policies, and now a pauper's oath, so as to get medical care. Fine thing for a democracy. May I in all fairness ask you and your colleagues how you can vote against this bill when, from the President on down to the newest Members of Congress, you will get free socialized medicine at either the Walter Reed or Bethesda hospitals? After all we retired old folks paid the taxes that erected these hospitals for our political boys to have no worries about sickness and its tremendous expense."

"I haven't been to a doctor in almost 4 years and I just can't afford to go."

"The cost of medical care for people over 60 years of age is exorbitant. I am a member of this age group."

"Surely a country so free spending abroad can take care of its elderly population. Certainly it makes more sense than the bomb shelter plan Rocky (Governor Rockefeller) is trying to push."

AGAINST FORAND BILL

"I am not only strenuously against the Forand bill because of the many objections voiced by the American Medical Association, but I find it absolutely impossible to justify any legal act which will saddle my children and grandchildren with a completely unnecessary tax burden."

"It would seriously weaken if not destroy the entire social security structure."

"It is socialized medicine."

"It is the opening wedge for a Government-controlled program of health insurance."

"Our private insurance companies will always do a far better job at far less expense than the Government could ever hope to do."

Birmingham Bar Association Opposes Voting Referee Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution which was adopted a few days ago by the executive committee of the Birmingham Bar Association in opposition to the voting referee proposal presently being considered in the House of Representatives. The Birmingham Bar Association is composed of all lawyers licensed to practice in the city of Birmingham, Ala., and the opinions expressed in this resolution are those of the best legal talent available in my district. I urge that every Member of the House of Representatives give this resolution very careful consideration:

RESOLUTION OF THE BIRMINGHAM BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas there is now pending before the 2d session of the 86th Congress of the United States certain legislation relating to so-called civil rights which is but a patent attempt to further infringe upon the rights reserved and guaranteed to the several States, and to the individual citizens thereof under the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the legislation thus proposed is inimical to the best interest of the people of the United States of America, and, if adopted, would tend to create discord, violence, and disunity among the people of this country and spread further disrespect for law and order and would gravely distort and immeasurably impair the respect of the people for courts in general, and the Federal judicial system, in particular; and

Whereas many of the provisions of the proposed legislation are as objectionable to the people of this country, in this day and age, as were the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts, which were unfortunately and vindictively adopted over a Presidential veto in the not too distant past; and

Whereas the executive committee of the Birmingham Bar Association views with alarm, the continued efforts of the Federal Government to encroach upon and invade the constitutional rights reserved to the States and to the people under the pretext of guaranteeing "civil rights" to certain segments of the population now residing in the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Birmingham Bar Association, in meeting duly assembled, a quorum being present, That said committee, on behalf of the Birmingham Bar Association, does hereby oppose the enactment into law of any provisions of so-called civil rights legislation now pending before the 86th Congress of the United States, which create or authorize, or tends to create or authorize, the appointment by the Federal judiciary, or by any other Department of the Federal Government, of any referee to police voting qualifications or voting procedures in the several States, or of any registrar to undertake to create a Federal system of registration of voters in the several States; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress from the State of Alabama be advised by the president of the Birmingham Bar Association of this expression of concern

with the legislation pending as aforesaid, and that each Member of the Congress from the State of Alabama be and he hereby is commended for the vigorous and determined opposition heretofore manifested against such legislation; be it further

Resolved, That Members of the Congress from the State of Alabama be and each of them is hereby urged unrelentingly to continue to oppose and fight against the passage of any legislation which tends to undermine or subvert judicial processes long established in this country, or which impairs, or tends to impair, the integrity and respect of our judicial system and its administration of justice; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and copies thereof forwarded promptly by the president and secretary to each Member of the Congress from the State of Alabama and to the press and to such other persons and organizations as the president of this association may deem appropriate.

Marine Corps May Get New Cold War Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the mounting discussions of U.S. foreign policies, it is gratifying to note an increase in the number of thoughtful articles by writers of responsibility as well as courage. The latest is an informative discussion by Mr. Anthony Harrigan in the March 13, 1960, issue of the *News and Courier*, Charleston, S.C., one of the Nation's most ably edited newspapers. Because of its pertinence, I commend the article for reading by all concerned with the formulation of U.S. policies:

[From the *Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier*, Mar. 13, 1960]

MARINE CORPS MAY GET NEW COLD WAR MISSION

(By Anthony Harrigan)

How can the United States outthrust, outplan and outperform the Communist enemy in use of military forces for political ends?

That is one of the survival issues facing our country. It is not the nation that has the most missiles that will win the cold war, but the nation that finds new ways of using its military power in situations short of a big war.

The Soviets have proved resourceful in discovering ways to apply their military strength. They armed the North Koreans who fought against the United States. At present, the Soviets are helping Chinese Communists to build a submarine fleet. Red Army tanks have been used by Nassar's United Arab Republic in attacks on Israel. Moscow-trained military advisers are with the Syrian Army. Reports are coming from Latin America that a legion of Communists will be formed to fight for any nation threatened by U.S. "reactionaries."

American traditions make it hard for this country to adjust to Soviet cold war techniques. For example, the United States in years past has laid stress on separation of military action and political action. But today, when the Communist enemy fights with a combination of bribery, political leaflets and guerilla groups, separation of

military and political action is a handicap to the United States.

Lack of political preparation of America's fighting men was evident in Korea, where many U.S. prisoners of war were unequipped to face Communist brainwashing. Because other Koreans and Lebanese are likely to occur, the United States must face up to the changed ways of war.

News ways of war are being put into practice in the two great underdeveloped areas of the world—Latin America and Africa. Both areas are the home of unstable countries suffering from political immaturity and explosive nationalism.

Not even the basic political blueprint has appeared in Africa. Though new African nations are gaining independence each year, the political pattern is unsettled. Ghana soon may be locked in political struggle with Nigeria over which nation will dominate west Africa. Armed conflict cannot be ruled out.

The outcome of this and other struggles on the Dark Continent concerns the United States. Where the United States has a stake in the outcome of a political dispute, the need may arise for intervention at some point on the spectrum of politico-military activity.

Many of the new nations in Africa have strategic importance. Somalia, now an Italian mandate area, and British and French Somaliland border respectively the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden. They overlook the southern approaches to Red and Arabian Seas and wash against Iran, Pakistan, and India.

India is a neutral nation, but the other two are allied to the United States. If Somalia, which will soon gain its independence, were ruled by a pro-Communist regime, the seapower of the United States and its allies would be endangered in the Indian Ocean. Red naval units based on the east coast of Africa could seal off that part of the world from the Western democracies.

Neither can the United States ignore the successes of communism in Latin America. One of the principal objectives of Cuba's revolutionary government is to drive the United States from its great naval base at Guantanamo Bay. Throughout the Caribbean are important listening devices that help guard the American mainland against Soviet submarine attack. Leftist rule of the Caribbean Federation, for example, would mean real risks for the American people.

Trouble in Latin America is not new. During the 1920's and 1930's the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps were called upon to exercise a stabilizing force in the Caribbean and Central America.

An era of good neighbor relations led to withdrawal of Marines. But the stepped-up tempo of trouble in this hemisphere suggests that the United States may have to link military force to political activity.

If intervention is again a possibility, the United States must give thought to actual techniques. The French experience in Algeria makes clear that police actions require special training of troops.

In 1956, Brig. Gen. Paris de Bollardiere, a French military zone commander in Algeria, developed a new approach to pacification. He said: "We are separated by a wall from the Moslem community." Realizing this difficulty he temporarily abolished orthodox military organizations. He formed small units that combined political work with attacks against terrorists. Thus the French military forces became closely identified with a villager's safety and security.

The time may not be distant when the U.S. Marine Corps will be called on to utilize similar techniques. If ordered into Cuba, the Corps would want to identify itself with Cuban groups that opposed the Castro forces. Political pacification would not be easy for the Marine Corps today, which stresses amphibious warfare and vertical

envelopment with helicopter attack forces. In retirement now are the officers and non-coms who restored order in Haiti and Nicaragua in years past. The whole focus of the Marine Corps has changed as a result of its experience as an assault force in World War II. But a new emphasis on pacification duties may be necessary because of the national stake in holding down Communist movements.

Because the marines are a flexible, battle-ready professional fighting force, they may well become the national instrument for checking Communist indirect aggression. If this is the case, marines may have to be given new and different training in languages, political administration, and pacification methods. Techniques of political persuasion may have to be taught not to a small handful of high-ranking officers, but on the squad level.

This sort of mission would be a new one to the American Armed Forces. But as Communists make clear, they are engaged in a war that could last decades. The counterattack against Communist activity in Cuba, or even Africa, must be made with weapons and tactics that are suitable.

Ireland the Gift Giver—An Address Delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John K. Cartwright on March 17, 1960, at the Banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of St. Patrick's Day last week I was privileged to attend the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick here in Washington. The whole program was wonderful and the evening was a happy and festive one indeed. One of the real highlights of the occasion was the singularly fine address delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John K. Cartwright of St. Matthew's Cathedral here in our Nation's Capital. Needless to say, I have listened to a great many speeches on the many St. Patrick's Days I have celebrated over the years. Monsignor Cartwright's address ranks among the very finest I have ever heard. Its high quality is immediately apparent and stems in large part, I feel, from its overall tone of universality—a quality not often found in speeches commemorating St. Patrick's Feast Day. I take pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in placing this address in the RECORD so that all may have the benefit of its message. The monsignor's speech follows:

IRELAND THE GIFT GIVER

There is a tradition of good will and of almost mystical friendliness which invests this feast when men of different races take on an imaginative citizenship in the Irish race. The same spirit of good will and compliment is prevalent in the eulogies of St. Patrick. Sometimes the compliments abound in fancy rather than in the sober reality of historical

realization. And it is a pity that a sort of mist—legendary however beautiful—seems to gather around one who nevertheless lived in the real world of the fifth century and whose achievement was one of the most powerful in human history. St. Patrick's mission made a whole people a part of Christendom and therefore a part of European history, and therefore a part of our history. There was about him a splendor of instantaneous success that is nearly unique. There was also a unanimity on the part of the people whom he won. St. Patrick and his companions were apostles, missionaries, teachers. But they were not martyrs. And here again in the marvelous welcome given to his message there was something strange and marvelous and not to be forgotten.

With your permission, however, I shall dwell tonight not so much on St. Patrick and his work but on the centuries that were its consequences.

My subject is "Ireland, the Gift Giver." As such I ask you to dwell with me for a moment upon the rich endowments, the rich generosity of its people in the past, and upon its rich potentialities for further contributions in the present and the future.

In the very distant past of Roman imperialism the Celtic peoples pass before the lens of history. They succumbed at first to the Roman sword and afterward to the organizing genius of the Roman lawyer and engineer. But they were not, for all that, an inferior people. The ancient writers including Caesar, who conquered them, recognized in them a people who had something to give to even Rome. Lucan, the poet, saluted the bards, the spiritual leaders of the Celtic tribes as those to whom was given knowledge "of the gods and the powers of heaven." "From you," he said, "we learn that the frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave;—death, if your lore be true, is but the passage to enduring life."

"The frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave." So thought the Roman of the Celt, who awakened within his civilized and conventional mind the wild surmises of the spirit, the haunting conviction of immortality which is native to the immortal soul of man. Such was not the only, but the chief contribution of the Celt. The Roman gave him roads and commerce and stability. He awakened in the Roman the suggestion which precedes the faith that "the frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave." The Roman worked and fought and built, yielding structures that might serve the purpose of this world's day. The Celt, even before he was a Christian, pointed beyond the horizons of this world's sunlight to the vaster issues of the everlasting day when man's true destiny will be accomplished.

The time was to come when Rome's imperial secret perished from his mind and heart. The legions vanished, the roadways fell into decay, commerce shrank, schools disappeared, art was corrupted, the Roman peace gave place to chaos and the laws yielded to anarchy. Civilization gave place to barbarism. The fair cities with their temples and porticoes were replaced with the hovel structures of those who came from the forests. The power of reason and the human mind to advance upon the wilderness seemed to be lost. And on the ancient frontiers the children of civilized Rome and civilized Celt alike trembled within the diminishing circle of the light.

Then came salvation. Within the frontiers the bishop and the Benedictine arrested the ravaging hand and directed the new tribes on their path to the new civilization of the Middle Ages. And on the frontiers a renewed civilization, not the Roman Empire but Christendom, achieved anew its powers of expansion and of carrying the mission of light to the peoples who sat in darkness.

If we are civilized today we owe it to the past. Not to one past but to many pasts: the

past of Greece and Rome and equally with these to the glorious and sometimes unappreciated past of the Middle Ages. The men of the centuries from the fifth to the tenth strove pitifully and piously to save the fragments of their past. And in the nobility of that struggle was achieved a new present as the basis for an even nobler future. Upon the work of those five centuries you and I depend for letters, for art, for music, for government. Science itself which is the creation of our own time and which sometimes makes our own times seem very self-sufficient—science itself is born to us but the stream of its blood comes down from those noble and pathetic ages when men and women yielded their courage to protect the diminished yet precious inheritance which their age had given to them, and in the midst of exiguous resources and sterile ruins gave birth again to mankind's creative powers.

Those five centuries were great not so much for their achievement but for what they made possible to the high Middle Ages and to us. And in those great five centuries one of the greatest names is borne by those who did the greatest deeds, the scholars and the monks of Ireland. Sedulius Scotus at Liege whose verses carried into Christian expression the ancient Celtic longing for immortality, Virgilius at Salzburg who, long before the instruments of modern science were invented, reflected the scientific longing to break the limits of time and space; John Scotus Erigena who opened again for northern peoples the problems that were first stated in Ionian and Apulian cities by Thales and Pythagoras. These names are perhaps not in much currency among us today. But if others forget, let Irishmen remember that the gifts of scientific curiosity and literary expression and philosophic thought which are the very blossom of civilization were given to the ancestors of Englishmen and Frenchmen and Germans and Americans over 1,000 years ago by Irishmen. It was not always Irishmen who gave them, and they were given not only by Irishmen then. But the Irish gave them and gave them chiefly at the time when the rest of us needed them most, at a critical age of danger and spiritual starvation. And had it not been for those generous gifts of ancient Ireland, the rest of us might be Franks today instead of Frenchmen, Teutons instead of Germans, Anglo-Saxons (or even Jutes) instead of Englishmen. And America might still be a continent of Cherokees and Iroquois.

And note how these great scholars became the pilgrims and colonists of Christendom on its frontiers. Today there are cities in the heart of Europe which then were village outposts of culture. In those places there lingers in many a name and many a monument the remembrance of the Irish pioneers. Their monasteries helped to keep religion and learning in Rouen before it became the Athens of the Normans; in Cambrai where it fronted on the desert northern flatlands; in Cologne when the Rhine was a crossingplace for savages and before anyone had seen even in imagination a Gothic spire; in Luxeuil when Columbanus wrestled with the cruel and lustful strength of the Burgundians; in Rheims when it was just becoming the baptismal front of Christian France; in Ratisbon before the first of the Danube's valleys had become a hearth of ordered industry and peace; in St. Gall when the austere mountain solitudes behind it were not yet won for either faith or patriotism; in Bobbio when the Alpine passes had been lost to the wilderness and Italy's frontier shrank to the Apennines. To all these places the Irish came. On all that march of Christendom they brought gifts to men, and bright in the coronets of those crested cities are the emeralds of Irish faith and Irish learning.

These ancient achievements are our memories. Yet the Irish people do not rest only

upon ancient glories half lost in the Celtic twilight or dim in the distant balefires of the Dark Ages. They are a vital people today in a country which is at long last their own. And to all the countries of the Western World they have carried an individuality which is one of the great contributions to the history of today.

Many peoples of Western Europe have in the last four centuries carried the streams of their best traditions to our country. Here the German has brought his steadiness and workmanship, the Frenchman his art and his clear thought, the Englishman his love of the representative institutions which it was the honor of his forbears first to achieve, the Spaniard his dignity and independence which made Spain in our time the first country clearly to repudiate the international folly and crime of communism. These special characteristics of each land accompany the general qualities of patience and courage which were needed to turn this savage continent into the home of settled peace which is America.

Surely the Irish were not lacking in those general qualities of patience and courage. But patience and courage have been the quality in some degree of every nation that has survived the years. What of the special and individual gifts that Ireland contributed to the treasury of our Nation's annals.

It seems to me that they are two, these gifts of Ireland to America. And I feel that they are gifts which America has not yet used to their fullest extent. They are gifts which at first sight are not closely associated. Yet perhaps their fountains lie close together in the recesses of the human soul. These two gifts are humor and spirituality.

Americans like to think that they are humorous, and so they are. But our characteristic humor finds its expression in clever slang and in the wisecrack. And these, though good things in themselves, do not have the force which they should have to dissipate the snobisms which are among our more-grievous afflictions. These mental inadequacies to deal with the absurd have done much mischief and could do more. But the Irish sense of humor—the realization of absurdities in the heart of things—makes the Irish (and would make us) immune to snobbery and pussyfooting and pomposity.

The second contribution which the Irish have made to America is spirituality. Centuries ago the Roman recognized in the Celt that quality in which he himself was lacking. "The frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave." And today America needs if not to gain at least to preserve this realization of the primacy of the spiritual. Perhaps under God the Irish were sent here to enrich our beloved country with a greater vision of the fact that "the frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave."

For assuredly the Irish are leaders among the races of men in keeping the sense of the spiritual. In other lands the hard clear light of common day makes real the things of earth and banishes the thought of the supernatural. In Ireland the clouds and rain break from time to time and let heaven's sunlight down as through a window to bless the valleys and to glorify the misty mountain tops. Light is a visitor from heaven that comes and goes. Perhaps that is why the Irish are so hospitable and so polite to suggestions from above and why the thought of heaven is always present in their minds.

Chesterton tells a beautiful story that came to him from Donegal. An Irish farmer was walking on a mountain road. Suddenly he met a beautiful woman holding in her arms a child. To his question she replied: "I am the mother of God. And this is Himself. And He's the boy you'll all be wanting at the last."

Is not that an exquisite story? And is it not very real? Real of our forbears, and, please God, somewhat real to us. The di-

vine and the eternal dwell familiarly in the Irish mind and heart. To such minds and hearts it is not surprising to think of divine incarnations and celestial visitants. Nor is it strange or shameful that these heavenly guests should take the accents of their Irish hosts, or compensate for the poverty of Irish firesides by utilizing the poignant and imaginative speech of a people whose wealth has been of the spirit. The Flemish painters who lived in a land of rich commerce adorned their madonnas with the brocades and velvets of the wives of merchant princes. The Italians endowed her and her Child with the noble physical features that are the endowment of their people. The Irish, without brocades and canvas and without great churches intensely realize the divine and simply conceive it in their daily speech. The word made flesh has these long centuries been a familiar and beloved visitor on the hearth and in the hearts of every Irish home.

We do not wrong the dear country that is our own in saying that it needs more of this. May we hope that it is the destiny of the Irish in America to give her this one more great gift. Our land is richest in the world in material resources; richest in the noble traditions carried to her by her myriad peoples and races; mightiest in the opportunities that lie before her for leading the world to better destinies. May she take from the Irish as she has taken from the other peoples the characteristic and gracious gifts that Ireland has to give. May she achieve in the future as she has achieved in the past a glorious terrestrial destiny without rejecting the insight into the heart of the world which is Irish humor and without forgetting the Irish insight into spiritual realities, the Irish faith that "the frontier of man's spirit is not the senseless grave."

Our Monetary System: A Most Unusual Newspaper Informs Its Readers on the Subject of the Nation's Money System and the Federal Reserve's Monetary Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, during January and February of this year, the Texas Observer ran a series of articles under the general title "PATMAN on Money." This title refers, of course, to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who, as most of us know, is an expert on monetary matters to be reckoned with.

These articles are most enlightening. Despite the obvious importance of this subject, I regret to say it is one which is too much neglected, particularly by the public press. More than that, the Government officials in charge of monetary matters and the banker-philosophers who speak on the subject have a way of surrounding this subject with much mysticism, gobbledygook, and, at times, downright misleading statements. As a result, the public is more confused than enlightened concerning one of our most important social institutions, namely, our money system.

I believe that the Members will find the Texas Observer's articles both informative and stimulating reading. And because of the scarcity of enlightening information on this subject, I have thought that I could do a good service by calling attention to such information from time to time.

A word about the Texas Observer. It is a weekly newspaper, published at Austin, Tex. It is one of the rare giants of American journalism. It reports on those important issues which most of the newspapers of the country find either too hot to handle or too difficult to handle. As a consequence, it has a high reputation and a devoted following of subscribers over the country—from the farthest corner of Texas to Maine.

The first of the articles I have mentioned appeared in the January 15 issue of the Texas Observer, and it is as follows:

[From the Texas Observer, Jan. 15, 1960]

PATMAN ON MONEY—PATMAN CHARGES "ROBBERY IN BROAD DAYLIGHT"

(The observer's intent in the series here beginning on Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN and the banks is not to advocate nor evaluate PATMAN's ideas but to give them a full hearing. We invite disputation on the subject and trust our readers will agree that if Mr. PATMAN is right, the Congress has neglected a national scandal, while if he is wrong, he is very wrong.—EDITOR)

WASHINGTON.—"Oh, it's cruel. It's highway robbery in broad daylight. Imagine the Government paying that much for its own credit."

In such language does the venerable WRIGHT PATMAN, Congressman from Texas since 1928, condemn rising interest rates on money.

In 1945-46 PATMAN said, the interest rate on short-term obligations of the Government was three-eighths of 1 percent, but the rate has increased more than 10 times. Long-term Government interest rates are over 4 percent, and the bankers are "shooting for 4.5 percent bonds."

PATMAN favors a limit of 2.5 percent interest on long-term Government bonds.

"This is a case of the majority needing protection from the minority—the bankers having all the privileges," PATMAN told the Observer in an interview in his Washington office. "The people who run the big papers are hooked up with them."

"We have no supervision over the banks. We can't get an independent audit—we haven't had one in 46 years. They have enough power to stop any investigation."

"The people are paying interest of at least $3\frac{1}{2}$ billion a year they wouldn't have to pay. The total interest payments on the national debt are \$9 billion a year—the largest item in the budget except national defense, 50 percent higher than all payments to all veterans of all wars for all purposes."

RUN THIS COUNTRY

"The Federal Reserve ought to be impeached," the Congressman said angrily. "They absolutely ought to be impeached. It's a disgrace to let a few fellows representing Wall Street absolutely run this country and have more power than Congress does."

PATMAN said the open market committee of the Federal Reserve System, a committee which buys and sells Government securities in the open market but in secrecy, is composed of five members selected by banks and seven who are "supposed to be public members—but of course they're private bankers."

"The Federal Reserve banks regulate no

private banks now—they're just stuffed shirts, spending tremendous amounts of money. The open market committee makes the fundamental decisions," he said.

The people do not understand that the banks manufacture money, PATMAN declared. "They're the manufacturers, creating money. The Federal Reserve banks create dollars out of the Government's credit when they issue Federal Reserve notes. They have 25 percent in gold behind it, but the gold belongs to the Government. The gold is really a fiction; on the international market, some like to deal with gold."

The private banks, in relationship to their reserves, can then "manufacture as much money as they want to make—from their own greedy standpoint," PATMAN said. "They can put all their money in Government securities and go fishing."

A SCANDALOUS STORY

He has been swinging, too, against what he regards as banks' evasion of financial responsibility for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"The banks were supposed to pay one-twelfth of 1 percent of their deposits" to FDIC, he said, "but during the 80th Republican Congress the law was changed so that the FDIC Board can get \$3 billion from the U.S. Treasury any time they want it, direct. This is a Government obligation for which they (the banks) pay nothing—a bonus to the banks. And then they began cutting the one-twelfth of 1 percent contribution, until they can subtract 60 percent of that one-twelfth."

"It's a scandalous story, scandalous," PATMAN exclaimed. "The U.S. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has 81 cents to protect every \$100 on deposit." In the event of a run on the banks, he said, "the Government would just print the money."

The national debt ought to be paid off to a certain amount, "but we've got to have a national debt," PATMAN believes. To pay it off quickly and abruptly would cause "the worst depression in history." As long as the private sources of capital will not provide enough funds to keep the economy going, the Government must do so, and this means the national debt, he reasons.

PATMAN believes bankers should be removed from the Federal Reserve Board. "It's scandalous. It's shocking. It's so shocking—the people won't believe it," he said, handing the reporter some CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

"You won't find debates. Because they won't challenge me. They keep it out because they know damn well what I can do to them," he said.

"Pressures from the bankers and the frequent charges that reforms bankers oppose would be inflationary intimidate many persons on the subject of money," he said.

"It hasn't intimidated you, I notice," the reporter observed.

"No sir. It will not," he said.

THE NO. 1 MONEY MAN

PATMAN is not just another Congressman. He is second-ranking member of the Texas delegation in tenure. Only Speaker RAYBURN has served longer.

He is chairman of the House Small Business Committee. Every other Congress he is chairman of the Joint (House-Senate) Economic Committee. On the powerful House Banking and Currency Committee he is the third-ranking member.

Born near a railroad siding named Patman's switch (for his family, who settled there, near Texarkana, after the Civil War), PATMAN was graduated from Hughes Springs High School and earned his law degree from Cumberland University, Tennessee. ("I only got involved in banking and finance because I had to," he says.)

He served in the Texas Legislature from 1921 to 1924, was district attorney for the

fifth judicial district of Texas, and was elected to Congress in 1928.

Bankers all over the country know about him, and some fear him. The Associated Press said in a story from Washington, December 28, 1958, that his ideas about money and credit "in some outraged quarters" earn tags like "sawdust floor economist," "cheap money," and "funny money."

But, said AP: "Money, like the weather, is something everyone talks about, but few really understand it. PATMAN is one who does. In spite of the controversy over his economic philosophy, the solemn Texan probably rates as the No. 1 money man in Congress because of his knowledge of this complex subject."

When a man of this standing declares, as PATMAN did, for instance, in a letter to the Observer on December 19, 1959, that "the Federal Reserve Board now is guilty of wilful misconduct and gross malfeasance in office. They are doing what is equal to highway robbery in broad daylight by imposing extortionary interest rates upon the people and permitting a few to make their millions overnight through the free use of the Government credit"—then one would expect the Nation to take notice.

But it has not.

TAKE THE FLOOR

His views have made no real impression on the Congress. The Democratic Party does not take them up—in fact, does not, as a general matter, discuss banking, except for occasional rhetorical abuse. And PATMAN charges that the press blankets out a discussion of his field and his ideas.

Last Congress, arguing against what he said would have been a bigger giveaway than all the Teapot Domes, Dixon-Yates deals, public land grabs, timber steals, and defense contract riggings put together, PATMAN said:

"The reason is, the people generally are not informed about it and enter no protest. The Members of Congress have terrific pressure from the banking lobby that will profit so handsomely from this giveaway. Our exposés are scandalous and shocking but they are only printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is read by few people."

Last March, PATMAN made a speech to the U.S. House charging that the Federal Reserve system and the Republicans in 1958 "gave"—literally "gave"—the banks \$10 billion in 1958. His reasoning was complex and required some sophistication about banking. He had just finished charging that in fact, the \$67 billion of interest-bearing U.S. Government securities the commercial banks hold have all been acquired by money "created on the books of these banks."

Then he asked the House:

"Is there a Member within the sound of my voice who will dispute what I have said about that? Of course, there is not. There is not a person in the Government who will dispute it, because it is an inescapable fact. It cannot be disputed. So, here we are, 436 Members of the House, sitting right here on the sidelines seeing this happen in broad daylight and feeling helpless to do anything about it. That is the reason I complain."

But a Member did rise to the microphone. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports the colloquy:

"Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?"

"Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa."

"Mr. GROSS. How did the gentleman vote on raising the debt limit?"

He had voted no, PATMAN replied.

He tried again in April. Market trading in onions is regulated by the Government, but market trading in Government securities is totally unregulated, he declared. The interest rate had just gone to 4.26 per-

cent on longtime securities "for the first time since the early twenties." Pleading for attention, PATMAN continued:

"The Federal Reserve Board last year furnished the banks enough free reserves, absolutely free, without a penny cost, for them to go into the market and purchase \$10,400 million in U.S. Government securities. That was manufactured money. That was money created on the books of the banks. Every dollar of that money must be paid. By whom? Every bill says 'U.S. Government will pay on demand, so many dollars.' That is how. That is you. That is the people. In other words, it is a mortgage upon all the property and upon all the incomes of all the people of the United States to pay that money which was created by the flick of a pen on the books of the banks in 1958 in order to buy these bonds totaling \$10,400 million."

"If any Member of Congress can justify that," challenged PATMAN, "I wish that Member would speak out and I wish that Member would take the floor of this House and say it can be justified. I know now that no Member will do that because no Member will try to defend that policy. It cannot be defended. But we have remained silent. We have not done anything about it. Now it has overtaken us in a devastating, ruinous way. We must immediately pay some attention and see if we cannot do something about it."

The Worthy Pilcher Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the leading daily newspaper of the Second Congressional District of Georgia, the Albany Herald, carried an editorial in its March 19, 1960 issue, entitled, "The Worthy Pilcher Report." That editorial points out the magnificent service performed by the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee during a 40,000 mile tour of Far Eastern and Middle Eastern nations. The work of that subcommittee reflected great credit upon every member of that fine subcommittee, and I am particularly proud of the leadership and wisdom displayed by my colleague and neighbor, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman J. L. PILCHER, and I think the editorial points up dramatically the services rendered, and that the editorial should be made a part of the RECORD.

The editorial reads as follows:

EDITOR'S OUTLOOK—THE WORTHY PILCHER REPORT

Second District Congressman JOHN LEONARD PILCHER's Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on the completion of a 40,000-mile tour of 17 Far Eastern and Middle Eastern nations to study the impact of U.S. foreign aid in these areas, has issued an eminently sensible report citing the strikingly dangerous gap which exists between grandiose projects at the top and millions of human beings still starving, still untaught, who have neither the stamina to undertake nor the capacity to understand self-government. Significantly, the Pilcher subcommittee does not condemn foreign aid per se, nor has the chairman ever done

so. But it does have a great many thoughtful things to say about obvious maladministration as well as the need for a reappraisal and revision of the mutual security program by the Washington Government.

The conclusions of the subcommittee, to which a lone and mild Republican dissent was raised by a single member, are worthy of the closest attention in the 2d session of the 86th Congress which must act on the administration's request for still another \$4.2 billion in foreign aid funds. What the Pilcher subcommittee had to say about the planning and execution of our assistance programs abroad comes close to spearing directly to the heart of the trouble. Newly independent, underdeveloped countries usually seek to build great prestige public works like huge dams, steel mills, and superhighways, often with little regard to overriding economic considerations. Unfortunately, the United States has acceded to too many of these programs, in the subcommittee's view.

For example, the study notes that the cost of an elaborate highway in Vietnam has skyrocketed from \$18 million to \$85 million and may exceed \$100 million before its completion. Yet the Congressmen found this particular work "completely unrealistic" in terms of that nation's needs. In Korea, the mission found 300 projects were programed and more were scheduled to begin before the existing projects had been completed successfully. "Such an approach is costly in operation and inconclusive in results," the lawmakers held. A Korean fertilizer plant, started with aid dollars in 1955 and earmarked to cost \$19.5 million, already has received more than \$40 million, is still not operating and will not reach full operation for several years. These are but a few of many such examples, and they naturally moved the Congressmen to the only conclusion consonant with the dictates of commonsense: "The study mission found a tendency on the part of several U.S. personnel serving in foreign nations to magnify the interests of the particular country to which they are assigned. As a result of this practice, some projects have been undertaken without adequate consideration either of suitability or excessive cost to the United States."

This situation has resulted in nations like India, which faces a food crisis due to overpopulation and a grave lack of agricultural production methods and procedures, building vast industrial monuments while the national investment in agriculture lags and people starve to death. True, rapid industrialization is the rage in many underdeveloped countries, but the difficulty lies in the too often rapid pace of the undertaking, as the House subcommittee observed. This failure to put first things first can have tragic results, not only for the recipient nations but for the donor as well. Hungry people are easy prey for the glittering promises of communism. In this sense, American foreign aid, as presently constituted, is not meeting the most elementary test of the U.S. national interest.

Our central error lies in our attempt to do too much in too many places with available funds, as Congressman PILCHER and his colleagues make plain. Conceding this premise, it is necessary to proceed to the logical conclusion that American assistance be limited henceforth to a few fundamentals—food, education, and adequate military defenses. The total burden which this Nation bears is no light one. But to make the load even heavier through carelessness, slipshod administration and ineffectual planning is the height of foolhardiness. The Pilcher Report thus serves the best interest of the American people in calling to public attention not only the obvious errors, but the need for a reformation in mutual assistance.

Violation of International Convention of 1888 by Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno, at the Carnegie Endowment Center on March 3, 1960, made a talk that I believe is worthy of his high office and the attention of his fellow Americans. He rightly waxes indignant at the actions of the head of the Egyptian nation in violating the International Convention of 1888 which governs the operation of the Suez Canal, in committing acts of piracy, in violating the decree of the United Nations of September 1, 1951, and further, in violating the principles of the United Nations to which Egypt was bound. "There shall be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination overt or covert." "The operation of the canal shall be insulated from the politics of any country."

Under unanimous consent I include this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO, AT CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT CENTER, MARCH 3, 1960

Mr. Chairman and friends, in the early part of December 1959, the Green ship *Astrypalea* stood into the beautiful harbor of Haifa, Israel, to take aboard as prosaic and as unprovocative a cargo as ever rode the ocean waves—cement, 400 tons of it. It had been purchased by a firm in Eritrea on the Red Sea. A ship may get to Eritrea from Haifa by traveling southwardly through the Suez Canal, a voyage of some 1,000 miles, or it may reach Eritrea by circumnavigating Africa, that is, by sailing westwardly to Casablanca, southwardly to Cape of Good Hope and then northwardly through the Indian Ocean, a distance of some 10,000 miles. Obviously the captain of the *Astrypalea* took the shorter route, charting his course due south and, on December 18, arrived at Port Said for passage through the canal connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea.

Here, however, he found the locks closed to his ship. Egyptian guards, acting under orders from Gamal Abdel Nasser, president of the United Arab Republic, informed the captain that he could pass through the canal only if he first surrendered the cement he was transporting from Haifa. The Greek captain refused to give up his cargo and equally declined to return to Haifa, the alternative offered by Nasser. And with this impasse the *Astrypalea* became immobilized in the waters of the Mediterranean at the head of the canal, as much as if it had been congealed in the cement which it carried.

I was traveling in the Mediterranean at the time and was considerably interested in the legal phases of this extraordinary event.

Ten days later I was honored by an interview with Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion in his office in Jerusalem, and I asked him what he thought of the action of the Egyptians in demanding the cargo of the *Astrypalea*. We had been conversing for some minutes before I mentioned the episode at Port Said, and up until this moment the

Prime Minister had been very cheerful. When I put the question, however, his calm and amiable features tautened, his eyes flashed, his hands clenched and one word explosively rose to his lips—"Robbery."

And that's what Nasser's action was—robbery. Nor was this the first time that the Egyptian Government had unfurled the black standard of freebooters.

In April 1959, the Danish freighter *Inge Toft*, chartered by the United Mediterranean Agencies, of New York, also set out from Haifa, also carrying cement, in addition to other products, for passage through the Suez Canal on her way to the Orient. She was halted at Port Said and directed to discharge her Israel-loaded cement and other cargo. The captain refused and Nasser ordered the ship detained. The Government of Israel, the owners of the ship and the owners of the cargo all protested, but Nasser refused to allow the ship to proceed. As a consequence, the *Inge Toft*, like the ship in Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, stuck in the motionless sea as if embalmed in pitch.

Eventually the owners had to capitulate to Nasser's imperious demands. The detention was costing them a thousand dollars a day. The cargo was surrendered to Nasser who, adding insult to injury, compelled the owners to pay unloading costs so that it could not be said that they had been coerced into giving up their property. This is like making the victim of a robbery pay for the revolver with which he is compelled to surrender his wallet so that it may be said that, after all, he was not coerced since it was at the persuasion of his own weapon that he handed over his money.

And, so far as the *Astrypalea* is concerned, she still remains to this day rusting in the murky waters of Port Said. Israel has produced documents proving that title to her cargo of cement is in the purchasers at Eritrea who anxiously await their goods, but Nasser still refuses to remove his usurping hand from the bulwarks of the unoffending vessel.

The mere narrative of these two outrages is enough to prompt the brow-wrinkling inquiry: Upon what basis does Nasser claim the right to take property belonging to someone else? And how does such brutal appropriation differ from piracy?

Nasser claims that a state of war still exists between Egypt and Israel and that, therefore, he may, on his own authority, close the Suez Canal to Israel. The answers to Nasser's contentions are so many and so overwhelming, individually and in combination, that, in replying, one runs the risk of allowing indignation to overcome articulation.

In the first place, the *Astrypalea* and the *Inge Toft* are not Israel ships. In the second place there was nothing in the cargoes of these two ships which could possibly do damage to Egypt as they passed through the canal. In the third place, the cargoes were no longer the property of Israel citizens since the consignees had paid for them in Haifa and were merely taking them home. The argument advanced by Nasser, in this respect, if accepted, would justify the creditor of a shoe store owner in assaulting and pulling off the shoes of a customer who had purchased and paid for the shoes in that shoe store.

And then, so far as the state-of-war argument is concerned, it is to be noted that the aggressive war which Egypt launched against Israel terminated almost 12 years ago, and, incidentally, it terminated in Egypt's defeat, so that she may not presume she has a victor's right to a loser's property.

Of course, Nasser maintains that the Egypt-Israel war has not terminated because a treaty of peace has not been concluded between the two countries; there was only

an armistice. But it is not Israel that is at fault here. It is Nasser who refuses to dip the pen into the ink. He prefers to stir into the inkwell the vials of hatred, racial poison, and impassioned hostility.

But, even if we were to assume that technically the two countries are at war, and even if we were to assume that the *Astrypalea* and the *Inge Toft* cement belonged to Israel, Nasser could not, under international law, confiscate the cargo as contraband. The very object of an armistice is to suspend all belligerency. Violently seizing noncombatant goods is as much an act of war as firing a gun.

But these arguments are all wholly unnecessary and superfluous because Nasser has no right whatsoever to stop any ship, no matter what its registry and no matter what it is carrying, from passage through the Suez Canal. The International Convention of 1888, which governs the operation of the canal, specifically provides:

"The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open in time of war as in time of peace to every vessel of commerce or of war without distinction of flag."

"Consequently, the high contracting parties agree not in any way to interfere with the free use of the canal in time of war as in time of peace."

"The canal shall never be subjected to the exercise of the right of blockade."

In spite of this specific, ironclad, interpretation-proof prohibition against interference with passage through the Suez Canal, Nasser has, with a heavy hand, seized the helms of numerous ships at either terminus of the canal and refused to remove his hand until bounty, by way of surrender of cargoes, has been paid into the coffers of his anti-Semitic hatred. In this nefarious process, cargoes of meat and hides have been held until they spoiled, indispensable goods needed in a rapid building and expanding economy have been delayed to the point of ruining innumerable projects. Oil tankers have been held up unless the owners agreed not to sell oil to Israel. This means that Israel has been compelled to expend from \$8 to \$10 million a year more for fuel than she would ordinarily pay if she could buy canal-transported oil.

Israel naturally protested to the United Nations against these acts of outlawry, and, on September 1, 1951, after Nasser had been given the fullest opportunity to explain his actions, the Security Council ordered Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial ships and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

But Nasser spurned this decree as he ignored the convention of 1888. On September 28, 1954, he brazenly halted the Israel freighter *Bat Galim*, appropriated her cargo of 93 tons of meat, 42 tons of plywood, and 3 tons of hides, imprisoned her crew, confiscated the ship and impressed her into the Egyptian Navy.

The brilliant Israel Ambassador Abba Eban, in protesting to the Security Council against this Egyptian crime, declared:

"It is difficult to think of a larger aggregate of offenses against international law and maritime tradition than those which Egypt compressed into the single episode of the *Bat Galim*. There is obstruction of free navigation; piratical seizure of a ship in an international waterway; physical violence against the persons of mariners exercising innocent passage; fabrication of charges against sailors intransigent; unlawful imprisonment; the bearing of false witness from the highest tribunals of international security dishonorable nonfulfilment of a

pledge given by a member nation at the table of the Security Council."

When the case of the *Bat Galim* was discussed in the Security Council, the Representatives of the United States declared:

"We cannot fail to state our view that Egyptian restrictions on ships passing through the Suez Canal, whether bound to or from Israel, or whether flying the Israeli or some other flag, are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, contrary to the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951 (S. 2322), and a retrogression from the stated objectives to which both sides committed themselves in signing the armistice agreement. We cannot fail to state, therefore, that we look to Egypt to give effect to these decisions and agreements."

On October 12, 1956, Egypt was reminded again of her international obligations. The Secretary General of the United Nations read to the Security Council the list of principles to which Egypt was bound. Nos. 1 and 3 read:

"There shall be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert."

"The operation of the canal shall be insulated from the politics of any country."

In February 1957 President Eisenhower said to the American people and to the world that if Egypt tried to block Israel shipping in the Suez Canal "this should be dealt firmly by the society of nations." And what has happened since then? Egypt has not only tried to block Israel shipping. She has blocked it. She has more than blocked it, she has usurped it—all in flagrant defiance of international law, in opposition to United Nations edicts, and in disregard of maritime principles and elementary rules of justice.

And what has the society of nations done about these unspeakable usurpations? There have been remonstrances, protests, and mild criticisms, but no action. The United Nations sent its Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, whom I greatly admire, to plead with Nasser, but since when, has law had to plead with outlaw, since when has honor had to plead with infamy, since when has authority had to plead with mutiny, and loyalty with perfidy?

Nasser, of course, resisted every appeal. He was deaf to reason, impervious to logic, scornful of legal obligation, insensate to demands of fundamental humanity.

There is utterly no excuse for Nasser's bellicosity. No nation has any design on his territory. On the contrary, many nations are assisting Egypt with heavy financial loans and private investment will tremendously help her economy. But those who are giving assistance to Nasser in this manner, and the United Nations which has been extremely lenient in its treatment of Nasser, should ask themselves if in view of Nasser's attitude toward international law, they are not building for themselves a Frankenstein on the Nile?

I believe in the United Nations with every atom of sincerity; it is the one bastion of hope for salvation of the world, but I feel that its failure to deal firmly with Nasser may lead to holocaust.

Of course, it is futile to compare Nasser with Hitler because the evil of Hitler, as the world now counts time, occurred so long ago that only the victims of his fiendishness can sense the horror which his name immediately conjures. But it is not inappropriate to say that the Western World is appeasing Nasser with the same lack of foresight manifested when the later-to-be allies were attempting to soothe the ferocity of the Nazi monster.

Nasser's despotism over the Suez Canal cannot possibly be defended. It has been condemned by the society of nations gen-

erally and by the United Nations officially, but no pragmatic force has been exerted toward making him obey the law. The situation is worse than that. He has been led to believe that he may continue his usurpations without hindrance. He applied to the World Bank for a loan of \$56½ million with which to widen the canal. This would have been the time to demand guarantees that he respect international law and no longer interfere with Israel shipping. But no such guarantee was asked of him and of course he offered none. The loan was approved and Nasser may now widen the canal to allow for a greater scope to the stream of his fierce hatreds.

He has already given ample evidence of the expansion of his anti-Semitic malevolence. He has called upon all the Arab nations to devise plans and ideas on how to destroy Israel. One of his mad plans is to divert the waters of the Hasbani River in Lebanon, which lies north of Israel, so as to reduce Israel's water supply. In order to accomplish this piece of satanic sabotage, the Lebanese would have to tunnel through mountains at a cost of from \$10 to \$15 million. Another plan is to reverse the course of the Baniyas which now flows down from Mount Hermon, and divert it through mountainous country to the Yarmuk.

Anyone who has traveled through the Arab regions can see the great need for water for the prime requisites of life: the satisfying of thirst, the preparation of food, the answering to the demands of sanitation and agriculture. Nasser is building a dam on the Nile to supply water in his own Egypt, but to the north he would build a reservoir of hatred so as to channel the poison of hateful spite into all the Arab countries. Instead of helping the Arabs to get more water, he would endanger the sources which they do have. Instead of helping them to get more bread, he feeds them with the cry that Israel must be destroyed.

But why must Israel be destroyed? What has Israel done which calls for her extinction? Never was a country brought into existence under more lawful auspices than Israel. The United Nations, in General Assembly convened, after long deliberation and study, decreed the autonomous formation of this state, this little state which in size is not as large as our State of Vermont. The land space of the nations in the Arab League, on the other hand, would cover an area equal to one-third of the whole United States.

On March 14, 1948, this tiny piece of the earth's surface, the state of Israel, with a population of only 650,000, became an independent country. On March 15, 1948, the very next day, the armies of six Arab nations thundered across their respective borders with guns, bayonets, scimitars, and knives to kill off the 650,000. Why?

Were the Arab invaders seeking to take up where the Nazis had left off? The Nazis had already persecuted, tortured, butchered, and slain 6 million human beings, the mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, and other kindred of the 650,000 in Israel. Were the Arabs hoping to finish off the race entirely? And, if so, why?

What amazes me more than anything else in the history of the last quarter of a century is the fact that the United Nations did not come to the assistance of its own creature. Why didn't the countries which had fought for the freedom of the world extend a helping hand to the Israelis who also needed freedom, needed it as much as any other people in the world? It may be that the world was tired of fighting, tired of helping, so it decided to let Israel fend for itself. But the Israelis had been fighting not only during World War II, but through the centuries for the right not only to be free but to survive. And so, although there were only 650,000 of them banded together in this

little defile of destiny, they opposed the invaders. They fought with the pluck and the heroism of the Spartans at Thermopylae, the Finns at the Mannerheim Line, the minutemen at Lexington, the Texans at the Alamo, and the Marines at Solissons—and they threw back the invaders.

The leaders of the Arab nations should hang their heads in shame for this unprovoked assault on a little sister in the family of nations, and the world should take off its hat to the courage, daring, resourcefulness, and willingness to sacrifice on the part of the defenders of Israel—for the sacred cause of liberty and independence.

Since the end of the war Israel has worked and continues to work. She wants peace. As her citizens plow the fields, operate machines, build roads, erect homes, churches, and schools, she stands ready at any moment to pick up the fountain pen at her side with which to sign a treaty of amity and concord with all her Arab neighbors. But Nasser gives evidence of not wanting peace.

So long as he can keep the Arabs in a fever of agitation over a country other than the one in which they live, he hopes to keep them from thinking about his dictatorship. The only way a dictator can retain absolute power is to direct the attention of his subjects from their own miseries by telling them they must fight against a threatening country. And so, in Hitlerian fashion, Nasser exhorts the Arabs to destroy the Jews who are their mortal enemies. But the Jews are not enemies and they entertain no ill feelings toward the Arabs. I personally witnessed in Israel the freedom which the Arabs enjoy in that country. They have all the rights and privileges of the Jews. They hold property, they vote, they speak without hindrance. They elect representatives to the Israel parliament. The Arab children go to Arab schools. They may worship as they wish and no one attempts to proselyte them.

Nasser blindfolds the people in his country and the other Arab countries to these facts and calls for war against Israel. Using Hitlerian methods of propaganda and employing unashamedly the most primitive hate-raising methods, he screams that Israel is determined to conquer the Arabs and that it wants to reign from the Nile to the Euphrates. If his philippics were not capable of stirring up tragic results, they could be regarded as ludicrous. Israel has a land area of 8,050 square miles. The land area of the countries in the Arab League, whose leaders have all proclaimed hatred for and hostility to Israel, covers 1,444,000 square miles. The population of Israel is 2 million, that of the Arab countries 51 million. Israel's land is basically sterile, stony and one-half of it is desert. Much of the Arab lands are rich with oil deposits and contain vast potential fertile domains. If Nasser would release the Arabs from the physical and emotional burdens of war preparation and if he would lift from them the racial prejudices with which he has yoked them, these domains could be cultivated and eventually developed until they would smile a good living for all the inhabitants.

Eric Johnston, chairman of the Committee for International Economic Outgrowth, who has made an intensive study of the Mideast problems, declared in a special article in the New York Times, that with the harnessing of the five main rivers in the Arab countries, the Tigris, Euphrates, Litani, Jordan, and the Nile, there would be reclaimed for agriculture 8 million acres of land. And why has this not been done? It is not because of lack of offer of financial help. The West has offered many times to finance river development programs in the Arab world. The United States offered to finance a \$200 million project in the Jordan Valley; it has made funds available to Jordan for a project on the Yarmuk.

Why, then, have the Arab countries not devoted themselves to turning arid land into opulent farmland? Mr. Johnston replies to the question: "The answer, I think, lies in these factors: The basic instability of the region; the intensity of inter-Arab mistrust and rivalries; the Arabs' emotional rejection of Israel, and the whole pattern of political insecurity and social ferment that has made the region a hotbed of trouble."

And who has done most to make the Arab world a hotbed of trouble? The answer can only be Gamal Abdel Nasser. Who continues to tell the Arabs that they must reject Israel, even destroy her? The answer is still Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Of course, if the Arabs were to analyze Nasser's fulminations, they would laugh in his face at his ridiculous charges that Israel is intent on gobbling up the Arab countries. To speak of tiny little Israel, which is such a little speck on maps of Eurasia that there is not enough room for printing its name entirely within the space allotted for its geographical borders—to speak of this lamb devouring the elephantine land mass of the Arab nations is nothing short of sheer nonsense.

Of course, while Israel is a lamb in size, it has a lion's heart, and it will not allow itself to be attacked and not fight back. This lamb will not allow itself to be taken to the sacrificial block to satisfy Nasser's ambitions. And therein lies the danger that the United Nations must confront. Nasser is amassing, along the Israel frontiers, troops with tanks, cannon, bombers, machineguns and all other impedimenta of war. And while he is doing this, he is seeking to whip up war hysteria through the Arab League by crying that he is set to begin the sacred march, he is ready to fight the holy war, he is prepared to shed blood, and he yearns to realize his dream of many years to drive the Israelis into the sea.

He taunts the premier of Iraq for not being equally as sanguinary. He calls upon Iraq to "fight with us against Israel on the battle-front lines."

These fiery exhortations are intended to incite the Arabs into attacking along Israel's frontiers. And if they attack, what will happen? The attack will surely be repelled to under the law of self defense, reserved in the United Nations charter. But that will not end the matter. The self-defense will bring on reprisal, and the barbarous spectacle of bloody combat will be upon us once again. And as the blood flows and homes fall, and the ground scorches, the world will hold its breath to see what Russia will do. Unfortunately, Russia's performances in the past can give us no assurance that she would do other than seek to use the conflict to her advantage in fulfillment of her long predetermined plan to achieve world conquest. Russia's action in such a case could be such as might bring remonstrances from the Western World, with the taking of necessary security measures. And then, what?

Aside from realistic attack and defense, there is always the possibility of a misunderstanding of some kind, and the first intercontinental missile would be on its way. It is because of such dire possibilities that the Philadelphia Inquirer said only last Sunday: "The increased massing of the United Arab Republic troops at Israel's borders, plus other military demonstrations pushed by President Nasser, confront the world with a new explosive Middle East."

"Serious tension there could at any time spark off an Arab-Israeli armed clash, with dangerous and widespread consequences."

The editorial carries the heading "Dynamite Keg in Middle East."

The New York Times said recently that border clashes constitute a "warning that a

half-trigger situation continues to exist in Palestine—a situation that could blow up the peace of the Middle East."

Only 2 weeks ago the able and highly respected General Secretary of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjöld, said that the situation in the Middle East was "deteriorating." He declared that the only way to break the "chain reaction of reprisal and counterreprisal was to strengthen the hand of the United Nations and for the United Nations to stick to its guns."

I agree with that recommendation absolutely. I believe that the Security Council should step in at once—step in before it is too late. I believe that Nasser at this very moment is no less dangerous to world peace than was Hitler, 22 years ago. Nasser does not have the diabolical ability that Hitler possessed, nor does he have anything like the military machine which Hitler commanded. But he has given evidence of being just as unreasonable and as unwilling to listen to reason, and, with the powder keg admittedly existing in the Middle East he could, through unbridled egotism or dictatorial inebriation, strike the match which could accomplish the holocaust the United Nations was formed to prevent.

The United Nations came into being while the flames of World War II were still licking at the ruins of the abode of civilization in which 22 million human beings had been reduced to ashes. Fully aware that another such war would finish off the human race completely, the peoples of the world authorized their representatives to build an ark of covenant for world peace. They spoke through the Charter of the United Nations. Article I of the charter enumerates as the first purpose of the United Nations:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

Who can doubt that Nasser's actions threaten the peace of the world?

Article II, sections 3 and 4, provide:

"3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Who can doubt that Nasser and the Arab nations with which he is conspiring have violated and continue to violate these provisions of the Charter of the United Nations?

Under all these circumstances, I believe that the Security Council should convene and order Nasser at once to do the following:

1. Lift his illegal blockade of the Suez Canal, and allow ships the free navigation which international law authorizes and guarantees;

2. Cease his agitations for war and the shedding of blood.

3. Enter into immediate negotiations for a treaty of peace with Israel under the auspices of the United Nations.

If Nasser fails immediately to obey these mandates, the United Nations should expel the United Arab Republic from the United Nations, as provided for in article 6, as follows:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Progress in Space Promotes Peace and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Thursday night to attend the reception and banquet given by the Baltimore Association of Commerce commemorating the second anniversary of the Vanguard I earth satellite, and to hear my distinguished colleague on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO. As the principal speaker on this historic occasion, Mr. DADDARIO made an excellent analysis of the great challenge and the equally great opportunity which lie before us in space. He clearly pointed out why this Nation must recapture the leadership in space technology to maintain the security of the free world. I urge my colleagues to give careful study to his speech which follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO DELIVERED AT SECOND ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF VANGUARD I, AT BALTIMORE, MD., MARCH 17, 1960

From Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va., crowding against the eastern Atlantic seaboard, live approximately 40 million Americans. This is the greatest concentration of population in the United States. Within this area is a great amount of our national talent and ability.

This one gigantic community is alert to the future, and it has shown its awareness by meeting the problems of growth that have confronted the Nation. A tremendous road network, interwoven with bridges and tunnels, binds it together. Schools by the thousands, from the lowest to the highest levels of education, have been provided. In our midst are located some of the outstanding intellectual communities of the world.

I live and work in this community as many of you do, and know the great concern that exists about the state of our national effort in space. Our people respect achievement. They were proud when Vanguard I was fired into orbit 2 years ago today. They were proud of the technical accomplishments, in which the Martin Co. played such a large part. They had a natural expectation that the United States would be first in space. They saw the Vanguard accomplishment as a great step forward in the reestablishment of our world position. They expect that more will be done and demand that it shall.

Within the week, we have seen a 94.8-pound sphere hurled millions of miles into space. Pioneer V is on its way to a 527-million-mile trip around the sun. It carries five principal scientific experiments to teach us more about the universe. This, too, is a heartening accomplishment and deserves to be applauded.

To some, the exploration and uses of space are an illusion. It is not unusual to hit pockets of doubt in the course of our progress. You hear expressions of scorn about visionaries, and severe concern about the pocketbook. I am reminded of the words Columbus wrote in a letter after his first voyage:

"For although men have talked or written of these lands, all was conjecture without getting a look at it, but amounted only to this, that those who heard, for the most part listened and judged it more a fable than that there was anything in it, however small."

Consider that Columbus was beset by some of the same difficulties that our scientists and engineers face today. He was required to submit his proposal to the so-called Talavera commission of learned men for review and to justify his requirements. They held hearings in the year 1486, and issued their report in the year 1490, 4½ years later. They judged that the promises of Columbus "were impossible and vain and worthy of rejection." They reported to their royal majesties that it was "not a proper object for their royal authority to favor an affair that rests on such weak foundations and which appeared uncertain and impossible to any educated person, however little learning he might have."

Yet, curiously enough, it was the educated, then as now, who knew how well the foundations had been laid for such a trip. For centuries, men had been making discoveries that pieced together the maps from which Columbus's great design sprang.

The Renaissance was a great age of exploration, not unlike today. We have broken the bounds of many scientific fields, and we have discovered others that our scientists long to invade. Historians think that the welfare of a country and its will to explore may be closely related. The energy, the inquiring mind, the courage for endurance that find expression in exploration may well turn out in themselves to be the most important measures of a country's greatness. I hope the zeal and courage that have brought us in this half century to the top of Everest, to the North and South Poles, to the greatest depths of the oceans, and even into the heart of the atom, will not lessen.

Why do men seek these things? It is sometimes difficult to explain why it was necessary to get to Timbuktu or Lhasa, or even Everest or the Matterhorn. The common motives for exploration are given as conquest, military advantage, plunder or trade advantage, commercial gain or scientific advantage. Yet, I rather like a somewhat more irreverent analysis by the sage of Baltimore, the late H. L. Mencken. He said:

"The value the world sets upon motives is often unjust and inaccurate. Consider, for example, two of them: mere insatiable curiosity and the desire to do good. The latter is put high above the former, and yet it is the former that moves one of the most useful men the human race has yet produced—the scientific investigator. What actually urges him on is not some brummagem idea of service, but a boundless, almost pathological thirst to penetrate the unknown, to uncover the secret, to find out what has not been found out before. His prototype is not the liberator releasing slaves, the good Samaritan lifting up the fallen, but a dog sniffing tremendously at an infinite series of ratholes."

And today, of course, on the heels of the scientific investigator comes the congressional investigator.

Why should Congress, or the Government, display so much interest in scientific advance, the quest for knowledge? Why should men of industry or the university, or the laboratory spend so much time coming to tell of their plans to people on Capitol Hill?

I am privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives, assigned to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, chaired by the Honorable OWEN BROOKS, of Louisiana. A parallel space committee exists in the Senate. When these committees were established at the beginning of this 86th Congress, they were the first new

parallel standing committees created in half a century.

These committees were created because Washington has recognized that science and innovation is the greatest single factor affecting our future economic growth and national security. Radical technological change has forced repeated attempts to adjust our policymaking processes so we can best use, or come to grips with, the challenge of research and development. An analysis of the 1961 budget shows that some \$8,391 million is identified as Federal support of research and development. How we spend that money is very important to the American taxpayer. In a sense, we are diverting money from his pocket to what we believe is necessary for the common good and the national security. He expects that this money will not be spent lightly, and he is entitled to a close review of these efforts.

While we are reviewing these programs, it is also the responsibility of Congress to establish governmental policies in science and astronautics. We are confronted with issues of a highly technical nature in an era of exploding technology. The world is in the grip of a scientific revolution, which offers both promise and danger. It is of vital importance that we, the lawmakers, make every effort to understand the implications of the language the scientists speak, so that we may incorporate this knowledge into planning for national security and industrial well-being.

We must make every effort to know what is happening in scientific areas. We must analyze these issues and the needs they pose. We must bring together men from government and industry—in short—the best brains we can summon to our assistance in this task, listen to proposals for solution, investigate conditions, seek to choose wisely among courses of action set before us and act to propose laws that can help secure a more orderly progress.

Congress has set the policy that U.S. activities in outer space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. Project Vanguard satellites were launched on such peaceful missions, to gather data for analysis by scientists throughout the world. One small package of instruments in Vanguard I has provided a tremendous amount of information.

Since that launching, there have been a number of others, up to and including the successful Pioneer V. There have been other attempts which have failed. There have been efforts canceled because no back-ups were available, the funds not having been provided. And criticisms have continued of low priorities, piecemeal funding, and too many administrative channels—faults which plagued the first Vanguard, as well as its successors.

These continued criticisms caused disquiet across the country last fall and led to many reappraisals. When Congress reconvened in January, our committee undertook a broad look at the posture of our space effort, the nature of the so-called space gap, and the details of the criticisms.

We have heard considerable testimony from many witnesses—diplomats, defense experts, space experts, scientists, administrators, and businessmen. Some disputed others. Many acknowledged past errors in the space program. Others tied our space effort to national policy and the defense of the Nation, while still others cried out that defense has no part to play in space.

From these posture hearings, still to be concluded, I have personally drawn some tentative conclusions:

First, space exploration is one of the major keys to our survival. This has far-reaching significance in the cold war today and the possibility of global conflict in the future. Rightly or wrongly, world opinion has asso-

ciated Russian achievement in space with general Communist technological superiority. This fact was substantiated by Under Secretary of State Livingston Merchant, when he acknowledged that the spectacular nature of the space effort in Russia has made the job of the State Department a tougher one. The following day, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, George V. Allen, said bluntly that space achievements go far beyond their intrinsic importance when they are examined by the peoples of other countries.

The second conclusion I have drawn is that space holds advantages for both civilian and military users, and it can be dangerously unrealistic to hold to artificial compartments for civil and military research.

Going back to the posture hearings again, the committee has heard testimony from numerous civilian and military leaders in the Department of Defense. Each recognized the need for the military in the space race; some stated the case more strongly than others. General Trudeau, Admiral Hayward, and General Schriever did an excellent job of enlightening the public to the potential threat from space. The committee also heard the NASA 10-year program, calling for ever-increasing performance in space throughout the next decade.

My third conclusion is that there is a critical urgency associated with the space program. For years, members of the Department of Defense—then the only organization with a capability for space flight—could not even refer to satellites or space exploration. Our attitudes changed when the first sputnik temporarily shattered our national smugness and complacency. That Russian vehicle and subsequent Russian space accomplishments gave us the shot in the arm to press forward in search of a way for survival in the space age. As a result, we expanded our missile and space base. The foremost space question before the public today is: When will we catch up with the U.S.S.R.?

Our Nation has excelled over all other nations in this industrial age because we have been able, through our vast industrial energies and resources, to produce results faster and better than any other people. And I propose to you that the concentrated, vigorous application of our national talents and abilities cannot only overcome the Russian space lead, but can also surpass it. The full utilization of our resources would leave no doubt in the mind of the world regarding the effectiveness of the democratic system to meet any challenge and overcome any obstacle.

There are several other conclusions that I have reached during these past 2 months of hearings. But I believe the three just mentioned are the most important. To recapitulate: (1) Space exploration is one of the keys to survival. (2) There is a need for both the military and civilian approach to space. (3) There is urgency associated with the program.

Let us again refer to the NASA's 10-year program for space. To many, the program is realistic and acceptable. To me, the program lacks foresight and urgency. I would take exception to the timing of many projects, but will limit my remarks to only three major areas: The F-1 engine; Project Rover, the nuclear-powered rocket; and NASA's lack of a plan for manned lunar landing during this 10-year period.

The F-1 engine, being developed by North American's Rocketdyne Division for NASA, will produce 1½ million pounds of thrust. Four of these engines will be clustered to make the Nova launch vehicle of 6 million pounds of thrust, enough thrust to launch a manned interplanetary mission.

The NASA claims that this engine has been delayed 12 to 18 months, due to lack of funds in the 1960 budget. As a result, the first flight test is not scheduled until 1968,

and no date has been set for the completion of the Nova space vehicle. It will be 8 years before we are ready to flight-test this vehicle. Is that urgency? Is it typical of the urgency associated with the space program? I assure you that I am vitally concerned, and I suspect you are, too.

When the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses appeared to discuss the nuclear propulsion powerplant, their testimony conflicted, in my opinion, with that of the NASA witnesses. Project Rover, the nuclear-powered rocket, is being developed jointly by AEC and NASA. The AEC is responsible for designing and operating an engine. NASA takes it from there, assembles it, flies it and fits it into the space program. The AEC witnesses stated that they can develop the Rover device and demonstrate its actual use, probably in a shorter time than set forth in the requirement.

The NASA witnesses, however, were much more conservative. They assured the committee that the program is being expedited to the fullest extent. So the debate is on—it will continue for years to come. How will it be resolved? Hopefully, there is a sense of urgency in the AEC, as indicated by the fact that on March 8, the AEC itself transferred funds within its budget to add \$11 million to the Project Rover experiments. I see no comparable sense of urgency in the NASA program. And yet, knowing the importance of this project, I long to sympathize with the AEC witness who commented: "I would like to see this one have the stars and stripes on it, for a change."

The last point I wish to make regards NASA's lack of a plan for a manned lunar landing during the next 10 years. There are rumors already flying that the U.S.S.R. will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution on the moon. Will we be there to greet them? Or is that the day we shall promise to accelerate our program for a manned lunar landing?

Mr. Khrushchev has already boasted that the mark of the Soviet Union has been stamped on the moon. It is well within the technical and industrial capacity of the Russians to land a man on the moon one day in the near future.

The future of the free world may well depend on whether or not a U.S. mission is already on the moon when that event occurs.

Consider the possibility of a Russian lunar base and the threat that could literally be hung over the heads of the free world. Gen. Homer Boushey, of the USAF, was the first to speak out in favor of a lunar base, its capabilities and potential. His remarks were scoffed at in some circles. I, for one, fear the results of being second on the moon. A manned lunar landing and return, in the 1970's, as NASA outlines its schedule, is much to late.

The first need, then, is the recognition that we must be first. I believe that we cannot fail, if we resolutely determine that we will not. Once that is accepted, some other lines of approach fall into place.

We must, for instance, make better use of the resources of industry and management available to us in this country. We know that the full scale of the skills and talents here have scarcely been tapped. Even in production, we are not making the defense effort today in terms of proportion of gross national product that we were in 1953—and we are making only one-fifth the effort we made in World War II, when we knew it had to be done.

We must do everything we can to streamline, and to make more effective the organization and management of our national programs. Few believe that we are squeezing every last ounce of effort out of our Defense Establishment. I can tell you candidly that I do not think we have enlisted all our managerial talent in this space field. We certainly do not see the

single-mindedness of a Manhattan district in this space effort.

Even in such a field as communication of information regarding the state of the art, more must be done. Researchers are complaining about the proliferation of scientific papers and meetings. Industry is said to be committing some \$21 million a year to these exchanges, which consume 258,000 man-days of technical time, and it has been difficult to weed out overlapping and duplication.

Is the way we disseminate technical information good enough to meet the challenge of modern technology? A recent Guggenheim Foundation study urged we go beyond our traditional ways to seek better methods that could produce important results.

We have made real gains in awakening to scientific research and findings elsewhere in the world. Government has intensified the translation of scientific documents. We are translating more papers on scientific work than ever before. The material is made available to industry through the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce, and there has been a growing interest. I am told that OTS is selling more monographs every month, and that more libraries, industrial and public, have started following the material. The twice-monthly publication, Technical Translations, which started a year ago with 150 to 175 listings of new translations, now lists about 600 an issue. Government is thus pointing out some 12,000 to 13,000 translations a year which may be of use. Industry is also showing interest in a projected publication that would digest news releases and articles in Russian journals, so that a quicker break is possible in learning what the Russians are doing.

Today, the problems of space research, development, exploration and exploitation are still in their infancy. Vanguard I was a stepping-stone to a great future. What is still needed is a firm and clear decision by the United States and the free world to press ahead. The Communists are making capital of space exploration and the propaganda that goes with it. They found in their space achievements a chance to prove to themselves and to the world what they could do in a highly advanced technology. The United States must counter this propaganda by unleashing its technological know-how and industrial power to regain world leadership in the space race. Then our deeds will speak for themselves.

Statement of Robert T. Stevens, President of J. P. Stevens & Co. Before U.S. Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens & Co. before the U.S. Tariff Commission relative to its investigation of cotton imports:

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT T. STEVENS,
PRESIDENT OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC., NEW
YORK, N.Y., MARCH 4, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Robert

T. Stevens. I am president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., a publicly owned company manufacturing a wide variety of textile fabrics. We have been in business since 1813—a very long time in American industrial history. I come before you as an individual American citizen engaged in the textile business. I do not represent any group or organization. I do, however, speak in behalf of the 34,000 workers in our company and for the company itself. We are very vitally concerned with these deliberations.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this Commission at this hearing which is called for the purpose of determining whether articles containing cotton are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to interfere materially with the Department of Agriculture's export program for cotton and cotton products.

I also wish to express my appreciation of the wide knowledge of and interest in the problems of the cotton textile industry on the part of the U.S. Tariff Commission, as evidenced on many occasions over a long period of years.

My testimony will be in full support of the petition filed by the National Cotton Council under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. It is most constructive that the enlightened leadership of the National Cotton Council has seen fit to attack the very ominous situation with which the American cotton growers' best customer, the American spinner, is now faced. The growers' interest and ours are the same.

Already sorely pressed by the dramatic increase in imports of manufactured cotton products, as set forth by previous witnesses, the full adverse effects are yet to come. The extent to which the American cotton textile industry will be permitted to survive, is clearly in the minds of the executive and/or the legislative branches of our Government. The importance of this hearing, therefore, before this duly constituted independent agency cannot possibly be overstated. It is essential that all the pertinent facts be set forth.

Let me, at the outset, make one point unmistakably clear. I do not seek to keep foreign manufactured products out of the United States. Having served our Government, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, from time to time over the past 25 years, I have some real understanding of the problems the country faces, including its foreign trade policy. I recognize the extent to which foreign trade policy becomes an integral part of overall foreign policy. Textiles have, however, been called upon to carry far too much of the load of our foreign policy and the time has come for drastic action, unless our Government desires to consider the textile industry as expendable.

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., has a close connection with the cotton growing industry of America. Of our 52 manufacturing plants, spread from Maine to Georgia, south, and west to Tennessee, 23 are devoted to the manufacture and finishing of cotton textiles. Most of these plants are located in close proximity to the traditional cotton growing areas of our Nation. We purchase large quantities of American cotton. American textile mill raw cotton consumption is about 9 million bales per year and J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., consumes about 4 percent of this total. I believe, without an expanding cotton textile manufacturing industry, that American cotton growing will eventually be drastically curtailed. Likewise, without American cotton, produced in abundance on American farms, the domestic textile industry of the United States would no longer be able to play its appropriate part in the American economy.

I have in my hand, and would like now to submit as an exhibit, an advertisement which our company placed in a number of newspapers, including the Washington Post and New York Times, on February 24. It will be recalled that Congressman HEMPHILL of South Carolina referred to and quoted extensively from our public service message in that advertisement. The chart in the center graphically portrays what has been going on in the unchecked upward zoom of cotton textile imports. The advertisement puts before the American people the facts of life on this subject, under the heading, "The Influence of Uncontrolled Textile Imports on Our Economy."

During 1959 cotton cloth imports, exclusive of garments, reached an all-time record, high of more than 240 million square yards, or a gain of 70 percent over 1958. That is for cloth only. However, according to figures released by the Northern Textile Association, based on Department of Commerce information, in addition, there were cotton goods imported during 1959 in the form of shirts, blouses, yarns, knit goods, and other cotton manufactures in the amount of 406 million square yards. Thus, total imports for 1959 were 646 million square yards. If projected on an annual basis, the figures for December 1959, the latest available, would indicate total cotton and cotton product imports during 1960 of something on the order of 1 billion square yards. The present imports tend to destroy price levels in the United States on all textiles because foreign cotton goods are always sold cheaper than American goods.

One does not have to be an expert in this matter to realize that the American cotton textile industry, as we know it today, cannot withstand the shock of these present and potential floods of goods from low-wage countries overseas. With respect to imports of total garments from Japan and Hong Kong alone for 1959, they represent what would equal the production of about 97 sewing plants in the United States in various communities with an average of 250 employees per plant. A small business individually—a very large business overall.

A noble concept, passed in 1934 as an emergency employment measure to promote international trade, the Trade Agreements Act, has been broadened in its administration, under Secretaries of State of both political parties, to a point of greatly assisting all of the free world trading nations. For some of these countries, the results have been extremely successful. Our markets have been opened up to them as never before. About 75 percent of American protection has gone. Unless action is taken, based upon the facts today and not upon those of 5 years ago, we shall continue to give away a constantly increasing portion of the domestic market. The brilliant economic recovery of the free world trading nations has created an entirely new set of circumstances.

The potential dangers in this situation have frequently been pointed out to the executive and legislative branches by many of us who have weekly payrolls to meet in the United States and could see what was happening. While it is true that the Committee for Reciprocity Information holds open public hearings, subsequent bargaining negotiations with other countries by the executive branch of our Government have been carried on in virtual secrecy. Unlike other parties to these same negotiations, no qualified textile industry representatives have ever been permitted to sit in on the actual tariff cutting.

Once the damage had been done, hordes of importers in the United States came forward to take advantage of the situation. Apparently they do not understand the implications as they ride the crest. With 4,150,000 Americans now unemployed, according to the latest Department of Labor figures, in a time of so-called prosperity, they are not con-

cerned over the closing of still more American plants and the addition of still more Americans to the rolls of the unemployed. Unless havoc is deliberately to be wrought on the American cotton textile industry, it is essential that a system of quotas for fabrics, for garments, and for other important items, including textile fibers, be established by categories and by countries. And there isn't too much time.

It is a mighty good feeling to know that an American businessman can come before this independent commission of our Government and receive objective consideration as he frankly sets forth the problems he faces from overseas.

Gentlemen, I recognize fully the narrow scope of this investigation. I am aware that this scope is not of your making. However, it would be incredible to me that any limitation of scope will preclude the presentation before this Commission of all the pertinent facts bearing upon the problem of the cotton textile industry, as the main customer of the American cotton grower. The stringent limits placed upon this inquiry were not contemplated by the sponsors of section 22 of the act.

During the debate in the U.S. Senate regarding the original section 22 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the record clearly indicates the intent of Senator La Follette, author of the section 22 amendment. On page 11503 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 20, 1935, he is quoted as follows:

Mr. La Follette: "So far as I am concerned, I cannot see any logic in taking the position that, on the one hand, we are going to tax the American consumer for the purpose of raising the domestic price of agricultural commodities, and then in the same program, with an alarming increase of imports threatening to undermine and destroy us, we are not willing to grant discretionary power to the President of the United States and the Tariff Commission to take the same action to protect the program which we are willing to afford to American industry under the Industrial Recovery Act. I say there is no logic in it; I say there is no justice in it; and I say, besides that, it is folly, unless we propose to repeal the Agricultural Adjustment Act and abandon the program." That quote from the remarks made by Senator La Follette, author of the section 22 amendment, embodies his philosophy and intent. It is clear and precise.

Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, in support of the La Follette amendment, referred to the textile millworker and the difficulties which he would encounter. Here is what he said. "Yes; [the textile worker] will be less able to carry on, because his domestic market will be reduced; but, if this amendment shall be adopted, he will be at least protected against cheap foreign labor competing with his own output." Here also the legislative intent is clear and precise as to what section 22 was supposed to accomplish but the desired result has not yet been achieved, even after 25 years. Subsequent amendments to section 22 have served further to clarify and strengthen the intent of Congress but, unless the section is invoked, it remains an ineffective instrument. Has not the time arrived to act?

It is curious that American cotton textile manufacturers should appear at this hearing in an effort to shield their workers from what Senator Walsh called "cheap foreign labor" way back in 1935, especially since our Government has created in large measure the situation which faces us today. For example, during World War II Japan's spindles were reduced, by melting or by bombing, from about 10 million to a little over 1 million. In the reconstruction period which followed the war, with so much aid available from us in various forms, a balance in Japan's industries should have been planned. Those in authority were aware that approximately 60

percent of her prewar exports had been cotton goods and yet they pushed relentlessly to reestablish a cotton goods production base for that equivalent.

Japan is a trading nation, like Great Britain, with few natural resources, and should have reindustrialized with wide diversification, like England or France. American manufacturers have been increasingly plagued by this unnecessary over-emphasis on cotton goods production. The situation has been heightened by the Japanese use of much cotton other than American in their fabrics shipped to us here in America.

A look at the Japanese imports of raw cotton is revealing. During the first 11 months of 1959, out of a total of 2,235,000 bales imported into Japan, 476,000 or 21 percent came from the United States. By comparison, in 1958, total imports for the year were 2,124,000 bales, of which 837,000 bales were American cotton or 39 percent. Not only is the best customer of the American grower, the American spinner, being hurt badly by Japanese textiles but, the 1959 figures just cited would indicate that the American grower has little to count upon by way of Japanese preference for American cotton. The Stevens Co., a single American spinner, is purchasing three-quarters as much American cotton as all the American cotton imported by Japan in the first 11 months of 1959. And we paid 6 to 8 cents per pound more than the Japanese. Which is the more valuable customer for the American cotton grower?

The special Senate subcommittee, consisting of Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island, chairman; Senator COTTON of New Hampshire and Senator THURMOND of South Carolina, which in 1958 investigated the problems of the American textile industry, said in its report to the U.S. Senate in February 1959, "Textile mill products have a high military priority. The Department of Defense has ranked the textile industry second only to steel in terms of military essentiality. It would be the height of folly in a world where we must realistically recognize the necessity for military preparedness—however much we hope for and work toward the elimination of war—to allow the domestic textile industry to contract to the point where it could not satisfy our basic civilian and military needs in the event of an all-out emergency." In my considered opinion, there are parts of the textile industry, as of today, that could not supply the basic needs of war. The recommendation of the Pastore Committee for the establishment of quotas has not yet been implemented, even though made more than a year ago. Action is what is desperately needed.

In addition to providing necessary strength in emergencies, the day in, day out contributions of the textile industry to the national economy in peacetime should also be considered. I shall now outline briefly a tabulation of Federal, State, local, and other taxes paid by J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., with its 52 manufacturing plants including the approximate amount of money withheld from the pay envelopes of our workers for Federal and State taxes in the year 1959.

Federal income tax	\$6,907,681.80
State and local taxes:	
Income	1,314,355.18
Franchise	202,323.84
Sales and use	178,194.85
Real estate and personal property	2,138,666.29
Other	198,566.57
Subtotal	10,939,788.53
Federal income tax withheld	14,702,604.86
State income tax withheld	1,500,000.00
Subtotal	16,202,604.85
Total	27,142,393.39

This is the yield from only one company in the textile business and there are thousands of other textile companies in the United States. If a lot of them are not to survive, where will their share of Federal, State, and local taxes come from? Is it reasonable to expect that foreign countries will come to the aid of the U.S. Treasury?

Another vital facet of these imports is the serious balance-of-payments deficit in which our country now finds itself. And this at a time when our production is larger than production in any other country. But our exports have declined from their peak and our imports have increased. This fact, along with foreign aid and other elements has created this adverse balance-of-payments position. Instead of large credit balances, we now have deficits on the order of \$3,500 million to \$4 billion per year.

That 646 million square yards of cotton products imported in 1959 played its full part in last year's imbalance. It must be apparent that what is being done or not done about foreign trade concerns the very economic foundation of the United States.

I have already testified to the fact that our company consumes every year, large quantities of American cotton and that we pay more—now about 8 cents more—per pound than any foreign manufacturer. We do not object so much to paying a premium price if it really results in assisting the American cotton grower to maintain his markets. We do object, however, to paying the premium price and then having excessive foreign yardage and garments coming in to our stores in unrestricted amounts, thus resulting in unfair advantage to the foreign manufacturer.

For the last 10 years we, as a nation, have been very busy shipping our textile workers' jobs abroad. Since 1950, there has been a steady decline in jobs from about 1,290,000 to approximately 950,000, a drop of 340,000 workers. Not all of this was due to imports but that was surely one of the most important factors in our loss of textile jobs.

As the chief executive officer of a company employing 34,000 workers, it is my principal responsibility to see that these fine people have full-time jobs, thus providing not only for their economic well-being but also contributing to the well-being of their families and the communities in which they live. I am sure you will agree that such an operation requires a lot of planning and forward scheduling. It seems a fair question to ask—how can any textile manufacturer plan ahead effectively with the constantly eroding influence of these skyrocketing imports?

We expect periodic ups and downs in our business and we have learned to roll with the punches, as business conditions demand. But we cannot, with a high labor cost content in our products, compete with wages as low as one-tenth of ours, and with brand new textile plants overseas constructed with the aid of the American taxpayer. And it is no easy thing to plan modernization, expansion, and research in the face of these steadily ascending imports. Is it wise to invest more of our share owners money in the things we should be doing? This is a very serious question.

It is no secret that many American companies in various lines are rushing overseas to manufacture components and end items, taking advantage of low foreign wages, in order to bring these products back into the American market at costs far below American costs. Is that really what our Government intended as a byproduct of its foreign trade policy? I do not think so. And yet, if our Government does not, through definite action, and soon, make clear to the American business community that this is not the desire of Government, then the movement overseas will continue at an accelerated rate. Every day of delay in making our national

policy clear in this regard means the loss of still more American jobs. And make no mistake about it. There are plenty of plants that are now operated in certain areas overseas by Americans primarily to supply the American market with products which exploit cheap foreign labor. Do we support such runaway plants as American policy? I certainly do not. We have not used a yard of foreign cloth, even though many of our competitors feel they must do so.

As these hearings progress, regarding one specific phase of foreign trade, there seems to be mounting evidence of unrest elsewhere in Washington on some aspects of overall foreign trade policy. I refer to the Bailey concurrent resolution in the House, which seeks to forestall further tariff cuts by our GATT negotiators. Then, there is the revised Keating bill in the Senate, which would make very drastic changes in foreign trade determinations. We are not yet halfway through the period of the Trade Agreement Act of 1958 but the rising groundswell of American discontent with some phases of our foreign trade policy becomes increasingly evident. Only a week ago last Wednesday, the day the Stevens Co. advertisement appeared, 12 Senators went on record about the danger of these textile imports in a 2-hour discussion of this serious matter on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

This devastating effect of imports on some American industries was surely not intended by Congress or the executive branch. President Eisenhower's letter of February 17, 1955, to Congressman JOSEPH MARTIN, made the position of the executive branch clear. And I surely do not believe the President's position has changed. While the extension of the Trade Agreements Act was being considered by Congress, he said—in part:

"I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve."

On the same date, February 17, 1955, the President also wrote to Congressman BASS of New Hampshire. He said:

"I appreciate that legislation of this character has always aroused concern among industries that are fearful it may be administered so as to affect them adversely. Such fears are in fact groundless, for it would ill serve our Nation's interests to undermine American industry or to lower our high living standards. Our own economic strength is a pillar of freedom throughout the world, and it would be irresponsible to take any action that would weaken it. For this reason no American industry is going to be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Nor will any American industry be placed in jeopardy in the trade negotiations which are to begin next week at Geneva under the existing trade agreements law."

If ever any industry has been placed in jeopardy, it is the textile industry of the United States right now. The President said in his letters to Congressmen MARTIN and BASS that this would not happen. Administration of the legislation has thus not yet in fact worked out as the President clearly intended that it should.

If this Commission recommends to the President the imposition of an equalization

fee on imported cotton manufactures, and, if the President implements such a recommendation, the job will only be started. It would surely be helpful. Such action will not of itself, however, stop the erosion of the industry. In heavy cotton yard goods, a real measure of assistance will result. In fine cotton goods entering the United States in the form of blouses and other made-up garments, the implementation of a favorable recommendation by this Commission will afford much less assistance.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate the basic relationship which exists between the American cotton grower and the American spinner. The economic facts of life dictate the need for this relationship because the American spinner has been, is, and should continue to be the best customer of the American cotton grower.

Until our Government effectively removes by executive or legislative action the sword of Damocles which hangs over the industry's head, there can be no real security for textile workers and no real foundation on which the industry, both grower and spinner, can build to its rightful place in the American economy. Dynamic, growing American industries, including the essential textile industry, all in support of a strong military defense posture, are the surest guarantees of free world survival in the nuclear age.

I thank you.

Unrest In Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman HERBERT BONNER of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee 2 weeks ago went to Panama at the request of U.S. officials. His purpose was to help allay the unrest that exists in the Republic over U.S. operation of the canal.

Mr. BONNER was accompanied by Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, the ranking Republican member of the committee, which handles legislation dealing with the canal. They made the trip by commercial airlines. While they were there, they talked to President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., and Ambassador Julian F. Harrington, two newspaper editors and many businessmen, about the existing problem and what might best be done.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD a series of three newspaper articles by Bruce Jolly, Washington bureau chief of the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, who was in Panama on another story at the time, which describes the situation as he found it, its importance to the United States and how Mr. BONNER and others feel it might be met: [From the Greensboro Daily News, Mar. 14, 1960]

CANAL PROBLEMS—EGYPT FUNDS HINTED IN PANAMA UNREST
(By Bruce Jolly)

RIO HATO, PANAMA, March 13.—The Panama Canal is the lifeline of the Western Hemisphere, and quite possibly of the free world.

It is also becoming one of the major headaches for the United States at both the international and the Latin American level.

The canal is only 50 miles long, but around it centers political intrigue that extends as far as the Soviet Union. In both South and Central America, where tensions already exist, the United States will be judged by what it does here.

At issue is U.S. control of the canal, through which 50 million tons of cargo float each year from all parts of the world.

So far as nationalistic elements in the Republic of Panama are concerned, U.S. control is a festering sore nurtured by a rash of political promises.

But the issue is international. Funds for the upcoming election, in which control is an issue, are said to be coming from as far as Egypt, where it is felt it would be to that nation's psychological advantage if the Panama Canal were nationalized. However, Communist elements are not playing a major role in the picture, yet.

This is the situation as an election in Panama approaches in May. It means problems for the U.S. Department of State, has caused concern in Congress, and was one of the reasons for a demonstration of strength by the 82d Airborne's 325th Battle Group centered at Fort Bragg, which dropped paratroopers in war games here last week.

Currently the problem hinges on two things. Panamanians want the Republic of Panama flag flown on the Canal Zone with the U.S. flag. They also want a larger slice of the proceeds from the operation of the canal.

Now Panama gets approximately \$2 million annually from the U.S. Government in connection with canal operations. Extremists want that increased to half the gross take of \$80 million a year.

More moderate Panamanians realize the absurdity of such demands. Nonetheless, they feel the Republic of Panama is getting the short end of the stick. For the most part, they feel the Republic's return should be around \$4 million.

They say that the Panama Canal Company returns \$2,700,000 annually to the U.S. Treasury, and ask why the Panama Government shouldn't get a larger return too.

In no sense in the picture is Republic of Panama military strength involved. There is none. Panama is a small country with a population of about 1 million, ruled by the old-line families. What industry there is runs on a monopolistic basis, with these families having most of the control.

The situation has generated a fear in many quarters that some day, under the stimuli of the issues that exist, there will be a ground swell behind an elected opportunist who would attempt to become the nation's strong man.

Such a pattern is not unfamiliar in Latin America. If it should develop, it would create one of the biggest problems the United States could face in its own backyard. That such a development is deemed possible here is indicated by the fact that much of the money old-line families have is placed in banks elsewhere, and not put back into developing the country.

Part of the Panama problem stems from the low living standards that exist because of lack of industrial and agricultural development. One of the best means of bringing those standards up, it is felt generally, would be through investment of capital from the United States and other states and other parts of the world.

But private capital investors are cautious. Growing tensions in Cuba, uneasiness in other South and Central American countries, and the Latin temperament, all play a part in the picture.

No development of the strong man is anticipated in Panama, but the concern over

the possibility is present as the United States juggles with the problem. Every move that is made in relations with the little Republic is weighed carefully.

The current problems that must be met are ramifications of a nationalistic urge. They are whether the Panama flag will be flown in the Canal Zone and whether the economic return from the canal operation shall be increased.

But there may be more to come.

[From the Greensboro Daily News,
Mar. 14, 1960]

CANAL PROBLEMS—UNIVERSITY IS CENTER OF UNREST

(By Bruce Jolly)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—U.S. difficulties in Panama have been intensified in recent years largely because of Panama's economic problems. The center of unrest is the University of Panama.

In Latin American countries universities by tradition are untouchable areas. A person is a student even though he takes only a 1-hour course and is in his early fifties. In Panama the university has become a haven for extremist thinkers.

The leader of Panama's extremist group is Aquilino Boyd, member of a well-known Panama family and a deputy in the National Assembly. He was Foreign Minister at the start of President Ernesto de la Guardia's administration.

His extremist cohort is a professor at the university named Ernesto P. Castillero, who has been described as emotional, short, humpbacked, highly intelligent, and fanatic. While Boyd was Foreign Minister, Castillero was Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs.

STARTS PROTESTS

Boyd embarked on an aggressive campaign of diplomatic protest toward the United States, and in June 1958 the President reorganized his Cabinet. Both Boyd and Castillero were out, and Boyd broke with the President.

It was Boyd who was credited with starting the demonstration on March 3 in the Canal Zone that many feared would get out of hand.

But his own party has repudiated him, and Boyd today is considered meaningless as a candidate in the elections to be held in May.

However, of necessity, all the candidates have taken over Boyd's principal ideas. Essentially, they are for the flying of the Panama flag along with the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone and more financial return for Panama from canal operation.

Their demands, however, are by no means as extreme as Boyd's, who overreached himself when he called for the United States to hand over one-half of the gross income from operation of the canal. That would have been \$40 million annually.

The main candidates today in the election are Ricardo Arias, who was president of Panama briefly following the assassination of President Remon, and Rodolpho Chiari, a ranch owner. Both are prominent Panamanians.

Neither of the candidates likely to win is an extremist, basically. But each, either by inclination or under public pressure has been asserting that the United States must make greater concessions in control of the Panama Canal.

There is a growing middle class in Panama, but for the most part its citizens are poor. They are excitable and intensely nationalistic. The canal issue is more of a rallying point for their resentment against the free spending, sometimes arrogant Americans than anything else.

But the overall problem has created tremendous difficulties for the United States in its relations with the Republic of Panama and its peoples.

There are many, however, who see the situation more clearly than others. A taxi driver had this to say one night:

"They want more than they can handle and it will hurt the country if they get it."

MIXED PEOPLE

People of Panama are a heterogeneous mixture. At the top are the pure Spanish, who took over the nation from the Indians. They killed them off to the point that they had to import Negro slaves.

Later came the West Indian Negroes, who were imported to work on the canal, first by the French and then by the United States. Chinese were also imported, and many have become prosperous. There is a large Hindu colony, and those Indians are said to have "just sort of come."

There has also been some English and United States immigration, along with Greeks, Italians and some French. A number of Jews came here and stayed during the 1600's when Ferdinand and Isabella threw the Jews out of Spain.

These are, for the most part, the peoples who make up the population of Panama. Despite their derivation, they today are Panamanians. They want to prosper and they want their nation to prosper.

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Mar. 16,
1960]

CANAL ISSUE SOLUTIONS DISCUSSED

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA, March 15.—There are short-range solutions to the United States-Republic of Panama problems over operation of the Panama Canal, but the real answers are long range.

This is the opinion of U.S. Ambassador Julian P. Harrington, a career diplomat who has been in Panama since 1955.

He accompanied Representative HERBERT BONNER, Democrat of North Carolina, chairman of the House committee that handles Panama Canal Zone legislation, when BONNER conferred with Panama President Ernesto de la Guardia last week about issues involved in canal operation.

There are two outside potential sources of trouble. The Communists, who are small in number but able troublemakers, and the United Arab Republic unit which has a staff in Panama that has been increasing in size.

CONCERNS UNITED STATES

The UAR move concerns U.S. officials, but BONNER declared before he left Panama to return to the United States last week that the United States and Panama could get along all right "with proper diplomatic relations."

He said he felt that the operation of the canal is a "mutual project," and "I think something can be worked out to satisfy these people under the tensions that exist."

BONNER declared that more consideration should be given to flying two flags (United States and Panama) in the Canal Zone area, provided it is done "under proper conditions and in the proper place."

But the North Carolina legislator sidestepped the question of a possible increase in the amount of Panama Canal profits the Panama Republic gets. So did the Ambassador.

PROPOSAL REJECTED

In the background lies the question of whether the Canal Zone operation should be handled by an international unit. Such a suggestion has been made by former President Harry S. Truman and by Adlai Stevenson.

It wasn't received too well in Panama and BONNER rejected any such proposal with an emphatic "No."

"We must retain control of the canal for the best interests of everybody," he declared. Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington, ranking GOP member

on the committee that BONNER heads, was of the same opinion. TOLLEFSON accompanied BONNER to Panama.

Another major question that has been raised, principally by Panamanians, is the possibility of Republic of Panama representation on the Board that runs the Panama Canal. BONNER also rejected this proposal.

"Any Panamanian on the Board would be pestered to death. It would create too many problems," he asserted.

HUMAN NATURE

Whether concessions to the Republic of Panama in the operation of the canal would alleviate the tensions, or just bring a desire for more authority is still another question that the United States must consider in weighing the problem.

"It is human nature for the Panamanians to want more and more, but in any step in that direction, we must have a firm basic agreement as to how far we will go," BONNER asserted.

No one expects the elections that are coming up to have any great effect on the situation. Extremism will be in the wings and not in the foreground, but even a moderate leadership in the Republic of Panama will face pressure to get something done.

Besides, as one source put it, "the people have learned the power of mass demonstration."

Communists are and will be in the picture, but they are being watched closely by the police.

The situation in Panama today is what has been described as an "uneasy truce." If the United States operated as the Soviet Union does, the issue could be resolved in short order at the expense of the Panamanian people.

But it doesn't and it won't. So the answer will come from only one avenue, which was expressed by BONNER in this way:

"We've got to have a greater understanding between the two nations over this issue, and the peoples of the two nations. To my way of thinking, that's the answer."

Wins Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in times of peace, even during a cold war, many of us are inclined to overlook the fine job our armed services are doing to protect our Nation.

One of the units defending us has its headquarters at Redmond, Wash., in my district, and I believe this unit typifies the hard work and devotion to duty of our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen. This unit is the 4th Missile Battalion, 60th Artillery.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert a news story which appeared on page 1 of the March 3 issue of the Sammamish Valley News, published in Redmond, Wash.

LOCAL NIKE UNIT NAMED THE BEST IN UNITED STATES

Redmond's military units were named the most outstanding in the entire U.S. Air Defense Command at a special ceremony held on the parade ground of D Battery's control area Monday morning.

Presentation of the trophy for the best Nike-Hercules firing record in the United States during 1959 was made by Maj. Gen. P. H. Draper, Jr., Chief of Staff of the Army Air Defense Command. The general, who is stationed at Colorado Springs, Colo., was on a 3-day orientation tour of the 31st Artillery Brigade units throughout Washington.

Acceptance of the trophy for the men was made by Lt. Col. Richard F. Cox, commander of the 4th Missile Battalion. Colonel Cox also accepted a similar trophy for outstanding performance presented by the 31st Brigade Headquarters at McChord Air Force Base.

Accompanying General Draper on his visit to Redmond were Brig. Gen. Daniel O'Connor, commanding general of the 31st Brigade; Lt. Col. P. A. Anson, secretary to the general staff, U.S. Air Defense Command; and Maj. Charles A. Duncan, training officer of the 26th group.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army has informed me the trophy was awarded for the highest annual service practice score during calendar year 1959 for a battalion of three batteries or less. The 4th Missile Battalion scored 8,249 points out of a possible 9,000 pounds.

Since the battalion was first organized in December 1917 at Fort Monroe, as part of the 60th Artillery Regiment, it has served with distinction. During World War I, the battalion earned campaign streamers for its action at St. Mihiel and the Meuse-Argonne.

Its demobilization in February 1919 at Fort Washington, Md., was only for a brief period. The unit was reconstituted and reorganized 3 years later as the 60th Artillery Battalion, Antiaircraft, at Fort Crockett, Tex. It was expanded to regimental size later and sailed to the Philippine Islands, where it fought the Japanese forces until May 6, 1942.

Before it was forced to surrender, the unit earned three Distinguished Unit Streamers. These decorations were embroidered Manila and Subic Bays 1941-42, Manila and Subic Bays 1942, and Defense of the Philippines. It also won the Philippine Presidential Unit Citation, embroidered "7 December 1941 to 10 May 1942." Among its campaign streamers, of course, is the one which reads Philippine Islands.

Its officers and enlisted men have earned for the battalion the 1957 USARADCOM annual service practice championship in addition to its recent award.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these men and believe they represent the type of personnel in all forces. They are men who in preparing for war help maintain the peace.

Ohio State Western Conference: NCAA Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, to its laurels as Big Ten champion, Coach

Fred Taylor and his great Ohio State University basketball team added the National Collegiate Athletic Association title Saturday night, March 19, 1960, defeating California by the widest margin ever registered in a championship in the NCAA tournament history.

Coach Fred Taylor is to be congratulated for his outstanding leadership and guidance of the fine young men who made up this championship team. Much credit also must be given to Jack Graf and Frank Truitt for their excellent work in scouting and assisting in coaching.

The championship is the result of strictly team effort and although there are a number of outstanding individual stars on this ball team, their sportsmanship and team play were particularly impressive.

The State of Ohio and the Nation are justly proud not only of the starting five, Jerry Lucas, Larry Siegfried, John Havlicek, Joe Roberts, and Mel Nowell, but also the bench strength of five players possessing nearly equal abilities, Dick Furry, Richie Hoyt, Howie Nourse, Bob Knight, Gary Gearhart, John Cedargren, and Dave Barker are entitled to an equal share of the credit.

Inquiry Into the Sunset Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill, H.R. 11159, which I believe would broaden significantly work opportunities for people over 65.

Often it is difficult for the aged, after retirement from work, to channel their energies into leisure-time activities. Although there are some signs that Americans are beginning to accept other values besides those of productive work, the most desirable utilization of leisure time is still not understood by many. Today as yesterday, holding a job is still the badge of self-respect for an overwhelming majority of people. For many, work is more than a source of income; it also provides personal dignity, a sense of worth, and a feeling of social participation.

In the March 20 New York Times magazine, Gertrude Samuels, reporting on old-age retirees in St. Petersburg, Fla., wrote a rather gloomy description and concluded in part:

Boredom and loss of community status as well as the need for work are usually at the root of the trouble.

She pointed out that a large problem was that the local labor market was glutted with old people who offer to work for "practically nothing" in order to hold on to their social security benefits.

This article underlines the importance of the bills I have introduced that will

discourage exploitation of the elderly, and increase their incomes.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include Gertrude Samuels' "Inquiry Into the Sunset Years" in the Appendix of the Record:

INQUIRY INTO THE SUNSET YEARS

(By Gertrude Samuels)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—Every week, more and more people in the afternoon of their lives pack up and go south in search of the rainbow—sunshine and security. Some have quit work because of compulsory retirement plans; some are widowed or alone in the world, and seek to start a new life; some are weary of the rigors of northern winters; some heed the sun to fight illness.

Florida, with its advertised sunshine, sea, and ease of living, promises the rainbow.

Some 4,000 prospective permanent residents, young and old, pour into Florida each week, giving this State the second fastest rate of growth in the Nation (after Nevada). By 1970, the newcomers are expected to push the population from today's 4,900,000 to 8 million to make the State the eighth largest. Since 1950, it has had an 80 percent increase in elderly residents; and in 1957, the latest year studied by Washington, the migration to Florida of social security beneficiaries aged 65 and over—the so-called retirees—was greater than that to all other States combined.

Who are the retirees? Where are they living? What do they do with their new leisure? Where do they get their income? Are they happy?

The answers must be approached through understanding what growing old means to most people economically: 74 percent of our aging population either have no income or receive less than \$1,000 a year; 11 percent have an annual income of between \$1,000 and \$2,000; only 15 percent of retirees receive more than \$2,000 a year.

For the most typical picture, the Florida State Development Commission at Tallahassee refers the visitor to St. Petersburg. The town of 180,000 on the west coast is known as the retirement capital of the United States. Although its city fathers stress that 50,000 schoolchildren attest to the number of young couples in the community, the city has long been geared to attracting senior citizens, some 64,000 of whom draw social security checks.

Central Avenue, which bisects the "Sunshine City" and is its Broadway, looks like a vast, friendly summer porch. Hundreds of green park-like benches are placed back to back for the comfort of passerby and shoppers. From the crowded benches, where oldsters in dark glasses and light clothes soak up the benign sunshine comes, snatches of conversation:

"Where you from?"

"Cleveland, where else? That's where all the healthy ones are from."

"Joe, I've found where you can get two cups juice for 15 cents, real good stomach medicine like, don't give you heartburn, nothing."

Three white-haired, suntanned ladies, neatly got up in summer coats, gay scarves and comfortable shoes, totter into the crowd arm in arm, saying to no one in particular, as though on a cruise ship, "We're just going to take another turn around the block." They pass signs for "Blood pressure on the heartometer, 50 cents," hearing aids, and one moralizing: "The best way to break a habit is to drop it." On one side of the block are 4 finance and loan companies and 4 real estate companies. The streets are built up at sidewalk crossings to make it unnecessary to step down.

Many newcomers live a short drive out of this crowded central area in the mushrooming housing developments on the outskirts.

But many on the green benches live in the small hotels and rooming houses nearby. For the most part, these are not equipped to cater to the older persons' needs, but offer only standard, small bedrooms with bureaus and rocking chairs. To save money, many retirees eat in the 10-cent stores, and at 4 o'clock every day, a little drama is enacted on one downtown street where 3 cafeterias provide cheap meals: the elderly start to come, some alone, some assuming indifference, to study and compare the 3 window menus before queuing up for dinner.

Many living on marginal incomes have discovered Webb's City, an extraordinary cut-rate department store which sells everything from 65-cent haircuts to hamburgers, furniture, fur stoles, and drugs. The oldsters buy cheap meals there and stock up on low-priced canned foods.

The sun and their calories are what they watch closely. You find them fishing off the bridges when the weather is not too frosty (a poll shows that fishing is the biggest attraction), listening to free concerts from folding or wheel chairs, playing shuffleboard by the hundreds every day on the Mirror Lake courts, sitting in lonely contemplation of pelicans and life on the pier.

Many tell you that they are detached enough about families, friends, and material possessions to enjoy making their old dream of retirement in the sun come true. But many are clearly finding that the arithmetic of aging has little to do with the sun.

On the first of every month they eagerly await the postman who brings them one or two O.A.B.'s (old-age benefit checks). These average \$67. In some cases there is a company pension check. Then they crowd to the banks downtown to cash them personally.

But sudden medical expenses can drain away savings. Under the law, they cannot qualify for public assistance for the first 5 years of residence. Thus, at a critical time of life, when dignity and self-reliance are precious possessions, they may have to turn to friends or families for help.

In some boarding houses there are people alone in the world without means, sharing a room with two or three others. Often they need nursing care, but there are few hospitals to accommodate them, or else hospital beds are priced out of reach. A visit to the county veterans hospital disclosed that it had a waiting list of 700 persons.

And for many there are also social and psychological problems. Many feel cut off from families and lifelong friends, from grandchildren and from just seeing young people. There are new industries on the fringes of town that have attracted younger families. But the preponderance of the old, the halt and the lame wherever one goes is depressing to many who feel separated from the natural flow of life. As one spry old lady who looked about 100 put it: "Too many old people."

A measure of what transplanting brings can be glimpsed from a sampling of successes and failures.

Dr. Francis Smith and his wife Emily, in sport shirts, shorts and sandals greet the visitor with, "We haven't had as much fun all our lives as we've had here in the last 2½ years."

They live at Catalina Gardens, a green community of pastel-colored, middle-income homes, flowering lawns and one-car garages. Dr. Smith, 62, mild, genial, gray haired and bespectacled, was a scientist with the Bureau of Standards in Washington, doing gas-chemistry research. After 32 years he was making \$8,200 a year. Mrs. Smith, vivacious and gray haired, was a professor of textiles at the University of Maryland, but stopped teaching 6 years ago. They had good friends in Washington and hated to leave them.

"But we simply decided," said Dr. Smith, "that if we were going to have any fun out

of life—now that our children are grown—I'd better retire before I went out on a wheelchair. When I looked out of the window, I wanted to see sand and not snow."

They toured Florida and neighboring islands, and liked the west coast best because of its relatively large city facilities plus vacation attractions.

Dr. Smith continued to work until 60, to qualify for his full annuity; then they sold their five-room house in College Park, Md., for \$13,200 and, by cashing an insurance policy and adding some savings, they put cash down—\$14,500—for their new house and lot here "to relieve us of any worries about paying out installments from annuities."

They furnished the airy two-bedroom house for ease, and Dr. Smith put in the lawn. They have learned to live on his annuity of \$4,800 a year by carefully planning a budget: \$350 a month for food, utilities, clothes and entertainment; no eating out; \$37.50 for winter heating.

Most important, they found that "instead of retiring from life, we didn't stop working, we just changed our work." An old hobby—shelling—has become their joint scientific interest. It pays them nothing, but enriches their information about the life of the sea. Today Dr. Smith heads a shell club of 180 persons, aged 12 to 80, and the Smiths have developed and scientifically labeled an enormous collection of rare, tiny shells, 100-specimen sets of which have been sent to schools throughout the country.

"We love this," Emily Smith says, "spending hours of the day together and having a sense of accomplishment, making scientific information available where it has not been before."

"I think I know now the difference between the happy and the lost," Dr. Smith adds. "You must have a general background about a lot of things, and an innate curiosity about everything. Then you're never lost."

Another couple with less to live on than the Smiths, but just as content in their way, are the Alexander Andersons, both 74, from Zellenople, Pa. (population 5,000).

In the roominghouse area of the Mirror Lake district, they have rented at "Aunt Genie's Cozy Inn Apts," a furnished, two-room-and-porch flat for \$75 a month. The furniture is worn but comfortable, cretonne drapes separating the bedroom from the living room and large kitchen.

Mr. Anderson, a retired carpenter, large and ruddy faced, still retaining his Scottish accent, is almost totally deaf and suffers from dizzy spells. Mrs. Anderson, plump, precise and motherly, has arthritis "which I just refuse to give in to." They lost their only son, Robert, in Korea and she carries his picture and the War Department letter of condolence in her bag.

In Zellenople, they live in a rented room, and come to St. Petersburg by bus for 6 to 8 months each year "for the climate." They must manage on \$212 a month—\$132 from social security plus \$80 in veteran's compensation. Their pleasures are simple: she likes to read—newspapers, church papers, her Bible; he likes the shuffleboard courts and lawn bowling, and is proud of the food bargains that he brings from Webb's City several times a week.

They carry some hospital insurance, "but it doesn't cover but a third of our needs, and if anything happened to us, I don't know what we'd do." Thus, Mrs. Anderson literally counts the pennies, keeping groceries to \$2 a day, and occasionally dropping some item—like buttermilk, when the price rose 2 cents recently—so as not to incur debts.

They like this life in their old age, and their new friends. "Some people are wedded to their furniture and carpets," Mrs. Anderson says with a smile, "but our values are

higher than material things. I had 94 Christmas cards to send, so that shows how many friends we have everywhere."

On the other side of the picture, one glimpses disillusionment and frustration. Boredom and loss of community status as well as the need for work are usually at the root of the trouble.

In the Brentwood Heights area of middle-income homes, where several "for sale" signs are planted firmly on the front lawns, are the Browns (they wanted their real names withheld—two brothers and a sister in their 60's). They are from Philadelphia, where one brother was a cabinetmaker, the other a school board attendance officer. Another aged sister and her son bought the house next door.

The two families sold their homes to come here 2 years ago. They paid cash, \$17,000, for each of these three-bedroom homes, where they live on pensions and savings. But both families became fed up a year ago.

In their former suburban homes they had raised their own crops of vegetables and had an idea they could do the same here. "But the ground is all sand, and nothing will grow," said one brother. "All summer long you're out there spraying insecticide to kill the bugs. We can't even raise grass. But the most important thing is that we're not interested in fishing and old people's hobbies. We need to be active. Here we just sit around and do nothing. It's boring."

One sister suffers from arthritis, and thought it was going to be warm here all the time. "But the frost sets in, and these houses are not built to withstand the cold weather—they're masonry homes and not insulated to withstand the cold like ours up North. And my son can't get work—he's a war veteran and needs a construction job."

They looked bitter and worried. "Any-one coming here should rent for 6 months first," the sister added, "not buy, like we did, to see if they like the change. And our family's up there. In a way, you can say that we're homesick. We're going home."

Not far from this area was a Long Island couple who had put their life savings into their new home, in hope of getting a job to supplement their income. They now are desperately trying to make ends meet. The husband a 65-year-old builder and construction worker, had suffered from heart attacks and high-blood pressure, and paid \$11,500 cash for the 2-bedroom home so as to save the interest on a mortgage. They had loved their nice home in Glen Cove, but had been persuaded that life in St. Petersburg would be cheaper and healthier.

Now the husband finds that the local labor market is glutted with old people who offer to work for practically nothing in order to hold on to their social security benefits. Moreover, it costs a separate license fee to work in each city district. He has occasionally been driven to repair roofs (which endangers his health) so as not to dip into savings that can only see them through for a year.

To help out, his wife has been working part time at a snack bar, bringing in \$30 a week. Food costs are high—they, too, shop at Webb's City—and they are doing without a phone or any luxuries.

"We don't owe anyone anything right now," she said with mixed pride and bitterness, "but we're making it by the skin of our teeth."

"If I could just get a repair job here and there," he said. "A lot of people making the change don't realize that you leave all your lifelong friends behind. It's hard to start again."

What lessons are there in the St. Petersburg story?

Some retired couples, living simply without luxuries, feel happier here than in their for-

mer lives. But some—no one knows how many—are certainly unhappy in their discovery that it takes more than sunshine and shuffleboard to solve critical problems. For the old have the same basic needs as the young—to feel needed, to feel loved, and to give love, to know a degree of economic security, reasonable health, meaningful work. Here, far from families and friends, many are discovering that their needs are unmet in this setting with its inadequate services.

Dr. Howard Carter, county health officer in the division of gerontology and research, which is conducting a 5-year survey of oldsters to determine their health status and needs, puts it this way:

"Where we are falling down is that older people with limited means have difficulty finding the proper housing, proper food, proper care here. They have virtually nothing except the boarding home where someone might try to care for them out of kindness."

Even State and local officials, who once made a play for retirees, now try by letter and interview to discourage from coming, prospective newcomers who have less than \$250 a month fixed income, or who need jobs either to forestall boredom or to supplement income. They warn that job opportunities are so scarce in St. Petersburg and many other Florida communities that only 1 percent of those 65 and over are able to get work; and that under the law new arrivals cannot get public assistance for 5 years.

In contrast to the "sharp operators" who paint optimistic pictures of cheap lots on the beach and the life of Riley in new housing developments; the State retirement department is urging prospective residents to drive up and down the State first, and to ponder the wisdom of severing home ties and making a change. But as one official wryly said: "You can point to the hazards involved, but you can't stand at the border with tommy guns and order people back."

As for retirees in general, wherever they may be, the St. Petersburg experience underlines four basic facts:

1. Most of them do not have enough money to live on. Social-security benefits are inadequate, whether oldsters are living in the sun or the cold. The latest figures published by the Social Security Administration, for March 1959, show that aged beneficiaries (women 62 and older and men 65 and older) numbered 10,500,000; the average old-age (retired worker) benefit paid to them was \$71.84. (Only about 1 million—less than one-tenth—of these retired workers are helped by private pension plans.) The figures do not cover people in the most severe straits—those who are on public assistance or who receive no social-security benefits.

2. Retirees must struggle to stay well in later years. At some point, a 65-year-old couple who today are well and self-reliant will need partial or total care. Because they live in straitened circumstances, they cut corners on food, undernourish themselves and fall ill. They are denied care, because they cannot meet medical costs which in recent years have skyrocketed, and because few communities provide them with proper nursing facilities.

3. They need places to live. A generation ago it was not uncommon to find two or three generations living together in our largely agricultural and small business society. Today there is no room for grandparents in the new urban society; and in any case, doubling up gives rise to family conflicts. But too much emphasis is being placed on the commercial, single-family dwellings, instead of on low-cost living facilities that are suitable to those of advancing age (with uniform heat, maximum sunlight, grab bars to reduce hazards, nursing care within reach).

4. They need meaningful jobs. Just as bewildering for the man who is independently wealthy as for the retiree on marginal

income is the sudden discovery that after a lifetime of work society has no use for him. The older generation, at present around 16 million, is expected to number 21 million by 1970. Since man is living longer, thanks to science, he is going to have to be able to work longer—otherwise he will be a burden to himself, the younger generation or the mental wards.

For many months panels of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been studying problems like these, and touring the country for firsthand stories of senior citizens. Proposals now before Congress are for an increase in old-age benefits; expansion of the program to provide medical care for beneficiaries; improvements in nursing facilities; the enactment of State and national laws that would bar discrimination against senior citizens still capable of handling good jobs.

While Congress probes the matter, the retirees here can perhaps get some cheer from an old hooper at the pier auditorium.

Captain McGinley, of Virginia, small and frail and 78, loves to get on stage several nights a week to tap out his old soft-shoe routines for the enthusiastic crowds of retired laborers and telephone operators and engineers and patrolmen and doctors. He replies to their applause with an undeviating curtain line:

"Good night, folks, God bless you, and may the good Lord take a liking to you."

"Tad" Walters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday, March 20, Dallas Morning News, written by one of the finest newspaper reporters I know, Mr. Walter Hornaday. The article concerns one of our colleagues, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania:

WALTER'S COOL CALMNESS HELPS CONTROL DEBATES

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—A white-haired Congressman from Pennsylvania presided all last week over the House of Representatives while the inflammatory civil rights bill was debated.

FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat, of Easton, Pa., was unruffled as liberals pressed for strong legislation and southerners fought back with might and main.

His own calmness and reputation for fairness helped immensely to keep the discussion from becoming too heated and getting out of control.

"TAD" WALTER has been called on many times by Speaker SAM RAYBURN to sit in the chair when highly controversial issues were before the House.

(To explain why RAYBURN isn't presiding, the House, after general debate on a bill, resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole to act on amendments and the Speaker names a Member to wield the gavel.)

"He's one of the most useful men in the House," RAYBURN said. "I've put him in the chair when these hot bills come along because every Member has faith in him."

WALTER'S Pennsylvania district is highly industrialized and a conglomeration of many nationalities—descendants of migrating

Irish, Welsh, Poles, Germans, Italians, Slav, and what not.

Ordinarily a Congressman from such an area would be a leftwinger. But not "Tad" WALTER.

His thinking is more Texan than extreme liberal. He fares poorly in Americans for Democratic Action vote scoring.

He was floor leader for the tidelands bill that restored the offshore submerged lands of Texas and other coastal States and set aside a Supreme Court decision.

WALTER believed the Supreme Court was wrong in saying the States didn't own their tidelands and has since been critical of other decisions.

The Pennsylvania Congressman has been responsible more than any other single member for preventing the long-existing limitations on immigration from being weakened.

When President Eisenhower last week urged Congress to change the immigration formula to double the number of entrants to around 500,000 a year, WALTER charged it was purely a political move. He said the welfare of the Nation must not be sacrificed to the dictates of election-year politics.

WALTER was equally vociferous in criticizing Adlai Stevenson for advocating liberalization of the immigration laws. He got aboard the Stevenson campaign train to explain to the presidential candidate why he was wrong, but was not able to reach the presidential candidate, either because Stevenson didn't want to see him or his aids barred the way.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, WALTER is in strong position to stop legislation breaking down existing laws on entrance of aliens.

While J. Frank Wilson, of Dallas, was a Congressman, he worked closely with WALTER on immigration matters. One year he accompanied WALTER to a meeting of the inter-governmental commission for European migration.

WALTER and RAYBURN have a deep admiration for each other.

In 1952, when it appeared possible that the Democratic National Convention might be deadlocked, WALTER and other friends of the Speaker set up an organization to be ready to move in if the opportunity came.

WALTER was assured of 95 percent of the Pennsylvania delegation for RAYBURN, but the chance to push the Texan's name never arrived.

"It's a shame that the Speaker has not been our President," WALTER said.

The Pennsylvanian has his hands full at all times. He is chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and next in line for Democratic chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. He heads the House patronage committee, whose task it is to distribute jobs on Capitol Hill to deserving Democrats. WALTER first came to Congress in 1933. Only eight Democrats have more seniority.

The 65-year-old Congressman is a veteran of World Wars I and II. He has received numerous awards for his public services, including decorations from foreign governments.

He is a graduate of George Washington and Georgetown Universities of Washington, vice president of a Philadelphia bank, and director of a hometown bank.

For all his idealism, WALTER is a practical politician, as shown by the fact that he has had no opposition in the Democratic primary since he was elected to Congress for a third term.

When he goes to his district and visits industrial plants, the workers greet him as "Tad." WALTER explains his ability to get reelected year after year to his constituents' faith in his desire and ability to look after their welfare, even if they may disagree with him on many matters.

"My people are not hyphenated Americans," he said. "They are Americans."

WALTER was once invited to join the minorities section of the Democratic National Committee, a group that tries to round the votes of so-called minority blocs. He refused to accept. Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, took the place.

His staff wishes he wasn't so busy. His secretary, Ruth Miskell, complained she has a hard time getting him to slow down long enough to talk to him about congressional office problems.

WALTER works at high tension and worries a lot about the way the Nation is turning, but keeps his faith in the ability of the people, through Congress, to work out the best solutions.

"I believe Speaker RAYBURN and I have much the same political ideas," WALTER said.

Civil Defense Continues To Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, very few articles have illustrated more vividly the strange picture of neglect that prevails in America's civil defense preparations than the penetrating report of Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 18, 1960.

The article by General Phillips is a stern reminder of the continued failure of this Government to face up to its major responsibility in the field of civil defense.

The life or death of millions of Americans may be determined by what we do in this area in the next few years.

I hope that every member of this body will read the Phillips article, which follows:

UNITED STATES SPENDING MORE IN 2 YEARS TO PROTECT A FEW DOZEN ICBM'S THAN TO SAFEGUARD ITS PEOPLE—DISPARITY BETWEEN EFFORTS IS NIGHTMARE TO ADVOCATES OF CIVIL DEFENSE WHO SEE LIVES AS MOST PRECIOUS ASSET OF NATION

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The United States will spend more money to harden (protect) a few dozen intercontinental ballistic missiles from hostile attack in the next 2 years than it will to protect 170 million Americans from the same attack.

The money spent for active defense against attack—air defense, warning systems, etc.—each year is more than would be spent for civil defense in 50 years at the present rate.

To those who study the problem, the disparity between the effort to protect the weapons and to protect the people is a nightmare. They regard the people as the Nation's most precious asset. Productive capacity and capable military forces are only services provided for the welfare of the people. Of what value is a protected missile if the populace is destroyed?

Study after study has shown that casualties can be reduced 50 to 75 percent if an adequate system of shelters is built—simple home shelters against radioactive fallout and deep ones against blast in cities.

The complacency in a matter so vital seems to stem from the whole theory of deterrence.

It is not hard to sell the idea of spending to deter a war, but it has always been difficult to get the United States to spend to prepare for war. But preparedness has always meant the same thing as deterrence.

Deterrence can fail. If it does, the resultant catastrophe will be greater than has ever been visited on mankind. It is quite possible that the survivors will be few, in the absence of large-scale provision of shelters.

The United States is spending between 0.1 and 0.2 percent of its military budget on its civil-defense program, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands are spending a proportion from 10 to 20 times as large. The Soviet Union has a very extensive program, but its cost is not available.

In a strategic sense, civil defense is also a deterrent. In a crisis, the threat of nuclear war against an unprotected population is much more serious than it would be against a protected people.

The credence our allies are willing to give to use of our deterrent in their defense may also depend on whether our own population has a reasonable chance of survival or is unprotected.

When the major war threat was a bombing attack, a warning period of up to 3 hours could be expected. Under these conditions, evacuation of cities, in the absence of other protection—and none was provided in the United States—was deemed a proper defense measure.

Now that the major threat is an attack by ballistic missiles, with no warning or, at the most, 15 minutes of warning, evacuation is no longer feasible.

Shelters are the only possible protection for those who are in metropolitan areas that can be considered targets. There will almost certainly be strategic warning, that is, a period of tension (which ordinarily is not recognized to be serious). During this period a semipermanent evacuation of women, children, and the aged could take place.

But the majority of the population of metropolitan areas would have to remain. There will, however, always be a small percentage with a well-developed instinct of preservation who, like the wise ones in Berlin last May 27, will find the period of tension a proper time to take a vacation.

Shelters can vary from simple protection from fallout for a few hours or days, to reinforced basement shelters in homes that will enable the residents to survive even if the house is destroyed, to heavy shelters below reinforced floors in large buildings, to deep underground shelters in major cities built to withstand anything except a direct hit.

All types are necessary, but few of any type are likely to be built unless the building is required by Federal law and some incentive or subsidy is provided.

Sweden has the most advanced program of deep shelters for the city population. Rock or concrete shelters designed to give protection against high altitude detonation of hydrogen bombs are being built in the central parts of all cities with a population of 50,000 or more.

One example is in Stockholm. The famous Rock Garage, with a granite roof 50 to 65 feet thick, cost \$1,600,000 and can seat 10,000 people. In peacetime it is used as a garage. The cost was shared by the central government, the city of Stockholm and the private garage firm.

The Swiss shelter program is aimed at providing shelter for 2 million people in cities by 1963.

The Soviet Union uses all means of civil defense. Civil defense is under the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) with a first vice minister in charge. He holds the rank of lieutenant general. The chief of the national civil defense staff is a major general.

The subordinate MVD organization of civil defense is militarized. The staffs extend to larger cities and potential targets outside the cities. The suborganizations are composed of members of the governments of the Soviet republics, regions and cities.

The subways in Moscow and Leningrad have been deliberately built deep, up to 130 feet, to provide shelters. The Moscow subway can shelter about 1 million persons. New buildings must have approval of the civil defense organization for the shelter protection built into the basements. Extensive instruction on the construction of fallout shelters have been given.

An official Soviet statement asserts that 85.5 percent of the population has completed a 10-hour course on civil defense. A second course of 22 hours was started in 1958. The training is compulsory and includes protection against chemical and bacteriological warfare. A third program was started in 1958 to be completed in 1960. Two additional courses, one of which was for school children, have been announced since.

The United States is the only major nation living with the threat of nuclear war delicately balanced on the deterrent theory that fails to take protection of its people seriously.

To the Sons and Grandsons of Confederate Veterans: Why You Should Join the Sons of Confederate Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement made by the distinguished writer, Lee Meriwether, of St. Louis, addressed to the sons and grandsons of Confederate veterans.

This statement was forwarded to me by a very distinguished lawyer in Memphis, Mr. John W. Apperson, who reminded me that Mr. Meriwether was once a citizen of Memphis, Tenn. In December 1862 his mother was banished from Memphis by General Sherman.

Mr. Meriwether has written many books, including the life of Senator Jim Reed, of Missouri. He is now writing what he calls his last book to be entitled "My First 98 Years." He was 97 years old last Christmas Day.

The article follows:

TO THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS: WHY YOU SHOULD JOIN THE SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS

(By Lee Meriwether)

Since I became a member of Sterling Price Camp No. 145, of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, 50 years ago, I have often been asked "What is the good of such an organization?"

I reply to that question: "Do you want the word to think your father was a traitor who should have been hanged?"

When you reply, "Of course not," I say: "Then you should join the Sons, for their sole purpose is to keep history's records straight."

Never was there more need for our organization than now, for hardly a day passes but some northern newspaper or magazine says the South fought to perpetuate human

slavery and that Confederate soldiers were traitors who should have been hanged. Recently Time said Alabama hates Negroes so much that it sentenced a poor Negro boy, Jimmy Wilson, to death for stealing only \$1.90. I got from Judge Walter B. Jones, who tried Jimmy Wilson, these facts: Jimmy, the "boy" is a husky man of 40; it is true the purse he stole contained only \$1.90, but it is also true that Jimmy seized a woman by the throat, almost strangled her, tried to rape her, and desisted only when her screams brought people to her aid. It also developed that Jimmy had been convicted of several felonies.

I asked Time to publish these facts and not let its readers think Alabama hates Negroes so much that it hangs a "poor Negro boy" for stealing \$1.90. Time replied it had no more space for the Jimmy Wilson case. I mentioned this case at a meeting of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, and they broadcast the facts Time refused to publish. Thus, thousands of people learned the truth about Jimmy Wilson because the Sons helped keep history's records straight.

On January 11, 1960, Time devoted a whole column to praising the play "Andersonville," presently being presented in movie theaters throughout the country. The column contains not one word to let the readers know the play it praises libels Major Wirz, commander of Andersonville prison, and also libels the entire people of the South. The play pictures Wirz as starving and torturing 20,000 prisoners while the southern people looked on approvingly, and did nothing to stop the atrocities.

The truth is, Wirz was a humane man who did all in his power for the welfare of his 20,000 prisoners. He gave them the same rations given Confederate soldiers, and when the South became too impoverished to supply even those meager rations, Wirz offered to release all his prisoners to a Union commander if he would accept and feed them.

The offer was rejected because the North's policy was to starve the South into surrender. The Union commander knew if he accepted and fed the Andersonville prisoners it would mean Wirz would not have to feed them, then the rations he was giving prisoners could be given to 20,000 Confederate soldiers.

The U.S. War Department's 1867 report says the percentage of deaths of "rebel" prisoners in northern prisons was greater than the deaths of Union prisoners at Andersonville; the report explains this by saying the "rebels" when captured were so emaciated they could not respond to adequate rations.

While the South struggled for independence it was necessary to lie about Major Wirz and the South in order to make northern men willing to invade the South and kill southern men and burn southern homes. But it is not necessary, it is not decent, to repeat such libels today, nearly 100 years after the South was conquered. I asked Time to tell the truth about the South, but it refused to do it; so the Sons again kept history's records straight by broadcasting the facts about Andersonville.

During the War Between the States, 2,200 Confederate prisoners were confined in a camp at Elmira, N.Y. The camp was unsanitary; unaccustomed to northern winters, the prisoners in ragged, threadbare uniforms, suffered from cold and lack of medicines.

The North could have remedied those conditions, for it received supplies from all parts of the world. But it did not remedy them and the 2,200 prisoners died and were buried in Elmira.

The South's ports were blockaded by northern fleets; it had only its own scanty supplies. Drugs that might have saved the lives of Union prisoners at Andersonville were made contraband by their own Government.

In the light of these historical undisputed facts the movie play "Andersonville" is an infamous libel.

As long as the northern press and such plays as "Andersonville" picture our fathers as cruel traitors, just so long will it be the sacred duty of the sons and grandsons of Confederates to join our organization and help keep history's records straight.

Educational Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial on the subject of American education, which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on March 20, 1960:

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun, Mar. 20, 1960]

EDUCATIONAL DILEMMA

If we accept the views of some critics at face value, American schools are in bad shape. Standards are woefully low. Other countries, such as Britain, are so far ahead of us as to be practically out of sight.

This kind of criticism, and the very serious questions that arise from it, caused U.S. News & World Report to look into the British educational system and to compare it with ours. The results of the study, under a London dateline, appear in the magazine's March 7 issue. And the picture, from the American point of view, is a good deal brighter—despite some cloudy patches—than the more extreme detractors of U.S. education would have us believe.

The article starts out with the big question: Do British children get a better education than their American counterparts? And that, it finds, can't be answered with a simple, unqualified yes or no. The answer, instead, is divided: "It is true for a minority—the brightest children in Britain. It is not true, on the whole, for the majority of youngsters."

It is important to understand that there are fundamental differences between the British school system and ours. As the magazine puts it, "In Britain the bright pupil gets practically all the breaks." If it is decided, when he is 11, that he is among the top 25 percent of pupils in his district, he is eligible for a special school and is destined to get much more education than the mill run of children.

These latter, the article goes on, must be content with the second best. Attending college is virtually out of the question. They usually enter the ranks of labor at 16.

Britain's famous "public schools"—which are in reality private schools, with tuitions running to \$1,500 a year—are widely and deservedly praised, as are her great universities. But only about 7 percent of British children go to those schools. Moreover, Britain is near the bottom of the list of nations—25th—in the proportion of population attending universities. The United States is first in this regard, and Russia is second.

U.S. News observes: "Many educators say the big difference between British and American schooling is this: Americans believe that all children should have the opportunity of equal education. The British believe

in educating an intellectual elite by limiting the opportunity of higher education to a tiny minority."

Britain does seem to be ahead of us in certain areas. Educators are high in their praise of what is known as streaming. This is a system by which children are assigned to classes on the basis of intelligence, so the bright child will not be held back by the dull. And British schools seem to be much more advanced in maintaining discipline than is generally true on our side of the ocean.

But American education has its virtues, too. As a matter of fact, Britain is borrowing ideas from U.S. education and is particularly interested in providing greater educational opportunity for more children. Here's the conclusion U.S. News reaches after its close study: "The conclusion reached after a close look at the educational system in this country is this: The theory that British schools are better than American schools doesn't hold water as a general proposition. The brightest pupils go to schools that, on the whole, are appreciably better than most American schools. But the vast majority attend schools that are inferior to those in America. And, for most, schooldays end at a very early age, by U.S. standards."

Joseph I. Echikson, M.D., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of a number of bills pending before the Congress that seek to solve for the elderly the problems of costly and prolonged illness, I have asked consent to include in the Appendix the remarks made on February 9, 1960, by Dr. Royal A. Schaaf, President of the Medical-Surgical Plan of New Jersey, at a testimonial honoring Dr. Joseph I. Echikson at South Mountain Lodge, B'nai B'rith, South Orange, N.J. The viewpoint that he has expressed contains statements that are worthy of serious consideration by every Member of the House.

The talk by Dr. Schaaf follows:

REMARKS BY ROYAL A. SCHAAF, M.D., PRESIDENT, MEDICAL-SURGICAL PLAN OF NEW JERSEY, AT TESTIMONIAL HONORING JOSEPH I. ECHIKSON, M.D., SOUTH MOUNTAIN LODGE, B'NAI B'RITH, SOUTH ORANGE, N.J., FEBRUARY 9, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Dr. and Mrs. Echikson, distinguished guests, members of B'nai B'rith, and friends of Dr. Echikson, I deem it at once a pleasure and a privilege to have been invited to speak to you tonight as you pay tribute to my close friend and professional colleague, Dr. Joseph I. Echikson, on this auspicious occasion. It is most gratifying to have heard the words of praise and appreciation of Dr. Echikson's life and work and the recognition of his great service to his patients and to the people of our State. He well deserves all of the nice things that have been said about him and I concur fully in the thoughts that have been expressed. I have been happily associated with your distinguished guest for many years, in a variety of activities related to health care, especially in the field of cancer control to which Dr. Echikson has contributed so much.

There is much that I could say in praise of Dr. Echikson but to spare him embarrass-

ment and to avoid "gilding the lily" I shall only quote the phrases that are engraved on the Edward J. Ill Medal awarded to him by the Academy of Medicine of New Jersey last May: "Unselfish physician. Devoted teacher. Generous public benefactor." These seven words epitomize the sentiments of his professional colleagues in regard to their beloved friend Joe.

THE ECONOMICS OF HEALTH CARE

I have chosen for my title "The Economics of Health Care," a subject among those currently uppermost in the minds of our people, because of its personal, economic, social, and political aspects. By most of us, good health is thought to be an inalienable right of man, along with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. By many of us, also, ill health is thought to be—as indeed it is—a personal misfortune to the sufferer and his family, one for which he, himself, is in no way responsible, and hence, that he, individually, should not be required to bear the cost of his treatment. All too many of us, our number increasing rapidly, are prone to shirk our duty to our parents, and, too often, to our defective children—prone to send an aged parent, a little forgetful, a little childish, in need of tender, loving care, to a public mental hospital; an afflicted child, to a haven at Vine-land. This tendency, although quite understandable in the light of present day hectic living conditions, is most regrettable.

Health is defined as a state of complete physical, mental and emotional well-being. By this criterion, it may be said that few of us enjoy perfect health, even though we are able to live a full and active life. A great many of us can be truly said to be healthy in one of these areas, a lesser number, in two, but rare is the individual who may be said to be healthy in all three—a man such as Winston Churchill at the time he assumed the reins of the British Government following Dunkirk. Think of his physical vigor, his keen intellect, his imperturbability in the face of frightful danger.

A complete program of health care requires much more than the services of physicians and hospitals. Many other professional people, organizations and agencies must contribute their talents and resources to the total effort. Among these are dentists, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, research workers, drug and instrument manufacturers, public health officials, sanitary engineers, the voluntary private nonprofit health agencies, such as the American Cancer Society, in which Dr. Echikson has been so active, the Antituberculosis League, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and others. The aggregate cost of all of these services is of course, very great—staggering in fact—yet it is less by a large margin than the combined amounts spent in the United States each year for liquor, tobacco, cosmetics, and beauticians not to mention amusements alone. There is no doubt about the ability of our people to pay for a complete health care program, the best in the world, under a voluntary, free enterprise system of payment if they have the will and choose to do so. Certainly there will always be many unfortunate people who are unable to pay for their health care, just as there are many who cannot defray the cost of food, clothing and shelter. There are presently available, throughout New Jersey, ways and means for providing health care for all needy persons and there is no good reason why they should not obtain it if a reasonably intelligent effort is made by them or in their behalf.

The present day standard of health care in the United States is simply astounding as demonstrated not only by the lower morbidity and mortality rates but also by the average life span of our people, increased by more than 20 years since 1900. More progress has been made in the field of health care in the past 50 years than in the 50 centuries that

preceded them. The late 18th century developed vaccination against smallpox whose ravages had kept world population at a stable level for at least a thousand years. The 19th century introduced general anesthesia, by chloroform and ether. Pasteur's work in the field of bacteriology, with his demonstration of micro organisms as the cause of disease in man and animals; the application of Pasteur's principles to the development of antiseptic and, later, aseptic surgery by Lister, the identification of the malarial parasite and its transmission by the mosquito, and the isolation of bacteria as the cause of several diseases, notably the tubercle and the typhoid bacilli. It was in the 20th century, however, that the application of this basic knowledge bore fruit. Since 1900 we have effected the control of most of the diseases caused by bacteria, protozoa and parasites.

We have learned about allergy and the use of vitamins in nutrition, how to save and prolong the lives of sufferers from diabetes and pernicious anemia; how safely to transfuse blood; how to administer anesthetics; how to use the sulfonamides and the numerous antibiotics, so valuable in the treatment of infectious diseases, especially pneumonia, syphilis and many of the diseases caused by viruses.

Great as these advances in health care have been, our health picture is much less rosy than we should wish to have it. Although many of our dangerous health problems have been solved, as a result of our increased life span, they have been replaced by several others in the field of degenerative diseases incident to older people; notably cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and cancer. In addition, our complex, rapidly moving machine age life has brought about a notable increase in our mental stress and emotional tension with the resulting marked increase in the number of cases of mental and emotional disorders.

For the most part these newer and more pressing health problems are included in the category of long-term illnesses—those requiring extended and expensive medical and hospital care, with their consequent drain on the financial resources of the patient and his family. How tragic is the plight of the family whose breadwinner lies for months dying of cancer, at the end leaving his family bankrupt, not only in money but also in hope.

A health care problem of increasing importance is that related to the medical and hospital care of our senior citizens—those of us, like myself, who, in the minds of some, having attained the arbitrarily selected age of 65, instantly become indigent and in poor health—or do we? From my own long observation I know that a great many of us, after the age of 65, enjoy excellent health, remain vigorous, and are capable of much productive and valuable work. It is wasteful of manpower and money to force the retirement of able-bodied and competent workers so arbitrarily, and the prevalent practice has created economic problems and hardship for many persons and families who are thus forced to subsist on the meager benefits of the social security system. Certainly, under the present conditions of full employment and the demand for additional workers, the age limit for compulsory retirement for all able-bodied workers in industry must be increased at least to age 70. This practice alone will change radically the problem of health care for our senior citizens, many of whom are and wish to remain independent and self-reliant.

My purpose in speaking to you this evening is to outline for you, in general terms, a practical method of defraying the cost of health care in a voluntary free enterprise manner, a method advocated and wholeheartedly sponsored by organized medicine, which includes the American Medical Association, the Medical Society of New Jersey

and the Essex County Medical Society. We should bear in mind that much of the expense of our present health care program is borne by government at different levels, Federal, State, county, and/or municipal, out of general tax revenues, including the cost of food, milk and water protection, sewage and refuse disposal, correction of air pollution, public health services and other agencies, not forgetting the voluntary nonprofit health organizations such as American Cancer Society and numerous others. Moreover, the cost of medical and hospital care for mental, tuberculous, and contagious patients is largely met by special publicly supported State and county hospitals for such patients. Therefore, our problem is related to the payment for medical and hospital care rendered to sick individuals.

For purposes of discussion we may divide the population into four groups from the economic standpoint. These are:

1. The wealthy who can easily pay for as much and as elaborate health care as they need or want.

2. The great middle class of gainfully employed people who may quite readily bear the expense of adequate medical and hospital care by purchasing prepaid sickness insurance, either in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, or in one of the strong commercial insurance companies such as the Prudential, the Metropolitan, the Travelers, the John Hancock, the Equitable, and others.

3. The medically indigent, by which we mean those persons who are able to pay for their food, clothing, and shelter, but who cannot meet the expense of personal or family illness.

4. The indigent, by which we mean those persons on the relief rolls of our municipalities, who are wholly dependent upon public or private charity for the provision of the four essentials of life—food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.

The voluntary prepaid sickness insurance movement has been the most spectacularly successful insurance venture in the entire history of that industry in its many ramifications. For example in New Jersey, about 80 percent of the population have some hospital and medical insurance in one form or another. Although sickness insurance covers a large part of the cost of medical and hospital care, there are a number of areas in which it is inapplicable or unavailable.

Except to a limited extent, it can be obtained by the elderly only at prohibitive premium rates, because of the greatly increased incidence of illness requiring medical and hospital care among such people. It is unavailable to the indigent and the unemployed, partly because of the high incidence of illness among such people, but also because they lack the money with which to pay premiums. Neither is it available to persons who are suffering from chronic or long-term illnesses. One cannot insure against a catastrophe that has already happened any more than one can insure a house against fire, when a conflagration has already started. Nor should we attempt to insure the cost of ordinary house and office calls. To do so inevitably leads to a multiplicity of small claims, the adjudication of which costs just as much as large ones and, in addition, the premium rate becomes excessive.

There is, however, an increasing demand on the part of labor, in labor-management negotiations, for management to assume the cost of house and office calls as well as that of hospital and medical insurance for employees, because the payment of the premiums for such insurance does not represent taxable income on the part of the employee, and it is deductible as a business expense on the part of the employer. Of course, the people eventually pay for this coverage by the increased cost of the products they buy. "Vincere non notest" is a Latin phrase which

roughly translated, means "you can't win." We, the people, always pay and pay and pay.

At this point you well may ask "If the elderly, the indigent, the unemployed, the chronically ill may not be insured against the cost of medical and hospital service, how, then, may they be provided with the needed medical and hospital care?" In reply, I would say that every man, woman, and child in the State of New Jersey is entitled to adequate medical and hospital care. If they, themselves, are unable to pay for these services, they must be paid for out of general tax funds, State, county, and/or municipal, the administration to be at the local level, where the need for the aid and the amount thereof may be accurately determined.

Next, you may ask "How may the required money be obtained?" To which I would reply "Let the Federal Government relinquish to the States the field of the amusement tax. Adequate amounts of money could be raised almost painlessly from this source. If people objected to paying an amusement tax, they could avoid doing so by seeking entertainment at home via television and radio. There would be no hardship entailed to anyone. Certainly the Federal Government should not be involved in this kind of relief. It could be provided much less expensively were the taxes to be levied by the States and expended by the State and county governments. Of every \$3 sent to Washington only \$2, at most, are returned to the States. Besides, a needy person in Newark would be only a piece of paper in Washington. Charity is a personal thing—the gift, without the giver is bare.

We, as citizens, should be willing to have our municipal, county, and State governments pay to the hospitals the proper per diem cost for the care of indigent patients. Were this done, much of the financial difficulty of our hospitals would be averted. I know of one important hospital in which the per diem cost is \$31, but where the county government pays only \$9 a day for the care of indigent patients leaving the balance to be added to the bills of self-paying patients. Such a situation is unjust and intolerable.

We hear much these days about the exorbitant premium rates for Blue Cross coverage, not only in New Jersey but throughout the entire United States. There are three principal reasons for this state of affairs:

1. The 8-hour day, the 40-hour week, the month's vacation, and the 2 weeks of sick leave with pay each year for most hospital employees, not to mention the minimum hourly wage of \$1 for all. Even thus, the hospital worker is receiving only his or her fair compensation, long overdue.

2. The greater demands for additional coverage of hospital benefits—X-ray, oxygen, drugs, and expensive special services of all kinds.

3. The growing inflation in our country which adds to the cost of all goods and services.

Still, prepaid sickness insurance is the greatest bargain available to the American people, but we should not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs by excessive demands for medical and hospital service under our sickness insurance contracts.

You have heard much recently about the widely debated and controversial Forand bill, which proposes to pay the hospital and medical bills of all persons over 65 covered by the Social Security System. This would be unnecessary, frightfully expensive, and unjust to the younger people whose social security taxes would be considerably increased in order to raise the needed money. Moreover, if adopted, the Forand proposal would be a Trojan horse approach to the establishment of a system of socialized medicine in

the United States. All Congress would need to do would be to lower the age limit for eligibility by 5 years each year, and in 10 years we would have completely socialized health care.

At this point I might say parenthetically that organized medicine is unalterably opposed to socialized medicine, not for economic reasons, but because it would lead inevitably to deterioration in the standards of medical and hospital care now prevailing in the United States.

In conclusion may I say that we, the people, must have a complete health care program of excellent quality; that such a program will be costly; that we can pay for it under a voluntary, free enterprise system; if we have the will to do so, and whatever the cost may be, its attainment will be well worth the expense and effort required. We are living in a marvelous age, and we can confidently look forward to national good health and happiness, if only the leaders behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains can restrain themselves from unleashing nuclear warfare.

U.S. Hospital in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Thursday, March 10, 1960:

U.S. HOSPITAL IN POLAND

With Joseph Lester of Kingston general chairman, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD toastmaster and a large delegation of local residents due to attend, the dinner the Pulaski Foundation is sponsoring in Washington on March 28 in honor of Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI of Milwaukee and W. O. Biernacki-Poray of Montclair, N.J., for promoting better understanding between the peoples of the United States and Poland will have special interest to this community. The guests of honor have been designated as Polonia's "Men-of-the-Year" for their roles in the erection of a children's hospital and pediatric center at Krakow in tribute to the memory of General Casimir Pulaski, Polish hero, who gave his life for American independence in the Revolution.

Presence of 100 Members of Congress and a descendant of General Pulaski, who is coming to America from Poland especially for this occasion, will make the gathering a memorable one. Mr. Poray was the architect who prepared the plans for the project and Representative ZABLOCKI made it possible to realize this dream through legislation, releasing U.S. funds to Poland to finance the work, with special contributions from private citizens and groups.

The timing of the project is excellent as Poland observes the 1,000th anniversary of the launching of the nation and also prepares for the 600th anniversary of the famed Jagiellonian University of Krakow in 1964. In this undertaking, the close ties existing between the people of the United States and of Poland, will be demonstrated in no uncertain terms.

The idea of the hospital originated with Mr. Poray who was born in Poland and came to the United States with his parents in 1917. A highly successful designer, it was natural for Mr. Poray to conceive a

memorial that would be both lasting and useful. He made a special trip to Poland to survey the possibilities of such a project. The need for a hospital for children was so apparent no selling was required.

Back in America, he enlisted the cooperation of a number of friends of Poland and admirers of General Pulaski. The administration in Washington gave the project the green light and the next step was to release a portion of the \$200 million credit the United States has in Poland through the sale of goods. It was here that Representative ZABLOCKI fitted into the picture because action by Congress was necessary to change the law, prohibiting aid to countries, dominated by the Communists. An exception was made because of General Pulaski and the nature of the project, intended to benefit the Polish people directly, not the regime in power.

The United States has spent billions around the globe to promote good will for our country and to advance the cause of freedom. The relatively modest investment in this project should yield eminently satisfactory dividends, for it will be a daily reminder not only of the Pulaski links that bind the two peoples, but of other things they have in common—love of God, respect for humanity and dedication to justice as well as liberty.

Your Education for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the distinguished Chief of Staff of the Army to the members of the cadet corps at one of the most outstanding military colleges, the Citadel, on the occasion of Corps Day, marking the 117th anniversary of that historic institution.

General Lemnitzer, a friend of Gen. Mark Clark, the president of the Citadel, is a former comrade in arms of General Clark. General Lemnitzer, the soldier's soldier, gave words of wisdom and advice to future officers of the military. No one is better qualified to give advice. No institution has made a greater contribution to our military—in every war since its founding in which this Nation has become involved.

The address follows:

YOUR EDUCATION FOR LEADERSHIP

(Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at Corps Day, The Citadel, Charleston, S.C., March 19, 1960)

The opportunity to be present at the Citadel's Corps Day gives me a great deal of pleasure. In the first place, I have a number of close associations with the Citadel and with Charleston. These I value very highly. In the second place, I welcome the chance to speak to this particular group of young men. This is so because you and your contemporaries represent a potential of tremendous value to this country's future.

Throughout the years, I have had the opportunity to observe many of the graduates of this great school. In World War II, during the North African campaign and the Sicilian landings, I commanded the 34th

Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade. Practically my whole staff in that organization was made up of Citadel men. Consequently, I have first-hand knowledge of the splendid qualities the Citadel instills. Indeed, the outstanding work of Citadel graduates has come to my attention in peace as well as war; and not only in North Africa, but also in Europe, Korea, Japan, and the United States.

These achievements are a tribute to the education which cadets receive here, and to the great traditions with which they are imbued. These achievements are a tribute, too, to the outstanding staff and faculty who direct this school. That great soldier, educator, and gentleman, Gen. Charles P. Sumner, made a tremendous imprint over many years. The men who direct the Citadel today have carried on his same high standards.

Among the officials of the Military College of South Carolina, it has been my great privilege to know several of them for a good many years.

In fact, your administrative dean—General Honnen—and I were classmates at West Point. I remember very clearly the days when he was captain and star shortstop of the Academy baseball team, on which I was the catcher.

My association with your president, General Clark, and my admiration for him are also of long standing. During the days when the United States was mobilizing its strength for World War II, General Clark was Chief of Staff at the Headquarters of the Army Ground Forces. At that same time, I served at that headquarters as Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans. Later, I had the chance to work closely with General Clark in England, during the preparations for the north African landings. He was General Eisenhower's Deputy for Operation Torch, as the invasion was known, and I was the Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations. I was with him as his deputy on the submarine mission, in advance of the landings, when secret meetings were held with French representatives. I can assure you, from personal knowledge, that General Clark's persuasiveness and skill as a negotiator made a tremendous contribution to the success of the invasion when it took place shortly afterward.

It was also my privilege to serve with General Clark, as his Deputy Chief of Staff, while the 5th Army was being formed, prior to the invasion of Sicily. Throughout the long, bitter fighting in Italy, I gained still further reason to admire his skill and leadership. I was Deputy Chief of Staff to Field Marshal Lord Alexander, who was the Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean. In that capacity, I was in an especially good position to observe General Clark's outstanding achievements in the face of innumerable obstacles and difficulties, and his great contribution to Allied victory.

In addition to my associations with the graduates and officials of the Citadel, I have a special feeling for this beautiful old city of Charleston. Nearly 20 years ago, I was stationed for a time at Fort Moultrie. Then, 2 years ago—on Armed Forces Day of 1958—I had the opportunity to visit here again, and to renew my acquaintance with Charleston and its citizens.

For all these reasons, therefore, coming to the Citadel today gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.

However, while it is pleasant to look back, it is more important to look ahead. For you young men, it is especially important to do so. It is because I want to speak in terms of your opportunities and responsibilities in the future that I have entitled my remarks "Your Education for Leadership."

We are living in an age of extremely rapid change. Indeed, there has not been any time since the Renaissance when the

rate of progress has been so great. During a period of only a few years, advances in technology have brought fantastic developments in communications, in transportation, in the control of physical power, and in medicine—indeed, in virtually every phase of man's material endeavors. These, in turn, have made it possible to achieve great improvements in the daily living conditions of large segments of the world's population. The pace at which our knowledge is growing holds out the clear promise that the progress which has been achieved in these fields is only the beginning of what we can anticipate.

With all this, it is ironic indeed that we are also faced with dangers which far exceed anything that the world has ever known. President Eisenhower summed this up very clearly in his state of the union message. He said:

"With both sections of this divided world in possession of unbelievably destructive weapons, mankind approaches a state where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. No other fact of today's world equals this in importance—it colors everything we say, everything we plan and everything we do."

To meet these dangers, we must of course maintain the strength to counter the threat which menaces us and other free nations. Such strength depends in part on military capabilities. In addition, it also depends on economic factors, and on the psychological and moral factors which can be summed up in such terms as determination or strength of will.

Our efforts to maintain our strength in all these forms are essential. However, there is also another line of effort which, to my mind, is also essential. What I am referring to is the achievement of progress in the fields of understanding and human relations which will match our progress in technology.

Technology is based on natural or scientific laws. These are statements or formulas of the nature, order or sequence of given phenomena. As far as existing human knowledge goes, these characteristics will always be the same under the same conditions.

In contrast, the type of progress which I have in mind is, in many respects, far more difficult to attain. For one thing, it depends on a large number of interrelated variables. It concerns the human mind and emotions. It involves individual and social forces. These, clearly, are matters which we cannot treat with the certainty, exactitude, and precision which are possible in technology. Hence, the progress of which I speak not only requires knowledge, but it also requires keen judgment and penetrating insight.

In sum, this is a very complex task. People who have tried to visualize the future, from Jules Verne to the authors of science fiction today, have had no serious problem when it came to conceiving fantastic technical devices. Buck Rogers and his counterparts live in a world of scientific marvels. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that the problems involving human relationships with which they cope are no different from those which have troubled mankind for centuries.

Many people perhaps assume that human attitudes are unchanging. I cannot agree. If this were true, man would still be a savage in a jungle. Only a hundred years ago—at the very time when the Citadel was being established—there were many places in the world where a foreigner, simply because he was a foreigner, was greeted by automatic suspicion and distrust. The presumption was that he had arrived to gain something at the expense of the local population. Why else would he be making his visit?

Improved travel and communications, with increasingly close ties between peoples, have changed this situation considerably. There is a tremendously greater opportunity for people of different nations to meet and un-

derstand each other. Look at the opportunity which military service affords. Time was when a soldier could expect to spend only a relatively small part of his service overseas. But today, members of our Armed Forces are serving around the globe, alongside our free world allies.

Such service affords marked opportunity to the individual to improve his personal understanding of other peoples. The accumulation of such understanding by individuals increases the body of understanding within the Nation as a whole.

In this connection, I want to stress particularly the importance of communication between people of different languages and cultures. The potential consequences of misunderstanding today are much too great to be risked. Consequently, foreign languages have become an increasingly vital field of study. Not only does knowledge of the language of a nation permit much more effective communication, but it provides an insight into the character and culture of that nation, which can be obtained in no other way. In addition, again for the purpose of crystal-clear communication, it is important for Americans to master our own language, in both written and oral expression.

Certainly, too, a great deal of effort in the areas covered by the social sciences in general is clearly called for. Knowledge and understanding in these fields are as vital to success in meeting the problems and dangers facing us as are knowledge and understanding in the technical sciences. Obviously, a starting point for any such effort is in education—not merely in subject matter, but in the basic approach to the educational process.

Education, in my opinion, has three essential elements.

One of these—but only one—is, of course, the development of knowledge. Education instills knowledge of facts, of techniques and skills, and of the principles underlying those techniques and skills. Such knowledge, however, is in the nature of a tool. It is essential, but it is a means rather than an end.

The second element of education is development of judgment. To be sound, judgment must be rooted in thorough factual knowledge, but it transcends knowledge alone. In this regard, I want to quote from William Johnson Cory, the 19th-century English poet and educator. He wrote that:

"You go to a great school not so much for knowledge as for, arts and habits; for the habit of attention, for the art of expression, for the art of assuming at a moment's notice a new intellectual position, for the art of entering quickly into another person's thoughts, for the habit of submitting to censure and refutation, for the art of indicating assent or dissent in graduated terms, for the habit of regarding minute points of accuracy, for the art of working out what is possible in a given time, for taste, for discrimination, for mental courage and mental soberness."

The two elements I have listed—knowledge and judgment—pertain primarily to the intellect. To them I want to add a third. That element which has fundamental influence on the effectiveness with which knowledge and judgment are used, is the development of character. This Nation looks to its college graduates—as men who have completed the process of formal education—for the leaders to guide the way through the dangers and difficulties ahead. For that reason, I consider character development one of the most overriding requirements of education. That is because character is absolutely essential to wise and effective leadership.

This fundamental principle was the basis of the brilliant work of Col. Sylvanus Thayer,

who was the superintendent of West Point from 1817 to 1833. It is fitting that he is known as "the father of the Military Academy." More than that, however, he ranks among the most influential figures in the evolution of American education. His process of developing educated leaders can be described as a triangle: a solid base of personal integrity, with thorough academic instruction and sound discipline—which must begin with self-discipline—providing the other two sides. No one has yet been able to improve upon this design.

Because they operate within the pattern established by Sylvanus Thayer, combining so effectively all three of the elements of education which I listed, schools such as the Citadel are making a vital contribution. It is a contribution which benefits the young men who have the privilege of receiving this education. Through them and their future influence, moreover, it benefits the Nation as a whole.

I am greatly impressed with the developments here at the Citadel under the leadership of General Clark. The high academic standards which are maintained here foster the intellectual qualities which I mentioned. Beyond that, however, the Citadel offers something more. This is the development of qualities of responsible leadership. The development of the leadership ability of you young men, based firmly upon the Citadel's Honor Code, is invaluable from the viewpoint of the military services. However, it is also invaluable from the viewpoint of this country's future.

First, there is the military advantage of your education. To a very large extent, after your graduation you will begin a period of active duty with the Armed Forces. Some of you will become career officers. Those who do not will enter one of the Reserve components, which constitute a major element of our military strength in today's threatened world. In any of these cases, your education enables you to make an important contribution to our military effectiveness.

This is so for a number of reasons. Because the Citadel is a military school, you have been taught about discipline, but you have learned that effective discipline is intelligent and understanding, not blind and slavish. You have been taught to be confident and self-reliant, because an effective military man must be able to plan and think for himself. You have been encouraged to be forceful and energetic, because an effective military man must be able to put his plans into prompt and vigorous execution. You have learned the importance of forethought and attention to detail, because an effective military man must be able to carry out complex operation, often in short periods of time, without the opportunity to correct earlier mistakes. You have been taught to be flexible, because an effective military man must be able to meet and overcome the unexpected. Finally, you have learned the importance of understanding people and of getting along with them. This is of overriding importance, because an effective military man—especially an effective military leader—is concerned with activities whose success depends upon the combined efforts of many people working together toward a common objective.

These characteristics are of obvious value in the military field. However, they are equally of value in any field of endeavor. They are qualities which are vital in order to continue the progress which has already brought us so far. They are vital, also, in order to work out solutions to the problems and to overcome the dangers which lie ahead.

Although you are receiving a splendid education, you must not allow your process of learning and growth to stop when you get your diploma. Robert M. Hutchins, the former chancellor of the University of Chicago, once stated that "The college graduate is presented with a sheepskin to cover his intellectual nakedness." I would not go so far as that. However, I do want to point out that although some of you will be seniors at graduation time in June, in whatever field of activity you enter you will be freshmen again the following September. This by no means discounts what you have already accomplished. It merely emphasizes the truth that the only basis for continued accomplishment is continuing effort.

In my remarks to you, I have stated that the future holds great opportunities, and that it is threatened by great dangers. I have said that because of your special advantages of education, a great share of the responsibility for exploiting these opportunities and eliminating or surmounting these dangers will shortly rest upon you. I am well aware that you have heard much the same statement before, and I am sure that you will hear it again. Even so, this point is worth emphasizing because it is a fundamental truth that should guide your thoughts, efforts, and decisions.

To meet your great responsibilities, the Citadel has given you tremendous assets. It has given you knowledge; it has provided you with outstanding models of achievement; it has imbued you with a great tradition. Most important of all, it has fostered in you the qualities of character which are the indispensable foundation of all lasting accomplishment. You could not be better armed for the tasks that lie ahead. I am sure that in carrying them out, your actions will add still greater luster to this great school's splendid reputation, and contribute positively and substantially to the Nation's benefit.

The Chinese Outlaws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Mirror of March 16, 1960:

THE CHINESE OUTLAWS

James A. Farley, eminent American and one of the greatest leaders in Democratic Party history, has returned from a 6-week business trip (he's board chairman of Coca-Cola Export) in the Far East and South Pacific.

His sound advice, based on talks with leaders throughout free Asia, is that it would be a colossal mistake to give any kind of recognition, United States or United Nations, to Red China.

The bloody crimes against Tibet, the invasion of Indian territory, harassment by China of other neighbors, Peiping's refusal to renounce the use of force—these have all caused a sense of revulsion in Asia. Any weakening toward the Communist butchers would be disastrous.

A Tribute to Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD a letter that I received today from a citizen of Wisconsin. The writer is one Robert Moses and his purpose in writing was to apprise me of a resolution adopted by the State administrative committee of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin. The resolution expresses in glowing terms the high respect and admiration for Gov. G. Mennen Williams of my own State of Michigan that is felt by these Wisconsin Democrats. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Governor Williams is one of my constituents. Speaking as his representative here in the Congress I feel that this letter bears out very well something I have felt and known for a long time; namely, that the splendid efforts that Governor Williams has put forth on behalf of our own fair State of Michigan have endeared him to people in many other parts of the Nation. I am pleased to introduce this letter as concrete evidence of that fact:

MARCH 18, 1960.

Representative LOUIS RABAUT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: As the Congressman of Governor Williams' home district, you may be interested in the following resolution which I presented for unanimous adoption at the March 5 meeting of the State administrative committee of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, held in Milwaukee:

"Whereas, Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan announced this week that he would not seek reelection to an office which has brought great distinction to himself, his State, his country, and his party;

"Whereas Governor Williams, a warm humanitarian and dedicated champion of a better world, has decided 'as a private citizen or as a public official to advance the cause of peace in the national field';

"Whereas Governor Williams, an outstanding liberal, has built a 12-year record of unmatched accomplishment of Michigan history—a record which has earned for him the kind of admiration and respect that make many people feel he deserves an even higher executive office;

"Whereas Governor Williams, a giant among national Democrats in the pattern of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has provided brilliant political leadership to a rejuvenated Democratic Party—the type of political leadership that not only has helped to mold Michigan into a Democratic stronghold but also has had remarkable influence on the resurgence of Democratic Party strength in Wisconsin and other Midwest States: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the State administrative committee of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin, meeting in Milwaukee, March 5, express deep regret that Governor Williams has decided to step out of public office in Michigan; be it further

"Resolved, That the State administrative committee commend the fine achievements

of Governor Williams during the past 12 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the State administrative committee extend to Governor Williams the best of luck in his future undertakings; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Governor Williams so that he may be reminded that Wisconsin Democrats have a soft spot in their hearts for him and that they hope he comes back to Wisconsin again and again in the years ahead."

Yours sincerely,

BOB MOSES.

A Farmer Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I was impressed by a discussion of farm problems with my friend D. J. Wedding, of Cairo, Mo. He is a 100 percent farmer and it is his contention that one of the major farm problems is "agribusiness." Upon my return to Washington I received a letter from Mr. Wedding wherein he clearly presents his reasons for the farm problems as follows:

According to one report 90 percent of all food products goes through a food chain at one time before reaching the consumer. The food chains are now buying farms, raising crops, and feeding these crops to their own livestock which were raised on their farms. All this is in direct competition with the individual farmer. We think this is fast leading to a monopoly. We just cannot compete without Government help.

The domestic parity plan, developed by the Grange, will solve most of our problems with cereal grains. First let's not let our surplus holding scare us into senseless programs. In designing our agricultural programs we must remember two facts: We must continue a program of abundance; all control measures should be to see that this oversupply moves along a narrow line. Another fact is we cannot allow one commodity to decrease the price of another. A good example of this is feed wheat. If wheat prices are allowed to drop to the feed price level, then wheat will replace corn in many feeds, thus increasing the carryover of that crop. For these cereal grains then I believe we must take the domestic parity approach with the addition of many more acres in the conservation reserve.

Now turning to feed grains, no one likes production controls but everyone I talk to thinks this is the fastest and best way out of our oversupply. Most are willing to leave 10 to 15 percent of cropland idle, without compensation, if the Government will guarantee a fair and livable price for the rest of the crop. This price to be 100 percent of a new fair-price formula based on cost of production, labor management, and risk. Until this new formula is reached, 90 percent of present parity may be used.

For a short-term program the Missouri Grange recommends that allotments of bushels or hundredweights be established for feed grains, corn, and grain sorghum, with all farmers complying. These allotments to contain the estimated amount of each commodity that will be used in this country for the year of allotment. This will stabilize

consumption with production. The surplus can be handled by setting aside a security reserve. We suggest a 3-month supply. The remainder to be used in foreign aid, Public Law 480, and expanded school-lunch and institutional programs.

These plans will take the Government out of the storage business which is very costly and doesn't help the farmer. I believe that overproduction and low prices can be handled simply and much less costly to the Government if we face the facts and not listen to economist and city publications that do not realize we must have a net farm income that is livable in this country.

Prairie Creek, Ind., Flood Project Nears Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, having had a continuing concern for flood control and water and natural resources development, it is with great interest and pride that I note the commendable progress being made toward the establishment of the Prairie Creek, Vigo County, Ind., watershed program.

Recently, the Prairie Creek Watershed Association and supervisors of the Vigo County Soil Conservation District signed the official application for Federal authorization to establish flood-control measures in the area.

As reported, under the program the area can receive Federal funds for the construction of flood-retention walls, dredging of the creek beds, grabbing and widening of the creek bank, and the creation of numerous small water basins.

The following article, appearing in the Terre Haute, Ind., Tribune, March 17, 1960, further explains this laudable project which will benefit so many in the Prairie Creek area:

To qualify, a large majority of landowners in the area were required to pledge themselves to conservancy measures on their farms in order to discourage later erosion and watershed faults that might recreate the land inundation problems.

WILL SEEK APPROVAL

The signed application now goes to the State office of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for designation to the Water Shed Planning Party Headquarters after it has first received the approval of the Indiana State Flood Control and Water Resources Commission. The WSPPH at Paoli is in charge of planning flood prevention and soil conservancy projects with persons in the various conservancy areas.

The Prairie Creek effort is the first such movement in Vigo County to progress to this degree, although, others are currently underway, officials pointed out.

Some 9,000 acres in southeastern Vigo County are involved in the Sullivan County watershed area now established under the name "Busseron Watershed Conservancy District." It has progressed through legal authorization by court order.

As in the Sullivan County project, the Prairie Creek watershed area of 30,000 acres

extends over into Sullivan County, including some 2,000 acres.

Work on the Prairie Creek project has been aided through the cooperation of the Agricultural Stabilization Administration and the office of the Vigo County Extension Service, according to Lawrence Wilson, soil conservationist.

Officers of the Prairie Creek Watershed Association are: Lloyd Deutsch, chairman; Forrest Johnson, vice chairman; Burch Harlan, secretary-treasurer; Dale Hayhurst, and Edgar Boyll, directors from Vigo County, and Gene Hunt, Sullivan County director.

Supervisors of the Vigo County Soil Conservation District working on the project: Pete Farmer, chairman; Lyman Pendergast, vice chairman; Dale Hayhurst, secretary-treasurer; Alen Haymaker, and Floyd Lenderman.

A New Chapter for the Norwich Diocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, St. Patrick's Day, the Most Reverend Vincent Joseph Hines, D.D., J.C.D., was consecrated and enthroned as the second Roman Catholic bishop of the young diocese of Norwich, Conn., at St. Patrick's Cathedral in that city.

A native of New Haven, Conn., Bishop Hines brings to his new post a wealth of experience, a rich academic background, and the humility of a true man of God.

Last Thursday the citizens of eastern Connecticut of all faiths joined in extending their sincere congratulations and best wishes to this eminent churchman as he began his stewardship as spiritual leader of eastern Connecticut's 155,000 Roman Catholics.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the Hartford, Conn., Catholic Transcript of March 17, 1960, on the subject of Bishop Hines' consecration. The editorial, entitled "A New Chapter for the Norwich Diocese," follows:

A NEW CHAPTER FOR THE NORWICH DIOCESE

Today a new chapter in the as yet brief annals of the diocese of Norwich opens. The second bishop of the see is consecrated and enthroned. The latter ceremony has local precedent, in the enthronement of Bishop Flanagan 6 years ago. But Bishop Hines is the first to receive the fullness of the priesthood in the Norwich cathedral. Eastern Connecticut, of course, did not have to wait until the fifties and sixties of the present century to make the acquaintance of bishops for the first time. From 1843 to 1953 it was within the jurisdiction of the bishops of Hartford and saw nine of these travel its broad expanse furthering the work of the Lord.

Indeed, from 1843 to 1872 what is now the diocese of Norwich was closer to the bishop of Hartford, at least geographically, than Hartford itself, for in that period the bishop, though styled "of Hartford," resided in Providence and could readily glance over the border at the section of Connecticut which first catches the light of day, while Hartford is still in shadow. Moreover, previous to 1843 some bishops of enduring fame vis-

ited the land of the Thames: John Carroll, the first of the American hierarchy, when all American Catholics looked to Baltimore for fathering; and Jean de Cheverus, later a cardinal, when the hub of New England Catholicism, if not of the universe, was Boston.

Eastern Connecticut, to repeat, has not waited until now to learn about bishops. And as the first bishop of its very own, it had a churchman of unusual competence and cordiality, a man and priest who commanded reverence and love. Bishop Flanagan pioneered wisely. He organized carefully, put many good works in operation, and set down foundations on which his successors could build for many a lifetime.

The first bishop now has his first successor, and again Norwich can count itself blessed. Bishop Hines brings to his new office a wealth of talent, breadth and depth of experience, the respect and confidence of all who have observed him in the busy years he has spent in various capacities in the diocese and archdiocese of Hartford. He has been assistant in a parish, principal of a school, Army chaplain, chancery official, and a most trusted and prized adviser to his former ordinary. His academic background is rich; studies, pursued with distinction and crowned with honors, in this country, Paris, Rome. He has dealt with every sort of business that confronts the ruler of a diocese, and has always handled it sagaciously, efficiently, and constructively. He has all the initiative and the prudence, nicely balanced, required of one in the position to which the Holy Father has called him.

But he is only human. He needs the best that the priests, religious, and laity of Norwich can give him if his purposes are to be realized and his program successfully carried through. He needs the prayers of every one of us, in or out of his diocese, who wish him well and look for great things from his administration.

More Hawaii Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to call to your attention and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues a timely editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner of March 12, 1960, concerning "More Hawaii Flights":

MORE HAWAII FLIGHTS

Growth of Los Angeles as an air traffic center stands as one good argument in support of the application of Western Air Lines to provide jet service to Hawaii, now under study by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

With travel to and from the islands rapidly increasing, commonsense also would seem to be a factor. Existing transpacific air service, excellent as it is, frequently finds schedules sold out and travelers, not only vacationers but those on urgent business, forced to wait.

Entrance of Western Air Lines into the Pacific coast-Hawaii picture would mean more adequate provision for a travel demand that gives every promise of even greater increase in the future.

Furthermore, Western's plan for direct San Diego-Hawaii service and linkage with other

western cities served by the line recognizes the practical value of fast, convenient travel.

For Los Angeles itself, every new airline coming in, every addition of service means better airport facilities, better passenger convenience and many other advantages. Western Airlines' proposed service would be a step forward in our own progress.

Autumn Island and Other Poems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, previously I have called to the attention of the Congress some of the very fine poems of Mrs. Mattie M. Kelly, of Destin, where the waters of the Gulf of Mexico meet those of Choctawhatchee Bay in Florida. I received many commendations about the caliber of Mrs. Kelly's work and I have the privilege of again submitting a number of her poetic creations:

AUTUMN ISLAND

This time of year the island
Is the pawn of summer's firebrand dawn.

Autumn gold anoints the heads
Of branch and brush,
And tufts of brown and tattered grass
Spur jewels in the burnished sun.

Against the moted, slanting rays,
Some stumbling crisscross in their ripened age,

Heavy-bellied sea oats,
Shaped with love and lust,
Nod wheatbrown heads to the wind's even-song,

Pregnant with fertile seeds of warmth and sky
And fecund earth sea-washed to snow-whiteness.

Frescoed against the island sky,
A match and mate of blue herons
Prance and coo, fly and prance,
To the stilling summer dance;
Behind them longing shadows fade into a yesterday.

Distance is wider in-between,
The silences and voice and echo—
Sounds of sea upon the ear are mellowed rapture
Of autumn-filled and autumn-gloried things.

SEA BIRDS' BIRTH

Let us hie to the sea again
While the water is pale blue silver,
The sun is up, and the clock has struck
The seven sabre.

Let us hie to where the birds build nests,
Where they nest, my darling, together,
Let us cradle alone on the white sea sand
That cradles the migrant strollers.

And watch the baby wings like angel wings
Flitting above the snow-downy bed,
White fledglings sprawled like new-flung shells

From some deep ocean floor.

Sunning, running—
White conchs washed in winter sun;
Learning, yearning
For the bright, far world beyond.

Soon some strong wave or sou'west wind
Will wash away the bar where you are,
And the transient sand will be a new-formed
nesting strand
For your love-things to come again.

LOVE

When God made love, He made the beautiful,
A tiny tendril for a finite hour,
When God made love, He made the miracle
That brightly twines the tapestry's full
flower.

Though some have scorned the fingers angels
kissed,
And boldly bent the blessed form of birth,
When God made love, He made the beautiful,
The joy, the wonder-power that fills the
earth.

High Costs, Low Prices Drive More Farm People to the City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that Members of Congress, as well as others, will be interested in an article that appeared in the March 20 issue of the New York Times entitled "High Costs, Low Prices Drive More Farm People to the City." This statement, by J. H. Carmical, analyzes the farm situation in a somewhat different light than others who discuss the agricultural situation. The article in particular gives facts and figures that are most interesting and I include it herewith:

HIGH COSTS, LOW PRICES DRIVE MORE FARM PEOPLE TO THE CITY

Despite the billions of dollars being poured into agriculture by the Federal Government, the economic situation of the Nation's farmers continues to worsen. With production costs rising and prices for farm products declining, the producers of the country's food and fiber are finding it increasingly difficult to operate profitably.

Some of the big and efficient farm producers still are able to make a fair profit and thus are sharing in the Nation's general prosperity. There are many not so favorably situated, who are less efficient and just able to squeak by. But there is a large group, mostly smaller farmers, who cannot mechanize advantageously, and they are being forced out of agriculture.

TREK OF LONG DURATION

The trek from the farm has been underway for years, reflecting largely the technological changes taking place in farming that have brought about a steady rise in production. The number of farms has dropped steadily and the farm population has fallen to about 20,000,000, from 30,000,000 20 years ago, despite the great gain in that period in the Nation's total population.

There is virtually no slackening in the decline in the number of farms. Only recently, the Department of Agriculture estimated that the number of the Nation's farms fell 2 percent last year. In addition, it noted that those persons who remained on the farm were obtaining a larger amount of nonfarm income.

Whether this movement away from the farm is good or bad for the Nation is a question only the future can answer. So far, industry has been able to absorb rather easily the millions who have quit the farms. Factors that have eased the movement have been the building of homes and other facil-

ities in cities for the newcomers and the billions of dollars being spent for mechanization and improvement of the farms by those who remained.

In the last 20 years, the shift in the Nation's population to urban areas from the farms has become such a part of the general economy that a slackening in the trend would tend to slow business activity.

The creation of bigger and bigger farms and the increase in production for each man-day have caused a serious surplus production problem. At the same time, these are factors tending to hold prices of food down and thus helping to stem the inflationary tide. With the number of farm units declining, there are fewer to share in the proceeds from the sale of farm products and thus the earnings of some farmers may have increased in times of falling prices.

The farm dollar, however, still must be shared by too many people to permit a reasonably high standard of living for most farmers. According to the Department of Agriculture, the income of the farm population from farming last year averaged \$643, or \$105 less than in 1958, when it was \$748. With the \$317 cleared from nonfarm sources, the per capita earnings of the farm population were raised to \$960 last year, in contrast to earnings of \$2,202 for the nonfarming population.

NET INCOME FALLS

The average realized net income for each farm unit last year is estimated by the Department of Agriculture at \$2,364, compared with \$2,767 in 1958. These figures cover the rental value of farm dwellings, the home consumption of farm products and Government payments to farms.

Because of increased expenses and lower prices for their products, farmers last year retained as net income only 29.6 percent of the gross realized farm income. This was the lowest figure in history.

The farmer last year received only 38 cents out of each dollar the consumer paid for food produced by the domestic grower. This also was the smallest amount on record and it compared with 49 cents in 1951 and 52 cents in 1946. The decline stemmed largely from increased transportation and processing costs that the farmer had to absorb.

FOOD BASKETS COMPARED

Further proof that the farmer is not sharing as he should in the present prosperity is offered by the trend in the retail cost of food and the value at the farm.

Last year, a typical urban wage earner's family paid for food originating on domestic farms a total of \$1,040, for which the farmer received \$399. In 1946, this same food basket would have cost only \$752 at retail and the farmer would have received \$392. In 1951, the food basket would have cost at retail \$1,024 and the farmer would have obtained \$497.

In 1959, the farmer was receiving only about 2 percent more for the food he grew than in 1946 while the consumer was paying almost 50 percent more at the retail level. As an indication of the stability of food prices at retail in the last 8 years, the food basket in that period has risen only \$16, or about 1½ percent, but the farm value has declined \$98, or about 20 percent.

Of course there were more food baskets sold in 1959 than in 1951, since a farm population of around 20 million persons was feeding upward of 160 million. In 1951, it took 24 million people on the farms to furnish the food baskets for about 133 million persons.

While the decrease in the farm population and the increase in the nonfarm population will aid agriculture by increasing the consumption of farm products, the adjustment has not yet been such as to absorb the falling price of farm products.

Despite the decrease in the number of farm units in recent times, the problem of the farmer still is that he can produce more than he can dispose of at a fair price. With the production curve pointing still upward as a result of research and technological improvements, the problem appears likely to become more acute.

At present, Washington is trying to find an answer, but it will be most difficult because of the complicated nature of the problem. Also, it is involved deeply in politics and the feeling is that a sound law would be difficult to draft in an election year with Congress and the administration so far apart on the question of what should be done to have a sound and prosperous agriculture.

Some Aspects of the Forand Bill: Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the more controversial pieces of legislation pending before this Congress is the health insurance bill, commonly referred to as the Forand bill, H.R. 4700. Throughout the various stages of its pre-vote consideration we have heard many claims made for it and many charges leveled against it. I am somewhat afraid, Mr. Speaker, that these many and varying claims and counterclaims may have had the effect of confusing the American people about this bill. I submit that such confusion, if indeed it does exist, is contrary to the nature and ends of the democratic process. In our democracy the public—from whom all power comes—should be clear and well-informed on the important issues of the day. Only in this way can we here in Congress hope to devise and elicit legislation that truly reflects the will of the people. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to include in the RECORD an article from the March 19 issue of the AFL-CIO News concerning the Forand bill. I make this inclusion in the earnest hope that the information imparted in the article may serve to clear the air and eliminate the confusion that I fear now exists about the Forand bill and what it proposes to do.

The article is as follows:

AFL-CIO CALLS FORAND BILL BAR TO EXCESSIVE CHARGES

Passage of the Forand bill would protect the public against excessive charges on medical care for the Nation's older citizens, the AFL-CIO has declared.

At the same time, the federation asserted in a fact sheet published by the department of social security, the measure would relieve welfare agencies, hospitals, and non-profit medical care programs of the high cost load of the aged, which has led to large and growing deficits.

Here are the highlights of the fact sheet, entitled "Nine Good Reasons for the Forand Bill," available through the AFL-CIO department of social security:

"1. More than 13 million men and women now eligible for old-age benefits under so-

cial security would get lifetime protection under the bill which would pay the cost of 60 days of hospital care annually, additional skilled nursing care, and surgical benefits. If the beneficiaries under the railroad retirement system were also covered the figure would be considerably larger.

"Old people not entitled to old age benefits would be aided indirectly if they were forced to turn to public assistance. Since a smaller number of people would be forced to seek public aid, each one could be given more adequate assistance from the limited funds available to welfare agencies.

"2. Young workers would gain since their aged parents would be protected at once, and they and their families would have similar protection on retirement. Maximum cost to each worker would be \$12 a year, with a similar payroll tax for the employer.

"3. Few persons over 65 have or can afford good health insurance protection through any other means. According to the latest Government figures, only two out of five have any protection, most of it inadequate since it can be canceled or has lifetime ceilings. In addition, such policies cost between \$6.50 and \$8.50 per person per month and pay part, sometimes not even half, of hospital costs for up to only 31 days.

"4. Claims that voluntary insurance will grow rapidly, as are made by the commercial insurance industry and the American Medical Association, are unsubstantiated. Not only have no figures been released to support these assertions, but predictions for the future disregard serious financial obstacles to the aged purchasing this insurance.

"5. The Forand bill would strengthen welfare agencies, hospitals, and such voluntary plans as Blue Cross and relieve them of the high-cost load of the aged. Many hospitals have large and growing deficits. Because it includes retired people without charging them more than the community rate, Blue Cross keeps raising rates, as a result is increasingly threatened by competition from commercial insurance.

"Public welfare agencies now spend \$300 million a year for health care for the aged. In many communities a large part of all old age assistance costs are for medical care, which is an evergrowing burden.

"Financing health care costs through the social security system would help community agencies to improve and extend services. In particular, high-quality, skilled nursing homes would be assured of adequate revenues.

"6. The cost would be moderate—only about \$1 billion the first year, according to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"7. The new benefits can be financed on a sound basis through social security payroll taxes without endangering present cash benefits. Health insurance provided through this system would be the best insurance buy available.

"8. The Forand bill follows the established patterns for paying the costs of health care, despite charges from the AMA that the bill advocates political medicine or socialized medicine. These opponents used similar unfounded slogans against medical care for dependents of servicemen, workmen's compensation, Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, disability benefits, Federal grants to local health agencies, and many other worthy programs.

"The bill would protect the public from excessive charges by the small minority of doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes who let business motives dominate their medical activities.

"9. Persons most familiar with social security operations and the health needs of the aged support the Forand bill's principles. Among them are two former Social Security Administrators—Charles I. Schottland and Arthur Altmeyer; the retired president of the

National Blue Cross Association, Dr. Basil C. MacLean; the American Public Welfare Association; American Nurses' Association, and the National Association of Social Workers."

Cardinal Cushing Calls Bishop Walsh Modern Martyr—Red Chinese May Have Sounded Own Death Knell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston, said Friday night that the Chinese Red regime may have sounded its own death knell when it sentenced American Maryknoll Missionary Bishop James Edward Walsh to 20 years imprisonment.

The vicar general of the Maryknoll Missionary Order, Very Rev. John F. Donovan, said of the Shanghai people's court action:

If love is a crime, then he is guilty.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the statement by Cardinal Cushing, which appeared in the Boston Globe of March 19, an editorial from the Springfield Daily News of that same date entitled "No Room for Love," an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "Bishop Walsh's Crime," and a New York Times News Service dispatch printed in the Boston Herald, also on the 19th:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 19, 1960]

CALLS BISHOP WALSH MODERN MARTYR—CARDINAL CUSHING SAYS CHINESE REDS MAY HAVE SOUNDED OWN DEATH KNELL

Richard Cardinal Cushing said last night that by imprisoning Bishop James Edward Walsh, an American missionary, the Communist regime in China may have sounded its own death knell.

The cardinal, who has known the bishop for nearly 40 years, called him one of the finest missionaries ever to go to China and one who was loved by the Chinese people.

The Communists by their action have attacked China itself, the cardinal declared.

Here is the cardinal's statement:

"The news that Bishop Walsh has been sentenced to prison may solve the mystery as to his whereabouts these past few years but it scarcely reveals what manner of man he is.

"I have known this extraordinary Maryknoll missionary for almost 40 years, most of which time he has spent working in China. He lived and breathed the mission. He had come to know the Chinese people very well, to love them very deeply and to serve them faithfully.

"In giving himself with unselfish dedication he had become a victim of those rulers who would replace freedom with slavery, love with exploitation. We can see in Bishop Walsh the modern martyr whose courage is born of a Christ-like spirit of charity.

"I would call him the finest missionary to go forth from America in my lifetime.

"By sentencing Bishop Walsh the Communist regime may have sounded its own death knell in China. In its newest treachery 'the friend' of the Chinese people is unmarked; he is exposed; not as a giver,

but as a thief; not as the benefactor; but as an enemy without peer. In attacking a man of charity who has given his life for the Chinese people the Communists have attacked China itself.

"Love is his only crime and because of this sublime guilt he may well have the courage to say of his persecutors. 'Forgive them, for they know not what they do.'"

[From the Springfield Daily News, Mar. 19, 1960]

NO ROOM FOR LOVE

The United States shares, with Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, what he has described as his personal feeling of "revulsion" over the sentencing by a Shanghai "people's" court of Roman Catholic Bishop James Edward Walsh to 20 years' imprisonment.

Bishop Walsh, now 68, the last high non-Chinese Roman Catholic official on the Chinese mainland, was accused of leading a campaign to undermine the Chinese Communist regime.

Bishop Walsh, a member of the Maryknoll order, first went to China in 1918 as a missionary and remained there several years before leaving on another assignment. In 1948 he returned as head of the Central Catholic Bureau of China.

In 1955, with his movements made increasingly difficult by the Communist government, he and others were offered an opportunity for repatriation. Bishop Walsh rejected the opportunity, and told friends he would attempt to continue his work among the Chinese people despite the perils of the political situation.

The sentencing of Bishop Walsh, disclosed yesterday, was followed promptly by the statement from Very Reverend John F. Donovan, vicar general of the missionary order, that the bishop was indeed guilty—but only of the crime of love.

"If love is a crime," said the vicar general, "then he is guilty."

The vicar general noted that Bishop Walsh has endured flood, famine, pestilence, bandits, and war to manifest his love for the Chinese people, and "remind them that they were not alone in their time of suffering and persecution."

Red China has shown once again that there is no room for this kind of love in a state which reduces the individual to the role of vassal.

Mr. Herter chose accurately when he expressed the feeling of his own nation in the word "revulsion."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1960]

BISHOP WALSH'S "CRIME"

Bishop James Edward Walsh of Cumberland, Md., may spend the rest of his life in a Chinese prison for offending the Red China Government. At 69, he has been a servant of the Chinese people and of his church for almost half a century. All of us, of whatever religion, can share in an admiration for Bishop Walsh and indignation for the cruel 20-year sentence inflicted upon him.

An associate, the Very Reverend John F. Donovan, vicar general of the Maryknoll Fathers, said of him: "If love is a crime, then he is guilty; if opposition to a brutal and tyrannical regime is a crime, he is guilty; if allegiance to his church is a crime, then he is guilty." In the raw, bitter communism of mainland China most of the civilized virtues are crimes and the Sermon on the Mount is full of treason.

Secretary Herter's protest will carry little weight with a government which charges our own Government with an "imperialistic scheme to subvert the Chinese people's democratic regime." But outrages such as this may well be remembered when somebody inquires why we do not want Red China in the United Nations or a Red Chinese Ambassador in Washington.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 19, 1960]

BISHOP A PIONEER IN MARYKNOLL

New York.—Bishop Walsh was one of the first six students to join the American Catholic Foreign Mission Society of Maryknoll in Ossining, N.Y., when it was founded in 1911. He was ordained to the priesthood 4 years later and began his long missionary career in China in 1918 when he was among the first American priests to enter the Far Eastern mission fields.

He was born in Cumberland, Md., and was graduated from Mount Saint Mary's College at Emmitsburg, Md.

NAMED PREFECT

In 1924 he was named prefect apostolic of Kongmoon, the first American-born prefect in China, and 3 years later he was consecrated bishop of Sanclan Island, off China's southern coast, where St. Francis Xavier, the 16th century Spanish Jesuit missionary died in 1552.

During the next 10 years he assumed charge of missionary work in Koan area of south China covering 20,000 miles. The general chapter of the Maryknoll Fathers held in Hong Kong in 1936 elected Bishop Walsh the order's superior general.

Shortly after completing his 10-year term as superior general in Ossining, Bishop Walsh returned to China where he became executive secretary of the Catholic Bureau, a religious organization coordinating missionary, cultural, welfare and educational activities in China. The organization was suppressed in 1951 by the Chinese Communists who accused Bishop Walsh of turning it into an anti-Communist stronghold against the people.

Bishop Walsh is a brother of William C. Walsh, former attorney general of Maryland, and of the Reverend John F. Walsh, also a Maryknoll priest. Three sisters are in religious orders.

Union County Farm Bureau Letter Regarding National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I inserted into the RECORD an editorial from one of the newspapers in my district which was critical of the American Farm Bureau Federation's position regarding the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act. The Farm Bureau unit for that newspaper's county has asked that their reply to this editorial also be entered into the RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore want to insert the following letter from Mr. Grant Henderson, president of the Union County Oregon Farm Bureau:

ISLAND CITY, OREG., March 18, 1960.

Re S. 2929.

HON. AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: In regard to the reading of an editorial from the La Grande Observer into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 1 of this year, we would like to clear up a few apparently mistaken ideas you may have.

The Farm Bureau policy in regard to the National Defense Education Act can be found on page 46 of the American Farm Bureau handbook for 1960.

As you well know, Farm Bureau policies are not written by the people in offices or at the top of the organization. Rather, they are introduced by local Farm Bureau members within their own county, from there they progress to the State office where they are studied and sent to each county and center for action by all the members within the State. Once each year the voting delegates from each county meet with all the other delegates from the remaining counties and they cast their votes on each and every policy or resolution as directed by their county farm bureau.

The result of this caucus then gives the State president his instructions as to how to vote when he convenes with the other State presidents. As in all democratic processes the majority rules and these then become our American Farm Bureau policies for the current year.

This is the way the policy concerning the disclaimer affidavit was arrived at by the 1,600,000 members of the American Farm Bureau.

Certainly these farm families should carry more weight with our lawmakers than just one person writing an editorial in a small-town paper.

We, the members of the Union County Farm Bureau, request that this letter be written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also. We feel it states clearly our thinking and should be heard by the Members of Congress and should be read by you.

We recognize the fact that many persons would not flinch when asked to sign the loyalty oath or disclaimer affidavit but when they must face the possibility of perjury it would throw a different light on the subject. This is our one weapon against more socialism and communism and, if we are correct in our thinking, there are too many Socialist and Communists in our Government, education plants, etc., now.

Please give this matter your most careful consideration and carry out the wishes of your many Farm Bureau friends.

Sincerely,

GRANT I. HENDERSON,
President, Union County Farm Bureau.

A Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two interesting and factual articles appearing in successive Sunday editions of the Salem (Mass.) Sunday Express of February 28 and March 6, 1960, written by my good friend, the Right Reverend Monsignor Ladislaus A. Sikora, of Salem, a great thinker and a foremost fighter in the cause of a free Poland.

These impressive articles deserve widespread coverage because they come from a great inspiring spiritual leader endowed with superb piety, great ability, and extraordinary vision, as well as lofty patriotism.

Monsignor Sikora has been one of the outstanding leaders in the Polish cause for some time past, and he is fully informed on all aspects of the questions relating to the establishment and restoration of freedom, liberty, and democratic institutions for Poland and other small nations of the world.

This is one of the greatest moral questions facing the free world, and we cannot afford to settle it on the basis of appeasement. Instead, Americans must show they are prepared to render constructive assistance in helping all small nations in reaching the goals of restored independence and freedom.

I hope that Monsignor Sikora's sage views and sound, wise recommendations regarding this great human question will be widely read and taken to heart by the American people.

The material follows:

[From the Salem (Mass.) Sunday Express, Feb. 28, 1960]

FREE POLAND IS KEY TOWARD FREE EUROPE—I (By Rt. Rev. Ladislaus A. Sikora, P.A.)

The reason we have difficulties with the Soviets today, is because their armies are in Berlin, and on the banks of Elbe and Vistula Rivers, but mainly because Poland is under the Soviet occupation. (Western Powers are responsible for this state of affairs.) Our strategists, in focusing their attention on Berlin, let the Russian bear sneak through the central Europe with millions of Soviet armies occupying Poland, East Germany. Now we are trying to get them out of these territories.

At present, many realize that Poland is the main political and strategic point in the central-eastern Europe. Napoleon learned this truth when he said that Poland is the keystone of Europe. Unfortunately he learned this too late. Are we realizing this fact? We hope that it is not too late.

Poland is important because of her geopolitical position in that part of Europe. She forms a natural wall protecting the western culture and the Christianity against any aggressor. Unfortunately Poland at the same time is the springboard for any and for every aggressor, who may be eyeing the conquest of Europe. He knows that he must overpower and possess that springboard. That is why we have Germany's "Drang nach Osten," and that is the reason why for centuries Russia struck against Poland.

Because the one who seizes the Polish Baltic and the Poland's territory will reign not only over Poland, but over all the central-eastern Europe, and over all those nations, over all their riches and exports. When Poland loses her freedom and independence, all the nations (inhabiting) from the Baltic to the Black Sea and the Adriatic lose their freedom and independence. And the one who reigns over these territories from the Baltic to the Black Sea is easily tempted to become master of the whole Europe.

Germany has tried to do this during the last two World Wars. And now the Soviet Russia is attempting it. (The writer by accident has met Trotsky in Boston during one of the secret meetings, when Trotsky was forming the first Communist cells in Boston. Trotsky boasted then that it will not be very long after they prepare and brainwash a new Russian generation that the Soviets will rule whole Europe. He boastfully threatened that they will take the United States of America. This was 41 years ago. How similar is the Khrushchev's: "We will bury you.")

Let us look at some figures. According to the Anglo-Saxon report: One day during World War II cost Britain about 20 million

pounds and the United States of America over \$100 million.

Now, if, after defeating Germany in World War I, the equivalent to 10 days of war expenditure was spent in due time to strengthen the defensive potentiality of Poland, there certainly would be no World War II. And if at the same time the Western Powers and especially the United States did not give enormous credit to Germany, we absolutely would not have the Second World War. (America alone has pumped into defeated Germany over \$200 billion.) The Western Powers refrained from investing their capital either in Poland or any other country located in that sector of Europe between the Baltic and the Black Sea.

After all, these countries and these nations are by nature peaceful countries. The credits allotted to them, doubtless they would have used toward the reestablishment of peace in Europe and not for the military and war preparations.

They would have used these credits to rebuild and to strengthen their economic conditions, to bring about prosperity to their peoples.

And they would have been a strong asset in supporting the rest of Europe by way mutual and reciprocal exchange of food and raw products. But the Western investors were afraid of the risk?

They wanted rather to reinforce the Militarism of Germany. Why we ask? The final results were that our American soldiers were killed on the battlefields all over the world during the Second World War.

They were felled by shells made by American labor and paid for by our own and with our American moneys. These are the facts. Sad as they are, nevertheless, these are true facts which should not be forgotten.

Whoever wants to assure a lasting peace, freedom and real security in Europe, must so arrange the future European peace agreement as to make it impossible not only on paper, but in reality and factually to prevent any future aggressor from rising again to threaten or to disturb that peace. This pertains to both Germany as well as to Russia. At the same time these peace agreements should strengthen Poland and other nations of central Europe, that they be able to fulfill their historic destiny of defending the Western civilization. Strengthen these so that they may not be again temptation to or the prey of any future assailants. There are over a hundred million inhabitants in central Europe. Its natural political, economic and strategic hub is Poland. Poland has never threatened their freedom. When Poland is strong, the neighboring nations have confidence and will cooperate with Poland for their common good, as they have done for centuries before.

[From the Salem (Mass.) Sunday Express, Mar. 6, 1960]

A FREE POLAND SEEN KEY TO FREE EUROPE—II

(By Rt. Rev. Ladislaus A. Sikora, P.A.)

It is a real tragedy for Europe and for Germany as well, that the fate presupposes that the Germans be good Europeans. But the Germans have understood their position in Europe as having the right to dominate Europe, to be the masters of Europe. And if today Chancellor Adenauer's Germans tell us and the world that they wish to be good Europeans, they should be such, not only in regard to the Western Europe and in regard to the Western nations, but they should be so especially in their attitude toward the nations in central and Eastern Europe. Otherwise we must question and doubt their "European cooperation." This pertains especially to the Oder and Neisse boundaries. They must set aside any and all plans and endeavours of "revision." This

particular territory restored to Poland, belongs historically to Poland. Statistics show that there are over 8 million Poles living in this sector, and less than 100,000 Germans. This territory is not essential to Germany's existence. For without these territories Germany today is a foremost economic power on the European continent.

Certainly it does not suffice to hear the official statement of the Chancellor telling us that Germans do not intend to demand a change or revision of the boundary lines of Oder and Neisse, but that they only wish to make agreements with Poland in a peaceful way. Unfortunately, such and similar assurances were made by the Germans after World War I.

We recall 1918, 1919, and 1939. Stresemann wanted to be known as a good democrat. But his assurances did not prevent Germany from invading Poland in 1939 and to start World War II. Today's assurances could be broken tomorrow.

That is why we say that it is in the interest not only of Poland, but to the rest of Europe, in the interest of peace and security of Europe, it is essential that the Western Powers and especially the United States recognize immediately the present boundaries of Oder and Neisse as permanent and unalterable.

Like the so-called Danzig Corridor so today this Oder-Neisse boundary line decides the fate.

On this boundary line depends the war or peace in Europe, with all its consequences for the free world.

We realize that it would be impossible today to defeat Russia by military or material forces.

Irreligious communistic idea which threatens the whole civilized world today, must be counteracted by another strong idea, christian idea, idea of freedom and that the right is the might. Give back to Poland a real freedom and independence.

Liberate and free Poland from iniquitous, cunning, insidious Soviet occupation, imposed on the Polish nation by the Allies, who should now insist that the Soviets take their armies out of every captive country.

This is fundamental condition, basic and so necessary to the very idea of the free world.

Strong Poland, free and independent with her eastern boundary as agreed upon by the Treaty of Riga, and the Oder-Neisse frontier in the west will have amicable cooperation of other freed nations in central Europe.

This will become a natural and a strong bastion of freedom, peace, security and the progress of the Western democracies.

Only then, Americans will not be obliged to cross the Atlantic to save Europe.

And the American people will not have to contribute so heavily of their national income for the defense of America against the Soviet menace or against any other assailant.

We repeat, Poland is the test of the big powers' sincerity. Strong Poland is needed to hold in abeyance both the Soviet and German imperialisms.

Today everything points to the American Nation's prestige, greatness, integrity, and leadership in the free world.

Destiny places upon us, Americans, a serious obligation to pursue a great, clear, but firm and decided policy in protecting and regaining the freedoms of the captive nations, which were seized and are occupied by the Soviets.

It is necessary that we here in America add to our enormous material strength and potentialities also our spiritual and moral forces.

Europe looks toward freedom. World wants to be free. It is not sufficient that the western half of the world be free.

The entire Europe should be free. And this includes the central and eastern Europe. Every nation wants to be free.

The organization of free Europe should be given over to the free nations.

Certainly it should not be left to Germany or Russia. United States of Europe could and should unite all the nations in Europe. Free with free, and all equal.

To this idea Poland has always been a strong exponent.

Poland betrayed, martyred and exhausted was thrown into the orbit of her enemies, the Soviets, now is awaiting her liberation by those who are responsible for her present plight.

As long as that nation holds her own in present horrible conditions, with odds stacked against her, there still is some hope of saving the world from the barbarism and the tyranny.

Other captive nations look toward Poland for a sign of hope whether the allies of yesterday will keep their word and promise.

We must realize that endurance has its limits, no matter how strong, noble or courageous it may be. We must hasten to help Poland.

Captive nations watch for developments in Poland.

And they ask are the Western Powers ready to give help to Poland, known as the foremost ally.

If they do not help Poland, these captive nations lose faith in the Western Powers.

We have failed the Hungarian patriots. We must not fail Poland.

This would bring only a despair among all occupied countries. Help given to Poland, will raise the spirit and give hope to millions.

We should hasten to aid Poland get rid of her occupant. We must help Poland. Poland was and still is, in spite of the betrayal a true ally.

She is ideologically a friend of the United States of America.

That is history. Poland called the Mother of the Allies, the inspiration of the heroic world in these her tragic days looks forward with confidence toward the United States and waits hopefully, that during the coming summit conference our American representatives will represent our great Nation with dignity and firmness to give hope and confidence to the enslaved and captive world that America is the champion of freedom for all nations.

South Is Seeking Home Rule, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times Union of March 20, 1960, contains a stimulating editorial entitled "South Is Seeking Home Rule, Too." It occurs to many southerners that some people these days are more interested in giving home rule and local self-government to people in the District of Columbia than they are in allowing such throughout the South. Moreover, there are some who are more interested in local self-rule in areas across far distant seas than they are in such self-government in the Southland. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Mar. 20, 1960]

SOUTH IS SEEKING HOME RULE, TOO

Maybe if liberals weren't so determined to impair home rule in the South, they'd

have better luck with their pet bill to provide self-government to the residents of the District of Columbia.

As should be generally known by now, Washingtonians not only are disenfranchised—wonder if the Civil Rights Commission ever investigated conditions in its place of birth?—but they have no say at all in the conduct of local affairs. They can't even combine to try their hand at bloc voting.

So there's a bill in Congress, as there has been for years, to let the inhabitants of democracy's capital enjoy the rights, privileges, headaches, and frustrations that go along with self-rule. The well laid plan, though, has run up against a southern stumbling block—refusal by the southern-dominated House District Committee to discharge the bill from its clutches to the House floor for debate and action.

This question of sovereignty for district residents offers the southerners a chance to point out that it is control over local affairs that they are fighting for in the civil rights dispute. The various proposals for Federal legislation on voting and desegregation matters would chip away in the South at the very thing that some are attempting to restore in Washington. If it's good one place, it ought to be desirable in another.

What would appointment of referees or registrars to police voting practices do but take control of elections out of local hands? Does the Federal Government have such a monopoly on virtue that it would do a more honorable job? Exposure of wrongdoing in high places within the Federal hierarchy doesn't support any such thesis.

The same argument can be advanced concerning education. There are strong efforts to let the Federal Government move into our classrooms. Its resources are more unlimited, and consequently the job it would do would be superior, or so the reasoning goes.

All of this questionable "progress" has to be weighted against the loss it would cause. Removal of local control would discourage local interest in home affairs, hastening the day of absentee government, the day when the "Feds" take over every walk of governmental life and tell citizens when and how to do everything.

Only when that day comes, the people subject to such outside influence will no more be citizens, with the power to determine their own fate, than the residents of Washington.

Second Battle of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was just a year ago that I rose on the floor of the House and began what I termed "the second battle of Gettysburg." The situation at Gettysburg itself—the impending threat of commercial invasion into the heartland of the Nation's most historic shrine—has changed little if at all in the intervening year. What has changed has been the awareness of the Nation, and I hope the Congress, to the fate that lies in store for a precious national monument unless something is done about it.

It is somehow fitting that almost as if to commemorate the anniversary of the campaign to save Gettysburg a group of

school children has chosen to send me their own contribution to help. I would commend both their action and their letter to my colleagues. The letter from D. Bruce Connor, supervising principal of the Newport Union schools, Newport, Pa., follows:

Several days ago in our eighth-grade history class the students were discussing with their teacher, Mrs. Mary Wertz, the "Save Gettysburg campaign." Our boys and girls seemed highly disturbed over the invasion of commercial activities on the land surrounding the historic Gettysburg battlefield. Feeling that their nickels and dimes might help preserve this site as a national shrine, the class set out to enlist the help of all students and teachers in the Newport Union school system.

As a result of interest in preventing further nonhistoric encroachment to the Gettysburg battlefield area, I am pleased to enclose a check in the amount of \$60.10 on behalf of the Newport students.

Because of your interest in the Gettysburg project, we are sending this check to you and asking that you forward it to the proper officials.

That check I have turned over to the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, the group which has been organized to raise funds with the purpose of doing whatever they can to assist the National Park Service in saving the battlefield for history rather than souvenir stands. To tell you about the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, let me include their fact sheet in the RECORD:

GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION, GETTYSBURG, PA., FACT SHEET

WHAT GBPA IS WORKING FOR

To prevent non-Government-owned lands within Gettysburg's famed battlefield proper from disappearing in a welter of housing developments and commercial structures. In recent years, business and residential expansion has encroached heavily on important battleground areas, and the pace of expansion appears to be increasing. The only guarantee of preservation of hallowed areas is ownership. A total of 680 acres is needed now—as building expands eastward, lands must be acquired to preserve the cavalry battlefield, 3 miles east of Gettysburg. The current problem that is urgent is the protection of the main battlefield.

GBPA SERVES THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE NATION

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association is a nonprofit, nonsalaried association incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. In the words of the association's governing body, in a resolution adopted November 21, 1959:

"The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association shall be an organization wherein all who are in accord with its objectives may join in supporting and preserving this most historic battleground and assuring the safeguard of the Nation's hallowed shrine."

HISTORY OF GBPA

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association was initiated in August 1959 by a committee of Civil War students, attending the second annual Civil War Study Group at Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa. GBPA was strengthened further when on September 26, 1959, a board of directors and temporary officers were selected. On November 16, 1959, the association received its charter of incorporation from the Adams County court, Pa., and on November 21, 1959, directors and officers were confirmed, and bylaws were formulated.

Members of the Second Annual Civil War Study Group recognized the need for the

association when it became apparent that privately owned land, long considered important parts of the battlefield, was purchased by a development company to be sold for building lots, at the same time Adams County commissions decided to sell farmland owned by the county of the poor farm homestead.

Realization that part of what was always considered the battlefield could be lost forever to housing and commercial development led Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association to take immediate action to secure this ground for the National Shrine.

GBPA HONORARY ADVISORY BOARD

Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, U.S.A., retired, Washington, D.C.; Robert E. Lee IV, San Francisco, Calif.; the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia; the Honorable J. Caleb Boggs, Governor of Delaware; the Honorable Price Daniel, Governor of Texas; the Honorable Foster Furcolo, Governor of Massachusetts; the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Governor of North Carolina; the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania; the Honorable Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey; the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland; the Honorable S. Ernest Vandiver, Governor of Georgia; the Honorable J. Glenn Beall, U.S. Senator, Maryland; the Honorable John Marshall Butler, U.S. Senator, Maryland; the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, U.S. Senator, Virginia; the Honorable John A. Carroll, U.S. Senator, Colorado; the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania; the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senator, New York; the Honorable Hugh Scott, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania; the Honorable Willard S. Curtin, U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania; the Honorable Edith Green, U.S. Representative, Oregon; the Honorable James M. Quigley, U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania; the Honorable Fred Schwengel, U.S. Representative, Iowa; the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania; Mr. V. C. Jones, Curtis Publishing Co., Washington, D.C.; Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, State of Maryland, Military Department, 5th Regiment Armory, Baltimore, Md.

GBPA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Maj. William M. Haller, U.S.A., Hollidaysburg, Pa., president; John J. Cabaugh, Harrisburg, Pa., vice president; Dr. Robert L. Bloom, Gettysburg College, secretary-treasurer; William D. Andes, Andes Advertising Agency, Lancaster, Pa.; William H. Baker, York, Pa.; Joseph N. Dempsey, attorney at law, Asbury Park, N.J.; Robert D. Hoffmann, Harrisburg, Pa.; G. Henry Roth, newspaperman—Gettysburg Times, Gettysburg, Pa.; Dr. Frederick Tilberg, Historian—Gettysburg National Park, Gettysburg, Pa.; Scott A. Trexler, Allentown, Pa.; Fritz S. Updike, editor—Rome Sentinel, Rome, N.Y.; and Dr. Theodore M. Whitfield, Western Maryland College, Md.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS PRIOR TO GBPA

The emergency created by the housing development on the first day's field and the potential private use of the adjoining Adams County Poor Farm led local organizations and individuals at Gettysburg to attempt to request congressional purchase of the lands over which the 1st and 11th Corps fought on the first day, including the Barlow's Knoll. Areas also in jeopardy include land along the Emmitsburg Road, near the Peach Orchard, Devil's Den and the Round Tops.

The local groups were joined by interested persons and organizations throughout the Nation. Much publicity was given by major national publications.

WHAT THE CONGRESS DID AND DIDN'T DO

In March 1959, the House of Representatives rejected the Department of the Interior's request for three-quarters of a mil-

tion dollars to acquire additional battlefield lands at Gettysburg and other Civil War battlefields. Finally after many debates both Houses agreed to appropriate a sum of \$450,000.

Any portion of the appropriated sum designated for use at Gettysburg would be subject to congressional limitations. The first required zoning at local levels. Assuming that zoning is completed, this proviso is completely logical. Zoning would prevent commercial blights from appearing on the battlefield in the future, and the Federal moneys would be spent to acquire and remove those which already exist. The final condition imposed by Congress is that under no circumstances will any of the money be spent for the acquisition by the Federal Government of the Adams County Poor Farm.

The limitations imposed by Congress preclude the immediate use of Federal funds for the purchase of land—which must be acquired now, if at all, for preservation.

LOCAL DILEMMAS

Cumberland township faces difficulties in enacting adequate zoning laws, ones that should have been created a generation or more ago. Not only will the zoning laws be difficult to enact, but they will require time, and time is of the essence now. Many local persons argue against zoning, and the limitations on individual rights. When these limitations are imposed on property rights and these properties have value, enacting a zoning ordinance is most difficult. Moreover, zoning will protect only from commercial development, not housing expansion.

For the erection of a new and modernly equipped county home, Adams County commissioners have depended upon the income obtainable from the sale of the old Poor Farm. The county, to make an immediate profit by selling the Poor Farm, would destroy a huge segment of the battlefield. This area cannot be purchased with Federal funds.

HISTORY OF GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD AS A NATIONAL SHRINE

On August 14, 1863, Attorney David McCaughy, of Gettysburg, wrote to other residents: "Immediately after the battle of Gettysburg, the thought occurred to me that there could be no more fitting and expressive memorial of the heroic valor and signal triumphs of our Army on the 1st, 2d and 3d days of July 1863, than the battlefield itself with its natural and artificial defenses, preserved and perpetuated in the exact form and condition they presented during the battle."

On April 30, 1864, Gov. A. G. Curtin of Pennsylvania approved an act to incorporate the "Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association." The first organization dedicated to raise funds and purchase the lands required to preserve the battlefield.

The association was organized to sell shares, at \$10 each, without limitation as to the number of shares any citizen could subscribe, as the more generous the fund the more liberal the bounds of this sacred patrimony which it is proposed to perpetuate.

Committees throughout the State of Pennsylvania were named and they joined the local men in the project of raising funds.

By 1895 the Pennsylvania-Incorporated Memorial Association had secured about 800 acres of land and had erected numerous markers and monuments.

On February 11, 1895, the Federal Government by act of Congress established "A National Military Park at Gettysburg." The Secretary of War was authorized to receive all of the land, rights of way and property of the Gettysburg Memorial Association.

In 1933 the national park was transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior.

CURRENT SITUATION

At the present time there are 2,773 acres of land held by the Federal Government. Some acreage was purchased as directed by congressional acts, and others were bought by organizations and donated.

Over the years much of the remaining privately owned holdings, such as the land currently in jeopardy, has remained much as it has always been, and so for most visitors it appeared the same as the adjoining Government-owned land. With this situation remaining unchanged, no outcry came, but the recent rapid growth of homes and businesses everywhere revealed the present danger.

GEPA AIMS OR GOALS

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association is aware of zoning and other efforts being made to prevent the desecration of the battlefield, but holds to the belief that the only permanent solution is the immediate purchase of the land with or through privately donated funds.

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association will solicit funds on a nationwide basis. All private donations collected will be used to secure the additional land for the National Park Service.

The perfect result of this Gettysburg campaign of solicitation would be a contribution, however small, from every man, woman, and child in the United States.

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE OF GEPA CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED BY GEPA

Emergency committee: Chairman, Mr. Cliff Arquette, Gettysburg, Pa. (television star, Charlie Weaver). The current program of the emergency committee is the television appeal through Charlie Weaver for contributions toward securing one square inch of needed battlefield land.

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association receives mail at the Gettysburg Post Office, Post Office Box 1863, Gettysburg, Pa.

For convenience in writing checks or money orders, the short title "Battlefield—Gettysburg," presently publicized by the television star, Charlie Weaver, can be used.

Mail donations, contributions, and/or gifts to the Gettysburg address for purposes of tax exemption to benefit donors, GEPA has applied to the U.S. Government for a certificate of exemption.

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association will acknowledge all contributions.

WILLIAM M. HALLER,
Major, U.S. Army, President, Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association.

Doctors and Hospitals Oppose Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have received many letters from good friends and influential people of the congressional district I represent in opposition to the Forand bill—H.R. 4700—and any similar legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits. From my tabulation of the let-

ters received on this proposal it is my opinion that an overwhelming majority of all doctors and hospitals are opposed to the Forand bill. Not only doctors but a substantial number of other responsible citizens have expressed their opposition to the bill.

Today I received a resolution from the Missouri Association of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, as follows:

Whereas House Resolution 4700 (Forand bill), 86th Congress, and the Kennedy-Hart bill, U.S. Senate, propose hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries under the Social Security Act; and

Whereas other such legislation may yet be introduced; and

Whereas all such legislation would unquestionably lead to extension of such provisions to a wide segment of the American people, with apparent socialization of medicine in the United States; and

Whereas all such proposed programs under governmental direction would lead to a drastically lower standard of health care at a much higher cost to the American people; and

Whereas such programs would seriously curtail voluntary private effort which continues to provide for the American people the highest standards of health care found anywhere in the world; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Missouri Association of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons registers opposition to House Resolution 4700, 86th Congress, and the Kennedy-Hart bill, and any similar legislation that may be introduced.

Tripletalk on Vested Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to my bill, H.R. 1345, and that of my colleague, Representative O'BRIEN, H.R. 404, and the companion Senate measure, S. 1103, by Senator KEATING, which would permit the sale of vested enemy assets to private American investors, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of Tuesday, March 1, 1960:

TRIPLETALK

That remarkable collection of philanthropists (with other people's money), the Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, has now achieved the improbability of surpassing even itself in the concoction of cant. In addition to all their other heart-throbbing designed to seduce the American taxpayer into paying the German Government's debts to German citizens, the committee's propagandists now urge this handout as a "gesture of confidence in the wholesome, democratic forces which are currently under strain in Germany." Parsing this doubletalk for the unsophisticated reader, the committee's press release explain, somewhat ambiguously, that it refers "to the recent swastika paintings in Cologne and elsewhere."

The severity of some U.S. reactions to the recent wall paintings in Germany may have created there the feeling that, as a nation, we have reacquired the wartime stereotype

of Germany as a nation of National Socialists. The best way to deal with this threatening doubt of our stability is to deliver on the promises the United States made before the incidents started.

What this seems to be saying is that the recent indications of lingering nazism in Germany have raised doubts there as to American stability; and the only way to regain German confidence in the United States is through the payment of a large, lush cash ransom. It also seems to be saying that the notion that there was ever any national socialism in Germany, even during the war, is just a thickheaded American invention. What it doesn't seem to be saying is that there is any need at all to restore American confidence in German stability.

Let's set the record straight once more about those "promises the United States made before the incidents started." The only promise made by the United States was a promise made (along with other victims of Hitler's aggression) to forgo reparations after the war in return for a German promise to pay the claims of German citizens arising out of the seizure of their investments here. This was a simple bookkeeping quid pro quo. A formal treaty was signed embodying it. The United States kept its promise—thereby helping Germany to become the most prosperous country in postwar Europe.

It is true that in the summer of 1957, when Chancellor Adenauer was running for reelection, the White House in Washington announced that it would ask Congress to give Germany an equitable monetary return for some \$400 to \$500 million in property seized during the war. Next spring, President Eisenhower did ask Congress for this largesse; Congress, very sensibly, ignored the request. The Committee for Return is now trying to get Congress to redeem the German Government's promise to pay the claims of Germans. And they may lose confidence in us if Congress does not. The mind boggles. The stomach turns. There is fever; there is pain.

Election Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting election notice from Jamaica. It was called to my attention by a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, Martin R. Freedman, Esq.

While we are debating the voting rights issue, I think it is important for us to note that in islands neighboring us, there is a plan guaranteeing universal suffrage and assuring the only kind of literacy which the voter should need in casting his ballot: knowing which candidate for public office is his choice.

In the Jamaican election notice prospective candidates either pick certain campaign symbols or are assigned them. These symbols are used both in the campaign by the candidates and the election board which places these symbols opposite candidates' names on ballots. The purpose of having the symbol is, of

course, to help those voters who cannot read but who have sufficient interest, knowledge, and understanding to recognize the candidate of their choice on their respective ballot.

In the United States the problem of illiteracy does not exist to the extent that it would be necessary to adopt the Jamaican method. On the other hand, the meaning of literacy seems to vary so much from State to State that it has been used in many places as a weapon to stop qualified people from voting. I am hopeful that the present civil rights bill will change this situation.

The election notice follows:

ELECTION NOTICE—SYMBOLS TO BE USED OPPOSITE CANDIDATES' NAMES ON BALLOT PAPERS

Prospective candidates for the pending K.S.A.C. and parochial elections are hereby informed in accordance with regulations published in the Gazette on the 13th of February 1956 that they should apply to me in writing before nomination day for the allocation of symbols to be printed opposite to their names on the ballot papers to be used on polling day.

The regulations provide that prospective candidates should set out in their application three symbols in the order of their preference. I shall, in due course, allocate to each candidate 1 of the 12 symbols set out below, subject to the provision in the regulations designed to give effect to the wishes of political parties or groups.

Under the regulations the allocation of symbols is made at my discretion and it is pointed out that it may not be possible to meet the wishes of all nominated candidates. I shall, of course, notify all concerned of the symbols allotted to all candidates.

Any person nominated as a candidate who does not make an application for a symbol will have allotted to him 1 of the 12 symbols which has not been allocated to any other candidate in the same electoral division at this election.

The symbols to be used at elections are shown below.

1. Hand.
2. Star.
3. Head.
4. Horseshoe.
5. Bird.
6. Bell.
7. Woman.
8. Tree.
9. Bus.
10. Hoop.
11. Crossed hammers.
12. Heart.

O. M. ROYES,
Chief Electoral Officer.

Electoral office, Kingston, January 25, 1960.

Disarmament Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, with all the present talk about disarmament, it behooves us to be wary of proposals put forth by the rulers in the Kremlin. Our experiences of the past in dealings with the Soviet have not been favorable, to say the least. Their utter disregard for the sanctity of agreements has been am-

ply demonstrated on many an occasion. Let us be sure that when we move in any direction so important to the future we are aware of all consequences.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the U.S. News & World Report of March 28, 1960, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

DISARMAMENT BLACKMAIL

(By David Lawrence)

The Soviet plan calls for disarmament within 4 years. During that time, the West is supposed to abolish all foreign bases, send American troops back home, and trust to the good faith of the Communists thereafter to destroy their nuclear weapons.

The Soviets insist that they shall retain a free hand to do as they please after the West has given up its conventional forces and abandoned all foreign bases for troops, missiles, and planes.

The Western plan calls for three stages without arbitrary time limits but demands initially a formula for compliance by the governments concerned.

Basically, the West wants a condition of mutual trust. It asks for immediate action aimed at "preventing aggression and preserving world peace and security, as national armaments are reduced," and declares that this can best be achieved "by an international organization, to be an organ of, or linked to, the United Nations."

The Western plan, in a nutshell, seeks to establish conditions of mutual confidence and good faith before either side is expected to give up its weapons.

The Soviets, on the other hand, brazenly ask that the West disarm at once, with all foreign bases and conventional forces eliminated in about 3 years. The first official statement made by the Soviet delegate at the Geneva Disarmament Conference says:

"During the same period it will also be possible to carry out such measures as the liquidation of alien bases on foreign territories, the withdrawal of foreign troops from these territories back within their national frontiers, and their disbandment as well as the cessation of the production of all types of conventional armaments."

Then, after the American missile pads and air bases for our bombers in Europe and Asia have been demolished and all American forces have gone home, the Soviets say that "all types of nuclear and rocket weapons should be destroyed and liquidation of entire machinery of states should be fully completed."

What is surprising about the plan is not that the Soviets propose such a procedure, but that they should believe the Western governments are naive enough to accept it. No Trojan-horse scheme could be conceived with greater boldness or more transparent insincerity.

The world is asked to accept a disarmament plan which weakens its power of military retaliation while relying on an autocratic government in Moscow to carry out its pledge of disarmament. Actual experience, moreover, teaches us that the Soviet Government has violated virtually every important international agreement it has made in the last 25 years.

The British Minister of State, David Ormsby-Gore, touched on this same problem when he told the assembled delegates at the Geneva Disarmament Conference that the plan adopted must not at any stage give significant military advantage to one country or group of countries over others. He called for effective controls and remarked that there is no use "blinking at the fact that suspicion exists between nations and they will not be convinced that their neighbors have in fact reduced their forces until they

have proof of it." He also warns that "it must be the object of a control system to furnish such proof."

The world has known for a long time that disarmament cannot be undertaken either immediately or in stages without foolproof measures of control, and that to permit one side to have a military advantage during any stage of the process opens the way to blackmail.

Really nothing new in principle has been developed by the disarmament discussions of recent years. They resemble many past efforts in history. They are either well-meaning attempts to stop the arms race temporarily for economic reasons and to preserve a "balance of power," or they are crafty and insidious schemes to accomplish a military supremacy for one side or the other by playing on the credulity of an adversary.

The Soviet objective of the moment is primarily to make propaganda—to give the appearance of peaceful intent and benevolent purpose. This is designed to allay unrest and fear inside Russia that the Kremlin is heading toward war. But the plain facts are that the tensions in the world are produced right along by the Soviet Government and its agents in foreign lands who are engaged in intensive campaigns of subversion.

The Communists are responsible for the tension in Korea and the Far East, the tension in the Middle East, the tension in Africa, the tension in Cuba and Latin America, and the tension over West Berlin.

How can there be any progress toward disarmament when there is so little faith in the word of the present Soviet Government? Only the peoples of the Soviet Union can assure world peace, and they can do so by ridding themselves of a tyrannical government that doesn't honor its agreements and by substituting a free government that the world can trust. That's the only sure road to a reduction of armaments.

Comments by the Late Senator Robert A. Taft in Support of School Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln said, when the Nation was faced with new conditions and new problems, that "we must disenthral ourselves." The people, he declared, had to understand the changed state of the Nation to make new decisions. This was at a time when our country was predominantly rural. Today, our population is increasing so fast that it will pass the 200 million mark in only a few years. Plainly, we are facing new conditions and new problems. New challenges demand new stratagems and new tactics. Never before has our Nation faced the threat of a first-class industrial power with such a concentration of advanced technical force as that of Soviet Russia.

In order to meet the challenge of Russia's swift thrust toward leadership, we are going to have to call on every resource. Most of all we are going to have to call on our mental resources. Winston Churchill said:

The empires of the future are the empires of the mind.

We cannot afford to lose the talents of even one person with a superior intelligence merely because he may come from a poor home and has no money to go to the high school or college.

The fact is apparent that our lack of foresight is catchig up with us. J. Edgar Hoover has said that crime is increasing four times as fast as the population. The huge waste involved in crime is far more costly than would be the cost of perfecting our educational plant, raising our teachers' salaries, and assuring everyone as good an education as he desires and deserves. The U.S. Office of Education points out that there is a classroom shortage of at least 135,000 and a teacher shortage that is to become more pronounced. Education, primarily, should be the responsibility of local authorities, but if they do not meet the challenge, I am afraid Uncle Sam will be forced to step into the breach in the interest of national security. I think that given the facts our people will find the right way.

Mr. Speaker, because the House will soon debate the question of what further role, if any, the Federal Government should play in the vital field of education, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include for the benefit of my colleagues the comments made on the floor of the U.S. Senate in support of legislation for schools by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, on March 23, 1948:

SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, SR., OF OHIO

Why Mr. Taft changed his mind: "Four years ago I opposed the bill on this subject, but in the course of that debate it became so apparent, upon further study, that that was not the fault, necessarily, of the States where they lived, but rather of the financial abilities of the States that I could see no way to meet the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without some Federal assistance, particularly for those States which today are considerably below the average of wealth in the United States."

To keep America free: "I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them."

The Federal Government must help: "In matters affecting the necessities of life—and I should like to confine it so far as possible to the necessities of life, namely, to relief, to education, to health, and to housing—I do not believe the Federal Government can say it has no interest, and say to the people, 'Go your way and do the best you can.' I do not believe we should do that. Because of the way wealth is distributed in the United States, I think we have a responsibility to see if we can eliminate hardship, poverty, and inequality of opportunity, to the best of our ability. I do not believe we are able to do it without a Federal aid system."

Strengthen all States: "I do not believe that even the wealthier States are able today to do all the things the people want them to do. They are not able to do it simply

because the power of the States to levy taxes is very limited and unsatisfactory. We may approach the problem in some other way; but I do not know of any State aid program which has undertaken to exclude any State from some participation in the program. I believe that the general principle holds true, that if we are to do it at all, we must include all the States, including the wealthier ones. My theory is that if we do not undertake a Federal aid program, we shall have a national program forced upon us. I think it would be far better to strengthen the States—the strong States as well as the weak States."

No other way: "It is popular to provide for public works. Public works are nice things; we can see them. But when it comes down to the basic necessities of life and the basic elements of human welfare and human progress, there is nothing more important than education. It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance."

Safe from Federal control: "In my opinion, those of us who are interested in seeing that the power of the Federal Government does not increase are on sound ground in supporting the granting of Federal aid to enable the States to do what is necessary to resist Federal action, and then to insist that there be no interference with the power of the States to require their governments to administer their own affairs."

A long history of U.S. education support: "I should like to point out that Federal aid to education is not new in principle, that the Federal Government has always shown an intense interest in education throughout the United States. The Land Grant College Act provided an endowment to support at least one agricultural and mechanical college in every State. Furthermore, we have made appropriations for agricultural experiment stations. We have extended Federal aid for programs of cooperation with the States in extension work in agriculture and economics, and also in agricultural and industrial courses in secondary schools. Of course, going back to the beginning, it will be remembered that practically all public lands, I think, were distributed on condition that one section, sometimes two sections, in every township should be set aside to be sold and used for the purpose of local education. So, the general interest of the Federal Government in education cannot be questioned from a historical standpoint."

It can be done: "But I believe very strongly indeed that in this field and in health and other fields dealing directly with human welfare we must work out a sound system of improvement. I think that the best form we have today is the form of Federal aid to the States, leaving complete control of the administration of the funds and the administration of the programs, for which they must have the primary responsibility, in the hands of the local communities."

Fundamental American principle: "I think we have a tremendous obligation to provide equality of opportunity to the children of the United States. When the Declaration of Independence said that all men are created equal it perhaps made an extreme statement, but I have always felt that what was meant was that all men in the United States are entitled to equality of opportunity. No child can have equality of opportunity, in my opinion, unless to start with he has a basic minimum education. There are many children who may have the mental capacity or the mental brilliance to rise above that handicap; there are many who will educate themselves; but I think they comprise a very small proportion of the total. The ordinary child who receives no education is, in effect, condemned to a life of poverty, a life

on the basis of a low standard of living, a life of little interest, and a life which is of little value to the people of the United States.

"I feel very strongly that we in this country have an opportunity which no other country has ever had, because of our tremendous productive ability, to see to it that equality of opportunity is afforded to all children born in the United States, or at least to aim in that direction and to achieve that end as closely as possible by administrative methods."

People on the move: "Today people move all over the United States, so there is a national interest in the basic education which they have received."

Demands of the people: "The people have become more and more interested in the action of States and localities in various fields. The demands for State action have constantly increased until today I believe that even the wealthier States are not able to meet the demands the people themselves make upon them in the particular fields which are their primary obligation."

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Fourth of July is our national holiday, so independence day under various names is the signal holiday for many nations of the world.

For the Greeks, independence day has special and perhaps unique significance. Celebrating the beginning of the revolt against Ottoman rule which began on March 21, 1821, Greek Independence Day marks the renewal of the traditions of freedom, independence and cultural excellence which have been the hallmarks of Greece since ancient times.

Indeed, if there were such a thing as a copyright on these ideas the Greeks would hold it. For it is to ancient Greece that we must look for the source of our ideas of individual freedom, of the relation between the free citizen and the state and of many other of the highest achievements of Western civilization. The Greeks conceived these ideas, developed them and put them into practice, and finally, through their writings, transmitted them across the dark ages of history so that they might be reborn in modern forms.

These ideas and traditions have never really been lost in Greece, although that country through the centuries suffered heavily from alien rule and oppression. Throughout the long Muslim rule, lasting more than 300 years from the 15th to the 19th centuries, these ideas and traditions kept Greek society alive and ready to reassert its rightful place in the world. The Greeks fought bitterly for their independence for over 6 years from 1821 to 1827 and in this fight and victory set an example for the nations of the modern world.

As Greeks celebrate the 139th anniversary of the beginning of their renewal of independence, the sentiments of all people committed to freedom and independence are with them.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of March 19, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT—MARCH 19, 1960

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The civil rights debate struggles on with progress not readily recognizable (see newsletters March 5 and 12). Contrary to expectation, debate time has not been curtailed. Patience and tolerance also exceed expectation. Since only the House bill (compared to the Senate's) went through normal committee hearings and deliberation, the House action becomes even more important in determining the final bill. Yet, even in the House, much of the legislation is being written and rewritten by floor amendment and debate, rather than acceptance of the committee's bills and amendments. While full membership participation is democratic, many Members suspect that such hasty drafting and offering of amendments may result in poor legislation.

House action included: (1) Two amendments were ruled out of order. (a) Federal aid for desegregation of schools, and (b) the creation of a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity; (2) furor over the "conclusive presumption of the denial of voting rights" when an area is ruled by Federal court as having such a pattern of practice; (3) conflict over Presidential appointed Federal enrolling officers (to police local elections) versus Federal court appointed referees to assure everyone a vote regardless of race or color. The referee plan won out; (4) Acceptance of amendment to permit the issuance of court provisional voting order if qualified applicant has filed a complaint 20 days prior to election; (5) a southern Member, spokesman for others, threatened to bolt party leadership and the Speaker when the House is organized in the next Congress. This brings up the question, is there a basic Democrat clash? While party differences are most evident in civil rights, southerners are not nearly so dedicated to States rights and conservatism in other legislation. Southerners, at Congress outset are responsible for selection of their liberal leaders, whom they now battle and criticize.

For my part, I am most aware that the civil rights controversy is a political exercise for both parties. So much is this evident and true that I cannot share the viewpoint of many in either political party. This is a sectional dispute. The grave issues of constitutional freedoms will not be solved, only endangered or transgressed. True, we are safe to the extent that bad law may not take effect because it lacks popular acceptance (the prohibition law, another example). My earlier questions asked in debate remain unanswered. Not explained is why another law is needed now—allegedly to protect voting rights. The 15th constitutional amendment, the act of 1870, and the 1957 act provide pro-

tection. Why in 2 years has the tough 1957 act, protecting voting rights, been invoked only four times?

On the Senate side, noteworthy is the Goldwater list of the 800 separate acts of labor violence in the Kohler strike and the extension (for the first time) of bans on bombing and violence to include labor-motivated trouble. Another blessing as one Member saw it was that lengthy civil rights debate prevented other unnecessary liberal legislation from being considered. Still overlooked are these factors: (1) Discrimination according to many is greater in the North; (2) the crime rate and illegitimate birth rate in integrated areas are soaring.

The civil rights bill—whatever it may be by that time—should pass next week. Other controversial problems confronting us, awaiting attention, include: (1) Political postponement of interest rate ceiling removal; (2) socialized medicine; (3) Federal aid to education; (4) increased immigration quotas; (5) increased Federal aid to promote growth of export trade.

Some interesting defense capability figures came to my attention the other day. Before anyone takes to the hills, stampeded by an election year's military scare talk, he might ponder this for a moment: What if we could swap positions with the Russians? If you could trade places, and problems, with them tomorrow, both nations would still have operational missiles with lethal destructive capability, but you would also face a nuclear bomber force at least four times the size of yours, poised at innumerable nearby bases in every direction from you, and against which you have virtually no proven defenses. There would be aircraft carriers and strong naval forces cruising 100 miles off your coast, capable of launching nuclear bombers and missiles. Nuclear submarines would lie undetected within missile range of every one of your major cities. And there you would sit, with no comparable weaponry.

If we traded places with Russia we'd find ourselves producing only two-fifths as much steel, one-third the hydroelectric power, one-third as much oil, and one-half as much aluminum, 10 percent as much natural gas, one-third as much copper, and only 5 percent as many electric motors. To get in Russia's shape, we would have to abandon 14 out of every 15 miles of highway, destroy 19 out of every 20 autos and trucks, scrap 2 out of every 3 miles of railroad track and 60 percent of our freight cars, and sink 8 out of every 9 merchant ships. And we think we've got problems. If we traded places with Russia, our only gain would be a rocket on the moon. Oh, yes, it was free enterprise and individual freedom that produced our present armed might, and the economic strength to support it.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact the Forand Bill To Provide Health Insurance Coverage as Part of Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I

include resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts in support of the Forand bill:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT THE FORAND BILL TO PROVIDE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE AS PART OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Whereas the Forand bill now pending before the Congress of the United States provides health insurance coverage as part of social security benefits thereby providing 9 out of 10 people 65 years of age and over with health and hospitalization benefits as part of their social security benefits, said benefits to be paid for by the beneficiaries during their working years; and

Whereas said bill has the endorsement of many medical and hospital authorities and is considered essential to meet the growing need for more adequate medical care for elderly people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give early and favorable consideration to the enactment of the Forand bill providing health insurance coverage as part of social security benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, February 29, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

Clerk.

In senate, adopted in concurrence, March 2, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,

Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee)". His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Getting Ahead With Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a copy of the speech made by Dr. Charles R. Sayre, president, Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, Greenwood, Miss., before the annual meeting of the Cotton Buyers' Division, South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Charleston, S.C., on March 11:

GETTING AHEAD WITH COTTON

TARGETS IN COMMON

First, may I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the opportunity to participate in this meeting of the cotton buyers' division, South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association.

The common target for all in the industry is getting ahead profitably with cotton.

As businessmen in cotton, you and I must consider these basic questions:

First, Will I make a profit this year—1960-61?

Second, Will this year's actions bring more profitable business next year?

Third, Are my actions and those of others in my segment of the industry helping toward a brighter future, expanding markets, and bigger profits beyond?

Fourth, Is greater economic freedom ahead?

I shall use numerous preliminary estimates and guesses in this discussion. They represent the best arithmetic and opinions that I have come by. Please adjust them to fit your information. Use them warily, with discretion, and, at your risk.

POSSIBILITIES—1960 CROP

As most of you know, the national allotment for 1960 is 16,310,000 acres, identical with 1959. This total climbed to 17,333,000 acres when the B option acreages were included last year. According to data developed recently by Mr. Lamar Fleming, Jr., more than 13 percent of the allotted acreages were not harvested. This underplanting reflects the soil bank and other reasons for nonuse of allotments mainly in the Southeast and in the hilly areas of the Mid-south, Texas, and Oklahoma.

PUBLIC LAW 86-172

One new feature enters the 1960 underplantings picture. Public Law 86-172 was passed during the last session of Congress. This law makes it possible for a farmer who decides not to plant to release more freely the unused acreage to his county agricultural stabilization committee and still keep his acreage history for the future. He must plant 75 percent of his allotment once in each 3 years and release the unused portion or he loses the allotment permanently. This provides considerably greater incentive than heretofore for unused allotment transfers. Transfers can be made across county lines by the State ASC committee without affecting the statistical history of the county of origin. Much of the unused acreages in 1959

were in the Southeast. In Mississippi, the net underplantings in 1959 amounted to 168,500 acres. A statewide campaign is underway to get these allotments transferred and planted. Similar campaigns will be conducted in several other States.

A reduction in the allotments not harvested, by as much as 20 percent, would mean approximately 480,000 more acres in production, compared with 1959. Assuming a yield of 375 pounds of lint per acre with the bulk of the transfer in lower yield sub-regions, the net addition to production would amount to about 360,000 bales. Most of this cotton will be eligible for price supports, mainly under the (A) option purchase program.

PRICE SUPPORTS LOWER—1960 CROP

Again, as most of you know, the 1960 crop will be the second and last year of the (A) and (B) grower options under existing law. Price support levels will be 5 percentage points of parity lower for each option, compared with 1959. Using the August through January quality differences and the usual locational differentials, the SLM 1½¢ inch support and release values at Mississippi Delta points, would compare with the September figures for the crop as follows:

	1959 crop	1960 crop
Strict Low Middling 1-1/16:		
(A) Purchase.....	32.30	31.32
(B) Loan.....	26.60	25.53
CCC resale, (A) cotton.....	29.26	28.08

It is needless to mention to this group that a greater reduction will prevail for white cottons and still smaller difference between the 1959 and 1960 support levels for the lower grades. For example, projections of CCC resale values for LM 1-1/16 using the same methodology, gives 24.55 cents per pound. The September 1959 resale for LM 1-1/16 was 24.64 cents in the Delta.

RESALE POLICY AND CARRYING CHARGES CHANGED

On the first day of this month, USDA announced that the minimum resale price for 1959 and prior crops of upland cotton in its inventory will be the higher of (1) the market price, as determined by Commodity Credit Corporation, or (2) 115 percent of the Choice (B) loan during the 1960-61 marketing year. The options (A) cotton from the 1960 crop will, as for 1959, be sold at 110 percent of the Choice (B) loan.

Preliminary approximations for September 1960 reflecting the above policy, compared with CCC minimum resale value for September 1959, gives the following:

Preliminary projections, September 1960, CCC minimum resale prices compared with September 1959—Mississippi Delta¹

	1959 resale, all stocks	1960 resale	
		Option (A)	1959 and prior crops
Middling 1½¢.....	33.22	31.28	32.71
Strict Low Middling 1½¢.....	29.26	28.08	29.36
Low Middling 1½¢.....	24.64	24.55	26.66

¹ Using August through January differences for 1960 crop.

Carrying charges for price support and resale purposes for the next marketing year will hinge upon 20 points per month compared with the current 15 points. None will be added in August and September, and in October the addition will be 10 points only.

FIVE OTHER SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY—1960-61

We face five other sources of uncertainty as each of us try to extend our profits for 1960-61. These include the extent of growers' choice of the (B) option, level of export subsidy and CCC reclass regulations, level of textile demand, level of textile imports, and, of course, the weather.

We all admit our frailties in dealing with the weather. But, it is already dealing with the planting season at hand. Freezes on February 24 and 25 knocked out about 100,000 acres of cotton which had been planted in the Rio Grande Valley. Ground temperatures were around 50 degrees as late as March 5, with plantings getting underway in stride just this week.

In much of the Southeast and Midsouth land preparation is considerably behind schedule.

OPTION (B) PROSPECTS

Along with price support difference six primary factors affect growers' efforts to maximize income as they choose between the (A) and (B) options including:

1. Availability of top-quality land and water.
2. Adequate machinery.
3. Stable sources of labor.
4. Management on the job.
5. Suitable financing and financial risks.
6. Market prospects.

I shall review in detail only two of those considerations—financial risks and market prospects.

Cash outlay for preharvest production costs have skyrocketed during the past 15 years. I happen to be the President of the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation, which finances approximately 175,000 acres of Delta cotton each year. On the average for 1944 through 1949 the preharvest advances per acre were \$42.06. In comparison, those advances for 1955 through 1959 averaged \$99.60 per acre—a 237 percent increase. In other words, the Delta cotton grower must lay a \$100 bill on each acre of land before he picks a lock and has a chance to get a dollar in return.

Financial risks, coupled with the noncontrollable elements of production, have spawned an attitude of caution among the medium and small-sized cotton farmers in many parts of the Belt. This is counteracted to some degree by contracts being made in advance, particularly in parts of Texas and California and, to a lesser extent, in the Midsouth.

A \$50,000 limitation upon the amount of price supports advanced to any one person or firm was imposed by Congress last July. This catches many growers at about the 300-bale production mark. Beyond \$50,000 the available price supports for either (A) or (B) options will be provided as recourse loans repayable 1 year after a date as yet to be established by the Secretary of Agriculture. This adds greatly to producer risks.

At first glance, it seems that because of the limitation many additional growers would choose (B). This is offset, in part, by a provision in the law which enables a grower to bypass the \$50,000 limitation through a reduction in production (as measured by

acres) to 20 percent less than his plantings in 1959.

Last year about 31 percent of the Mississippi Delta acreage was under (B). This year I'm guessing the Delta percentage at 36 to 39 percent with little change in the rest of Mississippi. However, obtaining 3-year average yields, rather than last year's high yield would mean a total (B) production about the same in the State.

Rapid sale of the 1959 production, except the middling and better cottons, and the policy change for resale of old crop stocks by CCC to 115 percent of the (B) loan level have provided encouragement to (B) growers as to market prospects.

A rather wide range of guesses have been circulating in the industry as to the probable (B) acreages and production for the coming crop. I shall add my guess by subregions. Adjustments in acreages by States and parts of States have been based upon viewpoints of a number of people. Yields have been adjusted roughly to the 3-year period 1957-59.

Mr. C. C. Smith, vice president of the National Bank of Commerce has been particularly helpful in this guessing effort. The record should be clear, however, that errors committed and omissions made must be placed at my doorstep.

The subregion picture could turn out to be something like this. The production on farms under the (A) option with cottons not eligible for purchase because of the \$50,000 support limitation are included with (B) option cotton.

1959 (B) acreages and estimated production compared with "highly preliminary" estimates 1960 (B) acreages and production by subregions¹

	1959		1960	
	Acreage	Production	Change expected	Production
			Acreage	Yield
Southeast	Thous. 170	Thous. 163	Same	Increase
MidSouth	986	1,217	Increase	Decrease
Southwest	1,487	1,164	do.	Same
Far West	813	1,754	do.	Decrease
Total	3,456	4,300		5,960

¹ (A) Cotton on farms affected by support limit included with (B) baleage.

Taking a plus or minus of 5 percent from the 5,960,000 bales total, a reasonable guess ranges between 5,650,000 and 6,250,000 bales of (B) production.

A little increase through better yield would be logical in the Southeast. Compared with 1959, the yield reductions in the MidSouth may offset some of the acreage increase. The options and the data for Texas almost defy analysis, but a big gain appears to be obvious. The same holds true for Arizona and the rest of the Far West.

For guesses of 7 million plus bales of (B) production a favorable planting season throughout the belt and peak yields everywhere are implicitly assumed. The actuarial possibilities of a completely favorable combination are rather remote.

If (B) production is 6 million bales, or perhaps a little less, the spot market situation should be a healthy one. More than 3 million additional bales would be needed to round out a 9 million bale domestic consumption. The 115 percent release price for old stocks should bring this out of current crop. There should be no hesitation on carryover since 1961 price supports are apt to be about the same or a little above the 1960 crop support levels.

These are interesting added wrinkles in relation to low grades. The CCC inventory will include only a limited supply. In coun-

tries outside the United States most of the cotton is hand-picked. These factors should result in extra activity for the Strict Low Middling and lower qualities.

DEMAND FOR UNITED STATES TEXTILES

Growers benefited greatly from the pickup in textile demand in this country during the past several months. Since textile production has not reached a high peak so quickly after the upturn, it is to be hoped that the top curve of the cycle will be prolonged. The evidence that new orders have slowed a bit in some lines is a source of concern. Also, any shadow of inventory increases is of key consequence.

On net balance, domestic consumption must be well in excess of 9 million bales yearly, if growers here are to achieve and maintain even a reasonable level of production efficiency.

IN BRIEF, PROFIT PROSPECTS FOR 1960-61

All of the above has been pointed toward an appraisal of profit prospects for 1960-61 for major segments of the cotton industry.

The picture in brief is about like this:

1. Some 350,000 bales primarily (A) option, could be produced from acres released and transferred under Public Law 86-172.
2. Price support down 5 percentage points both (A) and (B) options—resale SLM $1\frac{1}{16}$, Delta points about 28.08 cents.
3. CCC resale of 1959 and earlier crops 115 percent of (B) loan—SLM $1\frac{1}{16}$ Delta points about 29.36 cents.
4. Carrying charges for price supports and resale, 20 points per month.
5. (B) and "(B) type" production might range between 5,650,000 and 6,250,000 bales.
6. Export program delayed—subsidy should be roughly 1 to $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents below the current 8-cent level.
7. Hope for continued high level domestic textile demand.
8. Textile imports approaching 400,000 bales annual rate—quotas needed, likely hard to get.

On net balance, I read that rating card as favorable for the home team. But, long profits will require top-level batting averages. Slow starters could easily be left out. Good volume, reasonable prices.

AHEAD FOR 1961-62

The second consideration, posed earlier, is: Are the things being done now, by Government and by industry, likely to obstruct profit possibilities a year hence—1961-62.

Under current laws the Government program will be:

- (1) A single price support at a minimum of 70 percent of parity based upon the average quality of the crop.
- (2) Minimum national acreage allotment, 16,310,000 acres with no upward adjustments on individual farms.
- (3) Continuation of release and transfer of allotment acreages between farms and counties within same State without loss of history.
- (4) CCC required to sell abroad at price that will maintain the "fair historical share" of world markets for cotton from the United States.
- (5) CCC stocks to be offered at 115 percent of the loan level.
- (6) No restrictions, except voluntary quotas with Japan, on textile imports—unless new action taken.
- (7) Import quotas on raw cotton.
- (8) No limitation on amount of price supports extended to individual farm or firm—likely to be reenacted.

I shall renew only two of the above features in which the Government is directly involved.

The base for price supports will shift, for 1961-62, from M seven-eighth-inch cotton to the average of the crop (something near SLM $1\frac{1}{16}$ inches). This should reduce the level of support 1.0 to 1.35 cents per pound. But, parity itself is likely to continue to rise,

but more slowly if the formulas are not adjusted again. The net change should not be a very big one—perhaps a sideways movement or up slightly.

By 1961-62 unrestricted, textile imports could do unreckonable damage to offtake from domestic sources. Remedial actions are a must.

Here it is well to recognize that U.S. exports make up only 13 percent of the total entering world-market channels. Whenever we pull back, other cotton-exporting countries expand and quickly fill the gap.

There are three most important areas of activities in which the industry could materially affect the 1961-62 prospects. One is, continued use of discretion in the amount of increase in mill operations.

Another is, greatly intensified attention to factors affecting cotton's "processing-performance qualities" on the farm, at the gin and in market channels.

The third area, for early analysis, is the quantity and makeup of the supply, if the national acreage allotment remains at the minimum level. If you use 6 million bales in round numbers, as the estimate of 1960 crop (B) production, then production on (B) option farms might be reduced by say 1,700,000 bales for the 1961 crop. If domestic consumption and exports continue at current levels, it is readily conceivable that a larger national acreage allotment would be highly desirable for 1961. If action is attempted legislatively, the practical timing would probably be near the end of the present session of Congress.

IS MARKET EXPANSION AHEAD?

In 1958 the cotton industry, USDA, and much of the leadership in the Congress turned boldly toward market expansion as a fundamental adjustment that would bring reasonable levels of profit and stability. The basic tools to be used include price adjustments, quality development, and preservation, research, and promotion.

Big steps have been taken in price adjustments amounting to roughly 4 cents per pound in 2 years.

Additional narrowing of quality differences will encourage harvesting and ginning practices which will preserve more of the desired qualities. The incentives have often been lacking or not big enough. In fact, rigidities in the price support structure have often thwarted educational efforts in the quality field. Something of a "muddling through" attitude has prevailed in some areas when spot values and support levels have remained close together for one or more entire marketing years.

Steps taken during the past 2 years have helped greatly. Many of you have reviewed, in a fine way, the several sides of cotton's quality problems with producers throughout the belt, and when they have visited in your mills. Such efforts, I'm sure, will be continuing ones.

With custom ginning and other transitional steps appearing, a series of price and risk-spread mechanisms may evolve. These may bring profit motivation and processing-performance into the same alignment for the grower, ginner, and manufacturer.

On several quality problems, progress seems to be moving at a snail's pace. A few examples are in bagging improvement; rapid measurement, tools, and techniques; improved chemical modifications of cotton; and "break throughs" in genetics and breeding to bring practical results from interspecies hybrids in cotton.

Through intensified research and promotion the cotton industry and its leading firms must guide more of its own destiny in the future.

Tremendous technical advances in cotton production, marketing, and manufacturing will be required to make U.S. cotton, and cotton goods competitive in price and in quality in the future. This can only be done

if the textile industry is in a healthy and economically virile position with promising prospects foreseeable for at least a decade or longer. The industry has charted a course—a sound one. But, tangible safeguards from cheap competitors from the outside is an essential if the industry is to have enough financial depth to invest, in a big way, in future progress.

It is fair to say, too, that cotton farmers cannot wait indefinitely for market expansions. The reduction of 4 cents per pound must be offset by larger volumes, if farm incomes are to be kept at reasonable levels.

CAN LESS GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE BE EXPECTED?

The cumulative effects of economic disparities throughout the world and the great amount of excess capacity at each level of the cotton industry has ensnared us in one Government program after another. It is likely that even more entanglements are ahead.

Yet, to develop the economic vigor adequate to stand alone, against all odds, should be the continuing target of a united industry.

It may be a long way off, but it is worth working for.

Thank you.

Power for a Billion Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we in New Jersey are proud of the vast research efforts which have been centered in our home State, particularly in recent years. The skills and knowledge assembled in New Jersey are formidable; the projects which have taken place there are often incredible and stirring to the imagination.

In the Newark Sunday News magazine section of March 13, John Cunningham tells about one such effort. In it he shows how today's investment in research could become a small down payment on an achievement which could be one of the milestones in the history of man's progress.

Though scientists must necessarily be precise and cautious about the potential effects of their work, we laymen cannot help being impressed at the ultimate goals which spur their day-by-day work. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER FOR A BILLION YEARS

(By John T. Cunningham)

Twenty minutes in a Colorado ski chairlift in the winter of 1951 might well have implications for the next billion years—and if those 20 minutes do stretch into a billion years, give or take a few centuries, then Dr. Lyman Spitzer, Jr., and his aides at Princeton University will have conquered a personal Matterhorn for the benefit of all mankind.

Dr. Spitzer was the man on the chairlift and he is also the mild, even shy, director of

Princeton University's project Matterhorn, a research project which seeks to convert the awesome potential of nuclear fusion into a fuel source unto the year 1 billion, A.D.

Nuclear fusion takes place naturally in outer space on the sun or in the stars. This known phenomenon of the heavens is common knowledge to Dr. Spitzer, whose achievements in astronomy have earned him a respected niche in scientific circles even without his current work at Princeton.

Naturally, then, the device which may one day solve mankind's power problems is termed a "stellarator" or "star generator." Dr. Spitzer thus neatly ties up enthusiasms: "project Matterhorn," for his interest in mountain climbing and skiing; "stellarator" for his hope to transform a secret of the stars into an earth source of power.

The third basic model in a series of stellarators is now nearing completion on a 70-acre tract at Princeton University's James Forrestal Research Center, south of Route 1 and about 3 miles from the main university campus. This is called the model C.

Will this third model, being finished at a cost of \$36 million (Atomic Energy Commission funds), be the anticipated source of power?

Everyone connected with the project quite frankly answers negatively.

The AEC's area manager at the project, Enzi De Renzis, declares: "This is not a prototype of a nuclear fusion power source. This is not even a tool; we don't know what it will do. Two years ago there was an air here of 'it's just around the corner,' but now we know we're in for a long haul."

In agreement, Dr. Spitzer says: "This is another step in our research. We hoped to know whether our theories would work before now. I can't say how likely we are to be successful ultimately, but I would say our chances are 50-50—exactly what I believed in 1951."

Even now, with the model C stellarator not yet installed, project heads discuss refinements. They speak of C-2 and C-3 stellarators and beyond these, even other stellarators.

How does a governmental agency dare spend \$36 million on a device and the buildings to house it, knowing in advance that this is not an answer? Well, for one thing, this is \$36 million expended against a billion years of the future. It is, more important, \$36 million invested against the day when all known sources of energy—coal, wood, petroleum, and uranium—are used up.

Should that seem something trivial to the average American as he steps on his starter on a Sunday afternoon and prepares to burn gasoline at the rate of 12 to 14 miles per gallon, let him take heed.

This is how serious the matter is: If the world's use of power continues to rise at today's rate, consumption 100 years from now will equal about 1,000 times the present demand. At that rate, all known oil reserves would last 1 month in the year 2060, the coal would last about 6 months, and readily available fission fuels, such as uranium, would disappear in a few decades.

Soon, possibly before the year 2100, the world would come to a great and silent halt. No Sunday traffic jams would be experienced; there would be no gasoline. No TV critics would be needed; there would be no electricity, much less TV. Cold and darkness could engulf the world a mere 150 years hence. An alternative might be solar energy, but the cost would be staggering.

Princeton's stellarator has as a goal setting back the fuel exhaustion danger beyond the point where any of us need to fret. Should the Matterhorn theories work, unlimited power would be available to meet 1,000 times the present energy consumption for 1 billion years.

Anyone who wishes to find the detailed

workings of a stellarator can find thousands of words of description and scores of incredibly complicated formulae. This is no longer classified information, but for all except far-advanced mathematicians and physicists, it might just as well be.

All too simply stated, a stellarator works by confining and heating deuterium gas, a heavy form of hydrogen, to temperatures above those on the sun (about 100 million degrees). When this is done, the deuterons—or nuclei of the deuterium atoms—will fuse and give off the sought-after energy.

A very small fraction of the released energy would be directly in the form of electrical power, but nearly all would be heat. That, quite prosaically, would be fed into steam boilers to make generators run for a billion years and on and on would go the refrigerators and TV sets exactly as in the year 1960.

Theoretically, then, by heating the heavy hydrogen sufficiently and by devising a container capable of enclosing a hot gas equal to heat on the face of the sun, the world would be back to full power.

Scientists long have theorized in these general terms. Many have sought to find the solution. One Argentine scientist announced in 1951 that he had found the answer—just as Dr. Spitzer, who never had hoped to seek, much less find, the answer, began on a skiing trip to Aspen, Colo.

"I knew the problems of containment of a gas at 100 million degrees," Dr. Spitzer recalls. "I wondered how the Argentine scientist had succeeded."

The wonderment whirled in his brain until he began the 20-minute ski lift alone. When he stepped off the lift, he felt he had an answer: A "magnetic bottle," not a bottle in the conventional sense, but rather a continuous flow of magnetic force which would keep the tremendously hot deuterons in place as effectively as a glass bottle contains beer.

Returning to Princeton, Dr. Spitzer wrote a modest paper setting forth his theory and on that basis received an AEC grant of \$50,000, a sum as modest as his paper.

Acceptance of an AEC grant for anything which seemed so close to "practical" research called for some soul-searching by the Princeton University Research Board. This, quite bluntly, seemed well removed from the "pure" or "basic" exploration which universities see as their role in research.

Dr. Henry De Wolf Smyth, present chairman of the research board, remembers the quite debate. His viewpoint is of utmost importance since his work in atomic energy ranges from fundamental work on the atomic bomb to membership of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1951 to 1954.

Princeton tradition is much a part of Dr. Smyth, since his father taught at the university before him. He muses in retrospect:

"This project is unique in the university setup. Ordinarily we wouldn't be involved, but we approved the project because our Dr. Spitzer had suggested it and because the goal was so vital, so spectacular, that we felt the work would be a national service."

From such a moderate beginning, with the implicit belief that the work would soon move off to an industry for development, Project Matterhorn has grown. Today, in its multimillion-dollar surroundings, the project employs about 350 persons (with more to be hired).

Curiously, Dr. Smyth points out, as more and more money and scientific knowledge is expended, the goal becomes increasingly remote.

"None of the early shortcuts to power worked," he explains, "so that has forced us into original research. This is a novel twist."

Dr. Spitzer felt the goal could be reached quite readily in 1951. The name "Project

Matterhorn" symbolizes that belief. Dr. Spitzer, a mountain climber of considerable skill, chose the name himself. This is why: "To me, Matterhorn means a spectacular peak, one worth climbing but one which is not too difficult to climb."

Dr. Spitzer and his wife, Doreen, have scaled the mountain peak itself—going to the top of Matterhorn in 1955 ("thanks to a good guide"). He still likes the name for his project, but comments wryly: "We haven't fallen off any ledges yet, but our Matterhorn at Princeton has difficulties more subtle and dangers less fatal than Switzerland's peak."

By dangers less fatal might be meant perils from radioactivity found in atomic fission (splitting) as a source of energy (as differentiated from fusion of a stellarator). The stellarator has virtually no radioactive dangers, and no radioactive waste.

As far as the difficulties are concerned, however, they are very much present, subtle or no.

Dr. Melvin B. Gottlieb, associate director of the project and an articulate spokesman, sums up the situation by declaring, "We haven't found the answers, but we've come up with some most pertinent questions."

The answers have not yet been found to the problems of containing the gas or heating the matter to temperatures beyond a few million degrees. The charged particles stray from the magnetic bottle long before fusion takes place.

"We had to assume the plasma (the deuterons and electrons in the magnetic field) would act in a simple way," Dr. Gottlieb explains. "Now we know that the assumption of simple process is not valid; more complicated processes are going on, too."

Nine years and millions of dollars certainly have not been expended in vain. Theory has advanced tremendously, especially at Project Matterhorn, now recognized as having the Nation's top collection of plasma physics theorists. Each advance in theory means a step nearer the threshold of the exciting potential of unlimited energy sources.

Project Matterhorn attracts top minds. For one thing, this field of plasma physics has become increasingly popular; each advance brings more applicants for positions. They must bring with them a knowledge of the science, plus an appreciation for theory. "Theory always has been vital here," Dr. Gottlieb emphasizes. "That's in the image of Lyman Spitzer, who is strong in theory, in method and in control. He is the heart of Project Matterhorn."

Scientists also seek identification with projects such as Matterhorn because of the chance to work in mankind's behalf. "Scientists are sensitive people," says Dr. Gottlieb. "They've inwardly been hurt by charges that they're bent on destroying civilization."

Accordingly, with theorists on hand to propose new challenges for the model C stellarator, with enthusiastic physicists, mathematicians and engineers to translate that theory into action, and with the great new stellarator about to be installed, Project Matterhorn nears new heights.

Already the three tremendous 95-ton flywheels are being put in place to run the generators which will send direct current electrical power into the stellarator at fixed pulsations of a fraction of a second's duration. The emplacements for the stellarator are ready, the controls and measuring devices are nearing completion. Sometime within the next year the model C will be tried.

Everyone is optimistic, but wary. Perhaps this is signified by the fact that the model C will occupy only about one-third of the floorspace in the huge room allotted to the stellarator. That makes a visitor aware that something else is anticipated.

Up the figurative slope of Princeton's Matterhorn climb the scientists, guided by Dr.

Lyman Spitzer, Jr. He is aware that in at least one way he is better off than the Argentine scientist whose faulty announcement of the discovery of nuclear fusion began that fruitful thought session in the Colorado chair lift.

What happened to the Argentine?

"They put him in jail," responds Dr. Spitzer, with the slowly widening grin that makes him a more likely-to-succeed Matterhorn guide than a man with knowledge and theory alone. People follow such a man.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, because the subject of chemicals in food is of nationwide interest I am inserting, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, a letter from the superintendent of one of the largest food processing plants in the entire United States and which is located in my congressional district.

This letter shows that the National Canners Association, reputable canners of food, and the California Packing Corp. in particular, are taking steps to insure that food offered to the public is completely pure.

The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA PACKING CORP.,

San Jose, Calif., March 8, 1960.

Subject: Chemicals in food.

The Honorable CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Congress of the United States, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Public attention has recently focused on the question of harmful chemical residues in food products resulting from the misapplication of pesticides to the raw products. Consumers are understandably confused because the amounts of certain chemicals that would be harmful to humans have never been scientifically established. Growers and processors of fruits and vegetables have a problem in making certain that only permissible pesticides are used at the proper times and in the proper concentrations. I am writing this letter to acquaint you with our company's chemical pesticide policy and the control program recently adopted by the canning industry.

Our company's raw product procurement and processing operations in Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties as well as in all other areas in which we procure and process fruits and vegetables are governed by formal policy, which specifies that:

"No crop is to be accepted and processed which has been treated with or grown on land treated with a pesticide chemical which has not been accepted for registration by USDA for use in connection with all growing of the commodity involved * * * (and) the usage limitations which have been accepted by the USDA must be adhered to for the specific fruit or vegetable commodity to which they apply."

It is understood that to effect such a program requires not only extreme vigilance on our part, but complete understanding and cooperation on the part of growers.

The canning industry through its national organization (National Canners Association) and State and regional canning associations has initiated a program to inform all of the

canners throughout the United States of their responsibility in this matter, with suggested procedures for implementing control measures. This program also embodies cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Extension Service, land grant colleges, various State agricultural agencies, national and local farm organizations, the farm press, and various other means of educating those engaged in growing and processing.

A considerable tonnage of fruits and vegetables for canning are grown in your district, and therefore this subject is of importance to the growers of these crops. I am sure you likewise recognize the long-range economic effect on our community should consumer confidence in canned food become damaged. Negligence by a very small percent of the Nation's canners or growers can mean financial ruin for all, regardless of acreage location or who distributes the product.

For these reasons I am calling this matter to your attention so that you may be apprised of the action which we and other members of the processing industry are undertaking in this respect, and I am attaching a copy of the industry program.

Canned fruits and vegetables are today among the most economical buys the consumer finds on the supermarket shelves, and we intend to keep them that way through the use of every advance in agricultural and processing science which is consistent with the complete health safety of our products.

Should you have any questions or comments relative to our effort, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

W. F. WESTON,
Superintendent.

Imports of Lambs and Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in view of the import statistics in the last 2 or 3 years as compared with previous years, it is not difficult to realize that the sheep industry is justifiably alarmed and distressed at the serious threat to continued existence in the United States. My State of Nebraska is among those that are so concerned.

The sheep and wool industry is a vital one to the well-being of this country. Sound national policy would dictate that such measures as are available be taken to assure survival of the growing of sheep and the production of wool within the United States, and the avoidance of a situation of being totally dependent on imports for our supplies.

Steps in the direction of either tariff rates revision or of quotas on imports can be taken only through action before the Tariff Commission and a recommendation by it which will later be acted upon by the President.

Hearings before that Commission on this subject are currently in progress.

Among the witnesses who have been called to testify on the current and specific statistics, especially as they apply to Nebraska and Wyoming, are

Charles Jones, of Huntley, Wyo., president of the North Platte Valley Lamb Feeders Association; J. F. (Pat) King, of Morrill, Nebr.; and Lowell Wilkes, of Scottsbluff, Nebr.; who are members of that association.

It is from witnesses as these that the real, brutal impact of imports on the domestic industry will be clearly and forcefully presented and portrayed.

As a preliminary to their more specific and authoritative presentation, the Senator from Nebraska personally appeared before the Tariff Commission earlier today to present a statement on this general subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the statement to which I refer.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA
BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON
LAMB AND MUTTON IMPORTS INTO THE
UNITED STATES

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the U.S. Tariff Commission on the subject of lamb and mutton imports into the United States.

The prompt scheduling of this hearing on your own motion following the application of the National Wool Growers Association and the National Lamb Feeders Association was gratifying to all who are concerned with and affected by the growing competition from lamb and mutton imports facing this industry.

Much attention has been justly devoted to this recent development by the press and trade journals. It is abundantly clear that the industry is genuinely alarmed and distressed by the growing competition from abroad. Its concern with the present and prospective situation must not be ignored if our domestic production is to survive the new developments.

Under such circumstances, this hearing and the reported findings by the Tariff Commission will accomplish many good purposes. In the first place, a record will be available against which we can substantiate or dispel the apprehensions of the lambgrowers.

The alarm, by the way, over the present import situation must not be underestimated. With the information presented at hand, it is reasonable to say that the picture has changed over night. Shipments of mutton into this country increased from 17.2 million pounds in 1958 to 47.3 million pounds in 1959. Imports of lamb climbed to 9.5 million pounds last year as contrasted with 6.8 million pounds in 1958.

The total imports of lamb and mutton were more than twice as high in 1959 as in 1958, and 15 times as high as the 8-year average from 1950 to 1957.

We are told that Australia and New Zealand have immense sheep populations. These countries are seeking new markets, especially since the termination of an agreement to supply the United Kingdom market with certain quantities of lamb and mutton. Indicative of this, in addition to increases in imports of dressed lamb and mutton, last fall two shipments of live lambs, and so far this year a third, each numbering about 25,000 head, were imported from Australia.

The long-range and total meaning of these figures I will leave to those present and intending to testify. They are better versed in the economics and familiar with the statistics which pertain to this situation. They are prepared to furnish the desired analysis and evaluation which might assist you in this investigation. I will make only one, pos-

sibly self-apparent, observation. As matters now stand, such foreign production spells competition under increasingly adverse conditions for American producers.

Furthermore, we do not need to speculate as to how soon such conditions will endanger the industry generally. The growers have already experienced a sharp drop in ewe prices. Also, last fall when imports of dressed lamb were heavy, growers received 15 percent less for their lambs than the year before, which was 7 percent lower than the average for the last 5 years.

The inescapable fact is that our Australian and New Zealand competitors can deliver lamb in this country considerably lower than our production costs. Furthermore, the marginal difference cannot easily be overcome. It is estimated that, to compete with the foreign price, our producers would have to be able to raise lamb for about one-half of what it costs today. Faced with steadily rising production costs, rather than declining, this means that the industry is virtually unable to match the foreign price.

Against this background of large and continually increasing imports, the need for the industry to turn to the Tariff Commission for protection of the domestic production is clear and urgent.

With me this morning are Mr. Pat King, of Morrill, Nebr., and Mr. Lowell Wilkes, Scottsbluff, Nebr., both representing the North Platte Valley Lamb Feeders Association. They join the many others present in urging this investigation under section 7 (the so-called escape clause) of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They have prepared a thoughtful statement with the knowledge that, only upon a finding that dressed lamb and mutton and live lambs are being imported into this country in such quantities as to cause or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry, can the desired relief be recommended by the Tariff Commission.

I subscribe fully to the idea that an application be made to the Tariff Commission under this provision of the act. The action of the Commission, furthermore, in recognizing the urgency of their case by setting this hearing was indeed welcomed by all of us. Through your investigation will the industry obtain a full report regarding the current situation and the expected trends of the market.

Any action taken by the Tariff Commission must be geared to the established facts of immediate or threatened injury. In this respect, the reported findings will furnish the information and lay the foundation for recommendations balancing the needs of the industry and the public at large.

I commend to your attention the statements that will be made by the representatives of the industry present here this morning.

May I urge that careful consideration be given to establishment of action affording a proper and fair measure of protection to the domestic production of this vital industry.

St. Lawrence Seaway: Engineering Marvel; Economic Fizzle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Sunday edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer, entitled "Still

Waiting for Spring on the Seaway," effectively points up the one feature; namely, the 4 months' freezeup, that persuaded many of us to vote against the project when it was originally before the Congress.

The Inquirer editorial is prefaced by this observation:

This is the first day of spring, by the calendar, but the ice is still hard along the St. Lawrence Seaway, where not a ton of ocean cargo has been moved since last December 3.

And then, to emphasize the vast difference between the seaway and a truly year-round waterway, the Delaware River, the Inquirer zeroed on the obvious shortcomings of a transportation medium that is out of service for 4 months out of every year in these words:

The St. Lawrence Seaway rates high as a product of human ingenuity, but it simply is not in the same class with the Delaware River when it comes to moving cargoes—whatever the season.

Last year, before the seaway went into deep freeze in December, it handled 20 millions tons of cargo. That's about one-fifth the tonnage on the Delaware in 1959.

Finally the Inquirer concluded with these comments:

The St. Lawrence Seaway may be an effective avenue of maritime commerce within narrow limitations, but its value and efficiency have been vastly overrated. The American people should be told more about the superior facilities provided by the Delaware River and the port of Philadelphia. And no waiting for the ice to break up in April, either.

Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to emphasize the facts of a situation which the quoted editorial has scored on all essential points. I want to reaffirm, however, that these facts were before the House when many of the members voted against a project that could never be reasonably efficient and which will always constitute a two-pronged attack on Pennsylvania; namely, by bypassing the port of Philadelphia and at the same time exacting so much from our taxpayers to pay for what has turned out to be an economic disillusionment.

Coastwise and Intercoastal Shipping Problems Ignored in Commerce Department Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, as a firm believer in the need for an adequate U.S. merchant marine, to serve both the foreign commerce of our country and its logistics requirements in time of war or national emergency, I have awaited with much interest the report on Federal transport policy which the Department of Commerce undertook at the request of President Eisenhower.

That report has now been made, and given broad publicity. Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which likewise is conducting a study of the Nation's transportation policies, facilities, and needs, has a particular interest in this report, and I will have something to say about it at a later date.

Today I would like to direct attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce, under date of March 17, anent the Commerce Department report. Particularly I would like to quote one short sentence from the report, which goes as follows:

It is almost incredible, in fact, that a survey covering so broad a transport field, and going into some of its aspects in such detail, should ignore the problems of coastwise and intercoastal shipping, now fighting with its back against the wall on issues that cut across the most vital nerves of Federal transport policy.

So deplorable is the condition of the coastwise and intercoastal shipping industry, that since we began our committee hearings in this field late in February, the one remaining common carrier vessel serving Pacific coast ports has been forced to suspend operations. Thus, for the first time in this present century, except possibly for a year or so during wartime, the Pacific coast is without a single vessel offering itself as a common carrier to transport the lumber, canned goods, and many other items which traditionally have been carried by vessels in the coastal and intercoastal trades.

When the Commerce Department, which was established to foster and develop transport facilities to serve the country's needs, ignores a situation such as this, which is clamoring for redress, it lays upon the Congress, and, in a special way, upon our Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a responsibility for action which cannot and will not be ignored.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Journal of Commerce be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YET TO COME

It is not fair to dub the Mueller report on Federal transport policy "just another Weeks report," as some carriers are doing, with reference, of course, to the survey released by then Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks in 1955, only to vanish shortly thereafter into obscurity.

Perhaps it was due to the very fact that the present Secretary feared this appellation and determined to avoid it that the Commerce Department's new approach (Federal transportation policy and program) became a far broader, more penetrating and more thoughtful document than its predecessor.

That something is wrong with our transportation system, with the Federal law that governs it and with the administrative apparatus regulating it is getting more apparent every year. The financial deterioration of the railroads, the vast complexity of the rate structure, the constant battles between carriers, the great wastage of time, money and talent on trivial regulatory cases, the glacial slowness of ICC procedure and the inequities of tax and regulatory poli-

cies—all testify to the need of not one, but many broad changes. It is, indeed, high time that the seriousness of the problem should be stated in terms as somber and in a perspective as broad as set out in the Mueller report.

But to say this is not to say that this report lived up to its promise, not even in its statement of the problem, which is clearly its strongest section.

It is almost incredible, in fact, that a survey covering so broad a transport field, and going into some of its aspects in such detail, should ignore the problems of coastwise and intercoastal shipping, now fighting with its back against the wall on issues that cut across the most vital nerves of Federal transport policy. It is more understandable, but still regrettable, that its authors could not come to grips with two problems of great moment to the trucking and railroad industry, the multiplicity of State weight limitations in the first instance, and of State and local taxation in the second.

So while the picture presented is graphic, it is incomplete. And because it is incomplete, the recommendations which have now emerged are lopsided, and as strangely vague in some instances as they are surprisingly specific in others.

Nearly all carriers can find something of what they want in this report.

If the rails are chided for showing too little imagination, for cutting rates in the wrong places and not cutting them in the right places, they have the satisfaction of knowing the report's authors want ICC to be more lenient on them in setting floors on rates, and want it stopped from suspending their proposed rate changes just because some other carriers protest. These are important points.

If the Mueller report would saddle trucks and water lines with user charges and deprive them of some of their current protections against rail competitive rate cutting via ICC, it supports their claims for a greater integration of transport through joint rates and indicates that, if the rails are given these added advantages, they may get them only at the price of losing some of their exemptions from antitrust prosecution.

It is quite possible that all the different policies the report advocates could be pursued simultaneously (including a greater coordination of Federal transport controls) with benefit to the transport industry and shippers alike. But can they? We may never know.

The trouble is in the maldistribution of weight among the points put forward. The report states precisely where out-of-pocket costs should be set in computing the railroad rate minima. But when it gets around to user charges on inland bargelines and airlines, it speaks only in terms of principles. And it is even more vague in suggesting a change in the protection weaker carriers might be granted under the antitrust laws. Having just touched upon the subject, it promptly dropped it.

We would not say that the Mueller report is a prorailroad document loaded against other types of carriers. But because it is as specific in recommending certain changes in Federal regulatory policy that the railroads want right now as it is vague in holding out compensating benefits to other carriers, we cannot altogether blame other sections of the transport industry for feeling aggrieved.

This does not cancel altogether the soundness of some of the major recommendations contained in the Mueller report, but it does pretty well dash the expectations of those who hoped this would turn out to be the definitive or ultimate survey of U.S. transport policy. That, unfortunately, is yet to come.

Here Comes Your Airmail—By Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there has recently appeared in Washington newspapers an interesting message from the Southern Railway System. Under a picture of a diesel engine pulling a train through a snow storm, there is this caption: "Here Comes Your Air Mail—And Your Highway Mail, Too."

The picture and caption tell quite graphically the story of how the Post Office Department—and private business, too—depends on the railroads when all other means of transportation fail.

The message continues:

Every year, the railroads are being squeezed out of more and more of the mail-carrying business. Mail once hauled by rail is being diverted, instead, to highway trucks and to the airlines.

But what happens when the weather gets ornery—when trucks bog down on snow covered highways and planes are grounded?

You guessed it. Back to the railroads it comes in a veritable flood. Then the railroads get the mail—and get it through, too. All of it. Until the sun shines again.

The proven ability of the railroads to carry the mail under any conditions and in all kinds of weather didn't "just happen." Railroad transportation is dependable transportation. And in their mail-handling equipment and facilities, railroads have an investment of about a billion dollars.

During the recent series of bad storms throughout the South, railroads were called upon many times and in many places to help carry on the postal tradition that the mail must go through. And it did.

But if diversions to other carriers continue, the day may come when railroads will not be able to move all mail at the drop of a snowflake. And if this ever happens, all America will be the loser.

It is signed by Mr. Harry A. DeButts, president of the Southern Railway System.

Mr. Speaker, this message has a significance for Congress. We all recognize the importance of the railroad industry, as everyone does. But we must do more than merely recognize this importance. We must take action to see that this most vital mode of transportation is healthy and ready for emergencies, not only those caused by inclement weather, but the emergencies, related to national defense.

I do not believe it is any exaggeration to say that this country could not have won recent wars without the railroads. Certainly we could not carry out our national defense effort today without the tremendous moving job done by the Nation's railroads.

There are many bills before Congress which would aid the railroads in one way or another. I would call attention to H.R. 9488, which would prohibit the diversion from the railroads to the airlines of first-class mail on which airmail

postage has not been paid. There are several companion bills to H.R. 9488, which I introduced early in this session, among them H.R. 9741 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN].

A companion measure has also been introduced in the Senate, S. 3214, by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

I am hopeful that there will be early hearings on the House bills before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

It does not make much sense for the Government to engage in any practices which would hurt the railroads when the Nation depends on the industry so much. Unless we act most carefully in promoting competing means of transportation, we will surely find we are hurting the industry which carries the bulk of the freight which is moved in this Nation. Unless we are careful, we will find the railroads will not have the ability and capability of handling the load—of mail, of defense freight, and of private business—which we expect them to carry when other forms of transportation temporarily fail or when special needs arise.

Biographical Sketch of Ernest Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Ernest Henderson, president of the Sheraton Corp. of America and a distinguished citizen of Boston. I bring this to the attention of the Senate because of the publication yesterday by the David McKay Co. of "The World of Mr. Sheraton," the autobiography of Ernest Henderson. This autobiography affords an insight to the workings of the American economic system as well as to the genius of one of Massachusetts' leading citizens.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERNEST HENDERSON, PRESIDENT, SHERATON CORP. OF AMERICA

The head of a system of 54 hotels, with over 25,000 rooms, maintained by a staff of 21,000 people, yet a man who finds time to be proficient in many dissimilar fields, is Ernest Henderson, president of the Sheraton Corp. of America.

In addition to directing operations of the one-third-billion-dollar hotel empire from the Boston home office, Mr. Henderson travels an average of 50,000 miles a year between the 34 cities that have Sheraton hotels and numerous other centers around the globe to scout out new locations—yet this modern Yankee trader still finds time to: collect antiques, with which he sometimes furnishes hotel luxury suites; play several musical instruments and compose popular tunes and become an accomplished color photographer. He is an avid radio ham, operating a 1,000-watt broadcasting set from his home, from which he can establish con-

tacts with radio hams in 40 countries around the globe.

Mr. Henderson's heterogeneous interests perhaps developed from what was an unusual background and schooling for a boy born in Chestnut Hill, in the suburbs of Boston on March 7, 1897. He was the son of Bertha von Bunsen and Ernest Flagg Henderson, a historian whose work involved research in many libraries throughout the world, with the result that young Ernest attended schools in France, Germany, and Switzerland. He also attended Noble and Greenough and Browne and Nichols in this country, before entering college. He then entered Harvard University, with the class of 1918, proficient in several foreign languages.

During his freshman year, young Henderson first met Robert Lowell Moore, a classmate who was to become his business partner, closest friend, and cofounder of the great Sheraton Hotel system.

It was 1914, the early days of World War I, and there was an acute truck shortage, as a result of which, and in order to supplement their families' allowances, the two freshmen entered into their first corporate business venture.

At that time the Ford Motor Co. made no trucks, but some enterprising businessmen had discovered a serviceable truck could be made from a Ford chassis by removing the body of the Model T, taking off the rear wheels and welding on a more powerful rear axle.

This transformation involved discarding the new bodies of the Model T passenger cars and the two Harvardians found a use for them. They bought the surplus bodies from the truck makers for \$25 each, combed the used-car yards for 1912 and 1913 Model T's, and, with hammer, welding torch, and wrench, welded the 1914 tops to 1912 chassis, resulting in a net profit of about \$175 a car.

Within a few months their dormitory yard looked like a used-car lot, and business increased so much that the Model T magnates rented a barn and were employing classmates as mechanics on their assembly line.

The partners converted dozens of these automobiles before the Ford Motor Co. went into the truck-making business and the supply of automobile bodies dried up. But by that time, the two had lost interest in supplementing their college allowances, for when the United States had entered the war, they both left school to join the services.

Young Henderson became a pilot in the Navy Air Service, and was shipped to Europe where he logged most of his time ferrying Caproni planes from the Italian factories to the front in France. His service was not without hazard in the early days of flight and lackadaisical maintenance which the lieutenant soon discovered when he made a forced landing because a worker had left a hammer in the engine.

At the war's end, Ernest, his brother George, an infantry captain, and Moore, a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army Air Service, traveled all over Germany, picking up souvenirs. However, they were enterprising and picked up items that were scarce in this country and yet inexpensive in Germany because of inflation—articles like German Army binoculars, cameras, lenses, police dogs, and ship models.

From this start, after their return to the United States, was born Henderson Bros., importers, and the three friends alternately took summer trips to Europe to purchase their varied goods.

One item on which the partners took a flier that almost turned out to be a failure was a German ersatz suit, which retailed at only 50 cents. The suit turned out to be made of paper and unfortunately tended to disintegrate in the rain leaving customers occasionally in distress during moist

weather. The alert importers eventually found a market for them, however, and no complaints. They sold their stock to a Chicago undertaking concern who used the suits in their business.

Immediately after the war, young Henderson obtained a job with General Electric in Schenectady, N.Y., but after a year returned to Boston and rejoined his former roommate, Moore, for graduate study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Radio was in its infancy in 1920 when Henderson and Moore were studying in the M.I.T. laboratories. Good sets with loudspeakers cost a lot of money, but the partners discovered that with the profit from importing activities they could assemble radios and sell them for \$89.50, well below any competition.

They put together the first sets themselves, but after they got into production formed the World Radio Corp., and as the popularity of radio increased and the boom years came, they had 30 retail stores spotted around New England and were grossing \$1 million a year.

In the depression thirties, the partners bought control of an investment company, Beacon Participations, for \$10,111. They used this company to purchase real estate at deflated prices and within 5 years were in control of \$30 million worth. It was through Beacon that they made their entrance into the hotel business with the purchase of the Hotel Continental in Cambridge, Mass., which they bought in 1934 at an auction as an experiment.

By 1939, the chain had four hostels including the Sheraton in Boston, from which, with typical shrewdness, it derived its name. The hotel had a new neon roof sign. This helped influence the adoption of the name and urn symbol of the 18th century cabinet-maker, Thomas Sheraton, whom antiquarian Henderson had always admired.

In 1941, the complex capital structure of Henderson and Moore's various investment companies was simplified into one top investing company entirely financed by one class of stock. The company continued to pick up hotels and office buildings from banks, insurance companies and bondholders' committees that were having a hard time then. In 1943, it shifted from the investment company status to become Sheraton Corp., a real estate owner and manager. From then on, the Sheraton chain expanded rapidly, and in 1946, through an exchange of stock, the corporation took over the ailing U.S. Realty & Investment Co., acquiring valuable real estate and a listing on the New York Stock Exchange.

Starting in Boston and Cambridge, Sheraton moved outward, taking in Worcester, Rochester, New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, and eventually San Francisco and Los Angeles, as well as eastern Canada with the purchase of seven hotels in the Cardy and Ford chains in 1949 and 1950. During the acquisition of these properties, Henderson and Moore instituted scientific methods of cost-cutting and management. Experts in interior decoration, engineering, personnel, entertainment, public relations and advertising were put to work providing the hotels with the best possible services and all benefited from the economy of control purchasing within the framework of local autonomy.

In 1956, in a \$30 million deal, Sheraton bought the Eppley chain of 22 hotels.

Until 1957, Sheraton had followed a policy of buying existing hotels and converting them to the high standards set, but in that year the first Sheraton-built hotel opened in Philadelphia—the \$16 million, 1,000-room Sheraton.

Another phase of Sheraton expansion began. The \$15 million luxury skyscraper Sheraton-Dallas opened this spring. The

200-room Sheraton Inn in Binghamton, N.Y., opened this spring and a 300-room hotel in Portland, Oreg., opened at the end of September. Other projects are underway at Baltimore, Md.; San Juan, P.R.; Kingston, Jamaica; Edmonton, Alberta; Minneapolis, Minn.; Oakland, Calif.; and Houston, Tex.

Despite all his corporation activities and the numerous hobbies he pursues, Mr. Henderson still reserves time for civic duties. During 1956-57, he served as president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, and was also a director of the United Fund drive. Mr. Henderson is now chairman of the board, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce; he will soon retire as president of the World Trade Center in New England, in whose behalf he has been active in promoting international business for the prosperity and development of the six-State area.

In his spare time during the past year, Mr. Henderson has completed the manuscript of a book to be entitled "The World of Mr. Sheraton," to be released by David McKay Publishers, next February.

Mr. Henderson married the former Mary C. Stephens in 1923, and they have five children: Ernest III; Victoria Lee (Mrs. Thomas Mott Osborne II); Augusta Gurney deBunsen (Mrs. J. Carleton Petrone, Jr.); Barclay Stephens; and Mary Caldwell Stephens. There are currently seven grandchildren.

Johnny Kemp: 1960 National Easter Seal Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and proud to pay tribute today to a young fellow North Dakotan who is an inspiration to all America and especially to all children and adults who live with crippling handicaps. He is, furthermore, outstanding proof of the fact that America cares what happens to its crippled.

This young man—10-year-old John Daniel Kemp of Bismarck, N. Dak., is the son of John B. Kemp, civil engineer in charge of the Federal roadbuilding project in western North Dakota. He is also the 1960 national easter seal child, chosen in recognition of his almost incredible conquest of a major handicap.

Johnny was born with only stumps of arms and legs. Today, because of the combined forces of many individuals, public and private health agencies brought to bear on his rehabilitation, and because of his own indomitable spirit, Johnny Kemp plays baseball, football, and marbles. He swims, draws, and writes. He attends regular school and gets better than average grades. He is an active member of a Cub Scout troop. He is a daily communicant at his church and he has a Sunday newspaper route. He is fully accepted as one of the boys in his neighborhood. All of this he accomplishes on two artificial legs and with two hook hands. It is his ambition to be a doctor.

Johnny is in Washington to further the annual Easter seal campaign of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and its affiliated units in all

of our States. He is working so the diversified professional services of this organization may be extended to more crippled boys and girls in addition to the quarter of a million now being helped in Easter seal treatment centers throughout our Nation. He wants to see all crippled children have the same chance at rehabilitation he has had.

In view of the fact that nearly 5 percent of our population presently can profit from care such as that provided by the Easter seal societies and because some 60,000 babies are born in this country each year with major crippling problems, and because Johnny Kemp appears here today as the representative of these millions of Americans, I therefore, commend and congratulate John Daniel Kemp for his remarkable achievement in personal rehabilitation. I wish him a long and useful and rewarding life and success to the Easter seal appeal for which he is working so unselfishly.

Students Take Stock Plunge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, teachers in our public schools are continually finding new and novel ways to give students meaningful lessons on topics of great interest and usefulness. I have the feeling that many of these experiments and programs go largely unnoticed outside the classroom; they are accepted as a matter of course by the teachers and the students.

The Newark (N.J.) Evening News of March 10, however, did give considerable attention to one program in three civics classes in my hometown, Westfield, N.J. A teacher, James N. Sabbagh, has decided that the best way to help students understand the stock market is to help them participate in its activities, at least in a limited way.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Securities, I was particularly interested in his methods and in the students' response, which was decidedly enthusiastic.

Mr. Sabbagh has again demonstrated that a good teacher will usually find a way to make the most intricate subject understandable and even enjoyable.

At a time when American financial news is of worldwide importance, it is surely important for Americans to understand that news to the greatest possible extent.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STUDENTS TAKE STOCK PLUNGE

(By Richard Y. Haver)

WESTFIELD.—The budding blue chip barons of Westfield are off to a slow start in the stock market, but optimism still prevails.

The youthful investors on the New York

Stock Exchange are members of three civics classes at Roosevelt Junior High School. They have pooled their resources, totaling \$53, and taken the plunge on one share of common stock of Pennsylvania Railroad and one of Detroit Steel.

But the nature of the market being what it is, the students soon learned the pot of gold was not close at hand. In fact their holdings have taken a dip in value, with "Det Stl Cp" down from 24½ (which the students paid) to 19½ late this week, and "Pa RR" off from 15½ to 14¼, a new low for the year.

MOANS AND GROANS

"These kids aren't discouraged yet," James N. Sabbagh, their teacher, observed. "They still come charging into the classroom each day and head for the bulletin board to check the closing prices. Lately all I've been hearing are moans, but back they come the next day expecting to see the chart line on the rise."

The idea of purchasing stock was conceived by Sabbagh a year ago, but initial classwork was restricted to having pupils choose and follow a stock through the graph method. The experiment was so successful Sabbagh decided to have a more detailed program with this year's classes.

The first step by the classes was the selection of a board of directors, consisting of two members and one alternate from each of the three civics classes. The board chose a chairman, secretary, and treasurer and decided that participation in the stock plan would be voluntary with a minimum of \$1 and maximum of \$2 from a student.

The board, which makes all decisions, purchased the two stocks, with the remaining money held for miscellaneous expenses. The faculty adviser only makes recommendations and votes only to break ties. At the end of the school year the stock will be sold and the money returned in proportion to the investment.

WALL STREET VISIT

To gain firsthand experience about the operations of the stock exchange the three classes toured the Wall Street building in January, about 6 weeks after they had purchased the stocks.

Sabbagh noted that "the students now have a better understanding of our basic economic, political, and social ideals. They are actually participating in free enterprise, but I should mention that their investments are by no means speculative, with the only objective capital gain. Such a practice would obviously destroy the purpose of our program."

But capital gain is not entirely forgotten. One student commented, "Right now it looks like I'm going to lose money on the deal, but it has been a great experience and fun just making like a financier."

His classmates are equally enthusiastic and agree the experience is a profitable one—academically, if not financially.

It Is the Red Chinese Who Block Exchange of Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond from the New York Herald Tribune of March 19, 1960. It is strange that the erroneous notion is still

so widely held that it is our Government that is blocking responsible American newsmen from going into Communist China to observe and report conditions there, when in fact it is the Red regime itself which blocks such entrance. Their action seems to be the orthodox Communist practice laid down by Lenin, "In diplomacy words must never have any relation to deeds, otherwise how could it be diplomacy?"

The article follows:

THE RED CHINESE—THEY BAR EXCHANGE OF NEWSMEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

After 2½ years of fruitless negotiation between the United States and Red China to bring about an exchange of working newsmen, the evidence is conclusive that the Chinese Communists want to continue to talk about it—and seem determined to prevent it.

Each side says that it favors reciprocal reporting privileges.

Each side blames the other for the fact that nothing happens.

From a study of all the official statements made since the talks began in August, 1957, it seems clear to me that the Chinese Communists do not want to exchange reporters with the United States but do not want to admit that they don't.

Here are the reasons why this conclusion now is inescapable:

1. From the beginning of the negotiations the United States has offered to Red China exactly the same rights and facilities for accreditation as the United States offered to every other country. Chinese Communist correspondents would be admitted to the United States on the same basis as British, French, Indian, or Soviet correspondents—and vice versa. This equal treatment Red China refuses to accept.

2. Red China demands something different. It demands an advance agreement that a precisely specified number of correspondents be guaranteed. Such an advance agreement would mean that by limiting its applications, Red China could require us to admit any individual it chose to nominate or else force us into violation of the agreement. No other country in the world deals with correspondents on this basis.

3. The State Department has validated passports to Red China for the representatives of 30 American news-gathering organizations. Red China has granted but one visa, this to John Strohm, an agricultural expert who wrote for the Newspaper Enterprise Association. Though claiming we prevent their correspondents from entering the United States, Red China has never made even one application for a U.S. visa so that we could permit them to do so.

4. Even if Peiping wouldn't undertake a larger exchange of correspondents with us, the New York Herald Tribune recently suggested a one-for-one exchange. The Red Chinese didn't say "No." They just didn't say anything.

It was to this end that the president and editor of the Herald Tribune sent on December 22 last a letter to Chou En-lai, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Peoples Republic, making the following proposal:

"DEAR MR. MINISTER: The New York Herald Tribune has long believed that reciprocal reporting privileges in the Chinese Peoples Republic and in the United States would be beneficial to both our countries and would promote better understanding between our people. To this end one of our most experienced staff correspondents, who has served this newspaper for years, Mr. A. T. Steele, has applied for a Chinese visa. I am taking the liberty of asking if you would give this your personal consideration in the hope that you

also believe it would be desirable to have American journalists in China and Chinese journalists in America. . . .

"What I am suggesting, in good spirit and in good faith, is that one good way to begin is to take a modest and practical first step.

"I would like to see any Chinese newspaper and the New York Herald Tribune join in making such a beginning, which could well grow into larger reciprocal reporting privileges. For this purpose I hope you will authorize a visa for Mr. Steele and I feel sure I am correct in saying that an application for a U.S. visa for a Chinese correspondent will be welcomed in Washington.

"ROBERT M. WHITE II."

Two days after this letter was cabled to the Embassy of the Chinese Peoples Republic in London, the Herald Tribune received a cable from Yeh Shou-tseng, Third Secretary of the Embassy, stating that the letter had been received and transmitted to Peiping.

Result: Total silence; no visa for Mr. Steele; no visa request from any Chinese correspondent.

Fort Scott National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, few Midwest cities can boast the historical significance of Fort Scott, Kans., evidences of which have been remarkably preserved.

Camp Scott was commissioned in 1842 as headquarters for troops and a few years later was officially named Fort Scott for the popular hero, Gen. Winfield Scott.

In the period from 1862 to 1865 Fort Scott was a vital point in the proslavery and free-State guerrilla warfare. With slave territory to the east and free-State Kansas territory on the west, Fort Scott was the center of the prewar conflict that gave the State the name of "Bleeding Kansas."

Today the military barracks of 1842 and one of the Civil War blockhouses, Fort Blair, are still standing on Fort Scott's historical site, the Carroll Plaza. The blockhouse, built in 1863, has recently been restored to its original form and surrounded by an embankment with a Civil War cannon at the entrance. It stands behind Headquarters House on a bluff that overlooks the north approach of the more than 100-year-old military road. Other buildings still standing at the site are officers' quarters buildings, hospital building, and bakery.

Local organizations and many prominent citizens in our State are endeavoring to have this area designated as a national park.

At a current session of the Kansas Legislature, meeting in January of this year, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6 was unanimously adopted, urging and requesting Congress to speedily act on pending bills which would establish a national historic site at Fort Scott, Kans.

Last December I requested the Department of Interior to send representatives from the National Park Service to

Fort Scott to further evaluate the possibility of designating this area as a national park. I am glad to report that this visit has been made, and their report is being further evaluated by the National Park Service.

An editorial written by Fred Brinkerhoff, editor of the Pittsburg Headlight & Sun, in regard to Fort Scott, appeared in the March 12 issue of that paper. Mr. Brinkerhoff is recognized as our State's outstanding authority on historical matters and in view of the State's centennial, which will be celebrated next year, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPOT IN HISTORY

Fort Scott has received new encouragement in its efforts to have the old Military Establishment site taken into the national park system. Service officials have just paid a visit to Fort Scott and been given information upon which there can be based a review of the proposal. This review has been promised. Other Government officials having to do with the proposal have reported adversely as to Fort Scott. Fort Scott, the military post, they have said, was not important enough in history to warrant its being taken into the national park system. But at Fort Scott Monday night the visiting officials were told of the significance of the old post in history and furnished with documentary evidence. Unfortunately eastern influence on the bodies making decisions, is great. Many of these persons never can see any value in anything in the Midwest. Here, officials are dealing with a subject that involves the Civil War and the years immediately preceding that war. The big battles and campaigns of the Civil War were east of the Mississippi, the largest ones in coastal or near-coastal areas. Historians of the period naturally devoted most attention to the major struggles in the East. Later, attention has been given the war in the West, meaning the Mississippi valley and nearby, on the east side of the Mississippi. Historical appraisals were sound and so historians have long bypassed the war on the western border, the battles and campaigns and other operations west of the Mississippi. But it should be crystal clear that the Civil War history cannot be written without including the operations west of the Mississippi. Grant's early operations were in Missouri. Sherman had a command in that State. The possession of St. Louis was a vital thing for the Union cause. Missouri territory from St. Louis to Independence or Leavenworth was tremendously important to the Union cause. The Confederates fully recognized this fact. They organized operations and early battles, Wilson's Creek near Springfield and Pea Ridge in northern Arkansas were of great significance in the developing war.

For 4 years the armies of Price and other Confederate leaders campaigned through southwestern Missouri and northwestern Arkansas. There was action over in Indian territory in which Indian troops were involved. Up and down the Kansas border, from Westport south to Fort Smith and beyond in Arkansas the conflict raged. Throughout the entire war the rehabilitated Fort Scott—a post created 20 years before for the protection of the white settlers against the Indians—was used as a supply station for the Union troops operating in Kansas, Missouri, and Indian territory. Fort Scott was threatened by the Confederate forces throughout the war but it never was taken and stood there as a base of supplies

and the mobilizing point for Federal troops. And still Interior Department officials cannot see that Fort Scott had real significance in the Civil War.

Surely no history of the Civil War that overlooked the war west of the Mississippi, the war on the western border, could be written. No history of the war on the border, the war west of the Mississippi, that ignored Fort Scott as a major place, could be written.

The old buildings at Fort Scott, the plaza, and the grounds around that were in the establishment should in simple justice to millions of Americans who in future years will be touring their country to take a look at history firsthand, be put into the national park system.

Johnson's Position Stronger Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of March 13, 1960, from the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex.:

JOHNSON'S POSITION STRONGER THAN EVER

It was no surprise when the Senate of the United States refused to impose a gag-rule on 18 southern Senators who were filibustering against a new civil rights bill.

It requires a two-third vote of all Senators present and voting to impose cloture on debate. The actual vote by which cloture was rejected was 53 against, only 42 for, or about 22 votes shy of the required two-thirds.

Senators on both sides of the party aisles crossed over to put the quietus of cloture. Whereas it is conceivable that two-thirds of all Senators might vote for some form of civil rights legislation, the point at issue was a gray horse of another color; namely, preservation of unlimited debate in a body that has shown a traditional hostility to gag rule.

Eventually, perhaps, some sort of civil rights measure will be put through; but it won't be what the extremists sought, and it could be something the South can live with without stultifying its views on the subject.

More than likely, the bill that passes, if any, will more closely resemble the moderate measure introduced by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON in January, a measure denounced by press and politicians of the South in ringing tones, than the administration measure introduced later.

This writer pointed out at the time that Senator JOHNSON might feel that acceptance of a moderate bill, like his own, was preferable to having a much more severe group of laws shoved down the South's throat by a coalition of Republican and northern liberal Democrats.

The result of the vote on cloture, along with one or two other Senate actions at the time, strengthening this view, and the raucous outcry against JOHNSON in the Deep South may simmer down without any permanent impairment of his presidential ambitions, if any.

Senator JOHNSON's mastery of Senate leadership suffered no setback in the hullabaloo over cloture. The man is still in command of the situation, the most powerful single figure in the Nation's Capital.

Those who had begun to count him out as a presidential potential might find it expedient to revise their estimate.

East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, recently the Globe-Gazette of Mason City, Iowa, published a very apt editorial entitled "Hawaii Is Indeed Crossroads of World."

The March 1, 1960, editorial points to Hawaii as the meeting place and link between East and West, between Orient and Occident.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, calling attention to the proposed International Center at the University of Hawaii, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII IS INDEED CROSSROADS OF WORLD

Manifest destiny has a peculiarly important role for our 50th State, Hawaii. That's to be a meeting place and link between East and West, between Orient and Occident.

With the granting of statehood to the islands, the opportunity and the challenge have been expanded. And, it should be added straightway, the Hawaiians are ready.

An International Center, integrated with existing facilities of the University of Hawaii and the State of Hawaii, has been set in motion. Its program is complete and far-reaching.

Students from abroad, especially southeastern Asia, as well as American youth, will study and consider together the trends of history and the pressing international issues.

An international training facility, utilizing the university's best minds, will train Asian students in agriculture, community services, education, health, industry, and social welfare.

Scholarships and fellowships to the center will be provided for selected Asian and American students. Distinguished teachers from both Asia and the Western World will be available.

Translations of significant materials to and from English and Asian languages is planned. Tutors and counselors with a mastery of both eastern and western languages will live in the special dormitories.

The University of Hawaii in a half century has grown from a single college to 7, from 500 students to 7,000, from a faculty of 13 to 500.

Under the guidance of Dr. Gregg M. Sinclair, who served as president for many years, the university placed special emphasis on its departments of Asian studies.

Now, in retirement but still vigorous, Gregg Sinclair is giving much time and attention to this international center of which we speak. It's constantly in his thoughts and dreams.

This year the Hawaiian Legislature revealed its concern by appropriating half a million dollars to construct the first unit of a building to house foreign students.

Two hundred students from other lands, most of them Asians, already attend the university under visas. The international center would be a projection and amplification of existent activities.

The oriental collection of the Sinclair Library, established in the thirties, contains 75,000 volumes and some 350 periodicals, with newspapers published in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

Admitting Hawaii to statehood, after having granted independence to the Philippines, was a 10 strike for American prestige in the uncommitted parts of the world.

President Eisenhower in several public utterances has directed attention to the strategic situation of the Hawaiian Islands.

"To the islands," he once observed, "Asia and Europe and the Western Hemisphere have contributed their peoples and their cultures to display a unique example of a community that is a successful laboratory of human brotherhood."

The active interest and support of mainland Americans in making this manifest destiny materialize will be welcomed, we are assured.

Southern Senators at the Pass of Thermopylae

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, there appeared an article entitled, "Southern Senators at the Pass of Thermopylae," by Judge Walter B. Jones.

This is a tribute to the 18 southern Senators who are presently battling for constitutional government and States rights. This article should be read by all liberty-loving people:

SOUTHERN SENATORS AT THE PASS OF THERMOPYLAE

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

Two of the most heroic fights in all recorded history are the battle at the Pass of Thermopylae and the defense of the Alamo during the war for Texan independence.

You recall that during one of the wars between the Persians and the Greeks, 480 B.C., the defense of the little pass leading from northern to central Greece by King Leonidas and 300 Spartans made history which will never be forgotten. The Spartans opposed the Persian Army of about 40,000 soldiers, holding the mountain pass for a whole day after the treacherous Ephialtes showed the Persians an unguarded pass over the mountains so they could attack the Spartans in the rear. When it was suggested to the Spartan leaders that they should retreat because the Persians had so many archers, the flight of their arrows would darken the sky, the Spartan remarked: "So much the better, we shall fight in the shade."

The 300 Spartans stood their ground. Leonidas was killed and not a Spartan was left alive. Years after a monument was erected at Thermopylae to the gallant Spartans. This was the epitaph:

Go tell the Spartans, thou that passest by, That here, obedient to their laws, we lie.

Then history tells how Travis, Bowie, and Crockett and 180 Americans defended the Alamo in 1836. They were besieged by 7,000 Mexicans under Santa Anna for 2 weeks. The Americans were all killed and massacred, but around them lay dead 1,500 Mexican soldiers. "Remember the Alamo" became the war cry of the Texans.

And so today there stands in the U.S. Senate at Washington a group of 18 southern Senators battling with Spartan-like courage for constitutional government, waging heroic struggle against an overwhelming majority from the rest of the country.

Who are these 18 southern Senators? What States made them Senators of the United States?

LISTER HILL and JOHN J. SPARKMAN represent Alabama; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida; RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia; ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; JAMES O. EASTLAND and JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi; SAM J. ERVIN, Jr. and B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina; OLIN D. JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND, South Carolina; and HARRY F. BYRD and A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Virginia.

These Senators of the United States from nine Southern States represent the very flower of American statesmanship. Their total length of service in the Senate is 261 years. RUSSELL and BYRD have been in the Senate for 27 years, LISTER HILL 22 years, EASTLAND and MCCLELLAN 17 years, JOHNSTON of South Carolina 16 years, HOLLAND, ROBERTSON, and SPARKMAN 14 years, and other southern Senators for many, many years.

Seven of the U.S. Senators have served as Governors of their States: HOLLAND, RUSSELL, TALMADGE, ELLENDER, JOHNSTON, THURMOND, and BYRD. Many of them served in the House of Representatives for term after term. Many of them were great trial judges and one of them a member of the supreme court of his State.

These Southern Senators of the United States hold the chairmanships of nine powerful Senate standing committees: ELLENDER of Louisiana, Agriculture and Forestry; RUSSELL of Georgia, Armed Services; ROBERTSON of Virginia, Banking and Currency; BYRD of Virginia, Finance; FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, Foreign Relations; MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, Government Operations; EASTLAND of Mississippi, Judiciary; HILL of Alabama, Labor and Public Welfare; JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Post Office and Civil Service.

These great statesmen from nine Southern States, with loftiness of purpose, are standing in the Senate hour after hour, day after day, waging, under the leadership of Senator RUSSELL, a courageous battle against the civil rights bill, a bill which would take away from the States of the Union their time-honored right to determine the qualifications of voters in the State. The bill would place the rights of the States in this respect under referees appointed by Federal judges and would nullify the State constitutions. The bill would enact punitive legislation against the South. Its aim is to punish the South because it stands for obedience to the Constitution.

The States have never delegated to the Federal Government at Washington the power to control elections in the States. There is not one line in the Federal Constitution giving either Congress or Federal judges the power to control and direct elections and voting in the States. The American Bill of Rights distinctly says that the "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It is a tragic thing that a partisan majority in Congress, on the grounds of political necessity, are attempting to change our form of Government. This majority seeks to take away from the States power that has always belonged to them, and give to Federal courts and judges a power the Federal Constitution denies to them. The letter of the Constitution has not changed in all the years since its adoption. It speaks today as it did when it came from the hands of its framers, and it speaks plainly against the civil rights measure now before the Senate.

Northern papers and magazines, the New York Times, the Herald-Tribune, Life, Time, Look, and other publications, denounce the 18 statesmen from the South, when they ought to be praising them for their courage

and determination in battling for the preservation of the Constitution. These Senators are pictured as standing in the way of the right to vote, and this they are not doing. They are standing for the Constitution. They are battling for the preservation of States' rights for local self-government, and they stand in the Senate unafraid and undaunted.

As I think of these 18 American statesmen, representing 9 Southern States in the Senate of the United States, and recall their courageous stand—call it "filibuster" if you want to, and probably Leonidas at Thermopylae and Crockett and Bowie at the Alamo "filibustered," too—I recall William Wetmore Story's stirring words:

Speak, History! Who are Life's victors? Unroll thy long annals and say, Are they whom the world called the victors—who won the success of a day? The martyrs, or Nero? The Spartans, who fell at Thermopylae's trust, Or the Persians and Xerxes? His judges, or Socrates? Pilate, or Christ?

Cuba and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cuba and Communism," which was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AND COMMUNISM—BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL MEN NEAR DESPAIR AS LEFTISTS' POWER GROWS—TEN OF GOVERNMENT'S TOP 50 ARE REDS OR SYMPATHIZERS; PATROLS TEACH YOUNG—KEY JOBS FOR FOREIGN LEFTISTS

(By Cal Brumley and Ed Cony)

HAVANA.—"Now, our country is nobody's private property. It is collective property—that is to say, the people's."

"One worker is not going to go on exploiting the other workers. All rewards will be equal. If we establish 10 factories, one earning much, the others less, we will not reward one more than the others. No, sir."

These words are Fidel Castro's. He uttered them one night recently over TV as he told the Cuban people what his revolutionary government had in mind for them. At the very least it must be described as a form of socialism. And many, both here and in the United States, see it as a communism.

A young Cuban businessman, still in his twenties, says in bitter, exasperated tones: "It doesn't matter that Fidel himself isn't a Communist. Just look at what his government is doing. Study the decrees they're issuing."

A U.S. official in Washington offers this appraisal: "We see nothing to stop the leftward drift of Castro. The Communists seem to know the right buttons to push to get the reaction from him they want. The Reds couldn't ask for a better front man than Fidel."

A LEFTWARD MARCH

A visitor to Havana is struck by the degree of unanimity among business and professional groups here—both Cuban and foreign—that Prime Minister Castro's govern-

ment marches leftward at an accelerated pace and that there's no hope of stopping it.

A few months ago these same people weren't nearly so pessimistic. There was a feeling then that the influence of moderate advisers would limit Mr. Castro's leftward drift. But many of these moderates since then have quit the government or have been fired. Now the increasingly violent anti-U.S. line of the government and the spate of government decrees affecting business adversely are seen as the results of calculated Communist policy. Business and professional men here now commonly accept the view that the Communists have penetrated deeply into the government, the army, the labor unions and the educational system.

This view may be biased, of course. Many business and professional men, in these groups, especially those in the American colony here, have viewed Mr. Castro with suspicion right from the start. And some, attracted by the seeming stability offered by the Batista regime, were considered pro-Batista almost until Castro's predecessor fled on January 1, 1959.

While it may be subjective, the concern over the Castro government is genuine, and, it's shared by foreign diplomats and other impartial observers here. Businessmen are close to despair. "Castro will take every last acre of land we have, eventually, and drive us right out of the country," gloomily predicts an American sugar executive here. Already, this official has seen men from the Institute for Agrarian Reform (I.N.R.A.) take 3,000 head of his company's cattle and burn the I.N.R.A. brand into them. "We have no receipt or no idea of what—if anything—the government will pay us for them," he says.

The vice president of another American-owned sugar company says flatly: "They are deliberately out to destroy private enterprise in Cuba."

HIGHER LABOR COSTS, TAXES

A man in another line of business—he asks that it not be identified—says without the slightest bit of hope that he can last perhaps 3 more months. "Then," he says, "I will have to close down because of the higher labor costs, higher taxes and declining business. But it is forbidden to close down. So the government will intervene (seize and operate the business without formally expropriating it). In normal times I'd have an equity of \$400,000. But now I won't get a cent. I will have to leave Cuba and try to start over again somewhere else."

A Cuban businessman in a service industry reports he sees long-time business clients "being ruined every day." He is certain it is no accident. "Cuba today follows the straight party line. Some people say Fidel uses the Reds. I think it is the other way around. He's a virtual prisoner of the Communists."

Although it is a matter of debate whether Mr. Castro is anyone's prisoner, Communists certainly do have a chance to get his ear. One man here whose job it is to analyze the political scene estimates that 10 of the top 50 Government posts are now held by Communists or extreme leftists. "All of them are in key positions," he adds. And an associate of his observes: "It's really academic whether these men carry Communist Party cards in their pockets or not."

LEADING LEFTISTS

Among the 10 top leftists are such individuals as Raul Castro, Fidel's brother and chief of the army; Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the Argentine revolutionary who heads the National Bank; Antonio Nunez Jimenez, chief of INRA, which has become a sort of super-state with a mission to run a large slice of the economy; Armando Hart, who holds the Education post in the Cabinet; Foreign Minister Raul Roa, described as a "semi-Red with a long-held hatred of the United

States"; and Osmani Cienfuegos, Minister of Public Works.

These key men are bringing others of like ilk into the Government to fill posts just under the top rank, as well as posts down the line. "Communists are sprinkled all the way through the Government now," sums up one informed American. Che Guevara, for instance, in the short time since he succeeded moderate Felipe Pazos as head of the National Bank, has brought in a new general manager, a new secretary of the bank, a new chief of the loan department, and a new head of the monetary stabilization fund. "They all sympathize with Che politically, and you know what that means," says one U.S. official.

A Cuban businessman says: "In my limited contacts with the bank, I've run into at least five Communists—a majority of them from other countries. One Chilean told me the party had ordered him up here to help out the revolution."

While no one has been able to make an exact count of the Communists and pro-Communists who have been coming into Cuba from other lands to help out, the number is considerable. One man in the Government ventures there are "at least 300" of these foreign technicians from Chile, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Mexico. It is too early for the Russian technicians to be appearing under the new Cuban-Russian trade and aid pact, but there is no doubt they'll be coming soon.

A RUSSIAN BEACHHEAD

In Washington a U.S. official says bluntly: "The Cuban-Soviet pact gives Russia a propaganda and subversion beachhead in Latin America such as they've never had before. The Soviet technicians will begin to pour in soon."

Already, the Cuban Government is aiding Reds from other lands. Latin Communists, unable to get passports from their home governments to visit European or Asian countries, come to Havana. Here, they get these highly prized documents from the Castro regime just as if they were Cuban citizens.

Although these passport irregularities have been a well-kept secret, a source in Havana in a position to know the situation says: "They began issuing these passports 6 to 8 months ago, and since then, there's been an uninterrupted flow of Latin Communists to such cities as Vienna, Geneva, Cairo, Peking, and Moscow."

Communist influence in the Government spreads out to infect many other areas of Cuban life. Consider the handwork of Education Minister Hart, who has completely reorganized the school system. Private school owners fear his Decree 2099, which spells out the reorganization, threatens the end of private schools in Cuba.

Paragraph 178 of the decree, for instance, gives the Government the right to intervene in any school whenever Government education officials "consider this measure convenient because of problems which would affect educational interests." This broad, ill-defined power "means one student can go up to the education ministry and complain that we have disorder in the classroom—and that is all it will take for the Government to seize the school," says one educator. "Or one parent or one teacher could do it," he adds.

HIGHER TEACHER PAY

Private schools already are being buffeted by a decree of the Minister of Labor which has raised teachers' salaries from 22 to 100 percent. A stiff tax increase has raised costs, too. "And at the same time, our income is going down," says the director of one private school getting out his books and showing a visitor that his February billings were off 36 percent from February, 1959. "We depend on the economy of the country," he says. "Some people can no longer afford to

send their children to us; others are leaving the country." This educator is convinced his school will be either bankrupt or intervened before the next school year rolls around, and he claims this is just what the Government wants.

Next year, all Cuban schoolchildren are supposed to learn their geography from a new book by I.N.R.A. Chief Nunez Jimenez. This "revolutionary geography" will expose the young students to political and economic ideas heavily flavored with Marxism and generously seasoned with nationalism.

One passage holds that whoever owns the lands, mines, woods and other national wealth will dominate transportation, commerce and industry, too. "Political control is only a consequence of economic control," Mr. Nunez Jimenez adds. From this Marxist idea, he goes on to say that foreign companies dominate the sugar industry, "the basic wealth" of Cuba. He also points to foreign control over mining concessions.

He says this concentration of "wealth in North American hands weakens" Cuba. He claims it dilutes the culture, habits, folklore "and even our language." He deplores the tendency in Cuba to call "bodegas" grocery stores, and "escuelas" schools. "The greatest task for Cuba today is to struggle against all this, so the land will be ours, the mines nationalized, the industries run by us," Mr. Nunez Jimenez exhorts his youthful readers.

STRESS ON U.S. EXPLOITATION

It certainly is no secret that the army indoctrinates its recruits. One American here explains that almost every course of army instruction includes "discussions on the revolutions." He says the instructors emphasize American "exploitation" of Cuba. No less a figure than Che Guevara, as head of army training, directs the indoctrination program.

In addition to the regular army, thousands of other Cubans are getting the rudiments of military training in workers' militia, farmers' militia and in student militia. And the training includes "civic indoctrination," as well as close-order drill.

"In this indoctrination, they don't openly talk of communism," says a Havana businessman. "Instead, they say there are two sides in the world—the capitalists and the socialists. We have four of our own workers here in the office taking the course and already they tell us they're on the side of the Socialists. All four are good Catholics, too, but they've been brainwashed," says this businessman sadly.

One rule on militia membership: Excluded are Cuban employees holding responsible positions in foreign companies.

Cultivation of the young mind is being pursued through a militia-type program, as well as through school books. One Cuban here tells this story: "My 15-year-old son joined a juvenile patrol at the urging of his friends who told him he'd learn scouting and marching. They picked up the boys in Jeeps and station wagons and took them to the Cabana military fortress for training."

POLITICAL AWAKENING

This parent didn't become concerned until suddenly he began hearing his son talking about "oppression of the masses" and about "imperialist capitalists exploiting the Cuban people." He found his son's sudden "political awakening" stemmed from indoctrination classes with the juvenile patrol.

For the training of even younger minds, there are the "infant patrols"—children not yet in their teens.

In the CTC, the Cuban labor federation, there are no card-carrying Communists among the top 13 members of the governing group. David Salvador, head of the CTC, was expelled from the Communist Party in 1951. But there is no indication that he has

drifted very far to the right since then. At least three other Communist sympathizers are among the federation's top 13, including Jesus Soto of the textile workers and two officials of the bank workers' union. Arrayed against these four are two anti-Communists and seven nonentities, according to one American labor specialist here.

This man puts his finger on what he regards as two examples of Red penetration of labor: Hoy, the Communist newspaper, is sold—or given away if it can't be sold—in almost every workplace where there are union members. The workers' militia "is right out of the Communist handbook," he says.

Another labor specialist here contends: "The CTC isn't a labor movement any more, but rather a well-organized labor wing of the Castro government." This man notes the CTC has recently extended a 6-month no-strike agreement. He also cites a new labor law under which the Minister of Labor, a Government official, is to have the say in new hiring. The law provides that the Minister make a census of the unemployed. Thereafter, when an employer wants to hire someone, the Labor Minister will submit a list of those eligible.

GETTING OUT THE MILITIA

One assigned task for the labor movement: To trot out the workers' militia for Castro-called public demonstrations.

Communist influence in Cuba today seems to exceed greatly its relatively small numerical strength. Party membership has expanded about 50 percent since the revolution, but it still numbers only about 18,000 in this nation of nearly 7 million people.

Actually, the Cuban people have little appetite for communism when it is openly identified. This may help explain the violent reaction of the Castro regime to any charge of Communist influence in the Government. Anyone who criticizes the Government as Communist-leaning faces the charge of being a counterrevolutionary.

Some anti-Communist groups are beginning to appear. A Catholic youth group has been distributing anti-Communist pamphlets, for instance. One of its most successful ones: A leaflet linking Cuban Communists to the Batista regime, which did allow the party and its top members a certain amount of freedom. With typical Cuban humor, the leaflet listed a telephone number to call for further details of the Communist-Batista ties. The number was that of the Communist Party. "They got hundreds of calls, we're told," says one member of the youth group with relish.

A newly organized group with anti-Red overtones is the Christian Democratic Movement, or the MDC as it's called. Said to be an embryonic political party, the MDC recently announced its aspirations. It called for free elections in Cuba as soon as possible, a fairly direct slap at the Castro government which shows not the slightest inclination to hold elections.

The MDC also identified both communism and neofascism as the great enemies facing Cuba. And it hinted strongly that the advocates of Marxism are out to subvert the revolution to their own ends.

MDC leadership, primarily young Cuban lawyers and members of other professions, is considered sound, and some observers in Havana give the group a chance to develop eventually into a significant force in Cuban political affairs. The MDC emphasizes it is not tied to the Catholic Church and draws its membership from non-Catholics as well as Catholics.

In fact, one of the MDC's present weaknesses is considered a lack of Catholic Church support. So far the church has been sitting it out despite increasing anxiety among its priests and hierarchy over the Communist influence in the revolutionary government. One vigorous Havana priest who believes the

church should be taking a more active anti-Castro role, contends: "Up to now, the hierarchy here has been intimidated."

PROPERTY RIGHTS, DIGNITY OF INDIVIDUAL

Another churchman agrees in essence but speaks hopefully of a pastoral letter which he says has been prepared and which he hopes the Cuban hierarchy will issue soon to be read in all Cuban parishes, a technique the church used recently in the Dominican Republic against Dictator Trujillo. The letter would defend the private property and the dignity of the individual, without directly attacking Dr. Castro.

There are also reports of small, isolated groups within the revolutionary movement who are beginning to think in terms of diverting the revolution from its leftist course.

There is also some unrest among students at Havana University. A number of students recently have criticized the Government, and some students have led a demonstration against Russia's Mikoyan when he visited Havana to open the Soviet exhibit and sign the U.S.S.R.-Cuba trade-aid pact. There are reports that Dr. Castro plans to install Foreign Minister Roa as the new head of the university to exercise firmer control over the students.

One Cuban cites a recent incident as contributing to student unrest: "Che Guevara made a speech at the university the other day saying that the needs of the state will determine how many doctors we train in the future—not the wishes of individual students."

But like all other resistance groups, the students are given not the slightest chance, right now anyway, of providing serious opposition to Dr. Castro, who still enjoys the adulation of the vast majority of his countrymen.

Federal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented the following statement to the Post Office Committee in regard to pay increases for postal workers.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN LEONARD G. WOLF, DEMOCRAT, OF IOWA, IN SUPPORT OF A PAY RAISE FOR POSTAL WORKERS AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, MARCH 22, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the enactment of legislation in this session of the Congress to provide a pay raise for our postal and other Federal employees. The wages of these employees should, without question, be brought up to the level of private industry for work requiring the same education, experience, training, skill, and intelligence.

The facts speak for themselves. In a recent issue of Labor Week, it was pointed out that the average weekly "real" income of Federal workers (including Post Office employees) was down 3.3 percent from last year. These figures are based on basic data of the U.S. Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture.

The most graphic single example of the need for a pay raise for our postal workers is in the fact that under the present pay scale, no mailman can qualify for a Federal Housing Authority loan on even a \$15,000 home. To guarantee a \$15,000 home, the FHA re-

quires an annual salary of at least \$5,384. No letter carrier in the entire United States is making such a salary. The average letter carrier's annual wage is \$4,640.

Employee	Gross pay each 2 weeks	Deducted for Federal taxes	Deducted for retirement	Deducted for insurance	Net pay each 2 weeks	Number of dependents
No. 1.....	\$195.19	\$21.10	\$12.60	\$1.50	\$159.90	3
No. 2.....	195.19	16.40	12.60	1.50	164.60	3
No. 3.....	187.50	10.40	12.19	1.25	163.66	5
No. 4.....	191.72	11.10	12.19	1.25	167.18	4
No. 5.....	195.19	16.40	12.60	1.50	164.60	6
No. 6.....	195.19	7.10	12.60	1.50	173.90	5
No. 7.....	187.50	15.00	12.19	1.25	159.06	3
No. 8.....	187.50	19.70	12.19	1.25	154.36	3
No. 9.....	168.03	6.80	10.79	1.25	149.19	6
No. 10.....	187.50	19.70	12.19	1.25	154.36	2
No. 11.....	181.50	14.00	11.49	1.25	154.85	5
No. 12.....	188.88	15.30	11.49	1.25	160.84	3
No. 13.....	185.12	19.30	11.49	1.25	153.08	2
No. 14.....	191.35	15.70	12.44	1.25	161.96	3

It is not difficult to visualize the difficulty a parent faces in trying to feed and clothe and house as many as five children, most of them in school, and a wife, on a salary of \$72 or \$73 a week. The grocery bill alone for a family of this size cannot be less than \$40 a week—at a bare minimum. That leaves \$33 a week to pay for transportation, housing, clothing, utilities, and doctor bills.

Under the present pay scale, the postal employee receives less pay than the unskilled worker. Three Presidential vetoes have put this pay rate several years behind that of his fellow workers in private industry. If we expect to retain in the Federal service capable, efficient, and well-trained workers, we must pay them a livable wage.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that this committee report out at the earliest opportunity legislation to bring the salaries of postal and other Federal workers into line with present-day realities.

To point up the problem which our postal employees are facing, I would like to set out the salaries being received by 14 postal employees in my district:

salute these fine Negro leaders. We congratulate them. We believe we speak the sentiments of the whole State when we applaud the intelligent Negro leadership for their sensible attitude.

To say the least, their courage has avoided friction, discord, and strife—possibly a great amount of bloodshed.

Outside agitators entering the boundaries of Mississippi are here to serve no good purpose. Their mission is one of hate and to raise money—to pass the collection plate—and espouse ideas from across the sea.

Storage Charges on Uncle Sam's Surplus Grain Soon May Be Trimmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following revealing and interesting article from this very reputable publication:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 1, 1960]
STORAGE CHARGES ON UNCLE SAM'S SURPLUS GRAIN SOON MAY BE TRIMMED

Private warehousemen got an average of 16.5 cents a bushel annually in Government storage pay. The Federal storage and handling bill for grain and oil seeds now runs over \$500 million a year. Government-industry negotiators are working on a new master contract to replace the one expiring June 30. Bets are that the average bushel payment will be cut by 2 cents. Federal storage men, armed with largely secret study data, say the commercial operator's average direct cost is only 8.4 cents a bushel. Presidential hopeful Senator SYMINGTON contends the cost-payment spread permits lush profits.

Farm boss Benson and his men dispute any idea of widespread profiteering. But they concede they've been dealing without accurate up-to-date information on storage operators' costs. The current contract is 4 years old. Many grain storers in recent years have turned from expensive elevators to cheaper low-lying bins. Government studies suggest some "high cost" operators may be charging Uncle Sam for nonstorage of their grain businesses.

Commercial grain storage capacity now totals about 4.2 billion bushels, more than double the space that was available a decade ago.

Courageous Negro Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Courageous Negro Leadership," written by Hon. James M. Ward, editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News. Mr. Ward is a very able editor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGEOUS NEGRO LEADERSHIP

A band of professional egotists, hate mongers, and racial agitators have invaded Jackson and this central Mississippi area within the past few hours in an attempt to organize lunch counter sitdown demonstrations by young Negro college students.

The Jackson Daily News is aware of these attempts to create friction in a city which has enjoyed a wealth of good relations between the races.

We are also aware of the fact that, because of the outstanding and dedicated leadership of various institutions for Negroes in this area, the agitators were turned down. At least one outstanding Negro citizen ousted the delegation from his office.

Such acts of courageous citizenship in the face of pressure should be recognized. We

Sound Economics Can Make Good Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the 1960's promise new plateaus of economic achievement for the American people.

The bright outlook includes opportunity for more jobs, greater personal and national income, attainment of new goals in business and industrial programs, and better living for our people.

At the same time, the future will place ever-greater demands on our economic system.

Among other challenges, those will be the need for: Advancements to meet the needs of a fast-increasing populations, now numbering about 180 million people; and a progressing country; supporting a strong, and costly, national defense program; and successfully meeting the ever-growing economic competition from the Communist bloc.

We recognize, of course, that there are differing theories—even among experts—on how best to further improve our economic system.

Unfortunately, also, realistic efforts to resolve problems are sometimes frustrated, regrettably, by attempts to make political footballs out of economic difficulties. Despite this tendency by would-be opportunists, however, I continue to believe sound economics make the best politics.

In the long run, adherence to fundamentally-sound economic principles can be the only reasonable basis for long-term solutions of our problems in this field.

Now, what are the practical steps necessary to combat inflation and promote progress? These include: First, realistic Federal spending policies; second, a balanced budget, and, if possible, a surplus to begin reduction of the national debt; third, carefully restricting Federal programs to proper limitation of Federal responsibility so as to prevent undue competition on the money market or create unnecessary competition with private enterprise; fourth, revision of the tax structure to plug loopholes, eliminate inequities, provide incentives for economic growth and expansion, and reduce the inflationary effect which taxes—apparent and hidden—have on prices; fifth, further educating our people to the realism that demands for more and more services by the Federal Government can only postpone the time for a lessening of the tax burden; and finally, sixth, assuring a competitive climate in which businesses, industries and other enterprises—both small and large—have an opportunity to prosper and make their contribution to our economic life.

Overall, the Government, as well as consumers, labor, industry and all others, have a proportionate responsibility not only for sharing in the efforts to combat inflation, but also to promote economic health for the country.

How?

Through sound buying, borrowing, spending, and saving practices by consumers.

Labor: By making only realistic demands for pay and better working conditions based among other factors upon productivity.

Industry: By establishing realistic pricing-and-profit practices on commodities.

Recently, I was privileged to publish an article in the American Bar Association Journal entitled "Sound Economics Can Make Good Politics."

Reflecting further upon additional factors involved in promoting economic strength, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND ECONOMICS CAN MAKE GOOD POLITICS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

Not since the Greenback Party heyday in the 1880's has there been as much congressional debate of economic-fiscal policies as there has been in recent months. Listening to the new economic prophets of cheap money at any price, of Government pumping additional money into the economy and the inevitability of inflation—all in the name of full employment and growth, naturally—one may almost feel guilty to sound the old-fashioned notes of dollar stability and budgetary restraint.

Speaking recently to an American audience, the former president of the Central Bank of the Federal Republic of Germany had this to say:

"To a foreigner it seems almost absurd that there should be certain quarters in the United States where inflation is tolerated or even recommended. Surely any price to be paid for inflation must be excessive, considering not only the adverse economic and social effects, but the irretrievable losses in national prestige it may entail. Reports of inflation in the United States would not only mean the depreciation and ultimate devaluation of the dollar, but also an acute decline in the moral authority, power, and international stature of the United States."

And on the lessons of inflation, German economists are certainly entitled to speak authoritatively. The devastating German runaway inflation of post-World War I years still serves as the classic anti-inflation warning in economics textbooks, and it is this lesson that has produced the present German economic vigilance and restraint. That close links bind a nation's prestige to its financial posture is evidenced from the manner in which the emergence of the German mark as a sound and stable monetary unit has enhanced the stature of the new Western Germany in the family of nations.

Yet the full danger of inflation apparently has not yet been sufficiently realized by our "creeping inflation" advocates who continue to preach a theory as old as ancient Rome and the Greenback days, and already discredited that long ago. But this is one time when the man in the street is better advised than some of the economic experts representing him. For the hundreds of letters I receive each month from average Mr. and Mrs. America put the finger on a domestic enemy they fear most—inflation.

IS IT NOT SAFE TO BE THRIFTY ANYMORE?

A recent survey of the country's economic situation concluded: "The gloomiest finding is a weakening of the resistance to inflation." True, most people yearn for economic stability, and four out of five persons inter-

viewed thought that prices, wages, and profits should be held from going higher for the next 2 years. But at the same time these people had little hope that this will happen and 7 of every 10 thought that prices would continue to rise.

To the well-known economic perils of inflation may thus be added the psychological impact of this acceptance of the inevitability of inflation: an erosion of individual and public confidence in the soundness of our currency and economy, with resultant injury to the long-acquired habits of thrift and economic prowess.

A middle-income businessman recently interviewed on the question of inflation responded thus:

It just isn't safe to save anymore. I decided inflation couldn't be stopped. So I cashed in all my insurance and bought stocks.

The lack of faith in the cures of inflation, slowly turning into mass uncertainty, tends to accentuate the already existing problem and may turn the slow march toward inflation into a stampede. The present heights of the stock market are certain evidence of the population's desire to have its savings sheltered from inflation, through a rush into equity investments. What would happen to our economic balance if the present uncertainty turns into a material-value psychosis, with more bondholders, insurance holders, and the like, all at once deciding to liquidate their assets?

The serious effects of the inflationary trend in recent years are easily ascertainable. The 1939 dollar today buys 48 cents worth of goods. The standard indicators of the decline of the purchasing power of the dollar, the Wholesale Price Index and the Consumer Price Index, have risen more than 50 percent between 1946 and 1953. A survey of rising prices indicates that under Roosevelt, the cost of living rose 3.3 percent annually and under Truman, the cost of living sprinted 6.8 percent each year. (Of course, under Roosevelt we had war, and under Truman the postwar problems.) Since 1952, the rise in the cost of living has been held to an average gain of 1.4 percent. In the last 3 years the increases in the Consumer Price Index have still been only moderate: 1.5 percent in 1956, 3.4 percent in 1957, 2.7 percent in 1958, 0.9 percent in 1959.

This slower increase which is referred to as creeping inflation, may not seem to be very large to the uncritical observer. But an annual rise of 2 percent will wipe out half of the purchasing power of the dollar in 35 years, and a 3-percent rate will result in a similar reduction in less than 25 years.

The proponents of inflation say there is no need to worry about inflation, as long as it is of the "creeping type." Since many labor contracts already have escalator clauses, it is suggested that such clauses might be extended to pensioners, insurance beneficiaries, bondholders, and the like—thus permitting everybody to adjust their income with inflation. But it takes a little critical thinking to realize that not everybody can equally ride the escalator at the same time. And as one commentator has put it: "It is the height of folly to imagine that we can inflate without some groups paying the price."

A further weakness of the creeping inflation proposition is its assumption that we can police inflationary trends at will. But let us ask this of the proponents of creeping inflation: "How do you confine inflation and keep it down to a so-called 'delightful' and 'reasonable' 2 percent per year?" It is not too difficult to see that inflation cannot be kept automatically within prescribed limits. For if the public becomes aware of an official policy to permit a limited depreciation of the dollar, it will try to protect itself, and by so doing it will inevitably accelerate the pace of the price rise. As one commentator put it:

If the public knows there will be a creeping inflation of 2 percent per annum, then the 2 percent will be reached not at the end of the year, but at the beginning, and the pressure for inflation will mount.

It must be concluded, therefore, that unless remedial action is undertaken to curb inflation—a large and increasing section of the population will be exposed to its harmful and often devastating effects. Inflation, obviously, affects most adversely that part of the population that must depend on a non-varying income, or an income that does not vary as fast as the price increases—Government workers, other public servants, school teachers, unskilled workers, bondholders, and the 20 million of senior citizens and others living on annuities, pensions, social security, and public aid. The list includes also the farmer who was traditionally thought to favor inflation because it acted to increase land values, but who currently finds himself unable to pass on his rising costs to the consumer. And due to recent population trends, produced by the growth in the population's life expectancy and the increase in the number of people in public service, an increasingly larger percentage of the people is placed on the inflation victim list.

THE FUTURE OF THE DOLLAR IS THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN ECONOMY

The adverse effects of inflation are felt not merely on the purse of the individual American. Its direct impact on economic growth, periodic recessions and the balance of trade must not be underestimated.

Inflation hinders long-term economic growth by discouraging the savings which produce the capital necessary for the country's economic expansion. American economy must continue to expand in order to meet the increasing and more varied needs of the American people, and in order to hold back the growing Soviet economic offensive. The major key to future economic growth in America is increased productivity, and the greatest contribution to such an increase is the investment in new machines and equipment—but the magnitude of such an investment depends upon the level of savings.

This is a time when we can ill afford to lag behind. At present the Soviet industrial output is still estimated to be only 45 percent of ours. But realizing that the rate of growth in Soviet production is about 9 percent annually, while our annual growth is less than 3 percent, it becomes apparent that with the situation remaining substantially the same the Russian economic handicap may disappear and they could catch up with us in as little as 12 to 14 years.

The table that follows shows how long it will take the Russians to catch up with us, if we do not watch out.

U.S.S.R. rates of industrial growth	(In years)		
	U.S. rates of industrial growth		
	2 percent	3 percent	4 percent
7 percent	17	21	28
8 percent	14	17	21
9 percent	12	14	17
10 percent	11	12	14

For those that still think about Russia as the backward industrial country of 1918 or 1928, this will come as a shock. But it is with this realization that we must look at the need of future economic developments in America—and such developments will not be possible in an economy crippled by inflation.

Inflation, furthermore, by interfering with the free operation of the economic forces tends to make our recessions much worse and weakens our post-recession recuperative facilities. The accumulation of excessive

and burdensome inventories during inflation periods—because of the prospect of higher prices as inflation continues—saturates the markets to the point that they are unable to absorb new products, thus slowing down post-recession recoveries. Inflation, similarly, will lead industry to temporary over-expansions, due to the fear of increasing costs, but such expansions must eventually be followed by cutbacks, thus accentuating the problems of cyclical unemployment.

Inflation, finally, has adverse effects on our foreign trade and may cause the United States to be priced out of world markets. The high prices of American products, to which inflation contributes, weaken our competitive position abroad—where 5 percent of what American factories produce is being sold, providing 5 million jobs for American breadwinners.

Unreasonably high production costs make us also much more vulnerable to foreign competition in our own domestic markets. While our 1958 export of manufactured goods still remained 2.4 times as large as our imports, the trend in the last 2 years has definitely been toward a more balanced foreign trade. It is now estimated that the 1959 exports of \$15,900 million will exceed imports only by some \$900 million, which appears like a disastrous drop in comparison with some of the recent exceptionally high excesses of exports over imports, running more than \$6,500 million as late as 1957. But while remembering that the earlier unusual excesses were caused by World War II and postwar needs, and that no country has held such a lopsided trade balance for very long, we must not, at the same time, permit our economy to be inflated to a position of competitive disadvantage. Several pockets of unemployment, in my State and in others, can already be attributed to our disability in specific industries, to meet the prices of our overseas competitors.

That the stability of the dollar is essential to the stability and growth of the American economy is all too obvious. What needs to be determined, however, is what measures would most effectively act to curb inflation. And one big question will then still remain: Will we have the wisdom, the courage and the determination to pursue the necessary remedies?

INFLATION AND THE PROPHETS OF INEVITABILITY

Traditional economics explains inflation in terms of the supply and demand theory, saying that whenever an increasing amount of money is bidding for a limited quantity of goods, prices are driven up. Usually it is assumed that it is the Government money printing presses that produce this increasing supply of money, either directly or indirectly—through fiscal and monetary policies and the operations of the Federal Reserve System. But what must be remembered is that more money in the marketplace does not always mean that new money is being created. More money bidding for goods could also mean that money hitherto in the hands of the population, but unused, is suddenly appearing from its hiding places to compete in the market. Thus while Government fiscal policies and Government spending have a tremendous impact on economic trends, fiscal and monetary manipulation alone will not halt inflation in a relatively free economic system. Certainly the Government cannot be expected to do the job of inflation policing alone. Since the reasons for inflation are manifold, only a comprehensive program which will take all factors into account will provide an effective remedy.

I am certain that there is no need to elaborate here on the factors customarily advanced as responsible for inflation. But it would be desirable to keep in mind the broad composite of the elements contributing to inflationary pressure:

(1) Governmental expenditures based on debt financing which by increasing the amount of money in circulation create inflationary pressures; (2) governmental over-spending in areas where full employment already exists, thus creating excessive and price-raising demands for facilities and labor; (3) floors under commodities which raise prices higher than the level set by the free play of the forces of supply and demand; (4) excise and other taxes which penalize or hinder business growth; (5) excessive import quotas and tariffs, which permit the keeping of artificially high prices for some products; (6) inefficiency in management and inefficiency in production. (Listing the factors which are traditionally stated to be inflationary in terms of price levels is not necessarily an argument against the practices named. For it must be realized that in our complex and comprehensive society some of these practices are quite essential for the protection of our social and economic way of life.)

It is on top of these classical concepts of inflation that the new schools of economists have mounted their newer interpretation of modern inflation. And although the classic theories have not been totally discarded, the vogue these days is to give top listing to the two new theories of "cost-push" inflation and "administered price" inflation. The first, which is contrasted with the classical "demand-pull" inflation, is described as an upward moving wage-price spiral—a vicious circle in which higher wages cause higher prices, which in turn necessitate higher wages, ad infinitum. The second theory, again, explains inflation not as a product of free market play but as a result of the restrictive price-fixing schemes of big business.

In these new theories the prophets of the inevitability of inflation find the foundation for their dogma. Creeping inflation, say they, is the price that we must pay for the maximum growth of our economy. Growth, according to this school, has always been accompanied by inflation, and now too we have two alternatives: either economic growth inescapably accompanied by creeping inflation, or else, price stability accompanied by economic stagnancy and unemployment. And the choice, so they say, is ours to make.

These prophets of inevitability have been divided into two schools—those putting the blame on labor and those attributing it to industry. According to the first, the rise of strong trade unions makes it almost inevitable that economic expansion will be accompanied by rising labor costs. Thus when the rate of expansion is sufficiently high to produce virtually full employment, unions are in a strong position and are able to raise wages far faster than the increases in output per man-hour. Accordingly, the fact is cited that during the 11 years of 1947 to 1958, hourly earnings in all private industry rose about twice as fast as real product per man-hour—for while the rise in hourly earnings was 66.7 percent, the rise in real product per man-hour was 33.6 percent. It is to these extra wages, unmatched by additional products, that inflationary pressures are attributed. To prevent any further inflationary moves, claim the critics, it is industry's duty to stand fast on present wage contracts and not permit any new unjustified wage increases.

Labor, on the other hand, is proposing to find the main reason for inflation in industry. Postwar wage increases are therefore shown to be merely chasing prices up, and labor is pictured as attempting only to restore the real value of labor earnings. Even as middle of the road a reporter as *Business Week*, in commenting on the role wages played in postwar inflation, found that "unit labor costs seem to have followed prices uphill through most of the postwar years." If labor is not responsible for infla-

tion, the real culprit must therefore be elsewhere. It is here that the theory of administered prices comes into being, a theory which charges business with eliminating the flexibility of the free market, and creating a new type of inflation by monopolistically and artificially maintained high industrial prices.

To determine the existence and extent of administered prices practices the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am a member, has been conducting extensive hearings for the last 2 years. These hearings dealt with the problem of administered prices in the automobile, bread, roofing, and steel industries. One of the measures proposed as a cure to this problem is Senate bill 215, introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY, which seeks to keep the prices of key products down by exposing the big corporations, in a selected number of industries which seem to set the price pattern, to public opinion pressure through a requirement that no price increases be undertaken without prior public notice and a hearing to justify such increase. But although self-restraint on the part of industry in setting prices is to be much desired, I question the wisdom of this bill's interference with price and market flexibility. Still, if industry and labor do not develop a more responsible economic attitude, legislation of this type will become necessary.

But whether subscribing to one of these new theories or the other, several of the new economists allege that the new facts of American economic life will make ineffective the standard measures designed to fight inflation. An economy that is geared to growth and is favorable to high employment, say they, is also favorable to increased prices. Thus, so long as demand is near full employment levels, we must expect that in industries characterized by strong firms and strong unions, prices and wages will react on each other in a steady upward spiral.

The desirability, and indeed the necessity of American economic growth, we will most certainly accept. But that inflation is here to stay, and that more of it is still coming, is not, in my opinion, a necessary conclusion. Economic facts and developments are in a constant state of flux, and I believe that a reappraisal of many accepted economic assumptions may raise serious doubts as to the soundness of the predictions of the inflation prophets. Furthermore, inflation can be fought and must be fought, but like all other social maladies, the remedy is not simple or speedy.

A PROGRAM FOR AN ANTI-INFLATION OFFENSIVE

A recent study of the relationship between economic growth and inflationary trends has produced some interesting new comments on the relative independence of the two. "Despite popular opinion to the contrary," says Edwin L. Dale in the New York Times magazine: "Inflation has not been the normal condition of the American economy. It has been neither usual nor unusual. Prices were lower in 1890 than they were at the end of the Civil War, and the period was one of fairly rapid economic growth and expansion. Prices were stable during most of the 1920's. A great deal of the price rise in the past 150 years has been associated with wars and their immediate aftermath."

Accepting the thesis of the war's responsibility for inflation, some economists forecast only very limited future rises in living costs, now that the postwar adjustment has finally set into effect. It is their view that the use of the classic weapons against inflation, in recent times, was still being blunted by the spending and lending powers generated by World War II. Since the banks emerged from the war with \$90 billion worth of Government securities and only \$26 billion of loans to their borrowers, any Government attempts to tighten the

money market were ineffective since the banks could simply sell some of the security reserves to get the funds to make more loans.

But now, some 14 years later, the country is finally growing out of the enormously inflated money supply with which the economy emerged from the war. In the more or less normal peacetime prosperity of the 1920's, the total money supply in the country was a little over one quarter of the gross national product. At the end of World War II the money supply soared to about one-half of the national product, thus making more money available to chase after the produced goods—but recently we have gotten back to a more normal ratio of less than one-third. This, according to some economists, should act to substantially relieve inflationary pressures in times to come. But stability will occur only if our economic policies take advantage of these natural developments, not if we go contrary to them.

In addition to this natural development in our economy, which may considerably lessen the factors driving for inflation, more effective protection against inflationary pressures must be provided by a planned and coordinated program, requiring both governmental and private cooperation.

There have been some crash programs—designed to knock out inflation—which have contained one or more of the following suggestions: (1) stop Government spending and deficit budgets; (2) abolish farm and other subsidies; (3) cut taxes; (4) tear down import barriers; and (5) break up large corporations and powerful unions. But in looking for means to stop inflation, we must make certain that we are not also knocking out our economic system and our way of life. For example: It is the national policy of this country to protect its citizens against unemployment. Unemployment carries a high price tag: in terms of broken homes, loss of self-respect, and loss of national product. We cannot, therefore, undertake to curb inflation at the price of increasing unemployment. Likewise, we cannot stop inflation at the cost of substituting centralized planning and a totalitarian economy for our long existing and generally successful economic freedom. It must be further remembered that there is no magic in a stable price level. Naturally, stable prices going hand in hand with an expanding economy is the most desired situation. But stability of prices during the 1920's did not prevent a most catastrophic depression—and price stability may often conceal inequalities in the economic structure which may eventually upset the effective working of the whole economy. Our aim therefore must be price stability coupled with economic growth; price stability under which employment is full and the individual is free; price stability under which the economy is not unduly restrained.

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO STOP INFLATION

Government spending: The oft-repeated proposal for cutting Government expenditures does not offer a simple solution, since national security, increasing demands for Government services and the dangers of unemployment necessitate certain levels of spending. But Government enterprise should be more and more directed to those areas where additional Federal expenditures will act to relieve depressed conditions and to reactivate idle labor and facilities—rather than increase pressures in areas where labor and facilities are already fully utilized.

Balanced budget: A balanced budget does not offer a magic formula, since a balance could coexist with unemployment and a slow rate of economic growth. But deficit financing is inflationary in nature, and although a balanced budget is not always attainable, we should have it as often as we possibly can. Balancing the budget will also go a long way psychologically in con-

vincing the people that the Government is determined on fighting inflation.

Fiscal-monetary policies: The Government can help stabilize prices by tightening credit policies, and this has been one of the most effective means for combating inflation in England, in recent years. But naturally, we do not want a tight money policy which subordinates economic growth to stable prices, and which creates substantial unemployment. It is most essential that we have flexible monetary policies—designed to meet changing needs and to aid market adjustments. But the flexibility of such policies greatly depends on the Government's own financial position: For Government deficit budgeting may produce pressure on the Federal Reserve System to follow an easy money policy, to assist in financing and refinancing Government deficits.

Farm subsidies: It has been said that supporting prices of basic farm commodities at parity is a potent source of inflationary pressure, while at the same time offering only temporary relief to farmers—since the basic farm problems remain unanswered. Because technological progress has tended to make the large commercial farm relatively efficient, 44 percent of our farms now produce 91 percent of the value of marketed farm produce. Quite often it is the affluent farmer that is being subsidized, while little help is going to the needy one. The rise in output per man-hour has in recent years been more rapid in agriculture than in the rest of our economy, but the farmer cannot be deserted because he has learned to be more efficient. Still, with Government payments continuing to comprise 40 percent of net farm income, and the Federal-held surplus and pledged loans totaling more than \$9 billion by the end of 1959, we must search for more permanent, constructive, and lasting solutions for the farming sector of our economy. Developments to bring industry into the farm areas should be encouraged and relocation and retraining grants should be made available to assist the submarginal farmer desiring to enter more promising employment.

Cutting taxes: Cutting taxes, unless we also produce an equivalent reduction in Federal expenditures, will act to encourage inflation rather than to slow it down. But a reform of the tax system, with the main emphasis upon measures that will produce the means for financing research and modernization of our industrial machinery, is an important part of any effort to increase the efficiency of the economy and to keep costs and prices down.

Cutting personal and corporate income taxes and the modernization of depreciation laws are necessary developments, but as long as the people require more and more Government services, and as long as international security requires tremendous expenditures, only minor relief can be expected in the total tax picture.

Foreign trade: Foreign competition, it is said, can generally be expected to act as stimulus for the reappraisal of costs and prices, while high tariffs and import quotas help keep up domestic prices and shelter inefficiency and monopoly. It is quite probable that the United States can at times make its economy stronger by exposing its producers to fair competition from abroad. But modifications in a free trade policy are necessary in order to protect strategically essential industries, or to protect our economy against subsidized and unfair competition. Since cheap labor abroad coupled with effective new machinery and plants, to which we have contributed through our foreign assistance, may have adverse effects on our own economy—it may be necessary to study the further need for quotas. Still, if inflation in this country is harnessed there is no reason why we should

not be able to compete favorably with other countries—both in our own and in foreign markets.

Curbing bigness: The efficiency, mobility and the power of our economy are directly related to its size. There is no crime in bigness, for a big country requires big business. Breaking up large corporations and powerful unions will not by themselves stop inflation. Breaking up unions in several parts, so there would be several unions in the same industry, would not have the intended results—for confusion, rivalry and union warfare would certainly not act to diminish the upward pressure on wages. Likewise, giving the job of big industry to a large number of uncoordinated and resources—poor entrepreneurs will not aid efficiency or lower prices.

But constant vigilance is necessary to make certain that competition becomes more vigorous and pervasive in American economy. The claims of "administered prices" in American industry, as well as the complaints of wage increases causing "cost-push" inflation, indicate that constant Government attention must be directed to the maintenance of a competitive order both in industry and in labor. With labor income comprising some 62 percent of the national income, it is evident that wages have a substantial impact on consumer prices, and thinking citizens will agree that antimonopoly controls must apply to all kinds of private economic activities—whether carried on by industry, commerce, labor, professional associations, cooperatives or any other combines. Such controls, however, must not be exercised in a haphazard, fragmentary and disjointed manner. Creating a just and proper balance in our economy requires the production of a comprehensive program, well-coordinated and positive in approach, in which the legislative, administrative and judicial branches of the Government must cooperate.

PUBLIC INITIATIVE IN COMBATING INFLATION

Our economic system—to which we have been fondly referring, in recent times, as "People's Capitalism"—is dependent for its true success not on centralized direction and scrutiny of the Soviet type but on widespread creativeness, ingenuity, and cooperation. "People's Capitalism" implies that the means of production are not merely in the hands of the few giants of industry, but are dispersed among large numbers of property holders, professional people, farmers, public servants, and laborers. "People's Capitalism" does away with the discredited Marxist theories of capital-labor struggle, predicted to work the internal destruction of capitalism, and strives, instead, toward a closer "working partnership" between all the elements participating in the national production: capital, management, and labor.

It is with the belief in "people's capitalism" that I am calling for a rapprochement of management and labor—to plan together for the common and public good, and to work together against the destructive powers of inflation.

Management by enlisting the active cooperation of all employees, from top executives to the lowest of orderlies, can succeed in reducing the ratio of payroll expenses to sales revenues. "At the present time," we must agree with one expert commentator, "only a few enterprises really succeed in gaining the active cooperation of their workers. Today the most important capabilities of the American workers, their imagination, their ingenuity, their ability to invent and to discover shortcuts are rarely put to use because methods of management in most plants are not designed to bring out these qualities. Indeed, most managers have little conception how much ability is going to waste through not being used."

Encouragement of productivity through a

system of bonuses, providing workers with additional pay whenever the ratio of payroll costs to sales is reduced, has proved effective in the industries that have tried it. Stock options to labor as well as management increase the sense of partnership. Still, the use of these procedures is not widespread enough and their more general adoption will depend on an increasing degree of mutual confidence and a change in some of the adversary philosophies of management and labor. I believe that these and other new management methods, designed to enlist all units of production in improved teamwork, hold great promise for checking rising costs.

Labor, likewise, must exercise statesmanship and restraint in its constant drive for higher pay and better working conditions. It must be remembered that higher labor pay may be almost totally cancelled out by the higher prices of the commodities that labor must buy. Some inflationary force has been previously provided by union-management bargaining in key industries, for although only less than one-fourth of our workers are unionized—the effect of increased wages was often felt throughout the labor market. But the situation is now changing, and the developments in the steel strike indicate that the settlement is likely to produce no substantial increase in the price of steel. If the changed attitude in steel and auto negotiations will be heeded by other labor contracts, the increases in the cost of labor and the resultant impact on prices will be much more moderate in the early 1960's than it has been since the end of the war.

Generally, public encouragement should be given to the nongovernmental sector of our economy in any of its endeavors to increase national productivity, to guide production into items with greater durability, less obsolescence and lower prices. For as the chief manager of the Union Bank of Switzerland put it recently:

"Higher productivity will be able to keep prices down and money sound, provided that management will finally feel the moral responsibility to pass technical progress on to the consumer in the form of lower prices."

I have, therefore, noted with full agreement the recent statement of Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, that in order to achieve general price stability, price reductions must be accomplished in the industries "where productivity gains are especially rapid." In fact, Dr. Saulnier urged both labor and management in those fields to forego part of the gains of productivity in the public interest; labor by accepting lesser wage increases than the productivity gains, and management by cutting prices instead of taking the productivity advances in higher profits. Thus, both labor and business should be urged to exercise better judgment and more responsibility in setting prices and wages consistent with general stability. And competition should be preserved in both products and in labor so as to limit the power of business and labor to set unreasonably high prices and wages. England and Germany are apparently finding solutions, cannot we—we reasonable Americans—exemplify our reasonableness by using good judgment?

GOOD ECONOMICS WILL MAKE SENSE

It has been said the term "inflation," like the term "rheumatism" at the turn of the century, covers a multitude of ailments. With the multiplicity of factors which contribute to inflation, it is obvious that no one all-purpose pill will cure it. We have listed the reforms that are needed in several fields, and it would be unrealistic if we forgot that there always are formidable obstacles to changes in public policy. Such comprehensive Government and private sector policy

to curb inflation may appear to present some difficult problems, because at first glance it may seem to pit the general interest in a stable dollar against many organized and vocal special interests. But I believe that the program outlined by me demonstrates that anti-inflation action can be taken without serious or lasting damage to any of the constituent parts of American economy. Still, all these interests and groups must be educated to understand that their own welfare turns, in the long run, upon a strong and effective national economy, adaptable to change and capable of competing in the international market.

I believe that the essential first step in the campaign for a stable dollar is the restoration of the public confidence in the stability of our currency. A legislative statement proclaiming the goal of stabilizing the purchasing power of the dollar is one appropriate way of demonstrating Government's determination to act.

The second necessary step is the development of an economic plan which will combine our desire for stability with our need for growth. A strong statement urging creative thinking on the economic future appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"There is not much doubt that the economy can be expanded rapidly if the Federal budget is rapidly inflated. But to conclude * * * that we need only spend a lot more Federal money fast is to ignore the crucial parts of the problem. How can we get a satisfactory rate of growth without inflation and without relying on a vast military effort? * * * Perhaps the answer lies in some kind of economic plan based on a controlled increase in creative public expenditures, accompanied by taxes to pay for them. Devising such a plan is the task of economic statesmanship, and putting it into effect the task of political leadership. Cannot our society generate the political and economic resources necessary to meet such a plain challenge? This much is certain: Unless we do meet this supreme challenge of our times, we shall see more and more peoples drifting toward communism, fewer and fewer committed to the islands of freedom."

To help produce such a plan and to create better and high-level coordination of the several departments and units of government in pursuing both stability and growth, I have introduced legislation for the establishment of a National Economic Council for Security and Progress. I am convinced that the economic challenge posed to the free world by international communism is one of the most serious aspects of the cold war, and that this war may well be won or lost in the markets of the world and on the production line. The proposed Economic Council is patterned after the existing National Security Council, whose main functions are military, and is founded on the belief that planning economic security and progress is as important as planning military defense. Consisting of Cabinet secretaries and other top-level Government officers, it will be the council's function to advise the President with respect to national and international economic development, and to enable the departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively, amongst themselves and with private business, in matters relating to national economic developments and the role of America in world economy.

I should like to say this in conclusion: Let us restore the faith of the people, and we would have taken the first step. But let us not fail to pursue a comprehensive and long-term program that will guarantee our citizens, young and old, working and retired, employed, self-employed, and employing others, the security and stability that are derived from knowing better what tomorrow will bring.

Our National Flower—The Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have written me concerning our national flower, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an unusually informative letter from a lovely lady who lives at Calvert, Ala., whom I have known all of her life, Mrs. Evelyn Nader. Mrs. Nader has also written to our President last November in behalf of the rose as our national flower. Mrs. Nader has certainly made a strong case for the rose, and I feel confident that her letter will be of interest to all of our people throughout the 50 States of our Union.

The letter follows:

CALVERT, ALA., March 16, 1960.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRANK: The time is getting near when Congress will vote on a flower to represent our Nation. Several people have nominated various flowers, including the corn tassel. But don't you agree that a flower that is going to represent our Nation and our people should not be just anything that can be picked up anywhere? This, to me, would be like walking down a street, up to a person, and say, "Congratulations, buddy; you are now our new President." I think that picking our Nation's flower should be like picking our President. Choose one that has background and morals that we can look at and very proudly say, "That is our national flower." Such a flower will not only represent our Nation, but also what the United States stands for—freedom, democracy, and liberty. And not any of these things have been handed to us on a silver platter. They have been fought for and paid heavily for.

Now I would like to nominate the flower that I think stands for these things—the rose. I know that a Senator is also backing the rose; I don't remember his name or whether he is a Democrat or Republican, which doesn't matter—he is an American.

Mr. FRANK, I know that you love flowers and have had experience in raising roses; so you know that you can't just stick a rose in the ground, forget it, and expect to get beautiful flowers. A rose has to be planted carefully to make sure the roots get a good start. After all, the roots are the mainstay of anything, including our country. A rose also has to be pruned and the decayed leaves pulled away. Doesn't this also coincide with our justice? A decayed person or criminal is pruned away from society so he won't infect other people. A rose must be sprayed to protect against the many insects and bugs that would invade and try to devour it. This is also significant of our Nation. If we don't protect our country against the people who would invade us, our Nation would be devoured. We must continually be on our guard and defense. Our flower must also be able to withstand many hardships and bloom out again—here again the rose. It withstands cold, heat, flood, and drought, and comes out again to be as beautiful as ever. Therefore, it can be raised in every State in our Nation, including our new sister, Alaska—again symbolizing the United

States, because we have withstood many crises and always come out as strong as ever.

There are many varieties of roses, also colors, which again symbolizes our democracy, where people of every race and creed live in one country.

The variety of roses is so large that we could have one named for each State, or have one named for each President. Several Presidents already have been so honored, including the present Mr. Eisenhower.

Several beautiful flowers have been nominated for the role of national flower, but I beg you to compare their qualities and beauty with the rose, then ask yourself, "Can any one of the others even come close to the rose as a representative of our Nation?"

After all, with an American Beauty rose in every yard, can you deny that this would indeed be America the Beautiful?

Very sincerely,

Mrs. EVELYN NADER.

The Most Dilatory Body in Washington—
The Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 the Denver Post carried an excellent editorial on the question of the "Most Dilatory Body in Washington—the Federal Power Commission."

A few days ago I introduced legislation to force the FPC "to get busy and carry out its statutory duty to regulate natural gas rates."

We thank the Denver Post for its support when it said, "We have no doubt the FPC would become a beehive of activity, grinding out decisions in rapid order if the Wolf bill were to become law."

The editorial follows:

IOWA LEARNS ABOUT GAS RATES

Representative LEONARD G. WOLF, Democrat, of Iowa, wants to pass a law requiring the Federal Power Commission to get busy and carry out its statutory duty to regulate natural gas rates.

It seems that in parts of Iowa the Northern Natural Gas Co., a pipeline wholesaler of gas, has made three successive rate increases, which are subject to later review and possible refund.

But the FPC, which is about the most dilatory body in Washington, has not yet gotten around to passing on the reasonableness of any of the three.

While consumers are shelling out money month after month to pay for the three increases, they are wondering if they will live long enough to receive and enjoy any refunds to which they may be entitled when the issues finally have been decided.

Colorado gas consumers can sympathize with the Iowa consumers, but cannot offer them any words of cheer or hope.

In Colorado four gas rate increases were piled up on top of one another from January 1, 1954, to February 5, 1958.

The FPC never did show any interest in trying and disposing of the cases with reasonable dispatch.

When collections under these increases got up near the \$100 million mark, it became obvious that both the pipeline company and its customers would be hurt if the dispute

over the four increases were not settled quickly.

The failure of the FPC to pass upon the increases had kept the pipeline company from going ahead with plans to enlarge its gas supply to the growing Colorado market.

It also was threatening to jeopardize the income tax refunds which the pipeline company needed to recapture if it were to pay large refunds for overcharges.

Because the FPC fell down on its job; the pipeline and the customers finally arrived at settlements between themselves by horse trading methods which gave the customers refunds totaling approximately \$50 million and served to scale down the four increases by a nominal amount.

Settlement by negotiation was far from satisfactory, however.

It required both sides to bargain away certain disputed rate principles, the "rights" and "wrongs" of which could only be decided if the FPC had gone through with normal hearing and decision procedures.

The people of Iowa are learning what the people of Colorado have known for a long time—that gas rate regulation as administered by the present FPC is a joke.

Representative WOLF has proposed a bill which would require the FPC to dispose of any rate increases case filed by any pipeline company before it could permit the same company to file a second rate increase and collect still higher rates thereunder, subject to possible later refund.

We have no doubt the FPC would become a beehive of activity, grinding out decisions in rapid order, if the Wolf bill were to become law.

Any change that might stir the FPC from its condition of suspended animation is greatly to be desired. We wish Representative WOLF luck in his venture.

The Airlift Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Tuesday, March 22, 1960:

THE AIRLIFT PROBLEM—I: CARIBBEAN EXERCISE EXPECTED TO LEAD TO BROAD STUDIES OF MILITARY TRANSPORT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Clarification, or resolution, of the perennial defense controversy about military airlift requirements may result from exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine, now starting its second week.

The 2-week maneuver, ending March 28, involves virtually all the Military Transport Service's 483 four-engined passenger and cargo aircraft, and more than 20,000 troops of the Army's Strategic Army Corps. The Puerto Pine phase of the exercise involves the transportation from 14 airfields all over the United States to Puerto Rico and return of the Army troops and of 11,000 tons of supplies. It is the largest military airlift exercise ever held.

The Big Slam phase has intensified for the 2-week maneuver the normal flying activities of MATS to an average of about 8 flight hours daily for each plane—a rate estimated as minimum wartime tempo. The strain placed on pilots and air crews, in this doubling of their flying time, and on maintenance and

communications personnel in working 12 or more hours a day, is described as a test of the war readiness of the Transport Service.

FIRST TRAINING OF KIND

It is that, but exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine is also a good deal more. It is valuable training, the first of its exact kind. It is a public relations tour de force directed toward Congress, now considering military appropriations during an election year.

It is also a field laboratory that may produce tentative answers to some of the major problems, difficulties and controversies that have complicated the issue of military air transportation.

That the Pentagon and Congress are obviously hoping for some answers from exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine is shown by the schedule of elaborate critiques to follow the end of the operation on March 28.

MATS will hold its own critique at Scott Air Force Base in Illinois early in April. The Army will follow with a similar dissection of the Puerto Pine phase of the maneuver at Fort Bragg, N.C., headquarters of the Strategic Army Corps. Joint critiques will follow in the Pentagon.

About mid-April a Special Armed Service Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, which has been studying the Nation's military airlift capabilities, will be given a full report on the exercise.

The problems to be discussed at these critiques include:

Military airlift requirements; the extent to which these requirements can be met by commercial carriers; the modernization of MATS and the kind of military aircraft required; the effect of developing technology on what were formerly two different and sharply distinct functions—tactical and strategic airlift; and the organizational and command relationships of the Air Force's Tactical Air Command and of MATS and of either of them to the Strategic Army Corps and the Army in general.

Detailed and intensive consideration of all these problems and the close working relationship that has been established between Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, new Army Chief of Staff, may well lead in time to a greater and more realistic emphasis on airlift requirements for limited, as distinct from general, war.

High Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the resolution of the March 11 meeting of the board of directors of the American Public Power Association to be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

Whereas the electric power industry requires an unusually high amount of capital investment per dollar of revenue; and

Whereas much of this investment by local publicly owned electric utilities is financed by long-term borrowing; and

Whereas the interest rates which apply to this borrowing therefore have a substantial effect upon the ability of these local publicly owned electric systems to supply an abundance of low-cost power to their consumers; and

Whereas the interest rate on public agency borrowing has recently approached the highest level in a quarter of a century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the American Public Power Association, a service organization which represents more than 1,000 local publicly owned electric systems throughout the United States, urges the Congress to support policies favorable to low interest rates, and to oppose legislation such as H.R. 10590, which would breach the traditional ceiling on long-term Federal borrowing and would adversely affect the interest rates on bonds issued by local publicly owned electric systems.

Adopted at regular meeting of board of directors, American Public Power Association, at Washington, D.C., March 11, 1960.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a portion of the remarks of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, made on March 15, 1960, before several teachers and educators in Abilene, Tex.

The portion of Dr. Harris' speech relates to the majority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

When, with Vice President Nixon, or whoever is to preside, I enter the Senate Chamber at the beginning of each session, and the one in the chair announces "The Senate will be in order, and the Chaplain will lead in prayer," I am never far from a distinguished Texan. A tall form, bowing reverently, but a few feet from the rostrum is the majority leader. I refer of course to my good friend, and your great Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. He is always there at the opening unless an important conference takes him to the White House.

In my judgment, he is as able a leader of a deliberative body as our country has produced.

In his alert brain there seems to be a built-in diagram of the Senate. With uncanny accuracy he is aware of the probable attitudes and reactions of the Senate Members to pending bills. But, all that knowledge is the result of painstaking care and toll.

During these hectic, wearying days of the round-the-clock civil rights debate, I have watched his demeanor with admiration. In the midst of it all he has remained considerate, courteous, and fair. As I have seen him exert his leadership, I found myself thinking of a line from Kipling's "If"—"If you can keep your head when all around you are losing theirs and blaming it on you." Well, Kipling concludes if you can you'll be "a man"—and, we might add, if you can in the U.S. Senate, and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON has, you'll be not just a sagacious politician, but a statesman tall enough to look over mere partisan fences to what he deems best for the Nation's welfare as a whole.

When, in the midst of the debate, I told him I was coming to Abilene—in his State—his face lighted up and he said, "that's one of my favorite places—give them my love."

Cheering the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate, which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1960:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—CHEERING THE FLAG
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

What has happened to the exultant surge of pride in the hearts of Americans when anywhere the Stars and Stripes are unfurled?

In this year of our Lord, as we enter a fateful decade in the life of our Nation, and of all nations, there is little necessity to exhort people inside our Nation, and outside, to shout our faults and failings from the housetops. There are already too many experts in that field.

Of course, vilifying America has been the stock in trade of atheistic communism both in Russia and on mainland China these many years. For them, nothing good can come out of this free land. Their bitter billingsgate is a sort of pathological reaction to the Marxist goal of ultimate world domination. The jeers of the Sino-Russian tyranny are expressed in half-truths and outright misrepresentations as with gleeful delight they hold a magnifying glass over our admitted imperfections. All that is a part of their big lie propaganda. We do not expect them to cheer for the red, white, and blue.

But our deep concern in this message is the contemporary tendency for misled citizens of this valiant land—the envy of all the earth—to follow the example of covetous outsiders who push their hate campaigns against anything they dub American.

One thing to remember is that dictatorship washes its soiled linen in private. Nothing is made public which does not pass official censorship. The whitewashed reports given to the enslaved, and to the outside world, are "doctored" to conform to the purposes of tyrants whose will is the nation's policy. In a genuine democracy all is different. It is what is wrong which is likely to be exhibited. In democracy the people are not regimented or coerced to accept everything handed down from an all-wise hierarchy. The people with conscience and wills unfettered work out their own salvation in the gymnasium of their own decisions and actions.

In competition with the iron regime of conformity, government of the people, and by the people, has a temporary disadvantage. Its dirty linen is hung out on the public common for all to behold. There are investigations and revelations which enrage and shock the preponderantly decent members of the commonwealth. Those who are aghast at the iniquity exposed are likely to lose a sense of proportion and, looking with scandalized eyes, to ask in despair, "Is this America?"

The subversive forces working feverishly day and night to discount our democracy often succeed to an alarming degree in getting shocked Americans to conclude that this great experiment in freedom has broken down. There are many who, failing to put crimes against the state in their true proportion to righteousness in this good land, come to think of the flag as having lost the

stars of its idealism, and the white stripes of its virtues, leaving nothing but a waving red blush of shame as a national emblem.

But, thank God, this is not so. With all that tends to drag the American dream from its pinnacle, there never was a time since Betsy Ross designed the starry banner which has been lifted in heroic yesterdays from Independence Hall to Iwo Jima, when it was more appropriate for Americans with a Te Deum in their hearts to sing, "Three cheers for the red, white, and blue."

Where, oh where, but in America is plenty so shared, need so alleviated, sympathy so abounding, gulfs so bridged? It is the land of the friendly face turned to all the world. Quite significantly a great British newspaper, true to the Union Jack, the Manchester Guardian, declared editorially some time ago: "The United States has done more than any other country to guarantee peace in the world. America remains the foremost country in the world whose ideal in the words of its own Constitution is 'to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty.' The United States has done more than any other country in the world to help others, and to secure their help, prosperity and welfare." And so, from 3,000 miles away, under English skies we hear the refrain, "Three cheers for the Red, White and Blue."

Discouraged and disgusted Americans, deceived by a distorted sense of proportion, need to read the story of Elijah. After great hours of triumph in whipping the priests of Baal, the prophet behaved like a pouting child. In a fit of depression he believed that the whole nation had turned to denial and corruption. He thought that he alone had preserved national honor. Sitting under a juniper tree he wished he had never been born. But he was mistaken. God told him there were many quiet homes where people, such as are the heaven of any land, had not defiled their garments. The prophet was given to know that his arithmetic was all wrong and, instead of being alone, he was off by 6,999. God's word came to the prophet, "I have left me 7,000 in Israel whose knees have not bowed unto Baal." And so Elijah ran up the flag again with pride, as we must do in our own land.

To be sure, corruption gets the headlines; but to one traitor to the flag there are 7,000 whose patriotism is as pure as that of the Founding Fathers.

In this epochal day, with many "false lights on the shore" and with those on board who do not have America in their hearts, still with swelling pride we can join in the cheers which ring in Longfellow's lines—

Sail on, O Union! strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

So cheer for the Red, White and Blue
whose mandates make tyranny tremble.

Clara McMillan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the House an event which occurred in South Carolina of more than passing

importance. On March 15 Mrs. Clara McMillan, my immediate predecessor and the wife of our late Congressman, Thomas S. McMillan, whom you, Mr. Speaker, knew, and many other of our colleagues, was elected Mother of the Year in South Carolina. This honor could have happened to no finer person. Clara McMillan represents the most ennobling virtues of southern womanhood and motherhood. Despite the conflicting currents and distractions of modern-day living, her life will serve as a stabilizing inspiration to contemporary motherhood to withstand the insidious forces that mark modern-day living.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose an article from the Charleston, S.C., newspaper, the News and Courier, in which this important event is noted:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Mar. 15, 1960]

MRS. McMILLAN OF ULMERS IS MOTHER OF YEAR

COLUMBIA.—Mrs. Clara Gooding McMillan of Ulmers in Allendale County, the only South Carolina woman to serve in Congress, Monday was named South Carolina Mother of the Year.

The 65-year-old widow of former Congressman Thomas S. McMillan and the mother of five sons will succeed Mrs. Hugo S. Sims of Orangeburg as State mother.

When her husband died in 1939, Mrs. McMillan succeeded him as U.S. Representative from the State's First Congressional District. She served 14 months of her husband's term.

At the time of her husband's death, Mrs. McMillan was left with five sons, ranging in age from 9 to 17.

After retiring from the House, she worked for the National Youth Administration, the Office of Government Reports, the Office of War Information, and the State Department, where she was a congressional liaison officer.

Mrs. McMillan was born near Brunson in Hampton County, was graduated from the old Confederate Home College in Charleston, and later taught school at Crockettville before marrying.

Her husband was at one time speaker of the State House of Representatives and was elected to Congress for eight terms.

Four of her sons—Thomas S., James C., William G., and Robert H.—all hold technical jobs at the Savannah River nuclear plant. The other son, Edward W., is serving in the Navy.

Mrs. McMillan has 15 grandchildren.

She will represent South Carolina in the American Mother of the Year competition.

Our Monetary System: High Interest Rates Are the Same as a Sales Tax on the Great Majority of the American People, Except That the Revenue From This "Tax" Goes To Fatten the Profits of the Financial Institutions and the Incomes of a Few Wealthy Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 I called attention to a most unusual and informative series of articles pub-

lished by the Texas Observer, of Austin, Tex., dealing with our monetary system and many of the Federal Reserve's present policies and practices.

These are extremely important articles, it seems to me, because they deal with a subject which intimately affects the economic well-being of all of us, as well as perhaps our national posture in the contest with Russia and the other countries that are pursuing the Communist brand of economic organization. Consequently, when I mentioned these articles previously, I put the first of the series into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension to my remarks. Today I invite the Members' attention to the second in this series of articles, which is titled "High Interest Is a U.S. Sales Tax."

The high interest policy is, indeed, equivalent to a tax on the American people. It is a tax from which about 98 percent of the people lose and about 2 percent of the people enjoy an unwarranted bonus. The second of this series of articles is unlike the others in that it was not written by the staff of the Texas Observer, but is a statement contributed by our colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Those people who are under an illusion that the Republican Party has established a record of fighting inflation and that the Democratic Party is the party of inflation have a surprise in store. The gentleman from Texas has prepared a tabulation of all of the roll-call votes on the issue of inflation during the World War II and postwar years. The factual record as to how the members of the two parties have voted on the question of checking inflation has shown that the Republican Members of the House over the years have voted consistently and overwhelmingly for inflation and against measures to check inflation.

I will not give away the plot but will reserve for the reader an opportunity to learn the exact scores in the article below. This article appeared in the Texas Observer of January 15:

HIGH INTEREST IS A U.S. SALES TAX

(By WRIGHT PATMAN)

TEXARKANA.—If Congress passed a stiff sales tax—one which would take a big bite out of every dollar consumers spend for groceries and everything else—many people would be up in arms about it. It is no wonder, then, that many people resent the administration's high-interest policy.

For 98 percent of the people the high-interest policy amounts to the same thing as a sales tax, except there are two notable differences. First, the tax is somewhat hidden and the uninformed consumer does not recognize it as one of the things causing his dollar to shrink. Second, this hidden tax is not going to pay the cost of Government nor reduce the Federal debt, but does fatten the incomes of a few families of great wealth, plus, of course, the incomes of the big bankers and Wall Street money dealers.

Consider what high interest has done just to the cost of owning a home. The present rate on FHA guaranteed mortgages, compared to 1952, means that the typical home buyer today—one with a \$13,500 mortgage—is paying out an extra \$4,500 in interest charges. The chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing recently computed the cost this way: This average family purchasing a home today could have an added

bedroom and an added bathroom, and perhaps a garage also, for what it is paying in extra rates on most other things. The increase in FHA rates is relatively modest—a mere 35 percent since 1952. The total cost of high interest to the average family would come to a staggering amount if anyone could compute it. It takes a huge bite out of the budget of the family that buys an auto, a washing machine, or anything else on time.

More than that, it shows up in increased prices, because business firms—retailers, distributors, manufacturers, and so on—must all have credit. Increased interest rates have increased business costs. Today the average American family is paying \$200 a year in interest charges just to carry the Federal debt, and this is being rapidly increased as old bonds issued at lower rates are being retired and replaced with new, high-interest bonds.

There is nothing new about the Republican high-interest policy, nor about the cry that high interest fights inflation. This is an issue between the two political parties as old as the Republic itself. Oldtimers will remember that when the great depression was at its worst—when factories were closed down, 10 to 12 million were unemployed, the men were standing in breadlines all over America—the Republican policymakers were crusading against inflation just as much as today, if not more so. Actually, this crusade was continued even during World War II.

To illustrate, recently I found in my files a letter written to me in early 1942 by the late, great Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma, in which he said this: "Inflationary has become an epithet of denunciation for any expansion of credit. It is used as a financial ghost to frighten the unintelligent." (Senator Owen, I might add, was longtime chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; he helped draft the law setting up the Federal Reserve System and was one of the alltime great experts on our money and banking system.)

Despite all the talk about inflation when interest rates are at issue, Republican policy has been anything but good when real inflationary issues have been at stake. A few years ago I had tabulated all of the rollcall votes in the House between the beginning of World War II and the end of 1954 on measures where inflation was directly and plainly involved. There were 36 such rollcall votes in this period, having to do with such questions as whether we should have price controls during World War II, whether we should have more taxes to pay more of the cost of the war, and so on. There were 7,000 votes by Democratic House Members and 6,600 votes by Republican Members. These Republican votes were 76 percent for inflation and only 24 percent against inflation. The Democratic votes were 32 percent for inflation, and 68 percent were against inflation.

Incidentally, the letter from Senator Owen which I just mentioned was concerned with an issue which is with us again today. The issue was, and is, this: "When the Federal Reserve decides to increase the Nation's money supply, which method should it use?" The Federal Reserve has two methods. It may itself acquire more Government securities, in which case the interest payments on the securities are returned to the Treasury and the taxpayer is saved this cost. The other method is for the Federal Reserve to change its regulations so as to permit the private banks to create the money with which to acquire more Government securities. In this case there is no cost to the banks, but the interest payments go into bank profits.

Naturally, many bankers oppose the first method. It not only denies them an opportunity to pick up more Government securities

free of charge, it also tends to reduce interest rates generally. When interest rates on Government bonds go down, all interest rates go down. The present Federal Reserve Board is siding with the private bankers; but during World War II and up until the present administration, the Board sided mostly with the public.

Perhaps I should point out that the Nation's money supply is not fixed, but is increased when and as the Federal Reserve decides it should be increased. Generally, the money supply should be increased along with increased production of goods and services, otherwise a money pinch will tend to prevent an increase in production from taking place.

During World War II the Democratic administrations managed the Federal debt without raising the interest rate on long-term Government bonds above 2½ percent. This was also true in the postwar years—up until mid-1951—even though there were shortages of materials and no price controls. Naturally, many bankers did not like the low-interest policy and set up cries of inflation, but not quite for the same reason they are crying inflation today. The present administration has raised interest rates on long-term Government bonds to 4½ percent, and at this point it is stopped by a law passed during Woodrow Wilson's administration, in 1918, which sets a ceiling at this level.

During the past session of Congress the Wall Street bankers and administration brought all kinds of pressures to get this ceiling repealed, but Congress refused. The great crusade against inflation now being intensified, with the help of new recruits from the advertising council and many national organizations, is aimed at stirring up grassroots support for repealing this 40-year-old law. If this succeeds, all interest rates will continue upward and the average family will be even harder hit.

Plainly, the tight-money and high-interest policies have done none of the good things claimed for them. These policies brought on the great recession of 1957-58, yet even then, when industry was operating at low gear, the big unions obtained wage increases and the big corporations raised prices to cover the increased wage costs, and then some. High interest comes out of the economic hides of the unorganized and less powerful, namely, the consumer and small-business man and the farmer. To illustrate, farm income has gone down from \$15 billion in 1952 to about \$12 billion in 1959. But personal income from interest has gone up from \$12 billion in 1952 to about \$22 billion in 1959. Not more than 2 percent of the families profit, on balance, from high interest. For example, U.S. savings bonds are the most widely held by the interest-bearing obligation. By law only individuals can own them, and they are aimed at small investors by being issued in small denominations and made available on payroll savings plans. Yet a recent Federal Reserve survey shows that only 5 percent of the American families own 87 percent of the \$42 billion savings bonds outstanding, and 72 percent of the families own none.

KEY POINTS ARE LISTED

TEXARKANA.—In a statement of points which "should not be overlooked" in the Observer's report on the monetary situation, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN said:

"Over 40 years the Government interest rate on long-term bonds has been fixed at not exceeding 4½ percent. During this time we have gone through depressions and inflations and the rate was maintained at approximately 2½, seldom over 3 percent, with no demand to increase the overall of 4½ percent, until President Eisenhower demanded it recently.

"During 12 years, from 1939 to 1951, the Federal Reserve maintained the long-term rate at 2½ percent, and bonds did not go below par. During a part of this time the Federal Government was spending a quarter of a billion dollars a day in World War II. During a part of this time we had the greatest inflation threat caused by the holdup of purchasing power at a time when goods were not available and people holding this purchasing power all wanted to spend it at one time after the war was over. Notwithstanding this most trying time in history for our fiscal policies, the Government long-term rate was maintained at 2½ percent, and these bonds did not go below par.

"If such rates can be maintained as indicated, they can be maintained any time if the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee will cooperate. The truth is, the Open Market Committee is composed of five members who are selected by the banks, with the other seven Federal Reserve bank presidents. Seven members of this Board are selected for 14-year terms by the President and the other five are selected by the commercial banks who profit from their operations. This is a weakness right here. The people who profit from high interest rates are fixing them.

"On the national debt we are paying \$1 billion more in interest in 1959 than in 1958. We are paying \$4 billion more in 1959 over roughly the same debt in 1952. Our President is forcing an extortionate interest rate policy by allowing Federal Reserve to be independent. It is robbery in broad daylight.

"One of these days the people will get the truth about how our money system is manipulated by a few, and a change will be made. It is difficult to get the facts over when only one side is carried in the press or included in news information by other means of communication."

Wilkes-Barre Indebted to American Legion Post 132

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of March 14, 1960:

CITY INDEBTED TO LEGION

Post 132 of the American Legion is to be commended for providing the city with a \$14,500 ambulance with an assist from the public.

In years gone by, the Legion had financed the purchase directly, but last fall it announced help would be needed on the project with the post making a substantial contribution and sponsoring the undertaking.

Because of the multiplicity of drives, the ambulance fund ran into delay in the final stage, but happily when the situation was called to the attention of the community, the balance was forthcoming. In fact, it was not even necessary to make a special solicitation which had been proposed.

Wilkes-Barre is deeply indebted to the Legion for this enterprise. The ambulance, in use daily, in its own sphere is as essential as the fire department to the well-being of the municipality. The past two decades, Legion ambulances have responded to 22,000 calls. That is an impressive record that speaks eloquently for itself.

Food Power, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, agriculture has served as a foundation for our economy.

In the face of complex problems—resulting in costly programs of assistance—the Nation at times, unfortunately, loses sight of the tremendous significance of the farm economy—the production plant turning out food, a most valuable resource.

Because of an ample supply of high-quality, nutritional food produced by the American farmer, the average citizen today is a stronger, healthier, more energetic, creative individual.

Recently, the Central Soya Co., Inc., of Ft. Wayne, Ind., published a fine brochure entitled "Food Power, U.S.A."

Reflecting the fundamental significance of the farm economy to our economy, the health of our people, and progress of our Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the publication printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD POWER, U.S.A.

FIVE MORE MOUTHS EVERY MINUTE

Today, the U.S. farmer, who has never failed to make his land yield to meet demands of the time, is breadwinner for 173 million Americans * * * and his U.S. family is increasing at the rate of five mouths a minute.

In the early 1800's, farming was a way of life, and the average U.S. farmer was producing enough food and fiber for himself and four other people. By 1920, the average farmer was supplying food for himself and eight other people, and the number of farmers was declining.

In the early thirties, an agricultural revolution began that has been gaining momentum every year. Electricity and tractors, trucks and farm equipment, and many other agricultural advancements were boosting the farmer's productive ability. Currently, our farmers feed themselves and 20 others. Soon it will have to be himself and 25 others.

Farming is no longer a way of life—instead, it is a highly skilled profession demanding many special talents.

Acreage for croplands in the United States has remained almost stable for the past 35 years. Yet population, which has always increased, is recording explosive growth, and showing a strong preference for eggs, meat, and milk every year.

Production is increasing

Fewer U.S. farmers, on larger farms, working fewer hours, are constantly increasing egg, meat, and milk production. Their progress in efficiency has increased farm output in the past 17 years as much as the total increase in the 120 years from 1820 to 1940.

As a nation, the United States has 7 percent of the world's population, and only 13 percent of our people are farmers. Yet U.S. farm producers, representing less than 1 percent of the world's population, are responsible for 51 percent of the egg production, 41 percent of the red meat, and 46 percent of the fluid milk in the world.

This tremendous production of Foodpower, U.S.A. was thought unattainable just a few years ago, and yet, there is no time to look at the record or rest on laurels. With no allowances for changes in per capita consumption, the production of eggs, meat, and milk must be increased at least another 25 percent by 1975, just to meet the expected increase in U.S. population.

Food's a good buy

Despite the rising index for costs of living, most protein foods, especially eggs and many meats, can be purchased for less money now than it took 10 years ago. The same methods of volume and efficiency in production that have made this possible should continue to make protein foods a good buy in the future.

FROM FARM TO MARKET TO DINNER TABLE

Miracles, in growth and production, in processing, in distribution and marketing, put sunnyside eggs, a sizzling steak or a cold glass of milk on American dinner tables.

With almost jewel-like precision, our delicately balanced animal food production machine meshes many indispensable "gears." Each gear is vital, each is powered by freedom of production and purchase. Each gear is governed largely by freedom of competitive enterprise.

Competition is keen

U.S. housewives with their freedom of purchase and desire for low-cost food have a powerful influence on the prices and volumes in every phase of food production, except the growing of grains on American farms.

The poultry, livestock or dairy producer must meet market prices influenced by housewife demand with a minimum of "outside" interference. The feed manufacturers supplying these food producers must meet competitive prices. The meat packing-houses, egg stations, poultry dressing, and dairy plants must operate within a narrow margin that is controlled by an intensely competitive food marketing system. The corner groceries and supermarkets are competing with each other for the millions of food dollars housewives hold.

It is this cherished privilege to compete and to purchase that lets a Philadelphia housewife buy a weekend roast that was born on the plains of Texas, fattened in feedlots of the Midwest, marketed through stockyards in Chicago, packaged, displayed, and sold at her local supermarket.

Controls are costly

Necessity motivates invention—demand for quick action usually results in politically expedient measures. Such was the case for beginning a program of production controls in agriculture. But in so doing, the power supplied by freedom of production is reduced. Freedom of competition in production and marketing is drastically impaired or eliminated.

Artificially supported prices have encouraged production of impractical volumes. Acreage limitations have been largely offset by increased yields per acre, transplanted acreage, new crops or production areas.

Unwieldy and enormous carryovers of some basic crops are now plaguing agriculture. These carryovers are confusing agricultural planners and costing taxpayers billions of dollars each year.

One agricultural newcomer in the United States—soybeans—has for the most part been left alone. With vision, soybean producers have resisted suggestions for acreage controls urging instead a program that would encourage production for use.

In this atmosphere of freedom, soybeans have become a major farm cash crop, the chief source of protein in today's vital animal feeds, an important source of fats and oils that have strengthened our national economy and let us share our blessings with other nations of the world.

Through tremendous increases in production with no cost to taxpayers, soybeans are making important contributions to foodpower, U.S.A.

EGGS "OVER EASY" PLEASE

Laying hens are efficient factories that use poultry feed as their raw material to turn out an economical and health-giving food—eggs.

Like any other factory, production efficiency—how many eggs from how much feed—is an important factor in production rate, volume and cost. In 25 short years, U.S. egg production has jumped from less than 3 to nearly 5½ billion dozen eggs per year.

Most of this astronomical increase in production has been due to the development of better egg "factories" and more efficient egg-producing feeds. Because of these developments, U.S. citizens are buying eggs today for less money than it took 10 years ago.

LIGHT MEAT OR DARK?

Meat-type broiler chickens and their heavier cousins—turkeys—provide 30 or more pounds of appetizing and healthful meat for each U.S. citizen per year.

Here again, production efficiency is the key. The more meat that can be produced from a bag of broiler or turkey feed, the more drumsticks, thighs and breasts there are at lower cost for our dinner tables.

Twenty-five years ago, U.S. turkey production was less than 250 million pounds per year—today it exceeds 1¼ billion pounds, providing Thanksgiving fare for the year around.

The broiler industry did not exist on a commercial scale 25 years ago. Yet this popular poultry meat has almost replaced the farm "fryer" of yesteryear making fried chicken a year-round meat instead of a seasonal treat. Today, broilers, the most efficient of our meat-producing animals, supply more than 4¼ billion pounds of tasteful meat per year.

THE MOST NEARLY PERFECT FOOD

Nature's most nearly perfect food and the first food fed to almost every baby born is milk.

There were almost 25 million cows on U.S. farms 25 years ago and they produced nearly 104 billion pounds of milk per year. U.S. milk production now exceeds 125 billion pounds per year and the number of cows on farms has dropped to 23 million.

Today's milk cow is bred for higher productive capacity, and she has modern dairy feeds to help her reach her inherited potential. These same feeds prolong her milking life, letting fewer cows produce more milk for longer periods of time for increased food production.

Dairy animals, too, make valuable contributions to low-cost meat supplies.

ANOTHER SLICE OF HAM

Pork production, making ham, pork chops, and bacon, is the largest single use to which our bin-bulging U.S. corn crops are put.

Just as with other food-producing animals, the ratio of feed per pound of meat in hog production has been substantially improved by the development of modern feeds. Scientific breeding and feeding practices are producing leaner, more palatable pork cuts for foodpower, United States of America.

Twenty-five years ago, U.S. pork production was nearly 9 billion pounds per year. At that time, hogs were marketed at 6 to 8 months of age. Almost 800 pounds of feed were needed to finish a weanling pig for market.

Today, pork production is a high-volume, high-efficiency operation, supplying more than 11 billion pounds of pork per year. Hogs go to market at 4½ to 5 months of age. Heavier, meat-type weanling pigs are now being finished for market on less than 500 pounds of feed.

MAKE MINE MEDIUM RARE

Steaks and roasts from beef are America's favorite meat, and beef cattle are the backbone of U.S. meat supplies.

In a short 25 years, beef production has risen from 6 to 14 billion pounds per year. In the same period, beef consumption has jumped from 46 to more than 85 pounds per person.

Beef production has also had the benefit of modern feeds. Today's cattle eat less per pound of gain, gain weight faster, produce beef that tastes better than that of yesterday.

Thanks to modern feeds, many farm crops are used more efficiently and there's more beef to eat.

SERVANTS UNSEEN AND UNSUNG

No man stands alone—behind our eggs, meat, and milk producers, and their record of progress, is an agricultural "army" whose services are unsung.

Educators, research workers, agricultural experiment station, and extension personnel all are scouting the horizons, and pointing the way, for agricultural improvement. These men know the need and are devoted to finding the methods for progress. Years of effort may lay behind their developments. But the reward is great, more Foodpower, U.S.A.

Agricultural universities and land-grant colleges of America are constantly equipping our agricultural manpower with "why" and "how-to" knowledge that helps them see the paths of progress that can and should be followed for tomorrow.

Research projects—sponsored by industry, education or government—are being carried on daily throughout our land. Out of these may come a hybrid seed that will yield more per acre, a hybrid breed that produces more food in less time, a blood-typing practice that reveals how much a dairy bull calf will improve milk production of his future daughters without waiting 5 years for an answer.

The value of these projects for future production cannot be measured in terms of today, they must wait for the results of tomorrow.

From test strips of land at U.S.D.A. and State agricultural experiment stations come new methods of tillage, new principles of crop fertilization, new practices for plant cultivation and harvest. All these result in greater production, and are vital factors for future Foodpower, U.S.A.

Agricultural extension people carry the message to the farmer. Through them, and their desire to see better methods put to good use, the practices, products, and principles for progress are "fed" to our food producers.

Just as with humans, farm plants and animals are subject to sickness, too. Countless doctors, our veterinarians, botanists and entomologists, devote lifetimes to fighting insects, parasites, and disease.

Their efforts may result in a plant or animal more resistant to disease, a new method for disease diagnosis or prevention, a product for insect, parasite, or disease control. Saving what our farmers already have is vitally important to increased production of the protein foods we prefer.

The feed industry: From feed manufacturers, pharmaceutical companies, protein processors and other commodity suppliers have come many important contributions. Nutritionally balanced feeds, vitamins and hormones, antibiotics and medications, all have been developed through progress in industry research to increase food production and makes farm operations more efficient.

Trained representatives make daily rounds, stressing the advantages of properly feeding livestock and poultry, recommending sound management and production methods.

Small Slam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, Tuesday, March 22, 1960:

SMALL SLAM

The lessons of the Army Air Force practice airlift to Puerto Rico underscore the urgency of a House Armed Services Subcommittee's plea for modernization of the Military Air Transport Service. By working its crews double time, calling on civil carriers to supplement its operations elsewhere and choosing a nearby island for the exercise, MATS has been able to move 21,000 soldiers in a few days' time. But only a third of the equipment that such a force would need in a real emergency was included in the lift.

If the exercise had been carried out over the Atlantic or the Pacific—as would be the case in a real limited war situation—the picture would have been completely different. Most of MATS' aircraft are old and slow, of World War II vintage. In a full-scale emergency, if island-hopping became impossible because of enemy submarine or missile attacks, MATS would have no more than 29 reasonably modern aircraft capable of strategic, long-haul transportation.

Yet in the face of these known deficiencies, which the so-called Operation Big Slam—Puerto Pines served to illustrate, the President has approved a mere \$50 million in the 1961 budget to begin development of a new military jet cargo plane. At best such a plane might take 5 years to produce. Nothing is provided for acquisition in the meantime of converted commercial jet planes which, in modest numbers because of their great carrying capacity and high speed, could transform MATS into the modern supporting arm that all the services urgently require.

Before the House subcommittee, headed by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, completes its timely month-long study of national airlift needs and capabilities, it will no doubt become apparent that modernization of MATS is intricately bound up with an unresolved dispute between the Air Force and the civil airlines over MATS future. The civil view was largely reflected in the President's recent policy statement on MATS which in effect urged that the military get out of the international airline business except for operations essential to its so-called hard-core mission.

As interpreted by the private carriers, this would ultimately mean that nearly all of the 1 billion ton-miles of transoceanic cargo now hauled annually by MATS would be shifted to the private carriers, which presently carry a little more than half that amount. The Air Force seems far from ready to accept this interpretation, with MATS arguing that it must maintain at least a 5-hour-per-day aircraft utilization rate to be ready for the 12-hour-per-day lift which it is charged with providing in a war. The civil concept of the hard-core-only policy would trim this to 1 or 1½ hours a day.

If the real readiness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet could be improved upon and if MATS could revise its training and other readiness concepts as drastically as the private carriers think it could, perhaps some

adjustment of international cargo business in favor of the private carriers could be justified. The carriers insist they cannot afford costly jet cargo planes without assurance of a large slice of the cargo now hauled by MATS.

But however this dispute ultimately is settled, it ought not to stand in the way of an immediate military-civil agreement that provides for the prompt ordering of converted jet liners suitable for military troop and cargo lift. Government and industry ought also to cooperate in the development of more advanced cargo planes, designed to meet both military and civilian requirements. Meanwhile, a Defense Department review of the President's broad policy statement on MATS is proceeding, and in this context and before the Rivers subcommittee the question of who is to operate the new aircraft in peacetime can be further explored. Both the Air Force and the civil carriers recognize the inadequacy of present cargo planes for military and commercial needs, and upon this agreement a program for modernization should be able to proceed.

An Open Letter to the Taxpayers of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the Christian Layman of Alabama to insert "An Open Letter to the Taxpayers of Alabama" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This letter was distributed by this organization:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE TAXPAYERS OF ALABAMA

Incidents, happening here in the cradle of the Confederacy, for the past few days have been most disturbing, not only to the citizens of Alabama, but throughout the Nation.

The Amsterdam News, a New York Negro newspaper, carried the following headline last Saturday, "Negroes in Dixie Sing: Sit Down and Fight a While"—and all the time we have been told that no one was fighting—just passive resistance. One out-of-State agitator told a mass meeting at Alabama State College (for Negroes) that we've got them so disturbed they don't know what to do.

A TV newscast pictured a recent meeting being held at the college. A Negro girl came to the mike and made the statement that when they expelled the nine . . . they expelled the entire student body. Are such statements as these Christianity or Gandhism? This might be worthy of consideration, and use the money to help relieve the 10 percent cutback in other State supported schools.

We white people of this State, who carry better than 70 percent of the tax load that supports this Negro college, are thoroughly disgusted with outside meddling and being told that we do not know what to do. We are thoroughly disgusted with suggestions made by the president of this college, such as . . . Let's take time to think things through . . . appoint a biracial mediation committee, etc. We remember that this was the pattern in 1955, regarding bus boycott. Look what happened. Many of our white taxpayers were amazed when they

learned from records that 5 of the 9 ring-leaders were out-of-State students.

We commend Governor Patterson and the State board of education for the stand they have taken and we want the world to know it. (We list below members of this board and suggest you contact them and let them know your feelings in the matter.)

In addition, gentlemen, and in consideration of the facts revealed, we respectfully request that you release to the taxpayers of this State, an itemized list, by name and address, of all out-of-State students attending Alabama State College.

ALABAMA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Hon. John Patterson, president.
Mr. Robert R. Locklin, Mobile, First District, term expires 1961.

Mr. J. T. Albritton, Andalusia, Second District, term expires 1965.

Mr. J. P. Faulk, Jr., Samson, Third District, term expires 1961.

Mr. Harry M. Ayers, Anniston, Fourth District, term expires 1963.

Mr. J. J. Benford, Albertville, Fifth District, term expires 1961.

Mr. E. W. Skidmore, Tuscaloosa, Sixth District, term expires 1963.

Mr. W. C. Davis, Fayette, Seventh District, term expires 1965.

Mr. Cecil Word, Scottsboro, Eighth District, term expires 1965.

Mr. Chester Austin, Birmingham, Ninth District, term expires 1961.

Dr. Frank Stewart, State superintendent, secretary and executive officer.

Respectfully submitted,

THE CHRISTIAN LAYMAN.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., March 5, 1960.

Dr. Joseph I. Echikson Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1960, the South Mountain Lodge of B'nai B'rith presented the Americanism Award to Dr. Joseph I. Echikson of South Orange, N.J. This is the latest of numerous honors that have been conferred upon Dr. Echikson, for his brilliant leadership in his profession and in his community. All Americans have reason to be grateful to Dr. Echikson for his dedicated service, particularly for his outstanding contribution to the crusade to track down the great scourge of cancer.

The award was made to Dr. Echikson at impressive ceremonies at which the invocation was given by Rabbi Theodore Friedman, spiritual leader, congregation, Beth El; the welcome was delivered by Dr. Irving Schein, chairman, Americanism Award Committee. Guest speaker was Dr. Royal A. Schaaf, president, Medical Surgical Plan of New Jersey. Presentation of the award was made by Mr. Philip Lax, president, South Mountain Lodge, whose felicitous tribute follows with Dr. Echikson's gracious response:

The Americanism Award of B'nai B'rith is given each year by South Mountain Lodge to a man who has performed outstanding service to his community.

Many men reach the pinnacle of success in their chosen profession, but few are prone to give of their time and energy, and go far and above their normal call of duty.

It is truly a great man who attains these qualifications, a man with deep feeling, who thinks more of his fellow humans, and their comfort, rather than his personal welfare and relaxations. Dr. Joseph Echikson truly represents the ideals and qualities that lie behind this most coveted award, for although a noted heart specialist, his farsightedness and deep concern for his fellow man led him to a desire to establish a means of attacking the equally dread disease of cancer.

Through his efforts, capabilities and leadership he was a guiding factor in the growth and development of the New Jersey Cancer Society, of which he is a founding member. As such, he was directly responsible for bringing the problem of cancer and cancer research to the public. To have been a motivating factor in establishing the New Jersey Cancer Society is accomplishment enough, but to have been closely associated with its organization, development, and administration, surely must have been a tiresome, and in many ways, a thankless task.

Because of his achievements in both medicine and service to his fellow man, Dr. Echikson was awarded the Doctor Edgar J. Ill Award by the Academy of Medicine in New Jersey for his accomplishments in the field of medicine, public welfare and civic activities. In 1952 he received the Bronze Medal from the National Board of Trustees of the American Cancer Society. His biography is one for which he can truly be proud.

Tonight, we, the members of South Mountain Lodge, are doubly honored, for this makes the first time that one of our own members has been chosen to receive the B'nai B'rith Americanism Award.

Dr. Echikson, as president of South Mountain Lodge it is my pleasure to present the B'nai B'rith Americanism Award to you. It reads "Presented to Joseph I. Echikson, M.D., in recognition of outstanding leadership, unselfish service and devotion to his fellow man."

"SOUTH MOUNTAIN LODGE,
B'NAI B'RITH.

FEBRUARY 9, 1960."

DR. ECHIKSON'S RESPONSE

Mr. President, Dr. Schaaf, Dr. Schein, and the members of his committee, members of the lodge, my friends and family, I am understandably flattered by your gracious comments and I am at the same time most humble.

I am most impressed by the designation of your award, namely, the "Americanism" award. This is a most impressive title. It strikes at the very core of my philosophy of life. There are many who do not realize that in a democracy such as ours, there is an opportunity and privilege and indeed the duty and obligation to serve for the benefit of our fellow man. Such a philosophy does not exist in a totalitarian system of government. I am concerned, as I am sure are you, with the State of our welfare and with equal vigor I oppose the philosophy of the welfare state.

To be of service to one another without thought of material gain is one of the principles upon which our great country was founded. This is truly the spirit of America and, therefore, this award is aptly named. It has been given to others as recognition of the services which they had been privileged to give others, and while I do not feel worthy of your commendation, still I am deeply impressed by the significance of this award.

No man attains the qualifications which this award implies except through the helping hands of many other equally deserving people. If, as you believe, I deserve any

praise I must honestly state that I accept this award in behalf of those many wonderful citizens who have assisted me and have been most unostentatious in their efforts. At this moment I stand in the precarious position of being placed on a pedestal and I accept this honor with humility, knowing full well that the only place one can go from a pedestal is to fall off. I hope that I shall have the character and good judgment to maintain this enviable position so as to continue to merit your good will.

It has been a source of great joy to me to have served in various activities and I hope that my efforts have been of benefit to others.

In closing I wish to thank Drs. Schein and Alan Brotman and the members of the committee who have recommended me for this great honor and to the members of the lodge who endorsed this recommendation of the committee. I thank Dr. Schaaf who has honored me by consenting to speak here tonight. This is indeed a great compliment to me. I thank my dear wife who has through the years encouraged me and provided me with the time to participate in these various activities. She has made great personal sacrifices in my behalf and I wish to publicly acknowledge them. I thank my children for honoring me by taking advantage of the educational opportunity provided to them. I also thank my parents, who unfortunately have passed away, but who like all good parents provided me with the opportunity for education. They practiced self-denial to the highest degree. Unfortunately they are not here tonight, but I am sure that they would believe every word of praise which had been spoken here tonight. I thank my many friends who honor me by being present here on this occasion. My cup runneth over with joy. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Sterling Forest Gardens: America's Newest and Largest Floral Showplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I was pleased to welcome to Washington a most gracious and charming young woman from my State, Miss Anne Purves. She was visiting our Nation's Capital as ambassador of Sterling Forest Gardens, America's newest and largest floral showplace at Tuxedo, N.Y.

Miss Purves was a most attractive representative of the Empire State and one in whom all New Yorkers can take great pride. In the larger sense her visit was of interest to all Americans because she brought with her information and an invitation to view the wonders of this new addition to the New York State scene.

Sterling Forest Gardens are dedicated to the concept of a more beautiful America. Organized as a nonprofit corporation by a farsighted group of New York leaders, headed by Robert W. Dowling, these gardens represent an effort to emphasize the spiritual values of beauty in the lives of Americans.

Situated on a 125-acre tract near Tuxedo, N.Y., in what was formerly unre-

claimed swamplands, Sterling Forest Gardens will become an almost unrivalled permanent floral showplace, a rendezvous for flower lovers, naturalists, and horticulturalists from all over the world. The gardens will be open to the public on May 1, 1960. The opening will be a fine tribute to the role that forward-looking private citizens can play in what may become one of the most pressing problems of the future: the conservation of our Nation's great natural beauty for all of our citizens.

The gardens were designed as a garden of gardens, and were created by a distinguished staff of horticulturalists, landscape designers, engineers, and other garden experts. Work began on the project some 2 years ago, when 75 men undertook the task of clearing the wild, swampy area. Since then, this cooperative, nonprofit venture has created a system of drainage, formal design gardens, landscaped lakes, forests and lawns, and a unique exhibit showing man's relationship to time. Throughout, great care has been taken to preserve native trees, bushes, flowers, and other natural contrasts to the formal settings.

The first planting of tulips, which formally inaugurated the planting of the gardens themselves, was made September 17, 1959, by Her Royal Highness, Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands.

This and other aspects of the development of the gardens, created by City Investing Co. and Sterling Forest Gardens Corp., of which Robert W. Dowling is president, was carried out with the cooperation of the International Flower Show Committee of the Netherlands. Since that time, more than 1.5 million tulips, hyacinths, daffodils, and other early-blooming Dutch bulbs have been planted.

The first blooms will be followed by petunias and azaleas in May; iris, peonies, roses, begonias, hermercallis, and delphinium in June; lilies, snapdragons, marigolds, tritoma, and dahlias in the summer months; and asters, chrysanthemums, and helenium in the autumn. In fact, this scientifically planned garden, marked by the largest collection of spring flowers in any garden in the United States, will be a continuously changing panorama of bloom planned to change every 2 weeks from the opening on through the summer and into the fall.

A number of striking features are planned for these unusual gardens. They include the following:

A motor train, similar to those used at the Brussels Fair, will be used to transport visitors between the parking areas and the gardens' entrance. The train will run through a scenic wooded drive and past the Dutch Dam, on its way to the entrance.

A series of six lectures on the floral displays at different locations in the gardens will be broadcast over an electronic lectern system. Portable electronic receivers will be made available to visitors who wish to hear the lectures.

Jean Delacour, one of the world's leading aviculturists, will provide a colony of rare and exotic birds to be housed in uniquely designed aviaries

placed throughout the gardens. Birds that will be represented include flamingos, demoiselles, swans, crown cranes, peacocks, and varieties of small birds.

Two features which will be made available to large groups, garden clubs, and other societies are a special club meeting pavilion inside the gardens and an extensive picnic recreation area located near the parking areas.

A number of works of art are being designed for the gardens, since they are planned as a cultural as well as floral attraction. They will include a sculptured Raintree fountain, portraying the legendary tree of good luck and happiness. In another area, various fountain displays will illustrate man's growing enlightenment in his relation to the universe, tracing his concepts of the world from prehistoric time through the present and into the age of interplanetary travel.

The personal enthusiasm of Mr. Dowling and his associates in City Investing Co. plus the wholehearted cooperation of world horticultural leaders, has been responsible for creating Sterling Forest Gardens.

Samuel R. Walker, president of Sterling Forest Corp. and City Investing vice president, personally visited famous gardens in Europe when the project was first considered. He has participated actively in every phase of their creation.

Gustave Springer, American representative of the Associated Bulb Growers of Holland, brought leaders of the bulb industry to the United States to help in the selection of the site and to cooperate on many phases of the gardens.

W. Fred Johnson, vice president of Sterling Forest Gardens Corp., has had the responsibility of directing actual work on the project and carrying out the designs and plans of the many consultants.

Mr. President, I am confident that Sterling Forest Gardens will become more than a mecca for flower lovers. It will become more than an important center for research in horticulture.

I am extremely hopeful these gardens will help renew and justify our faith in man's capacity to create beauty and to keep and sustain it as part of the spiritual wealth of this Nation. It will serve as a living testimonial to the ability of private citizens to contribute substantially to the saving of America's precious natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Story Behind a Major New Garden," written by W. Fred Johnson, and published in the January-February 1960 issue of the Garden Journal, the publication of the New York Botanical Garden.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STORY BEHIND A MAJOR NEW GARDEN (By W. Fred Johnson)

Sterling Forest Gardens, now being created on a 125-acre tract near Tuxedo, N.Y., will open to the public May 1, 1960, with a display

of one and a half million hyacinths, daffodils, tulips, and other Dutch bulbs. Planning a single huge floral display such as this is a tremendous job in itself, but it is only a small part of the work being carried out, for the gardens must be kept in continual bloom straight through the summer and into fall.

Our staff has traveled thousands of miles in this country, and Robert W. Dowling, president of City Investing Co., and other members of that organization, which is co-sponsoring the gardens, have visited such famous foreign gardens as Tivoli in Rome, the Gardens of Versailles, Kew Gardens, Keukenhof in Holland, and even the famous gardens of Japan. All this was done to study methods of presenting constantly new floral displays and to observe at first hand the ways in which the interest and delight of visitors can be heightened in a garden.

FREQUENT NEW DISPLAYS

At Sterling Forest Gardens, we plan to introduce new floral themes every 2 weeks from May through the summer and far into the fall. Dutch bulbs—incidentally, the largest such collection in any garden in the United States—will give way to the finest and newest in iris and roses. Then annuals and perennials will come into bloom, to be followed in the autumn months by tremendous displays of chrysanthemums.

Sterling Forest Gardens are located in the foothills of the Ramapo Mountains, in a setting of woodland, meadow and rugged foothills. A number of small lakes have been created on the grounds, and unusual fountains, including a representation of the raintree, mystical tree of good luck and happiness, are planned to delight further the eyes of visitors.

EXOTIC BIRDS

The area being a wild one, there is already considerable birdlife in the gardens, and we believe that it will increase markedly as time goes on. But many of our native birds are rather inconspicuous; so to bring additional color and brilliance to the gardens, exotic species will be introduced. We should like also to have a few of the deer native to Sterling Forest in the gardens, but we have learned that they unfortunately have a very healthy appetite for the leaves of our hundreds of thousands of tulips. They will be fenced out, but can be seen roaming the other parts of the forest.

No doubt everyone is going to exclaim over the scope of the gardens and their wealth of plant material, but probably only one in a thousand visitors will realize that the story of their development has been, and continues to be, one of constant struggle against time and nature. We have been working for nearly 2 years to transform the area into this major floral showplace, and we have had as many as 150 men and dozens of large and small pieces of equipment busy at the job through the spring, summer, and fall of both 1958 and 1959.

NATURE—FRIEND AND FOE

Many times the elements of nature that have worked against us were the very ones we wanted to harness and have work for us. The principal ones, of course, were weather and water—water in the form of rains, floods, torrential downpours, masses of water falling and flowing across a very narrow area confined between hills.

The main part of the gardens is located in what was a swamp 2 years ago, with several feet of water standing in it. It was surrounded by wooded hills, which created a basin through which floods poured. Deposits of peat and clay in the swamp had been covered by water for centuries, perhaps thousands of years, and our first task was to cut huge drainage ditches 15 feet deep through the area to permit this water to drain out.

A SOLUTION FOUND

After much study and experimentation, we learned that it would be impossible to drain the underground water regardless of how many ditches we might dig, for it was trapped by various layers of clay and peat in a very complex arrangement. The only solution was to strip off the entire area and remake it completely with the clay as a base, then a deep layer of pervious sand and finally a layer of soil for growing the plants. By this method we were able to establish the underground water table at a desired level and to control it.

We had to prepare for flash floods of 3- to 5-inch rainfall within an 8-hour period. Such a devastating flood pouring down from the surrounding hills into the flat basin which would be the gardens could destroy them.

"DUTCH" DAM

Our solution was the creation of the series of lakes in the gardens which are actually flood catchment basins, and which at the same time serve the esthetic purpose of further beautifying the grounds. These catch basins are linked by underground conduits, permitting the flood of water to flow from one to another. Finally, the entire system is regulated by an automatic dam (called "Dutch" dam because the design is a copy of one we saw in Holland). It will open when the flood level in the lakes reaches a certain level, so that heavy floods can be passed through the system and out of the gardens without causing damage to them.

We had to think not only of how to get rid of the water but also how to get it back during the dry seasons, when plants need water badly and when the lakes might become dry. An irrigation system of pipes was installed. To make sure that the lakes do not go dry, we had to go to another swamp on a higher plateau above the gardens, and this was converted into a 10-million-gallon reservoir and emergency water supply.

AN INVASION

Another major problem in the development of Sterling Forest Gardens was the dense growth of brush in the swamp area. In fact, it was so dense that 2 years ago Dutch landscape architects responsible for the overall garden design got completely lost in it for about 30 minutes when they were making an inspection tour. Finally we heard their yelling and directed them back to the highway.

Seventy-five men, 35 chain saws and several bulldozers worked for 3 months during the summer of 1958 clearing out the area. During the height of this operation the noise in the confines of this basin was intense—in fact, it sounded like an invasion.

Even while this clearing was going on, six crews were working continuously surveying the area, and two draftsmen were translating their information onto detailed topographical maps. These are unusually large in scale and unusually detailed—we know the location of every single tree and every single boulder in Sterling Forest Gardens, and also the depth of the soil everywhere within its bounds.

RAINY DAY BLUES

Great pains were taken to preserve every possible tree in the area, and also the shrubbery, such as the native laurel. With huge bulldozers and draglines working all through the area, this was no simple task. Special equipment had to be selected and extreme supervision exercised for working the ground among the trees to prevent scarring them and damaging their root systems.

Spring of 1959 came, and even though we had studied weather reports for many years past, we began watching the skies as anxiously as a wheat farmer in the Middle West at spring planting time. We knew that when rains came our equipment would bog down and work would have to be

stopped. Initially a heavy rain would stop work for 10 days to 2 weeks. After the area was shaped and improved, this loss of time was reduced to 2 or 3 days. In our schedule of work we had allowed 50 percent lost time due to rains from June 1958 to May 1, 1960, the opening date. We have needed every day of good weather.

SUPREME TEST

Our flood control system came to a supreme test at the last rain on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, October 22, 23, and 24, 1959, when a record rainfall of 3.5 inches descended within 8 hours. Our hearts were in our mouths; as we watched to see if our system would work or if the gardens would be destroyed. The system worked. The gardens were not destroyed. Rather, within hours after the rainfall we were able to walk almost any place; within 24 hours we could walk in the flowerbeds and within 48 hours planting was resumed.

The Dutch have been cooperating throughout this mammoth project by the International Flower Show Committee of the Netherlands. When planting time came this fall, for the 1½ million tulips, hyacinths, daffodils, and other bulbs, they offered to see us through that immense operation by sending nine young experts to supervise our untrained men. We owe the Dutch a vote of gratitude for all their interest and for their drive in getting the work done.

We hope that this brief report gives horticulturists, gardening enthusiasts, and the general public some idea of the tremendous amount of planning and work that has gone into the creation of this new, major floral showplace. Creating the lovely spectacles which they will see beginning May 1, 1960, has been a major undertaking, with its full share of anxious and worrisome moments, hours, and days. At the same time it has been an inspiring and exhilarating experience which more than 200 men and women have shared. We hope, in turn, that the gardens will prove an inspiring and exhilarating experience to the millions of people expected to visit them over the years.

Food Additives and Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to my colleagues an excellent statement dealing with the question of food additives and cancer:

STATEMENT OF FEDERATION OF HOMEMAKERS, ARLINGTON, VA., PRESENTED JANUARY 29, 1960, BY MRS. ANN BOORAS, PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Ann Booras, president of the Federation of Homemakers. Our federation is most appreciative of being afforded this opportunity to express the views of its membership with respect to proposed legislation dealing with the use of colors in foods and cosmetics. Our Federation of Homemakers, although but recently formed, consists of housewives residing in this area and in many of our States. We also have junior members attending local colleges. Our members are concerned not solely with the health and well-being of our own families, but with the

good health of all consumers. One of the objectives of our federation is to acquaint our members with past and future food legislation and the tasks and needs of the Food and Drug Administration in enforcing these specific laws.

We wish to thank the members of this committee for presenting to Congress recently an excellent food additives bill which includes the Delaney cancer clause. In our opinion, consumers should be most grateful for the protection now being afforded them through the enforcement of the Delaney cancer clause to the food additives amendment.

Some of our members have read the 1957-58 printed report of the hearings relative to proposed chemical additives bills held before the Subcommittee on Health and Science of this committee, and are impressed with the testimony of reputable doctors and scientists contained therein. From time to time we shall quote from this remarkable report portions of the testimony given by these eminent and highly respected authorities.

It is fortunate for consumers that this committee has a wealth of information obtained from numerous hearings on chemical additives. We feel confident that this committee will deliberate unhurriedly and will present a color additives bill to the Congress which will decrease the risks consumers may now unknowingly be taking by ingesting certain suspect dyes in their foods. We urge that any color additives bill presented to the Congress contain the Delaney cancer clause.

We note that the American Cancer Society in a letter dated July 22, 1957, written by James S. Adams, chairman, Legislative Committee, to Chairman John Bell Williams, relative to proposed chemical additives bills recommends: "That no substance shall be approved found to induce cancer in man, or after tests provided in No. 1 above, found to induce cancer in animals." In this same letter Mr. Adams states "the problem is one in which the individual citizen is powerless to protect his own health but must depend upon the Food and Drug Administration." Mr. Adams also believes and we continue to quote: "in considering the health problem created by the increasing use of chemical additives in food the adage 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure' is particularly applicable." Mr. Adams then urged "that your committee recommend legislation to the Congress to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration." This advice, in our opinion, can be applied also to the proposed color additives legislation.

Quite a few of our local members were present for Secretary Flemming's appearance at the morning session of the color hearings and were tremendously impressed with his statement to the committee. We are all agreed that consumers will benefit from his forceful presentation of the objectives of the administration's color additives bill. The members present at the morning session applauded the Secretary's summary on page 24 of his statement, particularly No. 3 which we quote here as it expresses the opinion of those members attending the hearing:

"3. We have concluded that such an anticancer clause constitutes sound public policy in view of the fact that no one knows how much or how little of a substance will induce cancer when added to the diet of man if it has been demonstrated that it will induce cancer when added to the diet of a test animal. In other words, if a person includes in his diet substances that induce cancer when included in the diet of test animals, he is taking an unnecessary risk. The Government has a responsibility to see to it that we are not exposed to unnecessary risks of this character. In discharging such a responsibility the Government can conceivably contribute to a reduction in the mounting number of cancer cases."

We wish to remind this committee that in 1939 American housewives, through their various organizations and clubs, went on record at hearings conducted by the Federal Security Agency that they wished only colors certified as absolutely safe used in their foods and for decorating such foods. These same housewives in 1939 went on record that they preferred to have the colors of their lipsticks and other cosmetics limited to a relatively few harmless shades than have a variety of hues provided by suspect or proven dangerous dyes.

If today's housewives were consulted about this problem of colors—our federation feels confident they, too, would go on record as wishing safety of the product to be paramount. Now that we are accustomed to the brightness which lipsticks give to our faces and the lift to our spirits, we would be loathe to forego our addiction to them—but we do plead that only the most benign dyes be selected. Members of our sex start using lipsticks these days at age 12 or thereabouts and continue their use till we depart this existence. Because of such universal and continual use of lipsticks by all ages of our female population, cumulative effects of the dyes must be seriously considered. It must also be recognized that lipsticks are being used by young persons whose cells are still dividing rapidly. Such dyes may have a different effect on these young persons than mature persons. Lipsticks are also applied by expectant mothers, whose bodies undergo so many drastic changes during the stress and strain of pregnancy. Then consideration of the possible effects upon the elderly who may be taking medication for chronic illnesses is suggested. Today it seems more necessary than in the past that in the best interests of the users lipsticks should be limited to a few harmless colors and variations of shades until lengthy tests on laboratory animals assure the wisdom of permitting a wealth of shades and colors.

In the case of food colorings, the very young ingest them as well as the aged and chronically ill of both sexes. The adolescent and the pregnant and those with allergies—all ingest food colorings—sometimes unknowingly (as in the case of butter). In these circumstances surely total impact on the human system should be considered as well as cumulative effect and synergistic action. It is our understanding that competent authorities believe that children, because of their immaturity and their state of growing, may be affected by chemical additives and dyes in a different nature than mature persons or mature experimental animals. Therefore it was very distressing to learn that the yellow and orange AB and OB dyes, now removed from the approved FDA lists, were used in many of the favorite foods and snacks of children. We trust these two oil dyes were never used in lipsticks. Now when the human system has to cope with air pollution and water pollution, as well as the products from atomic fallout, it seems especially needful that discretion and caution should be observed in the choice of dyes to be used in our foods. We would like to point out here that Dr. Jolliffe, eminent nutritionist and medical authority, has stated in the New York State Medical Journal, September 15, 1955: "although in America today, life expectancy at birth is near the best of any civilized country in the world, but at the age of 40, life expectancy is near the bottom."

In support of Secretary Flemming's policy that "no one knows how much or how little of a substance will induce cancer when added to the diet of man if it has been demonstrated that it will induce cancer when added to the diet of a test animal" we quote from the testimony of Dr. Francis E. Ray, research professor and director, Cancer Research Laboratory, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., before your committee, at the hearings on food additives legislation.

Dr. Ray stated: "There may be a safe dose of some cancer-producing chemicals, but we do know there is no safe dose of certain other cancer-producing chemicals. We do not know everything about cancer-producing chemicals. There, my feeling is we should be on the safe side. Because we know there is no safe minimum dose for certain cancer-producing chemicals, I think we ought to adopt that rule, at least tentatively, that there is no safe minimum dose."

In considering this important color legislation, we would like to remind the committee that for 25 years Agene was used to mature flour in this country. Then its use for this purpose was discontinued when research on dogs indicated it might be quite harmful to humans. Coumarin was used as a flavoring agent for 75 years before its use, too, was discontinued because it was felt it might have damaging effect on humans. Subsequent research may prove that many dyes now considered relatively innocuous are capable of causing harm to consumers. Dr. Ray also pointed out on page 200 of the Food Additives Report: "I wish to make one other point, too, and that is: Our experiments show that the younger the animal is when he is treated with cancer the more certain is the production of cancer. And so we may be initiating cancer in the children of today by the addition of chemicals, and they are very susceptible to that. We will not know, perhaps, for a generation or two what the effects will be." At this point we would like to remind the committee that the American Cancer Society in a press release last spring announced that cancer seemed to be getting more prevalent in younger women these days and was definitely more prevalent in children.

Dr. Morton L. Levin, in the Chemical Additives Report, states that cancer is a "common disease." We quote from his remarks, which appear on page 355 of the aforementioned report: "In the presence of a common disease, of which most cases are of unknown causation, I think you can understand the sensitivity of physicians and public health authorities to the possibility that substances which we do not suspect today may be causative of cancer."

"In other words, we cannot rule out the possibility that seemingly innocuous substances, on the basis of general experience, may turn out to be significant for cancer when studied thoroughly."

It would appear from the foregoing quotations that our bodies are old fashioned and do not adapt themselves easily to drastic innovations. It seems to us that simply because it may take years to recognize the damage done to body cells by certain pesticides, additives, and dyes, discretion and caution should not be discarded and their use permitted in our foods. It would be a tragedy for a child, initially damaged by a chemical additive at 4 or 5 years of age, to be struck down fatally by cancer at 15 or 16; yet such tragedies may even now be occurring.

Again we wish to thank the members of this committee for granting us this opportunity to convey the opinion of our members.

Millennium of Christianization of Poland Noted at Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, an editor from Passaic, N.J., which appeared in the Bethlehem (Pa.) Bulletin on Friday, March 11, 1960:

MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANIZATION OF POLAND NOTED AT CONFERENCES

(By John C. Sciranka)

The writer, is grateful to well known Dr. Oskar Halecki, professor at Fordham University, for an opportunity to participate in two academic conferences held in commemoration of the approaching millennium of the Christianization of Poland.

The first conference was held at the Fordham University on November 14, 1959, by the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, of which Professor Halecki is president. The subject of the conference was "Millennium of the Christianization of Poland."

Very Rev. Lawrence J. McGinley, S.J., rector of Fordham University, opened the conference. Prof. Berhart B. Lander, also of Fordham, spoke on "Holy Roman Empire of the 10th Century and East-Central Europe."

Rev. Dr. Francis Dvornik was on the program and he was to talk about St. Adalbert (Vojtech), famous bishop of Prague, who baptized St. Stephen, known as the first King of Hungary. Dr. Dvornik who is held in high esteem as a noted scholar was unable to be present on account of a heavy cold.

Rev. Astrik L. Gabriel, professor at Notre Dame University, spoke about Polish and Hungarian alliances. Professor Chudoba spoke about St. Adalbert (Vojtech), who was born in 956 A.D., in Prague. His father Slavnik was the Lord of Libice and his mother was Strezislava. He was baptized Vojtech, which means solace of the armies. Archbishop Adalbert, in Devin confirmed him Adalbert, which name is used by many German historians. In 986 when only 30 years he was consecrated bishop by Bishop Detmar. Bishop Vojtech labored in Bohemia, Slovakia and Poland. He suffered a martyr's death by the pagan Prussians on April 23, 997, when his feast is observed. The largest Slovak Catholic society is named in his honor.

On March 5, 1960, a second academic conference of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America was held at Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York City. Dr. Henry L. Roberts, director of the program on East-Central Europe at Columbia, was chairman. He was introduced by Professor Halecki.

Prof. Ludwik Krzyzanowski, editor of the Polish Review (published by the Polish Institute), spoke on Poland's contribution to Western civilization. He was followed by Prof. George Y. Shevelof of Columbia University, who spoke on "Poland's Cultural Impact on the Eastern Slavs." Prof. John A. Lukacs, of Chestnut Hill and LaSalle Colleges, both in Philadelphia, had as his topic "Poland's Place in the European System." He is a well-known author of several books on this subject. "Poland's Place in the Baltic Region," was a theme of Prof. Arnold Speke of the University of Riga. Dr. George Washkovich of Hunter College, New York City, spoke on "Poland's Place in the Slavic World."

The second conference had two sessions just like the previous one at Fordham, one in the forenoon and afternoon. Discussions followed the morning and afternoon lectures. Both conferences were held on the highest academic level.

The year of 1966 is accepted as the marking of Christianization of Poland. The millennium will be observed in 1966.

Dr. Washkovich, who studied at the famous Charles University in Prague, capital of Czechoslovakia, is an American of Slovak descent. His parents came to America from Michalovce in Zemplin County, which

was also the home of Col. Geza Mihalotzy, well-known organizer of the Lincoln Rifleman of Slavonic origin, which he organized in February 1861, and received a written sanction from the famous emancipator. Mihalotzy was a captain of Chicago sharpshooters in 1861. He fell in the battle at Fort Chattanooga, which is often also called Fort Mihalotzy.

Dr. Washkovich spoke about the famous Slovaks—Jan Kollar, Pavel Safarik, Anton Bernolak, as well as Czech, Polish, and other Slavonic leaders of over a century ago, who had the foresight to vision the strength of the Slavonic people, now under the domination of Soviet Russia.

The writer was happy to join the discussion especially when given an opportunity to pay tribute to famous leaders like the late Polish military leader, Marshal Joseph Pilsudski, whose 25th anniversary of death is observed this year and who according to the late Col. Stephen Bonsal, author of "The Unfinished Business," a Pulitzer Prize winner, and "Sultors and Suppliants," helped the well-known Slovak leader Msgr. Andrej Hlinka to reach Paris on the Polish passport in 1919 to file at the Peace Conference the just claims of the Slovak nation for their autonomy as formulated in the Pittsburgh Pact, signed on May 30, 1918, in Pittsburgh, Pa., by the late President Thomas G. Masaryk, whose 110th birthday was observed on March 7.

The discussion was very lively. Prof. Henry L. Roberts as chairman kept the discussion most interesting and Professor Halecki in his remarks at the opening and the conclusion of this second academic conference made everyone feel eager to participate in other conferences for more interesting lectures on Poland and its neighboring Slavonic countries, who are Christian in character and are proud of their cultural heritage, which these conferences give an opportunity to acquaint the vast American public and enrich our melting pot for a stronger America.

Protecting the Small Businessman in the Meatpacking and Retail Meat Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], with whom I have joined in sponsoring legislation on behalf of small business.

On February 25, I introduced H.R. 10682, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to strengthen independent competition in the meat industry. The chief sponsor of this legislation was the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who has taken the lead in fighting for small business.

The purpose of this bill was to prevent the choking off of small business by vertical monopolies in the purchasing, processing, and retailing of livestock and livestock products. Investigations by the House Committee on Small Business and other studies have revealed an unhealthy trend toward monopolization in the food industry. This legislation was spe-

cifically designed to deal with one phase of that problem.

Section 1 of the bill would make it illegal for large food chains doing a volume of business greater than \$10 million a year to engage in meatpacking. The same section of the bill would make it unlawful for the packers doing a business of more than \$10 million yearly to enter the retail food business. On this section of the bill there can be no objection from those who believe that competition is essential to our free enterprise system. We need to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent a few huge corporations from securing a monopoly grip on our food industry.

The second section of the bill was intended to prevent large buyers from exploiting livestock producers through certain types of privately negotiated purchases. This section would have required that livestock producers selling more than \$100,000 yearly in livestock or purchasers buying more than \$1 million annually must carry on their transactions of livestock for slaughter through public competitive bids.

Several livestock producers in my State have pointed out to me that this second section of the bill might interfere with essential market operations for both producers and purchasers of livestock. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and as he has stated in his remarks today, he and I are both anxious to remove any part of the legislation that might jeopardize legitimate marketing. I am, therefore, joining today with Mr. ROOSEVELT in offering an amended bill which strikes section 2 from the original legislation. The amended bill on which we will seek action contains only one provision, namely, the portion making it illegal for large food chains to enter the meatpacking business or for large meatpackers to engage in the retail food business.

The section to which some of the cattlemen have taken exception is completely removed from the legislation.

The War We Are In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week we were all saddened by the tragic accidental death of Reuben Robertson, one of America's leading public servants in Government and industry. Mr. Robertson was Deputy Secretary of Defense from 1955 to 1957, and has served the Government in various other important roles, most of which related to the Nation's defense setup and mutual security. At the time of his death, he was president of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co., of Hamilton, Ohio.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that the Champion Paper Co. has

frequently demonstrated its enlightened interest in the Nation's broader policy issues. Another high-ranking Champion official who has served in Government with distinction is Karl R. Bendetsen, a vice president of Champion. He has also filled various Pentagon posts, including Under Secretary of the Army, and served on Panel II of the Rockefeller Report on the Military Aspect of International Security.

Recently a brochure produced by the Champion Paper Co. entitled "The War We Are In—View I," came to my attention, Mr. President. This report offers a remarkably clear and vivid articulation of the protracted war the United States is in for the establishment of peace and the survival of freedom. It analyzes the methods, strength and tenacious dedication of the Communists, thus demonstrating the deepest implications of the crucial challenge that the United States and the free world face.

I ask unanimous consent that the introductory section of this study, entitled "The War We are In," along with two revealing quotes of Chairman Khrushchev and a concluding quote, by way of an answer and a "call to arms for Americans," by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, which are found in the Champion pamphlet, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask consent for a section of the same study entitled "The Anatomy of Peril" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR WE ARE IN

The war we are in has been characterized as a protracted conflict. The man who has best described it is one of the most remarkable political and military strategists of all time—Mao Tse-Tung, designer of the Red Chinese colossus and the most formidable of living Marxist-Leninist theoreticians. It is his thesis that war and peace are not now separable conditions.

This protracted conflict is simple in concept, immensely difficult in execution—involving every sector of human activity, political, economic, psychological, cultural, technological, and military. There is about it one reasonably sure thing—it may most swiftly be lost by the side unaware that it is fighting it.

Most simply stated, here are the basic guidelines of protracted conflict: (1) Knock off your enemies one by one, as they become exposed. This applies to jungle warfare and it applies to international political warfare. Kill the straggler in a group of men. Penetrate the straggler in a group of nations. (2) Keep the enemy off balance. Again, it applies to jungle warfare or to the international thrusts and feints that have become a familiar Soviet tactic. (3) Sap the enemy's will to resist. This includes propaganda and cultural warfare and extends everywhere from convincing the enemy that you are technically superior—through talk as much as talent—to disarming him with the beauty of your ballet troupes. (4) Avoid a frontal assault, a knockout punch, until such time that it can succeed without powerful retaliation. (5) Divide the battlefield into a peace zone and a war zone. The peace zone of today is simply the full area of the Soviet Empire. All international tensions, according to the ground rules of Sino-Soviet tactics, lie within the war zone. Thus, the question of colonialism may be debated

in regard to Algeria, never in regard to Hungary or Tibet.

This concept, relatively new to the West, is ancient in the Orient. Centuries before Mao, in 500 B.C., the Chinese militarist Sun Tzu wrote that "To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Mao himself quotes several of Sun's formulations in his *Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary War*. One is: "Avoid the enemy when he is full of dash, and strike him when he withdraws exhausted."

But perhaps the most pointed of all that Mao quotes is this: "Make a noise in the east, but strike in the west."

"The Soviet Union is in a capitalistic encirclement and must be ready to deal a crushing blow to any attempt of the aggressors to hinder our peaceful construction."—Khrushchev, speech of February 23, 1954.

"I would like to draw your attention to the fact that at present the concept of 'capitalistic encirclement' of our country itself seriously needs a more accurate definition. With the formation of the world system of socialism the situation in the world has altered radically and it has not altered, as you know, to the advantage of capitalism. At present it is not known who encircles whom. The Socialist countries cannot be considered as some kind of an island in a rough capitalist sea."—Khrushchev, interview with Serge Groussard of the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, March 19, 1958.

"To my mind, American citizens must be much more conscious of the real dangers of our times and be willing to treat the time as not peacetime."

"How can American democracy meet the crisis of our times? To my mind, Theodore Roosevelt's guidance of many years ago is still good. 'Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood—the virtues that made America.'"

"The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love of soft-living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

"If Americans can get together—unite behind their leaders in the crisis of today—which is a real crisis, believe me—their security is assured. If they cannot so unite—if they insist on business as usual—politics as usual—then I fear for the future of this Republic, no matter how much military strength we have in being."—American Security in the Nuclear Age, an address by Adm. Arthur W. Radford before the Cincinnati Council on World Affairs, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 30, 1959.

THE ANATOMY OF PERIL

Perhaps the most penetrating public study ever made of the war that Communism is waging against the free world, was one released in May, 1959, by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. In book form it is entitled "Protracted Conflict," published by Harper & Bros., New York; its authors are: Robert Strausz-Hupé, William R. Kintner, James E. Dougherty, and Alvin J. Cottrell. The excerpts reprinted here concern what could be the most fateful decade of this century.

The next 10 years of the protracted conflict may prove to be the most momentous in human history. The Communists will try to exploit this period to disarm and divide the West; to complete their military buildup; and to win the technological race. The Communists recognize that they must strive for a decisive margin of superiority in the realm of military-technological weapons—a margin which would enable them to

attack with impunity or to pose to the West the choice between surrender and total defeat. In the event of such a decisive breakthrough in the weapons race, the protracted conflict could be terminated by a strategic knockout blow. In the absence of a decisive breakthrough, however, any marginal superiority in the weapons race can serve to enhance the effectiveness of other conflict means—political, psychological, organizational, or economic.

The Russians, their frequent aberrations of doctrine notwithstanding, remain convinced Marxists. According to Marxist dialectical doctrine, technology (i.e., the means of production) is the key to the revolutionary process in history. But in the post-Lenin view, technology does more than merely transform the class structure of society; it transforms, also, the international power situation by gradually replacing one socioeconomic system with another. This, indeed, is the new meaning of the dialectic in the global setting of the protracted conflict. Marx taught that the industrial proletariat would assume one day complete control of those technological instruments which are the Unterbau of social power. Lenin substituted the conflict of state systems (Socialist versus capitalist) for the conflict of social classes (proletarian versus capitalist). The West's historical position of global supremacy has rested upon its virtual monopoly of technological power. To achieve hegemony for themselves, the Communists realize that they must not only break the West's technological monopoly but also outdistance the West in those technological capabilities which will form the future Unterbau of international power.

In addition to superior weapons, technological reserves are also needed to compensate for the possibility of successful hostile surprise. Communist strategists are well aware that the Western Alliance will not launch preventive war. Since the Western nations extend to the Communists the option of striking the first blow, the former must be ready to absorb the heavy cost which their defensive posture entails. This is primarily a matter of maintaining adequate levels of reserve forces. If the offensive and defensive capabilities of the two sides, at a given time, should balance out quantitatively and qualitatively, and should a surprise attack be technologically feasible, the Communists can count upon a sizable strategic margin in their favor, simply by virtue of their assured ability to make the first move. This factor points up the difficulty of calculating a safe margin of Western deterrence. The Communists are able to measure margins of deterrence differently from Western strategists because they may hope to destroy a substantial portion of the West's offensive capability before it can be put into operation. For this reason, the concept of global dispersion of strategic capabilities takes on added significance for the Western nations.

Technology is not merely a matter of hardware. Politics, psychology, and other social sciences are interwoven with developments in the technological order. The term "psychotechnology" indicates a broad and as yet unexplored area, the significance of which may be illustrated by citing the possibility of posing nuclear threats either physically or psychologically. No doubt, the technological race between the Atlantic allies and the Soviets forms a backdrop for many apparently unrelated international disturbances. The dramatic technological advances announced by Moscow in recent years have spurred the Afro-Asian systemic revolution. Soviet backing has emboldened anti-Western nationalist leaders—in the Middle East, for example—to challenge the West under the shield of Soviet nuclear blackmail. By thus supporting the forces of anti-Western nationalism with veiled nuclear

threats, the Soviets hope to effect a gradual rollback of the West's overseas strategic bases upon which the West's nuclear delivery capabilities largely rest.

The military technology of a nation or of a bloc of nations depends upon a number of broad factors. Many of these determining factors lie beyond the ability of the Communists to control or influence outside of their own sphere. But the Communists can be expected to do whatever they can to hamper weapons-system development in the Western countries. By stressing, in their propaganda, the potential devastation of nuclear conflict, they play upon the guilt feelings of Western scientists and thus attempt to make them reluctant to participate in military programs. By proposing suspension of nuclear weapons tests, they seek either to reduce the Western lead or to increase their own. The Communists also try, through nuclear blackmail and pacifist propaganda, to turn the peoples of the world against Western bases on their soil.

In the face of this calculated Communist campaign to win technological dominance there are some potentially dangerous gaps in our Military Establishment. Among these are our inadequate capability for fighting certain kinds of limited war, with or without atomic weapons, may well be one, although there is wide disagreement among the professionals as well as laymen on the limits of limited war and on where and when such a war might or should be fought. But the central military problem is to stand up against the Soviets' military-scientific blackmail and to meet, in the last resort, a Communist all-out nuclear attack: The West's extended strategy must rest upon the psychological as well as the objective acceptance of the risk of total conflict. Anchored in that resolution the West's extended strategy must seek to make an all-out war an extreme risk for the Soviets, to unhinge the Communist system and thus bring Soviet expansion to a halt. It is rather in the psychological arena than in its technological workshop that the West has displayed its most alarming shortcomings. Objectively, Western strategy has been far more effective than the sensational charges of its critics will have it. No doubt, our military posture is susceptible to a great deal of improvement. But an exaggerated zeal for improvement, especially when it is triggered by pained surprise at the latest ploy of Communist psychological warfare or considerations of domestic political advantage, might prove to be "counterproductive" in developing our real range of power.

There is a considerable gap between the launching of a Sputnik and the zeroing in, with Soviet intercontinental missiles, of all the West's farflung strategic installations. It is the responsibility of the free world scientists to scrutinize the significance of sensational Soviet technological achievements, especially those which are announced by Communist political news agencies, and not take Communist claims at face value. It is the responsibility of Western journalists to place those achievements in their proper perspective. As the world moves into an era of accelerating technological development, there is a greater need than ever for the exercise of a critical faculty by Western elites. If the latter drop their intellectual defenses, the Communists are certain to take advantage of the breach. We can, if we choose, expand and utilize our superior technology to foreclose any possibility of the Soviets seeking to resolve the conflict by force. This choice will be costly, but in all prudence it must be made.

Much has been said and written about the battle for the minds, hearts and stomachs of the "uncommitted" world. To many, this struggle is tantamount to the battle for

the world itself. Few would doubt that the hunger, poverty and disease which are the continuing lot of millions of people living in the free world are a source of danger in the protracted conflict.

The key problem is not only to develop the appropriate economic techniques but also to change the cultural and social ideas of the so-called backward peoples in order to bring them from their sunken civilizations into the 20th century. As Western technical culture has become universalized, the peoples in the dependent lands are reaching eagerly for the material benefits symbolic of Western culture even while they reject the socio-political ideals upon which this culture was built.

Most Western plans for coping with the understandable aspirations of these peoples completely overlook the psychological gulf which divides East and West and which only time—rather than increased communications—can bridge. In the wide areas of Asia and Africa, the economic, political, and ideological revolution in progress represents the fragmentation of the organic oriental society under the impact of the industrial West. If this revolution is anti-Western, this is due at least in part to the simple psychological fact that man instinctively resents change and the agencies that would bring about this change in the ways of his life.

The Communists have demonstrated that they understand only too well the forces at work in the systemic revolution. While the United States is attempting to solve the problem of the underdeveloped areas by working from the top down—i.e., through the existing government—the Communists are working from the bottom up, that is, by gearing their policies to the emotions of the people. U.S. policy is predicated upon the maintenance of existing order; the Communists' upon the creation of chaos. The foreign-aid programs of the West are guided largely by objective economic criteria; the Communists are interested only in the conflict and propaganda potential of a given foreign-aid gambit—be it a steel mill in India or pavement on the streets of Kabul.

For two-thirds of the world, the process of economic growth is just in its inception. It is essential in the early phases of this process that the most powerful economic power on earth exercise prudence in laying the philosophical and strategic guidelines of its aid program.

Most of the emphasis of the programs tendered thus far has been on the economic aspects of the problem. But even our economic hopes can be realized only in an environment free from the threat of Communist penetration. Foreign economic-aid programs cannot be carried out in a vacuum, divorced from political considerations. True enough, in view of all the complaints uttered in many recipient countries about aid with political strings attached, we might be tempted to think that such a separation can and must be made. In fact, this is neither feasible nor desirable. It is possible, albeit sometimes difficult, to separate private foreign investment from foreign-policy considerations. It is patently impossible, however, to draw any firm line between a government-aid program and international politics. No matter how much the West is willing and able to invest in the development of the "uncommitted" countries, there will always be a gap between the Western contribution and rising native expectations. The Communists need only move into this gap, be it even with the most modest resources, in order to divert to themselves whatever credit the recipient peoples might have been willing to accord a foreign giver. We cannot afford the luxury of succumbing to the demands of so-called neutralist nations to satisfy their hyperbolic economic demands lest they drift into the Communist orbit. We must never lose sight of the fact

that much of the fashionable "neutralism" which abounds in the "gray areas" depends, for its *raison d'être*, upon the continued bipolarity of the world. These countries cannot embrace categorically one or the other side of the global conflict without forfeiting their unique bargaining position. If many of the new nationalist leaders have not realized it before, they are beginning to learn by hard experience that communism is even less capable than we of meeting their economic needs. To ungracious demands from these quarters that we supply the aid they seek or see them go Communist, we may well heed George F. Kennan's advice and bluntly tell them: "Go."

The current phase of the protracted conflict will not be settled by the battle for the uncommitted areas however vital the outcome of this battle may subsequently become. Instead, the crucial decisions will be made in the hearts of the opposing camps—in the Western alliance and within the Communist bloc which stretches from the Elbe to China's Yellow Sea. In the underdeveloped world, the West's strategy for the decade ahead cannot be more than a holding action. There, the task must be to gain time, to avoid fixed commitments, to improvise and to abstain from action for action's sake. The contention, often heard in our midst, that the underdeveloped world represents increasingly the decisive battlefield of the cold war bespeaks the success of Communist strategy in distracting our attack from the most vulnerable sector of the protracted conflict—the Communist system itself.

Electronics and the Future Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of hearing Gen. E. R. "Pete" Quesada address the Electronics Industries Association here in Washington.

I was so impressed with the solid observations and specific program outlined by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency that I am bringing his entire address to your attention.

It is refreshing to have such positive leadership given to an agency as exhibited by General Quesada. It is not surprising, however, because his record causes us to expect no less leadership.

The address follows:

ELECTRONICS AND THE FUTURE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

(Address, by E. R. Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, before the Electronics Industries Association Government-Industry Dinner, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 17, 1960)

I am indeed happy to be with you tonight and to discuss some of the more challenging problems facing us in the aviation community. This evening I hope to give you an up-to-date report on our plans and programs to provide safer and more efficient aviation facilities for the Nation.

Aviation and electronics have come of age during the lifetime of many of us here tonight. What's more, the two industries have grown up together. The years following Orville Wright's historic 12-second

flight at Kitty Hawk have been years of phenomenal progress for both aviation and electronics. Electronics has had its impact on the growth of the aviation industry. Likewise the electronics industry has benefited from the inexhaustible market generated by the air age. Manual and mechanical systems and devices in aircraft have been replaced by smaller, lighter, less expensive and more efficient electronics packages. The remarkable progress in electronics in the last decade is a tribute to engineers and scientists of the world who have dedicated their efforts to research and development. And, I might add, a tribute to the electronics manufacturers for their efficiency in producing the products of research and development for distribution to the users. In this regard, your organizations have promoted, not only our Nation's productivity but have furthered the well-being of its individual citizens as well.

As we look now to the future, aviation will rely on the efforts of men such as you to an increasing extent to provide the necessary airborne devices, navigational aids, and communications equipment that are the life's blood of a safe and efficient air traffic system. Your steady growth over the past several years reflects the increasing dependence that we are placing upon your industries in helping us reach our objectives. And I would say, without hesitation, that the electronics industries, big as they are, are only beginning to tap their productive potentialities. Your greatest years still lie ahead.

Now what are the objectives of the Federal Aviation Agency? There are many, but there is one that takes number one priority: Air safety.

We must attain air safety to the most absolute degree possible, for every type of aircraft that uses the navigable airspace, whether large or small, jet- or piston-engine, whether flying under visual or instrument flight conditions, from takeoff to touchdown.

I believe we have made excellent progress in the field of safety, through more and better navigational and communications equipment, through research and development activities, improved flight standards and air traffic control regulations and procedures, higher medical standards, and pilot qualification, and many other related factors. This progress has been due to the efforts of not one agency or one group, but rather to the cooperation and hard work of the entire aviation community.

The aviation picture today is rapidly becoming more complex. The airspace, which was more than adequate when I started my flying career 35-odd years ago, is literally shrinking as the result of increasing air traffic and the introduction of bigger, faster, and higher flying transport planes and thousands upon thousands of business and private aircraft. Today we have over 100,000 active aircraft in the United States. Of this number 70,000 are civil. We estimate that by 1965 we will have 83,000 civil aircraft in our national inventory. In terms of hours flown, we expect general aviation aircraft to jump from its current rate of 12 million hours per year to 16 million by 1965. This will be an increase of 33 percent in the next 5 years. These statistics are staggering in themselves, but when we consider the fact that next year we will have 225 jet transports operating in our system, the immensity of the task we face strikes home with stark reality. Now then, what are some of the specific problems associated with modernizing our national system of aviation facilities? First, to accommodate increased numbers and complexity of aircraft in smaller blocks of airspace, and still maintain safe separation between aircraft, we must provide a measure of flexibility in our air route structure to permit the more efficient utilization of our precious com-

modify—airspace. This requires improved navigation devices both on the ground and in the air. Our ultimate goal is to provide a navigation reference throughout the airspace from the ground to the highest altitude at which aircraft will fly. This means that we must provide facilities which will permit aircraft to be flown off airways—off the established air routes—a system in which aircraft are not necessarily required to fly from navigation aid to navigation aid.

There are available today, in various stages of development, many navigation systems that will permit off-airways, point-to-point flight. At our National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, in Atlantic City, we are currently experimenting with Doppler navigators, pictorial displays, self-contained dead-reckoning computers, and other techniques to determine how this equipment can be used in a system based on ground-referenced devices. The accuracy of position information required for air traffic control demands at this time that self-contained airborne navigation systems be updated periodically by reference to a ground navigation facility. The VORTAC network being implemented throughout the country will provide accurate azimuth and distance information to facilitate this updating.

I would emphasize here that radar, our primary surveillance tool, plays a most important role in increasing the number of aircraft that can be safely flown in a given block of airspace. In addition to our own radars, the FAA has controllers at 38 Air Defense Command sites to provide radar advisory service under a joint use arrangement.

So far, my discussion has been pretty much directed to separation problems in the lateral plane. Of no less importance, and of at least equal complexity, are the problems associated with maintaining vertical separation between aircraft.

The ground-determined height of aircraft has long been a missing dimension in air traffic control. We are currently developing an air height surveillance radar. A receiver only, passive system, it uses an S-band air surveillance radar as the target illuminator. The antenna system is a 160-foot high structure, consisting of three antenna arrays, arranged to form an equilateral triangle, 60 feet on each side. The height-finding radar is designed to furnish comparative heights of aircraft within 50 miles of the airport complex.

We also need altitude information on aircraft that are in the enroute area, beyond the reach of our height-finding radar. There are several possible means of obtaining this information. One method we are investigating involves the use of the radar beacon system. A radar beacon, of course, is by nature a data link. The radar beacon system can provide the four essential bits of information required for positive air traffic control: range, bearing, altitude, and identity. The beacon system which the FAA is implementing presently provides three of the four, and we are now in the early stages of developing the capability of obtaining aircraft derived altitude information via the radar beacon link. Although our operational beacon capability today is limited, we are rapidly implementing beacons in our high density areas. By July of 1962, we should have operational coverage of the navigable airspace over the entire country, with over 50 beacons operational.

Another difficult problem facing us today is the ever-increasing demand for radio spectrum utilization. As more and more aircraft are introduced into the system, the overcrowded air traffic control and air navigation frequency bands will reach saturation in high density areas. We do not foresee any significant increase in aviation's share of the spectrum. We must live with what we have

and to do this, the FAA will do everything possible to insure that the bands of the spectrum allocated to aviation are assigned and used effectively. We are modernizing voice procedures and seeking ways to improve voice intelligibility. We are working to achieve improved techniques and better frequency stabilization.

We are well aware of the fact that the communications bottleneck must be overcome. We have developed and are currently testing a high-speed, automatic ground-air-ground communication system known as AGACS. AGACS is an experimental tool with which we will determine the design characteristics for a two-way data link adaptable to the requirements of all users of airspace. Within a 2-minute rollover cycle, AGACS handles up to 500 two-way messages. These messages are contained within a single frequency channel, as is presently used for voice communications. Routine flight instructions and advisory information from pilot or controller are transmitted to the aircraft or control station. Here they are converted into direct reading displays. Voice radio will still be used for nonroutine and emergency communications.

Implementation of radar beaconry, data link, VORTAC, and the host of other improvements to the overall air traffic control environment will provide the air traffic controller with the information he needs to move air traffic safely and expeditiously. To be of maximum value to the controller, this information must be correlated and applied swiftly and efficiently. The FAA is developing a data processing central designed to relieve the controller of many of his routine clerical chores and allow him to spend more of his time in his decisionmaking capacity. The data processing central will automatically print and update flight progress information. It will probe for, detect, and display potential conflicts between aircraft in the system. It will assist the controller in scheduling aircraft for landings. The data processing central will be available for use in the New York area in 1963.

Another extremely important area in which we are making progress is the development of a blind, or all-weather, landing capability.

Last year alone, the airlines forfeited \$23 million in revenue because they were not always able to deliver their passengers and cargo to destination airports. The military needs the all-weather landing capability to insure a full retaliatory combat potential. We are currently evaluating systems developed by the Navy and Air Force for their applicability to civil operations.

The introduction of this all-weather landing capability must, of course, be an evolutionary process. Our program is divided basically into three phases: In the first phase, our attention is directed to the improvement of the present instrument landing system (ILS) and the ground control approach (GCA). The second phase of the program involves the testing of an all-weather landing system for interim application where the need is urgent. And, finally, we will develop new techniques for a landing system suitable for the future air traffic environment.

Our National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center is today a full-fledged experimental facility complete with instrumented laboratories, high-capacity computer and simulation facilities, and is staffed by a dedicated group, and technically recognized experts in all fields of the informed aviation world. We are in the final phases of the development of improved standard airport lighting. We are evaluating five different visual glide slope systems. We are actively investigating aircraft arresting devices. We are making excellent progress in our program to automate weather measurements and provide for their automatic transmittal

to forecast centers. We are actively pursuing a program to collocate high-altitude air traffic control and air defense functions in the SAGE Super Combat Center.

In our long-range planning, we must envision the effects on our control system of the eventual introduction of supersonic and ultrasonic aircraft in the air carrier inventory. When this takes place the human limitations of pilot and crew to control their aircraft will become more apparent. It will be necessary to turn to automatic devices for the airborne environment to achieve maximum safety in flight. The quantity and the complexity of the electronic gear that will go into future aircraft will be greater than what they are today.

Future flight environments will require electronic equipment with greater operating extremes to cope with the variety of new problems created by supersonic speeds. This will not necessarily present new problems in design because much work in this area has been done in the missile programs. It will involve application of known principles and techniques to new equipment.

Powerplant performance and structural fatigue under high temperature conditions will have increased importance to safe operation. These problems will require close monitoring. Sophisticated electronic recording devices may be necessary to accomplish this monitoring.

Control of a supersonic airplane by a so-called autopilot, requires more precise and rapid sensing of airplane deviations from the flight path. Greater speed and accuracy will be demanded in the performance of the necessary corrective actions by the autopilot than are required in the autopilots of current turbine-powered airplanes.

Since the performance of a supersonic airplane is so critical and its instrumentation and control systems are so complex, the pilot will need information on flight parameters faster than can humanly be determined or computed. Therefore, the pilot will need assistance from sensing systems fed into a computer. The computer in turn will provide rapid answers to the pilot.

It is conceivable that ultimately the pilot will only monitor control of the airplane. The intelligence from the computer will be harnessed to provide actual control of the plane. All the parameters for a given flight might be fed into a computer before the takeoff and the entire flight to the end of the landing roll would be controlled automatically. The airborne portions of the VOR and DME systems would furnish some of the intelligence used in such a flight control system.

Coupled with flight control, would be automatic control of the various systems in the aircraft, such as engine fuel management, pressurization, anti-icing and deicing systems. This would appear to be the ultimate and will not all come at once. There will need to be intermediate stages in which only a portion of such control is utilized.

Since the takeoff of a high-speed aircraft is perhaps the most critical portion of a flight, information to show whether to continue the takeoff or to abort is very important. This involves sensing of engine power, aircraft speed, outside air temperature, and so forth. The computer will compare this data with ideal parameters and give the pilot information needed. This might logically be one of the first steps in the intermediate stage.

It is easy to see that systems such as I have just described would have to have extreme reliability and fail-safe performance. FAA will determine minimum performance and reliability standards. The equipment will have to meet the standards originally and be maintained so as to continue to meet them.

As you can see, electronic needs for future aircraft will be great.

In addition to the automatic control systems mentioned, the present day navigation equipment such as VOR, DME, LORAN, and DOPPLER will have to give way to more sophisticated electronic equipment to handle future navigation problems. This does not mean that the basic system will change, but rather equipment of those types will need to be redesigned to take advantage of improvements in the state of the art—to increase reliability and simplicity and to reduce size, weight, and cost.

Our progress to date is in large part attributable to the outstanding contributions of the electronics industries to our programs. Our continued progress and leadership in aviation will require sustained and imaginative research, development and productivity. They will require vitality, creativeness, and the application of new skills and techniques on the part of science, management, and government.

As a regulating agency we cannot cope with the problems which will confront us in the future without your continued help and guidance. I urge that you continue to assist us in whatever manner that is at your command. We will require advice and assistance on performance standards for the new types of equipment. Such standards in the past have been prepared to a great extent under the auspices of the Society of Automotive Engineers and the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics. Many of your member companies have furnished technical assistance on the working committees of those organizations. Continued technical support by working either directly with us when we ask for collaboration or as members of SAE or RTCA will be of great assistance. Knowing of your past record, I look forward to your future support with confidence.

Nationalism in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Marquis Childs, "Is Nationalism Rising in Europe?" concludes that the national feeling and development in certain nations of Europe, and particularly West Germany, is reaching new proportions.

While Mr. Childs does not draw conclusions, his observations are pointed and suggest varied possibilities, all of which warrant careful attention. Under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I submit his article which follows:

IS NATIONALISM RISING IN EUROPE?

(By Marquis Childs)

Germany today is Konrad Adenauer. Behind all the complex forces contributing to the German resurgence the Chancellor, as he has proved once again in his latest visit to this country, is the symbol and the front of what is again rapidly becoming the most powerful nation in Europe.

It is a paradox of Adenauer's dominance of the German scene that it both heartens and alarms those who hoped for a new and democratic Germany. He is so completely what he is—deeply religious, steeped in the cultural and political traditions of an older Germany, a stout old oak breathing defiance at Germany's enemies.

But at the same time it becomes more and more evident that he is a revered leader

without challenge or rival, and the precedents for that kind of leadership in Germany are far from happy. Increasingly, for all his allegiance to the Western Alliance, Adenauer is becoming the symbol of a national Germany. The analogy with Bismarck, with Kaiser Wilhelm II and, briefly, with von Hindenburg inevitably occurs. And, as the world has hardly forgotten, it was another and democratic leader who came at the end of this succession.

The attitude of the German people today offers evidence of both the guilt and pride that are a heritage of the past in the resurgent new nation. If you talk about the signs of anti-Semitism in Germany what about anti-Semitism in almost every other part of the world? You reproach us with seeking military bases in Spain but have not other Western Powers put bases in country after country? Does not the United States have airfields in Spain?

In the view of this observer it comes down to the following: a revived national Germany finds itself competing more and more effectively with other nation-states that are themselves increasingly nationalistic. A revived Germany will not longer be restrained by reminders of the guilt of the war or the mass crimes of the Nazis.

Nationalism, in short, and not just German nationalism, is more and more a force in Western Europe. How can you expect us, the Germans are in effect demanding, to be virtuous and renounce our deserved place in the sun when everyone else is scrambling to get ahead by any means they can?

No one can doubt Adenauer's loyalty to a supranational ideal. From the beginning he has been convinced that the only solution for Germany was within the NATO alliance and the European market. He talks with fervor of the dedication of German youth to the European ideal. Yet, as the German chancellor at 84 retires into a more and more lonely eminence where his word becomes law, it is clear that while these institutions have to some degree restrained the nationalistic competition they have certainly not ended it.

Within the common market of the six European powers both Germany and France are subtly striving for supremacy. NATO has remained a defensive military alliance despite all the talk about giving it a political and economic reason for being. With France so deeply committed in Algeria, the 12 German divisions that are coming into being will have a predominant position.

The British after 1945 held aloof from Europe, apparently hoping to play the old game of divide and rule. In the face of the common market they have organized the seven European powers that were outside and a threatened rivalry between the two groups can play havoc with tariffs and trade.

The underlying truth is that the frame of cooperation was neither big enough nor compelling enough. So the old nationalistic pieces are reappearing on the chess board.

As France demonstrated by setting off an atomic explosion at a heavy cost in terms of money and manpower, the competition is certain to extend to nuclear weapons unless some controls are quickly agreed to and put into effect. Nor will Germany be excluded from this competition. Whether it has come too early or too late, the era of the German scapegoat is rapidly drawing to an end.

After the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima the late Albert Einstein said: "Everything has changed except the thinking in men's minds." Nothing could illustrate this more dramatically and more poignantly than the revived current of the old nationalism. In that current the new Germany is swimming hard and fast and it would be little short of a miracle if she were not.

Civil Defense Workers, H.R. 856

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced my bill H.R. 856 to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to persons engaged in civil defense.

On February 24, 1960, it was my privilege to appear before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of the measure.

My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WIER. This is H.R. 856?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIER. Identify yourself, and the number of the bill.

Mr. MULTER. I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Representative of the 13th District of New York.

I appreciate the opportunity this committee gives me to appear here in support of my bill, H.R. 856.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, in order to save some time, I offer my prepared statement for the record, if you will take it that way, and I will give you a brief summary.

Mr. WIER. No objection? So ordered. We all have a copy of your report now.

(The information follows:)

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I first express my thanks to you and to the other members of this subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to appear here today in support of my bill, H.R. 856.

"This legislation is designed to extend the coverage of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to include certain persons engaged in civil defense. Specifically, in the language of the bill, it would cover 'part-time and full-time, paid and unpaid volunteers, auxiliaries, and civil defense workers subject to the order and control of State government or any political subdivision thereof engaged in, training for, or traveling to or from, activities relating to "civil defense"

"I have introduced this bill because I sincerely believe that there are good reasons why the Federal Government should assume some responsibility for the welfare of these people if they are killed or injured while on duty.

"As you probably know, the protection provided to many of the people working either full time or part time in civil defense is in many cases woefully inadequate. This has been the case ever since the Federal Civil Defense Act was approved in 1950, and I think it is high time that we take the necessary steps to rectify this situation.

"In past years legislation has been introduced to authorize the Federal Government to make contributions to assist the States in awarding death or injury compensation in these cases. However, no action beyond hearings has ever been taken by Congress on any of this legislation. Over the years, apparently, the idea has prevailed that any compensation to be paid to people injured in the performance of civil defense duties should be paid solely by the respective States.

"This plan may be satisfactory in theory, but in actual practice it has been demonstrated to have serious shortcomings.

"Although it is true that many States have passed legislation to protect civil defense workers, it is also true that most of them have not done so. Even among the States which have acted, the coverage is not uniform. This in itself is unfortunate.

"Of greater importance, perhaps, than the inequity of uneven coverage among the States that have done something is the fact these workers in far too many States have no protection at all. These States have had 10 years to enact at least minimal legislation, but they have not done so.

"This situation is grossly unjust. Protection must be given to these people, and I think the Federal Government has a clear and compelling responsibility to provide it.

"I know that I do not have to make a case for what might happen to all of the American people if we should become involved in another shooting war. The consequences of such horrors are beyond our capacity to imagine. We must, if we are to be realistic, recognize the possibility of such a conflict.

"In the event of an enemy attack, the civil defense workers would be the most vulnerable group in our civilian population. They would be confronted with what, to say the very least, would be hazardous, demanding, and highly important duties.

"It is unthinkable that so many of them should be expected to serve under these circumstances without the benefits of adequate death or injury compensation. Yet, this is exactly the situation that has existed for 20 years, exists today, and will continue to exist unless and until Congress takes the necessary action to remedy it.

"By the very nature of civil defense work, if the program is to have any value at all, a great many people are required to participate in it. You cannot accept just anybody for these jobs. The work requires people with intelligence, a deep sense of responsibility, and a profound concern for the welfare and safety of the United States.

"The recruitment of persons of this caliber has always been a serious problem. And no wonder. We make heavy demands upon their time and upon their physical and mental energy, but, at the same time, offer them little or nothing in return.

"The inadequacy or complete absence of any death or injury compensation is a most serious barrier to recruitment of civil defense volunteers. As long ago as 1953 the head of the Federal Civil Defense Administration wrote: 'The Federal Civil Defense Administration continues to be seriously concerned over the representations by many State and local civil defense directors that the absence of compensation coverage for volunteer workers seriously hampers the development of a strong U.S. Civil Defense Corps.'

"There is every reason to think today that the assurance of compensation insurance would be of great assistance in this recruitment. The strongest argument for it is that it could correct a palpably unjust condition that can be measured in dollars and cents. But there are other arguments as well. As a moral factor, the knowledge that they were backed up by a program of Federal compensation insurance would demonstrate to the civil defense workers the genuine concern of the National Government in civil defense and in the welfare of all persons associated directly with it.

"The recruitment and training of personnel and other aspects of civil defense is the prime responsibility of the Federal Government. It has been delegated in part to the States and local governments.

"All of these levels of government have failed to deal adequately with this question of injury and death compensation for civil defense workers. I do think, furthermore,

that under the circumstances, the Federal Government has a duty and an obligation to do something about this. It was for this reason that I introduced H.R. 856.

"Let me, in conclusion, point out that this bill offers nothing in the way of compensation for unpaid volunteers or in the way of additional compensation for paid workers in the performance of their regular duties.

"The cost of this measure, if enacted into law, is important, of course, but it should by no means be controlling. It is far more important that the few payments that might be made under its terms would be money well and justly made. The very least we can do for anyone who meets some accident or injury in connection with his civil defense work is to guarantee to him that he will receive some compensation as a result of his misfortune.

"It is my sincere hope that the committee will see fit to report favorably a bill. In my opinion it deserves prompt consideration by Congress.

"Again I thank the members of this subcommittee for the courtesy they have shown me in giving me this chance to appear in support of H.R. 856."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, most of the bills that you have before you, and Mrs. St. George's bill is one exception, are retroactive in effect in that they try to cover situations of persons already injured or families of those who have been killed or died as a result of injuries under various and differing circumstances.

I think the St. George bill, like my bill, is prospective in effect in that it attempts to remedy a defect in the law as to all and sundry who may come within the terms of the law if it should be amended.

I have been offering this bill since 1951, and I am very happy that the committee has seen fit to set it for hearing as it reviews the entire act to determine how it can be brought up to date and made more effective.

Mr. WIER. I may say to you we have two or three other bills on the so-called civil defense noneligibility.

Mr. MULTER. I am glad that other members have also seen the need for this.

Mr. WIER. Congressman FINO has one in here.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I think Mr. FINO's bill applies to persons who have heretofore been injured or the next of kin of persons who died as a result of injuries sustained in civil defense activities.

I do not think his is prospective in effect where mine would cover everyone and anyone who may be injured or dies as a result of injuries while working in civil defense.

The primary issue that the committee must determine is whether or not civil defense is a Federal obligation. My view is that it is. The defense of the country is the Nation's obligation.

While that portion of it which is referred to as civil defense has been delegated in part to the States and the municipalities, it is an unconstitutional delegation of power. I say that the U.S. Government cannot delegate its responsibility. While it can ask the municipalities and the States to assist in the program, it cannot pass on to them its responsibility to defend the country in time of peace and in time of war.

While we talk of war in the old sense of the shooting war, the cold war is just as much a war as the hot war or the shooting war. While we prepare for the time that we hope will never come of a shooting war, it is that portion of that responsibility of the Federal Government that we address ourselves to with a bill such as mine.

The training of persons in the Armed Forces is training for defense and national security. The training of volunteers and others in the civil defense of the country is the same kind of preparation. We will not

need them unless there is a shooting war or unless the country is attacked. We do not need our Armed Forces except to the extent they are a deterring effect upon an aggressor or potential aggressor. We will need them when the time comes to defend our country and its people and its property.

This bill has been prompted, in part, by my actual experience during the 1940's when I helped set up in the city and State of New York the air raid warden service and the police and firemen's volunteer auxiliary services.

Every time someone was in training in any of those programs and was hurt or they learned of somebody being hurt while going to and from a training center or in the training center, or while actually performing those duties, and they found that there was no way of their family being protected in the event of the death of the volunteer, and there was no way of even getting his medical expenses paid, if the volunteer was hurt, we lost hundreds of volunteers. The services almost disintegrated every time there was an injury or death, the reports of which were carried in the newspapers. We have the same thing today.

The New York State Civil Defense Commission as early as 1951 said the question of insurance protection for civil defense volunteers had arisen in every one of our 104 local offices of civil defense. The lack of proper coverage has definitely impeded our efforts to build up a strong civil defense volunteer force. The same thing occurs even today. You cannot get these people interested to do the job when you are not going to give them some protection.

It is true that we pay our members of the Armed Forces. But historically it is the duty, not the privilege; it is the duty of every American citizen, every able-bodied American citizen to serve his country in its defense.

The U.S. Government as the sovereign has the right to call up these men and these boys and require their services without compensating them. We do it because it is the right thing to do, not because it is the legal thing. So with these civil defense volunteers. There is no obligation to pay them but it is our duty to at least compensate them for their injuries and give their families some compensation in the event of a death while performing this very necessary volunteer service.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULTER, I do not mean to interrupt you but you referred to civil defense volunteers. As I understand it, your bill would specifically include a full-time paid civil defense worker and presumably paid by the State government, or perhaps a municipality.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What would be the justification for including in this protection that type of individual?

Mr. MULTER. I include part-time and full-time, and paid and unpaid volunteers.

The justification is this: We should have one system uniform throughout the entire country to cover all of these people.

There is one defect in this bill which you call attention to. There should not be double compensation or double payment to these people. If a paid employee, part-time or full-time employee, gets any compensation as a volunteer or otherwise gets any compensation on the local level, I do not intend that it be supplemented. But he should get it. He should get it to the same extent throughout the country. If he is getting \$25 a week payment under a local statute, and this will provide for as much as \$500 a month or \$100 a week, he should get the difference. But these people who are serving the country should be on the same basis and compensated on the same basis. If some locality thinks they cannot pay as much as the Federal Government

does, give them the difference. If they are paying more, he gets nothing from the Federal Government.

To that extent my bill needs amending. I do not want double compensation. I do not want supplemental compensation. I do think they all should be compensated, or their families in the event they are compensated, on the same basis from one end of the country to the other.

That, I think, presents the problem to you gentlemen for your consideration.

I am sure all of these bills that are before you are entitled to your sympathetic consideration and you will give them the deserving attention they need. You have a tremendous task before you to try to fill up the loopholes that exist in the law and correct inequities in the law.

I am sure you will bring out an overall bill that will encompass all of these situations.

I have no pride of authorship. I do not urge you must bring out my bill, or my bill is the only way to do this. I think you can bring out one comprehensive bill and include the provisions of mine to the extent they appeal to your sympathetic consideration and do the real job that has needed doing since 1940.

Mr. WIER. Mr. MULDER, if I could think of anything that could be said about this bill or the need for it or lack of need, I will say that the State administrator in my State is a very, very good friend of mine, and he comes down here quite frequently to the Civil Defense National Committee meeting, that is, the representatives of every State come here for an assembly. Yet the only place that I learned of or have been approached for this is New York.

My administrator in Minnesota has never approached me and I would presume that there must be some accidents out there because the civil defense in the major cities, like Minneapolis, St. Paul, work at the football games where they are called out for traffic duty. When there is a big fire they respond for so-called policing. They have so-called police uniforms. That is limited. They are continually doing these things. They are not just waiting for somebody to shoot and start a war. They are doing State work. On the Fourth of July they are spread around the State as something to warn people that they are watching them.

But my friend has never approached me on this question of compensation for these men that serve in his department.

Mr. MULDER. I think, because your State has been much more forward looking than mine, your State has assumed the monetary obligation involved and enacted a statute that covers these men, so that they get compensation in the event of injury and the families are protected in the event of death.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULDER, the chairman pointed out that to some extent the functions of civil defense work are certainly not national in flavor. Supervising traffic at a football game would not necessarily create a Federal responsibility if the individual were injured I would think this could be used as a disastrous argument against your point of view.

Do you happen to know how many people would be included as possible beneficiaries under your bill?

Mr. MULDER. It is impossible to foretell how many might be injured.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How many people are engaged in civil defense activities, broadly?

Mr. MULDER. I do not have that number.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Many millions, I would assume.

Mr. MULDER. The Civil Defense Administration certainly could supply that information to you.

You will find that as of today it is comparatively few because you cannot get the

volunteers on the local level to take up this national defense problem.

I have another bill which requires the U.S. Government to take over and do this job. I do not prohibit them from decentralizing. But you are never going to get a good national civil defense organization on the local level. It is a national problem and you cannot stir these people except in time of war.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you define it as a national problem and if you say in the discharge of their Federal responsibilities and spell them out, you might have, I think, sounder ground for arguing that they should be compensated by the Federal Government.

If a man were injured directing traffic at a football game and you said the Federal Government is responsible for his total disability payments, you would get into trouble.

Mr. MULDER. You are certainly right.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So I would think if we were going to extend coverage to potentially hundreds of thousands of people that might be injured, millions perhaps—

Mr. MULDER. Under my bill—you see, I know how these men work and what they are doing—those—who have volunteered. Therefore, my bill says "while engaged in"—this is on page 1, line 10—"engaged in training for or traveling to or from activities relating to civil defense as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the Federal Defense Act of 1950."

That excludes the policing for traffic and the policing at football games. It refers, specifically, and covers them only while engaged in true civil defense as defined by our national statute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Unfortunately, I did not have that statute with me. Presumably they are called out for traffic because they are members of the civil defense organization.

Mr. MULDER. On the local level. They have been enlarged to take in strictly local problems.

Mr. WIER. That is the only training they get.

Mr. MULDER. It is not the training called for by the Federal Civil Defense Act.

Mr. WIER. When we have a big parade—the Shriners, and the Legion, let us say—all of them are called out for policing the parade. We do not have enough policemen for that kind of a job.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would not a policing function such as that be included within an appropriate definition of training for civil defense work?

Mr. MULDER. I think it is stretching it awfully far.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We do not have the definition. It is difficult to say.

Mr. MULDER. I never intended to cover that kind of function. It is necessary to keep these volunteers to give them something to do to keep their interest. In many communities they get additional policing duties. It gives him a feeling he is doing something for his community, while at the same time they keep up the defense organization. They must be in a state of readiness in the event the holocaust might come that we all fear but hope will never come.

Truly, it is not a part of civil defense duty to be policing a parade or football game or playing the part of a traffic officer.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the case of a disaster, a sweeping disaster that might well be useful background to have had to be able to direct traffic out of the disaster areas.

Mr. MULDER. You now get into that basic problem about which there has been such tremendous difference of opinion. When you train a soldier—take, rather, a man in the Navy—what good is that training of showing him how to march and right face, left face, and about face? Yet it is part of basic

training. There is the argument: Should we not stop wasting time training an artilleryman to march? Should we not stop wasting time training a pilot of an airplane to march?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What would a civil defense worker in peacetime be engaged in officially unless it were something like the duties which the chairman indicated they do as a practical matter?

Mr. MULDER. The only actual training for work he has to do is that which includes first aid, fire protection, police protection—yes, and traffic control would undoubtedly come within that. I suppose you could stretch it far enough to say that this training at the parade and at the football game is training him in traffic control.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think you might get into an administrative nightmare to try to say that it was not direct training or reasonably a direct connection between the actual disaster and training.

Mr. MULDER. You put your finger on something that probably requires definition in the statute.

Mr. WIER. Let me point out also in connection with the Federal relationship that last year all of the administrators of civil defense were down here making a sincere effort to get some heavy equipment; and when my friend came up to see me, I said, "What are you going to do with heavy equipment?"

He said, "Roy, we have a job. When we have a forest fire either on State or Federal property, most all of the western States pull these people out and use that heavy equipment for firebreaks."

So they were having an awful time getting some of the military surplus—that is, big tractors and equipment like that. I was wondering what they were training for. That is what they wanted it for. It was for protection of the forests up in the northern part of the State.

Mr. MULDER. Let me indicate this to you: As early as 1951, when the bill was first introduced, the Secretary of Labor said:

"It is the opinion of this Department that the Federal Government should assume responsibility for the payment of benefits only with respect to civil defense workers killed or injured as a result of enemy action as distinguished from injuries or death incurred in training or duty in advance of enemy attack."

I am sure you gentlemen would not agree with that kind of differentiation between injuries received while training to protect the country in event of attack.

Mr. ZELENKO. Under the present rules of war there would not be anybody left to administer this act if it were during a holocaust.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let us change it to instead of rules of war, philosophy of war.

Mr. WIER. When did you get that letter?

Mr. MULDER. This letter is a copy of the letter from the Department of Labor of August 1, 1951, sent to Chairman BARDEN of the Committee on Education and Labor with reference to my bill, H.R. 3468, which was the identical counterpart of the bill now before you.

Mr. WIER. You heard the statement I made a minute ago.

Mr. MULDER. Yes, I did.

Mr. WIER. That we are getting reports on all these bills from the Department.

Mr. MULDER. Yes, I did. The reason I read that, that was the only objection he raised at that time, that we should assume the responsibility and pay them if hurt during attack or hurt during war, that we should not pay them while being trained to prepare to do the right thing.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. MULDER, I think you agree that the difficulty of determining what constitutes training constitutes a problem as far as we are concerned; because of the necessity of being liberal in that defini-

nition, it makes it difficult not to get a tremendous number of beneficiaries even though it may be a very fringe kind of training for an actual disaster.

Mr. MULTER. As I said in my main statement, while the cost of this program is important, it should not be controlling. When we get into talking about numbers who may be covered, I think it is important to consider how many will have to be covered, but whether there are few or many, the principle is the same. If we should give them this compensation, I do not think it should matter whether there is 1 or 1 million that will have to be compensated. This is our obligation. If this is the Federal Government's obligation, we should meet it.

Mr. GOODALL. That is true, but you still have the problem of getting the Federal Government into covering them in all sorts of situations where they are doing nothing at all that is connected with the national purpose so-called.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I agree.

Mr. GOODALL. This is particularly true because your section 2 would eliminate the present provision.

Mr. ZELENKO. Would the gentleman yield for one moment, please?

Mr. GOODALL. I yield.

Mr. ZELENKO. I have to leave to attend another meeting. I want to interrupt to commend my distinguished colleague from New York for bringing this problem to our attention and continuing to bring it to our attention.

I am most sympathetic with it. Something should be done. I think we almost all agree that the difficulty is how. I know if you continue to press this problem we will come to a solution.

These people are entitled to some kind of help, as I pointed out in the case of Mrs. St. George's bill. I am with you on the general theory. I hope we can work something out.

Mr. MULTER. That is all I ask of you.

Mr. ZELENKO. I commend you again for continuing to properly press this. You have been one of the leaders in pressing this and pointing out to the attention of the country this subject.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ZELENKO. If you will excuse me.

Mr. GOODALL. Your section 2 provides that the civil defense employees will be considered employees of the Federal Government for purposes of compensation.

This would raise all of these problems we are talking about if we change that classification and make them Federal employees for purposes of Federal compensation. Then what forest fires they are fighting or when there is a snowstorm or whatever it may be presumably the Federal Government would be responsible every time they are called out.

Mr. MULTER. That is so. But the main purpose, of course, of section 2 is to bring them into that so they can use that same machinery. You do not have to set up new machinery. There is no new department called for by my bill. They will file their claims just as though they had been employees. They will go through the same process that any other Federal employee's claim would have to go through. It is an expeditious way of handling it. It is a fair way. It never gives them complete compensation but it does put them on the same basis.

But as you both pointed out, the bill is by no means perfect. It probably needs clarification so as not to bring into it those that should not be covered.

Mr. GOODALL. I have one more question here.

Was there any particular reason that you put in this provision for maximum benefits provided under the act? It is my understanding that would provide for something like \$525 a month for these people.

Mr. MULTER. I think that would probably

come to about \$525 a month and the reason I did that was that my experience in New York City and New York State is that most of these volunteers are businessmen and the higher paid type of employee. You do not get the man who is earning \$50 or \$75 or \$100 a week ordinarily into this program. You get the man who has gotten to the point in life where he has the time and the feeling that he owes a duty to his community. There is an obligation to his community and to the country to do something in times of need and stress and disaster.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There may be such competition for positions under this provision that you will lose those higher paid types for the lower paid who would like to receive such compensation if they should be injured, I should think.

Mr. MULTER. I would have no objection to this provision reading that you take his base pay on the outside as the measure of his damages, not to exceed the maximum, so that if you got the man who is in the \$200-a-week category he is going to be limited to the maximum. I have no objection to it being handled that way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Then you will get the \$200,000 a year man crowding for the consideration.

Mr. WIER. Let me assure, you, Mr. MULTER, since there are 20 amendments, it would be much easier if we already had a good bill. Some of the things I learn here in these hearings about the present Compensation Act, which it is a very good act for those that are covered, but there are a lot of problems.

Now, Mr. McCauley told us as an example that when somebody asked him about who is covered an example would be this:

If the Government or some agency of Government assigns two or three professional people in University of Minnesota, for example, to do some research work, by Government assignment and under the jurisdiction of the Government, even though they draw their pay out there, their university pay, as long as they have that assignment they are covered by compensation.

There are so many inequities in this bill. I am talking about maximums and minimums.

Some of the military is covered. Some of the military is not covered. Some chose not to be covered and preferred the Veterans' Administration compensation.

So this is not a simple bill.

Mr. MULTER. No. I think the task of your committee and the task of every congressional committee would be made a tremendously lot easier if we had some overall requirement in the law that every agency having jurisdiction under a particular bill or act would have to review at least every 10 years and submit to the Congress or the congressional committee involved in recodification bringing it up to date and indicating to the Congress what difficulties they have run across, what problems they have had in the administration of the act, and bring in a proposed overall bill so as to modernize the law.

If they did that once every 10 years, your problem would be a lot easier. I know ours would be in my standing committee. But they do not do it.

Mr. WIER. It is 11 years now since this bill was amended, so we have these problems that have come to light in those 11 years.

We want to extend our appreciation, Mr. MULTER, to you for pointing out some of the problems. It is a very controversial bill.

You gave us a job here and Mrs. St. George gave us a job in trying to define what the civil employee is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might add, that as might be expected, Mr. MULTER has been both an interesting and provocative witness.

I congratulate him on the handling of this subject.

The State of Our Cities and Suburbs in a Changing America—A Statement of the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to draw to the attention of Members of Congress an excellent statement published in March 1960 by the advisory council of the Democratic National Committee on the state of our cities and suburbs in a changing America.

This statement was prepared by a group of distinguished Americans who serve on the advisory committee on urban and suburban problems of the Democratic advisory council. Chairman of this committee is Mayor Richard C. Lee, of New Haven, Conn.; vice chairman is Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, Pa.; secretary is Mr. Edward J. Logue, and counsel is Mr. Charles Patrick Clark.

Members of the advisory committee on urban and suburban problems are: Dr. Stephen K. Bailey, Edward F. Barry, Nathaniel S. Colley, Prof. John A. Davis, Mayor Joseph E. Dillon, Dr. Thomas Hopkinson Eliot, Brig. Gen. Arthur Evans, B. T. Fitzpatrick, Gordon Freeman, Charles F. Palmer, Dr. Ira Reid, Victor Reuther, James H. Scheuer, Mayor Edward F. Voorde, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Mayor Ben West, Dr. William L. C. Wheaton, Dr. Robert Wood, Catherine Bauer Wurster.

My distinguished colleague, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, will insert the second part of the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following mine. Part 1 of the statement follows:

THE STATE OF OUR CITIES AND SUBURBS IN A CHANGING AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

The advisory committee on urban and suburban problems of the Democratic Advisory Council is composed of mayors, businessmen, labor officials, scholars, public administrators, and other civic leaders who have a deep concern and extensive firsthand knowledge of the problems confronting urban and suburban America today. The committee was formed to investigate these problems and to prepare a responsible program for their solution.

The committee has divided its task into two parts, as follows:

1. Policy paper No. 1—A report on urban and suburban problems of national concern.
2. Policy paper No. 2—Policies and programs for the solution of these problems. (In preparation.)

1. A CHANGING AMERICA

Every day the United States becomes more urban, less rural. Only a half-century ago, a majority of American families still lived on farms or in rural areas. Today, four-fifths of all American families live in cities or in the suburbs which surround them. By 1975, only 15 years away, our explosively growing population will sweep 55 million additional people into metropolitan areas—50

millions into existing or newly created suburbs.

As our population has grown, suburbia has become the chosen way of life for 50 million Americans and a fond dream for the urban millions who will escape there as soon as they can. Suburbia is a new mode of life in a changing America.

At the same time, America's older cities are all threatened by spreading slums and blight. The central cities of metropolitan areas confront not only rapid deterioration of residential neighborhoods but pressing problems of industrial and commercial obsolescence as well.

The Housing Act of 1949 set forth as our national goal the achievement of a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Ten years later we are a long way from achieving that goal.

This report concentrates on the physical and environmental aspects of urban and suburban life because they determine to such a large extent whether we Americans can use our material prosperity to enrich our lives or whether careless use of our wealth and productivity will blight our lives as well as our landscape.

Progress toward a better and fuller urban life is largely the responsibility of local institutions, private and public. The working presumption of the Democratic Party since the days of Jefferson has been that governmental power should be lodged in the smallest jurisdiction possible—and that even here the powers of government should be used to encourage and supplement private effort.

However, many problems in our life as a Nation cannot be solved solely by local, private or even State actions. When necessary, the Democratic Party over the years has proved its willingness to sponsor and to carry out vigorous programs at the Federal level in cooperation with local, State, and private efforts.

2. THE STATE OF OUR CITIES

Urban areas are as old as civilization. Cities are, and always have been, centers of trade, commerce, industry, transportation, and culture. People live in or near cities for the economic and cultural opportunities which urban and suburban life are supposed to provide. But the hope and the reality in much of America today are tragically far apart.

After 10 years of Federal aid for slum clearance and urban renewal, spreading slums and blight still threaten to destroy American cities as desirable places to live and work and raise a family. Despite substantial progress in many communities, urban slums continue to spread as fast as, or faster, than efforts yet made to clear them out or clean them up.

Slums and blight—the shame of our cities

The financial cost of urban slums is enormous. Slums go hand in hand with soaring rates of crime, delinquency, and disease. Neglect of urban neighborhoods costs our cities and our Nation untold millions in declining tax revenues, restricted economic opportunities, and the wasteful loss of once decent housing in urban neighborhoods. The taxpayer must pay an ever-increasing amount of local, State, and Federal taxes because of slums and deficit areas.

We pay a frightening social cost for slums as well. For millions of children the asphalt jungle of the slums is a grim mockery of the American way of life. For our country the waste of potentially useful and constructive lives is a loss we cannot long afford.

Slums are no minor sore on the body politic. They are rather a major malignancy, a spreading cancer.

There are today more Americans living in slums than on farms. The count now stands:

Farm dwellers.....	21,000,000
Slum dwellers.....	22,000,000

At the present rate of action, public and private, it will take at least a century to eliminate the slum dwelling units which exist today. And the slums are growing, spreading every year.

It is time for Americans to get better acquainted with their slums.

Perhaps what is needed most is some good old-fashioned walking tours. There is no substitute for what the senses can observe—the sight and sound and, above all, the smell of the slums.

If we look into the heart of a slum (usually only a 5- or 10-minute walk from the city's center), at the crowded streets, the debris-littered backyards, and, inside, up the stinking stairways into the overcrowded rooms, we can see for ourselves how far short we are falling in providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

Slums are neither inevitable nor hopeless. To say that the richest nation on earth cannot abolish its own urban blight is preposterous. Yet, in most instances, it is unhappily true that local, State, and Federal action to date in slum clearance, urban renewal, public housing, and code enforcement have only scratched the surface.

Decaying neighborhoods

Existing slums are bad enough but an equal and critical issue is the speed with which once decent neighborhoods are becoming decaying neighborhoods.

The rock-bottom slums tell only part of the story. All across America, more urban neighborhoods are slipping into blight than are being preserved in those few cities which are seriously trying to reverse the trend. Many older neighborhoods which could be preserved and enhanced by prompt and effective action are deteriorating beyond repair, victims of civic and national neglect. Our largest supply of decent, moderately priced housing is thereby depleted and new slums are created.

Neighborhood decay has many causes:

The automobile and the increasing mobility of American life have rendered many older neighborhoods obsolete.

The American standard of living is changing. The migration to the suburbs and the flight from older neighborhoods are a drive for more open space—elbow room—and better or at least more modern community facilities. The individual family acting alone cannot preserve the old neighborhood and its only recourse is to move to the suburbs, if it can afford to do so.

However, the root cause is the utter inability of the American city with the financial resources presently available to it to maintain standards of municipal services required to prevent decay. At the same time, our cities are unable to make the capital expenditures in new schools and other modern community facilities which will renew urban residential neighborhoods and keep them competitive with the suburbs.

The housing crisis

American cities are beset by a critical shortage of decent housing for the low- and middle-income families who form the overwhelming majority of their inhabitants. Federal housing policies and programs for these families are ineffective. We need effective housing programs for these families, and we must take positive steps to insure that there will be equal opportunities for all in choosing a place to live.

Housing for low-income families

Millions of American men, women, and children desperately need to get out of the clutches of slums. They live in housing which cannot be reclaimed by urban renewal or rehabilitation. Private enterprise is unable to build housing at prices these low-income families can afford and still make a profit.

We cannot continue to turn our backs on these families and tolerate the enormous social and financial costs of slums. We must establish the publicly assisted housing program at a level which will meet the housing needs for these millions of American families of low income.

Publicly assisted housing is the only means through which low-income families can be rehoused decently. The present Federal public housing program does not even pretend to meet the demands for decent housing for low-income families. It is merely a token effort, no more. Substantially larger amounts are needed to take care of the minimum number of families whose relocation is required by slum clearance, public highways, and other programs.

Two decades of experience have much to teach us about right and wrong ways of providing publicly assisted low-income housing. Improvements can and must be made but the defects of the present program should not be allowed to obscure the desperate fact that the need for publicly assisted housing for low-income families is greater now than at any time since the start of the public housing program. It is past time to face up to this need and to devise acceptable means of meeting it.

Housing for middle-income families

There are more than 15 million families with annual incomes between \$3,500 and \$6,500. It is these families that the Federal Housing Administration was set up to help. Yet increasingly FHA has moved away from these families, and the effective market for new private sales or rental housing has steadily become limited to upper-income families.

Moderate-priced homebuilding has also been sharply retarded by the restrictive credit policies of the Federal Government, which have raised financing costs sharply. Consequently, at a time when the need for expanded homebuilding for middle-income families is increasing rapidly due to population increase and dislocation from highway and urban renewal projects, we are building almost no moderate-priced housing, either in central cities or suburbs. Middle-income families in both cities and suburbs are subject to exploitation, hardship, disillusion, and despair in their quest for suitable housing.

Housing for minority families

Negroes and other non-white Americans suffer from much worse housing conditions than the rest of their fellow citizens. In many cities in all sections of the country the only housing available for non-whites has been secondhand housing formerly occupied by whites. The expansion of the non-white population in these cities has been confined to older neighborhoods. Overpricing, overcrowding and profiteering on the limited number of dwellings available to non-whites in rapidly aging neighborhoods have consequently accelerated decay. Thus the pressure is on minority housing to become slum housing.

The Negro and other non-whites have been increasingly caught in a crushing vise largely fashioned and encouraged by Federal housing policies. Discrimination in newly created suburban housing developments in all sections of the country has received the tacit support of FHA. Suburban housing is closed to the Negro in the face of the unwillingness of too many other Americans to share their neighborhoods.

On the other hand, the worst slums which are largely occupied by minority groups have been among the first to be cleared by slum clearance and highway programs. As a result, minority groups, particularly Negroes, have suffered far more than others from family displacement, the housing shortages which result and the lack of adequate relocation and low rent housing programs. The vise becomes tighter—non-white families are ex-

cluded from the suburbs and routed from the slums.

The extra burden suffered by minority families makes especially urgent the expansion of low rent and middle-income housing. Above all, there must be recognition of the right of every American family to have freedom of opportunity to choose a place to live and to have equal access to the means of financing that choice.

Commercial and industrial blight

The blight that afflicts urban areas is not limited to residential neighborhoods. All cities are afflicted with large areas of commercial and industrial blight. These older industrial and commercial districts have traditionally provided a firm economic base, assuring steady jobs and strong economic support for local government. An urban renewal program which deals only with residential areas and ignores the rebuilding of the urban industrial and commercial centers cannot succeed.

Downtown United States of America

The central business districts of American cities are in grave trouble. They are losing their capacity to compete effectively with new suburban shopping centers. The buildings are obsolete, streets are jammed, parking space is lacking. Driving downtown has become too much of a chore for the housewife, and transit service has deteriorated badly. These conditions have led to the flight of business from central districts, with a loss of income, jobs, and retail services to customers. Consequently, the municipal tax base is shrinking at a time when service costs are steadily rising.

Downtown should be an attractive marketplace for goods and services and for ideas as well. Downtown traditionally has been the economic heart of the metropolitan region, for the suburbs as well as the city.

Imaginative solutions have been developed which would enable central cities to renew their downtown areas. The ideas are there, but so far there has been little action because the financial resources are not available for more than token action.

Urban industry

Urban industry is the principal source of America's great power and wealth. But vast changes in our economy and technology have impaired this economic base of the city, creating industrial slums, depressed areas with resistant pockets of unemployment, and shifts in the location of industry and jobs. Cities must seek ways to adjust to these changes to provide jobs for workers, spending power for consumers and efficient locations for the manufacturer and tradesman.

Cities need to adjust to technological changes in plant location, transportation and labor skill requirements. Industrial slums, filled with overcrowded and often unsafe loft-type factory buildings must be replaced with newly fashioned industrial parks. More spacious industrial areas, with parking space, room for expansion, modern highways and other facilities are needed if the city is to continue to provide employment for its citizens. Centrally located plants will remain attractive to industry only if modern industrial areas, skilled workmen and excellent public services are available in new central industrial districts.

At the same time, cities are also the seedbeds for new industries and services. Only the city can provide the multiplicity of skills, business services, and proximity to customers required by the newly established small enterprise. This vital economic function must be carried on in cities at an increasing rate.

Some cities have been bypassed in our recent economic growth. These stagnating or depressed areas suffer from chronic unemployment, depressed business, and unused skills. These areas need help in rebuilding

their economies to serve the Nation, and to provide for their people a share in a growing national economy.

New life for our cities

Our report contains some sharp and unpleasant findings about the state of our cities today. But cities have survived recurring crises through the ages as important centers of population, culture, wealth, and commerce. We are confident they will meet this present-day challenge as well. There are signs everywhere of growing awareness of the problems of slums and blight.

Citizens throughout America are awakening to the disturbing trends in our cities and to the opportunities which lie ahead if our Nation mobilizes its resources to build a better urban life for future generations. Some cities have taken giant steps forward. Hundreds of other cities and towns are planning for the future and struggling to rebuild themselves within the confines of inadequate Federal programs.

A beginning has been made. We need to know more about the nature and dimension of urban problems. We need the imaginative research and a relentless quest for forward-looking solutions. But far, far more important we Americans must decide that we will put to work all of the resources, public and private, Federal, State, and local, that are required to banish slums from our country.

The State of Our Cities and Suburbs in a Changing America—A Statement of the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of a statement issued by the advisory council of the Democratic National Committee entitled, "The State of Our Cities and Suburbs in a Changing America."

The second half of this statement follows:

3. THE SUBURBS—A NEW AMERICA

Suburbia is a distinctively new American way of life. A new family style of living, informal, friendly, and comfortable, has become an American goal. There is no doubt that Americans like it. In recent years, the move to the suburbs has become a mass migration.

A number of complex social and economic factors accounts for this unprecedented suburban migration:

The press of population growth, the lack of decent housing accommodations in the central cities and the unparalleled prosperity and mobility of postwar American life.

The new family way of life, the rising birth rate and the desire for space and elbow room.

The distaste of many Americans for declining and slum-ridden cities. In the suburbs, Americans recapture the old American dream of smalltown living.

Suburban sprawl

When do suburbs stop being suburbs? Fifty million Americans live in the suburbs right now. Eighty percent of our future population growth will take place in suburban areas. Each year more open space around our cities disappears as a million

more American families join the suburban migration. Villages become suburbs and the suburbs themselves grow into an urban sprawl.

There inevitably are problems in any mass migration. We must report that the great expectations of suburbia are beginning to tarnish in the face of the gigantic suburban population avalanche and increasing suburban sprawl. The suburbs confront these serious problems:

An ever-growing school population and rapidly rising tax rates.

Ever more congested commuter traffic patterns.

Demands for waste disposal, adequate water supply, and other public services.

A lack of public open space and recreation areas and the need for protection of natural scenic and physical resources.

To the residents of suburbs these problems are as pressing as the spread of blight and decay which confront our older city centers.

Soon: No more open space

Each year more and more open land is chewed up by the bulldozer (now 3,000 acres per day) as more and more American families join their neighbors in the countryside. The open country around our cities disappears. The historic townhall and quiet village green which have stood for generations as symbols of America's lovely small towns are being overwhelmed as a result of pell-mell suburban growth.

Small towns and local governments have been unable to stem the onrushing tide of suburban growth. Flying over the mushrooming suburbs which are growing up around our major cities, one sees that there will soon be no more open space in suburbia. It will take many years and much money just to unsnarl the congestion that is already here.

It is important to understand that the problems of suburban areas do not arise from any shortage of land. There is plenty of land for future suburban growth if we use it properly. What is lacking is not space itself but public policies and controls which will assure a balance in the new uses of the land. If our governments and our citizens do not concern themselves with the impact of suburbia on the land, then suburbia will, in fact, become a gigantic sprawl and a blight upon the landscape. This is no prophecy of the future. It has already happened outside our biggest cities.

There is an urgent need to preserve natural open space as well—the woodlands, hills, farmlands, and streams which give rural America its charms and which can give pleasure to both city dweller and suburbanite. Solutions which will preserve open space and retain local autonomy are imperative. The suburban way of life has too much to offer and on the whole has been too successful to be allowed to destroy itself.

Financing suburbia

At the town hall local officials have unhappily watched suburbia tax rates spiral upward. Suburban towns need suddenly to supply all the services that cities have developed over many years. The press of an ever-increasing number of families on schools, roads, water supply, waste disposal, and police and fire protection is forcing suburban finances to their limit.

There are four principal causes of suburban financial difficulties:

The taxes on homes alone will not support the public services these homes require. The majority of suburbs would be deficit operations already without State aid.

Nine large metropolitan areas today have 250 or more governmental units apiece; the average area has at least 50 separate jurisdictions. There is a massive mismatch between the supply of revenues and the needs of public service within this governmental maze.

There is little chance to spread costs across the entire range of properties which benefit from urban services. Here and there a suburban town endeavors to seal itself off from its neighbors and attract the "right kind of people" or the "right kind of industry." But few can succeed. The process of industrial diffusion gives some suburban towns tax windfalls but neighboring towns are denied access to the resulting revenues. American suburbs have on the whole been unable to act jointly with one another to make and carry out effective public policies to finance local services.

Fundamentally, all urban areas, central city and suburban, face an acute shortage of revenues. Local governments do not have access to the full range of taxable resources and must rely primarily on the property tax to meet increasing municipal costs. And tax revenue problems are partly man made in our local communities. There has been a failure of will, a failure to organize and administer local taxes with maximum effectiveness.

4. COMMON PROBLEMS OF CITIES AND SUBURBS

The city and suburb are inseparably linked. Without surrounding suburbs, the modern city would perish; without the central city the suburbs would wither away. Their markets, labor forces, manufacturers, and community services are mutually interdependent. In our studies we have concentrated on four areas of public service which reveal this interdependence most forcibly: transportation, education, recreation facilities, and air and water pollution.

Transportation and highways

Transportation binds the city and suburbs together. The automobile and commuter rail service made suburban expansion possible. Automobile ownership has doubled since the war and will increase an additional 60 percent by 1970. With nearly all America on wheels, cities and suburbs face transportation and traffic congestion problems which would have seemed like nightmares only 20 years ago.

The family car both serves and plagues the city dweller who must face streets jammed with peak-hour traffic, parking space forbidden or usurped, and traffic a constant hazard to life. Moreover, urban mass-transit services are declining in efficiency and economy. To the suburban commuter, the transportation mess spells traffic tieups, more lost time, deteriorating transit services, and lack of parking facilities at his destination. And suburban neighborhoods live under the threat of the poorly planned expressway that may cut through their heart, blighting homes and landscape.

We have scarcely begun to plan and construct the whole new transportation system which is so necessary to keep American cities and suburbs free from hopeless congestion. And transportation solutions cannot be achieved unless attractive and efficient rapid mass-transit facilities and improved rail service are developed to relieve the load on our highways in peak hours.

Education for our children

All American families, urban and suburban, want the best possible education for their children. Yet inadequate schools are the most pressing of urban and suburban problems.

The facts are plain:

Central city schools are typically old, lacking in play space and athletic facilities and unable to provide a school program as balanced and complete as that offered in the suburbs.

Suburban schools are newer, but overcrowded classes and double shifts are common and programs for the exceptional and the handicapped are lacking. Local tax rates are soaring as residential property is forced to bear major school costs.

Are there enough parks and playgrounds to go around?

Increasing family incomes, greater national wealth, and more leisure time, all spell greater opportunities for recreation. Yet both urban and suburban communities lack space and facilities for local, weekend, or vacation recreation.

Cities and suburbs lack recreation playgrounds, playfields, and parks for day-to-day recreation. Weekend and vacation spaces away from population centers are equally necessary in our society. But our remaining natural recreation areas—forests, lakes, rivers, and ocean frontage are disappearing rapidly. Our national parks are already jammed in season, and are overused. The vast Midwest today lacks lake, river, and forest areas needed to accommodate the present population, much less the greater population of the future. Cities, metropolitan areas, even States cannot meet these future needs in an era when 20 million people can drive across State boundaries on a brief weekend.

Air and water pollution

One city's refuse can pollute a hundred miles of river or water frontage. Industrial refuse has fouled thousands of once beautiful streams on which others depend for fresh water supplies. As our urban population grows, these problems of water and stream pollution have become more pressing. The spread of urban areas into continuous belts hundreds of miles long in the East, Midwest, Far West, and South have intensified the problems. In addition, metropolitan areas face growing problems of access to fresh water for domestic and industrial use.

Smog-industrial smoke, automobile exhaust fumes, and the soot of millions of home furnaces combine to foul the air with disease-breeding hydrocarbons and suffocating oxides. To date we have done little to curb these hazards.

6. THE NEED FOR NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

It would be an intolerable irony of history if the United States were to withstand the rigors of the cold war and the pitfalls of economic instability only to fall prey to civic disorganization in our slum-ridden cities and mushrooming suburbs.

Destroying slums and providing balanced and orderly suburban growth in a prosperous economy are primary domestic issues of our times. There is an urgent need for effective and vigorous national leadership.

This is the eighth and last year of the Eisenhower administration. We must report that the President and his administration are either uninformed or unconcerned with the mounting urban and suburban problems around them.

From the lack of sympathy and concern in the White House, it seems to us quite clear that the President and his budgeteers have neither seen nor heard nor felt the plight of the 22 million American slum dwellers. And with 50 million Americans already in the suburbs and 50 million more on the way, it is folly indeed to say that suburban problems are none of the Federal Government's concern.

Our conclusions with respect to the scope and effectiveness of Federal policies and programs are these:

Urban and suburban policies and programs are not at all geared to the total national solutions which are so urgently needed. Rather, in terms of action today, only a token effort is being made.

Federal aid programs are uncoordinated and are on a restricted, piecemeal basis.

The White House has directed that the plain intent of the Congress be frustrated through the creation of an ingenious administrative obstacle course for even the limited funds which are available. Through government by veto, the President has re-

peatedly destroyed all congressional efforts to fashion a comprehensive legislative program for urban renewal, depressed areas, and many other problem areas.

In far too many American cities today there are more slums than there were 10 years ago when the 1949 Housing Act was passed.

We can only conclude that the President and the Republican Party have turned their backs on cities and suburbs all across America.

AMERICA LOOKS AHEAD

The Democratic Party has demonstrated by its record in Congress a serious concern with urban and suburban problems and a willingness to provide responsible solutions and creative leadership. It is the task of the Democratic Party to prepare and implement action programs which will reverse these disturbing trends and make the American ideal and goal of a full and rich life a reality for all our citizens.

Our cities and our rapidly growing suburbs are the basic framework for our life and civilization in the challenging years which lie ahead. The deepest roots of day-to-day American democracy lie in our allegiance to our local communities, whether city or suburbs.

It is time that we as a Nation and as people take all the steps necessary to achieve the goal of a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

We propose that the Democratic Party rededicate itself to this goal and to its early achievement.

APPENDIX

Selected bibliography

This bibliography contains brief annotations on the leading books, articles and special reports which deal with urban and suburban problems.

Additional information and materials may be obtained from the following organizations: American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, 2 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.; American Municipal Association, 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Special works

1. "The Urban Revolution, a Program for Survival."

Draft policy paper prepared for the Democratic Advisory Council's Committee on Economic Policy.

A convincing statement of the urban problems facing the Nation and a call for ideas and courage to develop new concepts of effective action.

2. The Rockefeller Report on "The Challenge to America: Its Economic and Social Aspects," 1957.

Widely hailed as a hallmark of "intelligent capitalism at its finest" this report presents a remarkably thorough statement of the economic and social problems facing America. It falls short in prescribing remedies adequate to meet the problems as presented. It goes far beyond any proposals that the present administration has made.

3. "Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs," 1953.

This report was accepted in large part by the President and helped form the basis of the Housing Act of 1954 which broadened the scope of urban renewal. When compared with the veto message on the Housing Act of 1959, it now appears ironically out of date.

4. "Where Shall We Live?" Report of the Commission on Race and Housing, 1956.

A lively and very thorough discussion of segregated patterns of living and their impact on the future. Prepared by a distinguished Commission.

5. American Municipal Association, "1960 National Policy Recommendations."

The AMA represents more than 13,000 municipalities across the country. The AMA policy recommendations have been hammered out over the years and represent the best thinking of the city officials who know the urban and suburban problems from firsthand experience.

Articles

1. William L. C. Wheaton, "What Next for the Cities?" Housing Yearbook, National Housing Conference, 1959.

The lead article in the 1959 Housing Yearbook examines the consequences of the forthcoming population expansion, the decline of cities and the need for a long-range program of significant proportions to make both cities and suburbs attractive and livable.

2. Edward J. Logue, "Urban Ruin—Or Urban Renewal?" New York Times magazine, November 9, 1958.

A concise policy statement of the need for a continuing and comprehensive national urban renewal program.

3. William L. C. Wheaton, "A New Cabinet Post?" National Civic Review, December 1959.

A discussion of the proposal to create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

Committee for Economic Development

The Committee for Economic Development is a nonpartisan organization composed of leading businessmen, educators and civic leaders which has made significant contributions through economic research on a national scale.

Through CED's Area Development Advisory Committee, several very useful, detailed monographs on urban and regional problems have been commissioned and published. Other papers are now in process.

CED has not itself taken a policy position on these matters. The research is a significant contribution.

The published papers are:

1. Dr. Raymond K. Vernon, "The Changing Economic Function of the Central City."

A detailed analysis of what makes a big-city economy tick and why we should expect more dispersion, not less, in many traditional areas of central city dominance.

2. Dr. Robert C. Wood, "Metropolis Against Itself."

An analysis of the problems of government organization and overlapping jurisdictions in metropolitan areas.

Other useful works

There are a number of worthwhile books, articles, pamphlets, and other materials devoted to aspects of suburban and urban problems. Several of these are listed below:

1. *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 75 Sup. Ct. 98, 99 L. Ed. 27 (1954).

The leading constitutional decision on redevelopment, Justice Douglas' opinion for a unanimous court is a broad and clear statement of public purpose.

2. "The Culture of Cities," Lewis Mumford.

The dean of critics of the American scene examines the make-up of urban life.

3. "The Human Side of Urban Renewal," Millsbaugh & Breckenfield.

A lively and stimulating study of the effectiveness of rehabilitation as it has been practiced in several American cities. Mr. Millsbaugh is presently Assistant Commissioner for Urban Renewal with the Federal Government.

4. "Metropolis in Ferment," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1957.

A series of challenging articles on the varying dimensions of urban problems and predictions for the future. These articles have unusual scope and intensity.

5. "Veto Message of the Housing Act of 1959."

The President vetoed the 1959 Housing Act on July 7, 1959. The message was printed in the New York Times of that date and may also be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The message makes an interesting contrast with the report of the 1953 President's Advisory Committee on Housing Policy and the President's own budget message of 1954.

Books

1. Editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis": New York, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958 paperback ed.

An exceptionally well-written book by "people who like cities." The most comprehensive and up-to-date work available on the broad range of urban and suburban problems. Includes discussion of the nature of cities, mass transportation, municipal administration, the spread of slums, urban sprawl, and urban design.

2. Robert C. Wood, "Suburbia": Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1958.

A complete and challenging study of the suburbs, their politics and problems. Discussion of the economic and social forces at play in suburbia and how they may shape its future. The author explodes several suburban myths and illustrates the strength of suburban trends as well.

3. Wilfred Owen, "Cities in the Motor Age": New York, the Viking Press, 1959.

A well-written and comprehensive book based on a 1957 conference on the impact of the Federal highway program. Discussion of the transportation problem, both auto and mass transit, in the context of the changes in cities and the requirements for effective policy. Not a traffic engineering treatise but a book for laymen to enjoy and ponder.

4. John K. Galbraith, "The Affluent Society": Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1958.

A book full of fresh ideas that will startle and educate Democrats concerned with economic and social problems in these times. Very well-written with humor and dispatch. Presents a superb case for the importance of revised allocation of national resources in an abundant economy.

5. Charles F. Palmer, "Adventures of a Slum Fighter": Atlanta, Ga., Tupper and Love, Inc., 1955.

An account of the first slum-clearance, low-cost housing project in the United States and the author's efforts to start the housing program on its way during the 1930's.

Family Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently, seven Governors appeared in person before the House Agriculture Committee to testify in support of the Family Farm Income Act of 1960, sponsored by myself and a number of our colleagues in the Congress.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], a chief sponsor of the family farm legislation, both observed that they could not recall any previous time when so many Governors appeared in a body to testify in support of agricultural legislation.

The intelligent concern of the midwestern Governors with the problems of

agriculture is a most encouraging factor in the present effort to establish an improved farm program.

Under unanimous consent I ask that a recent news broadcast prepared by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association at St. Paul, referring to the testimony of the Midwest Governors, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

Every once in a while a group of people in leadership positions will organize spontaneously and initiate an action that deserves the acclamation of all the people in the countryside. When this happens, as it happened Tuesday in Washington, it is usually motivated by a very serious situation that affects the welfare of all the people.

The group of men we are referring to is made up of 10 Midwestern Governors who went to Washington to seek the aid of Congress and top Government officials in easing the disastrous cost-price squeeze on farmers. These leaders are deeply concerned about the plight of agriculture. It promises no good for the economy of their States and they would like to see it corrected before really bad trouble develops.

As far as farm families are concerned, if the Governor of your State was present in this group you can be proud that you have an aggressive leader who is not only working for you as farmers, but for all the other people in your State.

So right now let's name these State leaders: The group included seven Governors in person: Hershel C. Loveless of Iowa, Orville Freeman of Minnesota, Steve McNichols of Colorado, Ralph Hereth of South Dakota, G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, James Blair of Missouri, and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. Three others sent personal spokesmen. They were Governors Joe Hickey of Wyoming, Ralph Brooks of Nebraska, and George Docking of Kansas.

All 10 put their unanimous support behind the Burdick-McGovern farm bill now in the House. It is similar to the Family Farm Income Act of 1960 in the Senate, where its author is Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota. We've talked about this bill before and you'll be hearing a lot more about it in the future because it is shaping up as the most promising piece of farm legislation introduced thus far.

When the group of governors appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, Chairman Cooley observed that it was the "most distinguished group to appear before this committee."

As spokesman for the governors, Hershel Loveless of Iowa laid the case for agriculture before the committee. He said that farmers have been badly hurt by rising costs and falling income. "There is in Iowa," he said, "a growing support for the idea that production should be controlled." Governor Freeman of Minnesota seconded that, and added that farmers have demonstrated in referendums a complete willingness to cooperate with control measures because they know they cannot survive much longer without fair prices and incomes. Freeman pointed out that farm income in Minnesota has been dropping by an average of \$30 per year per farmer while nonfarm income is increasing by \$70 a year.

The governors said that a decent farm bill that will do something for farmers and control production and be fair to city people at the same time, may never get by the President, but it is still up to Congress to pass such a bill and give the Chief Executive a last opportunity to make good on his farm promises.

Farmers will certainly welcome this action by their governors. It is a positive step in the right direction, of the kind that has long been urged by the farmers of GTA the co-op way.

The Forand Bill—Trend or Treadmill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech recently given by Dr. Leon Roe, of Canisio, N.Y., to several meetings in the 37th Congressional District of New York. It deals with H.R. 4700 and similar proposals, and, I believe, throws light on some interesting aspects of these proposals:

SOME CONSIDERATIONS OF THE SOCIAL-ECONOMIC-POLITICAL ASPECTS OF HEALTH CARE

(By Leon M. Roe, M.D.)

When one begins consideration of the social-economic-political aspects of present-day health care, he must, by necessity, give some thought to the trends that are occurring in the lives of Americans.

It is my philosophy that, with the framing of the Constitution of America, our forefathers intended that each American citizen and those of future generations should have both freedom of opportunity and the individual responsibility to provide for their own welfare. However, a large segment of our population no longer holds to this view. Since the middle thirties, a philosophy of security for all and the promulgation of a welfare nation has come to the fore, both in the minds of many of our citizens and the thinking of many of our Federal and State governmental officials. For those who may not believe this statement, please take heed of the following facts: In midyear of 1953, the welfare portion of our Federal Government was \$6.9 billion. To midyear of 1961, the welfare portion of our Federal budget will be \$20.3 billion or an increase of \$13.4 billion in 7 years. This includes the following categories, all of which our Federal Government has a hand in helping supply the money: old-age insurance pensions, civil service pensions, disability pensions, people on relief, jobless benefits, State employment services, railroad workers' pensions; grants and loans to colleges, school districts and students; school lunches, some 2.3 billion meals per year; hospitals, health and other welfare costs. This does not include veterans' pensions and benefits to veteran dependents such as the \$60-million medicare program which was reestablished by Congress for the year of 1960.

For a specific example of the way in which new programs tend to spiral in cost, take a look at the disability pensions. These started going out to disabled workers 50 years of age or older just 2 years ago or in 1958. The initial cost was \$170 million a year; the cost of the coming year is forecast at \$610 million or a near 5-fold increase in 2 years. Plans now receiving serious consideration would give this program a big lift by easing the rules and removing the age requirement for disability and thus further increase the rapidly growing cost of this single program.

There are few who would argue against the good sound economic-social progress of unemployment insurance and the disability program based upon bona fide claims, or of reasonable and necessary Federal aid to education, hospitals and health. However, when plans are brought forth at any level of government to supply health insurance by compulsory taxation, either to a select group or to every American citizen, the

issue of the responsibility of the government versus individual responsibility and freedom of private enterprise has been reached.

Despite outstanding progress and effort being made by private industry to provide voluntary health insurance, including the aged, for all who desire it, there are opposing forces to this scheme of doing things. One such force is powerful influences in our Federal Government which apparently feel that it is their responsibility to see that every recipient of social security has health protection whether he needs it or not. Another force is the State government and, of course, a third force is a segment of American people who want to be provided by the Government in one form or another with health protection. As a result of this trend, bills have been introduced into the Federal Government and others are now being considered in our New York State Legislative Health Committee to provide compulsory health insurance through payroll deduction on both the part of the employer and the part of the employee.

One such bill which is now before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington is H.R. 4700 or the Forand bill. This bill was introduced by Representative AMIE FORAND, and is strongly supported by the AFL and CIO union organizations. In essence, this bill provides for additional deductions in social security to provide 120 days hospitalization and surgical care, and 120 days nursing home care in any one year for every recipient and his or her beneficiaries of social security. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to contract with hospitals, surgeons, either as groups or individuals, and nursing homes for such care. As of today, there are approximately 16¼ million people in the United States who would become, were this bill passed, eligible for these benefits. Mind you, these benefits are not based upon the need for help or assistance. It would make no difference how many shares of stock, how much money in the bank, how much property an individual might have, he and his dependents would be entitled to his 120 days hospitalization, surgical care and 120 days in a nursing home if he needed it out of each year.

Now from my personal welfare as a physician, I would probably benefit from such a bill since 35 percent of all those people in Steuben County now receiving old-age assistance also receives some form of social security. For example, were I to do an appendectomy on one of these people, instead of receiving \$50, which is our present welfare fee for this service, I probably would be reimbursed with a fee of \$125 to \$150 or possibly more. And of course, each year many more people become eligible for social security. Within our own county it is anticipated that within the next 10 years 70 percent of all recipients of old-age assistance will be receiving some form of social security. So you see, from a personal viewpoint, I really would have nothing but gain.

However, I am opposed to this bill in principle and for the following reasons: It places the Federal Government in a position of supplying health insurance on a large scale program and thereby becoming a large competitor of private enterprise. Since approximately 20 percent of all hospital admissions are over 65 years of age and nearly all admissions to nursing homes are in the aged group, such a bill could place the Federal Government in a dictatorial position of setting the standards of hospital and nursing home care. Further, in a liberal sense of the word, this bill is discriminatory. First, it provides only for a select group of people but at the same time every employer and employee would pay for it by taxation. Second, it discriminates against hospitals since among other things in the provisions

of the bill, these folks, except in an emergency, could not be given care except in accredited hospitals. And since hospital accreditation is relatively new, there are many good hospitals in the Nation which are not yet accredited. Third, it discriminates against the medical profession since only the surgeons would benefit. It is a well known fact that the ills of these people are more often medical such as strokes, heart disease, diabetes and pneumonia rather than surgical conditions.

The cost of this bill which is now estimated at \$2 billion in its first year of operation, will very rapidly become a staggering figure in the very near future, as witness the multiplying cost of most any national health insurance program or of our own disability program. As you know, Sweden inaugurated a complete system of socialized medicine in 1956 and within 4 years the rapidly rising of unanticipated costs of this form of medicine made it mandatory that beginning January 1, 1960, the Swedish Government had to add a 4 percent tax on everything sold in Sweden to help them underwrite their medical program. You also know that under the present system of laws, social security will increase each year until in 1966, it will reach a total of 9 percent or a 4½ percent for employer and 4½ percent for employee. Further deduction from paychecks for further increases in Social Security or any other form of compulsory health insurance make for less take-home pay, thereby the unions fight for another round of wage increases and inflation goes on and on. Therefore, to my mind, this bill is definitely of an inflationary character. But more important than the economics involved, this bill would tend to lessen the individual's responsibility throughout his lifetime to provide for his own welfare through voluntary means.

In addition to the Forand bill and the Federal Government, hearings were held in Albany on February 18 and 19 of this year on six bills which were introduced by the Joint Legislative Committee on Health Insurance Plans. This new series of bills would provide health insurance coverage for New York State workers covered by the Disability Benefits Law whether employed, unemployed, or the recipients of public assistance. In the words of Senator Metcalf, chairman of this committee, "We are aiming at using the resources of private industry in cooperation with Government to achieve the goal of adequate health protection for as large a proportion of our people as possible without abdicating this responsibility to some mechanism of the Federal Government. We are not attempting to accomplish womb-to-tomb coverage," he said, "we are simply trying to establish a comprehensive health insurance program in New York State's tradition of responsibility for neglected human needs. Moreover, there is the very obvious object of reducing the staggering burden of the cost of public welfare."

Now it is to be admitted that it is very difficult to argue against such a statement in this day and age when so many are thinking of security. However, we must remember that this is a compulsory form of health insurance. It would require all employers governed by the disability benefits law (in essence, all those with three or more employees) to provide basic health insurance coverage at least as comprehensive as presently called for by a disability insurance law. These provisions themselves would be increased by the bills referred to, to a minimum of 120 days of hospitalization, plus a medical and surgical schedule with maximum benefits of not less than \$250. This particular bill further specifies that the cost of health insurance must be shared on a 50-50 basis between employer and employee when only the employee is covered, and on the basis of 35 percent for the employer and 65 percent for the employee when both the employee

and his dependents are covered. It would permit any existing coverage provided by disability benefits law or workmen's compensation to be counted against an employer's responsibility under this bill.

A second bill in this series would provide that the cost of health insurance coverage of an employee, should he become unemployed, must be included in the premium of the group policy while the employee is still on the job, or all employers of three or more are to be taxed one-fourth of 1 percent for payments into a health insurance unemployment fund to be administered and regulated by the Workmen's Compensation Board. Contributions would be made for 1 year before the law goes into effect in order to build up the fund. There is a provision also that if the fund should fall to less than \$20 million, the board is authorized to increase the rate of contributions of employers in order to bring it up to that figure.

A third in this series of six bills provides that after an unemployed worker has exhausted his benefits and goes on public assistance, his health insurance premiums are to be continued, the payment to be made on a 50-50 basis by the municipality in which he resides and the State of New York.

A fourth bill makes the same provision but the State department of health is given jurisdiction over its administration with the public health council promulgating rules governing the minimum quality of hospital, medical, and surgical care to be provided.

Now in addition to these bills, there is a bill sponsored by the unions of New York which is called a health center bill. This bill would incorporate the Syracuse Health Services, Inc., with power to establish and maintain health centers and furnish medical facilities to members of unions in Onondaga, Cayuga, Madison, and Cortland Counties, subject to approval of the State board of social welfare. It further states that this corporation shall furnish such facilities to members of any union within the counties of Onondaga, Cayuga, Madison, and Cortland and their families, and to employees covered by collective bargaining agreements between such unions and employers, or association of employers and the families of such employers and to any other people interested or, in other words, to the public. This bill, known as the Hughes-Brown bill, would place labor unions in a position to dominate medical care within a community. The growth of their facilities would be at the expense of facilities maintained by management, private hospitals, etc., which are more representative of the public in general. Four certified Syracuse labor leaders are named in the bill as those who would form the corporation and would be the health center's first board of directors. From newspaper releases, it is in the long-range planning that this health center would eventually revolve around a union controlled 200-300 bed hospital.

Now is there a need for this type of legislation either on a State or Federal level? It does seem absurd that in this day and age of high prosperity with an automobile or two and a television or so in nearly every home, and with personal income at an all-time high of \$373 billion per year, that compulsory State or Federal Government sponsored health insurance is necessary. It may be that we have reached the stage where one has facetiously defined an underprivileged child as one whose parents have two automobiles but no motorboat. However, in view of this pending legislation, studies have been done by many groups to determine if there is a need for such a bill. Although it is granted that statistics may be found to support almost anyone's viewpoint, one recent reasonable study by the Health Information Foundation showed that the group over 65 years of age is as heterogeneous as

any other group in our Nation. Many are rich—many are poor—but the majority are in between. When asked the question, "How would you meet a medical hospital bill of \$500 or more?" 82 percent answered that they would meet it in whole or in part from savings, current income, life insurance, mortgages, health insurance, or from children and relatives. Only 18 percent indicated they would have to rely on public assistance or charitable aid. It is obvious from this study, at least, that whatever problem exists, is among the needy or the near needy aged who would be rapidly reduced to a state of destitution by a major illness.

In recognition of this fact, the board of trustees of the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association recently adopted a resolution dedicating their full resources to accelerate the development of adequately financed health care programs for needy persons, especially the aged needy. Both organizations stated that the indigent or near indigent is primarily a community responsibility. The resolution further pointed out that the Forand bill fails to meet the need of the indigent aged since the vast majority of such aged are not eligible to receive social security benefits. United Medical Service of New York City, which is Blue Shield and Blue Cross, has just recently developed a voluntary health coverage program for individuals of any age who desire it. Last year, the Buffalo Blue Shield Group put into effect their golden age health insurance program in which individuals past 65 years of age could receive this type of insurance. So far, the plan is working out well and appears to be financially sound. Other Blue Cross, Blue Shield nonprofit groups are rapidly studying and preparing to bring forth senior citizenship health and hospital insurance coverage. Many of these plans also offer health insurance for catastrophic illnesses with benefits ranging from \$5,000 to \$15,000. Many private insurance companies are offering at reasonable prices to senior residents health insurance plans which adequately cover surgical, medical or hospital expense. Already in this Nation, 43 percent of those over 65 years of age are covered by some type of insurance and it is anticipated by the Health Insurance Council of America that by the end of 1960, 60 percent of those over 65 who wish to purchase such insurance will be covered, and probably by 1970, 90 or more percent of such people will be covered.

Thus, through present social security cash benefits, private pension plans, increasing savings and liquid assets, through the combination of these, the economic resources and purchasing power of the group over 65 years of age is rapidly and steadily improving. Thus voluntary and governmental enterprise that preserves individual responsibility and initiative have teamed up in recent years and are moving rapidly to resolve whatever problems still remain. It seems to me that if State and Federal governments wanted to be more helpful, they could allow as legitimate tax deductions the premiums paid on health and hospital insurance. Further studies under the present program of old age survivors and trust funds and welfare agencies could be made to determine the possibility of insuring these people as a group on a local level, either through Blue Cross-Blue Shield, or through commercial insurance carriers as a means of protecting local governments against the rising costs of the welfare budget.

Political developments along all lines of health care should be closely watched by every American. If this type of legislation as discussed, is enacted into law, it will directly affect our economic and, to some extent, our future way of living. Union leaders, of course, who would like to have a hand in the health care of our Nation are strongly supporting these various types of

legislation. As you know, with all due respect to the many fine men and women who are union members, the leaders of these unions have become strong, powerful and in a sense arrogant. With some union leaders, it is becoming extremely difficult to negotiate with them on any reasonable basis.

It is my personal opinion that one can justifiably say that no Federal agency, or State agency, or union agency has ever been able to do a job as well, as efficiently and as economically as private enterprise. By the same token, those of us who are interested in maintaining some semblance of individual responsibility, private enterprise, and initiative, must see to it that no one within our county and, if possible, within our State or Nation, goes without adequate medical or hospital care because of lack of funds. In doing so, we must be aware of the ever-rising costs not only of health care but of national inflation in general.

Quoting from Paul Talbot, who heads United Business Service and writes a weekly statement in this bulletin, "If we are to adequately appraise current events in the historical perspective, where better can we turn for helpful guideposts than to that great work of Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. From this huge mass of fact and opinion we find that Gibbon lists five primary causes for the deterioration of Roman society. They are: (1) The rapid increase of divorce and the undermining of the sanctity of the home. (2) The spiraling rise of taxes and extravagant spending. (3) The mounting craze for pleasure. (4) The building of gigantic armaments and the failure to realize that the real enemy lay within the gates of the empire in the moral decay of the people. (5) The decay of religion and the fading faith into a mere form, leaving the people without any guide. Granted, that many things have changed since the days of the Roman Empire—and over two centuries since Gibbon wrote—but the indictments he lists came much too close for comfort. From an objective, historical viewpoint, we may be treading a dangerous pathway."

In the final analysis, methods of supplying health protection, whether voluntary or compulsory, will be made by the decision of the American people through their elected representatives in Government.

Except in areas of real need, how much of the individual's responsibility do we wish to relinquish either to the State or Federal Government?

The People Are Fed Up With Our Present Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss once again my bill, H.R. 10350, proposed legislation to repeal all agricultural price-support subsidies and to provide for the disposition of the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory without disrupting normal marketings.

First, I should say frankly that the Department of Agriculture opposes enactment of my bill. According to the Department, the elimination of all price support, as contemplated in H.R. 10350, is not in the best interests either of

farmers or the economy as a whole. The Department's report expressed concern for the magnitude of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and growing investment; but rather than advocate elimination of price-support activity, it viewed price support at realistic levels as valuable in helping facilitate orderly marketing and in stabilizing the economy.

As to the provision in my bill for use of proceeds of surplus sales for loans to help relocate small and inefficient farmers hurt by ending Federal farm subsidies, the Department preferred a program aimed at assisting such affected families stay in farming and as promoted now to widen off-farm job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture says that this year the United States will have another record or near-record production of crops. The Government survey shows that farmers will plant about as many acres of cropland this year as last. The prospect of this surplus-harassed industry is more overproduction, as was the case in 1959 and back in 1958. So, especially in grain, the surpluses accumulate year after year and go mostly into Government hands.

I asked for the best guess of the Department of Agriculture as to the price trend or level of wheat under conditions assuming removal of the present Government-held surplus from the domestic and foreign market as provided under my bill. All I could get in the way of an answer was that removal of the wheat surplus would have a stabilizing influence on market prices, but such a step was not believed to be in the interest of farmers or the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen estimates of prices and trends furnished the House Committee on Agriculture based on proposed farm programs. I would have thought such projections could have been arrived at under conditions believed probable if my bill were enacted. But I will say this, that there are those who favor a return to the law of supply and demand and the conditions which would result from my bill, and these same supporters are farmers. I think they know the situation. Many farmers have written saying they support my plan.

Almost 20 percent of the entire Federal budget, or more than \$7 billion, is appropriated to help the farmers. That is too much. It is too much especially because the program is a failure. It is too much because it favors the big and rich as against the small and poor. It is too much because our farm program is socialistic and not in harmony with free enterprise. I am told a vast army of Federal career employees who hold their jobs through this federalized farm program opposed ending controls and subsidies. As one of my constituents wrote me a few days ago, we should back out of this farm giveaway before we are trapped and can never get out. I wonder if already it is not too late.

Speaking of constituents, I sent out a questionnaire with this question: "Do you favor reduction in agriculture price supports?" This went to a cross section of voters, and a tabulation of replies by an

independent organization showed that 4,055 answered "Yes" in favor of reduction. Only 469 replied "No," that they were against a reduction.

Since I introduced H.R. 10350 I have received letters of support from all over the country. Here is a typical unsolicited letter which reached my office on Saturday. It is from Bridge City, Tex., and is a sample of the widespread opinion held by the American people in strong opposition to our acreage and price support farm program:

MARCH 15, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELL, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: "Deo gratias" for you and your resolution H.R. 10350. It is my fervent hope that you will not waver in your fight to convince your colleagues of the saneness and merits of this all-important matter.

This is America—I believe. Then why must Congress be so discriminatory in its legislations? Are the Members that hungry for self-gain? Then if this be the case they will certainly change when the rest of the 180 million Americans who are not farmers wake up.

The present program's purpose expired when the Nation came out of the depression period 20 years ago. Yet it keeps coming back like a song. One of the most aggravating melodies I have ever heard.

The only consequence of the immediate enactment of your proposals would be just so many millions having to get off Uncle Sam's "gravytrain" and go to work. The biggest consequence would be a marked decrease in the Federal budget—a budget that would end up with a tremendous surplus to pay off the national debt which seems to be the farthest thing from most Senators' and Representatives' minds. This is, of course, probable if the many Socialist-minded people in Congress doesn't give the money away to Tito, Poland, Cuba, or TVA, REA, or you name it.

The Government needs a lot of money to keep its 17,000 businesses going, especially since Uncle Sam doesn't care if they make a profit or not. The taxpayers will make up their deficits and keep them in business.

I am following your efforts on this matter very closely in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Please continue your American program. Let us always be able to say that this is America, "The land of the free and the home of the brave—and not the home of the hypocrite."

Respectfully yours,

EARL J. ANGELLE.

The Fight To Save Our Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner on Tuesday, March 15, entitled "The Fight To Save Our Wilderness" is of particular interest to all who are concerned with the preservation of the natural beauty spots in our Nation.

We have enjoyed these gifts of nature and we should safeguard and preserve

them so that those who come after us in this great country may also enjoy them.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Mar. 15, 1960]

THE FIGHT TO SAVE OUR WILDERNESS

Few areas of true wilderness remain in our country, and each day they grow more precious because more scarce. They do not belong to living Americans in fee simple, to do with as we like. They came to us in trust, as part of our inheritance, with the obligation that we pass them on undisturbed to future generations.

Today the pressures to break that trust are heavy. In part they come from exploiters, though these are not numerous. The greatest pressure is one for which none of us and all of us are responsible. It is the massive, all-pervasive, all-encompassing force of explosive population growth. Unless the trust is made all but unbreakable, it will not stand against that pressure. And time is short.

Pending in the U.S. Senate is a measure, S. 1123, to create that kind of trust. Commonly called the wilderness bill, the measure would create a National Wilderness Preservation System. Into that System would be deposited virtually all of the federally owned areas now designated as wild, wilderness, or primitive areas, the unspoiled back country of national parks and monuments, and some wildlife refuges and other minor areas.

No private lands would be added to Federal ownership by this bill, nor would any Federal lands be designated as wilderness that are not already so designated. Why then, you may ask, is the bill necessary?

Because these lands have a wilderness status only by administrative decree, and could lose that status by another administrative decree. Bitter experience has shown that such losses do occur. The wilderness needs the protecting arm of a strong, unambiguous law, and would get it under the wilderness bill. That is why we strongly urge public support for its passage.

The bill is particularly vital to Californians. They have the most wilderness to protect; at the same time the threat is acute here because of our abnormally rapid population growth and great tourist popularity.

Twenty-seven areas in California, constituting 9,000 square miles, would be preserved as wilderness. More than half of that is contained in just three areas, Death Valley National Monument, Joshua Tree National Monument, and the Yosemite National Park back country. Most of the remainder is in northern California's national forests.

These are all places where man is a visitor, not an inhabitant, and so they should always be. For man the urban dweller remains a child of nature, with a deep-seated need for wilderness where he can go and refresh his spirit, but not stay. He will destroy the last remaining wilderness only at his peril.

Israel Reaches New Peaks of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we American friends of the people of Israel are proud of their accomplishments to date and wish them well for the future.

As Israel progresses through these times of risk, I wish to bring further to

the attention of the American people how the people of Israel are accepting this challenge and are working bravely toward peace and progress:

AMERICAN ISRAEL
PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1960.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I am enclosing the text of the statement made by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, chairman of our committee, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs last week.

As Rabbi Bernstein pointed out, we believe that Israel has used American aid wisely and well and has become a showcase testifying to other nations that a state which preserves free institutions does more than any other form of government for the well-being of its people. As you will remember you had a significant part to play in this in 1951, when U.S. aid to Israel began.

We hope that American aid to Israel will be continued to enable her to expand her production, so that she may anticipate the termination of German reparations in 1963. Furthermore, as you know, Israel has never received the gift of arms or defense support, although she must carry a crushing burden to equip and train her forces in order to deter aggression from neighbors who are receiving large-scale shipments of arms from the Soviet bloc.

May I also call your attention to the concluding portion of Rabbi Bernstein's statement, suggesting that the Mutual Security Act provides an opportunity to reaffirm America's traditional support for freedom of the seas and our opposition to boycotts, blockades, and aggression.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all that you have done in the past. It is pleasant to reflect that Israel has made such dynamic progress, thanks to you and others who have championed this cause.

Cordially,

I. L. KENAN.

STATEMENT OF RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN, OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MARCH 14, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for the privilege of appearing before this committee today on behalf of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

Our committee's purpose is to strengthen American-Israel friendship, in the service of peace in the Near East. American friendship for Israel is, we think, indispensable to the attainment of a peace settlement in this troubled region. We hope that ultimately the Arabs will abandon their sterile and costly war against Israel. That day will come when the Arabs finally realize that they cannot alienate America as Israel's friend. This is one of several reasons why we urge continued American economic assistance to Israel.

One of the important criteria of our aid program is whether a nation can make effective use of our assistance. Our past aid to Israel—governmental and nongovernmental combined—has been generous and substantial. It has not been dissipated. On the contrary, it has been used wisely and well.

Twelve years ago, when Israel was established, it was predicted by some daring spirits that Israel might absorb a million refugees in a decade. She did—a spectacular and unprecedented achievement. A tiny country—8,000 square miles—much of it eroded wasteland and with a population of 800,000, made a home for a million people in a decade. It is one of those rare countries where

people are wanted, where people have value, where human personality is respected and dignified. We Americans may take pride that we helped Israel as she worked to receive and rehabilitate the refugees who found sanctuary on her shores. We helped her to put people, land, and water—three precious resources—to work, in harmony.

I do not wish to offer detailed statistics, but there is ample evidence of Israel's growth and development. The average annual increase in Israel's gross national product has amounted to about 10 percent over the past 10 years.

1. The national product, which was about 375 million Israel pounds in 1950, was close to 2,700 million Israel pounds in 1958. In real terms, this means that, allowing for increase of prices, the national product has increased more than threefold in that period.

2. The value of agricultural production, for example, has risen from 175 million Israel pounds in 1950 to about 560 million Israel pounds in 1958. Similarly, industrial production has gone up from 470 million Israel pounds in 1948 to 1,500 million Israel pounds in 1958.

3. There has been a significant improvement in Israel's exports balance payment position. In 1949, exports from Israel amounted to \$51 million, compared to \$455 million of imports. In other words, Israel was paying only 11.7 percent of its imports with its own exports. In 1959, total imports were about \$600 million, compared to total exports of some \$300 million in goods and services. Thus, Israel was paying its way to the extent of about 50 percent. And it hopes to reduce the balance of payments deficit to some \$200 million by increased production and increased exports in the next 4 years.

4. Israel is now making vigorous efforts to attract private investment. Recently, an Investment Authority was established. It hopes to attract \$300 million from private investors in the United States in the next 4 or 5 years. The new law for the encouragement of capital investment passed in 1959 is one of the most liberal laws in the world for the encouragement of private investments. It allows for the full repatriation of profits, for accelerated depreciation, and for generous tax concessions.

Thus, one may hope that in a few years Israel will be in sight of economic balance.

This advance would be much faster if Israel were not the victim of a declared war by her neighbors, who disrupt her trade by boycotts and blockades, and who have forced her to spend a disproportionate part of her earnings on the purchase of arms and training in their use.

We have been hearing a good deal about the concept of "showcase" aid. Certainly, the foreign-aid record demonstrates that Israel is eligible for that classification. For here is a country which shows that our aid, prudently and effectively used, can propel her toward economic equilibrium. The people in that country are making the best possible use of the money we have invested there.

Moreover, Israel must accelerate her productivity to anticipate the serious problems ahead, which arise because reparations payments from Germany will end in 1963.

But we must assess Israel's significance as a showcase from another aspect. We believe in freedom and individual personality. We count Israel as an exhibit—as a testament to other nations of the world—that a democracy, which preserves free institutions and self-government, does more than any other form of government for the well-being and happiness of its people.

This is not intended as a sermon. It is a highly practical thesis. It is being proved. We will need more than weapons—more than missiles and space ships—to secure the survival of our civilization. We will need people who share our commitment, who cherish

our faith in the worth of the human personality.

I would like to refer to another problem which faces Israel. We should bear in mind that Israel does not receive any gift of arms from our country.

When I first addressed this committee some years ago, it was to express concern on American arms shipments to the Arab States, and particularly to Iraq. I could not understand why our Government sent guns to nations which were openly in a state of war with Israel, and at the same time denied Israel the arms and security treaty she sought back in 1955, when President Nasser opened the Near East to penetration by the Communist war machine—Soviet arms and technicians. Although Nasser continues to receive modern weapons from the Soviet bloc, at bargain prices, Israel is still compelled to shop around the world and to pay top prices for arms.

Our committee has favored economic aid for all underdeveloped peoples. In the past, we have urged you to vote economic assistance for the Arab peoples, as well as for Israel. We continue to do this. And we have urged constructive programs for the resettlement of the Arab refugees, who were displaced by the folly of the Arab leaders who went to war against the United Nations partition resolution in 1948.

We have hoped that economic development, which raises living standards, will help to reduce tensions in the area.

The Arab war against Israel is not the primary or major cause of Middle East problems. The internal conflict in the Arab world, as well as the Arab-Israel conflict, grow out of the poverty of the Middle East, the waste of its resources, and the maldistribution and misuse of its wealth.

The tension between Israel and the Arab States is but one facet of this overall problem. The Arabs are torn by their rivalries. Hostility to Israel is a weapon to be brandished in the competition for domination in the Arab world. But, if the Arabs could concentrate on economic development, if progressive leadership could preach cooperation instead of animosity, the antagonism between the Arabs and Israelis could be quickly ended. There is no issue dividing Israel and the Arab States that cannot be resolved if the Arabs recognize the reality and durability of Israel's existence and negotiate differences with her directly—at the same table. And, as Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld pointed out last year, the resettlement of the Arab refugees will be achieved with the economic development of the Arab countries.

We do not accept the Arab thesis that we must choose between the Israelis and the Arabs and that friendship for one precludes friendship for the other. We want our country to be the friend of Israel and the friend of the Arab peoples, and we want them to befriend each other. We are convinced that Israel and the Arab States have much to gain by cooperation and peace, and we work to bring that about.

We believe in economic assistance to the Arabs as well as to the Israelis, and we stress economic assistance rather than arms. But we must enter some reservations. We question the wisdom of aiding any country if that aid is used to further that country's war against another. Our aid is negated if our assistance to one people is used to damage the economy of another country which also receives assistance from us. This question arose last fall when the Western World loaned the United Arab Republic \$56 million to widen and deepen the Suez Canal, at the very moment when the U.A.R. was using the canal as an instrument of aggression and when it was detaining two ships illegally, demanding the surrender of their cargoes.

The Charter of the United Nations is clear. Members are pledged to abstain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. When the Arab States proclaim that they are in a state of war against Israel, they violate the United Nations Charter, just as President Nasser flouts a U.N. Security Council decision when he blocks Israel shipping through the Suez Canal.

Is it right to grant aid without requiring the recipients of our aid to conform to the laws and standards of the international community? No nation has an automatic right to our assistance. No nation should be allowed to extort assistance from us merely by threatening to go to Moscow. Laws govern the relations of nations. We should not close our eyes to their violation.

It is disturbing to reflect that we, ourselves, have involuntarily become implicated in the Arab boycott. There was a time when our country firmly resisted any attempt by another government to discriminate against an American citizen. We have always favored freedom of navigation in international waterways. American citizens have always acted within their indisputable rights in taking their ships and in traveling wherever their legitimate business called them on the high seas. And they exercised those rights in the well-justified confidence that their Government would sustain them. Yet our money goes to help a government which uses an international highway—the Suez Canal—as a private lake. The U.S. Navy has been advising shippers who trade with Israel that they bid for the business of carrying oil cargoes for the Navy at their own peril. And our surplus foods can be carried to Arab countries only in ships which avoid traffic with Israel.

The Mutual Security Act is the major legislative expression of American foreign policy. It is the one opportunity which Congress has to declare its views on matters involving our relations with other nations. Perhaps this legislation offers an opportunity to reaffirm our traditional support for the freedom of the seas and our abhorrence of boycotts and blockades, aggression, and war, and our determination never to compromise with aggression wherever it may arise and in whatever form it takes.

Our country reaches an eminence of greatness and strength and is most honored and respected by others as it adheres to morality in the conduct of our foreign policy. Our decisions must be ordered by our convictions, never by our fears. This is the road to peace, not only in the Middle East, but everywhere in the world.

Adenauer in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my continuing concern with the stalemate in Berlin leads me to submit the following article for the RECORD under permission to extend remarks.

In this article, Columnist Walter Lippmann reiterates his personal views on why serious negotiations on Berlin should be held in the near future. Equally worthy of note, I think, are his estimates of the significance of the recent

meeting between President Eisenhower and Dr. Adenauer.

The article, which follows, is from the March 22 edition of the Washington Post:

ADENAUER IN WASHINGTON

(By Walter Lippmann)

After his talks with the President, Dr. Adenauer said in a speech before the National Press Club that one sentence in the official joint statement "contains the basis for the West's attitude towards Khrushchev's demands with regard to Berlin and it is therefore of decisive importance in the present situation." Dr. Adenauer asked us to read this sentence most carefully.

What does the sentence, which is of such decisive importance, say? It says that the President and the Chancellor "agreed that the preservation of the freedom of the people of West Berlin, and their right of self-determination, must underlie any future agreement affecting the city."

Any future agreement. If that sentence is as important as Dr. Adenauer says it is, the President and he are agreed that there may be a new settlement in Berlin, which protects its freedom and its right of self-determination. It means, moreover, that they can imagine an agreement on Berlin made before the reunification of Germany. It means, moreover, that they are not committed to insisting that the freedom and the right of self-determination of West Berlin can be protected only by the maintenance of the status quo.

If the spirit and the letter of the Eisenhower-Adenauer statement express the authentic considered view of the Chancellor, then he has been misrepresented in this country by his most ardent supporters. They have been telling us that there should be no negotiations about West Berlin, that any future agreement would be appeasement and a surrender to the Soviet Union. They have been insisting that the fate of the free world depends upon revoking the promise made at Camp David to negotiate about Berlin.

They have, it appears now from the official record, been more royalist than the king, more Adenauer than Adenauer himself.

What happened, quite evidently, is that the Chancellor failed to persuade the President to revoke his pledge to negotiate and having failed, he accepted the President's formula. This formula contains the gist of the matter which is that, provided it protects the freedom of West Berlin, we are prepared to explore and consider and, if possible, to negotiate a new settlement. This is all that the British Government and all that the American critics of Adenauer's rigidity, have ever wanted to do.

The President has refused to tie his hands and he has preserved intact his right to explore the problem of the future of Berlin. Will this mean that in admitting that there is a problem of Berlin and that he is prepared to discuss it with Khrushchev, he is weakening the Western position? It will look that way to some.

But on the whole, he will not, I believe, weaken the Western position and rather he will reinsure it for the future.

To be sure there will be some Germans in West Berlin and there will be people elsewhere who, having been taught to believe that any discussion of Berlin is appeasement, will be worried and frightened when Berlin is discussed. That will be too bad and they should be reassured. But the real question at the bottom of the argument is whether the Western position in Berlin will grow stronger if we postpone a negotiation or whether it will deteriorate.

Because I am convinced that time is not on our side in West Berlin, I believe we

should attempt now to negotiate a new settlement which protects the freedom of West Berlin. Mr. K. may refuse to agree to such a settlement. It would not surprise me at all. But our diplomatic position in Europe and in the rest of the world will be stronger if we have attempted to make it and if we have identified ourselves with a genuine attempt to reach an accommodation in Berlin.

There are two main reasons why I think the Western position in Berlin will not grow stronger. The first is that Eastern Germany is playing an increasingly important role in the upsurge of the Communist economy. It is significant, as Flora Lewis reported in the New York Times on Sunday, that the migration from West Germany to East Germany is now half as large as the migration the other way. That reflects the rising economic levels in Eastern Germany. The stronger the East German economy becomes, the more difficult and the more distance will be its integration with Western Germany.

The second reason for wishing to see a serious negotiation about Berlin in the near future is that it would be very desirable that a political settlement should bear the imprint of Adenauer and De Gaulle. What does the West gain, what do Germany and France gain, by putting off serious negotiations until after Adenauer and De Gaulle have departed?

Does anyone know what Germany will be like after Adenauer? Does anyone know what France will be like after De Gaulle? It does not seem to be wise and prudent to put off into the indefinite future the crucial problem of Germany.

Four Star Television Series of Films on the Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to be able to report that there is some constructive work underway in two areas which are the frequent targets of destructive criticism.

I have learned that Four Star Television, one of the largest and most reputable producers of television films, is working with the Department of State toward the production of a series on the work of the men and women of the Foreign Service.

The public image of the State Department has been distorted by a number of recent publications, notably a book called "The Ugly American." We would be foolish to maintain that in an organization so large, there are not persons unsuited to represent this country abroad; but it is my view that such people are the exceptions, rather than the rule. And I believe that most of our Ambassadors, consuls, and other diplomatic and technical attachés, do an onerous and important job, daily turning in a creditable performance, and occasionally a heroic one.

The television industry, too, has come in for a great deal of adverse publicity. Here again, I am unprepared to believe the the venal and fraudulent efforts of the few should be generalized to charac-

terize the many. There are producers to whom public service means more than a slogan, and whose taste earns them a place on my screen.

Therefore, a combination of the Department of State and a sincere producer can result in a series which raises the standards of the television medium, and portrays to the public a more accurate picture of the Foreign Service. I am confident that this producer will bring forth a series replete with appropriate dignity and information, and still one which is entertaining.

I should particularly like to commend Dick Powell, the head of Four Star for his vision in seeing the value in such a series; our good friend Sylvan M. Marshall, an outstanding Washington attorney, for his role in bringing the Department together with Mr. Powell; to John Scall, the foreign correspondent for the Associated Press, who will head up the creative writers; and to Assistant Secretary of State Andrew Berding, and his top aide, Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, for their cooperation.

Charles L. Lathero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last week Members of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress on both sides of the aisle were grieved to learn of the death of State Senate Librarian Charles L. Lathero, former resident of Altoona, Pa. Funeral services were held Saturday, March 19, at Camp Hill, Pa., where he had made his home with his devoted wife Cora, for the past several years.

Charlie Lathero was a close friend of mine for many years. He was the possessor of a pleasing personality that won him many warm friends in his years of service with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was said of him that he knew the mechanics of State government to such a degree that he was regarded as a "walking encyclopedia" when it came to answering questions concerning agencies of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. If Charlie did not have the answer you could rest assured that he would develop the information. This personal service he rendered to persons of all political faiths in a sincere and gracious manner. It was an outstanding characteristic of the type of service Charlie took delight in giving to those who sought his assistance.

The death of Charlie Lathero is a source of deep personal sorrow, and Mrs. Van Zandt and our son Jamie join me in expressing our profound sympathy to his wife, Cora, and other members of the family in the great loss they have sustained.

The following editorial by Mr. J. Edward Benney, city editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, appeared in the March 21

issue. It is an excellent tribute to the many fine qualities of Charlie Lathero who will be sorely missed by a large circle of friends and acquaintances who revere his memory and who are grateful for the opportunity of having known such an outstanding American and able public servant.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Mar. 21, 1960]

CHARLES L. LATHERO

Charles L. Lathero, Altoona native, who held the important post of State Senate Librarian at Harrisburg and who died last week after a prolonged illness, was a self-made man of the sort becoming increasingly rare.

His own native talents and energies, coupled with his qualities of mind and character, won him a State and National reputation in the realm of politics. His total service with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania covered a span of 27 years during which he weathered the changes in the political tides because of his ability to perform the job at hand.

Mr. Lathero became Senate Librarian in 1948 and his success in fulfilling this post won for him the unanimous endorsement on every occasion by all of the members of the State senate, regardless of their party affiliation. This was a genuine tribute to Charley Lathero's popularity and devotion to his responsibilities.

There is no partisanship in the mourning at his passing. He will long be remembered as a leader of skill and enormous personal charm. Blair Countians in particular have lost a good and true servant in the governmental affairs at Harrisburg.

What About National Defense, Neutrality, or Neglect of Duty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the general executive board of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO, Camden, N.J., together with an advertisement which appeared in the newspapers of Boston, New York, Baltimore, New Jersey, and Washington:

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE & SHIP-BUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO.
Camden, N.J., March 17, 1960.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of the House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: For 7 weeks now, Bethlehem Steel Co.'s eight Atlantic coast shipyards have been shut down by a strike of our union's members.

Our union's officers declined for 7½ months to sanction a strike, despite the almost unbearable provocations to which Bethlehem subjected our members. We took this position not only because of the hardship a strike would impose on our members, but in large measure, also because of the disastrous effect a strike in Bethlehem's shipyards would have on our country's defense program. These yards are building and converting for the Navy critically needed nuclear-powered and missile-carrying vessels.

During the 7½ months before we finally sanctioned a strike, we pleaded with the chairmen of congressional committees concerned with national defense, we pleaded with the Departments of Defense and of the Navy, we pleaded with everyone in Government who would give ear, to prevent the serious injury to our national defense that Bethlehem's irrational and stubborn course of conduct would make inevitable. Our pleas fell on deaf ears.

The enclosed advertisement, which appeared in the newspapers of Boston, New York, Baltimore, New Jersey, and Washington did cause the Navy Department at long last to bestir itself, in the sixth week of the strike, to prevail on Bethlehem to promise to resume negotiations with our union and to negotiate in good faith.

But on March 14, when negotiations were to be resumed Bethlehem found new excuses for refusing to negotiate and to attempt to settle the strike. Whether the Departments of the Navy and of Defense are reluctant, or feel it to be inexpedient to exercise the powers at their command to prevent Bethlehem from continuing to inflict serious damage upon our country's security and its defense program we do not know. We do know, however, that it is quite clear that Bethlehem has thus far been given no reason to feel that it must do what the country's best interests demand.

We believe that inquiry by you in the proper quarters, and your encouragement of appropriate action, will be materially helpful in bringing to an end this disgraceful attack upon our national defense by Bethlehem Steel Co.

Fraternally yours,

JOHN J. GROGAN,
President.
ANDREW A. PETTIS,
Vice President.
ROSS D. BLOOD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WHAT ABOUT NATIONAL DEFENSE, NEUTRALITY, OR NEGLECT OF DUTY?

Four months ago, Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates told the Nation that one of the chief factors that made the steel strike a national emergency was that the shortage of steel and steel parts threatened to curtail the Navy's shipbuilding program.

The U.S. Supreme Court was so impressed by Secretary Gates' statement that it stopped the steel strike.

President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon were so concerned about the imminent danger that they intervened to settle the steel dispute even after the strikers had returned to work.

Today we have steel, but eight of the country's major shipyards have been closed for 4 weeks.

Work on atomic-powered vessels and missile-carrying ships in these yards is at a standstill.

A nation threatened by saber-rattling enemies, with its very survival at stake, is entitled to know why.

There are two reasons:

1. For 7½ months, Bethlehem Steel Co., the owner of the closed shipyards, has refused to bargain in good faith with the employees' union for a new contract. During these months Bethlehem has lowered wage payments to these loyal American workmen; it has deprived them of seniority rights and has taken from them working conditions they had enjoyed for 20 years. For 7½ months the men refused to be provoked into a strike. Finally, they could not take it any longer—in defense of their self-respect, of their patriotism, of their human dignity, they struck.

The superior court of the State of Massachusetts, in a written review of the shipbuilders strike, said: "We find * * * that

the company was not making every reasonable effort in good faith to settle the dispute. . . . While the parties [Bethlehem Steel and the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America] have conferred with governmental mediators, the company's position remains unchanged and it refuses to change any provision of [its] proposals. . . . Throughout this period of time, the company refused to make any concessions with respect to its [Bethlehem's] proposal. . . .

2. Mr. Gates' Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy knew that if Bethlehem persisted in its unrealistic attitude towards labor, a strike would be inevitable. They also knew that the U.S. Government, which they represented, was Bethlehem's best customer. Since the end of World War II, the United States Navy has given Bethlehem more than a half billion dollars in contracts without any competitive bidding. Surely, Mr. Gates and the Navy knew that businessmen are usually eager to please a good customer. Yet neither the Department of Defense, nor the Navy, took a single step to prevent Bethlehem from pursuing policies which created the crisis into which our naval defense has been plunged.

The Navy Department calls the situation a labor dispute and adopts a policy of neutrality.

We, as representatives of Bethlehem's shipyard workers, submit that there can be no neutrality when a Government contractor's greed and irresponsibility stop work on vital defense contracts.

We submit that there can be no neutrality when 18,000 men and their families are forced to suffer privations through no fault of their own.

We further submit that if the steel strike posed such a threat to our naval defense that President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon forced a settlement, they and Secretary Gates should certainly intervene in the shipyard situation.

We are certain that if our Nation's leaders demand that Bethlehem make an honest and realistic effort to settle the shipbuilding strike, it will only be a matter of hours until Bethlehem does so.

JOHN J. GROGAN,

President, International Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time; *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

A World in Debt to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated at the Israel 12th anniversary dinner, sponsored by the Charleston Committee for State of Israel Bonds, Sunday, March 20, 1960, in our capital city of West Virginia.

My fellow citizens afforded me the pleasurable opportunity to extend greetings on a program in which I preceded that veteran minstrel who mixes wit with wisdom, George Jessel, the "Toastmaster General of the United States," who delivered a meaningful address.

After Cantor Paul Reiss opened the program with the singing of "Hatikvah" and "The Star Spangled Banner," Rabbi Samuel Volkman of Charleston's Virginia Street Temple offered the challenging invocation.

Fred Marks, general chairman of the Committee for State of Israel Bonds, delivered a warm welcome and was followed by Mrs. Benjamin Newman, chairman of the committee's women's division, who spoke helpfully. The Governor of West Virginia's greetings for the State government were presented by his assistant, Charles Straughan. Mayor John Shanklin responded with greetings on behalf of the city of Charleston.

Dr. I. E. Buff, West Virginia State chairman for the 1960 Israel bond campaign, and Mrs. Buff, who serves with Dr. Willard Pushkin as honorary chairmen of the campaign, were most thoughtful and generous as my host and hostess at this impressive event.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the invocation offered by Rabbi Volkman, extracts from Sol Padlibsky's news story of the dinner meeting in the Charleston Daily Mail, Monday, March 21, 1960, and extracts from my remarks on the subject, "A World in Debt to Israel."

There being no objection, the invocation, news story, and Senator RANDOLPH's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION OFFERED BY RABBI SAMUEL VOLKMAN, VIRGINIA STREET TEMPLE, CHARLESTON, W. VA., ISRAEL 12TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER, CHARLESTON, SUNDAY, MARCH 20, 1960

Dear God, we thank Thee for the privilege of living in this period when we witness the might of Thy hand, sovereign amid the flux of world events.

And for signs and wonders manifest in the restoration of a remnant of our people to the land of our forefathers.

For the healing of the wornout hills which exult in their new-found raiment of verdure.

And for the revival of an age-old people now learning to sing a new song of hope and faith in the future. Grant, dear God, that we may share in the pride and the glory of their accomplishments; that the heirs of tomorrow may include us in their prayers of thanksgiving.

Bless this occasion. Bless all words spoken here that they may enhance, ennoble, and strengthen the purpose for which we have come.

We thank Thee for the bread we are about to eat and say altogether:

Boruch Attah, Adonoi Eloheinu Melech Ha-Olom Ha-Metzle Lechem Min Ha-Aretz.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Mar. 21, 1960]

(By Sol Padlibsky)

George Jessel, "the toastmaster general of the United States," spurred the sale of \$85,500 worth of State of Israel bonds last night at a sellout banquet at the Daniel Boone Hotel.

A sizable amount of the bonds was purchased by non-Jews at the affair sponsored by the Charleston Committee of the Israel Bond Campaign, of which Fred Marks, the master of ceremonies at the banquet, is chairman.

Jessel regaled the diners with his accounts of first meetings with reception committee people in his tour across the United States in his Israel bond campaign. He sprinkled Yiddish words, which lose something in translation, in his remarks.

He told the diners that he didn't have a religious background, and that when he was 8 years old he was alone with his mother on the East Side of New York after the death of his father.

RELIGION IMPORTANT

"I have been in the show business for more than a half century," said Jessel. "A few years ago I realized that it was important to me that I manifest the meaning of living a religious Jewish life."

"The work I am doing in the interest of the State of Israel formerly was undertaken by my good friend, Eddie Cantor. That was about 10 years ago. Cantor suffered a heart ailment, and I pledged to myself that I would carry on Eddie's great work for Israel."

"I have spoken in 110 cities across the Nation in 121 days, and each day has meant increasing gratification of a program that must continue to keep the sacrifices of the Israel pioneers always in our memories."

(Jessel has been honored by Israel's Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, in Jerusalem for "unselfish and devoted aid to the State of Israel." Last year, at a dinner in Hollywood, celebrities participated in a "salute to George Jessel" in behalf of Israel bonds. The dinner, which paid tribute to Jessel's 50th anniversary in show business, resulted in the sale of more than \$1,500,000 of Israel bonds.)

U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, a guest, characterized the rise of Israel as "one of the greatest achievements in the history of mankind."

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, 12TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL DINNER BY CHARLESTON AND SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA BOND COMMITTEES, DANIEL BOONE HOTEL, CHARLESTON, W. VA., MARCH 20, 1960

A WORLD IN DEBT TO ISRAEL

We are here to celebrate the 12th anniversary of the final fulfillment of the words of the prophets and the reward of 2,000 years of Jewish longing and aspirations. We are here also to contribute to the perpetuity and the strength of the State of Israel which presents this fulfillment, and more specifically, to the amelioration of circumstances for some 350,000 Jewish refugees in Israel who remain virtually homeless and unabsorbed. And despite the 12 amazing years of growth and development since the recognition of Israel, the path ahead is still marked with danger signs and strewn with obstacles.

War clouds gather in the Middle East. Reinforcements are again posted on the frontiers of Syria and Jordan. The Suez Canal is still blocked to the ships of Israel. And a fanatic's well-placed bullet in any of the capitals of the Middle East could easily plunge that area into war. Thus, it behooves us each—of whatever religious faith—to examine the nature and reason for our commitment to Israel.

As Americans and as participants in the great enterprise of Western civilization we are committed—within certain limitations—to the support of Israel. Our obligations are both moral and political.

First, we are politically involved in the support of an independent and peaceful development of Israel, because of our part in the United Nations partition of Palestine out of which the State of Israel emerged. This was further sealed by President Truman's immediate recognition of Israel on May 14, 1948, only a few hours after the final withdrawal of the British forces.

But American political support of Israel is not solely a matter of our keeping trust with past resolutions to serve Israeli interests. We have strong and compelling reasons of our own self-interest in our desire to see Israel prosper and flourish in peace. As a cultural enclave of the West, it offers our best hope for the development of democracy in a section of this earth torn for centuries by oriental despotism, intrigue, and tribal rivalries.

And despite the current and continuing tension between Israel and the neighboring Arab states, support of Israel represents the best hope for political stability and orderly progress in the Middle East, hence, our strongest defense against measures of desperation taken by some Arab leaders with their attendant infiltration of Soviet influence. Even though the Communist planners have made some costly blunders in the Middle East, the Red capacity for making mischief is unlimited, and the Russian interest in the stability of that area is far less immediate than that of the Western Powers.

Stated in its bluntest terms, as long as the Middle East is a battleground of the cold war, Russian interests are served by instability and by pitting Israel and the Arab nations against one another, while we must seek to maintain political stability and develop friendship with the Arab nations with-

out sacrificing the legitimate claims of the Israelis.

But more binding than any of these is the moral debt we owe to Jewish culture and tradition for having first awakened the moral consciousness of Western man. In the history of Western civilization perhaps the first truly civilized answer to the question of what each of us owes to his fellow man solely for the sake of man's humanity to man is given by the writer of Leviticus: "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus 19:34).

The intellectual and spiritual contributions of Judaism were the source of the early nourishment of that which is most precious in Western civilization—the idea of the dignity and integrity of the individual, expressed in the despairing cry of Job that "I will not sacrifice my integrity," even in the face of an omnipotent God—the idea of social justice, served in varied ways and by such diverse personalities as Moses, Spinoza and Karl Marx—and the belief in the brotherhood of all men as the children of one Creator—these values lie at the heart of Western civilization and were the source of much of Christianity and Mohammedanism.

Also, as members of Western civilization and as brothers of the human race we are morally obligated to the cause of a Jewish national homeland as insurance against the persecution and oppression which has marked the life of the Jew in Diaspora. Spinoza, gentle and noble among our great philosophers, wrote that "A free man thinks of nothing less than of death; and his wisdom is a meditation not of death, but of life."

Thus he set forth the text of Israel. For certainly no people has offered its martyrs as bravely and in such numbers as the Jew. The Christian martyrs of the Roman Empire are numbered in the thousands. The Jews cannot name or number their martyred millions in the world of Christendom, culminating—to the eternal shame of all men—in the ghastly and inhuman crematoria of Hitler's making.

There has been a further difference between the lot of the Christian martyr and that of the Jew. The Christian died secure in his faith in the reward of an immediate afterlife. The Jews received no halo and no promise of reward; and though the idea of an afterlife acquired some popularity after the dispersion, it has never been the article of faith, the flaming conviction for the Jew that it is for the Christian. If Jewish martyrdom had meaning it was related to the continuity of Judaism and the hope of the ultimate rebirth of a Jewish national homeland. In the moving words of the ancient lament, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." For this compelling reason, the free nations of the West—which call themselves Christian—must help justify the nameless martyred millions of Jews.

But there is a further debt of Western World to the Jew. Here I speak of the astounding intellectual and cultural contribution Jews have given to our civilization. Not only did the Jewish people give the Western World their own Book in the Old Testament, but it was the Alexandrian Jews who translated the Book of Law, the Pentateuch, into Greek.

It was these Jews and succeeding generations who kept alive the knowledge of classical Greek during the early Middle Ages when the light of learning had been virtually extinguished in Europe. And it was in large part through Jewish philosophers in the service of Moslem courts that classical

learning was reborn in Europe, thus laying the foundation for the Renaissance.

This Jewish devotion to intellectual achievement—so strong as to have been thought by many Jews and non-Jews as a hereditary trait—has placed the civilized world in lasting debt. Negligible as a political power in the world at large, and representing less than 1 percent of the world population before World War II, the Jewish people have supplied a leadership far out of proportion to their numbers in every field of human arts and sciences. And though this has been a contribution of individuals rather than of a group, it has been in large part the result of mobilizing the individual's resources in response to the oppression of the group. This capacity perhaps more than any other has been responsible for keeping the Jew alive as a cultural and national identity through 2,000 years of the dispersion.

In this sense, the oppression of the Jewish people may well have been a stimulus to the creativity of individual Jews. But whatever the source, the modern world would be far poorer but for the artistic and scientific contributions of Jews. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to remark that of the four men who have framed the problems of our century, three were Jews. I refer to Charles Darwin—the only gentile of the four—Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Albert Einstein.

Whatever one may think of the conclusions they reached, the works of these four men opened new ways of thinking for mankind and gave a distinctive stamp to the modern world.

One may only speculate on the direction that Jewish creativity will take in the homeland of the State of Israel, though one may safely guess that the amazing Jewish resourcefulness and energy will remain. The brief history of the State of Israel is already filled with the pages of gallantry and courageous self-sacrifice.

Federal Aid Is Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat, March 20, 1960:

FEDERAL AID IS EXPENSIVE

Everybody ought to know by now that there are no pockets in Uncle Sam's Santa Claus suit. Every dollar he spends is dredged out of the citizens' pockets.

We like to think that Federal aid is easy money. But it's our own money that we had to earn, and forking it over to Uncle Sam's collectors, then getting it back again, is a mighty expensive process.

It takes a host of officials, drawing salaries in acres of offices, and traveling hither and thither, to handle all the bookkeeping, accounting, and redtape involved in reaping the tax money and paying it out.

It's a whale of a big business. Virginia's Senator HARRY F. BYRD lists 60 grant-in-aid programs to the States and local government units in 1959. By way of contrast, there were less than a half-dozen such programs in 1933.

The 60 operating in 1959 ranged through help to education, highway building, health activities, assistance and welfare grants,

housing and home financing, and a "scatteration" under other heads. Not included are the larger farm aid programs or the retirement plans financed by "deducts" from wages, salaries, and employers, or the big housing subsidies.

And the 60 programs paid out, in 1959, about \$6.4 billion. Another \$3.1 billion went to individuals, under some 30 programs. It sounds pleasant and generous.

But to get that money from Washington, the Nation had to pay a much larger sum in taxes. For, Senator BYRD finds, it costs Uncle Sam about 20 percent in salaries and other expenses to operate these programs.

Many of them are necessary, some vitally so. Most serve good purposes. But many could be operated more economically by people in their own States and communities.

Yet it's unlikely that the number will be reduced. It's more apt to increase. There should be a firm stand against any more. The traffic cost on the taxes paid and getting them back is too high. And it builds a national power which shrinks State and individual rights as it grows.

The Case for the Wilderness Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, on February 23 I inserted in the Record a statement on the wilderness bill written by a former colleague of mine at the University of Wyoming, Prof. Burton W. Marston. Mr. Marston, a lifelong sportsman and outdoorsman, stated very well the case for some kind of constructive wilderness legislation. Mr. Marston is currently president of the Traveler Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of which I am also a member.

It has come to my attention since that a second installment of his discussion of the wilderness bill appeared subsequently in the Laramie Boomerang. I now have a copy of this later supplement and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record. So that those interested in keeping these two excellent tracts by Mr. Marston together, they should know that the first installment appeared in the Record on February 23, page A1450.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang, Feb. 7, 1960]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—THE CASE FOR THE WILDERNESS AREAS

Since the introduction of the original wilderness bill in the Senate, this proposed legislation has been the subject of all kinds of speculation and strange conjecture. This continues among the opponents even though amendments have been written into the bill to meet many of the objections made. Many of the opponents' statements seem to bear little relationship to the actual language and purpose of the pending legislation. Supporters of this legislation are being accused of being motivated by selfish interests. All sorts of dire consequences are forecast

by these opponents should this legislation be enacted.

Our good friends, the stockmen, seem determined to make out that all grazing privileges now enjoyed by them in the present wilderness area of the national forests will be withdrawn, or that, with grazing permitted, numerous additional regulations will be set up to hamper them in the grazing use. A study of the bill should show anyone clearly that this action would be impossible. Besides, public opinion, often a powerful factor affecting public administration, will undoubtedly continue to act as a balance wheel to departmental supervision, as it always has in the past.

Among other objections to this type of legislation are the following: It would destroy the principle of multiple use (a term which has undergone much distortion in its meaning and application) now enjoyed by the public in such wilderness areas; only a privileged few would have access to and use of these areas; the bill is unnecessary, since the Forest Service, Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service are already doing a good job in administering these areas; it locks up untold resources that are needed for economic reasons; it would add vast acreages to lands now set aside for preservation; it would create a new danger to families and individuals who might become lost or stranded in these areas; and, no action should be taken on this legislation until after the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has given the report of its study, due late in 1961.

To all these objections the proponents of this legislation feel there are logical and obvious answers which definitely negate the objections. Many of the answers are contained in the bill itself and have already been given wide publicity. Actually the wilderness proposal is not very new; its enactment would change little, at least for some time to come. These areas are already closed to commercial exploitation—as in the national forests, the national parks, and wildlife refuges—but largely by Executive order or regulation rather than by law. One is prompted to note that we have had such areas in Wyoming, large ones, for many years, and nothing dire has yet happened to the State or to any of its residents as a result.

In spite of the persistent opposition, it is evident that the idea of preserving the wilderness areas seems to meet with general approval. Even many of the opponents have publicly stated they are for wildernesses. However, when it comes to proper organization of Government control of the Federal lands and the particular use or restriction of use that is involved, wide disagreement seems to prevail. No one group wants to sacrifice a present use or have it restricted in any way in order that a true wilderness area may be made possible. This is true in spite of the fact that many of the present uses of wilderness areas complement each other and can be followed at the same time.

That there is widespread support of this legislation was brought out in the various congressional hearings that have been held, in the number of bills that have been introduced in both Houses of Congress, in the support of the present measure in the Senate by several large national organizations. To name a few—the Wilderness Society of America, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and many others.

In urging that these wilderness areas be handed down to coming generations protected by law and not by mere administrative order (as at present), proponents of this legislation feel there is much more involved than mere legislative detail. The natural heritage of lofty mountains, rugged landscape, and untouched nature is a soul-

healing inspiration to any and all who view them or become associated with them in any manner. They represent a treasure beyond price to the mental and physical well-being of increasing millions of Americans in years to come, especially to those who are willing to put forth a little health-giving exercise and effort to enjoy the beauty and solitude these areas can provide. In addition to wilderness enjoyment these areas do, of course, provide vast water storage, forage, wildlife, and scientific values such as soil, wildlife and watershed research.

Proponents of the legislation believe that the areas we now have left should be protected and maintained; that we guarantee their future as wilderness. Otherwise, the population pressures being what they are, we may expect to see a Coney-Island type of use abounding in many of these areas in the not too distant future. This could involve four-lane highways encircling our highest peaks and penetrating the present areas of solitude, with all sorts of commercial exploitation established. It could happen.

Under the regulations we now have, as far as wilderness and primitive wild areas are concerned, it is a generally recognized fact that the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service have done a magnificent job of maintenance. In this connection it is interesting to recall that for many years the Forest Service was the whipping boy of the grazing interests, who contended against the so-called high grazing fees imposed by the Service, while the farm organizations of the Middle West deplored the so-called cheap grazing lands available to the western stockmen on the reserves.

The thing with which we are concerned is this: We have no guarantee, under the present form of administration, that in future years some of these policies of the Forest Service could not well be changed, and for the worse. We have seen a great many changes come about through political pressures and various other developments that have changed the status of our public lands and other lands of the country.

Action now to protect and preserve a reasonable portion of these valuable wilderness areas may well prove a most beneficial endowment for the future of this region. A letter from supporters of the wilderness preservation idea to your Congressmen may help to bring favorable action on this legislation soon.

BURTON W. MARSTON.

Export-Import Bank Makes 100th Loan Under Cooley Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the Export-Import Bank announced that it had made its 100th loan to private business firms abroad under the provisions of section 104(e) of Public Law 480, the so-called Cooley amendment.

This provision was added to the law in 1957. It provides that up to 25 percent of the foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus commodities under title I of Public Law 480 shall be made available through the Export-Import Bank for loans to private industry in the countries from which the currencies

originate. Loans are available to U.S. firms, their branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates for the purpose of business development or trade expansion, or to host country firms having no U.S. affiliation for purposes which will expand the market abroad for U.S. agricultural commodities. This has turned out to be one of the most popular and constructive uses of the currencies received in our surplus disposal program.

I am including for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, a letter I have just received from Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, president of the Export-Import Bank, commenting on the current status of this program, and attachments showing in detail the loans which have been made since last November 20 and the status of funds under this program.

As an example of the beneficial use to which this money is being put, I would call the attention of Members to the list of loans which have been made during the past few months and to the fact that four of them have gone for the expansion or construction of pharmaceutical manufacturing plants in parts of the world where modern medicines are in scarce supply and great demand. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can continue to use the foreign currencies accruing to us under this program in this beneficial manner.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1960.
The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: The enclosed statement, which will be released on March 21 announcing the 100th credit authorized under the section 104(e) loan program, will, we believe, be of interest to you. Additional authorized credits, which will be announced later in the month, will bring the total to 105 for the equivalent of about \$62.3 million.

Several major credits in Indian rupees have been announced in recent weeks. In fact the Bank has now committed more funds in Indian rupees than in any other currency. We believe that the program in India is now well underway. Our representative in that country is very much encouraged about the interest that is being shown in the availability of these funds.

We have been less successful in finding good borrowers for the currencies of certain other countries including the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, Ceylon, Taiwan, and Korea. One of our directors, Mr. George Blowers, will visit the U.A.R. in a few weeks, and two staff members who have specialized in work on 104(e) loans will leave in a few days on a trip that will take them to Pakistan, Ceylon, Taiwan, and Korea. We anticipate that these visits will be of material assistance in developing potential applications.

We now have about 200 active applications for the equivalent of \$149 million. Sixty-nine of these applications are for Argentine pesos and French francs, which are not available at this time. There has been no change since we last wrote you concerning the status of the Argentine sales agreement. It is our understanding that very little has been deposited under this agreement and that the period in which shipments were to occur has elapsed. Similarly, we have no immediate expectation of receiving French francs because of the failure of the French to buy the cotton which constituted the principal element in the sales program. However, in neither cases is the situation clear enough to permit us to

remove these applications from our active list.

If the Argentine and French applications are not counted, there remain about 130 applications for the equivalent of \$77 million, and we have available to us at this time uncommitted funds equivalent to \$108 million. Most of these applications are for Israeli

pounds, Peruvian soles, Colombian pesos, and Indian rupees. Of these currencies, only the pounds and rupees are available at this time, although sales agreements with Peru and Colombia have been announced which are expected to generate currencies of those countries for 104(e) loans.

There is attached a list of the credits

authorized since we last wrote you on November 24, 1959, as well as a table which shows the provision made for 104(e) loans under the commodity sales agreements announced since that date.

Very sincerely,

SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
President.

TABLE I.—Sec. 104(e) credits authorized Nov. 20, 1959, to Mar. 17, 1960

Country	Borrower	U.S. affiliate	Amount in thousands of dollar equivalent	Purpose
Ceylon	Pfizer-Dumex, Ltd.	Chas. Pfizer & Co., New York	422	Working capital and construction of a warehouse and showroom for a pharmaceutical plant.
China (Taiwan)	Lien Chen Automotive Co., Ltd.	Federal Eastern Corp., Delaware	126	Facilities for the repair and sales of automobiles.
India	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of India Private, Ltd.	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Ohio	4,744	Facilities for the manufacture of rubber tires, tubes, and related materials.
	Synthetic & Chemicals, Ltd.	Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Ohio	8,274	Facilities for the manufacture of synthetic rubber.
	Hindustan Aluminum Corp., Ltd.	Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., California	2,110	Construction of an aluminum reduction plant.
	Mysore Cements, Ltd.	Kaiser Industries Corp., California	1,160	Construction of a cement plant.
	Merck, Sharp & Dohme of India Private, Ltd.	Merck & Co., New York	1,053	Construction of a pharmaceutical plant.
Israel	Rastrom, Ltd.	Rassec Financial Corp., New York	111	Facilities for the manufacture of concrete building materials.
	Silos & Warehouses Co., Ltd.	None (expand the market for U.S. grains)	125	Construction of grain storage facilities.
	Ameor, Ltd.	Phileo Corp., Pennsylvania	656	Facilities for the manufacture of household refrigerators.
	Haifa Silo, Ltd.	None (expand the market for U.S. grain)	275	Construction of grain storage facilities.
	Palestine Milling & Trading Co., Ltd.	do.	56	Do.
Italy	Abbott Laboratories de Italia, S.R.L.	Abbott Laboratories, Illinois	886	Construction of a pharmaceutical plant.
Korea	Chon Nam Spinning Co., Ltd.	None (uses U.S. cotton)	308	Installation of equipment and working capital for a cotton textile mill.
Pakistan	Abbott Laboratories (Pakistan), Ltd.	Abbott Laboratories, Illinois	423	Construction of a pharmaceutical plant.
Turkey	Williams Bros. Co.	U.S. firm, Tulsa, Okla.	333	Working capital.
	Minneapolis-Moline Turk Traktor ve Ziraat Makineleri, A.S.	Minneapolis-Moline Co., Minnesota	778	Working capital for manufacture of agricultural and roadbuilding equipment.
Uruguay	TEM, S.A.	Hoover Co., Ohio	238	Facilities for the manufacture of electrical household appliances.
	General Electric, S.A.	General Electric Co., New York	534	Do.
	Sudamtex de Uruguay, S.A.	United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., New York	246	Working capital for the manufacture of textile products.
Total			23,062	

¹ Increase in credit previously authorized.

² \$267,000 immediately and the remainder contingent upon the collection of sales proceeds.

TABLE II.—Public Law 480 commodity sales agreements and supplements, Nov. 20, 1959, to Mar. 17, 1960

(In millions of dollars)

Country	Date signed	Market value of sales agreement	Provision for sec. 104(u) loans	
			Dollar equivalent	Per cent of sales proceeds
India (supplement)	1959 Nov. 23	\$18.5	\$0.9	5
Uruguay (supplement)	Dec. 1	20.8	5.2	25
Turkey	Dec. 22	35.0	5.3	15
	1960			
Greece	Jan. 7	6.3	.9	15
Israel	do.	30.2	6.0	20
Uruguay (supplement)	Jan. 13	6.0	1.5	25
Pakistan (supplement)	Jan. 28	26.0	2.6	10
China (supplement)	Feb. 11	6.0		
Poland (supplement)	do.	41.5		
Peru	Feb. 12	12.0	3.0	25
Vietnam (supplement)	Feb. 13	1.3	.3	25
Total		203.6	25.7	

¹ Emergency purchase of wheat.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington today announced its 100th foreign currency credit to private concerns abroad. A textile firm, Sudamtex de Uruguay, S.A., of Montevideo, a subsidiary of United Merchants and Manufacturers, Inc., whose main offices are

in New York, will receive 3 million Uruguayan pesos (the equivalent of \$300,000). All Eximbank foreign currency loans are made under section 104(e), the Cooley amendment to Public Law 480 which is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Eximbank President Samuel C. Waugh said that Sudamtex is a leading private facility in Uruguay, and that it operates an integrated textile mill in the city of Colonia. Funds loaned by the Bank will provide working capital to assist in financing expansions in the manufacture and distribution of cotton textile products in Uruguay. It was also stated that the 3-million-peso loan would be increased to 5 million as additional Public Law 480 money is available. The credit is repayable over a 4-year period beginning in 1961.

In reviewing what he termed a successful program for foreign currency lending, Mr. Waugh pointed out that subject loan to Uruguay brings the value of loans authorized to the equivalent of \$57.2 million in 16 countries.

The first credits under this program were authorized in June 1958. Of the 100 loans, 91 have been to U.S. firms, their branches, subsidiaries or affiliates for the purpose of business development or trade expansion, while 9 loans have been made to "host-country" firms having no U.S. affiliation for purposes which will expand the market abroad for U.S. wheat, barley, feed grains, hops, and cotton.

The loans have helped finance the foreign currency costs of a wide variety of industrial and commercial activities, including the manufacture of chemical and pharmaceutical products, cement and cement prod-

ucts, paper, rubber and rubber products, animal feed, malt, textiles and clothing, electrical appliances and equipment, automotive parts, agricultural and industrial machinery and various products of refractory clay, steel, aluminum, wood and plastic. Nonmanufacturing activities have included petroleum storage and distribution, grain storage, retail merchandising, automotive parts repair, and a hotel.

Most of the loans have been of comparatively modest size, ranging from the equivalent of \$100,000 to \$500,000. Only 14 loans have been for the equivalent of \$1 million or more. The two largest have been to the Indian affiliates of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., both of Akron, Ohio. The credit to the Firestone affiliate is for the equivalent in Indian rupees of \$8.3 million for a synthetic rubber plant. The credit to the Goodyear affiliate is for \$4.7 million for a factory to produce rubber tires, tubes and related products.

An important use of the foreign currency loans is to help finance the local costs of projects, the foreign exchange costs of which the Bank finances with its dollar loans. Such complementary loans of \$840,000 and 12 million soles were made for a caustic soda plant in Peru. Combined loans of \$13,600,000 and 10 million rupees will help finance an aluminum reduction plant in India.

Substantial funds continue to be available in most of the currencies for which the Bank is now accepting applications. The following table shows the estimated amounts potentially and presently available after deducting credits authorized to date.

[In millions]

Country	Currency	Maximum potentially available	Probably available now
Ceylon	Rupee	22.0	5.9
China (Taiwan)	New Taiwan dollar	152.3	124.9
Colombia	Peso	40.0	
Ecuador	Sucre	4.5	4.5
Finland	Markka	318.3	190.8
Greece	Drachma	74.8	46.3
Iceland	Krona	19.4	17.2
India	Rupee	366.1	250.8
Indonesia	Rupiah	556.8	107.3
Israel	Pound	22.8	10.8
Korea	Hwan	700.0	700.0
Pakistan	Rupee	139.6	100.7
Peru	Sol	88.8	.9
Philippines	Peso	1.9	1.9
Turkey	Lira	109.7	62.3
United Arab Republic:			
Egypt	Pound	11.5	5.7
Syria	do.	8.6	
Uruguay	Peso	43.0	
Vietnam	Piastre	104.8	51.4

Applications may be submitted either directly to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C., or to the U.S. Embassy in the country concerned. A detailed statement of the information required of applicants may be obtained from the Eximbank upon request.

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 17 marked the anniversary of the surfacing of the nuclear submarine *Skate* through the Arctic ice. It seems to me appropriate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to the late Hubert Wilkins, whose contribution to this achievement was enormous.

One of my constituents, Mr. A. J. Marino, of Weehawken, N.J., has made a study of the life and work of Sir Hubert, and I am indebted to him for the following summary.

Although Hubert Wilkins was an Australian, he worked and lived for many years in the United States. He died on December 1, 1958, at the age of 70, still working to advance our military strength by his work with the Army laboratories at Natick, Mass.

When he took a small plane from Alaska to Spitzbergen, Norway, in 1928, he was the first man to fly across the Arctic. Among the many decorations he received at this time was a knighthood conferred upon him by the King of England.

In 1931 he outfitted an obsolete submarine loaned to him by the U.S. Navy and made the voyage to the Arctic Sea, sailing under polar ice. His adventures were described in his book, "Under the North Pole," published in that year.

Of the many tributes paid Sir Hubert, certainly the most dramatic took place on March 17, 1959. On that date the submarine *Skate* broke through the ice and surfaced at the North Pole. Services were conducted for Sir Hubert, and his

ashes were thrown to the winds as a final honor to a great explorer and scientist.

Sir Hubert's achievements are described in some detail in an "In Memoriam" prepared by the Office of the U.S. Quartermaster General. I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps, I wish to pay homage to Sir Hubert Wilkins, renowned arctic explorer and authority on polar regions and deserts. From 1942 until the time of his passing in 1958, he rendered outstanding services as environment specialist and consultant to the Quartermasters General.

Sir Hubert dedicated his time, talents, and remarkable fortitude to fulfilling one of the most important missions of the Quartermaster Corps, that of protecting the soldier against environmental hazards.

Typical of his breadth of interest, physical stamina, and devotion to duty, Sir Hubert voluntarily participated in the rigors of military maneuvers in the Arctic, Tropics, and major deserts of the world. In this manner, he experienced firsthand the effects of environmental stresses upon the soldier and his equipment.

Sir Hubert Wilkins made invaluable recommendations and personally devised techniques which greatly enhanced the Army's research and development program, including: functional garments, oversnow equipment, and personnel shelters to protect against the hazards of the Arctic and Antarctic; specialized footwear and handwear to prevent injuries caused by extreme cold; sleeping bags to allow soldiers to rest and regain functional efficiency; nutritional combat rations capable of preparation under extreme conditions; a face mask to protect against the bitter arctic winds; protective clothing for fighting crash fires; color shades and camouflage techniques to conceal soldiers in arctic, desert, and tropical environments; and attitude training to eliminate the soldier's fear of the unknown by instilling confidence in overcoming environmental hazards through the establishment of good living habits and the proper utilization of clothing and equipment.

The contributions of Sir Hubert Wilkins to the welfare and effectiveness of the U.S. serviceman in peace and war are beyond measure. His advice and guidance, based upon his vast experience, are reflected in countless improvements in rations, clothing, and other quartermaster supplies and equipment provided our Armed Forces. The successful operations of our military forces in any geographical area of the world, today and for the years to come, will constitute a living monument to his memory.

A. T. McNAMARA,
Major General, U.S. Army,
The Quartermaster General.

Proposed Jane Addams Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the

birth of a famous American woman, a fellow Illinoisan, Jane Addams.

I am proposing the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp marking the century which has gone into history since we Americans were first privileged to have this devoted woman among us.

Many remember Jane Addams as a social worker probably well in advance of her time. Others perhaps have lost sight of the fact that she also was an ardent advocate of peace.

Native of Cedarville, Ill., she was a graduate of Rockford and with Ellen Gates Starr she opened the social settlement of Hull House in Chicago in 1889, continuing as its resident head until 1935.

She became the acknowledged leader of settlement work in the entire United States and in 1919 she was chosen president of the International Congress of Women, presiding at conventions at The Hague from 1915 to 1922 and in other conventions at Zurich, Vienna, and Washington.

With Nicholas Murray Butler in 1931 Miss Addams shared the Nobel Peace Prize. She was author of "Democracy and Social Ethics," "Twenty Years at Hull House," "A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil," and "The Second Twenty Years at Hull House."

Her memory lives in the hearts and minds of many Americans today and through the issuance of hundreds of millions of postage stamps will be brought to graphic attention of the present generation.

A Reasonable Measure on Campaign Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, many of our leading newspapers have long led the struggle for modernization and revision of our election laws. Their contribution in informing the people as to the issue before the Senate last January was quite helpful in the passage of a good clean elections bill. The Louisville Courier Journal, one of our Nation's outstanding newspapers, has for many years been in the forefront. They are continuing their efforts on behalf of the clean elections bill, and I ask unanimous consent that two editorials which have appeared in the Courier Journal respecting the clean elections bill, since its passage in the Senate, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 1, 1960]

A REASONABLE MEASURE ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Congratulations to Senator HENNINGS of Missouri and those of his colleagues who have refused to abandon hope that Congress

can establish some sort of effective control and accounting of expenditures in Federal elections. Legislation to this end has been approved in the upper House by 59 votes to 22.

The Senate bill is especially noteworthy in that it would apply to primaries as well as general elections, and would also embrace committees set up to support individual candidacies.

As Mr. HENNINGS pointed out, primaries are, in practical effect, the only real elections held in about a third of the States. When the winner of a senatorial primary, for example, is assured of a seat in the Senate, he thereby assumes certain responsibilities and obligations to the whole people of the United States. It is ridiculous to say that those people have no business regulating the conditions of the primary wherein he is chosen. The States rights argument has been carried to great extremes, but it reaches sheer fantasy when it puts a no-trespassing sign on expenditures made in primary elections for Federal office.

The same no-trespassing sign applies at present to the expenditures of special local and State committees acting in a candidate's interest. Such groups may do the largest part of a candidate's campaign financing, but this is technically without his knowledge and consent. Therefore, neither he nor anybody else, has to account for the money.

The Senate bill, though it has now survived the hostility of such powerful figures as Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader DIRKSEN, still faces a battle in the House. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, for one—an extremely formidable one—objects to the provision holding candidates in primaries to account and actually is among those who call this an invasion of States' rights. Neither he nor Mr. JOHNSON seems to have much regard for his party's rights—or, at any rate, his party's national interests.

[From the Courier-Journal, Mar. 12, 1900]
ELECTION REFORM WINS IN SENATE, SNAGS IN HOUSE

The Federal Elections Act of 1959 (S. 2438), won its way through the Senate by the tidy majority of 59 to 22. Both of our Kentucky Senators voted for it. It seems too bad that its reforms would only go into effect next January 1, thus skipping this year's elections, but its sponsors knew they had a better chance of passing it that way. And the important thing is to get it on the books for the future.

Briefly, the measure lifts the ceiling on what each national committee can spend on a presidential campaign from the present unrealistic \$3 million to \$12½ million. But it introduces some notable new restrictions. For the first time, each individual is limited to \$10,000 a year for political purposes. Also for the first time, local and State committees must report everything they spend for Federal candidates, if the sum is above \$2,500. And primaries are brought under the same provisions as general elections.

The Senate bill was a victory for Senator HENNINGS, who has worked for years on election-spending reform. Similar measures have been introduced in the House by Congressman UDALL, of Arizona, and Congresswoman GREEN of Oregon. Observers see serious trouble ahead in the House. Why?

The answer seems to lie mainly in the restrictions the legislation places on primaries. These are the really vital elections in one-party States, notably in the Deep South. Of the 22 Democratic votes cast against the Hennings bill in the Senate, 15 were cast by Democrats from that region. And the seven negative Republican votes included such partisan stalwarts as Senators BRIDGES, BUTLER, HICKENLOOPER, and DIRKSEN.

The legislation must now run the gauntlet of the House Administration Committee. Its chairman is a Texan, OMAR BURLISON. Eight of its 15 Democratic members are from the South. Among the 9 Republicans are several who seem more likely to follow the lead of Senator DIRKSEN than that of the 21 Republican Senators who voted for the Hennings bill. It will take strong national pressure on the administration committee to pry this valuable legislation loose.

Regarding H.R. 1923, a Bill To Amend Title X of the Social Security Act To Enable the States To Provide More Adequate Financial Assistance to Needy Individuals Who Are Blind and To Encourage and Stimulate Needy Blind Individuals To Become Self-Supporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, I introduced a bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting.

Almost a quarter of a century of experience with the Federal-State program of aid to the needy blind has given us a greater understanding of the needs, problems, and capabilities of the men and women whose welfare is the concern of this program. The blind assistance provisions of the Social Security Act were adopted at a time of depression. The primary objective then was relief from the distress of poverty. We now know that assistance can be granted to needy blind people on terms that inescapably perpetuate poverty and dependency. The importance of more adequate relief from poverty among the blind than we now grant cannot be overemphasized. But relief alone is not enough; rather, it must be given on terms which assist, encourage, and impel the recipient to achieve independence and self-support by offering to him hope and opportunity.

A new approach in providing aid to the blind under title I of the Social Security Act has become imperative. This public assistance program will soon become one entirely for blind men and women in the productive years of life. Owing to the greatly expanded coverage and increased benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, those who lose their sight from diseases associated with the aging process will almost exclusively be old-age insurance beneficiaries. Blind workers who have succeeded in securing employment or self-employment in covered occupations will likewise be entitled to old-age benefits upon retirement.

The fact emerges that the category of blind people to be helped by public assistance will in consequence be composed predominantly of those who still have ahead of them years of possible productive effort and contribution to their communities and their families. It is of the utmost importance to these individuals as well as to the country that their productive powers be preserved from atrophy. This can only be done by granting assistance to them under conditions which save and promote their sense of personal worth, individual dignity and self-respect as valued members of a democratic society. Aid to the blind can be made into a program which extends to recipients the American tradition of opportunity. Reshaping the law to accomplish this end in addition to affording greater security from want is the principal purpose of this bill.

The amendments adopted by the Congress in 1956 contained important additions to the purpose clauses of the provisions relating to aid to the blind in the Social Security Act. The Congress recognized that much can be done by agencies administering blind assistance programs to encourage and help blind recipients to attain self-support and self-care. The changes in the law which were then adopted clearly authorized these State agencies to include as regular parts of programs, services by case workers and specially trained personnel designed to assist recipients to regain self-support and self-care. The amendments of 1956 also authorize—but less clearly—State agencies to assist recipients in the development of individual plans to attain self-support by utilizing whatever income and other resources they may possess in efforts to become established in occupations for which they may be fitted or in small business undertakings as well as whatever other ways may be feasible.

It appears unfortunate that, although a goodly number of State agencies are laying plans to add personnel to their staffs for the purpose of providing self-support services, the possibilities of encouraging and helping blind aid recipients to utilize their resources in fulfilling their need to be restored to gainful activity have been neglected. The fault perhaps lies with the inadequacy of the amendments of 1956. The Congress should make it unmistakably clear that the law contemplates and requires the widest possible use by recipients of individual resources in plans to achieve self-support and self-care. The need of every person to be a productive and contributing member of his community should be recognized as fundamental and as of equal importance and vitality as the need for food and shelter. The bill I have introduced would accomplish this objective by proposing several new provisions intended to give a wholly new conception and perspective to public assistance for the blind.

First, the bill proposes that all blind recipients be given incentive by granting them increased exemptions of earned income up to \$1,000 per year, and that incentive to gain complete economic independence be retained by gradually re-

ducing aid payments to them through the device of taking into consideration only 50 percent of each earned dollar above \$1,000 per year. The existing law was amended in 1950 to provide that \$50 per month of earned income be disregarded in determining the amount of monthly assistance. Thousands of blind recipients took advantage of the exemption to improve their slender economic status and some were stimulated to achieve self-support.

But the ceiling on incentive is still retained and the amount of exempted earnings has proved to be too low to gain a firm foothold on the economic ladder. For most it has been impossible to make in a single bound the immense leap from economic dependence to complete self-support which the present exemption necessitates. For fear of losing what little security blind assistance affords, others have been discouraged from making the effort. The method proposed in the bill for a larger exemption and for reducing aid payments gradually as independent earnings increase will at one and the same time enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, stimulate them to greater efforts to become self-supporting, and enable them to achieve total economic independence.

Second, the bill provides that every aid to the blind recipient shall be entitled to possess at least the assessed valuation of \$3,000 of real and personal property; and additional possessions of real and personal property may be approved for individuals whose individual plans for attaining self-support may require their use. The requirement in the present law that all property and income of a blind individual must be utilized exclusively for his maintenance as a prior condition for receiving assistance has succeeded only in either impoverishing the individual who becomes a recipient or compelling him to live in impoverished circumstances without assistance.

To permit individuals to retain and enjoy modest amounts of property while being eligible for assistance is to preserve a basis for rehabilitation. To enable recipients to utilize their own property and other resources to gain self-support and independence from aid is to put constructive purpose into the law.

Implementing the self-support purpose further, the bill prohibits any public assistance agency from requiring blind recipients to subject their property to liens or transfer to these agencies title to their property as a condition of receiving aid. Encumbering the property of blind aid recipients deprives these individuals of an ability to use their own possessions for self-restoration and rehabilitation. We cannot successfully help the blind to return to productive and useful lives if we permit their futures to be mortgaged or their property to be taken from them because they received assistance in time of need.

Third, the bill also requires that the ability of relatives to contribute to the support of recipients be entirely disregarded in determining eligibility for public assistance. The enforcement of the legal responsibility of relatives to support dependent blind persons has never been

financially significant in reducing public assistance expenditures. It has, however, demoralized recipients by constantly emphasizing in their minds their dependent status and sense of helplessness. The enforcement of relatives' liability is unjust to aging parents of blind individuals still in the productive years of life and unfair to their youthful children endeavoring to become established in the world and generally results in spreading poverty rather than relieving it. The enforcement of relative responsibility is frequently disruptive of family relations, creates bitterness and resentment where hope and affection should be fostered and saves little or nothing in the cost of assistance to the blind. Accordingly it has no place in a welfare program which ought to maintain the sense of importance and belonging on the part of a recipient within the atmosphere of good family relations as a sound basis for his adjustment to blindness and restoration to normal life.

Fourth, the bill further provides for equal minimum payments to all eligible blind individuals except that the minimum would be specified by each State and could, therefore, vary with local conditions.

But the present system of individually budgeting recipients on the basis of individual need individually determined by a wide exercise of discretion on the part of individual social workers would be in a large measure replaced. Individual budgeting inescapably leads to the gradual assumption by social workers of control over the affairs and lives of recipients. If every bit of income must be searched out and every resource tracked down before the amount of each month's payment can be determined on the basis of the budgetary deficiency which then exists, the inevitable result is that the blind recipient, already oppressed by a sense of helplessness, soon loses all direction of his supposedly free consumption choices. The fibers of self-reliance are quickly sapped and loss of self-management is the unavoidable consequence. Under these conditions, the personal qualities of morale and enterprise which are indispensable to rehabilitative effort are undermined and destroyed.

The payment of fixed minimum amounts of aid to which all eligible persons are equally entitled as of right will reduce administrative overhead and preserve and promote the moral and psychological well-being of recipients. It will restore to them a power to manage their own affairs. It will nourish initiative and stimulate self-improvement. In contrast to the rigid means test and individual budgeting, equal minimum payments determined by law will provide a floor of security and foster economic independence and social reintegration.

Finally, to assure that aid-to-the-blind payments will more adequately meet the actual financial needs of recipients while they are in distress, the bill raises the ceiling on the matching of State funds by the Federal Government from the present maximum of \$65 per month average payment made to each recipient to \$75 maximum. When the

Social Security Act was first passed in 1935 the maximum payment to any blind recipient in which the Federal Government would participate was fixed at \$30 per month, of which the Federal Government would pay one-half. The maximum amount in which the Federal Government will share has been increased by only \$35, and even this increase includes average expenditures for medical care not authorized prior to 1950. Yet the cost of living has more than doubled since 1935 and the standard of living to which the American people have become accustomed has sharply risen. The consequence of the Federal Government's failure to keep pace with rising prices has been that even greater poverty and distress has been imposed upon the blind who must depend on public assistance. They have been compelled to eat and dress and live in a manner markedly different from the rest of the community. Many of the States have demonstrated their willingness to meet in part the challenge of the desperate situation thus brought about and have raised payments substantially above the Federal matching ceiling, but, others have fallen far behind. The latest figure available show that average payments throughout the United States are but \$69.05 per month, and this includes average expenditures for medical care.

The time has been long overdue for the Federal Government to attempt more reasonably to meet its responsibilities for raising the level of aid to the blind in every State. The bill therefore proposes that \$30 out of the first \$35 of average monthly payments to the blind shall be paid by the Federal Government. In addition, the variable grant formula adopted by Congress in its 1958 Social Security Amendments is continued. Thus the Federal Government not only will pay \$30 of the first \$35 of the average payment to all recipients; but, also 50 to 65 percent of the difference between \$35 and \$75. Accordingly, even the States which have the least ability to raise assistance payments without additional Federal participation because they have the smallest taxable resources, will be enabled to meet the actual needs of the blind recipients more adequately.

Adoption of these amendments will mean that the rehabilitative approach will constitute the very core of the Federal law providing for aid to the blind rather than the present outmoded Elizabethan Poor Laws concept of counting each penny of a resource unto the third generation. We now know from the examples of increasing numbers of blind men and women who successfully work at a wide variety of occupations ranging from electricians and farmers to businessmen and college professors that every blind person who is sound of body and mind is capable in his productive years of completely normal living and economic usefulness. By revising the Federal law, we not only translate into effective statutory provisions the 1956 enactment of the purposes of self-care and self-support; we can also materially encourage and enable the one-

third of this Nation's 350,000 blind persons who are dependent upon public assistance to take their rightful places in the economy as taxpayers rather than as tax consumers. It is high time that the Nation's laws providing for aid to the blind catch up with the facts established through a quarter of a century of experience under the Social Security Act.

The World Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we sometimes hear that our young boys and girls today are not concerned about the daily struggles for human freedom being fought here at home and by men and women around the world. I believe that the speeches given by Burtman Johnson of St. Peter, Minn., representing Nicollet County, and Linda Zimmer, St. Joseph, Minn., for Stearns County, in the annual Minnesota 4-H radio speaking contest are vivid examples of youth's concern for their brothers in need. The topic for which Burtman received the champion's prize and Linda, second place, was "Why I Am Concerned With the World Refugee Problem."

More than 800 Minnesota boys and girls participated in this contest which was sponsored for the 18th year by the Jewish Community Relations Council of our State in cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Minnesota. The 17 district finalists participated in 2 days of activities in our Twin Cities, visiting the State Capitol, the university, and Central High School in St. Paul, which arranged a Rural-City School Day, and Mount Zion Temple in St. Paul.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two fine addresses showing the concern of two of our Minnesota young people for the world's refugees be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM CONCERNED WITH THE WORLD REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By Champion Burtman Johnson, Nicollet County, St. Peter, Minn.)

"We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms: Freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want, freedom from fear." These famous words were spoken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on January 6, 1941. Has everyone in the world obtained these four freedoms in the 19 years since these words were uttered? Sadly, we must answer "No." We see that one of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way has been the world refugee problem.

I am concerned about the world refugee problem for three reasons. First, I am concerned because of what will happen to the refugees if nothing is done. Second, I am concerned because of what will happen to

the world if nothing is done. Third, I am concerned because of what will happen to me if nothing is done.

Why am I concerned because of what will happen to the refugees? Let us look first at the refugee problem caused by the Second World War and the activities of the National Socialist Party in Germany and the Communist Party in Russia. As unrest grew and war approached, thousands of mechanics, factory workers, engineers, teachers, preachers, and farmers of eastern European countries such as Poland, Austria, Latvia, and Bulgaria, fled or were taken from their homes. Most lived in concentration camps; many became slave laborers. Thousands of Jews were uprooted and subjected to brutal, cruel, and inhuman treatment.

After the war, thousands returned to their homeland. Large numbers would not or could not go home. Many were in excellent health and able to emigrate to other lands. Through the displaced persons act, the United States admitted many refugees who could not have come otherwise because of a slight health defect. At the beginning of this year there remained only 28,000 "hard core" refugees in Europe. Now during World Refugee Year it is expected that all of the remaining 120 camps in Europe will be closed and the people integrated into new countries.

World Refugee Year is an intensive effort of 65 of the United Nations to give increased assistance to the millions of homeless scattered around the world. While much will be accomplished during World Refugee Year, especially in Europe, it will be far from a complete solution to the world refugee problem. Rather, it should give us an increased awareness of the great problems that still remain in Africa, the Middle East and Asia.

One hundred and eighty thousand Algerians who fled their country during the long war for independence now roam through Tunisia and Morocco.

One million Arabs were displaced by the establishment of Israel in 1948. They are now a political football not only for the two nations immediately involved, but also for the United States and the other great powers. However, the fact remains that they are living under deplorable conditions. The United States and Britain contribute \$30 million annually, which is 90 percent of the relief money spent on these Arabs.

Thirty million dollars may sound like a huge sum, but it amounts to only \$30 worth of aid for each refugee each year.

Hong Kong has as many people as the State of Minnesota, crowded into an area less than one two-hundredths the size of our State. One-third of these, about a million, are refugees from Communist China. Many live and die on the street. For thousands more "home" is a mere shack made of scraps of tin, bamboo, or wood. The most tragic of the numerous problems in this crowded area is the youth—one-third die before the age of 16, usually of tuberculosis. Many teenagers are hardened criminals, saying that it is the only way to survive.

Similar, if not worse, conditions prevail in other parts of the world, especially in the Asian countries of India, Vietnam, Korea, and Macao.

Why am I concerned because of what will happen to the world? We can clearly see that if nothing is done to alleviate the problem, it continues to grow. We took action on the European refugee problem and we shall soon have almost completely eliminated it, but in Asia where we have done very little, the problem continues to grow by leaps and bounds. This problem could very well be just the sore spot over which a devastating war could erupt. We also know that if we do not help these refugees to become rehabilitated, their talents will be permanently lost to the world. The world cannot evade, or ignore the refugee problem.

Why am I concerned because of what will happen to me if nothing is done? I read in Genesis the question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The Bible clearly teaches that we are indeed our brothers' keepers. We know that there is a God who will hold us responsible for our dealings with our brothers on earth.

How then can we show our concern for these refugees? We can support the relief work program of our church or synagogue. We can encourage the Government to make a careful evaluation of our refugee work and our immigration laws, which would result in a more positive approach to the refugee problem.

Through a deep awareness and a genuine concern, great things were accomplished in Europe to eliminate the refugee problem, but, regrettably, the same cannot be said of Africa and Asia. The people of other countries may differ from us in the color of their skin or in their form of worship, but dare we say that we have no responsibility for their welfare? The four freedoms have almost been attained in most of the countries of the Western World, but is that enough? We must not think that these ideals are impossible and impractical for the rest of humanity. Most important, we cannot forget for one moment that we are our brothers' keepers.

WHY I AM CONCERNED WITH THE WORLD REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By Second Place Winner Linda Zimmer, Stearns County, St. Joseph, Minn.)

Over 15 million people are living without a home, without a country, without hope. These are the refugees of Europe and Asia. Is there really no room for them on this earth, or is it that there is no room for them in our hearts?

The World Refugee Year began July 1, 1959, and will end June 30, 1960. The need for this effort was seen by four Englishmen who had toured European refugee camps in 1953. They were horrified by what they saw. In some cases, one member of a family was too sick or too old to migrate. The others refused to leave this member behind, so all remained in the camp. In other instances, the refugees were unskilled workers whom no country wanted.

In October 1956 the world had shown that it could open its heart to refugees. At this time a revolt was being staged in Hungary. After a few days of desperate and tragic fighting for freedom, the Hungarian students and workers were crushed by Soviet tanks.

At the height of the fighting, thousands fled their homeland to escape Communist persecution. Many fled to Austria, and within 2 months the total of Hungarian refugees reached 200,000.

Within 8 months nearly all had been resettled with the help of Western nations. Here was a dramatic example of how free nations working together can help the homeless.

Yet you'll find millions of refugees in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, in India, and in scores of other places. They all have one thing in common, the desire to stop being a refugee.

Refugee camps are spread across the world. They consist of barracks or mud huts, food is rationed in small portions. Disease is continuous because of the unsanitary conditions. It is hard for us to imagine the life of a refugee when we live in comfort. United Nations funds, plus help from churches and private welfare agencies, keep thousands of refugees from starving. But you, you the contributor, you are the refugees' only hope. Agencies need your support to continue their work.

Money is not all that is needed. Clothing, food packages, and prayers can make you

a helper of the homeless. Two cents buys a day's milk ration for an Algerian refugee child. Two dollars provides supplementary feeding for 1 month for an undernourished Algerian child. Twenty dollars outfits any refugee for the winter.

Meanwhile the refugees sit and wait. Many older men and women look forward to death. What else is there?

Kaya, a 15-year-old Arab girl is typical of many. Her wardrobe consists of one ragged cotton dress and one burlap dress which she uses when she hunts for bits of useful garbage along the streets. She doesn't go to school because there are no schools for refugees. The desire to learn is there but the fulfillment of that desire cannot be a reality. Kaya knows this, yet she does not understand the reason for her lack of food, clothing, and a home. We who have all that Kaya may never have cannot give her a sufficient answer. Yet we can assure Kaya and others like her that there is hope. For without hope there is nothing. Our contributions and our awareness of these needy people can bring a smile to the cracked lips of a girl who seldom smiles.

In Hong Kong there are 1 million Chinese refugees who have poured into the colony since the Communists took power in 1949. Today, one of every three persons in Hong Kong is a refugee. For thousands of men, women, and children, home is a shack made of scraps of wood, tin, or bamboo. Three people rent a bed and take turns sleeping in it for 8 hours each.

Why should I, a teenager, be concerned about this problem? My main reason for concern is the fact that 25 percent of these people are under 16 years of age.

Today's younger generation will make up the world of tomorrow. But how can tomorrow's generation be developed, and its leaders discovered if many of them are situated in refugee camps?

I feel it is my duty to inform others of the need for helping refugees. This I can accomplish through my daily conversation and by participating in events such as this. Freedom of speech and press are not just words in our Constitution. They are at my disposal if only I make use of them in the correct way. Once the American people are made aware of this problem facing our Nation, half our battle is won.

Let us who know freedom show our thanksgiving for the blessings bestowed upon us by helping the refugees. After all, they are human, too.

Oppose Glacier Peak Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in Washington State we have about 9.7 million acres in six national forests. Three of these are in my district and legislation introduced in the 86th Congress would affect not only these national forests, but also the economy of the district.

The following Associated Press story, which I include in the RECORD, appeared in the Bellingham Herald and other newspapers in my district on March 14, 1960. The story is an indication of the growing opposition to any attempt to create a national park in the Glacier

Peak area situated in three of Washington State's national forests.

STATE SPORTSMEN OPPOSE GLACIER PEAK PARK PROJECT

VANCOUVER, WASH.—The Washington State Sportsmen's Council voted active opposition Sunday to proposals for a national park in the Glacier Peak area of the north central Cascades.

Two resolutions calling on the council to work against the park plan passed almost without a dissenting vote.

Foes of the 1,600,000-acre park contend it would increase the amount of land on which nearly all forms of hunting are banned to nearly half of the State's total acreage.

WANT MORE INFORMATION

Action was deferred on a related resolution asking council endorsement of a bill before Congress to create a wilderness area in the same north Cascades region. Delegates to the quarterly council meeting said more information was needed on the bill.

The Student Oath Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials which I have received regarding the affidavit section of the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, Dec. 27, 1959]

THE STUDENT OATH ISSUE

It seems hitherto to have been difficult in some quarters to grasp the essential facts of the so-called student oath issue. But with President Eisenhower favoring the repeal of the controversial clause and with Harvard and Yale conspicuously leading the way—although a number of smaller institutions had previously rejected Federal student aid because of that clause—the prospect seems good for the passage, at the coming session of Congress, of the bill for repeal which Senator KENNEDY vigorously promoted at the last session.

The crux of the matter is not the oath of allegiance. It is the peculiar affidavit of belief, which no one except students receiving Federal aid is now required to sign, and which has been stricken out of other Federal legislation. The bill introduced at the last session by Senator KENNEDY and Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, would have repealed, in its original form, both the affidavit of belief and the oath of allegiance. It was so approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which reported it favorably 12 to 3. After debate, the bill was amended so as to retain the oath of allegiance but to insist on the elimination of the affidavit of belief. In this form, which exactly fits President Eisenhower's statement at his press conference on December 2, the bill will come before Congress when it reconvenes next month.

The President declared himself categorically in favor of the affidavit's repeal. But he saw no objection to the oath of allegiance. As reported by President A. Whitney Gris-

wold, of Yale, in one of the best and most careful analysis of the whole situation: "The colleges and universities are not protesting the oath of allegiance." President Griswold adds: "By itself the oath is no more than an affirmation of the duties every citizen owes to his country. . . . The disclaimer affidavit, on the other hand, extends beyond the basic law of the land into the realm of belief and conscience, where definitions are vague and actions become matters of debate."

Perhaps the most effective statement by President Griswold is this: "A natural reason for the position of the colleges and universities is that no one enjoys being doubted when everyone else is trusted." That is an exact statement of the present situation. The requirement of an affidavit of belief was dropped out of the Taft-Hartley Act by the so-called tough Labor Reform Act of this year for which the Senate voted 90 to 1. President Griswold further states: "Farmers, veterans, and beneficiaries of social security (to say nothing of other recipients of Federal benefits) . . . have never had to make a disclaimer affidavit." It is hardly to be wondered at that teachers and students in colleges and universities protest at being the only recipients of Federal aid who are now singled out and required to file affidavits as to their beliefs. It is as if they were the only ones in the entire country to be suspected. Instead of that, they are the very ones on whom we may well rest, through the progress of education, our strongest hopes for the wisest and firmest establishment of freedom under constitutional government.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade Jan. 12, 1960]

REMOVE THE DISCLAIMER

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has said that he will press for early congressional action to remove the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act of 1958. President Eisenhower has indicated that he feels the affidavit is not essential. And if Congress doesn't get bogged down in re-arguing a subject already thoroughly examined at the last session, it ought to be able to end quickly most of the controversy over the so-called loyalty oath provisions which have been to educators an objectionable aspect of an otherwise admirable Federal student loan program.

Much of the confusion about the loyalty oath lies in lumping for public discussion under this heading two separate and distinct requirements of the act. One is that a student who gets a Federal loan must subscribe to an oath or affirmation that he will support and defend the Constitution. The other is that he must execute an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means.

As the debate in Congress last year showed, the educational world's principal opposition is not to the oath affirming loyalty but to the affidavit disclaiming disloyal thoughts and associations. And repeal of the affidavit, as distinct from the oath, should not be too difficult to achieve. Most Senators in their votes seemed to recognize the validity of the objections raised by a number of distinguished colleges and universities to this feature.

The two most salient of these objections, it seems to us, are that the affidavit is discriminatory in that it questions the beliefs of college students while those of other recipients of Federal loans go unquestioned, and that the affidavit's vague provisions crack the door to possible invasion of academic freedom.

Both the oath and affidavit were part of a section tacked on to the education act hast-

ily and without much consideration. Discarding the latter and letting the former stand, while in the nature of a compromise with those who think that verbal protestations are an effective guarantee of loyalty, would at least permit the benefits of the Federal loan program to be received by students in colleges which decline on principle to participate in the loan program so long as the affidavit provision stands.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 29, 1960]

MR. NIXON HITS THE AFFIDAVIT

Vice President NIXON, in response to a query from the heads of three midwestern universities, has declared himself in favor of repealing the controversial disclaimer affidavit required of applicants for federally aided student loans. This is the negative affidavit, in which each student applicant must specifically swear his innocence of any subversive thoughts or associations.

As a nation we should have more faith in our college students than to single them out for any such disclaimer, as if the exposure to learning made them especially suspect. And we should have more faith in the strength of free institutions than to act as if an ordinary citizen's loyalty has to be, or can be, coerced.

The President has already urged repeal of the offensive requirement; Senator KENNEDY has introduced a bill that would effect repeal. The Vice President's support, hopefully, will help end this affront both to our colleges and to their students.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 8, 1960]

THE BADGE OF ANXIETY

A government that is forever requiring oaths of loyalty and allegiance from its citizens bears the face of an anxious and worried government. It is fearful of revolution and takes to looking into people's eyes to see the first symptoms of rebellion.

The loyalty oath and Communist disclaimer now exacted from college students seeking Government loans under the National Defense Education Act are a badge of an American anxiety. They plainly suggest an uncertainty about the future of the country, a neurotic fear that sedition is dangerously prevalent.

And not only dangerously prevalent, but so sinisterly concealed that it cannot be detected by ordinary vigilance, but must be found by asking every citizen: "Will you swear you are not a traitor?"

The oath-affidavit device is so badly suited to uncovering revolutionists that a government would hardly invoke it short of desperation.

It is a device so blackened in history by the oppressive tests of religious or political conformity that those who know the past well are the ones who most vigorously oppose the oath in the colleges.

Alexander Hamilton was one who lived close to that past, and though he was no liberal, he denounced every loyalty oath.

Such an oath, he said, "substitutes for the established and legal mode of investigating crimes and inflicting forfeitures, one that is unknown to the Constitution and repugnant to the genius of our laws." Such oaths invert the order of things, obliging the citizen to establish his innocence and holding out a bribe to perjury.

The ordinary resources of criminal prosecution ought to be enough to weed out any seditious student who might seek a Government loan. It ought not to be necessary to resort to the indirection of prosecution for perjury rather than for the substantive crime.

Senator MUNDT has proposed an amendment to the Defense Education Act making it a crime to accept a loan while engaging in any activity already prohibited under the

1940 Smith Act, which in turn makes it a crime to teach or advocate, or conspire to teach or advocate, violent overthrow of the Government, or to belong to a group having such an aim. This seems to pile crime on crime, but it at least makes an act and not the denial of an act the cause for prosecution.

A strong nation, a nation well founded in the principles of human justice and dignity—as we believe this Nation to be—ought not to need constantly to demand protestations of loyalty from its citizens. It ought not to act the jealous lover, forever demanding a statement of affection.

This national display of anxiety is unworthy of us.

A Leader Dies: Jose Antonio de Aguirre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, with great regret I learned this morning that Jose Antonio de Aguirre, President of the Basque Republic in Exile, had died yesterday in Paris of a heart ailment.

Determined, genial, democratic, Jose Aguirre was a proper and able leader of a great nation. He was my friend. I shall always cherish his memory. Two years ago at his invitation I visited Etchola, near St. Jean de Luz, France, on the Spanish border. There I met him and the other Basque leaders. Last year he visited in Washington and came up to my office.

Dr. Aguirre knew Latin America very well. He had friends everywhere. He and Dr. Jesus de Galindez had been good friends. We shared a lack of admiration for Dictator Franco and other tyrants, including of course Trujillo.

The Basques are a remarkable people. Jose Aguirre was a remarkable man. His spirit will live as long as there are men and women who cherish freedom and decency.

Under unanimous consent I include the obituary from the New York Times, March 23, 1960:

JOSÉ ANTONIO DE AGUIRRE DIES; BASQUE LEADER OPPOSED FRANCO—HEAD OF GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE WAS ASSOCIATE OF GALINDEZ—TAUGHT AT COLUMBIA

PARIS, March 22.—José Antonio de Aguirre, who was head of the Basque Republican Government during the Spanish Civil War, died here today of a heart ailment. He was 56 years old.

Dr. Aguirre was appointed head of the Basque Government when the Spanish Republican Government in Madrid granted autonomy to the Basque Province. Though a devout Catholic, he was one of the most active and forceful opponents of Generalissimo Francisco Franco's regime.

During World War II he spent 2 years in New York as a professor of history at Columbia University.

WORKED WITH GALINDEZ

As president of the Basque Government-in-Exile, Dr. Aguirre had worked closely with Dr. Jesús Galindez, who disappeared mysteriously on March 12, 1956. Dr. Galindez had been a registered agent of the Basque here and an instructor at Columbia University.

During the investigation of Dr. Galindez' disappearance, Dr. Aguirre reported that \$1,016,000 collected by the missing man for Basque Government use had all been accounted for and that the Galindez accounts had been "meticulously kept."

Dr. Aguirre was elected president of the Basque provinces on October 7, 1936. During the Spanish Civil War, he was quoted often as describing the Nationalists under Generalissimo Franco as opponents of everything prized by the Basques—their language, customs and political aspirations.

Basque support of the Loyalists (Republicans), however, was attributed more to racial aspiration for autonomy than to sympathy with Loyalist politics. The Basques were said at the time to have chosen the alliance with Madrid as the lesser of two evils. It was said further that the religious issue apparently played a comparatively small part in the Basque stand.

After the Nationalist victory, Dr. Aguirre escaped to France. When the Germans drove through that country he fled to Belgium, and for a time took refuge in the Chilean Legation in Brussels. In France he was with a group of Basque refugees who were under fire near Dunkerque.

From Belgium, Dr. Aguirre went to Germany and escaped from the Nazis by going through their country in disguise. Later he went to Switzerland and to Sweden, where he boarded a cargo ship under an assumed name and sailed to Brazil.

Dr. Aguirre did not reveal his true identity until he had crossed the border to Uruguay. He was in Montevideo in 1941 when the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, announced his appointment as a lecturer on Spanish history and law.

In a book he wrote, "Escape Via Berlin," published in 1944, Dr. de Aguirre told how he posed as a Panamanian, with a newly cultivated personality and mustache, in the German capital and was helped by Pan American diplomats to reach Sweden. Help came also from the Swedish Social Democrats, who cut red tape with aid from the British.

Missouri Sets Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senate has been occupied for several weeks with the civil rights debate, particularly with the right of all citizens to vote. The Rolla (Mo.) Daily Herald calls attention to another side of voting. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Rolla (Mo.) Daily Herald, Mar. 14, 1960]

MISSOURI SETS EXAMPLE

Before long many well motivated organizations will begin prodding the American citizenry to get out and vote in record numbers this year.

They'll be trying to stir the lazy, the indifferent, and the preoccupied. And they should try. The privilege of voting in a free society is too rare a possession to be shrugged off.

But even the most earnest and the most successful exhorters will not be able to do

much about the millions who will be disfranchised this year because they have moved recently and have not yet met residence requirements for voting in their new location.

In far too many States, the requirement is a solid year of residence. Only a few, Ohio (40 days), California (54), Missouri (60), have cut this to levels that are sensible for a vast, mobile population like America's.

In any given year, from 80 to 35 million Americans change residence, a substantial proportion from one State to another. It defies reason why they should be put out of action for a year as voters.

All of the States might well follow the example of Ohio, California, and Missouri.

A Realistic Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, faced as we are with a burdensome, scandalous surplus accumulation of wheat, everyone seems to be spending more time trying to place the blame than in solving the problem.

I am happy to see that both President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson have taken the broader view. They have repeated that this is a problem national in scope. It is not a Republican problem nor a Democratic problem and its solution will not be provided by either party working in partisanship. It will only be resolved by both parties working together in the national interest.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues across the aisle do not approach the wheat surplus with the same attitude. They hammer away, day after day, trying to take the shoe of responsibility off their party's foot and put it on the GOP.

I am happy to note that some of our leading newspaper editorial columns are not mixed up in their history and do not mind calling a spade, a spade. I submit to your attention an editorial from the February 16 edition of the San Diego Union entitled, "A Realistic Farm Program":

NO MAGIC FORMULA—A REALISTIC FARM PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has made it clear in a message to Congress there is no magic formula for giving American farmers all the prosperity they want and deserve. He pledged, however, his determination to work out the best possible farm program without claiming it is any panacea.

The Chief Executive promised Congress he would approve whatever it enacts within a framework which recognizes realistic price support levels and avoids direct Federal subsidy programs.

Mr. Eisenhower's message reminds us that in this election year there is certain to be considerable agitation over farm legislation and policy. So it is not too early to lay on the line some of the facts concerning this traditionally controversial issue.

Remember, when you hear Members of Congress criticize them, that the current price support and production laws don't represent Republican farm policy.

Basically, these laws date back to 1933. They were intended to meet the crisis of a

worldwide depression. Their purpose was to help farmers by raising prices they received for food and fiber. The basic idea was to create an artificial scarcity.

Then at the start of World War II, this policy of a scarcity was reversed to meet food demands created by global conflict. Price supports were raised to a high level during the war emergency and their continuation for 2 years beyond the war was assured.

But—and here's where the trouble started—in 1948, 1950, and 1952, three successive Congresses failed to remove the wartime level of price supports, despite the original intention of a 2-year postwar limit. Hence production, began to exceed demand. This is the root of our present farm troubles.

During 22 of the 26 years encompassed by this legislative history, Congress was controlled by the party now in the majority, the Democrats. The Republicans held party responsibility only during 1947-48 and again in 1953-54.

Thus virtually all present farm legislation governing price supports and production controls was written by the Democrats.

They apparently are satisfied with the present farm program, for they have the votes in Congress to change it and have not done so. Yet the Democrats complain about what they call the Eisenhower farm program and blame their favorite whipping boy, Agriculture Secretary Benson.

Remember these facts as farm legislation becomes an increasingly greater issue in the months ahead.

Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the real impact of the administration's tight-money policy is in the family budget of the average wage earner.

The editors of the Machinist, official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, have, in an editorial in their March 10, 1960, issue, illustrated most clearly what high interest rates and tight money mean to their members. The plain fact, as the editors say, is that it has cost a family with a 25-year loan on a \$12,000 home \$1,800 more in interest over the life of the mortgage because of increased interest rates secured by this administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Your Money," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY

A lot of union members have been adding up the interest payments they made last year. That April 15 deadline for filing income tax returns is not too far off.

For most of us the largest item of interest we pay is for the mortgage on the house. Adding it up, the homebuyer is amazed that so much of each payment goes for interest, so little for principal.

The union member may not realize it, but at this point he has run smack into the high

interest, "tight money" policy of the Eisenhower administration.

This is the policy that Leon Keyserling, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, calls a "bonanza for bankers." Keyserling explained just why in simple ABC terms at the IAM's international staff conference last week at Chicago. Here are some examples he cited:

Go back to your mortgage. Suppose it's a 25-year loan on the typical \$12,000 home that so many families are buying. Because of the increase in interest rates since 1953—the tight money policy—those families are going to pay \$1,800 more interest over the life of the mortgage than they would have paid if the 1952 rates had remained in effect.

Take another example. Let's add up all the interest obligations American have accumulated over the past 7 years. This includes interest on the Federal debt, State and local communities' debt, and individual debts for homes, farms, cars, and other so-called durable goods.

This bill for interest is \$10 billion higher over the 7 years than America would have owed if the interest rates of 1952 had remained in effect.

As Leon Keyserling points out, the administration hails its tight-money policy as a preventive for inflation. But inflation can't possibly develop with more than 4 million Americans out of work and the Nation's industrial system operating at considerably below capacity. Tight money is making it more difficult for smaller firms to create jobs and expand production.

Keyserling says that about the only inflation going on is the ballooning of the profits of the banks from the excessive interest payments.

It seems to us that it would be a good idea this election year to find out just which of the candidates proposes to continue this tight money, bankers' bonanza policy. We're going to be paying on that mortgage for a long, long time to come.

Toward a Peak of Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address by Chancellor Chester M. Alter delivered at the Founders Day banquet, University of Denver, March 7, 1960. We, in Colorado, are delighted to have such an excellent chancellor. He has made much progress in bringing the University of Denver forward in the field of education. This address was delivered on the 96th anniversary of this outstanding university. I know it will be of great interest to all who are concerned with private institutions of higher education. The address is as follows:

TOWARD A PEAK OF EXCELLENCE

(Address by Chancellor Chester M. Alter, Founders' Day, University of Denver, March 7, 1960)

On this occasion, Founders' Day, we gather to honor those who through the years, in a variety of ways have founded, nurtured, and sustained this institution. It is proper that

we should do this. At your plates you have found a replica of the document which set the beginning of this university, and which contains the names of those who were responsible for its founding. Down through the years trustees, chancellors, professors, staff members, students, alumni, and friends have made their contributions. They, too, should be recognized and remembered.

But as I read the history of this institution, I am impressed by one certain fact, that those who have made the major contributions to its growth were, of all things, not persons prone to look backward; they were men and women who kept their eyes on the future, on what lay ahead. And so tonight I know of no better way to honor those who are responsible for our being together here in this university than to follow in their footsteps, to look ahead, to think with you about the great challenges yet to be met. That mission I hope I have defined as the title of my address tonight, "Toward a Peak of Excellence."

For those of us who live near mountain country and who drive on easy roads to lofty heights, it is difficult to believe that only recently in the history of mankind have mountains been other than foreboding pinnacles shrouded in mystery and darkness. To ancient peoples the mountains were considered to be not a part of this earth but rather a sort of half-world between the earth and sky, the home of gods and demons, no place for mortal man. James Ullman, in his fascinating book, "The Age of Mountaineering," tells us that less than 200 years ago, any traveler compelled by circumstances to cross the lowest of the Alpine passes set out in mortal terror, his soul already commended to his God, not so much because of highwaymen that might well beset him on those deserted heights as for the probability of his encounter with a demon, a dragon, or the ghost of Pontius Pilate.

Slowly, however, Ullman tells us, as the 18th century came to a close, "As in every sphere of human thought and activity the bonds of ancient tradition were broken, as frontiers were pushed back with dazzling rapidity, man looked about him with fresh and eager eyes. Then the towering Alps, which had for countless centuries moved him only to awe and terror, now suddenly became a challenge, beckoning him to try his newfound knowledge, his skill, and his courage."

Today there are few peaks that have not given up their secrets. It is a rare and happy breed of men who climb our mountains. Why do they climb? Why do men turn their backs on the easy security of their daily lives to face the wind, the ice, the snow, the crumbling rock, the avalanche, the danger, and the death?

"The answer to this riddle," Ullman tells us, "is simply this. The men of the mountains climb because that is the way they are made. Scanning the heights, they see more than rock and ice and snow and the immense blue emptiness of the sky. They see, too, a great challenge to their own qualities as men; a chance to conquer their own weakness, ignorance, and fear. They have found the divine harmony and simplicity of the natural world, and themselves, as men, alive in it, a part of it. The mountaineering spirit lies not in what men do, but in what they are—in the raising of their eyes and the lifting of their hearts."

I have dealt this long on man, and the mountains which once he feared but which now he climbs in high adventure, because I think there is a parallel if we are to take seriously the mission of the university as being that which titles this address: "Toward a Peak of Excellence." The parallel is intriguing.

For countless centuries man's attitude toward knowledge resembled to a remarkable degree his fear of the mountains. Live in the safety of what you now know; pass on

without question the precepts you have learned; ascend the foothills only if you must, but let no man come up into the mountains where the gods dwell. The age of enlightenment, of inquiry, came slowly and those Galleos who edged their way upward into the shrouded mysteries to see what they could find, found principally great penalty for their irreverent adventure. And then, with almost bewildering suddenness, these fetters were struck off and man with high adventure began the dazzling exploration of his world, of himself, and of his society; his limitations only those that lay within himself.

The parallel continues. Today the mountain peaks that fall beneath the pitons and the crampons of the mountain men do not fall easily. Those who do climb are only those who must. They are those who ache with challenge and who, when defeated, whisper through cracked and wind-burned lips, "I'll get you yet."

And it is equally true that the peak toward which we aspire in higher education is not one that can be easily accomplished by wishful thinking. The task will be difficult, and dangerous. No easy highways to this crest. We have in the 95 years of our history already reached the high country and even this far the way has been hard, has been achieved only by devotion and dedication on the part of all who have worked in this great enterprise. It would be easy and safe and pleasant to stop here, and such a decision could, perhaps, be justified. We are good enough. Security is within our grasp. Here we could with modest effort long survive, indeed usefully survive; and to the valley dwellers this is perhaps enough. Why, then, press on to the peaks, the peaks of excellence? The impulse I believe is the same that drives the mountain men. We will press on because we must. The good is not enough. To men who would adventure in the mountain ranges of the mind, there can be no turning back. Whatever the horizons, they are too small; whatever the accomplishment, it is not enough; whatever heights have been scaled, others lie beyond. We will strive for this peak of excellence—because we must.

There is yet another parallel. Great mountain climbing is never an afternoon excursion. It is the result of years of preparation, of meticulous care, of well-laid plans. We read with interest how, in the great and successful assault on Mount Everest, level by level assault camps were set up, secured, provisioned, and then above them other camps, and then still others. Personnel, equipment, provisions. The logistics of such an assault are fascinating. And, always, there is plan. The configuration of the peak has long been studied. The glacial routes assessed. The treacherous cornices appraised. The scaling of these peaks is then no accident. The assault in every sense is the final execution of a master plan.

So too must we, as we move toward this great peak of excellence, chart our way. The crest toward which we climb must be identified, our resources numbered, our plans prepared, our methods appraised, the path we intend to take carefully charted. This we are doing and will continue to do, and tonight I would like to share with you at least the outlines of our goals, our progress and our master plan, here at this, your University of Denver.

What, first of all, is the nature of the peak of excellence that challenges us?

Two major problems confront us today in higher education. The first and by all odds the most urgent is the critical and perilous struggle that through our lifetimes will continue between the free world and the forces of totalitarianism. Grim as it is at present, I hear no thoughtful and authoritative voice that promises us some surcease; instead we are told that the forces of the

enemy will grow stronger; that in our democratic societies we have not even begun to face up to the realities of the coming struggle. Against this enemy then the forces of freedom must marshal every strength. The strongest of these can be our intellectual powers, and our finest armor the moral and spiritual resources of responsible free men. We must if we are to survive develop a nation of responsible citizens, capable of evolving through democratic processes great and dynamic leadership. In this necessity, higher education shoulders an enormous responsibility. Never has the need for quality in education been so imperative as now and through the decades that lie ahead.

Concomitant with this challenge, however, there is another problem. In a sense, this is the problem of numbers. Because of a variety of forces which are already in motion, colleges and universities in concert face the gigantic fact that 10 years from now their student populations will have more than doubled; some extend the numbers far beyond that proportion. The often mentioned population explosion is partially responsible for this fact. In addition, however, a growing economic base has made it possible for a greater percentage of young men and women to attend college than ever before. This fact we all applaud, as do we applaud the added fact that the growing realization of the importance of higher education has made available from public and private funds huge sums for scholarships.

But still another force is operative, and this one, though seemingly inevitable, gives us cause for concern. This is a growing so-called democratization of the intellectual base and of the function of higher education. More and more the justification of higher education has been expressed in terms of added income, better jobs, a higher level of postgraduation employment; and more and more there has crept into the curriculums of higher education those courses and departments and schools that are designed to prepare a hopeful student for his initial entrance into a career. We have been prone to tell ourselves that these students, because of their employment interests, have thus been exposed to at least some of the "liberating influences" of a college education that otherwise they would have entirely missed. But we have learned to our sorrow that such courses and departments breed still others, until today in higher education we face a vast proliferation of such subject matter, most of it professional but all too much of it at the lower level of vocational training.

Whatever the wisdom or the propriety or the value of these various trends may be, the results are unarguable—the college population over the next decade promises to all but engulf our educational institutions.

As difficult as this problem may seem, particularly against the backdrop of the new urgency of our major task, I see in our uniquely American dual system of higher education the machinery to meet this growing challenge, if both the tax-supported public institutions on the one hand and the private, independent institutions on the other, vigorously supported and adequately financed, set about the performance of their unique tasks. These I would define in broad generalization as follows:

To the tax-supported institution must fall the major burden of the onslaught of numbers and the concurrent expanding range of narrow needs that require an ever-increasing assortment and variety of courses. I am sure that most administrators of these institutions will exert every effort to modify this trend and to contain it within reasonable limits. I also know, however, that constituencies will be served wherever the tax dollar goes and although the serving of these relatively narrow needs of growing numbers

of persons is not the only, perhaps not even a major obligation of publicly supported institutions, it is surely they that should be principally charged with this task.

To the independent university, then, falls another obligation. This I would define as the attainment and the nurturing of great peaks of excellence in those relatively few intellectual, cultural and professional areas deemed most vital to the undergirding of a free society. This they should do by providing for relatively limited numbers of intellectually exceptional students extraordinary opportunity to develop themselves to their greatest potential in those areas in which the undergirding necessity is the development of the life of the mind.

This I believe to be the special mission of the University of Denver and toward the accomplishment of this mission I believe our major energy should be expended.

There is a special dimension to the propriety, indeed the urgency, of making this our mission. If, as I have said, this task of excellence is one of the special missions of the independent university, then it must be by reasons of geography be the unique responsibility of the University of Denver. The independent university flourishes in New England and along the Atlantic seaboard; there are many in the South and in the Middle West, several along the Pacific coast. But in this great 12-State area of the high plains and the Rocky Mountains there is but one, and that the University of Denver. In a very real sense then the full accomplishment of this character, the achievement of this peak of excellence, is our special obligation to higher education in this fast developing heartland of the United States.

This, then, is the nature of the peak we would ascend. This in vast generalization is our goal. How then are we preparing, must we prepare, for the accomplishment of this herculean task?

I have said that we will operate on the basis of selectivity of exceptional students. This principle is even now being applied. In my annual report you will find a description of our present methods of selection, all based upon such criteria as college board examinations, academic records and if need be, personal interviews. Let it be noted that last autumn our rejection of applications was 44 percent higher than those of the year before, although our total enrollment increased by only 6 percent. The process of selectivity is taking place.

What are our plans for the future? On the basis of present standards of admission, and against the general trends in college populations, I would predict that an enrollment of from 15,000 to 20,000 students would be entirely possible. How large do we propose to be? I envisage for the University of Denver not 20,000 students, but rather a limitation in size to some 8,000 students, 80 percent of whom would be full time, regularly enrolled. I would further envisage that about 1,800 of our total population would be enrolled in our graduate programs, 600 of these in our college of law. I would propose that about 3,800 students will be the maximum size of our college of arts and sciences, including certain professional fields such as education; that in business administration there will be in the neighborhood of 1,900, in engineering around 500. I firmly believe that to accomplish and maintain the excellence we desire and for economic reasons, we must hold our total student body this far in numbers below the levels of probable applications for admission.

We must be equally selective as we build our faculty to meet this rise in student numbers and intellectual ability. This indeed is both our most important and our most difficult task. We must maintain a healthy student-faculty ratio but the usual teach-

ing load of the average faculty member must be no more than 10 hours, rather than the present 15. Through increased and thoughtful use of teaching fellows, however, and through new and effective technologies of communication, I am convinced we can materially enlarge that extraordinary degree of intimacy between faculty and students that must be found at senior and graduate levels and which is already one of the great hallmarks of instruction at the University of Denver.

I see as an optimum distribution of faculty rank, approximately 37 percent full professors, 25 percent associate professors; the rest at the rank of assistant professor or the rapidly disappearing rank of instructor. Our full professors must be only those who by their efforts have distinguished themselves as scholar-teachers, and who day by day continue to build into the character of the university that intellectual maturity, that gentle wisdom which is the inevitable heritage of their long devotion to the life of the mind. The achievement of this rank should be difficult—but it should be rewarding. Our associate professors should be, as generally they are the country over, vigorous and energetic scholars, testing their scholarship through publication, initiating those programs in the university which eventually grow to great stature. No one should be brought into this rank who does not give great promise of such scholarly activity as to eventually merit the rank of full professor. These men and women, our professors and our associate professors, are our richest resource. It is this area of strength that at all costs must be maintained, encouraged, and protected.

As this faculty is built to meet the challenge that we face, two obligations are paramount. First, and by all odds the most important, we must develop programs of such high excellence that they invite the participation of established and potential scholars. And second, we must acquire the resources needed to offer some measure of just compensation. Without this latter, programs cannot be maintained, but without the former, without the presence of intellectual excitement, without the atmosphere of learning, scholars such as we desire cannot be secured nor kept, no matter what the financial reward. The scholars among our present faculty are evidence that certain programs at the University of Denver, present and potential, are powerfully compelling attractions, even though economically we have as yet no bargaining power at all. But if we are to attain the peak of excellence, this poverty of compensation must come to an end. I am firmly committed to the policy that in our future, all reward must be determined by the evident contributions of each faculty member to the intellectual community that we now have and that we are determined to build. I am equally committed, however, to the firm intent that by the centennial year of 1963-64, for those who measure up to the obligations of their rank, present salaries on the average should be doubled.

Exceptional students and an exceptional faculty, if these are not part and parcel of our plan, let us here and now turn away from any assault on that towering peak of high excellence.

What of our programs? What charts are there for the gaining of this hoped-for summit? These, I have said, are to be based upon a selection of those areas of study—intellectual, cultural, and professional—most vital to the undergirding of a free society.

Tonight I have no time to name the programs, one by one. But I would like to suggest a few yardsticks that may be used to determine the propriety of an academic program at the University of Denver.

First, every program that is to be maintained or inaugurated at the University of

Denver should be rooted and grounded in intellectual content. Moreover, it should be of such a nature that profound insights into the discipline of each program can be achieved through continuing research. In addition, every program should be capable of significantly enriching important areas of knowledge and understanding, that through its study meaningful horizons can be pushed back through inquiry, creativity, imagination, and perseverance. I think it is apparent, then, that at the core of all such programs are the traditional disciplines of the liberal arts and sciences, which deal with the nature of man, his social arrangements, and the physical world in which he exists.

Already, of course, our paths have been charted in this direction. Our college of business administration, I am proud to say has made significant and important strides in this direction. By comparison with other such colleges in the Nation, its faculty has developed to a unique degree professional studies within the framework of intellectual content, devoted to the comprehensive understanding of the economic, industrial and commercial climate of our society and increasingly rigorous in discipline. Much the same can be said of our college of engineering and of most of the professionally oriented programs within the college of arts and sciences.

I am sure that these trends will continue, that there will be a further permeation of these programs by the liberal arts, that to a decreasing degree will special attention to the peculiar problems of any small segment of our business or professional world be permitted to obscure the student's opportunity to gain a better understanding of himself, his physical environment, and the structures of society which man has created.

In a society in which the business and professional man seems to play an ever-increasingly important role, in which he is so often called upon to make important judgments in areas outside of his professional knowledge, we cannot afford to develop professional men and women who are scientifically illiterate, naive in the social sciences or inept in those areas of understanding, the humanities, that affect our value judgments and our tastes.

There are, in a sense, two other interrelated dimensions of our programs that must be kept in mind. These I would describe as their richness and their degree of concentration or depth. As the intellectual capacity of the average student increases, and as within our student body exceptionally capable young men and women are identified, I believe it to be our obligation to increase the extent of the areas of knowledge with which they should come in contact, or the depth of those experiences, or both. Once again this process has already begun. Beginning next fall, for example, we will launch our centennial scholars program. This is designed for exceptional entering freshmen in all undergraduate colleges. Through advanced placement, accelerated learning, special colloquia, independent study, directed reading and research, these young men and women will be given special challenge equal to their exceptional ability. This has been called our centennial scholars program because these young men and women will graduate with our centennial class in the spring of 1964. Already, however, as work on this program has moved ahead, there is planning underway to offer a similar program for the class that enters in 1961 and 1962 and 1963. I am confident that as we approach our centennial year of 1964 the intellectual level of the average student will have so materially increased and our drive for excellence will have reached such proportions that what is now a special program for unusual students will have become, with modification, the normal program for our average student; and that for those al-

together unusual entering freshmen of the year 1964, programs of yet greater excitement and challenge will have been prepared.

Development of depth of study in our programs is closely related to their potential richness. The easiest measure of such depth is, I presume, the extent of the work in any program which is available beyond that required for the baccalaureate degree. Let me begin by saying that, with a few exceptions, any field that is legitimate for undergraduate study ought to be of such proportion as to merit potential graduate work through the level of the doctorate. I am, therefore, certain that we must prepare to increase our present areas of doctoral study, being certain, however, that the resources of each area are entirely adequate for such advanced scholarship. We must have available the scholarly staff, the library, the laboratories and the other facilities that can enable and encourage a young man or woman to set out on what should be an exciting though often lonely adventure that leads to the legitimate doctoral degree.

Yes, permeating our programs there must be that richness and that depth of scholarship which alone can create that peculiar excitement to be found in the true climate of learning. In this direction, of course, we are already moving. Only this year we have extended our doctoral studies to additional areas in the College of Arts and Sciences; we have given much time and attention to the bolstering of other master's programs (which we hope will soon lead to doctoral studies); we have taken initial steps toward reduction of faculty loads to encourage additional activity in research and creative work. The charts are being drawn, the routes outlined, the strategy mapped. We are determined that our continuing assault on the highest peak of excellence will not be blunted or turned back.

Even as in mountain climbing, so, too, in our adventure, the problem of logistics is a difficult one. The procuring, the upkeep, the intelligent use, and the functional design of necessary equipments may well make or break such an enterprise. Though ideas in universities do not come from bricks and mortar and research does not spring spontaneously from test tubes, serious limitations in such physical properties do tragically limit the scholarly and creative capacities of our scholars and artists, both student and faculty. There is heartening evidence, however, that here, too, the university is "on its way." These past years have been exciting ones, for they have seen a committed dollar volume of building which exceeds that of the entire previous history of the university. Highly important to the new character of our students, who now in great majority come from outside our State, is housing. Two new residence halls costing \$1.7 million and housing 432 men and women were dedicated last year. Right now, on the drawing board are plans for several more such halls and, if present plans meet no unexpected reversal, ground for the first of these will be broken in 1961.

In the area of academic life, you know of the \$1,250,000 grant by the Boettcher Foundation, the largest such grant in the State's history, for the construction of the first three units of the Boettcher Center for Science, Engineering, and Research, which will permit a new, exciting, and unusual integrated program in these three areas. Construction on this great project will begin next fall. John Greene Hall, a new engineering-research facility, is already in use.

The University Law Center, which will not only house our law school but which also will be the center of legal activity in this great region, is moving rapidly through construction and will be ready for use next year.

And on the drawing boards are plans for other buildings which I am confident will soon be in construction. We are moving, and with heartening speed.

Behind all such development, however, as well as behind our plans for scholarly peaks of excellence, looms that inevitable and highly American symbol, the dollar sign. In the area of dollar support, as in other areas, the last decade at the university has seen progress of such remarkable dimensions as to demand national attention.

I am firmly of the opinion, however, as I review these past 10 years, that the near miraculous growth in the dollar support of this institution can be attributed not alone to the devotion, the energy, the dedication, and the faith of such wonderful groups as our trustees, our alumni, our business community, the Methodist Church, and our many other friends. It is also the result of a determined effort on the part of the university to assume its proper role as that of an independent university, devoted to programs of importance and high quality, girding itself for this mission that I am describing tonight, the vigorous assault toward peaks of excellence. I am equally convinced that as we fix our eyes on this single purpose and move unwaveringly toward this goal that the emerging character of the University of Denver will command those dollars necessary to its task.

The picture, it seems to me, is clear. Where 10 years ago, unrestricted corporation-foundation giving was \$25,000, last year it was over 10 times this amount. Where a decade ago annual unrestricted alumni contributions amounted to \$8,000, last year they were \$44,000, and this year the goal is \$100,000. Where 10 years ago support from the Methodist Church was only \$1,000, this year it is 33 times as much. When to this is added all other gifts and grants, the sum total for this past year given in support of the University of Denver amounted to nearly \$3 million, 128 percent over that of the year before. Yes, the logistics of the University of Denver's determined assault on a peak of excellence is demonstrably possible. For as we doggedly ascend these difficult heights toward that fixed and unalterable goal, the pride, the affection, yes, and the common-sense of the enlarging community which thus we serve to highest purpose will pour our in generous abundance the resources that excellence requires. Of this fact I am supremely confident.

Toward a peak of excellence.

The times require this of us. The universe about us is convulsive with change. We stand on the brink of space. We stand as well on the brink of catastrophe. In that portion of the world which is yet free, and its boundaries seem sometimes to be shrinking, no greater task confronts us than the continuing generation of responsible men and women, devoted to the preservation and the enlargement of a free society.

The responsible individual and a free society in an expanding universe. The dimensions of this challenge are infinite. This is the challenge of higher education, and to that challenge every university, in its own way, must respond with the best that lies within it.

Tonight I have tried to outline my impressions of the measure and the method of our task—to press on toward a peak of excellence. Of this task it may well be said, as James Ullman does of those who scale our earthly mountains: "Over and above all else, the story of mountaineering is a story of faith and affirmation—that the high road is the good road; that there are still among us those who are willing to struggle and suffer greatly for wholly ideal ends; that security is not the be-all and the end-all of living; that there are conquests to be won in the world other than over our fellow men. For it is the ultimate wisdom of the mountains that man is never so much a man as when he is striving for what lies just beyond his grasp, and that there is no battle worth the winning save that against his own ignorance and fear."

West's Dramatic Disarmament Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, last week carried a very good editorial respecting the West's disarmament plan. While newspapers across the land have commented on this plan, I believe this editorial should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and all others who have the opportunity to read the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, Mar. 15, 1960]

WEST'S DRAMATIC DISARMAMENT PLAN

Geneva, historic name for peace from that first international conference following the Crimean and American civil wars, marks Time's rolls again.

From Geneva the dispatches in your morning Gazette today report that five Western Powers unveil a dramatic disarmament plan. It would create an international group so powerful it eventually could veto a nation's military budget.

The proposal is gigantic in its potentialities. It is one more step of a hungered world clutching at man's eternal hope to end war. It is the aim, and we hope with more success, of the Hague tribunal called in the last part of the 19th century by Czar Nicholas II, the Disarmament Conference of the Harding-Hughes era, the Kellogg Pact of Coolidge's day.

Man has ever hoped for peace, abortive efforts as most have been, notably the Congress of Vienna following the Napoleonic wars and the Versailles Conference and ill-fated League of Nations after World War I.

All the world professes to want peace. We of the America know we are sincere. Would to heaven the ruling nation of the Old World, Soviet Russia, could believe us. Truly the millennium lies in the success of what was announced at Geneva yesterday.

Were that program the brainchild of the Kremlin what world propaganda the Eastern World would set forth.

What will the Eastern World say of this? That remains to be seen.

Here, possibly, just possibly, may be the time and the occasion for the meeting of the minds—to end the means of mass destruction.

History may have been made at Geneva yesterday. The ghosts of millions of people killed before their time by the Four Horsemen cry out to us please, please, not to let this golden opportunity pass us by.

An Expert Speaks on Imports and Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, recently certain labor groups, more and more in-

dustries, and agricultural producers have voiced growing concern, if not alarm, over the great upthrust of imports. In product after product new high import records have been established.

Total 1959 imports reached a new high record for all time; \$15.2 billion in imports exceeded by more than \$2 billion the previous record made in 1957. Meanwhile, our 1959 exports at \$16.3 billion were \$3 billion below the level of 1957.

Among the products that have been imported in fast-rising volume in the past 2 years are meat, lamb, and cattle. The uptrend demonstrates how vulnerable this country is today in point of import competition. The same thing is happening in automobiles, textiles, barbed wire, nails, tuna fish, plywood, sewing machines, cameras, tile, woolen goods, transistor radios, umbrella frames, machine tools, athletic goods, and many other items.

These great intruding volumes of goods from abroad, Mr. Speaker, create a condition that requires serious attention. It is true that many parts of the world can now, and do in fact, produce at much lower prices than we can manage. We have helped production rise to new levels of efficiency in other countries. We have given our factories over to visiting productivity teams from abroad in great numbers and, at the same time, have sent overseas some \$30 billion in the most up-to-date machinery and equipment, a large part of it paid for by our taxpayers.

Low foreign wages, coupled with much higher productivity that has resulted from the extensive mechanization abroad, have increased the competitive advantage of many foreign producers and manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. O. R. Strackbein spoke before the annual meeting of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association in Kansas City. Mr. Strackbein, a student of international trade, is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, which comprises over 50 industries, agricultural, and labor groups and organizations that have a common problem in import competition.

While all of us may not completely agree with Mr. Strackbein's solution, there is no question but that he places emphasis on a most serious problem affecting the American economy of today. I found his speech highly informative and I believe it would be of great interest to my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks previously granted, I include Mr. Strackbein's address:

THE IMPORT STAMPEDE

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The great upsurge in imports in recent times has confronted many American industries with the increasingly pressing question of survival. That this is not merely a sensational observation but a reasonable appraisal of competitive realities will become clear if we look at the international economic developments of the past 2 years against the background of domestic economic policies of the past quarter century.

Massive changes have come about during that period. These changes are now coming into focus as a challenge to the international economic posture of this country.

I am well aware that this sounds preposterous to those whose heartbeats are lulled by the surging uptrends of our economic indexes of all varieties. National income is expanding. Employment is high and growing. Consumers are spending freely and money is flowing from buyers to sellers to producers in broadening streams. Great industries are planning billions of dollars in plant renewal, plant expansion and new production facilities. Exports give evidence of revival. We will sell abroad more cotton, more aircraft, more steel and fats and oil.

So say the official soothsayers and promoters of the grand optimism. Imports will level off. Our foreign account will run a lesser deficit and American vigor and unbounded know-how will conquer all, and thus prevail over sundry perils and assaults. This is good psychology in the wrong frame.

To be sure, it is good psychology in the face of adversity to be optimistic rather than gloomy, and not to dwell on difficulties and obstacles except as means of assessing them the better to overcome them. The best psychology, however, is to face facts; not to ignore them. Empty optimism is the best prelude to a headache. Mature people should assemble the facts, look at them, study them, try to determine their meaning and be guided by their significance.

After World War II nearly all economists were convinced that a very difficult period of unemployment and readjustment would occur. They were wrong; but they were not wrong because they harkened back to previous experience. They were wrong because they had not taken into account differences between post-World War I and World War II conditions. I do not say that these differences were so visible at the time. Ex post facto reflection is nearly always superior to estimates of currently moving forces that do not say in a loud voice what they mean or what is their intention. A later look-back often makes us feel stupid for not having recognized on the wing what now seems as clear as the hand before our face.

However, having made the passage from disarmament to peacetime operation after the war without an upset, let alone a crash; and having in the next decade or more encountered and weathered three recessions, each of which could have led into a tailspin but for some saving grace, many economists are now about to make the awkward error of the feverish twenties, and say that we are in a new era. We are so powerful and robust that we can overcome all onslaughts from without as we have withstood those from within.

Did we not roll over the recession of 1949 without scars or broken bones? Again in 1954, did we not shake off all interference and blockages and roar once more on our way. Then very recently in 1958-59, did we not repeat our previous performances; and are we not again on the highroad to more wonderful goals than ever before? Are we not now a \$500 billion economy? Was this not foreseen and forecast? Is it not manifest destiny then that we will keep on endlessly, our course pointed ever upward and onward?

Yes, we will live on expansion and expansion and expansion—in all directions, across national borders into foreign lands. Optimism and expansion will conquer all. So say the present-day professional optimists.

It is a heady elixir.

Of course, no one wants a breakdown; but we can import one if we refuse to recognize and deal with realities.

Among these realities are:

1. An untenable international competitive position.
2. A heavy and stubborn deficit in our total foreign account.

3. An expansion of imports and a shrinkage in exports.

4. High domestic production costs compared with other countries.

5. A sharp uptrend in foreign productivity per man hour.

6. A wage lag in relation to rising productivity abroad.

7. Loss of U.S. technological leadership among the nations.

8. Increasing trend toward mass production abroad.

9. Emigration of American capital to lower-wage countries.

10. Discouragement of expansion plans among domestic industries, especially suppliers, dedicated to the American market.

11. Increasing importation of parts and semimanufactures by domestic manufacturers as a means of competing with imports of finished manufactures.

12. Automation as a means of improving competitive position, resulting in unemployment and failure to absorb millions of additions to the labor force.

What does all this mean?

The answer can be given by looking around us. Let me offer a few examples.

Steel, automobiles, typewriters, sewing machines and petroleum are products that we were long accustomed to export while we imported little of them. These were the output of our most advanced industries in point of mass production and technology. We are now importing more of the products of these former American export pacesetters than we are selling abroad. A complete turnabout has occurred.

How could this happen?

If imports were able to attack and take the very ramparts of our most highly productive industries, what can they do and what have they already done, to others of our industries?

Some measure of this new condition may be gained from the fact that imports in the first 10 months of 1959 from Japan increased 54 percent compared with the first 10 months of 1958. In the case of Europe the increase was 43 percent.

Here are some of the echoes:

U.S. imports of Japanese electronic products in the first half of 1959 at \$22 million surpassed the whole of 1958 and tripled the 1957 figure of \$7.5 million.

According to President E. L. Wheatley, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, 7,500 potters lost their jobs because of permanent company shutdowns in the last 10 years. Relentless import competition was the cause.

These experiences do not augur well for expansion of American industry. Not only did the pottery industry not expand in keeping with the increase in population; it actually contracted.

In 1947 our coal industry delivered 631 million tons of coal to customers. In 1949 residual fuel oil began pouring in from abroad, directly displacing coal. At the same time coal was suffering from domestic competition of diesel oil and gas. The impact of imports greatly aggravated the plight of the already beleaguered coal industry.

Then a few years ago we began to export coal in considerable volume, some 50 million tons a year. This foreign market came a cropper because foreign import restrictions were imposed. Exports are now greatly reduced and no longer offer the hope of a few years ago.

U.S. hosiery exports dropped 38.6 percent in the first 7 months of 1959 compared with the same period in 1958. "Our export market suffers a slow and painful death," said the president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers.

Other products are facing similar difficulties, many of them from imports.

The Leather Glove Manufacturers Association reports that of the two leather glove producing areas in New York State, New York City has discontinued production while Fulton County producers have been whittled from 184 firms to 56.

Cattle hide imports more than tripled in the first half of 1959 while exports dropped sharply. Live cattle and beef imports in 1959 amounted altogether to an equivalent of more than 2 million head. Imports of lamb have also climbed sharply.

Woolen worsted imports, imports of silken fabrics, of cotton textiles and cotton garments, are causing great concern in the textile industry. Stainless steel flatware, bicycles, hardwood plywood, tuna and other fish, watches, lead and zinc, fluorspar, shrimp, and glassware are all products that are sorely beset by import competition. The only factors that have kept these industries on the survival list has been the phenomenal population growth, high consumer purchasing power, sustained by the high defense expenditures and other liberal Federal outlays.

What of the future?

If this country encounters another recession, will the combination of factors be the same as in the postwar period up to now? Will our economy again be able to stop short of a depression? In what respect have important factors shifted in recent years?

Previously there was the elasticity to be found in promoting exports through foreign economic and military aid, Public Law 480 exports, that is, sale of farm products for foreign currency or outright gifts; subsidization of agricultural exports such as wheat and cotton, Export-Import Bank loans, World Bank credit, and encouragement of foreign investments through guarantees against expropriation, etc.

In the past few years much of this elasticity has been used up. We have been running a heavy deficit in our total foreign account: \$7½ billion in the past 2-year period. Our gold has been flowing out; and it would flow out more rapidly had not our Government interest rates been raised. Unfortunately this upward trend in interest on the public debt increases the burden on the Treasury itself. The same holds true of our encouragement of agricultural exports. We can increase these exports only by increasing our subsidies or offering more extensive sales for foreign currencies. This means further burdens on the Treasury.

Our interest payment on our public debt is now about \$9½ billion per year. It will go on up quite sharply as bonds come due and have to be refinanced. Meantime our costs of production are already high in relation to the rest of the world, weighted down with high defense expenditures, foreign aid, the interest on a public debt of \$295 billion, social security costs, farm surplus holdings by the Government, rising wages, and much else that prices our goods from 30 to 40 percent above the world market.

If we move into another recession we will not have as we did in 1949 and 1954 a foreign world to supply, a world still hungry for our exports. Rather we will face a world that is competing with us not only in our own country but in world markets. Instead of burgeoning, our exports will be shrinking. Our investments in foreign plants will be relieving us of exports and some of our foreign production will be flowing back to us and creating competition with our home industry.

Unless we begin to place restrictions on imports to prevent the progressive loss of our home market, as other countries have done very extensively in postwar years, we will be driven to an even smaller share of both our home and our export markets. Competitively we are at the mercy of foreign production that has the advantage of low wages, increasing productivity, and lesser public burdens of taxes. Our economy has

lost its great productivity lead; but has kept its wage lead. Therefore if we are to stand we must make judicious use of tariffs and quotas, even as other countries also resorted to import restrictions as they needed them. The best insurance of survival for many of our industries lies in offsetting the great wage-productivity gap that separates them from other countries.

Without import restrictions, tailored to particular competitive conditions, more of our industries will be driven to progressively smaller segments of our market. We are not bound to grant to imports the right of eminent domain in our market. Under existing trade policy a virtually free hand is given to imports to capture from any American industry from a quarter to a half or even more of its market, while legislative enactments have deprived these industries of most of their competitive defenses. If we insist on such domestic economic policies we owe it to industrial and agricultural producers and to their workers a commercial climate in which they can compete. Tariffs or tariff quotas are the best instrumentalities to accomplish this and we should use them to assure our competitive survival.

World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the march of humanity toward its high destiny in this world has for centuries been impeded by the roadblocks of bias, bigotry, and distrust. It is heartening, therefore, to note the great and far-reaching counteraction to such roadblocks that is represented by the spirit of World Refugee Year. This year of 1960 has been so designated, under the auspices of the three great religious faiths of the United States, and the present week of March 20-27 will mark the active launching of the vast work of charity that will give life and meaning to World Refugee Year.

In witness of the importance of the mission thus undertaken, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has issued a pertinent official statement. Mr. President, in view of the timeliness and significance of this statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

The three great religious bodies—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—which afford spiritual comfort to the people of America, are united in an effort to succor the needy people of other countries. This project of mercy has particular emphasis now because 1960 has been set aside as World Refugee Year.

This union of our religious organizations is a magnificent expression of brotherhood in action. It truly exemplifies the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Their overseas relief programs bring help and comfort to victims of war, disaster and political upheaval. They provide food, clothing, shelter, medicine in emergency

crises and also continuing assistance to millions of underprivileged and undernourished men, women, and children.

The leaders of all faiths have agreed in selecting March 20-27, 1960, as the period of their intensive effort. The Protestant appeal is called "One Great Hour of Sharing," in Catholic churches it is designated "The Bishop's Relief Fund," in Jewish temples and synagogues, it is the "United Jewish Appeal Special Fund." The campaign will culminate on March 27, but the United Jewish Appeal will continue throughout the season.

The people of the Empire State have always responded to this great religious entreaty with warm hearts and open hands. I urge them especially in this World Refugee Year to keep faith with this noble tradition.

Problem for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star, Tuesday, March 22, 1960:

PROBLEM FOR ALL

For two persuasive reasons the economic and social problems of the Nation's senior citizens currently are receiving the most searching attention since the principle of public responsibility, even though limited, was recognized in passage of the Social Security Act in 1935.

In brief, the reasons are: (1) That the steady lengthening in average life span has increased greatly the older-age population—the number of people who have passed their peak earning power and who are living on relatively small, fixed incomes in an era when virtually all living costs, and particularly those involving protection of health, have been rising; (2) that there already has been evidence on State and local levels of these older citizens uniting in bloc voting, a tendency which gives increasing political significance to their needs and wishes.

At the moment, Congress is examining the problem on two fronts and, quite understandably, with a thought to the potential impact on this year's national elections. It is reasonably certain, too, that the campaign platforms of both political parties will contain a plank calculated to have special attraction to the more than 20 percent of the eligible voters who will be 60 or older by November. On Capitol Hill, the broadest study has been made by a Senate labor subcommittee with the committee majority making 12 far-reaching recommendations for greater Federal services to the aging. More immediate possibility of action, however, exists on the House side where the Ways and Means Committee has several legislative proposals for broadening social security coverage. Most controversial of these is one sponsored by a high-ranking committee member, Representative FORAND, Rhode Island Democrat, to provide Government-paid health care to social security pensioners. Mr. FORAND has announced that he will ask the House membership to sign a discharge petition if the Ways and Means Committee does not report his bill to the floor in the near future.

The fact that there are political implications almost automatically built in to public consideration of this overall problem should

not becloud the problem itself. The Senate subcommittee majority, for example, was not talking of something unreal when it referred to problems facing "the young couple with aged parents to support; the middle-aged who find employment opportunities closing to them; those about to step over the threshold into the strange and uneasy world of retirement; and the aged themselves who, having reached the alleged golden years find them a badly tarnished imitation." This is not a problem for paternalistic Federal action only. As the majority said, it is a challenge calling for a partnership approach "utilizing all levels of government, private organizations and individuals." Focusing national interest on the problem today should help resolve it tomorrow.

Higher Interest Costs Extra Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I fear that our sometimes abstract economic policy discussions and the administration's stubborn defense of "tight money" fail to take into account just what Republican increases in the interest rate mean to individual Americans.

We all know that we need houses, highways, and schools in every part of our Nation and that we are going to need more every year. The AFL-CIO's monthly Economic Trends and Outlook for February points out that because of "tight money," a 10-room school will cost an additional \$7,500 in interest this year and \$150,000 more by the time the bond issue matures. It will cost a State government \$93,000 in extra interest this year and a total of \$1,860,000 before a \$5 million highway project begun this year is paid for. Individual home buyers will pay at least \$3 billion in additional interest on 20-year mortgages signed in 1960. Small businessmen will pay an extra \$850 million on 1960 short-term loans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent report published by the AFL-CIO Economic Policy Committee be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HIGHER INTEREST COSTS EXTRA BILLIONS—TIGHT MONEY COSTS TOO MUCH

The only price rise that does not seem to bother the administration very much is the higher cost of borrowing money. For 7 years Federal Reserve and administration spokesmen have repeatedly issued public "inflation warnings" and called for tighter money. Despite their announced concern about inflation, however, they have not been warning the American people about the unnecessary billions of dollars tight money costs. But higher interest rates cost more now and will cost more in the future than much of the spending the administration calls inflationary.

Unlike some other prices, the cost of borrowing money usually lingers on—sometimes for a quarter of a century. The person who

borrow money for 10 or 20 years does not have to worry so much about tomorrow's rates. He will be paying at today's rates for years to come. Recent high interest levels will therefore continue to hurt taxpayers, homebuyers, farmers, small businessmen, and consumers for a long time—regardless of the direction rates may take in the future.

How much will they hurt? The cost-conscious administration has not bothered to find out. Sufficient data has not been collected. The President's Economic Report this year merely discusses percentage trends in interest rates, but provides no detailed information about the total cost of higher interest charges.

MORE THAN \$4 BILLION

These percentage figures mean the American people are now spending billions more for interest payments than they would be spending if interest rates had stayed at lower levels. Nobody can begin to tell accurately how much more until the Government collects and supplies adequate data. But some rough projections can give a good idea of the billion-dollar implications in some of these changes.

More than \$4 billion in extra interest payments will be spent in the near future—nearly \$3 billion in the 1961 Federal budget and over \$1 billion in 1960's extra interest charges for some other parts of the economy.¹

Estimated difference between interest payments at 1960 rates and at 1952 rates on some 1960 loans

Type of loan	Extra cost of interest in 1960	Extra cost of interest over lives of loans
	Million	Billion
State and local bonds	\$143	\$2.9
Home mortgages	354	5.4
FHA	91	1.6
VA	35	.7
Conventional	228	3.1
Consumer loans	315	
Automobile paper	180	.8
Other consumer		.5
Goods paper	135	.3
Business loans	425	.9
Total	1,237	10.0

¹ Or \$1.2 billion.

Close to \$3 billion of the total \$4 billion will go into extra Federal interest payments—out of tax dollars—in the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1961. (The word "extra" is used to denote the additional interest costs above the budget of 7 years before.)

Seven years earlier, the cost of maintaining the Federal debt—interest payments on the fiscal 1954 budget was less than \$8½ billion. For fiscal 1961 it is scheduled to reach more than \$9½ billion. That is almost a 50-percent increase in interest charges on the Federal debt, although the debt itself is estimated to be only 3 percent higher than 7 years before.

\$3 BILLION MORE

The \$3 billion in additional interest charges is more than the administration has budgeted for any of the following programs:

¹ These estimates represent only part of the cost of higher interest charges. They serve as examples of the magnitude of the total. They compare only what some current rates are costing with what the rates 7 years before would have cost. They do not include the extra charges for higher interest during the past 7 years. They do not include the extra cost of higher interest rates on loans to be issued in future years.

	Billions
Atomic Energy	\$2.7
International Affairs and Finance	2.2
Commerce and Housing	2.7
Natural Resources	1.9
Public Assistance	2.1
Veterans' Compensation	2.1
General Government	1.9

Why doesn't this extra \$3 billion in interest payments cause the administration to crusade against inflationary interest rates? Why doesn't the fact that this increase costs more than the housing bills vetoed as inflationary last year cause the administration more serious concern? The administration chooses to ignore the importance of their impact.

The President's solution to the problem of higher interest costs, is to lift the legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on long-term U.S. bonds, to complain about inflationary pressures which these interest rates reflect, and to suggest that higher interest rates on bonds might somehow bring some other rates down. No mention is made of the tight-money policy's upward pressures on rates in other sectors of the money market.

COMPETITION

The budget message sounds as if interest rates have moved upward magically in response to inflationary pressures, without any conscious influence by the administration and/or Federal Reserve Board tight-money policy. Seven years of intermittent money tightening prove the fallacy of this implication. The Government has influenced the rise in interest rates in the short-term market and refused to take actions that would alleviate interest rate pressures.

Now that long-term bond rates at 4¼ percent will not attract investors, the administration merely finds that they cannot compete for investment funds and wants to lift the legal ceiling.

If the Government were a business, as the administration seems to think, how many businesses successfully compete with themselves? By forcing the Government to compete for investors as if it were a private corporation while at the same time helping to force interest rates upward through tight-money policies, the administration has helped increase the cost of Federal interest payments \$3 billion. Yet it would consider an extra \$3 billion for labor and public welfare inflationary.

The argument that the public receives these interest payments will not change the result. After all, any government spending reaches the public in one form or another. Surely Federal spending for schools, houses, health and welfare reach more of the public in more ways to the greater advantage of more people than interest rate money which mostly pours into financial institutions of the Nation.

1960'S EXTRA \$1.2 BILLION

The extra cost of today's interest rates extends far beyond the Federal budget. Over a billion dollars will go into this year's extra interest payments for just a part of this year's total volume of loans. Over the life of these loans, the extra interest charges would come to more than \$10 billion. At 1952 interest rates this year's interest costs on the estimated 1960 volume of loans for State and local governments, various kinds of mortgages and some consumer and business borrowing would be more than a billion dollars less.

The table on page 1 shows how these estimates are distributed.

THE EXTRA \$143 MILLION—STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

Tight money has already delayed many State and local government projects, but some public service needs can be put off no longer. The bond issues in 1960 will cost an extra \$143 million in interest payments this

year. This amount includes only the extra payments in 1960—the excess of 1960's interest rate over 1952's interest rate—applied to an estimated volume of 1960 bond issues.

That means that \$143 million in extra interest payments will be added to the cost of vitally needed schools, hospitals, roads and other public necessities. This extra cost will continue for an average of 20 years until the bonds mature.

Almost \$3 billion extra, therefore, will be spent by these governments for interest on bonds of 1960 issue by the time those bonds mature.

How is this estimate reached? In 1952, the average municipal bond yield was 2.19 percent. By 1957, tight money had driven the average up to 3.60 percent. As 1960 began, a conservative estimate of the year's rate was about 4.05 percent.

Based on these yield rates, \$143 million more will be spent this year on this year's bond issues than would have been spent if 1952 rates were still prevalent today. Since the average length of such bonds is 20 years, the cost over the life of the bonds will be \$2.9 billion higher than at 1952 rates. It will be \$691 million more than if 1957 rates—those prevalent just 2 years ago—had been maintained.

The impact on the cost of various projects, these State and local bond issues finance, illustrates even more concretely the added cost of today's high interest rates.

A 10-room schoolhouse, for example, financed this year would cost at least an additional \$7,500 in this year's additional interest charges and about \$150,000 more by the time the bond for the schoolhouse matures.

The interest cost of this hypothetical schoolhouse is based on the Office of Education's estimate of a single classroom's construction cost of \$40,000.

Compare the total cost—payment of interest and principal—of 10 such classrooms over the 20-year life of a school bond. At 1960's interest rates, the total cost would be \$724,000. At 1957's rates, it would be \$689,000. At 1952's interest levels, the cost would be \$575,200.

An extra \$148,800 over the total life of the bond, therefore, is added just because interest charges are so much higher than they were 7 years ago. (\$724,000—\$575,200 = \$148,800.)

The same is true of other projects. A million-dollar hospital projects will cost an extra \$18,600 in interest payments this year, if comparisons are made between 1960 and 1952 interest rates. In 20 years, this little extra item will come to \$372,000.

A \$5 million highway project this year will cost a State or local government an extra \$93,000 in this year's interest payments. By the time the highway is paid for, the extra interest charges over those at lower rates will come to \$1,860,000.

Obviously these estimates are not inclusive of all the extra interest charges paid this year, as State and local governments continue to pay for bonds issued in the tight-money years before this. These rough approximations give an indication only of an extremely high added cost from extra interest charges at today's rates.

Some estimate that the total extra interest costs for State and local governments are now running at a rate of \$350 million yearly, basing their estimates on relationship between State and local debts and the Federal debt and other comparisons. Until the Federal Government starts to supply adequate information, no one will know what the amount is. But even the minimal figure of \$143 million—just for this year's added costs—illustrates how heavy the burden of interest payments is.

It is interesting that the administration, so concerned with every upward wrinkle in

the consumer's price index, and so interested in shifting almost every public service cost to the States, has made no extensive study of the high cost of high interest at this level.

THE EXTRA \$354 MILLION—MORTGAGES

Nor has the Government come up with any extensive study of the total interest costs to home buyers, based on rising interest payments. 1960 FHA, VA, and conventional mortgages may cost an extra \$354 million in interest costs this year.

FHA mortgages may cost homeowners an extra \$91 million in this year's interest payments—\$91 million more than 1952's interest rates would have required. By the time those mortgages are paid off, the extra interest charge will amount to \$1.6 billion.

VA mortgages will cost another \$35 million extra this year because rates are higher than 7 years ago. By the time these mortgages are fully paid, the extra cost will easily be three-quarters million dollars.

These figures do not even take into consideration the money paid in discounting FHA mortgages—currently costing several million every month.² They do not count the cost of last year's excessive mortgage rates, or the possibility of too high rates next year. They merely assume that last year's volume of mortgage loans will be maintained, and estimate the cost of interest over the life of 1960's probable mortgage volume.

Conventional mortgages will cost an extra \$228 million in interest charges this year. Over their lives (averaging 20 years) this year's conventional mortgages will cost an extra \$3 billion.

For individual home buyers, these slight percentage hikes in mortgage rates will amount to thousands of dollars on individual loans.

Consider, for example, the person who gets a typical \$12,000 FHA mortgage this year, at the current 5.75 percent rate (plus one-half percent insurance charge).

His mortgage will cost more than \$3,000 more over its total life than if 1952 FHA rates still prevailed. It is up \$1,620 over 1957 just in added interest charges during the life of the mortgages.

Here are the figures showing the extra cost of higher interest for a \$12,000 FHA mortgage:

Year	Rate (percent)	Total cost	Extra cost of higher interest
1952	4½	\$23,556	
1957	5	22,140	\$1,620
1960	5¾	23,760	3,204

The added expense for a VA mortgage is much the same although the rates and average length of time for payment are different. A typical \$13,000 VA loan for a typical

²In early February, Representative ALBERT RAINS, chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on Housing, announced that mortgage premiums on Government-insured mortgages were costing home buyers approximately \$45 million each month. By discounting, or subtracting a percentage of the face value of the loan in advance, the lender gets a rate of return comparable to high-interest rates in the open market. Average rates actually paid on FHA and GI loans therefore amounted to 7 percent instead of the statutory 5½ percent on FHA and 5¼ percent on GI. In theory, the homebuilder or seller pays these discounts, but actually the costs are passed on to home buyers in added costs of housing. Typical discounts amount to 5 percent on FHA and 10 percent on GI loans.

27-year span cost 4 percent in 1952—or a total of \$21,307. By 1957, the rate was up to 4½ percent, making the total cost of the loan \$22,490. This year, the current 5¼ percent VA rate has upped the cost to \$24,336—more than \$3,000 over the cost of such a mortgage in 1952.

Interest rates on a typical conventional mortgage have changed less in the past 7 years than other mortgage rates—only 1 percentage point higher. The average amount of such a mortgage is also higher—\$14,000. Because of the higher interest rates, however, this year's average conventional mortgage will cost \$1,876 more in its 20-year life than the same \$14,000 mortgage cost 7 years ago.

MONTHLY PAYMENTS

Even monthly payments are higher than the slight percentage changes would indicate. The interest on FHA's typical \$12,000 mortgage costs \$15 more a month this year than it would if 1952 rates still applied. Interest on VA's typical \$13,000 loan costs \$16 more a month, and a conventional mortgage's interest is up \$12.50 since 1952.

Added altogether the higher cost of higher interest for homebuyers will amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars just in extra interest payments this year for this year's estimated volume of mortgages. Several billions will be spent for extra interest before these mortgages are fully paid.

It's odd that a cost-conscious administration does not publicize this cost.

THE EXTRA \$315 MILLION—CONSUMER LOANS

Additional billions have been and will be paid for higher interest charges on consumer purchases. Nobody knows how much. In this mysterious area, even the levels of interest rates are not known. All the American consumer knows is that costs have gone up.

Estimates (based on two items for which some figures are published—automobile paper and other consumer goods paper—and assuming a 7-year rise of only 1 percent in interest rates) show that part of this year's cost will amount to \$315 million in extra interest charges. Extending these estimates over the life of the loans, an average of 30 months, the extra interest cost is up \$0.8 billion over the cost at 1952 rates.

Beyond that, the possibilities of additional charges run into billions, but there is no way to get an estimate. Even the individual buyer has no way of knowing the interest cost. For example, the retail seller now tells the buyer only how much his monthly payments will total. The interest charge per month, the yearly rate of interest need not be mentioned.

In the same way, a small loan company need tell a borrower only that the monthly interest rate is 3 percent, not that the yearly rate might be 36 percent.

Only recently, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has introduced a bill, S. 2755, to require labeling of such purchases. Labels would list the yearly interest charged on loans, as well as a breakdown of the amount of interest and the amount of principal. For example, a \$250 charge for a TV set would include \$230 for the TV set and \$20 for financing—clearly marked, plus an indication of the annual rate of 20-percent interest.

The administration has made no announced effort to get such information—either in specific or general form. Two and one-half years ago, the Secretary of the Treasury merely told a Senate committee such information was not available and described the difficulties of obtaining it.

THE EXTRA \$425 MILLION—BUSINESS LOANS

Short-term money rates have increased sharply in the past 7 years until the extra cost in 1960 is an estimated \$425 million. These short-term loans average 2 years in duration, and rates on them have risen from

3.5 percent in 1952 to 4.6 percent in 1957 to 5.3 percent in 1960.

Over their life, 1960 short-term loans will cost at least an extra \$850 million, almost a billion more than they would cost at 1952's 3.5-percent rates.

MORE THAN \$4 BILLION

These estimates for some of 1960's extra interest costs, therefore, total over a billion on this year's loans: \$143 million for State and local bonds, \$354 million for mortgages, \$315 million for consumer loans, and \$425 million for business loans. That \$1.2 billion total is merely a slight indication of the extra cost of high interest rates.

Another \$3 billion, estimated for the fiscal 1961 budget, puts the near future's extra interest up to more than \$4 billion. Past years' extra interest and the extra charges on future loans would add additional billions of dollars to this cost.

Nearly 1 Million Unemployed Americans in 138 Pockets of Chronic Unemployment Look to the Democrat-Controlled House of Representatives To Approve an Area Redevelopment Bill Before Adjournment

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this second and concluding session of the 86th Congress convened January 6 and until this time very little has been said and no action has been taken regarding S. 722, a bill providing for area redevelopment aid to the Nation's 138 labor surplus areas commonly described as being "pockets of chronic unemployment."

The Douglas-Payne bill, S. 722, which passed the Senate last spring by a vote of 49 to 46 and which was reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 13, 1959 is now bottled up in the House Rules Committee where it appears to be headed for a legislative death after lingering there since May 19, 1959.

While the Rules Committee refuses to act on area redevelopment legislation, nearly 4 million American citizens or 4.8 percent of the Nation's labor force are hopelessly unemployed. While it is true that the nearly 4 million unemployed are distributed throughout the Nation yet in the 138 labor surplus areas or pockets of chronic unemployment nearly 900,000 are without employment and living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Among the 138 labor surplus areas, 31 of them are classified as major labor surplus areas, with 558,850 persons unemployed. Please keep in mind that these people residing in the 138 labor surplus areas have been unemployed for years; their unemployment compensation benefits are exhausted; their age is against them; and the only thing they have to their name is the roof over their heads.

Speaking frankly, they should not be expected to migrate elsewhere for employment, as their problem should be solved at the local level. It is the people in these areas of chronic unemployment that area redevelopment legislation will benefit.

Time and time again the need for area redevelopment legislation has been explained to Congress as well as the great effort that labor surplus communities are making to rehabilitate their economy.

Committees of both Houses of Congress have held hearings in Washington and at strategic points throughout the Nation. As a result there are scores of area redevelopment bills pending in both branches of Congress, together with 18 volumes of printed hearings containing nearly 26,000 pages of testimony and costing the taxpayers of the country over \$150,000.

Mr. Speaker, it would not surprise me if Congress, since 1955 when the legislation was first introduced, has spent over a half million dollars on hearings, travel, printing, and so forth. The only thing we have to show for this expenditure of funds is the bill, S. 722, now bottled up in the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, since the Senate has already spoken by approving the area redevelopment bill, S. 722, it is squarely up to this House to take action on the legislation. As already mentioned, S. 722 is tied up in the House Rules Committee where the membership is composed of eight Democrats and four Republicans. In view of the fact that the House of Representatives is controlled by the Democrats by nearly a 2-to-1 majority, the responsibility for getting action on area redevelopment legislation rests solely on the shoulders of the Democrat Party.

Those of us who want immediate action on area redevelopment legislation are not unmindful of the fact that the Senate bill S. 722 is not getting much support from the Eisenhower administration because of the difference in cost between it and the administration bill.

Therefore, since it has been frequently urged during the past 6 years that there is a definite need to compromise conflicting views regarding area redevelopment legislation, those of us in favor of such action repeat again it is the only means of ever obtaining favorable consideration of the legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our best hope is to have the House approve a bill and then try to reach a compromise through a Senate-House conference committee, as it is only through acceptance of a compromise that hope lies for enactment of an area redevelopment bill.

Time is running out on the 86th Congress, with adjournment predicted early in July or less than 4 months away.

Since we have legislated for practically every segment of the American economy and for varied groups, including foreign nations friendly to this country, in my mind we owe prompt and proper consideration of the plight of the 900,000 hopelessly unemployed who reside in 138

labor-surplus areas which have been suffering from chronic unemployment for several years.

Therefore, it is my sincere hope that the House of Representatives will accept its responsibility for the fate of area redevelopment legislation by prevailing upon the Democrat-controlled House Rules Committee to take immediate action on S. 722, which passed the Senate a year ago.

Such action would pave the way for an early vote on a vital legislative measure concerning the health and welfare of nearly 1 million unemployed Americans.

Resolutions Adopted by the Student Council of Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, With Respect to the Loyalty Oath and the Disclaimer Affidavit in the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the students taking part in the "Week in Washington" program which I initiated and sponsor in cooperation with the Iowa clearinghouse for students and instructors of Iowa colleges, is Miss Lois Christopherson, a junior at Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

Miss Christopherson called my attention to a resolution adopted voluntarily by the student council at Grinnell. Because I know of its voluntary nature, entirely free of any influence or pressure from the school administration, I asked her to draft a note which would explain the background leading up to this action and to make a copy of the resolution available to me.

I particularly feel that it should be brought to the attention not only of the committees in Congress now considering legislation to repeal these sections of the National Defense and Education Act, but of all Members as well. I am sure that my colleagues will agree that this is a significant contribution to the issue at hand. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to have Miss Christopherson's note printed in the Appendix of the Record, along with a copy of the resolution.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: As a small but excellent liberal arts college, Grinnell has recently instituted under the sponsorship of its student council a thorough review of the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit which are attached to the 1958 National Defense Education Act. The debate began with the election of a student council president who had spent the previous semester as a political science student at American University, and was facilitated by organized discussions in each hall, as well as by an all-college coffee hour in which a student-faculty panel discussed the merits or lack of such of the two attached oaths. The immediate result was a highly stimulating interest in public affairs in general; the ulti-

mate result was a unanimous vote of the student council, as well as an overwhelming vote of the general student body, favoring the repeal of both the disclaimer and the loyalty oath. The vote was taken after an evening of considered discussion in each hall in which both the pros and cons of the two oaths were reviewed. And it should be emphasized that although the college administration had previously taken a stand in opposition to the disclaimer and loyalty oath, the administration did not exert any influence at all on the discussion or on the final student vote.

The resolution drawn up by the council and approved by the student body is as follows:

Very sincerely,

LOIS CHRISTOPHERSON,
Grinnell College Student Council.

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958 established several programs of Federal aid to education; and

Whereas section 1001(f) of the act provided for a loyalty oath and a disclaimer affidavit to be signed by all applicants for loans; and

Whereas there are grave doubts as to the constitutionality of a provision which may infringe upon the first amendment protection of belief and association; and

Whereas it is a denial of due process of law to compel an individual to gage his conduct by such vague criteria, when criminal liability may turn on his action; and

Whereas the singling out of the academic community for affirmation of loyalty and belief is invidious and implies distrust with no factual foundation; and

Whereas the oath and affidavit reveal a lack of confidence in our form of government and in our social institutions; and

Whereas Grinnell College, along with 18 other distinguished colleges and universities, has refused funds under this act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Grinnell College Student Council, representing student sentiment, favor the repeal of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act.

Resolved, That the Grinnell College Student Council endorse the stand taken by the faculty, administration, and trustees of Grinnell College.

Resolved, That the Grinnell College Student Council establish a committee to foster student activity for repeal of section 1001(f), the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions of the act.

Resolved, That the Grinnell College Student Council communicate this resolution to Senators and Congressmen, newspapers, and the student councils of other colleges and universities.

Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 12, 1960, Branch 210 of the National Letter Carriers Association conducted a rally for the postal employees of the Rochester, N.Y., post office. At that rally, a resolution concerning H.R. 9883, and other postal pay increase legislation was adopted. I should like to insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Resolved, That we are in dire need of passage of pay legislation and urge support of H.R. 9883 or similar bills to place letter carriers and other postal employees in a position to maintain a decent American standard of living.

Sam W. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, society is always the loser when an able citizen retires from his chosen field of work, and so, with the scheduled retirement of Sam W. Russell from the Federal-State Market News Service, it can check up another loss.

This dim prospect, however, becomes brightened by the realization that this competent citizen and my good friend retires from his active endeavors with that deep sense of satisfaction which flows from a job well done.

In recognition of our friendship and as a tribute to his dedicated service, I submit to the RECORD the following article on Sam W. Russell as it appeared in the March 16 issue of the Bangor Daily News:

VETERAN CROP REPORTER ENDS LONG SERVICE TERM

PRESQUE ISLE, March 15.—Sam W. Russell has been a reporter for the Federal-State Market News Service since teeth were pulled for a dollar and the Saturday Evening Post sold for a nickel.

On March 25 he will retire, following 38 years and 3 months of Government service. The 3 months were with the U.S. Army during World War I, and for the last 22 years Russell has been Federal-State Market News Service representative in Presque Isle, the largest Market News Service field station for a single commodity in the Nation.

Russell has been responsible for sending daily potato bulletins 5 days a week to about 3,600 sources.

"I live in the house by the side of the road and try to be a friend of man," paraphrased Russell Tuesday in an interview. "My longest stretch in terminal market reporting on fresh fruits and vegetables was on the Washington Street wholesale district in downtown New York, from 1923 through 1928. I went to field reporting, returned to the Washington market in 1929, and in 1939 was assigned to the Presque Isle office."

These are important dates in Russell's career. Actually there have been a number of other assignments. And he spent the 1935-36 season in Presque Isle, before being assigned here in 1939.

The bulletin which Russell issues from the Presque Isle office of Market News Service has been described as offering a clear picture of market conditions for the given day— which the consumer wants. The service is free and comes from Russell's office in the Postal Building.

The bulletin includes information on daily rail shipments from Maine, carlot holdings at terminal markets, prices at certain terminal markets, destination of all Maine carlot shipments, weather and other facts.

Russell had reported on grapes, snapbeans, onions, watermelons, strawberries, cabbages, tomatoes, and other products. He has

worked in Rochester, N.Y., Leesburg, Fla., Valdosta, and Macon, Ga., Elizabeth City, N.C., Laredo, Tex., Olney, Va., and Newark, N.J.

His bulletins here are issued from September through June, to 38 States and to Canada. Russell compiles his daily report from telephone conversations, personal visits, wire, mail, and teletype figures from Maine and from terminal markets in other areas.

Russell is from Altoona, Pa., and is a graduate of Pennsylvania State College.

He was the first member of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct a regular market news service program on radio.

Russell lives on a 3-acre farm on the Caribou road and raises chickens and sells eggs. His philosophy is: "Do the very best you can and be glad you are yourself."

Good and Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I recommend as an antidote for the particular poison being spread by those who see nothing but the seamy side of the American economic system the following article by John Allan May, humorist and London correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor:

GOOD AND RICH—COME WHAT MAY

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Somehow I cannot quite bring myself to believe all I read about today's America.

"Our industrial system has gone soft and is progressively less able to compete," writes a great and thoughtful American editor of my acquaintance.

And Thomas Griffith, I see, who has just published a book that is rather critical of American culture, puts it in these words: "Our goal has become a life of amiable sloth."

Neither of these remarks quite fits in with the other complaints made simultaneously by both these and other critics. The chief other complaint is that it is making money—that is the central, and most revolting, feature of American society. But there you are; you cannot have it both ways unless you happen to be a critic.

"For what makes money cannot be really wrong and what doesn't make money can't be really important. . . . The real test is ability to 'meet a payroll,'" reports Prof. D. W. Brogan, ironically, reviewing Mr. Griffith's book in the Guardian.

"This," the professor, a good friend of America, adds, "is described as the free-enterprise system, and this is the doctrine the United States offers as the one thing needful to the insurgent masses of Asia and Africa."

And then I see that Thomas Wiseman, a theatrical columnist, commenting wearily on an interview he had with William Saroyan, says that Mr. Saroyan's insistence on the essential goodness of man "hardly sounds so noble" in a period when there are "two cars in every garage."

Now, although it does not seem to me that a man has necessarily to be ignoble to buy his wife a car, or that people would be really better people if only they made less money, I should like to make it quite clear before getting on with the play that I admire these critics personally, and that I, too, favor the ends they think they favor.

I, too, think professors important. I, too, want to see wider freedoms for all men. I, too, want to spread justice. I, too, want to help eradicate the poverty of the poor. I, too, want to prove the brotherhood of man and improve the quality of society. Yet when the critics fulminate in quite the way they do about America the curtain always goes up in my mental theater and I find this scene playing:

A Cabinet office. Two men are sorting mounds of papers and of strange-looking gadgets.

President Grogan: "What went wrong? Why have we produced so many things? Don't you know things do not make the quality of our life? It's ideas. Why all these millions of things?"

Secretary Frifith: "I'm afraid it was a little miscalculation, sir. Changing that slogan, 'No more amiable sloth; now for stern, energetic action.' People began to produce and produce and produce, you know. Sweet people, but while we used to have too much of everything before, now we've got much too much. They are so productive. And it is all stuff we don't even want."

President Grogan: "That's impossible."

Secretary Frifith: "I agree, sir. I agree. Of course it is. But you'll remember that when we produced what people wanted or could be persuaded they wanted, an awful lot of people made money. And we just couldn't have that."

President Grogan: "The only really profitable thing for society is to insure that what is made is profitless."

Secretary Frifith: "Exactly. I will have that inscribed on the dictatorship bill, sir. It is very clear. Now that brings me to the report of Secretary for Aid Wisestman. I am afraid it will be a bit of a shock, sir. The underdeveloped countries have all joined the Communist bloc."

President Grogan: "It's impossible."

Secretary Frifith: "Quite so, sir. You will recall our campaign to impress upon them that making money was not in the least important and that production does not, as businessmen used to claim, provide a service for one's fellowmen and that rapid material progress must be eradicated as it is founded on greed and that philosophy above all is the thing. It was successful and they became even poorer than they were before."

President Grogan: "Impossible."

Secretary Frifith: "Absolutely. A secondary consequence, of course, was that note from the President of Fakiristan drawing your attention to a surplus of philosophers, teachers, and lawyers in his country, whom we offered posts at our colleges where they now are, some of them upside down. Well, now, after all that they say that what they really want is work for their people and buyers for their produce and profits for their expansion."

"None of this our new doctrine offers them. The Soviets, of course, have always been outright materialists. So now they have easily persuaded them that these things are so worthwhile that even freedom is a small price to pay for them."

President Grogan: "Planning is better than freedom. I agree there. Free enterprise is for the birds. What is that noise?"

Secretary Frifith: "Oh, I forgot. There are 75 million Americans out of work now that we have eliminated wants. They are outside and want to know what to do."

President Grogan: "Tell them to attend my lecture this afternoon. And later, this evening maybe, to become cultured."

The curtain falls on him.

Moral: The essential goodness of a man has nothing whatever to do with the size of his garage or the fullness thereof. But the wealth of his neighbor has. Particularly if the latter builds garages or fills them.

It is important to the world that America be good and rich. And it is not, after all, impossible to be both. Or even to be free as well.

Impact of Increasing Imports of Fabricated Products on American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress a few days ago, the President expressed his concern over the growing foreign competition to the American exporter and directed the several agencies of the executive branch to take certain steps which may help to strengthen the competitive position of our export industry. He has asked for the support of the Congress toward this end, and such support, I am certain, will be forthcoming, since the economic strength of the United States is a matter which transcends the boundaries between political parties and between sectional interests.

Without in any way minimizing my support of the President's recommendations with respect to exports, I would call your attention to the other side of the coin of foreign trade. The President's message does not deal with this other side of the coin, but I am certain that we cannot effectively and justifiably treat the one side—exports—and ignore the other side—imports. The one bears on the other as the back of the hand bears on the palm.

The disastrous impact of increasing imports of fabricated products on our American industries, particularly the so-called small business element of our industry, and which is felt with special emphasis by the skilled and unskilled laborer who is the veritable backbone of our industry, was clearly stated by Mr. James A. Roemer, chairman of the board of the Sharon Steel Corp., in that corporation's bargaining conference with the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, on May 15, last. To these pertinent remarks, I would earnestly solicit your attention:

A very good customer of Sharon Steel bought 13,867 tons in 1955; 18,587 tons in 1956; 15,958 tons in 1957 and only 6,349 tons in 1958.

In this instance, the 10-inch mill lost about 5 weeks' work to foreign competition. Here was \$4 million of business and wages that went to Europe, as the contribution of Sharon Steel and its employees.

This foreign material was delivered to the customer's plant at \$22 to \$30 a ton less than our delivered price. And this customer is not on the eastern seaboard. One of our eastern seaboard customers bought foreign 10-inch mill tonnage at \$44 a ton under our delivered price. This gives you some idea of how foreign competition in 1958 affected you and the Sharon Steel Corp.

A highly respected constituent, Mr. Ray F. Eisenbies, president of the Sawhill Tubular Products, Inc., of Sharon, Pa., recently analyzed for me the effect of

increasing foreign competition on his company, as well as on other American companies engaged in the manufacture of steel pipe. Imported steel pipe amounted to over 200,000 tons in 1958, and to an all-time high of 553,000 tons in 1959. Mr. Eisenbies tells me that many of his company's markets, particularly those adjacent to ocean harbors, have already been seriously affected and, with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, others will soon feel the impact. The cost of this Nation's economy both in profits and in jobs, is steadily mounting and urgently requires the best thought that can be brought to bear on the solution to the problem in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As a contribution to that solution, I would say that the remedy probably lies not in the erection of high tariff walls against foreign products, but in the establishment of quotas for such products whose unrestricted importation inflicts heavy penalties against American industry and labor and seriously weakens our country's defensive strength. The philosophy of quota limitations has been well accepted as a legitimate and effective means for the protection of American agriculture, as well as American industry and American labor.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other firms in my congressional district—as well as throughout the Nation—that are bleeding because of this unexpected influx of imported goods upon our markets. I hope, therefore, to supplement this report with additional data from firms in my district and throughout the country.

In the meantime, I respectfully urge the Members and the cognizant committees of the Congress to give this matter their prompt and most sympathetic consideration.

The Nth Country Problem and Arms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the wide diffusion of nuclear weapons is one of the great threats of the sixties. During the course of our discussions on control and inspection, the spread of science and technology in the nuclear field is not standing still. As knowledge and greater technical competence increase in different countries, there is the accompanying danger that there will be many new atomic powers anxious to have their own supply of weapons.

In assessing the threat, in order not to overestimate it nor underestimate it, we need all the sound, factual information we can acquire. A recent study by the National Planning Association, "The Nth Country Problem and Arms Control," makes an important contribution to the kind of information we need.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for the RECORD a section of this report:

STATEMENT BY THE NPA SPECIAL PROJECT COMMITTEE ON SECURITY THROUGH ARMS CONTROL ON THE NTH COUNTRY PROBLEM AND ARMS CONTROL

Acute fears have beset us since the introduction of nuclear weapons of mass destruction. But we have occasionally found some comfort in the thought that peace might be assured by a "balance of terror": that, while nuclear weapons are confined to just a few great nations with an enormous stake in the planet's land and people, an all-out nuclear war is unlikely. This balance is an uneasy one, involving many complicated factors and it impels a continuing race for new offensive and defensive armaments.¹

EQUILIBRIUM AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS DISTRIBUTION

But the production of both atomic and hydrogen weapons by Great Britain, the more recent development by France of atomic weaponry (which will soon be demonstrated by a test explosion), and the rumors of nuclear weapons research in Communist China raise disquieting doubts about the validity of the "balance of terror" formula. Atomic weapons may eventually become so widely diffused that there will be no equilibrium or symmetry in their distribution. Among their owners may someday be rulers—and perhaps even ex-rulers—who have no major stake in world stability. Indeed, it has even been suggested that eventually atomic weapons, like other powerful armaments, might find their way into the international open market, or that they might fall into the hands of outlaws and revolutionaries.

This is a problem which has caused considerable concern for some time. It was referred to in our earlier report, "1970 Without Arms Control" (pp. 39-42), and in recent months it has been the subject of considerable discussion in the United States and abroad.

As factual background to assist in planning arms-control measures to deal with this problem, we are publishing the accompanying technical paper in which three qualified scientists have attempted to estimate the difficulties which face a new power aspiring to enter the nuclear-weapons race and to set forth in detail the factors involved and the resources and capabilities required. We believe it will be of great use to bring this material to public attention so that students and observers in the fields of international affairs, military science, economics, government, and the natural sciences may use it in making their own analysis of the problem.

The paper shows that many nations are capable of creating an atomic weapon without outside assistance. But it offers no encouragement to those who think that such a program can be undertaken without facing difficult obstacles and high costs. And the cost of the warhead represents only a small part of the cost of maintaining the deterrent.

It is as easy to overestimate the rapidity of the spread of nuclear weapons as it is to underestimate it. The difficulties and delays faced in the French atomic-weapons program demonstrate concretely that a nuclear-weapons capability is not easily arrived at. After the first working models have been produced, many hurdles remain. Even the testing of weapons presents problems. France has received strong protests from nations neighboring her test site and from the United Nations General Assembly, which called on France, by a vote of 51 to 16, to cancel her proposed tests in the Sahara.

Deep fear of the imminent spread of independent nuclear capability has on some occasions been accompanied by an emotional zeal to wash the problem away by dramatic

gestures. Perhaps as a reaction to the seeming complacency of statesmen, individuals in Britain and elsewhere have urged such desperate measures as unilateral nuclear disarmament. Those who view the problems of mankind in a context larger than their own immediate time and place are entitled to great respect. Their contribution to public discussion of security problems is a valuable counterbalance to an all too prevalent tendency unthinkingly to accept outworn concepts. However, the lessons of recent history warn that, within the realities of the moment, it is possible that such counsels may lead, not toward peace, but toward war. It is arguable^{2,3} that World War I, would not have been started if the attitude of the allied powers, particularly America, had been clear from the outset; that Hitler would never have embarked on his infamous adventures if he had been aware of America's deep commitment to European security; and that the North Koreans would not have invaded South Korea if they had correctly understood the concern of the United States with the integrity of the Republic of Korea. Further, it is the nature of world politics today that those urging unilateral disarmament can speak freely on one side of the world but not on the other. Their right to speak openly is essential to the maintenance of free government. However, in foreign countries which are not accustomed to free and vocal public discussion, reports of these activities might create an impression of division and irresolution, which might well tempt an act of aggression.⁴

But while the immediacy of the dangers of nuclear diffusion is often overestimated, it is obvious that four nuclear powers present different problems than do two nuclear powers. If France could independently produce an atomic bomb at a time when her military and economic power were being subjected to heavy strain, still more countries might also produce one at some time in the future. It is by no means clear how fast events are moving, but it is certain that they inevitably move only in one direction—toward the greater spread of nuclear weapons capability.

DANGERS OF DIFFUSION

This committee feels that the prospect of widely scattered nuclear weapons presents a very serious threat to world stability. This scattering was called the "third country problem" in the days before Britain had nuclear power; it was called the "fourth country problem" before France had the bomb within her reach; and it is now safer to call it the "Nth country problem." It is a challenge which is not receiving the very serious attention it deserves at home or abroad. It is also a possible opportunity—an opportunity to find at least one common concern which might move the nuclear powers of both the East and of the West to achieve some limited agreements for joint action.

Proliferation of nuclear weapons will inject incalculable factors into the equation of international politics. Some countries, under economic or other pressures, may eventually sell atomic weapons. Governments under fanatics or dictators may act rashly. The possibility of accidental or of unauthorized use of atomic weapons will increase. Irresponsible "mischief-making" by one small nation could catalyze a nuclear conflict between larger powers, or might cause pre-existing nonnuclear hostilities to escalate into nuclear hostilities.

The risk of accidental war by the mischievous action of a third party or by the possible mismanagement of tests, war exercises, strategic miscalculation, and the like is further enhanced by the rapid introduction of "quick reaction" systems. These tend to be inflexible, so that full-scale war may grow out of inadvertencies or deliberate mischief. It will become even more difficult to achieve and enforce arms control agreements, and

much harder to inspire confidence in their effectiveness.

Since it is hardly reasonable to expect a nation developing nuclear weapons to refrain from testing them, worldwide radioactive contamination is likely to exceed predictions based on projected tests by the present nuclear powers only.

The Nth country problem derives urgency from the fact that we are approaching the point where it will no longer be possible for the present nuclear powers to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Once a nation has successfully complete an atomic weapons program, it will have nuclear stockpiles which can be stored without appreciable deterioration, which can survive changes of government, and which can be sold, exchanged, or given away.

The period, then, in which the major power blocs have a common opportunity to limit membership in the "atomic club" is, in the long view of history, a very brief one. We are now living in that period, and 10 years of it have gone by.

The question of whether to invest or not to invest in nuclear armaments will be debated in many capitals during the years ahead. No aspirant can afford to ignore the grave difficulties and heavy expenses which confront a would-be atomic power, nor ignore the fact that a profuse capacity for destruction is not necessarily a source of security. It is certainly clear that atomic weapons projects are not, in the present state of the art, easy for a middle-sized nation to undertake. But standards of rational priorities of economic effort are not always observed, and from the days of the pyramids of Egypt, human needs have been sacrificed to concepts of glory. We cannot predict with assurance what nations will have, and what nations will not have, independent atomic capabilities in the years ahead.

FRANCE AND BRITAIN

This statement is not a discussion of arrangements to share weapons or delivery systems with allied nations as a matter of mutual defense. Such arrangements are made within the context of existing arms competition and tensions, and this committee does not recommend unilateral disarmament measures. Nor do we criticize British and French decisions to achieve independent nuclear weapons capability. We note, however, that many competent military experts, including outstanding experts in Britain and France, have criticized the British and French nuclear weapons development from the standpoint of the effective allocation of defense effort.

It has been said that the disproportionate emphasis on a strategic nuclear weapon has resulted in a neglect of more important limited war capabilities and that possession of a small stockpile of nuclear weapons of a fairly primitive sort, without advanced means of delivery, is of doubtful value. Although France has an advanced aircraft industry, it has no heavy bomber which could effectively penetrate the borders of the Soviet Union, and neither France nor Britain have the long-range missile capabilities required for modern nuclear weapons systems. Security vis-a-vis the great powers cannot be achieved merely by developing a nuclear warhead without the support of the most modern aircraft and missiles. And the use of nuclear warheads against targets whose defenses are more primitive raises the specter of the catalytic wars, which starts between small nations but eventually draws in great-power protectors.

However, the much criticized French decision to arm atomically was not lightly made. The French were persuaded primarily by the argument that no alliance or commitment would be strong enough to compel any nation to risk nuclear destruction to aid another. They would explain their position approximately as follows: (1) Nuclear power

Footnotes at end of speech.

does not deter aggression unless the potential aggressor believes that the nuclear retaliation, causing greater destruction than he is willing to bear, will actually be used to answer an attack; (2) it is not credible that a country will enter a nuclear war, exposing its own cities to obliteration, solely in defense of another nation; (3) therefore, the only nuclear power that deters an attack on France is one that rests entirely in French hands. Some French writers go on to make three further points: (4) The only nuclear deterrent that will protect other European countries is one that lies completely in the hands of each such country; (5) therefore, each European country should have an independent atomic capability; and (6) since the interests of France are closely enmeshed in those of the rest of Europe, France will be safer if every major European country has its own atomic weapons capability.

However, the strong impression persists that the true French motivation, conscious or unconscious, is the belief that possession of nuclear weapons will heighten national prestige and promote French eligibility for American nuclear assistance.

PEACEFUL USES AND MILITARY DEVELOPMENT

The accompanying technical report shows that the distribution of reactors to utilize atomic energy for peaceful purposes has considerable bearing on the distribution of military nuclear capacity, because of the possibility of using these reactors to produce weapons-grade fissionable material for weapons. Intergovernmental contracts for assistance in building power reactors are going forward rapidly. They are constructive and commendable. At the moment, they do not involve the danger of military production, but such programs may well, over the years, expedite a spread of nuclear weapons. The possibility can be minimized by control arrangements over the type of reactor and its operational processes, and over all the materials that enter and leave it.

Controls are made technically possible because the very practices which contribute to the manufacture of the best weapons-grade material are those which tend to make the production of heat and power least efficient. Perversion of the purposes of the reactor can be prevented by requiring that the design of the reactor and the procedures for handling fuel conform to the necessities of efficient energy production, and by forbidding those which result in the purest material for weapons. If fuel rods remain in the reactor beyond a certain period, the plutonium 239 that is collecting in the fuel elements becomes poisoned by plutonium 240, which makes the resulting material more difficult to use for weapons purposes. Thus economic operations favor longer fuel cycles, and the use of shorter cycles would indicate a military purpose.

The Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has drafted a set of control regulations subject to approval in 1960 by the Agency's General Conference, on which all members are represented. Euratom (European Atomic Energy Community) is also trying to develop such a safeguards system, and the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada place safeguards on their exports under bilateral contracts.

The maintenance of strict control arrangements in bilateral contracts may become more difficult, however, as the bargaining power of recipient nations increases. Fuel consumers, led by India, demonstrated a strong resistance to controls in the discussions which preceded the adoption of the statute of the IAEA. In their view, the imposition of controls was an insulting symbol of the desire of the great powers to perpetuate a monopolistic position. These pressures may become difficult to resist in future bilateral contracts.

The IAEA presents a genuine opportunity to mitigate the danger of the diversion of nuclear power reactors to military purposes. It can administer controls strictly, without injury to national pride. Its rules provide for the application of a very effective set of controls. At the present time, the IAEA, a large and expensive piece of administrative machinery, is standing idle. The nuclear powers are bypassing it by the use of bilateral contracts. Yet, the IAEA could insulate the major powers from imprudent demands on the part of recipient countries. An agreement, expressed or implied, among the major powers to use the IAEA in place of bilateral agreements would be a major step toward eliminating the possibility of the diversion of power systems to weapons development.⁹

This would at least provide some method of controlling the use of the reactors supplied under economic assistance programs. It would not provide a complete check on nuclear weapons development in the recipient countries, however, because this would also require control of fuel fabrication, chemical processing, and isotope separation facilities. When extensive controls are proposed, the issue will undoubtedly be raised as to whether recipient countries would be willing to accept such interference with what they regard as their own economic-political development unless the major powers themselves were subjected to similar inspection. Such controls might very well be instituted, however, if the major powers would agree to a cutoff of future nuclear weapons materials. And the execution of such tasks might conceivably be assigned to the IAEA.

NUCLEAR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Military assistance programs involving atomic weapons are also going forward. These programs in themselves involve a spread of nuclear weapons capability, but this is a derivative capability rather than an independent capability. This paper is concerned with the spread of independent nuclear capability.

It should be noted, however, that a derivative nuclear weapons capability is in itself a step toward eventual independent capability. Nuclear powers will attempt to retain the control over their nuclear warheads which are placed in other countries for emergencies, but it is to be expected that these efforts will be resisted. General de Gaulle, for example, resists any control by the United States of its atomic weapons stored in France. In treaties with other NATO countries the United States has found it necessary to vest in the recipient countries a right to continue to receive both ancillary equipment and restricted information on the use of nuclear systems, and this right can be determined only by consent by both parties until the expiration of the NATO treaty.

In situations of military assistance, it is possible that, over the years, accommodation to the recipient country may eventually erode controls. Here, particularly, one must weigh the effectiveness, in a critical juncture, of the treaty pledge as against the fact of effective territorial sovereignty and the possession of military force at the site of the weapons stores. While NATO military assistance programs involving nuclear weapons may tend to spread independent nuclear capability, the alternative would be either (a) the possibility of independent development of nuclear weapons by each of the NATO countries, or (b) the imposition of a unilateral arms handicap on the NATO nations.

In the nature of things, arrangements of this sort among the NATO countries are

widely publicized and vigorously debated, while the placement of nuclear weapons in the Warsaw Pact territory remains a military secret.

There may be many excellent reasons for opposing such a deployment of weapons on the NATO side, but to oppose them merely on the basis of a broad policy against nuclear diffusion would seem to place a disadvantage upon the side which operates openly.⁷

Furthermore, at the present time, no arms control agreements have been entered into, and under these circumstances it would not be fair to ask one side to accept unilateral handicaps.⁸ The fact that this momentum exists, and will exist on both sides is, however, a powerful argument in favor of the proposition that agreements should be reached as early as possible.

SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM

This committee is agreed that it would be desirable to prevent the wider diffusion of nuclear weapons capability. However, it finds that the problem is an extremely complicated one, since the basic requirements—scientific knowledge, industrial and material resources, as well as technological skills—are already being distributed around the world at a rapid rate. It has considered many possible solutions.

Treaty limitation: Some have suggested an international treaty which would limit nuclear weapons to the present "have" nations without embracing other aspects of arms control and international security. This idea was rejected because it was felt that it could easily be evaded and that it would be meaningless in the event of war. Its enforcement would require a high degree of inspection in the nonnuclear countries. Those who are innocent of any nuclear power would naturally resent being inspected more than those who possess atomic weapons.

Voluntary limitation: A suggestion advanced by Ireland's Minister for External Affairs, adopted by the United Nations Political Committee on November 16, 1959, calls for voluntary measures: Nuclear powers should undertake to refrain from supplying nuclear weapons to States which do not possess them, and nonnuclear nations should undertake to refrain from manufacturing or acquiring such weapons. This, like all pronouncements which are merely declaratory, would operate effectively against open societies but would not operate against closed societies.

International control of nuclear testing: In our statement "International control of nuclear testing" (July 1958), we pointed out that one of the primary values of an agreement to discontinue nuclear tests would be its tendency to curb independent nuclear development by new powers. We stated:

"A prohibition on nuclear tests by itself cannot prove a completely effective control on the spread of nuclear bombs among many nations. . . . A relatively crude bomb could be developed by a determined nation without testing, although it is not very likely that any nation would even commit a weapon to use without some testing and/or practice firing by its own nationals. Also, certain countries, such as Britain, France, and Sweden, might test at least until agreement is negotiated, although we doubt that they would block agreement."

"Thus, other control measures, particularly a control on the production of nuclear materials, will be necessary adequately to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Nonetheless, a test prohibition can be one helpful measure, and it is clearly the simplest and most feasible step that can be taken now."

Although not a guarantee of complete certainty, we believe that a test discontinuance agreement would effectively limit the membership of the so-called "atomic club."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Agreement to cease production of nuclear materials: International arms control agreement to cease production of nuclear materials would, of course, make possible a far more effective method of preventing the development of nuclear weapons by the nuclear have-nots, because it would install a more thorough type of inspection machinery, which would enable the detection of preparations for weapons manufacture at early stages.

Up to the present time, negotiations for both a production cut-off and a test agreement have been stalled, because of the Soviet Union's refusal to accept the inspection machinery which is required to check on compliance.¹⁰ But it is difficult to conceive that the nonnuclear nations will accept a nuclear inspection system which does not also apply to the nuclear nations.

Limitation in exchange for protection: It has also been suggested that the have-not nations could be dissuaded from independent development of atomic weapons if the have nations would give them a firm assurance to protect them by the use of their own nuclear weapons. However, a have-not nation may find it difficult to believe that its ally would risk nuclear destruction in its behalf.

Limitation of independent capability by freer distribution of weapons: Another suggestion has been that the have nations freely offer nuclear assistance to their allies, under conditions which restrict the availability and use of these weapons. This suggestion is of some value if the problem is to prevent the immediate commencement of research and development programs; however, it obviously is not a bar to the ultimate diffusion of independent weapons capability. It spreads derivative nuclear capability in order to prevent the spread of independent nuclear capability.¹¹ The reasoning behind the proposal is: They are going to get it anyway, so why not share it in a way that retains some military and legal control in the center of the power bloc?

Limitation enforced by haves: Finally, it has been urged that the have nations agree to impose their will by force on the have-not nations, and to introduce a rigid inspection system which would also be imposed by force.

It was also suggested that the three nuclear powers, in giving economic assistance in nuclear power production, should supply reactors on a lease system only, and should reserve to themselves the processing of reactor fuel elements. This would satisfy a demand for electrical power without giving control of fissionable material. A simple inspection process would prevent fuel reprocessing. The penalty for violation would be a joint withdrawal of economic aid by the nuclear powers.¹²

This proposal did not recommend itself to the committee because it was felt that so high-handed a procedure would hardly be an acceptable method of enforcing the peace. It was also felt that since the have powers have had so much difficulty in reaching agreement on far less controversial matters, it was very unlikely that they would work together in so unconventional a project and at the expense of their allies.

Furthermore, with respect to this and other limitation proposals, this committee feels that unless a have-not country is presented with an alternative which will guarantee its security, it cannot be expected to renounce its aspirations to achieve weapons which the have nations already possess. The basic problem is to achieve some method of offering security to a nation which is asked to forego its nuclear potentiality.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion the committee finds:

1. That if present national policies continue, independent nuclear military power

will be spread widely among many countries within the next 30 years.

2. That the diffusion of independent nuclear weapons among many countries will, over the years, upset international stability and increase the danger of war.

3. That the spread of nuclear know-how and equipment through international assistance in peaceful economic uses of nuclear power, although useful and praiseworthy, might tend eventually to contribute to the diffusion of military nuclear power.

4. That nuclear military assistance programs providing for the gift and loan of warheads do not directly create independent nuclear power, but are factors which will tend over the years to contribute to the growth of such independent nuclear power. The committee concludes:

1. That the dangers of the wide diffusion of nuclear weapons within the next 30 years are real. Such diffusion may very well vitiate the stability which could conceivably otherwise arise in an era of balanced nuclear forces. These dangers must be considered by both the United States and the Soviet Union in all their negotiations on arms control. Neither side wishes to take substantial risks, but both sides must consider the heavy risks involved in continued inaction.

2. That the nuclear powers could curtail the dangers of perversion of economic aid programs for peaceful uses of nuclear power if they would make greater use of international agencies which impose stringent controls. Both the East and the West could operate through the IAEA without loss of national advantage. This would require no further treaties. If one side embarked upon such a policy and the other did not follow, there would be no loss greater than a slight loss of operating efficiency and of influence on the commercial aspects of reactor operation.

3. That direct control of the spread of independent military nuclear power is possible only in terms of larger disarmament arrangements. The promulgation and enforcement of an effective international accord to cease nuclear tests will tend to prevent the development of nuclear weapons by new countries. More comprehensive agreements—particularly those looking toward controls on production—will provide a more potent inspection system, which could enable control authority to detect evasions with certainty and accuracy.¹³

Members of the NPA special project committee on security through arms control signing the statement:

Franklin A. Lindsay,¹⁴ acting chairman of the committee; McKinsey & Co., Inc.

Jerome H. Spingarn, secretary of the committee, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Archibald Alexander, Bernardville, N.J.

Harding F. Bancroft, secretary, the New York Times.

Harrison Brown, professor of geochemistry, California Institute of Technology.

David F. Cavers,¹⁵ associate dean, Harvard Law School.

Norman Cousins,¹⁶ editor, Saturday Review.

William C. Davidson,¹⁷ Argonne National Laboratory.

Harvey A. DeWeerd,¹⁸ Rand Corp.

David H. Frisch,¹⁹ professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

David R. Inglis,²⁰ Argonne National Laboratory.

Amron H. Katz, the Rand Corp.

Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Brandeis University.

Klaus Knorr,²¹ center of international studies, Princeton University.

Walter J. Levison, Itek Corp.

John M. H. Lindbeck, center for East Asian studies, Harvard University.

John F. Loosbrock, editor and assistant publisher, Air Force magazine.

David Reisman,²² Harvard University.

Richard B. Roberts, department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Lauren K. Soth, editor of the editorial pages, the Des Moines Register & Tribune.

Albert M. Stone,²³ technical assistant to the director, Johns Hopkins applied physics laboratory.

Robert C. Tait, senior vice president, General Dynamics Corp.; president, Stromberg-Carlson Division.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Heathsville, Va.

Robert C. Tucker, department of political science, Indiana University.

David J. Winton, chairman of the board, Winton Lumber Co.

Kenneth Young, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.

Arnold S. Zander, international president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

¹ A continuing race for armaments, even among a few powers, does not assure lasting peace by a balance of terror. Progress toward arms control is essential, and obtainable only by vigorous effort with sufficient priority compared to immediate military consideration (William C. Davidson and David R. Inglis).

² I think this is misleading and inaccurate. Nations do not go to war because of their ignorance of what some other nation might do. If they take the initiative in going to war, they do so because their total estimate of the situation tells them that this is the favorable time (Harvey A. DeWeerd).

³ It seems to me that a great mistake of many Americans is to assume that Khrushchev is like Hitler, just as it was a mistake of many fellow travelers and liberals in an earlier day to make too sharp a distinction between different brands of totalitarianism. Hitler, like Stalin, was a wild and often wholly irrational tyrant with megalomaniacal aims, while Khrushchev and his band are politicians in charge of a going concern, men of little fanaticism (despite service to the ideology of Marxism and Leninism), and at least as concerned as we are with keeping a viable system alive. In this they differ very greatly from the Chinese who are still in a terrifyingly fanatical stage. Thus, the notion indicated in the text that pacifism on our side is a danger because it may tempt the Russians to an act of aggression is open to question in spite of the example of North Korea (the North Koreans may well have moved without official blessing from Moscow in one of the many misunderstandings that can happen even in a totalitarian regime). Nor is it quite true, but self-righteous, to say that these voices of conscience are free to speak and demonstrate on one side of the world but not on the other. It is my impression that Polish intellectuals have been quite courageous in self-expression if not in public demonstration.

It is difficult intellectually not to let our thinking about the future be governed by efforts to correct mistakes in the past. The statement brings to mind the belief that Oxford pacifists of the 1930's encouraged Hitler in his hope that England would stay neutral in the face of his aggressions. The implication is that, to deter aggression now, our minuscule group of pacifists must line up with the most xenophobic elements in the country to avoid any sign of our being divided and irresolution. Again, the assumption that the Soviet Union now wishes to incorporate Western Europe, or at least West Germany, and is only deterred by force, may well be contrary to fact. In my opinion, the last thing the Soviet Union wants within its borders is millions of anti-Communist socialists and social democrats—or even idealistic and rationalistic western Communists. The

division and irresolution in this country that is most salient is not that concerning foreign policy, but rather that concerning the aims of our national life—aims often so thin and unimpressive as to lead some to look to our enemies abroad for an agenda of living and dying and a factitious source of unity and dedication (David Riesman).

"The situation today can no longer be measured in terms of the thirties. The security of the United States and indeed of the world depends not on arms supremacy but on arms control. Even if we have an overwhelming advantage (which we do not) with respect to the nature and number of weapons, if the situation should get out of hand (perhaps through an accident) then the result would be destructive of the national welfare. All thinking with respect to the problem of security today should begin, I believe, with the recognition that victory can no longer be achieved through military means. Victory, however, is critically important. It must therefore be pursued through those means which make nonmilitary victory possible.

Against this changed background, it becomes important, it seems to us, to break away from old patterns of thought, however valid they may have been up through the end of the Second World War. This is especially true in the matter of unilateralism. To take the flat position that all unilateralism is bad could mean, in practice, a serious loss for the United States. Our failure, for example, to take the initiative with respect to a cessation of nuclear weapons testing cost us heavily in a large part of the world. We should never have allowed the Soviet Union to be the first to do the obvious (Norman Cousins and David Riesman).

"The argument that increased military destructive capabilities reduce the danger of war is not convincing. In Korea, international supervision of steps to achieve political stability including free elections, coupled with adequate programs to improve the living conditions and the rights of the people in the area, would have been alternate actions to military backing of Syngman Rhee, and might have had a better chance of preventing war. It must also be stated that, to a large extent, the historical role of military forces has already been abandoned, and that tangible defense and profitable conquest have been replaced by deterrence. This change, together with the widespread reliance upon and deployment of nuclear weapons, represents in itself a desperate and unprecedented measure. Advocacy of principled action when such upheavals are taking place, reflecting concerns beyond our immediate time and place, gives less indications of division and irresolution than that shown by countries which discourage or suppress such expression (William C. Davidson).

"The proposed use of the IAEA may have other merits, but I do not believe that it would significantly delay the diffusion of nuclear military power. Either the "haves" do, or they do not, want to assist particular countries in becoming nuclear powers. If they want to do so, the IAEA, or its use proposed above, will hardly stand in their way (Klaus Knorr).

"Counterbalancing the military disadvantages of considerable openness are the essential differences in the relationship between the U.S.S.R. with the Warsaw Pact countries, as compared to that of the United States with the NATO countries, which would make the Soviet Union reluctant to supply nuclear weapons to the Warsaw Pact countries unless forced to do so as a countermeasure to open nuclear dissemination. For other reasons as well, the disadvantage is a limited one, and can be more than offset by the advantages of a broad policy against nuclear diffusion (William C. Davidson and David R. Ingalls).

"While we are working toward IAEA and arms control agreements between us and the Red bloc, we ought to limit the diffusion of nuclear weapons among NATO and other anti-Communist nations for a very simple reason: Nothing will do more to solidify the Warsaw Pact, inhibit possible liberal development within the U.S.S.R., and repel the neutral nations from us, than to allow Germany and Japan—and eventually Turkey and Pakistan—to get nuclear weapons (Dave Frisch).

"Recognizing the grave difficulties of "Treaty Limitation," "Voluntary Limitation," "Limitation in Exchange for Protection," and "Limitation Enforced by Haves," we may nevertheless need to try some or all of these ideas if international testing and production limitation agreements are not soon forthcoming (Dave Frisch).

"That is, required by the proposals so far made by the West. Requirements may be modified both by the improvement of detection techniques, which could be pursued with more vigor, and by reevaluation of the danger of low kiloton evasions compared with dangers of the Nth country and other problems associated with continued testing (William C. Davidson and David R. Ingalls).

"Derivative nuclear capability, defined in committee finding 4 on page 15 to include nuclear warheads, shares many of the dangers of independent possession by increasing the probability for accidental war, and for the catalyzing of wars between major powers as a result of acts by smaller ones. Furthermore, it involves weapons based on many years of design and testing, rather than the relatively primitive weapons achievable initially by independent efforts. Dependence of a nation's armies on nuclear weapons obtained through derivative capability, coupled with modern weapons know-how, can provide a decisive incentive for the development of advanced independent capability. Any stockpiling of nuclear weapons by additional countries, even if originally subject to restrictions on their use, seriously complicates eventual control (William C. Davidson and David R. Ingalls).

"It is my opinion that this approach holds some reasonable promise (A. M. Stone).

"Although I share the committee's view that measures to curb the spread of nuclear arms are desirable, I cannot appraise the danger in terms of the committee's assumption that "present national policies" will continue during the 30-year span it allows for the diffusion of nuclear weapons. I believe it probable that, long before many middle-sized and small nations have squandered resources in developing nuclear armaments, the tensions that make such conduct conceivable today will have subsided (David F. Cavers).

"Chairman Richard S. Lehman is not participating in the work of the committee while engaged in a Government assignment in the field of arms control, and therefore did not take part in the preparation of this report.

"See footnotes to committee statement.

The Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excellent editorial pertain-

ing to the Forand bill which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 22, 1960:

THE FORAND BILL

For countless older people, living on small fixed incomes or pensions, the rising cost of hospital-medical care presents an increasingly cruel and worrisome dilemma. Just at the time in their lives when they need such care most, and when the cost of providing it for them is multiplied, they can least afford it.

What to do about this dilemma is the subject of a blazing controversy in Congress over a bill known as the Forand bill. Sponsored by Representative ARNE J. FORAND, Democrat of Rhode Island, the bill is undergoing hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. Very simply, it would provide "free" (that is, taxpayer) health insurance for everyone eligible for social security old-age pensions. To finance it, an additional payroll tax would be borne by every employer and employee.

The Forand bill has been vociferously supported by the AFL-CIO and all the usual labor-liberal political action groups. And it is roundly denounced as an entering wedge for socialized medicine by the American Medical Association. The Eisenhower administration has opposed the bill while conceding that the problem it aims at does exist. Health-Education-Welfare Secretary Flemming is scheduled to spell out the administration view and offer the committee an alternative approach tomorrow. Vice President Nixon is said to have pushed hard within the administration for support of a modified version of the Forand bill.

We hope the administration will come up with something solid and imaginative. For while the Forand bill does, in our opinion, need some modifying, we think it would be a bad mistake for its critics—doctors, private insurers or anyone else—to underestimate the seriousness of the problem it deals with, or the anxiety which millions of older people now experience for lack of access to adequate health protection at moderate cost.

The basic idea of using social security machinery in one way or another to extend health insurance coverage to old-age pensioners not only makes sense, but it has an aura of political inevitability. The whole history of social security in this last quarter century, after all, has been one of continuous mushrooming growth, often with too little heed paid to the cost factor. This latter objection has been raised by critics of the Forand bill, who claim that giving full health coverage to everyone eligible for an old-age pension would cost far more than the bill admits.

Quite apart from the actuarial soundness or unsoundness of the Forand bill, however, our main objection to it as it stands is that it would create a new and unnecessary Federal insurance bureaucracy. Instead of just underwriting the abnormally high cost of covering the over-65 age group in the existing plans—Blue Cross, Blue Shield and the like—the Forand bill would create a needlessly competing system. In that respect, it is wide open to the charge of being an entering wedge for socialized medicine.

Far better, it seems to us, would be a Federal approach which aimed simply at charging the social security system the difference between the cost of providing hospital-medical care for those under 65 and the 2½-times greater cost of covering those over 65. This great difference in the use of medical care facilities by the older group is, after all, the crux of the problem. There are various ways in which that cost differential could be absorbed by society. One, for example, would be to require that all group plans offer coverage at a uniform rate regardless of age—and then bill the social security fund for whatever difference there

experience tables showed between the cost of caring for those over 65 and under 65.

While the Forand bill needs substantial modifying, however, it has the virtue at least of going right to the heart of what is admittedly a very real and pressing social problem. In fact, it may well turn out to be the most insistent social security problem of the sixties. And it is the kind of problem which—for obvious political as well as sound social reasons—simply is not going to take no-action for an answer.

The South Is Not Helpless in the Presidential Election of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1960 issue of the Alabama Lawyer appears an excellent article by my good friend, Hon. Gessner T. McCorvey, of Mobile, Ala., entitled "The South Is Not Helpless in the Presidential Election of 1960."

Gessner McCorvey is one of the most distinguished members of the Alabama bar and was formerly chairman of the Alabama State Democratic Executive Committee. He is highly respected not only in our State, but throughout our Nation and is known as an authority on constitutional law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would behoove all of our Members of both parties and of all sections of our great Nation to read this timely article. The South has nurtured the Democratic Party through its leanest years and has been the backbone of the party ever since the party's beginning. The South's leadership is fighting a last ditch battle for the rights of the States which our people believe were intended for the States to maintain and exercise, by our Founding Fathers. It gives me great pleasure to include Mr. McCorvey's informative article in the RECORD, at this point:

THE SOUTH IS NOT HELPLESS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1960

(By Gessner T. McCorvey)

Much has been said and written in recent months by those posing as Democrats to the effect that the South is helpless in its fight to maintain the constitutional doctrine of local self-government—more properly referred to as "States rights." Those making such announcements, who take the position, to use a slang expression from a popular song of some years ago, that "The South Is All Dressed Up and Nowhere to Go," are ignorant of our political history and also ignorant of our Federal Constitution.

The South by making the fight that Alabama and three other Southern States—South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana—made in 1948—can fully protect its right through proper use of the electoral college.

Some of the powers that be in high Democratic circles even take the position that they can win without the South. In my opinion these gentlemen with such views are just sadly mistaken.

Recent developments have made it imperative that the Southern States fight for their survival if we are going to preserve the traditions of our homeland.

THE SOUTH IS NOT HELPLESS

It is only necessary for it to use a weapon given to it by our Constitution, namely, the electoral college, and we can win our battle if all Southern States will join together in demanding that any so-called National Democratic Party seeking the electoral vote of the South, must first be made to understand that the South will only support for President and Vice President candidates who will demand a continuance of our segregation practices, and candidates running on a platform which announces in unequivocal terms that it recognizes as the law of the land the 10th amendment to our Constitution which provides as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The Democratic Party as we and our ancestors have known it, is a party which has as its cornerstone the doctrine of States' rights, as guaranteed by the above quoted section of our Constitution. Our ancestors went to war to preserve these rights.

In 1948 Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana, made a valiant fight by the use of the electoral votes of these States. Had Texas, Florida, Virginia, and Tennessee joined us in 1948 (and in 1952 these States deserted the anti-southern party calling itself the national democratic party) we would have undoubtedly put two great southern Democrats at the head of our Government in Washington—STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and FIELDING WRIGHT, of Mississippi.

In view of the recent unconstitutional decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school segregation case, it is now necessary for the South to fight, if our civilization is to survive as we have known it.

We of the South have the purest Anglo Saxon blood in the Western Hemisphere and we must keep it that way. How any southern white man or woman could think of supporting for President of our beloved country a man who advocates this unthinkable antisouthern racial program, is simply more than I can understand.

I yield to no man in my respect for the desire to help our colored friends. However, in the South, we must have segregation. All intelligent Negroes realize this.

Aside from the outrageous effort which the National Democratic Party is making to wreck our civilization along the racial line, I would certainly like the best in the world to see that the national party using the label Democratic so conducts its affairs that men like Norman Thomas, the Socialist Party's six-times candidate for President, cannot say he would never again be nominated for President by the Socialist Party, as this is unnecessary since the so-called National Democratic Party, as now constituted, has adopted the entire platform of the Socialist Party.

Everyone agrees that we should fight out our differences "within our party." However, we mean within our own party, and not within the party of our enemies. Here in Alabama our party is the Democratic Party of Alabama, and we fight out things within our party in the primaries conducted by the Democratic Party of Alabama.

When we talk of the Southern States combining their electoral votes and demanding fair treatment from the Federal Government, we frequently hear criticism by those who are unwilling to fight to the effect that what we are advocating is that this country have some 15 or 20 different political parties such as some of our foreign neighbors are cursed with. We plan nothing of the sort. We only wish to see that there is one American party which is willing to fight for constitutional rights and stand firmly and unequivocally for a government which recognizes the fact that our Constitution ex-

pressly provides that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Neither the so-called National Democratic Party nor the National Republican Party is willing to make a fight to preserve States' rights. We have at hand right now conclusive evidence of the fact that we of the South can expect no help from either of the major political parties in our effort to maintain segregation throughout our area. While General Eisenhower has, in many respects, made a great President; yet he certainly "stepped out of bounds" when he sent his Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, before the Supreme Court of the United States to argue in favor of the abolition of all segregation throughout our public schools. We cannot hope for any relief from any party whose leaders try to wreck our civilization and absolutely throw to the four winds the cardinal principle of States' rights which was granted to the States at the time our Government was formed, merely because they wish to capture the Negro vote. Unless the above quoted clause protecting the rights of the States had been inserted in the Bill of Rights, we would have had no Federal Government, as many States would have refused to be a part of any government where their rights were not protected. Consequently, unless the Democratic Party is going to return to its former principles and, in the platform of its national convention, firmly stand for the doctrine of States' rights, then our only hope is for the people of the South, through the electoral college, to make their voice heard.

Much has been said and written about the hopelessness of the fight of southern Democrats. With this I cannot agree.

We southerners consider the doctrine of States rights the foundation stone of the Democratic Party as we have known it. We are opposed to a powerful centralized bureaucratic government in Washington which undertakes to deprive the States of their independence of action in those matters which have not been delegated to the United States by the Constitution.

In answers to the charge that southern Democrats who are unwilling to follow the rabid antisegregation leaders of the Democratic Party have nowhere to go except to join the Republican Party, let me point out the fallacy of any such claim by briefly reviewing the situation in the presidential election year of 1948. At that time I was chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee of Alabama, and was one of Alabama's 11 presidential electors, being chairman of the Alabama electors.

As everyone knows, in 1948 Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina cast their 38 electoral votes, joined in by 1 elector from Tennessee, for Gov. STROM THURMOND of South Carolina for President and for Gov. FIELDING WRIGHT of Mississippi for Vice President.

It has been stated by some of the pinkish press that our fight was senseless and stupid. I would like to present a few figures to show how ignorant is any man who makes that contention.

The Constitution of the United States, which has often been described as the greatest document ever penned by man, gives relief to us from the situation which might arise when neither of the candidates nominated by the two major parties is acceptable to the American people.

There were 531 electoral votes. A candidate for President had to receive 266 electoral votes in the electoral college or else the election of a President was thrown into the House of Representatives. In 1948 Truman received 303 electoral votes, or 37 more than the required majority. I had assumed that California would, of course, go for Dewey, with Governor Warren, of California, on the

Republican ticket for Vice President. Then, too, I thought that the influence of Senator Taft and other Republicans in Ohio would be such that Ohio would go Republican and that Illinois would also go Republican. California and Ohio each had 25 electoral votes, and Illinois had 28 electoral votes. Consequently, if any two of these three States had gone Republican, it would have meant that Truman would not have received a majority in the electoral college. California, Illinois, and Ohio all went Democratic in 1948.

Or, if any one of these three States had gone Republican and the States rights Democrats had been able to carry Texas with 23 electoral votes, we would again have had a situation where Truman would not have received a majority in the electoral college. In fact, if both California and Ohio had gone Democratic, but Illinois had gone Republican, then Truman would still have been prevented from getting a majority in the electoral college if any one of the four Southern States of Virginia with 11 electoral votes, Georgia with 12 electoral votes, North Carolina with 14 electoral votes or the other 10 electoral votes from Tennessee had gone for THURMOND. We would have had the same result if Texas, with her 28 electoral votes, and any two other Southern States had gone for THURMOND.

If any of the situations above mentioned had come about, the election of a President would have been thrown into the House of Representatives, with each State having one vote. If a majority of the State delegations in the House had been Democratic, there would have been no chance for a Republican to have been elected President. The House of Representatives would have been limited in its vote for President to the three high men in the electoral college, viz: Truman, Dewey, and THURMOND. Under the Constitution the House of Representatives could not have gone outside and elected anyone other than one of the three high men in the electoral college. If a majority of the State Delegations in the House had been Democratic (and they certainly will be in 1960), the selection of a President would then have been strictly between Truman and THURMOND. The Republicans would not have thrown their votes away by voting for Dewey. If the southern Congressmen had stood by THURMOND, as I am sure they would have done had they seen a chance to elect the first southern President since the Civil War, I doubt if there was a Republican Congressman who would have voted for Truman in preference to THURMOND. In the first place, no one had even been more badly abused than those Republican Congressmen had been by Truman. In the next place, a sound and conservative statesman of the type of STROM THURMOND would appeal much more strongly to the average Republican Congressman than would Truman with his socialistic leanings.

Consequently, the States rights movement came very near succeeding in 1948, and it was far from being a forlorn hope. As one of the noted columnists put it, THURMOND's election "didn't miss by more than an eyelash."

I could not better express the feelings and sentiments of the vast majority of the conservative States Rights Democrats of the South than to quote the very forceful and vigorous language of Texas' great Governor, Allan Shivers. The following is the statement of Governor Shivers:

"In the dignity of our history and the majesty of our manhood we say to the national party: 'We must see the black and white of the platform and the color of the eyes of the nominees. We offer no blind, debasing, humiliating pledge in advance, to accept without murmur whatever may be handed in grudging charity after we have stupidly surrendered in advance and cravenly

thrown ourselves at your mercy.' No, the Democratic Party of Texas, I hope, is to be dealt with in 1952 before, during, and, if necessary, after the national convention in July. I scorn the suggestion that 'loyalty' demands an abject contemptible unconditional surrender in advance to the whims or dictates of any absentee overlords of the national party."

"The self-governing and self-respecting Democratic Party of Texas, which nurtured the still, small light of the party of Jefferson and Jackson for 50 years during which it was extinguished in darkness in the North and East, does not slink or cower, hat in hand, to anybody's back door to make a blind trade of our heritage for a small handout."

Those are magnificent, forceful, fighting, and ringing words. Would that more southerners had shown a like manful, defiant, and fighting spirit when the customs and traditions of our beloved people have been so viciously attacked by those who are so aptly described by Governor Shivers as "absentee overlords of the national party."

Our fight should, of course, be made within the framework of our own party—the Democratic Party of our respective States. No third party should be considered. All we have to do is to see to it that our people are placed in a position where their wishes can be freely expressed in the primaries of their own party. For the present—and probably for some decades to come—our State will in all probability vote the Democratic ticket in the November general election. It is our job to see to it that this Democratic ticket for which we vote is a ticket which represents the voice and sentiments of the real people of the South, and not a ticket forced upon us by the national convention of any party, masquerading as Democrats, when such party has not the slightest conception of what we mean by States rights, the cornerstone of the Democratic Party, as we have known it throughout the years. We do not wish to leave the Democratic Party, but, on the other hand, we are not willing for a group having ideas entirely foreign to our views to take over the party known as the Democratic Party and try to make us—through our party loyalty—swallow ideas and principles which we are unwilling to adopt. All we have to do is to keep our State Democratic primaries open to all Democrats and in these primaries nominate as our candidates for presidential electors for the ensuing general election only candidates who are willing to fight for the principles for which the Democratic Party as we have known it down the years has stood. We can only do this when our voters are free and can express their views at the polls. The voters cannot have a free expression of their wishes if they are to be bound by party rules that force them to vote for candidates who may have different views from their own. The State Democratic executive committees of the Southern States would be pulling off a Russian stunt if, while urging everyone to vote, they would only permit them to vote for candidates for presidential elector who will promise to support whoever is nominated by a national convention in which the smaller States have very little voice. For example, in 1948 we nominated as our presidential electors 11 staunch State rights Democrats. I was among that number and was made chairman of the Alabama presidential electors. When we participated in our party's primary, we took a pledge to support the nominees of that primary in the ensuing general election, and this is exactly what we did. We supported ourselves in the general election and were overwhelmingly elected. Then, in compliance with the promise we had made to the people of our State that we would never cast an electoral vote for Harry Truman or anyone else advocating his anti-segregation programs, we cast Alabama's electoral vote for Thurmond and Wright.

Perhaps it would be well for me briefly to review, especially for the benefit of the younger generation, why it is that for decades past we have had what is known as "The Solid South." We never hear of the "Solid North," the "Solid West," or the "Solid East," and here is the reason. Shortly after the tragic era of the sixties, the Republican Party was in power and that party was headed by such South haters as Thaddeus Stevens who, spurred on by his Negro mistress, wished to treat us as a group of conquered provinces and furthermore desired to Africanize the South. The Republican Party stood for a strong and powerful centralized Government in Washington rather than for home rule, local self-government, or what is more correctly termed State's Rights. While I do not think the group then in control in Washington represented the sober sentiment of the great majority of the people of the North and East, yet they were in power, and had divided our Southland into a number of military districts with a military general over each district, backed up by Federal bayonets. Then came the historical congressional election of 1874, when there occurred an upheaval which neither the politicians nor newspapers had foreseen. The Democrats were swept into control of the Congress by a great victory which was referred to as a "tidal wave." I think that was the origin of the term "tidal wave" which has been frequently used in our political life for the past 75 years. With the Democrats in complete control of Congress, the Thaddeus Stevens group of South-haters who wished to grind our Southland under their iron heels was unable to obtain appropriations of the necessary funds with which to continue the subjugation of the South. The Grand Old Democratic Party, a name I will always revere, honor, love and cherish,—having charge of the purse strings of the Nation, refused to furnish further funds to continue the oppression of our people. The result was that Federal troops had to be withdrawn from the South, as they would not serve without pay. This was the end of "Carpenterbagism" in the South—at least, during that Tragic Era—and our Nation settled down to become the greatest on the face of the globe.

The doctrine of States' rights as guaranteed by the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, was at that time recognized throughout the Nation as the foundation stone of the Democratic Party as our fathers and grandfathers knew it. The Democratic Party, following the teachings of the immortal Jefferson, demanded that each State be permitted to handle its own affairs instead of each State having to take orders from Washington.

We can well understand, when we reflect on this situation, why it is that southern men and women of all classes and of every shade of thought—ministers, bank presidents, engineers, doctors, lawyers, architects, industrialists, office and factory workers, white collar employees of every type, farmers, laborers, and all other southerners—unitedly stood by the Democratic Party as it was then known. It was the party that denounced interference from Washington with the internal affairs of the States and it was only by handling our own affairs, without interference from Washington, that our southern civilization could possibly survive.

From that day down to a few brief years ago, we owed our allegiance to the Democratic Party and we were true, loyal, and faithful in discharging our obligations to the Party that had saved the Southland from destruction. We furnished our electoral votes, year after year, to the party which had meant so much to our people. There are years within the memory of all of us when the candidates for President and Vice President of the Democratic Party did not receive any electoral votes, except those of the Solid

South. But for us the Democratic Party as a national party would have passed into oblivion and disappeared from the political scene as did such parties as Teddy Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party, the Progressive Party, the Populist Party, the Prohibition Party, the Know Nothing Party, and countless other parties whose names flashed across the political horizon for a few brief months or years.

But now, what do we find? We find the party that we of the South admittedly saved from destruction on a number of occasions, brutally turning against us and biting the hand that fed it. No more unscrupulous plan could be concocted by the mind of man for wrecking a civilization than the plan which the anti-South faction of the National Democratic Party devised for no other purpose than to lure the Negro vote of Harlem and the slums of other northern and eastern cities. To this plan they give the high-sounding name of "Civil Rights Program." It should more properly be termed a "Civil Strife Program." By this shameful and conscienceless betrayal of the South, and by this endeavoring to force upon us impossible conditions, they hope to keep the Negro vote of the North and East. Just think to what depths of degradation they have sunk when they are willing to stab in the back those who have on numerous occasions saved their party from complete destruction. It is hard to conceive that such unprincipled political opportunists could live in this great country of ours.

We can well understand why it is that under existing conditions there is no longer the burning desire which formerly existed in the hearts of all southerners to see the banner of the so-called National Democratic Party victorious. To many of us that party is regarded as a group of socialists masquerading as Democrats under the name of "National Democratic Party."

The South has ample "presidential timber" and if the Southern States would pool their political power, so to speak, by a wise use of their electoral votes, I have no doubt that a great southerner can be put in the White House. To mention several of the great leaders of the South who would adorn the office of President of the United States, and whom we could all be proud of, let me refer to such outstanding southern statesmen as HARRY F. BRAD, of Virginia; JAMES B. BYRNES and STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, both of whom are worthy successors to such great and patriotic South Carolinians as Wade Hampton and the immortal John C. Calhoun; Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi; Governor Allan Shivers, of Texas; and Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia. These great southern statesmen are a few of those who have been most active in the fight to preserve the South and its traditions.

I feel confident that if the South will stand together by use of its electoral votes it can control the situation in 1960. Without some part of the southern electoral vote I don't think that the nominee of either the National Republican Party or of the National Democratic Party can get a majority of the electoral votes, and when the election of a President is thrown into the House of Representatives, it is my firm belief that the candidate for President supported by the States' rights electors from the Southern States will be elected, because the House of Representatives will be Democratic. No Republican Congressman, when he saw a Republican had no chance in a Democratic House, would think of such a thing as voting for the nominee of the Democratic National Convention in preference to voting for a great Southern States' rights Democrat of the type of the statesmen above mentioned.

In Alabama and other Southern States there is a very sincere respect and affection

existing in the relationship between the races. We southerners are proud of the fact that we have none of the horrible race riots which have so frequently occurred in the North. There is not an intelligent man or woman in the South, white or colored, who does not realize that this is due solely to the fact that we practice, and will insist upon, the absolute segregation of the races. In Chicago, Detroit, East St. Louis, and other northern cities there have been more Negroes killed in one race riot than in all the lynchings in all of the Southern States in all of the 90 years since the Civil War. Notwithstanding our ideal racial relations in the South, the abolishment of all segregation laws and practices is one of the main planks in the so-called civil rights program.

There is no State in the Union in which the relations between the white people and their colored friends are more harmonious and friendly than in the State of Alabama. In fact, Alabama and other Southern States are the only places on the face of the globe where two entirely separate and distinct races live together, side by side, in peace and harmony. All intelligent southerners, both black and white, well know that this is due solely to our segregation laws and practices now in force and which will continue in force.

The attempt to force upon the South an FEPC law is, of course, nothing more nor less than an effort to break down all segregation practices.

One of the finest tributes ever paid to the southern people was that of the late Senator Borah, one of the really great Republican Senators of a few years ago. In discussing our handling of the race situation, Senator Borah made this statement:

"I shall contend that the southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history dealing with a problem of similar nature."

What a pity that men like Harry Truman of Missouri, Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, and Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, could not have the understanding, the intelligence, the wisdom, the fairness, and the knowledge of history that men like Senator Borah possessed.

I appreciate the fact that in 1948 when many southerners refused "to take it lying down" but stood up and fought like men, some of those who made the fight were penalized by bureaucratic Washington by having their patronage taken away from them. As a result of this we now find some of these very officeholders crawling back to Washington, begging forgiveness and promising to be good little boys and never to transgress again. I guess it is the old case of "the burnt child dreads the fire." However, the vast majority of Southerners who are not interested in holding any political job but who are only interested in trying to save our wonderful country before it is too late, are not overawed by the threat of bureaucratic Washington to deny them any patronage. They will vote as freeborn American citizens for what they know is best for their country, unless the small groups constituting the State Democratic executive committees of the respective Southern States adopt resolutions which will compel Democrats to stay out of their State Democratic primaries unless they will first take an oath to support the nominees of the so-called Democratic National Convention even though such nominees openly and defiantly announce their intention to wreck our southern way of life and play havoc with the friendly relationship existing between the races throughout the South by abolishing all segregation.

The large group of southerners to which I belong is frequently referred to by the Trumanites, the Humphreyites and the Steven-

sonites as "Dixiecrats." To me "Dixie" is a grand old name and always will be. I could not possibly have any objection to the word "Dixiecrat" except that it carries with it the idea that the indignant revolt of our people as a result of the usurpation of the powers of the States by the Federal Government, as a result of the wasteful expenditures of public funds, as a result of the creation of countless Federal jobs for the faithful and as a result of the almost unbearable tax burden which has been piled upon the shoulders of all classes of our people, is confined to the South, when, as a matter of fact, this indignation is nationwide. The word "Dixiecrat" is applied to us in sneering and contemptuous tones by the "Patronage Counter Boys"—even by some southerners who are eating out of the public trough—who try to make light of the fight we are making to preserve our civilization.

Let me add that I am confident that there are thousands, yes, tens of thousands, of genuine and worthwhile Americans in States throughout the North, East and West, who believe as we do that the Constitution is the law of the land and that the States should run their own affairs without interference from Washington. A strong States' Rights candidate for President of the type I have above mentioned would be welcomed by such citizens in all sections of our country, and we would undoubtedly receive help from areas of America outside of the South, in our fight to restore constitutional government to our people.

Some of the politicians who wish to whip the South in line try to scare and frighten our Representatives in the Congress—both in the Senate and in the House—by threatening them with demotions on committees, the loss of committee chairmanships, etc. To anyone familiar with the situation this is ridiculous and really silly. The national Democrats, even if the Democrats were in control of the Senate and the House, could not possibly organize either branch without the votes of the southern Democrats. Furthermore, in 1948, none of the 39 Congressmen or 8 Senators who supported Thurmond and Wright were in any manner demoted on committees or deprived of committee assignments. Then, too, threats like this really get nowhere as the average southerner does not scare very easily.

It is my sincere hope that the people of the South will rise up in 1960 as Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana did in 1948, and make their voices heard in the electoral college in the selection of our next President and Vice President.

Indignities to Humanity by Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News on Saturday, March 19, 1960, carried a page 1 story with the caption "Meyner Proposes U.N. Admit China." Speaking in Los Angeles, Calif., Governor Meyner was quoted as saying:

For if the United Nations can be transformed into an agency with effective powers, then the real question will be, not should Communist China be admitted to membership, but rather what can the world do to make sure that Communist China doesn't stay out.

I find myself in disagreement with this point of view. The country we are talking about is the same one that had the audacity to inflict an outrageous 20-year sentence upon Bishop James Edward Walsh. This was but the most recent of a series of indignities to humanity by Red China.

May we remember these acts and the unheeded protests of Secretary Herter when we consider whether or not such a government should be a part of the United Nations.

Nothing Is Wrong That a Little Money Can't Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a supporter of an expanded program of range rehabilitation on our public lands. The deterioration of this public asset has not only resulted in hardships for current users of the range, but means that we, as a nation, are not getting the maximum benefit of this important resource. A realistic program of rehabilitating these rangelands is demanded by our traditional multiple use approach to land management. I commend to other Members' attention the following editorial from the Oregon Cattlemen of March 1960:

NOTHING IS WRONG THAT A LITTLE MONEY
CAN'T CURE

(By Cecil L. Edwards)

A 5- to 20-fold increase per acre in forage production could be easily attained if a greater share of the funds received from national public land resources were diverted to restoration of Oregon's public rangelands. In short there is nothing wrong with the Bureau of Land Management practices that a little money couldn't cure. Range restoration experiments have conclusively proven that there are several million acres of Oregon land that will respond in almost dramatic fashion to seeding practices using improved native grasses such as Whitmar's beardless wheat grass (domestic version of famed Oregon blue bunch grass), crested wheat grass and others that have shown adaptability to Oregon range conditions and use. Re-seeding, brush clearing (elimination of sagebrush, rabbit brush and Juniper), development of water holes, building of fences and cattle guards for management control and a carefully planned grass seeding program would do the job. Careful analysis shows that the costs of such a program carried out on a long range basis would actually be a paying investment not only in direct returns to the Government from greater rental fees and increased tax receipts, but also measured in indirect returns that come under the broad complex of applied conservation.

The Bureau of Land Management receives about seven times more money from the sale of natural resources on the public lands than is committed back to the land. True a large part of these receipts are from such non-renewable resources as minerals, gas and oil, therefore it would seem all the more in the public interest and wisdom to literally plough back some of these funds in that

great and ever valuable renewable resource—grass. Nature will then take over and with good management, provide a new crop every year. Oregon is apportioned only about \$225,000 for all range projects that involve some 15 million or more acres. This is a pittance when considered in relation to the chore. Costs of range improvement work varies from \$3 to about \$8 per acre. This is a real bargain when it is considered that in a typical average instance, 4 acres can be made to take care of as much game or as many head of livestock as 20 acres or more are now required to do. An increase in the capacity of ranges is the only practical answer to the ever increasing BLM cutbacks and to the big squeeze being imposed on the cattle industry through accelerating recreational demands. It is suggested that all readers of this editorial whether rancher or conservationist write their Congressman, outline the facts and press for a greater diversion of public land receipts to the improvement of public lands. The rotogravure section in this issue carries a picture story of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon, its problems and practices. Write your Congressman today.

Address by Dr. Harlan Hatcher at Annual Congressional Dinner of University of Michigan Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues the following speech by Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan. Dr. Hatcher's timely address was made at the annual congressional dinner of the University of Michigan Club of Washington on February 24, 1960:

When the University of Michigan men are gathered together anywhere in the world, they will represent a good share of the leadership in their respective communities and in the business or professions which they serve.

Our reunions in Washington are annual demonstrations of their numbers and their distinction, especially in the field of public service. Once again I salute you, and express the pride of the university in your work and your accomplishments.

I greet you with a truism: this is a fast-moving era. It is hard to keep it in focus or in perspective. You must take some specific benchmark in time, like the prostrate Europe of 1947 and the Recovery Act or Marshall plan bill of April 1948, and measure it against the present prosperity of West Germany and the debate on 12th-year extension of the plan with a budget of over \$4 billion.

Or you weigh the fact that we no longer monopolize the A-bomb, but share it with Great Britain and now France, and are in danger of being surpassed by the U.S.S.R. And we consider the new debate touched off by the missile and space age.

In industry we have only to measure the magnificent General Motors and Ford research centers in their campus settings against these same establishments when I became president of the university 9 years

ago. Pre-World War II plants are largely out of date and have been replaced with new ones making products that were only in the research stage a few years ago.

These are only three random samples of the nature of our changing world environment. You may add your own. They will touch every detail of your personal, community, and national life.

The University of Michigan helps create these changes. It must also respond to the changes which it has helped to effect. There are perhaps a dozen or so pacesetters among the universities in the world today. Without trying to rank them in order of distinction and service, the University of Michigan must accept the honor and the responsibility of being one of them. Our university would have to undergo constant change merely to retain its relative position. It must move aggressively forward to provide the research and training on the rising levels which the safety and welfare of the Nation so urgently demand.

We are having some trouble getting really conscious of the nature of these demands and adjusting to the rising level. We have all been so busy trying to keep up with the needs of our growing children on their way through nursery, kindergarten, the grades, and now the high schools, that we haven't actually attacked the problems confronting the colleges and the universities. We haven't much time, and we can't put it off much longer.

We still seem to think that it is just a matter of some more teachers and classrooms and a TV program to accommodate more undergraduate students in our colleges. It is that, of course, but in this decade and for this generation a baccalaureate degree is only a beginning. It is now roughly the equivalent of a high school diploma in our fathers' day.

Of the 24,000 students now enrolled at the University of Michigan, almost 40 percent already have attained their first degree. On this one thread you may unravel the story of the swift pace of change in our time. And from it you may deduce the problems which we must proceed confidently to solve.

Our present outmoded and inadequate physical facilities bear about the same relation to the present needs in engineering, medicine, music, and dentistry, as the Mack Avenue or Highland Park plants would bear to present needs of the Ford Motor Co. or Kettering's old laboratory to GM's program of modern research.

The University of Michigan is a constitutional corporation with a budget for all operations for the year ending June 30, 1959, of \$92,614,994. Of this amount, \$26,000,224 was spent for research, and \$40,607,583 in the general fund primarily for salaries and wages. This general fund item is the heart and center of our budget.

Of this \$40,600,000, 9 1/2 million came from student fees, and \$30 million as a direct appropriation by the State legislature.

Another vital part of our operation is capital outlay. We were making good progress on overcoming obsolescence and adding urgently needed space for our 16 colleges and schools. But in 1957 the program came to an abrupt halt, and no money has been provided by the State for new construction since that time. The situation has gone from serious to critical in this fast-moving age. Our planned program languishes while our needs mount.

These few facts will help pose the most pressing problem the university has confronted in many years. When and how will we be able to regain our traditional place in faculty salaries to guarantee the retention of, and addition to, our distinguished faculty? When and how can we get started again on building the facilities needed by all units, but especially by en-

engineering and the sciences, by medicine, dentistry, education, architecture, and music?

I understand that about 90 percent of our military striking force is vested in Strategic Air Command. I would say that at least 90 percent of our country's creative force centers in the colleges and universities. And in many critical shortage areas, it resides in a limited number of our ranking universities. They must be nourished and supported. The whole precious future of the Nation depends upon it. How shall we do it?

Under the special stresses of our time, and the resulting American psychology, it has become natural and habitual to turn to Washington and ask for Federal aid for a great variety of services—including some aspects of education.

The American tradition has been, and still is in theory, that full responsibility for education rests in the community, the district, or the State. By and large these local agencies have done a fair job, and in some cases a most outstanding one.

But the problem is big and getting bigger; the needs are now pressing, and becoming critical and national in scope. We have been edging into, or drifting into, or backing into stronger and stronger Federal involvement. Let's take a quick look at the developing situation.

The National Government is already spending heavily for research. The research demands of the country, especially in all aspects of defense, have become as stupendous as they are urgent. The scientific personnel in our universities have been called upon for help. The Federal Government enters into contract with the university for this research service, and the universities have responded, often for patriotic reasons at some expense and sacrifice of mission to themselves. This is now a major assignment in institutions like Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Institute of Technology, the University of Michigan, the University of Chicago, and the University of California at Berkeley. Ever-increasing sums of Federal money go to the support of this effort. The program has become so intertwined with the institutions that serious consequences would result if this support were suddenly cut off. It amounts to about \$20 million a year at the University of Michigan.

The Government has taken on some major responsibilities in the field of health and medical care for the Nation. Research, medical training, and patient care are expensive. The Federal Government has given substantial aid to medical colleges and schools of public health to provide buildings and laboratories and to support certain programs of training and research. Grants from this source have enabled us to keep moving in the last 2 years at the University of Michigan where we have added to the laboratories of the school of public health, and have built, jointly with the State and foundation funds, a Mental Health Research Institute, and, jointly with private gifts, a laboratory for the college of pharmacy.

The Federal Government helped us build our great new radiotelescope at Peach Mountain near Ann Arbor. It recognized responsibility for helping educate the veterans who had served in World War II and in Korea. The \$16 billions invested in this effort are among the most productive ever spent by the Nation. It has also acted as guarantor for loans for building student housing on a self-liquidating basis.

The Federal Government recently extended still further its responsibility through the National Science Foundation and the National Defense Education Act. It gave some recognition to the teaching staff under the Fulbright bill.

It has also given aid to communities where its activities required a large number of people to take up residence and, therefore, imposed an undue burden upon the established schools, and where its installations removed property from the tax rolls. For many decades it has made substantial appropriations to the agricultural colleges for research and extension services of many types. And, in the days when the Federal Government had something of its own to give away, it granted Government lands to the States to establish schools, and, later on, what are still termed the land-grant colleges and universities. Our great Willow Run Research Laboratories were a gift to the university by the Federal Government as surplus property.

This, together with school-lunch programs, teaching materials, and kindred items, is not an exhaustive list, but a fair sample of the nature, extent, and magnitude of Federal aid to education as it has so far developed.

The one critical final step which has not been taken is a direct appropriation by the Congress to pay professional salaries and to build classrooms and teaching laboratories and libraries on the campuses.

Yet, as I have already pointed out, these two items, the operating budget and the classrooms of all types, are right now among our most urgent needs, and our State legislatures are finding it difficult to finance them.

Should the Federal Government take the final plunge and give aid for these purposes?

One of these days the Congress will have to give an answer to this one. It may not be one dramatic act, but a series of smaller ones that will drift us into a policy.

This is a question that needs the most careful study and appraisal. We need to know what we are doing and why. I will make a few observations on it. Education for the growing child population is a national necessity. Research and training on the advanced graduate and professional level and in certain critical shortage areas has now become equally vital to the United States as a Nation. The traditional interest of the individual States meshes with the new and advanced collective needs of the Union. It is already a serious question whether the single efforts and decisions of each separate State can do what the Nation as a whole must have done. Our few distinguished private institutions which are equipped to serve this need can carry only a part of the load. The responsibilities of publicly supported universities are grave and inescapable.

By and large the States have done well by their universities. But the individual States consider themselves handicapped by the present tax structure and the philosophy behind it. In any quest for taxes the Federal Government comes first. The Congress of the United States can and does levy and collect taxes in Michigan beyond the imagination or practical power of the legislature of the State. The legislature says taxes are already too high, and that other sources of revenue have been preempted by the Federal Government. They may recognize the needs of higher education for staff and facilities but they say they cannot find the money after the Federal Government has taken its levy.

Increasingly the mood of the local units is to cut back or stand still, or to seek aid from the Federal Government. Yet the hard fact remains that the Congress has no money it does not collect from the same people whom the legislatures say it cannot tax further. It is a head-on collision nearing a stalemate. Some accommodation to the dilemma must be found soon.

It seems unlikely that State legislatures will move far enough and fast enough to do what is nationally required.

It is certain that the Nation as a whole must have bold, vigorous, and immediate action to protect its stake in education, particularly on the highest levels where the expense is greatest.

The Congress, therefore, has a limited number of choices. To be exact, it has three.

1. It could make a direct appropriation in some form to help support faculty salaries, to provide laboratories, libraries, and classrooms, and to aid the general operation's budget. Serious problems of philosophy, tradition, law, and administration attend this one. This is the step not yet taken and it has many pitfalls that should be carefully marked and labeled.

2. It could voluntarily and with stated intent relinquish certain sources of revenue, or allocate earmarked funds, to the States on which they could levy for the support of education.

3. It could enter into partnership with the legislatures in determining what joint responsibilities they share on the national and State level, and it could then exercise its more potent taxing power to see that the national as well as the State interest in education is served. The University Grants Committee of Great Britain is one possible form which this solution might take.

A possible fourth choice, that of a hands-off policy, has long since been exercised as we have already indicated.

It is possible that any of these alternatives could be operated within the American tradition of local responsibility and control in education. It is no longer a question of Federal aid, but of how much, in what form, for what purpose.

We cannot permanently drift along in our new world setting without a more rational and assured plan of support for our universities, and we should have a firm and acceptable rationale for Federal participation.

At this point one looks again at our great and wonderful Republic, and the values for which it stands. Our pride in our achievements for our people is matched only by the envy or the determination of other nations to catch up with and overtake us. These countries know that education is the key that unlocked the door to greatness for us. They are emulating us in this. The dividends which they are beginning to reap are gratifying to them.

We may not slumber or sleep or grow complacent. We must press on for the right things. And then we must be willing, after sorting them out and marking their value, to pay for them.

Why are we all working so hard? What do we want to buy with our higher wages and bigger dividends?

Of course we want to buy houses, cars, food, clothes, and other private spending items. We also want to buy education, general health, roads, and reasonable happiness and security for our children, ourselves, and the older members of our families, and for our country.

These services can be had for most of our people only through the group investment principle of individual payments to a responsible operating agency. Unfortunately we have no better label for this investment or purchase plan than the annoying and unlovely word, taxes. This sorry word was disfigured long ago by the arbitrary taxgatherer of ancient and selfish tyrants. It, therefore, has wrapped round it an aura of extortion, of robbery, of seizing the substance of the needy family to gratify the lust of the idle.

We need a new name for our service-purchase plan. Perhaps if we called it our quarterly payment to the Great American Investment Trust Fund we might understand the process better and participate more willingly.

We could advertise it with Securities and Exchange Commission approval as the one gilt-edge, blue-chip, growth-stock corpora-

tion that is guaranteed to hedge us against inflation and yield the highest dividends and richest returns on our investment.

Then we might talk more realistically about the things we must buy for America, and decide more rationally which we shall pay for by private purchase plans, and which and how much we shall buy for the citizens as club members.

The U.S.S.R. resolved this by virtually abolishing the freedom of choice of the individual. Its leaders are quite boastful of their plan of complete state authority and imposed control. They claim that this is the way of progress and the future, and that they will overtake and surpass this "supreme achievement of capitalism" which is America.

I honestly don't think they will. And I think our way of diverse support and individual freedom can meet the challenge. But I shall feel a lot happier about it when we shed a little more of our easy complacency, and face up to the inescapable and demanding fact that we must get on with the exciting and rewarding task of making and keeping our great universities the best in the world. The extra margin that produces greatness makes all the differences in the returns.

Ireland's Day of Joy and Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the editorial taken from the New York paper, the Irish Echo, did not reach me in time to insert on Saint Patrick's Day, March 17. However, in reading this editorial, I was struck with something new and I take the position that it is never too late to pay tribute to Saint Patrick and, therefore, insert herewith the editorial of the Irish Echo written for Saint Patrick's Day, 1960, and commend it to all readers:

St. Patrick's Day is with us again. The world has long recognized it as a day outstanding in the annals of Ireland's contributions to civilization through the medium of Christian culture for hundreds and hundreds of years. The universality of its recognition is unique as a testimony of the world's appreciation of a saint whose influence on Ireland's mode of life changed its whole concept of the eternal destiny of mankind, lifting it to a supreme and sublime acknowledgment of the Heavenly Creator of all humanity.

As a day of joy and thanksgiving for the ineffable and efficacious blessings which St. Patrick brought to Ireland, the 17th of March is, with the Irish race both in the land of its nativity and away from its shores, a day to be observed and celebrated with due cognizance of racial traditions for festive occasions, among which worship of God, that was so dear to the heart of Ireland's national apostle, has priority. That is surely a fitting form of both devotion to God and reverence to the one who made His name a household word in Ireland.

And the Irish-born Gael and those who came among the Gael and adopted the native customs of the race are justified in making St. Patrick's Day an event which is redolent of olden and historic times of patriotism and allegiance to faith and fatherland. In many a far distant land from Ireland its

exiles epitomize those traditional aspects of the country in which St. Patrick was to find so much pleasure and consolation among its people.

THE WEARING OF THE GREEN

The green banner for Ireland's honor
And the shamrock so evergreen,
They are ours here after the manner
Of the land where they first were seen.

Parades in honor of St. Patrick's Day in the United States, and there will be quite a number of them with some of the largest within the environs of this city, will, as customarily, be featured by a general wearing of the green in regalia, banners, flags, rosettes, and uniforms, with an overall display of the shamrock among the paraders. This is what really makes the outdoor celebrations connected with Ireland's great annual festival so attractive and colorful and, most of all, so reminiscent of Ireland.

With the tunes for Ireland's glory,
Flourishing from bagpipe and fife,
Telling us again the story
Of Ireland's patriot life.

There should be no need to remind any person of Irish birth or descent that a green token of some sort should be displayed by that person as a mark of esteem for the commemoration of Ireland's patron saint.

Our Monetary System: How the Tight-Money and High-Interest Policy Affects Small Business and Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I called attention to a series of articles published by the Texas Observer on the subject of our monetary system and on the subject of the Federal Reserve's economic policies which are being effectuated through its manipulations of the monetary system.

Today I want to call attention to the third in the series of articles by the Texas Observer staff.

This article explains some of the reasons for the growth of big business, for the tendency for control of more and more of the country's economic resources to become concentrated into the hands of the giant corporations, and the interlocking relationships between the big industrial and utility corporations and the big financial corporations.

As I have indicated on previous occasions, these articles by the Texas Observer review the record and the activities of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the subject of the management of our monetary system, and the articles thus frequently quote our distinguished colleague.

Without reference to this personal aspect of the articles, however, they are informative and challenging. It would seem to me that the grave problems dealt with here are properly the business of all Members of Congress, and I believe that all Members will find these

articles both interesting and profitable reading.

The third of the series of articles is as follows:

[From the Texas Observer, Jan. 22, 1960]

WHY BORROW WHAT YOU HAVE?

WASHINGTON, AUSTIN.—WRIGHT PATMAN, the Congressman from Texas since 1928, is a raging populist, an old-style liberal who distrusts Eastern robber barons and casts his baleful, corrosive oratory against the New York sharpies in what Henry Clay Alexander, chairman of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of Manhattan, calls "the always fascinating and elusive subject of money."

PATMAN has never confined his crusades to banking. In 1956, for example, he introduced a bill to graduate the corporate income tax. Corporations receiving net income of \$50 million or less would have received substantial tax reductions (a \$10 million net income company would pay 10 percent less taxes). Corporations with net incomes of \$50 million or more would have paid higher taxes. The government's total income would have been the same.

"If it is fair and just to have graduated tax rates on individual incomes, then it is equally fair and just to have graduated rates on corporate incomes," PATMAN argued. "The tax structures is channeling substantially all of the income available for investment in business growth into a few super-giant industrial corporations, and making them investment bankers. These corporations are rapidly taking possession of all of the productive wealth, yet the result is a slowing down of industrial growth and a disappearance of competition, upon which our historic public policy depends for regulation of the free enterprise system. Small and medium size firms are being squeezed out. If our free enterprise system is to survive, these trends must be reversed."

In 1952, he recited, one-tenth of 1 percent of U.S. corporations had 48 percent of all the net income of the corporations. Nine-tenths of 1 percent of the corporations received 71 percent of all the net corporate income. "We need to check the wave of corporate mergers and consolidations," he told the House.

What happened to his bill?—for it has not been heard of since. PATMAN told the Observer in Washington—as though of a trip to the moon when he was younger and rash—"I couldn't get anywhere on that. I couldn't even get a hearing on it. Perfectly justified—but I couldn't get a hearing."

HIS ROLE IN HISTORY

PATMAN's fights for small business are a part of the history of the United States. In 1936 he coauthored the Robinson-Patman Act, a basic part of the national law against monopoly which is sometimes called the small businessman's Magna Carta. In August 1941, he introduced a resolution calling for an investigation into why small business was not receiving more defense contracts. He was listened to. The House Small Business Committee was created, PATMAN was made chairman, and throughout the war he watchdogged the interests of small business in the defense effort—automobile and tire dealers, hogging of scrap metal by big firms, the black market in meat, defense of price controls, the lumber industry, the independent oilmen.

In 1942 he introduced the bill which became the Murray-Patman Act creating a Small War Plants Corporation with a revolving fund of \$150 million.

Still hard at work on these themes, PATMAN's small business committee, in a 1959 report, struck at interlocking directorates and managements among the major financial and industrial corporations of the country. Conclusions:

"These top financial companies are interlocked with the larger firms of American

industry and finance to a remarkable degree. In fact, the degree to which the top financial companies were found to be interlocked in and among themselves is quite remarkable.

"Of the 135 base companies in the study (the largest companies in each field), 107 shared at least 1 officer or director in common with another of the 135 base companies. Among the 35 commercial banks, 32 were interlocked with 1 or more of the other 135 top companies. Of the 20 mutual savings banks, 19 were interlocked with 1 or more of the other top financial companies. Of the 20 life insurance companies, 18 were interlocked with 1 or more of the other 135 companies. Of the 20 fire and casualty companies, there were also 18. Among the 20 investment companies, 11 were interlocked with at least 1 other company. And, of the 20 investment banks, 19 had interlocks with 1 or more of the other 135 companies.

"Turning, then, to the longer list (1,667) of manufacturing, commercial, utility, and other nonbase companies, it was found that 905 shared directors or officers with 1 or more of the 135 top financial companies."

Last October, speaking to the automobile wholesalers of Texas in Dallas, PATMAN advocated legislation against "predatory pricing" in the car industry and warned against growing concentration of economic power—a key theme of the New Deal dusted off for 1959. He demanded to know why the Republicans had licensed only 35 new companies under the new small business investment company program, for which a bill he sponsored obtained \$75 million in new money. He and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON had coauthored the basic law on the subject, the Small Business Investment Act, in 1958.

Thus PATMAN has been fighting what he regards as dangerous concentrations of business power since his earliest days in Congress. It surprised no one to hear, last month, that he is defending Texas laws prohibiting bank monopolies against a pending decision of the Federal Reserve Board to permit a bank holding company to acquire more voting stock in the First National Bank, of Paducah, Tex.

"I am on the side of small banks, the medium size banks, and all other banks not pursuing a greedy policy," he says. "I am against the greedy big bankers who are trying to continue to monopolize the free use of the Government's credit and have a Nation of only a few banks with branches."

IN A NUTSHELL, DISNEY

PATMAN lay low in the Congress on money and banking for many years, quietly drawing forth facts on the subject in public hearings. Then, in 1943, he appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Ways and Means during a hearing on "Debt Limit of the United States." If PATMAN's views ever prevail on the question of money and banking, or simply if he is right, his testimony on February 13, 1943, was historic.

At this time the national debt was \$135 billion; by the end of the fiscal year 1944, it was to have zoomed to \$210 billion. Enormous war expenditures had to be financed. "The occasion of my appearance before this committee," PATMAN said, "is to make a suggestion about how billions of dollars a year can be saved by Government on this huge national debt."

"My plan is no different from present plans and methods except that no interest will be paid by the Government for a large part of its credit used to finance the war."

He was not, PATMAN said, opposed to interest being paid for other people's hired money; he was not opposed to States, counties, and political subdivisions paying for money they hired. "I am opposed to the U.S. Government, which possesses the sovereign and exclusive privilege of creating money, paying private bankers for the use of its own money," he declared—and the issue was joined, then and there.

"These private bankers do not hire their own money to the Government," he declared. "They hire only the Government's money to the Government, and collect an interest charge annually."

This was admitted, PATMAN said, by the highest monetary officials in the Government and the major bankers. He had been interrogating them for years.

After selling all the war bonds and collecting all the taxes possible, PATMAN said, the Government still needed more money to finance the war. "That money must be obtained through creation; it has got to be created. And my point is that the money, if it has got to be created on the Government's credit, that the people should not have to pay interest on that money that is so created. That is it in a nutshell, Mr. Disney."

PATMAN then defended his bill to authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue non-interest bearing bonds to finance the part of the war that would otherwise be financed by the Federal Reserve and the commercial banks on interest-bearing Government bonds.

PATMAN was simply saying that the Government was giving the banks its credit and then paying the banks interest for the use of its credit. Congress, under the Constitution, has the right to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Some new money must be created; let the Government create it, and inflation will be retarded by the amount of interest the Government does not have to pay.

"Why should we burden the taxpayers on a \$300 billion debt, when we know they will never be able to pay more than just the interest on it?" he asked. "That means a perpetual debt of \$300 billion. That means that any inflation that we have in that \$300 billion will remain indefinitely, whereas if you adopt a plan of saving the interest on a substantial part of that money, you can reduce it each year by as much at least as you would pay in interest, and then you reduce the inflationary condition each year instead of having it remain the same each year."

MR. DISNEY'S RETORT

The committee chairman, R. L. Doughton of North Carolina, asked PATMAN how the banks could be induced to lend the money without getting paid interest. PATMAN told him, in effect, he just did not understand. The Government-controlled Federal Reserve banks would furnish the money. "Suppose the Federal Reserve banks balk?" "They can't balk. They are an agency of the Congress," PATMAN told him.

PATMAN recited testimony in which Mariner Eccles, head of the Federal Reserve, agreed that what the Government does anyway is create money to buy Government securities. "That is what your money system is," Eccles had said.

"Why should the Government borrow its own credit?" PATMAN pleaded. "If we spend \$300 billion on this war, it will cost about \$8 or \$9 billion a year to pay the interest. . . . In all probability, this is all the taxpayers of this country will be able to pay, and will, therefore, be unable to make any payment on the principal of the debt each year. That being true, all the money that will be raised in taxes to pay on the national debt will go to the people who are using the credit of the Nation absolutely free, and who have had farmed out to them the use of the idle gold free, and the people will therefore be caused to pay a debt that is useless, wasteful, extravagant, and unnecessary."

"The people do not have the money and we have got to create it," PATMAN said. "I don't want the taxpayers of this Nation to pay interest for the next 200 or 300 years. That is the point I am trying to make."

Doughton was not disposed to effect any sudden reforms. "This is a rather sweeping change," he said, "and the committee could hardly be expected to come to a satisfactory decision until it heard all the facts from the people who wish to be heard."

The charge of "greenback" minting and "funny money" was suggested by Representative Harold Knutson of Minnesota. He recalled that he had been in Germany after World War I and had to pay 1,250,000 marks for ham, an egg, and coffee he could not drink. "I am not saying you haven't got a plan, because I don't know enough about it," he said.

PATMAN said the reason Germany had such inflation was their small gold reserve. "It does look to me as though we should be able to find a way of working out this thing without placing too great a strain upon our economy," said Mr. Knutson. "I can't say you haven't got a good plan, Mr. PATMAN, because I don't know."

"We don't have to go to Germany to find out about money or currency," PATMAN rejoined. "Go to the Confederate States of America, after the War Between the States, and you will find currency just as worthless. . . . That is all that is behind money, the integrity of the nation, the ability of the people to pay taxes."

Mr. Disney—Mr. Wesley E. Disney, Congressman from Oklahoma—was heard from, too, the transcript of the hearing, smelling of stockrooms and yellowing with age, reveals.

"I have heard it suggested that would put the Government in the banking business. I have heard that statement in connection with Mr. PATMAN's bill," he said.

Ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at the time of the passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, replied: "The Government should leave the banking business to the banks, most emphatically, and the banks should leave the governing business and the exercise of sovereignty to the Government," he said.

PATMAN's bill never passed. Today the national debt is only a few billions short of \$300 billion. The annual interest charges, paid out of taxes, have attained \$9 billion a year, the second largest item in the Federal budget. There is no immediate prospect that the necessities of taxing and spending will permit the reduction of the principal of the debt anytime soon.

If PATMAN was right, something is wrong.

The New Textile Products Fiber Identification Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, the recently enacted Textile Products Fiber Identification Act is a significant advance in the long-established congressional policy of protecting the consumers of our country against deception in the marketing of clothing and textile fiber products.

I believe that the scope and purpose of this act should be set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in aid of widespread understanding of the beneficial effects of this important law. For this reason, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I set out an article on the act written by Alvin David Edelson, a knowledgeable lawyer who has had long experience in the field covered by the act.

The article by Mr. Edelson follows:

THE NEW TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACT

(By Alvin David Edelson, associate member of the law firm of Noble & Moyle, of Washington, D.C., and formerly trial attorney with the Bureau of Litigation of the Federal Trade Commission)

On March 3, 1960, the Textile Products Fiber Identification Act, enacted by the 85th Congress on September 2, 1958, became law. Because of the vast commercial field covered by the act and, of course, the fact that in finality such acts are drafted by lawyers, the Textile Products Labeling Act will raise a large number of complications, both legal and commercial, and present to the lawyer and businessman who must deal with it, the usual difficulties. This article will not attempt to treat the question of the advisability or the desirability of the new textile act. The act, like its predecessors, the Fur Products Labeling Act of 1950, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, will, judging by the experience of the mammoth growth of a permanent body of administrative law, be here to stay. The businessman must live with it, the legal profession, both governmental and private, will mold it. But for the somewhat harassed businessman, beset with hundreds of governmental regulations, this article will attempt to give a rough and broad outline of problems to be encountered.

COMMERCE AND JURISDICTION

Of primary interest to the businessman, of course, is whether or not the act pertains to him. Generally speaking, since the act defines a textile fiber product as: "(1) Any fiber, whether in the finished or unfinished state, used or intended for use in household textile articles; (2) any yarn or fabric, whether in the finished or unfinished state, used or intended for use in household textile fabrics; and (3) any household textile article made in whole or in part of yarn or fabric," excluding products subject to the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, nearly any businessman in the textile field, including retailers, will be covered. Since even the layman is well aware that national governmental, including Federal Trade Commission, jurisdiction must depend upon interstate commerce, it may be well to get into this aspect now as laid out in the act, and show its relation even to the usually immune small local intrastate retailer.

The Textile Act, like its predecessors, the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, has, in addition to the standard commerce clause, specific commerce clauses as defined in section 3(a-d) of the act. Section 3(a) of the act covers "the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or the importation into the United States of any textile fiber product which is misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised." As can be seen, such a clause would not only cover the intrastate manufacturer but could cover an intrastate manufacturer who delivers to a buyer who subsequently sells interstate. Further, advertising in commerce by itself would create jurisdiction. Since almost all newspapers have interstate circulation, the placing of an advertisement not in conformance with the act would by definition in section 3(a) invoke Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction. Thus, as those who are familiar with the Fur and Wool Acts are undoubtedly aware, the Textile Act is similar in its attempted approach to jurisdiction. In legal parlance, section 3(a) might be termed a "stream of

commerce" type jurisdiction; and although such jurisdiction as relating specifically to the Commission's labeling acts has not been strongly tested, the principle as was developed in the General Motors and Ford Motor Company cases has been strongly established. Thus, for lawyers who relish that big constitutional question, which at a single blow wipes out an entire administrative function; and for the businessman who looks forward to it simply from the point of view that it is one less headache to deal with, section 3(a) presents poor prospects, save perhaps from a few hypersensitives within the administrative circle itself. Thus, as all-inclusive as is the net which hangs from section 3(a), its inclusiveness would appear to be of most proper legality, and indeed by modern-day standards should not startle the lawyer or businessman. But, as pointed out, section 3(a) is but the beginning of a large legal pincer movement and is followed by an even more extensive, section 3(b).

Section 3(b) covers "the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported of any textile fiber product which has been advertised or offered for sale in commerce." As the reader can readily discern, the process of jurisdiction is based on the fact that articles have been tainted in commerce by advertisement or offer. This proposition has not been tested in the courts, but it appears of small likelihood that it will be, as it strikes at a somewhat unusual situation. However, from the businessman's point of view it means that he will be held to the act if he handles goods which have been previously offered in commerce or advertised in commerce. Thus, local intrastate businessmen run the risk of violating the act by not knowing the history of the goods they are dealing with. For instance, a businessman buying goods advertised previously by the seller in the Chicago Tribune, which seller did not label such goods in accordance with the Textile Act, would be in violation as the goods have been tainted by commerce as defined in section 3(b). Since the Chicago Tribune has a substantial out-of-State circulation, the goods have a history of being advertised in commerce. The lesson here would appear to be: Know the history of your merchandise.

Section 3(c) of the Textile Act closely resembles section 3(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act; but if anything spells its traceback jurisdiction in bolder and clearer terms, section 3(c), covering "The sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported after shipment in commerce, of any textile fiber product whether in its original state or contained in other textile fiber products"; is mammoth in its jurisdictional scope. As can be seen, it, like section 3(b), is a traceback type jurisdiction hinging its jurisdictional base on the history of the goods. The businessman will have easily guessed at this point that section 3(c) will virtually cover almost every retailer of soft goods in the United States. Or more simply seen from the reverse side, a retailer, in order not to be in commerce under this clause, would have to receive all of his textile products from manufacturers located in the same State as himself. Naturally, even if such a retailer exists, he would have to avoid the pitfalls as already outlined in sections 3(a) and (b). Thus, as the act is written, even the usually immune small local retailer will undoubtedly fall subject to its provisions.

The constitutionality of this type clause has not seriously been tested. Under the Fur Products Labeling Act, a case was decided in the Ninth Circuit Court in California, *Pelta Furs v. Federal Trade Commission*. But the case, while purportedly covering the point in part, appears to really have missed the mark. Its comments on traceback jurisdiction

really amounted to dicta, as an actual sale in commerce was in evidence in that case.

Thus, in the final analysis, if all parts of the Textile Products Labeling Act stand, the businessman, unless confined to local trade and advertising and local source of supply, will fall subject to its jurisdiction.

LABELING PROVISIONS

Having determined one is subject to the jurisdiction of the Textile Products Labeling Act, what happens then? The labeling provisions of the Textile Act are very similar to the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939. Section 4(a) makes it a violation of the act to falsely or deceptively stamp, tag, label, invoice, advertise, or otherwise identify a textile fiber as to its constituent fibers. This provision is relatively simple. One cannot call rayon nylon. Thus, section 4(a) is strictly prohibitory in nature. For instance, just as in the Wool Products Labeling Act, failure to place any label on a product at all would not be covered by section 4(a). This situation would be covered by section 4(b) of the act which sets out the mandatory requirements for labeling, invoicing, and advertising.

Section 4(b) requires the textile products to be labeled or tagged, and to disclose the following information: "The name of each fiber which constitutes 5 percent or more of the product with each name being given equal prominence, and the names appearing in the order of their predominance by weight." What this means, quite simply, is that if you have a raincoat composed of 30-percent nylon, 20-percent rayon, and 50-percent acetate; the order of names on this label must be acetate, nylon, and rayon. This principle of disclosure by order of predominance, in fact, has been insisted on by the Commission under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and was actually litigated in the *Cannon Mills* case (Docket No. 7115). In fact, it was litigated on behalf of the Commission by this writer. Previous to that, the principle was strongly entrenched in the Commission's trade practice rules for the rayon industry. If a fiber or fibers compose less than 5 percent of the product, it cannot be designated by trademark or generic name, but only as "other fiber or other fibers," thus, 70-percent nylon, 26-percent rayon, 4 percent other fibers. Nondeceptive trade names may be used in conjunction with a generic name. As in the Wool Products Labeling Act, one can designate ornamentation as: "All nylon exclusive of ornamentation"; "All rayon, 4-percent silk ornamentation." Further, as in the Wool Products Labeling Act, ornamentation is limited to 5 percent of the total fiber weight of the product.

If one is tempted to think that the requirements of section 4(b)(1) are mere technical trivialities, the history of proceedings under the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act should discourage such approach. Lawyers defending clients before the Federal Trade Commission and thence to the courts have found the so-called de minimus arguments to be given short shrift.

Section 4(b)(2) of the act is again very similar to the Wool Products Labeling Act. It requires setting out the percentage of fiber by weight. Thus, one cannot set out 50-percent nylon, 30-percent rayon, and 20-percent cotton. A percentile must thus always precede the fiber name. The prohibition against setting out generic names in front of a fiber or fibers which compose less than 5 percent is reiterated in this section. Perhaps it would be as well to advise the reader that this appears to be a sore point with the Commission. It undoubtedly has resulted from the irresistible temptation of the advertiser to put his best foot forward, even though it might only be a toe or, more

closely, a toenail. Needless to say, the act covers the situation, and a label attempting to proclaim the wonderful virtues of a below 5-percent material will be in trouble.

LABELING TOLERANCE

Provision is made in the act for deviations under allowable tolerances. Under rule 43 (a), a tolerance of 3 percent has been established, add or subtract. If you have an actual 38-percent nylon, 35 or 41 percent will pass the mark. Past this point, the burden shifts to the manufacturer to prove unavoidable variations in manufacture despite due care. The crucial point to remember is, of course, that the burden has shifted, and the manufacturer is put to proving his case. Where representations are made that a fiber is composed of but one material, such as "all nylon," tolerances of any sort will not apply, save as to ornamentation. A 3-percent or even a 1-percent deviation under such circumstances is a violation. As can be easily seen, a manufacturer, not certain of the history of his goods and with bad or clumsy records, will have a difficult time complying with the law, despite the best intentions. Indeed, such was often the case under the Wool Products Labeling Act.

IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE ON LABELS

Section 4 of the act requires the name of the manufacturer of the product, or one or more persons subject to section 3, with respect to the product. Such a requirement is usually not difficult to comply with, save that the big retailer usually runs into trouble during his substitution of tags. The nemesis here is the carelessness of employees making substitutions. This provides a constant headache for the large retailer. The Commission's point of view appears to be that goods when exposed to the customer must provide that customer with all required information. Goods exposed to the customer for long periods, waiting for tags to fill empty places, would appear to be waving the flag at the bull.

FOREIGN DISCLOSURE

Section 4(b) (4) requires foreign disclosure. That is, the name of the country where the product was manufactured and processed. Foreign disclosure not only permeates the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, but has a long history with the Commission under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. It perhaps can be considered a sore point, as it goes back to high-pitched emotional feelings of a less-sophisticated America. But with the Federal Trade Commission the principle seems to be firmly established in law; regardless of the fact that people no longer consider imports from Japan as "junk" nor imports from Germany as "tops." Needless to say, one must view the foreign disclosure requirement with great care.

ADVERTISING

Like the Fur Act, but unlike the Wool Act, the New Textile Products Labeling Act has specific provisions covering advertising. Indeed, the Wool Products Labeling Act does not cover advertising at all; misleading advertising of wool products has been, and continues to be, charged under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Section 4(c), which controls the advertising of Textile Products, is a bit peculiar in its effect, as it is what, one may term, quasi-mandatory. Section 4(c), for example, requires that all information required under sections 4(b) (1) and 4(b) (2) be contained in the body, heading, or other part of the advertisement, except that percentages need not be shown, if any disclosure or implication of disclosure of fiber content is made. The requirement would appear to come into play if a disclosure or implication of disclosure of fiber content is made. Of course, if no disclosure or implication of disclosure

is made, the advertisement goes unaffected by this act. The difficulty is immediately seen in the term, "implication of disclosure." This is defined in rule 40 as "terms in written advertisements which are descriptive of a method of manufacture, construction, or weave, and which, by custom and usage, are also indicative of a textile fiber or fibers; or the use of terms in such advertisements which constitute or connote the name or presence of a fiber or fibers." This would appear to indicate that terms such as satin, tweed, plaid, and the like, are sufficient to invoke the section. Secondly, the advertising terms developing from day to day would do likewise; Satiny, Nylonette, Rayex, and those other ingenious devices of the advertising copy man. This act will not outlaw the terms which imply, or the disclosure, but once such terms are used, the information as required in sections 4(b) (1) and 4(b) (2) must become part of the advertisement. Rule 40 is broad, and administrative experience might well have foretold that it would be. The Commission, rather than attempt to set out every name at the onset, has chosen to wait, and pick and choose amongst those that are developed. Instead of outsmarting the ingenuity of the industry, the Commission appears to have wisely chosen to out-wait them.

More liberal, in a small respect, is the fact that Section 4(d) does allow the placing of additional information above that required on stamp, tag, label, or other identification in advertisements. This is not allowed under the rules of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act.

SPECIAL LABELING SITUATIONS

Also, section 4(e) of the act provides that each textile fiber product contained in a package need not be labeling if the sale is intended in package form for the consumer, and the package carries a stamp, tag, or label equally applicable to each product in the package. While this would appear to be sufficient for a manufacturer or other person who intends final sale in package form, one who breaks the package for individual sales has the responsibility of full labeling requirements as provided in rule 28. In the case of, let us say, sheets in a package, disclosure on the box is sufficient to cover sale if the package is sold. Breaking up the package and selling the sheets individually means labeling. As can be seen, the problem here will probably be one for the retailer who will, in most instances, demand labeling of individual items regardless of whether packaged or not.

The act by virtue of section 4(f) makes allowances for severance from bolts, pieces, and rolls. Tags on the bolts, pieces, or rolls will serve to cover sales of pieces cut from these. There is provision, however, that a representation of such a portion as containing a different fiber percentage than indicated requires labeling. In actuality, this portion of the act should not provide too much difficulty, providing the representation to the retailer is not out of line.

USE OF FUR NAMES

Of great interest to the trade, and especially the retailer, should be the fact that the Textile Products Labeling Act covers the use in advertising of any fur name or fur note fur. Section 4(g) of the act prevents the use in advertising of any fur name or fur symbol which is not a fur or fur product within the meaning of the Fur Products Labeling Act. This, naturally, creates a bit of a headache. Fur names permissible under the Fur Products Labeling Act are listed in the Fur Products Name Guide. Thus, the familiar pitfall of using improper animal names, under the Fur Products Labeling Act, will be present under the Textile Act. Once again, the principle problem will no doubt occur at the lower echelon of employees; and the familiar examples of viola-

tions such as Persian, instead of Persian lamb, Mouton, instead of Mouton-processed lamb, and the like, will haunt the department manager. A textile product containing the hair, fiber, or blend of an animal may be described as such, but only as rabbit hair, or the like. The attempt to use that much better sounding, but incorrect French word Lapan hair, will be "verboten."

If instruction under section 4(g) of the act appear somewhat stringent, the rule covering this section is more so. Rule 9(b) prevents the use of the name, or part of the name of a fur-bearing animal, whether a single word, a combination word, or any coined word, which is phonetically similar to a fur-bearing animal name, or which is only a slight variation in the spelling of a fur-bearing animal name. The Commission sets out examples: "Ermine," "Mink," "Persian," "Broadtail," "Sabelon," "Minx," etc. It is well to remember these are only examples. The stringency of the statute in regard to fur names appears to have grown directly out of the Commission's experience under the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act. Undoubtedly this section will receive heavy play at the investigative level, as it will enable the Commission to enforce a principle that it has thus far been unsuccessful in enforcing under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as witnessed by the Elliot Knitwear case: "(Cashmora), where the advertiser advertises 'Cashmora contains no Cashmere'."

Needless to say, the ingenious devices of the advertisers will be seriously hampered by the act; but in large part, it probably the advertising in the industry that is most likely responsible for the interest created in legislation in this field.

HANDLING AND DESTRUCTION OF LABELS

Section 5 of the act provides for protection against mutilation or destruction of labels, and makes such, a violation of the act. This appears to be a supersafeguard against an event rarely occurring and would not appear to be a real problem to the legitimate businessman. However, with the extensive jurisdiction which is the Commission's under the Textile Act, the new large number of previously introduced businesses might spotlight a few of the more colorful merchants. As the story goes of an aroused housewife in Los Angeles who purchased a pen and pencil set, a ladies pocketbook, and a mink coat for \$35, and duly registered her complaint that the mink coat was not in fact mink. "That's right," said the merchant, "but what's she complaining about, I only made \$10 on the deal." So can be expected a host of similar tales.

SUBSTITUTION OF LABELS

Section 5(b) (1) and (2) allows for persons carrying duly registered identification numbers to substitute labels meeting 4(b) (2) requirements for labels already on the product. The Textile Act, like the Wool Act, and the Fur Act, allows for the use of substitute labels. This, of course, is of benefit to the large retailer who prefers his personal label on the goods. But as can be imagined, introduces a number of headaches. Carelessness of retailers in making correct substitution has caused a great deal of difficulty under both the Fur and Wool Acts. The fact that de minimis is no argument under this act, coupled with such carelessness, could well spell trouble. It would appear that continuing supervision in this area is clearly indicated. The "I didn't know" defense has never availed too well, and would appear to be growing steadily less persuasive.

BREAKING PACKAGED GOODS

Section 5(c) provides that breaking a unit label package will require labeling the individual units so sold. This is a retailers problem; and it would appear that, if the retailer has any idea that packaged units, al-

though intended for sale in such forms, will in all probability be broken by him, he would best have all units labeled individually before accepting them.

RECORDKEEPING

As can be expected, the Textile Act will provide some of its worst headaches in the area of recordkeeping. It can well be expected that this area will be viewed closely by the Commission, as it undoubtedly will be the Commission's greatest means of enforcement. Recordkeeping is covered by section 8 of the act. Section 8(a) requires every manufacturer, subject to the act, to maintain proper records showing the fiber content, as required in the act, of all products made by him. Such records must be kept at least 3 years.

Section 8(b) provides that persons who substitute labels pursuant to section 5(b), such as retailers already discussed, shall keep records showing all the information on the discarded tags and the name or names of the person or persons from whom such textile product was received. These must likewise be kept for 3 years.

Section 8(c) makes the failure to keep records, as outlined above, a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act; an unfair method of competition and an unfair or deceptive act and practice. However, the area of recordkeeping can run into deeper waters. It would appear that willful falsification of records under the act would clearly violate section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which is a criminal offense calling for a fine of from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and imprisonment for, from 1 to 3 years. Complete failure of recordkeeping results in administrative action; willful false recordkeeping, into a criminal offense. Section 6 of the Textile Act is implemented by rule 39, which more clearly spells out the details.

Rule 39(a) requires maintaining records by the manufacturer, irrespective of whether a guarantee has been given or received. While a guarantee protects the person it is given to as to representations made on its contents, it does not relieve the person from recording in the regular manner. The rule undoubtedly was made to enable the Commission to get behind each and every transaction and trace it to its source. As in the Wool Act, undoubtedly the Commission will prove many of its cases by records rather than in the laboratory.

Rule 39(a) (1) and (2) spell out just how records are to be kept. Rule 39(a) (1) calls for the percentage of each fiber placed in each style, lot, or description as applicable to the textile fiber product of such manufacturer in the form of a fiber, yarn, fabric, or other form. Thus, the fiber is picked up in the cradle and followed to the grave, as 39(b) (1) calls for some means of identifying the records with the textile product to which they relate. In addition, virtually all data pertaining to raw stocks including correspondence must be kept by the manufacturer.

Experience under the Wool Act and Fur Act would indicate that records are of paramount importance; and, of course, section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, already referred to, demands they be treated with more than casual attention.

NEW FIBERS

If the new Textile Act is broad in its coverage by inclusion of a new vast multitude of numbers, it is peculiarly unequalled in its power under section 7(c). The Commission's power under this section, supplemented by rules 6 and 7, almost amounts to licensing power. In this respect, the Commission departs from the largely prohibitory Wool and Fur Acts. Under section 7(c): "The Commission is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, includ-

ing the establishment of generic names of manufactured fibers, under and in pursuance of the terms of the Act as may be necessary and proper for administration and enforcement." While it is true that the Commission was authorized under the Fur Products Labeling Act to establish a Fur Name Guide, it was hardly expected that any new animals would be discovered, at least on earth. The textile industry, of course, presents an entirely different picture. New textiles have, in recent years, developed to an enormous extent; nylon, rayon, acetate, etc. If the Commission has interpreted the act correctly, witness rule 6(a), it now sits in judgment on newly manufactured textile creations and, in fact, determines if they are new. Rule 7 is in fact a name guide covering manmade fibers, defining them in terms of chemical formula and weight.

Rule 8 provides a real base for establishing a generic name for a new fiber. This provides for an application in writing, which gives, broadly speaking:

1. Reasons why the product should not fall under one of the names as set out in rule 7.
2. The chemical composition of the fiber.
3. Suggested names for consideration as generic.
4. Other pertinent data.
5. The proposed market date of the product.

Under the rule, the Commission acts in 60 days or devises or assigns a symbol, pending further consideration. The rest of the rule reads as follows: "After taking the necessary procedure in consideration of the application, the Commission in due course shall establish a generic name or advise the applicant of its refusal to grant the application, and designate the proper existing generic name for the fiber."

The rule is peculiar in two respects. First, the Commission in naming a new fiber, not only purports to judge if the fiber is new; but even if the Commission does find it new, the Commission appears to have reserved the right to name the fiber itself. Suggested name of the manufacturer appears to be just that suggested. Secondly, and coupled closely with this fact, is that no criterion has been set up under this rule to establish why the Commission can refuse a manufacturer's generic name if the manufacturer has in fact produced a new fiber. It would certainly appear that the Commission has brought itself squarely into the realm of property rights with rule 8. Further, it would appear that the rule as read might well be void because it either extends past the intent of Congress, or if not allows deprivation of property without due process of law. This is patently obvious because the rule as read allows the Commission to establish its own generic name without question. Since no criterion are cited, a theoretical situation can be used where the Commission could act arbitrarily and capriciously and still be within the letter of its rule. There is, in fact, presently a manufacturer bringing suit against the Commission to challenge the Commission's denial of a new generic name. *Courtlands (Alabama) v. Federal Trade Commission, et al.* This suit, however, does not reach this point because the Commission has denied that the fiber involved is new. But the battle might well shape up. It is one thing to list names of fur-bearing animals. No one owns these names or created them. But, isn't it another to insist on the right to establish names which reflect the work and creativeness of new man-made fibers. Thus, aside from the question of deception, it appears to this writer that Congress and the Commission both might have exceeded the bounds of the Constitution. That is, it might well be that Congress did not have the power to give and the Commission the right to establish generic names in the first place.

It appears to this writer, at least, that such is the case. Certainly where no relation can be shown to deception, one really wonders precisely what section 7(c) is hinging on. Undoubtedly, this portion of the statute of the rule involved here will be tested sooner than any other provision, and those who are interested will find out.

INJUNCTIVE POWERS

As under the Wool Act, the Textile Act gives the Commission injunctive powers wherever the Commission has reason to believe that any person is about to perform an act which would violate the Textile Act. For some reason the Textile Act does not, as the Wool Act does, give the Commission condemnation power.

Injunctive proceedings under the act are covered by section 8. Under this section injunction may be sought and held in effect until final administrative determination by the Commission, or final disposition by the court on review. The injunction obtained by the Commission under this section goes against the act and not the goods. For example, goods may continue to be shipped, but failure to label properly, or to invoice properly, or other violations named in the injunction, means disobedience to court order and, of course, is punishable as contempt. Injunctive power is one of the Commission's most powerful weapons. Under the act, the Commission can bring such suits in its own name, and does not have to liaison through the Justice Department. Thus, the Commission can act with relatively fast speed. Of course, the possibility of swift punishment, vis-a-vis, contempt of court, before the case is ever touched by administrative process, gives the Commission an advantage it does not enjoy under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. There is little question in this writer's mind that the Commission is far more potent under its Fur, Wool, and Textile Acts, than it is under section 5. Yet section 5 was initially created as the heart and core of the Federal Trade Commission. If anything, the injunctive power of the Commission will certainly go a long way toward the Commission making itself felt in industry in an unprecedented manner, and perhaps might spell a revision in the future to grant such powers across to the boards to all acts administered by it.

FOREIGN IMPORTS

The difficulty of American goods complying with the act, and imported goods not doing so, has been contemplated under the act by section 9. This section requires that imported goods meet the requirements of section 4 of the act, and further prohibits companies from falsifying or perjury invoices. Such falsification or perjury will allow the Commission to ban such companies from importing, save by filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount double the value of the products. Despite this section, imported goods improperly labeled may be expected to give trouble, where proof of mislabeling must depend upon records rather than laboratory techniques. This would be so, quite naturally, because of the inaccessibility of such records. This problem is still a headache under the Wool Act because of the fact that no laboratory technique has been sufficiently developed which can determine the difference between wool and so-called reprocessed wool. However, where chemical determinations can be made, the problem dissipates; and, of course, chemical techniques on manufactured fibers should not be difficult to determine. If this proves not to be so, however, the American manufacturer will find himself once again the victim of his country's own good business practices.

GUARANTEES

As in the Wool and Fur Acts, the Textile Act provides for the protection of the busi-

nessman vis-a-vis the guarantees. However, mere provision of guarantee is not enough. This is covered by section 10 of the act. This provides that a person shall not be in violation of the act if he receives a guarantee in good faith, signed by and containing the name and address of a person in the United States by whom the product was manufactured and received from, and which states the product is not misbranded or falsely invoiced.

The key here is good faith. It can be expected that a person, for example, could not receive goods which have patently obvious defects, and rely on his guarantee. In short, the experienced businessman cannot, because of the guarantee, express the state of mind of a housewife. Good faith will be within the realm of reasonableness of business experience. It is doubtful that a man in the silk trade 20 years can assert a guarantee as a defense to linen being labeled as silk.

Three types of guarantees are provided for under the act. A specific guarantee covering a shipment or series of shipments, in which case the guarantee appears on an invoice or other relating paper. A continuing guarantee from the seller to the buyer covering all textile fiber products sold between the two, as between a manufacturer and retailer; and a continuing guarantee filed with the Commission by the guarantor, covering all textile fiber products handled by the guarantor. Under the rules, a separate guarantee may be given in reasonable form, and rule 36 provides suggestions as to how the guarantees shall be made. The continuing guarantees, however, from seller to buyer, are mandatory and not suggestive. These must be used as set out in rule 37. As can be expected, continual guarantees with the Commission also require mandatory forms and are set out in rule 38.

It can well be expected that guarantees will be a sore point with the Commission. They go to the integrity of the entire act; and furnishing false guarantees is a violation of the act under section 10(b). A person guaranteeing on the basis of a guarantee will not be guilty under this section. But again, good faith is the crux of a successful guarantee defense.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Like the Wool Act and the Fur Act, the Textile Act contains criminal provisions. These are not to be taken lightly. This is covered by section 11(a) of the act. Willful violation of sections 3, 5, 6, 9, or 10(b) is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The key here, is "willful." This concept does not include carelessness, occasional slips, and the usual trivial type mistakes, but calls for a definite and knowledgeable intent. This definite and knowledgeable intent, however, may be inferred from the circumstances. Unlike the injunctive power granted to the Commission under the act, the criminal provisions of the act call for the Commission's certifying all pertinent facts to the Attorney General; and if the latter concurs, he shall cause appropriate proceedings to be brought. From experience under the Wool Act and Fur Act, such proceedings are much slower than injunctive proceedings; but if increases in personnel is granted to the Commission, it may well be that increased activity may take place in this area. The weight of this section will most likely fall more toward the manufacturer than the retailer, as it appears an economic fact of life, in our times, that very often the retailer does not really know the quality and composition of his merchandise, and has become strictly a brand man. This would appear especially so in some of the larger retail chains. The lesson, if any, appears to be the exercise of due care and ordinary business judgment.

EXEMPTIONS

Exemptions of various types of articles of manufacture, and incidental articles, are set out in section 12 of the act. The important point to remember here is that this exemption is lost if any representation as to fiber content of each article is made in any advertisement, label, or other means of identification. By representing, the act is invoked. Provision is made under this section as well for the Commission to exclude other textile products on the basis of lack of necessity of the protection of the ultimate consumer, and insignificant textile fiber content.

SUMMATION

In summing up, as the Federal Trade Commission goes, the Textile Act is one of vast and sweeping powers, for the reason that a mammoth number of businesses will be suddenly required to perform mandatory functions to be policed by the Commission; and for further reason, that the act contains injunctive powers and criminal penalties. Strangely enough, the Commission can with this simple Labeling Act hit harder, faster, and more effectively than it ever could under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act or the Clayton Act. The act does not provide the built-in defenses of the Robinson-Patman Act or the long established decises and rational of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. If defenses are developed, they will have to be new, and created from everyday circumstances. Fortunately, methods of procedure, including administrative hearings, rights of appeal, and the like are part of this act, as this act is part of the Federal Trade Commission Act. But it would be useless to pretend that the businessman has not been beset with yet another onerous burden of governmental regulation.

The act is concerned with technicalities, and this voids the screen represented by the businessman's favorite phrase, "a mere technicality." Its primary essence in being appears to be to keep the ultimate consumer informed to pinpoint accuracy. Whether or not the ultimate consumer really wants to be so informed, or what his real preferences are, is now a moot question. Whether the act is really a good thing, is also for the time being, moot, as is whether its purpose will be served. For the businessman, it is here.

How Much Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record an editorial from the Central Oregonian of March 17, 1960, published in Prineville, Oreg. It deals with a topic which has traditionally been of vital interest to westerners, and which is becoming similarly important to people all over the Nation.

The article follows:

How Much Water?

By 1980 the United States could be a water-shy nation if proper forethought, planning, and action are not taken to stop waste, pollution, and other misuses of this valuable resource.

This warning was sounded recently by Roscoe Flemming, special correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor.

"The 250 million or more Americans of 1980 will need usable water in huge new drafts, for new uses and thirsty industries," Flemming says. "The Nation's needs for fresh water have doubled each quarter century. And the pace grows faster."

One of Flemming's first concerns is for those communities who are seeing the door of opportunity slowly close because of the lack of this one resource. Those communities with a large, sure supply of fresh water lose no opportunity to brag of it as first among their attractions for new industry.

In Crook County, where the city of Prineville has applied for additional water from the Crooked River project for (among other things) industrial purposes, it is fast being learned that water is the resource necessary to develop all others, so the country must provide usable water in advance of all other resource development.

Yet, with the importance of water such as it is, people largely refuse to become concerned—as long as water comes out of the taps. Flemming points out that as a people Americans have been spoiled. They get worked up about water only when the well runs dry or conversely, in time of flood.

The average irrigation farmer, according to Flemming, pays about one penny for a thousand gallons, or more than four tons, delivered all the way from the mountains to nourish his crops. If he has to pay more he grumbles that he cannot make a living at the high cost of water. This is quite often true, he agrees.

The big fact about the U.S. water supply is that nature still provides much more than the Nation could consume, but that with present means, only a fraction of it can be utilized. Most water is still wild, captured in the hills like an animal, leashed, and led to where it is put to work.

What are some of the things to worry about regarding our water supply? In a normal year rainfall in the United States supplies about 5 billion acre-feet of water. The Nation, however, actually loses about 10 percent of this. Of this 5 billion acre-feet, about 70 percent becomes runoff from which man dips for his needs. But so far he is dipping about one-third—the rest is so distant from where he needs it, or is otherwise so unavailable that it costs more than it is worth.

Flemming points to the Nation's 2 million manmade reservoirs as another source of water. Pertaining to dams, U.S. Geological Survey experts say that it gets more expensive in each basin in proportion to the amount of water usefully stored, until at last it will become uneconomical in all basins. Even now, the United States pays in terms of water lost to evaporation from such artificial reservoirs alone at least 33 million acre-feet yearly.

Turning to ground water, there is many billion acre-feet of it. But for much of it the cost of pumping is prohibitive, and much of it is so mineralized it can't be used without treatment.

It is doubtful, Flemming writes, that complete distribution of surface water will solve the problem. At the same time, he states, the largest potential supply of fresh water lies in stopping waste of the available supply in such menial tasks as carrying off sewage. He mentions seepage in the western irrigation districts, too. A general yardstick, he says, is that only about half the water in the reservoir actually reaches the crops. Even then, it is likely to be carelessly used.

Flemming mentions other possibilities for increasing the water supply: Controlling evaporation.

Cutting forests selectively, as on the western mountains, permitting to reach the ground snow that otherwise remains up on the evergreen branches by billions of tons and softly and silently vanishes away?

Making snow reservoirs by covering huge mountain drifts with such substance as sawdust in order to cut down melting and evaporation.

Seeding the clouds to increase rainfall.

Finally, freshening salty water from the 314 million cubic miles of ocean.

All this will take much more cooperation among various agencies than is now being experienced. Marion Clawson, of Resources for the Future, notes what he calls an obsession of westerners to expand irrigated farming with water that may actually be much more needed for expanding cities or industries.

Will this result eventually in a National Government water policy that will limit the amount of water going to farmers?

Was Mr. Vanderbilt Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the January 1960 edition of the Quarterly Review, a publication for public relation consultants. The article was written by my good friend Mr. William Safire, vice president of Tex McCrary, Inc., one of the leading public relations firms in this country.

Mr. Safire is a former newspaper correspondent and foreign correspondent for WNBC. I thought that the article would interest former newspaper and public relations men who are serving in the House today, and I therefore include it, as follows:

Was Mr. Vanderbilt Right?

(By William Safire)

William Vanderbilt, railroad tycoon was trying to get some sleep one night aboard his private car, when he was aroused by a newspaper reporter pounding on his door. He declined to see the reporter, who indignantly replied: "But I represent the public."

Thereupon the commodore's son roared back with the words that have been the bane of the existence of New York Central Railroad press agents to this very day:

"The public be damned."

With the benefit of historical hindsight, we might well conclude that this statement caused severe damage to what we now refer to as his industry's corporate image.

Indeed, a public-be-damned attitude became the bete-noir of textbooks and learned articles on the technique of public relations and almost every practitioner in the field today has heard himself saying to a client: "You can't adopt a public-be-damned attitude." The PBDA—as the reactionary attitude may be referred to among communications counselors—might well be replaced totally by what the Federal Communications Commission has named the PICON: Public Interest, convenience, and necessity.

At a recent board meeting of a large corporation, the chief executive officer, with an eye toward increasing earnings, made a suggestion about moving a certain plant's location, undoubtedly an unpopular move to at least one community and a segment of the company's personnel. The suggestion was met with negative head-shakings. All

around the table. "Bad for public relations" was the consensus.

The executive excused himself for a moment, stepped into an adjacent executive washroom, looked straight in the mirror, and silently mouthed the words, "The public be damned." Thus relieved, he returned to the board meeting and gracefully acquiesced.

In today's business community, public relations has assumed an aura not unlike motherhood or apple pie. Very few red-blooded Americans will admit they don't like apple pie—those who do are considered iconoclasts, suspiciously eccentric—and nobody at all will come out against good public relations. And as it became sacrosanct, it became a shield for abuses.

The less significant abuses—some corporate yachts and airplanes, fringe benefits to top personnel all written off as "public relations expenses"—do not concern us here. What is far more important is to examine the effect of public opinion on the operation of a business, to see how "public relations considerations" affect basic corporate decisions. Never admitting it openly, many an executive wonders when a public should be damned, when it should be pandered to—and wonders if there is ever a happy medium.

Let's set up a few ground rules that most businessmen will accept:

1. A business is in business to make a profit, not merely to make friends.

2. A business that has to cheat and lie to make a profit should go out of business, voluntarily or otherwise.

3. In the long run, a favorable public opinion toward your company or product helps create profits. Lincoln said: "Any policy to be permanent must have public opinion at the bottom."

4. The long view cannot always be taken in a competitive situation—a still longer view is staying in business. Lincoln was denounced as a dictator when he made the unpopular move of suspending the basic right of habeas corpus; sometimes, though not always, the ends justify the means.

Apply the above ground rules to specific situations, and see what happens.

CASE 1: LAYOFFS

A publicly owned company, existing solely on defense contracts, lays off its men frequently whenever there are cutbacks. A committee from the town and from the union urges the company to begin a program of diversification, a good hedge against the cutbacks. The public relations counsel advises strongly for this, as the only way to win good community and employee relations. The company's treasurer points out that the money market is very bad for a diversification investment at this time, and that since the cutback-speedup cycle is profitable though unpopular, he advises that any thoughts of diversification be postponed. Which public do you damn, your local community or your stockholders?

CASE 2: TESTIMONY

The president and owner of a company is called before a congressional investigating committee. His reputation is important to him; as far as he knows, he has been honest most of the time, but there are a few situations that he would rather not go into, part of his distant past. Dilemma: Should he be a cooperative witness and try to answer everything?

Says the public relations counsel, who probably has not been told everything: "Client, you have nothing to hide. Pleading the fifth amendment would bracket you with racketeers and thugs and Communists—it is essential, for your good name and for the public relations of your company, to answer all the questions to the best of your ability. If they get to a delicate subject, let your memory go hazy, but look like you're trying to cooperate."

Says the lawyer, who does know everything, because a client's relationship with a lawyer has been established by the courts as completely confidential, and a public relations man's has not: "If the questioning is more than superficial you start taking the fifth. We'll accuse the committee of irrelevancy, take a contempt citation, and beat it in the courts."

Many a businessman, faced with this dilemma, will say: "I'll listen to my lawyer. A lot of good public relations will do me in jail."

CASE 3: DISCLOSURE TO PRESS

You are planning a significant merger between two publicly held companies, on a 3 shares for 1 basis. A reporter hears a rumor and asks you for an interview. If the rumor sees print, the price of the stock of the smaller company will rise sharply, probably ruining the deal.

The reporter is sure to ask you to confirm or deny negotiations, neither of which you can properly do. If you deny, you are lying, and if you confirm, you spoil the deal. If you refuse to do either, you are tacitly confirming. You could take the reporter into your confidence and ask him to run nothing, and most financial reporters are extremely responsible men; some, however, may not want to run the risk of being beaten to their story by other newsmen.

Your public relations man wisely tells you that "it is very bad public relations to suddenly become unavailable to the press. And if you get this particular reporter mad, he'll be sniping at us for years. From the long-range point of view, see him and let's try to get him to hold it." In the long view, you know he's right. But if you don't put this merger through, your company will be in dire straits and may never see the long view. You know the reporter's editor won't run a stock-stimulating rumor without some indication of confirmation, such as a refusal to deny the rumor—and if you don't see the reporter or answer his calls, he won't have that refusal.

At this point bad public relations often sets in and many a businessman decides this would be a good time to go to a convenient hospital for a 3-day checkup.

CASE 4: LOBBYING

Your company is induced to locate near a certain city with promises of long-term low property taxes. You buy and build a headquarters, and along comes a new political administration in the city that promptly threatens to raise your property taxes.

The matter is put to the city's voters in a referendum. Your public relations counsel prepares to launch a campaign to defeat the tax rise, lays out a plan using every trick in the book; ads and stories appealing to the city's fiscal responsibility, veiled hints to employees that higher taxes might mean lower wages, establishment of independent citizens' committees to support your point of view, the complete public relations package. He takes a quick poll before he begins, assesses the voters at 60 to 40 against you, but feels an aggressive campaign can eke out a victory at election time.

You calculate the risk. If you win, you'll probably have to fight it out again next year; if you lose, you lose for good—they'll never lower your taxes once they're raised. Then you calculate the cost; the public relations campaign will run about \$20,000.

You talk it over with a lobbyist at the State capitol. He says, for a \$20,000 retainer, he will get the State legislature to pass a bill effectively blocking the city from ever annexing your property and raising your taxes. "Sure it's lousy public relations," he admits, "but the hue and cry in the city will die down after a while. And your conscience is clear—you're only making

sure you get what the city promised you in the first place."

You write a check for \$20,000 and give it to whom? The lady or the tiger?

None of the foregoing illustrations was hypothetical; in each instance cited, an actual corporate executive was called on to make a decision, carefully weighing the "public relations considerations."

The reason why no corporate names are mentioned here is that in each case, the decision was, in essence, "the public be damned." Damned it was, but with a minimum of fanfare; once the decision was made, the public relations man was called upon to sugarcoat the pill as best he could.

ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC RELATIONS MEN INVOLVED

Interestingly, the four public relations men reacted differently. One quit in a huff, after telling off top management eloquently in a board meeting that he would never become a "mouthpiece for a company with no conscience." Another felt the same way, but he liked the money he was getting so he swallowed his integrity. The third, an organization man and generally insensitive soul, figured that whatever the boss decided must be right and he plunged in to repair the damage.

The fourth public relations man, an independent Madison Avenue operative who is cordially hated by many and thoroughly respected by most, explained his reaction in this way:

"The function of a lawyer is to warn of pitfalls and discover loopholes; a treasurer, or a certified public accountant, contributes to a decision by showing quickly and accurately what the effects will be on the books; a registered lobbyist, at his best, can closely assess the chances of passage of pertinent legislation and predict what is necessary and to get it across.

"My job in this case was to calculate the effect of the alternative actions on public opinion, and to recommend the course that would be best for the long-range public relations of the company. The president listened carefully, agreed with my thinking, and did precisely the opposite. He decided the other considerations were more important, which was his prerogative.

"No, I don't feel I should resign the account. I'm a professional counsel; I counseled professionally and was right about my area. If I were the company president, with the responsibility of looking at all the other facets in a decision, perhaps I would have done the same."

Too detached a point of view? Perhaps. But lawyers and accountants should not be asked for public relations advice, nor public relations men for legal or financial opinions, unless they have passed the bar or are qualified financial men.

The sooner management men recognize the area of limitation as well as the area of competence of their various counsel, the better able they will be to lay out clearly the factors in a corporate decision.

And the sooner public relations specialists realize that their special area is not always the overriding factor, the closer they will come to professional status and the easier they will find it to live with occasionally necessary "public-be-damned" attitudes.

The arrogance of the robber barons of the 1890's seems to have been replaced by the arrogance of those self-appointed corporate consciences today. A conscience in business is an extremely important thing, but there are those times when the native rue of resolution is sickled over with the pale cast of overemphasized public relations. The public, as well as the customer, is not always right.

In the next few years, as more public relations men drop the messianic pose and adopt a more professional attitude, we may see this significant consideration in a corporate deci-

sion—the public relations aspect—find its proper place in the management of honestly profitable business.

Yes, Mr. Vanderbilt, even in the future there will be a right time and place for your "public-be-damned" attitude. But it's never a good idea to holler it at a reporter.

Hoffa's Private War on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times, on March 16, carried a most interesting and enlightening editorial, which I am including in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House and Senate:

HOFFA'S PRIVATE WAR ON CONGRESS

James R. Hoffa is out to "get" 82 Members of Congress running for reelection this year. He has marked them for political oblivion in a confidential memorandum he has sent his trusted lieutenants in the Teamsters Union. Also on his blacklist is Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, a candidate for President, because KENNEDY supported a labor reform bill in Congress last year.

The Hoffa memorandum details an election battle strategy designed not only to defeat the 82 he has listed because they supported labor law reform last year but also to give support to 59 Representatives Hoffa believes will "buy" Hoffa's program for weakening the new restrictions.

Some of those Hoffa wants to retire from Congress have long been regarded as friendly to labor, but Hoffa wants to replace them with persons friendly to Hoffa. He is even willing to accept segregation extremists to unseat those on his blacklist.

The purge list came into the hands of the New York Herald Tribune last weekend. Hoffa denied its existence, naturally, because he does not wish to have his Napoleonic political dreams of power known to the general public. As Senator KENNEDY said when he read quotations from the secret list:

"Hoffa's proposed purge list should be an alarm bell to all Americans. Hoffa's only standard is not whether candidates have supported legislation in the interests of organized labor or the general public but only if they will 'buy the line.' I am delighted to be high on Hoffa's purge list and am certain the vast majority of members of both political parties will regard Hoffa's opposition as an endorsement."

We would not automatically support any candidate opposed by Hoffa—some may deserve defeat for reasons other than those that motivate Hoffa. But certainly any candidate who buys Hoffa's line and is willing to trade his independence for the dubious support that Hoffa can deliver deserves public scorn.

Hoffa is an associate of hoodlums and goons and he should be removed from his position of power in the labor movement for the sake of labor's own good name if not for reasons of public morality. Instead, he has the tacit support of many persons in the labor movement and he is encouraged to use his union to corrupt a congressional election.

Hoffa is not only at war with the public, he is at war with the top leadership of the AFL-CIO. In a meeting here last weekend he denounced George Meany, AFL-CIO

president, for not fighting labor reform vigorously. Hoffa is bidding for power in the labor movement outside of his own union. His proposal that all union contracts expire on the same day as the Teamsters' union contracts, which he made here and in New York Monday night, would make Hoffa the most powerful man in the labor movement. He could stop all industrial production if his mad dream of power came true.

Public reaction against Hoffa's private war on Congress is sure to be swift and impressive. We doubt whether he even has the support of all of his union members. Even John L. Lewis could not deliver the vote of his union members in 1940 when he turned against F.D.R.

Responsible labor leaders should see the direction in which Hoffa is heading. It was the Teamsters' (and a few other unions) use of force and intimidation that helped bring on labor reform last year. His present activities must surely intensify the demand for more labor reform and more curbs, reflecting outraged public opinion.

Salute to Columbian Bar Association Upon Admission To Practice Before the U.S. Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, March 22, 1960, was the commencement of a new tradition in the history of the legal profession in New York. Thirty-eight members of the Columbian Lawyers Association were admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. One of them was a woman. I had the high honor and privilege of sponsoring this group before our highest court in the land.

Last year the Columbian Lawyers Association initiated the practice of arranging for the admission of their legal membership to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. Then 53 members were so admitted.

The Columbian Lawyers Association is a young, flourishing bar association operating in the first judicial department of the State of New York. Its membership consists of more than 600 members and is composed of lawyers of Italian origin who practice principally in the city of New York and the county of Westchester. Many of them are leaders in their respective communities. They are dedicated to guarding our American traditions and to building a sound body of law for our future.

Among its foremost aims is the maintenance of a high standing of conduct for the legal profession, including the prosecuting officers of both the Federal and State Governments and the selection of capable and learned judges to serve in our courts. They are of the firm belief that in order to fulfill the great promises pronounced in our Declaration of Independence and to realize the American goal of equal justice before the law, lawyers must be skilled advocates,

sensitive to justice, and with high standards of conduct, both for the bar and the justices of the courts.

The journey to Washington was meticulously prepared by Joseph Contiguglia, a member of the association, and a referee in the workmen's compensation board in the State of New York. Done to transport 38 active lawyers to Washington from the city of New York and other members who were interested in accompanying the applicants. The success of the program was a credit to the planning and preparation which Mr. Contiguglia provided.

Prior to being sworn in by Chief Justice Earl Warren, this bar group had the distinct pleasure of meeting with the Clerk of the U.S. Supreme Court, James R. Browning, for a half-hour. Mr. Browning detailed the intimate workings of the members of the Supreme Court in the exercising of their discretion to review a matter or to decide a case. The explanations afforded the group by Mr. Browning provided a better understanding and appreciation of the tremendous tasks which burden the Justices and the procedures in the accommodation of conflicting viewpoints.

Prior to the formal swearing in, Chief Justice Earl Warren met with the group informally and discussed the aims of the bar association and the Chief Justice stressed the importance of a familiarity with the workings of the Supreme Court and the need of lawyers being admitted to practice before the supreme judicial body.

After the admission to the Supreme Court, the Columbian lawyers had luncheon at the Congressional Hotel. Several Members of Congress attended the luncheon. Representatives Victor L. Anfuso, of Brooklyn; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey; and JACOB H. GILBERT, of the Bronx, addressed the group, pointing out the significance of their membership in the U.S. Supreme Court and the pride that they felt in this demonstration by New York's legal talent.

On the evening prior to their swearing in, a reception was tendered to the group and many of their Washington friends by Mr. and Mrs. Gaspar Morell, a former New Yorker, now a successful Washington builder. Mr. Morell's beautiful home on Kalorama Road, on Embassy Row, provided the scene for happy reunions and pleasant exchanges. Several Congressmen attended the reception, including Congressmen ROBERT N. GAIAMO and EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut. Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, attended the reception and, as a former New Yorker, recalled his experiences in that great city and welcomed the lawyers to our Capital. Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, member of the House Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary and Related Agencies of the Appropriations Committee, also welcomed the association and presented the viewpoint of those who controlled the purse strings in the protection of our court system.

Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, a member of the Judiciary Committee from North Carolina, also welcomed this legal entourage, and although we were in the process of considering the controversial civil rights bill wherein Members from the North and South disagreed, he demonstrated that our disagreements could exist without the Members being disagreeable. One of the guests was Col. Giovanni Nicollo, assistant air attaché of the Italian Embassy and professor of aerodynamics. He addressed the gathering and expressed his pleasure of this practice of lawyers visiting the Capital City for such a lofty purpose of being admitted to the Supreme Court. Mr. and Mrs. Mario Noto, Assistant Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, also graced the reception with their presence. Also in attendance was Inspector Anthony Richitt, of the Metropolitan Police Department. We cannot express fully our appreciation for the hospitality of Mr. Gaspar Morell and his lovely wife, Anita Morell, whose charm has been recently displayed in the Washington press.

The roll of the newly admitted members to the Supreme Court is as follows: John F. Aiello, Charles Bakos, Nicholas A. Basso, Sabino J. Berardino, William J. Bianchi, Carmine J. Capozzola, Ralph A. Cavallo, Leonard A. Conticello, John H. Curcio, Michael A. Del Greco, Michael A. Di Salvo, Thomas Esposito, Max Feigin, Theodore R. Freschi, Joseph P. Gaiamo, Arthur F. Lamanda, Vincent J. Mandese, John J. Mangini, John Jay Mangini, Jr., Joseph A. Marchetti, Pascal Marsico, Anthony R. Martorano, Pasquale A. Mele, Edward Howard Mollison, Murray E. Morrison, Alfred F. Muscio, Pasquale Palumbo, Carmine J. Perrotta, Miss Annette M. Pollaci, Joseph F. Romano, Joseph V. Rubino, John C. Sacco, Anthony Serpone, Michael Sibillio, Alfred Frank Sica, Anthony B. Tripodi, Merritt T. Viscardi, and Salvatore Viscardi.

The president of the organization is Michael LaPenna, who was the spokesman for the group with Chief Justice Warren at their preinduction conference.

Now that these lawyers have returned home to New York leaving Washington richer because of their visit, I say to them "Congratulations and Hail Columbian Lawyers Association."

"Believing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days when the struggle for the minds of men reaches new heights and greater fury, let us also remember that we have a most encouraging weapon which can help bring ultimate victory to the peoples of the free world in their

efforts to live in freedom, democracy, and human dignity.

I refer to faith in God and the belief in the existence of the Supreme Being. Communism is a godless ideology, without a soul, without a heart, without any resemblance to a decent way of living. Its leaders are heartless and ruthless. Its whole way of life is devoid of any understanding or appreciation of the individual human being, his moral concepts, and his belief in the Supreme Ruler of the World.

It matters not what one's creed may be, whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, whether Mohammedan, Buddhist, or other faith. What matters is the fact that one faith in his heart and prays in his own way to his God. A person with faith is a better and more moral human being. A person who believes cannot lose faith in the future of mankind or in the hope for a better world.

Mr. Speaker, these thoughts came to my mind as I was reading the words of a new song, called "Believing," which has just been recorded and released to the public. The words and music were composed by Ethel Phillips, Kenneth Roberts, and Anne Lavere. It is recorded on Genie Records with the noted singer, Jeannie Thomas, as vocalist. I want to congratulate all these people for a magnificent job.

The words of this brief song are as follows:

Believing is like a prayer,
Believing is everywhere;
Believing can be the start,
And happiness will soon be in your heart.
A little faith in all you do,
And miracles will soon come true;
The magic a wish can weave,
Is yours and yours alone—if you just believe.

Remember Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, instead of our being able to move forward in these last few years to an enduring peace, our growing military and diplomatic weakness has brought us virtually to the brink of nuclear war.

Almost unbelievably, with the current administration, advertising catchlines have supplanted realities in the conduct of our Government. Where, in 1952 and 1956, this Nation was led to expect a bold new policy of seizing the initiative and leading the world to newer and better things, we have been given "salesmanship at the summit" and lectures about who knows more about defense matters than almost anybody else.

The weakness of our so-called foreign policies would make a jaybird jeer. And in the face of the greatest peril we and the democratic nations of the world have ever known, the President has developed the fixation that balancing the Federal

budget is the most important issue this Nation faces.

Nothing could be further from the facts—except perhaps the phony and flagrantly untrue slogan "Peace and Prosperity," now being readied by the Madison Avenue boys for the administration's upcoming election campaign.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask to include the following revealing and interesting article from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of Monday March 7, 1960, entitled "Eisenhower Never Has Ended the War in Korea."

EISENHOWER NEVER HAS ENDED THE WAR IN KOREA

Remember Korea?

It is where President Dwight D. Eisenhower went immediately after his election in 1952 to keep a campaign pledge. It is a place Eisenhower is credited with pacifying.

"He ended the Korean war, didn't he?" many ask.

The fact is he tried to sweep it under the rug. Look magazine states boldly: "Almost 6 years after the Korean war armistice, there is no peace."

In many respects Korea is the cruelest hoax ever played on the American people. The armistice is somewhat of a fraud because it released Red Chinese troops to attack elsewhere, as has been seen in Peking's assaults on Quemoy, their role in wresting Indochina from France and their attacks on Tibet.

Few realize the facts set forth in Look. Some 40,000 American soldiers still man a single strand barbed wire fence between South and North Korea.

The Americans are armed chiefly with World War II weapons. Look found the 8th Army there has no M-14 rifles, no M-60 machineguns, no M-59 tanks, no M-59 personnel carriers and no surface-to-air missiles for air defense.

Gen. George H. Decker, Army Vice Chief of Staff, says American forces in Korea are right down to rock bottom in logistic support. Certain trucks have been rebuilt as many as six times.

By contrast Russia is in the second round of weapons modernization since World War II and it is a cinch bet that what North Korea needs Russia will supply.

Gen. Carter B. Magruder, commander of United Nations forces and the American 8th Army in South Korea, summed the situation up for Look when he said:

"If there was fighting that used up equipment rapidly we could not support sustained operations."

The Nation's policy assumes the threat of massive nuclear retaliation will deter the Communists from starting a new war in Korea. But it did not deter them in Indochina, India, and Laos. U.S. soldiers have been taken to the brink in South Korea with outmoded climbing equipment and the situation is a decoy for an all-out war.

The next time anyone says Eisenhower ended the war in Korea the bluff should be called and raised.

Program for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey taken by the Gallup poll revealed

a strong trend among our people to insist that the President of the United States should be a "worker for peace." That is, the major criterion for the political leader of our Nation should be that he is dedicated to and capable of developing a positive U.S. program to build a just and enduring peace.

Such a program has been largely spelled out over the past several years by the senior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. In a series of addresses and legislative proposals Senator HUMPHREY has issued a dramatic challenge to his fellow Americans to take the leadership in a worldwide cooperative effort to build peace through concrete, specific works of peace.

Much of this program the senior Senator from Minnesota has presented to the Senate in legislative form. In some instances there has been action to implement his proposals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a brief summary of the chief points of Senator HUMPHREY's program for peace, a program which could form the basis for a more creative and effective foreign policy for our country in the coming years.

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S PROGRAM FOR PEACE

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's program for peace is the result of years of study and experience in the field of foreign affairs. He is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and a former delegate to the United Nations. He has traveled widely and met with the top leaders of the world, including Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

His thesis is that the United States must act boldly with measures to remove the basic conditions and causes of violence and war from the world—poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy—and to create a world security system to replace the arms race.

The Humphrey program is a positive program. It is written in solid and bold legislative proposals. These are its provisions:

A MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR PEACE

Early in 1960, Senator HUMPHREY introduced legislation to establish a National Peace Agency, with the responsibility and authority to coordinate America's efforts for peace.

The National Peace Agency would marshal the full scientific genius of America to tackle the immense technical problems of arms control—a "Manhattan Project for Peace." The Agency would be charged with responsibility to find new ways of achieving disarmament agreements and developing workable and safe inspection and control systems.

The Humphrey proposal sets safeguarded disarmament as the basic, immediate goal of the United States. The National Peace Agency would provide the governmental machinery through which that goal could be achieved.

Senator HUMPHREY said on March 7: The American people are more than willing to pay the billions requested by the President for arms; indeed we are willing to

invest far more than that, and for the present we shall be forced to do so. There is as yet no escape from the arms race.

How much more eagerly our people would support an investment in the creation of an alternative to the arms race.

Our people are eager to get on with the creative, humanitarian projects that we have so long dreamed of, eager to plow into the works of peace the dollars we are now pouring into the works of war.

FOOD FOR PEACE

The Humphrey program for peace clearly outlines the "creative, humanitarian projects" which are necessary to remove the conditions of war.

The foundation of his "Works for Peace" is a bold new program contained in legislation introduced in 1959—the International Food for Peace Act.

This legislation would authorize far broader and more positive and constructive use of America's food and fiber abundance as a weapon against hunger and starvation.

A food for peace program would also promote the economic development of backward nations, help to stabilize American agriculture and serve the foreign policy of this country by building essential conditions of peace.

Senator HUMPHREY's legislation provides for increased sales and grants of America's agricultural surpluses and allows for contracts of sufficient duration to enable other nations to plan their development more efficiently.

Today the United States spends more than \$1 billion a year just to store food and fiber surplus and many of our leaders consider that surplus a problem of disposal.

The food for peace program would, instead, convert local currencies obtained from loans and sales of food and fiber into positive works of peace. And it would give the American people reason to thank God for the great abundance of their soil, and to find deep satisfaction in the knowledge that it is being used for worthy purposes.

HEALTH FOR PEACE

The Humphrey program emphasizes that disease is the enemy of all men, and that rampant disease can weaken the will of nations and add to the conditions of war.

Senator HUMPHREY has offered legislation to provide additional funds for the World Health Organization to use in the battles against cancer and heart disease and to strengthen the office of Surgeon General of the United States for international health efforts.

His program calls for establishment of a National Institute for International Health, through which medical scientists of the world could cooperate in the war against diseases.

He has also proposed Soviet-American institutes of health in which Russian and American medical scientists could work side by side to fight disease. These institutes—plus reciprocal professorships and fellowships in universities of both nations—would provide international zones of peace, zones of enlightenment, zones of healing.

A WHITE FLEET

One of the most dramatic of Senator HUMPHREY's works for peace is his pro-

posals for a White Fleet—mercy ships which would bring help and relief to the people of disaster areas.

His proposal calls for the United States to demothball Navy ships, reoutfit hospital ships with the help of private foundations, and let them serve as task forces for peace.

These White Fleets could be sent to the scenes of earthquake, flood, hurricane, famine, or disease epidemics. One would be kept in the Mediterranean and the other in southeast Asia—each ready to bring help within 3 or 4 days to any disaster area within 1,000 to 1,200 miles.

Each group could throw into a port 800 to 1,000 hospital beds, operating facilities and laboratories, power for a whole city, and emergency rations for 300,000 people for a full week.

Two White Fleets could be operated at a cost of between \$10 million and \$15 million—a small investment for a great work of peace.

EDUCATION FOR PEACE

The Humphrey program for peace would also attack illiteracy and ignorance—two basic ingredients of violence and war.

His proposal is based on the premise that underdeveloped countries cannot hope to become strong forces for freedom and peace unless their citizens can develop sound judgment and diverse skills.

It was spelled out in legislation to establish in the executive branch of our Government an International Educational Development Foundation.

This agency would have the authority to assure a vigorous program through which the United States would assist other nations in improving their educational systems.

Public and private groups would be enlisted in an effort to provide more and better schools, teachers, and facilities to areas held back by illiteracy.

Such a program would be financed by local currencies acquired from sale of America's agricultural surpluses.

The pool of such currency now amounts to about \$2 billion, and is expected to reach \$10 billion by 1963. Only a tiny fraction of available currencies is used for educational purposes. The Humphrey food for peace program would increase the amounts used in the battle against illiteracy and ignorance.

DEDICATION AND ACTION

The Humphrey program for peace recognizes the dedication of all Americans to the goal of a world in which all men are free and secure. It recognizes the latent power and skill of America which can be harnessed to achieve that goal. Creative leadership can harness the great driving force of America in the works of peace, as it has many times mustered it to defend our Nation in great wars.

The Humphrey program for peace calls for hard work and constructive action to take giant strides toward America's goal and to utilize fully America's energies.

With dedicated leadership, that program can succeed and America's goal of an enduring peace can be achieved.

Some Words of Truth About Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is both refreshing and reassuring to find in today's metropolitan press a strong word in defense of America's embattled farmers, who are the favorite whipping boys of many editorial writers and columnists.

While anyone close to the farm economy is aware of the grave problems confronting the hard-working Americans who operate our farms and dairies, the farmer continues to be the object of attack and misunderstanding.

No fiction is more widely circulated than the claim that our farmers enjoy great subsidies at the cost of the city dweller, who derive no benefit from the Nation's farm program.

It is true that we appropriate billions of dollars for that farm program, and it is equally true that many dollars in that program are expended in undertakings of doubtful benefit to a sound farm economy.

It is equally true, however, that many dollars identified as "appropriations for agriculture" go into nonfarm pockets.

It is also emphatically true that the city family derives enormous benefits from many governmental programs that are known as farm programs.

A real service in public understanding was performed this week by the Tulsa Daily World, in an article by that newspaper farm editor, Herb Karner.

Mr. Karner's article, the first of several he proposes to write on the subject, is entitled "Many Enjoy Subsidies at Farmers' Expenses":

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World, Mar. 21, 1960]

MANY ENJOY SUBSIDIES AT FARMERS' EXPENSE (By Herb Karner)

A recent letter to "Voice of a Free People" appeared in the Tulsa Daily World written by a Tulsan in which he criticized the farm program and concluded his letter saying:

"May I ask why the farmer should be subsidized while those engaged in other small businesses are not? If I go into the grocery business and go broke, Uncle Sam merely says: 'That's too bad.' If a working man loses his job he gets a few weeks of unemployment pay and then is on his own. He gets no subsidy year after year and I believe he is just as much an American as the farmer."

"The farm program is nothing but class legislation."

Hey, Just one cotton pickin' minute. There is entirely too much talk going on about how much farmers are costing taxpayers that is completely misleading.

The above letter is a classical example of the great American indoor sport of forming opinions and passing judgment without bothering about facts.

Sincere as the above writer is, it's obvious he is completely unaware of the situation. And we're first to admit he is justified in his statement politicians are using the "farm

program" to drive a wedge between city folk and farmers to further their own political ambitions, and while there may be some elements of truth in what they say, most of it is unfair.

So, it's high time to sit down and separate fact from fiction, because we believe city folk have a greater stake in a prosperous agriculture than do farmers themselves.

It's high time our taxpayers had some truth about the \$7 billion farm budget that is causing the average "man on the street" to scream farmers are getting rich at their expense, claiming only farmers receive a subsidy.

So, let's talk about subsidies—and at the same time make it crystal clear we are not defending or trying to justify a continuation of ineffective farm programs and abuses now in operation that have hurt the farmer more than they have helped him.

But, we want to point out farmers are not the sole beneficiaries of that \$7 billion farm budget—not by a long shot.

What makes up the agricultural budget anyway? How much goes to farmers?

The farm budget is something of a catch-all. Many of the items, about half the total amount, have absolutely nothing to do with supporting farmers, but are primarily a public service.

And right here our friendly farm critic makes his first serious error when he says "the working man gets no subsidy," and city folks pay the farm program costs without benefiting.

If taxpayers want to be realistic about cutting down the farm budget, let's start by cutting out all give-away food that goes into welfare, school, service, institutional, and foreign aid channels.

Sure. It's all charged to farmers. Welfare commodities amounted to over \$300 million alone last year, with our own State getting a \$15 million slice of the melon.

So, if the man out of work that only gets a few measly unemployment checks, which we've yet to see a farmer collect after a crop failure, he probably lugged home plenty of free groceries, paid for out of farm program funds. A subsidy? What else?

Just one step farther. The popular hot school lunch program cost a whopping \$150 million, and the special school milk program added another \$75 million.

In Tulsa County alone the school milk program is costing in the neighborhood of \$25,000 a month.

Who benefits? Well, since farm population is around 10 percent it becomes rather painfully obvious if our farm critic has any children in school, he's benefiting directly from the farm program budget—if he has any relative or friends getting welfare hand-outs—anyone in the armed services or State or Federal institutions, taxpayers are footing the bill with farmers getting the rather odious credit for it.

Sure. Let's not subsidize the farmer, but let's also keep the record straight. Let all who are benefiting in this "great barbecue" pay their own way for a change, or at least admit they are receiving a bigger handout than the farmer.

Mr. Tulsan, who claims "the farm program is nothing but class legislation," did you enjoy your bacon and eggs this morning? And the pot roast you had last night?

This may come as a surprise to you, but the USDA meat inspection program cost the agricultural budget \$21 million last year. A program solely to assure you a safe and wholesome supply of food.

So, if you don't want this subsidy, you can help cut the farm budget by inspecting your own food, or take your chance of running up your grocery bill because your ever-lovin' wife bought inferior produce.

No subsidy? Friend, your food bill is lower today in relation to earning power than it ever has been. That pot roast you ate last

night cost you less because low-cost meat imports last year accounted for 10 percent of the beef consumed.

This depressed the price of beef, and who picked up the tab? Nobody but the farmer—the profit he lost is still in your pocket, friend.

And so it goes—

You receive no farm subsidy? How about the services you receive from our county agricultural agent? Or didn't you know our friendly and efficient county agent, John Stoger, and his hard-working force spends more time with city folk than with farmers?

Your lawn not doing so well? Shrubs look scrawny? Ray Zimmerman and Ansel Hull, extension specialists, are helping hundreds of city folk iron out their problems.

Jim Hamilton, marketing specialist, keeps track of food bargains and lets you know about them daily in newspapers, including the World, and radio. Is your home a better place to live in because your wife may be a member of the home demonstration club? Gladys Logue and Evelyn Stringer, home demonstration agents, spend countless hours with city folk.

Your kids, or youth you know, active in 4-H? Roy Sharkey, assistant county agent, is on tap to guide them and give them supervision and counsel.

Wonderful service, isn't it? Who pays for it? Why, taxpayers, of course. Where does the money come from? By now you must have guessed—from county, State, and Federal farm budget. Who gets kicked in the shins because the farm budget is so high? That independent soul who has twice as much invested per farmworker than industry has per worker—the farmer.

Sure, ask the average "man on the street" what he thinks of subsidies and chances are 10 to 1 he'll say he's against them.

Ask him who gets most Government subsidy and his answer will be the farmer.

Ask him if he or his business receives a subsidy and he'll tell you in no uncertain terms, "No." Our friendly farm critic said so in his letter.

Well, next week we're going to talk about more subsidies. It'll be a jolt to learn in the past 50 years for every \$1,000 this country has spent for subsidies the American farmer has received only \$5—yes, that's right, a measly 5 bucks.

That's why farmers are getting awfully tired of indignant letterwriters, misinformed politicians, metropolitan newspapers, and sophisticated slick magazines screaming about the cost of the farm program.

The New York Times Hails Two of Delaware's Great Museums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service reports that Americans are taking a deep interest in our own history, and that the proof of this interest is the millions of people who visit our historic sites and buildings each year. The National Park Service is charged with responsibility for many of these sites and buildings under the broad authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation, established by the Congress

some years ago, also is doing its utmost to preserve those important buildings connected with our past as a nation.

Americans spend about \$2 billion each year to travel abroad to visit the ancient buildings and sites of other lands, and the significant growth of interest in our own American history means that an increasing share of the travel dollar will be spent with our own merchants, hotel and restaurant owners, and other businessmen.

The New York Times recently called attention to two great museums in Delaware, the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, and the Hagley Museum, which are musts on the list of those who are interested in our own American history.

I include here an excerpt from the New York Times article of February 28, 1960:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1960]
DELVING INTO AMERICA'S PAST IN DELAWARE

(By Max H. Siegel)

WINTERTHUR, DEL.—Of all the areas on the eastern seaboard where scenic beauty is combined with historic sights and associations, few can match in richness and variety the country along Brandywine Creek, which crosses the Delaware-Pennsylvania border just a few miles northwest of Wilmington.

This is a region of rolling hills, with views to enchant the nature lover, sites to intrigue the historian and collections to charm both the antiques lover and the casual tourist.

The outstanding attraction in the area is the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum. It is an eight-story stucco building that rises among the hills of Mr. du Pont's estate. Behind its weathered walls is housed the most extensive and probably the most expensive collection of Americana ever assembled.

There are about 100 rooms in the museum. And these, together with small halls, foyers, and alcoves, are furnished impeccably in the styles that prevailed in this country between 1640 and 1840. Everywhere, the visitor will see a blending of history and craftsmanship.

A NEW ROOM

Such great attention is paid to detail that recently the outside wall of the museum was pushed back 12 inches to allow the installation of a parlor from a stone house built in Wernersville, Pa., around 1775. It is impossible to detail all the other treasures of the museum, but among them are a part of George Washington's dinnerware set, French porcelain ordered for the White House by President James Monroe and a chair from the home of Gov. John Penn, the last colonial proprietor of Pennsylvania. Also on view are a Gilbert Stuart portrait of Washington, for which the general posed, and several rare tankards and a pitcher by Paul Revere.

Another aspect of early American life is portrayed in an old mill a few miles from Winterthur. The building, completely restored and modernized, is the Hagley Museum. Here is portrayed this country's early economic growth through a graphic presentation of the industries that flourished along the banks of a single stream—the Brandywine.

Exhibits open to the public carry the story of Brandywine from the days of Indian culture through the Du Pont family's first powdermaking operations.

While the Hagley Museum concentrates on telling a story of the past, it uses every modern device known to museums to do so. It has motion pictures with sound, a talking map, dioramas, working models, and just simple exhibits. One of the most interesting

is a 20-foot relief model portraying the Brandywine Valley during the time of its greatest significance as an industrial center.

Should the visitor be sated with the story of the past, he can travel a few miles west to the famous Longwood Gardens in Kennett Square, Pa. The gardens have been under development since 1906, when an old property dating to colonial times was acquired by Pierre Samuel du Pont for his personal use as a country estate.

The gardens are open to the public every day of the year. But in the winter, the visitor will have to be content with about 3½ acres of hothouses.

ITALIAN WATER GARDEN

In warmer weather, acres of outside gardens are open to visitors. They include an Italian water garden containing beautiful fountains and pools, an open-air theater with underground dressing rooms, an unusual water curtain and stage fountains, and an arboretum. The outdoor gardens may be visited from sunrise to sunset.

To get the most out of a visit to the Brandywine Valley, the tourist should make arrangements in advance. The Winterthur Museum, which is not open Sundays and Mondays, requires advance reservations. Requests listing one or more possible open dates should be mailed to the Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Del., at least 2 weeks in advance of the time desired.

Hawaii: Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Monday, March 21, 1960, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, setting forth another reason why Hawaii can be justly called the Land of Opportunity: [From the Honolulu Advertiser, Mar. 21, 1960]

If you doubt that Hawaii is a "Land of Opportunity"—take a look at the Man Kwong Loo family.

Today, Loo is a successful businessman who has started 12 children well on the way to bright careers.

Forty-five years ago, Loo was a poor immigrant from Canton, and in 1922, he was a 25-cent-an-hour worker at the Hawaiian Pineapple Co.

The Loos, who operate a grocery at 1203 Palama Street, were examples of energy, industry, and imagination to their 12 children.

But Mrs. Loo credits Navy apprenticeships, scholarships, and the GI bill with big assists in giving their children higher education.

"With such a large family," she says, "we couldn't finance college educations for all the children."

Frank, the eldest, got his start by graduating from Navy apprentice school at Pearl Harbor. He went on to the University of Hawaii, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the University of Ohio, and Yale law school—on scholarships. Today he's a State legislator.

Bill, an electrical engineer at Pearl Harbor shipyard, graduated from the University of Michigan under the GI bill.

Herbert is treasurer of the Apprentice School Alumni Association and vice president of the Pipefitters and Plumbers Local 811.

George, another former Pearl Harbor shipyard worker and University of Michigan graduate, is a research attorney with the U.S. Patent Office in Washington.

Henry and Elsie graduated from the university here. He is an Air Force lieutenant in Japan. She teaches English at Roosevelt High School.

Victoria is a registered nurse. Janet turned down a college scholarship to attend St. Francis Nursing School.

Shirley and Abraham are students at the university. Lilly work at the American Security Bank. Ralph, the youngest, is a sophomore at McKinley High.

Immigrant Loo has lots to be proud of.

Fair Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, we have for days now been concerned with discussing and acting on one of the basic rights of free American citizens—that of voting.

This is as it should be because the right to the ballot is fundamental to our democracy.

I, for one, regretted however that Mr. CELLER's amendment for creating a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts was declared not germane because of an overly restrictive rule under which the bill is being considered. The purpose of the amendment was "(b) To implement the policy of the U.S. Government to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of persons in the performance of contracts or subcontracts to provide the Government with goods or services."

The right to equal job opportunities is of paramount importance in a thriving democracy. All that was requested in this amendment is that competent, qualified workers be given a fair chance to hold jobs on federally paid-for projects without regard to their color, race, religion, or national origin.

To those of my colleagues who believe that we here are attempting to punish the South with civil rights legislation, may I point out that the equal job opportunities amendment is as necessary in the North as it is in the South.

The North—especially the great metropolitan centers—has traditionally been the land of opportunity for Negroes of the South who increasingly are being displaced by the agricultural and economic upheavals below the Mason-Dixon line. The unskilled of these people who are strangers to urban life have often met prejudice even in our States. As painful as is this process of integrating people into what to them is an alien way of life, I am confident that the cultural, social, and economic problems are being worked out.

We in the many States of the North, for example, have tackled the problem

of discrimination on the job with fair employment practice laws. We attempt with these laws not to erase prejudice from hearts, but to make it possible to be just—to give a man, or a woman, a fair break at getting and holding a job he or she can well do.

I am proud of the record of my State, Minnesota, in this field. We have had an effective statewide fair employment practices statute since 1955. In fact, I was one of the authors of the Minnesota law and helped secure its enactment when I served in the legislature.

I am proud, too, that each of our three major cities, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, has local ordinances to implement fair employment practices.

Being just and decent to minorities has paid off for us in Minnesota with peace, mutual respect, and prosperity. In fact, I recommend these qualities highly to those of my southern colleagues who have drunk so deeply from the cup of disregard.

We have temporarily been prevented from offering this amendment, commissioning equal job opportunity under Government contracts, and other amendments just as worthwhile.

But we will be back—again, and again, and again—for the cause of justice in civil rights shall ultimately be triumphant.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, there is a proper and growing concern in our country about protecting our people against chemical contamination of foodstuffs. It would indeed be ironical if our expanding scientific ability to protect ourselves from pests, fungus, weeds, and insects should be turned into a menace to our people.

Achieving controlled and safe use of chemicals is a serious problem, not only to consumers, who must be assured of protection, but to the farmers and processors who raise and handle the crops. Both farm groups and processors and canning organizations not only recognize the vital necessity of proper use of chemicals but, I am glad to say, they are adopting rigorous voluntary programs to guarantee the safety of foods produced in this country and to assure consumers the products for which they are responsible fully meet all health requirements of the pure food laws.

I believe the program of the canning industry is particularly worthy of commendation. This program has been adopted as a matter of company policy throughout the United States, and I would like to call the attention of the Members to the expression of company policy and control recently communicated to me by Mr. R. U. Mackay, district manager of the California Packing Corp.,

in my home city of Fresno, Calif. Needless to point out, the successful operation of this program in Fresno County is of great importance to the Nation, because that county is our country's leading agricultural producer.

I think it is worthy of note that adoption of these forward-looking policies will protect consumers of American produced foods, but they will not afford equal protection on imported food. This emphasizes the urgent need to insure that food imports conform to health and quality standards of domestic production.

Mr. Mackay's letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: The public has become more and more aware recently of the possibility of harmful chemical residues in food products which may result from misapplication of pesticides or fungicides to raw products. I find that many persons are understandably confused because of varied information published as to what residues may or may not be harmful to humans. Growers and processors of raw products used in the fruit and vegetable canning industry have a great problem in making sure what pesticides or fungicides can be used and in what dosages and at what times they may be used. I am writing this letter to tell you of our company's chemical pesticide policy and the control program which has recently been adopted by us and the canning industry.

Our company has a definite policy to be followed in our raw product procurement and processing operations in the Fresno area and which also applies to all areas in which we procure our fruit and vegetables. Which specifies that "no crop is to be accepted and processed which has been treated with or grown on land treated with a pesticide chemical which has not been accepted for registration by USDA for use in connection with all growing of the commodity involved [and] the usage limitations which have been accepted by the USDA must be adhered to for the specific fruit or vegetable commodity to which they apply."

We know that in order to carry out our policy to the proper degree we will need extreme vigilance on our part and also we will need vigilance and cooperation on the part of the growers from whom we procure our products. The National Canners Association, which includes practically all canners in the Nation, has accepted the responsibility of this matter and has outlined a basic procedure to be followed to see that a pure and clean product is distributed to consumers. This program also needs and accepts cooperation of Government agencies, farm organizations, and the press, in order to educate the various persons responsible for the growing and processing of our food products.

The Fresno area is the center of our national raisin production and also produces a large quantity of other fruits which are used for canning, therefore, I am sure this subject is of great importance to you and to the growers of these crops.

As indicated by the cranberry episode, negligence by very minute portions of the producing or processing segment of our food industry could mean financial ruin to a great many of us regardless of the area in which the negligence occurred. I would like you to be apprised of the action which we and others of the processing industry are taking in this respect and I am attaching to this letter a copy of the industry's program.

We are fully aware of the fact that canned fruits and vegetables have tremendous distribution throughout our Nation and they maintain their position as some of the most economical foods on store shelves. We are proud that we have helped to establish this position and intend to maintain our position.

I can assure you we are going to do our utmost to see that the consuming public continues to get the cleanest and finest possible products for our Nation's dining tables.

Should you have any comments relative to our efforts, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

CALIFORNIA PACKING CORP.,
R. U. MACKAY, District Manager.

A Report From Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, President Harold C. Case of Boston University recently returned from a 2-month tour of the continent of Africa in the interests of higher education. His trip was under the auspices of a grant from the Ford Foundation to the university's African research and studies program. On March 14, 1960, President Case delivered an address entitled "A Report From Africa," at a special Boston University founders day convocation in Hayden Hall on the University's Charles River campus.

With world attention being focused on Africa, I am sure this report will be of special interest to my colleagues, and in the extension of my remarks, I include Dr. Case's excellent address as follows:

A REPORT FROM AFRICA

(By President Harold C. Case of Boston University)

Sierra Leone, on the bulge of west Africa, has spectacular natural beauty. With its high escarpment, beautiful beaches, tropical forests, and lush undergrowth, it is a lovely country. Freetown, its capital, is large, crowded, bustling. In Freetown and elsewhere, Africans walk, while Europeans ride, and the interweaving of vehicular and foot traffic is constant, dangerous, and confusing.

One evening in Freetown we were guests of honor at a garden party. The women's clubs of Sierra Leone were launching a co-ordinated program for the improvement of the women's organizations. The garden was large; its formal planting resembled a Florida estate. Gay colored lanterns, an African band, rich and varied costumes, provided a festive setting.

Dr. and Mrs. John Karefa Smart, whom we had known since 1947, when he was a student in Edinburgh and we were American leaders in a world conference in Oslo, were our host and hostess. Dr. Smart, a Sierra Leonean, is a graduate of McGill University, School of Medicine, Harvard School of Public Health, Edinburgh School of Divinity. He is a member of the Prime Minister's Cabinet, as the Minister of Mines, Forests, and Labor.

We talked of world affairs, African nationalism, the obsession with independence on the part of leaders of Sierra Leone, and the scheduled constitutional conference to be held in London in April 1960. He reminded us that the new air-conditioned hotel under construction in Freetown is scheduled for completion in time for the independence celebration hopefully set for December 1960. The discussion was informative, sophisticated, and inspiring. Suddenly Dr. Smart

said: "Please excuse me. This is a dance of my tribe."

He left the group seated around a table, joined the dancers, and, dressed in his tribal robe, he danced with the abandon of a true member of his African tribe. The rhythm of the drums ceased, the music stopped, the dance ended, and Dr. Smart returned to our table, seated himself, and began the conversation about political freedom in the modern world, precisely where he had left it off.

He had illustrated one of the problems of Africa and had demonstrated an important prospect for success among emerging nations.

The problem is the tension between the forces of conservatism, illustrated in the tribe, the Poro or secret society, the village in the bush with its hereditary chief and council, the folk wisdom and the barter economy, on the one hand; and the claims of nationalism, portrayed in the university graduate, the tools of modern industry, the resources of forest, mine, and river, the currency economy, the western clothes, and the atomic age, on the other hand.

This tension is expressed in a popular west African song in which a girl speaks of her fondest hopes. She sings:

"What shall I do to get a man of that type?
One who is a 'been to,'
Car-full and fridge-full.

What shall I do to obtain a man like that?"
—"The Way in Africa," Carpenter.

The English is mangled, but the meaning is clear; a "been to" is one who has been to college, has traveled and who knows the world. "Car-ful" means that he has acquired a car; "fridge-ful," that he has a refrigerator. What more could any girl ask?

There is an element of tragedy in this new tension. The stable, quiescent way of African life is ending. Village crafts are dying out; manufactured goods are cheaper and better. Sewing machines are humming in every African city, but needlework is suffering. Bicycles shorten and improve the pleasure of travel, and trucks are more comfortable and less strenuous than heads for transporting freight. Currency offers much wider range of choice for commodities than barter. The comfort of a night's sleep on a good mattress defeats all arguments for traditional rest on reeds and straw on the ground. In this movement, the tribal chief is becoming a civil servant who collects taxes from each hut in his village. He is no longer an hereditary monarch who leads his tribe on lion hunts.

To be sure, there are important gains. Disease is decreasing, and some World Health Organization teams, with African assistance, have succeeded in virtually eliminating certain prevalent diseases. Infant mortality is being reduced, although 40 to 50 percent of the babies die in their first year, and 60 to 70 percent within the first 5 years. Diet is being improved. More proteins are available, and people are living longer and better. Life is slowly becoming more comfortable, less painful.

Still juju continues. Bones, bits of hair, monkey heads, snake skins, chemicals for potions can be purchased in any native market. Secret societies still claim the membership of all tribal members. Animism and Moslemism and Christianity struggle for the minds and loyalties of the people. Education is respected and sought more universally than any other modern influence. The quality, kind, and philosophy of education will shape Africa's future. Whoever shapes the mind, will fashion the nation.

But the sober fact is, that the old customs are weakening. The city with its vast slums and its tragic unemployment is recruiting young Africans. Western clothes are replacing tribal robes. Cinema houses are

crowded by Africans who see American-made motion pictures with violence, sex, and sordidness as their principal themes. The machine is winning over the handcraft, and the hospital is replacing the witch doctor. The old days will never return.

In this breathless moment of social change, a vacuum of serious import and large proportions is being created. The old ways are becoming bankrupt because they have not provided the things young Africa wants. They have not produced income for cars, modern houses, satisfactory education, the respect of other nations, or political independence. So they are being repudiated.

Psychologically, the African wants a "place in the sun." He wants to decide his own fate. He wants membership in international organizations. He is likely to believe that all these things—appliances, education, communication—go along with freedom, and are free. A good deal of disillusionment lies ahead for Africans.

But the danger was illustrated for us in a conversation with a musician-composer who wrote the Ghana national anthem. He sang it for us, with the original words, then with the official words. In the official version all reference to God as leader in the struggle toward national character has been taken out, and man's inner drive to fulfillment has taken its place. "This," said the professor, "illustrates one of the problems of Ghana."

The hope is that John Karefa Smart, doctor, minister, statesman, who talks about the philosophy of independence one moment and dances with his tribe the next, and Prof. Philip Gbeho, of Achimota School in Accra, who writes an anthem of faith and who understands why secular language has replaced his words, illustrates the human bridges that span the chasm between old ways and new ones, and provide spiritual qualities for national health.

The day we arrived in Freetown, the harmattan began. The harmattan is a wind; it begins to blow across sub-Sahara Africa in December and continues for 4 months. It makes life beautiful. The day before our arrival, the temperature in Freetown was 95°, and the humidity was 99 percent. As we arrived, the winds had lowered the temperature to 75° and the humidity to 65 percent. These winds form in Siberia, sweep across the frigid steppes, gather up red dust called laterite in the Sahara Desert, and are the air conditioners of central Africa, from Dakar on the West Coast, to Zanzibar on the east. The laterite dust is microscopic and sifts into everything—houses, closets, suitcases, cameras, food—everything.

Suppose that dust were made radioactive. It is swept up, mopped up, washed off, inhaled, swallowed. It pervades. This is the underlying reason for the violent reaction of people who live south of the Sahara to atom bomb tests in the desert. The fallout in that dust may bring a change in weather, ruin crops, stop the rainy season, blight the lives of millions of Africans, or so they believe.

Viewed from our safe vantage point in the United States of America, the protest may seem like nonsense. But when one is on the spot, contending with the dust, and taking on new energy because of the invigorating harmattan winds, the hostility to those tests seems very real.

And anyway, this issue involves the importance of getting inside any situation, if you are to understand it, much less report about it.

If you were planning to visit 11 African countries in 10 weeks and were seeking to get accurate information, proper documentation, to comprehend the deep-seated conflicts current on that vast continent, and to reach well-grounded conclusions, how would you go about your task?

We spent a year in preparation, with advice from members of the Boston University

African research and studies staff, conferences with African Ambassadors, educators, Government agents, students, and with British officials who were visiting or studying in the United States. We read broadly and hopefully with some depth.

We approached Africa by way of England. In London, we spent days conferring with officials in the British Colonial Office, the Inter-University Council, the bureau of commonwealth studies of the University of London, and the Fulbright commission for the United Kingdom. In Paris, we conferred with an American authority on the Belgian Congo, former U.S. consul in Leopoldville.

Briefed on British and Belgian Africa, we received the benefit of the knowledge, points of view, concerns, and constructive suggestions of citizens of the United States assigned to these African countries. They included ambassadors, consuls general, consuls, information officers, public affairs officers, ICA technical experts, educational consultants, businessmen, and, of great importance, their wives.

We left Africa with profound respect for the Foreign Service staff members of the United States. They are well trained, wise, and dedicated. They deserve a better hearing than they are receiving at home.

British, French, and Belgian officials, governors general, permanent secretaries of education, staff members, principals of university colleges, members of faculties of teacher-training institutes, technical schools, vocational schools, industrialists, directors of airports, seaports, mines, construction projects—all gave us time and knowledge to aid us in understanding Africa.

But we gained most from our association with Africans. We conferred with them in their offices, homes, schools, colleges, industries, markets. They represented brilliant, but illiterate, business executives; graduates with advanced degrees from Boston and other outstanding American and British universities; executives of banks, industries, agricultural and engineering experimental stations; taxi drivers, people on the street, civil servants, prime ministers, cabinet members.

I want to offer some observations based on our experiences.

No one knows all about all of Africa. Experts usually begin by limiting the areas or range of their authoritative information. For Africa is not a nation, nor is it likely to become one at any foreseeable time. It is a conglomerate of emerging peoples. They have intertribal and intersectional hostilities. They speak more than 500 languages or dialects. In many sections they still lack a viable economy, and a majority of Africans live in primitive conditions at a subsistence level. Illiteracy averages 90 percent in the sub-Sahara countries.

So Africa is a series of concepts—and concepts change from day to day.

I prefer to call it "paradoxical Africa," not "darkest Africa." Regularly scheduled planes of latest design, with excellent multiracial crews, connect all principal cities. There are bush trails below, but up there the airways are well charted and traveled. However, the airport at Dakar is next-door neighbor to thatched-roofed rondavels or huts, where half-naked women do back-breaking work. At Kano, in northern Nigeria, on the edge of the desert, and the caravan route, the emir long since ordered a trumpeter to mount a camel and blow a warning blast, so that women would not be endangered by being seen by strangers. The emir's directive is still in force, and today, when the public address system at the Kano Airport announces an approaching plane, the camel-riding trumpeter rides to the main gate and blows furiously, warning women that strangers are about to arrive.

Air France flies from Dualla to Lambarene, to Brazzaville, in Equatorial Africa. Our

plane was a modern version of the DC-3. The food was good. The plane was filled with passengers and cargo. Imagine our surprise to note that directly behind our seat was a box of cargo, and that it contained a live cobra, en route to the Pasteur Research and Health Institute, in Brazzaville.

The Albert Schweitzer Hospital on the Ogowe River has places for 350 patients and their families. The operating rooms and out-patient clinic are modern. But families live with and care for their sick members in buildings erected for that purpose, and each morning women arrive from up or down the river, with perogues (boats carved from logs), with bunches of bananas, yams, fish, or pieces of meat, to cook in iron pots for their families.

In Nungua, Ghana, there is a modern agricultural experimental station, and its excellent results in improvement of plant and animal strains and better methods of cultivation, will make a vast difference in Ghanaian life; but as Mr. J. J. Hill, its manager, led us around an experimental field of pineapples to a banana grove, and we walked ahead in a carefree manner, he stopped us, searched for a good-sized tree branch, and led us into the banana grove, saying, "We have three deadly snakes here—the spitting cobra, black mamba, and puff adder. One never walks here without a stick to kill a snake."

Nigeria has a new government-operated television station at Ibadan, a city of 750,000. It had been on the air about 1 month when we were there. I was the first American to appear on that station, to discuss education. Every aspect of that broadcast was at the level of standards of communication in the United States. After the broadcast was ended, I congratulated the crew and staff. The director, a Britisher, is the only non-African on the staff. He replied, saying that my approval meant more than I might know, since not a single member of the station's staff had ever seen a television set nor watched a television program when he began to train them 4 months before the date of my visit.

So, will you set aside your impressions of a continent made up wholly of pythons and bushmen, of impenetrable rain forests and unexplored valleys, of witchcraft and primitive existence; and will you consider a continent with the most primitive living and the most articulate scholarship on earth, the most backward witch doctors and the most advanced medical service, black magic and modern psychiatry, pythons and Pasteur institutes, ancient bushmen's paintings and enchanting modern art—all existing side by side.

Nineteen hundred and sixty may prove to be the turning point in the whole historical encounter between Africa and the West. The torch of true political independence and economic freedom is being carried from hill to hill, across west Africa through Senegal, Gambia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Ghana, Liberia, and Nigeria, into the steaming forests of the Congo, the vast expanses of equatorial Africa, and on to South Africa, Rhodesia, Kenya, and Ethiopia.

Two hundred and thirty million people, with widely differing cultures, vast geographical separation, many separate languages, religions, and customs, and spread out in 12 million square miles of territory, are emerging. Drawn toward industrialism as a moth to a lamp, they are striving in various ways for a new life.

No thoughtful person can ignore Africa—because of, first, its size, one-fifth of the earth's surface, larger than China, India, and the United States of America combined. French Africa is 20 times larger than France. British Africa is 20 times larger than the United Kingdom. The Belgian Congo is 100 times larger than Belgium. Portuguese Africa is 23 times larger than Portugal.

Second, its natural resources, the iron, copper, uranium, cobalt, nickel, rubber, diamonds, gold, oil, waterpower (Volta River, Kariba Dam), on which every nation and individual now depends. The largest undeveloped natural resources on this planet are in Africa.

Third, its rapidity of change. Five years ago, three-fourths of the population of Africa received decisions handed down by London, Paris, Brussels, Lisbon, Amsterdam. Then, a half-decade ago, only Ethiopia, Liberia, Libya, Sudan, and the Union of South Africa were free of European rule. Now, the following are on the way to, or have already achieved independence from colonial domination: Sierra Leone (constitutional conferences to begin in London next month); Ghana, starting its fourth year of independence; Nigeria, now constructing the government buildings and negotiating with British and American leaders to counsel them on their way into full independence; the Belgian Congo, moving so swiftly that the Brussels Government has speeded up the date of independence four times in 24 months and has unfinished government buildings in Leopoldville, begun in the confidence that Belgium would weather the storm for many years; Guinea, left by France without typewriters, trucks, adding machines, appliances of all kinds, and now being supplied by the Czechs and Russians—having renounced the French franc and announced a new currency within a week; Rhodesia, a federation primarily in name, unwilling to continue, victimized by white settlers; Kenya, emerging from the London conference with more political and economic power in the hands of Africans than anyone had considered possible at this time.

Certainly, Africans are moving at a dangerous pace, around uncharted political curves, on undeveloped economic bush trails. They lack enough educated leadership. They are risking much. But they are determined. The magic word is "independence." They say, "We are finished with a horse-and-rider civilization. We refuse to be ridden any longer."

The permanent political alignments of emerging African nations will be the decisive balance in world politics.

Fourth, its human resources. The real potentiality of Africa does not lie in its mineral deposits or its forests, nor in its waterpower.

We are witnessing an all-out effort on the part of the small nations to raise their living standards, to achieve freedom from colonial powers, to manage their own destinies. The unique aspect of this situation is that it comes at a time when there is a sense of international responsibility on the part of powerful nations, and when a world forum, the United Nations, guarantees a hearing to these emerging countries.

Colonialism, at least so far as Western powers are concerned, is in its final stages. African countries are presently uncommitted. We should not be maneuvered into the position where our assistance of any sort appears to be forced by the growing interest of the Soviets in African nations.

On the other hand, to assert that Communist influence in Africa is negligible or that the Soviets are not utilizing all methods at hand to capitalize on this social revolution, is to be both naive and blind.

Let me cite two examples. In equatorial Africa, four U.S.-financed leader grants are offered annually. These are the conditions. The applicant must be fluent in the use of English. This automatically bars most young men and women from equatorial Africa, since they speak their own African language and French, but only a few speak or understand English. The applicant must prove that he has not belonged to any Communist organization. This is difficult for him to prove, even if it is a fact.

Russia offers 400 scholarships to equatorial Africa. There are no language requirements. Nor is any student barred because of his organizational memberships. He is met on arrival in Russia, by an African, speaking his own native language. We required a student to remain in the United States until his work is completed. Russia requires him to return home each summer, and with the best Russian-made clothes, good luggage, a fine bicycle, and a prepaid vacation; he is directed to travel in the villages. There he makes an impression. He looks well fed, is well groomed, has the best equipment, and he credits all of these things to his friends, the Russians.

I do not intend to generalize. I do desire to infer Russian interest in the future of equatorial Africa.

In Ethiopia, the Emperor's visit to Russia produced an offer of a loan of \$100 million (U.S. dollars) but with the proviso that a technical school should be built by the Russians, for the Ethiopians, in Addis Ababa. Russian-made equipment, Russian teachers, in the capital city may have no long-term political significance, but they do indicate the strategy being employed by the Soviets.

What may we do to promote the well-being of African people, to support the movements for political independence, and to strengthen the economy, morale, and morals of these emerging countries?

First, the United States of America should rely on principles, not on expediency, for its policies. We should announce our complete opposition to colonialism, on the ground that it is immoral, and that if it had usefulness, that time has passed.

Africans want our reassertion of democratic ideals, belief in independence, and support of freedom.

Second, we should acknowledge that the pace of events in Africa cannot be controlled by European powers. We should then proceed to give counsel for implementing the legitimate aims of Africans, not standing aside as if we were neutral, unless a conflict with Soviet interests is involved.

Third, we should think with some pride of our association with Africa through Christian missions. More than 90 percent of all primary or elementary education in Africa today is mission education. Virtually every adult leader in sub-Saharan Africa is a product of a mission school. Biblical precepts in which these leaders have been rooted will have value in future administrative policies they will develop.

Fourth, we should claim our Negro citizenship as the world's most compelling link with African nations. One in ten Americans has an African ancestor. The American conscience established Liberia as a home for emancipated slaves and named its capital for the President of the United States, James Monroe. The dramatic value of our policy of noncolonialism should be exploited.

Fifth, we should give our primary concern to two phases of the new African education and economic improvement.

Concerning education, it is too late to try to educate rank-and-file African adults, more than 95 percent of whom are illiterate. Instead, we should assist in the establishment and use of new instruments of communication, the picture, radio, television. A single radio and loud speaker will serve a typical African village. Programs in African language will be understood by everyone. The meaning of independence, the responsibilities of citizenship, ways to sanitation, personal health, better foods, improved agriculture, animal husbandry, and many other important subjects can be taught to illiterate people, at low cost, by modern electronics.

Elementary education is the key to the future for every African country. Presently more than 70 percent of the elementary teachers are inadequately trained; many have only 2 years of formal education. The

extension of the well-equipped teacher, the multiplication of teacher training, the recruitment of qualified Americans to strengthen teacher education, must be one of our concerns. The standard maintained and the prevailing philosophy of elementary education will ultimately determine the quality of leadership and the political affiliations of Africa.

African textbooks have been largely British or French inspired. They must be rewritten to provide materials for African culture and conditions, for the education of Africans. To this task we could give valuable assistance.

The task of elementary education belongs to the Government; mission schools should continue to serve and to expand their facilities and staffs, with Government standardization and financing.

Secondary education should be the joint responsibility of Government and missions. Larger numbers of young Americans should be recruited for high school teaching and for secondary teacher education in Africa. When colleges and universities, and private and public high schools guarantee professional position, with advancement, to members of their staffs who elect to teach in Africa, for 3, 4, or 5 years, the recruitment will be made much easier.

Higher education in Africa enjoys very high standards, but is still much too small in enrollment to provide the number of well equipped leaders needed.

This is not entirely because colleges are late arrivals on the scene. Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone is more than 100 years old. Still, it was granted a charter as a University College only last month. That college admits 150 Nigerians, partly because there are not enough qualified Sierra Leoneans to fill all of its places.

Lovanium University in Leopoldville has buildings worthy of any university in the world, and a distinguished faculty, and the only atomic reactor in Africa. But the reactor is not used by African students, while places are vacant in the institution, because in all of the Belgian Congo, there are so few graduates of secondary institutions.

I have suggested to Monsignor Gillon, rector of Lovanium, that until the time comes, perhaps 10 or 15 years from now, when that university has a full enrollment, an intake from institutions of higher learning in the United States of America, for a junior year in Lovanium, be arranged.

The university college in Salisbury will be 4 years old next September. It enrolls 335 students, only 31 of whom are Africans. Its facilities are excellent. Its standards are very high. Its influence is notable. On its opening, African students were housed separately from European students. There is a law in the Federation of Rhodesia prohibiting Africans and Europeans from residing under the same roof. During the first year the European girls became fond of the one African girl then enrolled. She lived alone in a dormitory. They requested permission to invite her to move into their residence hall. The request was granted. She moved. The city of Salisbury reacted against the move with violence. The second year, 8 African men students were housed in a hall for 32 students. European men were denied admission because their dormitories were crowded. European and African men were housed in the same building, with the result that the law has been amended, making this arrangement legal, but only on the university grounds.

On the other hand, a dozen nations in Africa lack accommodations for students. Nigeria alone has an estimated 10,000 qualified students who cannot continue their education because the university college, with 400 students, at Ibadan is filled.

Russia has proposed to the world that it will build a free university for 4,000 students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. This

is a propaganda victory for the Soviets, unless we are able to make a better proposal. A small group of distinguished colleges and universities recently announced a plan to accept 25 African students for college education, with all costs incurred in the United States underwritten. This is a good example of the idea I now propose.

There are more than 1,900 colleges and universities in these United States. Unlike the Russian proposal of a future fulfillment—these well-established, accredited institutions could achieve an immediate educational victory by agreeing to accept an average of two African students for full-time study, each with tuition, board, and room provided by the college, for a period up to 4 years.

Announced now, the plan could become effective in the fall of 1961, with details for applying, evaluation of educational credentials, establishment of a committee of Americans, joined by Foreign Service officers, to interview candidates in Africa, with the stipulation that African governments will provide transportation and incidental expenses. The effect on African countries in a decade would be phenomenal.

Since technical experts are critically needed, I suggest the development of a pool of experts, available for high-level use overseas, answering to the United Nations for appointments, but financed by the United States.

Believing in the idealism of American young people, I propose that we seek to enlist 1,000 college graduates for educational service in other countries, for a period of not less than 3 years, with a bonus for their service, in salary and status, instead of a vocational penalty, as they now find it to be.

Because capital is essential for underdeveloped countries, investment in projects promising recovery, and hence treated as loans, has worth. Roads in Africa are essential for economic improvement. A hard-surface road there stimulates economic development to justify its cost.

Harnessed water power can change the face of west and central Africa. Business agreements, with steady governmental support, through international monetary organizations, but assuring the countries of Africa that they can anticipate such projects and organize for full utilization of the expected resources, will contribute much to steadiness in African countries.

This may be one of the most important years of this century. In it, the future trend of mankind on this planet may be determined. The decision is now being made, and the issue is whether the democratic societies have the will and the self-discipline, the creativity, and energy necessary to do the things required to win for the world a full triumph of the way of independence and freedom.

If we can discipline ourselves to do hard work in behalf of mankind's future, to act from principle, not out of the demands of expediency; if we can make headlines because of our absorption with people, not payola; with issues, not filibusters; then we can make an unprecedented contribution to the underdeveloped countries, and in the process, find our own quality of freedom.

The Airlift Problem—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, Wednesday, March 23, 1960:

THE AIRLIFT PROBLEM—II—CARIBBEAN GAMES POSE THE MAJOR TASK OF SETTING MILITARY TRANSPORT'S NEEDS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The largest peacetime military airlift operation in history—Exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine—now in its second week, has posed, and may attempt to answer, a number of major air transportation problems.

The first and major problem, which has led to much confusion about the amount of military airlift needed by the Nation, is the statement of requirements. The Joint Chiefs of Staff outlined the general military needs of the Nation to support these strategic concepts and war plans.

The Joint Chiefs have stated the military airlift requirements for general atomic war. MATS says it can meet these requirements with its present force of 483 4-engined passenger and cargo planes.

However, the Transport Service believes that replacement aircraft and a modernization program are needed particularly for some of the aging cargo aircraft such as the Douglas C-124 Globemaster, which is the workhorse of the service's fleet.

REQUIREMENTS UNSPECIFIED

But the airlift requirements for limited war—a small atomic war, or a war waged with conventional weapons only—had never been outlined, at least to the Army's satisfaction.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff apparently believe an airlift adequate for general war is adequate for limited war. But the Army holds that a large part of MATS might be earmarked in a time of emergency for support of the Strategic Air Command and other missions, and that not enough would be available to transport troops overseas quickly.

The Army's statement of requirements has tended to stress mass as well as speed. The Army would like to be able to move at least one airborne division, preferably two—(11,890 men to a division)—anywhere in the world in a week or less.

Ideally, the Army would like these troops combat-loaded and ready to land on enemy territory instead of using staging bases on friendly soil from which to prepare for an airborne assault. The Army says the 101st Airborne Division can move out of Fort Campbell, Ky., in 4 days but that the limitations of the airfield stretch this out to 7 days.

ALTERNATIVES OFFERED

However present plans of MATS, the Army declares, contemplate a time period of 28 days.

The transport service says that, using all its available planes for troop lift only and assuming that the troops would be landed at a friendly airbase to reload in troop carrier assault aircraft to attack an enemy objective, 15½ days would be required to move one airborne division 5,000 miles.

If all the available transport and cargo aircraft in both the Tactical Air Command, which operates troop carrier assault aircraft, and MATS were used, this time could be cut by a day. If 232 more aircraft of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet—commercial planes earmarked for military use in time of emergency—were used, this time might be cut to 9.2 days.

There are thus many different estimates of the time required to move an airborne unit a given number of miles in a certain time. All these estimates differ depending upon the assumptions.

About all the Army and transport service agree upon is that more modern airlift is needed; they differ as to kind and amount. Both also seem to agree, with the support of

many civilian authorities in the Pentagon, that the Nation's present outline of airlift requirements for general atomic war is unrealistic. They also agree that it places emphasis on the most unlikely kind of war and that more stress should be given to airlift needs for limited war.

Exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine has stressed, as all troop transportation exercises have done, that any attempt to combine mass and mobility adds up to astronomical aircraft requirements.

All the fuel used in Puerto Rico for the transport service's planes was transported there by sea. No ammunition is being airlifted.

SUPPLIES BY AIR LIMITED

Only about one-third of the supply requirements are being transported by air. Medium and heavy tanks cannot be air transported, and even the light tanks can be airlifted only at the rate of one in each aircraft.

The airborne division has 52 light liaison aircraft and helicopters in its organization. These must be disassembled for air transport and the Army now contemplates using a naval aircraft carrier to transport them.

In Lebanon, a sea "tail" of about 25 ships was required to back up and support one airborne battle group of about 2,000 men.

Thus there are many observers who believe that the Army has set its airlift requirements too high and that the concept of total air transportability—the so-called air transportable army—is beyond achievement now or in the foreseeable future.

Instead of attempting to move masses of troops and equipment by air, the objective should be the extremely rapid transportation of fairly small numbers of troops—lightly armed and with limited staying power—to any part of the world.

These fire brigade forces could then be reinforced and supplied, not only by airlift but also by prepositioned stocks of arms and equipment in various parts of the world and by support from the sea.

Airlift is essential for speed but seallift is equally essential for mass and staying power.

Taxes and Farm Prices Hinge on Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following carefully reasoned article by the distinguished secretary of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Carleton I. Pickett, whose knowledge of farm problems and integrity of viewpoint cannot be questioned:

TAXES AND FARM PRICES HINGE ON WHEAT

(By Carleton I. Pickett)

Wheat is the key to the whole political farm problem. It is more important to Massachusetts farmers—even fruit and vegetable growers or cranberry producers and to Massachusetts taxpayers than any other matter before the Congress. The outcome of wheat legislation probably will shape all other farm legislation and the amount of money we pay for farm programs.

Here is a support program that has caused a wild explosion of surplus, an ugly growth on the agriculture economy and on the problems of taxation.

The experts say that a thousand dollars a minute are being spent on storage alone. The political impact of those engaged profitably in storage is tremendous enough to reach up to and shape the farm policies of a Massachusetts contender for the Presidency. They involve organized labor to such an extent that the policies for agriculture are being influenced by labor.

The situation is so serious that bills are going into the congressional hopper at great rate to adopt variations of the Brannan plan to pay farmers for the difference between the market price and a Government-legislated price. These aim at controlling the number of cows per farm or the number of acres. Other bills want to deputize farmer committees to control output and price. Still others seek to maintain the old parity yardstick of support. None are going to help but the advocates are many, well organized, and vocal.

Have you written to your Congressman yet about wheat and taxes? It may be too late in another 10 days.

The farm bureau proposes:

1. Elimination of all wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas.
2. A price support based on the corn price support adjusted for differences in weight and nutritive value.
3. No sale of wheat stocks in storage on the domestic market to compete with producers.
4. Cushion the shock of the new and much lower support price by temporary use of the conservation reserve part of the soil bank.

Quick action by the Congress can protect this year's crop and not saddle the farmers who do not grow wheat and the taxpayers with unsound and costly programs.

To all of New England the outcome of the wheat crises is of deep concern. We cannot go on establishing by law subsidized crops far in excess of what we can ever use. Nor can we pay the bill for more of the same or for any of the visionary schemes with political appeal.

Someday we have got to get agriculture back on its own feet. We do not want to destroy it by ill-conceived cures or by extreme rapidity but everyone ought to demand of his Congressman that we start right now.

In wheat areas the mail from farmers, bankers, storekeepers, labor unions, and just people is pouring into Washington.

Farm bureau has proposed to the Congress principles that will work. It has appealed to its friends to make themselves heard.

John Puts June (and Cadott) on State Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's new 1960 highway map, which is a guide to the State's 9,000 lakes, 1,500 trout streams, and 5 million acres of publicly owned forests, has an added attraction so far as my office is concerned. The cover picture shows my secretary, June Kysliko, sitting by a waterfall on the Chippewa River in my home district in Wisconsin.

The color photo was taken by June's father, my friend John Kysliko, who runs a farm near Cadott, Wis., and is well

known for his black-and-white and color photography. John has had one or more pictures included as representative of Wisconsin on the State's highway map for 5 consecutive years, but this is his first cover picture.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a story about the highway map written by Walter H. Brovald, editor of the Cadott Sentinel:

JOHN PUTS JUNE (AND CADOTT) ON STATE MAP

"Three colorful new features highlight the State highway commission's 1960 edition of the Wisconsin highway map now ready for distribution."

So reads the opening paragraph of the official news release concerning the brandnew State map, but folks in Cadott and surrounding area will be quick to note a fourth colorful feature, and one in which the village is unique.

Right on the cover of the map is a picture of Cadott's own June Kysliko, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Kysliko. John, who has had one or more pictures included as representative of Wisconsin on the State's official map for 5 consecutive years, is able this year to boast of being a cover photographer. He took the picture of his daughter sitting beside a gentle falls of the Chippewa River bed near Jim Falls.

John has had as many as four of his photographs selected for use on the map in past years, but those "three colorful new features" the State boasts of resulted in a sharp reduction in the number of pictures used this year—but John is justifiably proud that his one picture is the cover photo.

One of the inside photographs, however, is a special one for John, too. It was taken by Mrs. Robert Andre, another daughter of the Kyslikos' and shows their granddaughter, Ann Andre, of Milwaukee, feeding ducks in Milwaukee Park.

What about those three new features of the map?

The more than 100 miles of interstate highways opened for traffic in 1958 and 1959 are shown for the first time on the map and the locations of the portions still to be completed are also indicated.

The mileage log on the map's back has been made much easier to read through the use of pink, blue, yellow, and green color on the cities names and on the mileage figures.

And Wisconsin's eight State symbols—the flag, flower, tree, wildlife animal, song, fish, bird, and animal—are pictured in natural colors. Twelve color photos portray the State's natural beauty and recreational advantages.

Enlarged area maps of Milwaukee and 13 of the State's other largest cities are included on the map along with the information on the location of historical markers, State parks, and forests. A new, easy-to-read legend makes route finding simpler than ever before.

Governor Nelson's message on the map includes a cordial invitation to tourists to visit Wisconsin with a request to motorists to observe careful driving practices.

About 800,000 copies of the map will be distributed this year through service stations, hotels, motels, restaurants, and other public places and a copy of the map is included with each reply to the thousands of requests for information on Wisconsin received by the conservation department.

Beautiful and useful as the map is otherwise, it is expected to have a large circulation in this area as residents make use of the opportunity to point out to travelers and visitors that John Kysliko has really put Cadott on the map.

Small Business Administration—Its Responsibilities and Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the Michigan Business Review. The author, Mr. Philip McCallum, of Ann Arbor, Mich., is Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and in his informative article describes the varied activities of his agency in assisting small business.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—ITS RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROGRAMS

(By Philip McCallum)

President Eisenhower on July 18, 1958, signed into law the Small Business Act of 1958, creating for the first time in history a permanent agency of the U.S. Government to foster the welfare of small business enterprises.

The importance of small business to the Nation's economy, of course, had long been recognized. During World War II the Smaller War Plants Corp. was created to help harness the full effort of the Nation's small business firms to the war effort, and when the Korean conflict began the Small Defense Plants Administration was created for a similar purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corp.'s financial assistance activities included loans to small business concerns and to the victims of floods or other natural catastrophes.

The Small Business Administration succeeded the Small Defense Plants Administration in mid-1953 with broadened powers to assist all small business concerns.

MADE A PERMANENT AGENCY IN 1958

By 1958 the need for the services of the Small Business Administration to foster and assist the Nation's small firms had been so firmly established that the agency was made a permanent part of the Government virtually without opposition.

Not only was the Small Business Administration made a permanent agency in 1958 but its powers to help the small business segment of the economy were increased by enactment of the Small Business Investment Act. This legislation authorized the creation of private companies which will furnish equity funds and long-term financing to small business concerns. The functioning of local development companies and small business investment companies and the Federal assistance available to them will be described hereafter.

The philosophy that led to the establishment of the Small Business Administration is perhaps best stated in the Small Business Act of 1958, which says:

"The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless

the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed. It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government (including but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction) be placed with small-business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SBA

To achieve this basic purpose the Small Business Administration has established various programs of assistance to small firms.

The Small Business Administration has five major areas of responsibility:

1. Helping small business gain access to adequate capital and credit through financial counseling, bank-Small Business Administration participation loans, direct Government loans, and assistance to privately owned small business investment companies;
2. Helping small business obtain a fair share of Government purchases and sales;
3. Helping small business obtain competent management, technical and production counsel;
4. Making disaster loans to persons whose homes or businesses have been damaged or destroyed by storms, floods, and other natural disasters, and to small business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury because of excessive rainfall or drought conditions in their areas; and
5. Serving as an advocate of small business with other Government departments and agencies in many fields and programs in which small business has an interest.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A summary of each of the responsibilities assigned to this Administration follows:

The Small Business Administration since its inception has operated a financial assistance program designed to provide term loans to small manufacturers, service industries, retailers and other businesses eligible by size, dollar volume, or other pertinent standards.

These loans, made on either a direct basis or in participation with banks, have totaled more than 18,000 in number for \$850 million since the inception of the program in 1953.

The loans have been in amounts from \$1,000 to \$350,000 with an average of \$40,000 (although nearly 60 percent have been for \$25,000 or less). Maturity dates have been averaging about 5 years, although longer maturity dates are provided when considered necessary.

Small manufacturers, retailers, service establishments and other small businesses are eligible for SBA loans for business construction, conversion, or expansion; the purchase of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies or materials; or for working capital.

There are two broad types of Small Business Administration business loans: "participation" and "direct." In a participation loan, the agency joins with a bank or other private lending institution in a loan to a small business concern. In a direct loan, there is no participation by a private lender—the loan is made entirely and directly by the SBA to the borrower.

By law, the agency may not make a direct loan if a bank or other private lending institution will join with it in a loan to the borrower.

Business loans generally are repayable in regular monthly installments, including interest on the unpaid balance, and can have maturity dates up to 10 years.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

In addition to the direct financial assistance rendered to small business concerns by SBA under the Small Business Act, further assistance was authorized through the creation of small business investment companies and development loan companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This assistance, which is actually rendered by privately organized companies, is not a duplication of the direct assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration but is designed to make long-term funds and equity financing available to the small business segment of our economy. Considerable testimony was presented by the Federal Reserve Board and other authorities to show that the costs in underwriting for public sale security issues in small amounts is disproportionately high to small business concerns. The Congress passed and on August 21, 1958, the President signed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, thus providing the means by which privately organized and operated small business investment companies would serve as a source of equity and long-term financing for small business concerns.

Small business investment companies contemplated by this act were authorized to provide the equity and long-term funds for small business concerns, which large underwriting firms normally provide for the larger corporations. Whereas the securities of large corporations are bought by underwriting firms and resold to public investors, the securities of small business concerns could not be expected to be as marketable as those of the larger companies. As the cost of investigating and investing in small concerns is relatively high, it was necessary to provide certain inducements to private capital to invest in the long-term debt or equity securities of small business concerns.

FINANCIAL ADVANTAGES

The act, therefore, necessarily gave to the small business investment company substantial inducements, including tax advantages, provided certain amounts of Federal funds to assist in the formation and growth of small business investment companies, and permitted the purchase of securities convertible into the stock of the small business concern financed.

Many companies, after a study of these inducements, have been formed. To be exact, 68 small business investment companies have been licensed by the administration as of January 22, 1960, and in addition, applications for the forming of 81 additional companies have been submitted.

The financial assistance that SBA may give to a small business investment company is the authority to lend any one company up to \$150,000 to assist the company to obtain the minimum required capital of \$300,000; furthermore, SBA is authorized to loan any one small business investment company an amount equal to one-half of the company's capital.

TAX BENEFITS

The tax benefits available to small business investment companies are briefly these:

A small business investment company actively engaged in the business contemplated by the act will not be subject to taxes on accumulated earnings.

A small business investment company (except under certain circumstances) is also exempt from personal holding company taxes.

Under the Technical Amendment Act, losses realized on the stock of a small business investment company may be treated as an ordinary loss rather than a capital loss. This loss deduction applies to all purchasers of stock from a small business investment company and is not limited to the original stockholders.

The Technical Amendment Act also permits 100-percent deduction rather than an

85-percent deduction allowed to the corporations for dividends received by the small business investment company.

A further inducement for the formation and successful operation of small business investment companies is contained in legislation passed by the Senate (S. 2611) which will, if enacted by the House, provide greater flexibility in the types of securities the small business investment companies may take from the concerns they finance. This should enable small business investment companies which are experienced in underwriting and selling securities, to create and sell, profitably, to public investors and investing institutions many of the securities they generate. Greater flexibility in the types of permissible securities should also augment the borrowing power of the small business investment companies from banks and other institutions.

ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

The other type of company eligible for financial assistance under the Small Business Investment Act is the development company—both the State and local development company. The act authorizes SBA to loan to a State development company an amount equal to the loans obtained by the State development company from its members and others, the only proviso being that the State development company must use the funds obtained from SBA to finance small business concerns.

The act also authorizes SBA to loan to a State or local development company a total of \$250,000 to assist in the development of any one project. At least 20 percent of the cost of the project such as the completion, expansion or conversion of a manufacturing building must be provided by the development company, in which case SBA will provide the remaining 80 percent. The property being developed must be leased to an identifiable small business which will be required to make periodic payments to the development company sufficient to repay the funds advanced by SBA.

During the first year of operation 34 loans had been made to State and local development companies in an amount of \$4,181,774.

THE PROCUREMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Under the procurement assistance program, which is a major activity, the agency helps small business concerns obtain a fair share of Government contracts. Although work toward this objective is done in many ways, perhaps the most effective means is through cooperation with the major Government purchasing departments and agencies to have bidding on suitable contracts or parts of such contracts reserved for small business concerns.

This program, known as our joint set-aside program, has resulted in the awarding to small firms of approximately 75,000 Government contracts totaling about \$3 billion. This applies only to contracts set aside for small business and does not include many billions of dollars which small firms have received in Government contracts either as prime contractors or as subcontractors.

ASSISTANCE WITH MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Another responsibility which has been assigned to the Small Business Administration is to assist small business concerns with their management problems. This activity is referred to as the management and research assistance program.

This program is educational in nature and is conducted principally through administrative management courses, management research, and publications for small business owners and managers. SBA co-sponsors management courses which are offered by universities and colleges. SBA has co-sponsored nearly 700 of these management courses in cooperation with 255 educational institutions. Since the start of the program

in 1954, 21,500 business men and women have attended these courses. The students—small business owners and managers—pay the cost through tuition.

SBA issues many publications relating to various management subjects. Recent titles include "Pricing Arithmetic for Small Business Managers," "How Better Business Bureaus Help Small Business," "Traps To Avoid in Small Business Management," and "How To Reduce Your Operating Costs." Nearly 7 million copies of these publications have been distributed upon request.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

In addition, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the agency was given the responsibility of launching a new research program through which State agencies and educational institutions will be given grants of not more than \$40,000 per year within each State to finance small business management studies and counseling.

During fiscal year 1959, 52 grants ranging from \$7,465 to \$40,000 and totaling approximately \$1,900,000 were awarded to educational institutions and State agencies for studies of specific small business problems, in each of the States and District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The University of Michigan has received a grant of \$40,000 to make an analysis of the management factors contributing to the success or failure of small manufacturing concerns.

When this study and others are completed, they will be widely disseminated by the Small Business Administration and the universities, and they may well be of special interest to the readers of the Michigan Business Review. It is the consensus that a great deal of valuable information will be developed by these research studies.

Another form of direct assistance is, of course, the disaster loan program which is mentioned above as the fourth major area of responsibility assigned to SBA. Since this program is not in the strict sense a business program, I feel that any further discussion of it would be beyond the scope of this article. The discussion so far has been restricted to what might be called the agency's direct forms of assistance to small business concerns.

ADVOCATE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT

The fifth responsibility which has been placed with this agency and which affects each and every small businessman in the SBA's function as the advocate of small business in Government.

Many sections in the Small Business Act refer to the responsibility of SBA in formulating policies which affect small business, a few of which are being pointed up here. The act empowers the agency whenever it determines such action is necessary "to consult and cooperate with all Government agencies for the purpose of insuring that small business concerns shall receive fair and reasonable treatment from such agencies."

Another section of the act says in part: "To the extent deemed necessary by the Administrator to protect and preserve small-business interests, the Administration shall consult and cooperate with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government in the formulation by the Administration of policies affecting small-business concerns."

Much has been done since the Small Business Administration was created to foster the interests of small businesses. In 1958, President Eisenhower created a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. This small business committee consisted of certain members of the Cabinet and the Small Business Administrator. In addition, other department and agency heads were designated by the Presi-

dent to participate on an ad hoc basis as seems desirable.

This committee has made recommendations for both administrative and legislative action. Many of these recommendations have become law.

The Small Business Administration during the past year has continued to be an advocate for small business with many Government departments and agencies. It has been possible by consultation at early stages in the formulation of regulations and policies to make certain that artificial impediments are not placed in the way of the growth and expansion of small business.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

To illustrate the broad range of activities in which this administration has participated, here are a few examples of interagency cooperative effort:

In its new responsibilities for increasing small business participation in sales of Government property, the Small Business Administration is working closely with those Government agencies having disposal activities. A cooperative agreement was developed with the Department of Agriculture to assure small business an increased share of Federal timber, and the agency has completed a similar agreement on forest land controlled by the Department of the Interior. The agency also plans to develop cooperative agreements with all other departments having responsibility for the sale of real and personal property.

Representatives of this agency have conferred with representatives of the Federal Aviation Agency about financial assistance to small airlines and loans to private business concerns for hangar facilities.

SBA has also collaborated with the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce in helping small business concerns obtain access to scarce materials.

With regard to small business participation in the President's highway program, the agency has worked with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce.

The Small Business Administration in collaboration with other agencies has reviewed the labor standards provisions of Government construction contracts in an effort to simplify the procedures and thus facilitate the participation of small business in Government procurement.

SBA is collaborating with the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, and other agencies in a study of Government procedures, policies, and regulations which may adversely affect small business. Agency employees are participating with the General Services Administration in the preparation of a single set of Government procurement regulations.

Recommendations have been made to the Department of State about hardships imposed on small business in cases such as the export of ferrous scrap and other materials in short supply, and restrictions imposed on goods shipped from the United States.

These are but a few of the instances in which this agency has been working with other departments to strengthen small business.

A CONTINUING PROGRAM

In summary, therefore, it can be said that the Small Business Administration has made progress in its responsibility to give financial procurement, management, and technical assistance to small business. These programs have solved and are continuing to solve many of the individual problems of small business concerns.

The Federal Government, the Congress, private business, and the country at large all recognize the vital contributions that small business makes and must continue to make

to the national economy and to the American free enterprise system.

It is the purpose of the Small Business Administration to improve and strengthen the agency's established programs, and, if appropriate, to devise new ones which will encourage and develop the potential capacity of small business to contribute to our competitive economy. SBA also must and will bend every effort to the creation of an economic climate in which small enterprises can be started and can grow and flourish.

A Helping Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Wallowa County Chieftain, of Enterprise, Oreg. It deals with the general question of economic aid:

[From the Wallowa County Chieftain, Mar. 17, 1960]

A HELPING HAND

One of the greatest misconceptions about communism is that it makes its greatest gains through force, subterfuge, and pure propaganda. Actually, the appeal of communism lies in its promise of a better life to people who live in desperate straits. For those living without hope on a bare subsistence level almost any program which offers a chance for something better seems worth trying. People at this level cannot possibly lose by a change. The worst that can happen to them is to continue on the same animal standards.

Even a change, without any gain, offers some escape from the deadly monotony involved in putting out a maximum effort merely to stay alive.

Hundreds of millions of people in the world live at this bare subsistence level. Many of them are illiterate and very few of them, if any, are even remotely interested in the theories of capitalism, socialism and communism. They are interested only in concrete offers for more food, better clothes and homes, and a chance to move up toward the standard of living of the more fortunate classes.

Foreign aid, if it is designed for anything more than to buy anti-Communist guns and manpower, must reach the poorest people in a way which will bring work constructing land reclamation, irrigation and improvement projects, which will build industries, clear out slums and erect decent homes, which will build and staff schools and which will be aimed at helping people at the lowest level become constructive workers with a plan for a much better life and a helping hand to make that plan possible.

If we were using all of our surplus money, manpower and resources in a program such as this we could make friends all over the world and we would be able to see substantial gains, which are difficult if not impossible to find in foreign aid which provides only the munitions of war.

But we will find that it is impossible to make capitalists in days, months or years out of people whom we assist upward from the bare subsistence level. It would not be economically possible to supply every subsistence tiller of the soil, with a privately owned farm, an individually owned home

and an adequate list of equipment and livestock. And even if it were financially possible, the uneducated and untrained worker would not have the skill and the knowledge to operate successfully on his own on the farm or in business.

When masses of people are to be helped in their rise from a subsistence level the effort must necessarily be a cooperative one. A minimum amount of everything—housing, land, tools and technical assistance—must serve a maximum group. This may be simply cooperation, or it may be socialism or even communism, but it is the only way. If adherence to an ideal and a principle holds us off from extending a helping hand on this basis the day when there will be a better world for millions of helpless people will indeed be a long way off.

The Challenge of Youthful Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years there has been a stagnant complacency in national leadership. At the very time when this Nation and the free world face serious threats which endanger freedom and democracy, we have looked in vain for the President of the United States to speak out and grasp the reins of leadership.

During the dreary fifties, students on the campuses of our Nation—terrified at first by McCarthyism, and then lulled by the disease of national complacency—turned their attention to more frivolous pursuits and began training for their grey flannel futures. Those of us who went to college in the 1930's and were participants in the intellectual ferment of the Roosevelt era began to despair about the future of our Nation.

Fortunately, however, we are seeing signs of a new intellectual awakening on the campuses. Students are waking up, are grappling with the major issues we face, and are talking and thinking about the great problems which some of our national leaders have refused to acknowledge.

As a sample of the inspiring activity of one campus group, the following article from the March 26, 1960, issue of the Nation magazine shows that many students today are moving "ahead of their adult advisers, both in desire and imagination." To me this activity is immensely heartening and may portend a fresh and realistic national leadership in the years ahead.

The article follows:

CHALLENGE ON THE CAMPUS (By Dan Wakefield)

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—At the tables down at George and Harry's restaurant-bar in New Haven, a handful of Yale undergraduates who suspected that neither the Whiffenpoof Song nor the howl of the beats provided the ultimate answer to the young generation in America, conceived and initiated an idea called "challenge." Now, a year later, the

challenge idea has not only become a primary topic of talk and activity at Yale, but has stirred more interest in dozens of college campuses throughout the country than anything since Gus Dorais and Knute Rockne invented the forward pass. Its aim is to "confront individuals with the crucial issues of today's world" and challenge American college students to stand up and take a part in dealing with them.

Last week, Challenge held its second colloquium at Yale on the topic of "American Democracy: Myth or Reality?" featuring such varied interpreters of the American dream as A. Philip Randolph, Barry Goldwater, Harold Taylor, and Thurgood Marshall. The first colloquium, held last December, presented "The Challenge of the Nuclear Age," with interpretations by Hubert Humphrey, Carlos Romulo, Gen. James Gavin, and geneticist Dr. James Crow. The featured participants not only act as lecturers, but attend coffee seminars with the students to answer questions and present their views in a manner more informal than is possible from a platform.

The colloquiums are the feature each semester of a program that begins with evening gabfests, down at George and Harry's, meetings and discussions among students of each of Yale's 10 colleges, discussions with campus professors on the semester's challenge theme, and leadup speakers to provide background information. The full-house audiences of last week's colloquium were made up not only of Yale students, but of more than 500 visiting undergraduates, from 40 or so colleges around the country, who have started, or hope to start, challenge programs on their own campuses.

This spring's program began with some words by William C. Devane, dean of Yale College, who explained that when several students came to him last year with the idea of challenge, he told them he didn't think it would work, and he was glad to see now that he had been wrong. So much for the inspirational stimulus of the older generation. The three students who conceived the challenge idea—Sam Bowles, Ralph Bryant, and Richard Celeste—eventually got backing from Dean Devane and leading Yale faculty members, as well as important Yale alumni and New Haven civic leaders; but originally they were greeted by friendly skepticism on the part of their elders.

The students seem to have been far ahead of their adult advisers, both in desire and imagination. The Reverend William S. Coffin, Yale chaplain and one of the first faculty people to whom the students went for help, recalled recently that when they contacted him, "These fellows had thought of everything. They wanted to get the best people for the first colloquium, and they weren't kidding when they said the best. When they started out they wanted Camus, Schweitzer, and Bertrand Russell. They were asking me last spring about how to go about getting Camus—they'd already written letters and had friends of his write letters—and I suggested that they get in touch with Germaine Brée, in New York, who wrote the book on Camus' work. One of the fellows said, 'Oh, yes; I'm having lunch with her tomorrow.'"

The three challenge originators finally called a meeting with some of the faculty members to "pool ideas." Ralph Bryant, one of the student trio, explained that "We bought a jug of sherry and got 8 or 10 faculty members in and told them what we wanted to do. The faculty was pessimistic—because of a lack of funds."

The students refused to share the pessimism. One of them, Richard Celeste, had won a \$1,000 Yale undergraduate prize, and he contributed \$700 of it to get the challenge movement underway. That summer all three worked to raise funds, and through

contributions from the New Haven Foundation and the Danforth Foundation, plus interested Yale alumni, they had \$7,000 by November. They also had a list of sponsors, including Connecticut Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, Representative Chester Bowles (his son, Sam, was one of the movement's originators), New Haven Mayor Richard Lee, faculty members such as Henri Peyre and Harold Lasswell, and alumni including Arthur Watson, president of IBM, and Henry J. Heinz II, president of H. J. Heinz Co.

The challenge originators were also far ahead of their elders in conceiving the operational aspect of the movement. The most obvious thing, of course, would have been to name a president, secretary, and treasurer—the usual American procedure for getting things done whenever three people get together. But the students felt that it then might turn into just another campus political group, with factions and internal politics detracting from the real purpose. The three originators weren't looking for campus prestige—their records at Yale had already won them offers of Rhodes scholarships—and they decided to work on an informal basis, without official titles or offices, in nightly sessions at George and Harry's which anyone interested was welcome to attend. The maturity of the students involved can best be measured by the fact that this has worked.

Stephen Kass, a Yale junior who was one of the organizers of the challenge spring colloquium, explained to a visitor that "We didn't want an 'empire.' Everyone's welcome to our meetings, and the guys who come most often and take the most interest take the jobs that have to be done. But nobody has a title, and the work is passed around. The guys who organized the winter colloquium were mostly seniors, and they've stepped aside now and mostly juniors have done the work on this one. There are freshmen, sophomores, and grad students, too. A graduate art student designed our literature and stationery. The fellow who's introducing A. Philip Randolph today is a freshman."

The common ground on which these students of different ages, educational interests, and political ideas have met is best summed up in the words of Challenge's own statement of origins and goals:

"As university students we are concerned with understanding the world in which we live. Yet we find that our environment is narrowing and fragmenting our awareness of the contemporary challenges. Our concern and sensitivity have become intellectualized and sophisticated to the point where we are unable to respond creatively to those crucial issues which are so complex that they often seem remote."

This sense of remoteness that so often hangs, like Fitzgerald's romantic mist, around the spires and towers of college campuses was vigorously dispelled during Yale's spring challenge weekend. Although the featured speakers recited from the podium the same basic texts that they offer to all public gatherings from the Baptist fish fry to the Phi Beta Kappa luncheon, they were brought down off their oratorical heights in the coffee seminars—one of the most important aspects of the weekend colloquiums. In a quick stop-in tour at some of these student-speaker sessions, a visitor heard a Yale undergraduate question Philip Randolph on how a white college student could help bring about the integration of the segregated musicians' union locals in New Haven; Harold Taylor, the Leonard Bernstein of progressive education and former president of Sarah Lawrence College, was asked if he didn't think most American college students had to be forced into learning anything; BARRY GOLDWATER, who, in his formal speech, had recommended the breakup of unions into autonomous local units, was

asked if he would recommend the same program for General Motors.

On the Sunday of the challenge weekend, more than 50 visiting students got together with some of the Yale men to discuss the problems and prospects of organizing a challenge program on their own campuses. They were there from Antioch, Columbia, Smith, the University of Texas, Sarah Lawrence, Oberlin, Russell Sage and other schools of all types and sizes now involved in one stage or other with starting a challenge program. Some wondered how such a program could be made successful on a small campus not as well known as Yale. Ralph Bryant commented:

"The most expensive thing is the colloquium, with outside speakers, but that isn't necessary, and we don't feel it's the most important thing we've done. Most colleges aren't able to throw a big colloquium, but they can get seminars and discussions going with professors on their own campus. We decided that our success shouldn't be measured in how many big names we got for colloquiums, or how many people attended, but how many individuals at Yale radically changed their lives—like deciding to go to work in Africa, or actually doing something about what's going on in the world."

Yale students have already begun to make that kind of response to the challenge they have been presented with. Twelve undergraduates are going to Africa this summer to build schools; a half-dozen have applied to teach in Nigeria next year; eight Yale students were the first northern collegians to initiate a sympathy picketing for the Negro sit-in strikes at southern lunch counters. On the weekend of the challenge colloquium, Yale student Al Lowenstein spoke at a rally which raised several hundred dollars for the Negro students expelled from Alabama State College.

There is, according to the student leaders, a marked increase in political activity on all sides. "Before," one of them said, "it was just a small clique that took part in political activities. All the political groups have come to life this year, both on the right and the left. We got Bill Buckley for a challenge speech before the student conservative society did, and they had to get on the ball. The same kind of thing has happened with the liberal groups."

The aim of challenge has not been to build up any particular partisan group, but to destroy what it calls "privatism"—the withdrawal into one's personal affairs to the neglect of the world around them. In a résumé for other colleges called "Organizing a Challenge-Type Program," the Yale students explained that one of the basic problems is deciding "whether the program will advocate openly a particular political point of view or will remain aloof from expressing a preference for one side or other of the political spectrum." Although "all of us have strong political ideas," the Yale students decided to keep the movement nonpartisan, in order to appeal to a wider group of students and sponsors. "By seeming to rise above purely political issues, the program will influence many people who consider politics somewhat unworthy of their attention. . . . It will be somewhat frustrating not being able to advocate your own political feelings, since you will have to try to present both sides. Also, the group will not be able to take political action as a group, but only as individuals."

This is the course that the Yale students decided on, and it has already proved its success. Editorials in many college newspapers have praised it as the answer to the way up from apathy, and institutions which have not yet begun similar programs have sounded notes of guilt and hope. Perhaps the most eloquent came from the Sophian, the Smith College newspaper, which announced plans for a challenge program at

Northampton beginning next fall. Speaking of the vital need for it, the Sophian said:

"So, sometimes we write home to mummy and daddy about the world situation, and occasionally we mention it to dear ol' Joe. Dear Joe smiles and asks us to dance."

"We think of the money America spends on beer and cigarettes and we worry about the economy, and democracy, and things, when we see another TV antenna go up across the street. We remember 'The News of the Week in Review' as we reread Vogue. We frown about our culture and its values as we tip the Negro waiters, and we promise we'll talk about the image of America sometime to somebody when we tour Europe this summer."

"We muse, and shake our well-brushed heads, and say America's challenge is Soviet communism, and we can't fight that, can we? When we get out of school, maybe. In the meantime it can all slide off our shiny heads, our feminine shoulders, our manicured hands. Bravely we can look to the future, stars in our eyes, thinking that someday we, too, shall do great things."

"We're the very picture of American youth. We gaze at the wide horizons of the world before us, with a questioning mind, filled with faith, hope, and charity. We forget that challenge, like charity, begins at home."

The best critique of this "silent generation" has come not from Kenneth Rexroth or the editors of Time, but from one of its own undergraduate observers; the best challenge to its role in the future has come not from parents or professors, but from its own campus leaders.

Peiping's Fatal Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very sincere and truthful statement that appeared in the editorial column of the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass.:

PEIPING'S FATAL ERROR

The whole Christian world has been aroused by Red China's action in sentencing 68-year-old Bishop James E. Walsh to 20 years' imprisonment on a trumped-up charge of espionage.

Here is a man who has devoted a good part of his adult life in the service of his church and the Chinese people. A Maryknoll missionary for nearly 40 years, he had come to know the Chinese people very well and, in the words of Archbishop Cushing has "loved them very deeply and served them faithfully."

Bishop Walsh had absolutely no interest in politics. He never had any connection with the American Government. His interest has been solely in the religious life of the Chinese people. He has received sorry repayment for his love and devotion.

The utter ridiculousness of the charges against Bishop Walsh is convincingly revealed by the fact that Peiping radio, in the same broadcasts announcing his sentencing, also accused Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York of having joined with Bishop Walsh in carrying out subversive activities.

Cardinal Cushing, who was intimately connected with the Catholic mission before becoming an auxiliary bishop of the Boston archdiocese, says the Chinese Communist

regime, in this latest travesty on justice, may well have sounded its own death knell. The reason is that a wave of anger has swept the globe at what amounts to a death sentence for a man who has given his life to the Chinese people and whom Cardinal Cushing hails as "the finest American in my lifetime."

The United States plans to protest this tragedy. If protests are of no avail, let us have stronger action. Otherwise, we may well become the laughing stock of the world.

At least, let us hear no more fatuous drivel about admitting these bandits to the United Nations.

Resolution by Crook County, Oreg.,

Stockgrower's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to insert into the RECORD the following resolution of the Crook County, Oreg., Stockgrower's Association regarding the important matter of range rehabilitation on our public domain:

RESOLUTION BY THE CROOK COUNTY STOCK-GROWER'S ASSOCIATION

Whereas the potential development of Oregon's public range, watersheds, and game habitat has been sadly neglected because sufficient funds have not been allocated to the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management for public range project needs; and

Whereas the results of range experimental development work on typical and suitable range areas have conclusively demonstrated that the carrying capacity for game and livestock can be economically increased up to fivefold or more. For example on an average dry range ordinarily requiring 20 acres per animal unit for the allowable grazing period, five animal units can be supported on the same 20 acres after eradication of sage, rabbit brush, and juniper, and accomplishing a reseeding program with adapted perennials such as Whitmar's beardless wheat grass (domestic version of native Oregon blue bunch grass) Crested wheat grass, Russian rye and others, costs vary from \$4 to \$6 per acre; and

Whereas the cash receipts from the sale of natural resource products provided by public lands has exceeded by approximately seven to one the amount of money being reinvested in public lands, including the expenses of Bureau of Land Management administration. It is realized a substantial amount of the funds received are from non-renewable resources such as gas, coal, minerals and oil. This fact however emphasizes the urgency of reinvesting these receipts in development of the renewable resources such as range grasses, edible plants and forests; and

Whereas funds allocated for development of public ranges, watersheds, and game habitats should be considered as a profitable investment in lieu of an expense because of increases in grazing fee receipts that will accrue due to increased animal unit carrying capacity of the range, increased recreational values and as the logical offset to compensation for the direct loss of revenues and the indirect losses in other related taxes being brought about by the increasing number of withdrawals and cutbacks encountered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a long-range master plan of development for said ranges, watersheds, and game habitats be initiated and accelerated, to be financed by a greater apportionment of the receipts from public resource products sales; and

Resolved, That said long-range master plan should contemplate at present values a minimum investment of \$4 per acre. Only suitable areas to be considered. The Government funds be expended on a matched basis with private moneys, provided a reasonable security of tenancy is assured for those persons holding permits and participating in the expenditure of private moneys; and

Resolved, That the sense of this resolution be communicated to the Oregon congressional delegation, other livestock associations, conservation and outdoor groups, and the Secretary of the Department of Interior.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 1959, I gave a speech before the American Academy of General Practice—physicians—at Kansas City, Mo. Three weeks later I gave the same speech before the convention of Missouri insurance agents in St. Louis, Mo.

I had prepared this speech for delivery to these seemingly diverse groups intentionally. Both groups are concerned with the problem of medical care for our people. The doctors are primarily concerned with the problem of the adequacy and the quality of medical care. The insurance people are primarily concerned with the problems of cost of medical care to our people.

We, the people's representatives in the Federal Government, are concerned with how well we are meeting all the problems of medical care in our society and what part, if any, the Federal Government should or might play in moving ahead toward a solution of these problems.

This speech serves as background for a further and more detailed discussion of the problem of medical care for the aged which I shall undertake tomorrow under a special order to speak, which I have been granted.

The above-mentioned address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS BEFORE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF GENERAL PRACTICE STATE OFFICERS CONFERENCE, KANSAS CITY, MO., SEPTEMBER 27, 1959

The American people seem to be genuinely concerned about inflation. The genuineness of their concern is borne out by the fact that they now relate inflation to Federal governmental expenditures and Federal taxes.

There was a time when a political philosophy of tax and tax and spend and spend did mean elect and elect. That was in the days when the wealth in the United States was distributed in sufficient disproportion that those on the short end of the stick looked upon the Federal Government as an efficient device for redistributing the

wealth. And those on the short end of the stick were in sufficient number when, united by a common purpose, they became the majority at the elections.

However, today with the wealth more evenly distributed and certainly the Federal taxload being placed primarily on the overwhelming majority of the people instead of on the rich, it has become apparent that the Federal Government is no longer the efficient device for redistributing the wealth that it once was. At least the Federal Government in bringing about redistribution is no longer redistributing from richer to poorer, but in accordance with no recognizable formula, unless it is of one from those who have learned to use political power to those who have not learned to use political power. However, redistribution in accordance with such a formula is hardly one that will gain the support of the majority of the people at the polls. Quite the contrary—as it becomes more widely known that this is the effect of Federal Government redistribution of wealth, the majority of the people will oppose the political philosophy of Federal expenditures and Federal taxation, unrelated as it has been to what the expenditure is for and unrelated to the efficiency with which Federal expenditures achieve the purpose sought.

What I have said here, if true, and I believe it is true, should be a source of great comfort to the medical profession in its fight against what it has properly defined, in my judgment, as socialized medicine. If what I have said is true, then we can begin to discuss the question of Federal expenditures on the basis upon which they should be discussed and not upon the emotional and irrational basis of the past which springs from the cultivated belief that almost any Federal expenditures meant a redistribution of the wealth from those who have to those who have not.

I have not said that the medical profession has won its fight against the various projects to have the Federal Government spend federally collected taxes in the medical field; I have merely stated that now the medical profession can have a rational public debate on the merits and demerits of Federal expenditures in these areas. They will no longer be fighting against a hidden but powerful emotion in the breasts of the majority of the American people which looked upon Federal expenditure as being of some personal benefit inasmuch as they were not the ones who paid for it.

It will be noted that the old New Dealers, today's reactionaries who want to go back to the old days of spend and spend and tax and tax, still use indigency as the vehicle to get most of their programs enacted into law. Although some of the younger, in years, members of this reactionary crowd, realizing that indigency in the United States has not the meaning that it had in the 1930's, have latched onto another vehicle upon which to carry their program of spend and spend and tax and tax. The new vehicle they seek to employ is the fear of Russia.

It is important to realize that these middle 20th century reactionaries are not so lacking in intelligence or so full of wistful thinking as to construct their vehicle out of an impossible pumpkin. There still is such a thing as indigency and it is a real social problem. There is such a thing as the Russian threat. The important question is whether they will be able to use the problem or the threat in such a way that rationality again gives way to emotion so that Federal expenditures becomes synonymous with solving the problem or the threat.

Does anyone question that this is occurring? I am certain if they sat and listened through the congressional hearings and the floor debate on these issues over the past 10 years they would see this subtle switch on

the part of many of the same people from indigency to Russia.

It is true that there is another emotion tied into Federal health programs—that is the emotion of all human beings to regard death and disease as a social and, even more important, a personal enemy. What must be done with this emotion is the same that must be done with these other human emotions. Channel it into the right direction and not let the neo-Federalists, the mid-20th century reactionaries I have previously referred to, make Federal expenditures synonymous with fighting the enemy. I am afraid they have already made considerable advancement toward achieving the synonymy. The enormous increases in the appropriations to the National Institutes of Health, in my judgment, rests primarily from their achieving this end.

But, in meeting this problem, it is important to realize that counteracting the emotion is only the first stage of action. Counteracting the emotion only puts us in a position of rationally debating the question of how does our society best meet the social enemy, disease and death? If not through Federal expenditures, how?

Indigency, Russia, and disease. The quacks say the patent medicine Federal tax money, if taken in sufficient quantity and often enough, will cure all three and a number of minor ailments as well. An analysis of this patent medicine reveals that it is heavily laden with opium and the well-being that seems to follow after immediate dosage stems from a deadening of the senses, not a deadening of that which alarmed and activated these warning senses. Opium is a valuable drug when used properly and under careful direction and, coming out of the metaphor, it is important that we don't condemn Federal spending per se simply because some of us see the damage it has caused and may cause. It is important only that we rationally consider when Federal spending can and should be used and when it should not be used.

I want to discuss another public emotion which the doctors must face in dealing with the problems involved in the relationship of their profession to the Government. Now that the people are alerted to the dangers of inflation, they have become concerned with the cost items of the goods and services they purchase which go to make up the cost-of-living increases which they assume are identical with inflation.

Indeed, the general public is not alone in considering cost-of-living increases as inflation per se. Many professional economists seem to view the two phenomena as interchangeable. I shall discuss the difference between the two with particular reference to medical costs. I am certain the medical profession is aware of the fact that the doctors, hospitals, pharmaceutical industry and other industries related to health have become, to some extent, the *bête noire* of those who are now shouting about the cost-of-living increases.

Indeed, the neo-federalists perversely use this increased cost item as a further argument to concentrate more power in the Federal Government. Nothing that will serve to increase the power of the Federal Government seems to escape their hungry eyes. They are in the forefront crying that the Federal Government has to regulate in some way or other these costs to keep them down. At the slightest indication of an economic disturbance they urge price controls. So effective have they been in their propaganda that in a recent Gallup poll the majority of people who, when asked which political party they thought was most concerned about keeping prices down, stated the Democratic Party over the Republican Party. The neo-federalists, being almost completely within the Democratic Party, can

claim credit for this image through their propaganda in advocating price controls.

Costs of hospitals, doctors, drugs, nursing service all have increased more rapidly since World War II than probably any other set of costs in the cost of living indexes. But costs are only one side of the coin. The other side of the coin is the quality of the product or the service one buys. In the cost of living index a day at a hospital is the same, whether the day was spent in 1920 or 1959. But does one get the same results for a day in the hospital in 1959 that one got in 1920? Hardly so. Improved equipment, medical knowledge, drugs, etc., mean that the average stay in a hospital is quite a bit less, and the number of those who come from the stay on their own feet instead of in a box is considerably higher. Furthermore, the vast majority of our people utilize hospitals today when formerly it was almost a luxury reserved for people with adequate means and people located near the urban areas.

Inflation in its economic sense means debasing the currency. In theory, the same thing costs more because the dollar has changed its purchasing power. Increased cost of an item might be inflation, but it also might be the result of the quality of the item having been improved. If the item has been improved it is axiomatic that there has been some cost for that improvement. This cost will be reflected in the price of the item, or absorbed in the saving resulting from increased productivity in the manufacture and distribution of the item, or absorbed in the saving resulting from a greater quantity production of the item (which is similar to increased productivity).

Undoubtedly there has been some saving in the human health industries resulting from increased productivity and from the efficiency gains of larger productions because more people buy health services these days. On the other hand, this is a field in which there has been a tremendous technological improvement. The rate of improvement has been so great that it can appropriately be called a revolution. Rapid economic growth of this sort (technological improvement) carries with it an increased amount of obsolescence. Not just obsolete equipment and tools, but also obsolete human skills. Furthermore, rapid growth such as this is based upon increased research, development, and education. All of this costs considerably. It costs a great deal more at the time it is going on than the savings resulting from increased productivity. This is the period in which we presently are.

The question the public should be asking themselves about medical costs is not the question of what the increased cost is but, is what they are getting worth the cost. In the field of health I doubt if anyone, upon analysis, regrets the \$10 a bottle we pay for one of the new mycins. Certainly, he could still buy a patent medicine for a dollar a bottle which makes even greater claims to health than the wonder drugs. But he spends the dollar, or either the \$10, out of choice.

So having discussed the factors which the advocates of socialized medicine have been using as arguments for their program, indigency, Russia, disease and cost, and having pointed out that these are emotional and unreal arguments, the question still remains how does our society move ahead in combating the real problems of indigency, Russia, disease and costs?

First of all, we must recognize that the path to attaining these goals are not in all instances the same path. Indeed, the path to decreased costs is definitely going in a different direction from that of combating disease and staying ahead of Russia. Combating disease and staying ahead of Russia requires more, not less, technological advance-

ment. It requires more education, research and development and will bring in its wake more obsolescence, not less. All of these items are bound to increase costs and so aggravate the problems of indigency as well as the problems of cost.

In respect to the first two goals, our society through the private hospitals, privately operated medical profession, the private pharmaceutical industry, the private nursing profession, has done an amazing job over the past few decades. Never in the history of the world has there been such advancement in combating disease. I see no argument or reason whatsoever for stating that we are not "going fast enough" in advancement through our present setup. Therefore, the arguments for more Federal expenditures in this area seem without foundation.

Indeed, by going as fast as we have in this area we have aggravated the problems of cost and indigency. Our people now live 10 years longer due to the advancements in technology in the health field, but there has been little planning for financing the extra 10 years our citizens now have. Indeed, when our people over 65 today were starting out their productive lives they based their savings (consciously or unconsciously) upon the average life expectancy. Increased cost of living both from increased standard of living as well as unadulterated inflation has badly damaged what planning they could do entirely apart from the extra 10 years they unexpectedly have been called upon to finance.

The Federal Government by its own default in properly handling the fiscal affairs of the Nation has aggravated the problem almost as much as the technological advancement has. The Federal Government's basic contribution to economic affairs is to maintain the dollar as an accurate measuring stick of human labor, ideas, and savings. I think before we call upon the Federal Government to do anything more in the field of solving the problem of cost we need to call upon it to do its basic job to preserve the dollar as an accurate measuring stick. If the Federal Government does not do this, it is almost impossible to solve the problem of cost.

The advocates of the Federal Government entering the field of solving the problem of increased cost claim that this must be done to spread the costs among all of our citizens. I asked the AFL-CIO representative at the recent hearings on the Forand bill what difference there was between Federal Government insurance and private insurance. Although he had been spending a great deal of time testifying on the subject of the Forand bill, he suddenly discovered that he was taking time from other witnesses. He stated that he didn't think he had time to answer this question.

Well, this is a basic question. What is the difference between spreading the risk through Federal insurance and spreading the risk through private insurance companies? Well, first of all, the private insurance companies must deal with people who can afford to pay for the insurance and, therefore, cannot be solving the problem of indigency. Should the problem of indigency become involved in the problems of spreading risk among the bulk of our citizens who are not indigent?

I think not. In fact, by failing to separate the problem of indigency from the problems of insurance we damage our progress in meeting both the problems of indigency and the problems of cost.

There is a second difference between Federal insurance and private insurance. Whichever sector of the society is used, Government or private, an insurance program requires capital formation. There is only one way for the Government to acquire capital, that is through taxation. But anytime Government provides the capital formation, it withdraws both the capital and the in-

surance operation itself from the tax base. It leaves the problem of future taxation more difficult. Furthermore, and possibly even more important, in insurance capital formation, the capital must be invested. Government cannot, or let's say, has not up to date, invested in anything other than its own securities. Private enterprise, on the other hand, properly invests in the economic growth of the society. The Government investment is sterile as well as withdrawn from the tax base.

Furthermore, there is a great danger in Government capital formation. A realization of the sterility of Government investment in its own securities has stimulated the neofederalists, always looking as I have stated, for any argument to place more power in the hands of the Central Government, to suggest that they invest in Federal public works bonds. Up to date, I have always left this subject with the statement I leave it up to your imagination the complications and economic damage that would result from the Government going into the investment field. I still leave it up to your imagination, but I am afraid the time is not far off when somebody is going to have to spell out in detail just what this damage is. The neofederalists are pushing their theme.

I am satisfied that the private insurance companies have been doing a tremendous job in meeting the problem of spreading costs in the field of health. However, the job has not been sufficiently good to keep up with the needs resulting from the great technological revolution in the field of health. On the other hand, I believe we are reaching a plateau and future advancements will not be as great as those in the past. This will give us some chance for a breather. In all of the advancements in extending the length of life expectancy there has been no extension of the total life span of man. It still remains around 115 years. All of the advancement has been in the area of having more men and women approximate the goal of 115 years. Death rather than disease is the social enemy. But now that death is being unmasked, the philosophers are again raising questions as to whether death is the social enemy we have all assumed it is. We have made these assumptions in direct conflict with the religion we profess which does not regard death as a social enemy. Sudden death through accident or disease, yes, but accident and disease are the enemies, not death.

Finally, I come to the question of indigency. I was greatly impressed with the testimony of the AMA representatives at the Forand hearing when they pointed out that inadequate health services were peculiar on a geographical basis, not on a basis of human chronology. In other words, where there were inadequate hospitals and doctors' care, all persons regardless of age felt the brunt of this inadequacy, not just the aged. Where the medical facilities were good in a community, all the community benefited from these good facilities, regardless of age.

This, to my mind, quite clearly points out that treating indigency on the basis of age is a wrong way to attack the problem. For this reason, the Forand bill which does seek to treat inability to pay for health facilities on the basis of age is basically in error. It will hurt rather than help in treating the problem of indigency. Furthermore, as I have previously suggested, because the Forand bill mixes indigency up with spreading the costs of those who are not indigent, it hurts the solution of indigency and it also hurts the solution of the cost problems which the 98 percent not indigent have.

Indigency should not be proliferated according to age or according to health, housing, education, food, or anything else that is a human necessity or human want. If a person is indigent, that person is in need of whatever housing, health, food, and love and

affection, too, possibly. Indigency must be dealt with on an individual basis and it must not be confused with other social problems, else it will damage the solution of these other social problems and not be helped itself. What are the causes of indigency? It can be community indigency or it can be individual indigency. The two are separate problems and likewise should not be confused if we wish to solve them. Community indigency is largely a problem of economics and should be kept in the field of economics for solution. The Federal Government can be of real assistance in solving the problem of community indigency, but primarily by working on the economic climate not through direct intervention. Direct intervention can create more problems than it solves.

Individual indigency is a separate thing and we must ponder over it more than we have. Jesus said the poor shall be always with us. I believe I understand what he meant and it wasn't community poverty he was referring to. I believe he was referring to the poor of mind or those poor in talents. We do have and always will have many people with IQ's below 90. People who are capable of mingling in society appearing to be as normal as anyone else in the society and yet, due to their poverty in human talents, a prey to anyone who would take advantage of them. I believe the poor must be cared for on an individual rather than upon a political basis. Administering to the poor has always been a great weapon for politicians in controlling elections. Administering to the poor should be a matter of charity, not politics, and I use the word charity in its finest sense.

I believe the poor, or the problem of individual indigency should be left essentially to our community chest agencies, to our churches. Government can help the indigent through the medium of these private agencies.

Fortunately, the problem of community indigency is being solved in the United States. There is much still to be done, but I believe our society is getting on top of this problem. The problems of human indigency are by no means beyond the abilities of the 98 percent of our people who are not individually indigent to care for. To do this, we must keep our thinking straight and keep the problems of the poor from being confused with other problems.

Much needs to be done in the field of health, but much is being done. The goose which produces the golden eggs must be nourished and cherished. Impatience and greed which the neo-Federalists exhibit and only in death and no more golden eggs.

Balancing the Budget and Reducing the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of calling to the attention of my colleagues that I have introduced House Joint Resolution 656 which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget.

Similar legislation, I should explain, has just been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

This proposal if adopted and made a part of the Constitution would end Federal deficit financing or, to put it another way, it would establish a policy of a balanced annual budget with a net annual reduction in the national debt of not less than \$500 million a year. The amendment would require that Congress not adjourn until provision has been made to balance the Government's annual revenue with its annual expenditure plus a minimum payment on the national debt. In the event of war or other grave emergency under the provisions of this proposed amendment to the Constitution, by vote of Congress operation of the balanced budget and reduction of debt could be suspended.

In previous remarks to the House, I have pointed out that paying off the national debt takes less taxpayers' dollars per year than continuing and paying interest over a period of 100 years.

All sorts of suggestions have been made to stiffen the backbone of Congress and force Members to either vote for more taxes or to vote for reduced appropriations. The only workable answer that I can envisage is embodied in House Joint Resolution 656 because it would write the policy into the Constitution and make fiscal responsibility mandatory.

Here is a plan in which every young American has a vital interest. I dedicate it to the grandchildren of America. In addition, let me add, it would assure victory in our forthcoming economic struggle with communism.

I hope other Members in both House and Senate will join in support of this important proposal.

Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while the subcommittee of which I am a member is studying the extension of the minimum wage and maximum hour law it might be good to have in the RECORD pertinent facts and data pertaining to the subject.

With the problem assured of some action this session, I believe the following information to be invaluable to the Members of Congress:

FACT SHEET ON THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT BY THE AFL-CIO DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH

The Fair Labor Standards Act (wage-hour law) should be revised to (1) extend its coverage to millions of workers now not protected, and (2) increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour. This sheet lists briefly several of the basic background facts. The following pages present additional details.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

To how many workers? Some 20 million workers are not now covered, but about 11

million of them are in small business or purely intrastate operations essentially outside the scope of Federal law. The remaining nearly 9 million should be covered.

Why? They are largely in industries with low wages or excessive hours. They need the protection of fair labor standards. Over 3 million of them are today being paid less than \$1.25 an hour.

Who are they? They are mainly workers in large firms or in certain specially exempted operations. The largest group are some 4½ million workers in large retail firms. Details on the different groups are on the following pages.

What bill would meet the need? The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) has been endorsed by the AFL-CIO. It would extend coverage of the wage-hours law to cover 7½ million workers.

INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE TO \$1.25

Current minimum outdated

The existing minimum of \$1 an hour, enacted 4 years ago, should be updated to keep in step with rises in wage advances received by most of the country's workers, the cost of living and increases in the Nation's productivity.

Current minimum inadequate

The \$1 minimum is not enough to permit a decent American standard of living. Moral and social considerations require a more adequate minimum.

Increase would benefit the economy

An increased minimum wage would provide increased buying power for low-income families and thereby generate needed increases in business activity and employment.

Extension of coverage—overall picture

	Number of workers
Now covered by FLSA.....	24, 000, 000
Not covered because in intrastate or small business.....	11, 300, 000
Agricultural workers on large farms.....	1, 100, 000
To be covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.....	7, 600, 000
Total not covered.....	20, 000, 000

¹ Special separate legislation is to be considered on extending coverage to farmworkers.

² This does not include certain other groups also uncovered: (1) proprietors, self-employed and unpaid family labor, (2) Government employees, and (3) executive, professional, and administrative employees.

WHO WILL BE COVERED BY KENNEDY-MORSE-ROOSEVELT BILL

The more than 7½ million workers who would be brought under the FLSA by the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill are largely (a) employees of large firms in industries (notably retail and services) which have escaped inclusion under the act so far, and (b) employees in parts of industries which have held on to special exemptions (such as logging and canning) or which have succeeded avoiding coverage because of the acts restricted definition of coverage (as in the case of wholesale trade).

About 60 percent of the workers to be covered are in retail trade. Some 25 percent are in hotels, laundries and other services, wholesale trade, and construction. The remainder are in such varied industries as logging, local transit, taxicab, telephone, and water transportation.

The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would cover them by (1) changing certain unduly narrow definitions of coverage; (2) specifically including large enterprises in certain industries; and (3) eliminating various exemptions.

The large retail and service enterprises to which the bill would extend coverage are those which do \$500,000 or more annual business (or if they do over \$50,000 business with industrial customers). So-called "mom-and-pop" shops are also explicitly excluded; smaller retail and service firms would remain uncovered.

WHY COVERAGE SHOULD BE EXTENDED

Denial of legal protection has meant that many uncovered workers are paid pitifully low wages or are required to work excessive hours without overtime pay. Their wage and hours standards have lagged far behind those of the economy as a whole.

Of the over 7½ million workers to whom the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would extend coverage, about 3 million still are paid less than \$1.25 an hour.

Theoretically, uncovered workers are (a) in small local operations and (b) are supposed to be protected by State minimum wage laws.

Actually, (a) many of them are not in tiny enterprises but in large retail, service, and other corporations which can well meet the national minimum wage and hours standards and (b) the States have with few exceptions been unable or unwilling to provide adequate minimum wage protection for workers not covered by the Federal law.

SUMMARY OF GROUPS OF WORKERS COVERED BY KENNEDY-MORSE-ROOSEVELT BILL

The following is a brief listing of specific groups of workers not now covered by the FLSA who would be brought under its protection by the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.

Retail trade:

Not now covered by FLSA.....	6, 920, 000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.....	4, 500, 000

Special exemption for retailers and the present definitions of interstate commerce now exclude some 97 percent of retail workers from coverage.

The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would cover workers in large retail companies. It defines large retail enterprises as those with annual sales of \$500,000 or more (or which have \$50,000 annual sales to industrial customers).

Hotels:

Not now covered by FLSA.....	461, 000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.....	240, 000

Hotels now have the same exemptions as retailers, regardless of their size. The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would extend coverage to about half of all hotel workers by applying the FLSA to large hotel operations, those which do an annual business of \$500,000 or more (which would mean an average of \$1,400 every day).

Wholesale trade:

Not now covered by FLSA.....	797, 000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.....	270, 000

Over two-thirds of the Nation's wholesale workers are already covered by the act, but the present restricted definition of interstate commerce excludes the others. The change proposed by the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would bring protection to about a third of those now excluded.

Laundries and dry cleaning:

Not now covered by FLSA.....	522, 000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.....	210, 000

Laundries now have the same exemption as retailers. The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would extend coverage to workers in the large commercial and industrial laundries and cleaners, those which do \$250,000 or more annual business or those with industrial business at least equal to 15 percent of their volume. The small home laundry and the

neighborhood dry cleaner would continue exempt.

Construction:

Not now covered by FLSA..... 1,616,000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill..... 1,205,000

The present acts coverage of construction workers is limited mainly to work on facilities used in interstate commerce. The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would cover construction firms which do annual business of \$50,000 or more.

Logging:

Not now covered by FLSA..... 86,000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill..... 86,000

The present act exempt logging firms with 12 or fewer employees, supposedly because such small companies could not otherwise compete with large companies. In practice this exemption for small firms has been used by large ones to evade the purpose of the law: they have subcontracted their work to small, uncovered firms instead of giving it to their covered workers.

The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would correct this evasion by eliminating the exemption and thereby covering all logging employees.

Telephone exchanges:

Not now covered by FLSA..... (1)
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill..... (1)

*The Labor Department has estimated that 47,000 telephone operators are exempt. The communications workers estimate that 22,000 are exempt. A major proportion would be covered by the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.

The original FLSA did not exempt any telephone operators. In 1939, the law was amended to exempt operators working in exchanges with less than 500 stations and in 1949 the exemption was extended with 750 stations. Large independent companies have taken advantage of the exemption.

The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would modify this exemption to apply only where telephone service is provided through a switchboard located in the operator's home.

Seafood processing:

Not now covered by FLSA..... 22,000
Covered by Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill..... 22,000

The present act covers fish canning workers but exempts other fish processing workers. The Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would eliminate this differing treatment by covering all seafood processing workers.

Other uncovered groups:

Among the other uncovered groups to which the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill would extend coverage are workers in miscellaneous service industries (365,000 workers), financial firms (120,000), newspapers (17,000), water transportation (100,000), transit (65,000), taxicabs (50,000), miscellaneous manufacturing (100,000), and miscellaneous transportation and warehousing (110,000).

INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE TO \$1.25

Current minimum outdated

The present \$1 an hour minimum lags behind the times in many respects. An increase to at least \$1.25 is needed to up-date it.

(1) General wage movements: The minimum should be raised to keep pace with advances in the wage structure generally. In 1949, when the minimum was put at 75 cents, the average hourly pay for industrial workers was \$1.40, so that there was a gap of 65 cents between the minimum at the average.

In the 9 years since then, the minimum has been raised only 25 cents to \$1, while the average has gone up 79 cents, to \$2.19. The gap is now \$1.19.

Even an increase in the minimum to \$1.25 would only reduce the gap to 94 cents (\$1.25 minimum as against \$2.19 average), a gap still substantially larger than in 1949.

(2) Cost of living and productivity: The \$1 minimum has also fallen out of date because of increases in the cost of living and advances in national productivity.

If Congress does nothing more than merely adjust the minimum to take account of cost-of-living rises and national productivity movements, it would have to raise the minimum to about \$1.25.

From mid-1955, when Congress enacted the \$1 minimum, until January 1959, the cost of living has increased 8.2 percent. On productivity, the U.S. Labor Department has calculated the annual rate of productivity improvement in postwar years as 3.4 percent to 3.9 percent. Applying the annual rate compounded for the 4 years 1955-59, the allowance for national productivity advances would be 14.3 percent to 16.6 percent.

Applying the cost of living change (\$1 times 8.2 percent equals \$1.082) and the productivity trend (\$1.082 times 14.3 percent equals \$1.237 and times 16.6 percent equals \$1.262) the \$1 minimum should be adjusted to about \$1.25.

It should be noted that in major higher-wage industries, this rise in the cost of living has meant compensating wage adjustments of over 18 cents, and increases to share in productivity advances over the same period have been over 26 cents, to make a total of 44 cents an hour, as compared to the 25 cents increase involved in raising the minimum to \$1.25.

Current minimum inadequate

The objective of the minimum wage law is to enable a "standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers." The present \$1 minimum is far short of this standard.

For a full year's work of 2,000 hours, the \$1 minimum means \$2,000, which is less than the minimum income estimated by various States as necessary for a minimum living standard for a single self-supporting woman with no dependents. The State of Washington's calculations, for example, indicate that at least \$2,900 a year is now necessary for a single woman's minimum budget. This is \$1.45 an hour for a full year.

The income needed to support a family decently is of course larger. The Labor Department's "City Worker's Family Budget," which measures how much is needed for a "modest but adequate" standard of living for a family of four, indicates that \$2.25 an hour is necessary for such a standard.

Moral and social considerations require that the \$1 minimum be raised. Decent family life is all but impossible on such a minimum or if several members of a family are forced to work in order to eke out a mere subsistence for the family.

Moreover, low wages are a drain on society. Low income and its miseries breed disease, slums, and degraded living, crime, and other social ills, the costs of which are borne by the public. An increased minimum wage is a significant element in combating such social problems.

INCREASE WOULD BENEFIT THE ECONOMY

A higher minimum wage would also benefit the Nation economically. It would provide increased buying power for low-income families. It would mean enlarged markets for consumer goods, increased business activity for small retailers and for the economy as a whole.

This type of boost for economic activity would aid the recovery from the 1957-58 economic recession and help provide job opportunities to reduce the present high level of unemployment.

A Proposal To Establish Clinics for Narcotic Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for Federal assistance to the States for the establishment and operation of outpatient clinics for narcotic addicts. These clinics would follow the British practice with regard to the gradual reduction method of the treatment and the furnishing of narcotics to persons whose addiction seems incurable.

Much has been said and written about the narcotic problem in this country, but we are no nearer a solution of it today than we have ever been. The illicit traffic in narcotics seems to increase from year to year, despite the fact that the Federal Narcotics Bureau and its agents are conducting a relentless fight against drug smugglers, peddlers, and pushers.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to cite some interesting statistics which give us a picture—though not a pretty picture—of this problem. These are official figures taken from testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee at its hearings on January 26, 1960, by Dr. H. J. Anslinger, the Commissioner of Narcotics, and his immediate assistants.

The total number of active narcotic addicts in the country as of December 31, 1959, was reported to be 45,391, divided as follows:

	Percent
Negro.....	26,146 57.6
White.....	11,703 25.8
Puerto Rican.....	3,889 8.6
Mexican.....	2,823 6.2
Others.....	830 1.8

They are divided into age groups as follows:

	Percent
Under 21 years.....	1,743 3.8
21 to 30 years.....	24,343 53.6
31 to 40 years.....	14,058 31.0
Over 40 years.....	5,247 11.6

On page 145 of the hearings cited above is a list of the number of addicts in all the States, from which I quote the following:

	Percent
New York.....	20,732 45.7
California.....	6,471 14.2
Illinois.....	6,191 13.6
Michigan.....	2,366 5.2
All others.....	9,631 21.2

Other States with a fairly large number of addicts are: Texas, 1,566; District of Columbia, 1,116; Missouri, 1,030; New Jersey, 892; Ohio, 619; Pennsylvania, 557; Louisiana, 434.

I might add that the exact number of addicts in the country is not known. It has usually been estimated at about 60,000, based on the number of persons who have been in contact with law-enforcement agencies. Dr. Charles W. Nick, secretary of the National Advisory Council on Narcotics, has cited one au-

thority who estimates "that there are three addicts who have not been in contact with the law for every one who has." The noted sociologist, Prof. Alfred R. Lindesmith, points out the interesting though regrettable fact that "even if one accepts the minimum estimate of addiction given—namely, the 60,000 figure—there appear to be more drug users in the United States than in all the rest of the Western World combined."

This is a very sad commentary on our society and civilization. Why should the United States, which has the highest standard of living in the world, have such a large number of drug addicts? Of course, I am especially perturbed over the fact that nearly half of the addicts in the country are in New York State. Where are we falling down on the job? Is it our approach to the whole problem that is wrong? Is it the treatment or lack of treatment that constitutes a major factor? Should we place the emphasis on jails, as we are presently doing, or on institutions? If institutions, what kind should it be—hospitals, clinics?

Mr. Speaker, I am no sociologist and do not consider myself an expert in the field of narcotics. My interest in this field stems from the time when I served on the bench as a city magistrate in New York where a number of narcotics cases came to my attention. Much of my information comes from reading some of the literature in this field, discussions with former colleagues on the bench, attorneys, and others. I was particularly impressed with a book on this subject "Who Live in Shadow," written by my very dear friend, Judge John M. Murtagh, chief city magistrate of New York, in collaboration with Sara Harris. On page 166 of the book we read:

Despite their own transgressions, and expressed decent sentiments toward addicts, the enforcement agencies vigorously demand ever harsher penalties and ever stiffer laws against addiction. What can they hope to accomplish with their stiffer laws? After all, the punitive, prohibitory approach to the drug problem has been the official policy of the United States for 40 years. No other country in the world has been so sadistic in dealing with addicts. Still there are more addicts in the United States today than in all the other western countries combined, and more juvenile users in New York City than in all of Europe.

Judge Murtagh believes that our present policy is ill conceived and that we should consider a change in attitude. I am strongly inclined to agree with him. In 1951, Congress passed the so-called Boggs law which increased penalties against narcotics violators, but the penalties seem to be hurting more the addicts than the dope racketeers. Our aim should be to break up the drug rings, the big operators and the illicit dealers, while those who are themselves victims of the drug should be aided in every possible way to regain human dignity and become rehabilitated.

Right now we have only two Federal hospitals in the whole country for treating narcotic addicts, one at Lexington, Ky., and the other at Fort Worth, Tex., with combined facilities for less than 2,500 addicts. The only other narcotics

hospital in the country is Riverside Hospital in New York City, which can accommodate about 180 addicts and is used exclusively for those under 21 years of age. Oddly enough, New York State, with 45.7 percent of all active narcotic addicts in the country, does not have a single rehabilitation center for the treatment of adult victims. It is well worth noting that the great majority of these people are never rehabilitated because the State courts cannot commit New York residents to Federal institutions.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we begin to recognize the drug addict what he really is, namely, a sick person who is badly in need of help and medical treatment, and not as a criminal who is to be thrown into jail and left there to rot. In other words, let us rightly consider it as a medical problem and separate it from the criminal phase of the overall problem. Let us provide the medical care and the rehabilitation for those who are themselves victims, and we shall be in a better position to check the whole problem, including the criminal phase of it.

Many experts in this field have in recent years called for the establishment of clinics to help in the care and rehabilitation of drug addicts by dispensing drugs, either free or at low cost, to those who cannot do without them. Commissioner Anslinger, however, is opposed to this experiment on the ground it would not work, citing an experience back in 1919. The fact is that that experience was of brief duration, but, even at that, some of the clinics were showing good results, yet the Treasury Department closed them all in 1924.

Since then 36 years have gone by and the Treasury Department has not changed its position in the matter. In the meantime, the number of addicts in the country has grown, the problem is greater than ever, and we are still pursuing the policy of jail treatment instead of a policy of medical treatment. I believe it is time for Dr. Anslinger and the Bureau of Narcotics to reconsider its stand on clinics, in the light of events since then, in the light of the seriousness of the problem, in the light of experiences abroad.

Let us look at the situation in Great Britain. There are no specialized institutions there for addicts. Treatment may be obtained in some public hospitals and several private nursing homes. An addict may obtain his supplies for the price of 1 shilling—about 14 cents—per prescription from a registered medical practitioner. One would think there would be wholesale abuse under this kind of a system, but how widespread is narcotic addiction in Britain? In its annual report to the United Nations Narcotic Commission, Britain reported in 1956 a total of 359 known addicts. The year before the total was 335. Washington, D.C., has more than three times as many drug addicts as all of Britain, while New York has 58 times as many. The United States has about three times the population of Britain, but more than 125 times the number of narcotic addicts. We should give serious thought to these facts.

Judge Murtagh in his book raises these questions:

Is there really anything in the moral law that suggests that we cannot ease the misery and suffering of an addict by the temporary, or if medically indicated, the continued administration of limited quantities of drugs? Indeed is it not rather a violation of the moral law to deny the addict the solace and comfort of the medical practitioner and thereby drive him into the hands of the underworld?

I think the answer to these questions is obvious. I am firmly convinced that if we establish clinics to treat the addicts and to give them limited quantities of drugs under medical care, we could certainly make considerable headway toward a diminution of this problem and toward eventual elimination of the drug menace which is threatening our youth in the larger cities.

Another achievement would be that we would be well on the road to driving out the racketeers and their billion-dollar racket which is thriving on human misery. This could be done by taking the profits out of the illicit drug trade and making it impossible for the racketeers to push their poisonous wares, because the addicts would no longer be dependent upon their mercies and would get the necessary help through legalized clinics.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of all these facts and reasons cited above that I am introducing a bill to establish clinics for drug addicts, somewhat along the British practice for narcotic treatment though not their system which is exclusively in the hands of the medical profession. My bill provides for the establishment of "narcotic addition clinics" for the treatment of addicts on an outpatient basis. Under this system, drugs would be made available under medical supervision to two types of addicts: First, to those who are capable of leading a fairly normal and useful life as long as they are forced to take a certain drug but not otherwise; second, to those who are undergoing treatment for addiction by the gradual reduction method.

The bill calls for an appropriation of \$5 million for the coming year to be used as grants-in-aid to States for the construction and operation of such clinics. These grants are to be made to the States on the basis of their addict population, financial need, and State effort. The States receiving such grants will be required to provide an equal amount of funds for the same purpose. In other words, this is to be a joint Federal-State endeavor. The bill also provides that the Surgeon General shall have the authority to make grants to the individual States on the basis of regulations prescribed by him in consultation with State health authorities.

Of special concern to me is the safeguarding of the youth of our country. Young people will not become victims of the racketeers and be subjected to their solicitation if those already tainted can be treated at the clinics, turned into useful citizens and prevented from becoming habitues of the drug habit. My bill aims to prevent drug addiction of youths by removing the profit motive in narcotic trafficking by racketeers.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that adoption of this bill will help to curtail the havoc being created in thousands of families where some member becomes the victim of dope peddlers. If we can succeed in eliminating the profit motive from the drug market, even partially, we will have made great progress on the road toward eventual curtailment and elimination of this dreaded menace. I urge the committee to give early and very serious consideration to this measure.

Irvine C. Porter Presented Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, an elaborately engraved and gold-inlaid rifle bearing the serial number 1,000,000 was presented by President Joseph V. Falcon, of the Savage Arms Corp., at Chicopee Falls, Mass., to President Irvine C. Porter, of the National Rifle Association of America, during a luncheon yesterday at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington.

This rifle, which will become part of the permanent firearms collection at the National Rifle Association headquarters in Washington, commemorates production of the millionth Savage model 99 lever-action big-game rifle, invented in 1893 by Arthur W. Savage.

Among those witnessing the presentation was a 62-year-old gentleman, Lucien Dugre, of Chicopee Falls, who had helped to produce this one millionth rifle for Savage Arms Corp. Mr. Dugre is the oldest Savage Arms employee in point of service, having been with the corporation for 47 years.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask that the speeches of Mr. Falcon and Mr. Porter be printed in the Appendix.

REMARKS BY MR. JOSEPH V. FALCON, PRESIDENT SAVAGE ARMS CORP.

President Porter and distinguished guests, we at Savage welcome you today and appreciate deeply your joining us to celebrate this milestone in the history of the Savage Arms Corp., the manufacture of our millionth Savage 99.

We are especially grateful, Mr. Porter, to you and the National Rifle Association for cooperating with us in commemorating this event.

This cooperation is altogether fitting when we consider the aims and goals of the National Rifle Association as stated each month on the masthead of their official journal, the American Rifleman. This reads, in part:

"The NRA's purposes are to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of firearms; to foster a knowledge of small arms and the ability to use them among members of law-enforcement agencies and the armed services, and all other citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; to promote social welfare and public safety, law and order, and the national defense. Membership in NRA is available to any reputable citizen of the United States."

These are exemplary goals. They are goals to which we at Savage and the users of our products—many of whom are NRA members—can heartily subscribe. In fact, the Savage 99—a sporting rifle for civilian sportsmen—could have been developed and have enjoyed such outstanding success only in a society of free men, whose right to bear arms is unimpaired.

This rifle is part of the American tradition of recreational shooting—a tradition based on the premise that the lawful ownership of firearms must not be denied American citizens of good repute, so long as they continue to use such arms for lawful purposes.

Charlie DuBuisson has touched upon some of the highlights of the history of the 99. Vice President Jack Knobe has spoken of a few aspects of its manufacture.

I believe the deep significance underlying the production of the millionth Savage 99 is especially apparent to all of us here today, as well as to Americans, generally. The millionth 99 perhaps is indicative of important basic values in the life of Americans.

The 99 was designed by an American and has always been made in America. Production of 1 million 99's has been made possible because of our American way of life in which management and labor work side by side for mutual benefit. If I may put it another way, the Savage 99 is the result of the happy combination of American inventiveness and craftsmanship which flourishes under our free enterprise system.

Production of the one-millionth 99 rifle is an event of considerable importance to us at Savage. Beyond this, we feel that it is a landmark in the American sporting arms industry. The lever action rifle, of which the 99 is one outstanding example, is a type indigenous to this country. It was designed and built by Americans for the needs and preferences of American sportsmen. That the 99 is known and respected the world over reflects credit on the entire American sporting arms industry.

With this in mind, we at Savage are proud and happy that the one-millionth 99 will be in the care of such an outstanding and representative organization as the National Rifle Association of America.

President Porter, on behalf of the Savage Arms Corp., I present to you the one-millionth production model of the Savage 99. It is most appropriate that this symbolic model be presented to the National Rifle Association of America to become a part of its historic collection at national headquarters here in our Nation's Capital.

REMARKS BY IRVINE C. PORTER, PRESIDENT NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, UPON RECEIVING THE MILLIONTH SAVAGE MODEL 99 RIFLE

Mr. Chairman, president of Savage, distinguished guests, and friends of NRA, this is, indeed, a historic occasion, and those of us from the National Rifle Association, who are privileged to be here today, are deeply grateful to Savage Arms Corp. for making this event possible.

I agree with you that the production of the millionth model 99 Savage rifle represents a landmark in American sporting arms industry, and that it does truly indicate that which is possible under the system of free enterprise which now exists in our country.

The production of the millionth model 99 by Savage points the way for America in the years ahead. What has been done in the past by vigorous and enterprising men in a free country charts with more than reasonable certainty what can and likely will be done in the future under such a system.

The constitutional right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms is a substantial and integral part of that system. This fact is important to Savage. It is likewise important to the National Rifle Association and it is basically important to this country.

Any inroads which are made on this right, however slight, circumscribe and undermine the ability of the people to protect and maintain the system of free enterprise under which it has been possible for Savage to develop, manufacture, and sell a million rifles of this particular model.

If this right had not existed in this country, it is reasonably certain that we would not have had the privilege of participating in this memorable event today. Likewise, it is certain that if this right is nullified or destroyed in the future, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for America to long thereafter remain free.

I am happy and delighted, therefore, on behalf of the National Rifle Association, its officers and members, to accept from you and Savage Arms Corp., the millionth model 99 lever-action rifle produced by your company. This rifle will become a part of the collection of historic firearms maintained by the National Rifle Association at its national headquarters in the Capital City of a great race of people known as the free and the brave.

We've Got To Have Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long regarded the junior college idea as one important approach to our Nation's growing educational needs, particularly at the post-high school level. In this Congress and in the preceding Congress I introduced legislation to provide assistance to the States in expanding their systems of community junior colleges. My bill, H.R. 967, is currently before the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial on the subject of junior colleges which appeared recently in the East Oregonian, published in Pendleton, Oreg., March 8, 1960:

WE'VE GOT TO HAVE JUNIOR COLLEGES

"He went to Oregon State College. He flunked out there. Then he went to Eastern Oregon College. He learned to study there and got good grades. Now he is back at Oregon State and he isn't having a bit of trouble." The young man's mother told that story recently. We hear it frequently, the only alterations being "she" instead of "he," and "Southern Oregon College" instead of "E.O.C."

What are educators learning from this story? There are varying interpretations. There is one common conclusion. It is that Oregon should be getting into a junior college program. California has a great number of junior colleges. Washington has 10. Oregon has only one institution that serves as a junior college, Central Oregon College at Bend. It is, under Oregon law, identified as a community college rather than a junior college.

Why has Oregon been so slow to get into a junior college program? Oregon's community college law places, we think, a burden upon local school districts that they have not been willing to assume. A school district or combination of school districts must furnish the buildings for a community college and must pay one-third of the operating costs. The Bend School District has had

a most difficult time keeping its community college in operation.

School districts throughout the State have had to build many additional elementary school classrooms and more recently additional high school classrooms. They have had to employ more teachers for those classrooms. The burden upon property taxpayers in many districts has been immense. They have shown either no interest in community colleges or a violent reaction to the program.

If a junior college program is going to develop in Oregon it must have the encouragement of executives of all the State's 4-year institutions of higher education. There are two aspects of this. In a recent issue of the Oregonian, Malcolm Bauer, associate editor of that newspaper, wrote of one:

"Unless college plant and faculty establishments of both private and public colleges can be expanded much more swiftly than anyone thinks possible, an increasing proportion of those who want to go to college and who could benefit from college study, will and the normal paths closed to them."

No one would seriously question the colleges' policy of basing admission standards on ability. But it should be a matter of public concern that hundreds of boys and girls qualified for education beyond high school may find opportunity closed to them in coming years. And they won't be ready for the labor market at 18; employment age is rising.

This prospect should be of particular concern in Oregon, because this State has lagged in providing productive alternatives to the conventional 4-year college career.

The other important aspect of the junior college program which cannot escape executives of 4-year institutions is the opportunity it affords to care for the student who is not ready to undertake a well defined program in a 4-year college, not ready because he does not know whether he can do college work, not ready because he is not sufficiently adjusted to leave home, or not ready because he has not decided upon a major course of study. The 4-year institutions in Oregon are admitting hundreds of students every year who have one or more than one of those deficiencies. It is costly for the college to register those students, provide teachers, classrooms, laboratories and dormitories for them, struggle with their problems, and flunk them out.

They can be put through the process at much less expense at home in junior colleges. Most important, the chances that they will go beyond a term or a year of education beyond high school are far greater in a junior college than in a 4-year college. And the chances are good that many will be so well prepared in junior colleges that they will do good work when they move on to 4-year colleges.

The Oregon Legislature and Oregon's 4-year colleges must take a new and harder look at this. Every means possible to encourage local school districts to establish junior colleges must be found.

Restoration of Freedom to the Captive Nations of Central and Eastern Europe

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with numerous Members of Congress by introducing the concur-

rent resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations. My action, like those of my colleagues, is intended to show the peoples of the world our constant desire for freedom for all mankind by holding out the firm and unshakable hope in the eventual triumph of freedom over tyranny.

Certainly, it is fitting and proper for Congress to remind the President, as he approaches the forthcoming summit conference, of our constant interest in the restoration of freedom of the nations now held against their wills behind the Iron Curtain. I especially remind the President of the tragic consequences—not only for the United States but for millions of free people—of the diplomatic failures of our Presidents at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Certainly, the policy of firmness that President Eisenhower will display at the coming summit meeting with Soviet Dictator Khrushchev is necessary so that worthwhile progress might be achieved. Appeasement is always a failure. President Theodore Roosevelt, in his policy of "speak softly but carry a big stick," set sound fundamental precepts for our conduct of foreign affairs that, when followed, always have been successful.

The people of the world must not be misled by any Soviet propaganda statements before, during, or after the coming conference. The Communists' plans for worldwide conquest are so apparent to all of us that we must not mistake their pious gestures of peace to mean a change in their fundamental philosophy.

Teachers' Salary Amendment Needed to House Committee-Approved Education-Aid Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1960, the House Committee on Education and Labor ordered reported a commendable, if slightly inadequate, education-aid measure providing for a 3-year, \$975-million program of grants to the States for school construction. Regrettably, the bill makes no provision for funds with which to assist the States in bringing teachers' salaries more in line with wages paid in comparable professions.

The \$1.8 billion school aid bill approved by the Senate on February 4, 1960, calls for, I think, a much more meaningful and realistic program. Providing aid for school construction and teachers' salaries at the rate of \$917 million a year for 2 years, the Senate-passed measure would contribute materially to attracting and holding the caliber of qualified teacher required to meet our ever-increasing national educational needs and demands.

It has been said, and I would like to echo, with emphasis, that too often persons appointed to teaching positions are unprepared, and if they do learn to teach well they very often learn at the expense of our children.

There not only is a painful shortage of school classrooms, of which I am sure all are aware, but there also is an acute shortage of qualified teachers. Why? To a large degree, because of low teachers' salaries. Low salaries frequently mean low morale, and the subsequent loss of good teachers.

It is a well-known fact, I believe, that in our economy, as well as any other economy, salaries are a major factor in determining choice of career. Unless the American public consents to elevate the salaries of its teachers to a professional level, the field of education will continue to lose talented, qualified, and interested personnel to other fields of endeavor.

As school enrollments relentlessly grow, we must meet the formidable, but not insuperable, challenge, of providing the necessary classroom space, facilities, and qualified teachers.

Teaching currently offers too little economic return and professional opportunity to recruit the number and quality of college graduates needed; and, the problem will become greater as enrollments expand and more teachers are required.

As a former educator, I know that teachers, as has been reported, are the most school going group in the country. Although their salaries for many years have been lower or only slightly higher than the earnings of all workers, the training of the majority of teachers is at a professional level.

Three out of four classroom teachers are expected by their school systems to take additional college courses periodically, with little or no added compensation. However, in other fields advanced education merits greater reward. Outside the field of education a premium is given for college study, particularly beyond a bachelor's degree. In school systems differentials for advanced training are small.

Based on reliable studies, many college graduates in other professions, 10 years after graduation, earn more than double the salaries of beginners. On the other hand, classroom teachers after 10 years earn less than 50 percent above beginners.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to consider very seriously the absolute advisability of amending the education-aid measure recently approved by the House Education and Labor Committee to include a teachers' pay provision.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the study and consideration of my colleague a factually interesting study prepared in 1959 by F. J. Seidner of the Public Affairs Institute relating to the Nation's current classroom and teacher shortage:

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

In January of this year the U.S. Office of Education released the findings of its annual survey of public schools. The results of the survey indicate that despite an increased effort on the part of the States, the school situation is still deteriorating.

The survey showed that 5.4 percent of the 33,936,000 pupils in the Nation's public schools, or 1,843,000 students, were in "excess of normal school capacity."¹

Of the 1,843,000 students in excess of normal capacity 67.8 percent were in elementary schools and 32.2 percent were in secondary schools. A great reduction in excess pupils in Alabama from 1957 to 1958 had a major effect on the national total. The country as a whole, excluding Alabama, showed an increase of 7.5 percent in excess pupils over the previous year. The reduction of 225,000 excess pupils reported by Alabama, however, caused the national total to show a decrease of 5.1 percent. The Office of Education's survey also demonstrated that although 71,600 classrooms were completed last year the classroom shortage was reduced by a mere 1 percent.

Anticipated total classroom construction for this year is only 68,400, 4.4 percent less than last, even though classrooms are being abandoned for obsolescence at an accelerated rate. In the 1957-58 school year 17,300 instruction rooms were abandoned, 10.3 percent more than the year before. The survey was completed before the catastrophic parochial school fire in Chicago on December 1, 1958. That disaster spurred a drive to eliminate potentially hazardous buildings, and large numbers of classrooms have since been condemned as unsafe. The Office of Education's compilation reports a need for 140,500 additional classrooms, 65,300 for enrollment increases and 72,200 to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

It is clear even from these figures compiled by the administration that school buildings are not being built at a fast enough rate to keep up with rising school enrollment, not to mention reducing the backlog or improving school standards. Annual increases in enrollment are currently estimated at 1.3 million.

The 68,400 classrooms scheduled to be completed this year will almost certainly fall short of the requirement for enrollment increases (estimated at 44,500 rooms in the survey) and to replace obsolete classrooms.

The usefulness of the data given by the Office of Education is limited by its reliance upon varying State standards and application of definitions. Because States report conditions according to their own interpretations of "normal" conditions, it is likely that the figures presented understate the extent of actual need.

The figure of 140,500 given for classroom shortage is considerably below estimates made by other sources, some of which put the number of additional classrooms needed at over 300,000. In a study financed by a \$3 million congressional grant, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself placed the figure at 312,000 in 1952. The mysterious decline in the intervening years is not attributable to school construction.

¹ The Office of Education sets no standards of normal capacity itself. Its statistical data are based on reports from the States and are dependent solely on State and locally determined standards of class size, capacity, etc. Local standards generally prevail as few States attempt to set overall standards. The questionnaire sent to the States by the Office of Education says, "the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity includes pupils exceeding the number that can be accommodated without multiple sessions, in the instruction rooms of accessible publicly owned school plants in use, according to State and local standards of normal capacity. For the purposes of this report, the excess enrollment in one school is not to be reduced by any unused capacity in another."

Overcrowded schools are not a problem restricted to any section of the country, to low income areas, or to urban centers alone. It is true, however, that due to population shifts urban and suburban areas and some parts of the country have been particularly affected. Especially badly hit are States like California to which there has been a vast migration of population. A large percentage of school buildings in use in our larger cities are obsolescent firetraps built before 1900. They often have no libraries, cafeterias, or other basic facilities.

It is well known that the effectiveness of classroom instruction is drastically reduced when crowded conditions prevail. Educators generally agree that elementary school classes should be no larger than 30 pupils per class and that secondary schools should have classes of no larger than 25. Yet a National Education Association survey of the 1957-58 school year showed that 6,800,000 elementary school pupils in urban school districts, or 55 percent of the total, were in classes of more than 30 pupils each. Over half a million students were in classes of over 40 each. And about 300,000 children were on half day sessions. These numbers are continuing to grow.

It is important to point out, even at the risk of belaboring the obvious, that overcrowded classrooms affect every child involved. Statistics tend to be misleading by stressing "excess" pupils. But in a class of 40, while only 10 children are labeled "excess," the remaining 30 are equally affected.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

The shortage of qualified teachers is at least as pressing as the shortage of classroom space. The Nation has been unwilling to offer sufficient financial remuneration or status to draw enough qualified persons into the teaching profession. In the fall of 1958 there were 1,301,000 full- and part-time public school classroom teachers, 812,000 in the elementary schools and 489,000 in the high schools. The Office of Education estimated the total teacher shortage to be 132,000, or about 10 percent of the total. The quantity deficiency of teachers has been over 100,000 every year since World War II.

All States require certification of persons teaching in the public schools. Because of the shortage of qualified teachers, emergency or "substandard" certificates are issued to teachers who fail to meet regular standards. The standards themselves vary from State to State. In the fall of 1958, according to the Office of Education, there were 92,000 persons teaching on an emergency basis with substandard certificates, a slight increase over the previous year. Of these, 68,156 were in elementary schools and 24,181 in secondary schools.

On the basis of 30 pupils per classroom in elementary schools and 25 in secondary schools, the Office of Education estimates that 2,649,000 pupils—7.8 percent of total enrollment—were taught by teachers with emergency credentials. Twenty-nine percent of elementary school teachers do not have bachelors' degrees. Even some of these, however, meet State certification requirements. Two years of college is sufficient for an elementary school teaching certificate in a fourth of the States.

The large number of emergency teachers does not, by itself, present the whole picture of the teacher shortage. The number of additional teachers needed to fill vacant positions and to reduce class size and workload must also be considered.

The total number of persons preparing each year at the bachelor degree level for a teaching career is insufficient to meet the quantitative need for teachers, let alone to upgrade standards. In 1957-58, 95,000 public school teachers left the profession. At the same time, the colleges graduated 116,000

qualified new teachers, but only 84,000 of these actually entered teaching.

For a number of reasons, of which low pay is certainly not the least, only about 70 percent of those preparing to teach become teachers. Of those prepared to teach high school physics or chemistry no more than 60 percent become teachers. These graduates are obviously lured to more lucrative fields of employment. There is generally a greater shortage of elementary school teachers than secondary school teachers. Here again, pay is a factor, high school salaries generally being the higher of the two.

The average salary of all classroom teachers in the United States is less than \$4,800. Only 20 percent of all teachers earn as much as \$5,000 and 17.5 percent of all teachers are paid annual salaries of less than \$3,500. The average annual salary for elementary school teachers for 1958-59 was \$4,575, the average for high school teachers was \$5,110.

Salaries vary considerably by States and sections of the country. The average annual salaries of instructional staff (teachers, principals, supervisors, etc.) in 1958-59 was \$5,992 in the far Western States including Alaska, but only \$3,882 in the Southeastern States, a difference of \$2,110. The New England States averaged \$4,981, the Middle Atlantic \$5,709, the Middle West \$4,978, the Southwest \$4,642, and the Northwest \$4,186. Alaska's average salaries were the highest at \$6,400, followed by New York State at \$6,200 and California at \$6,050. Mississippi was the lowest at \$3,070, Arkansas the second lowest at \$3,270.

There is a direct relationship between teachers' salary levels and amounts of training. School districts with higher salaries have better qualified teachers. As a teacher can transfer locations with relatively small difficulty, higher salaries or other incentives draw teachers to the better school systems. The teacher shortage is most acute among rural school districts where salaries are generally lower and working conditions not as favorable.

The average income of teachers is far below that of most other professional persons. Only the income of clergymen, librarians, and dietitians is less. It is lower than the average income of all employees in manufacturing as well as the average income of all the civilian employees of the Federal Government. It is only slightly higher than the average income of all persons working for wages or salaries.

Beginning salaries offered teachers are also far below those paid to college graduates in other fields. Graduates in teaching could expect an average starting salary of \$3,650 in 1958. Average beginning salaries paid college graduates—both men and women—in all fields was \$4,758, over \$1,000 more. For graduates with a scientific background starting salaries averaged well over \$5,000. With differences of this magnitude the prevailing shortage of teachers becomes easier to understand.

Studies made by the National Education Association conclude that teachers' salaries should be at least 60 percent above the present average level to meet any reasonable estimate of a professional level of compensation. And Dr. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said recently that a 100-percent increase in teachers' salaries within the next 5 or 10 years was a reasonable national goal.

Until salaries are raised to an adequate level it will continue to be exceedingly difficult to draw competent young persons into teaching, or to retain qualified teachers. Standards for teachers have been held down by salary levels, and will not go up until salaries are raised.

About 118,000 teachers left the schools in 1957-58. Although 20 percent of them re-

mained in teaching, others left for a variety of reasons, a substantial number entering other employment. Many trained teachers now working in other professions could be brought back into teaching by raising salaries. The same is true of many nonworking housewives who are qualified teachers and who would return to work if provided with adequate incentives.

**Greater Boston, Mass., Labor Council
AFL-CIO Supports H.R. 9070**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Stephen E. McCloskey, executive secretary of the Greater Boston, Mass., Labor Council, AFL-CIO:

GREATER BOSTON, MASS.,
LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO,
Boston, Mass., March 21, 1960.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in behalf of the 30,000 building and construction tradesmen who, in addition to being members of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, are also members of our organization in the Greater Boston area.

We are concerned with one of the principal defects of the Taft-Hartley Act; which places inequitable restrictions on the economic activity of building and construction trades unions, at the site of the building and construction job.

Building trades workers are presently denied the basic freedom of peaceful picketing accorded to other union members, as the result of the U.S. Supreme Court interpretation of section 8(b)(4) of the Taft-Hartley Act in the *Denver Building & Construction Trades Council 341, U.S. 675*.

We are in accord with the views expressed by President Eisenhower, when he first recommended the reversal of the *Denver Building Trades* rule in his message of January 11, 1954, wherein he stated:

"I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against . . . an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the projects, will not be treated as a secondary boycott."

We believe that the broad language of section 8(b)(4) is not consistent with the economic facts of the building & construction industry and in connection therewith, we call to your attention the language in Senate Report No. 1211, 83d Congress, 2d session, the following part of which we approve:

"Where two or more employers are engaged in operations on the site of a single construction project, each performing some phase of the work necessary for the completion of the project, be it a building, a bridge, a tunnel, or some other structure, it cannot be justifiably maintained that they stand in a strictly neutral relationship to each other. Rather, despite their existence as legally independent entities, they must be regarded realistically as partners in a single joint or common enterprise in which the individual interests of each are necessarily

dependent on the success of the undertaking as a whole. In such a situation the committee believes that a labor dispute originating between one of these employers and his employees in fact constitutes a dispute with all of the employers just as if all were co-partners in the legal sense in a single business enterprise."

Therefore, we urge you to support H.R. 9070, which was introduced by the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Congressman from New Jersey.

Please give this legislation every consideration.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN E. McCLOSKEY,
Executive Secretary.

Our World in Miniature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the *Methodist Story* of August 1959. It was sent to me by Mr. Harvey Beckendorf of Franklin, Tex., a member of the Methodist Church before whom I had the pleasure of speaking not too long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article has a moral, and I commend it to my colleagues:

A PICTURE OF MANKIND'S RELATIVE SHARES OF MATERIAL PROSPERITY

(By Henry Smith Lelper)

If, in imagination, we compress the present population of the world, now over 2½ billion, into a group of a thousand persons living in a single town, the following is the picture of contrasts we would then vividly see.

Sixty persons would represent the U.S. population; all others would be represented by 940. The 60 Americans would have half the total income of the entire town; the 940 would share the other half.

Thirty-six of the Americans in the town would be Christian Church members, and 24 would not. In the town as a whole, about 300 would be Christians and 700 would not. At least 80 persons in the whole town would be believing Communists and 370 would be under Communist domination. Possibly 70 in the whole town would be Protestant Christians.

Three hundred and three persons in the whole town would be white; 697 would be nonwhite. The 60 Americans would have an average life expectancy of 70 years, all the other 940 would average under 40.

The Americans would have 15½ times as much per person as all the rest on an average. They would produce 16 percent of the town's total food supply, eat up 14½ percent of that total supply and keep most of the remaining 1½ percent for their future use in expensive storage equipment. When it is remembered that most of the 940 non-Americans in the town would always be hungry and never know quite when they would get enough to eat, the situation created by this disparity in food supply and the existence of vast reserves becomes fairly apparent, particularly in view of the fact that the Americans already eat 72 percent above the optimum food requirements. They could actually save money by giving

away excess food because of the cost of storing it; but they think that would be a dangerous giveaway program of self-headed dogooders.

The 60 Americans would have of the town's total supply: 12 times as much electric power as all the rest; 22 times as much coal; 21 times as much petroleum; 50 times as much steel, and 50 times as much in general equipment.

The lowest income groups among the 60 Americans would be better off than the average in much of the rest of the town.

Literally most of the non-American people in the town would be poor, hungry, sick and ignorant. Almost half would not be able to read or write.

More than half would never have heard of Christ or what he stood for. But very soon more than half would be hearing about Karl Marx.

In view of these facts it is interesting to think that the average Christian American family would be spending \$850 a year for defense in force, and less than \$3.50 a year to share with the rest of the people in the town the knowledge of why there is any Christmas.

OUR ANSWER TO THE WORLD'S NEED FOR CHRIST

The position of Christian America is vividly shown in "Our World in Miniature." The chart below measures the value the American people are placing on their churches.

A Methodist expresses his concern for the evangelization of the world, the Christian nurture of its people, and service in Christ's name all through world service. This is basic. He may enlarge on this foundation through advance specials and offerings or gifts for many specific causes.

Where we put our money

Personal consumption expenditures in the United States of America in 1957:

	Billion
Crime	\$22.0
Clothing and accessories, except footwear	20.8
Gambling	20.0
Education	19.7
Medical care and death expenses	16.3
Recreation	15.9
Automobiles (purchases, new and used)	14.5
Accidents	11.9
Alcoholic beverages	10.7
Advertising	10.3
Tobacco	6.0
Religion and welfare	3.6

Hungarian Freedom Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people have not always enjoyed freedom, but they have always had the burning desire to be free and have always been ready to fight for their freedom. In 1848 they were prepared to revolt against their Austrian oppressors, but fortunately that was not necessary because they gained their goal without a revolution.

The revolution of 1848 in Europe was a severe blow to all autocracies there, and the despotic regime in Vienna was no exception. Early in the year the Govern-

ment in Vienna seemed to be toppling, and the Hungarians knew it. In Budapest a band of Hungarian patriots, instead of staging a revolt against the Government, prepared a list of their complaints, presented it to the Government, and demanded freedom. The Government, realizing its weakness and helplessness, proved conciliatory and granted the Hungarian demands on March 15. This was a significant victory for the Hungarians, and thus March 15 became their day of liberation, the Hungarian freedom day. On this 112th anniversary of that memorable day let us hope that Hungarians will again regain their freedom and enjoy liberty in their homeland.

War-Seized Assets an Old Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last year, I introduced H.R. 5636, designed to afford relief to certain American nationals whose property was damaged in central Europe as a result of World War II, and for return of a limited amount of assets to Germany, providing the West German Government honored certain long-existing debt obligations to American nationals. Last Sunday, March 20, 1960, the New York Times reported the most recent developments in connection with war assets which would be used to satisfy American claimants and the limited return of German assets in an article entitled "War-Seized Assets an Old Headache." In connection with the return aspect of German-held assets, it was well noted that West Germany had been somewhat less than scrupulous in fulfilling longstanding obligations to the international community, especially in connection with the Reichsbank's guarantee to non-German investors in the Golddiskontbank, whose dividends are still in default and remain unpaid solely because of delay in the liquidation of the Hitler banks, all of which has been to the great prejudice of many American investors. By your leave, I include the New York Times article as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1960]

WAR-SEIZED ASSETS AN OLD HEADACHE

(By Paul Heffernan)

Nineteen years have passed since the United States and Germany, as World War II belligerents, seized the assets of each others citizens as "enemy property."

Despite a series of treaties and other international agreements and six legislative bills submitted to Congress between 1943 and 1959 but not voted on, the foreign-domiciled private property rights injured by such seizures and by other acts of war—injured rights of both Americans and Germans—are still unsatisfied. Evidently official thinking in both nations about the issue is further apart than ever.

Just as after World War I Germany failed to keep her word about compensating Amer-

ican nationals for property rights, so, too, after World War II, has the Bonn Republic failed to live up to post-war promises to compensate her own nationals for the losses they suffered through the U.S. seizure of their property in 1941. Germany agreed to do this at conferences in Paris in 1945 and 1954 and in Bonn in 1952.

Instead, the West German Republic now wants the United States to return the war-seized property to the owners abroad. This procedure was followed after World War I for about 80 percent of the German property then seized in this country.

DILEMMA AGGRAVATED

Germany's official change of mind about what should be done about the enemy assets seized 19 years ago is aggravating a lasting Washington dilemma about the matter.

Should the United States return the war-seized German assets and negotiate with Germany by treaty for a lump-sum indemnity for the satisfaction of claims of U.S. citizens?

Or should the proceeds from the sale of the German assets—the stock of such enterprises as Schering, Rohm & Haas and Hugo Stinnes, for example—be distributed among U.S. nationals with claims against Germany? Is not this proposal—admittedly a 1945 expedient to get blood out of what everybody thought would be a postwar stone—against historic U.S. policy and the established principles of international law?

There is now before Congress another bill whose evident first purpose is to get action on the matter before the claimants die of old age. The bill is H.R. 2485.

The bill has passed the House and is awaiting consideration by the Senate.

PAYING BOTH SIDES

It would authorize disbursement of moneys from the sale of the German assets primarily to pay the claims of Americans. But it is estimated that there would be enough left over in the fund to pay German claims of up to \$10,000, an indemnity that would satisfy 90 percent of the interests with claims against the United States. Germany still demurs.

A recent report of hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce presents a succinct summary of the essential facts, going back to World War I days. The committee report, submitted by its chairman, Representative PETER F. MACK, Jr., Democrat, of Illinois, recommends adoption of the bill.

However, a minority report, signed by the three Republican members of the subcommittee—JOHN B. BENNETT, of Michigan, and PAUL F. SCHENCK and SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Ohio—argues strongly against the means advocated by the bill to serve the undisputed end.

The minority report contends that the burden of paying for the losses and injuries sustained by U.S. nationals should fall on German and Japanese taxpayers, and not, as the bill proposes, on "those German and Japanese nationals who happened to own property in the United States."

While disclaiming any wish to debate the question, the minority committeemen implied that the signatories to the Paris and Bonn agreements of 1945, 1952, and 1954 were in violation of international law and that any conversion of the seized assets would be a wrongful act of confiscation under international law, under the U.S. Constitution, and under statutory domestic law.

If the House-approved bill is a slight to the lasting international sanctity of private property rights, it is mostly because of the resolve of Congress that there shall be no repetition of the World War I war assets fiasco, in which the war victors indemnified

the losers and got nothing in return. The Congress may be more willing to face up to the ticklish issue of international law once the claims of U.S. nationals are satisfied.

West Germany has indeed performed a great service in the interests of international equity as well as in rehabilitating its own name by restoring millions of dollars of defaulted external debt to an interest-bearing basis. As a result of this constructive move, there will soon be a payoff of the first bonds of the 1924 Dawes loan. Under a sinking fund agreement stemming from the 1952 London conference on Germany's external debts, \$1,333,000 of the old dollar loan will be paid off on April 15 at the principal amount upon presentation to Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.

In certain other respects, however, the West German authorities have been less than scrupulous in fulfilling longstanding obligations to the international community. Some instances follow:

Although more than 14 years have passed since the end of the war, the Bonn government has still to fulfill the guarantee that the Reichsbank gave to non-German investors when their holdings of Reichsbank stock, were by official dictation, converted into preferred stock shares of a subsidiary institution, the Golddiskontbank. The Reichsbank-guaranteed dividends on the Golddiskontbank stock are still in default and action is still being delayed on liquidating the official banks of the Hitler regime that no longer have a function but only assets.

Although the deadline for holders of Young and Dawes loan bonds for accepting the West German Government's debt settlement offer expired more than a year ago, the Bonn republic has taken no steps to implement its treaty commitment to designate a time when nonaccepting holders of the defaulted bonds would be able to sue in the German courts for the fulfillment of the original debt contracts.

The West Germany of today is not a debt-ridden nation rationing foreign exchange to pay external debts; rather it is the biggest single lender to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Why should not bondholders who have not accepted settlement offers hold out for fulfillment of the original contract and be able to enforce that right in the German courts?

The time it is taking to settle such issues is casting a disquieting reflection on the appeal of the West German officials in behalf of the sanctity of property rights. Just because foreign nationals are unable to prod a government to action is no reason why that government should abuse the privilege of its sovereignty by giving its sanction to unconscionable delays.

S. Res. 94 Opposed by Members of the Long Island Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the members of the Long Island general assembly, fourth degree—patriotic—Knights of Columbus, Kings County, Brooklyn, N.Y., at their meeting on

February 24, 1960, is important enough to call to the attention of my colleagues:

Resolved, That the members of the Long Island general assembly, fourth degree (patriotic), Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N.Y., emphatically oppose Senate Resolution 94 and all other attempts to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us through the United Nations World Court. We, as citizens of the United States of America, who swear to support the Constitution of the United States, consider all such proposals to be in violation of our Federal Constitution since the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court (art. 3, secs. 1 and 2). We will not combine "with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments" (Declaration of Independence). We are confident that our elected representatives in the Congress, "The Senators and Representatives shall be bound by (their) oath or affirmation to support this Constitution" also (art. 6, clause 3).

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. BREGLIA,
Faithful Navigator.

Gleam Wears Off on Hound's Tooth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD a timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Eight years of hound's tooth crusading have produced a record that is something less than enviable. With a cloth-coat crusade in the offing this year it might be well to preserve the following editorial as a reminder of what such crusades can produce:

GLEAM WEARS OFF ON HOUND'S TOOTH

The quick replacement of John C. Doerfer by Frederick W. Ford as FCC Chairman indicates that the administration was not unhappy to see Mr. Doerfer go. A Federal Communications Commissioner who accepted favors from interests subject to FCC regulation was hardly a good advertisement for the Republican Party in a campaign year.

Still the Doerfer case remains an unavoidable reminder that this administration came to power promising to clean up the "mess" in Washington and improve official ethics. It is not the first such reminder, as the record shows:

C. Wesley Roberts resigned under fire as chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1953. It was disclosed that not long after Mr. Roberts had been Kansas GOP chairman, he had accepted a fee in the sale to the State of a hospital which the State already owned.

Hugh W. Cross resigned as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1955. Mr. Cross, a Republican appointee of the Truman administration, had talked to heads of railroads subject to ICC regulation about giving a Chicago transfer contract to an old Republican friend.

Adolphe H. Wenzell in 1954 served as consultant to the Bureau of the Budget on the Dixon-Yates power deal. As an officer of the financial agent for the Dixon-Yates power

combine, Mr. Wenzell was exposed as trying to advise both sides.

Harold E. Talbott quit as Secretary of the Air Force in 1955. A congressional inquiry showed that he had retained his partnership in an engineering firm and had used Air Force letters to try to promote his company's business.

Peter A. Strobel departed in 1955 as Commissioner of Public Buildings for the General Services Administration. Mr. Strobel had held on to a 90 percent interest in a firm which had a claim on the Army Engineers, and he negotiated privately with the Army for his firm.

Edmund F. Mansure resigned as Administrator of the GSA in 1956. Explaining why political favoritism had affected insurance brokerage awards subject to GSA jurisdiction, he said "practical politics" dictated that such awards should not go to firms which "did not help this administration get into office."

Murray Chotiner was dropped by the Republican National Committee in 1956 as director of its campaign school. The former campaign manager for Vice President Nixon had interceded at the White House and with the Civil Aeronautics Board in behalf of his private clients.

Robert Tripp Ross resigned as Assistant Defense Secretary in 1957. Congress learned the Army had given an \$834,000 clothing contract to a firm headed by his wife and brother-in-law.

Sherman Adams quit in 1958 as President Eisenhower's chief administrative assistant. Mr. Adams, it was found, had accepted expensive gifts and hospitality from Bernard Goldfine, whose companies had cases before the Federal Trade Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Richard A. Mack left the FCC in 1958. He later was indicted with Thurman A. Whiteside, of Miami, on a charge of conspiring to influence the FCC award of a Miami television license in which Whiteside was interested. Their first trial ended in a hung jury.

John C. Doerfer, to bring the record up to date, resigned from the FCC last week after it was shown he had twice accepted favors and hospitality from the owner of 12 stations subject to FCC regulation.

Other administrations, of course, have suffered from conflicts of interest. But these 11 cases occurred in an administration which was specifically pledged to better the record of the past and was committed to the cleanliness of the hound's tooth.

That tooth is showing cavities.

U.S. Battle Monuments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of Congress and the American people a few facts which are in deep contrast? We have placed in Europe inspiring memorials and memorialized cemeteries at an expenditure of about \$40 million to record the sacrifices and deeds of those who served in Europe in World Wars I and II. These memorials are beautiful, inspiring and of deep meaning to the thousands who view them and will view them for

generations to come. These American memorials are revered and cherished by the countries in which they are located.

In the Far East there were 4 million Americans engaged in World War II. The front was 8,000 miles from our shores and extended almost halfway around the world. To record that service and to perpetuate the memory of the sacrifices and history of that American effort we have one memorialized cemetery only, in the Far East.

In many countries of Europe the Congress of the United States has honored our dead and preserved for posterity the visual history of World War I and II, as follows:

MEMORIALS (NOT CEMETERIES)

Audenarde, Kemmel, Belgium.
Bellicourt, Cantigny, Aisne Marne, Belleau, Blanc Mont, Meuse Argonne, St. Mihiel, Services of Supply, France.
Naval memorial, Gibraltar.
Naval memorial, France.

MEMORIALIZED CEMETERIES—MEMORIALS (WITH NEARBY CEMETERY)

Brookwood, England.
Flanders Field, Belgium.
Somme, Aisne Marne, Olse-Aisne, Meuse Argonne, St. Mihiel, Suresnes, France.
Cambridge, England.
Normandy, Brittany, France.
Netherlands, Netherlands.
Henri Chapelle, Ardennes, Belgium.
Luxembourg, Luxembourg.
Lorraine, Epinal, Rhone, France.
Florence, Sicily Rome, Italy.
North Africa, Tunisia.

All of them are inspirational, meaningful, and a credit to the United States.

I am not including other memorials in the United States.

The contrast is that the only American recognition of what occurred in the Far East is the one memorialized cemetery near Manila for the American dead.

Congress created the Corregidor Memorial Commission. It was deemed desirable to place upon the hallowed ground of Corregidor one impressive significant and inspiring memorial to preserve the history of those who sacrificed and died in the far Pacific and of our entire service in the Far East. The Philippine Congress by resolution requested that it be placed on Corregidor. The Government set aside Corregidor as a shrine and to use it for the purposes of the memorial. A shrine commission was created and directed to confer with the American Corregidor Commission. The Philippine commission came to America for that purpose and among other things approved of the chosen design. One thing remains—to pass the \$7½ million authorization bill. The House of Representatives passed such an authorization bill late in the 85th Congress but Congress adjourned before action was taken in the Senate.

The request for the authorization is expected to be before Congress in the near future.

In my opinion, since about 15 years have elapsed since the retaking of the Philippines, we should not further delay the erection of this American memorial on Corregidor.

Resolutions of the Coffey County, Kans., Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including herewith resolutions I received from Mrs. Frank George, acting legislative director of the Coffey County, Kans., Farmers Union. These resolutions express the views of a substantial group of farmers in Coffey County Kans.:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL FARM PROGRAM

Whereas annual net farm income has fallen from \$15.3 billion in 1952 to \$10.3 billion in 1959; and

Whereas the 1959 prices received by farmers for their output were 16 percent below the 1952 level, and prices paid by farmers rose nearly 11 percent during the same period; and

Whereas since the administration has lowered support prices, surpluses have increased, which indicate that the present administration policies are a huge failure; and

Whereas USDA economists predict net farm income will fall to \$7 billion in next few years—less than half that of 1952 level, if price supports are withdrawn—as the present administration and a few others, advocates, which, we believe, would wreck our total economy as in 1930's: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Coffey County Farmers Union in session this 11th day of March 1960, at Burlington, Kans., favor a Federal farm price support bill, that provides:

1. Farmer-elected committees from county to national levels, with requirements that actual farmers have control.

2. A national food-use program, which would bring domestic consumption and foreign surplus utilization programs, into gear with the price support program.

3. Support level at not less than 90 percent of current parity for any commodity, whose producers have not disapproved a market supply adjustment program as worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture, and submitted to a two-thirds referendum.

4. A wide variety of methods to carry out these programs, including Government loans, marketing orders, allotments, incentive payments, and a strong soil conservation program.

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Whereas according to the National Education Association, and other study groups' reports, U.S. expenditures for school year 1958-59 for public schools, totaled \$14.5 billion, and at this same time, our expenditures for alcoholic beverages and tobacco was \$15.5 billion; and

Whereas according to these same study groups, 56 percent of the cost of public education is paid by local government, 40 percent by State government, and only 4 percent by Federal Government; and

Whereas a big increase in taxes will be necessary if we are to develop an adequate and effective educational program; and

Whereas most all local school, and some State taxes, are raised by a tax levy on real and personal property; and

Whereas farmers cannot add the cost of taxes onto the price of their products, and pass them on to consumers—as industrial

and commercial enterprises do—and, since an increase in local school taxes, would be a great burden on farmers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, we, the Coffey County Farmers Union in session this 11th day of March 1960, at Burlington, Kans., favor a substantial increase in Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools for school construction, and Federal aid for school instruction, to at least \$25 per child of school age, in these same schools, as provided in bill H.R. 22, by Representative METCALF.

Ike Answers Own Query on "Mess in Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the strange shyness that has in recent months prevented Republican leaders from reminding the public of what they termed in 1952 the "mess in Washington," under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to include the following editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Wednesday, March 16, 1960, in the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Ike Answers Own Query on 'Mess in Washington'":

If ever an issue came home to roost it is that of the Republicans who bellowed their way to office with the cry about the mess in Washington.

After a directed look at the milk coats, deep freezers, and frozen hams given to some persons in President Harry S. Truman's administration, Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 asked: "What is the system that allows the appointment of such men?"

With the resignation under fire of John C. Doerfer as head of the Federal Communications Commission, Eisenhower has become quite a veteran as an appointer of men who mess things up in Washington.

The President also appointed Richard A. Mack to the FCC. Mack has been indicted on a charge of conspiracy to defraud the U.S. Government relative to awarding a television channel in Miami. After a jury failed to agree early this year it was reported Mack was undergoing psychiatric treatment with his second trial in abeyance.

Vicuna coats, rugs, and free hotel lodgings have reached right into the White House and forced the resignation of the first Presidential aid, Sherman Adams.

Then there was the infamous Dixon-Yates deal which was aborted when the people discovered Adolphe H. Wenzel was cozily placed in the Budget Bureau while an executive of the First Boston Corp., a financial agent for the deal.

The President himself asked Congress to study the turning over to private interests of the Elk Hills oil field naval reserve. It was just such a proposal in the Warren G. Harding administration which led people to say "a new broom sweeps dirty."

And there have been nearly a dozen other such incidents, such for instance as the resignation of Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott after it was learned he was soliciting private business from his powerful office.

What history will say about the President's acceptance of gifts of valuable farm machinery and stock for his Gettysburg farm can be surmised.

Oh, for those fond hopes evoked when the President assured an audience in Brookings, S. Dak., no mess makers would get into his administration.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Time To Clean Up the Boxing Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in recent months there has been increasing agitation all across the country for action to clean up the mess in professional boxing. An article appearing in the April edition of Reader's Digest by James Stewart-Gordon entitled "Abolish Professional Boxing" contains a good deal of food for thought for all concerned with the future of the sport.

This article is a revealing and instructive treatment of the problems confronting professional boxing, although in all due candor I must say that I do not agree with its main thesis. It does, however, underscore the need for a prompt and thorough investigation by Congress. Such an inquiry should be delayed no longer.

Mr. President, any objective observer of the sports scene must admit that much in professional boxing in America today is rotten. The sport is sick, but we need not give up hope of curing the patient.

There is no question that there must be a thorough housecleaning from top to bottom. The crooks must be eradicated, the mob eliminated, and exploitation of contestants done away with as much as is humanly possible. I would hope that any congressional inquiry would also explore the rather serious medical problems discussed in this Reader's Digest article.

What is needed eventually is some kind of nationwide control of the sport, preferably under the guidance of an iron-fisted czar. I would hope this can be done by an organization outside the Federal Government. Baseball has tried this approach and it has worked with great success.

In the long run, an international organization must be established to police boxing, because even a cursory glance at the list of present world champions reveals the distinct global coverage of professional boxing. Mr. President, these are not impossible goals, and I believe they are worth striving for and are attainable.

Because it contains interesting information on the problems confronting boxing today, and because I hope it will prod action for the cleanup which is essential if the sport is to continue as the pastime of millions of fans, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Reader's Digest to which I have

referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reader's Digest, April 1960]

ABOLISH PROFESSIONAL BOXING

(By James Stewart-Gordon)

On March 5, 1959, Johnny Saxton, 28 years old, a former world welterweight champion, stood before a New York City judge, charged with housebreaking. The proceeds of the burglary: \$5.20. Saxton, who had reportedly earned more than a quarter of a million dollars during 8 years in the ring, was destitute, he said, and owed the Government some \$16,000 in back taxes.

The judge looked down at Saxton. "Johnny," he said, "where did your money go?"

Saxton answered in a slurred, barely audible voice, "I didn't get much of it."

"Why did you give up fighting, Johnny?" the judge went on.

Saxton dropped his gaze to the floor. "They didn't need me no more."

Today, after a suicide attempt, Saxton is a patient in Ancora State Hospital in New Jersey. With extensive psychiatric help, he is beginning to clear the cobwebs from his brain. "When I came here," he told me, "I wanted to get out of life. I knew I couldn't fight no more. I was supposed to have got big money from fighting on TV, but I never saw it. No one ever gave me more than a couple of hundred dollars at a time. Now I'm here in the hospital. That's what boxing did for me."

That's also what boxing did for Johnny Bratton, another former welterweight champion, who at 30 years of age had become an old man in an Illinois mental hospital.

The frightening truth is this: Professional boxing is the down-at-the-heels prostitute of organized sport. The cases of Johnny Saxton and Johnny Bratton are no rarities. They serve merely to illustrate the racket's outstanding characteristics: Brutality, and the venality and crookedness of boxing's managers and promoters.

When you watch a fight on TV, the odds are overwhelming that you see two muscular young men who are nothing but puppets of the mobsters who control the business. Often the fighters are subnormal mentally, either because they were born that way or because they have practiced their trade too long. They know who is to win and who is to lose—and when and how. And at the end of their ring careers they are usually both battered and broke, robbed by the men who have used them.

Considered coldly and on the basis of the evidence, professional boxing has absolutely no excuse for continuing to exist. It is time we were civilized enough to abolish this shabby game, on both medical and moral grounds.

The medical proof is hard to deny. Sometimes a single hard blow to the head causes death by massive cerebral hemorrhage. This was the case in four recent deaths: Walter Ingram in Guadalajara, Mexico; 19-year-old Golden Glover Antonio Lopez in New Mexico; German lightweight Karl Bick; and South African Jimmy Elliott. Since World War II, some 165 boxers have died of injuries suffered in the ring.

As Thomas Gorman wrote in a publication of the American Medical Association: "Boxing is the only sport where the head is the chief target, where the aim is to punish an opponent by knocking him out. But a boxer doesn't have to be knocked out or have his skull broken to be seriously injured. He may suffer pinpoint hemorrhages or other harm to his brain not apparent even to the trained physician."

Tests made by the U.S. Naval Hospital in Bethesda, Md., and by Dr. Ward C. Halstead, of the University of Chicago, show how dangerous these injuries can be. Dr. Halstead says: "Most of the bruising from a head blow occurs in the frontal lobes, the parts of the brain which control coordination, restraint and self-control. These lobes rest against a sharp, bony ridge; when the brain bounces inside the skull, this ridge bites into the frontal lobes and destroys their tissue. The brain, unlike some other parts of the body, cannot replace its own tissue. Damage is permanent."

This results in what is known medically as the "punch-drunk syndrome"—a shuffling gait, tortured speech and the inability to think clearly. Other common boxing injuries include damage to the eyes, kidneys and the heart.

If anyone questions the vicious effects of the so-called game of boxing, the experience of ex-heavyweight champion Gene Tunney ought to supply the answer. "One day when I was training," Tunney says, "I got a blow on my head. I felt as though a hole had been bored in my skull and a stream of hot water poured on my brain. A hot film came in front of my eyes. For the next 3 days I couldn't remember the names of even my closest friends; I was unable to orient myself. When I returned to normal, the possibility of becoming punch-drunk haunted me for weeks. The first seed of retirement was sown then."

On moral grounds, the truth is that professional boxing is not a sport at all. It is a sordid business designed to yield maximum profit to the men who control the fighters, the arenas, and the TV outlets. The fact that men can be permanently injured or killed in its practice is of little concern to the behind-the-scenes manipulators. Through their monopoly, known as the "Octopus," they decide for virtually every boxer fighting today—regardless of his skill—when he will win or lose, when and whom he will fight next.

This situation has come about largely because of TV. Before TV, professional boxing was generally confined to small fight clubs scattered across the country, a setup which made the sport too diffuse for control by one man or group of men. But TV made it possible to dominate the entire business.

For one thing, the TV network people were obsessed with the idea that in order to sell their broadcasting time to sponsors they had to make sure of a minimum of two fights a week throughout the year and enough championship contests to attract viewers. They could obtain these only through the "Octopus." And they made only one small request that the boxers be evenly enough matched so that the fights would usually go the limit—to provide ample time to get the commercials on the air.

Apparently the network people were not satisfied with the results. The National Broadcasting Co. recently decided to dis-

continue its Friday night fights as of September 1960. According to an editorial in *Sports Illustrated*, "The sponsor was happy because the fights were selling razor blades. The advertising agency was happy because the sponsor was. But the network was unhappy"—presumably, as columnist Red Smith surmises, "because it is not possible to offer 'exciting' matches with brandnew performers every Friday."

There will, of course, still be boxing on television, and the people who present it will undoubtedly still have to deal with the "Octopus"—with such men as Frankie Carbo, a convicted killer; James D. Norris, ex-president of the discredited International Boxing Club; Truman Gibson, Joe Louis' onetime tax lawyer; Mickey Cohen, Gabe Genovese, "Blinky" Palermo and, in Europe, Jack Solomons. Below them are the fronts, men like Hymie "The Mink" Wallman, Willie "The Undertaker" Ketchum, and Al "The Vest" Weill. Today some of these men, like Gibson, Genovese, Palermo, and Carbo, are under indictment in New York or California, or have pleaded guilty to illegal manipulation.

On October 30, 1959, Paul John Carbo, known as Frankie Carbo, Mr. Gray, "The Superintendent" and under various other aliases, pleaded guilty in a New York court to being (among other things) an undercover matchmaker in the bout between Isaac Logart and Virgil Akins, who tackled one another for a chance at the welterweight title in March 1958. The Logart-Akins production, a televised feature, was to have been preceded by the same careful preparations that had been made for many fights Carbo had staged before. This time, however, there was a difference: several strategic wire-taps, sanctioned by court order, were made by investigators for New York district attorney Frank S. Hogan, who has been fighting the boxing racket since 1947. Hogan's men were able to show how Carbo issued orders to Hymie Wallman and to Bernie Glickman, Akins' manager of record. They could prove that Jim Norris, sometime partner, sometime associate of Carbo, servilely took Carbo's orders. When they had enough evidence to bring indictments, they sprang the trap.

Carbo threw himself on the mercy of the court. He got 2 years in jail and a \$2,000 fine. His attorney, Abraham Brodsky, made a revealing remark: "The so-called sport of boxing should be abolished in this State. If boxing is a racket today, it always was and always will be."

He was right. Jailing Frankie Carbo will not kill the Octopus. Its tentacles are too long and too deeply embedded to be shaken loose by one conviction, even as important a conviction as Carbo's.

Jim Norris came into boxing with a \$50 million fortune inherited from his father, a midwestern and Canadian wheat manipulator. By purchase or inheritance he gained control of Madison Square Garden, the Detroit Olympia and Chicago Stadium. When he needed fight bills to fill his arenas, he found that Carbo could fix him up.

In time they gained control of the champions in all the important divisions and were able to pick opponents and make deals. To insure their continued control, they forced outside managers to agree that, in the event of a championship's changing hands, the new champion would fight under the aegis of the International Boxing Club.

John Bonomi, assistant district attorney of New York and assistant counsel to the Kefauver Committee, which recently announced plans to expose some of boxing's dirty laundry, says: "In 6 years of investigation I have found few fighters who are not wholly or partially controlled by the mob." Middleweight titleholder (in New York and Massachusetts) Paul Pender has spoken in less restrained fashion: "Boxing is rotten clear through, infested by gangsters and thieves."

The Octopus not only has built up a reliable stock company of fighters who obey scripts and who are seen regularly on TV as a reward, but has tried to reach referees and judges as well. As this is written, Bert Grant, a judge licensed by the New York State Athletic Commission, is under indictment for accepting bribes from Hymie Wallman. Grant, the indictment charges, was paid \$100 to vote for one of Wallman's fighters. While so far only Grant has been named, other indictments are pending.

When the Octopus does not have control of a fighter, it uses direct methods to remedy the defect. In the case of welterweight champion Don Jordan this has led to the indictment in California of Truman Gibson, "Blinky" Palermo and strong-arm men Louis Dragna and Joe Sica.

Last year in Los Angeles, Jordan defeated Virgil Akins for the welterweight title. Shortly thereafter, according to promoter Jackie Leonard, he and Don Neseth, Jordan's manager and a nonmember of the Octopus, received a visit from "Blinky" Palermo. "We want our cut of Jordan," Palermo demanded. Neseth and Leonard would not go along. One night about 2 weeks after testifying to this effect before the California Athletic Commission, Leonard was badly beaten as he was putting his car in his garage.

The athletic commission called Palermo, Gibson, Sica, and Dragna for a hearing, and turned the matter over to the U.S. attorney's office in Los Angeles for grand-jury action. An indictment was returned, and all four, along with Carbo, are now facing trial on charges of conspiracy and other crimes.

There is no place in the United States today for a sport that is as brutal and crooked as the boxing racket. Harold Barnes, retired official of the New York State Athletic Commission, a boxing judge for 38 years, says, "I consider boxing legalized murder. I would outlaw it."

Isn't it high time the United States banned this public butchery?

Where the Shoe Pinches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the *Wall Street Journal* of March 22 may help some of us to revise our thinking on raising interest rates on long-term Government bonds.

The theory that to do this would help the rich and hurt the poor will definitely not go down today with anyone trying to borrow money to build a home.

The National Association of Home Builders have finally waked up and rubbed the sand from their eyes and reversed their position. They now realize what many of us have long known, that many would-be homeowners simply cannot get financing at acceptable interest rates in today's market.

The article follows:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*,
Mar. 22, 1960]

WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES

The National Association of Home Builders, we see by a letter to its members, has found out that it makes a lot of difference where the shoe pinches.

For many months now Secretary Anderson has been trying to persuade Congress to change the law which forbids the Treasury to pay more than 4½ percent interest on long-term Government bonds. The chief opposition has come from those who say that, while this might make things easier for the Treasury Secretary, it would be a severe blow to ordinary folk who have to borrow money on long terms, such as on mortgages. Aren't mortgage rates already high enough without the Treasury "pushing" them higher?

So the Democrats in Congress, who profess a deep concern about homebuyers and the building industry, have told Mr. Anderson "No." If he's pinched for funds, let him stick to the short-term market.

But now the homebuilders have had some second thoughts. The association has just called on all members to write their Congressmen at once giving "strong support" to a change in the interest-rate limitation "at the earliest possible date." If the change isn't made quickly, say the homebuilders, it "could well mean tighter mortgage money and higher interest rates."

Behind this about-face is an interesting lesson in the economics of interest. It's one that might even be instructive to the self-styled "liberal" Democrats in other ways too.

The basic situation here can be described fairly simply. Because of the tremendous demand for the Nation's lendable funds, from both private and governmental borrowers, the price of money has been pushed up. Uncle Sam may offer to pay 4½ percent interest, but no lenders come forward for the reason that they can already lend their money elsewhere at a higher rate.

So with long-term money already "tight," the first reaction of many people was that to permit the Government, with its huge borrowing needs, to raise its interest bid would simply make the long-term money supply even tighter. The Government, so the argument ran, would then be competing even more directly with would-be mortgage borrowers, interest rates would rise further, people wouldn't be able to buy homes, the building industry would fall into the doldrums and that would injure the whole economy.

Of course this train of thought, however persuasive to the unsophisticated, overlooked one little detail. The U.S. Treasury had to get the money from somewhere, billions of it. And if it couldn't spread its borrowing over the long-term market, it had to borrow all the billions on the short-term market where there was no interest limit fixed by law.

What happened then was unforeseeable only by the kind of "liberal" Congressman who thinks statutory law will repeal the actual laws that govern economic affairs.

When the Treasury was forced to borrow its billions on short-term notes alone, short-term interest rates went skyrocketing. Last fall the Treasury had to pay 5 percent for notes maturing in less than 5 years. So, not unnaturally, people who had money in savings banks and building associations at much less interest drew out their money and bought the Treasury notes.

Hence the homebuilders discovered that "the Treasury's unavoidable financing activities are draining money out of the very institutions on which we must rely for mortgage credit." And they concluded that if the Treasury isn't permitted to meet the going interest rates in the long-term market, where it can spread its debt around, "we are all going to suffer severely."

So there you are. Those who refused to let the Treasury deal sensibly with the realities of the marketplace have brought about the very thing they professed they would avoid.

The political lesson should be plain when the Congressmen hear from the homebuilders. And the economic lesson might even remind some of them that when a shoe is badly made it's apt to pinch all over.

Tribute to the Late Senator Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Government Standard of March 18, 1960, an article entitled "Neuberger's Death Loss to Employees."

I ask unanimous consent that this article, on the late Senator Neuberger, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEUBERGER'S DEATH LOSS TO EMPLOYEES—
SERVED ON CS UNIT

Government employees lost a true friend and staunch legislative supporter last week with the death of Senator Richard Neuberger. Senator Neuberger died in Portland, Oreg., of a cerebral hemorrhage. He was 47.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee, the Oregon Democrat was in the forefront of activity on Federal employee legislation. Last year he headed the subcommittee that handled Federal employee health insurance legislation and the bill that ultimately became law was cosponsored by him and Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, chairman of the full Civil Service Committee.

Senator Neuberger's deep interest in health legislation was considered one of the key factors in enactment of the employee insurance program after similar legislation had been stymied for a number of years. At the time of his death Senator Neuberger was pressing for enactment of health benefits legislation to cover already retired Federal employees.

The Oregon lawmaker also played a key role in the 1958 pay campaign that resulted in a 10-percent increase for Government workers. He was chairman of the subcommittee that handled the pay proposals.

Earlier this year Senator Neuberger wrote Civil Service Committee Chairman Roger Jones urging the administration to support pay increases for Federal classified and postal workers. He said that in the light of its role in negotiating a pay hike for the steelworkers, the administration should back an increase for its own employees.

Senator Neuberger often pointed out to his constituents the fine job done by Government workers. In his final newsletter to Oregon voters was an item titled "High Quality of Our United States Employees."

Senator Neuberger had recently announced that he would seek a second term. His freshman term in the Senate was due to expire at the close of this year.

The Oregon Democrat underwent a cancer operation in 1958. The surgery was successful, but a number of unrelated illnesses followed. The Senator said he would seek a second term after he was pronounced fit to run following a series of medical examinations.

Senator Neuberger was the first Democratic Senator elected in Oregon in 40 years. He had served on the Civil Service Committee since coming to the Senate in 1954.

He entered politics in 1941 when he won election to a 2-year term in the Oregon House of Representatives. In 1949 he was elected to the State senate, serving there until 1954 when he won a seat in the U.S. Senate.

No successor has been named yet to fill the vacancy on the Civil Service Committee

created by Senator Neuberger's death. Oregon Gov. Mark Hatfield will appoint someone to serve out the remainder of the Senator's unexpired term. Under the State law, he must name a Democrat.

The 139th Anniversary of Greek
Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of all independence days have profound significance but the celebration on March 25, 1960, of the 139th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, is of especial significance for many reasons. In the first place, the ancient Greeks, who are renowned for the very high premium they placed on freedom and independence, were in a sense the first citizens of the West and of the free world. They showed the world that they preferred to fight for the preservation of their independence rather than willingly submit to conquering oppressors. In the second place, when eventually they were forced to submit to alien tyrants, they proudly maintained their spiritual independence for many centuries. And finally, in 1821 when they saw a chance of regaining their freedom and national independence, they staged a revolt which in the course of many years of bloody warfare, led to the birth of modern Greece.

From the day the stouthearted Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the standard of the cross over his monastic establishment in 1821 we have followed the course of events in Greece with keen interest and heartfelt sympathy. There never was, and let us hope that there may never be, any doubt as to where our wholehearted sympathy and national interest lie when freedom-loving Greeks have been pitted against foreign oppressors and totalitarian tyrants. We have always held them in exceptionally high esteem. Even before their war of independence we were fully conscious of our debt to Greece, the true cradle and nursery of many human values associated with our civilization. In a sense we have always regarded the Greeks as our cultural and intellectual forebears. When we attained our independence, helpless Greeks were suffering under alien oppressors in their homeland. And when the news of their revolt against the Turks reached us, it was natural for us to hope and pray for Greek success. President Monroe and many prominent legislators in Congress at the time voiced the overwhelming feeling of the Nation in their declarations. In his annual message on December 3, 1822, the President stated:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and re-

finement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of these people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

Famous orators and statesmen also voiced their concern in the matter. Daniel Webster characterized the Greek War of Independence as part of a greater struggle "between absolute and regulated governments." He declared in no uncertain terms that America could not hold aloof from world affairs, and he insisted that it was time for us to take a firm and definite stand on the question of the Greek War.

As one of the free States among the nations—

He said—

as a great and rising Republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were so disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world. . . . Our side of this question is settled for us, even without our own volition. . . . Our place is on the side of free institutions.

The core of this ringing peroration is in the last sentence: Our place is, and has always been, on the side of free institutions, erected and vigilantly guarded by freemen.

Henry Clay was equally clear in expressing the true sentiment of our people in Greek affairs. At that time there was the feeling in some quarters that the display of excess sympathy for the Greeks would offend the Turks. Clay thought that such unworthy reasoning was unbecoming to freemen and independent, sovereign states. His indignant retort to those who advocated restraint and caution read:

Are we so mean, so base, so despicable, that we may not attempt to express our horror, utter our indignation, at the most brutal and atrocious war that ever stained earth or shocked high heaven?

If the great body of Christendom can look on calmly and coolly, while all this is perpetrated on a Christian people, in its own immediate vicinity, in its very presence, let us at least evince, that one of its remote extremities is susceptible of sensibility to Christian wrongs, and capable of sympathy for Christian sufferings; that in this remote quarter of the world there are hearts not yet closed against compassion for human woes, that can pour out their indignant feelings at the oppression of a people endeared to us by every ancient recollection, and every modern tie.

These few excerpts from two great representative Americans clearly illustrate the true sentiment of our people toward the Greeks in their desperate struggle against tyranny. At the time many philhellenic groups were formed in this

country for the purpose of aiding the brave Greeks; many extended material aid to the Greeks. And in the end when Greek independence was an accomplished fact, we all were overjoyed.

Nor have we wavered since then. During and after the last two world wars we have done our very best to save Greece from the ravages of war, from the clutches of totalitarianism, and have worked hard in helping to maintain their hard-won and well-deserved independence. Thereby we have gained a worthy ally in our present struggle against Communist tyranny.

Greeks have not only been a freedom-loving people, but they have also been adventurers, and as a seafaring people they have been, and still are, great merchants and tradesmen. In search of freedom as well as for free opportunities, they have been globetrotters. As such they have flocked to this side of the Atlantic, and today there are more than 600,000 sturdy, hardworking, patriotic, loyal and law abiding Greek-Americans in this great Republic. It is true that the beginning of Greek immigration dates back to some 400 years, but actually, the arrival of the bulk of Greek immigrants are of relatively recent date. Mass immigration had its start during the last decade of the last century, and attained its peak during the 1920's. Since then the number of Greek immigrants have declined, mostly because of legal restrictions, but they are still coming, sometimes under special legislative acts, at about 1,000 or more annually.

In this country Greeks have settled in many metropolitan areas and commercial centers, and they have been a boon to the commercial life in many communities. It is true that in their early days Greek immigrants were employed as farm laborers, construction workers, and in factories. But later many came to our cities and began new careers. There some began business on pushcarts, as fruit and ice cream vendors. Later they owned ice cream parlors, confectionary stores and restaurants. Thus gradually they moved from curb to stand, from stand to store, from little store to big store, and then to chains of stores. From very modest beginnings they have progressively moved up and have prospered greatly. In a few special lines of business they have been exceptionally successful—especially so in the ownership and management of movie theaters and in the motion picture industry. The Skouras Brothers are, of course, outstanding examples. And the Stephen Brothers, of Philadelphia, claiming to have one of the largest tobacco industry establishments in the country, is the best known case in our own State.

There is another line of activity in which Greeks are famous, and which owes its beginning to a famous Philadelphian, investor John Cheyney. Early in the 1900's he became interested in deep-sea diving and gathered about him a group of Greeks as divers and expert sponge fishers. They then moved to Tarpon Springs, Fla., and there within a few years the town became famous as the sponge market. Today the Sponge Exchange there is owned and operated, al-

most exclusively, by enterprising and hard-working Greek-Americans. Lowell, Mass., is another community in which Greek-Americans form not only one of the largest elements, but also the most active and enterprising civic leaders.

In the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the honor to represent, we have many fine families of Greek descent, the members of which have distinguished themselves by their high type of citizenship and their adherence to moral and spiritual values. The cities of Altoona and Du Bois, as well as the boroughs of Clearfield, Philipsburg, State College, Bellefonte, and Tyrone have many prominent Greek-American families whose contributions to the cultural, spiritual, business, and civic life of these communities are well recognized and greatly admired and appreciated.

Although the vast majority of the Greek immigrants came to the United States with little else but their desire to work and improve their economic and social status, they have proved to be a valuable asset in their respective communities. Hard working and thrifty, they set as their primary goal to give a higher education to their sons and daughters. They are thirsty for education and learning. And they have shown their talents in many fields. They have brought their contributions to the American arts and sciences in a number of ways. In the realm of music the name of Dimitri Mitropoulos stands high among those of immortal fame as conductors. Nicholas Moscona, a great singer, was a distinguished member of the New York Metropolitan Opera for many years. No less famous is Miss Maria Callas, another talented and gifted singer. Greek-Americans have also distinguished themselves as painters, perhaps the best known among them being George Constant, whose works are represented in the Art Institute of Chicago. There have been prominent Greek-American actors in the motion pictures and theaters. Thus through their industry and ingenuity, through their great gifts and talents, Greek-Americans have contributed greatly to our civilization. But over and above their material and cultural contribution, Greek-Americans are among our most loyal, law-abiding, and patriotic citizens. They have proved devoted servants of our democratic institutions and courageous fighters for the defense of the American way of life. And we remember these fine deeds on this 139th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

The Budget Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 22, 1960, issue of the Aiken Standard and Review, entitled "The Budget Can Be Cut." This newspaper in my hometown has staunchly supported economy in Government spending and has also produced many strong editorials against the trend in this country toward socialism and a welfare state. I commend this particular editorial, which was written by the very able editor, Albert Howell, to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET CAN BE CUT

The average citizen wants a reduction in Government spending and lower taxes. But he's at a loss when it comes to recommending specific reforms. The budgets are enormously complex, and run to reams of finely printed pages.

There are, however, organizations whose business it is to analyze budgets and find where cuts are both possible and desirable. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce has done that with the Administration's 1961 budget. It proposes specific reductions totaling \$3.3 billion—all of a nondefense nature. Its report observes that the "proposals represent only a relatively modest but effective start toward control of Federal spending at a manageable level—that is, a spending level which will make practicable the tax reforms that are necessary to assure sound economic growth and at the same time permit reduction of the public debt."

The proposals cover a wide area—reduced spending on public works; reduced grants-in-aid of various kinds; curtailed loan programs; a cut in Federal civilian personnel forces, and so on down the list. Not everyone will agree with them all, and other studies stress additional areas of possible cutbacks. But the point is that we can have more economical government without undermining our defense in any way. And the main way to achieve it is by eliminating activities which can and should be undertaken by local government, by private enterprise, or by individuals.

Forty-second Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow one of the most dedicated, one of the oldest, and one of the most inspiring anti-Bolshevik, anti-Communist national groups in the world will celebrate the 42d anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic's Declaration of Independence. I am most happy to join with all white Ruthenians in commemoration of this monumental event in their struggle for freedom and independence.

For hundreds of years despite the facts that the Byelorussians have maintained their own traditions and cultures in a geographically distinct position on the great marshlands of the Dnieper, the

Dvina, and the Niemen they have been constantly harassed by powerful neighbors and overrun, occupied, and dominated by various Muscovite governments. Always, however, the spirit of the people has risen above the controls and brutal campaigns designed to stamp out their national existence and eradicate the Byelorussians as a free and independent state.

At the time of the destruction of the old czarist empire after World War I the Byelorussians seized the opportunity presented to create a new Byelorussian government and, on March 25, 1918, the National Council, Rada, announced the birth of the independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic. That is the event we celebrate today.

Almost immediately the new government was attacked by its powerful neighbors, the old familiar partitions of territory and abrogation of national rights came into being and, once more, the Byelorussians were a dominated and suppressed people.

But the old struggle still goes on. The Byelorussians are still firm in their belief in those principles of justice and morality which proclaim that governments can only derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. They know that freedom and national independence will one day be won against all the powers of terror and persecution.

Let us honor them on this anniversary of that glowing document which so glowingly expresses their magnificent hopes for national entity.

Outstanding Young Farmer in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a time in which the Nation is confronted by serious, complex problems in agriculture, I am always highly encouraged to find young folks who are willing to become farmers and are making a success of the job.

Today, I refer especially to Mr. Edward McFarland, dairyman of Dodge County, Wis.

Recently, our Badger State Junior Chamber of Commerce selected Mr. McFarland as the "outstanding young farmer for Wisconsin."

Currently, he is a successful partner, along with two brothers, operating a 315-acre, 85-cow herd dairy farm. He has the responsibility of managing the livestock and fieldwork.

In addition to dairying and an outstanding job of farming, he is active in community affairs; a 4-H leader; an officer of the Holstein and Guernsey Breeders Association; serves on local school committees; and is a member of the University of Wisconsin Farm Short Course Association.

As an outstanding farmer, Mr. McFarland will represent Wisconsin in the national contest in this field.

I wish him every success.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published an informative article on the high qualifications of this young man as an outstanding farmer.

Reflecting the kind of creative, hard-working, enterprising effort needed today in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARMER— WISCONSIN JAYCEES PICK

Think it would be a big job to pick out the outstanding young farmer in your local community? It's even a bigger job on a statewide basis.

But the junior chamber of commerce in Wisconsin has come up with their State winner. The man with the title "Outstanding Young Farmer for Wisconsin" is Edward McFarland, dairyman from Dodge County.

Young McFarland is in partnership with two brothers. They operate 315 acres, of which 295 acres are cropland. The partnership includes a farm dairy and delivery route which are the brothers' part of the partnership. Ed McFarland has the responsibility of managing the livestock and fieldwork.

The 85-cow herd of high-producing Guernseys and Holsteins is the product of efforts since he first got his hands in the farm business after completing grade school.

Today's milking herd of registered cattle was only a small herd of grade Guernseys 15 years ago. At that time Ed McFarland had started foundation stock with registered heifers in 4-H projects.

BUILT HERD TO 85

He built the herd from 20 cows to its present size without having to purchase any adult cows. He did this by raising his own carefully selected heifer calves and buying young calves from successful breeders.

Today the herd averages 11,000 pounds of milk per cow annually. Part of the barn holds a Holstein herd and the other part the Guernseys. McFarland has the Holsteins bred artificially but keeps a herd sire for the Guernseys.

The constantly expanding herd has kept the McFarlands busy remodeling their barns. The barn has been lengthened twice, and last year a pole-type shed was added for young stock. Silage is fed from four silos.

Ed McFarland's feeding program is based on high quality, homegrown roughage. Early hay averaged 18 percent protein this year. He feeds only hay and ground corn until January. Cows get no other protein supplement until late winter when urea is mixed with the ground feed.

Alfalfa, brome, and ladino clover are the hay and pasture mixtures. McFarland practices rotational grazing, moving the herd to new pasture every 4 or 5 days.

Most new farming practices get their first try in Dodge County on the McFarland Farm. His was the first place to try seeding alfalfa between wide corn rows.

FIRST TO USE CHOPPER

All oats are harvested for silage which creates a bedding problem. McFarland was one of the first farmers to own a stalk chopper and to bale stalks in the field for bedding.

A hay conditioner has been regular equipment for several seasons. Much of the hay is stored in a hay keeper. Hay yields average 4 tons per acre.

Ed McFarland's share of the farm partnership gives him a net worth in land, equipment, and livestock of over \$50,000.

But his activities are not confined to the farm. He's active in many community affairs. He's a 4-H leader and an officer in the Holstein and Guernsey breed associations. He's served on local school committees and is a member of the University of Wisconsin Farm Short Course Association.

Besides the honor of the selection as "outstanding young farmer," McFarland will get a free trip to California. A Wisconsin farm machinery manufacturer gave a new manure spreader to the State winner.

McFarland will be Wisconsin's representative in the national contest for the Nation's outstanding young farmer.

America, the Special Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, evening I had the privilege of attending the annual banquet of the order of Ahepa at the Statler Hotel here in Washington and was much impressed by the speech made to the gathering by Mr. George E. Loucas, of Weston, W. Va., of my congressional district, who is supreme president of this fine organization.

Under unanimous consent I include this gentleman's remarks in the RECORD for I believe my colleagues will find them most inspirational:

AMERICA, THE SPECIAL INTEREST

I wandered into history as I sat looking around and listening to the plaudits of Greece by the distinguished speakers who preceded me to the rostrum. I came from across the seas—westward from the shores of the cradle of democracy. Her mainland and isles free 139 years. I thought, it is only fitting and proper, then, that the sons and daughters, a new generation, originating from the mother democracy should tonight be hosts in honoring the sons and daughters of the daughter democracy—America—and particularly those representatives of the most envied legislative body, the Congress of the United States.

Your host the Order of Ahepa represents the first movement of its kind in the history of the United States where a group of first generation Americans organized voluntarily for the sole purpose of inculcating upon themselves the ideals of this Republic. And they have proved by their achievements that it is more important that America be born in the man than that the man be born in America.

Throughout the 38 years of its existence, the Order of Ahepa has functioned as a non-partisan, philanthropic and patriotic organization. Because of this fact, it has been able to exert a constructive influence in the councils of American affairs. With unity of purpose and objectivity of approach, we have contributed, and shall continue to contribute, to the solution of the problems that confront our Nation.

One of these problems is the challenge to freedom by the Soviet Union. Another is how to fight freedom's battle in the context of comfort and prosperity. We must not allow the thin veneer of peace and security to obscure the issue or to lessen our zeal. We are fighting the same battle that was fought at Gettysburg, at Valley Forge, at Marathon, and at Salamis. Freedom's battle knows no boundary, no race, no time, no

price. It knows only the devotion of dedicated men. We in Ahepa are resolved to defend the legacy of freedom and culture which our ancestors bequeathed to the world. And we are equally resolved to win converts to this cause.

We shall thus participate the more effectively in the great process of shaping our national purposes to meet the ever-growing threat to the American way of life. The American way of life is also the Hellenic way of life.

In order that we may coordinate further these contributions we have fully subscribed to President Eisenhower's People-to-People Program and as ambassadors of goodwill and as American citizens we depart March 22, 1960, for Greece. We, as "diplomats from Main Street" are taking 25,000 American books as a gift of Ahepa to Greece for distribution to various libraries. It's better to give books than guns.

I am mindful tonight that I am speaking to the elected representatives of the American people. This is a privilege and an opportunity, and I shall take advantage of both. You are Republicans and Democrats. You the conservatives and liberals. But more important than either, is that you be courageous. It may sound a bit presumptuous for a humble naturalized American of Greek descent to lecture to the Congress of the United States, but that is precisely what I propose to do. Our country, with the challenge it faces, can no longer afford the luxury of special interests. It is time that industry, labor, and farmer subordinate their special claims to the primary welfare of the United States. We must close ranks and speak with one voice if we hope successfully to meet the challenges to democratic survival.

We are confronting a crisis that demands leadership and patriotism. The Congress of the United States can provide the example by subjecting every measure to the acid test: does it serve all of America, or just a part of it. Let us stop thinking of ourselves as supporters of business, of labor, the farmer, the veteran. Let us become supporters only to the great principles on which this Nation was founded. For what is good for America is good for every American, irrespective of the groove or category in which he seeks to classify himself.

Under our Constitution there is no classification of rights, such as the rights of labor, or the rights of business, minority rights or majority rights, or rights for this or that segment of the population. We all have the same rights as Americans and we shall all enjoy them together only so long as we guarantee them to each other without prejudice or discrimination.

When Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that there are certain "inalienable human rights" he did not restrict those rights to white or Christian human beings, nor to the rich or poor, but wrote of them as belonging to every human being, each and every man being "endowed with them by his Creator." Similarly, when the American Constitution was written, it opened with the phrase "We the people of the United States," not "We the working people" nor "We the well-to-do people" but "We the people," all the people.

These inclusive phrases were not the careless words of men striving for rhetorical effects but the expressions of the deepest convictions of men who had grappled with the whole concept of liberty until it became the profoundest motive and passion of their lives. Those who hold these convictions and practice them without patronizing or catering to any group of citizens will be marked in history as the statesmen of our time. They are the leaders America will need in the struggle to determine whether we or the Soviet Union shall guide the destinies of mankind.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is my message. This is the message of the

Order of Ahepa to the people and to the Congress of the United States. This is our contribution to the fight for political courage and political integrity waged in the interest of a stronger and a greater America—an America that will continue to give its people liberty, dignity, and comfort, and to the less fortunate peoples of the world a solid hope that they too under our leadership and guidance will come to realize these precious blessings of Almighty God.

The Pressures for the Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of March 24, entitled "The Pressures for the Forand Bill."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESSURES FOR THE FORAND BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—There is a split among the Democrats, and in the Republican administration and Party, over whether Congress shall legislate an exclusive medical care subsidy for citizens over 65, to be paid for by a special tax levy on citizens in lower age brackets. Because the advocates of such proposals would further expand the scope of Federal spending in the direction of a welfare state, this should help to concentrate public attention on the great basic issue of this period: Where should the limit be set to the advancing centralization of Government in the United States?

That poses a fundamental dispute over political philosophy, of a nature and magnitude which in an ordinary legislative year would stimulate a clear-cut separation between the true believers in such expansions of the Federal function and the sincere disbelievers. But this is not an ordinary legislative year. In 1960 the next President and another Congress will be chosen. And politicians are convinced that a large majority of the votes of the rapidly increasing group of citizens over 65 will be cast for candidates who have helped them to solve the personal financial problem especially imposed by their growing need of medical care and its inflated costs.

ELECTION YEAR POLITICS

This professional political estimate has engendered sudden new pressures. Some are from Republicans on the President. He is opposed to a compulsory Federal subsidy, financed by an increase in the Social Security tax imposed on those still paying it for the benefit of those who have reached the age where they become noncontributing beneficiaries of social security. These Republicans fear that, if their party record on November election day consists only of the "exploration" the President has ordered into the potential of private financing of this medical care, the resentment of the group concerned could assure the defeat of their national ticket and many, many Republican candidates for Congress.

Consequently a number of Republicans who also reject the principle of this Federal subsidy may be expected to vote for it in some form. A widely accepted statistic is

that the American population over 65 years of age was 15.3 million at the beginning of 1959 and is increasing at the rate of 1 million every 3 years.

DEMOCRATIC VARIANTS

The Democrats are having less trouble in their ranks over legislating the principle. All of their Presidential aspirants have endorsed it, and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts (with Senator HART of Michigan as a cosponsor) has a bill to effect it. The only differences between this and the extreme measure sponsored by Representative FORAND of Rhode Island are of detail—such as the omission in the Kennedy bill of surgical fees FORAND would pay for. But KENNEDY claims his plan would cost less than FORAND's because of special inducements for home care, to relieve the additional burden on hospitals.

The Democratic chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, is presumed to look dimly on the entire concept, and to this committee any bill passed by the House would be referred. But the 1960 election pressures which will be applied to members of this committee, could prevail over its usually potent chairman. Among these pressures is organized labor's hearty support of the Forand bill.

AND THE OPPOSITION

The opposition argues in part: (1) A flat tax on workers, regardless of their ability to pay, to provide health benefits to all members of an age group, regardless of their economic need for it, is discriminatory. (2) It will produce like demands from other age groups, with socialized medicine the inevitable consequence. (3) It will undermine the project, at peril to the fiscal soundness of the social security system. (4) It will defeat current progress toward private financing, for which only time is needed to produce ways and means. (5) Hypochondriacs, and so forth, will crowd out of hospitals many needful of this care.

Examine those two sets of arguments, take also into account the failure of both parties to clarify for the people the limits each would set to the exercise of the Federal function, and it is easy to understand why most Democrats are driving for old-age health legislation in 1960 and why some Republicans fear to be left behind.

Forty-second Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with other Members in recognition of the Byelorussian Independence Day.

The Byelorussian people are among the largest of the many ethnic groups included in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately they had been subjected to Czarist Russia's oppressive regime since early modern times and had thus lost their independence, but not their love for independence and freedom. For centuries they struggled against their oppressors, always against heavy odds, and they had no chance to free themselves until 1918.

Soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime by the Russian Revolution, these 10 million Byelorussians felt free, took

their fate into their own hands, and proclaimed their independence in March of 1918. Thenceforth for a little more than 2 years they waged a continuous war against their foes on many fronts, particularly against Communist Russians. In 1921, before Byelorussians could consolidate their strength, the country was attacked by Soviet forces, it was overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, for almost 40 years, some 10 million Byelorussians dream of the days when, for a brief period, their homeland was free and they enjoyed independence. Today they observe the 42d anniversary of their proclamation of independence, and hope that soon they will celebrate it in a free and independent Byelorussia.

Harry Schwartz Writes on Succession to Power in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the 1960 American presidential campaign is now well underway. Although the election itself is still some 6 months off, the press is already filled with news of the various actual and potential candidates and of the most recent developments in the several presidential primaries being held throughout the country. All of these feverish activities are essential parts of the American political process involved in the formation of an overall national consensus on the major issues of the day.

Mr. President, as is well known, the matter of succession to leadership in the Soviet Union is far different from that encompassed in an American election campaign. The various rivals compete in an atmosphere of secrecy and intrigue far removed from the man on the street.

One of America's most able experts on Soviet affairs, Mr. Harry Schwartz, has written a very interesting and informative article on the men most likely to be in the running to succeed Premier Khrushchev. Mr. Schwartz notes that the Premier's recent bout with influenza raises all of the many questions as to who is the most logical successor to the man who now fully controls all of the Soviet orbit.

Mr. President, I found this article to be extremely enlightening. I commend Mr. Schwartz for his careful treatment of a most difficult subject, and I ask unanimous consent that his article which appeared in the New York Times of March 20, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER KHRUSHCHEV: SIX WHO MAY BE IN LINE TO SUCCEED—PREMIER NOW RULES STATE AND PARTY

(By Harry Schwartz)

Among other results, last weekend's announcement of Premier Khrushchev's influ-

enza reminded the world that he was subject to the same ailments and faced the same inevitable end as all other mortals. An immediate consequence of this reminder was strong interest in all major world capitals in the question: What and who comes after Khrushchev?

There has been comparatively little speculation on this matter before now for at least two reasons. One is that Premier Khrushchev's present eminence is of rather recent origin—it is still less than 2 years since he became Premier of the Soviet Union as well as First Secretary of the Communist Party. The second reason has been the seemingly boundless energy and excellent health the Premier has displayed in public at home and abroad, vitality not customarily associated with one who will be 66 next month. It was that image that the influenza announcement called into question.

Any discussion of the Khrushchev succession problem must begin with a definition of Mr. Khrushchev's role in Soviet society.

To appreciate fully that role it must be realized that the country as a whole and the Soviet Communist Party are both ruled by giant bureaucratic machines. Within the framework of the general line that has been set down, millions of people have intermediate managerial posts. They run factories, direct local fire departments, organize propaganda work in particular cities, conduct negotiations with foreign nations, and the like. The directives that guide these people are the composite work of many experts who draw up each year's economic plan, the annual national budget, and other key blueprints.

FOUR FUNCTIONS

Standing at the peak of both the Government and the party bureaucratic pyramids, Premier Khrushchev fulfills four main functions:

First, and most visibly, he is the chief salesman of the Soviet system both to his own people and the world. The importance of this role is evident from the great amount of his time the Premier spends traveling about the Soviet Union and abroad making speeches which automatically become a species of Soviet holy writ. He has fully grasped the potentialities of modern communications for projecting his personality into hundreds of millions of minds and souls ceaselessly at this propaganda task which he obviously regards as one of his key assignments.

Second, he is the chief arbiter and highest court of appeals when disputes arise in either bureaucracy he heads. This was brought out last September when the Soviet Minister of Higher Education, Vyacheslav P. Yelyutin, was asked what happened when he got into a dispute with the Minister of Finance over educational appropriations. "If the Minister of Finance and I can't agree," Mr. Yelyutin said, "We go before Khrushchev and he decides the fight. But it is dangerous to fight. Therefore we try to settle our problems amicably and usually do."

POLICY CHANGES

Third, it is he who must originate or be persuaded to accept any proposed major policy change and it is he who then appears publicly as the first advocate of any such change. Whether it be the new Soviet estimate of President Eisenhower as a man of peace which Mr. Khrushchev announced last September or the new Soviet educational system which combines classroom training with factory work, every major innovation must be his and be shown publicly to be his.

Finally, of course, Mr. Khrushchev is his own Minister of Foreign Affairs, the chief voice in Soviet foreign policy and the chief negotiator of the Soviet Government in the personal style of diplomacy which his travels

and meetings with world leaders this past half decade have made his trademark.

Against this background, it is instructive to compare Premier Khrushchev with his predecessor, Joseph Stalin.

Like Stalin, Mr. Khrushchev is now the public head of both the Soviet State and of the ruling Communist Party. Like Stalin, Mr. Khrushchev is the object of public adulation which attributes all major Soviet successes to his leadership and inspiration. Like Stalin, Mr. Khrushchev is the author of the speeches and statements to which Soviet writers look for appropriate quotations that are regarded as being authoritative dogma on all current questions.

Yet there are also some important differences between the Khrushchev and the Stalinist periods, which suggest that some caution is advisable before reaching the conclusion that the present ruler of the Soviet Union has simply mechanically repeated the pattern that existed when Stalin died.

The most important difference is that there is not in the Soviet Union now the terrible, stark atmosphere of terror imposed by the secret police that existed in Stalin's last years. Premier Khrushchev goes to great pains to mingle with the people in a manner reminiscent of an American politician seeking votes, something Stalin never did.

SPOTLIGHT ON HOPEFULS

Perhaps the matter is best summed up by the conclusion that Premier Khrushchev is the rational head of a bureaucratic dictatorship, while Stalin was the paranoid chief of a secret police system of total terror.

It is typical of the differences between the two men's style of rule that the key figures surrounding Premier Khrushchev—the obvious central characters in any discussion of the succession to him—have been far less in the shade in Soviet society than were Khrushchev & Co. while Stalin lived.

A few months ago eight names would have had to be included in any discussion of the Khrushchev succession problem. Since last December's Central Committee meeting, however, two of the eight, Nikolai I. Belyaev, former party boss in the vast Kazakhstan area, and Aleksei I. Kirichenko, former party personnel chief, have been demoted to the posts of provincial party bosses. They have presumably, therefore, had their future political prospects seriously dimmed, if not extinguished. Let us look at the half dozen who remain, the roles they occupy now, and their possibilities for maneuver.

ECONOMICS EXPERT

Oldest of the six is First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, 64, the top Soviet foreign economics expert. He has the prestige of having been a hero of the early days of the Soviet regime and of having been astute enough to survive a quarter of a century's vicissitudes in Kremlin factional battles. But his age and the fact that he is an Armenian suggest that his future is more likely to be that of an elder statesman than of a successor.

The youngest of the group is First Deputy Premier Frol R. Kozlov, 51. Premier Khrushchev told Averell Harriman last year that Mr. Kozlov was his choice to succeed him as Premier, but that job alone is not the center of Soviet power. He is still a relative newcomer to the Kremlin heights and so far as can be judged has not yet managed to build a personal power machine.

Next to the Premier, the most senior party secretary is Mikhail A. Suslov, 57, who has the reputation of being the leader of such Stalinist forces as have survived within the Soviet hierarchy. Primarily a theoretician and a propagandist, he seems to be the darling of Peiping's Communists and has managed to survive while still manifesting some clear signs of an independent attitude vis-à-vis Mr. Khrushchev.

Another party secretary, Averki B. Aristov, 56, may now again be head of the party's personnel division, a post of great potential power. Raised to the top by successful party leadership in Siberia, he is probably the leader of such "Siberian faction" as exists in the party machine.

Leonid I. Brezhnev, 53, a party secretary, has gone far by successfully carrying out Mr. Khrushchev's orders in the Ukraine and Moldavia in the 1940's and in Kazakhstan in the mid-1950's. He appears to be in charge of Soviet metallurgy, perhaps of all Soviet heavy industry, and his strength presumably lies in the industrial machine he commands.

AGRICULTURE DEPUTY

Finally there is Nikolai G. Ignatov, 58, who appears to be Mr. Khrushchev's deputy for agriculture. His closest party connections appear to be in European Russia, where he has held key posts, but whatever personal apparatus he may now have built up would seem to exist mainly among the bureaucrats who direct the nearly one-half of the Soviet population engaged in farming.

We know too little about the relationships among these six men, and among others who are less important, to predict in detail what would happen if Premier Khrushchev were to be replaced in the near future. But on the basis of what happened in the mid-1950's, in the period following Stalin's death, the likely future pattern would seem clear.

The immediate stress would be on collective leadership and on an outward show of solidarity among the heirs who were left. One of them, probably Mr. Kozlov but possibly Mr. Mikoyan, would be appointed Premier, while the key figures would have posts in the party's Presidium and Secretariat. Then the hidden rivalry and competition for power would presumably begin in earnest, culminating in a series of crises, in each of which some of those now great and powerful would be disgraced, until finally one person emerged again to exercise his version of one-man rule.

It is conceivable, for example, that Mr. Suslov would make a bid for power by appealing to the party bureaucracy to reverse some of the present leader's key policy revisions: the new emphasis on housing and consumer goods, the milder attitude toward the United States, and the like.

OPPOSING FACTION

If so, he would presumably be opposed by another faction, probably led by Mr. Mikoyan and some younger ambitious men, who might argue that Premier Khrushchev had not gone far enough. Such a revisionist group might try to appeal over the heads of the party bosses to the Soviet population, counting on the people's desire for a sharply improved living standard and for real peace to bring victory over the neo-Stalinists.

Should any such struggle arise, of course, the Chinese Communists might be tempted to intervene on one side or the other. And if they did, complications would arise for which there is no precedent in Soviet history and whose results no one can now predict.

Health and Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the opposition of President Eisenhower and the administration to propose some

system of health insurance for the aged is most unfortunate and shocking to a great majority of our people.

In my remarks, I include an editorial "Health and Old Age" appearing in the Washington Post of March 24, 1960:

HEALTH AND OLD AGE

There is a distressing lack of sensibility and imagination in the administration's failure to propose some system of health insurance for the aged. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, supported by Vice President Nixon, is said to have tried zealously to win presidential approval for an alternative to the comprehensive bill introduced by Representative AMER J. FORAND which would finance medical and hospital care for retired persons through increased social security taxes. But the President is reported to be adamantly opposed to the Forand bill, or any other insurance plan, on the ground that it would amount to socialized medicine. This bogus label applied by the propagandists of the American Medical Association to any form of prepayment for medical care is plain nonsense. It is especially disarming to find President Eisenhower narcotized by it.

Old age is the time of life when, generally, income is lowest and potential and actual illness is at its highest. Why should it be called socialistic for Americans to provide for the health hazards of their retirement years by paying insurance premiums through taxation during their wage-earning years? This is not socialism; it is simple commonsense. It is a practical scheme for enabling citizens to face old age with confidence and self-respect—to know that they need not depend upon the charity of doctors and hospitals for whatever medical care they may require. This is no more socialistic than any other form of social security.

Apart from the obvious interest of the aged themselves in providing for the future, there is a no less obvious national interest in seeing them provided for. Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging offers some interesting statistics. In 15 years, it reports, the over-65 age group will increase from the current 16 million to 22 million; currently, moreover, 1 out of every 3 persons between the ages of 60 and 64 has a parent or close relative in his 80's or older—the medical care of whom represents a serious drain on income.

Insured medical care for the aged will mean more hospitals, more remuneration for physicians, better health for the Nation as a whole. Failure to see this is a failure of responsibility. What a tragedy that the AMA's myopia and callousness should have infected even the President.

Small-Farm Cost Plight Illustrated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is always important that the Congress know what is going on on the homefront. Individuals connected with the Government have sincerely tried to better the lot of agriculture. We should keep in mind that a problem cannot be solved by pretending that it does not exist.

Net farm income is down to a point

where it is unfair to the Nation's farmers. I think there is a responsibility on all in dealing with this situation and is a responsibility on the administration and on the Congress, on the Republicans and the Democrats, and on the competing farm organizations. Politics and pet theories should be set aside and these groups should get together in a spirit of give and take in an effort to write helpful farm legislation.

In recent days, Mr. Don Muhm, farm editor of the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald, in his widely read column set forth some facts and figures which merit our attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the column may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Their being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL-FARM COST PLIGHT ILLUSTRATED

A veteran Farmers Home Administration supervisor provides figures which pretty much show the plight of the cost-price squeeze on the small farmer.

Irwin J. Doane, supervisor for the FHA in Butler, Seward, and Polk Counties, summarized 1959 averages from customer's well kept records.

He found:

The average farm was 257 acres in size, had a 1959 income of \$6,882, cost \$4,486 in operating expenses and left \$2,396 net for the farmer.

The farmer averaged 51.9 bushels per acre of corn (figure includes irrigated corn), 6.8 baby pigs per litter and had a yield per cow of 172.9 pounds of butterfat.

EIGHTY FARMS

"The summary was based on 80 farms in the three-county area." Mr. Doane, who has offices in David City, told the World-Herald.

"It sure points out the necessity of good production. And it is pretty evident what is happening to the small farmer."

Mr. Doane, who has been with the FHA 17 years, feels the margin between farm income and farm operating costs is "about as rough as I've ever seen it."

"Out of that \$2,396 net income must come family living expense, debt payment and capital purchases," Mr. Doane added. "That shows you why so many go to town to work as much as they can."

ALLTIME HIGH

Farmers, ranchers, and their cooperatives borrowed \$4 billion in 1959, according to the Farm Credit Administration.

That is an alltime high.

And, according to R. B. Tootell, governor of the farm credit system, the 1959 figure is an increase of \$599 million.

Also, it marked the sixth straight year that a record was set.

Water—Key to Your Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include an address made by Maj. J. L. Murphy, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, be-

fore the Manteo Ruritan Club, Manteo, N.C., on March 21, 1960.

WATER—KEY TO YOUR SURVIVAL—WILDLIFE
WEEK, MARCH 20-26, 1960

(Talk delivered by Maj. J. L. Murphy, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve (retired), before Manteo Rotary Club, Manteo, N.C.)

Chairman Taylor, distinguished guests, members of Manteo Rotary Club, the last time it was my privilege to visit with you, shortly after having been retired by the U.S. Marine Corps, I recall having said, among other things, that our advanced technology and ingeniousness, our vast industrial complex, the improvement of our personal and political moral standards over those of the 1920's, skilled leadership, the indomitable courage of our fighting men and our rich inheritance of natural resources accounted in large part for our winning World War II.

Tonight, I shall confine myself to remarks regarding our rapidly vanishing renewable natural resources with emphasis on "Water—Key to Your Survival," the theme of Wildlife Week 1960, sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation.

A brief statement of just what the National Wildlife Federation is, might be in order. The federation has a membership of well over 2 million individuals affiliated through conservation organizations in each of the 50 States of this country. These persons are dedicated to the necessary and beneficial use of our remaining natural resources and the protection and replacement of our sources of supply. No dues are collected by the federation, the sole source of support for its widespread activities comes from the sale of these wildlife stamps and a few related items.

The policies of the National Wildlife Federation are established by a board of directors of 17 members. The 4 general officers and 13 regional directors. I am a member of this board representing the region composed of the States of North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, and West Virginia. Under a paid executive director, the staff of the several divisions, education, conservation, business, and field implement these policies.

Because the federation is inherently an educational organization, its opinion and support is frequently sought by Members of the Congress, by governors and State legislators, and by the several Federal, State and local agencies concerned with our tragic neglect and waste in resource administration. Currently, attention is concentrated on the scarcity of potable water due to pollution, deforestation, expanding population, waste and related adverse influences.

We in North Carolina are fortunate in that our Senators, SAM ERVIN and EVERETT JORDAN and so many of our Representatives in the Congress are members of important committees before which bills affecting natural resources are studied. Our own First District Congressman, HERBERT C. BONNER is chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It is to this committee that much of the legislation concerned with our natural resources is referred. Mr. BONNER, over the years, has demonstrated his deep concern and studied conviction that our remaining renewable natural resources must be saved from the despoiling hands of greedy men and from the waste that can be attributed to man only on the basis of ignorance or stupidity. Yes, we are fortunate to have Mr. BONNER in this important post where he has earned the confidence and respect of conservationists throughout the United States. You folks at home should know this.

The North Carolina Resources Commission, in frequent conference with our State federation, has one of the outstanding conservation programs and one of the most experienced, alert, and active staffs of any in

the Nation. It was my privilege to have a small part in the creation of this commission and in the passage of legislation establishing the Stream Sanitation Commission and our newly organized Water Resources Commission. Currently I am concerned with a program of broad resource conservation education at the national level.

With well over half of the area of Dare County made up of water, it would appear that there is little for you to worry about. However, we must remember that local economy is firmly based on our State and national economy and that any setback in these areas will seriously affect us here at home. The river systems that find their outlet in our broad sounds must be kept free from pollution if we are to be free from contaminated supplies. The scarcity of usable waters is national in scope. Just about the same amount of water from the heavens continues to fall on this country as before. Scarcity arises because we do not protect and wisely care for what we have and because of increased demands due to higher standards of living and rising population. In just about the time it took me to say that last sentence, a child was born in this country, a net gain of one over deaths every 11 seconds. One more mouth to feed, a body to clothe, one more to house and to educate, one more to consume water. We must also be prepared to meet increased requirements for agriculture and for industrial expansion. It is estimated that by 1975, in just 15 years, our consumption of water will more than double present rates. To meet these needs requires the close cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies as well as individuals and private organizations with each performing their proper function. You and I have an obligation in this respect.

A headline in the paper this morning reads "Franklin Seeks Water Solution." Franklin, Va., is but a scant hundred miles from here as the crow flies. It is not a large community yet, to support its economy, requires 26 million gallons of water per day. The population needs 1 million and local industry uses 25 million gallons each day. The water table there has fallen from 26 feet to 114 feet and is still falling. We know of communities in this State where water is drastically curtailed during certain seasons and it just could happen here as we continue to grow and our water table lowers.

The necessity for clean waters that I have been speaking about have had to do with consumptive use. In this locality recreational use of water has a direct bearing on our economy. Fishing, hunting, and boating are important activities to us. It is therefore to our interest to concern ourselves with the pollution problems of upstate communities in order to insure the safety of the waters surrounding us for those who fish and hunt and bathe. To that end, we should encourage such programs as adequate sewerage treatment plants, increase in farm woodlots to provide a natural sponge for rainfall, assist farm agents in expanding improved agricultural practice to prevent continued erosion, don't cut down a single tree without replacing it. Encourage the planting of cover for wildlife as this will increase absorption and prevent runoff, give voice to your opposition to further drainage of pot-holes and submarginal lands that destroy waterfowl breeding areas. Assurance of an adequate, clean water supply requires constant vigil and cooperation. Earlier this month, I spent 10 days in Dallas, Tex., attending the annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation and the North American Wildlife Conference. There I heard speakers from all sections of the country—South, North, East, and West—express deep concern for our growing water problems and the necessity for studied teamwork to solve them. In the final analysis, however, each of us

must give heed to the situation and thought to correcting it. Where there is waste there will be want is surely true of water and continued abuse of this essential resource will rise to plague us until the end of time.

Contamination from atomic fallout and the disposal of atomic waste in coastal waters is but the latest manmade threat to survival. In rivers, the water that you touch is the last of what has passed and the first of that which comes. Keep it clean, keep it pure, for water is the key to your survival.

Thank you.

Reform School Graduate to Intercollegiate Boxing Champion and Now Million-Dollar-a-Year Insurance Success a Real Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I have read a newspaper sketch about a young man who is a friend of mine who has achieved an inspiring personal success.

His life started off in a bleak direction, however, for as a chronic truant in his childhood, he was sent to the Wisconsin State Reformatory at the age of 10. Here he discovered a skill which he used to gain self-respect and follow to a fine education and a promising future. He was a good fighter. For this young man, Robert Hinds, boxing enabled him to win success as a Golden Gloves, collegiate champion, and as a professional boxer.

Bob Hinds' major at the University of Wisconsin might seem far afield from his boxing talents; he studied art and sculpture, and had one of his drawings exhibited in the New York Museum of Fine Arts.

After graduation, Bob became an art teacher at Madison East High School, and also coached the school hockey team to a championship. To me, the only unfortunate aspect of Bob's story is that he felt compelled to leave the teaching profession in order to provide for his wife and family as he wished. Bob is exactly the type of young man who is a proper and effective inspiration and mentor for our children. There is, of course, no profession in our society that is more important to our future and our children's future than the teaching profession, and every loss of a talented and qualified teacher is a great loss to our society.

Bob Hinds is now a great success in the insurance field. He has earned more in this profession in his first 6 months than he did in 4 years of teaching. Wisconsin citizens are sincerely proud of Bob's achievements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article published in the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, and reprinted in the Kenosha Evening News, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER BOXER, BOB HINDS, BIG SUCCESS
(By Samuel C. Reynolds)

MADISON.—Bob Hinds today is a sensational success.

Last August, Bob, a former heavyweight on the University of Wisconsin varsity boxing team, began selling life insurance, and by January 16 had written more than \$1 million worth.

In insurance circles this is not just success, but unbelievable success.

ONCE CHRONIC TRUANT

Yet at one time this cheerful, personable young man was a lost soul. He was a chronic truant and landed in Waukesha Boys' Reformatory at 10 and stayed for 15 months.

The reformatory provided Bob with one great skill, without which he believes he would not be a success today—how to fight with his fists, and the knowledge that he was good at it.

This gave him the peg to grab to wrench himself back to a position of self-respect. He was good at fighting. For a boy who didn't feel himself good for much of anything, fighting was, strangely, the key to a successful future.

After leaving Waukesha, Bob went to live with a photographer on the Kenosha Evening News named Marshall Simonson.

HELPS GROWING BOY

"Marshall did a lot for me," Bob recalled. "He pushed me toward getting a better education. He concerned himself with my dress and behavior. He chewed me out when I needed it, and every time he did I knew he was right."

"Everyone has something good about them which they can take hold of and exploit," Bob said.

"For me it was boxing."

And Bob was good at it. In 1947, at the age of 14, he won the State 147-pound Golden Gloves championship, and repeated in 1949 in the 160-pound class.

GAVE RECOGNITION

These successes gave him the recognition he needed, and never again did Bob jump the track headed toward success.

Another friend and helper was Alan "The Horse" Ameche, Kenosha's, Wisconsin's, and now the Baltimore Colts' great football player. Hinds lived with Ameche during his freshman year in college.

Bob played fullback on the same Kenosha High School team as Ameche.

"Al is a very steady, not a rowdy kind of guy, and was a good influence on me," Bob said.

DUBIOUS HONOR

Among the Kenosha boys coming to the University of Wisconsin in 1951, Hinds and Ameche had the poorest high school scholastic records.

Ameche was a scholastic All-American for 2 years in college and Bob finished with a "B" average.

His major, too, seems rather surprising for a man who established a record as one of the most bruising college pugilists in the 3 years—1953 through 1955—he was varsity heavyweight.

He majored in art, with special interest in sculpturing and graphic arts. A figure drawing he did was exhibited in the New York Museum of Fine Arts.

1956 GRADUATE

Bob married the former Joy Harrington in Mazomanie in August, 1955. They have a boy, Jef, 3½, and a girl, Jill, 2.

He graduated from college in 1956 and began as an art teacher at Madison East. He coached the school's hockey team in 1958 and 1959 and won the city championship. This

was not bad for a coach who had never skated in his life.

He continued boxing after becoming a teacher, much to the discomfiture of Madison school officials.

Bob fought his last professional battle in Kenosha in July 1958.

RESIGNS AS TEACHER

He resigned as a teacher last July and began selling General Life insurance, under the direction of Ralph Shillinglaw, agency manager.

"I know of no instance in the history of the life insurance business where one man sold a million dollars worth in 6 months," Shillinglaw commented.

Bob believes his early troubles and his interest in art are both a help to him in his new career.

They certainly seem to be. Bob estimates that in the past 6 months, he has made more money than in 4 years of teaching.

But the best part of success for Bob is not the money.

"The nicest thing is when I think of where I was, and what I could have been, compared with where I am now," he said.

Bradley Wins National Invitation Basketball Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1957, just 3 years ago next Saturday, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, calling attention of the House to the fact that Bradley University of Peoria, Ill., had been crowned NIT champions. As an alumnus of Bradley, which is located in my congressional district, I was naturally very proud of this achievement, but today, I have, as a result of Bradley's recent NIT championship, even more reason to point up the signal accomplishments of Bradley's basketball Braves.

"Even greater achievements can be expected from Coach Chuck Orsborn and his Bradley Braves in years to come." These words concluded by previous remarks to which I have referred above, and no statement could have been made which would have expressed more accurately Orsborn's future.

In Chuck Orsborn's 4 years as head coach, Bradley has been in four national invitation tournaments. They missed the finals only once since 1957 and they missed a third championship only by the margin of an overtime loss in last year's championship game.

Bradley has been traditionally tough in tournaments. The Braves have a 9-won 3-loss record in the NCAA with two second place finishes included, and in the NIT, they own a 13-8 mark and 2 titles.

This past season's record of 27 wins against only 2 defeats marks the best in Bradley University history. It was, therefore, not surprising to see Bradley's coach, Chuck Orsborn named as the

Missouri Valley Conference's Coach of the Year.

Another item of import in Bradley's success was the predominance of sophomores and juniors, so once again we can look to the "years to come." Those who propelled Bradley to their second NIT crown and participated in the Herculean effort by the entire team in overcoming a 12-point deficit in the closing minutes of the championship game to win it going away are as follows: Dan Smith, Ed Wodka, All-American Chet Walker, Al Saunders, Mike Owens, Chuck Sash, Mack Herndon, Chuck Granby, Lee Edwards, Don Kissock, Mickel Tiemann, and Bill Roecker.

Texas Legislator Bill Kilgarlin Sees the Issue: Who Pays the Taxes—Main Difference Between Democrats and Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us have heard and read many definitions of the difference between Democrats and Republicans. Indeed many of us in the Senate have over the years debated this question with fervor and at considerable length.

One of the most penetrating, concise, and clear statements on the difference between our basic political party beliefs has been written by a brilliant young State representative in Texas, the Honorable Bill Kilgarlin, of Harris County. Representative Kilgarlin is a former professor at the University of Houston.

Mr. Kilgarlin says that for all practical purposes the "sole question is who pays the taxes." No matter how strong a preparedness program we forge, no matter how decent and responsible a public welfare program we institute, no matter how much as freemen we do to help the huddled, hungry, hopeless people of our own land and of other parts of the world, Mr. Kilgarlin's test is still a vital one. Who pays the taxes? Will it be, in a fair share, that 1 percent of Americans who own one-third of the Nation's wealth, or will it be, to a grossly unfair share, those one-third of the American people who own only 1 percent of the Nation's wealth? Representative Kilgarlin posed the question.

As one of Texas' most able and dedicated young statesmen, as State president of Texas Young Democratic Clubs, Representative Kilgarlin has written a column for the Texas Observer which is worthy of the thought and consideration of all of us in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column from the March 18, 1960, issue of the Texas Observer entitled: "The Real Issue: Who Pays the Taxes."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL ISSUE: WHO PAYS THE TAXES

(By Bill Kilgarlin)

HOUSTON.—There is perhaps no comment more exasperating to me than "I really can't tell the difference between Democrats and Republicans," unless it might be, "I vote for the man and not the party." Both probably have their origin in Texas, at least, within that same family tree of communication media which as long as I can remember have urged the election of a Republican President in leap year Novembers while plugging for conservative Democrats in Texas every other summer. It is just this encouragement of party irresponsibility which has led to illegitimacy in the family tree of Texas politics.

All but the most casual observers recognize the existence of some differences in political parties and political ideologies, but the newspapers have been woefully remiss (and perhaps by choice) in failing to pinpoint the most basic distinction existing in American politics, the difference between liberalism and conservatism.

In its August 3, 1958 issue, the Houston Chronicle editorialized on the subject, using such phrases as "more and more power in the hands of the Federal Government" and "high level of taxing and spending for such purposes as foreign aid, domestic welfare programs" to describe liberals, and "preserving States' rights," "opposing giveaway welfare and subsidy programs," and "keeping government close to the people" to designate conservatives. Somebody ought to invite the editors of the Chronicle to take another look at the picture. They and their colleagues would find at the bottom of the distinction the sole question of who pays the taxes.

That "more and more power in the hands of the Federal Government" really means, "We don't want Federal aid to education because the Federal Government has demonstrated a philosophy of taxing in accord with ability to pay. We're for supporting education, all right, but we want State legislators to do it because they protect our advertisers by upping the sales taxes on those least able to pay, the consumers who spend almost all they earn. Of course, that goes for such things as county hospitals. While we think such things are socialistic in principle if we're going to have them, let's finance them with a big bond issue so more of our advertisers can make a profit. Besides, we all know that property evaluations along Main Street are not nearly as high proportionally as those out in the residential areas. At any rate, it's better than a Federal health insurance program, which would be paid for out of income tax revenues."

Without attempting to carry this semi-ridiculous paraphrase any further, the point can be strengthened by a glimpse back at the 56th Texas Legislature, where in each of the four sessions the paramount issue was taxation. The liberals were plugging for a program based upon ability to pay, and from the day the first howl of anguish went up to save the hallowed banking institution, it was apparent what the conservatives were plugging for. The State of Texas still cannot extract its own money from the banks of this State. The final law contained a few sops for the liberals but in the main generalized a little more our nongeneral sales taxes.

The big issue was not spending. There was no talk about cutting out all this waste. Neither conservatives nor liberals were thinking about the Chronicle's "high level of spending" thesis when they went to bat for the State hospitals and colleges back home or those wonderful farm-to-market roads. While in truth most of the liberals were dis-

appointed that the appropriations bill was not larger, particularly for places like Gatesville and State hospitals and special schools, they, too, were swept along in the tide of thinking that asked not how much, but who pays.

The resolution passed by the Texas Legislature calling for the repeal of the 16th amendment got scant notice, yet it was one of the most basic issues on which liberals and conservatives drew the line. I do not know what substitute the conservatives have to offer for the income tax, but I can visualize such things as a national sales tax in the offing.

I realize that all differences between these two ideologies cannot be categorized under tax philosophy, and yet the battle over who pays the taxes is certainly the central issue in controversy. And often if the issue is not taxes it is a related fiscal matter such as high interest rates, tax writeoffs for a favored few, awarding contracts and then subsidizing private power companies where public power would have been better. It is no secret that big business favors the Republicans because Republicans consistently help out big business where the latter are most concerned, the pocketbook.

So when I am asked about differences between liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, I no longer attempt a detailed analysis. I just say the question is, "Who's going to pay the taxes?"

**Geneva Conference on Discontinuance of
Nuclear Weapons Testing**

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for over 16 months the British and United States representatives have reasoned and argued patiently with Soviet representatives at the Geneva conference on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons testing.

From the very beginning the Soviets have made clear their position and from this they have never budged:

First. They have insisted on a total and immediate ban on all testing.

Second. They have treated the inspection system as being something that can be worked out at leisure.

Third. They have tried to brush away the technical limitations of inspection.

Fourth. They would have us buy the test ban and worry about details of inspection afterward.

On March 19 the Soviets publicized and put forth what they claim as a new proposal. They have ballyhooed this as a great concession and one capable of breaking the deadlock. Yet it is obvious from a brief study of their proposition it represents no concession. It is one more attempt to force us into a total ban no matter the technical capability of detection, nor the degree of inspection they will allow in their country.

As you will remember the United States has for many months attempted

to reach agreement on a treaty which was as broad as possible, subject only to the condition that all its aspects must be capable of adequate monitoring.

We have established that tests in the atmosphere can be inspected and identified by technical means, as can those at altitude and with certain limitations.

We have established too, however, that the problem of monitoring underground tests, at least those giving a small signal, is much more difficult, if not impossible.

In recognition of these facts the President on April 13, 1959, proposed adoption of an atmospheric-only ban with joint research to improve detection systems. Khrushchev dismissed this proposal out of hand.

After further study and joint technical conferences on seismic detectability, the United States proposed on February 11, 1960, its threshold plan. Under this proposal tests in the atmosphere, in the ocean, and in space up to heights where effective controls can now be agreed, would be forbidden. More importantly those underground and which gave a seismic signal of magnitude greater than a certain value would be forbidden. Those of less than that value, because of the limitations of detection and inspection, would not be forbidden initially by the treaty. Joint research would be undertaken to determine the possibility of lowering the threshold as seismic detectability improved.

The Soviets have responded by claiming to accept the threshold principle and even the threshold value we propose. Yet they have conditioned this acceptance with limitations which make it meaningless. They accept only if there is a simultaneous treaty agreement to forego for several years those tests of less than the threshold value. Along with this they continue to indicate they will accept only the most limited and inadequate onsite inspection for investigation of suspicious events. In essence they continue to insist on a total ban and inadequate inspection.

I was convinced on my trips to Geneva to observe the conference that the Soviets were interested in a ban but only if no real penetration of their country was involved. I was convinced also, that as long as we continue our moratorium while discussions proceed, they are achieving in major part their objective.

We are now entering into a new era in disarmament negotiations, one in which the 10-power disarmament conference is considering many possible areas of agreement. The recent conduct of the Soviets in the test cessation conference has been far from reassuring in regard to real progress in these new areas. It would be tragic in my opinion for us to agree to a test moratorium treaty with the type of arrangements the Soviets visualize. To do so it would involve limitations in this area which were inadequately controlled. Moreover, it would furnish precedent for similar agreements on trust in other, perhaps even more critical areas.

Fidel Castro—Voice of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Latins Consider Fidel Castro as Voice of Russia," written by Jules Dubois and published in the Miami (Fla.) News of March 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATINS CONSIDER FIDEL CASTRO AS VOICE OF RUSSIA

(By Jules Dubois)

Fidel Castro is being hailed as the voice of Russia in Latin America and there is every evidence that he is working overtime to justify the title and seems to like it.

It has been well earned, for the bearded, rabble-rousing revolutionary premier of Cuba has displaced all of Moscow's former stooges. The Communists have labeled him the "leader of America" and his inflated ego has made him believe it.

Castro may not have joined the Partido Socialista Popular, which is Cuba's Communist Party, but membership is no longer a requisite nor very important in the execution of the Kremlin's master plan.

Ex-Presidents Juan Jose Arevalo and Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala never were known to have been admitted into Communist Party membership, but they led Guatemala into almost 10 years of Red rule.

A Spanish leftist career officer, Gen. Alberto Bayo, who says he's anti-Communist, trained Castro's initial invasion force of 82 men that sailed from Mexico in November 1956 to land in Oriente Province and set Cuba aflame.

Before that force left Mexico, however, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, young Argentine adventurer who had been friendly with the Communists in Guatemala, obtained a copy of a Russian book on guerrilla warfare tactics. Guevara cherished that book as a pious person would a Bible.

He attributed his success in the fighting in Oriente Province and later in Las Villas Province to what he had learned from that book.

Spanish leftist exiles made their way into the hills of Oriente Province and volunteered their services as gunsmiths and ordnance experts to Castro's forces. Their skill and ingenuity contributed greatly to supplying Castro with sufficient firepower for his small force to hold off dictator Fulgencio Batista's army until he could build up his own arms and munitions.

There is indisputable evidence, as I reported last October, that Castro either is a captive of the Communists or is in full agreement with them. The latter now appears to be the more logical assumption and is supported by the following:

He eliminated President Manuel Urrutia; Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz-Lanz, his chief of air force; and Maj. Hubert Matos, his military commander of Camaguey Province, because they were anti-Communist.

He used Communist smear tactics to discredit them before the Cuban people.

He has given increasingly free rein and positions of influence to Communists in the armed forces and the government.

He has refused to eliminate Communists from the officers' corps of the army.

He has made a documented Communist commander of the army ground forces, known in Cuba as the "tactical forces." He is Maj. Armando Acosta.

He has admonished the armed forces that any talk among troops against Communists or communism would be considered "counter-revolutionary."

He has allowed the Communist Party to organize and operate freely throughout the country while he berates plans of other parties or groups—all anti-Communist—to organize.

He made a trade and diplomatic deal with Russian Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan in which he promised Cuba's vote to the Communist bloc at the United Nations. That promise is implicit in the joint communique issued by Castro and Mikoyan as the latter ended his visit to Cuba.

He has made it extremely dangerous and unpopular to be outspokenly anti-Communist in Cuba.

He is seizing and confiscating private property, ranches, sugar plantations, sugar mills, businesses, and industries without any compensation whatsoever and much less the 20-year bonds required by the agrarian reform law.

He is directing personally the brainwashing of the Cuban people in the most concerted and concentrated "hate America" campaign in history.

He approved the publication and distribution as the official textbook for all high schools a geography written by Capt. Antonio Nunez-Jimenez, his Communist executive director of the Agrarian Reform Institute over which Castro presides. The geography rewrites the history of U.S. participation in the Spanish-American War.

It also preaches Communist economic social and political doctrine, although it does not mention Russia. And it advocates the U.S. evacuation of the Guantanamo Bay naval base in eastern Cuba.

He has ordered Cuban diplomats to spearhead anti-American activities throughout Latin America and especially in Panama.

He has organized a Latin American news service in which most of the staff and correspondents are Communists or fellow travelers.

He is fast eradicating all remaining freedom of speech and of the press.

He has seized or acquired all newspapers in the provinces and most of them in Havana. He also has seized or acquired several radio and television networks.

He has indicated there is little likelihood that free elections ever will be held under his rule.

He is leading the country into total dictatorship of the working class. When the chips are down and an inevitable opposition erupts into armed action, he might well become a bloodier dictator than any of his predecessors.

He deliberately and repeatedly accuses the United States of military and economic plotting against Cuba.

His newspaper, *Revolucion*, in violent language repudiated the American Embassy's statement of condolences over the recent disastrous explosion of a munitions ship in Havana Harbor.

His government cabled its thanks and appreciation for a message of condolence for the same blast from Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, while angrily rejecting the protest by Secretary of State Christian Herter that Castro's accusations of U.S. responsibility for the blast were false.

Castro has gone full circle back to the days when, as a university student, he was teamed with Communists at the University of Havana. Today, just as then, he finds Communists useful and expedient for his objectives. Conversely, Communists feel the same way about him.

Prize-Winning Essays on "Conservation, Whose Responsibility?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 there appeared in the Johnson City Record-Courier, one of the fine weekly newspapers in the 10th Congressional District of Texas, three of the winners in the 1960 Blanco County Conservation Essay Contest, the subject of which was "Conservation, Whose Responsibility?"

The essays were judged on the basis of originality, significance of content, and overall impact, and first place in the contest was won by Miss Joanne Lindig, second place by Miss Patsy Felps, and third place by Miss Corrie Ann Crofts.

Because of the timely nature of this subject, I know that the Members of Congress will be interested to note the perception of these fine young people, whose essays follow:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS ON "CONSERVATION, WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?"

(By Joanne Lindig, first place winner)

As I analyze this wonderful world of ours, I am confronted by two specific questions—What is the source of America's greatness, and to whom goes the responsibility for preserving her strength.

Freedom and personal liberty stand strong in America, but the basic ingredient of her greatness is the soil.

Our ancestors discovered this land, worked it, enriched it—yes, even wasted it. We cannot afford to gamble our resources, for unlike our grandfathers, there is no unexplored West for us to move on to, when this land is tired and spent. Money will not buy resources which have been wasted. They must be worked for, cultivated, and protected.

Moon rockets and conservation are to a great extent similar. Our continued world leadership depends not only upon our conquest of space but also the stewardship of our soil.

American agriculture is faced with grave responsibilities—her own increasing population, as well as countless foreigners are dependent upon our soil's prosperity.

Who can stand above a waving field of golden wheat, or newly harrowed field and not feel a deep sense of personal responsibility for its continued productivity?

People, evading their responsibilities, have attempted to shove conservation on to the shoulders of our Congressmen and the soil conservationists. These programs are doing more than their share. Conservation is too large a job to do alone. It requires the backing of all America.

It is time for the young people of America to wake up to the realization that as we are heirs to the land, we are also heirs to a responsibility for its conservation.

It is our debt and privilege, to ourselves, our forefathers, and our posterity, to leave the land richer and better for our having lived.

Natural resources are the basic source of America's greatness, and their conservation is a mandatory responsibility to everyone—the man behind the desk; the man with the hoe; students in college, and even the Presi-

dent of the United States. Indeed every man, woman, and child who warrants God's nearness, personal dignity, and national loyalty, has a responsibility to his God, to himself, and to his Nation for America's conservation.

(By Patsy Felps, second place winner)

Rich, productive soil helped us as a young Nation to produce more food and raw materials than we needed. Thus, productive soil contributed to the wealth of the United States and all it stands for. Agriculture, labor, and capital have become inseparable in our way of life. One depends on the other and natural resources continue to be a safeguard for our freedom.

Our land must be managed with "forever" in mind. We cannot take our resources without providing for the future. Put it another way; we preserve the capital and use the interest.

Now, in the mid-20th century, we have decided we had better start taking care of the precious topsoil which makes life possible for us. Our land is in direct connection with our future. It is our duty to keep our soil permanently productive if the foodstuff for our national family must yield from the land which we are preparing today. Healthy people must have healthy food from healthy soil.

Excess cropland has been wasted. This calls for the proper use and protection of every acre of land throughout America through the efforts of every individual. Our progress thus far is but a small fraction of what needs to be done.

When the American people understand a problem, they do something about it. Why, then, haven't more than the few dedicated persons done more about the vitally important work of conservation? It must become the accepted practice of all instead of just something we talk about. We can't risk any more cases of "too little too late." Every man, woman, and child must learn that the conservation of the Nation's resources is a major responsibility of theirs. And in the words of John Milton, "Accuse not nature. She has done her part; do thou thine own."

(By Corrie Ann Crofts, third place winner)

I am an American youth and I speak for conservation of America's land and its natural resources. For these are the symbols and essentialities of America's greatness and future existence.

Conservation is a present and future problem that faces not only the United States but every country in the world. We, as the future citizens of America, must awaken to this plague and meet our responsibilities. At present we must begin to familiarize ourselves with the basic methods of conserving nature. For example, in a government class one does not begin his study at the present age and travel back into the theory of his government, but rather begins with its basic fundamentals and later proceeds to advanced types of governing. Thus, as in the study of conservation we must first learn the basic ground works and then move on to advanced techniques.

As broadminded persons, we certainly realize that the responsibility rests on the shoulders of our citizens.

They are the backbone of America and the only force that can strike back against this great offender.

If we could only stress upon them the importance of knowledge—knowledge that can be gained through material offered to us by conservation experts. These people who have studied cannot be expected to do the job alone.

It takes each and every one of us. The urge to save our country's riches must come

from within. We must implant within ourselves a desire to attend our local soil conservation meetings and seek advice.

If we are as patriotic and peace loving as we profess, we will awaken to our responsibilities and not sit idly by and view the ruin of a land so great as this. For with knowledge as our armor and determination as our shield, triumph in behalf of conservation is inevitable.

The Law and the Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the book entitled "The Law and the Profits," by C. Northcote Parkinson. The review, written by John Chamberlain, was published in the book review section of the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 20, 1960.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING? SEE PARKINSON
LAW No. 2

(Reviewed by John Chamberlain)

When Woodrow Wilson was President he pecked out his own state papers on his trusty typewriter. When he felt the need of a wartime coordinator of public information, he employed one man, George Creel, for the post and told him to do the best he could on a severely limited budget. Though Wilson and Creel did creditable jobs, their day is gone forever. Modern complexity and efficiency require the existence of huge administrative staffs complete with batteries of ghostwriters, secretaries, stenographic pools, statisticians, per diem consultants, fleets of automobiles, and acres of filing cabinets. Or so we have been told.

One man, however, has presumed to doubt the modern faith in group dynamics as applied to the art of administration. When C. Northcote Parkinson, Raffles professor of political economy at the University of Singapore, formulated "Parkinson's Law" several years ago, it was obvious that political science had at last found its Sir Isaac Newton. Like any great principle, Parkinson's law has an elegant simplicity: "Work expands to fill the time available." Applied to government, this law means that the work of any bureau will be multiplied to the utmost limit of the budget which its chiefs are able to chivy out of Congress. Applied to private industry, the same law of bureaucratic expansion will tend to operate—but only up to the point of incipient stockholder rebellion.

When Professor Parkinson first stated his law of bureaucracy, he may have felt that governmental waste would forthwith be laughed out of existence. But—aside from the laughter—nothing happened. Momentarily nonplussed, the professor went to work gathering the information that has resulted in "Parkinson's Second Law." As duly explained in another rib-tickling book, "The Law and the Profits," the second law is most economically stated as "expenditure rises to meet income." With a private fam-

ily, this means that the more its breadwinner earns, the less it is apt to save. Out of this law, consumer credit has waxed fat. With government, the operation of the law has more sinister connotations than the increase of diners' clubs. If there is no legal limit to the taxing power, Parkinson's Second Law simply means that government will tend inexorably to take an ever-increasing percentage of the national income, arriving at last at the point where the economy must collapse upon the tax collectors' heads.

To show his second law in operation, Professor Parkinson has made research forays in two directions. He has rifled the records of civilizations, both ancient and modern, to determine the exact arithmetical point where governmental absorption of the citizens' energies must spill a nation into final decay. And he has collected telling illustrative material by gathering virtually every last scrap of idiotic material bearing on the growth of what he calls "the Anglo-Saxon waste line."

Out of his researches, the professor comes up with a magic figure: 35 percent of the national income is all any government can take in peacetime taxes without provoking complete and final disaster. Although the professor does some pretty fancy work with his slide rule to arrive at such a specific number, it is obvious from his historical citations that the taxation disaster point is somewhere in the neighborhood of a third of national income. This conclusion more or less corroborates the claims made by the Oxford economist, Colin Clark, after his studies of taxation, which make up in massiveness what they lack in Parkinsonian elegance of presentation.

Professor Parkinson does not advocate fixing the upper limits of the taxing power at 35 percent of national income. He would put the ceiling far lower, at 20 percent. This is all that a people will pay without succumbing to an exceedingly flexible interpretation of the idea of honesty, a corroding cynicism, and an unlovely envy. At 25 percent of national income, inflation will accompany the efforts of the tax gatherer to extort the required sum. And at 30 percent of national income, there will, says Professor Parkinson, be a notable decline in a nation's influence. People will cease to work at the top of their bent—and the resulting enfeeblement of the economy will become apparent both to one's allies and one's enemies.

To meet the argument that modern governments must take more than 20 percent of national income to pay for the exigencies of rule in the age of the jetplane and the hydrogen bomb, Parkinson falls back on his first law. With less money at its disposal, a government must automatically become more efficient. Any bureaucrat, says Parkinson, can do more work with fewer operatives to direct. Even the military would do better with a trimmed budgetary appropriation; as Parkinson points out, there is reason to complain when an Air Force bill for \$13.94, payable by a former employee, should have attached to it a 28-page invoice with the signatures of 2 lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 1 captain, a first lieutenant, and 13 civilian department heads.

No fanatic, Professor Parkinson disclaims any sympathy with the anarchistic contention that all taxes are an abomination. He believes in the necessity and in the legitimate functions of government. We must have such things as armaments, courts, roads, and plague prevention, says the professor—and government, he insists, is the natural agency for the provision of such essentials. Nor would the professor dismantle all of the apparatus of the welfare state. He would merely limit the overall funds available to the state on his theory, which he

supports most ably, that the artist—in this case the government employee—must do an infinitely better job if he has to work against resistant material. By making the artist conscious of cost, you improve his work. "Where there is no ceiling to the cost," says Parkinson, "the architect merely goes off his head."

One of Professor Parkinson's pet gripes is the expense incurred in printing things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of a Senator's or Representative's remarks. At the risk of the professor's displeasure, I am asking my Senator—he is PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut—to insert "The Law and the Profits," or at least this review of it, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If such insertion could induce the Congress to act on the Parkinsonian recommendations, it would be waste well spent. And the professor might be willing to admit one exception to his rule.

Caribbean Games Straining Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, March 16, 1960:

CARIBBEAN GAMES STRAINING AIRLIFT—MILITARY LEADERS CITE NEED TO MODERNIZE AND EXPAND THEIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

SAN JUAN, P.R., March 15.—Four-engined planes of the Military Air Transport Service and troops and equipment of the Army's Strategic Army Corps were accumulating impressive arguments here today for a modernized and strengthened military airlift capability.

Operation Big Slam/Puerto Pine, which opened on March 14 and will last for 2 weeks, involves about 444 transport and cargo aircraft of MATS and more than 20,000 troops and 11,000 tons of supplies. About half the aircraft are being used in an unending stream of air life flowing here to Puerto Rico from 14 fields all over the United States.

The other half are working at an accelerated tempo to maintain normal MATS service on global passenger and cargo routes. For the 2 weeks of the exercise the average peacetime flight tempo of MATS of 5 flight hours a day for each plane, is being increased to 8 hours daily.

Pilots are about doubling their flight time for the maneuver. And maintenance men and ground crews are working about 12 hours a day 7 days a week.

The exercise is testing the capability of the Transport Service to increase its flight operations rapidly to wartime tempo and to maintain that tempo for a fairly protracted period.

So far the air lift to Puerto Rico has gone like clockwork, as it was expected it would do. By early this afternoon 94 trips had unloaded 1,638 troops and almost 1,310 tons of supplies. The landings were made at Ramey Air Force Base and at Roosevelt Roads Naval Air Station.

The troops disembark at these staging areas, move into bivouac areas, prepare plans for an imaginary airborne assault against a mythical enemy and, after an average of 2 to 3 days on the ground, reload and fly back to home stations. The maximum number of troops in Puerto Rico at any one time will be about 5,300.

Among the units arriving today were National Guardsmen from the 2d Battalion of the 22d Field Artillery, Utah National Guard. They were flown from Hill Air Force Base near Ogden, Utah.

The 13 other fields at which troops are being loaded are Pope Air Force Base at Fort Bragg, N.C.; Hanscom Air Force Base, near Bedford, Mass.; Dover Air Force Base, near Dover, Del.; Donaldson Air Force Base, near Greenville, S.C.; Lawson Army Air Field, near Columbus, Ga.; El Paso, Tex., International Airport; Kelly Air Force Base, near San Antonio, Tex.; McGuire Air Force Base, near Wrightstown, N.J.; Fort Campbell, Ky.; Scott Air Force Base, near Belleville, Ill.; McChord Air Force Base, near Tacoma, Wash.; Connally Air Force Base, near Waco, Tex., and Charleston Air Force Base, near Charleston, S.C.

Army reservists from the 3d Battalion, 15th Artillery, 79th Infantry Division, are also numbered among the 80 Army units being airlifted here from 31 home stations in the United States. The major Army units involved are from the 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions and the 4th Infantry Division, plus other units of the Army's Strategic Army Corps.

Both Air Force and Army authorities here have strongly emphasized that the operation so far warrants a number of general conclusions.

Troops being moved here spend anywhere from 5 to 18 hours in the air flying in propeller-driven planes, whereas the average tourist flying to Puerto Rico in jets reaches here in about half the time.

MATS, its officers say, badly need modernization. It has only 29 of the most modern cargo aircraft—the Douglas C-133 Cargo-master, and it flies no jets.

The National Civil Liberties Clearing House: Guardian of the American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is appropriate that the National Civil Liberties Clearing House is beginning a 2-day conference in Washington as Congress prepares to enact a civil rights bill. This outstanding organization, which over the years has pioneered with vision and vigor in the fields of civil liberties and human rights, has contributed much to the advancement of the American ideal of equality for all citizens.

Over 100 national groups are expected to participate in this 12th annual conference, and I am confident its deliberations will help all of us who are working for civil rights progress. This morning's Washington Post contains an excellent editorial welcoming the clearinghouse and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GUARDIAN

Representatives of a great variety of national organizations will meet here today and tomorrow for the 12th annual conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

These assemblies have become a most important and useful capital institution. They serve to supplement the regular work of the clearinghouse in keeping its members informed about developments affecting the rights of Americans and the free character of their national community; and they afford an opportunity for discussion and the taking of common counsel regarding civil liberties. We welcome the conferees to Washington, congratulate them on their concern and wish them a more fruitful meeting. The clearinghouse stands as a guardian of the American heritage.

Second Look—Bentley Asks for It on Charges Against UAW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a wire service story which appeared in the Owosso Argus Press as well as the text of my remarks before a meeting of the Republican Town Club of Lansing, Mich., on March 18. I am inserting the following into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the discrepancy between portions of the newspaper account and the printed text of my remarks which was made available to the press:

[From the Owosso Argus Press, Mar. 17, 1960]

SECOND LOOK—BENTLEY ASKS FOR IT ON CHARGES AGAINST UAW

LANSING.—Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, has called for a second look at charges of corruption in the United Auto Workers Union.

BENTLEY said Friday night a Republican minority on the Senate Labor-Management Rackets Committee had shown there was "corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion, and collusion with the underworld within the UAW."

"These charges brought out by Republican Senators are far too serious to be dropped or ignored" even though the Democratic majority gave the UAW a clean bill of health, BENTLEY added.

BENTLEY, who has announced for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Democrat PATRICK McNAMARA, spoke to the Republican Town Club.

He said the Senate committee, now out of operation, needs to be replaced by a similar group to pursue charges against the UAW "relentlessly until no stone is left unturned."

BENTLEY also said that Senator JOHN KENNEDY, a committee member and Democratic presidential hopeful, and his brother, Robert, chief counsel for the committee, "deliberately contrived to prevent any real investigation," of the UAW.

PARTIAL REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ALVIN M. BENTLEY, BEFORE REPUBLICAN TOWN CLUB, LANSING, MARCH 18, 1960

During the life of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, a great deal of information was uncovered and brought to light regarding corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion and collusion with underworld elements in labor organizations

such as the Teamsters, the Carpenters, the Hotel & Restaurant Workers and other unions. In these investigations, all members of the committee cooperated thoroughly, both Democrats and Republicans. The one exception was the senior Senator from Michigan who withdrew from the committee early in its history and, by that action, showed little evidence of interest or concern in exposing such activities in the field of organized labor.

Now, however, members of the committee have divided sharply in their findings involving the United Automobile Workers. Within the past few days, three sets of separate views have been filed by committee members on this question. They included the views of Senators CHURCH and KENNEDY, filed jointly, and also of Senators MCCLELLAN and ERVIN, also filed jointly. These are the four Democratic members of the committee, Senator CHURCH having replaced our senior Senator from Michigan.

In their views on the Kohler and Perfect Circle strikes, these two sets were critical of both management and the union. The McClellan-Ervin views were more critical of the union than were the Kennedy-Church views. Both, however, completely exonerated the United Automobile Workers insofar as corruption and allied charges were concerned.

In contrast, were the separate views of Republican Senators GOLDWATER, MUNDT, CAPEHART, and CURTIS. In the first place, they accused the chief counsel of the Senate committee, Robert Kennedy, of refusing to make a thorough probe of UAW activities. They stated "throughout the course of the investigation a double standard of committee morality prevailed—one procedure was employed for the unions not connected with Walter Reuther and a different procedure was employed for the investigation of activities of the United Automobile Workers."

This, of course, is a serious charge to be brought against an employee of a congressional committee, especially when that employee happens to be the brother of a leading aspirant for the highest office in our country. However, the minority views continue with reference to the United Automobile Workers: "We are convinced that corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion and collusion with the underworld has occurred within the UAW."

Particular reference is made to the committee hearing of one Richard T. Gosser, formerly senior vice president of the UAW. The minority views continue "we have seen sufficient evidence during the Gosser hearing of kickbacks, terrorisms, collusion with gamblers, conflicts of interest, destruction of records, misappropriation of funds, falsification of records, and evasive tactics to convince us that a thorough investigation of the machinations of this individual and others would produce criminality on a scale comparable to that which has been previously exposed by this committee."

After referring to the damaging fact that two UAW witnesses, when questioned on this matter, took the fifth amendment, the minority views conclude by castigating the Democratic members of the committee for limiting the UAW investigations to participation in the Kohler and Perfect Circle labor disputes and for only making a cursory invited examination of a small part of the UAW's financial records. The minority views state that "from this fragmentary and entirely inadequate and incomplete investigation (the Democrats proceed) to issue a clean bill of health to Reuther, the UAW international, all of its officers and to its more than 1,300 locals and many joint councils."

These are grave and serious charges. If true, they would mean that while exposing graft and corruption in the Teamsters and other unions, the Democratic members of the committee, including Senator KENNEDY and his brother, the committee's chief counsel, deliberately contrived to prevent any real investigation of similar practices within the United Automobile Workers. Further, these charges, if proven, would completely abolish Mr. Reuther's claim that the UAW had received a clean bill of health from the committee in these respects. The charges are far too serious to be dropped or ignored.

Unfortunately, the McClellan committee has now passed into history and is now no longer a vehicle for further investigations of this nature. It is certainly not for me to criticize the Senate but I personally deeply regret that the existence of this committee was not prolonged or that it was not replaced by a similar organization.

For one thing, the committee was established to investigate improper activities in the field of management as well as labor but I have seen little, if any, evidence that there was much exploration in this field. Secondly, charges of as serious a nature as the foregoing against the UAW should certainly not be left unanswered but should be pursued relentlessly until no stone is left unturned.

Happily, we do have a vehicle for this second purpose. You will recall that some time ago Mr. Reuther announced the establishment of a public review board for the purpose of investigating all charges of graft and corruption against the UAW. It is my strong conviction that this board should immediately proceed with a thorough and detailed series of public hearings into the validity of these charges made by Republican members of the McClellan committee.

Naturally the board has no jurisdiction as to inquiring into whether there was a "white-wash" of the UAW on the part of the Democratic members of the committee. But where there are serious charges pending against this union, its officers, and members, I do feel that this board, which, I understand, was created for just such a purpose, should undertake a full and complete investigation of this matter. I therefore call upon Walter Reuther to request the members of his public review board to complete the job which it has now been charged that the McClellan Committee left undone. The United Automobile Workers, the largest labor union in our State, should not have these accusations of graft and corruption hanging over the heads of its officers and workers. There should be no shadow of doubt of the good name and reputation of this great organization.

I am certainly not in accord with many of the programs advanced by the UAW. I likewise do not concur fully with their methods of political activity even though I can appreciate and admire the success of their technique. But I am aware of the deep feeling on the part of the people of this country, whether a part of organized labor or not, against graft and corruption on the part of any part of organized labor. The UAW has commendably and properly undertaken to clean its own house. Charges of an extremely serious nature have now been leveled against it. I think the union owes it not only to its own members but to the public at large to have these charges thoroughly investigated by its public review board until the most hardened skeptic remains convinced of its unsullied reputation in this field. I ask Mr. Reuther and the members of the public review board to cooperate in this vital matter.

A New and Human Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part I of a fine study of new problems in conservation policy appearing in *Sports Illustrated*. This is an unusually suggestive analysis. Together with the recent studies by William Whyte, this opens up to the public an outstandingly important issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART I: A NEW AND HUMAN SCIENCE

(By Henry Romney)

In the year 1831 Alexis de Tocqueville, a 26-year-old French nobleman with a genius for observation, visited the United States. In his account, "Democracy in America," one of the greatest of travel books, he characterized the citizens and their New World as "that continent [which] still presents, as it did in the primeval time, rivers that rise from never failing sources, green and moist solitudes, and limitless fields which the plowshare of the husbandman has never turned. The physical position of the country opens so wide a field that man needs only to be let alone to be able to accomplish prodigies. Such is the admirable position of the New World that man has no other enemy than himself."

In the year 1959, only 128 years after Alexis de Tocqueville's visit to the "primeval continent," a distinguished American, Gen. Omar Bradley, surveyed his native land. "Year after year our scenic treasures are being plundered by what we call an advancing civilization," reported the general. "If we are not careful we shall leave our children a legacy of billion-dollar roads leading nowhere except to other congested places like those they left behind. We are building ourselves an asphalt treadmill and allowing the green areas of our Nation to disappear."

And in the year 2000, after a visit to the United States (there were 51 States at that time, including the Virgin Islands) under a study grant from the Rockefeller Bros. Fund (there were 8 Rockefeller brothers) Bagamisa Dankwa, a 26-year-old candidate for a doctor of philosophy degree from the Free University of Ghana in Africa, wrote in his resulting doctoral thesis, "Men of the Concrete Jungle": "Within the past four decades the population of this teeming country has almost doubled. In 1960 there were but 179 million Americans; there are some 325 million today. More than 35 million of these people are over 65, and the life expectancy of the average male citizen is 74, that of his wife 79. The average family income is \$15,000 a year, which is double the 1960 figure. The national average workweek is 28 hours. There are 220 million cars on American roads."

After a brief discussion of comparative data in Ghana, Dr. Dankwa continued: "To the American his leisure time has become his most treasured and sizable personal asset. His choice of a job and habitation is primarily influenced by where he will find

life most pleasant." Here, in one of the many footnotes that annotate his scholarly text, Dr. Dankwa cited a passage from an article entitled "Amenities as a Factor in Regional Growth" published in 1954 by the American Economist Dr. Edward L. Ullman: "For the first time in the world's history, pleasant living conditions—amenities—instead of more narrowly defined economic advantages are becoming the sparks that generate significant population increase * * *. In spite of the handicaps of remote location and economic isolation, the fastest growing States are California, Arizona, and Florida."

But in the year 2000 prosperity had become a two-edged sword—pleasant living conditions and the amenities of life were not to be found easily. "Eighty-five percent of the American people live in cities," reported Dr. Dankwa. "Ten great supercities, boasting 5 million or more inhabitants each, dominate the land and shelter one-third of the total population."

The pattern for the year 2000 is set today. There is a rapidly compounding awareness that for every city-based American it is becoming increasingly difficult to find open country; that on the east and west coasts the cities are agglutinating at an astounding pace, swallowing up the land that once separated them; that beaches are getting smaller and more crowded each summer; that it is getting harder to find or keep up a place to hunt or fish or play golf or spend a vacation. "Never before has suburbia seethed with so many protest meetings," writes William H. Whyte, Jr., editor of the Exploding Metropolis, "whether [highway] rerouting petitions, save-our-trees groups or stop-the-rape-of-the-valley emergency committees." We have already passed the critical point toward total urbanization of the United States—from now on more of the same means a radically different life for all.

Even 15 years from today, by 1975, the fundamental upheavals in population, leisure time, family income, mobility and urbanization of the land triggered by the years immediately following World War II will unavoidably have created a country radically different from what we still consider our heritage. The land as it was in Daniel Boone's time, or at the time of the great westward homesteading migrations, or even at the time the first automobile took to a rutted road, has become little more than a nostalgic memory.

All this being, so and seemingly irreversibly so, what is there to be done about it?

In the first place, is it necessary to do anything about it? The answer is a resounding "Yes." For no matter how urbanized and industrialized man has become—and increasingly will become—he is first and foremost an animal temporally rooted in the soil. Our fundamental heritage is not scientific or industrial but biological. "Man, despite the extraordinary mental accomplishments that have brought about his present-day civilization," writes the great naturalists and conservationist, Fairfield Osborn, "has been, is now and will continue to be part of nature's general scheme." Only very recently in terms of our biological inheritance and our own history on earth have we committed ourselves to that very specialized environment of the present day: The industrial society. We must provide room in that specialized environment for all of our needs, including those, such as communion with nature, which are not directly pertinent to our specialization, for if man cuts himself off entirely from the soil, his own character will change drastically.

To deny the simple human needs for open spaces, water and sky, to repress our humbler, soil-rooted past is dangerous. A psychiatrist recently put it this way: "An individual may not feel the need for occasional replenishment in unspoiled surroundings, but neither does he feel the need for vita-

min D, the deprivation of which produces rickets." The demand for outdoor recreation, by the year 2000, will have mounted toweringly along with the factors producing it, as the chart on this page shows.

It is obvious, therefore, that something must be done. But where are we to look for the solution?

Historically, man's relationship to his natural environment has been the special province of the conservationist. But man, to the conservationist of the past, was the enemy, the oppressor of wildlife and the squanderer of the earth's resources. It was the conservationist's mission to protect from man the bison and the whooping crane, the great stands of sequoias and the craters of natural geysers, safeguarding them from the barren consequences of man's conviction that he held a special place in creation and that the land and its creatures were an inexhaustible cornucopia. Later, when conservationists began to blend some scientific method with their evangelical fervor, it became the added function of conservation to protect important natural resources, such as soil and water, from the inroads of industrial civilization.

But today this historic responsibility of conservation has changed. Today it is man himself who is in danger of becoming a victim of the industrial civilization he has spread so vigorously across the land. The dilemma of man enmeshed in an asphyxiating environment of his own creation presents the greatest challenge conservation has ever known, one that calls for a fundamental change in attitude on the part of conservationists, a great broadening of conservation's socioscientific base.

Today the subject of conservation is people.

Today the object of conservation is to create and preserve our necessary natural environment for present and future generations.

Today the very name of conservation should be broadened to embrace the vastly broadened scope of its activities; henceforth it should be known as social conservation.

Social conservation implies responsibility for a whole range of man's pressing social problems—and social conservation has that responsibility. Social conservation must play a leading role in the social and economic effort to resolve the amalgam of related problems plaguing America—the senseless devastation of the countryside, the increasing dehumanization of the harassed and isolated city dweller, the resurgence of slum areas, the irrational violence of frustrated youth. Resources conservation, urban renewal, outdoor recreation planning, and city planning are all part of the broad attack on these overlapping problems. Concepts and techniques must be enlisted from many fields—from economics and sociology, from social anthropology and ecology and demography. The new people-oriented conservation discipline must encompass both nature and man.

All this is not to say that conservation's classic preoccupations with wildlife and wilderness are not as important as ever. They are—but they are no longer of primary importance. They represent today significant technical specializations within the total field of social conservation. Of primary importance are such things as the problems of the cities, or the fast-disappearing open space throughout the country, the increasing demands for outdoor recreation of all kinds, the mounting pressures on existing open land, public and private. Here the new discipline of social conservation can be used to full effect.

The results of population pressure and the lack of recreational land all over America show up dramatically in the predicament of our national parks. These most popular recreational lands are administered by an

agency within the Department of the Interior headed by Conrad Wirth. "Connie" Wirth's empire stretches from Yosemite in California to Acadia in Maine, from Alaska to Hawaii, and it is a rare week that does not see him pace a part of his domain. Behind Wirth are a \$75-million annual budget, a loyal band of influential men and a league of organized supporters 14,000 strong. Facing Wirth are some troubled times.

Historically, it is the mission of the National Park Service to "expose" as many Americans as possible to its scenic domain. Last year the parks recorded all of 62,812,000 visits from land-starved Americans who drove through the gates of the national parks for bumper-to-bumper communion with nature. Statistics show that the majority of these visitors spent less than a day within the parks themselves. Conrad Wirth, alternately appalled and delighted by the sheer number of his guests, feels he must make the effort to accommodate them by building new and wider roads, moving overnight lodgings outside park boundaries, and by discouraging such things as pack trips, which prolong visits. Many people interested in the genuine exploration and enjoyment of these extraordinarily beautiful areas feel they are being hustled through, almost as if our national parks are being turned into national parkways.

There is no letup in sight; on the contrary, over the past decades there has been a steady 8 percent annual increase of visits to the parks. By projecting this to the year 2000, Wirth can look forward to the alarming prospect of one billion visits, or playing host to every man, woman, and child in the United States three times a year.

Obviously this is not likely to happen. But just as obviously our great parks, representing as they do one of the few remaining opportunities for the weekending and vacationing urbanite to refresh and actively enjoy himself among splendid landscapes, cannot withstand these increasing pressures indefinitely.

A family should be able to find an opportunity for a day's outing, not necessarily in a great national park, but within reach of its home. It should not have to rely on the Federal Government for this, but rather on its own State and community. Certainly such local recreational facilities would take much of the pressure off the national parks, but this would be only an incidental benefit. More important would be the benefits which carefully developed and preserved open land would bring to the community itself and its residents. This apportionment of responsibility for the appropriate use and development of available open land in terms of people's varying needs is one of the fundamental concepts of social conservation. Everyone needs the stimulus both of readily available recreational opportunities and what Laurance Rockefeller has called "the cathedral experience" of truly magnificent landscapes.

In most of the country enough land is available so that a community need have only the will to insure the character of its environment for the future. But in the heavily industrialized parts of America it requires more than good will and a strong sense of purpose. In some areas the only hope of salvaging what still remains lies in the closest possible cooperation between government and community. However, there are difficulties inherent in this alliance, and they can best be illustrated by the dark history of a very present problem, that of the Cape Cod National Seashore.

In 1954 the National Park Service surveyed 3,700 miles of eastern seashore for the possible establishment of national seashore areas. A portion of Massachusetts' Cape Cod, running from Chatham to Provincetown and incorporating the Great Outer Beach, a

30-mile sweep backed by great cliffs where the dunes rise to a height of 50 feet, was given priority.

One of the most cogent reasons given by the Park Service in support of its choice was that this hitherto unravaged, dramatically beautiful stretch of shore was within a day's drive of one-third of the population of the United States. The Park Service pointed out that 11 percent of the population of the United States lives on the one-half of 1 percent of land that stretches between Massachusetts and New York City, the most densely populated, heavily industrialized area in the country. Yet there is not a single national park in this area and scarcely any public beach.

The arguments of need and availability struck as less than persuasive the residents of Cape Cod who were affected. After all, it was their land; what would happen to it and them if it became a national park? Looking around them, at their peaceful towns, at their weatherbeaten shingled houses which had often sheltered generations of the same family, at the stretches of beach backed by salt-water ponds, they saw no reason why they should share these pleasant things with invading hordes.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods," exclaimed one Cape Coddler spiritedly. "As a good Yankee and American citizen, I say that commandment is just as good today as it was in Moses' time."

Others thought purely of the fantastic figures involved. If the Great Outer Beach was within reach of one-third of the U.S. population, would that mean 50 million to 60 million people on their beach? "Who is to save us from rape and murder when those thousands who have never heard of us come wandering in?" cried a woman at a townhall meeting. Others were willing to disregard the criminal propensities of the visitors when they thought of their appetites. How many hotdogs, how many pizzas would 60 million people demand, and why should the National Park Service interfere with the natives' free-enterprise rights to feed them?

The Park Service made a gallant effort to explain why, beyond mere need, the Cape Cod Great Outer Beach was an area of national importance and should be preserved as such. It dwelt eulogistically on the beauties of the beach, the rare geological formations of the area, the unique flora and fauna, the wealth of recreational opportunities and the rich historic associations. It was, after all, the Pilgrims' first landfall in America before moving on to Plymouth.

An unimpressed descendant of these Pilgrims, Joshua Nickerson, a resident of Chatham, which his ancestors bought from the Monomott Indians in 1656, felt that the deeper meanings the cape had for the "natives" would be unappreciated by strangers. "You have to live here for 300 years as I have before you can see Cape Cod, let alone understand it," said Mr. Nickerson to E. J. Kahn, a sympathetic New Yorker writer who himself owns a summer house on proposed park land.

The Park Service, alternately wielding stick and carrot, pointed out to those anxious to save the cape that the newly completed highway down the spine of the cape would mean that the relative inaccessibility of the lower cape was not at an end and that the townships themselves would be powerless to stop developers from erecting the pizza palaces, bowling alleys, startling motels and lurid signs which have so completely despoiled the upper cape. Only the National Park Service, so ran its message, could really undertake to preserve the area and see that it was developed in keeping with its traditions.

A DOME-RATTLING FUROR

While pro-park and anti-park factions formed and argued on the cape itself, both

houses of the Massachusetts Legislature came out in favor of the park. Then in March of 1959 the Park Service issued two documents outlining the boundaries of the proposed park; it was to encompass 28,645 acres, almost 18,000 of which are privately owned. More than 600 homeowners would find themselves camping on park property, with the towns of Truro and Wellfleet suffering the greatest property loss. The furor which followed rattled off the golden dome of Boston's statehouse and echoed all the way to Washington.

"Everyone is in favor of a national park in theory," said a Senate staff member, "but wait until you want an acre of their land. On the other hand," he reflected, "how would you like a family with three children, two dogs, and a picnic basket romping across your backyard every day?" The cape is a place which breeds fierce loyalties, and so many of the families involved have lived in the same area, if not the same house, for generations that when Harvard Prof. Serge Chermayeff rose to speak at one of the public hearings, he apologized "for daring to love the cape after a flirtation of only 17 years."

Conrad Wirth, Director of the Park Service, came to the cape himself to explain what it meant to be a tenant on park land. Formerly private owners on public land had been given the choice of selling their property to the Government at a negotiated price or having a 25-year or life tenure. The towns involved might well be recompensed for their tax losses by a special grant of Congress.

Mr. Wirth's manner was a little insouciant for the cape's threatened residents. Mrs. Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., whose husband owns property in Wellfleet and who has just shelved plans for building an opulent house there, decided that "this seizure of property, however adequate or inadequate the compensation, differs little from the movement, displacement, and often annihilation of large populations in Communist countries." She likened Cape Codders to "the Dalai Lama of Tibet, exiled to a new land by the aggression of the Chinese Communists."

Cooler heads than Mrs. Chrysler's were working in the meantime to solve some of the problems involved. Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and JOHN F. KENNEDY collaborated with Representative HASTINGS KEITH on a bill which, while advancing the park, asked for concessions to local residents unique in the annals of the Park Service.

Senator KENNEDY wrote of Cape Cod that although "it lacks none of the natural beauty and scenic splendor which characterizes most of the national parks, it is not an unsettled wilderness or forest area. Particularly since there are residents whose roots on the cape reach back far into the past, it seems important to adapt a bill in such a way as to meet the legitimate interests and sentiments of existing residents." The bill provided that homeowners should not be required to give up their property rights as long as "acceptable" zoning was enforced. Furthermore, the six lower cape towns would receive very substantial financial assistance and might in the future develop for residential housing up to 10 percent of the total private land within park boundaries.

In December 1959, a hearing was held in Eastham on Cape Cod, by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with Senator FRANK MOSS of Utah presiding. The Kennedy-SaltonSTALL-Keith bill had done a great deal to alleviate the hostility of the anti-park faction by considering the human aspects. The dissidents still rallied chiefly around the economic threat to the towns. But some residents still had their personal reasons. Dr. Madalene Winslow, a tall, formidable woman whose ancestors arrived in Provincetown on a little sloop called the *Mayflower*, told the chairman that the proposed legislation made no provision for the picking of beach plums, blueberries, pine cones, bay-

berries, and rose hips, which cape families pick and preserve to supplement their income. She recalled a recent experience on a public beach when she was accosted by an official. "I was astounded when I was told to put my rose hips down," she said. "I did what a lot of people will do. I waited until that person had left. Then I picked them up and took them home and made my Rosa rugosa jam."

Joshua Nickerson still claimed that the cape is a homeland and not place to be gaped at. Francis Biddle, the former U.S. Attorney General, who divides his time between Cape Cod and Washington, declared: "You cannot have recreation and preservation at the same place at the same time" and expressed his aversion to the inclusion of the upland area, where he owns 20 acres. Professor Chermayeff, the self-confessed flirt, agreed that the recreational use of back-of-the-beach land should be strictly limited. "It's a miniature landscape," explained the professor. "A parking lot for 100 cars would leave a gash in the countryside. The very conservation of which you speak would fail."

Chermayeff went on to sum up what is perhaps the dominant feeling of the residents. "Whether we like it or not," he said, "the Cape has become accessible. The change coming to the Cape means it has to change. It is important to become reconciled. I am entirely for the park because it will give braking power to the change."

It is now 6 years since the land was surveyed by the Park Service. It may be another 2 years before the Service gets some of the land it wants. "I don't care which bill is passed," says Conrad Wirth, wistfully. "I'd just like to save some seashore."

The trouble is that on Cape Cod, as everywhere in the United States, time is running out. Given fair weather, bulldozers across the Nation will rip up another 3,000 acres of open land today. Another 4 million Americans will be born into this land this year. In the past conservationists have liked to quote Isaiah: "Woe unto them that join house to house" and to speak darkly of "rape," "plunder," and "frustrated futures." They may have been right—unless we take our point of departure from the evidence which is becoming clearer each day: there are no piecemeal solutions to the land problems of urban America.

Is there any solution at all? There is. In one of our great States, a small group of professionals has over the past 3 years taken a hard look at the people and resources of their State. In Washington, D.C., a group of distinguished citizens, working as a Federal Commission, is performing the same task for the country as a whole. The concepts of social conservation are being put to work right now. The results are of the greatest importance to every American.

Explanation of Provisions of Bill To Adjust Postal Rates, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the bill increases the rates on third-class mail which consists of circulars, merchandise, books, catalogs, seeds, plants, and so forth, in parcels weighing less than 16 ounces.

When fully effective, namely, January 1, 1962, it is estimated that these rates

will produce revenues sufficient to cover the cost of handling third-class mail.

The single piece third-class rate is increased in two steps from the present 3 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1½ cents for each additional ounce to 4 cents for the first 2 ounces and 2 cents for each additional ounce, effective July 1, 1960. On and after July 1, 1962, the rate will increase to 4 cents for each 2 ounces.

The bulk rates are revised upward. The current 16 cents per pound rate for circulars and merchandise is increased to 18 cents per pound on January 1, 1961, and 21 cents per pound on January 1, 1962.

The bulk pound rate of 10 cents per pound for books, catalogs, seeds, plants, and so forth, is increased from 10 cents per pound to 14 cents per pound on January 1, 1961, and to 18 cents per pound on January 1, 1962.

The current minimum piece charges in the existing law are retained but increased from 2½ cents to 3 cents on January 1, 1961, and to 3½ cents on July 1, 1962.

The minimum charge for odd-size pieces is increased from 3½ cents to 4½ cents, effective July 1, 1960.

Communist Penetration in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the danger of Communist penetration in Latin America is surely a real one.

Those of us who have been privileged to visit Latin America recently have seen clear-cut signs of the gains made by the international Communist conspiracy in several countries—and have spoken out about the danger. We have also seen the grave threat that Communist activity poses to several newly-established democratic governments of Latin America.

Even our President, on his recent tour of South America, was the target of a few ugly Communist-inspired incidents.

A short time ago I read a concise, and to my mind, accurate evaluation of the Communist situation in the Southern Hemisphere today. The article, titled "Moscow Marches Into Latin America," was written by Jack Anderson, and was published in *Parade* magazine.

I urge every Senator, who has not already done so, to read this article. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MOSCOW MARCHES INTO LATIN AMERICA—ON THE EVE OF EISENHOWER'S VISIT, HERE IS COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY REPORT ON THE COLD WAR TO THE SOUTH

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Eisenhower will begin his Latin American tour next week,

and not a moment too soon. For the whole area is seething with unrest. The angry mobs that greeted Vice President Nixon in 1958 still lurk in the slums. Their resentments have been inflamed by Cuba's Fidel Castro. And communism is making steady headway—creeping in some places, marching in others, but everywhere gaining ground.

One of the first targets of the Red offensive may be the toughest to crack. Recently, Moscow moved into Mexico with its famous Soviet trade fair. Mexico is better off than many of her neighbors and she is a faithful friend of the United States. But even Mexico offers cause for worry.

What about our other neighbors to the south? Recently a sober friend of the United States, Brazil's President Juscelino Kubitschek, warned the State Department: "Your problems with Cuba may seem a mild squall in comparison to what could happen here." Why are our amigos mad at us? Why is communism gaining ground, the United States losing it?

Recently, *Parade* investigated this question in depth. Reporters talked to State Department sources, Latin American diplomats, intelligence agents, economic experts. They read intelligence reports and visited several of the countries firsthand.

In general, Latin America has been caught up in a great social revolution. Since 1952, eight countries have overthrown dictatorships. But the people still are in an ugly mood. They judge their own poverty by U.S. standards. Theirs is a consumer revolution that democratic leaders, lacking the goods, cannot pacify.

Communists, quick to exploit dissatisfaction, offer Yankee imperialism as the scapegoat. Their campaign is directed from Soviet and satellite embassies, newly swollen with Latin American experts. Russia also is building cultural centers (latest count: 89 centers, 36 exhibits) and sending economic emissaries. And recently, Red China has become even more active than Russia in spreading subversion below the border.

This is the world's fastest growing area, and will finish the century with double North America's population. It is making rapid progress in education and technology. Thus it could be to us what Red China is to Russia: a friend for the present but a future challenge if the political tide should turn.

Here is a country-by-country report on the danger at our doorstep:

CUBA

Bearded, wild-eyed Fidel Castro, whose TV performances are rigged against the United States, has become a hero to Latin America's dirty-shirt crowd. Although he frenziedly denies he is a Communist, Communists have moved into his army, air force, police, and civil service. Of 17 trade unions, 4 are completely Communist-controlled and 6 are deeply infiltrated. Castro's economic boss is Argentine Communist Ernesto (Che) Guevara.

Havana has become a haven for known Communist agents—Russian, Chinese, Hungarian, and Polish—who are issued Cuban passports for travel through Latin America. In Havana's Chinese community the Chinese Communists now publish a newspaper.

From the idealist fighting for freedom, Castro has changed into an almost paranoid tyrant. He now exercises more control over the Cuban people than did his hated enemy, Batista. But, unlike Batista, Castro has the people behind him. Street mobs follow him blindly; the guajros, or peasants, look upon him as their Moses; chorus girls sing his slogans; even jailbirds have given up their cigarette allowances in response to his appeal for arms money.

Those who oppose Castro are winding up behind bars. Already 3,000 political prisoners languish in Cuba's jails—not a few of them his own revolutionaries, now accused of treason. By far the most sinister aspect

of Castro's rule, however, is his recruiting, training, and arming soldiers of fortune to plant his "democracy" on other soil. Recent expeditions against Panama and Nicaragua were Cuban equipped and Cuban directed.

What is behind Castro's violent, vicious anti-American tirades? Many experts believe his anti-Americanism is an inspired Communist maneuver to provide a cloak for his own chaotic administration and for further Communist infiltration of Latin America. Some authorities even suggest that Castro would like the United States to attempt to intervene so he would have an open excuse for inviting Russian help. The State Department is trying to be patiently tolerant toward Castro, but there is grave concern in Washington.

PANAMA

Inspired by Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal and encouraged by Castro's defiance of the Yankee giant, Panamanian nationalists are demanding a bigger cut of the Panama Canal's \$83 million annual revenue. But even more, they want the right to fly their flag in the Canal Zone.

The few Communists in Panama have been happily stirring up the Canal strife. But the biggest source of agitation is the United Arab Republic's Embassy. It still is actively encouraging and coaching nationalists.

For years Panamanians have not been happy about the way the United States has run the Canal Zone. One cause of trouble was eliminated in 1955 when it was agreed there no longer would be different wage scales for Panamanian and American employees.

The President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, first recommended hoisting the Panamanian flag alongside the Stars and Stripes. But the army kept raising technical objections until anti-American rioting flared up. Surrender on the issue now would be interpreted as a mob triumph and might encourage Panamanians to substitute rioting for negotiation.

ECUADOR

Intelligence Chief Allen Dulles has warned that Communists mean to disrupt the Inter-American Conference in Quito this year. The aim is to repeat the Bogotazo uprising that marred the Bogota conference in 1948. Only the strength of the late Gen. George Marshall, then Secretary of State, kept that conference going when frightened Latin statesmen wanted to head for home.

The Communist design is to start with innocent political parades, fanning traditional jealousies between the cities of Quito and Guayaquil. Quito has the political power; Guayaquil is the main port and financial center. Three times last year Communists whipped local incidents into major riots, causing more than 100 deaths. Each one was born in Guayaquil's slums, one of the worst Red swamps in Latin America.

BOLIVIA

It is often said that Bolivia is South America's chronic sick man. Her ailments, deep poverty, and a depressed tin industry, have not abated. And Bolivia is particularly sensitive to U.S. criticism: Riots broke out last year when a U.S. magazine suggested the nation be parceled out among its neighbors.

Part of Bolivia's problem dates back to the 1952 revolution, a social revolution that upset the old structure of wealth and landholding. Reorganization after the upheaval still causes many wrenches and upsets. And Bolivians are angry at U.S. tariff policy, which serves to protect the American tin industry against Latin competition.

CHILE

Chile will be President Eisenhower's third stop. Her government is democratic, staunchly pro-American and anti-Castro. Last year, when Cuba's defense minister,

Raul Castro, flew to the Santiago conference, he was given a polite brushoff. A minor official came to greet him; his plane was kept waiting on the runway; his luggage was searched and his inoculations record questioned.

But unrest has hit Chile, too, and from an expected quarter: Santiago's Chinese community, which has become a haven for Red Chinese propaganda. Like their neighbors, Chileans are angry over U.S. tariffs, which hurt tin and nitrate industries. Inflation is another issue. The present government won the last election because of a split in the leftwing vote, but now there is occasional talk of revolution.

PERU

Although Vice President NIXON was heckled in Lima, Peru's capital, the government here is considered pro-United States and fairly strong. It is in danger, however, from both right and left. Communists have made some inroads among students, and the copper miners' union is believed infiltrated. And recently there has been talk that Gen. Manuel Odría, Peru's last dictator, may return and run for the presidency in a democratic election. He is still popular with some elements, and could win.

ARGENTINA

Once the richest Latin American Republic, Argentina, the President's second stop, is striving to ride out the most serious economic storm in its history—the legacy of dictator Juan Perón, who left no gold reserve and sent the peso plummeting. President Arturo Frondizi's belt-tightening policies have not been popular, and this has kept the nation on the brink of revolution, which constantly flares up in the form of strikes and riots. The Communists have formed a back-alley partnership with the Peronistas (Perón's old supporters) and are seizing every excuse to widen the breach between president and people. They tried to oust Frondizi last June, but they underestimated him. He is still in office; they are in hiding.

Frondizi, who has the backing of businessmen, brokers, and bankers, was originally supported by the Communists but now believes coexistence with them impossible. He needs 6 months of domestic peace before Argentina can begin to recover. If he fails, there may be no alternative but a dictatorship.

BRAZIL

U.S. relations with Brazil—the President's first stop on his trip—are at their lowest ebb in modern times. Brazilian leaders accuse the United States of treating their vast country as if it were a tiny Caribbean republic. As a sort of economic declaration of independence, they signed a deal late last year with Russia for \$200 million in foreign credits.

In this year's presidential election, soaring inflation and grinding poverty will be the campaign issues. The United States can expect to be roundly blamed for both. The Brazilian press is almost universally hostile to the United States. Brazilian leaders have appealed for a dramatic gesture such as the Marshall plan as evidence that the United States is not indifferent. If aid is not forthcoming, Brazil may start slipping away from the West.

VENEZUELA

Although Venezuela is enjoying an oil boom and has cash in the bank, Caracas, the capital, is ringed by slums whose inhabitants are nourished on Communist propaganda. Their frustrations could burst into riots, even revolution.

President Romulo Betancourt has given Venezuela a constitutional government, popularly chosen, for the first time in history. He has made headway in setting up new industries, selling oil abroad, and starting low-cost housing projects. Betancourt also

has brought leaders of other parties into his government. Only the Communists have been frozen out.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

For more than 29 years, Rafael Leonidas Trujillo has ruled the Dominican people as absolute boss and has rarely lost a night's sleep. Now Fidel Castro has him awake nights.

Although the Republic's economy slumped 20 percent from July to October, Trujillo went on an arms-buying spree. Army officers and civil servants were called on to donate a month's salary to foot the bill, following the example set by free-spending, film-star-loving Gen. Rafael Trujillo, Jr., who gave up a \$3,000 monthly pay check.

Trujillo's fears are by no means groundless. Two Cuban-based rebel forces have invaded the Republic. Although both were repulsed handsily, they rattled Trujillo badly. And intelligence reports have it that another invasion force is in training on Cuba's Isle of Pines. It is said to consist of 3,000 desperate men recruited from the ranks of common criminals.

NICARAGUA

President Luis Somoza, a dictator trying desperately to change his spots, has two crosses to bear: his father's name and Fidel Castro's ambition.

Somoza the elder, murdered by an assassin 4 years ago, ruled Nicaragua for 20 years. His sons, Luis and Anastasio Jr., have tried to erase old hatreds. But two rebel bands have drawn a bead on the Somozas. One is Cuban-trained, Communist-inspired, and Castro-directed. The other is anti-Communist and wary of the Cubans. The first tried an invasion by aid from Costa Rica. After a 4-hour fight three rebels and three Somoza soldiers were killed. The 45-man anti-Communist attempt at invasion bogged down right at the start.

The threat of invasion has prevented the Somoza brothers from relaxing their grip as much as they apparently would like. For hate of the family is rife, and Castro will not be curbed by one small reverse.

PARAGUAY

After a brief flirtation with democracy ("I am to perfect a durable democratic regime"), Paraguay's 46-year-old dictator, Gen. Alfredo Stroessner, abandoned the idea. The end came when 800 high school students, protesting a trolley fare increase, were beaten and tear-gassed by police. The government canceled the increase, but 1,000 students marched on Asuncion's largest school. They were met by police who flogged them.

When Congress voted to "condemn the police methods," Stroessner decided that democracy had gone far enough. Now he is back running an absolute dictatorship, one of the chanciest jobs in this age.

COLOMBIA

Colombia's rule is democratic but she also has economic problems, partly the result of looting by past dictators and partly because of her 1-crop coffee economy. Armed bands roam the countryside, attacking small towns. One source compared it to "the Wild West with machetes." The casualty rate from bandits is eight deaths a day. Neither the police nor the army in this troubled nation has been able to deal with them.

URUGUAY

This sound, sincere little democracy of wool-growers—the President's last stop—now is having troubles, for which the blame is placed primarily on the U.S. wool tariff. Quick to foment strife, Russia is pouring in propaganda.

And Montevideo, Uruguay's capital, seems to be a center of Communist intrigue. The Soviet Embassy has a staff of 70, gets more than 50 pouches of directives from Moscow every week. Five officials always meet the

pouches at Montevideo airport, hustle them straight to the Ambassador's residence. From here the Communist word is believed to fan out through the hemisphere.

GUATEMALA

Having once had entree to the presidential palace, Communists now are trying to get back in. A campaign of sabotage, bombing, and terrorism has begun in an attempt to oust conservative President Ydigoras Fuentes and replace him with former President Jacob Arbenz, a pro-Communist now in exile in Uruguay. Arbenz has declared himself ready to launch his coup from there.

HAITI

The U.S. Marines are back in Haiti, this time at the invitation of President Francois Duvalier. Duvalier invited them when he found himself caught between two strong-arm neighbors, Cuba's Castro and the Dominican Republic's Trujillo.

Duvalier seems to have been hexed since he took over the tiny republic. One of his chief problems—incongruous in this age—is that uneducated Haitians still believe in voodoo charms and his enemies keep trying to break his spell over his countrymen.

While few others of our Latin neighbors adhere to voodoo, Duvalier's problems in a sense typify those of the whole area. For every nation has its own difficulties with ignorance, poor education facilities, superstition, and disease. Almost the entire hemisphere suffers from abject poverty, crippling inflation, and underdeveloped resources. It is making progress, but there still are too many voids for many Latins. And where voids exist, quick-stepping communism is ready to march in.

HOW THE REDS WOO MEXICO

(By Thayer Waldo)

MEXICO CITY.—More than 900,000 persons flocked into National Auditorium here recently to see the 2,400 exhibits of the famed Soviet trade exposition, making its first stop outside the United States. At the same time, Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan came to call. Composer Dmitri Shostakovich gave concerts. A 26-member Soviet delegation showed up at the Acapulco film festival.

It was all part of a \$500,000 propaganda offensive directed from Moscow. What kind of impact did it have?

Parade was on hand to investigate this question with fair visitors. And as the answers above show, most Mexicans are too sophisticated to be bowled over by Russian attention. Typical was the balanced comment of Prof. Eugenio Argudin, who teaches math at National Polytechnic Institute:

"A marvelous display of scientific, industrial, and artistic achievement—but we produce better consumer goods right here in Mexico."

Josefina Chavez Zuniga was blunt:

"I didn't see one item that I'd buy in preference to our own products."

THE COLD WAR

Nonetheless, Russia's big show could prove the single most productive investment in the East-West battle for men's minds. For despite present good relations, Mexicans find it comforting to be reminded that the United States has a strong rival on the international scene.

"Just look at that oilfield machinery," said Angel Marquez, a hacienda field hand, after touring the exhibit. "Communism must be a fine thing and I'm sure Russia is a good place to live."

"For 30 years I've been driving capitalist automobiles, and I can tell you they just don't stand up," said a cabdriver, an admitted Soviet admirer.

And inside the exhibit halls were loose-leaf notebooks with signs urging visitors to

record their impressions. One book had 72 entries; 68 were laudatory. But they had a remarkable sameness of phrasing. "Symbol of the people's progress" was a favorite. The dissenters were outspoken: "Very impressive, very formidable," wrote one. "Now I would like to hear a few words from the Hungarians."

But of all those interviewed by Parade, only three had harsh words for the United States—even among those who spoke glowingly of Russia. "You Americans hold a unique place in history for having tried to be benevolent to all the world," said one left-minded lady.

Mikoyan, the old Armenian trader, was shrewd enough to sense this. There were no attacks on the United States, just the familiar themes of coexistence, peace-is-wonderful, socialism-will-triumph. But he was not above the sly dig: "One reason I love Mexico is that nobody's afraid of the word 'revolution'."

Revolution is a patriotic word in Mexico, where the last big one took place only 50 years back. But today revolution seems far away. For 10 years, Mexico has boomed. A whole new middle class has sprung up—hungry for the good life. In such an atmosphere, communism seldom prospers.

Against such a background, why did the Kremlin pick Mexico to launch its promotion campaign? One explanation was given by Mikoyan: trade. Another is that the exhibits were easy to move down from the United States. And certainly the idea of awakening envy among all Latin peoples was involved. The fair will remain in Havana all this month, and may appear soon in Caracas, Venezuela, and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

For all their present prosperity, many Mexicans came, saw, and were impressed. But what will happen in less prosperous nations? There, in the view of such experts as U.S. Ambassador Robert C. Hill, Russia's new propaganda drive could spell real trouble.

Red China: Another Atrocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the most recent example of Red Chinese terror and inhumanity is the tragic treatment of Bishop Walsh. I should like to include in the RECORD a recent editorial from the pages of the Newark Evening News:

BISHOP WALSH'S FATE

Americans, regardless of religious persuasion, may hope, however faint such hope may be, that Red China will heed the U.S. Government's formal appeal on behalf of Bishop Walsh, the latest victim of Communist inhumanity.

At 69 and in failing health, Bishop Walsh is condemned to 20 years' imprisonment, in effect a life sentence, as "a longtime U.S. spy." Such is Peiping's way of rewarding this Maryknoll priest, who has served the Chinese people for 42 years. His real crime, of course, has been to spread the word of God to a people under the heel of a godless government.

For any who may have forgotten Red China's atrocities in Tibet, the fate of Bishop Walsh is a reminder of the evil nature of this government which aspires to sit in the United Nations.

More Social Security Means More Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is presently considering in executive session amendments to the Social Security Act.

One of the important issues before the committee is whether or not we will approve an amendment such as that advocated by my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], H.R. 4700 to bring within the framework of the OASI program a new program providing health care for the aged.

In the February 27, 1960, issue of the New Orleans Times-Picayune an excellent editorial appeared dealing with this subject. One of the important and perceptive points made in this editorial points out the great progress that has been made in providing health care protection under a free enterprise system of private insurance. The editorial goes on to comment that a governmental insurance program directed toward the Federal socialization of this protection would do much to either impair or destroy this free enterprise undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include the text of that editorial from the Times-Picayune:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MORE TAXES

Taxes are a primary function of the House Ways and Means Committee, and that is the reason most of the social security bills are before that committee. They are primarily tax bills. If enacted some of them would mean taxes—in capital letters.

A measure like the Forand bill, for instance, would probably hit taxpayers—by way of pay envelop deductions—for about \$2 billion the first year, followed by a big increase year after year. This is the one so drawn as to get the socialization of medicine underway. It would grant to all social security old-age pensioners and dependents (also those eligible for the pension) 120 days a year in hospitals and nursing homes and pay the physicians. The service would have to be obtained from hospitals and doctors listed by the welfare and health department. The Government would pay the money, not to the pensioners, but to the hospitals, nursing homes and doctors.

This venture into socialism would cost real money, of course. Its sponsors say that it would increase the social security pay envelope deductions only one-quarter to one-half of 1 percent—at first, anyway. But the fact is that the payroll cut is already up to 6 percent and in another 9 years will be at least 9 percent without any further liberalizations and without the Forand bill. The way things are going the deduction soon could be 12 or 15 percent (half from employee and half from employer). Add that to the Federal income tax deduction of 20 percent or more plus still more deductions to come, and it can be seen that the take-home could be pretty badly shrunken. Some States are working on the envelope deduction for State income taxes (which are tending to rise) and there is a bill in Congress now to authorize the Government to deduct city transaction or income taxes from the

salaries of Government employees for the account of the city governments.

As an election year gesture, Congressmen feel bound to do something in line of social security—at the public expense, naturally. Maybe they are not quite ready to take the leap into Forand socialism but there are plenty of other envelope-deduction plans they can choose from. Senator JOHN KENNEDY has one in to allow people 65 or over 90 days of hospitalization and 120 days of nursing. That would be very costly also.

The administration, acting through the welfare and health department, is expected to come up with a counterproposition to grant any person 65 or over a hospital policy (not surgery or medical) that would pay the hospitalization after the beneficiary paid the first \$200 or \$250.

In connection with these bills, the public, it seems to us, needs to consider two things: How much payroll deduction it can stand for these social security liberalizations and how far it wants the Government to go with its medical socialization.

Within a few years, we surmise practically everybody will be covered with private pre-paid medical and hospital policies, if the present trend is not interrupted with Federal socialization. The real problem here is to provide policies that will reasonably meet the soaring cost of medicine and nursing. Some hospitalization policies are now fairly adequate but generally insurance policies for medicine and surgery for people over 65 are either too costly or are inadequate.

The 1959 Crop Price-Support Commodity Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, you will recall yesterday I included information on loans made under the 1959 crop price support programs by the Commodity Stabilization Service of the Department of Agriculture which amount to more than \$50,000 per producer.

At that time I stated that the \$50,000 limitation which I proposed is higher than desired. It should be reduced to \$25,000 or less, but from a practical standpoint the opposition to my limitation among the Democratic Members of Congress dictates the position of suggesting a \$50,000 limitation if one is hopeful to have such passed.

The following are the 1959 crop price support commodity loans for wheat only under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000 by producer. This report covers only wheat for the loanmaking period terminated on January 31, 1960; and the amounts shown represent loans made, without regard to whether the loans have been repaid or will be repaid before maturity.

If the limitation as suggested in my bill were reduced to \$25,000, the Federal Government would not be required to make similar loans next year. These loans result in a loss to the taxpayer, because it is not required that the repayment be made in money, rather repayment can be made by commodity. This results in a loss of millions of dollars to the taxpayer.

1959 crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer

WHEAT

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
ARIZONA				KANSAS—continued			
Rancho Tierra Prieta, Inc. and Black Land Farms, Inc.	Eloy, Ariz.	25,681	\$36,467.12	Charles Breeding	Rolla, Kans.	22,300	\$36,705.00
ARKANSAS				A. L. & L. W. Swart	Oakley, Kans.	21,117	35,688.28
Wesson Farms, Inc.	Victoria, Ark.	17,856	33,026.40	W. R. Gorsuch & Son	Selkirk, Kans.	10,611	34,907.58
H. T. Dillahunty	Hughes, Ark.	17,381	32,501.83	Roberson Bros.	St. Francis, Kans.	18,388	32,546.76
CALIFORNIA				Ferguson Bros.	Kensington, Kans.	17,687	32,367.21
Desert Ranch	Firebaugh, Calif.	22,645	47,781.66	W. D. Brady	Dodge City, Kans.	18,367	32,141.67
Hammonds Ranch, Inc.	do.	21,226	44,786.32	Lloyd Callen	Tribune, Kans.	18,280	31,989.42
Clare Reproth	McFarland, Calif.	18,998	30,066.20	Robert W. Thierolf	Tribune, Kans.	16,847	30,736.65
W. K. Lowe	Woodland, Calif.	17,617	34,158.70	Taylor & Son	Tribune, Kans.	16,596	30,204.72
Thomas & Thomas	Firebaugh, Calif.	17,627	34,019.34	Jacob A. Spiegel & Sons	Formosa, Kans.	16,220	29,844.48
Jack Harris, Inc.	Five Points, Calif.	16,856	32,632.87	Ted P. & Betty Lahr	Abilene, Kans.	16,106	29,796.10
Mettler & Bury Farms	Bakersfield, Calif.	14,909	30,757.87	Leland Christ	Holcomb, Kans.	16,408	29,633.55
Lewis G. Brown, Floto & Kirksly, Adobe Ranch.	Madera, Calif.	15,762	30,415.70	Tunis & Son	Satanta, Kans.	15,575	28,813.44
John P. Curtis	San Miguel, Calif.	14,049	28,253.61	Joe Faulkner Estate	Colby, Kans.	15,708	28,646.40
Filos & Walter	San Luis Obispo, Calif.	13,263	25,067.07	Will R. & Willis Christian	Ulysses, Kans.	16,178	28,635.05
COLORADO				R. H. Garvey Estate	Colby, Kans.	16,908	28,211.04
Andrew Blake	Woodrow, Colo.	27,855	49,464.82	Perry A. Williams	Rolla, Kans.	17,059	28,147.35
Stewart Bros.	Elizabeth, Colo.	27,995	48,431.07	Vernon Irvin	Goodland, Kans.	15,306	27,703.86
William Stretesky	Juliusburg, Colo.	27,105	47,704.80	Charles S. Drew	Garden City, Kans.	15,402	27,569.58
Eresch & Hinkhouse	Burlington, Colo.	27,567	46,348.79	J. D. Hewes	Ingalls, Kans.	16,081	27,490.07
Willard & Frances Hubbs	Ryers, Colo.	26,005	45,248.70	Marshall Farms	Brewster, Kans.	15,932	27,118.96
Wood Land Co. care of J. P. Morrow	Lincoln, Nebr.	27,550	43,704.11	Alphonse Richard	do.	15,879	26,993.74
Arthur W. Fritton	Arapahoe, Colo.	22,837	41,563.94	Harry E. Wright	Sublette, Kans.	15,293	26,762.68
Harold Kuckartz	Arriba, Colo.	22,063	40,340.14	Flory & Rockhold	Salina, Kans.	15,524	26,701.57
J. W. O. Davis	Bennett, Colo.	22,811	39,919.25	Charles Bernard Estate	Holdridge, Nebr.	15,179	26,239.67
R. N. Knudsen & Don Knudsen	Arapahoe, Colo.	21,976	39,556.80	C. B. Campbell	Lamar, Colo.	14,646	25,630.50
Kenneth Kinnle	Juliusburg, Colo.	22,450	39,287.50	Leroy F. Cooley	Garden City, Kans.	14,196	25,532.80
Biondini Bros.	Alva, Okla.	22,985	38,615.35	Roy Leathers	Satanta, Kans.	13,536	25,039.75
Dale Mitcheek	Cheyenne Wells, Colo.	20,407	36,936.67	MINNESOTA			
Florenza Posa, Jr.	Hugo, Colo.	20,360	35,426.40	Phillip W. Pearson	Lancaster, Minn.	15,497	29,859.57
Warren Konkel	Walsh, Colo.	20,000	35,200.00	William Sepeanski	Stephen, Minn.	13,914	25,323.79
Murray E. Griffin	Nunn, Colo.	18,841	33,160.16	MISSOURI			
Schmidt Bros.	Strasburg, Colo.	17,813	31,172.75	Dearmont Oliver	East Prairie, Mo.	17,458	33,519.84
Thomas J. Klausner	Rogger, Colo.	17,304	30,108.96	Carl Donath	Palmyra, Mo.	17,951	33,888.86
A. C. Reinert & Sons	Holly, Colo.	16,533	29,759.40	Ed Marshall & Sons	Charleston, Mo.	15,312	28,125.54
Ezra Allshouse & Son	Akron, Ohio	16,473	29,157.21	MONTANA			
Harold & Dan Kissler	Watkins, Colo.	16,836	29,144.04	Allen Kolstad	Chester, Mont.	29,406	46,989.00
A. N. Fillmore	Boone, Colo.	16,658	28,996.10	Carl Brown	do.	27,254	44,711.28
Paul Woolfolk	Towner, Colo.	16,565	27,994.85	W. R. Selstad	Great Falls, Mont.	27,691	44,318.07
Brucher & Brucher	Broomfield, Colo.	13,984	27,968.00	Brown & Brown	do.	25,635	42,033.26
Milton Vice	Genoa, Colo.	15,778	27,453.72	John Kell & Sons	Ledger, Mont.	25,413	40,914.93
Smyth Bros.	Juliusburg, Colo.	15,640	27,370.00	George A. Gray & Son	Carver, Mont.	25,148	40,893.39
Turner Bros.	Nunn, Colo.	15,788	27,313.24	Newell Nish	Buffalo, Mont.	24,527	39,509.89
Harry J. Hansen	Genoa, Colo.	15,455	27,046.25	Sylvia E. Gravel, Richard and Robert Gravel	Great Falls, Mont.	22,615	37,047.70
Vratil Bros.	Limon, Colo.	15,082	26,996.78	Vic Gee	Big Timber, Mont.	22,648	36,916.24
Joe Neal	Springfield, Colo.	15,923	26,750.35	Kraft & Martin	Hamre, Mont.	22,833	36,761.13
Shirley B. Garvey	Fort Worth, Tex.	15,967	26,647.64	Dwight J. Charlson	Carter, Mont.	22,628	36,728.08
Arthur Marquardt	Juliusburg, Colo.	15,178	26,492.50	Bjelland & Robinson Offerdahl, Ole Offerdahl	Conrad, Mont.	22,351	36,415.04
Ruth G. Fink	Topeka, Kans.	15,714	26,241.83	NEBRASKA			
John E. Harker	Arapahoe, Colo.	14,145	25,200.90	Nash Bros.	Redston, Mont.	20,329	36,388.91
IDAHO				H. B. Kolstad	Chester, Mont.	21,228	34,813.92
T. E. Robinson	Kamiah, Idaho	28,531	46,230.30	Vale Creek Ranch, Inc.	Billings, Mont.	21,357	34,464.93
Robert & Seth Ricks	Reasburg, Idaho	28,289	45,545.29	Herbert G. Bliz	Box Elder, Mont.	21,201	34,046.62
A. E. Bott and Demar Bott	Newdale, Idaho	28,687	45,307.18	Walter Banks & Sons	Brady, Mont.	21,208	34,048.44
Grant Glorfield	American Falls, Idaho	28,806	42,472.64	R. O. Conover, Jr., Max Conover	Blowview, Mont.	21,067	33,917.87
The Lloyd Ranch	Lewiston, Idaho	22,938	39,999.12	Elton W. Good	Flowere, Mont.	20,666	33,272.26
Wittman Farms, Inc.	Lapwai, Idaho	23,335	39,088.86	Birkeland & Son	Fort Benton, Mont.	20,468	32,953.48
W. B. Savage Ranches, Inc.	Kimberly, Idaho	23,227	38,969.61	H. W. Walker	Flowere, Mont.	19,116	31,825.20
Fred G. Mayer & Sons	American Falls, Idaho	24,036	38,782.47	Cornier Farming Co.	Billings, Mont.	19,460	31,825.20
Max Parkinson	St. Anthony, Idaho	25,929	37,325.75	Oliver and Greta Morkrid	Chester, Mont.	19,057	31,622.91
Paff Bros., Inc.	Garfield, Wash.	21,638	35,588.52	King Colony	Moore, Mont.	19,276	31,034.36
Drechal Bros.	Worley, Idaho	21,629	35,588.52	Willard Wilson	Lodge Grass, Mont.	18,446	30,834.72
McGregor & Storey	Lewiston, Idaho	21,589	35,393.47	B. D. Haxton	Great Falls, Mont.	18,446	30,159.79
O. J. Neely	Reasburg, Idaho	23,316	34,974.61	Robert S. and L. G. Bradbrook	Rapelle, Mont.	18,594	30,122.28
Kiehl D. Parkinson	do.	20,613	32,933.67	Lezy KT Ranch, Inc.	Pillings, Mont.	18,620	30,096.13
Shayne Linderman	Newdale, Idaho	20,181	32,289.60	Juedeman Grain Co.	Geraldine, Mont.	18,277	29,974.28
Richard Lawson	Tensed, Idaho	18,369	31,813.41	Deerfield, Colony	Danvers, Mont.	18,453	29,700.33
Chester Hyllton	Declo, Idaho	19,567	29,937.28	Hunsaker Bros.	Toston, Mont.	18,134	29,389.76
Reid Angus, Dean Angus, James Nowland	Burley, Idaho	17,401	28,392.51	R. Michael Menli	Conrad, Mont.	18,452	29,309.57
D. E. Hallowell	Fairfield, Idaho	17,614	27,957.16	Chris Onstad	Great Falls, Mont.	18,059	29,074.99
Commons Bros.	Roy, Idaho	16,639	27,121.57	R. T. Morrow	Billings, Mont.	17,937	28,911.68
Harold Heaton	Tekoa, Wash.	15,262	26,648.52	J. W. Swinney	Gildford, Mont.	17,677	28,277.66
Ed S. Covington	Reasburg, Idaho	16,382	26,268.94	Burton & Roland Wright	Moore, Mont.	17,556	28,265.16
Stanton Becker	Genesee, Idaho	15,901	25,918.54	Roy Killenbeck	Scobey, Mont.	16,305	28,117.12
Joe Lux	Nepesee, Idaho	16,000	25,760.00	Arnold Pearson	Richland, Mont.	15,596	27,760.88
ILLINOIS				Sam T. Crockett	Great Falls, Mont.	17,123	27,668.03
Shafer & Losch	East Alton, Ill.	16,022	30,902.37	Walter Passage Farms	Carter, Mont.	16,678	26,851.88
KANSAS				Glen Bramlette	Fort Benton, Mont.	16,616	26,818.78
J. Ernest Bertrand	Oakley, Kans.	28,902	49,999.89	Roy Rambo	Hingham, Mont.	16,289	26,491.02
Charles & Carl R. Lucas	Johnson, Kans.	27,552	48,491.52	A. A. Dawson & Son	Belt, Mont.	16,447	26,479.07
E. L. Hatcher	Lamar, Colo.	27,600	46,475.00	Thomas O. Wharram	Highwood, Mont.	16,358	26,336.38
Clarence Simmonds	Syracuse, Kans.	25,704	46,010.16	Otto Johnson & Sons	Sand Coulee, Mont.	16,344	26,117.79
C. Wilber White	Goodland, Kans.	25,921	45,361.75	Jess Kilgore	Three Forks, Mont.	16,106	26,097.29
Frasier Farms	Sharon Springs, Kans.	24,756	43,888.00	Eagle Implement Co.	Billings, Mont.	17,048	26,082.67
Dr. R. T. McCreight	Ness City, Kans.	25,289	43,020.29	Peter Christofferson	Big Sandy, Mont.	16,087	26,060.94
S. E. Dennis	Scottsbluff, Nebr.	22,614	39,624.64	Charles Shelton	Cott Bank, Mont.	15,792	25,740.96
Gunnels Farms	Colby, Kans.	23,017	39,128.90	Haugrud Partnership	Mott, Mont.	15,678	25,323.00
W. R. Houston	Tribune, Kans.	21,178	37,606.84	Marion Wilson	Kremlin, Mont.	15,889	25,304.95
				Barbara Witt	Fort Benton, Mont.	15,280	25,257.42

1959 crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer—Continued

WHEAT—Continued

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
NEBRASKA—continued				OREGON—continued			
Jira & Mark Schekell, Ora Phillips, Norman Anderson.	Hemford, Nebr.	21,655	\$38,545.90	H. F. and Bobbie A. Root	Wasco, Oreg.	15,000	\$27,000.00
Spencer Farms	Sidney, Nebr.	23,416	38,167.80	H. R. Schilling	do.	15,691	27,016.02
H. B. Wellnitz	Rushville, Nebr.	19,968	35,143.68	A. A. Campbell & Son	Walla Walla, Wash.	10,203	27,545.39
Morrison & Quirk Alfalfa	Harvard, Nebr.	18,510	34,429.21	Bill Wolfe	Wallowa, Oreg.	15,470	26,917.80
Robert R. Elliott	Solvang, Nebr.	18,701	33,425.38	Joe Bibby	Grass Valley, Oreg.	14,371	26,586.35
Vance Clark	Chappell, Nebr.	19,007	33,262.25	Charles Carlson	Ione, Oreg.	14,382	26,319.06
A. L. Rosener & Sons	Daykin, Nebr.	17,440	32,468.64	Jesse Ray Fleming Estate	Maupin, Oreg.	13,955	26,309.29
Ralph Smith	Palisade, Nebr.	10,852	30,165.08	Leonard Fields	Wasco, Oreg.	14,890	25,910.26
W. J. Tolence	Hemford, Nebr.	17,412	28,968.92	T. H. Fraser	Portland, Oreg.	14,000	25,900.00
Fred & Wayne Lyon	Moravia, Nebr.	15,739	28,604.09	Marshall E. Meyers	Echo, Oreg.	14,314	25,831.72
Narjes Furns	Sidney, Nebr.	16,980	27,818.40	Albert Dooly	Prescott, Wash.	15,099	25,719.09
Eugene Scheffek	Alliance, Nebr.	15,444	27,335.58	Robert Rothrock	Milton-Freewater, Oreg.	15,153	25,788.03
Cliff Harvey	Glenview, Nebr.	15,888	27,296.55	Peter Meyers	Echo, Oreg.	14,245	25,738.84
Bernice Linn	Kimball, Nebr.	15,473	27,040.85	Robert Rothrock	Adams, Oreg.	14,230	25,738.84
Preifort Bros.	Belvidere, Nebr.	13,658	25,813.30	S. E. or Ada Brogottii	Helix, Oreg.	15,000	25,650.00
Leslie E. Smith	Imperial, Nebr.	14,314	25,494.27	I. Z. Weimar & Sons	Condon, Oreg.	13,908	25,690.72
Alvin Thompson	Elsie, Nebr.	14,394	25,477.38	Morehouse & Elliott	Wasco, Oreg.	14,542	25,427.43
Ruth Bohlke	Hastings, Nebr.	14,788	25,348.70	Ernest French	Pendleton, Oreg.	13,941	25,223.21
				Carl E. Myers	Condon, Oreg.	14,404	25,097.05
NEW MEXICO				SOUTH DAKOTA			
Williams & Sons	Clovis, N. Mex.	18,992	34,376.12	Dennis L. Anderson	Oneda, S. Dak.	22,597	42,313.16
W. L. Lockmiller	do.	19,954	33,921.80	Orville Schwartz	Batesland, S. Dak.	19,033	33,878.74
Claude W. Reeves	Portales, N. Mex.	19,794	33,254.30	Robert Weiner	Martin, S. Dak.	16,267	29,334.03
J. M. Ross	Hogers, N. Mex.	17,959	32,057.52	Lottie Weiner	do.	14,774	26,842.42
Otto Smith	Clovis, N. Mex.	14,448	26,005.29				
NORTH DAKOTA				TEXAS			
F. L. Barthel	Pingree, N. Dak.	17,051	31,514.77	C. H. Kuper	Dalhart, Tex.	27,175	48,100.33
Raymond Forester	Conway, N. Dak.	16,618	30,909.48	Earl McGurrough	Perryton, Tex.	24,081	44,067.63
J. O. Hull & Son	Edinburg, N. Dak.	15,143	28,014.55	Marshall Cator	Sunny, Tex.	24,361	40,867.88
Jack Halverson	Forest River, N. Dak.	14,084	26,618.76	W. L. Bryant	Hartley, Tex.	23,532	39,802.16
				T. C. Harvey, Jr.	Gruver, Tex.	21,457	38,407.94
				Lacy Meek	Dumas, Tex.	20,650	35,930.56
				D. T. Reed	Hercford, Tex.	19,878	35,838.90
				Stovall & Stovall	Panhandle, Tex.	19,470	34,009.27
				R. D. & Billy McClellan	Gruver, Tex.	20,000	34,000.00
				Kenst & Groendycke	Dalhart, Tex.	19,252	33,933.50
				Bates & Stringer	Dumas, Tex.	19,616	33,346.64
				Robert Ownbey	Spearman, Tex.	19,392	33,109.31
				Ed Stallwitz	Dumas, Tex.	19,314	33,091.99
				Gist Farms	Vega, Tex.	17,547	32,285.56
				Meyer Bros.	Wilderado, Tex.	17,493	32,186.20
				B. G. Green	Hartley, Tex.	18,525	31,306.96
				H. C. Brown, Jr.	Farmworth, Tex.	18,038	30,664.02
				M. A. Black	Friona, Tex.	18,003	30,605.10
				B. C. Cates	Floydada, Tex.	16,929	28,948.03
				Arthur Stavio	Sunny, Tex.	16,929	28,979.86
				E. F. Dryden	Dalhart, Tex.	16,764	28,481.80
				Charles P. Dickinson	Beverly Hills, Calif.	16,461	28,476.66
				Bill Lasley	Stratford, Tex.	16,684	27,862.00
				J. W. Huff	Dumas, Tex.	15,999	27,316.83
				L. T. Wright & Ethel Lance	Farmworth, Tex.	15,000	27,300.00
				John A. Smith & J. B. Turner	Hercford, Tex.	14,679	27,008.90
				Claude W. Sloan	Amarillo, Tex.	15,545	26,736.83
				Frez Zimmerman, Jr.	Floydada, Tex.	15,539	26,571.13
				Price & Price	Stratford, Tex.	14,731	26,515.19
				L. J. Schmidt	Dalhart, Tex.	15,754	26,308.34
				L. J. Field	do.	15,473	25,759.48
				Ranza B. Boggess	Friona, Tex.	14,964	25,738.40
				Marshall Cator	Sunny, Tex.	14,749	25,200.23
				J. E. Crabtree	Dalhart, Tex.	15,000	25,200.00
				Carl H. Kuper	do.	14,797	25,155.46
OREGON				WASHINGTON			
R. N. Olsen & Chas. L. Powell	Moro, Oreg.	26,412	48,882.20	Harol A. Oliver	Prescott, Wash.	28,764	48,611.31
Raymond & Raymond	Helix, Oreg.	28,000	47,880.00	Erwin Bros.	do.	26,019	48,515.75
Storie & Storie	Pendleton, Oreg.	26,969	46,117.55	Jim S., Mary Lee Joanne, Lester L., and Mary S. Robinson	Walla Walla, Wash.	26,854	48,337.20
Temple & Temple	Echo, Oreg.	25,000	45,250.00	G. Byron Dague	do.	26,853	48,335.40
Cross Ranch	Pendleton, Oreg.	25,007	45,174.60	William Strohmaler	Lind, Wash.	26,934	48,136.46
Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Mikkalo	Mikkalo, Oreg.	25,008	44,570.97	Harris Bros.	Dayton, Wash.	28,549	47,559.66
O. A. Miller estate	Pendleton, Oreg.	24,624	44,569.44	Robert Anderson	Walla Walla, Wash.	27,876	47,389.57
Louise Barnett	Condon, Oreg.	24,079	44,545.50	Bergevin & Jones	do.	27,949	47,234.57
Chester R. or Roberta Dyer	Mayville, Oreg.	24,808	42,917.27	Vernon H. Robinson	do.	26,189	47,140.20
Archie Harris	Touchet, Wash.	23,834	42,901.29	Guy Kent	do.	27,305	46,418.21
Earl Meeker	The Dalles, Oreg.	22,506	42,701.40	Henry J. Franz	Lind, Wash.	25,898	46,364.92
Davis Bros., William Neal	do.	22,171	42,009.20	Zaring & Sons	Lacrosse, Wash.	26,309	46,040.40
Denward L. Bergovin	Ione, Oreg.	22,835	41,826.48	Anderson Bros.	Starbuck, Wash.	27,248	45,762.07
Rietmann Bros.	do.	21,964	40,249.02	Harriett, Richard, and Kenneth Owsley	Walla Walla, Wash.	25,478	45,726.24
Herman Snyder	Pendleton, Oreg.	23,440	39,925.87	Chester L. Henson	Prosser, Wash.	24,564	45,442.77
Walker Whitacre Ranch	Athens, Oreg.	23,374	39,734.95	Milton R. Loney estate	Walla Walla, Wash.	26,857	45,387.48
Purchase Ranches	Pendleton, Oreg.	23,303	39,630.81	Ray H. Lamp	Spokane, Wash.	26,072	44,541.40
Adams Livestock Co.	Athens, Oreg.	23,222	39,403.20	O. H. Woodward	Dayton, Wash.	26,000	44,520.00
Leonard Dorcuze & Son	Pendleton, Oreg.	21,235	38,435.35	Dippel Bros.	Garfield, Wash.	25,321	44,059.17
Timmermann & Co.	do.	21,042	38,086.02	B. W. Tyrell	Kennewick, Wash.	23,213	43,791.92
Van Hubbard	Ione, Oreg.	21,615	38,086.02	Ralph Collier	Connell, Wash.	22,164	40,846.33
James H. Maloney	Adams, Oreg.	20,429	36,976.49	R. J. McWhorter	Prosser, Wash.	22,014	40,725.90
W. D. Hardie & Sons	Condon, Oreg.	21,229	36,938.43	Darrell Peniot	Connell, Wash.	22,352	40,256.55
Harold G. Steen	Milton-Freewater, Oreg.	20,482	36,867.00	William George Harder	Kahlotus, Wash.	22,217	40,213.37
McEligott Bros.	Ione, Oreg.	20,199	36,852.34	Hofer Bros.	Walla Walla, Wash.	23,306	39,387.00
Harvey Smith	do.	19,651	36,709.84	P. L. and D. J. Harvey	Patterson, Wash.	21,725	39,105.70
Arnold Hoeft & Son	Pilot Rock, Oreg.	21,562	36,568.18	Frank B. Lenz and Arthur Berg	Ritzville, Wash.	20,776	38,432.39
C. H. Harris & Harold Coe	Joseph, Oreg.	20,173	35,101.02	Schwies Bros.	Hartline, Wash.	22,747	37,596.77
Franklin Lindstrom	Ione, Oreg.	18,802	34,407.66	William R. Sieg	Oakesdale, Wash.	22,748	37,533.75
R. A. Brogottii	Helix, Oreg.	19,317	33,911.36	Hobart Huggins	Hartline, Wash.	21,868	36,962.21
W. Lowell Steen & Steen Land Co.	Milton-Freewater, Oreg.	18,730	33,750.00	H. H. Higgins	Ephrata, Wash.	20,372	36,833.02
S. E. Brogottii & Sons	Helix, Oreg.	19,562	33,430.44	Verne J. Barbo	Dayton, Wash.	21,918	36,817.78
Lester F. King	do.	18,129	32,813.49	Ronald Ferguson	Walla Walla, Wash.	21,512	36,786.32
G. A. Sargent & Carl Tuggle	Wasco, Oreg.	17,610	32,754.60	Francis Munns	Dayton, Wash.	21,927	36,618.61
Lloyd K. McRae & Schvending Bros.	Helix, Oreg.	17,790	32,095.97	Eslick Bros.			
Remier Ranch	Lakeview, Oreg.	17,848	31,729.43				
Jim Valentine, Ed Rice	Hoppper, Oreg.	17,364	31,624.67				
Edgar Anderson	Blacklock, Oreg.	16,892	30,512.83				
R. D. & H. Grid	Walla Walla, Wash.	16,339	30,063.78				
Dyer Farms, Inc.	Mayville, Oreg.	16,984	29,551.29				
Van Buskirk & Lloyd	Olex, Oreg.	16,925	29,512.06				
Coleman Ranch	Echo, Oreg.	16,143	29,380.26				
Price & Leebetter	do.	16,290	29,357.95				
Hall & Mahoney	Cayuse, Oreg.	17,106	29,174.19				
Richard W. Hampton	Heppner, Oreg.	15,857	29,018.81				
F. N. Johns	Pendleton, Oreg.	16,028	29,010.68				
Gene Reynolds	Athens, Oreg.	14,951	28,940.64				
John E. Korvola & M. H. Carter	Grass Valley, Oreg.	15,993	28,048.64				
Harry Daruelle	Pendleton, Oreg.	15,603	27,944.52				
	The Dalles, Oreg.	14,457	27,905.91				

1959 crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer—Continued

WHEAT—Continued

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
WASHINGTON—continued				WASHINGTON—continued			
A. S. Miller	Colfax, Wash.	20,896	\$36,285.91	Matt Lyons	Waitsburg, Wash.	15,964	\$28,891.84
Mrs. Shirley Timm	Harrington, Wash.	21,720	30,272.60	Harry Carstensen & Son	Almira, Wash.	10,976	28,640.20
Charno Bros.	Amber, Wash.	22,252	30,249.61	Carl H. Repp	Farmington, Wash.	16,349	28,583.29
A. V. Clark	Pullman, Wash.	21,962	30,237.58	Fred Hofer & Sons	Walla Walla, Wash.	15,725	28,492.25
Joseph W. Mader	Palouse, Wash.	20,780	35,741.11	R. D. Ferris	Lacrosse, Wash.	17,291	28,453.47
Arcadio Schroeder	Wilbur, Wash.	21,394	35,514.12	Edward E. Topper	Harrington, Wash.	17,017	28,418.39
C. J. Thomas	Prescott, Wash.	18,314	35,487.47	Joe T. Smith	Sprague, Wash.	16,830	28,403.70
Allan Dale Struthers	Eureka, Wash.	19,564	35,215.20	Virgil Davin	Walla Walla, Wash.	16,904	28,391.29
James A. Scott	Pomeroy, Wash.	19,850	34,909.09	Harold Gwinn	Dayton, Wash.	16,896	28,384.44
Nick Seivers, Jr.	Lind, Wash.	20,822	34,947.48	Herbert Franz	Marlin, Wash.	16,709	28,350.44
Phillip Joy	Brewster, Wash.	20,671	34,311.24	Andrew Nilles	Mansfield, Wash.	16,680	28,184.96
Frank J. Wolf	Pomeroy, Wash.	20,624	34,235.01	Richard F. McKiernan	Pomeroy, Wash.	16,979	28,183.19
Chet Powers	Starbuck, Wash.	20,483	34,206.58	Endicott, Wash.	Pullman, Wash.	17,126	28,083.82
Fred Zimmer	Lacrosse, Wash.	19,391	33,934.62	Pullman, Wash.	St. John, Wash.	16,965	27,992.97
Alma Smith	Dayton, Wash.	20,192	33,922.83	James E. Orellly	Walla Walla, Wash.	15,546	27,882.80
Ray L. Small, Jr.	Lowden, Wash.	19,800	33,600.00	Garnett W. White	Kahlotus, Wash.	15,395	27,865.14
Robert or Minnie Franz	Ritzville, Wash.	20,000	33,600.00	L. D. Whitmore	Bickleton, Wash.	14,930	27,831.34
Howard Pettyjohn	Prescott, Wash.	19,795	33,506.44	Orville Hart	Walla Walla, Wash.	15,246	27,595.26
Henry L. Vincent	Walla Walla, Wash.	18,495	33,475.95	Waneta Heilman, Hofer Bros., Paul S. Hofer	South Los Angeles, Calif.	15,229	27,412.20
Ivan Eccles	do	19,800	33,462.00	Eldon Lepore	Harrington, Wash.	16,390	27,347.56
E. K. McGee	Dayton, Wash.	19,850	33,455.92	Thomas J. Byer & Sons	Pomeroy, Wash.	16,434	27,280.99
Paul Mader	Pullman, Wash.	19,231	33,400.82	E. W. & M. E. Johnson	Garfield, Wash.	15,520	27,057.40
Ed Richard & Marcus Stueckle	Lacrosse, Wash.	19,164	33,281.67	Mrs. Olin S. Maybelle, R. Brown, executor	Spokane, Wash.	16,208	26,939.52
Lester Sauer	do	20,286	33,268.76	Clarence Adams, Jr.	Coulee City, Wash.	15,892	26,926.81
Ferguson & Williams Ranches	Milton Freewater, Wash.	19,542	33,220.55	Joe T. Webster, A. M. Britton	College Place, Wash.	14,685	26,724.39
Joe F. Havlina	Connell, Wash.	17,948	33,203.43	Smith Bros. Ben L. & W. T.	Odessa, Wash.	15,941	26,462.61
Don Camp	Lacrosse, Wash.	19,002	32,838.62	Jake L. Smith estate	Waitsburg, Wash.	15,647	26,443.65
S.T.S. Farm	Walla Walla, Wash.	19,151	32,748.93	Escure Bros.	Quincy, Wash.	15,641	26,355.65
Alton Houser	Pomeroy, Wash.	19,571	32,683.29	Robert & Duane Tumm	Harrington, Wash.	15,973	26,354.62
Herron Bros.	Kahlotus, Wash.	17,257	32,615.07	Jack Penner	Dayton, Wash.	15,641	26,277.05
Milton Silzel	Oakesdale, Wash.	18,620	32,399.01	Edith Hair estate	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,508	26,259.48
Lewis A. Wade, Jr.	Pomeroy, Wash.	19,395	32,186.86	Peterson Bros.	Edwall, Wash.	15,710	26,235.48
Ellsworth Conover	Waitsburg, Wash.	18,973	32,081.61	Albert Miller	Hay, Wash.	16,023	26,190.39
Oliver Dezellem	Bridgeport, Wash.	17,890	32,022.79	Glen L. Lucht	Harrington, Wash.	15,684	26,192.03
Roy Sharpe	Malton, Wash.	16,581	32,000.97	Geo. Batterman	Wenatchee, Wash.	14,779	26,165.84
P. C. Donley	Pomeroy, Wash.	19,267	31,983.50	Burdett Prince & Sons	Clarkston, Wash.	15,816	26,096.32
Robert Whitmore	Pullman, Wash.	18,250	31,937.96	C. W. Heinemann	Ritzville, Wash.	15,514	26,083.62
J. I. Kupers	Harrington, Wash.	19,124	31,937.75	Henry W. Dowd	Prosser, Wash.	14,148	26,032.32
F. William Arlt	Wilson Creek, Wash.	17,614	31,705.20	Les and Art Maley	Thornton, Wash.	14,927	25,972.42
Fred Beckner	Washtucna, Wash.	18,491	31,518.61	Charles L. Chapp	Prescott, Wash.	15,360	25,957.84
Franklin D. Rockwell	Endicott, Wash.	19,127	31,516.29	Gluck heirs	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,412	25,941.60
Vollmer and Bayne	Prosser, Wash.	17,310	31,504.20	V. H. Rogers estate, Mary R. Sage, executrix	Bronxville, N.Y.	15,620	25,928.75
Sorrels Bros.	Lamont, Wash.	19,059	31,420.51	Harry Timpy & Eaton sisters	Waitsburg, Wash.	14,302	25,886.62
Levi Stradley	Pomeroy, Wash.	18,850	31,395.14	John V. Crouse	Washtucna, Wash.	15,393	25,772.74
Ralph Garrett	Endicott, Wash.	19,059	31,388.38	R. L. Cilne estate	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,243	25,747.58
Herb Meyer	Ephrata, Wash.	17,259	31,274.25	Virgil Klaveano	Thornton, Wash.	15,506	25,683.62
Walter E. Franz	Lind, Wash.	17,492	31,253.49	Mrs. F. C. Plucker	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,251	25,651.80
Redman Lasater	Prescott, Wash.	17,375	31,239.76	Clarence Johnson	Pullman, Wash.	15,547	25,617.95
Ivan Higgs	Eureka, Wash.	18,295	31,134.55	Clarence Gooley & Son	Harrington, Wash.	15,350	25,603.19
K. W. Robinson	Clarkston, Wash.	18,628	30,904.16	Harold, Mahel B., John Buckley	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,272	25,592.54
A. Mayberry	Govan, Wash.	18,599	30,808.14	Floyd W. Schy	Lamont, Wash.	15,476	25,484.49
Walter H. Johnson	Malton, Wash.	16,899	30,718.86	A. E. Schick & Son	Farmer, Wash.	14,237	25,484.22
Carrie Welch Trust	Coral Gables, Fla.	18,156	30,684.35	Ted J. Moore	Lamont, Wash.	15,417	25,438.79
Coreen Thompson	Almira, Wash.	18,125	30,630.66	William C. Hughes	Walla Walla, Wash.	14,040	25,412.40
Roy Allington	Odessa, Wash.	18,312	30,496.86	Robert Selg	Hartline, Wash.	15,000	25,350.00
Valentine Jess	Hartline, Wash.	17,924	30,470.43	Senkler Bros.	do	15,000	25,350.00
Robert K. Nelson	do	18,000	30,420.00	J. L. Williams	Lind, Wash.	14,218	25,341.16
Allen Deffenbaugh	Kemewick, Wash.	16,529	30,388.30	Dennery Neace	Waitsburg, Wash.	14,965	25,291.27
Brockel Bros.	Lacrosse, Wash.	18,441	30,243.16	Dan Brockel	Colfax, Wash.	14,474	25,235.46
E. Lasater & Nunn	Walla Walla, Wash.	16,798	30,236.40	Fred Robinson	Benge, Wash.	14,229	25,222.43
Francis Morgan & Son	Pomeroy, Wash.	17,024	30,132.48	Roy Henning	St. John, Wash.	15,280	25,211.26
Welsh Farms	Odessa, Wash.	17,117	30,128.34	Hazel D. Peterson & Sons	Almira, Wash.	14,910	25,197.17
C. G. King & J. C. Kinzer	Pullman, Wash.	17,165	30,039.17	E. A. Dumas	Pullman, Wash.	15,267	25,191.13
Ralph A. Gering & Sons	Ritzville, Wash.	17,735	29,977.35	Ernest A. Cowell	Eureka, Wash.	13,988	25,178.40
Kenneth Smith	Waitsburg, Wash.	17,717	29,941.53	Jim Poe	Hartline, Wash.	14,861	25,098.78
John H. Doneen	Farmington, Wash.	17,174	29,881.96	Herbert Armstrong	Harrington, Wash.	15,027	25,094.99
Joe Hargrove	Lancaster, Wash.	18,067	29,808.62	Henry Koenig estate	Colfax, Wash.	15,193	25,067.76
Verl Jonas	Dayton, Wash.	17,544	29,473.63				
Lester Parsons	Asotin, Wash.	17,902	29,249.97				
Johnson Bros.	Colfax, Wash.	17,673	29,160.24				
Joe M. Merrill, Robert D. Frazier	Walla Walla, Wash.	15,974	29,122.94				

A Report on Civil Rights in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast of last March 16 by the very well known and respected commentator on the daily events of the world, Edward P. Morgan of the American Broadcasting Co. I was particularly impressed by this broadcast and certainly commend it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Morgan is recognized for the fairness and con-

ciseness of his very popular program. A transcript of the broadcast follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MARCH 16, 1960

What is there, I wonder, which genuinely moves Americans these days? What is there beyond the departure of Jack Paar, the return of Elvis Presley, or the size of Mickey Mantle's salary which generates a real reaction from the public? Do we honestly care about anything, much, beyond the family front door? I would hazard a guess that sometimes, curiously, it is easier for us to identify with and become exercised about a far crisis than a near one—perhaps because the near one would, or should, command responsible action which we'd like to avoid.

If the daily news flowing from Orangeburg, Atlanta, Charlotte, Raleigh, Petersburg, and other southern waypoints were coming instead from New Delhi, Johannesburg, or Algiers, we might follow it excitedly as a major human drama and our top foreign

correspondents would be dispatched to the scene to write the latest graphic chapters in the unending history of men's struggle for freedom. But here at home we have a big segment of the American population in revolt, a moving spectacle which, before it is finished, may well rival the depth and power of Gandhi's shattering successful passive resistance campaign in India. And we react to this convulsion with about as much attention as we ordinarily give the National Safety Council's figures on holiday traffic deaths.

What we are actually facing here in these lunch counter "sit-ins" is only the latest manifestation of a revolution, peaceful so far, but a revolution nevertheless on behalf of 18 million American Negroes. Gradually but massively they are awakening to their constitutional rights and they are determined to get them fulfilled in a freedom they have never really had, either North or South. With sparse exceptions that are scarcely noticeable at the moment, the so-called

leadership of the South has completely refused to grasp the dimensions and the significance of the Negro liberation movement and are treating it with the flatfoot mentality of a country cop, a mentality which the British—with a little more polish perhaps, applied against Gandhi to their everlasting sorrow.

And what about the rest of us, how are we treating this dramatic phenomenon which is making history if not news? We are inclined to toss it aside as somebody else's problem and turn back to the television. If anything is happening in this country which is of profound concern to every one of us it is this heroic struggle of the Negroes to cut themselves loose from second-class citizenship.

Hardly a day goes by in this town but what some aspiring statesman or doom-cracking pundit issues a warning of heavy portent about the deterioration of the democratic system and the need to do something about it. But while we talk, a Negro teenager, not old enough to vote even if his election board would let him, is doing something about it. With quiet courage, he is daily braving tear gas, fire hoses, truncheons, jails, fines, taunts, threats, and grave bodily harm because he believes in something, as other American revolutionaries did before him. He is, as Thurgood Marshall said at Yale on Sunday, fighting our battles for us. What a monstrous pity it is that the white rock-n-roll set appears to have neither the guts nor the guidance to choose the meaningful side of the fight.

At his news conference this morning, President Eisenhower, who has always put such stock in the qualities of good will and human values, was asked whether he thought the current sit-in demonstrations at lunch counters and libraries were commendable examples of moral courage. Until he became entangled in legal technicalities, the President came closer than perhaps he ever has before to outright endorsement of the general Negro cause. He seemed to have been impressed by the discipline and peaceable determination of these participants. "I am deeply sympathetic," he said, "with the efforts of any group to enjoy the rights * * * of equality that they are guaranteed by the Constitution." But he condemned violence from any quarter and he was not sure of the legal rights of a Negro in a public place like a restaurant.

The lunch counter invasions are plainly infractions of local ordinances of State laws, some of them hastily put through. But lawyers differ over the ultimate validity of these statutes. They differed over the salt tax in India and the tea tax in the American colonies, too.

American Treatment of Cuba Shows a Policy of Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned about our continuing indecision and lack of firmness in dealing with the steadily worsening situation in Cuba.

My greatest concern is that the State Department policy toward the government of Fidel Castro is clearly a policy of weakness. Even worse, our policy has

now led to the appeasement of Fidel Castro.

The result, of course, is just what we should expect. Our appeasement has triggered more unfair and slanderous attacks against the U.S. Government from Castro's chief lieutenants.

A recent column in the *Palm Beach Times* of March 19, by George Sokolsky, makes this point very clear.

I will now ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TREATMENT OF CUBA SHOWS A POLICY OF WEAKNESS

(By George Sokolsky)

In a world where power has replaced justice and where war and the preparation for war are constant, it is not surprising that the American attitude toward Castro is regarded as weakness, as cowardice, as accepting insults because the courage is lacking to reject them.

But there is more to it than that. Some American companies have operated in both the United States and Cuba. The principal companies with interests in Cuba are the Cuban American Sugar Refining Co., United Fruit Co., and American Sugar Refining Co.

It is to be noted that a part of the 2-cent-a-pound subsidy which Cuba's sugar receives from the United States goes to American companies growing and manufacturing Cuban sugar. Cuba has a quota which currently amounts to 375,000 tons.

Whatever goes to the Castro government from this subsidy is used to purchase arms for Castro's army, to support revolutionary movements in Latin America, and perhaps eventually to demonstrate an ability to strike at some American spot at a time when it may be inconvenient for the United States to engage in a mopping-up of Cuba.

The weakness of American policy is based on three theories:

1. The United States is morally a better nation than Soviet Russia and, therefore, will not treat Cuba as Soviet Russia treated Hungary.

2. Whatever action is taken against Castro must be taken by the Organization of American States (OAS) and not by the United States solo.

3. The United States does not wish to irritate Soviet Russia prior to the summit conference and, therefore, it is sound to let Russia or Russian satellites get away with crimes during the present ticklish period.

Unfortunately, the formulation of this policy has been left to weak hands. Obviously, it makes no sense and will ultimately lose for us leadership in the Americas as it has lost leadership for us in Asia. Nobody wants to follow a weak leader. John Foster Dulles pulled this country over many hurdles by moving from strength. He prevented the Russians from choosing the time and place for strained relations. The Suez Canal incident must be judged from that standpoint.

The present policy of the United States, which some attribute to the thinking of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, is an idealistic concept of international relations based on the assumption that if nothing is done, Fidel Castro will come to his senses. It reminds one of the ideas of Col. Raymond Robins, way back in 1917-18, who believed that if the Communists were not interfered with they would ultimately come to their senses. By 1960, we know, for sure, that Soviet Russia has become the objective enemy of the United States with industrial and military strength beyond your imagination in 1917.

The same kind of thinking is going into

our attitude toward Castro and we shall probably not wake up to our necessities until this bearded devil throws a bomb on the Panama Canal or on Miami just to show us that he can spit on us. For once and for all, the United States must show that it does not need to take guff from anybody.

The Eisenhower policy of weakness, after he had himself for so many years pursued a policy of strength, is frightening because so much of what is left of freedom in the world depends upon the United States for leadership against Soviet Russia's imperialism. Upon whom are the free and hopeful people to depend if the United States continues its policy of weakness?

Many used to criticize Dean Acheson, when he was Secretary of State, for pursuing a policy of weakness, but, in retrospect, Dean Acheson was a giant of strength compared to what we have now. He, at any rate, attempted to disentangle the United States from the errors of Teheran and Yalta, but now we are risking our national dignity and prestige over a trivial island in the Caribbean. Not only that but we continue to subsidize Castro's government.

What is such a policy expected to accomplish? Politically it is meaningless because Castro knows what Khrushchev knows, namely, that Eisenhower will only be President until next January; that beginning in June, all the political personalities in the United States will be so completely absorbed with the political campaign, that no external question will be considered seriously. It is a good time to make trouble.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 139th anniversary of the independence of Greece.

I am very happy to join in the celebration of this day, because the idea of independence, as we understand it, had its birth in Greece, and the Greeks were the first to appreciate and enjoy its benefits. It is true that they lost it for many years, but they never lost sight of its value; and they continually struggled and finally regained their freedom and national independence.

Greece has had its share of misfortunes and miseries, especially during the last two world wars. However, today she is a strategic bastion of the free world against communism. On this 139th anniversary, let us all hope that she will face all dangers that may threaten her in the future with that firm determination and courage which have ever characterized the Greeks throughout their long and glorious history.

Freedom-loving people throughout the world have drawn inspiration from the long, hard, valiant, and epic struggle of the Greek people for their independence. This day has immortalized the bravery and devotion of this proud nation's warriors and martyrs.

Ancient Greece was the cradle of liberty; and apostles of freedom still look to Greece—both ancient and modern—

for those sturdy characteristics which make a people great.

On this anniversary, we of the United States salute the Greek people for their monumental contributions—both past and present—to our country and to our civilization.

Honorably Discharged Veterans With Less Than 90 Days' Service Deserve Equality of Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker in recent days many distinguished Members of this eminent body have raised their voices against the unfair treatment and lack of consideration which our country has given to certain segments of our population. To the list of groups unfairly treated, Mr. Speaker, I would add another. I refer to the veterans of the two World Wars and the Korean conflict, of less than 90 days' service, in the matter of non-service-connected disability pension. This is caused by section 521(b) of title 38 of the Code which prescribes 90 days of service, or a service-connected disability as qualifying factors for benefits.

World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, to which the pertinent section of the Code is applicable, were certainly no brush fires; they were, I submit, periods of the greatest emergency and peril. A grateful people should remember that every individual who entered the service of this country in those perilous times offered his life for the great principle at stake, and it matters little as to the period of time this Nation required his services. The time of 3 months, or 2, months, or 1 month, or a year furnishes no evidence as to the value of the veteran's services to his country in those precarious periods.

Many of these men had to tear up their roots in industry and in employment. Many men closed down their businesses, never to be regained. The economic harm suffered by them because of their entry into the service has never been properly compensated. Arbitrary distinctions for those who have served over 3 months and those who have served less than 3 months have accentuated the harshness and the unfair treatment. A man who has been inducted into service and who has been honorably discharged should receive equal treatment in the hands of the Government which calls him.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that in due course this body will approve the bill I am today introducing, the effect of which will be to remove from the law the provision which is unfair to veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict of less than 90-days' service in the matter of non-service-connected disability pension.

Proposed Legislation To Improve the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion during the present session regarding the advisability of providing medical insurance for our senior citizens. It has been suggested that this might be accomplished through an extension of the social security program. It seems to me that the importance of this issue should not obscure other issues in social security, or the fact that many inequities and inadequacies still exist in that program. As the proportion of older persons in our Nation grows, the importance of providing them security against degrading poverty also grows. For the past 8 years, as a Member of this Congress, I have fought to humanize and liberalize our present system. Today, I would like to discuss five bills which I think will go a long way toward improving the Social Security Act.

First, H.R. 3901 would increase the minimum monthly benefit from \$33 to \$50. This is not a new idea. I urged that this step be taken in 1956, when the minimum benefit was only \$30. Of course, the \$3 increase voted in the 1958 amendments was a step in the right direction. But \$33 was certainly not enough to live on then and is not enough now, since the cost of living has continued to increase. This seems all the more distressing since the group receiving the minimum benefit is almost by definition the group least able to provide old-age security out of its own resources. Fifty dollars per month is little enough to provide food, clothing, and shelter, but it would come a great deal nearer to that goal than does the present minimum.

Second, H.R. 4799 would repeal the so-called retirement test. As I have already noted, the minimum benefit under the Social Security Act is not enough to keep body and soul together. The same is true where persons are receiving more than the minimum. The maximum possible individual benefit at the present time is \$1,524 per year, and the average only \$890. This means that many individuals must work to support themselves even after reaching retirement age. Yet, under the retirement test, we begin to take away the meager benefits when the individual begins to earn any significant amount. This seems basically unfair since it hurts the people who are most in need. An individual who has substantial income from investment may keep all of that income and his social security benefits too. It also seems unfair that we tax workers in order to provide security in old age, and then reduce or refuse benefits when they reach the prescribed age. But, even if it were necessary that we have a retirement test, present law op-

erates so inequitably and capriciously that I think we should at least repeal it and start over. For instance, if a man can bunch all of his earnings in one month or a few months, he can still get his social security benefits for all the other months, no matter how much his earnings totalled for the year. To my mind this needlessly discriminates against those individuals who can only work at steady jobs for steady wages.

On the other end of the scale, Mr. Speaker, a man who works steadily for steady wages can actually come out with less income from combined earnings and benefits than if he had never worked at all. For instance, if the man earned \$1,200.01 in a year, he would lose a full month's benefit, which could amount to over \$100. Although I have urged since 1954 legislation improving the retirement test so as to remove these inequities, we have not succeeded in doing so. Therefore, I think we ought to do away with it entirely.

My third bill, H.R. 5308 would eliminate the provisions of present law which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65. This too is not a new idea and, in fact, was part of H.R. 7225 which passed this body in 1955. The report on that bill by the Committee on Ways and Means stated the situation quite clearly:

The principle underlying wife's benefits under old-age and survivors insurance is that a married couple should not have to get along on the same amount that is sufficient for a single person. Wives are generally a few years younger than their husbands. Thus, when the husband has to retire many couples have only the husband's benefit until the wife also reaches age 65.

The age of eligibility should be reduced to 62 for women workers, also. A recent study . . . showed that age limits are applied more frequently to job openings for women than for men and that the age limits applied are lower.

These principles have now been recognized, but have not been fully implemented. It is granted that the retirement age should be lower for women because to do otherwise would ignore realities. Nevertheless, present law seems based on the supposition that a woman who retires at age 62 requires a smaller amount upon which to live than if she retires at age 65. It seems to me this supposition is fanciful, and that the provision which is based upon it works undue and unnecessary hardship on women who are precluded from working past age 62 by conditions in the labor market over which they have no control.

I hope that my reference to the present retirement ages will not be construed as approval of them. In fact, I feel that the retirement ages for both men and women should be lowered to levels more in accord with the present condition of the labor market and the changes which are taking place in it. For instance, this Nation has already seen several great changes in its industrial makeup. The introduction of mass production was one. Each of these changes has been accompanied by the displacement of large numbers of workers who gained their livelihood in the older means of produc-

tion or the older industry. Those workers of advanced years suffered great hardship because they could not market their skills under new circumstances, and could not reasonably be expected to acquire new skills and learn new trades.

It seems clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that such a change is again taking place in this country. Automation is making itself felt in many industries today, and will in the near future affect many more. This change necessitates a reexamination of the present concepts of retirement. As men are replaced by machines, we will be faced with the increasing problem of workers of advanced years whose skills have become unmarketable, who cannot reasonably be expected to acquire new skills, who cannot compete with younger workers in the unskilled trades, and who are still under present retirement age. If the social security program is to provide adequate protection against such risks, it must make its benefits available when they are needed, and not after the worker has been forced to endure a period of poverty or dependence on his children. Therefore, I urge that this body pass my fourth bill, H.R. 2759, which would reduce the retirement age for men to 60 and the retirement age for women to 55. The need for such an amendment to the Social Security Act has already arisen, and will increase in the near future. I think we should do something about it before, not after, it reaches catastrophic proportions.

The fifth and last proposal which I intend to discuss is H.R. 5394. In 1956 we took a great step forward in social security by providing for social insurance against the loss of earning capacity due to physical or mental disability. This legislation partially closed one of the largest gaps in the protection afforded by the social security program. I say partially because present provisions fall a great deal short of answering all our present needs. For instance, only those disabled persons who are 50 years of age or older can qualify for disability benefits. This purely arbitrary dividing line excludes from benefits thousands of disabled workers and their dependents who are suffering great hardship because of the inability of the family worker to maintain them by working. In fact, it seems to me that the disabled persons under age 50 are more likely to be in need of such benefits than persons over age 50 since the younger workers are much more likely to have families, particularly children, dependent on their earnings. Therefore, my bill would remove the arbitrary age 50 requirement and make disability benefits available to any individual meeting the coverage requirements of the present law. I might add that the taxes we have already imposed on workers in order to provide disability insurance would defray the added cost of my bill so that no increase in the tax would be necessary. This fact was brought out at the recent hearings held by Subcommittee on the Administration of the Social Security Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare testified that removal of the age 50 requirement would present no administrative difficulties. Since we are already taxing the people an amount sufficient to provide such increased protection, I see no reason why we should not give it to them.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the strength of the social security system depends on our ability and willingness to mold it to meet current needs. These must be evaluated to a realistic way. First and foremost we should always remember that the statistics we deal with must always at some point be translated into human situations. I think the five bills I have discussed today are based on a realistic evaluation of human needs and that they propose changes which must be made to meet those needs.

Weaknesses of the Referee System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mrs. A. Powell Davies, chairman of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and published in that newspaper today. The letter points out the weaknesses in the referee system and advocates an administrative rather than a judicial process for restoring voting rights. Mrs. Davies is distinguished in her own right as the widow of the noted Rev. A. Powell Davies, formerly minister of the All Souls Unitarian Church, of Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST FOR CONGRESS

It is almost 90 years since our Nation guaranteed in the 15th amendment, that: "The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

The amendment did not limit its force to Federal voting. It specifically applied its prohibitions to "any State," and that means, and still means, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, and other States where large groups of even well-educated Negroes are being swindled out of the right to vote.

Yet the House of Representatives came within three votes last Friday of limiting the application of a watered-down voting-rights remnant of the civil rights program to Federal elections, which would have left local elections in the hands of the white officials who have been denying Negroes their constitutional rights.

Technically the gap may seem quite narrow between the proposal for Federal voting registrars appointed by the President and referees appointed by a Federal judge. Morally the difference is measured by the distance between law and the evasion of law. The referee plan, supported by the administration, even though it is advanced in good

faith by some of its proponents, would leave the Negro voter in approximately the same position he occupies today, because the legal machinery lends itself to continuous manipulation by those who do not believe in its purpose.

The President's Commission on Civil Rights, after long study of the problem, has recommended an administrative rather than a judicial process to restore voting rights. We believe that the Commission is right, and that the referee-judicial machinery is too costly and too complicated for the average voter to handle in prevailing circumstances.

Mrs. A. POWELL DAVIES,

Chairman, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
WASHINGTON.

An Open Letter to Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my great friend and former classmate, the Honorable Edmund C. Bunker, vice president, Columbia Broadcasting System, has kindly called to my attention the article included, herewith.

I have asked Mr. BUNKER to allow me to place this fine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This indicates what one of our great networks is doing to give America wholesome and cultural entertainment.

The article follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO TEACHERS

If the great New York Philharmonic were going to play in your town tonight, would you urge the boys and girls in your class to attend? If Bernstein or Stokowski or Mitropoulos were going to conduct Beethoven or Mozart or Bartok, would you encourage your students to experience this important event? We feel that you would.

Every week the New York Philharmonic does play in almost every town across America, over CBS Radio. No one has to stir from home. No one has to buy a ticket. A radio is your front seat.

This is just one of many programs on CBS radio that make a deliberate effort to bring your community cultural, informative, educational and, just as important, entertaining events that awaken your students to new ideas and great occasions, that teach them that the arts are for enjoying, that learning is for living, and show them the work you do in class extends far beyond the schoolroom blackboard.

Every week your students can attend the concerts of the magnificent Cleveland Symphony under the direction of George Szell. They can enjoy a weekly performance of the Metropolitan Opera during its season. So many young people have learned from these broadcasts that "Faust" and "Carmen" are exciting stories; that opera singers have as much to offer them as popular singers, that intermission features like Clifton Fadiman's interviews or Edward Downes' "Opera Quiz" are great fun. Have you told them how fascinating such worthwhile programs are?

Has it occurred to you to tie in "The Hidden Revolution" series with discussions in current events and social sciences and government? Last year this series won the Peabody Award for outstanding public service.

The subject is the changes and upheavals taking place in the world today. History before it's history. History while it's still a news story. Edward R. Murrow and Howard K. Smith narrate these programs. Your pupils will get to know men like Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, playwright Archibald MacLeish, Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn, professor of Anthropology at Harvard.

Do your students know how fascinating news can be when they hear it from a man like Lowell Thomas? He has been a cowpuncher, gold miner, college professor, newspaper reporter, editor, historian, lecturer, author of more than 45 books. His gift is an incomparable one. By telling the big, important stories colorfully and concisely, he makes them real and memorable.

Have you alerted your class to the fact that twice each day they can travel to the remote corners of the globe and get the news firsthand from the finest news reporters in the world—the CBS news correspondents? The programs are "World News Roundup" and "The World Tonight." And top newsmen like Eric Sevareid, David Schoenbrun, Daniel Schorr and Winston Burdett tell the story directly from the scene.

In your classwork in government or history have you suggested that your students listen to "Capitol Cloakroom," and "The Leading Question," broadcast each week on the CBS radio network? They'll meet national leaders, get to know their personalities and attitudes, get familiar with important public affairs as they take shape. Fine learning tool for future statesmen.

Is your class aware that by listening to "Face the Nation" on CBS radio they can hear, firsthand, opinions of world figures, as informed reporters question them? Great inspiration for future journalists, and voters.

Do your students know what they are missing by not hearing "Invitation To Learning"? Recently critic Alfred Kazin discussed Mark Twain's "Life on the Mississippi." Every week a well-known authority gives a new breath of life to an important literary work.

Do you realize how many CBS Radio programs are worthy of being made assignments for classroom discussion? Make it a habit to glance at your local daily radio schedules. For just to point out to the boys and girls who sit before you every day the opportunities they may be missing right in their own homes, just to hint that they might actually enjoy "Aida" or Haydn's "Surprise" symphony or a special news program might be opening a career, planting an ambition, enlarging life for them.

Not to open young minds to what lies so close at hand, so eager for use, so ready to serve, so worthwhile, might be to miss one of the great challenges of teaching. For what better way can we stir these young minds to think, to learn by doing, than by suggesting they use their time for something stimulating and constructive, that is theirs simply for the turning of a little knob.

If today radio stopped bringing such events to your town, if the New York Philharmonic no longer brought Beethoven, if "World News Roundup" no longer took you to Algiers and Tokyo, if the Metropolitan Opera performed only for New Yorkers, if intelligent worldwide news programs gave way to sensational headline flashes, if the only music available were rock 'n' roll recordings, then you and your community would be striving to improve the quality of radio. Fortunately CBS radio constantly strives to bring you educational, informative, cultural programs that assure your town the finest broadcasting fare.

It is you, by your interest, who control the quality of programming that is brought to your students, the men and women of tomorrow. Suppose, by your lack of enthusiasm, these wonderful things were no longer available, waiting to be heard. Wouldn't you as a teacher make every effort to bring them back?—CBS Radio Network.

Negro Civil Rights—Letter From Rev. Elmer Fowler and Article From the Chicago Sun-Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Reverend Elmer Fowler. His letter deals with the question of civil rights. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the same place in the RECORD an article, published in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 21, which relates to a statement made by Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, about practices in restaurants in the South.

There being no objection, the letter and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DORIE MILLER
MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: From the day in 1619 that the Dutch ship landed the first citizens from Africa at Jamestown, Va., the Negro has struggled, without due compensation, to make the United States a great industrial Nation. From the time of the tilling of the soil, the harvesting of the cotton, the laying of the railroads—in every field of labor—the forebears of the present students in Negro colleges gave of themselves—with their sweat, blood, and tears—these contributions to the world.

Today, in every walk of life, we have descendants of these early Americans represented. These include Ralph Bunche of the United Nations Security Council, Adam Clayton Powell, Congressman from New York; James C. Evans, civilian aid to the Secretary of Defense; Dennis D. Nelson, high-ranking naval official, and thousands of others who are outstanding leaders in their respective fields.

In times when the end of the world is possible by virtue of an atomic war, these young Americans of the Negro race are not satisfied with second-class citizenship and are proving that nothing less than success will satisfy them in their quest for first-class citizenship. We not only praise them but we support them in all phases of their endeavor.

In an unprecedented display of courage in the face of intimidation, economic retaliation and physical violence, thousands of southern students have elected to "fill the jails of the South" rather than be forced or intimidated into turning back in their struggle to end all racial segregation in the Nation their forefathers died to make great.

March 15, in Orangeburg, S.C., more than 400 Negroes were arrested and herded into a compound and immediately trials were begun for breach of peace. Many of those herded into the fenced-in area had been thoroughly soaked from fire hydrants and hoses, then left to mill outside in 40° temperature.

Such action by policemen who are sworn to uphold the law of the land, is typical of the obstinate refusal throughout the South to allow these students means of peaceful pursuit of their goal.

Nine students from Negro Alabama State College were expelled on orders of Alabama

Governor Patterson for their part in an attempt to eat beside white men in the Montgomery courthouse lunchroom.

March 16, the day after mass arrests in Orangeburg and Nashville, Tenn., President Eisenhower stated he thought such demonstrations as are sweeping the South, if orderly and seeking to support the rights of equality, should be permitted. The President stated further he felt some of the demonstrations unquestionably constituted a proper expression of convictions. He said he was deeply sympathetic with the efforts of any group to enjoy the rights of equality guaranteed by the Constitution.

In our appeal to this great legislative body it is evident by the progress of the Negro people and the fight in Montgomery, Ala., and in all sections of this great country and the present sit-down protests below the Potomac that the Negro people will not be content until they are first-class Americans. And each man in the Congress of this Government is being watched as to his speech and his vote to rid this great Nation of the present and long-existing evil of segregation and discrimination because of race, creed and color. It is almost impossible for a Negro American to plead for the expansion of democracy throughout the world without being humiliated because of his status and treatment at home. This is an open plea to this body for men to stop "playing politics" and place the welfare of our Nation in serious consideration as you debate this civil rights bill.

With many thanks, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

Rev. ELMER L. FOWLER.

FLORIDA GOVERNOR HITS STORE TACTICS

The Governor of Florida said Sunday he thought it "unfair and morally wrong" for a department store owner not to allow Negroes to patronize one department while being permitted to trade at others.

Gov. LeRoy Collins spoke on the Negro sit-in demonstrations during a day marked by statements from National Association for the Advancement of Colored People leaders on civil rights and the sit-ins which have led to the arrest of more than 1,000 Negroes in the South since February 1.

Collins, who is known as a moderate on the race issue, spoke to a statewide radio and television audience in the wake of Negro sit-down demonstrations at variety store lunch counters in several Florida cities.

MAY BE LEGAL, BUT—

"As far as I'm concerned," Collins said, "I don't mind saying that if a man has a department store and he invites the public generally to come in his department store and trade, I think then it is unfair and morally wrong for him to single out one department, though, and say he does not want or will not allow Negroes to patronize that one department."

"Now he has a legal right to do this. But I still don't think he can square that right with moral, simple justice. Now you may not agree with that."

In an abstract distributed by his aids in advance of the Governor's TV appearance, Collins' remarks included a statement that Florida variety stores ought to close down their lunch counters unless they can serve white and Negro patrons alike. But Collins speaking without a text, did not say that in his broadcast.

TO NAME COMMITTEE

Collins took to the air in an effort to calm racial tensions stemming from the sit-downs.

The Governor said Jesus Christ warned in the Bible that "every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every house divided against itself falls."

"Nothing can aid the Communists more to establish supremacy over this country than racial strife," Collins said.

He announced he would appoint a State biracial advisory committee on racial rela-

tions, and called upon Florida communities to take similar action.

AN UNEASY CALM

An atmosphere of uneasy calm prevailed in the South generally after Saturday's series of arrests and protest meetings against traditionally segregated seating arrangements.

At Savannah, Ga., a boycott of stores which operate segregated lunch counters was voted by a group of Negroes in the wake of 14 arrests, during demonstrations last week.

At Charlotte, N.C., Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP's chief lawyer, said his organization will defend with all its resources every person involved in a court action because of "a lawful and peaceful demonstration."

Marshall told newsmen he believed people taking part in sitdown demonstrations cannot rightfully be convicted of trespassing. But he admitted it is uncertain whether a store owner can be required by law to serve Negroes as well as white persons.

FINDS IMPATIENCE

Asked why sitdowns have spread so rapidly, Marshall said he believed Negro young people are impatient with the slowness of court action in furthering what he described as equality.

In Washington, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, said he thought the Government lax in the "really great social crisis" of civil rights.

In a televised interview on ABC's Open Hearing, he suggested that President Eisenhower could call on Congress to enact his civil rights bill without trimming it down and could fight for it like he's fought for other measures.

A Depletion Allowance for Wage Earners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, each individual is an exhaustible natural resource. Since I have always favored the principle of providing depletion allowances for those who extract oil and other valuable minerals from the ground, I believe we might consider applying the same principle to persons who work for a living and thereby exhaust their energies.

This could be accomplished by giving individuals a tax credit for earned income. This is not a new idea. The earned income credit appeared on our tax forms for 13 years before it was removed during World War II. The case for reviving this credit is concisely stated in the following article by E. J. Schmidlein, Jr., professor of accounting at Southern Illinois University, from a recent issue of the university's business bulletin:

EARNED INCOME CREDIT IS NEEDED FEDERAL TAX REFORM

(By E. J. Schmidlein, Jr.)

With respect to the national economy, economists and social philosophers agree that the healthiest form of income is earned

income. Fifty years ago, Hobson stated: "The quantity of wealth available for distribution depends upon the stimulus afforded to the productive energies of man: This stimulus in its turn depends chiefly upon the opportunity open to every member of the community to do his best work."¹ Consequently, under any system of incentive taxation, it could be expected that people would be encouraged to produce more, that is, to earn more by a tax structure that would impose less of a burden on the fruits of individual effort than upon unearned income.

Yet, despite all the reforms introduced in recent Federal tax legislation, the painful fact remains that no type of income is more heavily taxed today than is earned income. This despite the fact that we did have an earned income credit in our tax laws for a number of years. However, it became a casualty of World War II. Other wartime expedients have ended, but reinstatement of the earned income credit has been overlooked in favor of tax benefits elsewhere.

Provision has been made for both an exclusion of and a credit for dividend income so that this form of unearned income bears a lower effective tax rate than income that is earned. It may be noted also that a special provision for a retirement income credit has been introduced into the tax law. The result is that retired millionaires are afforded some tax relief while the worker who so laboriously earns his income is taxed in full. Then, too, capital gains have an effective tax ceiling of 25 percent. Moreover, the definition of a capital gain has been stretched to such an extent that income from coal, timber, and cattle operations often are limited to the 25 percent maximum rate of taxation.

Recently, there has been some agitation for an adjustment of the depreciation allowance permitted on business assets. The tax laws allow a deduction for depreciation of business assets that are consumed in the production of income. This provision aims rightly at preserving the capital invested in an enterprise. However, to date, the deduction has been limited to the recovery of the money invested in the assets, and in today's inflationary spiral, recovery of the money investment falls short of the desired goal. Consequently, it has been advocated that the money cost of business assets be adjusted for price level changes so that the depreciation based on the adjusted amount would result in the recovery of the real capital invested. Paton holds that "saving and capital formation are lagging and that this matter is especially serious in view of the continuing inflationary pressures."² He then adds that he is "firmly convinced that the most helpful specific change that might be made in the prevailing tax structure would be recognition, in some form, of the need for converting recorded plant dollars to a current basis in the computation of the depreciation deduction in the tax return."³ No doubt there is considerable merit to the proposal. However, it should be noted that, if inflation continues, as is anticipated, the effect would be lower business taxes due to increased depreciation deductions.

This latest proposal for tax reform points up the peculiarity that accountants do not depreciate the income of a workingman as they depreciate that from a machine since they cannot appraise the value of a human being. Hence, the income from labor, as stated in terms of money, is always larger than it would be if the computation of income from property were taken as the standard. Yet, the professional and laboring man earns an income which is part a salary and part a return on capital invested. From the point of view of an individual, an investment in education or training to acquire earning power is an alternative to the purchase of income-yielding property. As Robinson has pointed out, from the view of the economy as a whole, "The stock of teachers,

doctors, and trained workers of all kinds has to be maintained, by devoting resources to education, in much the same way as the stock of machinery has to be maintained by the engineering industry, and to increase the stock of trained personnel requires investment, just as much as to increase the stock of physical capital goods."⁴

To encourage business investment, the tax laws already provide for a depletion deduction in many instances. As a result, a single individual with earned taxable income of more than \$14,000 falls in the 47-percent tax bracket whereas a Texas oilman with investment income in excess of \$4 million ends up, after a 50-percent depletion deduction, with an effective rate of only 45½ percent on his income. Now, as described above, to further encourage business investment, it is proposed that business be allowed to adjust its depreciation deduction to recover "real" rather than "money" capital. Certainly our country should encourage the investor to invest. On the other hand, it would appear that equitably our country should, at the very least, encourage the earner of income to earn. This is not a new concept as witness the report of the Ways and Means Committee that accompanied the revenue bill of 1924: "The fairness of taxing more lightly the income received as personal compensation for services rendered than income from investment has long been recognized. . . ."

Conceptually, then, an earned income credit appears both equitable and desirable. Practically, there appears to be no reason to bar its reinstatement. The credit appeared on tax forms for 13 years and its return would not complicate the form any more than do the present special treatment items for capital gains, depletion deductions, dividend exclusion and credit, and retirement income credit. Then, too, the proposed reform of depreciation based on price level adjusted assets would complicate the tax return and would aid business. Now, the wage earner should have his turn. The next tax reform needed is an earned income credit for the individual.

¹ J. A. Hobson, the "Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy," London: P. S. King & Son, 1909, p. 164.

² William A. Paton, "Depreciation—Concept and Measurement," the Journal of Accountancy, October 1959, p. 42.

³ Ibid., pp. 42-43.

⁴ Joan Robinson, the "Accumulation of Capital," London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1956, p. 12.

The High Price of "Easy" Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The High Price of 'Easy' Credit," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HIGH PRICE OF EASY CREDIT

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS says millions of persons who buy on time, or borrow from some finance companies, are being deceived or misled into paying excessive rates of interest.

One gimmick in the system is credit insurance. Most people don't know they have it. It often is hidden in the costs of the car or appliance they buy on installments, or in the interest rate for the money they borrow.

Credit insurance is legitimate enough—it is the creditors' protection against non-payment of a debt or loan in case the buyer or borrower dies. It also is a protection for survivors. And credit insurance is available from many companies at reasonable rates.

But there are enough gougers to make this a highly profitable racket in most States. Scripps-Howard writer Jack Steele exposed this racket in a series of articles last year and since then insurance commissioners in many States have been trying to combat it.

Senator DOUGLAS now is holding hearings on a truth-in-lending bill he and 19 other Senators have sponsored. This bill would compel the easy credit boys to itemize their service charges, such as interest rates and premiums on credit insurance.

Most of us are careless about fine print. But in some of these loan or installment contracts there isn't even any fine print to tell the customer what he is paying. Since you can't very well outlaw suckers, the only way to protect them is to legislate against those who would cheat them.

This is another case where abuses of a few in a legitimate business probably will result in Government controls over the whole industry. It's a shame this is necessary, but since it is we say to Senator DOUGLAS—go to it.

Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.: Bright Star in U.S. Industrial Sky—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride in my district that I request permission to insert into the RECORD, beginning today, a series of articles entitled "Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.: Bright Star in U.S. Industrial Sky."

This series of insertions, Mr. Speaker, will highlight the high place Fairfield County occupies in the Nation's economy.

They will point up the fact that Fairfield County as a labor market ranks 22d among all U.S. manufacturing areas, outranking such centers as Kansas City, Rochester, Indianapolis, and Dayton.

I am indebted to the Fairfield County Trust Co. for the material upon which this series of insertions in the RECORD will be based and wish at this time to insert excerpts from an economic newsletter and fact sheet on the growth and development of Fairfield County as prepared and distributed by that outstanding organization.

The excerpts from the newsletter for September-October 1959 follow:

FAIRFIELD COUNTY: BRIGHT STAR IN U.S. INDUSTRIAL SKY

Fairfield County holds a high place in the U.S. industrial sky.

As a labor market, the region stands 22d among all U.S. manufacturing areas—out-

ranking such centers as Kansas City, Rochester, Indianapolis, and Dayton. Its prolonged housing boom also ranks its construction workforce 32d nationally.

The county's light, medium, and heavier industries produce a wide variety of goods, making it one of the most diversified industrial areas in the country. It ranks as a leader in the output of no fewer than 70 different products, according to Sales Management's Survey of Industrial Buying Power.

Business and industry know it as a center for aircraft frames and engines, copper rolling and drawing, machine tools and dies, office machines, electrical appliances, and rubber and plastic products.

Traditionally a leader in hats, Fairfield County also paces the country as first in the production of asbestos products and phonograph records. For around-the-home use, the county stands high in the production of sewing machines (second), vacuum cleaners (second), and cutlery (fourth).

Turning out products of men's minds has also kept the county on a high rung of the industrial research ladder. The area houses 133, or 37 percent, of the 358 plant laboratories of the research-heavy State, and employs 3,300, or 27 percent, of the State's 12,000 technical and scientific workers.

Come 1985, two heads for every one: A look into Fairfield County's future provided by a 3-year New York metropolitan region

study, conducted by Harvard University for the Regional Plan Association:

By 1975, roughly 1 million people in Fairfield County; by 1985, 1,300,000 or better. This would be double the present 632,000.

Greater shift of routine office activities from New York City, if transit difficulties continue.

Rapidly growing job opportunities.

Major economic growth in store for the more sparsely settled areas of the county.

The outward trek of the middle income groups from the city to Fairfield County is bound to continue, even accelerate.

Norden sets site in Norwalk: The well-known division of United Aircraft Corp. will spend between \$6 and \$10 million to develop an engineering research and manufacturing facility on an 80-acre tract in Norwalk. The site lies between the Connecticut Turnpike and the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad. Division manufactures electronic equipment.

Fertile spot for plant growth: For the first 8 months of 1959, industrial and commercial building in Fairfield County amounted to 2.2 million square feet, according to F. W. Dodge Corp. In dollar terms, this came to \$35.6 million, up 14 percent from last year.

More and more plants are finding Fairfield County to their liking. Since New Year's Day, the Connecticut State Development Commission reported these companies have announced construction plans:

Town	Firm	Space in square feet	Cost	Proposed structure
Bethel.....	Harco Chemical Corp.....	18,000	\$180,000	Factory and office building.
Bridgeport....	Carpenter Steel Co. of New England, Inc.	49,000	340,000	Factory.
Danbury.....	Barden Corp.....	22,000	450,000	Factory addition.
	Collin Campbell Co., Inc.....	10,000	70,000	Factory.
	H. Wibling Tool Co.....			Factory and office building.
Greenwich.....	Homelite Corp.....	5,000	75,000	Office building addition.
	Tricon, Inc.....	12,000	120,000	Factory and office building.
Norwalk.....	Edwards Co. Inc.....	24,000	190,000	Warehouse.
	Winchester Electronics Inc.....	9,000	70,000	Factory addition.
	Zell Products Corp.....	8,000	80,000	Do.
Stamford.....	Barnes Engineering Co.....	17,500	175,000	Research laboratory addition.
	American Machine & Foundry Co.....		170,000	Laboratory addition.
	Polymer Industries Inc.....	21,000	420,000	Manufacturing, office and laboratory.
Trumbull.....	American Machine & Foundry Co.....	15,000	450,000	Office and laboratory addition.
Wilton.....	Tomlinson & Hawley Inc.....	12,000	90,000	Factory.
	C.G.S. Laboratories.....	35,000	425,000	Electronic plant.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, is the 139th anniversary of the beginning of the struggle of the people of Greece for their independence from the Ottoman Empire. On March 25, 1821 the Greek War of Independence began when the archbishop of Patras raised the flag of freedom in the monastery of Aghia Lavra and the people of Greece dedicated themselves to the attainment of their liberty.

Though nearly a century and a half removed, the atomic age of America can profit greatly from the lessons of the classical age of Greece. These lessons, so basic to liberty-loving civilizations, are freedom, excellence, education and public service.

Upon just how well we learn these lessons may depend the survival of our

political freedom threatened as it is today by the tyranny of communism. In a world where the probable consequence of mediocrity is the enslavement of the human mind, we must strive always for excellence.

To mark the occasion of Greek Independence Day, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

Whereas the democratic ideals that have made the United States of America the greatest free nation in the world were born many centuries ago in Greece; and

Whereas these ideals have kindled in the hearts of the people of Greece the determination that no sacrifice is too great for the cause of freedom and democracy; and

Whereas in every country people of Greek origin celebrate March 25 as Greek Independence Day, this day marking the beginning on March 25, 1821, of a 7-year struggle of the people of Greece to win their independence from the Ottoman Empire; and

Whereas free men in every nation rejoice that the principles of democracy are again firmly established in the land of their birth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be author-

ized and requested to issue a proclamation designating March 25 of each year as Greek Independence Day and that he invite the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

Help for the Cuban People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Help for the Cuban People," written by David Lawrence and published in U.S. News & World Report for March 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR THE CUBAN PEOPLE

(By David Lawrence)

Cuba is not just Castro and his clique. Cuba has 6,500,000 people—and they are in serious trouble.

Cuba is a nation in bondage. Relations with the outside world—especially with the United States—have been messed up by a dictator. He professes to be a friend of the Cuban people, but he is beginning to act as if he is their worst enemy.

How can the Cuban people get the truth? Almost without exception, the newspapers and the radio and television stations are controlled. The irrational outbursts of the Government—and little else—are broadcast inside Cuba. Communists are in positions of influence.

The Cuban people today do not know the dangers they face. The truth must be given them at once.

As President Eisenhower reiterated in speeches on his Latin American tour, we champion the right of self-determination. The President said:

"We believe in the right of peoples to choose their own form of government, to build their own institutions, to abide by their own philosophy. But if a tyrannical form of government were imposed from the outside or with outside support—by force, threat or subversion—we would certainly deem this to be a violation of the policy of nonintervention and would expect the Organization of American States, acting under several solemn commitments, to take appropriate collective action."

This is a warning to the Communists in Moscow who have been fishing in Cuba's troubled waters. Already Communist propaganda is widely distributed inside Cuba. Fortunately, we, too, have access to the minds of the Cuban people.

If the friends of Cuba throughout this hemisphere were to organize and supply funds for radio broadcasts in the Spanish language directed to all residents of the island—which is only 90 miles away from us—something might be done to save the Cuban people.

It is important for the facts to be set forth. Cuba's biggest crop is sugar—it brings in about \$500 million a year from sales abroad. Cuba imports much food that she herself could produce. But a balanced economy cannot be attained if unbalanced minds are allowed to run the country.

Many people in the United States are talking about reprisals—about cutting off the subsidy our Government pays now for Cuban sugar. This would be a mistake. The President, however, should be given a flexible power to handle the sugar problem.

If the Castro regime, on the other hand, by its tirades keeps on stirring up bad feeling in the United States, it may be difficult to prevent drastic reprisals by Congress. In such circumstances, while the Cuban people might for a little while live on the fat derived from confiscation of foreign-owned property, the net result might be an increase in our own sugar purchases from Peru, Mexico, and Brazil. This could in a few years make us completely independent of Cuban sugar. Why should the American Government be forced into such a punitive policy?

Only the Cuban people can rescue themselves. They are an intelligent people. Their universities have turned out eminent men. They know the difference between dictatorship and democracy. They would concede that the past dictatorships have brought the present debacle. As President Eisenhower said in his report to the American people:

"Another persistent misunderstanding which I sought to correct wherever I traveled is that we sometimes support dictators. Of course we abhor all tyrannical forms of government, whether of the Left or Right."

But as long as we extend diplomatic recognition to a dictatorship government, we are accused of supporting such a regime.

There are, therefore, two steps we can take now to clear up such misunderstandings.

First, we can break off diplomatic relations with the Castro government. It obviously does not represent the Cuban people, and it has shown itself incapable of discharging international obligations—two requirements for the continuance of diplomatic recognition.

Second, we can appeal by radio to the Cuban people. This need not be an action of our Government, but a people-to-people expression of sympathy and concern.

We have throughout our history proclaimed our support for oppressed peoples. Our political parties in their national platforms have time and again expressed sympathy with groups striving for independence—the Boers in South Africa, the home rule groups in Ireland, the Armenians in the Near East, the Mexicans, and the Cubans themselves under Spanish rule.

If the facts were given now to the people of Cuba, they would insist on free elections. They would choose a sane leadership to rescue them from the economic and political chaos into which they have been plunged by selfish men who have been duped by Communist influences.

Let's help the Cuban people by giving them the whole truth.

Referees and Storm Troopers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights bill passed today is a blueprint for dictatorship. It is a bill against free voting rights. It is the opposite of a bill to protect voting rights. It will promote controlled and rigged elections. It favors the bloc

voter herded to the polls by goons and ward bosses operating under the watchful eye of Federal referees appointed by the political party in power. It will promote intimidation, discrimination, and fraud in elections. It can and will lead to a one-party system with Federal referees and party storm troopers. It will lead to a Stalin-Hitler type election with only one ticket on the ballot.

Unplanned Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Lippmann in his usual penetrating and analytical style brings us again to grips with the gnawing problem of Berlin and its future.

How long can we maintain the status quo without at the same time eroding our existing substantial resources for negotiation?

These and other related questions are posed in the article which follows and which I commend to the thoughtful attention of all my colleagues.

TODAY AND TOMORROW—UNPLANNED SUMMIT
(By Walter Lippmann)

On Tuesday Senator Gore was surprised and worried when Secretary Herter told him that there is no agenda, no understanding about what is to be talked about at the summit meeting in May. Instead of a planned negotiation the four heads of government are to hold 2 or 3 days of conversation, some of it so private that not even their foreign ministers will be present. Senator Gore did not seem to realize how much things have changed in Washington since the death of John Foster Dulles who used to insist that the foreign ministers ought to agree, or be in virtual agreement, before the heads of government are allowed to meet at all. Since the President has taken charge of foreign affairs, he has reversed this doctrine completely and has put his main faith in direct personal contact with the heads of all foreign governments.

This is not the only reason why, as Mr. Herter admitted, there is no plan for the summit. The other reason is that for the time being at least the President is not the leader of the Western alliance. He is unable to bring about an agreed Western policy on West Berlin and Germany, or indeed on any other substantial issue. For Bonn and Paris together have a veto on Western policy, and they do not want any negotiation on the German question.

This veto was first used effectively in October, shortly after the Nixon visit to Russia and the Khrushchev visit to the United States. The veto was used to prevent a summit meeting in December or January for the purpose of preparing the way for negotiations over Berlin. Both General de Gaulle and Dr. Adenauer were determined to avoid a summit meeting until the momentum of the Soviet-American conversations had been dissipated. So the date of the summit meeting was put off from January until May. During this interval diplomatic contact between Moscow and Washington was reduced to a minimum. At the same time pressure

was exercised on the President to tie his own hands before he went to the summit meeting in May.

This pressure campaign reached its climax in Dr. Adenauer's recent visit to this country. While he was not wholly successful—in that as Secretary Herter told Senator Gore, the President can still talk about anything at the summit—the campaign has succeeded in preventing any serious negotiation of an agreed Western position at the summit. There is none of the planning that Senator Gore would like because our French and German partners do not want any plan. They want to stand pat on the status quo.

Why? Because any genuine negotiation about Berlin, even though it guaranteed the freedom of the city, would in some form or another require an increased recognition of the East German Government. At present, the East German Government inspects and controls the civilian traffic between West Germany and West Berlin. It does not, however, control allied traffic. This traffic is controlled by the Soviet Union. A new agreement which guarantees freedom of access to West Berlin would almost inevitably have to bring in the East German Government.

This is the concession which Dr. Adenauer wants at all costs to avoid, especially before the German elections in 1961. He insists upon preserving the fiction that the East German state does not exist and is untouchable and unmentionable by the Western Allies. In this stand France, for its own reasons, supports him.

When he spoke at the National Press Club in Washington, Dr. Adenauer indicated why he thinks there is no risk in refusing to negotiate with Mr. K. about Berlin. It is "my firm conviction," he said, "that Khrushchev . . . does not want war . . . and will not risk his entire work, the development of the Soviet Union and the 7-year plan." Convinced of this, Dr. Adenauer does not fear the threat which Mr. K. has made about Berlin. The threat is to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany and then to let the East Germans and the Allies argue with each other about the right of access. For in Dr. Adenauer's view, if the East Germans did in fact interrupt the traffic of the Allies, the Allies would push through the obstacle, and the Soviet Union would not go to war about it.

This is the calculated risk which Adenauer and De Gaulle are prepared to take. I think the calculation may be justified, especially if we think of the East Germans attempting an actual blockade and not merely a perpetual and varied harassment. Even then, I believe we could live with it. It is not because I fear the physical blockade of Berlin that I think we ought now to attempt a serious negotiation about its long-term status.

What I fear is the decline of the Western position as compared with the growing power, not only the growing military power, of the Communist world. It is going to take more than a few billion dollars put into missiles and a better airlift to right in our own favor the overall balance of power. It is going to take a national revival in this country which only the more far-sighted among us are beginning to talk about, a national revival which is far from having reached the point where it is being translated into popular language and political action.

The Western position in Berlin is not likely to grow stronger. It is already fragile and precarious. It will become more so the more the people of West Berlin realize that they are not likely to see in their lifetime the liberation of West Berlin from the military trap in which it lies, and its restoration as the capital of a united Germany.

Our position in West Berlin, like so many of our bases overseas, is a wasting asset. If it is a grave mistake to negotiate except from a position of strength, it is also a grave mistake not to negotiate while you still have real strength from which to negotiate.

Small Business Administration's 13th Semiannual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the 13th semiannual report of the Small Business Administration has just been issued. I recommend it as a most comprehensive review of this important agency of the Federal Government.

The agency has summarized the major portions of the report in a well-constructed press release. Knowing that many of my colleagues will not have time to read the full report, I suggest the press release as being worthy of attention. Under unanimous consent I insert this release in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The steady increase in American business firms, further development of a Government-sponsored Small Business Investment Division program and a continuing growth of services by the Small Business Administration were reported to President Eisenhower and Congress today by SBA Administrator Philip McCallum.

The agency's semiannual report for the first half of fiscal 1960 noted that the number of businesses in the country totaled 4,684,000 on December 31, 1959, a growth of 81,000 during 1959. It added that the increase in business population has been continuous since 1939 and has been at a higher rate than the percentage increase in human population.

Inasmuch as about 95 percent of American businesses are classified as small, this is "testimony to the vitality of small business in the national economy," the report points out.

Passage of the Technical Amendments Act in late 1958 had an invigorating effect on small business incorporations, the report said in citing that 1959 saw a total of 193,078 incorporations, 28 percent greater than 1958's total of 150,781.

The report noted there were 1,579 business loans made by the agency in the July 1-December 31 period, for a total of \$69,479,000. For the year 1959 there were 4,533 loans totaling \$216,797,000. There were 320 disaster loans for \$2,005,000 in the final 6 months of 1959 and 806 loans for \$6,365,000 for the full year. These loans are made at 3 percent interest to businesses, householders, charitable institutions and churches for damages incurred by storms, floods, excessive rainfall or similar natural disasters.

Since the start of its financial assistance program in September 1953, the Small Business Administration has approved 18,271 business loans for \$856,304,000 and 8,936 disaster loans for \$94,521,000.

Of the business loan total, SBA's share amounted to \$724.1 million. The remainder came from participating banks. Funds have been disbursed to borrowers by the agency and participating banks in a total amount of \$669.2 million, comprising Government

funds of \$476 million and bank funds of \$193.2 million. Loans outstanding at the end of this period held by SBA and participating banks total \$428.6 million.

SBA now is administering approximately 19,200 business and disaster loans, including loans transferred from the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This increase in the agency's loan portfolio has brought additional servicing and administrative responsibilities. Intensive training programs for newly assigned personnel have been conducted in SBA's regional and branch offices. This has made possible a decentralization of records and loan-servicing functions which means better service to borrowers, the report explains.

In the 6-month period SBA approved 44 percent of the loan applications on which it took action. The cumulative ratio of approvals, since the start of the lending operations, is 53.9 percent.

Private banks' participation in SBA loans increased in 1959, reversing a downward trend which had prevailed since 1955. Of all business loans approved in the 6 months covered in the report, 60.6 percent were in participation with banks.

The report states that SBA's actual and estimated losses on loans, cumulatively since the agency's inception and through December 31, amounted to \$6,093,505, equal to 1.1 percent of SBA's share of loans disbursed.

SBA assistance to hospitals and similar institutions which are privately owned and operated for profit continued to be considerable. Through December, 50 loans had been made to hospitals and 139 to nursing and convalescent homes. These totaled \$15,186,500. In addition, there were 134 loans for \$2,895,000 to doctors, dentists, clinics, and other medical and health services.

Small businesses' share in Government contracts with business firms increased in fiscal 1959 to \$4,767 million, or 18.2 percent of the total Government contracts. In the previous year small business contracts amounted to \$4,600 million. The total of Government procurement for 1959 was \$29,319 million, up from \$27,926 million in 1958.

SBA's report shows that in the first 5 months of fiscal 1960 the net value of military procurement actions with small business was \$1,253 million, compared with \$1,203 million during the same months of fiscal 1959.

Government purchases involving expenditures of more than \$25 by civilian executive agencies, excluding the Atomic Energy Commission, increased in 1959 to \$1,632 million from 1958's total of \$1,598 million. Awards to small business increased to \$840 million from \$768 million for a percentage level of 51.5 compared to 48.1 percent a year earlier.

A section of SBA's report is devoted to discussion of the agency's Small Business Investment Division which was created by an act of Congress in late 1958. The act also granted the agency specific authority to assist State and local development companies in the financing of small businesses in their areas.

Under provisions of the act, SBA licenses small business investment companies which are privately owned and operated. These companies, in turn, provide equity funds and long-term loans to small business concerns. SBA is authorized to buy subordinated debentures from the investment companies in order to assist in creating their initial capital. Also, the agency may provide additional funds to encourage formation and growth of the companies. SBA's functions include the regulation and supervision of such companies. Licensed companies are entitled to certain tax advantages under the Technical Amendments Act of 1958.

Since the program got underway in December 1958, and through December 1959, a total of 143 applications for investment company licenses had been received and 62 licenses had been issued. A number were in the processing stage at the year's end.

(In calendar year 1960, up to March 15, investment company licenses issued reached a total of 80.)

SBA's Information Office began the issuance in November 1959, of a newsletter titled "The Reporter," which deals exclusively with information concerning the Investment Division and long-term financing. It is distributed to Members of Congress, the press, Government offices concerned, and professional, trade and financial media.

More than 4,000 requests for current and future issues of the new publication were received by SBA after the first issue was circulated.

The report points out that under the Investment Act of 1958 the agency may lend a State development company an amount equal to the company's outstanding borrowings from other sources. The proceeds of such a loan may be used for the purchase of equity in or long-term loans to small business concerns.

The agency now is permitted to lend up to \$250,000 for each identifiable small business concern which either a local development company or a State development company proposes to finance under section 502 of the act. Such loans may be used for plant construction, conversion or expansion. This may include the acquisition of land. These loans may be made by SBA in participation with regular commercial lenders.

This widening of SBA's authority is regarded by agency officials, the report states, as "an important potential as a catalyst to stimulate the economic activity of small business in local communities."

Fourteen State development companies and authorities now are eligible to borrow, with three more scheduled to join the list as soon as incorporation proceedings are complete. These 17 organizations already have a borrowing potential in excess of \$50 million which SBA may match.

The report regards as "even more significant" the assistance that can be made available through loans to some 3,000 local development companies that may be eligible to borrow from the agency under the 1958 act. The number of loans up to \$250,000 each that can be made to these organizations is limited only by the number of credit-worthy small businesses for which the development companies agree to undertake construction, conversion or expansion projects.

Through 1959 the agency had received 42 applications for loans under the 1958 act, aggregating \$5,081,000, and has approved 31 for \$3,785,000.

To brief the public on the development company loan program, a brochure "Loans to Local Development Companies," was produced and has been distributed. It describes financial assistance under the act and gives the step-by-step procedure for organizing and making applications.

Notable progress for the reporting period is seen in SBA's programs for improving management skills of owners and managers of small businesses. Grants of varying sums up to \$40,000 each went to 52 educational institutions in all the States, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia for 98 studies and surveys on topics of direct import to small businesses.

During the reporting period SBA distributed 859,000 copies of various management publications. Since the agency's inception, distribution of these publications has totaled 7,358,000.

The chapter on this phase of SBA accomplishments describes progress in several

other projects to aid small business executives.

There are reports also on SBA's Government procurement and property sales assistance program, on the production and technical assistance program, on the extent of cooperation with other Government agencies and other projects.

Our Monetary System: How New Money Is Created and Who Acquires the Assets Which the New Money Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on three previous occasions I have called attention to a series of articles published by the Texas Observer, of Austin, Tex., during the latter part of January and February of this year, dealing with our monetary system and the various ways the public interest is affected by the Federal policies concerning the operation of this system. These previous articles were included in my remarks of March 21, 22, and 23.

Today I wish to call attention to the fourth in this series of articles. It gives a readily understandable explanation of how our monetary system operates. And it traces the origins of our present fractional reserve system of banking back to the goldsmith bankers of Western Europe during the 17th century.

Those who would like an understanding of how money is created will find it in this article which is as follows. This appeared in the Texas Observer of January 29:

A THEORY OF MONEY—WHO CREATES NEW FUNDS?

AUSTIN, WASH.—How does new money get into circulation—and who gets the interest on the debt thus created?

WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, believes that neither Democratic nor Republican politicians understand the answer.

And if they did, he believes, the banker's house of gold would come melting down around them.

Congressman PATMAN says that the new money comes from the Government, but under the Republicans the bankers get all the interest, while under the Democrats the Government gets a goodly slice of it.

If that is too simple for you, then you, must be patient with him, for he can explain; but few follow him down the road of his reasoning to the conclusions at the end—conclusions momentous if correct.

With the press enforcing what PATMAN calls "a policy against reporting anything critical of the big bankers' policy line," some Members of Congress "have had the custom of saying that the only thing they know about money is they don't have enough of it." PATMAN finds it difficult to restrain his impatience with this attitude; but he does, always going on swiftly to the next point in his argument.

The Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Federal Government. Member commercial banks hold some stock in the System, but they cannot sell the stock, the Federal Reserve has no use for the money

the banks put up, and were the System to be liquidated, the banks would have to turn the stock back to the Government. All they get on it is a regular annual 6-percent interest. All the profits after expenses go into the Federal Treasury (except 10 percent which is held back for a surplus, but which also belongs to the United States).

Through the Federal Reserve, the Government creates the new money which the economy needs from time to time.

In an article published in 1958 by American Mercury, the rightwing monthly, PATMAN charged that "the present Federal Reserve banking system is manufacturing money in the bankers' interest and the banks' interest."

SOMETHING FROM NOTHING

PATMAN uses a simple illustration to explain how private banks "create money."

"If I deposit \$100 with my bank," he says, "and the reserve requirements imposed by the Federal Reserve are 20 percent, then the bank can make a loan to John Doe of up to \$80. Where does the \$80 come from?"

"It does not come out of my deposit of \$100; on the contrary, the bank simply credits John Doe's account with \$80. The bank's deposits are now \$180 where they were \$100 before. The bank simply created \$80."

"Furthermore, now that it has another \$80 of deposits, it may, by putting 20 percent of this in reserves, make still another loan in the amount of 80 percent of \$80, which is \$64. And so on, until the last loan it can make is zero."

"Or," PATMAN adds, "the bank can acquire Government obligations by the same process by simply creating deposits to the credit of the Government."

Money creating is a power of the commercial banks—it is not permitted savings and loan associations, insurance companies, credit unions, or other financial institutions, PATMAN explains.

What is true for the one bank does not, however, explain what has happened in the whole banking system. One bank's increased reserves decrease the reserves of the other bank. One must go back to the question. What is the banking system?

The goldsmith bankers operated in Western Europe in the 17th century before there was any banking system. Persons who had gold left it with a goldsmith for safekeeping. The goldsmith gave his depositors a receipt. These receipts were transferable, and they became, in effect, money. The goldsmith learned that people rarely brought back the receipts and demanded the gold, so he issued more receipts than he had gold—that is, he began making "loans." This was risky; each goldsmith was taking a chance, "playing the odds." Some were fortunate, others luckless. Sometimes a community's business life was disrupted.

"The goldsmith principle of issuing several dollars of money on each dollar of reserves (gold) is what we call the fractional reserve system by which commercial banking is done today," PATMAN says.

Today's commercial banking system differs however, two ways: first, the banks use a delegation of the Government's power to create money; second, PATMAN avers, "instead of paying interest on its reserve, as the goldsmiths did, the private commercial banking system gets its reserves as a gift, or at least an interest-free loan, from the Government."

PATMAN knows his language, "a gift," will be objected to. But, he says, "if this sounds fantastic, it is not nearly so fantastic as the phrases the bankers and some of the Federal Reserve people use to describe this matter. For example, the vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has objected to my saying the Fed has 'given' the banks reserves, particularly when the gift was made by reducing reserves. He prefers to say the Fed has

made more of the banks' reserves 'available' to them."

In fact, PATMAN asks, where did the reserves come from in the first place? He quotes a report by the key Federal Reserve bank in the United States, the one in New York, dated November 1953: "Actually, the Federal Reserve banks have been the principal source from which the commercial banks have derived reserve funds since the founding of the Federal Reserve System in 1914."

"In plain words," PATMAN says, "since 1917 the Federal Reserve has given the private banks \$46 billion of reserves. The banks have drawn out \$28 billion in cash—currency—and still have \$18 billion left in reserves today; and it is what is left in reserves that really counts. At the moment, the banks may create up to \$8 for each \$1 of reserves."

WHAT IS WHO?

PATMAN delights in quoting an exchange which vividly illustrates that the Federal Reserve, when it "buys" Government securities, creates money. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Marriner Eccles and a bewildered Representative Dewey were talking during some 1942 hearings.

"Mr. Eccles. Whenever the Federal Reserve System buys Government securities in the open market or buys them direct from the Treasury, either one, that is what it does—"

"Mr. Dewey. What are you going to use to buy them with?"

"Mr. Eccles. What is who going to use?"

"Mr. Dewey. The Federal Reserve Bank to make these purchases."

"Mr. Eccles. What do they always use?"

"Mr. Dewey. You are going to create credit?"

"Mr. Eccles. That is what we have ever done. That is the way the Federal Reserve System operates. The Federal Reserve System creates money. It is a bank of issue."

It was obvious to Mr. Eccles, but not to the Congressman; and it is not obvious to the citizenry to this day. Mr. PATMAN maintains.

The ordinary reader will not understand the next passage without a careful reading. The fact that few citizens have the patience to mull over such dry statements, PATMAN maintains, is the explanation of the possibility of "robbery in broad daylight." PATMAN tried to relate the substance of the matter by saying, "By a sort of magic, the money is created." But only the hard facts, as stated by Eccles in 1935, can explain how the banks are permitted to create money which they then can use for their own profit. Said Eccles:

"In purchasing offerings of Government bonds, the banking system as a whole creates new money, or bank deposits. When the banks buy a billion dollars of Government bonds as they are offered and you have to consider the banking system as a whole, as a unit—the banks credit the deposit account of the Treasury with a billion dollars. They debit their Government-bond account a billion dollars, or they actually create, by a bookkeeping entry, a billion dollars."

PATMAN objects that the banks then charge the Government interest on the bonds they have bought simply by "a flick of the pen" on their books.

He has approvingly quoted Thomas A. Edison, who had been asked, PATMAN said, whether the Government should borrow \$30 million to make repairs at Muscle Shoals Dam. "No," Edison had said. "Any Government that can issue a dollar bond, interest bearing, that is good can issue a dollar bill, noninterest bearing, that is good; the only difference is the bill is easier to redeem because it does not draw interest."

In other words, PATMAN says, the Government should not create debt bonds, give them to the banks, and then let the banks charge the Government interest on them; the Federal Reserve should buy the bonds itself, in which case the interest payments are returned to the Treasury.

CREATION OF NEW FUNDS

This phenomenon of creating money is discussed lucidly in an issue of Congressional Digest (November 1959) in which leading figures of the Government argued whether Congress should raise the interest ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds. (Arguing "yes" were Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., Senators Prescott Bush and Hugh Scott, and Marriner Eccles. Arguing "no" were Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Representatives PATMAN, HENRY S. REUSS, BYRON L. JOHNSON, and JOHN D. DINGELL.)

The editors of Congressional Digest explained, in an associated article, how the money supply is regulated. Credit, the editors explained, comes from savings (simply a transfer of funds from people who save to people who borrow), and from commercial banks.

"When the credit is commercial bank credit, there is a creation of new funds that did not exist before."

Suppose you go to a bank for a loan of \$1,000. The bank seldom pays out \$1,000 in cash; usually it credits your account with \$1,000. You can write checks against the account. The bank simply, on the books, increases its loans by \$1,000, and deposits go up by \$1,000.

Explained the editors:

"In the process of making the loan, the commercial bank has created a deposit. As banks expand their loans and investments, they create more deposits. As they contract their loans and investments, they extinguish deposits."

Anyone can see how important this fact is for the state of business and the economic health of the country.

The job of the Federal Reserve is to influence the flow of bank credit. As banks make more loans, people get more money to spend, and business picks up tempo. As banks pull in on their loans, people have less to spend, and the economy slows down.

MONEY CREATION PROFITS BANKS, PATMAN SAYS

The Federal Reserve influences what the banks do by the amount of reserves it creates or by changing how many dollars a bank can create for each dollar of reserves (that is, by changing the reserve requirements).

Suppose the reserve requirement is 20 percent. For every \$100 of deposits a bank has, it must keep in the Federal Reserve bank a reserve of \$20. The Federal Reserve can either increase or decrease the reserve requirements. In this way, it can permit the banks to loan more money, or require them to contract their loans.

This is the main mechanism by which the Federal Reserve tries to regulate how much money is being spent and invested.

Suppose the whole banking system has to have a total of \$20 billion in reserves. The banks have \$100 billion of deposits. The Federal Reserve then decides to increase the total amount of bank reserves in existence by \$1 billion. This means that the commercial banks, in the words of Congressional Digest's editors, "can use these reserves, making loans and investments and expanding their deposits (through the creation process) up to \$105 billion."

THE SAME EFFECTS EXCEPT

Once one understands that both the Federal Reserve and the private banks create new money, the issue becomes—at last, PATMAN sighs—which shall create it? He ex-

plained the issue in his August 13, 1959, newsletter to his constituents.

"The Nation's supply of money," he said, "can be increased in either of two ways."

"The Federal Reserve can acquire Government bonds, or other Government debt obligations, which cost the Federal Reserve nothing. The other method is for the Federal Reserve to amend its regulations so as to make it possible for the private banks to acquire more Government bonds. This costs the private banks nothing. Both methods increase deposits of the private banks, and the effects are the same, except for what happens to the interest payments on these bonds."

"When the Federal Reserve acquires them, the interest payments come back into the Treasury and help meet the expenses of government. When the private banks acquire the bonds, the interest payments go into bank profits. One of the big controversies now is over which method will be used in the months and years ahead."

In short PATMAN argues, the Government should buy its own bonds and take the interest for income, which expands the Nation's credit without increasing the Government's interest load.

If, however, the Federal Reserve reduces reserve requirements for the private banks, then the banks can use the created money to buy more Government bonds, and then charge the Government interest on them. He finds this senseless.

The banks, of course, see it another way. In a 1957 report, the American Bankers' Association's economic policy commission, foreseeing that "the needs of the public for currency and bank deposits will increase with the growth of the American economy," declared that the reserve base of the banking system would have to be expanded, "either by creating reserves through open-market operations or by reducing reserve requirements."

The American Bankers Association said the Federal Reserve, to follow the first Patman-advocated course, would have to further increase its investment portfolio, "which it is widely agreed, is already excessively large."

Where, PATMAN demands, is this wide agreement? "Only among the bankers, we can be sure, who wish to have a slice of this portfolio transferred to them."

ABA said that to keep up with the economy through 1961, the Federal Reserve would have had to buy \$7 billion in Government securities on the open market. PATMAN emphasizes that these securities would be interest free to the Government (that is, the interest would be used for the expenses of Government).

But ABA added, "It would be far better to provide for this growth by lowering the reserve requirements of member banks. It is true that the Government would lose a small amount of revenue, since about 90 percent of the Reserve banks' annual earnings after dividends are now being voluntarily paid over to the Treasury. However, the Reserve banks were never intended to be a source of revenue to the Government, and policy regarding the level of required reserves should certainly not be determined on the basis of the effect on Federal Reserve payments to the Treasury."

To which PATMAN angrily exclaims:

"If our policy on this question of giving away Government-owned securities to the private banks should certainly not be determined by what this will cost the Government, then may we ask on what basis should it be determined?"

"Who would like to explain why the banks should be allowed to use the Government's credit—free of interest charge—to extend credit to the Government at an interest charge? Who would like to explain why,

when the Federal Reserve decides to allow more money to be created to acquire interest-bearing Government obligations, it does not itself create the money and acquire the obligations? Who would like to explain why the interest charges should not go back into the Treasury instead of into bank profits?"

—R. D.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing

SPEECH
OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the forthcoming centennial celebration of the birth of a great American patriot, General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

General Pershing was born September 13, 1860, near the small community of Laclede, Linn County, Mo., in my congressional district.

A centennial observance worthy of this great American will be held next September 13 in this town of his birth and boyhood years. Plans for the celebration are going ahead rapidly under the able leadership of Mr. L. F. Moore of Laclede working in cooperation with veterans organizations and interested individuals.

A bill I recently introduced, House Joint Resolution 640, provides a vehicle by which all Americans may join with his friends and neighbors in Missouri in celebrating General Pershing's birth centennial.

The bill recognizes the significant contributions which General Pershing made to the Allied victory in World War I in organizing and leading the American Expeditionary Forces.

It recognizes the fact that his memory symbolizes the proud achievements and great sacrifices of the gallant men who served under him.

By authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim September 13 as a day upon which Americans should pay tribute to General Pershing and the men whom he led, it enables Americans everywhere to take proper note of their heroic contributions to the peace of the world and freedom of man.

I am deeply gratified that House Joint Resolution 640 passed the House of Representatives on March 21 and look forward to its approval by the Senate and the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, as long as men cherish the ideals of democracy, the memory of Gen. John J. Pershing will be revered. Although his reputation was forged in the furnace of war, he was a man of peace, a humanitarian.

General Pershing and his men destroyed the military power of his foes, but when the way lay clear to annihilate them and lay waste their lands, he and his comrades stayed their hands.

He gained victory without malice and justice without vindictiveness. There can be no greater achievement.

The Story of Gulf Oil—Reorganizing an Industrial Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following articles from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, March 21, 1960:

REORGANIZING AN INDUSTRIAL GIANT—THE STORY OF GULF OIL
(By Alvin Rosensweet)

Quietly but effectively, the Gulf Oil Corp. in the last 6 or 7 years has carried out a reorganization as sweeping as any in American corporate history.

"Decentralization" is a word that William K. Whiteford, president of Gulf Oil Corp., would just as soon eliminate from the English language. This is a curious anomaly in view of the fact that, since becoming president of Gulf on April 28, 1953, he has continually carried out a program of reorganization and decentralization of the management of the giant oil company.

"Eliminate the word 'decentralization,'" he says. "We're talking about placing the necessary responsibility and authority at a level where it's carried out. We're giving the man with the power to say 'yes' or 'no' the authority to say it directly to the man who can carry it out."

Whatever it's called under Mr. Whiteford's guidance, Gulf has risen to seventh place among all U.S. corporations with sales totaling \$2,769,377,000 in 1958. Net profits that year were \$329,533,000, fourth highest among all American firms and second highest among all U.S. oil companies.

EARNINGS ESTIMATE

Although Gulf's 1959 annual report has not yet been published, earnings are estimated at \$290 million and sales at \$2,710 million. Since 1952, when sales totaled \$1.5 billion and profits \$142 million, the figures have just about doubled.

Training young men against the time when they will become senior executives of the big Pittsburgh-based company is one of Mr. Whiteford's major concerns. He describes a corporation as being similar to a nervous system and quotes an old professor who told him a corporation is a biological animal.

"Partners die," Mr. Whiteford explains, "but a corporation reproduces itself in strength and security for its employees and shareholders. Corporations fold up and die because they don't reproduce vigorously. When I went to British-American Oil Co. in Canada the man who hired me said, 'I never thought I'd hire an American, but there's nobody here to run it.'"

In 1951, shortly after Mr. Whiteford was hired out of the presidency of British-American and was named a director and executive vice president of Gulf, Fortune magazine said Gulf made the move "because of his demonstrated talents for reshaping the management of a corporation without upsetting it."

"We want to advise our men without making them so afraid of mistakes that they will be afraid of decisions," Mr. Whiteford said at the time. "We don't want to pull authority to Pittsburgh. The men down the line know what is happening before we do, and speed is critical in exploring for oil or purchasing it or handling it. We don't want to miss chances."

REFLECTS PHILOSOPHY

Although it probably never will be completed, decentralization—there's that word again—has been accomplished at Gulf under Mr. Whiteford's leadership. This has become, as he says, a reflection of the company's philosophy, in order to get authority down to people who can carry out the orders.

Since about 20,000 of Gulf's 55,000 employees work in countries other than the United States and are of many different languages and nationalities, the magnitude of the problem is not difficult to visualize.

"The policy starts in Pittsburgh," Mr. Whiteford says. "The board gives us the money and the tools. The officers get these to operating men all over the world. We give them the funds, the objectives, and the power to do the job. They have to have the ability."

When Mr. Whiteford came to Gulf, he points out, senior vice presidents were generally men in their sixties.

"They concentrated on one phase of the business," he recalls. "They hesitated to take a chance in other fields in which they had no great interest. As a result a few men at the top were swamped with 75 percent of the company's problems."

"When I first came to Gulf I could hardly get away from my desk. I couldn't get acquainted with our people. I didn't know them and they didn't know me. Working that way isn't the same as talking over problems face-to-face."

Mr. Whiteford found Gulf somewhat decentralized but growing so rapidly that it was essential to step up the process to break up the functions of top-level management.

WARNED TO CHANGE

This resulted in the selection of a half dozen officials designated as "administrative vice presidents and coordinators." There is one each for crude oil, financial, production, manufacturing, marketing, and transportation.

"We have here a group of administrators who make sure the money and the tools get to the operating people," Mr. Whiteford explains. "If a policy doesn't work out they warn us to change the policy. We plan the battle but if there's something there we don't see they let us know."

Mr. Whiteford places great stress on these half dozen officers who, on the organization chart, rank below the executive group.

"They're young fellows, mostly in their forties, who came up through operating, have a flair for administration and the ability to advise and counsel operating people. The success of the system depends upon them."

"They also get broad training in corporate problems, legal, financial, production, and so on. They gain experience in everything from getting the oil to ships, to pipelines, to refineries, to bulk plants, to service stations."

Under this breakup of top level functions, any officer covers any field of corporate activity. But once an order is decided upon, an individual officer signs it.

"I hate committee decisions," Mr. Whiteford says of what has become a growing practice in big business. "If something goes wrong nobody ever remembers who made the decision but if it's successful everybody takes the credit. Now, an order must carry the signature of the individual officer responsible for making it. This way, the men on the firing line can always get decisions. And our top people—the board chairman, president and vice presidents—have the authority to make decisions."

"This system allows the vice presidents-coordinators to handle the day-to-day administration of the company. They have 95 percent responsibility. If something goes wrong the operating men can always come to an executive for an immediate answer. There's always a top executive available in Pittsburgh."

Once an order goes out from the executive offices here, copies go to the half-dozen administrative vice presidents and coordinators. Within 24 hours the decision reaches every Gulf employee throughout the world whom it affects. As the Gulf president points out, a decision may be made to one individual employee anywhere in the world, but at every level others who are affected by the decision know about it.

Last week, for example, a Gulf representative flew in to Pittsburgh from Japan to discuss with top management a problem that had arisen. In this case it was necessary for him to present all the aspects of the situation.

"We asked him why he didn't do such-and-such and he told us," Mr. Whiteford explains. "Out of what at first was vague talk we add a chip here and a bite there and we arrive at something, at a solution. Then the important moment comes when we ask him, 'What do you think of it?' He tells us what he wants. We tell him he has to handle the situation and that it isn't a committee decision."

Once the decision was made and signed, the order went through the Gulf empire to those affected—to the ships, the crude oil people, and those in manufacturing and financial.

"But if he goes back and things don't work out he can call the executive who signed the order," Mr. Whiteford points out. "We must remain flexible. Staying frozen gets you in trouble in worldwide oil. By dealing directly with the executive who signed the order our man in Japan gets flexibility. We tell our operating men that an executive order is not a corset. As a result of our meeting with him, we're not surprised if we later hear from him that a change in policy is necessary."

This makes for more intimate dealings between Gulf executives and Gulf people throughout the world, Mr. Whiteford says. And at a comparatively young age, people are being trained to become future senior executives.

"We have multiple executives. If they're wrong, I'm wrong. If I make one, they make one."

THIS IS THE GULF TEAM

W. K. WHITEFORD

A ruddy-faced man of 59 who has grown up in the oil industry from roustabout to president of one of the world's largest corporations, William K. Whiteford has headed Gulf since April 28, 1953.

He was born November 28, 1900, in Los Angeles, where he was graduated from Polytechnic High School in 1919. He enrolled in engineering at Stanford, and helped pay his college expenses by running a milk route, washing dishes in an off-campus restaurant and teaching tennis at a girls' school. But when his father, Gustavus A. Whiteford, a mining engineer, was killed in an accident in Mexico, he left school without graduating.

Mr. Whiteford worked for Shell Oil in the summers and in 1923 was a roustabout in the oil industry, digging ditches, laying pipe and performing other laboring jobs. In 1924 he became a production engineer for Barnsdall Oil Co., and in 1932 was named vice president and general manager.

Three years later Mr. Whiteford joined British American Oil Co. and in 1942 went to Toronto headquarters as executive vice president. He was elected president in 1943 and chairman in 1951. Later in 1951 Mr. Whiteford left to become a director and executive vice president of Gulf. In 1954 he was given the additional title of chief executive officer at Gulf.

Mr. Whiteford spends about half his time out of Pittsburgh, in the Far East, Middle East, Europe, South America, Canada, the

Southwest, and elsewhere. "Our people know me personally and I know them," he says.

Mr. Whiteford long since gave up tennis, and in his spare time shoots skeet or traps. He is a director of a number of major companies and a trustee of the University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. and Mrs. Whiteford live at Park Mansions, Frew Avenue, Squirrel Hill, and have two sons, William, Jr., and Peter.

WILLIAM L. NAYLOR

William L. Naylor, senior vice president, is a member of the administrative committee and other committees. He has served with Gulf 37 years in financial and management affairs.

Mr. Naylor is a native of Kentucky, attended the University of Kentucky, and joined Gulf in 1920 in Houston, Tex., where he worked 3 years. After 5 years with a Gulf subsidiary in Mexico he was transferred to Pittsburgh in 1928, becoming comptroller and vice president.

A. D. GRAY

Archie D. Gray, senior vice president, joined Gulf in 1935. A native of Franklin, Tex., he entered Texas A. & M. College to become an engineer but entered the Army in World War I. Following his discharge he entered the University of Texas, where he received his law degree in 1923.

Mr. Gray was elected mayor of Ennis, Tex., served two terms as district attorney of Ellis County, at Waxahatchie, Tex., and was assistant attorney general of Texas in charge of oil and gas matters. His first job with Gulf was with the firm's law department at Houston as a trial attorney.

He was made associate general attorney for the corporation and its subsidiaries in 1947 and moved to Pittsburgh in 1953, becoming general counsel in 1956. He was elected a vice president in April 1957.

R. O. RHOADES

R. O. Rhoades, chairman of the board of directors of Gulf, was one of the first geologists in the Persian Gulf area. He performed much of the geological work that led to the discovery of the oil fields in Kuwait, a small Shakhdom of the Middle East.

Mr. Rhoades, 64, was born July 30, 1895, in Ulrich, Henry County, Mo., attended the University of Kansas, served with the Marines in Europe in World War I, and was graduated from Stanford in 1922.

He was a geologist in Mexico, Egypt, and in the Southwest before joining South American Gulf Oil Co. in 1926. He became a representative in Gulf's London office before coming to Pittsburgh in 1940 to be chief staff geologist. He was named senior vice president in 1955 and chairman, October 1, 1959.

I. G. DAVIS

I. G. Davis, a senior vice president of Gulf Oil Corp., joined the company in 1934 as a geophysicist and was assigned to Venezuela. Four years later he joined the geological department of Mene Grande Oil Co., Gulf's Venezuelan subsidiary, in Maracaibo.

He was named manager of the Western Division of Mene Grande in 1948, and later became vice president and, in 1956, president of Mene Grande. Mr. Davis was elected administrative vice president and coordinator of production in 1958.

C. J. GUZZO

C. J. Guzzo, Gulf's vice president in charge of domestic marketing since 1954, was promoted to a senior vice president June 1, 1959. He has served 46 years with Gulf, joining the company as a clerk in 1914 at Alexandria, La.

He served as an agent in several southern cities and advanced to division general manager of the New Orleans sales territory be-

fore being elected vice president in 1954, when he moved to Pittsburgh.

E. D. BROCKETT

Before being elected executive vice president of Gulf January 1, 1960, E. D. Brockett had been president of the British American Oil Co., Ltd., with headquarters in Toronto, since April 17, 1958.

He was graduated from Texas A. & M. in 1934 with a degree in Petroleum Engineering and joined Gulf as a roustabout in the West Texas oilfields. Two years later he was promoted to petroleum engineer at Odessa, Tex.

Mr. Brockett entered the Army in World War II as a lieutenant and was discharged in 1945 as a colonel. He served primarily in the Pacific.

He rejoined Gulf in the Fort Worth area and was transferred to Pittsburgh in 1949 as staff engineer in the production department. Later he was sent to Venezuela and upon election as a Gulf vice president was placed in charge of Houston production operations in 1955.

Hospitalization and Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower, our No. 1 recipient of socialized medicine, has seen fit to turn his back on our 15 million other elder citizens in their quest for hospitalization and medical care.

Yesterday, March 23, his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and said that Mr. Eisenhower would not support the Forand bill or any others like it, nor would he present a substitute measure.

It is hard to believe that our President would take this stand when he has received free all the medical care, nursing care, and hospitalization he ever needed plus necessary medicines, since he was a cadet at West Point.

Not only has he, personally, received these free benefits, but so has his wife and, now since his son, too, is a major in the Armed Forces, his daughter-in-law and his four grandchildren receive like benefits. And the President can continue to enjoy these privileges until he and his wife no longer need them.

The legislation providing proper health care for our elder citizens could be enacted at a very small additional cost to the wage earners of today who would, in turn, be paying for their own benefits when they were eligible.

But, the President has spoken, and he has said that our elder citizens can continue to beg and borrow for proper medical care, and should they need hospitalization, they can always get it under the free clinics provided by the State with those less fortunate citizens we have on our relief rolls.

He forgets, or ignores, the fact that these 15 million are not as lucky as he was with a Government financed education, Government employment, Government pension plan, and Government retirement benefits that cover everything—even the cost of an aspirin tablet.

Some Case Stories of the Health Needs of Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have received a number of poignant case stories of the problems of older people in the Detroit area in obtaining and paying for hospital and medical care. My correspondents have been social workers employed in hospitals, family agencies, public welfare departments, and housing projects who, by the virtue of their positions, are in daily contact with the elderly and the sick. Said one social worker whose specific duty is to serve clients in her agency's department of services to the aging:

I daily encounter individuals who, for want of hospitalization insurance as a benefit included in their OASDI grant, are forced to do without necessary medical attention as well as experience extreme hardship due to ramifications flowing from this gap in our welfare structure.

This worker reports the case of a Mr. D who had been a skilled workman for over 45 years and expected, when he retired on OASDI, that his benefits together with the \$8,000 he had saved would carry him and his wife comfortably through their later years. However, a serious accident to Mrs. D took the entire life's savings in less than a year's time. Mrs. D's continuing illness requires that something like 25 percent of each month's OASDI check goes for drug costs. Despite the acute financial pressures on this family, they have managed, to date, to maintain themselves without applying for public assistance.

In still another case: Mr. A., after spending all of his savings to provide medical care for his wife who finally died of cancer, was obliged to apply for public assistance to supplement his OASDI benefit. He had, at one time, carried Blue Cross insurance but was obliged to give this up. Although a planful and prudent individual, Mr. A. had no recourse except to obtain public assistance because of the lack of hospitalization and medical care provisions under OASDI.

In another case: A social worker connected with a housing project reported on a survey of services needed among 1,100 residents in that project who are 60 years of age and over; 749 of these individuals needed medical care; while of this group, 693 could not afford such

medical care without some form of subsidy. Said this particular social worker:

It seems urgent that legislation be enacted at this time to provide adequate medical care for older citizens through Old Age and Survivors and Disability Insurance.

One of my correspondents carries important responsibilities for the Social Service Department of one of the largest hospitals in the Detroit area. Said this social worker:

In an effort to remain independent, many of these people have attempted to provide for medical needs by purchasing hospital insurance from Blue Cross or other private insurance plans. All of these plans are tremendously expensive in relation to the limited incomes of such persons and they are woefully inadequate in coverage to pay for the extensive and expensive care which many of these people require. We find that many of these patients are unable to pay for outpatient care and medications, as well as extended hospitalization. If they require nursing home care, they are forced to apply for public assistance with all of its humiliations including the encumbrance of their homes which constitutes a blow to their self-esteem out of all proportion to the money value of the property.

It would appear that the Forand bill offers the best plan for medical coverage of this age group. We would hope, however, that any legislation which is finally passed would provide some quality control over the care which is to be provided for older persons.

A report I received from a director of a family service agency in the Metropolitan Detroit area states as follows:

As director of a casework agency which deals with problems around the aged, I can readily attest to the need for more adequate health care of our aged population. Increasing cost of medical care and deflation of the dollar value has resulted for most aged individuals in a pressure and inability to meet even minimal health care costs. In most instances, it is all they can do to meet their basic maintenance needs.

Another social worker who specializes in working with older people provided me with four dramatic illustrations of the acute problems older people are faced with when expensive hospitalization and medical care is necessitated. I will only cite one illustration.

This was a couple, Mr. and Mrs. S, at the point of retirement, who had a combined monthly social security benefit and company pension of \$234 as well as \$6,000 in savings. Two years after Mr. S's retirement, Mrs. S developed a malignancy. A prolonged period of treatment, surgery and hospitalization used up all their savings. Shortly after Mrs. S's death, Mr. S suffered a stroke. He was hospitalized for an extended period of time. Since he had no one to care for him at his home, he was placed in a convalescent home which was not covered by Blue Cross. Mr. S had to apply for public medical care. He made the statement to me that all his life he prayed for financial independence in his old age and now he was forced to become a charity case for his care.

I am sure these case illustrations could be multiplied again and again not only in my district but throughout the United States. Perhaps the case that touched me most of all was one instance reported to me by another correspondent.

This was an elderly couple who had to move out of a desirable residential area into a slum area because their prolonged

illness used up their savings. It was necessary to mortgage their home which they finally lost because their social security benefits were inadequate to make the payments. In their retiring years, this couple who had lived in this particular section for practically all of their married life were compelled to undergo the tragic experience of losing all they had accumulated because of the costs of sickness.

I am pleased to note that the National Association of Social Workers, with which my correspondents are affiliated, in a statement called "Goals of Public Social Policy," urges that the Social Security System "contain a provision for medical service to covered persons and their dependents." I recall that, last July, when the Ways and Means Committee held its hearings on the Forand bill, Mr. Norman V. Lourie—chairman of the association's commission on social policy and action, and Dr. Charles I. Schottland—Commissioner of Social Security from 1954 through 1958, testified for the association in favor of the inclusion of health-care benefits in the social security system. At that hearing I asked former Commissioner of Social Security Schottland the following question:

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Do I gather that you think it is perfectly feasible to add such benefits (i.e., health care benefits), and that they can be administered very effectively?

Mr. SCHOTTLAND. Administratively, I think the problem is not as difficult as some of those we faced in the early days of the social security program when we had to start from scratch. I am firmly convinced, as I think are all the persons engaged in the administration, that this program can be very readily handled.

When I read of experiences of the sort I have cited as well as encounter daily old people for whom the cost of illness is devastating and tragic, I appreciate again the urgency of health care benefits for older people. Such benefits would fill the remaining large gap in our Social Security System.

It was evidence of the sort that I have cited here that caused Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging to put forth as its first recommendation the following:

As its first recommendation for action in 1960, the subcommittee recommends that legislation be enacted to expand the system of OASDI to include health service benefits for all persons eligible for OASDI.

Jane Addams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I introduced a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane

Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House. My purpose in this introduction is to join my outstanding colleague, the Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH of Illinois, who yesterday introduced the original resolution.

Having the honor and privilege of representing a district in the Chicago metropolitan area, I can testify to the honor and respect that is due Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

Military Strength: Foundation of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, delivered at Atlantic City, N.J., on March 7, 1960. General Lemnitzer discussed, "Military Strength: Foundation of Peace." It seems to me that the General has much of significance to say to the Congress and to the American people.

The address follows:

MILITARY STRENGTH: FOUNDATION OF PEACE

(By Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer)

It is a real privilege for me to join you here in Atlantic City. The opportunity to address such a group is one which I profoundly appreciate. Together, the organizations represented in this conference are concerned with practically the entire range of activities and interests of the American people. In my remarks, I shall deal with a subject which is of compelling interest to the American people—that is, national defense.

Because my subject transcends any one military service, I shall speak tonight not as Chief of Staff of the Army. Rather, I shall speak as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

With regard to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, incidentally, someone recently commented that while the Supreme Court deliberates and the Senate debates, the Joint Chiefs bicker. Seriously, despite the publicity given our occasional divergencies, I can assure you that within the JCS, along with our honest differences of opinion, there is a vast body of agreement.

Certainly, every informed person—in or out of uniform—agrees on the existence of grave military danger to the United States, and indeed to the world. President Eisenhower described this danger very clearly in his state of the Union message when he said:

"With both sections of this divided world in possession of unbelievably destructive weapons, mankind approaches a state where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. No other fact of today's world equals this in importance—it colors everything we say, everything we plan and everything we do."

The mere existence of this capability for mutual annihilation is alarming enough. What makes it even more menacing is the nature of the international Communist threat. International communism possesses military force of massive size and strength. It is global in its extent. It possesses a versatility which enables it to operate effectively throughout the entire spectrum of military activity—ranging from military

support of cold war, propaganda, subversion, and insurrection, through open military participation in geographically restricted conflicts, to general nuclear war.

Along with these characteristics, there is the Communists' ruthless pursuit of their long-range goal by whatever means are most expedient. There is ample evidence that when the Communists change their tactics, they are not necessarily changing their strategy or abandoning their ultimate objective. Lenin, himself, wrote that:

"The successful development of the Bolshevik doctrine through the world can only be effected by means of periods of rest during which we may recuperate and gather new strength for further exertions. I have never hesitated to come to terms with bourgeois governments, when by so doing I thought I could weaken the bourgeoisie."

On the subject of Communist tactics, I recently had an experience which had some rather interesting overtones. In an address a few weeks ago, I described the instruction given in Communist long-range tactics at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, as reported by a former student at that school. As soon as accounts of my speech were published, I began to receive a steady stream of letters. The tone of much of this "fan mail" was that I was being unfair to organized communism. From this reaction, I gather that any realistic discussion of Communist tactics strikes at a tender spot. All I can say is, let the Communists disprove the record—if they can.

That record since 1945 can be briefly summarized by a list of nations—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, China, Indochina, Korea, and Tibet.

At the end of World War II, we acted in the hope that the cooperation among the wartime allies would continue. We not only completely disarmed our former enemies, but we and all our allies—except Russia—literally dismantled our own Armed Forces.

By the time Czechoslovakia fell in 1947, the threat to freedom had become unmistakably clear. The United States and other free world nations realized that to halt this succession of advances they would have to develop arrangements, following the pattern of the Organization of American States, for their collective security.

Departing, to a marked degree, from our traditional peacetime foreign policy, the United States took the lead in initiating a number of very important steps.

Among these was the Truman doctrine, in 1947, for U.S. military and economic assistance to Greece and Turkey. You will recall that, at that time, Greece was under direct Communist attack, and Turkey was being subjected to heavy political and economic pressures.

Then, in 1949, the Vandenberg resolution was passed by the Senate. This action, which laid the groundwork for the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), was a great step forward.

Next was the initiation of our mutual security program. It was designed to assist the nations of the free world in developing their own strength. I shall have more to say about this later.

Since that time, we have joined in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Australian-New Zealand-United States Pact (ANZUS Pact). We have also entered into a number of bilateral security treaties with other important allies for mutual defense. These, with our membership in the Organization of American States, provide a global network of mutual security arrangements.

The magnitude of the Communist threat and of the means to counter it makes it obvious why military security today demands such a large share of the energy and resources of the United States and its allies. Although we are maintaining impressive

military strength, we threaten no nation. Certainly, all of us devoutly hope that world tensions can be reduced and ultimately eliminated by peaceful means. To this end, we must make every effort to seek solutions to the existing differences consistent with U.S. interests. However, we must approach any negotiations with our eyes open—bearing in mind the Communists' stated objectives, their capabilities, and their record of behavior. We must conduct negotiations from a position of strength. Finally, in the course of negotiating, we must not forget the strength of our position.

Regarding this question of relative military strengths, there are one or two points that I would like to make. Too often, some people follow a deceptively easy process to reach conclusions as to military power. They merely count up and compare totals of missiles, divisions, bombers, submarines, or some other item which they accept as a yardstick of strength. I admit that this method has the advantage of simplicity. However, it suffers from a grave disadvantage—it just is not valid. It ignores the fact that our military power is not determined by any single weapons system. Further, any assessment of military power which restricts itself to our own capabilities, ignoring those of our allies, can only be regarded as completely artificial and unrealistic.

To develop these points, I want to begin by discussing some of the chief characteristics of the military problem which faces us today. In order to understand what is needed, we must first view our problem as a whole. Because the Communist threat encompasses the entire range of military capabilities, we must be ready to meet it in any form or in any degree of intensity. The degree to which we are manifestly able to do so provides the measurement of our prospects of preventing war. We must be ready to conduct general war, because it obviously poses a direct danger to our territory and people. We must be ready also to deal with other forms of warfare because, otherwise, the collective strength of the free world may be nibbled away, laying us open to ultimate defeat.

One of the major requirements for deterring general nuclear war is to be capable of retaliating, with devastating force, for attack upon the United States. Our national principles and convictions are such that we would never be the aggressor. Therefore, the forces which give us the capability to retaliate must be as nearly invulnerable to destruction, even by surprise attack, as it is possible to make them. This is of the utmost importance.

Security against an enemy's initial attack can be attained by several means, in combination. These are both active and passive. They include early warning, the engagement and destruction of enemy attacking forces, diversification of types of our retaliatory means, and the mobility, dispersion, and protection of these retaliatory forces.

Our employment of these varied means complicates tremendously the planning problem for any would-be attacker. To bring out the scale of such a problem, I need only mention major elements of our retaliatory forces. We have operational long-range missile bases and we have long-range bomber units, not only throughout the United States but also overseas. Our tactical Air Force fighter-bombers in Europe and the Far East have a nuclear delivery capability. At sea, we have carrier-based aircraft with a nuclear capability. We anticipate improvements and increases in our missile strength—such as the submarine-launched Polaris—which will add still further to the mobility, invulnerability, and diversity of our retaliatory forces.

Now, a planner contemplating an all-out thermonuclear attack on the United States would require reasonable assurance that he

could destroy virtually all of these forces. Further, he would have to count on destroying them simultaneously. He would have to face up to the realization that if even a small portion of our retaliatory forces escaped his attack, they would still be able to inflict terrible damage on him. As one who has spent much of his life in military planning, I can appreciate only too well the restraining effect which this realization would exert on enemy planners.

Furthermore, as one familiar with our capabilities, I want to assure you that even if the Communists launched an all-out thermonuclear attack on the United States, tonight, nothing could prevent their bringing down upon themselves vast destruction from the retaliatory blows which we would still be able to deliver against them. My colleagues in the Joint Chiefs of Staff share this view. For that matter, so does Mr. Khrushchev. He himself has stated that, in the event of a general nuclear war, neither side could escape devastating destruction. In fact, the threat of such destruction, as the President has pointed out, is a common peril shared by both the Soviets and ourselves.

There is still another major aspect of our provisions for deterring general war, whose importance the Soviets also recognize. Marshal Malinovsky, the Soviet Minister of Defense, described this aspect recently in an address to the Supreme Soviet. He emphasized that success in modern war is possible only "on the basis of combined efforts of all types of forces." Marshal Malinovsky believes that, after a thermonuclear exchange, the issue would ultimately be decided by properly proportioned forces comprising land, sea, and air elements. Consequently, our strength in such forces is also an important factor in our capability for deterring general war.

To defeat attack, we must act promptly. Therefore, we maintain forces, combining all types, already deployed in key strategic areas overseas. We have the Seventh Army, Tactical Air Force units, and the Sixth Fleet in the European area. In the Pacific we have the Eighth Army, Tactical Air Force units, the Seventh Fleet, a Marine Corps division, and an Army division. For immediate reinforcement of these units in case of need, we maintain strategic reserves, including Fleet Marine Forces, Tactical Air Force units, and the Strategic Army Corps. As a basis for further reinforcement, all services maintain Reserve components, trained and ready to be called into uniform from civilian life.

These overseas deployments, strategic reserves, and Reserve components are also a vital asset for meeting the threat of attack on a scale less than general war—that is, the threat of so-called limited war. The deployed forces provide us with the capability to act promptly if a crisis occurs in the areas where they are located. The strategic reserves give us the capability to move rapidly to an area of crisis in some other part of the world. The Reserve components permit expansion to meet either threat if it should require an extended effort.

By maintaining our forces needed for a shooting war we are also contributing to the cold war in which the entire free world is now engaged. This observation especially applies to our Armed Forces overseas. Their presence in Allied countries provides incomparable psychological assurance of our readiness and willingness to share in the common defense.

In describing U.S. forces, I have not begun to give a complete picture of the military strength which is available to protect our national security. It is not the United States alone which is threatened, but all free nations. Furthermore, the United States has not been alone in taking steps to meet the threat.

Earlier, I listed the major international security agreements into which the United

States has entered. An extremely important contribution in this regard has been the mutual security program. This is the program whose military provisions enable us to assist allies to build up their own military forces. Under the program, we provide weapons, other materiel, and training assistance. Within the Department of Defense, I happen to have been the first director of the efforts to put the military portions of this program into effect. Part of that time I served under your chairman, Colonel Johnson, who was then Secretary of Defense. I have watched the program grow from its inception to its present state of tremendous value. With the passage of time, world events have strengthened my conviction that the mutual security program is based upon sound principles and that it greatly benefits the United States.

This program has frequently been misunderstood, and certainly it has been misrepresented. Its opponents have called it a giveaway program and have referred to it as foreign military aid—as though it were something given to other countries without return. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, the mutual security program represents a realistic, hardheaded, cold-blooded approach to our very tough security problem—a problem which happens to be shared by other free nations.

I would like to take particular note of the allegation that this program has been substantially responsible for the outflow of gold that has disturbed so many fiscal experts. The fact is that, of the money appropriated for this program for the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year before it, 85 to 90 percent has been spent in the United States for U.S. products. Furthermore, during the past 3 fiscal years, Allied countries have bought from the United States, under the mutual security sales program, enough weapons and equipment to offset the value of our mutual security program expenditures made abroad.

Now, what has the mutual security effort helped to achieve since its inception in 1949?

The Allied ground forces which are receiving equipment, advice, and training under this program have increased from 3½ to 5 million men. Allied navies have grown from 1,200 to 2,200 combat ships. Allied air forces have expanded from 17,000 to more than 25,000 aircraft—and about half of these are now jets. All Allied forces are better trained, better equipped, and better able to perform their assigned missions within our total Allied strategy.

I want to emphasize that the global and collective threat makes imperative a global and collective strategy. We have such a strategy. It is a blueprint calling not only for collective action among allies, but also for positioning of forces right up against the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—ready to counter aggression on the spot as soon as it occurs. This latter part of our blueprint, we term a "forward strategy." Furthermore, thanks in large part to our mutual security program, our allies maintain a military strength of over 6 million men to help support that strategy.

To illustrate, 90 percent of the ground forces that would come under General Norstad's NATO command in case of war would be provided by our allies. In the Far East, the forward strategy is supported by a total of almost 2 million men, under Admiral Felt, the commander in chief, Pacific. However, the U.S. nucleus of this force consists of only a small percentage of the total. In Korea, for example, General Magruder commands 21 combat divisions, but 19 of these are Republic of Korea units.

As a sidelight, I might mention the immeasurable value of peacetime experience in working with allies. It permits the development of a body of common doctrine, common terminology, common weaponry, and

mutual understanding. In World Wars I and II, none of this was possible until after we actually got into war. Mutual understanding among allies in peacetime is particularly important. I well remember the attitude which prevailed during the years before World War II. Time and again I heard the statement: "If we ever have to go to war again, by all means we should do so without allies." This remembrance highlights one of the things which has always impressed me about President Eisenhower. I am sure he had heard the same statements of misgivings about allies. Despite such a peacetime indoctrination, he was able, during World War II, to adapt himself to a situation wherein the Allied effort was mandatory for success. His inspired leadership of that effort is history.

I could go on at great length to illustrate the importance of the mutual security program. However, more examples would just prove the same point. This point is that the mutual security program makes it possible for collective security to function. To my mind, there are only two alternatives to collective security. One would be for the United States alone to provide the entire force required to counter the Communist threat. This is clearly a backbreaking, pained, and probably impossible task. The other alternative would be for the United States to withdraw into a Fortress America. I am firmly convinced that such withdrawal would be the prelude to inevitable defeat.

In brief, the mutual security program is a cornerstone of our total defense effort and of our national security. All members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff share this conviction. No matter how much any individual member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff might like to have more resources allocated to his own Service, we are unanimous in our belief that not a single dollar should be added to our respective Service budgets if that dollar had to be taken away from the mutual security program.

Meanwhile, I appreciate only too well the demands which security requirements, in addition to the mutual security program, are making on our national budget. I am aware that defense costs constitute one factor contributing to the current effort to seek a workable disarmament formula. My own view is that reduction of defense costs, while a valid reason to seek disarmament, is strictly a secondary one. The overriding reason is the possibility that disarmament may be able to lessen, in some degree, the terrible threat of mutual destruction that hangs over the world. This is the threat which the President mentioned in his state of the Union message and which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks.

The United States has consistently advocated realistic disarmament, and has repeatedly taken the lead in trying to achieve it. We subscribed to the Washington Naval Agreement 40 years ago. Since World War II, we have intensified our efforts in this regard. I myself took part in disarmament discussions in the early days of the United Nations. To list only a few of our major attempts since World War II, there was first the Baruch proposal, in 1947. At a time when we still had a monopoly on atomic weapons, this proposal advocated formation of an international authority. Control or ownership of all atomic energy activities which were potentially dangerous to world security would be turned over to this authority. Next came the President's atom-for-peace proposal, in 1953. It also called for creation of an international agency. Nations would contribute normal uranium and fissionable materials to this agency which would devise methods to use these contributions to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy. With Communist cooperation and participation, this could have been a valuable step toward international atomic control.

Then, in 1955, President Eisenhower offered his "open skies" proposal. If this had been accepted, each nation would have given the other participants a complete blueprint of its military establishments; each would then have provided to the others full facilities for aerial reconnaissance throughout its territory.

The United States has made numerous other efforts in behalf of world peace. So far, however, the result has always been the same. The Communists have proclaimed the most high-minded goals, but they have invariably balked when it came to actual agreement on specifics. In this connection, it is a matter of grave concern to me that, although the United States has repeatedly taken the initiative to achieve disarmament, the Communists—who have consistently blocked agreement—have had some success in persuading world opinion that they are the leaders in this effort.

I believe that our attempts must continue. However, I believe that we must not accept disarmament on such a basis as to reduce our relative power position vis-a-vis the Sino-Soviet bloc. Also, to insure that agreements are honored, there must be—as an indispensable prerequisite—a sound, workable, verifiable inspection system. This consideration has been basic to all the efforts we have made. It is the only possible approach, especially in this day of nuclear weapons. Any nation which has a sincere, honorable desire to achieve disarmament cannot take issue with such a system being agreed to before disarmament takes place. Disarmament without an effective inspection system is doubly dangerous. First, violations could not be surely discovered. Second, our people and our allies would be lulled into a false sense of security which could cause us to lower our guard—with possibly disastrous consequences.

The United States has had one actual experience of trying to work with the Communists in operating an inspection system. That was in Korea.

Among other things, the Korean armistice agreement of 1953 provided that the existing levels and types of military strength of both sides in Korea would be fixed as a ceiling on the forces to be kept there from then on. The agreement also provided for inspection teams, furnished by neutral nations, in order to insure that these levels would not be exceeded. The United Nations nominated Switzerland and Sweden to provide members of the teams; the Communists nominated Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The Polish and Czech members of the inspection teams rapidly made a farce of the inspection system. It soon became abundantly clear that the Communists were consistently violating the armistice agreement by strengthening and modernizing their forces. In July of 1957, the United Nations command, because of the long record of Communist violations, formally suspended the portion of the agreement which prohibited the introduction of improved types of weapons and equipment. We did so because, to be realistic, we were the only ones who were observing it. We were thereby penalizing ourselves and our allies, and placing the forces of the United Nations command in great danger.

Despite the obvious failure to achieve effective inspection under the conditions imposed by the Communists, the Polish and Czech members of the teams had steadfastly maintained that the methods followed in Korea are not only sound, but represent the ideal—the classic—approach for achieving global disarmament. All I can say is that this system, with its restrictions on inspections and its requirement for unanimous agreement before investigations could be launched, provides a clear blueprint of an

approach to which we must never agree. It proved to be a complete fraud in Korea. It would be even more fraudulent on a global scale.

In concluding my remarks, I want to say that national security depends on many factors besides military strength. However, lacking a completely fool proof world disarmament, military strength continues as an indispensable prerequisite for that security. I subscribe to an old Hindu proverb, which says that the man without a stick will be bitten even by a sheep.

Military strength stems from no single weapons system. It cannot be measured realistically by counting up totals of any single type of military resource, but must depend upon the combination of our capabilities. This combination must be such as to enable us and our allies to meet the threat throughout the entire range of forms and intensities it can take.

Our efforts are designed to join with our allies to produce, in unison, the versatile and effective strength required. From this we derive not only the best hope of preventing war, but also the strength from which to negotiate effectively for a realistic reduction in the tensions which create the hazards facing the world today.

Such a goal is surely worthy of our most earnest thought and our most sustained effort.

Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the captive peoples of Byelorussia, who commemorate the 42d anniversary of independence on March 25.

On that day, in the year 1918, the Byelorussian people took advantage of the chaotic situation in Russia to proclaim the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic. Despite years of czarist attempts at assimilation, the Byelorussians refused to forget their status as a distinct ethnic group. At the first opportunity they proclaimed their national independence.

Their freedom was, of course, short-lived, and they were soon overcome by another Russian oppressor.

The new oppressor tried to do what czarist Russia had failed to accomplish for centuries: the forcible Russification of the Byelorussian people. For the past 40 years they have embarked upon a brutal campaign of extermination, dispersion, and exploitation. Byelorussians are today in colonial status; they are ruled by Russian officials; their schools use Russian books; and the major part of their production is exported for Russian consumption. Byelorussian youth are deported to obscure outposts, and are subjected to intense Russian indoctrination. The population as a whole has been subjected to such pressures that it has suffered the heaviest losses in Russian history.

Despite this brutal suppression the Byelorussian people have accepted the rule of the Soviet no more than history

shows they accepted the rule of the czar. They continue to cherish the hope for freedom and independence in the face of permanent political terror and tyranny. Let us join the people of Byelorussia today, and the people of Byelorussian descent everywhere in the free world, in the hope that one day their noble hope may come to fruition.

United States Should Go Back to Own System of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Arkansas Democrat of March 20, 1960:

UNITED STATES SHOULD GO BACK TO OWN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

(By Karr Shannon)

At a recent newspaper conference, in trying to excuse the manner in which we have fallen behind the Russians, President Eisenhower said that "our people ought to have greater faith in their own system."

But what has Mr. Eisenhower done during his more than 7 years in office to bolster that faith? What has he done to strengthen our "own system" which Abraham Lincoln so aptly described as a "government of the people, by the people, for the people?" What has he done to restore and preserve such system?

Dwight Eisenhower took over the helm of government after a 20-year trend toward socialism under Roosevelt and Truman; he took over at a time when the government, founded upon the principles of democracy, was in a state of confusion and turmoil.

He has done nothing to stem the socialistic trend; rather he has encouraged, augmented and increased it. Under the Eisenhower administration, the annual cost of government has spiraled by the multiplied billions, the national debt has rocketed, inflation has gone beyond control, bureaucracy has sprawled and spilled over the borders of our own Nation, the U.S.A. is WPAing the world, and there has been less "government of the people, by the people, for the people" than at any time since the American Revolution.

WHAT IKE HAS DONE

Eisenhower urges that we have more faith in our own system of government. He urges this when the fact is that much of the loss of faith has been brought about by the many elements of compromise with the Russians which he himself has instigated.

What Eisenhower has done to enhance the socialistic trend and tax and spend and throttle the average voter's voice in the operation of his own Government makes Roosevelt and Truman look like pikers by comparison. He has maneuvered the New Deal and the Fair Deal into a Raw Deal.

He rolled out the red carpet to the world's most ruthless murderer—Khrushchev, and wined and dined him . . . and transported him all over the country at taxpayers' expense . . . showed him and informed him . . . This was the same Khrushchev who had said to the United States: "I will bury you."

Eisenhower has sent envoys into Russia—such as Agriculture Secretary Benson—to give the Communists billions of dollars worth of know-how—so they can bury us quicker.

WHY HELP THE ENEMY?

Why is our Government deliberately helping the enemy—our worst enemy on earth? Why do we give to this Communist nation—which hates us with a passion and is determined to destroy us—the secrets of our agricultural developments, our manufacturers, our know-how in just about everything? What is the reward?

Christ said: Cast not "your pearls before swine, lest they . . . turn again and rend you."

We do not need to change our system of government to meet the Russian challenge. We need only to return to the system founded by our God-fearing, freedom-loving forebears—our system.

This means that we must quit appeasing the mass murderer to whom our President extended the grand welcome. It means, as Otto Garr Tague, syndicated columnist, says, we must get out of this one-world trap which Eisenhower has helped set for us. It means, as Editor Tom Anderson of the Farm and Ranch states, we must quit subsidizing our enemies, destroying our markets and alienating our friends.

REPAIR THE DAMAGE

It means we must repair the damage done to the Constitution by the Warren-Myrdal court; restore States' rights; stop reconstruction of the South by the radical element in Washington; return to the people the right to run their own public schools; stomp out all societies and associations and other organizations, regardless of hue or cry, that are Communist dominated; stop the Civil War that is still going on—and worsening—between North and South.

To return to "our system," we must get out of the foreign aid racket; better still, get out of the United Nations; shuck the welfare state; reestablish the dignity of honest labor; sell the multiplicity of Government-financed, money-losing corporations to private enterprise; balance the budget; reduce taxes; begin liquidating the national debt.

If we do these things, then we can follow President Eisenhower's advice—regain our faith in our own system. There is little cause for pride or faith in the Government as it is now operated.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a vital ally, a NATO partner, and an old and dear friend of the United States—the country of Greece. I join all Americans of Greek descent in celebrating the 139th anniversary of Greek independence.

The Greek War of Independence began on March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece. This was the first step of the successful revolution against the rule of the Ottoman Empire. At first, the war was fought against great odds; but the determination and love of liberty of the Greek people won the sympathy and support of many other na-

tions, including the United States. This was the inspiring rebellion which brought men like Lord Byron from England to join the fight; similarly, it inspired other volunteers from other countries who also loved the cause of freedom. One of these volunteers, it is interesting to note, was an American colonel who brought back to the United States a Greek war orphan whose name was Lucas Miltiades Miller. Mr. Miller became the first Member of Congress of Greek origin. From the State of Wisconsin, he served in the House from 1892 to 1893.

The war of independence was partially successful in 1829 when Turkey recognized Greece as an autonomous principality. In 1832 the hopes of the liberty-loving Greeks were realized and Greece was recognized as a completely sovereign kingdom.

On Greek Independence Day we focus attention on the close ties between the United States and Greece, which date back to the Greek War of Independence and which are reaffirmed in our mutual alliance and friendship today.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it was 42 years ago today, March 25, 1918, that the people of Byelorussia cast off the rule of Moscow and proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian democratic republic. I am happy to call attention to the anniversary of that date in remembrance of an oppressed people's struggle for freedom and self-determination. These are the principles for which the United States stands as champion across the world.

Self-determination remains the dream of men everywhere. Few people are more aware of this than the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known to us. For centuries the Byelorussians have been denied control of their own destiny. They constitute a distinct national entity of 15 million people, in spite of persecution, war, deportation, and massacre. These people are united by cultural tradition, a common language, a history of struggle and most of all a common hope for freedom from foreign domination. They have been repeatedly denied this freedom. Ever since conquest by the Russian czars, there have been efforts to end their feeling of national unity, their Byelorussian language, their Byelorussian customs, and the teaching of free democratic principles.

Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are not allowed to celebrate the occasion of their March 1918 declaration of independence. So it is for us, who are free, to remind the world. Byelorussians who have come to this country remember. Their en-

terprising spirit and industry have made a substantial contribution to the greatness of the United States. Our citizens of Byelorussian origin are characteristically doing their loyal share in the effort to keep our country prepared to maintain the strength of the free world. But when their thoughts turn toward the homeland of their ancestors, hearts must be heavy indeed.

We, and the rest of the free world, must keep alive the flame of hope and extend encouragement. So today let us pause and pay tribute to this determined and courageous people. We must do all we can to help Byelorussians everywhere strive for the day when these fine people will be able to practice openly the concepts of the four freedoms and true democracy.

More Good Work by United Nations Children's Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Children's Fund has, over the years, been carrying on its good works for the children of the world in order to improve the conditions in which they are growing up. This will yield these children fuller, healthier lives and a better world in which to live.

The Children's Fund is pioneering new ways to improve the lives of these children. One of the recent developments by the United Nations Children's Fund is the development of high protein drinks for the children of areas where milk is scarce.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I am including information about the introduction of these new products to the good friends of the United Nations Children's Fund in Washington, D.C.:

WASHINGTONIANS TO SAMPLE NEW INTERNATIONAL FOODS

The most effective answers to the population explosion so far developed by science will be presented to a taste panel at the Cosmos Club on April 1 before a meeting of the Washington, D.C., Friends of the United Nations Children's Fund.

They are hitherto undeveloped ingredients that can be added to children's food.

UNICEF has assembled a selection of them as samples to unmined wealth in a number of countries whose children suffer from protein malnutrition. They include milk made from soybean powder in Indonesia; buffalo milk from India; flours made from fish in Chile, and from peanuts in Nigeria and India; sunflower seeds from Chile and sesame seeds from Mexico; cottonseed products from Central America.

These simple substances contain between 70 and 80 percent protein. They are readily and cheaply available, and are easily transformed into edible foodstuffs in less developed areas of the world where they are most needed.

There are today an estimated 1 billion children in the world—750 million live in economically underdeveloped countries

which are the principal areas for UNICEF assistance. Hunger is the major enemy for most of these children. The new foodstuffs are one of the chief ways whereby UNICEF hopes to reach more of the severely undernourished millions of the world's children.

The foods have a long storage life in heat and humidity, and can be made acceptable and palatable for absorption into child diets. These foods are hidden assets of the lands where they are indigenous because they have never been utilized to any sizable extent as human food. Some of these new uses of unexplored food sources are still in the development stages, awaiting final confirming experiments before they can be produced in commercial quantities.

The Children's Fund, working with the United Nations' Food and Agricultural Organization, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other agencies, hopes to be able in the years ahead to help countries develop these resources and so cut down hunger among these millions of children. This is one way of assuring that they will grow up healthier, stronger, and more economically productive human beings.

On the tasting panel to sample the new foods will be congressional and Washington sponsors of the occasion. These include: Mrs. Christian Herter, Senora Dona de Sevilla-Sacasa, Mrs. Arthur Harman, Hon. and Mrs. Arthur S. Flemming, Senator Theodore F. Green, Senator and Mrs. Alexander Wiley, Senator and Mrs. J. William Fulbright, Representative Frances P. Bolton, Hon. and Mrs. Walter H. Judd, Hon. and Mrs. Chester Bowles, Mrs. Homer Ferguson, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Mrs. Harold H. Burton, Mrs. Francis B. Sayre, and Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck.

The reception will be held officially to honor Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr., president of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF, and Minister Dr. Felix Schnyder, Chairman of the UNICEF Executive Board, and his country's permanent observer at the United Nations.

The American Hellenic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 139th anniversary of Greek independence. An added significance to this occasion is the recent founding of the American Hellenic Congress, a federation of leading nationwide American Hellenic Societies dedicated to meeting the challenges that confront our Nation. The Congress will henceforth speak as the united voice of some 2 million Americans of Greek descent.

This event is a milestone in their glorious history and under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the letter of the Honorable Dean Alfange, chairman of the American Hellenic Congress, which appeared in the February 16, 1960, issue of the New York Times.

FEBRUARY 9, 1960.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Though unnoticed in some quarters an important event, which gave substance to a long-cherished ideal, took place last week in New York City. It marked the launching of

a federation of Pan-American Hellenism under the aegis of the American Hellenic Congress. The distinguished churchman, His Eminence Lakovos, Greek Orthodox archbishop of North and South America, was named honorary chairman of the congress which will achieve de jure status upon ratification.

The component members of the new federation are the leading nationwide American Hellenic organizations, including those which are largest in numbers and oldest in point of service. Though each retains its identity, they will henceforth speak with a united voice in the councils of American affairs.

The American Hellenic Congress will strive, as stated in its charter, "to enlarge the areas of service to the United States and * * * to aid in the great process of shaping our national purposes" by coordinating the solid contributions to America by Americans of Hellenic descent.

That those whose ancestors lit the lamps of culture have seen fit, the more effectively to aid in confronting the challenges to a way of life bequeathed to us by ancient Hellas is, I think, a milestone which deserves to be recorded.

DEAN ALFANGE,

Chairman, American Hellenic Congress.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 8601 to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, January 27, 1960, in a brief statement when I signed the Civil Rights Discharge Petition as No. 14 thereupon and had done so the first day it was on the Clerk's desk, I also said that one of the reasons I had gladly and promptly signed that petition was because I verily believed in our constitutional form of government under which this Republic was founded and ordained, and which constitutional form of government I swore to uphold each of the seven times I have now taken my oath as a Member of this great National Congress of the United States of America.

The 15th amendment to our Federal Constitution provides as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

And now, having been personally present each of the days of this historic debate on bill H.R. 8601, and having voted on each and every one of the amendments and motions which have been put in place before we Members to vote upon during this debate, I will naturally vote against the anticipated motion to recommit this bill and will vote in favor of final passage of the Celler amendment.

Without consciously harboring any thought of ill will or antagonism or sectional feeling whatsoever toward any person or group of persons, or geographical areas of my beloved Nation, I nevertheless steadfastly believe that this bill will at least be some means of a considerable number of American citizens voting who are qualified under and in accordance with the laws of the States in which they reside, which citizens would otherwise not be given an opportunity to register to vote on account of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude. In other words, I believe this bill cannot help but make it an actual fact that the 15th amendment to our Federal Constitution providing that the right of American citizens to vote shall be implemented and given practical application in a substantial manner. I hope so. For, Mr. Chairman, to have the right of any American citizen, in any manner whatsoever, abridged in any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude is actually destructive of our American way of life.

I cordially compliment the members of the House Judiciary Committee on both sides of the political aisle for the thoroughness and dexterity and fairness with which they have presented both pros and cons to us who are not members of that distinguished Judiciary Committee. And because I think we are all aware of the very great and strenuous changes which should result as result of the passage of this bill, assuming it becomes the law of the land, I trust that no sectional ill will will continue to be expressed, nor charged, nor made apparent by any person or any group of persons. This bill applies to all areas of our beloved Nation and to all persons in our Nation. I hope and pray that only fair, equitable, and just application of its history-making terms and conditions and provisions will be made and that its administration will normally result in great benefit to many people and the many difficult problems these many people have faced; all of this to be for the benefit of our national soundness and happiness.

Joint Federal-St. Louis Study To Determine Causes of High Strontium 90 Level in St. Louis Milkshed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Public Health Service and St. Louis County and St. Louis City health officials today jointly announced the undertaking of a special study into the sources of the high levels of strontium 90 consistently being discovered in St. Louis milk supplies. I am extremely happy that this study is now going to proceed.

The people of St. Louis and surrounding areas have been understandably

concerned for several years over the high levels of environmental radiation being reported in that section, and particularly the high levels of strontium 90 in milk. Civic leaders in the St. Louis area have interested themselves in this problem in a very effective manner, and have joined with many of our outstanding scientists in St. Louis to try to find solutions for this invisible menace which threatens the whole Nation.

INQUIRY TO SURGEON GENERAL BY REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN

Last fall, I directed an inquiry to Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney of the U.S. Public Health Service asking what was being done or could be done to eliminate or reduce the amount of strontium 90 in our local milk supply. I said that I had read of encouraging research results in developing low-cost techniques for removing this dread contaminant from milk, through joint efforts of the Public Health Service, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Agriculture, and asked when we could look for practical results from this research.

I also inquired if the Public Health Service needed any legislative authority or funds to proceed expeditiously with the development of a commercial process.

In reply, the Surgeon General's office informed me, last October, that they still had to do a great deal of checking into the strontium 90 removal process to determine if milk treated by the so-called ion exchange method or by other methods which have been studied would still retain its nutritional and sanitary quality. I was informed that this research would continue.

ATTEMPT TO FIND AND ELIMINATE CAUSE

Mr. James G. Terrill, Jr., Acting Chief of the Division of Radiological Health of the Public Health Service's Bureau of State Services, then notified me of the plan being considered to try to determine, in cooperation with local and State health officials, the reason for, and the sources of, the high levels of strontium 90 contamination persisting in the St. Louis area. It was the feeling of the Public Health Service that such a study could perhaps be far more practical in reducing the strontium levels in the milk supply than a process for taking it out of milk.

Today's announcement made simultaneously by the Surgeon General in Washington, by Dr. C. Howe Eller, commissioner of health of St. Louis County, and by Dr. J. Earl Smith, director of health and hospitals for the city of St. Louis, of the initiation of such a study in the St. Louis milkshed is therefore very welcome to me, as I know it is to everyone concerned about this serious problem. The Public Health Service press release is as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1960

The second in a series of long-range studies of environmental radiation, now underway in various sections of the country, is being initiated in the St. Louis, Mo., area,

Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney announced today. Purpose of the studies is to determine the significance of previous findings concerning radiation levels in that area, according to Dr. Burney.

The project was announced simultaneously today by Dr. C. Howe Eller, commissioner of health, St. Louis County, and Dr. J. Earl Smith, director of health and hospitals, city of St. Louis.

The studies will begin in the near future with a preliminary survey of dairy farms in the various milksheds serving St. Louis. The survey will consist of investigations of water supplies, sources of animal food, climate, farming and animal feeding practices and other variables that may be associated with different types and levels of radioactivity in milk. The final phase of the milkshed study will consist of field experiments to determine whether, if necessary, the radioactive content of milk can be reduced by modifications in dairy farming practices.

One objective of this series will be to determine whether previous strontium 90 findings will obtain throughout the entire St. Louis milkshed, or only part of it. The levels of strontium 90 have been somewhat higher in the St. Louis milkshed than in other areas. However, the St. Louis average levels have been below those which the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRPM) considers permissible for lifetime exposure by the general population.

Techniques developed in the St. Louis study will be applied to similar milkshed investigations being planned for several other major metropolitan areas in the United States by the Public Health Service in cooperation with State and local health authorities.

The St. Louis study is an outgrowth of negotiations over the past several months culminating in arrangements among the Federal, county, and city health agencies which are expected to become effective within a few days. Under these arrangements the Federal Government will reimburse the St. Louis County Health Department for the cost of personnel, materials, supplies, and travel directly involved in the first phase of the study. The county health department is authorized to enter into agreements with local health departments in adjacent States for the collection and delivery of samples of milk, water, cattle feed, and other materials needed for analysis. The Federal Government will furnish certain necessary laboratory equipment to the St. Louis group, and the Public Health Service's Sanitary Engineering Center, in Cincinnati, Ohio, will assist in laboratory analysis of samples.

The Federal financial share for the remainder of fiscal year 1960 will amount to \$35,700. The total Federal share for fiscal year 1961 will be around \$100,000.

Because of the wealth of general information that will be developed on environmental radiation in the St. Louis area, it is expected that more elaborate investigations will follow the initial milkshed study. Such additional research would be part of the nationwide effort of the Public Health Service and State health departments to interpret the significance of radioactivity in the environment. They will be concerned with radioactivity measurements in water, air, milk, and other foods as well as radiation exposures from medical and dental X-rays. Major emphasis will be given to obtaining precise measurements of the amount and kinds of radioactivity taken in by people and also the amounts retained within the body. Actual radioactivity of dietary, water, and air intake among large numbers of individuals will be analyzed, and, by measuring the radioactivity of body wastes, the amounts retained as total "body burden," determined.

The first of these comprehensive studies, in San Juan County, N. Mex., was announced last week by Surgeon General Burney.

The Public Health Service's Division of Radiological Health pointed out that the increasing use of nuclear, medical, and dental X-rays, and radioactive isotopes for industrial and medical purposes makes it mandatory for official health agencies to begin accumulating precise knowledge of the amounts, kinds, sources, and body retention of radioactive substances in many different population groups. Such knowledge is necessary in order that health officials may be able to determine when actual or potential health problems exist, and to develop methods for coping with such problems.

Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This letter deals with the matter of fluoridation of the water of our country. It is written by a lady that I have the pleasure of knowing very well, and I know that she is absolutely sincere in her belief.

Whether fluoridation is good or bad has been argued throughout the land. I do not know the answer, but I give the opportunity to everyone to read this letter and form his own opinion.

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ARTHUR S. FLEMMING ON FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION

OF OUR WATER SUPPLY, INC.,

New York, N.Y., February 25, 1960.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: It is gratifying to read in the public press your recent statements on the dangers of toxic chemical additives in our food supply and contamination with spray residues and other substances of doubtful safety.

Encouraging as your recent statements are, we are deeply concerned by the inconsistency between your position on these matters and your advocacy of the addition to our water supply of fluorides which are more toxic than the additives you have condemned. For example, the day to day ingestion of fluorides in our drinking water is of far greater harm than the occasional turkey feasts with cranberries containing aminotriazole. Besides no one is compelled to eat cranberry sauce but everyone is compelled to drink fluoride in their water.

Even the experts in your department cannot guarantee that drinking fluoridated water may not injure some of the people. You should be aware that an increasing number of responsible members of the medical and dental professions continue to report the harmful, cumulative effects of fluoride.

In a democratic nation which prides itself on the protection it gives to the rights of the individual, how can you justify fluoridation? The conveying of toxic, therapeutic agents via so indiscriminate a vehicle as the municipal water supply establishes a dangerous

precedent. The American people have already demonstrated their opposition; more than 1,000 communities have rejected fluoridation and close to 100 after trying it, have discontinued it.

We recognize the need for better laws, and better enforcement of present laws to protect the public from poisonous additives. The principle must be upheld that where there is doubt, that doubt must be settled on the assumption that the health of the American people is primary.

Very truly yours,

EMILY MLHR,
President.

Mess in Washington Grows and Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I read the March 12 editorial in the Florida Times-Union, entitled "Mess in Washington Grows and Grows," with a great deal of interest. It is not my purpose to point any finger of scorn at anyone. It is my purpose to emphasize that the Republican Party, in pointing a finger of scorn at the Democratic Party in recent campaigns did so without putting its own house in order; and that it would be a good thing if both political parties would devote their time primarily to correcting such things, rather than pointing out the deficiencies of their opponents.

There is pending before Congress at the present time a substantial number of bills relating to the conflict-of-interest field. The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member will soon have before the entire House a modest proposal in this field which should gain everyone's approval, in my opinion. The House Judiciary Committee has pending before it a substantial number of bills which would deal with some of these problems on a governmentwide basis. The Committee on Legislative Oversight has pending before it a substantial number of similar proposals dealing with specific regulatory bodies. I sincerely hope that some concrete results of a substantial nature may be forthcoming from these committees to assist in strengthening the moral fiber of our Government.

Several years ago Congress enacted a code of ethics for Government service. It took almost 10 years from the original introduction of this modest proposal before it was finally enacted. The Civil Service Commission is of the opinion that the code of ethics has done a great deal of good since it was enacted, but it needs to be strengthened by a Commission on Ethics which could hear specific cases in a judicial manner and recommend to the proper executive, legislative and judicial authorities appropriate disciplinary action to be taken in specific cases. Of course no amount of legislation will solve all of these problems, but legislation can help to solve the problems and we are derelict in our duties in not enacting legislation in this field

as promptly as possible. The editorial to which I refer reads as follows:

"MESS IN WASHINGTON" GROWS AND GROWS

Frederick W. Ford steps up to the top spot with the Federal Communications Commission on Monday in wake of John C. Doerfer's forced resignation as chairman of the agency.

Few people are inclined to disagree with President Eisenhower's opinion that Doerfer's decision to quit was a wise one. The same cannot be said of other actions by Doerfer while head of the FCC.

Doerfer's sin was in allowing himself to become beholden to a broadcaster, whose holdings his agency had the responsibility of overseeing. It's naive to think that a man's decision affecting another wouldn't be colored by the fact that the former received a 6-day yacht cruise and other amenities from the hands of the latter, as was the case with Doerfer and a Miami radio and television executive. This is a clear case where business and pleasure should not mix.

What's so discouraging about this expose, for those who had hoped maybe at last a cleanup was in the making in the radio and television industry, is that the Doerfer affair occurred last month. That's after the major TV scandals were revealed and since a lot of pious statements about reform.

Ford is going to be on the spot to overcome the handicap of having been a member of a lackadaisical Commission not disposed to policing properly the industry it's appointed to watch. Unless he moves fast and in the right direction, the public may be clamoring for a wholesale housecleaning of the FCC to straighten up this phase of the mess in Washington.

The last phrase stirs memories—memories that Eisenhower was elected to office on a campaign to clean up that mess in Washington. Now will we have to elect another cleanup man?

Plenty of dirt has cropped in the Eisenhower administration that has been marked by the resignations of eight major officials who have quit under fire. Two were on the FCC and one was the President's right hand man, Sherman Adams. The Truman administration had no scandal worse than that associated with Adams, who was accused of taking favors from a Boston industrialist and using his influence in behalf of the industrialist.

The Democrats have a campaign issue themselves this time and surely they won't fail to exploit it.

But what do the people have? They elect one group which promises to throw the rascals out, only to let other rascals in.

Accidental War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a most thought provoking open letter from Jess Gorkin, editor of Parade magazine, to President Eisenhower and Soviet leader Khrushchev regarding accidental war was published in the March 20 issue of Parade.

The danger of accidental war in this pushbutton, missile era is real indeed. Mr. Gorkin makes a simple and practical suggestion to help avert such a

tragedy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I include a copy of Mr. Gorkin's open letter:

AN OPEN LETTER FROM THE EDITOR OF PARADE TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AND PREMIER NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV RE ACCIDENTAL WAR

GENTLEMEN: This open letter is respectfully written to make the following suggestion:

When you have your private talks in Moscow this June, I urge you to consider the establishment of a direct telephone line between you that will be open 24 hours a day, with standby interpreters. Its purpose: to prevent the possibility of an accidental war.

If you, as world leaders, are never more than a few minutes away from each other by telephone, then I believe the risk of accidental war will be immeasurably reduced.

Experts tell me that this system is not only technically feasible but inexpensive and could be established within a few days.

In response to this suggestion, one expert says: "Today President Eisenhower is seldom more than 1 minute away from some means of communication. By telephone, high-powered radio, even walkie-talkie, he can be reached almost instantaneously wherever he is—in the White House, in his plane, automobile, helicopter. I am sure that Premier Khrushchev is equally available for vital messages."

And what could be a more vital message than: "Mr. President, one of our missiles has gone astray. It is armed. We have been unable to destroy it in flight. I beg you to believe me, this is a terrible accident. It is not an attack."

Such a message would instantly alert U.S. defenses. It would also certainly give sufficient pause to the hand that presses the button for all-out retaliation.

An accidental war might be triggered by mechanical failure, human error, an innocent misunderstanding of orders, or plain ignorance. Such things happen every day in every walk of life.

One must add to this the possibility of sabotage, subversion, or the lunatic action of fanatics.

At least three of our missiles have gone awry:

1. In the spring of 1946, one of the most powerful rockets in the world at that time, an adaptation of the German V-2, was fired from the White Sands Proving Grounds in New Mexico. It went off course and crashed in a graveyard in Juarez, Mexico.

2. On April 14, 1955, a Nike missile accidentally took off from Fort Meade as a result of a short circuit. Fortunately, it landed just off a highly traveled road between Baltimore and Washington.

3. On December 5, 1956, a Snark long-range strategic missile took off from Patrick Air Force Base in Florida on a 3,000-mile closed circuit test mission. The missile missed its first turn and accidentally went into a Brazilian jungle.

You, Mr. Khrushchev, must know of Soviet missiles that have misfired or gone astray.

Today there are only four atomic powers—the United States, Russia, England, and France.

The highly reputable National Planning Association declares that in 5 to 10 years 25 more nations will be capable of joining the atomic club. Eleven of them, says the NPA, will be able "to embark on a successful nuclear weapons program in the near future." They are Red China, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, West Germany, East Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden and Switzerland.

Eight more—Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Holland, Poland and Yugoslavia—have the key resources and are

only short on scientific manpower, which they are busily training.

The remaining six—Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Norway, Spain and South Africa—have the cash, but must wait a little longer than the others to build up industry and scientists.

Rocket know-how is spreading just as rapidly as atomic know-how. Another great area for the risk of accident will thus be opened.

It is no exaggeration to say that a day may soon come when war by accident will be more of a menace to the world than war by design.

Today, only a relative handful of missiles stands armed and ready to go on the launching pads of East and West. In the near future there will be hundreds. They will be on the ground, underground, in submarines, in planes, on railroad flat cars, wherever man's ingenuity can put them. They will be on all five continents.

And as they spawn, the risk of accidental war spawns with them. Must they go unchecked?

Contact between you today, even on the most urgent matters, must wait on the cumbersome, slow-moving machinery of diplomacy, wholly unsuited to the lightning emergencies of the space age.

Gentlemen, I would respectfully remind you of that old saying paraphrased here: For want of a nail, a shoe was lost. For want of a shoe, a horse was lost. For want of a horse, a kingdom was lost.

Must a world be lost for want of a telephone call?

Respectfully,

JESS GORKIN.

The Missing Link

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very interesting editorial in the Waterways Journal published in St. Louis, Mo., on March 19, 1960, entitled "The Missing Link." The editorial points out the extreme importance of early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal and it reads as follows:

THE MISSING LINK

Prospects for the addition of a modest sum to the civil works appropriation bill for preliminary work on the Florida Cross-State Barge Canal in the fiscal year beginning on July 1 appear favorable, particularly if a united front can be maintained by proponents while the question is being weighed by congressional committees, an informed source reports. With most of the former opposition, largely centered in the Miami area, now melted away and with unequivocal support expected from Florida's delegations in both Houses of Congress, there is little reason for stalling this long-planned project any longer.

Over the years the proposed 12-foot channel from Jacksonville to the gulf coast (Ingalls, Fla.) has gained support, as its significance has become better understood, not just in the area which would be the immediate beneficiary but throughout the inland waterways system. Indeed, the Mississippi Valley Association, which speaks for water resource developers and shipping interests in the entire mid-continent area, has in-

cluded advocacy of the Florida channel as one of the major planks in its platform. Almost a year ago, the association's executive vice president, Everett T. Winter, journeyed from St. Louis to Washington to testify on behalf of the project, along with some 60 Floridians, before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Another well-known St. Louis waterways authority, Capt. A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., president of Federal Barge Lines, Inc., also spoke in favor of the canal at that time.

The proposed barge canal has aptly been termed the missing link in the inland waterways system. It would enable barge traffic originating anywhere in the present system to reach the Atlantic Ocean directly. Traffic interchange with intracoastal, coastwise, and international shipping at Jacksonville would open new sources of business for inland carriers, augmenting new tonnage consigned to or from that city, points along the route of the canal and nearby ports such as Tampa. The channel would undoubtedly also assume an important role in the Nation's defense program, which already must rely in many cases on water carriers to move missiles from inland arsenals to such bases as Cape Canaveral.

Capt. F. M. Hendry, a leading maritime figure in Tampa and forthright champion of the canal, last April gave the congressional committees eight sound reasons why the project should be built. Among benefits to accrue from the channel, he said, would be an increase in the Nation's and his State's economy, development of industry in a lagging area, a boom in smallcraft recreation and a strengthened national defense potential—even the difference between survival and failure in the next major world conflict.

These and other cogent arguments in favor of the canal, together with the quantity and quality of support which it has attracted, should assure the project a place in the forthcoming budget. It would seem that only lack of unity, indifference or overconfidence could now bring about defeat. With victory so close at hand, nothing should be allowed to interfere. The waterways need this final link.

Family Farm Income Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present my views on the Family Farm Income Act of 1960, of which I have the privilege to be one of the cosponsors.

The bill is designed to raise farm income, reduce surpluses, and slash Government costs. Perhaps it sounds difficult, but I believe it can be brought about. It provides for controlled production at fair price to producer and consumer. American farmers have been plagued by the present policies of the administration. Constantly lowering price supports and a weak control policy has greatly increased our surpluses. Farm income has been going down each year, with another 16 percent drop this year. I am told that the farm population has decreased by 15 percent; in 1952 there were 24.3 million people on the farm while we have only 20.8 million

people now. Similarly there has been a reduction of 15 percent in the number of farms; in 1952 there were 5.4 million farms while now there are only 4.6 million farms. Farm net income during this period has dropped from \$15.3 billion in 1952 to \$9.3 billion by January 1, 1960—that is, a fall of 40 percent. The parity ratio, the relationship between prices paid and prices received by farmers is at the lowest level in 19 years. At the end of 1959 the parity ratio stood at 77, a fall of 23 percent from 1952. This, Mr. Speaker, at a time when farm production expenses are up by 15 percent.

The farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has declined from 51 cents in 1947 to less than 38 cents at the close of the year. Farm marketing charges have increased by about 40 percent since 1947. Inflation and rising costs have affected the farmers adversely. Prices paid by farmers for commodities used in production, interest, taxes, and wages have risen from 240 percent of the 1910-14 parity base period of 1947 to nearly 300 percent in 1959. Meanwhile, prices received for farm products have declined from 276 percent of the base period of 1947 to around 230 percent in 1959.

Mass movement away from the farms has not fulfilled the prediction that such a shift would solve agriculture's problem of declining income.

Instead the migration of such people has created new problems for rural communities. The movement to the cities has also caused problems in the cities due to competition for a limited number of jobs. The conservation program of this administration has not yielded the desired results. With the present program the farmers can manage to adjust their crop rotation in such a way that it does not result in lower production. Storage charges on the overabundance is costing \$1.5 million a day, a colossal drain on the taxpayer. We are in chaos with this program.

The supply of a wide variety of high quality foods is the very foundation of our vast economic growth during the postwar period. It is unfortunate that the farmers who provided that food have not shared fully in the country's prosperity to which they have contributed so much.

With a view to curing some of the ills of the present farm situation the Family Farm Act of 1960 has been introduced. We believe it holds a promise of relief. The salient features of the bill are:

First, it reduces the cost to the Government by reducing the surplus in storage and by paying farmers in kind with grain taken from the existing surpluses. Marketing quotas will be set at a level which will allow a discharge of 10 percent of the surplus stocks each year that are held by the Government. The present storage cost of \$1.5 million a day will be reduced drastically each year. It is fair to mention here that any direct monetary subsidy without controls will tend to increase production. Our farm programs of the last 7 years have built a great surplus that will continue to hang like a Damocles sword over the farm economy and the Nation for many years. This bill provides payment in

kind, from the overflowing bins, in lieu of cash payments for the land placed in the soil bank. This would eventually balance the supply and demand aspect and we would not have disproportionately large reserves. It is also provided that the estimated cost to the Government in any year for any commodity shall not exceed 5 percent of the estimated crop sales of any commodity in that year.

Second. Our bill includes a voluntary program requiring a referendum, needing approval of two-thirds of the producers of each commodity to effect a change from the current program. The two-thirds vote feature has been introduced in order to keep the noncomplacent farmers from upsetting the program by growing more than those who follow the program. This way all the farmers will be obliged to follow the majority opinion. But if two-thirds of the producers voting in any such referendum do not vote in favor of such a program, the program then in effect under the laws on the date of enactment of this act shall remain in operation. Thus, you see, it would be the farmers themselves who would decide their own program, which, in other words means the farmers are given freedom to choose.

The farmers themselves, will adjust supply to demand by means of nationwide marketing orders or other commodity-stabilization procedures.

Third. The bill includes a soil bank feature. To take advantage of this feature the farmer must voluntarily take out of production 10 percent of his tillable land. In addition, to the 10 percent he has the option of putting in up to 30 percent additional tillable land for which he will be paid in-kind from the existing storage stocks.

The bill combines all feed-grains as a group and it would enable the producers of feed grain to sit down and evolve a workable total feed grain program.

Fourth. Midwestern dairy producers will be benefited. The bill enables the producers of meat, butter and cream and producers of milk for manufacturing and fluid consumption, to work out a national program on milk and butterfat which would make sense nationally as well as locally.

Fifth. Under the proposed bill, the school lunch and needy direct distribution program now in operation will receive increased moneys for distribution of high protein foods, not only milk but poultry and meat products also. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to spend \$500 million each year to purchase these items off the markets and make them available to the needy.

The greater use of these foods would directly create a greater demand for feed grains, to feed additional livestock which would also help to reduce present stocks of feed grains.

Sixth. The bill prepares the way for the HUMPHREY-WOLF food-for-peace program. I have been an advocate of and have worked for a food-for-peace program for a long time. We will be able to continue to push this program.

This bill tends to eliminate the depressing effects on main street. Under this proposal the placing of entire farms in the soil bank will be eliminated. No farmer will be allowed to put more than 40 percent of his tillable land into the soil-building base; moreover, payments or benefits under the act will be limited to not more than \$5,000 to any one farm operator in one year. The present practice all too often is to put the farm in the soil bank and then go to the city to work. This eliminates the demand for many community services normally needed.

I do not believe this is a perfect bill, but it is a step in the right direction. Modifications here and there will undoubtedly improve it. However, it does contain a suggested solution for many of the ills of the present program.

I would like to dwell upon the following features a little more in detail: First, feed grain and livestock; second, distribution of high protein foods in schools; third, small town economic situation; and fourth, food for peace.

FEED GRAIN AND LIVESTOCK SITUATION

The bill combines all feed grains as a group and would enable the feed-grain producers to decide for themselves what production program they want. This would be done by referendum and a two-thirds majority of producers of a specific commodity will make the decision. The combining of all feed grains is very important. Such things as overproduction of wheat often up-set the feed-grain situation under the present program. The envisioned commodity-by-commodity approach will not adversely affect other commodities. For example, wheat grown for feed will not be used for human consumption and vice versa. Great market fluctuations of feed grains have many times violently affected the price of livestock. More feed grains mean cheap feed grains thus depressing prices, and vice versa. A shortage of feed grains means high prices for livestock. These fluctuations are not desirable except to the profiteer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest one perfecting amendment. The bill now provides that only those farmers can vote in the referendum who have in the past, in at least three of the immediately preceding 5 years, sold not less than \$500 worth of the commodity in question. Since most of the feed grain producers in my district feed livestock, the feed grains they produce are fed on the farm. The value of their grain production is not counted. These farmers will in many cases become unable to take part in the referendum. In order to cover this point an amendment is needed. The farmers who have produced feed grains of the value of \$500 or more, whether sold or fed to their own livestock must not become disenfranchised.

We believe our bill would also directly help the meat, dairy and hog industry. Without a proper feed grain production planning program, overproduction results, which eventually depresses the farmers price of the meat producing and dairy industries. It is hoped that the part of the feed grain production can be

adjusted by increasing production of protein products, part of which under this bill will go to the school program. This would create a significant increased consumption of these abundant feed grains and thus create an additional supply of protein foods for the needy people. It would also provide an opportunity to the midwestern dairy producers to work out a comprehensive national program for milk and butterfat. I would not care to see any change in present marketing orders until this program is effective. I believe this dairy marketing area will deserve very serious study to be sure that we improve on rather than disrupt present marketing orders.

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH PROTEIN FOOD IN SCHOOLS

The bill provides for the increased distribution of high protein food—milk, poultry and meat to the schools and the needy. To many schoolchildren the only adequate meal is the one received at school. Many more children should be covered. Many of our needy senior citizens will also be aided.

The envisaged increased production of high protein foods—discussed under the feed grain and livestock—will be effectively consumed for the good of some of the people in areas in great need. Under this provision the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to spend \$500 million each year to purchase these items off the market, and make them available to the needy people. Mr. Chairman, this is a tremendously important section and should go far in helping the folks in real need in America.

SMALL TOWNS ECONOMIC SITUATION

This bill will help improve the situation in small towns. Under the existing program farm families put the entire farm in the conservation reserve, thereby depriving the local farmworkers jobs. Demand for goods and services is thus in two ways greatly reduced. This has greatly upset many small towns where alternate employment or business opportunities are not available. Many small businesses are forced out. This bill safeguards against putting the entire farm in the soil building base. A family can only retire land up to 40 percent of the total cultivated area. Another balancing feature is that no farm family will get payment or benefit more than \$5,000 a year for the retired land. With still 60 percent of the land under cultivation the farmer will have to stay on the farm. This would avoid farm population movement to the cities by putting the whole farm in soil reserve. These redeeming features will aid the economy of many small towns.

FOOD FOR PEACE

I have long been an advocate and have worked hard for a food-for-peace program. Under this bill a provision is made not only to protect our present commitments abroad under Public Law 480 but also to clear the way for my proposed food-for-peace program to help feed some of the hungry people of the world. This provision aims at promoting the foreign policy of the United States by helping to build essential world con-

ditions of peace by the more effective use of our abundant agriculture commodities for the relief of human hunger. Food can foster economic and social developments in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies. Mr. Speaker, I believe our agricultural surplus should be accepted as a blessing rather than a burden. America should feel proud that she is in a position to help feed the millions of undernourished people of the world. This is the only field in which America is a clear leader. Let us broaden the original food surplus dumping program under Public Law 480 in such a way as to include the proposed ideas in the Humphrey and Wolf food-for-peace bills for helping to feed the hungry people of the world.

It is humane to feed our hungry fellow human beings. But when we have such an abundance, we have a very great moral obligation. At the same time it is cheaper to send a bushel of wheat to a needy area than to keep it in bins over the long haul. A workable plan can be developed with wheat surplus countries like Australia, Canada, and so forth. This would avoid ill feelings between the have nations. These countries should also extend a helping hand in this humane venture. Agreed, it will be difficult, but this does not constitute an excuse. No great accomplishment in history was ever accomplished without hard work. This solution of our surplus problem is morally, politically, and financially worth a trial. Let us act sensibly and boldly to win friends through food. Let us act now to help our American farmers and our Nation out of the present dilemma.

Forty-second Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, wherever any white Russians or people whose ancestors came from Byelorussia gather, their thoughts are on their ancient homeland which is now suffering under the ruthless heel of despotic Communist oppressors.

It was on March 25, 1918, that Byelorussian patriots such as Lutskievich, Vatslav Lastovski, and others proclaimed their land as an independent republic. However, after the collapse of Germany, the Red army occupied the land and by February of 1919, all Byelorussia was in Communist hands. World War II ravaged that unfortunate country tremendously; 80 percent of all the houses at the cities of Minsk and Homel and 90 percent of Vitebsk were destroyed.

Byelorussia can be pointed to as an example of what befalls human beings

who are so unfortunate as to be under Russian bondage. Its leaders and intelligent persons were annihilated and others persecuted; its native culture suppressed and stifled; its religious life almost exterminated; and its people enslaved.

We in the United States, who take liberty and freedom for granted look with horror on the works of atheistic communism everywhere. As an American and as a Member of the Congress of the United States I strongly urge we support the worthy Byelorussian cause for liberation from the cruelties of Soviet Russia and that everything be done to assist them in their legitimate aspirations for justice.

Clarifying Jurisdiction in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the spring, 1960, issue of World Affairs there appears a review of Wallace McClure's book "World Legal Order" published by Chapel Hill, the University of North Carolina Press, 1959, sponsored by the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University. This review gives promise that the book will be valuable in clarifying the issues and the history of the relationship between internal U.S. law and the law of international treaties. I believe it will be a great contribution to a lasting peace through rule of law.

Under a previous unanimous consent, I am including the review here:

In a world in which political policies seem to be at conflict with fundamental principles of law, confusing their application and making us doubt their very validity, Dr. McClure comes forward with an analysis of American constitutional law so clear and forcible that one's faith in law is restored and the political obstacles seem to be less formidable than first appeared.

Here in the United States is a world legal order which might well be the contribution of the people of the United States to the solution of the problem. Our courts have proclaimed in case after case the supremacy of an international treaty over any national law to the contrary. As far back as 1796 the Supreme Court proclaimed, in *Ware v. Hylton* that an attempt on the part of the State of Virginia to convert debts owing to British creditors into debts owing to the State of Virginia was in violation of the higher obligations of the provisions of the peace treaty of 1783; and in *Cook v. United States*, as late as 1933, the Court held that the seizure of the *Mazel Tov* on the high seas, while legal under the later law of Congress, if dates alone were considered, was illegal under the treaty with Great Britain, which was not to be deemed abrogated unless an intention to that effect on the part of Congress was clearly expressed. In like manner, in part II of the volume, international common law is part of the law of the United States, and the decisions of the U.S. courts offer ample precedents upholding international customary law as the supreme law of the land.

In part III of the volume the author turns from national constitutional law to the legal structure of the world community, describing the United Nations as the international component of legal order, analyzing the United Nations both in respect to constitutional development through usage and explaining the policy of the United States and criticizing it in respect to the reservation entered to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, describing the policy as a setback to international adjudication. The emphasis put by the author upon world order as distinct from immediate national interests is highly commendable.

A closing chapter deals with "Human civilization and the law," summarizing the thesis of the volume and emphasizing the need of harmonizing law and justice, citing in this connection the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations that victories in the counting of votes are "likely to be illusory unless they are steps in the direction of lasting consent to a peaceful and just settlement of the questions at issue."

The World Rule of Law Center at Duke University in North Carolina is to be congratulated upon the first of its projected series of publications, which makes a constructive contribution to the greatest of modern problems, the establishment of the rule of law in international relations.

C. G. FENWICK.

The Religious Issue and the 1960 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I present a most interesting article, written by Ernest K. Lindley, which appeared last week in Newsweek magazine:

[From Newsweek, Mar. 21, 1960]

KENNEDY'S BIG ASSET

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

It is time for a blunt appraisal of the religious factor in the presidential campaign. Although Senator KENNEDY's Catholicism cuts both ways, the bulk of the evidence seems to me to indicate that it is a net asset—probably his most valuable practical political asset. How else can one explain the fact that in the public-opinion polls he has consistently shown up better than other Democrats when tested against Nixon, Rockefeller, and other Republicans? He has many assets, of course, but few which are unique. His intellect is first-rate but no better than that of several of his rivals, active or potential. He is a serious and generally well informed student of national and international affairs, but no more so than most of his Democratic competitors. Indeed, several can lay claim to longer and broader experience in public affairs. He is an astute campaigner. But, with allowance for Stevenson's limitations in this field, as much can be said of his rivals. His personality is exceptionally attractive, but the others do not lack magnetism.

BASE OF SUPPORT

Most of the other Democrats prominently mentioned for head of the ticket bear one or more special political handicaps, it is true. If KENNEDY's religion were such a handicap, he would not, I think, show up so well in

the public-opinion polls. Individually, these small samplings may err by a considerable margin but, nationwide, they have rather consistently indicated that KENNEDY is probably the best vote winner available to the Democrats. It is reasonable to suppose that this is because he attracts many of the Catholics who have recently voted Republican and that these outnumber the Democrats and independents who would vote against him because of his religion.

In appraising the religious issue, we should not be misled by the 1928 election. I "covered" that campaign as a reporter for the New York World and spent a good part of it traveling with Al Smith. His Catholicism was a factor but not in itself decisive. His opposition to prohibition, while an asset in the northern cities, hurt him in the South and rural and smalltown North and West. His East Side accent, lack of formal education, and brown derby had similar effects. (Senator Thomas J. Walsh, a good, dry Western Catholic Democrat, might well have held the South solid if he had been the presidential nominee.) The Republican Party was then more numerous than the Democratic. Herbert Hoover had long appealed to moderate independents and glowing prosperity practically guaranteed a Republican landslide.

BURDEN ON THE GOP

Although Smith lost 5 of the 11 Southern States, he carried Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Of the political handicaps he suffered, no more than two could apply to KENNEDY: Prosperity and Catholicism. Prohibition is a dead issue. KENNEDY is well-educated, indeed polished. Democrats outnumber Republicans, placing the greater burden of winning independent votes on the GOP.

Although the polls indicate NIXON will do well among independent voters, he lacks the nonpartisan background that Mr. Hoover had acquired through his relief activities and distinguished service under Mr. Wilson. Since 1928, especially in the last few years, the success of Catholic candidates for Governor and Senator in States with larger Protestant majorities indicates that fears about Catholic officeholders have diminished. It is doubtful if the interest of most Catholics in electing a Catholic President has diminished correspondingly.

I do not suggest that Catholics regularly vote for Catholic candidates. Certainly, many do not, especially when the non-Catholic candidate is obviously better qualified. But if I were a Catholic, I would seize the opportunity to break the barrier between Catholics and the Presidency—with the hope, too, that the Catholic, if elected, would by his conduct demonstrate that fears of a Catholic in the Presidency are unfounded.

Generally, conditions appear to favor a Republican victory in the 1960 presidential election. The Democrats may be able to win only by introducing a new factor. KENNEDY's Catholicism would be such a factor, and, in the net, probably a helpful one.

The Arab League—An Instrument of Peace?

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the magazine Prevent

World War III—No. 55, winter-spring 1960—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., contains a most interesting article entitled "The Arab League—An Instrument of Peace?" This article analyzes the history of the Arab League and its role in maintaining tensions in the Middle East. I believe this article would help to enlighten American public opinion with respect to Middle Eastern affairs, and I am accordingly inserting a condensed version in the RECORD below:

THE ARAB LEAGUE—AN INSTRUMENT OF PEACE?

In the world of politics, the use of catch phrases has a variety of functions. They may be employed to register a genuine achievement. Conversely, they can serve the ends of deception by proclaiming the attainment of an objective so as to conceal a dismal failure. The slogan of "Arab unity" would seem to fall into the latter category. It is forever on the lips of Arab politicians and propagandists. Indeed, it is repeated so frequently that even reputed experts on the Middle East accept this glittering phrase as though it were based on solid fact.

However, when one digs beneath the slogan of "Arab unity," one finds more substance to the charge that it helps to cover up profound and irreconcilable contradictions among the Arab states. A case in point is the Arab League, one of the few institutional setups which is supposed to belong to all of the Arabs. The Arab League, consisting of the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Iraq and Tunisia, is regarded as the Arab's prize exhibit of "Arab unity at work." How true is this allegation?

THE LEAGUE AT CASABLANCA

A few months ago the Arab League met at Casablanca. Press reports quoted the Arab foreign ministers meeting there, that the conference "boosted Arab solidarity from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic" (Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 9, 1959). Another report (New York Times, Sept. 6, 1959) termed the meeting "a new birth of unanimity." However, when one examines the work accomplished at this much ballyhooed conference, one finds that for all practical purposes it boiled down to the same old broken record, i.e., a pox on Israel. The Christian Science Monitor once noted editorially: "The best thing that the Arab League can say for itself is that it survives" (Sept. 10, 1959). The next best thing that can be said, is that the League's survival stems from its role as a breeder of hate and violence in the Middle East.

The whole world knows that unanimity vis-a-vis Israel is as simple as pie, and it is almost laughable that the foreign ministers from various Arab states had to travel all the way to Casablanca to reaffirm this rather dreary theme. In a very real sense, the fact that this was just about all that was "accomplished" gives negative proof of the deep-seated antagonism which beset relations among the Arab states. Indeed, before the League was able to convene the conference, the proposal to create a Palestinian Arab government (inspired by the Egyptians) was abruptly dropped. Knowing that Egypt's proposition would be at the expense of the Jordanian state, King Hussein's officials threatened to boycott the meeting unless the idea was discarded. It is also known that Jordan was willing to sit down with Egypt at the League meeting only after President Nasser informed the king through the league's secretary that he was not opposed to Jordan's claims to the throne of Iraq. In return, Hussein is reported to have pledged his support, should Nasser choose conflict with Israel. As one commentator described

it, the Arab League Conference in Casablanca petered out in the words of T. S. Eliot "not with a bang but with a whimper." The whimper is a pretty accurate description of the league's "accomplishments" since the day it was founded in March 1945.

LEAGUE'S BACKGROUND

What were the compelling factors influencing the establishment of the League? Perhaps the most important outside factor was British policy in the Middle East. During the war, Great Britain was very much concerned over the spreading Axis penetration into that area. This development created considerable difficulties for the allied states, both in Iraq and in Egypt. Apparently, the British felt that one way to counteract this danger, was to take the leadership in promoting the idea of Arab union. Thus, as Walter Z. Laqueur writes in his book, "The Soviet Union and the Middle East," the British believed that the League "would promote their interest in the Middle East." Furthermore, Mr. Laqueur points out that the British were also concerned with the French and Soviet influences in that strategic area. Consequently, the British Government encouraged the formation of the League and succeeded in pushing Egyptian leadership to the fore.

RIVALRIES

At first glance, the choice of Egypt is surprising. The history of Egypt's relations with other Arab States does not show an intimacy of purpose and action. Mr. Tom Little in his book "Egypt" observes that that country "being by temperament insular, was not pro-Arab, but history and Islam has made it Pan-Arab." The fact that Egypt had remained more or less aloof in her relations with other Arab States and yet showed a marked inclination to lead the Arab world, induced the British to involve her as a counterbalance to the Hashemite dynasty which ruled in Iraq and Jordan. This was particularly necessary in view of the fact that the Hashemites regarded the rest of the fertile crescent, i.e., Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine, as part of their natural domain. Therefore, the League, as the British saw it, was their means of preventing other countries from gaining influence while, at the same time, it was supposed to block any of the Arab governments from dominating the whole area.

The internal factors which brought the League into being, were the historical and cultural experiences shared by all of the Arab States. The dream of a United Arab empire was intermixed with the goals of a Pan-Islamic movement which also received powerful support in the Arab States. Furthermore, the League was looked upon as a potential vehicle that could be used against the West.

Yet, these very forces which seemed to make for unity, were burdened by contradictions. Thus, the idea of a united Arab empire is not exactly in harmony with Pan-Islam. Furthermore, the concept of a united Arab empire flies into the face of Arab nationalistic forces. Consequently, despite common bonds of language and religion, the Arab States have different historical developments, different traditions and memories, different physical environments, and different economic needs. It is clear then, that the very premises upon which the League was founded, was rent with contradictions from the very beginning. Egypt aimed at expelling the British forces and preventing the union of Iraq and Syria. Iraq, on the other hand, leaned more and more toward the West while, at the same time, seeking ways and means of gaining control over the so-called fertile crescent. Syria and Lebanon were both lukewarm to the Egyptians and the Iraqis while they sought their aid in expelling the French.

The clashes of interests among the Arab States were recognized in the league's constitution. Article 2 provides that the member states, while collaborating more closely with each other, are guaranteed their independence and sovereignty. Article 8 requires that every member state respect the forms of government prevailing in the other countries and to abstain from action calculated to change them. In short, the league, despite all of the fanfare attached to its creation as a symbol of Arab unity, could only be founded on the basis of the status quo. This means, it officially recognized that the member states had their own separate interests whose priority could not be denied. In a most enlightening analysis of the Arab League, Mr. J. S. Raleigh wrote: "The Arab League . . . is therefore—paradoxical as it may sound—not a Pan-Arab achievement but on the contrary a bulwark designed to protect the separate national independence of the Arab States, the inter-Arab status quo, against Pan-Arab union schemes" (Middle Eastern Affairs, March 1955). Discussing the rival schemes of the Hashemites versus the Egyptians, Mr. Raleigh further points out that this is clearly reflected in the constitution: "Constitutionally, therefore, the Arab League is based on an essential controversy that has been solved; in fact, it was only by leaving that decisive question open and ambiguous that the foundation of the league, cooperation between Egypt and Saudi Arabia on the one hand, and the Hashemite States on the other, was possible at all."

HOPES AND FAILURES

British hopes with regard to the possibilities of the Arab League have also fallen by the wayside. Here, too, the aim and result are not only wide apart but in a very real sense diametrically opposed to each other. This is seen by the fact though the British sponsored Egypt for leadership in the league, it has been the Egyptians who have been in the forefront in destroying British influence in the Middle East.

It is true that from its very inception, lip-service was paid to the idea of unity under the aegis of the league. However, in the actual workings of the league we find that the member states have more frequently ignored it on major issues. For example, Egypt did not consult the other members of the league on the nationalization of the Suez Canal. The league was not advised when Jordan grabbed part of Palestine in 1950 much to the chagrin and anger of the other Arab States. When Iraq signed the Baghdad Pact, she bypassed the league, as did Egypt when it annexed the Gaza Strip in 1949. One could cite many other cases where the member states entered into alliances, military and otherwise, where the league was left in the cold.

The divisions and squabbles among the member states became so bitter that within a few years after its founding it appeared to be a dead letter for all practical purposes. This was particularly true in 1950 when Jordan was denounced by Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia for having annexed Western Palestine. Only by resort to the old formula of "unanimity against Israel" was it possible to keep the League intact. Again the League's unifying power was found wanting in the fierce rivalry between Iraq and Egypt. To isolate Iraq, Egypt signed bilateral agreements with Syria and Saudi Arabia outside the League. Moreover, Egypt conceived the so-called Arab Collective Security Pact of April 1950. Ostensibly Israel was the target, but in reality, so Mr. Raleigh points out, it was an Egyptian move "to forestall any Iraqi-Hashemite schemes for union and aggrandizement."

The divisions and conflicts which have characterized inter-Arab relations, have put a damper on all major projects sponsored by the League. There have been a number of plans and blueprints for economic co-

operation and mutual aid. However, for the most part they have not been implemented. The decision to establish an all-Arab merchant fleet was never carried out. At one time, the League proposed to organize a civil aviation union as well as an all-Arab postal union. On another occasion the League recommended the development of an inter-Arab network of railway and roads. None of these plans have as yet materialized. Instead of economic harmony among the Arab States, one finds more rivalry and discrimination. Jordan is still at the mercy of Syria and Lebanon since she has no natural outlets to the Mediterranean for her export trade. The oil-rich Arab states are penny pinchers when it comes to helping their less fortunate Arab "brothers."

The difficulty of reaching agreement among the League members evoked an ironic comment by Boutros Ghali, professor of Cairo University, in his book "The Arab League." "Actually," Professor Ghali wrote, "the achievement of purely technical agreements among the Arab states involves a far more cumbersome process than the conclusion of political agreements with foreign states."

ROLE OF THE LEAGUE

Thus, we find that in all key spheres where the league was supposed to exercise an important influence, very little has been accomplished. Nevertheless, its advocates and supporters pretend that the league is a powerful factor in the life of the Arab States. The present secretary general of the Arab League, Abdel Khaliq Hassouna, is a very active man forever propounding the advantages of the league and assuring outsiders of its vitality and value.

Mr. Hassouna denies that the league is but a shell and vehemently rejects the charge that the league is the tool of any single Arab state. As an Egyptian, Mr. Hassouna's resentment against the accusation that the league is an Egyptian instrument, is quite understandable. But what are the facts? In the first place, the league from its very inception, was dominated by Egypt. The first secretary general was also an Egyptian. The permanent headquarters of the league is in Cairo and it is estimated that approximately four-fifths of the league's staff are Egyptian. It is also a fact that members of the league's staff have frequently been borrowed from the Egyptian Foreign Ministry. Moreover, the Egyptian Government foots the major portion of the league's budget.

The political aspects of Egypt's domination are perhaps more evident today than they were before Nasser took over. But even under the corrupt King Farouk the Egyptians dominated the deliberations of the league. It was under Egyptian inspiration that the league was prepared to expel Jordan in 1950. From the very beginning Egypt manipulated the league in such a way as to block the union of Iraq and Jordan. Obviously, Egypt aspired to play first fiddle in the Middle East.

NASSER'S TACTICS

When King Farouk was overthrown in 1952, the Egyptian officer clique headed by Nasser, was faced with important internal problems. There was the Moslem Brotherhood organization which yearned for power and therefore represented a dangerous challenge to the Nasser movement. This was complicated by the fact that the popular Egyptian General Naguib, who had become President of the newly established Republic, appeared to have ties with the brotherhood. Naguib himself, because of his popularity, was a figure to be reckoned with. There were other forces at work, both on the radical left and on the right, which created additional difficulties for Nasser. Therefore, Nasser's main concern in this period was to consolidate his hold on the Egyptian people. Once he was able to build a firm domestic

base, then he could take bolder measures in foreign relations.

Under these circumstances, the Arab League marked time while its future role awaited Nasser's evaluation. With all of the difficulties at home, Nasser was in no mood to stir a hornet's nest abroad. Therefore, he tried to assure rival states, particularly Iraq, that his government was seeking friendship and had no designs on others.

In August 1954 Nasser told a friend: "Nuri is in power in Iraq. This is the time to reach an understanding with him" (Tom Little, "Egypt"). In retrospect, this was a remarkable statement, because Nuri al-Said, the late leader of Iraq, has since been depicted by Cairo as the archtraitor to the Arab peoples. Of course, Nasser took this soft line toward Nuri al-Said in 1954 because of domestic difficulties which prevented him from taking a more aggressive stand. Other calculations may have entered into Nasser's tactical moves. Perhaps he hoped to make a deal with Iraq outside of the league which would result in Egypt's leadership of the Arab world. He knew very well that little could be done within the league because the Iraqi politicians had already come to the conclusions that it was nothing but a tool of Egyptian policy.

The extent to which Nasser tried to ingratiate himself with Iraq is illustrated by the fact that in May 1954 he told the Syrian Ambassador that Egypt would not object to Syria joining Iraq or Jordan "as long as there was public support for the policy." This was an astounding position to take, since it meant Egypt's endorsement of the Fertile Crescent scheme which had been the heart's desire of the Hashemite dynasty. However, before the year was up, Nasser's views had changed. His hope of winning over Nuri al-Said by smiles did not work. On the contrary, under Nuri al-Said's leadership, Iraq entered into talks with Turkey and Britain which eventually resulted in the Baghdad Pact of 1955. Four days after Iraq had entered into an agreement with Turkey which led to the pact, Nasser gave the signal for an unprecedented propaganda attack against Nuri al-Said, and the Iraqi government which he represented was overthrown.

He described Nuri el-Said as a collaborator and symbol of the old regime of oppression and corruption. By such tactics Nasser was able to incite wide masses of the Arab people and to distract his own people from their pressing problems. This made it possible for Nasser to embark on a bolder and more aggressive foreign policy. It was then that Nasser began to reactivate the Arab League as a means of isolating Iraq and carrying out Nasser's policies through the area.

"DEMOCRATIZING" THE LEAGUE

Nasser has tried in every possible way to polish up the Arab League so that it will appear as the shining symbol of "Arab unity." Membership in the League has been broadened although it still does not cover all of the Arab areas. Lately, the Secretary General of the League has tried very hard to win over Tunisia to participate in the League's work. Thus, Nasser's chief delegate at Casablanca proposed that the League's council quash the resolution by which the League last October (1958) condemned Tunisia for its dispute with Cairo. These gestures have not impressed President Bourguiba who has been one of Nasser's favorite whipping boys. Bourguiba knows that Cairo is still the headquarters of forces that are striving to subvert the Tunisian Government.

THE LEAGUE'S "NEUTRALITY"

In this connection it is noteworthy that both, Tunisia and Iraq, have avoided participation in the League's work for some time. It is obvious to them as it is to any

student of the League's operations, that it is in essence an instrument of Nasser's boundless ambitions. The Secretary General of the League told the Christian Science Monitor (October 14, 1959): "I challenge anyone to mention a single instance in which the organization has not been strictly neutral and impartial." Mr. Hassouna must have made this declaration with tongue in cheek. According to article 8 of the League's constitution, every member state is pledged to respect the forms of government prevailing in the other Arab countries and to abstain from any actions calculated to change them.

Yet, it is a notorious fact that the Nasser regime has systematically violated the spirit and letter of this article. Nasser has instigated assassination and revolt in the other Arab countries. His agents and propaganda mouthpieces are constantly striving to undermine Arab governments which refuse to kowtow to him. Practically every country in the Arab League itself has been victimized at one time or another by Egypt's flagrant subversive activities and brazen interference in their domestic affairs. The recent revolts in Iraq and the attempted assassinations of Premier Kassem revealed the long arm of Nasser. In September (1959) Nasser spoke softly to the King of Jordan; the following month King Hussein was called an imperialist tool. On October 12, Jordanian authorities announced the seizure of quantities of arms and explosives smuggled in from the UAR.

VIEWS ON THE LEAGUE

What has the league done to call Mr. Nasser to account? Failure to do so does not indicate genuine neutrality but, on the contrary, complicity. If the league were truly neutral, it would have acted long ago against Nasser, since the very essence of the league's constitution is based on the mutual respect that all member states were to have for each other. Without that mutual respect and pledge of noninterference the league would never have been born. The fact that the league has now failed utterly in this respect is perhaps the most convincing proof of its subservience to Egyptian policy. The subordinate relationship of the Arab League to the Nasser regime was described by the Lebanese newspaper *Al-Ahrar* which wrote that the Arab people "rejoice at the change in the policy of Abdul Nasser who has renounced violence in favor of softer methods in his efforts to regroup the states of the Arab League under his moral authority" (Sept. 13, 1959). The enthusiasm shown by this particular newspaper is in sharp contrast to the prevailing attitude toward the league and its mentor. Here are some examples:

The Jordan daily newspaper "Falastin" devoted a special article to the occasion of the League's 13th anniversary: "The League did not succeed in its mission and did not bring any benefit to the Arab peoples. From the day of its founding it became a shelter for idlers and dervishes who live at the cost of the Arab peoples and are financed by them. When worms devour the pillars of a building it is best to destroy it, and this is the case with regard to the decayed League. It is therefore fitting that the date of March 22 be observed each year as an annual day of lamentations of the League and not as a day of festivities" (March 22, 1958).

Yehya Hawash, a Palestinian refugee, wrote in "Falastin": "It is better that the League should mourn itself. It is over 10 years now that the League talks about Palestine. What did the Arabs of Palestine gain by this? The League should leave the refugees alone and not use their sad lot for public exhibition" (April 4, 1958).

"After the Egyptian revolution and the start of the struggle between Cairo and

Baghdad, the League gradually turned into an Egyptian tool. The chorus of opponents to this phenomenon spread from North Africa to Jordan and Iraq, and the demand was raised that the League's seat be transferred from Cairo to a neutral Arab capital such as Beirut or Khartoum and that the post of Secretary General be given, on occasion, to someone from another Arab country (than Egypt)" ("Al-Hayat," Beirut daily, August 9, 1959).

Thus, it is clear that "Arab unity" finds no solid basis in the Arab League.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 8601 to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that this civil rights bill comes before us so strapped by the rule of germaneness as to be almost impossible to strengthen by amendment.

I am the author and sponsor of a number of bills which I believe should be included in this measure and which this Congress should have an opportunity to at least consider. I will briefly list them:

H.R. 351: An omnibus civil rights bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in housing, employment, education and political participation.

H.R. 352: Permits Attorney General to initiate in the name of the United States civil actions to prevent conspiracies which interfere with civil rights of any person.

H.R. 353: Federal Antilynching Act for the protection of all persons from lynching.

H.R. 354: To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

H.R. 500: To prohibit the shipment of explosives in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of endangering lives or illegally destroying property.

H.R. 501: To prohibit the use of Government property by any organization practicing segregation on the basis of race, creed, or color.

H.R. 4261: To amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the United States and to broaden the duties of the commission.

H.R. 9318: To establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

These measures should be included in the bill. They would be of enormous assistance in guaranteeing full equality to all of our people everywhere.

I originally intended to offer amendments to this bill substantially identical

to my bill H.R. 500 which outlaws transportation of explosives in interstate commerce to injure or destroy person or property of another. This would raise a presumption that explosives so transported were shipped in interstate commerce and permit Federal authorities to enter and assist State officers to apprehend and punish those guilty of the bombings of churches, schools and places of business and residence. This amendment was offered with my support by a member of the Judiciary Committee. I regret that it was not adopted. I had further intended to offer an amendment outlawing lynching as provided by my bill H.R. 353, but after careful study of the House rules find such an amendment would not be germane to the legislation now pending and so would be stricken on a point of order.

I am also sorry that the provisions of former title III, identical to my bill H.R. 352, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] were stricken on a point of order. Adoption of this language would have enabled the Attorney General to institute civil proceedings to protect any right guaranteed by the Constitution.

It is interesting to note that day after day we have heard Members of this body point out the almost unanimous support for every citizen having the right to vote. Yet we have observed strong opposition to effective legislation which would have permitted vigorous Federal action to effectuate that high purpose.

I supported the provisions to establish a system of Federal enrollment officers where necessary to act to guarantee citizens in their right to vote where there has been a pattern or practice denying that right because of race or color.

In my view that provision is superior to the voting referee proposal which raises certain constitutional questions. I will however support the voting referee proposal although I regard it as less suited to the purpose. The enrollment officer provision would be vastly more effective in guaranteeing citizens their right to vote. It would not require citizens to, in effect, run the gauntlet before they could properly secure their voting rights and would be available on a finding either by the courts or by the Civil Rights Commission that a pattern or practice of denial of right to vote existed because of race or color.

The need for effective action in this is obvious. Father Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, and a member of the Civil Rights Commission, at a civil rights conference at that great school recently, in which I participated, told of "literally millions of people qualified to vote who are not able to vote." Father Hesburgh went on to tell of these disfranchised millions who are veterans of long wartime service, lawyers, doctors, ministers, doctors of philosophy, college presidents, college graduates, all taxpayers and many of them property owners, whose only real disqualification is that the community in which they reside prevents Negro suffrage by many subtle and direct ways. For example, there were some 214,213

Negro citizens living in 57 counties without a single registered Negro voter.

The full report of the Civil Rights Commission is replete with numerous examples to convince even the most skeptical that American citizens are being denied participation because of race or color in the voting process which is so indispensable to real democracy.

I have been greatly concerned over the inability of Americans to solve problems of living together peacefully, and sharing the benefits of living in our great democracy without racial discrimination. For this reason I was one of the sponsors and the third signer among the more than 200 Members of the House who signed the discharge petition which compelled the Rules Committee to bring this matter to the floor. This problem must be solved by all right thinking men working together, but legislation is desperately needed to establish a climate in which the great principle of equality may grow and prosper. It must be faced vigorously on all levels of government; judicial, legislative, and executive.

We must learn to live together and to recognize a man for his individual worth and not for the color of his skin.

The bill before us with the amendments included on the floor is by no means as strong as I would like to see it. If it is vigorously and properly enforced I am hopeful that it will result in progress in this field of human rights. Certainly the Attorney General and President will have no excuse but to act vigorously and use the process of law now being enacted to carry out the real intention of the Constitution.

I pledge my unwavering support and continued vigorous efforts in behalf of effective and strong civil rights legislation.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD at this point my two statements on civil rights legislation before the House Committee on the Judiciary during the hearings held in the 1st session of the 86th Congress:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 15TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DINGELL. I am a member of another committee which is meeting this morning and although I would like to talk longer before you here I will have to be a bit brief, Mr. Chairman.

I have never known a man for whom I have had more respect and regard than the outstanding chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to say that many of these bills proposed have a great deal of merit. I would like to associate myself with the chairman of the distinguished committee and urge enactment of his bill which I feel would be a great deal stronger and which would offer a great deal more advance, much faster than the administration's proposal offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]. I want to say that any civil rights legislation if it be worthwhile and if it offers any concrete progress of course would be in the public interest. I think we should not waste our time, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in reporting out a piece of civil rights legislation which offers less than

a long stride forward in this particular field. I am sure the members of the committee are well familiar with the bills which are already pending. I would like to comment briefly on two of them, Mr. Chairman, and to let my written statement apply to the others.

The first that I wish to refer to is the bill which would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency of the United States and to broaden the duties of the Congress to include investigation of all civil rights anywhere. This bill is numbered H.R. 4261. It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Rights Commission has been balked, blocked, delayed, harassed, and hampered by those who oppose its purposes and principles and who seek to narrow and limit its endeavor. Unfortunately Congress in its wisdom did not give sufficient thought to the problems that this Civil Rights Commission would meet when it first enacted legislation creating this Commission. The result was that the Commission has not been able to accomplish a great deal other than to make us aware of one basic fact which I think we all knew, that many of our citizens are being denied the right to vote in many parts of this great country and that there are many who are using all efforts to deny the Federal Government its right and its responsibility to see to it that its citizens are permitted to vote without regard to race, creed, color, or ancestry.

I would like to urge, Mr. Chairman, that if the life of the Civil Rights Commission is to be extended that it should be extended indefinitely. I would further urge that the Civil Rights Commission be permitted to extend and to broaden its field to include all civil rights.

Mr. Chairman, I am sponsor of another piece of legislation which I think this committee should very well consider, and that is H.R. 352. This would authorize the Attorney General to institute on behalf of and at the cost of the United States a civil action in equity for preventive relief whenever any acts have been committed which would give rise to a cause of action under section 1980 of the Revised Statutes. This would literally authorize the Attorney General to take any action to secure any rights protected and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States on behalf of any individual or group of individuals. This section 3 of the administration's recommendation previously when it was in Congress was reduced and narrowed in the Senate of the United States. I think if we pass this particular measure or a substantially similar measure we will find that this will be a tremendous step forward.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I would be glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCULLOCH.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the witness feel that there is any different attitude on this very controversial matter than there was when the House adopted it in effect last year or the year before?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not feel that there is any less need for a piece of legislation of this sort. I think certainly the House has established a very fine precedent in having adopted a piece of legislation of this sort. I know it is not included in the President's recommendation. I think it is an oversight since he said this is a good thing once before, and I don't think he would change his attitude on a matter so basic and important, nor do I feel any Member of this Congress who had previously voted for a matter of this sort could or should change his position. I am trying to answer the question, I want the gentleman to know. If the gentleman wants to ask me more questions or different questions or to elucidate on his question further I will be delighted to do my level best to do it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I think that the answer up to this point has been clearly responsive to the question and I thank the witness very much. I interrupted when I thought the answer had been made, for the purpose of making this friendly comment. I think the gentleman will recall that a number of us on this subcommittee gave the best we had during one of the most difficult times we had in the House within my time when the title in question was enacted.

Mr. DINGELL. I would certainly like to compliment the gentleman on his vigorous efforts on behalf of this proposal during the last session. I am very well aware of his efforts and on behalf of the people of my district I want to thank and commend the gentleman. I want to express high regard for him.

Mr. McCULLOCH. And if I may go on, of course the gentleman knows the unhappy experience that was had after that time, when the bill was finally enacted by both Houses of the Congress and that title was not included. It has been my feeling that sometimes the only way that any progress can be made is by moderation and compromise and give and take and I have never thought that it served a useful purpose, if I can paraphrase a famous statement, to march them up the hill and march them down again. That is the reason I pursued this. I cannot speak for the President on this particular matter in any way whatsoever, but the experience that we had last time has left its effect on a number of people who marched up the hill and marched down again.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to look upon it in a little different way, if I may. We should place in any kind of a bill that we present to the House as strong as possible a civil rights plan as we can muster up or conjure up. We may not be able to get all we want, but you know the Indians used to shoot at the moon with their arrows. They knew they could never hit the moon but they thereby became expert arrow shooters.

Now, we don't care what the Senate may do. We passed title III which is to my mind a very important segment of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which I might modestly say bears my name. The Senate saw fit to delete title III. As far as I understood the administration approved title III and now I don't think it was mere oversight. I think it was deliberate for reasons best known to the administration and title III has been eliminated from the administration program. I am sorry about this, but I will do all I can to reinstate title III or something like it in the bill before us, the bill we will endeavor to present to the House. The House passed it in 1957, and there is no reason we cannot pass it again and I repeat the responsibility for taking it out, if they wish to take it out, lies with the Senate.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to agree with the chairman and disagree with my distinguished colleague from Ohio. I feel that moderation entailed progress in the law and that there should not be vindictive action. Moderation certainly includes respect of the law, and must include progress toward equal rights for all. As the distinguished chairman said, shooting high is a necessary aspect of achieving success. If you shoot to be President of the United States you will rise high. If you shoot merely to become a streetsweeper—and I do not demean that particular profession—you will not necessarily reach higher than being a streetsweeper.

I think in this we should approach it with an awareness that section 3 was and is now good for America. It is my hope we will give the Senate a good, strong piece of legislation. Then if they want to weaken it or water it down, that of course is the Senate's prerogative. We will have the satisfaction of knowing that we in the House of Representatives have done the level best we

could. I once heard a saying that it is not necessary to succeed to persevere. I don't think—and I think the prior remark would buttress my statement—I don't think that section 3 was in any way a vindictive piece of legislation or that it was less than moderate. The President in one of his press conferences said it was a very moderate thing. It substituted for criminal penalties the gentle and mild persuasion and of equity and the mild, compulsive effect and the understanding which we find in equity as opposed to the harsh and perhaps vindictive approach that we see in a court of criminal jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct myself to a bill of mine, H.R. 500, which would outlaw the transportation of explosives in interstate commerce for the purpose of destroying or injuring the person or property of another without his consent. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that this is a good deal broader than some of the other legislation that has been introduced on the same point. It applies to injury or destruction of the person or property of another, which is a good deal broader than just churches or schools. For every bombing of a church or school there have been 15 or 20, and perhaps even 50 or 100, bombings of homes, private residences, and so forth.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that this particular piece of legislation is bottomed on the interstate commerce clause. We have a long judicial tradition on this particular subject. You will note the Lindbergh law which has been discussed this morning. We also include under the Federal power the fleeing from one State to another to avoid testifying or to escape criminal prosecution. We include the carrying of a stolen automobile, or other stolen property, across the State line. We also have the well-known Mann Act which affects the transportation of certain other objects in interstate commerce. There is an adequate basis in judicial tradition for this particular piece of legislation.

I would say that we add to this provision of the bill of Mr. McCulloch which would result in a still more complete proposal in that we would attack both the carriage of the explosive in interstate commerce and the freeing in interstate commerce after having committed the act of destroying the person or the property of another in one State.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do want to congratulate the members of the committee and yourself for this early hearing, to commend you for your interest in this most important subject. I want to express to you on behalf of myself and my people back home the sincere hope that this committee will report out a strong and vigorous piece of legislation, that we will not temporize or be concerned with the fact that the Senate may vote down a piece of legislation or that it will be watered down. I have not doubt that the bill will be watered down in the ordinary course of pressure in the House and the Senate, and I would say that this is all the more reason why we should at this initial stage report out strong and vigorous legislation. We seek to secure a piece of legislation which will protect the rights of all people and which will include progress for all of us within the framework of the Constitution.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman.
The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MILLER.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. DINGELL, I was interested in your comments concerning H.R. 352 and allied legislation that you said was very mild and that it substituted milder provisions for the criminal provisions; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. In previous bills which the Congress considered it did not substitute those provisions for the criminal statutes. It repealed no criminal statutes. We already have criminal statutes on the books that cover all these things. This injunctive pro-

vision was an addition thereto and not a substitute therefore.

Mr. DINGELL. Perhaps I gave the wrong impression. I would agree with the gentleman, and I do not urge the repeal of any existing Federal criminal statutes. Our Federal criminal statutes on this subject, including those passed in the last civil rights bill of the last Congress, have been found to be sadly wanting in protecting the rights of all of our people. I do not see that the passage of H.R. 352 or any other similar legislation would result in a complete cure to the problem of securing full equality for all the people of our country that we face today, but it is a more lenient and a more gentle form of persuasion than the criminal processes which might be available but which our experience indicates would not be available under our existing criminal statutes.

I am sure that the gentleman will recall that the really strong civil rights statutes were either repealed or held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court for one reason or another back in the 1870's and 1880's, and even the really strong codes which we had on the subject of civil rights have been eroded away except to include a few statutes today which are virtually unworkable.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions? We are obliged to you, Mr. DINGELL, for a very interesting statement.

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL, 15TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AT THE HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION ON MARCH 5, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for the honor and privilege of being here today to testify on the very important subject of civil rights legislation. I want to congratulate and commend the distinguished and able chairman of this committee for his long record as an outstanding civic libertarian, well known for his sincere espousal of the cause of full equality for all Americans, no matter what their race or religious affiliations.

My statement today will be brief. I am sure we all recognize that inherent in the Judeo-Christian religion is the concept that we are all children of God and are all created in His image. This is inherent in both the New Testament and the Old Testament.

In like manner we read in the great documents of American history that all men were created equal. The language of the Declaration of Independence is quite explicit on this and it reads as follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We are all well familiar with the language of articles XII, XIII, XIV, and XV of the Constitution, and most specifically, the language of article XIV and its due process clause which reads "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Article XV provides "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The amendment further provides that "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

These general principles are basic to all of the beliefs which we have in this country. Citizens from many lands have come here in search of freedom which they were denied in their country of origin. In the orderly

course of time many of these citizens have found this freedom. Yet each group has found certain discriminations waiting on its arrival.

The Irish and the Germans of the 1850's found signs saying no Irish or Germans need apply. These and other races found discrimination placed against them on their arrival. With the passage of history we have found them to be among our most industrious and worthwhile citizens. Indeed we are proud both of people whose forebears came from these lands and of the contributions which they have made to our beloved America.

No less proud are we of the contributions of the others who came; the Poles, the Serbs, the Czechs and the hundred and one other nationality groups who have contributed to our growth, progress and to our defense of our liberties in time of war.

All of us, Mr. Chairman, recognize that real liberty in this country is not shared by all of us to the fullest degree.

Discrimination of all sorts, subtle and otherwise, still besets citizens of almost every racial and religious background in one part or another of our land. No part of America is truly free of this cancerous growth.

So long as this exists we must recognize that no man or woman in America is completely free, regardless of the color of his skin or his religious affiliation.

For this reason I have introduced legislation on the general subject of civil rights. I prefer to call it human rights. I will refer to them by number and briefly detail what they do. It is my hope that this committee will report out one or the other of these bills or all of them, if possible.

Certainly, the very least that this committee and this Congress can do will be to continue progress in the fields of human relations by bringing out vigorous civil rights legislation.

By number, my bills are as follows:

H.R. 351: An omnibus civil rights bill to outlaw lynching, segregation in housing and transportation, to establish a code of fair employment practices and a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. This bill also outlaws the poll tax and strengthens existing Federal civil rights statutes in a number of other ways.

H.R. 352: A bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute on behalf of and at the cost of the United States a civil action for preventive relief whenever any acts have been committed which would give rise to a cause of action under section 1980 of the Revised Statutes.

This bill would authorize the Attorney General to institute on behalf of and at the cost of the United States a proceeding for injunctive relief in the name of any citizen whose rights under Federal law or the Constitution are being abridged by any individual or group.

This is a very mild piece of legislation. It has already been included in the recommendations of the President under a previous Congress and was included under one of the so-called administration civil rights bills earlier. That bill, however, was modified and so-called section 3 was narrowed and limited only to the right to vote. It would substitute for criminal penalties the suasion of courts of equity and their milder compulsive powers, which could better handle complex problems of human relations involving intense emotions.

H.R. 353: This bill outlaws lynching or violence which injures, kills or maims its victims where used to terrorize and intimidate or harass members of religious or racial groups to prevent them from free exercise of rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

H.R. 354: This bill is a compulsory Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. Its purpose

is to guarantee that a man shall be entitled to work for a living and to rise consistent with his ability. Its economic purpose is to outlaw racial discrimination which is a tremendous economic waste, computed by some to cost Americans billions of dollars a year.

H.R. 4261: A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency of the United States and to broaden the duties of the Commission to include the investigation of all civil rights anywhere.

In addition to these pieces of legislation I have introduced a bill, H.R. 500, to outlaw transportation of explosives in interstate commerce for the purpose of destroying or injuring the person or property of another without his consent.

This bill is aimed at the protection of all citizens. Its purpose is to see to it that the bombing and harassment of harmless and oftentimes helpless citizens throughout this country, churches, homes, and schools will be matters of Federal concern. Under this bill the Federal Government may enter the scene immediately after destruction of property or person by explosives on the presumption that such explosives were transported in interstate commerce. It is such transportation that is criminal under the bill which is an exercise of the interstate commerce power and strikes at all those who seek to harass and intimidate our citizens by bombing because of their activities on behalf of full equality or because of their racial or religious background.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this committee under your able leadership will report out some workable civil rights legislation to continue the progress that we began during the last session of Congress with the passage of the civil rights bill of the 85th Congress.

To do less would be to stagnate and to pass up an opportunity for real advancement in one of the most important fields of citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today.

Behind the Beard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Houston Post of March 17, which gives the views of a Catholic priest on the horrible situation in Cuba:

BEHIND THE BEARD—PRIEST BELIEVES CUBA MERELY "TRADED BUTCHERS" IN REVOLT
(By Joseph Martin and Phil Santora)

Father Juan Ramon O'Farrill has heard the last whispered confessions of at least 15 men sent to "the wall" to face Castro firing squads. He has accompanied the condemned along the "last mile" of dark corridors, trying to soothe their troubled minds with mere words, reciting the Litany up to the moment when his words were drowned out in the rattle of gunfire.

The experience has scarred him—even more so than the executions conducted by former Dictator Fulgencio Batista, because Father O'Farrill is one of the many men

who believed that Fidel Castro was the answer to Cuba's problems.

He has been thoroughly disillusioned. He has seen men condemned to die with little or no evidence of guilt against them. He has seen prisoners suffer cruel mental tortures in sadistic "execution rehearsals."

He says of Castro, whom he once followed: "Fidel is a magician, a master of simulation, of pretense. He says one thing today and the opposite tomorrow. He is a great actor. His ego has no limits and his cruelty has no limits. Compared to him, Batista was a benevolent man filled with understanding."

The 5-foot-6, brown-haired, brown-eyed priest was born on O'Farrill Street in Havana 43 years ago. The street is named for his grandfather, who fought with Jose Marti in the war against Spain. The little priest's father, also Juan Ramon O'Farrill, was a distinguished officer in the Cuban Army.

He was educated in Cuba and Paris and ordained in 1945 in the province of Cienfuegos.

During the Batista regime, Father O'Farrill was accused of secreting arms for Castro. He was taken into custody by the infamous Esteban Ventura, of the fifth precinct, and brutally beaten. Ventura's men smashed his ribs with rifle butts and partly destroyed the hearing in his left ear during a 9-hour grilling.

The youthful-looking cleric was forced into exile in Miami. On January 6, 1959, a few days after Castro's successful revolt, he obtained permission to go back to Cuba and visit the prisons to console and bring spiritual peace to the condemned men.

CRUELTY WAS SICKENING

"The Castro people thought I would obtain evidence against Batista followers," said Father O'Farrill, "but I refused to use my priest's robes for such purposes. My visits to the cells of the condemned, the kangaroo courts that passed capricious judgment on political prisoners, the cruelties and the utter disregard for human life and human rights sickened me."

"The Fidelistas became masters of the sadistic tricks. One of these was to tell condemned men they had been pardoned, that the president had signed their release from prison. While they were still rejoicing over the good news, an American, Herman Marks, would show up and tell them they were doomed to die."

Herman Marks is typical of the blood-thirsty Castro regime—the group that ironically came into power because Cubans were sick of being subjected to Batista's butcheries.

His police record includes 32 arrests on charges ranging from drunkenness, vagrancy, and assault to auto theft, draft-dodging and rape. Born in Milwaukee, Marks cut quite a criminal path for himself. In 1938, he escaped from a Wisconsin reform school. In 1946, he got away from an Ohio jail and 1950 from a California industrial farm.

He did 3½ years in the Wisconsin State Prison for raping a 17-year-old girl. Warden C. Burke remembers him as a "real stinker."

The 38-year-old soldier of fortune has a flair for the dramatic. On his left arm he wears a tattooed double heart inscribed "Love, Nellie." On his right arm is an 8-inch snake coiled about a dagger stuck through the top of a skull with the motto, "Death Before Dishonor."

And death is what Herman Marks has been dealing in; he has given the "ready, aim, fire" orders to more than 200 firing squads. He joined the Castro forces in the Sierra Maestra in December 1957, and has admitted executing as many as 11 men in a single night. He lost his job as executioner recently.

CASTRO BROKE PROMISE

"Many times in the final moments of truth, the condemned pleaded their innocence," recalls Father O'Farrill, "but these last words cannot be told, nor can the men be identified, because of the sacredness of the confessional. But there are some I can talk about."

Reinaldo Baro Merodio, for instance. Reinaldo was 22, one of the hundreds of Batista soldiers thrown into jail by Castro after the successful revolt. Castro had promised Gen. Eulogio Cantillo, head of the Batista forces, that he would not prosecute soldiers unless they had committed crimes of terrorism.

He ratified this promise in a speech in Santiago de Cuba on January 1, 1959. He repeated it in a speech at Columbia Barracks on January 28. It turned out to be a clear-cut betrayal; he was in this way able to win over the army.

"Reinaldo's only crime was that he had been a soldier, and at his age not a soldier for very long," said Father O'Farrill.

"His trial was conducted at night. I asked to be present and permission was denied. At 2:30 a.m. the trial was adjourned and he was taken to his cell. I presumed it would go on the next day and was about to leave when I overheard a group of officers say, 'Che Guevara has given a personal order that this man must be executed right now.'"

"I went to Duque Estrada, in charge of the tribunal, and asked him for the written sentence. He said the command came from El Che and what else did I need? He said there was nothing we could do. I asked permission to go to Reinaldo and break the news and give him absolution."

"He replied that he had no authorization to allow me in Reinaldo's cell. I told him he would have to arrest me if he wanted to keep me out and finally I was allowed to go."

"He (Reinaldo) could see in my face that I was bringing bad news. I started talking about religion, about the life after life. He began weeping and hugged me like a child. Then, feverishly, he began to put his cell in order."

"He gave his cellmate his belongings—a sheet, towel, a bottle of medicine, shoes and shirts. It was May 4, about 3:45 a.m. It wasn't raining and the stars were out. He shook hands with the eight men in the adjoining cells and told them, 'I hope you have better luck than I did.'"

"SOLDIER MURDERED"

"He left a gold watch for his mother. They had put handcuffs on him and now four bearded soldiers came for him. I walked by his side. Herman Marks was on the other side as we went down the dark corridors. The Cabana Fortress is a huge place and we had to take a car."

"Reinaldo had stopped crying and was quite composed at this point. I recited the litany as we walked, then rode, to the execution yard—'help of the Christians, refuge of sinners, mother of consolation, mother of mercy.'"

"The beacon from Morro Castle was splashing light and in the car Reinaldo alone gave the answer to the litany—'pray for us.'"

"We could see the huge Cristo de Havana in the rays of the beacon and I told Reinaldo that Christ is the only one who can penetrate the human soul. He replied 'for what, Father, if this Christ is made of stone it is useless—in a few minutes I'll present myself to the true Christ.'"

"We stopped at the courtyard. The wall was stained with the blood of countless others who had gone to their deaths. The firing squad was ready. I had heard his confession and I asked him if he had any last words. He said: 'Padre, I forgive them and I only hope my blood is the last to be shed.'"

"There was no blindfold. He stood there with his hands in handcuffs. I turned my face and didn't look again until I heard the shots. I turned just in time to see him leap convulsively into the air. He fell with his face on the ground.

"Marks gave him the coup de grace."

MENTAL TORTURE USED

Reinaldo was the last man Father O'Farrell ever visited in prison. Permission was withdrawn for the clergyman to console the prisoners.

On one occasion, before the Reinaldo incident, one of the political prisoners was taken out shortly before dawn, placed in front of the firing squad and "shot" in a mock execution in which blanks were used.

"They might as well have used real bullets," said Father O'Farrell. "He was more dead than alive when they brought him back. Later, they really did execute him."

A sample of the mental torture undergone by the prisoners is the case of Col. Rogelio Sopo, a navy physician. He had been acquitted by a revolutionary tribunal of having taken part in the Batista coup of 1952—but he was kept in jail.

"They destroyed him little by little," said Father O'Farrell. "I knew this man well. His conduct was above reproach. He was a dedicated doctor. He had studied in the United States.

"They kept him in a completely dark cell and they reversed his schedule so that he lost all track of time. His breakfast would be served at midnight. They would send guards to insult him, break his spirit.

"They would address him as Antonio Fernandez and kept repeating this until he almost believed he was Fernandez. Then they switched to other names. He lost all sense of time and self-identification.

"In 3 months he lost 25 pounds. They wouldn't allow him to sleep—another Communist trick. Finally, he went against the religion that had been a great part of his life. On March 18, 1959, he leaped to his death from the roof of the Morro prison."

The colonel's son, Edgar Sopo Granda, 20, lives in Miami with his mother, Josefina, 41, and a sister, Mariella. He still refuses to believe that his father was a suicide.

"I went to see Armando Lora, secretary of the Prime Minister," said young Sopo, "and he got in touch with Comdr. Juan Castineiras. When I got to Castineiras' office, he told me, 'Let him rot in jail.'"

"He whipped a pamphlet my father had written calling Castro a Communist out of his desk and repeated the threat of letting my father rot in jail.

"Lora protested, 'You cannot do this. The man is free—acquitted. This man must be allowed his freedom.' Castineiras told him, 'This is none of your business.' That was that.

"I was allowed to see my father. He told me to take care of my mother and sister. I put my arms around him. His arm felt as thin as a boy's under my touch. I said, 'Fuerte, papi' (chin up, keep strong). I never saw him alive again."

SNAPSHOT TREASURED

Edgar Sopo treasures a snapshot his father once gave him. It says on the back, "To Edgar, my best friend, son of my heart, who will surpass me in everything."

"There were no witnesses to his death," he says, "and no one can tell me what my father—who was in solitary confinement—was doing on the roof of the prison. My father was a very devout man, who said his rosary daily. He could not have committed suicide. Castro has eliminated others whom he did not like. My father is another of his victims."

In Memory of Franklin P. Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we learn of the death of Franklin P. Adams. He was a great journalist, an entertaining critic, and a wise man. The country owes him a great debt. Whether we know it or not, his good works will long continue to influence our thinking and our attitudes in many ways.

Under unanimous consent I will insert in the RECORD a brief review of Franklin Pierce Adams' life and works from the New York Times of this morning:

FRANKLIN P. ADAMS, COLUMNIST, 78, DIES

Franklin P. Adams, the F.P.A. of many newspaper columns and the "Information Please" radio program, died last evening in the Lynwood Nursing Home, 306 West 102d Street, at the age of 78. He has suffered from arteriosclerosis for 5 years and been confined to the home for most of that time.

Mr. Adams' column, "The Conning Tower," appeared successively in the New York Tribune, the World, the New York Herald Tribune (successor to the Tribune) and the New York Evening Post (now the New York Post). He became an "Information Please" panelist in 1938.

A former insurance agent with 1 year's experience in a Chicago newspaper shop, Franklin Pierce Adams came to New York in 1903 and for the next several decades pounded out a daily column of wit and wisdom in verse and prose that endeared him to a large section of the citizenry of the metropolis of his choice.

In his later years Mr. Adams combined wit and erudition to win an enormous following among radio and television audiences as one of the panelists of the program "Information Please." Some of these programs, during which he and other experts answered questions on a variety of subjects, were made into movie shorts.

The direct intellectual descendant of Charles Sauret Calverly and Sir William Gilbert, he spent a lifetime gently chiding the mispronouncers of English, the "Nice Nellies" of literature and all those other persons whose minor foibles made life irritating to the man who would quote Horace to a bus driver.

Mr. Adams, whose utmost seriousness always seemed like humor, was one of the better critics of the day. He sounded casual judgments on books in a once a week column and he was often borne out by subsequent acceptance on the part of the public.

Newman Levy, with his pert and impertinent ribbing of opera, found an outlet in "The Conning Tower." For many more years than the cynical thought possible, Mr. Adams kept alive the tradition started in Chicago by the late Eugene Field and Bert Leston Taylor (B. L. T.) of "A Line o' Type or Two" fame, and in Boston by the late Philip Hale, whose "As the World Wags" was one of the country's earliest columns.

ENDED AT THE POST IN 1941

After a long period on the World, F. P. A. transferred to the Herald Tribune in 1931. He continued there until March 1937. For a time his work appeared in magazines and in

1938, he began his column again in the Post. He left in 1941.

Mr. Adams was a native of Chicago, where he was born November 15, 1881, the son of Moses Adams and Clara Schlossman Adams. He attended public schools and the Armour Scientific Academy and was graduated from the latter in 1899. Then, for a little more than a year, he was a student at the University of Michigan.

His first journalistic endeavors were with the old Chicago Journal, after which he found a post with the old New York Evening Mail.

F. P. A. changed titles and jobs in 1914 when he took his erudition to the New York Tribune. His column there was known as "The Conning Tower" and it bore this title until the end. It was an editorial page feature of the Tribune until 1922, when Mr. Adams went over to the World.

Each Saturday he turned his column into a diary. He called it "The Diary of Our Own Samuel Pepys" and, written in the style of Pepys, it recounted many trivial things that Mr. Adams made seem important.

But those he so often wrote or let his contributors write of minor affairs, Mr. Adams had high critical abilities. He was one of the first to discover merit in the writings of Ring Lardner, H. G. Wells, D. H. Lawrence, Somerset Maugham, Sinclair Lewis, and many others.

Mr. Adams' light verses and parodies were reprinted in the following books:

"Tobogganing in Parnassus," 1910; "In Other Words," 1912; "By and Large," 1914; "Weights and Measures," 1917; "Something Else Again," 1920; "Overset," 1922; "So There," 1922; "So Much Velvet," 1924; "Half a Loaf," 1927, and "Christopher Columbus," 1935. He also reprinted his Saturday morning columns in "The Diary of Our Own Samuel Pepys," published in 1935.

In 1909, with the late O. Henry, he wrote a musical comedy called "Lo," and with Montague Glass, George Kaufman, Ring Lardner and others he was a coauthor of "The 49ers," produced here at the Punch and Judy Theater in 1922.

Mr. Adams is survived by his widow, Mrs. Esther Sayles Root Adams; three sons, Anthony, Timothy, and Jonathan; a daughter, Miss Persephone Adams; a sister, Mrs. Abraham G. Schwab of Chicago and four grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at the Frank E. Campbell Funeral Church, Madison Avenue and 81st Street, at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

You Can't Do Business With Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the lead editorial from the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star of March 7 on the subject, "You Can't Do Business With Castro," which I think is pertinent and true.

The editorial follows:

YOU CAN'T DO BUSINESS WITH CASTRO

Fidel Castro's hysterical foaming at the mouth over the munitions explosion in Havana Harbor can only be compared with Adolf Hitler's when he told the world about

the Reichstag fire, or how the peaceful Danes, Dutch, or Czechs were threatening him.

After saying that "a North American consul and military attaché" had tried to prevent him from buying arms, Castro shouted Saturday that "since they tried by diplomatic means to prevent that arms be sold to us, we have the right to think they could have tried to prevent it by other means."

It is impossible to say precisely just who are included in Castro's pronoun "we" besides himself, but certainly no one questions the right of an idiot to float fantasies harmlessly around in his own head.

However, there is no doubt at all who Castro meant by "they." He meant the United States. And granting even the pathological nature of Castro's compulsive television rantings, this outrageous charge by the head of a government cannot be excused on the grounds of lost emotional control.

Castro knew very well what he was saying, just as Hitler did. True, Castro's libelous words did not specifically name the United States. He is too slyly devious and cute for that. Tomorrow, like Abe Kabibble in the old comic strip, he can say, "I didn't say 'positively.'"

Nevertheless, the fact is that this man coldbloodedly and falsely used a disaster that tragically took the lives of many of his countrymen to foment support for his crazy career as leading U.S. baiter in the Western Hemisphere.

By now, there is no reason to blink at Castro's present basic policy.

When the people of Cuba threw out Batista, the new provisional government—of which the 26th of July movement was a part—had the good wishes of the people of our country, of the U.S. press, which had consistently denounced Batista's corruption and excesses, and of the U.S. Government itself.

But the multiparty coalition that, led by Castro, provisionally took over in Cuba after Batista fled no longer exists today.

In one short year, all but one officer of ministerial rank have been booted out or forced to resign. Elections are further away than ever. But though there have been no elections, the boss is already on his second president. The first, chosen—said Castro—because he was honest, was fired for the same reason. The second is a docile party nonentity, who was in 1950 elected to the Camaguey city council on the Communist ticket.

Today there are more men under arms than Batista had. Today criticism of the government is dangerous. Today, nobody dares ask for an accounting of anything the government does, or of the funds it collects. The big lie is routine government dogma.

Thus, in one short year, has been lost the revolutionary reform that everyone hoped would reestablish representative government in Cuba. In charge today are a handful of 26th of July political adventurers and the Communists who use them, busy launching a bread-and-circuses social welfare routine to hide their real aim.

There is no indication that the Pled Piper leading this disaster at the microphone won't be around for some time, wrecking the economy of a rich, beautiful and friendly neighbor island, shooting up nearby countries and being a headache to our State Department. Indeed, he's already that.

But there's also no doubt how he will end. He will end just like his brethren—Hitler, Mussolini, Peron, Perez Jimenez, Rojas Penilla and all the rest. He has already managed to wreck more in a year than tyrant Batista did in a decade.

Maybe even the maritime insurance people have found out by now that you can't do business with such people, and that un-

derwriting gun deliveries to Cuba is a bad risk.

As to the Havana explosion itself, the saboteurs have not come forward to give themselves a name. But they probably call themselves Cuban patriots, and they probably are.

Share Automation Gains, Avoid Strikes, Kaiser Tells Employers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., made a speech before the Los Angeles Rotary Club on March 1, 1960, in which he discussed the relationship between management and labor.

The Kaiser company has always been one of the first to adopt liberal forthright labor policies and this is emphasized in Mr. Kaiser's speech.

A report of his address appeared in the March 18 issue of the Contra Costa Labor Journal. I am very happy to make it part of my remarks:

SHARE AUTOMATION GAINS, AVOID STRIKES, KAISER TELLS EMPLOYERS

Workers should share the benefits of automation; collective bargaining must be made to work without Government coercion; unions and management should have day-to-day communication; Taft-Hartley doesn't work and all this makes dollars and sense for management.

This, in essence, is what Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., told the Los Angeles Rotary Club on March 4. Stepping out as one of the Nation's leading enlightened industrialists, Kaiser asserted that showdown deadlines in union contract negotiations must be avoided.

The steel strike, he said cost the labor, industry, and the people of this Nation \$6 billion. "We cannot afford these nationwide shutdowns," he declared, "and I don't care what industry you're talking about."

"As long as both sides look on the contract expiration date as the signal for nationwide advertising campaigns, recriminations, and all-out war—we shall have no hope in this country of peace and stability, let alone the kind of growth that spells survival."

Warning that our economy is expanding only half as fast as that of the Soviet Union and that accelerated growth is needed to meet the needs of an increasing population, Kaiser looked to automation to provide the answer.

But, he added "I wonder if some of us in management aren't beginning to look on automation as a weapon? Not as an advance for the common good—but as a means of defeating labor?"

"You aren't the one who is boosting the production, we tell the worker—our machines are doing it. No wonder the worker, under this charge of being obsolete, turns to the union for help. No wonder he thinks of automation as a job competitor—an intruder out to uproot his family, rob him of his wages, send him drifting goodness knows where."

"I don't think management really thinks in this manner," Kaiser continued, "but because of our need to stack the bargaining-table deck, we have shortsightedly seized on

automation as one of our ace cards, on the turn-down of wage demands. The union, in turn, has no other recourse but to fight automation as an enemy and fight it the only way it knows how—with featherbedding practices."

"We have said to the union, 'You have no part in this'—forgetting that it has been the power of the working people . . . which has helped bring about our high production, our high earnings, and our ability to accumulate capital investment, and thus give birth to this new wonder child, automation," the California executive observed.

Focusing on the heart of his argument, Kaiser explained "I think it is incumbent on management and labor to search for a means of getting beyond the bargaining table—and work toward some method whereby fluid negotiations can be carried on the year-round. We've done it with income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis—now why can't we do the same thing in industry, by working out an adjust-as-you-go work contract? Why issue ultimatums when we should be communicating together now—not just on wage issues but on other matters, vital to production and the welfare of our country?"

Kaiser said that his brother Edgar, in settling early in the steel strike had tried to work out just such a plan for Kaiser Steel, through the establishment of two experimental committees. One will try to reach a step-by-step solution to various issues concerning work practices. The other, referred to as the "Fruits of Progress Committee," will look for a way to share future cost-savings, perhaps some kind of built-in escalator.

"What we are looking for," Kaiser explained, "is a sharing plan—not profit-sharing (which would) make one team out of two by giving our workers a stake—an in-the-pockets takehome stake—in improved efficiency and production . . . If we fail maybe we've got to give it a second try, or a third."

Belittling the prejudice of some management spokesmen against working with labor leaders, Kaiser said "It has nothing to do with an honor-system, or high-sounding resolutions, or brotherhood pacts. . . . It comes down to dollars and cents. Those who would argue our present way of doing things is efficient—have got to show us first, in dollars and cents, that this is so."

Proposal To Issue "Champion of Liberty" Stamp in Honor of Paderewski's 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has recently been issuing a series of stamps dedicated to "champions of liberty." These stamps are used here and abroad and serve not only to honor the heroes themselves, but also to encourage the peoples who have lost their freedom and independence.

I have recently written to Postmaster Arthur E. Summerfield suggesting that a stamp be issued in the "champion of liberty" series on November 6, 1960, in honor of the late Polish leader, Ignace J. Paderewski, to commemorate the 100th

anniversary of his birth which occurs on that date.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my letter to Mr. Summerfield and his reply, dated March 23:

MARCH 15, 1960.

HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: It is my understanding that you have under consideration the suggestion to issue a stamp in the series on "Champions of Liberty" in honor of Ignace J. Paderewski, who was one of the world's great artists and the "Father" of the free Polish Republic that was established after World War I.

As you well know, Paderewski lived in the United States for a number of years and was a great friend of this country. He died in New York in 1941 and is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Paderewski was truly a great statesman and a Champion of Liberty of the era of the First World War and later. He helped organize a Polish Army in France from recruits in the United States, Canada, Western Europe and other countries where Poles live in large numbers. This army fought on the side of the Allies. After the war he helped organize the Polish Republic and for a time served as its President.

A special stamp honoring Paderewski is not only a wonderful gesture on our part in extending recognition to a Champion of Liberty who well deserves this tribute, but it would also serve as a great encouragement to the people of Poland in helping them to maintain their hopes for a free Poland. It should also contribute immeasurably toward the further growth of friendship between our two peoples.

Paderewski's birthday anniversary occurs on November 6, 1960. I urge you to give very serious consideration to the issuance of a stamp in his honor on that date.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1960.

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 15, requesting the issuance of a "Champion of Liberty" stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the former Premier of Poland, Ignace J. Paderewski, and to inform you that the issuance of this commemorative stamp is now being considered by my office.

I am delighted to know that you are interested in the issuance of this stamp, and you may rest assured that I will give your request my very careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

Byelorussia's 42d Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of in-

dependence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is being observed on March 25. It was on March 25, 1918, in the city of Miensk, when Byelorussia was proclaimed an independent country and its people a free nation.

Three years later the Communist rulers of Russia extended their domination over Byelorussia and subjugated its people. They have remained subjugated ever since, but the date of the proclamation of their independence is traditionally observed by freedom-loving Byelorussians wherever they live, with the exception of their ancestral homeland where freedom is forbidden.

Today, the people of Byelorussia are a captive nation facing the threat of physical and cultural extinction together with the other captive nations of eastern and central Europe. It is therefore most urgent for us, in the United States and throughout the free world, to encourage these peoples, to give moral and where possible all other support, so that they can survive this dark hour in their history. We must keep alive their yearning for freedom, their hopes for a better day to come, their desire to shake off the bonds of enslavement and tyranny.

In the month of May the "Big Four" are scheduled to meet in Paris at an East-West summit meeting. This would seem to me to be a logical time, place and occasion to bring up the question of the captive nations so that they may again enjoy the fundamental freedoms and the human rights to which they are entitled, to live under governments of their own choice, and to continue to develop their culture and to worship their God without fear of reprisal. We cannot permit the Soviet Union to ignore this problem any longer.

In the meantime, in the face of all adversities, I feel it is of utmost importance for the American people to join the Byelorussian people in prayer and hope that Byelorussia will once again rise in our lifetime as a free, democratic and independent nation.

Brazil Marches Forward and Wants United States at Its Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged recently to be host in my office to seven members of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies.

During the course of my very pleasant and lengthy conversations with my distinguished guests, it became evident that Brazil has embarked on an era of economic expansion and desires the cooperation of the United States.

In line with this belief, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a news story carried by United Press International, out of Knoxville, Tenn., where the Brazilian Congressmen visited after their stop in Washington.

In this story, the Honorable Antonio Sylvio Cunha Bueno, of São Paulo, one of the visiting dignitaries, made this statement:

It is quite needless, at this time, to emphasize the traditionally friendly character of the relations between the two great nations of the American Continent, since the recent tour of President Eisenhower afforded an opportunity for the reciprocal and definitive demonstration of that fact.

What I feel to be necessary, what all of us in my country hope will come to pass, is that the visit of the American Chief Executive will have served to make the American people aware that they should try and understand the Brazil of today: a Brazil which is, not only the same friend as always, but also a country in the process of creating an economy of its own and which has given proof of its capacity to develop and its determination to do so, even at the cost of considerable sacrifices.

Brazil's economic expansion is inevitable, as the expansion of the United States in the last century was inevitable. Would it not be better to share this task with us, instead of remaining in the sidelines as a spectator?

Brazilians are a sentimental people. They have always admired the United States as an example of respect for human dignity and material progress. At the moment when Brazil is going through a new phase of accelerated development in its economic life, that sentimentality in our makeup runs the risk of being shocked if our older friends, the Americans, hesitate to support the industrial growth of Brazil with the degree of cooperation that our common friendship warrants. That is justified by the pressing need to improve the living standards of the people and that is required by the economic and political doctrines of this hemisphere.

We, therefore, entertain the hope that the well-known sense of objectivity of this great country will enable it to understand the evolution of Brazil at this world juncture.

Brazil has entered an era of industrialization. What is happening today in my country is an authentic economic revolution which brings in its wake difficult problems of adaptation and adjustment, including those of a monetary character. Such problems, however, are always present when an underdeveloped country industrializes rapidly.

I can bear witness that Americans who know us are, both by temperament and friendly disposition, great enthusiasts on the subject of our progress. Brazilians, however, fall utterly to understand why some sectors in the United States insist in raising doubts about, and even in opposing restrictions to the economic surge of Brazil, by emphasizing the problems of adjustment and trying to ignore the substantial achievements of our development.

Brazil marches forward and nothing will prevent its expansion. We would like—and I say it again everyday—to have the United States at our side.

I would also like to insert in the RECORD a signed article by Mr. Harry W. Frantz, of the United Press International foreign department, on the occasion of the visit of the Brazilian Congressmen to Washington.

The article:

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—A party of seven Brazilian members of the Chamber of Deputies were guests at the U.S. Capitol today. They are beginning a U.S. tour concerned with multipurpose river development and the use of relatively arid lands through reclamation and irrigation.

All of the Brazilian deputies are members of the chamber of deputies committee on the San Francisco Valley development program, and this fact influenced their U.S. itinerary.

Representative DONALD J. IRWIN received the party in his office for a general informal briefing on congressional procedures and current legislation, including the civil rights situation. IRWIN was born in Rosario, Argentina, and later lived with his family in São Paulo, Brazil. The discussions today were in Portuguese.

The Brazilians were luncheon guests of Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and later listened to congressional debates.

The Brazilian legislators are the second recent congressional party from that country, the first group having come to the United States in October-November last year.

The party consists of Luiz Medeiros Neto, deputy from Alagoas; Paulo Frieire de Araujo, from Minas Gerais; Jose Passos Porto, Sergipe; Edward Agnello Pereira, Bahia; Manoel Jose de Almeida, Minas Gerais; Oswaldo Ribeiro de Oliveira, Bahia; and Antonio Sylvio Cunha Bueno, São Paulo.

The party is being accompanied by William Simonson of the U.S. Embassy at Rio de Janeiro, and Neil Seidenman of the State Department.

Deputy Cunha Bueno of São Paulo told United Press International that the visit here forms one more link in a traditional chain of friendship between two peoples.

"An ever broader understanding between great countries of North and South America will strengthen the security of democracy in the world," he said.

"The visit of President 'Léu' to South America represented a solid contribution to good relations between all of the Americas. The simple manner of the President of the United States made him a very popular figure among Brazilians."

Cunha Bueno said that he was surprised by the intense interest of the people of the United States regarding Brazil, and particularly its new capital of Brasília.

The Brazilian party will go to Knoxville, Tenn., March 22 and to Nashville March 23. Arrangements have been made for their inspection of the important facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) program.

They will be received by Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee, at Nashville March 23, and will be given a luncheon by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University. That university is celebrated for its inter-American activities, and for its publications concerning Brazil and Portugal.

The Brazilian party will be welcomed at Dallas, Tex., March 24, and at Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 25, with programs featuring soil conservation, irrigation and private electrical power installations of special interest.

At Bakersfield, Calif., on March 28, the Brazilians will start observations in the San Joaquin Valley, which is distinguished for large-scale farm operations, including cotton; extraordinary development of water resources including deep wells, and mechanization.

On a visit to San Francisco, starting March 4, the visitors will see the nuclear and steam electrical plants of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co., and visit a Ford assembly plant.

Arriving at Madison, Wis., on April 4, the visitors will observe the presidential primary election in Wisconsin on April 5. This is expected to be a major event in the race for the Democratic Party presidential nomination, measuring the strength of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY against Senator JOHN KENNEDY.

A Luso-Brazilian colloquium will be held at Madison. The Chicago program, starting April 6, relates especially to heavy industry, housing programs, and renewal of urban areas.

The party will reach New York April 10, with a visit to the United Nations as a principal event; and will depart for Brazil April 16.

Another Co-op Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a modern dairy plant in my home district in Wisconsin is the first in the Nation to produce grade A dry-milk powder. This new instant nonfat product is being made by the Turtle Lake Cooperative Creamery Association, of Turtle Lake, Wis.

Under the capable management of R. E. Miller, the dairy plant receives and processes 113 million pounds of milk a year. In addition to producing the new dry-milk powder, the plant manufactures butter and plastic cream and handles feed and fertilizer for its 700 patrons.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a story about the many achievements of this cooperative which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives News:

WISCONSIN DAIRY PLANT FIRST TO MAKE GRADE A POWDER

Turtle Lake Cooperative Creamery Association of Turtle Lake, Wis., last month produced what is believed to be the Nation's first grade A dry milk powder. The new instant nonfat product was packaged under a permit issued by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture.

Such a product is possible through quality production of farmer members and the new additions to the association's plant and equipment. With the assistance of the St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives a completely new drying plant in addition was made consisting of new receiving, processing, and boiler rooms, a new warehouse, new spray dryer, and other equipment necessary for drying skim milk.

"One of the anticipated major uses of the product will be for the production of cottage cheese," according to Manager R. E. Miller. Grade A farmer members will benefit through this new market outlet since their surplus grade A milk will not be mixed with grade B milk for manufacturing use.

Major market outlets for the grade A powder will be in Mississippi and Louisiana for use in making food products requiring grade A milk. Prior to availability of grade A powder milk, such markets had to be supplied with skim milk in fluid form.

The large warehouse which will hold 54 carloads of powder will facilitate the orderly marketing of powder manufactured during the flush milk production period.

The association was organized in 1916 to process farm-separated cream into butter. From 1930 to 1940 the patrons gradually shifted from farm-separated cream to whole milk. Today the association operates a diversified milk plant receiving and processing both grade A and B whole milk and manufacturing butter, nonfat dried milk and plastic cream.

Milk receipts run about 130 million pounds a year with about two-thirds of it being

handled in the grade A plant and the other one-third in the separate grade B plant. The association has about 700 members and also handles feed and fertilizer for its patrons.

Buy American Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Buy American Act to assist American firms seeking to do business with our Government has given me great concern. Last week I referred to the award of a contract for the Panama Canal Bridge, using West German steel, because the contractor using German steel underbid an American contractor by \$22,000. Yesterday I made reference to a new problem regarding locomotives for use in Panama Canal operations.

The locomotives required by the canal, and usually referred to as "mules," furnish the power to pull ships through the locks. They have a useful life of about 40 years.

At present the Secretary of the Army is considering a bid by a Japanese firm to supply new locomotives for a total of \$3,800,000. The lowest American bidder is the Plymouth Co. of Plymouth, Ohio, at \$4,700,000. To the Japanese bid, under various laws and regulations, may be added \$115,000 for special inspections that would be required, \$380,000 under the Buy American Act—10 percent instead of the 25 percent formerly allowed—\$228,000 because the Plymouth Co. is a small business, and certain other percentages so that the actual difference between the two bids is less than \$100,000.

However, as I pointed out with regard to the bridge contract, these figures tell only a part of the story. If Plymouth is awarded the bid, plate steel and stainless steel manufactured in my district will go into the machinery, and steelworkers in Canton and Massillon will realize direct benefits. Other subcontractors located in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Detroit will receive orders, and some of these are areas of critical labor surplus. At least one million man-hours of employment for American labor will flow from the award of the contract to an American firm.

This does not take into account the transportation of the components and of the machines itself, which means additional business for Americans; nor does it take into account the direct returns to Federal, State, and local government that will come from this contract if it is awarded to Plymouth.

Finally, let me say that the Plymouth Co. is a recognized producer for the Defense Department with an excellent reputation. It can be depended upon to produce a quality product that will do the job that needs to be done. We cannot place the same faith and

confidence in the Japanese producer. Further, during the 40 years these engines will serve, the Plymouth Co. in peace or war will be readily available to supply renewal and repair parts, an assurance we cannot have from a producer in Japan.

Plymouth is the only remaining American company devoted to the design, engineering, and production of industrial locomotives of the size and type required in this procurement. If it is denied Government contracts, the Plymouth Co. may not be in production when some dire emergency befalls us.

For all of these reasons, it seems to me that award of the locomotive contract to Plymouth is clearly in the national interest and the Army should so decide.

Their Day in Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial on the subject of pensions for veterans of World War I from the National Tribune, Stars & Stripes.

The editorial follows:

THEIR DAY IN COURT

The Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., were given an opportunity last week to present the views of that organization to the House Committee on Veterans Affairs relative to the subject of benefits for veterans of World War I, and particularly the need for adequate pensions for this fast-aging group.

The organization was represented by National Commander Charles A. McCarthy, of Ohio, National Jr. Vice Commander George Leary of Massachusetts, chairman of the national legislative committee of the organization, and A. E. Cross of Arkansas, chairman of the group's national hospital committee.

The full text of National Commander McCarthy's statement appeared in our issue of March 17. The statements of Leary and Cross are printed in this week's issue.

The appearance of the representatives of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., was the first official appearance before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs since 1956 to offer their program on needed veteran legislation to Congress. What struck us quite forcefully was the amity which prevailed between the chairman of the House Committee and the War I representatives. It is our hope that this friendly relationship once established may grow and expand. It is only by cooperation on both sides in a discussion can a sensible solution be reached.

Prior to National Commander McCarthy's presentation, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, House committee chairman, stated that he knew of no one better qualified to represent veterans' interests before his committee than Commander McCarthy.

The national commander's explanation of the needs of his membership was clear and to the point. He dwelt on the differences which existed between the discharged veteran of World War I and those of later wars. He pointed out that the discharged veteran of World War I had to go out and find a job at once, quite unlike the situation which

faced the younger veterans who had a cushion of 52 weeks of unemployment pay after discharge while seeking suitable employment.

Commander McCarthy painted an eloquent picture of the plight of the aging World War I veteran and explained why his group was seeking an adequate pension for them at this time. His presentation was not confined to pensions alone but he discussed the need for proper medical care, higher rates for the service-connected and other features of veteran legislation, including the elimination of the so-called pauper's oath from the application for medical care by the non-service-connected disabled.

All in all his talk was well received by all members of the House committee present and we feel that an "era of good feeling" has now been established between the World War I organization and the House committee.

It is true that Chairman TEAGUE did state that the organization could not hope for the passage of H.R. 9336—the pension bill introduced by Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts—in its entirety because there was some feeling in the committee that the principle of granting a pension to someone who doesn't need it "is not sound."

Chairman TEAGUE assured Commander McCarthy that the committee hoped to bring out a bill which would prove satisfactory to the World War I group and that there was a good chance of raising income limitations for pension purposes.

Without going into a discussion on the merits of H.R. 9336 or the statement as to "need" expressed by Chairman TEAGUE—all of which had been covered at length by the National Tribune in previous editorials, we are happy to know that there now exists a spirit of understanding between the leaders of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. and the House committee chairman.

Being able to meet on a friendly basis is half the battle and we trust that this spirit of understanding will continue with the result that a worthwhile pension bill will be brought forth by the committee. If there must be some compromise in order to secure certain additional benefits, then let that compromise be made, but let it be made on both sides.

Chairman TEAGUE criticized what he called the all-or-nothing provisions of H.R. 9336. Has he forgotten how the Congress of the United States was given an all-or-nothing bill last year when H.R. 7650 was rammed down the throats of House Members? If he has not forgotten the maneuvers which brought about passage of H.R. 7650 last year, if he realizes that it is a principle which works both ways and if he is able to reconcile his all-or-nothing attitude on H.R. 7650 with his opposition to certain provisions of H.R. 9336 then we feel that the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have made real progress.

We still believe that H.R. 9336 is a good bill and we hope it will be enacted into law as now written. At any rate the veterans of the First World War know now that at this time they have many supporters in the House of Representatives—Members who have introduced similar legislation as that proposed in H.R. 9336.

The National Tribune is happy about the progress of this comparatively new organization and it is happy to see that Chairman TEAGUE is not quite as obdurate on the subject of veterans' benefits for the World War I group.

We hope and pray that this feeling of mutual understanding and cooperation between the organization and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will result in the passage of a pension bill not only satisfactory to the Government but one which will prove of real aid to the group for which the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. and its leaders are working.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith two editorials from the Charleston News and Courier of March 22, 1960.

Since we are talking civil rights let us grant civil rights to all people—North, East, South, and West.

The editorials follow:

CIVIL RIGHTS LAW SHOULD GUARANTEE FREEDOM OF ALL FROM BLOC VOTING

If the Federal Government is determined to guarantee the civil rights of Negro voters in Southern States, it should guarantee also the civil rights of all the people in all the States.

Granting that promoters of civil rights bills in Congress are sincere in this respect, they are not going far enough in setting up Federal election referees to insure that southern Negroes are allowed to cast ballots. They should take steps to insure that Negroes, and any other kind of voter, are free to vote their convictions.

Voters in many parts of the country, notably in congested areas of the North and West, are not now free to vote as individuals. Rather they are herded to the polls and voted in blocs.

Labor union organizers, race leaders, goons who cajole or intimidate as the case may be, interfere with the orderly polling of free American citizens. Why has nobody proposed an amendment to the civil rights bills that will put real teeth into election procedures?

When Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, sought to broaden the Federal ban on bombing schools, churches, and synagogues to include labor union bombers, the Senate rejected the whole section. Civil rights were not recognized when labor unions became involved.

The same reasoning seems to apply to guaranteeing voting rights. Not only the right to register, but the right to vote without interference from anybody—Ku Klux Klan, NAACP, AFL-CIO, or any other pressure groups—ought to be spelled out in the bills.

Without such guarantees, the civil rights laws are not only meaningless, but actually misleading. We hope that Congressmen genuinely concerned for the welfare of the Republic will remedy the bills now under consideration.

RIGHT TO DO BUSINESS

The Missouri haberdasher, with characteristic vigor, says he would throw out any customer who tried to stop business. For this forthright comment on Negro demonstrations, former President of the United States Harry S. Truman has been criticized by a Negro bishop in Louisville. The clergyman favors the boycott to enforce demands for service.

In Florida, Governor COLLINS has confused the issue of lunchroom sitters by injecting morals. While a merchant may have a legal right to exclude some customers from some departments, Mr. COLLINS says he questions the moral rightness. A governor who mixes up laws and morals is treading on dangerous ground.

Senator KENNEDY, who has the inside track for the Democratic presidential nomination, says civil rights bills don't go far enough when they apply only to voting. By that we

gather he would extend the Federal power to other areas, perhaps to compulsory association at the dinner table.

We mention these three samples of opinion from representative spokesmen to illustrate the confusion now existing over the conflicting rights of customers and proprietors of business. In the same field is pressure on employers. An airline recently was forced to hire, against its wishes, a colored girl as a stewardess. The civil rights of business to operate peacefully and profitably enough to pay taxes are being steadily ignored.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 139 years ago when Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the standard of revolt in his monastery at Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, and his people joined him in this national struggle against their oppressors, his daring act ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous deed by a stout-hearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break from the events of preceding centuries when Greeks were subjected successively to the Romans, the Frankish kings and the Turks. That day became the Independence Day of the Greeks, and today on the 139th anniversary of that memorable event, Greeks mark it as their national holiday.

We, in this country, have always held the Greeks in exceptionally high esteem. We have always had great sympathy for them, and have done our utmost to help them whenever we could. In their fight for freedom and independence against the tyranny of the Turks, and especially in their desperate struggle to maintain their independence against fascism, nazism, communism, and all forms of totalitarianism, they have counted upon our sympathy and on our aid. We are proud to say that fortunately we have been in a position to help them and have not disappointed them. And this has been true in the past as it is at present.

In the early days of the Greek war of independence a number of philhellenic groups were formed in this country for the purpose of raising funds and thus extending material aid to the fighting Greeks. A wave of philhellenic enthusiasm swept over America. President Monroe himself was not immune to the contagion of this philhellenism. This is clearly shown in his annual message on December 3, 1822, when he gave some reasons for our interest in the Greek cause.

The mention of Greece—

He said—

fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested pa-

triotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

This was an eloquent and welcome explanation. As the elected head of the Government of this country, he expressed the feeling of our people. No less eloquent was Daniel Webster, perhaps the most illustrious statesman-orator of his day, when he characterized the Greek War of Independence as part of a greater struggle "between the absolute and the regulated governments." He stated that America could not and should not hold aloof from world affairs, and it was time for the people and the Government of this country to take a stand.

As one of the free states among the nations,

He declared—

as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were not disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world. Our side of this question,

He added, referring to the Greek War of Independence—

is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions.

There are many fine thoughts and noble ideals in these few sentences of that inimitable orator-statesman, but the core is found in the last sentence, for it reflects the full and free American spirit; our place is, and has always been, on the side of free institutions, erected and kept erect by freemen. And the Greeks were among the forerunners of freemen who founded free institutions and fought for their preservation.

Nor has our expression of sympathy and our show of kinship of ideas with the Greeks been limited to mere words and declarations. It is well known that whenever Greeks have been in trouble, in need of material aid, we have been generous in helping them. This has been particularly true at the end of the First World War, and of course more so during and since the end of the last war. Early in the course of that war, when Greece was overrun by the Axis forces, our wartime President, the late Franklin Roosevelt, declared confidently that Greece would be liberated and rewarded for her heroic fight on the side of democracies against the forces of barbarism and darkness. He certainly echoed the true

and genuine sentiment of the people of this country when he said:

I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities.

Our postwar role in Greek affairs, our aid to Greece, both financially and militarily, is rather widely known and I need not dwell upon them in detail. As soon as circumstances permitted, toward the end of the last war, we were more generous in aiding Greece than at any time in our history. In March 1947, when we were asked by the hard-pressed Greek Government for urgent emergency and military assistance, we felt that it was our duty to comply with this request. The then President Truman felt that it was our solemn responsibility to give all we could to save Greece from the tightening clutches of communism. In his message to Congress on March 12, the President declared:

I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government.

Here again the President was echoing the sincere wishes of our people. We could not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government, even though we had already expended more than \$500 million in the form of supplies, lend-lease aid, and under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Fortunately, we had some more expendable dollars, and we did not seem to mind to add close to \$3 billion worth of aid to the Greeks. Yes, the Greeks have deserved well of us. I am indeed glad to say that we were able and willing thus to pay at least a part of our intellectual debt which we all feel humanity owes to Greece and to the Greek genius.

In their enthusiasm for creative things of lasting value the attainments and accomplishments of the Greeks remain unsurpassed and unequalled. In their fervent enthusiasm for liberty and democracy they have struggled against great odds, have fought bravely, and have guarded their democratic institutions tenaciously. For almost 2,000 years, from 146 B.C. to A.D. 1821 Greece was ruled by the Romans, the Frankish kings, and by the Ottoman Turks. From the Battle of Corinth in 146 B.C. when Greece was overrun by Roman legions to the Battle of Navarino, in 1827, when the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks was finally brought to an end in Greece, Greeks lived under alien rule, but during those centuries their spirit of freedom was not extinguished; their dauntless will to fight never deserted them. And the best proof of that was the long, often despairing, and almost endless fight which they carried on for 8 years before they could attain their freedom and independence. Today in celebrating the 139th anniversary of that memorable day, Greek Independence Day, let us hope that they have the will and the power to defend it against all impending and potential dangers of totalitarian tyrants.

A Broader Policy for Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, hearings were concluded last week on H.R. 10572, a bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services. The bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman from Alabama deserves our highest praise for the leadership he has shown in this field.

Mr. Speaker, the proper management of our national forests is vitally important to northeastern Minnesota. Mr. George A. Rossman, publisher of the Grand Rapids (Minn.) Herald-Review has long been active in the cause of proper forest management and development. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. Rossman which appeared in the March 15 edition of the Herald-Review:

A BROADER POLICY FOR FORESTS

People in this area will be interested in a congressional hearing this week on a bill to redefine the purposes and policies of the National Forests. The bill reads as follows: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the Congress that the national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes. Nothing herein shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary of the Interior provided by law with respect to mineral resources."

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to develop and administer the renewable surface resources of the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtained therefrom. In the administration of the national forests due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas."

"Sec. 3. In the effectuation of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with interested State and local governmental agencies and others in the development and management of the national forests."

National forests were first established for preservation of timber resources and control of watersheds. As time went on, it became apparent that the forests also provide unusual opportunities for outdoor recreation, and that game and fish are renewable resources. The national forests in some areas also include large ranges suitable to grazing of cattle and sheep.

The Forest Service recognized these secondary values, and Congress appropriated some money for their development. During recent years it has become apparent that secondary uses of national forests are at some times and places as important as the primary purposes for which the forests were established.

The present bill has been introduced to obtain congressional approval for the prin-

ciple that all of the uses mentioned should receive the consideration which each merits. It would be recognized that forests can generally be most valuable if administered under multiple use plans.

Congressional restatement of the policy of the Federal forests will have several good effects.

One will be to recognize the "multiple use" and "sustained yield" policies of the Forest Service so that they cannot be set aside except by further congressional action.

Another benefit would be to encourage development of the National Forests to meet public needs in addition to forestry. For example the demand for outdoor recreational opportunities is increasing rapidly. With a broadened congressional policy for operation, the Forest Service will be in better position to meet these needs, and to resist possible pressure from those interested in "single use" of forests.

The importance of broadening the basic policy of the Forest Service can be well illustrated by what is happening on the Chippewa National Forest. Within the forest boundaries are 1,250,000 acres of forest lands. Many of the most attractive lakes of Minnesota are located in the forest.

As a result of more leisure time, higher personal incomes, greater mobility and more interest in outdoor recreation, the number of visitors to the Chippewa National Forest has increased rapidly. The number of recreational visits to the forest was estimated at 341,000 in 1955. By 1959 this had more than doubled to 706,000. By 1965, estimates place the number of visitors at more than 1 million and by 1970 at more than 1,500,000.

Growth of the recreational use of the Chippewa will not interfere with the growing of timber to any appreciable extent. However, to meet the growing demand for recreational opportunities will require that more funds be channeled through the Forest Service. Congressional delegation of responsibility should logically accompany increased activity.

During recent years the Federal Forest Service has been undergoing a thorough re-examination of its aims and programs. There is every indication that greater activity will be required in the future to meet needs in forestry, watershed, range and recreation development.

Congress has encouraged the Forest Service to meet the challenge of increasing and broadening demands for services. It is hoped that the hearings by the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Agriculture Committee will find support for broadening of the congressional policy to match the responsibilities which lie with those who administer large and important areas of public lands.

More Hawaii Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner:

MORE HAWAII FLIGHTS

Growth of Los Angeles as an air traffic center stands as one good argument in support of the application of Western Airlines to provide jet service to Hawaii, now under study by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

With travel to and from the islands rapidly increasing, commonsense also would seem to be a factor. Existing transpacific air service, excellent as it is, frequently finds schedules sold out and travelers, not only vacationers but those on urgent business, forced to wait.

Entrance of Western Airlines into the Pacific coast-Hawaii picture would mean more adequate provision for a travel demand that gives every promise of even greater increase in the future.

Furthermore, Western's plan for direct San Diego-Hawaii service and linkage with other western cities served by the line recognizes the practical value of fast, convenient travel.

For Los Angeles itself, every new airline coming in, every addition of service means better airport facilities, better passenger convenience, and many other advantages. Western Airlines' proposed service would be a step forward in our own progress.

Long Journey—Into Night or Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Americans are proud of the achievements of our civilian space agency in sending Pioneer V into orbit around the sun. Surely there is considerable potential for good in this accomplishment in terms of increasing our store of scientific knowledge. But at the same time, this achievement in rocketry has an implicit military implication.

Mankind's scientific discoveries are in themselves neutral, of course—usable for good or evil. All of us hope that the discoveries which may result from this one will not be put to destructive uses.

The Portland Oregonian recently carried the following excellent editorial on the significance and the possible eventful fate of Pioneer V that makes sobering and thought-provoking reading:

LONG JOURNEY

Space scientists say Pioneer V, the sun satellite, probably will remain in orbit for 100,000 years. This leads one to wonder what the earth and its inhabitants will be like when on that distant day the 90-pound aluminum ball reenters the atmosphere to end its long existence in a fiery flash.

One hundred thousand years is a long time in human experience. One hundred millennia ago, true man probably had evolved, but he had not yet left his bones and artifacts in the litter of Europe's caves. There the Neanderthals, possibly a subhuman species, held forth, chipping tools from stone and burying their dead with the most primitive of religious rites.

One would like to think that the human race will continue to progress and that 100,000 years from now all traces of its brutish ancestry will have disappeared. It is not at all certain, however, that when Pioneer V returns it will be greeted by intellectual giants to whom space will be as familiar as the air and seas are to us.

The button that sent this space probe and its predecessors on their long journeys are practically identical with those which

release potentially destructive intercontinental missiles. The flash that Neptune V makes in the sky when air and friction finally demolish it may be viewed with superstitious awe through a cave opening by a creature not much different from the hairy, chinless, apelike Neanderthaler of 100,000 years ago.

Those who control the buttons may decide within our time whether Neptune V's return will be witnessed by supermen or subhuman survivors of worldwide nuclear destruction.

Forty-second Anniversary of Byelorussian Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we make mention today of the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which since then shares the fate of other nations by being subjected to Communist tyranny.

This date, however, demands special significance since the Byelorussian people at present are incorporated within the official boundaries of the Soviet Empire, and are often overlooked because they are not ranked as one of the captive Iron Curtain nations, but are assumed to be part of Russia proper.

The facts, however, bear concrete testimony to the constant struggle of about 6 million brave people against the oppressive policies of Soviet atheistic domination. These brave Byelorussian people find their traditional language and culture subjugated and area controlled in a police state condition, and, in addition, their religious life oppressed—as is the usual pattern—wherever Communists seize control, all faiths share equally in being persecuted—the Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and various Protestant denominations suffer the same persecution of their churches.

Mr. Speaker, certainly it is appropriate for me at this time to point out that these noble people are a constant reminder to us of the inherent evil in communism, and should serve as a stern warning to those few misguided Americans who might be tempted to swallow phony Communist propaganda.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Byelorussian people and their history are so inextricably mixed with those of the Russian people that the distinction between the two peoples is sometimes misunderstood. This misunderstanding stems from the unfortunate fact that for centuries Byelorussians have been subjected to Russian rule, and the Russians have done their utmost to eradicate all Byelorussian national traits. But the Byelorussian people have not forgotten their distinct identity, and have always wanted to regain their freedom and independence. The year 1918 offered them the opportunity they awaited.

In that year, when the despotic czarist regime was gone, the Byelorussians felt themselves free and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 42 years ago. Then they set up the Byelorussian National Republic, and the 10 million Byelorussians were happy under their own government. But their independence was of very brief duration. Early in 1921 Soviet forces attacked and overran the country, and destroyed the Byelorussian National Republic. Fortunately, that did not mean the end of the spirit of freedom among the Byelorussian people. Even though for almost 40 years they have been enduring the oppressive yoke of Communist totalitarian tyranny, they still cling to their drive to be free and pray that at some future date freedom will be their just reward. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day, we echo their genuine sentiment and hope that they will attain their goal.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Where Do We Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Tuesday, our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], delivered a highly illuminating address at the annual dinner of the Harvard Club of Washington.

The title of his important speech was "Where Do We Stand?" It was a penetrating evaluation of the status of the United States in the world today. It was a sober and realistic appraisal of the decline of our Nation from its preeminence of leadership and power, a decade ago, to its present, far less influential position, when viewed against the phenomenal rise of Russia and of international communism in the world.

In a sense, our colleague's brilliant address was of something of an epoch-making character, which I think was summarized in his conclusion that the United States will not be restored to its position of influence, prestige, and leadership in the world, that our Nation will not recover its lost vantage, and will not do what is needed to be done in order to achieve that goal, unless and until the control of both the executive and the legislative branches is vested in one political party. Senator Fulbright said that unless the American people vest that control in only one party, the Nation will be courting disaster.

Not wishing to give a political connotation to his address, our able colleague did not tell the Harvard Club which political party he thought that should be, nor was it necessary that he do so. The fact is that never before in our Nation's history has the division of powers which Senator Fulbright deplors existed for so long as it has during the two Eisenhower administrations. Therefore, our colleague's dictum is both new in its affirmation of a transcendently important principle, and, coming in a year of a presidential election, timely and appropriate. It deserves wide recognition.

I ask unanimous consent that his eloquent and constructive contribution to our political science and to the national safety and destiny be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT AT THE 77TH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE HARVARD CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I consider it an honor to be invited to speak to this distinguished

audience of Harvard men. There are few who question the preeminence of Harvard University in the field of education. The influence of the graduates of Harvard upon the life of our country is unequalled by those of any other institution of learning.

Except for the fact that it descended from Cambridge University, rather than Oxford, there is little in its ancestry of which one may not be proud.

When Senator Gruening requested that I speak here tonight, I demurred most strenuously, as I was quite aware of the probable conflict in our points of view, inasmuch as I was nurtured on the conservatism of Arkansas University and Oxford. However, upon the earnest plea of Ernest Gruening that this group has never before had the opportunity of observing and of hearing a politician from the Ozark Mountains, my native reticence was overcome by my weakness for lecturing, acquired during the years when I was a professor.

I weakened in spite of the fact that I know many of us in public life talk too much.

In recent weeks I have had much sympathy with the point of view of the schoolboy who, when asked to describe Socrates, wrote as follows:

"Socrates was a Greek who spoke very often to the Athenians. They poisoned him."

It seems rather a shame to mar an otherwise festive evening by discussing serious and somber aspects of our national life, but such are my instructions. The most somber subject I can think of tonight is—what is our position in the world today, how are we measuring up to our responsibilities.

Where do we stand today?

A nation with a gross national product that will soon hit a peacetime high of \$500 billion and with a per capita income of over \$2500 (nearly double that of any other nation) is debating the extent to which our Armed Forces may be inferior to those of the Soviet Union.

If there is confusion about the facts, some things are clear. It is humiliating that the debate should have to occur. Its occurrence is evidence of our failures. It is a revelation of our lack of foresight, of possessing great riches, yet failing to use them to make ourselves, and keep ourselves, the world's strongest power, although to do less is to invite national extinction.

Mr. Khrushchev, having outrun us, is not one to let our grass grow under his feet. "It would be naive to think," he has said, "that we are going . . . to sit with arms folded" while the Americans "make every effort to raise their rocketry from the state it is now in and reach a better position." But before considering this, let us place the problem in perspective.

Men have anciently yearned for a universal commonwealth. Now we have it. But it is a commonwealth of fear kept going by a precarious balance of terror, a chilling oscillation between negotiation and incineration.

We endure in an era of total crisis. The great truths are denied. Black becomes white, the horizontal vertical. Whole states—as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Tibet—sink from sight. Whole countries—as Hungary—languish behind bars. An ancient culture—as China's—is shattered and remade overnight into the largest anthill slave state men have ever known.

All the world's parts, for the first time, are simultaneously out of joint. And while

horrors stalk the earth, weapons of potential universal destruction are hurled to the stars, or into the Pacific not too far from our shores. Everywhere the implacable cage stalks the unwary bird.

Our communications instruments are superb. Yet over huge areas the telephone is silent, the postman is frozen in his rounds, the airplane dare not land. We cannot communicate with the Russian people who occupy one-sixth of the earth's surface nor with the Red Chinese who compose about one-fifth of the world's population. Perhaps half of humanity lies beyond our hailing.

Where do we stand? What is our so-called peace? Is it not a monstrous make-believe to which men lend credence so that thereby they may have the prospect of another day under the sun?

The captains and the kings depart. Yesterday's empires—from Britain's to Japan's—are today dust. The world's stage lately occupied by several powers has been cleared of all but two giant protagonists. They are engaged in deadly conflict even if they are not in physical combat. The one holds half the world in its fist. The other haltingly sustains the remaining half.

We have never faced an antagonist quite like this one. The Soviet Union swiftly leaped from the oxcart to the moon; rose from a second-rate underdeveloped country to loom menacingly over the world.

Master of complex technologies, primitive and advanced, her soldiers march with black bread in their hands and the awful secrets of nuclear fission in their minds. Their leaders are obsessed by a dedicated sense of mission to dominate mankind. It long antedates Karl Marx and it did not falter when the Germans stood at Moscow's gates. Even as we sent stupendous quantities of munitions to the Soviet Union during the war Stalin was plotting for our demise in the postwar period.

Elsewhere, a colossal specter rises in the Far East. It commands the world's largest labor force. At this time 100 million people—a group exceeding half of our total population—are building the world's greatest network of hydroelectric stations, irrigation canals, and dams. Red China is attempting within one generation an enterprise greater than any undertaken by man: that of catching up, in this short time, with the most advanced industrialized nations. Many experts believe she will become a major industrial power during the late sixties.

China's vast population grows. Soon one in three, or one in four, of all men will be Chinese. Awesomely industrious, tough, injured to hardship, China's millions are as the fingers of the hand manipulated by their determined and ruthless masters. They direct a revolution unparalleled in this dimension which, in its pitilessness, has swiftly destroyed a culture ancient when Christ was born.

We may expect that within foreseeable time the fingers will become a clenched fist prepared to smash all that stands in the path of China's domination of the Asian reaches, their resources, and the nearly three-quarters of a billion people who inhabit them.

Returning to the Soviet Union we find that Mr. Khrushchev, even as he bade goodby to these American hosts, repeated what he has often said: "Communism would take us over." Given communism's unrelenting objective—world domination—this goal is logi-

cal. We must be the first to go by one means or another. For when the free world's shield is broken those whom it shelters become defenseless.

We have been warned, but have we heard? If we should perish it will not be for lack of warning but for lack of the will to survive.

In this context there is something new under the sun. It is a newness illuminated by the fact that the sun itself is no longer inviolate and unattainable. For the first time a would-be conqueror could win the world; win it in perhaps 30 minutes. He might succeed where others, from Genghis Khan to Hitler, had failed.

How almost overwhelming, then, must be the temptation to such a one to act? How nearly irresistible the compulsion to use his ocean-spanning, catastrophic weapons? How intoxicating the vision that, winning, the world would be one state to do his bidding with its people as his puppets, its continents as his provinces and its seas as his lakes?

How must the aspirant conqueror be moved when he contrasts the position of his country and ours at the end of the war—only 15 years ago—and today? For among nations, as among individuals, what ultimately counts is not being but becoming.

At the war's end we were, incomparably, the world's strongest power, commanding the mightiest fighting force ever assembled, and a monopoly of atomic weapons. Our wartime casualties had been small, our homeland was untouched, our farms and factories had hugely expanded. The world's gold flowed to us. The world's trade fell to us as former rivals were removed from competition. We stood upon the heights of power, prestige, riches. We had arrived.

What of the Soviet Union in 1945? She did not announce her casualties lest they reveal her grave weakness. But they were on the order of 20 million people. She suffered an enormous loss of houses, factories, powerplants, domestic animals. Many thought that for years to come her energies would be absorbed by domestic reconstruction.

But she quickly repaired her war damages. Then she built a giant heavy industry, created new cities, opened vast new lands to cultivation. Above all she advanced education in a mighty surge of passionate and determined effort. For, writes Dr. Lawrence Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education:

"The Russians have decided that education is the best means of winning their place in the sun—and on the moon. . . . The Soviet Union is like one vast college campus on the eve of a football game with its greatest rival. That rival is the United States."

This is the mark of our antagonist:

Forty-four years ago communism was confined to a rented room in Zurich, Switzerland. Today it dominates one-third of the earth containing 40 percent of the population and a third of the industrial power.

The Soviet Union's trained cadres operate throughout southeast Asia, and are now appearing in countries on our doorstep. Promoters of communism swarm over Africa and Latin America. In Egypt the Soviet Union is constructing spectacular works that will dominate world headlines for years to come and enable her to tighten her grip on the strategic Middle East where no former Russian regime had ever been able to penetrate. At the same time she lends money to free-world countries and builds great mills for them as in India. The Soviet Union is on the move.

Thus Lenin's "strategy of encirclement" is not only being fulfilled—it is moving ahead of schedule.

Surprisingly to the West, the Soviet Union exploded an atomic bomb only 4 years after the war's end. Four years later she ex-

ploded a hydrogen bomb. Now abreast of us in this field, she forged ahead of us in the conquest of space as she launched man's first satellite and was first to the moon.

She maintains vast armies, and a navy second to ours. No power has ever had, in peacetime, so many submarines. They number 450; two-thirds of them long-range ocean patrol types. In 1956 alone Soviet shipyards built 100 submarines, or one every third or fourth day during the year. This is as many submarines as we have in our entire fleet.

In addition the Soviet Union is mounting a worldwide trade offensive aimed primarily at us. Hence the challenge to us is total. It involves the military, the political, the intellectual, and the industrial. The measures of our antagonist cannot be countered by half measures or by halfhearted competition.

If, Mr. Khrushchev must reason, his country has come so far so fast, how much will it forge ahead of us in the future unless we greatly step up our pace in education, weapons, foreign aid, and foreign trade? But how shall we excel in these fields if we are more concerned with keeping up with the Joneses than surpassing the challenges of Khrushchevs?

How shall others appraise us—to consider only one phase of the struggle—in the light of Dr. Wernher von Braun's remarks about the conquest of space?

Last year he said the Russians disregarded our efforts. "The Russians appear so sure of their technological leadership," he observed, "and their ability to retain the initiative that they do not even consider the possibility someone else might beat them to the moon . . ."

They were right. They got there first.

Gen. Bernard Schriever has also said that there is "very much evidence" that Russia has greatly strengthened its bomber defenses. But the aircraft that might not be able to get through may not even be able to demonstrate their impotence. "For," states Gen. Thomas Power, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, "our bomber bases are vulnerable to surprise attack."

Generals are not to reason why. Their Commander in Chief complains that "too many generals have all sorts of ideas."

Yet mankind moves on ideas. Men with ideas are the makers and shakers of the world. The larger their number serving the country the more fruitful and vigorous the country. But few men of ideas come to Washington. They are not likely to seek service in a government which is scornful of their kind.

Next year, says Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, able chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Committee, America is going into a 2- or 3-year period when the Soviet Union's missile superiority will present "the most frighteningly important situation that we have had in our lives."

Recently three well-informed witnesses appeared before Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

The first was Robert A. Lovett, a Wall Street banker, a Republican, and a Secretary of Defense in the Truman administration.

He criticized the Defense Department for "its constant increase in committees (which) has reached a point where they are no longer mere nuisances, but have become positive menaces to the prompt and orderly conduct of business."

In executive session, Mr. Lovett indicated his belief that President Eisenhower leads a dangerously sheltered life as Chief Executive of the Nation. For, he said, the National Security Council protects Mr. Eisenhower from the debates that precede policy decisions.

Mr. Lovett was firmly convinced "we are doing something short of our best" in meet-

ing the "deadly challenge by an implacable, crafty and openly contemptuous enemy."

Finally, he said that the Budget Bureau has authority without responsibility in setting defense policy.

"I would not," said Mr. Lovett, "hesitate to increase the budget."

Mr. Lovett, I repeat, has had an enormous experience with our defense requirements. He is a leading Wall Street banker with a wide knowledge of financing, including Government financing, and is a lifelong member of the Republican Party.

A day later Mr. Robert Sprague testified. An industrialist, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, and consultant to the National Security Council, he also is a lifelong Republican.

Even more outspoken than Mr. Lovett, Mr. Sprague said, "The idea that an increase in spending for survival will bankrupt us is, to put a plain word on it, 'silly'." He pointed out that the Russians put 25 percent of their gross national product into military preparations, while the United States devotes only 9 percent of its gross national product to national security.

Mr. Sprague insisted that the United States be awakened to the scope of the overall Russian threat to us. But who is to ring the alarm bell?

"There is only one man in the United States that can do this effectively, and that is the President," said Mr. Sprague. He continued: "I believe, and this is a personal belief, that the danger is more serious than the President has indicated to the American public."

There ensued then this colloquy:

"Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE. I gather that you consider our present military program inadequate to the needs?"

"Mr. SPRAGUE. That is correct, Senator."

"Senator MUSKIE. And I gather that you consider the deficiencies a threat to our survival?"

"Mr. SPRAGUE. I do."

Another critic of the administration's defense policy was Mr. Thomas Watson, Jr., president of International Business Machines Corp. He said:

"We may gain peace of mind by mixing our own doubts about our abilities in rocketry with thoughts of the superiority of our Air Force and other weapons. However, this kind of thinking is not conducive to long-term world leadership."

Asked if he felt the military budget adequate, Mr. Watson replied:

"I do not believe the adequacy of our defense posture can be discussed in the same context as inflation."

Then he went on: "I do not agree with people who suggest that we must not push our economy to any point necessary to win in competing with the Soviet because then we might lose what made our country great. Our national goal should be clear superiority over the Soviet Union in all possible areas, and we should believe enough in our democracy so that we will not be reluctant to enter fully into the contest."

These men believe that our survival is imperiled; that we are not doing enough to assure our security to the greatest degree possible; that we should do more; and if it costs more to do more we ought to pay for it in the spirit of "damn the torpedoes, go ahead."

But let there be no mistake about this. If we are to have peace we must have a high degree of discipline at home. We must understand—and the President is the only man among us who can bring this forcibly to the Nation—that waging peace in our times is a task of formidable proportions second only to waging war.

The successful waging of peace requires a vigorous national administration, an informed people, and a mature people who

know that you cannot be adult without being willing to pay for what you want. It is only in heaven that you can eat your cake and have it too.

This is the melancholy pass to which we have come. It is like the common story of the rich, miserly recluses found starving. There has never been a time when we did not have the resources of men, money, and access to knowledge that might have given us a wide lead over any aggressor and make us attack upon us suicidal. Yet we have apparently believed we could not afford to spend enough to secure our liberties.

Money plainly is not power. It is only potential power. It becomes a real power only when used in quantities sufficient to the task. Today although the walls of our world might be tumbled down tomorrow, all our gold could not produce a single missile or enable us to hurl a rocket to the moon.

We must abandon the perilous notion that we can afford security only within the strait-jacket of the budget. This is equivalent to throwing 3 feet of rope to a drowning man who is 6 feet away.

If we had tried to fight the last war within the budget, we would have lost. Congress did not say to the Air Force: "For budgetary reasons we can allot you only \$2 billion." On the contrary, it said: "Tell us your requirements and we'll find the money."

Since we are now in deadly conflict with a prodigious antagonist, we can neglect nothing that might assure our security. So doing, we might waste some money. But failing, we would lose our lives.

There is no room here for margin of error. Gone are the days of the last two world wars when we could go to the battlefield in our own good time and relieve the balance. In 30 minutes we could now go from national existence to national death.

Certain it is that we cannot escape biology. When white men came here the Indians wanted what we want: to be let alone. But they were not let alone and could not stand against their antagonists. In the pitiless universe, plants, animals, or men struggle hard enough to survive or they disappear. The Indians are gone. History records their passing. But nature does not weep for them. She is concerned only with the survival of the species; not with some segment of it, not even with the survival of Americans.

Where do we stand? We stand today a nation with prodigious resources, able to afford private luxuries incomparable in history, but trailing the Soviet Union in science, space, armament, and most recently the winter Olympics. Rich in the private sector of our economy, we are poor in the public sector, and we will get poorer if we follow the admonition of our Secretary of Commerce, who branded any politician as irresponsible or an economic illiterate if he were to try to "drain from the bloodstream of the private economy the savings urgently needed . . . for growth."

Look but at the growth we get. Television repairmen being paid more than teachers; 200,000 fewer scientists and engineers than the Soviet Union with half as many college graduates; toilet water at every drugstore; and polluted streams in every State.

Without a sense of purpose we are not able to put our enormous productive capacities to the needs of the Nation. It's every man for himself, and the Nation take what's left.

Of course, if we think Khrushchev was only kidding when he said he would bury us, we have no need to worry. But I, for one, believe our security is at stake. And yet, we stand as a nation, a 20th century Babylon, headless and heartless, a big, fat target for the ably led Communist world and the clamoring, poverty-ridden new states.

Even if we don't know where we stand in the world—even if we would rather not

know—it is a fact that we cannot hide our image from the world and this image is as important as any "foreign policy" we might devise.

The challenge to us arises partly from the arrival on the world scene of the Soviet Union, but the challenge also arises from what we have let ourselves become.

The American people ought to be told the bleak truth about their world, the character of the forces arrayed against them, and what they must do, at whatever cost, to survive or even to bring about a state of high security. They must be told that, however, humane their society, whatever its ideals, this alone will not save them from destruction by a society armed with the prodigious mechanisms of our times and an implacable determination to dominate all men.

They must be told, furthermore, that the problems they face are incapable of solution within their time or the time of their children; that for decades to come the life of humanity will be threatened by the lava flow emerging from the greatest eruption of all time. They must be reminded of what history and experience demonstrate: That merely because something is desirable does not mean that it will necessarily come to pass; that things men have longed for during centuries are as far from being realized now as they were in the days of Babylon.

The people must be told, too, that it will not be enough simply to react to the Soviet threat and to clean our domestic Augean stables. Goals we must have to which we and mankind may aspire. And once the goals are clarified we must have the fortitude and the patience and the means to attain them.

You have been kind and patient and it is time to bring these remarks to a close. But I cannot conclude without at least a word about what we should do now, about all of this.

Of course, there are many things that need to be done, but there is one thing without which none of them will be done. That indispensable element is the placing of the responsibility for governing and the power to govern this country in the hands of one or the other of the political parties.

I realize that politics has become a naughty word in America, but as long as we retain our constitutional system, political parties are necessary evils. Unless we give the control of both the legislative and the executive branches of our Government to the same party we are courting disaster. There is no other way short of a dictatorship to focus the tremendous talents and the potential power of our people upon the problems which confront us.

It is within the classic tradition of democracy that this particular duty is the exclusive responsibility of the citizen voters of this great Republic, and none of these citizens bear a greater responsibility than those who have had the good fortune to attend Harvard University.

Civil Rights

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill, has my full support. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, for the Federal Government to see to it that every American enjoys the full and free exercise of his rights under the Constitution. Haggle we may over details, but Congress can no longer escape its plain sworn duty to insure and protect the constitutional rights of every American regardless of race, color, creed or place of residence.

All of us are well aware of the fact that discrimination exists in the North and West as well as in the South. In areas outside the South, discrimination is particularly aggravating in the fields of employment and housing but happily, steady progress toward ending it is being made.

To me, the most important provisions of this legislation are those concerning the voting rights of Negroes in the South where such rights are presently denied or curbed in direct and indirect ways in many counties.

The right to vote is the greatest right possessed by free men and women in a republic. An honest and secret ballot gives us the ability to choose our leaders and representatives. Without the right to vote, a citizen soon finds that, regardless of the provisions of the Constitution, he has no other rights except those permitted him by leaders he does not help select.

Ninety years ago almost to the day—March 30, 1870—we wrote the 15th amendment into the Constitution:

The right of citizens . . . to vote shall not be denied . . . on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Ninety years later we have yet to make good on that promise. In county after county in the Deep South, where thousands of Negroes reside and many own property, few or none are permitted to vote. Not only are these citizens prevented from voting by unreasonable and ridiculous tests, but by intimidation and violence as well. Ninety years is certainly long enough to prove that existing laws have not given Negroes in the South the voting rights which are theirs.

Voting referees are needed to see that the requirements for voting shall be uniform for all races.

The bill also protects voters from the threats and intimidation that have been so common in the past. The Federal Government must step in where necessary and give the right to vote to every qualified American citizen wherever it is denied.

In January 1959 I introduced H.R. 1933, a bill to prevent hate bombing. On May 13, 14, 1959, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on my bill and others with generally similar purposes. I was the first witness to be heard by the subcommittee and I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to quote a few sentences from my testimony at that time:

The weakening of the solidarity among the people of the United States by attacks on religious and racial groups, and buildings which they use, plays right into the hands of the communists. In no other way can the great strength of this Nation be weak-

ened as much as it is by pitting one racial group against another, one religious group against another, or one section of the country against another section.

The damage to our worldwide position as a guardian of liberty is incalculable if these conditions are allowed to exist without Federal law to correct them. The Communists are making supreme efforts among the peoples of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East to exaggerate our differences. Their propaganda mills exploit every single hate incident which happens here, whether it be a small local abuse or a major attack on a racial or religious group in the Congress of the United States.

The Nation cannot afford to permit the irresponsibility of a few individuals to jeopardize our prestige and leadership in the free world.

It is very heartening to note that title II of H.R. 8601 includes very practical provisions along the lines of my own bill H.R. 1933, penalizing those who do participate in hate bombing and related activities.

America's position in the world will be stronger with this civil rights bill on the law books of the Nation.

Impressive Photographic Exhibition in Connection With the White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us are aware that the White House Conference on Children and Youth is now getting underway. Some 7,000 delegates have come to Washington from all over the country to participate in these important deliberations. In connection with the conference, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an impressive photographic exhibit which has been assembled especially for this occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the subject be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The subject of this exhibition is the hope of this Nation—its young people. In 350 distinguished photographs, the selective eye of the camera has recorded the hopes and fears, the loves and problems, the triumphs and disappointments of individuals growing up in America.

The 50th Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, called by President Eisenhower, is charged with the great responsibility of planning to help youth build their world for tomorrow. The photographic exhibit on display in the West Ballroom of the Hotel Shoreham visualizes the many challenges that face delegates to the Conference.

There are expressions of a universal nature: the infant's abiding love for its mother, a child's discovery of life's magic in animals and flowers, youth's urge to rebel against what his sometimes illogical nature finds an unfair constriction of authority.

Other pictures focus on particularly American aspects of life: the adolescent boy's engrossing interest in automobiles, the relaxed give and take of learning in a democratic classroom, the problems of providing equal opportunities for all groups of American youth.

I commend to the attention of Senators this panorama of 350 pictures, which have been generously provided by many leading photographers and organizations, and then, as a public service, edited and assembled for the Conference by the Eastman Kodak Co. of Rochester, N.Y.

In a very real sense this exhibition, which will later be seen in other cities in America and abroad, illustrates the many fruitful discussions taking place in the sessions of the White House Conference. In as real a sense, it has significant meaning in relation to what we say in this Chamber now and in years to come. The camera has recorded the hopes for this country's future, which, in large measure, it is our task to make real.

The Balance of Payments Deficit—A Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 I was pleased to deliver the keynote speech at the 14th annual world trade conference of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce in Pittsburgh. My topic was "The Balance of Payments Deficit—A Challenge to America."

In my address I stressed the urgent need for reducing the deficit and told of the new program of informational and promotional activity in the foreign-trade field carried on by the Department of Commerce.

In his message to Congress, President Eisenhower outlined those plans. He echoed my expressed views when he said that "increased exports are important to the United States at this time." Besides creating more jobs for Americans, the President said, expanded exports will help to support such essential expenditures abroad as investment, private travel, maintenance of U.S. military forces, and programs of economic cooperation. It came as a source of some satisfaction to me that of the seven comprehensive steps charted by the President to stimulate exporting, five of them were embodied in my Pittsburgh speech. The seven steps the President directed the Government to take are, first, to strengthen the trade promotion services of the Department of Commerce, including its field offices located throughout the United States; second, to expand and give higher priority to the commercial activities of the Foreign Service; third, to expand the agricultural trade promotion activities of the Department of Agriculture; fourth, to place greater emphasis on the prompt reporting of information useful to American exporters; fifth, to establish new overseas trade centers; sixth, to make fuller use of international fairs, trade missions, and

other promotional means to stimulate the interest of foreign buyers in U.S. products while continuing to emphasize the basic objectives of the special program for international understanding; and seventh, to emphasize the promotion of tourist travel to the United States.

My own remarks in Pittsburgh follow:
THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT—A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

(Remarks by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, at the 14th annual Pittsburgh world trade conference sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting at the Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, March 9, 1960)

"The Balance of Payments Deficit—A Challenge to America." Here is a theme which still has an unfamiliar ring in American ears. Unfamiliarity, however, must not be permitted to block proper attention to the important issues underlying this theme.

The first of the two phrases, "the balance of payments deficit," is a rather technical term which not long ago was confined almost entirely to the jargon of specialists in international economics and finance. During the past 2 years, however, it has cropped up repeatedly in statements of public officials and business leaders, and has become commonplace in business and financial journals.

From these sources, the term has found its way with increasing frequency into the daily press, where it startles and sometimes bewilders Americans whose last news of the balance of payments had to do with the postwar dollar gap. This new term, "balance of payments deficit," is one which many of us associate vaguely with the problems of foreign countries, but are surprised and perhaps chagrined to find being used as a name for a problem of our own.

Unfortunately, public understanding of the balance of payments has not kept pace with the growth in news references to it. This conference will contribute much to the wider recognition and better understanding which are needed with respect to those issues. For this reason, the world trade council of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce is to be congratulated for its timely initiative in sponsoring today's meeting.

By way of preface, however, it may be worth while to recapitulate just a few of the most salient features of the current position. Leaving aside all reference to the trends and underlying factors which brought about that position, I would summarize it in very broad outline as follows:

In 1959 total U.S. expenditures abroad amounted to \$28½ billion. Slightly more than half of this (\$15 billion) was in payment for imports of foreign goods, and another \$5 billion went into purchases of various foreign services—shipping, insurance, tourism, and so forth. The remainder included roughly \$3 billion for purchases of our overseas military establishments and their personnel, \$2 billion for net foreign loans and grants by the Government, over \$2 billion for net private investment abroad, and a smaller sum for various private donations and pensions.

Foreign expenditures in the United States last year totaled approximately \$25 billion. Over \$16 billion of this was in payment for U.S. goods exported and more than \$7 billion was received for U.S. services rendered to foreigners and as earnings on our foreign investments. The remainder included relatively small amounts of foreign long-term capital invested here and of unrecorded transactions.

The foregoing figures do not include, either as foreign-aid grants or as exports, military goods transferred without reimbursement. Nor do they include the U.S. subscription to

the expansion of the capital resources of the International Monetary Fund.

Now, the U.S. expenditure total which I cited a moment ago exceeded total U.S. receipts on the transactions enumerated by \$3.7 billion in 1959. This difference, resulting in equivalent transfers of liquid dollar assets and gold to foreign ownership is, of course, "the balance of payments deficit."

Note that the deficit, so defined, is not a comprehensive measure of the change in our international net worth, by which I mean the excess of our investments and claims abroad over our outstanding liabilities to foreigners, long term as well as short term. In computing the conventional balance of payments deficit, we have treated U.S. foreign investment, both private and governmental, simply as an expenditure, rather than as an acquisition of valuable assets abroad. The result is a measure of the deficit strictly in terms of the effects of the transactions upon our international liquidity position.

This cash deficit in our international accounts, however, is a vitally significant and potentially threatening phenomenon, regardless of the size of our holdings of income-yielding long-term assets abroad, or of annual increases in them. These investments, in the main, are not at all liquid, and could not contribute much, should an emergency arise, to the problem of meeting demands by short-term creditors for withdrawal of their funds.

Fortunately, no emergency is at hand. Our economic and financial position is very strong. This gives us plenty of time to take action that will preclude the development of any emergency, provided that we use that time wisely for the application of policies designed to prevent extended continuation of balance-of-payments deficits on the 1958-59 scale. Drifting for even a few more years at the recent deficit level, however, would surely bring us into an unpleasant situation.

Moderate annual deficits in our balance of payments during most of the past decade, coupled with the large ones recorded in 1958 and 1959, have already raised the liquid dollar holdings of foreign countries—that is, their bank deposits here plus the short-term Treasury securities which they hold—from about \$6½ billion at the end of 1949 to \$17½ billion at the close of last year. Over the same interval, the U.S. gold stock dwindled from roughly \$24½ billion to \$19½ billion.

The increase in foreign countries' gold and dollar holdings to date could be regarded, for the most part, as a welcome restoration and redistribution of international reserves. It was a necessary condition for resumption of relatively unfettered multilateral trading patterns, and hence was a conscious objective of U.S. foreign economic policy for a number of years. It has been an essential factor in the recently accelerated dismantling of trade and exchange restrictions by important trading countries. Without it, the highly desirable reestablishment of external convertibility for major European countries a year or so ago could scarcely have been contemplated.

Nevertheless, we must ask how long the propensity of foreign countries to hold dollars as a reserve currency will remain strong enough to make them willing to add anything like \$3½ billion per year to their holdings. To date, they have taken the bulk of the liquid funds transferred to them over the past decade in the form of bank deposits and Treasury securities rather than in the form of gold. This attests to the confidence which foreign governments and their citizens have in our currency and to their faith in the economic and political stability of the United States. It also reflects, of course, their requirements for large operating balances to finance their trade both with us and to a considerable extent with each other.

Under present conditions, and with the attitudes now prevailing, our gold stock of \$19½ billion represents a rather comfortable international reserve, even though approximately \$12 billion of that total is required for our domestic monetary reserves under existing law. So long as no extraordinary and unexpected demands on our gold stock arise, it bears an ample ratio to our short-term international liabilities.

Still, if those liabilities should continue to rise rapidly, the ratio would soon become less ample. If it fell too low, it would expose our gold reserve to great jeopardy in the event of any development causing serious weakening of the confidence of foreign depositors in the dollar. If for any reason they were to attempt to convert a substantial proportion of their present dollar holdings to gold, or even to obtain full settlement in gold of U.S. balance of payments deficits on the 1959 scale, the simple arithmetic of the relationships I have reviewed is such that the available free gold reserve could be drained off very quickly.

If this happened, I do not believe I need to paint a picture of the chaos and uncertainty which would thus be introduced into international finance and trade.

Fortunately, this bogey is not imminent. Nevertheless, in order to prevent gradual drift into a situation in which it might quickly become a realistic threat, we should be prudent enough to take responsible steps now toward sharp reduction of the excessive deficit recently prevailing in our balance of payments.

The most authoritative projections of our international transactions which are available suggest that some corrective adjustment is already underway. American exports were depressed during 1958 and early 1959 in part by various cyclical and special factors which appear to be in process of reversal. Exports were rising fairly strongly in the latter part of 1959, and are expected to be considerably higher in 1960 than last year. Imports, on the other hand, tended to flatten out after mid-1959, following a very rapid rise during the several preceding quarters, and their further growth in 1960 is expected to be much more moderate than their increase from 1958 to 1959.

The anticipated recovery of the export surplus in our merchandise trade would mitigate appreciably the overall balance-of-payments deficit. According to these projections, the deficit might drop to the \$2½ or \$3 billion range this year. Such a level, however, would not be nearly good enough. Major efforts are still necessary to reduce it much further.

Over the last quarter century, the U.S. Government has taken the lead by example and negotiation in reducing tariffs and other restrictions to trade. Since World War II we have vigorously put forward our firm belief that liberal international trade policies are essential to free world economic progress and we have attempted to put this belief into practice in our own trading agreements. Despite some setbacks, our overall record is one of which we can justly be proud.

The United States should not try to redress the current deficit in its balance of payments by throwing aside its liberal trade policy and discouraging imports. Rather, we should seek to solve the problem by, among other things, promoting an expansion of our exports.

The advantages of a liberal import policy to the U.S. economy are clear. U.S. industry depends heavily on foreign sources of supply for a very large number of basic materials. For example, one-fourth of our iron ore, one-third of our copper and rubber, and the bulk of our tin, nickel, and newsprint come from abroad. The availability of these imports results in lower production costs and

greater efficiency. Imports also give the American consumer a chance to choose from a wider variety of goods than are available from domestic producers, and the competition of foreign goods with those produced at home offers direct and indirect advantages to the consumer in terms of price and quality. While this competition may at times be painful, it helps to keep American producers on their toes; helps to keep our economy dynamic; and helps to keep our prices in line. All of these things mean higher real incomes and a higher standard of living in the United States. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that trade is a two-way street. Our imports help to finance our exports; without one there could not be the other.

Reversion to a restrictive trade policy would dissipate the advantages mentioned above and would not solve the long-run problem of balancing the U.S. international accounts. On the contrary, backsliding by the United States would tend to be self-defeating since it would encourage a return to greater protectionism in other countries and lead to a contraction of our own exports.

We must not forget the importance of exports to the U.S. economy. Our exports provide employment, increase the volume of output and thus lead to lower costs of production and prices, and add to profits. In 1959, not an especially good year, over \$16 billion of U.S. goods were shipped abroad. Many U.S. industries depend heavily on large foreign sales. For example, 40 percent of our tractor production, 35 percent of our civilian aircraft production, and 20 percent of our output of trucks are exported.

At the present time world trade barriers are coming down and we are in a position to reap the fruits of our own liberal trade policies of the past which helped substantially in the postwar recovery of other free world economies.

During the period of the so-called dollar shortage, many countries found it necessary to impose extensive restrictions on imports in order to conserve their meager foreign exchange reserves. These restrictions were highly discriminatory against goods from the dollar area—especially the United States. The need for such restrictions has now been greatly reduced. The war-ravaged economies of Western Europe and Japan have been rehabilitated and most of these nations have built their gold and foreign exchange reserves to quite satisfactory levels. As a result, most of the industrialized countries of Western Europe were able at the end of December 1958 to adopt external convertibility for their currencies, a move which eliminated the financial justification for discriminatory restrictions against U.S. exports.

The U.S. Government has taken advantage of this new situation in world trade and payments to press for the rapid removal of import restrictions and, in particular, those restrictions which are discriminatory against dollar goods. Our view on the lack of justification for such restrictions has been enunciated both in international forums such as the International Monetary Fund, the meetings of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT), and the OEEC and in bilateral representations to the governments of our trade partners.

The need to do away with restrictions and discrimination has been recognized by the other industrialized nations and in some of the newly developing areas as well. Many countries have taken important steps toward reducing their restrictions and the discrimination which they have practiced against American goods. Among the countries which have acted in the past year are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and the United

Kingdom. Some of these countries have virtually eliminated discrimination against the dollar area.

The drive to remove quantitative import restrictions on dollar goods has received so constructive a response and has developed such momentum that we can look forward confidently to further advances in coming months. We can reasonably hope that by the end of the year discrimination against our exports will be almost a thing of the past. The U.S. Government will continue its vigorous efforts toward this end.

The Department of Commerce presently carries on an extensive program of informational and promotional activity in the foreign trade field. Plans are now underway to improve and expand these facilities for exporters. It is planned that these activities will include a strengthening of the Foreign Commercial Service in order to provide timely detailed information on trade prospects; find suitable foreign agents for U.S. firms (that is, you); provide overseas facilities for the dissemination of promotional material by American business firms; assist business firms in adapting their promotional activities to local needs; arrange appointments with prospective purchasers; and the like. In addition to these continuing activities, the Department of Commerce plans to expand its work abroad with respect to trade information centers; in providing foreign exhibits of American products known as world trade centers; through participation in international trade fairs; and through the sending abroad of trade missions of American businessmen to meet with local industry and Government groups. These expanded activities are likely to prove especially helpful to the smaller and medium-sized firms which do not have adequate foreign trade information, and to other firms which have not fully explored the opportunities which may exist in foreign markets. In this manner our Government is trying to stimulate increased interest and efficiency in foreign sales.

It seems clear to me that the most desirable line of solution is to be found mainly on the side of expanding our sales to foreign countries. Many, though not all, of the means being suggested on the other side—that is, for curbing our payments to foreign countries—tend either to raise questions of contradiction with some other equally important policy objective or to be potentially effective only in the short run.

Happily, however, one of the prime lines of attack not only promises to help on both sides of the balance of payments account, but also coincides fully with one of our most important national economic goals. Moreover, it can be progressively more effective in the longer run than in the immediate future. I refer to the prudent anti-inflationary management of the whole complex of our monetary and fiscal policies.

Quite independently of international trade and finance, of course, it is of the utmost importance that we pursue monetary and fiscal policies designed to avoid inflation and maintain a stable purchasing power for the dollar. Sincere and diligent labor-management cooperation and ingenuity to hold down or reduce costs is equally urgent.

The balance of payments deficit now presents one more powerful reason for pursuit of sound policies in these fields. By maintaining and eventually improving our international competitive strength, along with our domestic economic strength, wise anti-inflationary measures will both facilitate expansion of U.S. export sales and temper the growth of many competitive imports. They will also sustain foreign confidence in the value of dollar reserves and thus minimize any possibility that those funds might be used to drain off our gold reserves.

Another important line of attack on the balance of payments deficit which should be

entirely noncontroversial is vigorous diplomatic pressure on our friends and allies abroad to complete the job of removing anachronistic trade and exchange restrictions discriminating against the entry of our goods into their markets. The present administration has pressed energetically for such action by foreign governments. These efforts, abetted by shifting circumstances in the realm of international commerce, have been rewarded by very substantial progress in the past few years and especially in recent months. Much remains to be accomplished here, however, and our Government must redouble, rather than relax, its vigor on these issues.

To many observers, it has seemed that the obvious and easy way to correct the balance of payments deficit is to reduce some of our expenditures abroad—to tighten our belts and live within the means of our receipts from foreign transactions. As a generalization, however, and with the reservation that certain exceptions may well be in order, I would urge that we eschew this line of solution, at least unless or until we have unsuccessfully exhausted the potentials for achieving balance through expansion of our sales. And I do not think failure is likely if a genuine export drive can be mounted.

The trouble with seeking to cut our expenditures abroad—still generally speaking—is that there are few effective means of doing this which do not have highly undesirable or self-defeating side-effects. Most devices for this purpose would either abridge arbitrarily the freedom of choice and the economic welfare of American individuals and business firms, or interfere with the conduct of important international responsibilities which we have assumed for what most of us view as good and sufficient reasons.

For example, an attempt to restrain the outflow of U.S. private capital to foreign countries would not only be rightly resented by the investors as an inhibition of their scope of action and profit opportunities, but would run contrary to our national policy of stimulating and encouraging economic development throughout the free world.

Raising barriers to imports of industrial materials or capital equipment, while perhaps of immediate benefit to the limited groups of U.S. producers thus favored, is always subject to the strong objection that it raises costs, and thus depreciates the competitive positions, of other American producers.

Similarly, new barriers to imports of particular consumer goods would not only tap the consumer's pocketbook to the detriment of other U.S. industries competing for his dollar, but would also impinge objectionably upon his range of choice in spending his income. Any attempt to discourage U.S. tourist travel abroad would be equally open to the latter objection, as well as to others on political and cultural planes. We should do our utmost to develop tourist trade to the United States of America and the flow of funds it will bring to our shores.

Moreover, artificially increased restrictions on purchases from abroad, whether by industry or by consumers, would surely invite retaliation by foreign countries and undermine the international cooperation in reduction of trade barriers which we have led for many years. It would ultimately penalize our exporting producers and their employees through shrinkage of sales opportunities abroad, and thus in the end would not even contribute anything lasting to mitigation of the balance-of-payments problem.

In another area there is little doubt that we could achieve considerable reduction in the balance-of-payments deficit, at least for the short run, by cutting back the size of our overseas military operations and the expenditures which they entail. To do this solely on balance-of-payments grounds, how-

ever, at the cost of weakening our strategic position in the cold war, might constitute abdication of responsibility for a larger problem in order to meet a lesser one.

While there is probably room for desirable economies in overseas military expenditures, as in other segments of defense spending, changes in the program should generally be judged on their own merits. On the whole, it seems clear to me that there is less risk in accommodating the balance of payments to the imperatives of the international military situation than in tailoring the defense suit to fit the balance-of-payments cloth.

Similar considerations, though perhaps more controversial, may be advanced against the notion of cutting back our foreign-aid programs primarily in order to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit. Since the greater part of the aid is spent on U.S. goods and services, despite our liberal and statesmanlike policy of worldwide competitive-bid procurement for some of the more important programs, it would require disproportionately large reductions in foreign-aid outlays to achieve a given net effect on the balance of payments. Here, too, in the main, the programs should be judged on their merits in a context much broader than that of the balance-of-payments deficit.

So I return to the thought that primary reliance in meeting that challenge must be placed upon improvement of our international competitive position and expansion of our export sales. This is the path that will lead to the greatest benefits with the least incidental damage to other American objectives, domestic or international.

It seems to me that we have barely scratched the surface of what our country could achieve if we emphasized exports and made them a national objective, as do most of the industrialized European countries. They are export conscious. Goods are designed and styled specifically for foreign markets. They provide servicing of goods abroad and much time and effort is spent on foreign sales. The success of many of these programs is a very wholesome example to us, as we have never made a comparable effort, either through private enterprise or the Government.

Through the activities of the Export-Import Bank, we have for many years been engaged in an effort to promote our foreign trade by financial means. From time to time our efforts in this field have been reviewed. Recently, suggestions have been made that the facilities of the U.S. Government in this field, which up to the present time have been used largely to provide medium and long-term credits and guarantees, should be expanded to cover exports which are normally traded on the basis of short-term credits. A number of other exporting countries have provided such facilities for their exporters, and there is some evidence that our own exporters have on occasion lost business because more favorable credit terms were available from other countries. We are now exploring the need and usefulness of additional facilities for export credit guarantees and financing in the short-term field.

American business is living in a more competitive world. The Western European economies and that of Japan have recovered their health and vigor. The sellers' market of the postwar period is no longer with us and, henceforth, American products will move in world trade only to the extent that American producers are capable of delivering the right kind of goods at the right prices.

There has been a great deal of concern that American goods are becoming noncompetitive in world markets. However, there is no clear evidence to support a conclusion that the competitiveness of American producers has been impaired. The lower level of our exports during 1958 and 1959 was largely due to abnormal and special factors. With con-

tinued economic expansion in Western Europe and Canada and increased exports of cotton and commercial aircraft already on order, we can reasonably anticipate a substantial increase in our foreign sales in the coming months.

Furthermore, it is important to note that in recent years while exports of some U.S. products have declined, U.S. exports of goods embodying advanced technology have continued to rise. Our advantage in world markets has traditionally lain in the innovative field, in our ability and willingness to invest in research and development. We can maintain this advantage. Change is the natural way of our economic life. In adjusting to the realities of a new era, business has a continuing incentive to develop new products and to introduce fresh methods of production and merchandising.

Government can go just so far in furthering opportunity, but your own individual initiative and effort in development will, in the end, bring results for you and the United States.

Appeal for the Vanishing Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of yesterday, March 27, appeared an article by our able colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIER, entitled, "Appeal for the Vanishing Primary." The article reflects the freshness and boldness of thought that all of us have become accustomed to expect from the Senator from Wisconsin. I commend his article to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEAL FOR THE VANISHING PRIMARY—A SENATOR ANSWERS THOSE WHO WOULD ABANDON THE PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENTIAL POLL, AND SUGGEST THAT THE ANSWER TO THEIR CRITICISMS LIES IN THE EXPANDING SYSTEM

(By WILLIAM PROXMIER)

WASHINGTON—This Sunday hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin citizens are fighting out the presidential primary campaign of 1960. On the steps of churches, over a beer in taverns, in dairy barns and kitchens and automobiles, the argument, the contradiction, the agreement, the joking are rolling along faster and faster as the April 5 deadline approaches, a deadline that may seal the fate of HUBERT HUMPHREY, and JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The season of the primaries is upon us and the people of my State are happily engaged in what has become a rare—I think far too rare—American privilege: having a voice in deciding who is going to be either of the two (the nominees of the two major parties) who will have any chance to become the next President of the United States. In future weeks and months the people of some other States will have a similar opportunity.

There are a thousand reasons why this is a disorganized, irresponsible way for the country to be influenced in its choice of the occupant of so great an office. Many of the hundreds of thousands of conversations going on today in Wisconsin, for example, are ir-

relevant to the issues. Thousands of votes will be influenced by Muriel Humphrey's homey and simple coffee-hour campaigning for husband HUBERT, or racket-busting Bob Kennedy's tireless farm-to-farm barnstorming for brother JACK. And of course, KENNEDY's religion is constantly discussed and will persuade many.

Primaries have more serious inadequacies. Some were outlined by David Broder in this magazine a few weeks ago. Certainly the candidates may be hurting each other, and our Democratic organization in Wisconsin may be suffering a division that will take months to repair. And, as Adlai Stevenson pointed out in another recent article, the primaries impose a severe physical, financial, and time-consuming burden on the candidates.

A primary costs hundreds of thousands of dollars, while often exciting no contest at all. This year, for instance, will mark the first significant Democratic presidential contest in Wisconsin in 36 years.

It can be argued that a primary often fails to offer voters a meaningful choice. In 10 of the 15 States that permit presidential preferential polls, delegates to the national conventions are not bound, and often they are little influenced, by the voice of the people. In the remaining five States delegates are bound by the primary results. But in California a favorite-son delegation picked by the Governor will probably be unopposed. Indiana voters are expected to have no alternative to KENNEDY. In Maryland, WAYNE MORSE is the sole alternative to KENNEDY. In Oregon MORSE will run as a favorite son.

And what kind of choice will the Wisconsin voter really have on April 5? Only two of the five leading Democratic candidates are entered in Wisconsin. How about Symington or Johnson or Stevenson supporters? What choice do they have?

This weakness is only partly answered by the obvious fact that only KENNEDY and HUMPHREY chose to enter in Wisconsin. All candidates were free to enter. Presumably, any candidate really interested in the Democratic nomination, and who thought he had a very good chance in Wisconsin, would try to pick up the delegation by submitting his name.

Another weakness of the Wisconsin primary is that normally Republican voters, recognizing that Vice President NIXON is unopposed and little needs the prestige of a big vote in Wisconsin, can cross over in the primary. If they do so in sufficient numbers and the contest is otherwise reasonably close, Republicans can pick the Democrats' nominee.

One answer to this is that Republicans are American citizens, too. Why shouldn't they have a chance to influence the selection of the man who may be their next President? Of course, many Democrats won't buy this answer. They might, however, settle for the certainty that Republicans will be a minority, and probably a small one, in this Democratic primary.

In view of these serious weaknesses and imperfections, what can be said for the practice of having the plain voter play such a telling role in answering the big question?

There are three compelling arguments for the primary.

The first is that in an age of political apathy and indifference, of too much passive diversion and not nearly enough citizen responsibility, the presidential primary is exactly the kind of colorful, exciting, significant contest for public office that will persuade the citizen to discharge the active responsibility that he so rarely is called upon to assume. This is good for the voter as a man and as a citizen.

Besides, there is no more important activity for men who want to be President of the United States than to get out

and talk about the Nation's problems with the Nation's citizens. It is too often a temptation for candidates to avoid this most essential obligation to democratic leaders.

Wisconsin today affords an excellent example of the benefits to the voters of a presidential primary campaign. In the past 9 years I have campaigned intensively five times for statewide office in Wisconsin. I have met and shaken hands with well over a million Wisconsin citizens during this time. Since the presidential campaign began in earnest in Wisconsin, I have once again been out in the State talking with thousands of farmers and workers, tavern keepers and hardware merchants, housewives and college students. A sharp and exciting change has come over my State in the past few weeks.

Besides the irrelevant conversations, there is also a gratifying amount of talk about KENNEDY's battle for labor reform and HUMPHREY's fight for the dairy farmer; discussion of KENNEDY's strikingly thoughtful, logical, informed replies to questions—his impressive mental equipment—and of HUMPHREY's broad and deep competence in everything from fiscal policy to foreign policy.

Secondly, the primary makes sense because no one—not brilliantly informed delegates, not hard-working party leaders, not mayors or Governors or Senators—has as much right to say who should be the elected officials of a democracy as the plain voter—all the voters. And this should apply most strongly to the elective office that constitutes the greatest authority and heaviest responsibility the American people can give to any man. It should apply particularly to the primary system, because this reduces the choice of presidential candidates to two and affords the only real choice for the millions of Americans who consistently vote for one or the other of the major parties in November.

This is true not only because of the faith all Americans presumably share in popular democracy. It is true also on the practical ground that the plain voter, with all his shortcomings, will usually give a better answer than the political professionals in casting his vote. He will do so because he will usually ask the right question.

It has been my experience through three losing and two winning statewide campaigns that the voter almost never votes for a man simply because he thinks he will win. On the other hand—as I will try to show a little later—this is by all odds the major consideration of the party leader, the public official, the delegate.

Instead, the voter usually tries to answer the following question with his ballot: Who will make the best President of the United States? Often he may not have enough information to arrive at the right answer, but frequently he will. Today there is the magic of television and radio. Newspapers are reporting more fully, fairly and accurately than ever before. And both HUMPHREY and KENNEDY will have talked directly and personally to tens of thousands of Wisconsin citizens by election day.

After this kind of intensive campaign most plain voters may have a closer understanding of the characters, the minds and the attitudes on big issues of the candidates than Americans have generally had throughout our 170 years of democracy.

The third reason I vote for the primary system is the extremely serious weaknesses of the alternatives. The prime alternative is the selection of delegates by a State convention. Thirty-five States do this exclusively with no public presidential poll.

Why should such delegates—enjoying the wise and personal influence of party leaders, Governors, Senators, newspaper editors, top business and labor officials—usually better informed and more deeply interested than other voters—why should these delegates be considered such a grim alternative?

The answer is evident to anyone who has thoughtfully attended a State convention. Often a party chairman, a Governor or an unofficial but potent leader will actually select the delegation to the national presidential convention. In doing so, the leader, if his power is great enough, will pick delegates who will be amenable to his persuasion. Otherwise, he will unite with other party leaders until they can put together a strong enough combination to win convention approval. In any event, State conventions select the men and women who will represent the State in determining the presidential nominee on an emphatically partisan basis.

There is one all-pervasive and consistent principle: dedication to the welfare and success of the party as an entity. This is rarely the national party. It is far more often the State party—or even the dominant faction of the party within the State. The convincing argument is: What candidate can do the party the most good? The answer to this is usually—though not always—which candidate can win? Even a nationally winning candidate may not be best for the leaders in each State.

This victory criterion is the dominant one, but it is not the only basis of selection. The criterion in some cases may be: Will he help the ticket most in our State? The answer in New York may be quite different from that in Mississippi.

In both State and National conventions idealism is obvious. There is earnest concern with the national interest and a desire to nominate the man who will serve the Nation most ably. But the cry that never fails to bring partisan delegates up fighting in the intensely partisan atmosphere of a convention is "The man who will win in November."

From years of experience in campaigns, from public opinion polls, from scattered primary election results the delegates in general make the best guess they can as to who will be most likely to win in November. Of course, their decision is tempered. Even the most popular candidate cannot win if he is not acceptable, for whatever reason, to enough powerful State leaders. But, by and large, the decision is a giant guess on who has the best chance in November.

How much better to go directly to the voter, as Wisconsin is doing, and let him decide. At least let him decide how the votes of his own State should be cast at the national convention, after the voter has asked himself, not who will win, but who will make the best President.

I vote for the primary with all its obvious weaknesses, and though it has been losing ground. From its high point of 22 States, it was down to 19 States in 1956. It has fallen to 15 this year, and in 1964 the number will probably be even less.

Even in my own Wisconsin, where the Nation began the process of popular participation in Presidential campaigns by the first direct election of delegates to national conventions in 1905, the primary is in serious danger. The largest newspaper in Wisconsin has asked that State officials give earnest consideration to abolishing it. Top officials of both parties in Wisconsin will be sorely tempted to do so. With the grief the primary causes party organizations when it works, the wonder is that it has survived as long as it has.

For those who believe in popular democracy, the death of the Presidential primary would be a tragedy. If the Presidential primary disappears, a passive, apathetic America will slumber deeper than ever, as the real decisions on who should be President of the

United States are determined by a small group of deeply interested men and women in an atmosphere of almost irresistible partisanship.

No one would contend that the present, incomplete system of primaries is perfect, and many of us think the whole nomination process should be overhauled. To this end I shall introduce in the Senate in the near future a proposal for a constitutional amendment for a nationwide Presidential primary through which the rank-and-file voters could choose their own candidates.

Public opinion polls over the past few years have indicated that an overwhelming majority of Americans, no doubt disillusioned by what they have seen of the national conventions since televised coverage began in 1948, favor such a national primary and want a bigger share in choosing Presidential candidates.

I propose that in August of Presidential election years there be a nationwide primary vote to nominate the Presidential candidate in each party which qualified by having polled at least 10 percent of the vote in the previous Presidential election. To appear on the primary ballot, a candidate must submit a petition signed by qualified voters equal to at least 1 percent of the total vote cast for all Presidential candidates in the previous election. These petitioners must be residents of at least six different States, including two of the States with the largest populations, two medium-sized States, and two small States. If none of a party's candidates receives a majority, a run-off primary will be held in September between the two in each party with the greatest number of votes.

Tens of millions of American citizens would thus select the two men who would carry the banners of the Republican and Democratic parties in November. The parties would continue to hold national conventions following the primary, in order to nominate their Vice Presidential candidates and to write their platforms. Platform writing could then enjoy the attention it deserves. The party platform would also be, as it should be, the direct responsibility of the party's Presidential nominee.

I would accompany this proposal with an election-spending law directly relating to these primaries. The law would (1) limit the amount that could be spent by, or on behalf of, all candidates, and (2) require full disclosure of all contributions and expenditures, above a modest minimum amount, 72 hours after being received or paid out.

This highly desirable reform will undoubtedly take some time to bring about—if, indeed, it is ever achieved—but in the meantime we should retain the primaries we have, so that there is at least some opportunity for plain people to influence the nomination.

The presidential primary is not yet dead. It desperately needs improvement. But it is well worth fighting for and saving.

The big issue in this Congress in 1960 has been the battle over the right of all Americans—specifically the southern Negroes—to vote. What a paradox it is that, at the very time we are so deeply and properly concerned with this fight, we are passively permitting almost all Americans to lose the big share of their presidential franchise.

In an America that was founded and has flourished on democracy and that is still dedicated at great cost and risk to fighting for democracy throughout the world, the right of at least some plain Americans to have a voice in the primary election of their President should be enlivened, not killed.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King,
Christian Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable leaders of our time is the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, the distinguished Negro minister.

On March 10, 1960, Dr. King made an address at Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., a summary of which was prepared by Guy F. Hershberger, professor of history and sociology at the college. Dr. Hershberger's summary, which appeared in the *Elkhart Truth* of March 17, 1960, follows:

MARTIN L. KING: PROFESSOR'S VIEW

Martin Luther King is more than a champion of civil rights.

He is a minister of the Gospel whose roots are deep in the Christian heritage.

He speaks out of the deep religious experience and the sacrificial suffering of his own people. He has repudiated all violence.

Even though his suffering and that of his people has been far greater than that of the Founding Fathers, the movement which he leads was initiated, not by a "shot heard round the world."

It was founded in the church amidst hymns of praise and humble petitions from a thousand hearts.

"IF YOU HAVE WEAPONS, TAKE THEM HOME"

It was in this setting that Dr. King's spoken word was heard round the world; a word in behalf of freedom, yes; but also a word of love and mercy toward those who oppose freedom.

There were adversaries, some of them desperate. They even bombed his house. But when the crowds gathered about the ruins, some muttering thoughts of revenge, the fearless voice of Martin Luther King spoke softly once more, but clearly so that all could hear:

"If you have weapons take them home. If you do not have them, please do not seek to get them. Remember the words of Him who said, 'He who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. Love your enemies. Pray for them that spitefully use you.'"

G. M. Trevelyan, the British historian, has said: "Close your eyes to John Woolman one century and you will get John Brown the next, with Grant to follow."

Obviously King is far closer to the spirit of Woolman than to that of most 19th century antislavery crusaders; and if his people continue to follow his steps the Nation need not fear the outcome.

Should they fail to follow him, however, and should a new Garrison or a Lovejoy appear, the next might easily be a John Brown, or a Nat Turner perhaps, with bitter fruits to follow.

KING SEEKS PEACEFUL CHANGE

What they do, however, will be determined not so much by King and his people as it will by the rest of us who hold within our hands the power of the filibuster, whether in the Senate or in the local community.

Martin Luther King is engaged in a heroic effort to bring about an inevitable social change in a peaceful manner.

If the church, the school, the community, and the Nation support him, his people will continue to follow.

If we fail him they may turn to other leadership and then we may expect the whirlwind, not only on the national but also on the international scene.

Citizens disturbed about communism and subversive influence would do well to divert their activity from name-calling directed against the Supreme Court and against religious and educational leaders who have a concern for the welfare of underprivileged and minority peoples at home and abroad.

Instead they should ponder the following letter recently received from my friend Lewis Waiyaki of Nairobi, Kenya (East Africa), a graduate of Goshen College, and now a student at the University of London.

FROM NAIROBI TO GOSHEN COLLEGE

"I am writing regarding my younger brother Peter. He wishes to study in America and it is my desire and hope that he should go to Goshen College.

"There are very few places for colonial and commonwealth students in British universities. . . .

"We are going through a difficult time in my country. The removal of colonial rule is clearly in sight but frankly I do not know how we shall be able to find suitable men for the task which lies ahead.

"Of course you and I would hope that men who will have the responsibility of guiding our country in the years to come will be people who accept the path of Christ. . . . In facing this problem America has responded but I fear not sufficiently.

"It gives me sorrow to know that the country which is showing generosity to us is the Soviet Union while the Christian countries of the West remain practically idle. . . . Already a large number (of students from Kenya) are going to Russia and the countries of the East where our people have been promised any number of scholarships.

CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN MENNONITES

"To face the Russian challenge we have formed an overseas education body to organize scholarships abroad and, of course, to advise intending students.

"For the present I am representing that body in Europe. . . . I hope and pray that Mennonites in America . . . can see the challenge and face it before it is too late. (This desire) is based on the fact that they are Christian pacifists (to which I am committed) and they do not have a colonial history. I think with their help we can build a place in Kenya for all of God's children."

The New York Times of February 24 reported the opening this year of a new university in Moscow for students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

To be known as the University of Friendship of Peoples, it will offer specialized training of from 4 to 8 years with all expenses paid.

Enrollment for the first year is to be 500 students with future enrollments increased to 3,000 to 4,000.

The objective is to attract young teachers and specialists from the underdeveloped countries as part of a campaign to win the support of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

If half of what is here promised is actually done while Americans drag their feet on the whole question of foreign aid, where will African students go for their education?

And if students of color are expelled from American colleges because they wish to sit while eating at the dimestore lunch counter, will African students want to come to America?

NAIROBI, GOSHEN, AND ELKHART

We must not think for a moment that Peter Waiyaki does not know all about the present situation in Montgomery and the

South. This story reached Nairobi as soon as it came to Goshen or Elkhart.

Does anyone really believe that American policymakers have no business being sensitive to world opinion?

And shall we listen to those who classify Martin Luther King and Benjamin Mays, his mentor, as Communists and subversives? (This has been charged.)

Or shall we look to him as a great hope for a new day, on both the national and the international scene, and also work for the goal to which he aspires?

Or falling that, are we ready to accept the possible alternative of a fanatical, violent leadership capturing the mind of the people of color, a leadership represented by such as Elijah Muhammed, perhaps?

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to include in the RECORD the following article on Dr. King's address from the South Bend Tribune of March 11, 1960:

MARTIN LUTHER KING PLEADS FOR EQUALITY

(By Louise Purvis)

GOSHEN.—"Negro students in the South are determined to continue their sitdown strikes in spite of expulsion and arrests. They are not at all afraid."

Dr. Martin Luther King, Southern Negro leader made this assertion Thursday night in the Goshen College Union auditorium where he appeared on the lecture-music series.

Dr. King, who Wednesday sent a telegram to President Eisenhower requesting him to instruct the Attorney General to investigate the Gestapoke methods and reign of terror of Montgomery, Ala., law-enforcement agencies, said he was returning to Montgomery immediately following the lecture to appear in court this morning with 35 students arrested Tuesday by police there.

A believer in passive resistance, Dr. King, copastor with his father of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Ga., and former pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, spoke on "The Future of Integration." He conducted a question and answer period following the lecture.

He said there have been three distinct periods in the United States for the Negro over the years and in each period there finally came a decision from the Supreme Court to give validity to the Negro's quest for freedom.

LISTS THREE PERIODS

He cited the first period, from 1619-1863 as the period of slavery, then the second period, from 1863-1954 as the period of restricted emancipation. Finally, he said, they are in the period of constructive desegregation which began with the Supreme Court decision in 1954 making segregation unlawful.

"We have broken loose from the Egypt of slavery. We moved through the wilderness of segregation. We stand now on the border of the promised land of integration," he said.

He said the Nation is faced not only with a moral challenge but with national survival, since peoples all over the world are looking to this country for leadership in racial issues.

To solve the problem, Dr. King offered several suggestions. He said we must look to the Federal Government to play its role in implementing the law of the land. Then we must have religion and education to change the attitudes and hearts of the people.

IDEALS OF BROTHERHOOD

He said that liberals in the North must stand up and say discrimination is wrong. "What is needed now is a liberalism committed to the ideals of brotherhood."

"White moderates in the South must take a stand," he said. "There are many thousands of them, but they are silent because

they are afraid of social, political, and economic reprisals. He said the Nation must look to the churches for leadership, and finally, "the Negro himself must move peacefully and with love for his oppressors."

Dr. King said, "All over the South the Negro is rising up and saying he is determined to be free, he is tired of the yoke of oppression." His determination is growing every day, Dr. King said, but "he must never strive to substitute one tyranny for another. Black supremacy would be just as dangerous as white."

CHARGES GESTAPO TACTICS

Dr. King claimed that police agencies in Montgomery have been acting like a gestapo force, going into private homes, invading private meetings, blocking telephone conversations, and tapping telephones. "They say they will fill up the jails with the Negroes," he charged.

During the question and answer period, he said the sit-down strikes were spontaneous in the beginning, but are now being given backing and support by many groups, including the NAACP and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, of which he is president. He said the movement started in Greensboro, N.C., and has spread to 37 communities and almost every State in the South.

"The strikes will arouse the dozing conscience of the South," he predicted.

REFUTES MARRIAGE PLANS

He also scorned the idea that a desire for intermarriage with the white race has any bearing on the issue of civil rights. "The basic aim of the Negro is to be the white man's brother, not his brother-in-law," he insisted.

Dr. King was introduced by Dr. Guy F. Hershberger, professor of sociology at Goshen College, who met him on former occasions at meetings in the South of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

He spoke of Dr. King, who became a world figure when he was only 27 years old during the bus boycott in Montgomery several years ago, as a maker of history.

An Exposé of Charity Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Where Does Your Charity Dollar Go?" written by Peter Maas, Look staff writer, which appeared in the March 15, 1960, issue of Look magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DOES YOUR CHARITY DOLLAR GO?

(By Peter Maas)

RIVALRY AND RACKETS IN MANY AREAS OF PHILANTHROPY CUT DEEPLY INTO THE DONATIONS OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

If you bought tickets recently so that "underprivileged children" could see a circus, you may have added to the take of chiselers who are now on their way to another town to pull the same racket.

If you were one of those who gave nearly \$4 million to the National Kids Day Foundation to help "kids who are poor, ill housed, and neglected," not a nickel of your contribution directly aided any child.

If you received a dollar bill from the National Cancer Hospital of America and responded, as did thousands of others who contributed some \$630,000 to save victims like 5-year-old Johnnie Jones " * * * whose freckles light up the neighborhood," you were duped. No such hospital ever existed, and no patients were ever treated.

These are only a few examples of what can happen to your charity dollar through misrepresentation, enormous "expenses," or outright fraud. In countless other cases, charities may not be swallowing your dollar, but they are devoting only a portion of what they collect to the advertised causes. This comes at a time when Americans are being bombarded as never before by appeals from coast to coast.

In San Francisco, a young accountant earning \$7,500 a year toted up 178 national and local calls for his financial help last year. A well-known New York businessman, whose yearly income exceeds \$50,000, estimates that he annually receives close to 500 pleas for aid. In Chicago, a housewife who has to make do on a \$60 weekly budget found she had donated to 31 different drives within the past 12 months and recalls at least 2 dozen additional requests to serve as a volunteer solicitor.

What happens to your dollar in this unbridled competition? Even for the worthiest causes, a hefty chunk of it is quickly wasted in high fundraising costs. Among the major national health agencies, the chief battlers for the charity buck, only the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund deducts nothing for expenses. But low fundraising costs appeal to contributors, so elaborate accounting techniques are employed by many other charities to make these costs seem minimum. The most popular ploy today is to charge off fundraising costs to education. A flagrant example is the National Tuberculosis Association. Over 23 cents of every dollar you shell out for its Christmas-seal campaign is really eaten up by fundraising expenses. But most NTA locals simply charge off 40 percent of the fundraising cost to health education.

The NTA's justification for this procedure is based on a 2½-year study of its operation made 20 years ago by an accountant and senior student in business administration at Columbia University. The association's executive director declares that the figure has been reviewed periodically. It has also been reviewed and flatly rejected by one of the most effective charity-control boards in the country, the Los Angeles Social Service Commission.

Most of us have no other choice than to accept a charity's version of what it does with our money. In Los Angeles, however, every appeal undergoes stiff scrutiny by Social Service Commission auditors. In 1958, the last year for which complete figures are available, not one top health agency chapter there got a commission endorsement for keeping campaign costs to 15 percent of its take. In addition, the commission found that actual fundraising totals ran as much as three times the amount originally claimed for them.

Caught in the competitive crush, even the most reputable charities today resort to various stratagems to avoid being accused of high fundraising costs. One in New York City is The Lighthouse, an organization for the blind. In addition to its annual appeal, it raises money through the door-to-door sale of handicrafts made by blind workers. The salesmen are not blind. They used to operate on a commission basis—until the New York State Charities Registration Bureau classified them as fund raisers and their commissions as fundraising expenses. The Lighthouse now sells its wares outright to the salesmen, who, in turn, peddle them to the public. "It's a miserable situation," says

Bernard Perlman, able chief of the registration bureau. "They still invoke the name of The Lighthouse and often end up by earning twice as much as the blind people who are supposed to be benefiting."

Another result of intense competition has been an increase in the number of special events—one of the costliest ways of raising money for charity. At best, an agency nets barely more than half the proceeds. This is true even of a carefully planned benefit like the National Foundation's traditional Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial concert in New York City, for which tickets are sold all over the country.

In amateur hands, the results of a special event can be disastrous. In a western city, a group of women sponsored a fancy gala for a hospital in the name of a local diskjockey who had died of cancer. They finally raised about \$21,000—at a cost of more than \$18,000.

Along with the rash of appeals has come one promotion, stunt and gimmick after another, striving to enlist your sympathy—and your dollar. The most spectacular is the telethon, still widely used by several causes. How effective is it? A man who produced 22 telethons told me, "a telethon is considered a roaring success if the charity gets 40 percent of the gross. Some of them are lucky they don't lose money."

For the most part, this isn't due to unfulfilled pledges. Telephone verification of donations, along with swift pickups by car, usually results in an 85 to 90 percent collection average. The problem is the high cost of putting on the telethon. Some promoters pocket as much as 10 percent of the gross, plus expenses. The television station must be reimbursed for pre-empted time, plus overtime costs. The sanction of Theatre Authority, a national organization that passes on benefit appearances by performers, has to be obtained. If it is, Theatre Authority receives 10 percent of all contributions under \$100, to distribute to various actors' charities.

In New York City, performers will often go on telethons for minimum fees or none at all, because of the city's status in the entertainment world. But outside New York, with few exceptions, "nobody does nothing for nothing." A telethon producer describes what happens: "You usually import a cadre of three to five performers—a master of ceremonies, maybe a pitchwoman, a male and/or female vocalist and a children's star for Sunday morning. After that, you recruit local talent. If any of it is professional, you pay the prevailing scale. If the city has a strong religious or ethnic group whose support you need, you make a deal so its pet charity gets a cut. You pay for the installation and, in some cases, a month's charge for each studio telephone. Except for the volunteers, you pay for just about everything else. The vital thing is to have kids on camera, the kids who are going to be saved. That's what brings the money in. After all, a telethon is basically an 18-hour emotional tin cup."

What else dissipates your dollar? How much actually goes into salaries? No figures are more closely guarded. They never appear in health agencies' annual reports. To a direct inquiry, the reply is, "I'm afraid that's an internal matter."

Recently, however, I uncovered three "inside" budgets, which reveal charity-salary statistics never before published. In each case, payroll expenditures turned out to be the biggest single item. The budgets were for three top affiliates of national appeals.

The first budget was that of a local of the American Heart Association. Of the three, it had the lowest salary overhead. In accordance with national policy, the local retained three quarters of the money it

raised. About 40 percent of this—around \$280,000—went for salaries.

The second was that of a chapter of the American Cancer Society. Its national headquarters gets half the local take. Out of the chapter's half, over \$300,000—or some 55 percent of the total—went for wages.

The third was that of a branch of the National Tuberculosis Association. It hung on to nearly 90 cents of every dollar it raised. It also wound up the year spending more than 55 percent of its funds just for payroll purposes. In cold cash, this added up to almost \$400,000.

How much of your dollar goes to research? In most instances, only a small part of it ends up there. The one major exception, the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, is supported by the Walter Winchell Foundation; it uses all of your contributions for research. Of the bigger agencies, the American Heart Association devotes the largest slice of its budget for research projects. Next is the American Cancer Society.

The rest are doing well if their research allocations equal their fund-raising expenses. Even the old National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, now simply the National Foundation, spent twice as much on fund raising as on research, from 1938 to 1958.

One of the worst performances has been turned in by the National Tuberculosis Association. NTA always beats the drum for more medical research around fund-raising time. But it actually spent less than \$700,000 for research last year out of the \$25 million you gave its various chapters. Of the three major drugs now being used to treat TB, the association can claim only a fleeting role in discovering one. In finding and developing the other two—including the most important one—it played no part whatever. Outside the research field, local NTA chapters generally do a commendable job in alerting communities against respiratory health hazards and in locating new TB cases.

Today, trying to track down what happens to your dollar is hard enough. How to give it has also become a bewildering problem. There are two embattled camps trying to collect it from you. On one side are the community United Funds, which raise money for a host of health and welfare causes in single "give-once-for-all" packages. On the other are the "big-four" health agencies—polio, heart, tuberculosis and cancer—which conduct independent campaigns.

About 1,200 United Funds are in operation. They have extremely low fund-raising costs. They also cut down on the plague of multiple drives, while at the same time they protect weak but worthwhile causes that might otherwise be lost in the shuffle.

Advocates of separate drives for new health agencies advance this argument: If not allowed to have its own fund drive, a new agency would never get off the ground. By and large, the people in charge of United Funds do not favor admission of new agencies, because each such admission increases the amount of money to be raised.

Some United Funds are tremendously successful, especially in industrial centers where they have energetic backing from labor and management. Many, however, fall short of their annual goals. Lack of top leadership is one reason. The refusal of the "big-four" agencies to participate is another. The National Foundation has never allowed any affiliates to hook up with United Funds. The American Heart Association and the National Tuberculosis Association will not let any more locals join those already in United Funds. The American Cancer Society has ordered all its chapters out this year.

An established health agency that figures it has enough muscle to go for a bigger slice of the philanthropic pie by itself won't buy

cooperative charity drives, even if this means riding roughshod over some of its membership or shouldering aside other appeals. The American Cancer Society is a case in point. Now sure of its hold on the pocketbooks of millions of donors, the society commanded its chapters to get out of every United Fund, without ever seriously trying to set up a system where some chapters could stay in those United Funds that are successful.

Many chapters protested the edict; over 40 actually quit the society. The most senseless was in Detroit, home of the first and best United Fund, which last fall shot past its annual goal for the 11th consecutive time. When its Detroit unit elected to stay in the United Fund, the American Cancer Society gave up some \$800,000 as its allocation for this year, some 13,000 volunteer workers and what it had cited as one of the country's best cancer-education programs. The society is now forming rival locals in the areas where its chapters pulled out. In Detroit, it has already done so. Most observers predict a long, costly war. As a friend of charity told me, "Cancer is a dreadful disease; it deserves every cent I can give to help stamp it out. But I don't see why I have to pay to help stamp out the United Funds too."

At the same time, the number of health drives continues to mushroom wildly. There are some 19 national outfits currently passing the hat for the blind, three for cancer, three for muscular dystrophy, two for polio, two more for arthritis and rheumatism, and at least one each for about 40 other afflictions. How sensibly do you give to them?

Actual national health needs seem to play little or no part in eliciting the support of most Americans. There are, for instance, more facilities for training and supplying seeing-eye dogs than there are blind people who want them. The Seeing Eye, Inc., has so much money available that it has stopped soliciting and says, "No blind person is ever refused a dog because of lack of funds." Despite this, at least nine other guide-dog appeals continue to rake in millions of dollars.

You contribute about the same amount annually for 9 million severe cases of mental illness as for 200,000 sufferers from muscular dystrophy. Although there are 10 times as many retarded children as cerebral palsy victims, you gave the latter cause 4 times as much. The help given 250,000 multiple-sclerosis cases was about equal to that given 11 million sufferers from arthritis and rheumatism.

For fund raisers, the reason for this disparity is simple: To be successful, an appeal has to make you give "emotionally" and "from the heart." This means that the ideal cause has to have a "good child image" or "fear"—preferably both—going for it.

The classic case is the National Foundation, by far the biggest agency in the history of health appeals. Since 1938, you have contributed nearly \$520 million to it. In its heyday, it came close to convincing America that infantile paralysis was the country's No. 1 disease menace. Its souped-up drives—keyed heavily to children, hope for the afflicted and parental fear for those still untouched—are generally credited with turning the trick. A San Francisco doctor recalls, "When polio hit town, we had two epidemics on our hands. One was polio; the other was hysteria."

Polio is a cruel crippler. But, in fact, the National Foundation was always first among the major health agencies in fundraising and last in the number of victims needing care. Its big bankroll became the envy of every other agency. One year, the combined expense and special travel account of just the National Foundation's president, Basil O'Connor, was about \$72,000. O'Connor draws no salary.

Your dollars, as the National Foundation

is always quick to point out, paid for the Salk vaccine. But your dollars also contributed indirectly toward a Thunderbird sports car for O'Connor. The car was a present to him in 1956 on his 65th birthday. The money was raised through a solicitation of foundation employees, whose salaries are paid out of your contributions.

For a number of years, your dollars also picked up the tab of a National Foundation public relations specialist, one of whose functions was to travel abroad annually to look for photogenic children. The children were then flown to California to appear on a polio publicity float in the Rose Bowl parade.

Last year, you paid \$25,000 in effect for the services and expenses of a public-relations man under contract to the National Foundation to put on a one-evening fund-raising affair, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Concert.

You have paid well over a million dollars in a single year to a New York printer who supplies the National Foundation with brochures, pamphlets and so on, without having to bid for the contract. It is reasonable to assume that competitive bidding on much of this work would result in greater economy and efficiency.

How much of your dollar, meanwhile, do the rackets get?

In city after city, matronly women still stalk the sidewalks shaking canisters for vague appeals. Afterward comes the traditional split: 40 percent for the shaker, 40 for the promoter, and 20 for the charity—if it actually exists.

A classic case of chicanery around the country is the charity circus. A circus man comes to town, approaches a local charity and guarantees it a few hundred dollars in return for its sponsorship of the show. Next, a "boilerroom" operation gets underway. This consists of high-pressure sales pitches by telephone solicitors. The targets are business and professional people who can be counted on to buy batches of tickets. Ads for the program are also an important item. The cheapest ones—which simply say "Compliments of a Friend"—are pushed, because the same space can be sold over and over again.

A favorite gambit involving a circus took place in Buffalo recently. It was the Underprivileged Children Appeal. Telephone solicitors pressured firms into buying batches of tickets for orphans and less-fortunate children in local institutions. A spot check reported by the better business bureau revealed that tickets thus sold far outnumbered the children able to use them. One institution, for example, reported receiving over 200 tickets for its 30 young wards.

Enormous fundraising costs also drain away your dollar on a national level, particularly among some veterans' groups. Most of the cash ends up in the hands of commercial sharpshooters. Take the Military Order of the Purple Heart. It contracted with a mailing house to send out unordered boxes of Christmas cards to the public. The mailing house first got its expenses back, then split the rest of your donations 50-50 with the Purple Heart.

Big money is involved in some of these operations. One year the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) authorized fundraising mailing of seals, calendar identification cards, neckties, greeting cards, and flower seeds. A generous public responded to the tune of nearly \$2 million. The net to AMVETS, \$307,000.

Another veterans' outfit, now out of business, was the National Association of Veterans' Employment Councils (NAVEC). During a 22-month canter through your wallets—using ballpoint pen mailings as its gim-

mick—the association pulled in \$2.1 million. Expenses were \$1.9 million. Its declared purpose was to get work for handicapped veterans. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported that NAVEC furnished a list of 348 individuals it claimed to have helped. The committee was able to verify only 188, most of whom, it found, had been given part-time, temporary, or seasonal jobs. Eighty of these were employed as NAVEC fundraisers.

Almost all national charity rackets today revolve around unordered merchandise. A promoter approaches a struggling charity and offers to take over its fund-raising problems. In return, he gets the use of the charity's name to unload his cheap product, usually accompanied by a request for a donation of a dollar or more. The ball-point pen or other product probably cost him around 8 cents. In addition, he charges a fat fee for all his services. The charity is lucky if it receives 10 percent of the proceeds. The charity either doesn't know or doesn't care, since even this much money is probably more than it has ever got before. As Special Assistant U.S. District Attorney Frank McGarr told me, "It's a cute little game. Everybody comes out ahead except the public."

There are four basic steps you can take to protect yourself:

1. Never give to any street solicitor unless the drive has been officially certified by your community. Los Angeles has solved the problem by banning all such appeals.

2. Under no circumstances should you ever respond to an appeal by telephone. Invariably, this means that a "boiler-room" operation is playing you for what it can get.

3. Never donate to any cause that has sent you unordered merchandise. You are under no obligation to return it. If you mail back a contribution, you can be certain that most of it will not reach the unfortunates for whom the charity was organized. Nationally, there are two outstanding exceptions: the seal campaigns for the National Tuberculosis Association and the Crippled Children's Society.

4. If in doubt, check with your local better business bureau.

Rackets notwithstanding, nobody seriously questions the place of charity appeals in America. However, there is increasing evidence that the house of charity must set itself in order. The chaotic competition that currently exists simply adds up to a ruinous waste of your dollar.

Already, there are increasing signs of revolt on the part of contributors. Mrs. Evelyn Spaulding, energetic general manager of the Los Angeles Social Service Commission, notes, "The public is getting smarter all the time."

In 1959, Americans gave some \$7 billion to philanthropy. The share for health and welfare causes has dwindled steadily for the past 5 years. In Los Angeles, the total take for the 10 top health and welfare drives dropped nearly \$2 million last year. In Cleveland, cancer, heart, and polio all slipped below levels they had reached 5 years ago. The new expanded program of the National Foundation also fell far short of its expectations last year, and a supplementary drive was required. The Red Cross, in its drive, missed its goal by a whopping \$12 million. What is the solution?

There are almost as many answers as appeals. Some experts believe that local control with teeth in it, as in Los Angeles, is the only way out. Others have put forth the idea of having one national appeal for all health causes and another for welfare.

In Detroit, the outspoken executive vice president of the United Fund, Walter Laidlaw, said, "I think there ought to be a full congressional investigation of the whole field. If Congress can regulate labor unions, it can do the same with charities."

In New York, at last, two national health appeals, the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society, are beginning to recognize the consequences of multiplying drives. The society's outgoing executive vice president Mefford Runyan, said, "Taking a lesson from recent television developments, we should move to clean up the situation before it deteriorates further. * * * I believe that, for the protection of the public and the agencies, a sort of Dun & Bradstreet rating bureau should be set up independently of the agencies."

In the end, you will have to decide. It's your dollar.

Restoring an Abused Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Idaho Statesman, published in Boise, Idaho, dated March 19, 1960. It contains a most excellent definition of the word "patriotism" written by Mrs. Carolyn Frieze, chairman of Americanism month for Capital Post No. 136 of the auxiliary of the American Legion. The people of the United States are taking the word "patriotism" far too lightly.

The editorial follows:

RESTORING AN ABUSED WORD

One word which—like patriotism, liberty, and loyalty—has been sadly abused and distorted and debased is the word "Americanism."

Once held in high esteem by every American, it has been so thoroughly worked over by busy wrecking crews of "one worlders" and intellect saboteurs that it's now all too generally rated as a word that's corny, or descriptive of something to be ashamed of.

It's desperately in need of restoration to its original high standing as a word expressive of the lofty ideals this Nation stands for and of its national heritage of inestimable worth.

A sort of stigma has been attached to this word "Americanism" by process of deceit and trickery, downgrading its true meaning and significance.

It may best be restored, perhaps, by reassertion of a clear, honest, and readily understandable definition.

Such a definition has been provided by a Boise woman, Mrs. Carolyn Frieze, chairman of Americanism month for Capital Post No. 136 of the auxiliary of the American Legion. Here it is:

"First and foremost, Americanism to me means regard for the individual, the dignity of the human being.

"It means equality under the law, the right to the pursuit of happiness; it means the freedom to carve out one's destiny; the right to work and save, to plan and hope; to match wits and strength, and no disgrace if to fail; it means the right to try again, head up and chin high; it means the common good, the welfare of the community and Nation."

No high-flown, esoteric language, this. It's a plain, concise statement in words everybody understands, pointing truly to the goals toward which all decent people strive, and setting forth a declaration to which they gladly subscribe.

All those of us who cherish our Americanism are under obligation to its author.

The Nation's Last Redoubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD another very excellent editorial from the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle entitled "The Nation's Last Redoubt." The editor of this newspaper, Mr. Louis Harris, has done a very good job in giving a critical analysis to his readers of the so-called civil rights bill as passed by the House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S LAST REDOUBT

Vote-hungry politicians in the House have propelled the United States a step closer to totalitarianism with passage of what they have chosen to call a "civil rights" bill. Their action leaves to the 18 beleaguered southerners in the Senate the almost hopeless task of blocking the leftist movement.

What the House has enacted, in its five-point measure, is a bill that largely ignores the Constitution of the United States and bypasses the people of this Nation whose sole right it is to alter that document.

To two points in the legislation there can be no great objection. One is that which requires local election officials to preserve election records for at least 2 years and permits Justice Department officials to examine them on demand. The other makes it a Federal crime to flee across a State line to escape prosecution for bombing or setting fire to any building or vehicle, or for threats or false reports of bombing.

The other three points, however, clearly infringe upon the "rights" of each of the 50 States and the citizens thereof.

Let's take a look at the voting referee provision, for instance, as seen through the eyes of Representative EDWIN D. WILLIS, of Louisiana. Upon complaint, the Attorney General requests a Federal court to "make a finding" whether discrimination exists against Negro voters "pursuant to a pattern or practice."

The bill does not define what constitutes a pattern or practice and the decision on this question is left entirely to the discretion, whims, or prejudices of the judge who, incidentally, may come from any section of the country.

After the judge, under guidance of the Attorney General and without any specific provisions for a hearing on the part of the State involved, makes a finding that a pattern of discrimination exists, the decree would establish a conclusive presumption that all Negroes, even those not a party to the initial proceedings, have in fact been discriminated against.

It would make it totally unnecessary for them to prove any alleged discrimination on account of race or color.

A referee named by the jurist would then take statements, again without State interference. An amendment offered by WILLIS to have the referee prove a knowledge of election laws was beaten.

In violation of all standards of due process, the bill denies local registrars or State officials, who are presumed to have denied the right of an applicant to vote, the right to be present with counsel at the so-called hearing and the right to confront and cross-examine his accusers.

When the referee reports results of his phony hearing to the court, the State's attorney general is invited to file exceptions, but since the report contains only the self-serving declaration of the applicant, the invitation is practically meaningless.

After all this unprecedented procedure, the court awards the Negro a certificate that he is a qualified voter and then authorizes the referee, or any such person as he may designate, to attend the election at all polling places, look over the shoulders of State authorities and see that the person is voted, and that the vote is counted. If the judge's orders are not carried out to the letter, State election officials may be hauled into court, deprived of the right to trial by jury and be fined and/or sentenced to jail.

Another phase of the bill makes it a Federal crime to interfere by violence or threats with a Federal court's school desegregation order.

This innocuous sounding item could well mean that never again, on pain of being fined up to \$1,000 and jailed for 60 days, may a newspaper editor or commentator, for example, protest a desegregation order if, in any way, what is written or said may be construed as posing an interference or threat.

If the bill may be interpreted in that manner, here is another transparent encroachment on the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press.

Lastly, the bill authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to set up schools for servicemen's children where regular public schools are closed because of desegregation orders.

If that is done, Americans who oppose integrated schools are nonetheless going to be forced to support institutions they do not want, do not need—and will not utilize.

Such is the devil's brew that has been cooked up for consumption by the Southern States alone.

If it passes the Senate and becomes law, then the floodgates to any and all types of unconstitutional legislation will be open, and totalitarianism will have become an accomplished fact.

Youth With a Purpose: Miss Frances Quick, of Coos Bay, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about materialism today. When we find penetrating looks at our society, looks which mean hope and give added faith in tomorrow, we can be encouraged.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the essay, "True Security," by Miss Frances Quick, first-place winner in local competition in the current junior chamber of commerce national contest on the subject "My True Security." I commend Miss Quick for her excellent commentary and the junior chamber of commerce for sponsoring the competition.

Miss Quick's essay was printed in the March 14, 1960, edition of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World.

The essay follows:

TRUE SECURITY

(By Frances Quick)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Miss Quick, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hanon, of 629 Market, Empire, has won many awards in speech and composition at Marshfield High School, where she is a senior. This contribution, which she titled "True Security," won her first place in local competition in the current junior chamber of commerce national contest for talks on that subject.)

Most everyone wants security.

To most people, however, security has many different connotations. One may seek security in knowledge, another in monetary success, and yet another in feeling that his life is a service to the people around him.

Though interpretations of the word "security" may differ, most of us try to find an abstract or physical "something" that when everything else falls us we can say, "Because I have this, I possess security."

Too many people today seek security in the accumulation of money. Security means a well-paying job, a nice suburban house, a little money in the bank. Many people educate themselves merely to earn more money.

America is sitting in a complacent rut of dollar security. Our people seek freedom from worry in the gathering of material wealth. We are so content with our past achievements that we have no dreams or visions of something better. We relax and look around at the automobiles, the suburban dwellings, the TV sets, and kitchen gadgets, and we say, "We've done a good job. Let's not do anything that might destroy our little world."

Even our young people reflect this attitude of security. Just the other day I read a summary of over 1,000 teenagers' ambitions. The great majority weren't concerned with fulfilling a dreamed-of goal. They had only one goal—dollar security. Their favorite ambition was to have just a little more money than average; enough to have a few luxuries.

What has happened to the spirit of 1776 that our men and women no longer step strongly out to meet a world of challenge, but must hug tight their material wealth?

The United States was built by courageous, freedom loving men who weren't afraid to take a chance on something in which they believed. Our country was not built by people who relied upon their Government to do the big things, nor was it built by people who lacked the spirit to catch and hold a dream.

Where are the Thomas Paines, the Ben Franklins of today? Perhaps my generation can learn from these men of the past, for when we look back in history we find they had two things in common. First, they had a dream of something better; and second, they had the drive and the ambition to make that dream come true.

My generation must not fall into mediocrity where we work for just enough money to purchase that suburban home or station wagon. Everyone, of course, has to have certain essentials for life—food, clothes, shelter; but if America is to continue to advance, our youth must not want only material security.

We must not become so involved in seeking the comforts of life that we neglect our responsibilities to society. We must have the initiative to serve the community, to be a member of the school board, to serve on the city council, to work on that Red Cross project, to be informed concerning the problems of democracy, and to act, sometimes at a material loss to ourselves but in the long run, at a profit for both ourselves and our fellow men.

If I, and each of us, will have enough initiative to become involved in the affairs

of man and work toward the solution of our problems, we will find that not only are we ourselves secure, but our community, our State, our Nation, and the world will also be secure. This is my true security.

South African Protest Is in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and well-written editorial of March 27, which appeared in the Greenville (S.C.) News. It is entitled "South African Protest Is in Order." The Greenville News, one of the outstanding daily newspapers in the country, is well known for its strong and sound editorial writings. This is another of its good editorials which merits the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH AFRICAN PROTEST IS IN ORDER

Reacting to the State Department's criticism of the use of force and the shedding of blood in police attempts to control rioting Negroes in South Africa, the government of that country has told the United States, in effect, to mind its own business.

The South African authorities were entirely right.

The United States has no right in the first place to interfere in the strictly internal affairs of another country and, in the second place, the denunciation of the policies being enforced there by the police and the army can only make a bad matter worse.

Tragedy will be piled onto tragedy if the United States, through its meddling, encourages the rebellious African natives to continue their rioting and violence.

The action of the State Department in this instance is hard to understand in the light of the fact that it said nothing during the time Fidel Castro was carrying out his bloody purges to remove his political enemies in Cuba last year.

One suspects that this is one more ploy for the Negro vote in the United States, for the principal difference between what is going on in South Africa and the racial unrest in the United States is the relatively superior degree of civilization the American Negro has achieved since being transplanted to this country.

Taking a worldwide view, it is quite apparent that there is underway at this moment a rebellion of the colored races, especially the Negroes, against the white man's rule. Some have compared it to what happened in India before and after World War II, but the comparison is invidious.

This movement has been characterized as nationalism, an effort to end colonialism. It has some of those aspects, but it is more than that. Part of it, perhaps a big part of it, is due to Communist agitation. Another part of it is the hatred the Negro has come to hold for the white man whom he feels has exploited him for generations. And none can deny that there is some reason for this feeling.

What is happening in South Africa is part

of the pattern of what is happening in all of Africa. One by one the colonial powers have relinquished their control over certain African lands. Native governments have been set up, but rarely has the lot of the masses been improved.

There are two sides to the South African controversy. The most publicized phase of it is the effort of the Africans to overthrow what they consider an oppressive system imposed by the whites and the effort of the whites to maintain supremacy. But it isn't that simple.

The whites built a civilization in a wilderness peopled by savages. They brought to the savage natives a degree of civilization, sanitation, medical care and education. In return they demanded the labor of the natives. With a little learning and the desire to live like the white man, the native is demanding full equality now.

The white man, on the other hand, is fighting to preserve what he has built for himself and, indeed, for his very life. He knows he cannot long survive in a society dominated by radical demagogues of whatever color backed by the semicivilized masses who don't really know what they want and have no idea whatever of the responsibilities of self-government.

The situation in South Africa is such as to set the Communists to tingling with excitement and jumping with joy. And the United States isn't helping with its officious meddling.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 Americans of Greek origin and Greek people throughout the world celebrate Greek Independence Day which commemorates the success of the Greek struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Ancient Greece became the center of culture and education in the world, and originated the concepts of representative government and the rule of law.

Today the people of Greece are dedicated as were the people of ancient Greece to the principle of individual liberty and national independence.

Following World War II, Greece was engulfed in civil war brought about by the Communists in their effort to subvert the nation and bring Greece under Soviet domination. The people of Greece fought valiantly to preserve their independence, and with aid from the United States, the Communist insurrection was terminated. American aid was also extended to assist in rebuilding the economy of Greece.

The determination of the people of Greece to preserve the freedom and security of their nation is shared by the United States and the free world.

The people of the United States join with the people of Greece and those of Greek descent in the United States and throughout the world in commemoration of the 1960 observance of Greek Independence Day.

The Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as this body prepares again to discuss a housing act, the mayors of large and small municipalities have raised their voices to impress upon us the need for clear and effective action in 1960. These mayors do not advance theories; they point out facts and suggest answers. They are the men who are on the battlefield in the effort to save our cities and, in fact, to make our cities greater than ever before.

An article by Newark News Reporter George Kentera in the March 23 issue of the News describes the recent commentary made by Mayor Leo P. Carlin, of Newark, and other members of a mayor's advisory committee during a recent visit to Washington, D.C. I think that the comments are of direct concern to us and to citizens everywhere.

And, in the March 25 issue of the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., Reporter Frank Kelly describes the potential impact of just one relatively small urban renewal project in the city of Hackensack. Mr. Kelly makes the point, among many others, that the city will regain within a few years through increased tax returns all the losses it incurred in bringing the project into being.

Mr. President, the articles describe what can be done and what is being done under our urban renewal program. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 23, 1960]

MAYORS ASKS HELP IN URBAN RENEWAL—CARLIN JOINS PLEA

(By George Kentera)

WASHINGTON.—Mayor Leo P. Carlin of Newark, and other members of a mayor's advisory committee suggested yesterday that Federal housing agencies play a more aggressive role in urban renewal.

After meeting for more than 2 hours with Federal Housing Administrator Norman P. Mason and his aids, Carlin commented:

"We don't feel their hearts and souls are in the program. We're trying to educate them to go all out . . ."

ACKNOWLEDGES CONCERN

Mason acknowledged at a press conference that the mayors were concerned about whether his organization was wholeheartedly behind urban renewal and relocation housing.

For the city leaders, Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago, president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, presented a nine-point program which was largely a reiteration of recommendations made by the committee at its first meeting in December.

One recommendation called for a research program by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, parent of the various Federal hous-

ing bodies, "equal to the magnitude of the expanding urban problem."

Mason said he was happy to have the suggestion that a research program for which the HHFA had already asked \$600,000 be expanded. He also disclosed that the Agency was working on two plans which might meet the mayors' urgings for establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

One plan, which he described as somewhat narrow in scope, is to be discussed with the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, he said. The other, a broader plan, is still being worked out.

The mayors feel that a Federal department is necessary to give proper attention to the growing U.S. urban population.

Other recommendations were:

That the Federal Housing Administration, a part of HHFA, activate the program for housing for the aged already authorized by Congress, and that the HHFA recommend to Congress legislation "which will make it mandatory for FHA to bear whatever risks may be involved in issuing mortgage insurance for new building and rehabilitation in urban renewal areas."

On the first point, Mayor Kenneth Peterson of Minneapolis said the movement by homeowners from the suburbs back to the cities was creating a need for better urban housing, particularly housing for the elderly.

On the second, Carlin said Newark was now approaching the most important part of its urban renewal program. Private developers can secure necessary financing, he said, only if the Government looks at the program "with rose colored glasses and not with a jaundiced eye."

Carlin was accompanied here by Louis Danzig, executive director of the Newark Housing Authority, the city's redevelopment agency, and by George Oberlander, city planning officer.

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Mar. 25, 1960]

CITY RIPS DOWN BLIGHTED HOMES—RIVER STREET STRIP IN HACKENSACK IS LEVELED FOR URBAN RENEWAL

(By Frank Kelly)

HACKENSACK.—Paperwork which went to Washington almost 3 years ago is being translated into visible results along Hackensack's River Street.

TWO-AND-ONE-HALF BLOCK AREA

In April 1957 the Hackensack Housing Authority filed an application with the Federal Government for survey and planning funds. The local agency wanted to determine whether a 2½-block area between River and Moore Streets—extending from Mercer Street north to Camden Street could qualify for Federal assistance under the urban renewal project program.

Today, if you drive along River Street from Mercer to Salem Street you will see mounds of dirt dotting a strip of bare earth where only a week ago stood frame houses and here and there a small business.

Houses and stores will continue to come down until the entire area is leveled.

PROFESSIONAL BUILDING

What's planned for the tract? Among the more fancy-capturing structures called for by existing housing authority plans are a 7-story professional building, to be occupied by physicians' and dentists' offices, and a 10-story multiple-purpose unit which might well house hotel facilities, a convention hall with a seating capacity of more than 1,000, and a spacious underground garage.

The professional building which may also contain offices for lawyers and possibly commercial firms, is to be situated at Salem Street's south side. Directly across the street will be the multiple-purpose structure, covering the square block bounded by Salem and Camden, Moore and River Streets. Its

convention hall will have banquet provisions available for the more than 1,000 persons it could accommodate, smaller banquet rooms, adequate kitchen facilities for each dining component, and service enterprises such as a barbershop, beauty salon, and tailor shop.

Joseph C. Barsalona, executive director of the Hackensack Housing Authority, said plans have been drawn up along those lines on the basis of concepts and suggestions submitted to the Authority by many interested redevelopment agencies.

Barsalona pointed out that these existing plans as to the building's interior, as well as their locales, could be revised.

How long will it be before these and other structures planned for the Moore-River Street urban renewal project area begin to rise? That hasn't been determined, the executive director declared. Deadlines for sponsors to begin building will be set forth as part of the contract requirements.

FIVE PARCELS

Sponsors, to clarify the term, will be those corporations, companies, or individuals who submit the highest bids in a public sale of the project's sites. Of course, to qualify, bidders must agree to follow the general building directives stipulated for various points within the project area.

The general format to be adhered to, explained Barsalona, is found in a reuse evaluation of the 2½-block tract made by a competent appraiser engaged by the Housing Authority. His investigations resulted in recommendations for the best possible reuse of the land:

1. The area should be divided into five parcels, starting at the Susquehanna, New York, and Western Railroad tracks (Mercer Street) and proceeding northward to the project's Camden Street extremity.

2. The first or southernmost parcel should be allocated for a parking area.

3. The second parcel should be earmarked for parking facilities and a commercial building, such as a drive-in bank.

4. The third parcel should be the site of a professional building. These three parcels will comprise the square block between River and Moore Streets from Mercer to Salem Street.

5. The fourth parcel should be the site of a multiple-purpose building.

As has been pointed out, present plans call for it to be situated in the square block between River and Moore Streets from Salem to Camden Street.

6. The fifth parcel would be converted into a parking lot.

SALEM TO CAMDEN

This area, a half block in size, extends along the west side of Moore Street, abutting Main Street stores' rear property lines between Salem and Camden Streets.

Barsalona pointed out that no accurate estimate can be made of the number of vehicles the parking lots in the first and second parcels will be able to accommodate. This is because no absolute dimensions have been staked out for the professional and commercial buildings to be situated in the same area.

Proprietors of stores along the east side of Main Street between Salem and Camden Streets have expressed interest in a Housing Authority proposal. It calls for the store-owners to band together and purchase the half-block area which is designated as the project's fifth parcel. The Authority, in making the suggestion recently, pointed out that the 25,000-square-foot tract could provide parking for store employees and customers.

The project's total estimated cost, as approved by the Federal Government, comes to \$1,453,292. This figure, said Barsalona, includes the disposal of the land and the cost of constructing the new buildings.

Estimated cost for the acquisition of the 65 land parcels which made up the 2½-block area is \$1,187,175, according to the Authority's executive director. He explained that the Federal Government permits a 10-percent leeway in that total to allow for possible changes in real estate values between the time of the properties' original appraisal and their acquisition.

RESALE ALLOWANCE

The approximate resale value of the land when it is sold to sponsors wanting to erect buildings within the project area has been figured at \$464,649.

Barsalona declared that the net loss to be incurred by the city and the Federal Government in the resale transaction is estimated at \$925,800. One-third of this amount, or \$308,620, will be borne by the city, and the estimated two-thirds balance, \$617,240, by the Federal Government.

Of the city's one-third share, noncash contributions in the form of improvements, such as tree removal, street widening, curb and sidewalk replacement, and relocation of utilities where needed, will amount to \$51,818. Hackensack's cash contribution to cover the net loss comes to \$256,802.

When the housing authority, backed as required by the city council's votes, filed its application for survey and planning funds for this urban renewal undertaking, the total assessed value of the 65 parcels within the involved area—both buildings and land—totaled \$243,555. Based on the prevailing tax rate at that time, \$6.50 per \$100 of assessed valuation, the taxes being reaped from the entire area amounted to \$15,732.

Within a few years the city will stand to regain through taxes on the buildings to be constructed within the project area all of the losses it is incurring in bringing this project into being.

The anticipated total assessed valuation on the buildings alone, Barsalona explained, is \$800,000. "With the total assessed valuation of the land added in," he remarked, "the building-and-land figure will be more than \$1 million. Using the 1957 tax rate of \$6.50 per \$100 to arrive at a valid comparison," he continued, "taxes to be realized annually would be more than \$65,000."

Within the Moore-River Street area, before demolition work got underway 9 days ago, there were 62 structures located on 65 land parcels. As of last night, razing crews from V. Otillio & Sons, a Paterson contractor, had ripped down 33 dwellings.

Demolition crews can knock a house completely down within 15 or 20 minutes. Backfilling, leveling, sealing public utility lines—these tasks require the better part of an hour for each structure.

Barsalona reported yesterday that the Paterson firm was given 90 days to complete the job. He expressed great satisfaction with the rate of progress.

The housing authority for many months, while it was securing options on nearly all of the 65 land parcels in the project area, was busy relocating families which were losing their homes to make way for urban renewal.

WIDEN MOORE STREET

Plans also call for the widening of Moore, Salem, and Camden Streets where they pass through the project area.

Moore Street, now 40 feet wide, is to be increased to 56 feet. The additional 16 feet will all be taken by moving eastward.

Taking footage from both sides, city-provided crews will increase Salem Street by 20 feet in width, from its present 36 feet to 56 feet.

The 16 feet by which Camden Street's width is to be boosted, from 32 to 48 feet, will be taken from its south side only.

All of these measurements extend across the streets from property line to property line—that is, the dimensions include the sidewalk width.

Action has been taken for securing funds to conduct urban renewal survey and planning work in two other areas of the city—Central Avenue-Passaic Street and in the first ward.

As for the Moore-River Street project, Barsalona said, "We're at the halfway mark."

What remains to be done? Says Barsalona, "Street widening, relocation of utilities, and public sale of the land—that's all."

Commonwealth of Massachusetts Favors H.R. 9999

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Gov. Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts, together with his statement to the House Committee on Public Works in support of H.R. 9999 which is self-explanatory.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, March 23, 1960.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: I am submitting the enclosed report on H.R. 9999, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact, which I am informed is scheduled for hearing before the House Public Works Committee in Room 1302, New House Office Building on March 30, 1960, at 10 a.m.

The States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts have already enacted legislation which now requires the consent of the Congress to become operative.

Your support of the pending bill will be appreciated.

With every best wish to you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOSTER FURCOLO.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, March 23, 1960.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This report is submitted in support of H.R. 9999, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact.

The northeastern part of the United States is, by virtue of its geographic location and other characteristics, a great natural resource area. The increasing intensity of use of these resources, particularly water resources, requires coordinated planning for effective resource management and the orderly growth of the region. An inventory of these resources was published in the New England-New York Interagency Committee 46-volume report after 4 years of work and at a cost to the Federal Government of over \$6 million.

At a meeting of the Governors of the New England States in 1956, it was agreed to create in cooperation with the Interagency Committee on Water Resources of the Federal Government, a northeastern resources committee for the purpose of implementing the New England-New York Interagency

Committee report and coordinating the development of the resources, particularly the water and related land resources of the northeastern area.

At the present time, the Northeastern Resources Committee is made up of a representative from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and a representative of the Federal Departments of Interior, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Army, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Power Commission, all operating on a basis of equality.

The work of this committee has brought about a better coordination of the efforts of the States and the Federal agencies for the development of the water and related land resources of the region. From the first, the committee has had a vexing problem which must be solved before it can accomplish its purpose. At the present time, no provisions are made for funds to carry on the activities. It has been the practice in the past when a committee member was designated as chairman, the financial responsibility for keeping the committee in operation fell upon the State which the chairman represented. It became evident, therefore, that there is a need for organizing the committee on a more formal basis in order to make funds available from all the States and the Federal Government for this necessary activity.

After careful explorations were made of the type of organization that would be best suited for carrying on this activity, it was decided that an interstate compact should be entered into for the creation of a permanent Northeastern Resources Commission.

At a meeting of the New England Governors' Conference held in Hartford, Conn., on March 2, 1959, the Governors of all of the New England States, after reviewing the proposed compact, agreed unanimously to introduce enabling legislation in each of the States to authorize the States to enter into such a compact. Since then compact legislation has been enacted by the Legislatures of the States of New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

Accordingly, I feel that it is urgent that the pending legislation be enacted by the Congress in the best interests of the United States and especially the northeastern part thereof.

With every good wish to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FOSTER FURCOLO.

Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by the Honorable Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., was published in that paper on March 27, 1960.

Dealing with Supreme Court decisions, the letter is concise, but explicit. Mr. Bloch's argument is clear and irrefutable. His appeal for consistency and stability in government is Americanism at its best.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSING COURT DECISIONS—SOUTHERN SENATORS' POSITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS RULINGS SUPPORTED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In a letter in the Times of March 12 Prof. Alan Westin of Columbia University refers to the so-called "campaign of slander against the Supreme Court" allegedly being conducted by the southern Senators.

I immediately thought of your editorial of February 29, severely criticizing the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *Nelson v. County of Los Angeles*.

I wonder why people think that newspaper editors have a perfect right to criticize decisions of the Supreme Court, but when southern Senators, in the course of their duties, do the very same thing, their acts are characterized as slanderous.

The validity of the position of the southern Senators with respect to utterances of certain justices of the Supreme Court of the United States is demonstrated by utterances of Justice Black in the case of *Federal Power Commission v. Tuscarora Indian Nation* in a dissenting opinion delivered on March 7.

DISSENT BY JUSTICE BLACK

Justice Black said: "These Indians have a way of life which this Government has seen fit to protect, if not actually to encourage. Cogent arguments can be made that it would be better for all concerned if Indians were to abandon their old customs and habits and become incorporated in the communities where they reside. The fact remains, however, that they have not done this and that they have continued their tribal life with trust in a promise of security from this Government."

I cannot help but wonder where the sentiment expressed by those words was on May 17, 1954. Prior to that time we southerners had a way of life which the Government had seen fit to protect, if not actually to encourage, by inaction of Congress on the subject and by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court and other courts on the subject.

Further, Justice Black said: "It may be hard for us to understand why these Indians cling so tenaciously to their lands and traditional tribal way of life. The record does not leave the impression that the lands of their reservation are the most fertile, the landscape the most beautiful, or their homes the most splendid specimens of architecture, but this is their home and ancestral home. There they, their children and their forebears were born. . . ."

CUSTOMS AND TRADITIONS

We cannot help but wonder why Justice Black and the Chief Justice and Justice Douglas, who concurred with him, can so well understand and express the feelings of the Indians and at the same time not understand why we southerners wish to cling tenaciously to our customs and traditions, which have had the blessings of the law for 90 years.

The dissenting opinion concludes: "Great nations, like great men, should keep their word."

This is the self-same sentiment which our southern Senators and most southern lawyers have been sturdily and strenuously advocating since May 17, 1954. Prior to that date the word of this great Nation as pronounced by the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to the segregation of the races in the public schools was this: "The decision is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools, and does not conflict with the 14th Amendment." These words of Chief Justice William Howard Taft (*Gong Lum, et al., v. Rice, et al.*), language which we southerners considered to be the word of our great Nation, were concurred in by Justices Holmes, Van Devanter, McReynolds, Brandeis, Sutherland, Butler, Sanford, and Stone.

CHARLES J. BLOCH.

MACON, GA., March 18, 1960.

Inflation Is Poison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to bipartisan consideration the following editorial which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Evening Herald:

INFLATION IS POISON

One would have imagined that the National Democratic Advisory Council, consisting of grown men, would display some maturity and responsibility.

This council is not responsible because the record of any political party in the United States is made in Congress by legislation and votes.

The Democratic Party is the majority in both Houses of Congress and therefore we must look at that record. It is a better and more mature record than the 10,000 words that the retired personnel of the council threw together as political campaign fodder.

The essential point of the council's brain-damaged document is spend and spend, tax and tax, socialize and socialize.

The ghost of Harry Hopkins rode the council meeting, and no man has done the United States greater damage than Harry Hopkins who perfected the Marxian technique of using the taxing power to alter our form of government.

This country is going through a severe inflationary crisis, the dimensions of which are now apparent in our diminishing gold reserve, which is a product of the reduction of the value of the dollar during a period of excessive export of goods and dollars abroad.

American goods, in many categories, are outpriced in world markets and some even in the American market.

This is a principal factor in the considerable unemployment in the United States and in the high cost of living.

It is true that some of the countries that we have aided and put back on their feet economically have responded to our difficult position by reducing their tariffs and quotas set up against the United States while we were aiding them.

But this is a drop in the bucket.

What is needed most is that the Government of the United States recognize its awkward position, realize that its gold reserve is being reduced to the danger point, take steps to avoid the need for the revaluation of the dollar, and stop wasting money.

The National Democratic Advisory Council's program includes all the projects ever conceived by the wildest theorists, many of which have been abandoned even by the Democrats themselves.

The party of Thomas Jefferson advocates such total concentration of power and activity in the hands of a centralized government that it could produce a power in the White House more effectively dictatorial than anything that exists even in the Kremlin.

The program of the Democratic council makes one wonder if it was not concocted out of all the proposed platforms of both political parties since 1932 and boiled down into a document to fit the 1960 election.

Certainly, no Member of Congress could stand up under the consequences of this document in 1962 if even a tenth of the fantastic proposals were put into effect. This is an eloquent catchall designed to flatter each pressure group.

Where is the money to come from?

How is the taxpayer to live if he carries on his back the multitude of bureaucrats that

this council would have the Government employ and at the same time watch his dollar shrink until it looks like a Kerensky ruble?

This is the most irresponsible program in an inflationary period that could be imagined and it should be rejected by Democrats.

What Kind of President Do You Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I put into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by New York Times Washington Chief James Reston, on what kind of President the American people want. I ask unanimous consent today again that a second article on this No. 1 political subject by this gifted reporter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON—WHAT KIND OF PRESIDENT DO YOU WANT?—II

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—The "other America" was back in the news today: not the "the affluent society" we hear so much about, but the indigent society that once dominated the front pages.

In a country with the unbelievable annual personal income of \$393 billion (as of February), there are still 32,200,000 people living on less than \$50 a week for a family of four.

Included in these 32 million, are one-fifth of the Nation's children and 8 million over 65.

This raises again the insistent question of the presidential campaign: What are the role and scope of the Federal Government in maintaining the public welfare? How should the resources of the Nation be used? Should the President grapple with the problem, or pass by on the other side?

President Eisenhower chose this week to pass by on the other side. The Congress was dealing with the problem of health insurance for the aged. The President opposed the legislation under discussion. His Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare proposed that the administration immediately offer its own substitute bill to deal with the problem, but the President opposed that too.

WHAT MILK AND HONEY?

About the facts there is no dispute. As the President himself has often emphasized, the inflation of the last generation has been particularly hard on the old people. The 8 million over 65 in the low-income bracket cannot afford decent housing, proper nutrition, or adequate medical care.

Taking all aged individuals—16 million of them now, and 20 million 15 years from now—almost 60 percent have less than \$1,000 a year in money income. In 1959 2 out of 5 of them had less than \$200 for emergencies.

The main question here is not the specific bills introduced by Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, or Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Both involve the compulsory principle—supported by all the democratic candidates—of increasing the social security tax of people still paying that tax for the benefit of all old people who are now its noncontributing beneficiaries.

There are good arguments against this. One, for example, is that the proposed bills would subsidize the rich when they are old as well as the poor. Beyond this is the root question of paternalism and where the welfare state is to stop.

But these are important questions. There is an argument for going on. There is an argument for stopping. There is an argument for devising another and a voluntary way. There is, in short, an argument for doing anything but brushing the problem off without an explanation.

Life in youth-tide can care for itself. The welfare state does not have to relieve the young men in the Air Force from doing kitchen duty, as it just has. But people in affliction and adversity, standing on the summit of lean and slippered old age, are something else. Many of them have nothing to count but their years. Many more are in that witless stage of life and cannot even enjoy their memories.

If they are not a charge on the richest state ever devised by man, then they are at least a charge on the national conscience. Vermont Royster wrote a lovely editorial about them this morning in the Wall Street Journal, which is not an organ of rebellion. He is against the Forand and Kennedy bills. He hates the welfare state but he has a sense of pity.

EISENHOWER'S APPROACH

So does the President. As a human being he has retained as much humanity and compassion as anyone in the Capital. Also, he has this problem of caring for the aged in his own wife's family. But this merely brings us back to the main point: What kind of President do you want?

It is not the President's humanity that is at issue but his concept of the Presidency. It is not Eisenhower who is the issue but the man to succeed him, and the concept of government to follow after him.

This whole question of how we allocate and spend the Nation's resources has unfortunately drifted into black and white issues of whether we want tall fins with freedom or security with Government control. But before we get to the question of directing the Nation's resources, there is the question of directing the President's resources.

Obviously, the voluntary way is better, but if justice to the old people is not freely given, even then, before direction, comes the obligation of persuasion. The answer to the old people may be that the Government can't afford it, and shouldn't try to do more, but the point has to be explained. For if the old folk can't eat, at least they can vote. And so can the people who have to care for them.

Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped in Kansas conducts annually an essay contest among high school juniors and seniors on some subject having to do with the physically handicapped. This year the

theme was "Jobs for the Handicapped—Passports to Dignity."

Many of our high school juniors and seniors participated in the contest, and the winner of the first place was Jerry Ulrich, a senior in the Iola High School. He wrote an outstanding essay on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PRESENTS JERRY ULRICH, A SENIOR IN IOLA HIGH SCHOOL, AND HIS ESSAY IN A CONTEST AMONG JUNIORS AND SENIORS IN KANSAS HIGH SCHOOLS ON "JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED—PASSPORTS TO DIGNITY"

"I am a man—an individual capable of supporting my family by performing a task useful to society." To be able to say these words is the goal of some 4 million handicapped persons in the United States who have been told that they are able to learn to become self-sufficient. Already more than a quarter of a million physically disabled persons are self-supporting. How these disabled Americans have contributed to society is an interesting story of human trial and eventual success.

The disabled American is playing an increasingly important role in U.S. industry. In order to meet the increasing needs of consumers, industry must have a steadily increasing supply of skilled and productive workers. The opportunity for the trained handicapped person is there. His chances for learning were greatly increased with the passage of Public Law 565, the vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1954. This law enables the Federal Government to provide funds to the States so that they may aid individuals in preparing for, and engaging in, remunerative employment. The States have met this requirement by establishing vocational rehabilitation services. Although the organization of these services varies from State to State, the services all help to train the disabled citizen.

Rehabilitation services provide help for the disabled in several fields. The services operate on the theory, that, what a man has lost, is not nearly so important as what he has left. The handicapped person need only apply to a local rehabilitation office for assistance. Here he is periodically given medical examinations to determine whether or not he is overexerting. Physical aids such as braces and artificial limbs are provided by the rehabilitation services. When a disabled person is physically equipped, a counselor helps him pick a vocation for which he is suited. After the person has selected a vocation, he is given on-the-job training in a "factory clinic." Here the worker only needs to work as much as he feels able. He is served well-balanced meals in the factory's cafeteria. Counselors are always at hand to help the person learn his chosen vocation. This period of training ranges from several weeks to 3 years. When the disabled person is close to mastering a skill, he has a new sense of self-assurance, realizing that he soon will be able to take his place beside his fellow citizens in the working world. Upon "graduating" from a factory-clinic, a disabled person is, in the words of a factory-clinic supervisor, "a fine product—a whole, well, human being." He is ready to enter the working world.

Jobs for the handicapped are becoming available in increasing numbers. The rehabilitation service helps the newly-emerged

worker to locate a job and to adjust to his new environment. Employment opportunities for trained disabled citizens have increased substantially in the last few years. This is not because factories have added special jobs for the handicapped; on the contrary, businessmen are finding that it is profitable to hire the handicapped. In an aircraft manufacturing plant, for example, blind employees search through the sweepings from the assembly line for screws, washers, and nuts. The items found save the company \$65,000 a year. Surveys by the National Association of Manufacturers show that the disabled worker in the right job is equal to, and, in some cases, better than, his able-bodied peers in such important factors as attendance, safety, turnover, and productivity.

With the increasing complexity of industry, handicapped persons are actually surpassing their associates. This is true, especially in the electronics industry, where dexterity on the assembly line is of prime importance. A person who has lost his hearing is able to concentrate on his job because he is unable to hear, therefore, not disturbed by noise. A wheelchair worker is not so prone to becoming restless at a tedious job as is an able-bodied worker. What a person has lost in one type of ability he can compensate for, by concentrating on the development of the skill he is able to perform. A worker who has thus practiced a skill very thoroughly will be of above average proficiency in that skill.

Achievement of the goal of being a self-supporting citizen is not easy for the handicapped person. Although artificial limbs, training centers, and similar helps are very beneficial to the handicapped person, he must have something more than outside help. The physically disabled individual must possess the will to succeed. For a handicapped person to even realize that he is able to learn to compensate for his disablement, and to take the proper action, is a major step.

Take, for instance, the hypothetical case of George Anderson. George lost his arms in an automobile accident 4 years ago. Previous to that time, he was employed as a printer in a greeting-card factory. After his accident, George became very depressed because he felt that he would never be able to be a useful citizen again. Then one day, a friend told George about a vocational rehabilitation service, whereupon George went to the office to see if he could find a way of regaining his status as an independent individual. At the rehabilitation office, a counselor helped George to realize that he could help himself. With the advice of the counselor, George chose a vocation which he thought himself to be capable of learning, that of Spencerian writing. Using a pen attached to his head, George learned to write beautifully. The rehabilitation service helped George to get a job in the same greeting-card factory that he had worked in for several years before his accident. George is now a contented, satisfied individual, realizing that he is on an equal plane with his fellow man.

There are thousands of Georges, the disabled Americans who have found a new hope in life by becoming financially independent. But more than this mercenary advancement, these individuals have gained a new sense of self-assurance. By taking their places in the working world, the handicapped have made known their possibilities. Americans are showing a general trend toward accepting the handicapped. Industry knows that employing the handicapped is good business. For these reasons, the handicapped have been able to obtain jobs. Thus, raising themselves to the level of self-sufficient persons, handicapped persons have used their passports to dignity.

An Important Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we hear much about the growing dangers facing the many Americans who have become boating enthusiasts in recent years. As the number of amateur sailors continues to grow, so does the need for responsible and mature judgment by those citizens. I was interested, therefore, in the editorial praise given on March 10 by the Cape May (N.J.) Star and Wave to the work of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary in that area. The Coast Guard and the citizens are working together to prevent needless tragedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IMPORTANT PUBLIC SERVICE

An announcement last week that Flotilla No. 35, U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, will conduct a series of classes on the handling of small boats should be of no little interest and importance to a large segment of the permanent population and visitors to this seashore area.

With a tremendous upsurge in boating in recent years and the likelihood that the growth in its popularity will continue for the foreseeable future, there is increasing need for instruction, guidance, and surveillance in the interests of safety.

In an area such as ours with inviting expanses of ocean and bay so close at hand and offering so many alluring possibilities to those imbued with enthusiasm for boating and fishing it is essential that everything possible be done to promote safety afloat.

Besides offering instruction in basic seamanship and boat handling, one of the greatest problems confronting all who are concerned with promoting marine safety is the need to impress upon and instill in novices a strong and abiding respect for the power and the inherent dangers of the open water.

We who live at the shore have seen all too often the rollicking, devil-may-care landlubbers or "shooboxers" who hang outboard motors on any kind of a hull and roar off in all directions for a day's pleasure without knowing one end of a boat from the other. And we have seen all too often the results of such foolhardiness, the needless risk of life and limb, the unfair burden that is placed on others to save them from their own folly, and occasionally the tragic price they pay for their ignorance.

Yes, we who live by the sea learn in many ways to respect its power.

Dedicated to promoting better seamanship and safety afloat and to assist the Coast Guard in its many duties, the Coast Guard auxiliary has made a major contribution since its establishment some years ago. Through courtesy boat and equipment inspections, ready counsel and advice based on knowledge and experience and training, the auxiliary has done much to make boating safer and more enjoyable.

Austria Views Outer Seven Pact "First Step" to Trade Area for All Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. During the past several months, and especially since Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon formally presented the U.S. proposal for a greater economic community of the industrialized nations of the free world last January in Paris, much has been spoken and written about the eventual effect of the European Economic Community (Common Market) and of the newly created European Free Trade Association upon the trade and investment pattern of the free world. Concern has been expressed by many eminent economists and statesmen that the accelerated trade liberalization being planned by the members of the Common Market among themselves and the reaction to this potentially discriminatory program by the members of the Free Trade Association may result in uneconomic trade patterns and a disruption of the flow of trade, particularly from the United States to Western Europe.

Mr. President, the members of the European Economic Community, the members of the European Free Trade Association and other members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and Canada and the United States are scheduled to meet in Paris on April 21 for the purpose of negotiating an agreement for the establishment of an organization embracing all of them and pledged to coordinate action in trade liberalization and in economic support of the newly developing nations of the free world. In preparation, a meeting of nine exporting nations, including Japan, has already been successfully concluded this month in Washington; a 20-nation meeting on trade policies will take place in Paris later this month, and questionnaires concerning the structure of the proposed organization are already in the hands of its future member governments. It is heartening to read that Austria, one of the members of the European Free Trade Association, sees no real threat of permanent division and rivalry. Austria's Chancellor, Julius Raab, has recently made this clear, and Austria's Finance Minister, Reinhard Kamitz, has expressed his belief that, as a matter of fact, the future of economic integration rests in the two so-called rival organizations: EEC and EFTA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts of an analysis of the Austrian position on this matter which is so vital to the continuing success of U.S. free world leadership.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRIA VIEWS OUTER-7 PACT "FIRST STEP" TO TRADE AREA FOR ALL FREE EUROPE

To Austria the European Free Trade Association (Outer-7) convention recently signed in Stockholm is the first step toward reestablishing the economic unity of the free nations of Europe, which seemed to be seriously impaired when France, Western Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries organized the Common Market almost 2 years ago.

Underlining this view in a major debate before the Austrian National Parliament this past week Chancellor Julius Raab emphasized that for Austria the real object of the European Trade Association was to provide "basis of negotiation for multilateral cooperation" with the Common Market. Mr. Raab expressed his belief that European integration had already gone so far that there was no real threat that the two economic blocs would continue existing separately forever. "It is Austria's special task," he said, "ceaselessly and loudly to campaign for cooperation between the Common Market and the rest of Europe." European integration has been a constant subject of our policy explorations for 2 years, the Chancellor noted, leading the Austrian Government to conclude that the Nation's present economic aspirations and needs make participation in the EFTA a logical step.

The parliamentary debate revealed general agreement with the Vienna Government's position that the formation as soon as possible of a wider free trade area, embracing both the six and the seven was of paramount importance. "Austria must do everything to bring about unity in Europe and in this respect the country's function can only be supranational," commented Socialist member, Czernitz. Foreign Minister Dr. Bruno Kreisky indicated that he thought that Austria, within the framework of the EFTA would have opportunity to develop new and extensive markets. It is necessary, however, he stressed, that Austrian industry should embark on a more extensive modernization program and undertake imaginative and long-range investment programs to become even more competitive.

While there is broad unity in Austria on the importance of economic integration, it is not certain that conclusion of the EFTA pact will quiet some of the responsible voices who have urged Austria to take extraordinary steps to associate itself with the common market. The controversy centers on two points: Would such association be helpful to Austria's economic growth? and, Would "association," as opposed to full membership, conflict with the neutrality to which Austria pledged itself in 1955 when it regained full political sovereignty?

Austria's Finance Minister, Dr. Reinhard Kamitz, believes that, in the conclusion of the EFTA, the future of European economic integration rests in the two organizations—the Common Market and the newly spawned association. They must, he says, work together to "abolish barriers in trade and payments" among all the nations of free Europe. It is agreed in Vienna, explaining the eagerness of Austrian participation in the newest trade liberalizing effort, that the EFTA is truly a vehicle for expanding and liberalizing the trade of Europe and the world at large.

The core of the Austrian position was summarized in Chancellor Raab's presentation to the Vienna Parliament in this manner:

The most advantageous development in European integration would, of course, have been the extension of the OEEC into an all-

Europe free trade area. We would be remiss if there were no regrets expressed at this time that developments have not made this possible.

Mr. Raab stressed that present organizations seeking to integrate Europe further are not in a final form. Rather, they are still in a state of development. The present efforts have a tendency, Mr. Raab stated, to lead toward an ultimate solution of greater cooperation in Europe.

National Wildlife Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the Ripon Commonwealth Press of Ripon, Wis., published an informative article on National Wildlife Week, March 20-26.

In commenting on this special week, the editorial reviewed a specific project which, in itself, is a splendid example of wildlife preservation, the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge in Wisconsin.

Within 15 years, the program, administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, has transformed a rough marshland into one of nature's most spectacular wildlife panoramas.

In addition to providing a wildlife refuge—for geese, duck, deer, fox, and other wildlife—the Horicon project is serving as a constructive program in conserving a rich, natural resource: water.

Reflective of the constructive work being accomplished to preserve our wildlife, water, as well as other natural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

This week, March 20-26, is National Wildlife Week. We here, living close to the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge have something to celebrate—the resurrection of a marsh. Only 15 years ago this marsh lay dormant with just remnants of the wildlife of the past. Now it provides one of nature's most spectacular wildlife panoramas. Thousands and thousands of people throng to the refuge, principally in April and October, to see clouds of geese and ducks and other wildlife such as deer, pheasants, raccoons, and even the cunning fox.

The great transformation of these wetlands by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has taken place before our eyes. The refuge is known throughout the country and people from every State make it a "must" stop on their way through Wisconsin. Last fall over 75,000 geese were on the Federal refuge at one time. This spectacle is almost beyond comprehension. Many species of ducks nest and rest in the refuge. Last year the duck production was over 8,000 birds. Production of refuge byproducts, such as pheasants and deer, has helped make this area famous above all others in the Midwest.

This natural phenomenon can be repeated elsewhere in this State with your help. As the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge was

the product of the wants of the people, so can there be other areas developed for wildlife near your home. First we must have the wetlands in the hands of those who have the knowledge to develop and protect them. We must have water conservation—water is the key to your survival.

National Chiropractic Association Sponsors National Correct Posture Week, May 1-7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is generally agreed, I am sure, that the most important asset which one can have is good health. Without it our lives become burdensome, depressing and unproductive. The realization of our potential usually goes by the wayside when one cannot perform assigned tasks and responsibilities due to ill health.

The habits which are acquired in the formative as well as during the middle years often go a long way in determining the standards of health in our more advanced years.

Our health, therefore, should be guarded at all times with the utmost care. It is undoubtedly the most precious thing we have. Once lost through neglect, indifference or carelessness, it may never be regained. We all are acquainted, no doubt, with individuals who have actually thrown good, robust health to the four winds. This is indeed most regrettable and unfortunate to observe.

To retain sound health one must practice good habits, and one of great importance is proper and correct posture. This phase of our everyday physical well-being is for the most part generally neglected. For some reason we tend to think that so long as we continue to take diligent care of the prime requirements for good health, we can ignore the details which make for a happy, healthful life. Correct posture is one of those details and is of importance to proper physical development in our children and continues to play a necessary role throughout life.

Many of our outstanding athletes have reported that one of the contributing factors to their success was correct posture which provided the means for proper muscle development and coordination.

What is more imposing and picturesque than to see the Corps of Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point or the Brigade of Midshipmen of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis march in precision drills or pass in review at one of their football games? One of the factors contributing to these impressive displays is correct posture—en masse.

I desire now to call the attention of the Senate to the very fine work which has been done along this line by the National Chiropractic Association in

acting as sponsor for National Correct Posture Week.

The National Chiropractic Association is among those who have been urging higher health standards in America. This year from May 1 to May 7, inclusive, it is sponsoring National Correct Posture Week as a part of its better health program.

Many of our mayors and Governors have issued special proclamations urging the people to participate in the special educational activities during National Correct Posture Week, and the schools are paying special attention to this worthy program of training for our young people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy of Washington, D.C., who is director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Murphy's statement follows:

GOOD POSTURE, GOOD HEALTH

Contributing to national health and welfare by improving individual posture is the sole aim of the National Chiropractic Association when it annually sponsors—from May 1 through May 7—National Correct Posture Week.

This is the time when chiropractors use every means of publicity to draw public attention to this primary aim of chiropractic. They believe, preach, and practice that good posture and good health go together.

In that belief we are in complete agreement with every branch of the healing arts, and we are sincere in our constant efforts to cooperate with all Americans in improving the standards of our national health.

It has been most encouraging to note that many agencies of our Federal Government have been in the vanguard of those advocating correct posture as a definite aid toward sound health and long life.

All recruits are familiar with the basic teachings of our Armed Forces which stress correct posture—not only on the parade ground, but elsewhere. These teachings stress correct posture as a means of physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

Other Federal agencies, too, have long been leaders in this never-ending campaign to keep Americans posture conscious. For instance, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau, of the Department of Labor; the Federal Security Agency; the White House Conference on Child Health are but a few which could be listed.

SPOKESMEN AGREE

It is important to remember that good posture means much more than simply standing straight. Good posture is that position of the body in any activity in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort.

On this one point all spokesmen of all branches of human endeavor have agreed for hundreds of years that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good general health.

This viewpoint is shared by medical and chiropractic authorities, public health workers, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and specialists in industrial relations.

TEST YOUR POSTURE

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running (side view) from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips,

knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad, and you should see a chiropractor.

Standing

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

Sitting

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

Walking

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down. Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

OFFICIALS ENDORSE POSTURE WEEK

Without the wholehearted cooperation of the American people, National Correct Posture Week would be a meaningless phrase.

It is the wonderful assistance of school-teachers and school authorities, of State legislatures, of Governors and mayors, of Members of the U.S. Congress, and of the people themselves that has made National Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance in the United States.

Every year more and more officials at the city and State level proclaim its observance officially.

The active members of the National Chiropractic Association lead in observance of National Correct Posture Week, because the science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

The Budget Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 24, 1960 issue of the Edisto News of Denmark, S.C., entitled "The Budget Can Be Cut." This editorial is an example of the sound and well written editorials which appear weekly in the Edisto News, one of South Carolina's newest and most outstanding newspapers. It is ably edited and published by Mr. and Mrs. Jack H. Brewster.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET CAN BE CUT

The average citizen wants a reduction in Government spending and lower taxes. But he's at a loss when it comes to recommending specific reforms. The budgets are enormously complex, and run to realms of finely-printed pages.

There are, however, organizations whose business it is to analyze budgets and find where cuts are both possible and desirable. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce has done that with the administration's 1961 budget. It proposes specific reductions totaling \$3.3 billion—all of a non-defense nature. Its report observes that the "proposals represent only a relatively modest but effective start toward control of Federal spending at a manageable level—that is, a spending level which will make practicable the tax reforms that are necessary to assure sound economic growth and at the same time permit reduction of the public debt.

The proposals cover a wide area—reduced spending on public works; reduced grant-in-aid of various kinds; curtailed loan programs; a cut in Federal civilian personnel forces, and so on down the list. Not everyone will agree with them all, and other studies stress additional areas of possible cutbacks. But the point is that we can have more economical Government without undermining our defense in any way. And the main way to achieve it is by eliminating activities which can and should be undertaken by local government, by private enterprise, or by individual, and by other nations.

Upholding Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 24, 1960, issue of the Charleston Evening Post, one of South Carolina's most outspoken and widely read newspapers. The editorial is entitled "Upholding Law 'Of The Land'" and makes a point which merits the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPHOLDING LAW 'OF THE LAND'

The U.S. State Department has condemned violent measures used by police in South Africa against Negro mobs.

At several places thousands of Negroes staged demonstrations against laws which require nonwhites to carry passes. In one instance police were besieged and being stoned when they opened fire. A number of the rioters were killed and injured. Many buildings were fired by mobs.

All this is tragic and distressing.

The U.S. Government, through the State Department, issued a statement in which it placed the onus on the South African Government. The United States, it said, "cannot but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa."

The use of the word "mob" was delicately avoided. But that was the word often used

in denunciation of Little Rock citizens who demonstrated against school integration. The Government which condemns South Africa dispatched troops to Arkansas. Had it been deemed necessary, they would have been ordered to fire on the Little Rock demonstrators. They were fully armed, and ready to shoot. They were not there merely to stage a dress parade.

The President justified his Little Rock course as upholding the law of the land. Now what answer will he make if the South African regime says the police action was to uphold the law of the land? Whether laws against which the Negroes were protesting were good or bad, the fact stands that they are laws, and not merely laws decreed by court fiat. What's right about using troops to enforce the "law of the land" in the United States that's wrong about using police force for that purpose in another country?

Negroes in the U.S. South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the civil rights debate in the Congress has attracted widespread attention in the world's press. What we say and do here carries critical implications to our friends in the free world and in the uncommitted nations as well as to the Communist bloc. The nonwhite peoples who make up such a large part of the free world are especially concerned with our handling of this vital issue, and the editorial reaction in their newspapers should be of especial interest to us.

The editorial in the Hindu Weekly Review of March 7, 1960, a newspaper published in Madras, India, is typical of foreign comment that shows in a friendly way an effort to understand the issues and the problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial from the Hindu Weekly Review of March 7, 1960:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGROES IN THE U.S. SOUTH

By now the pattern of the struggle waged by the Negro people of the United States "to realize (their) place in society" is becoming clear. They are pressing for full voting rights, to which they are entitled under the law, and for as good an education as is being provided free of cost by the State for its non-Negro citizens. In actual practice, in the South, Negroes are prevented from exercising their franchise by means of regulations authorized by the various States. In education, Negro children have to be satisfied with the second best, in segregated schools. But the American Negro no longer speaks softly and treads warily. A systematic nonviolent struggle for full civil rights is being carried on and the courts are being fully used to secure completely for the dark people the rights to which they are entitled by reason of the fact that they are as good American citizens as any with fair skins. The American Negro wants to "belong" completely to the society and environment in which he finds himself; he

wants not to be an African but a full-blooded U.S. citizen. This many of the whites in the Southern States are determined to prevent him from becoming.

Many efforts have been made to circumvent the historic judgments of the U.S. Supreme Court which has decided once and for all that segregation in education is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has just now upheld the validity of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. In general the courts of the various Southern States are guided by local opinion and do all they can to nullify, in practice, the effects of the Supreme Court's decisions. The law, as administered in these States, is sometimes shocking. Only recently a group of whites, who dragged out a young Negro from a prison in Poplarville, Miss., last April, and murdered him, has been let off scot-free because a local grand jury would not even look into the case. The State legislatures have also tried their best to circumvent the Supreme Court judgments regarding segregated education. It may be remembered that Little Rock in Arkansas achieved a notoriety in this regard. In spite of tremendous handicaps the Negroes, under the guidance of dedicated leaders and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are carrying on the struggle for achieving full citizenship rights. In the latest campaign in Tennessee, the Negroes ask that they should be served while sitting at bars; racial discrimination has so long prevented this: the dark people are served only while they stand. This recalls to our minds the campaign for nonsegregated seats for Negroes in buses.

Though the outlook for the Negroes in the South of the United States is not very rosy, they are making a steady advance. Some of the plans to get around the integration of whites and blacks in schools have been frustrated. Public opinion in America is also growing more and more aware of the need for ending racialism within the country's borders, so that the United States could really qualify for leadership of the free world. The Federal Government is doing what they can to make civil rights a reality for the Negroes in the South. (There is some discrimination against the Negroes in the northern States, too, but it is on nothing like the scale in which it is practiced in the South where it is thought of as a part of the so-called southern way of life). A fresh civil rights bill is now being discussed in the U.S. Senate and President Eisenhower, though appreciative of southern feelings, has not encouraged any southern State in its campaign against the law of the land, as finally interpreted by the Supreme Court. At the moment of writing, southern Senators are carrying on a traditional filibuster to prevent the civil rights bill from being passed. We must hope that their attempts will fail. Mr. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, is known to be strongly in favor of full civil rights for the Negroes: And the Republican Party will support him. Among the Democrats, however, a split is threatened by this issue of full rights for Negroes. This crude racial prejudice is often sublimated into the so-called issue of State versus Federal rights. But America has a great democratic tradition. Her people are known for their friendliness and generosity. And the law is on the side of the Negroes, unlike in the Union of South Africa. But prejudices die hard. The democratic countries will watch the struggle of the U.S. Negroes with the confidence that ultimate victory will be theirs. It looks as if this issue will become a major factor in the next presidential campaign. In a land dedicated to freedom, we are sure racialism cannot survive forever.

Wildlife Federation Opposes Water Diversion From the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I recognize that the preservation and best utilization of our natural resources is essential if we are to meet the ever-expanding needs of the future.

In many areas of the country, particularly in the Great Lakes region, we have been blessed with invaluable resources, including water. However, if these waters are siphoned off to serve special interests, the result in the long run will, I believe, jeopardize the public interest.

Currently, there is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee a bill, H.R. 1, which would propose to divert additional volumes—dangerously large volumes, I believe—of water from the Great Lakes.

As my colleagues will recall, I have opposed such efforts in the past. Frankly, I feel, along with the majority of people in the Great Lakes region, that this would seriously jeopardize not only the commercial, navigational, recreational, and other activities on the lakes, as well as the St. Lawrence Seaway—the deepened and improved trade route from the Midwest to the ports of the world.

In regard to this, I was pleased to note that the National Wildlife Federation, at its 24th annual convention, also adopted a resolution opposing further diversion of water from the Great Lakes region.

Reflecting the views of the federation, which, over the years has endorsed and supported a wide variety of constructive proposals for conserving and preserving our valuable resource—water—I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Chicago, Ill., has been permitted by a Supreme Court decree of 1930 to divert 1,500 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes such water being diverted to the Mississippi River; and

Whereas Chicago is presently seeking legal authority to increase such diversion to 2,500 cubic feet of water per second; and

Whereas the maintenance of the proper level of the waters of the Great Lakes are a valuable natural resource used and enjoyed by the people of the affected states and Province of Ontario, Canada, and the resulting decrease in the water level of the Great Lakes has and is creating an embarrassing international problem; is also decreasing and injuring the fish spawning areas and waterfowl feeding and nesting areas; and is materially injuring the natural beaches, boating enjoyment, and fishing; as well as decreasing the navigability of commerce on the Great Lakes Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation in annual meeting at the Adolphus Hotel, Dallas, Tex., on the 6th day of March 1960, go on record as definitely opposed to the destruction and damage to recreational waters, the natural habitat of fish, and waterfowl and urge the vigorous opposition of all people to the continuing or extension of diversion of any Great Lakes water.

Khrushchev in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the timely and informative report on Premier Khrushchev's visit to France which appears in the most recent issue of U.S. News & World Report.

In this article, Robert Kleiman, regional editor for U.S. News, writing from Paris, discusses Khrushchev's efforts to drive a wedge between the French and the West Germans. Kleiman also suggests that Khrushchev's careful and dignified demeanor since he has arrived in France is an attempt to emulate and impress the great leader of the French people, Charles De Gaulle.

Mr. President, these and other equally as important observations make this a most worthwhile article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH KHRUSHCHEV IN FRANCE

(Khrushchev, back on tour, is trying a different tactic in France. But the goal's the same: to split the West. Regional Editor Robert Kleiman, on the scene, tells what the top Communist is up to—and measures his chances of success.)

PARIS.—The face that Nikita Khrushchev showed to Paris at the start of an 11-day tour of France was that of a cautious, polite, somewhat hesitant man—always anxious not to offend.

But, despite his careful display of courteous friendliness, the Soviet dictator set out immediately to try to stir up French fears of Germans, and German suspicions of the French. Almost from the moment of his arrival on March 23, it was clear that Khrushchev's chief objective in coming to France was to undermine the French-German alliance.

For example, Khrushchev drew applause from the Paris City Council when he revealed that the three German divisions that occupied the French capital in June of 1940 were destroyed by the Russians at Stalingrad in 1943.

To members of a Communist-controlled peace movement, Khrushchev said:

"The French must understand that they are the first to be menaced by the Germans. The Germans are dangerous only because they can start a war. Even a mad German militarist would not risk a war with us."

The Soviet Premier made plain that he wanted French support for "the conclusion

of a peace treaty with the two German states—a step that would commit France publicly and formally to a permanent division of Germany and Communist control of East Germany.

As French diplomats see it, Khrushchev's public remarks were aimed at the West Germans as well as Frenchmen. His talk of French-Soviet friendship was designed, it is felt, to make Germans suspicious about the possibility of a secret deal between Khrushchev and France's President Charles de Gaulle. At the same time, it is believed Khrushchev hopes French public opinion eventually will force a change in De Gaulle's policy of a close partnership with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany.

STICKING TO THE SCRIPT

France is the seventeenth country Khrushchev has visited since becoming the No. 1 man in the Kremlin. He gave observers the impression that the stakes for which he was playing here were higher than those on any previous trip—including his U.S. tour. From the outset, he seemed to be taking unusual pains to avoid any errors or any off-the-cuff remarks that could upset his plan.

The ebullience for which Khrushchev is noted was kept closely under control. Clowning was avoided. Even smiles were few. All his public statements were carefully prepared in advance—even the toasts. The Soviet leader seemed to be trying to maintain a kind of solemn dignity that would conform to De Gaulle's concept of statesmanlike behavior.

Khrushchev's solemnity contributed to a first-day impression that the Soviet leader was pale and tired, perhaps still recovering from the influenza that delayed his trip 8 days. But, on his first day, he went through a rugged schedule that began at 4 a.m. in Moscow and ended at midnight in Paris.

The next day—after a good night's sleep—Khrushchev appeared as physically healthy and mentally alert as ever during a 30-minute speech to 200 businessmen and a subsequent hour-long discussion with 50 of France's top industrialists and bankers.

CHEERS—FROM REDS

Paris gave Khrushchev a friendly reception. Most spectators were curious, but silent Communists were present in sufficient numbers, however, to provide hearty cheers whenever he appeared in public.

Vocal anti-Communists made only rare appearances. Some shouted "Budapest!" Some scattered nails on the Champs Elysées which street cleaners had to sweep up before Khrushchev's car passed by. They ripped down a few Soviet flags and got into one brief scuffle with French Communists, but there were no serious disturbances.

Everywhere Khrushchev went, he made an effort to woo his audiences and to avoid the ruffling-up he has caused so often in the past. There was none of the boasting arrogance displayed by him during visits to the United States and elsewhere.

ALL FOR NOUGHT?

After hours of private Khrushchev-De Gaulle talks there was no indication that Khrushchev's tactics had taken in the French President. On the contrary, in one of his rare references to his own allies, De Gaulle made it clear that France belongs to the Western camp and intends to stay there.

Just what the final outcome of Khrushchev's mission to France will be is far from clear, as yet. But diplomats in Paris, from the outset, were inclined to doubt that the Soviet Premier's soft-spoken wooing of the French will get him any further than the threats of direct action against West Berlin which he was making in more belligerent tones just a few weeks ago.

Salesman of Polaris: William Francis Raborn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Salesman of Polaris: William Francis Raborn, Jr.," published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALESMAN OF POLARIS: WILLIAM FRANCIS RABORN, JR.

COCOA BEACH, FLA., March 27.—On the wall outside the entrance to the Washington office of Rear Adm. William Francis Raborn, Jr., is a framed Bill Mauldin cartoon. It shows an Air Force general, cigar ground in his jaw, fishing from a small boat. Leaping from the water, looking cockily at the general's hook, is a large sharklike fish representing the Navy's Polaris-carrying submarine. The caption under the drawing reads: "Go Fly a Kite."

The cartoon is the admiral's answer to the Air Force campaign to gain operational control of the Polaris missile system, which is entering a critical series of tests. However, if he had been the artist, the caption would have been a good deal saltier.

"Red" Raborn, proud father of the Polaris program, is not the sort to ignore attempts to tamper with or run down his beloved project. He will go through the motions of insisting that he does not care to debate with someone who knows no more about naval affairs than a Swiss guard.

COLORFULLY TEXAN IN SPEECH

Then, the built-in laughter in his eyes dimmed for the moment and a gull-shaped crease forming on his ruddy forehead, he will take care of the opposition in words that are colorfully Texan in tone and content. But he does it without venom, with the self-assurance of a man who feels he is dealing from an unassailable position.

The admiral has headed the Polaris program since its inception in 1955, with a salesman's fervor.

The success of the program to date in meeting a drastically tight timetable indicates that the technician in the admiral is the equal of the salesman.

His enthusiasm and drive are reflected in his staff, which darts about the country to Polaris facilities from a headquarters in the Munitions Building along Washington's Constitution Avenue.

It is, as staffs go, a small, compact one. Associates insist that it is next to impossible to get Admiral Raborn to add an extra billet.

"I can get more work out of one overworked man than out of two underworked men," he says.

HE'S A "CAN-DO" MAN

In Navy parlance, the admiral is known as a "can-do" man.

"People will suggest 15 reasons why something cannot be done," one of his former assistants reports, "but he will have a 'gut' feeling that it can. So he does it."

Though born in Texas (June 8, 1905, in the town of Decatur), Admiral Raborn grew up in Oklahoma. It was Oklahoma's Senator Elmer Thomas who got him his appointment to Annapolis.

Almost from the start, his naval career took an aeronautic turn—and almost came to a quick end.

He had his first ride at Anacostia while on Christmas leave during his plebe year.

The engine died on the way down, and the plane made a dead stick landing on the edge of the field.

"Red" Raborn was a lieutenant stationed on the other side of the island from Pearl Harbor just before the Japanese attack.

A KNACK FOR ANTICIPATING

Exhibiting his talent for anticipating technical requirements, he had worried about the lack of antisubmarine equipment on the patrol planes in his squadron. He devised a rack for depth charges. The planes had them aboard when war came.

He was executive officer of the carrier *Hancock* during the Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and several other campaigns. He won a Silver Star for gallantry when the *Hancock* was hit by a bomb.

Since the war, Admiral Raborn has alternated between sea duty and research and development.

The admiral has a son and daughter, both married, by his first wife. He lives with his second wife, the former Mildred Terrill (she was a Navy nurse with the rank of commander) in a split-level home in Arlington, Va.

He used to be a heavy golfer but gave it up for the Polaris. He has also taken up the organ. But his main hobby is gardening.

"There's always time to pull a weed or two," the admiral says.

Rural Development Program—Excellent Work Being Done in Schuylkill County To Build Stability and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to direct attention to the Committee for Rural Development.

Last October while Congress was not in session, the President signed an Executive order establishing the committee, and it is possible that some of my colleagues in Congress may not have had this order brought to their specific attention. Certainly the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have not had the opportunity to see the order through the RECORD.

The administration has taken important steps in recent weeks to strengthen and expand the rural development program nationally. This is gratifying news, which will especially interest those Members of Congress who represent rural areas where families on small farms are having a hard time earning an adequate income due to rapid changes in the Nation's agricultural production and competition from the larger commercial units.

I have a firsthand knowledge of the rural development program, since Schuylkill County in my district is presently one of the participating areas. In

this county the Pennsylvania Agricultural Extension Service under the very capable direction of Mr. C. L. Robertson, the county agent, his associate county agent, Mr. Guy Temple, and other agencies, have joined with local leadership to promote better farms, better living in rural communities, and new off-farm enterprises.

Among other activities are the following: Through the leadership of those working with the rural development program, Schuylkill County's fine youngsters are being encouraged to participate in community improvement plans. Industry tours and other vocational guidance programs have also been set up for these young people. Leaders from all over the county are receiving help in trying together and stepping up industrial development plans. Plans to improve the tourist business locally are also going forward.

The Agricultural Extension Service has assigned Guy Temple, associate county agent, to head this program in Schuylkill County and it is with a great deal of pride that I call your attention to the following report just prepared for me by Mr. Temple:

The Schuylkill County rural development program came into being as a pilot program in the fall of 1957. The program first obtained a part-time worker in September 1958. Considerable time has been spent in becoming acquainted with the county, its people, and learning more about the rural development program.

A committee has been formed, namely, the Schuylkill County Rural-Urban Development Council, which is made up of representatives from business and agriculture, as well as other civic and community leaders.

The first work of the council was a problem affecting nearly all rural sections of the county, that of deer damage caused by an overpopulation of deer. The feeding of this deer herd has caused a great economic loss to many farmers of the area. As in all situations, there were two sides to the problem: the landowner having damage and the sportsman desiring a plentiful supply of game. Many individuals and groups had attempted to get this problem corrected. However, their efforts were not fruitful because factual information on damage and loss was not available.

Through the cooperation of the Pennsylvania State University resident and extension staff in the schools of agricultural economics, rural sociology, forestry and horticulture, and a local committee, a questionnaire was formulated. Locally, 4-H members, vocational agriculture departments, and interested groups in the county served as enumerators for the survey. Approximately 60 enumerators assisted in the survey, contacting nearly 200 landowners.

The work completed by the council with the assistance of other organizations confirmed that the deer damage was of a great economic concern to rural landowners. The loss in crops and property damage was \$492,000, nearly 5 percent of the total value (\$10,686,000) of agricultural production in the county.

These survey results were released to Pennsylvania Game Commission personnel, all county sport associations, and news articles were released to all county newspapers, plus two papers with statewide distribution.

We have since been informed that survey results were a major influence on the Pennsylvania Game Commission decision to place a larger number of antlerless deer licenses in Schuylkill County for the 1959 season.

It is anticipated to provide additional information through meetings and mass media to further improve landowner-and-sportsman relations.

As numerous contacts were made concerning the program it became evident that many people, including county, State, and Federal personnel were not aware of the functions or assistance available from established county, State and Federal public service agencies. This information was assembled in handbook form by the county steering committee and the State extension service provided the funds for printing. The handbook was distributed to community leaders and groups throughout the county. The council hopes to add additional agencies to this handbook and also attempt to keep it up to date.

Early in 1959, an attempt was made to contact as many county groups as possible and present a program to initiate some thought on their immediate community problems. As a result, many problem areas were more clearly defined to the people as well as to the Rural Development Committee.

From those problem areas mentioned, the steering committee elected to place emphasis on the following four areas:

1. Beautification of the county.
2. Zoning.
3. Youth.
4. Agriculture roundtable.

1. Beautification of the county: The various agencies of the rural development program are still working closely through their regular programs, with those farmers who have possibilities of learning the management skills necessary to efficiently operate their farm business. However there are many farmers who do not possess or cannot effectively learn the managerial skills. Consequently the council felt that these people might better their economic position through industrial employment. Therefore, any work done to improve the county will aid the existing industrial development groups in their efforts to attract industry, which will in turn offer this rural low income group new opportunities.

Industrial development groups in the area are doing a fine job in their work to attract and bring in new industry. However their job is made more difficult due to the general appearance of the area. Today industry considers esthetic value of an area as well as other considerations. Years of coal stripping has left many unsightly spoil piles along many of our highways leading into the county, and in some areas, even adjacent to homes. The council contemplated a project to reforest as many of these banks as possible. However an unforeseen, but pleasant circumstance has occurred which has partially sidetracked these plans—the announcement by the Philadelphia and Reading Corporation of their intentions to establish a refining industry in the area that will use some of the material in these banks.

However, experimental work to ascertain the species of trees, grasses and shrubs that are best adapted to culm bank planting is continuing. The Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Extension are cooperating on this work, with the first trial plantings to be made in April 1960.

There is one beautification project in Mahanoy City, that can be pointed to as completed. A small park in the center of the city is now the pride of that community. It was accomplished through local effort. The Council through the Extension Service assisted this group in drawing up the plans for the park.

2. Zoning: New industries are already locating in the county and there is the possibility of a new Federal highway crossing the county. Many people when considering

these possibilities felt the need for some long-range planning and subsequent zoning.

Present plans are for an educational program to provide an opportunity for people of the local communities to learn the true story of zoning, both its advantages and disadvantages. This is an attempt to get the right information disseminated before many false rumors become prevalent.

3. Youth: Many people expressed in the survey that they felt that many rural youth were only aware of farming as an occupation in the field of agriculture. In September of 1959 a new youth program called "Town and Country Business Club" was inaugurated. The program has four State objectives:

1. Provide a greater understanding of business as it operates in the marketing field through firms associated with agriculture.

2. Help in exploring the career opportunities in business closely related to farming so that capable farm youth remain in agribusiness careers.

3. Give youth who will remain on the farms a better appreciation of the problems and nature of agricultural marketing.

4. Point up the needs and benefits of training and education for youth anticipating employment with agri-business firms.

Presently 38 different rural youth have attended meetings of this group. The group recently won a statewide contest and in addition had one of the members, Miss Sandra Krebs, chosen as "All-American Teenager" at a related youth power Congress in Chicago. This program also is serving as an avenue for better relationships and interchange of ideas between agriculture and business.

4. Agriculture roundtable: An attempt will be made to develop such a program so as to disseminate information of a public affairs nature to as many rural residents as possible.

In addition to the above-mentioned activities the various agencies involved, soil conservation service, extension service, department of forest and waters, farm and home administration, agricultural habilitation and conservation committee, office of employment security, local chambers of commerce, and others are continuing their own respective programs of aids and assistance to the people of Schuylkill County.

Mr. Speaker, the rural development program, I am convinced, will grow into a major national effort to build stability and prosperity into our fine rural communities.

At this time I would like to include the text of President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10847 setting up the Committee for Rural Development Program on a formal basis to provide leadership and uniform policy guidance to the several Federal departments and agencies responsible for rural development program functions and related activities so that they may take more effective and concerted actions in carrying out those functions and activities and cooperate more effectively with non-Federal participants, both private and governmental, in the program.

The White House, in releasing the Executive order, had the following to say:

Members of the Committee include the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Chairman; the Under Secretary of the Interior; the Under Secretary of Commerce; the Under Secretary of Labor; the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and a member of the Council of Economic

Advisers designated by the Chairman of the Council.

The rural development program was initiated in 1955 as a cooperative effort of the Federal, State, and local governments, including the participation of private individuals and agencies, to develop the human resources in rural America with particular emphasis on improving the conditions of the numerous low-income families, both farm and non-farm, living in rural areas. In a special message to the Congress, April 27, 1955, the President directed attention to the problems of low-income rural families and presented recommendations for a concerted program developed in a study and report prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

Operating through State committees and centering in selected pilot counties, the rural development program includes specific activities, such as improving incomes from farming, providing more efficient farm marketing, promoting off-farm work, balancing agriculture with industry, evaluating rural manpower assets, increasing opportunities through vocational training, attaining better health, and improving basic education.

Today's Executive Order makes formal organization arrangements for the Federal Committee for Rural Development Program which has been functioning informally since the program was initiated. The seven-man Committee will direct its activities toward providing leadership and uniform policy guidance to the several Federal departments and agencies responsible for rural development program functions and related activities so that they may take more effective and concerted actions in carrying out those functions and activities and cooperate more effectively with non-Federal participants, both private and governmental, in the program.

Under the Executive order, the Committee is instructed to continue particular emphasis on effective public and private cooperation and leadership for rural development at the State and local levels.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING THE COMMITTEE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Whereas a substantial number of families, both farm and non-farm, living in rural areas have relatively low cash incomes and do not share equitably in the economic and social progress of the Nation, and it is desirable to encourage and assist such families by providing greater opportunity for their participation in the Nation's production of goods and services and in community, civic, and other affairs; and

Whereas the Federal Government, in cooperation with the several States and local governments and private agencies and individuals, has undertaken a rural-development program designed to develop the human resources in rural America by a series of concerted actions to identify the needs of low-income rural people and to help them to achieve greater rewards for their contributions to our national progress; and

Whereas the rural-development program has achieved steady progress toward its objectives, and the time has now come to consolidate its accomplishments and to provide more formal Federal organization for the program: Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established the Committee for Rural Development Program, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, which shall be composed of the following members:

- (1) The Under Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be the Chairman of the Committee.
- (2) The Under Secretary of the Interior.
- (3) The Under Secretary of Commerce.
- (4) The Under Secretary of Labor.

(5) The Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(6) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(7) A member of the Council of Economic Advisers designated by the Chairman of the Council.

(b) To assure effective functioning of the Committee and uninterrupted participation of each department and agency represented on the Committee, the head of each such department or agency shall designate an appropriate officer or employee of his department or agency as an alternate member to participate in the affairs of the Committee whenever the member may be absent or otherwise unable to participate.

(c) The Committee may request the head of any other Federal department or agency to designate a representative to participate in the affairs of the Committee as desirable in furthering the work of the rural-development program and related activities.

SEC. 2. The activities of the Committee shall be directed toward providing leadership and uniform policy guidance to the several Federal departments and agencies responsible for rural-development program functions and related activities so that they may take more effective and concerted actions in carrying out those functions and activities and cooperate more effectively with non-Federal participants, both private and governmental, in the program.

SEC. 3. In conducting its activities, the Committee shall place particular emphasis on effective public and private cooperation and leadership for rural development at the State and local levels, and to that end shall provide guidance for the conduct of Federal rural-development program functions and related activities in a manner designed to produce maximum State, local, and private participation and initiative in identifying and meeting local needs.

SEC. 4. Each department and agency responsible for functions and activities that can contribute to the objectives of the rural-development program and related activities shall carry those functions and activities forward in such a manner as to make the fullest possible contribution to the objectives of rural development.

SEC. 5. The departments and agencies represented on the Committee shall, as may be necessary for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of this order, furnish assistance to the Committee in consonance with section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691). Such assistance may include the detailing of employees to the Committee, one of whom may serve as its executive secretary, to perform such functions consistent with the purpose of this order as the Committee may assign to them.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, October 12, 1959.

Our Monetary System: How Proposals for Congressional Investigation Have Been Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on four previous occasions I have called attention to a series of articles published by the Texas Observer on the operations of our monetary system. These articles pointed to many questionable prac-

tices and policies, as well as to questionable organizational aspects of the system.

In truth, every social organization and every Federal agency should have a thoroughgoing congressional review at more frequent intervals than the Federal Reserve System has been reviewed. Actually, the last real investigation of this Nation's monetary system was made about a half century ago with the famous Aldrich Committee.

There have, of course, been recent proposals in Congress for a thoroughgoing investigation and study. One of these has been sparked by our colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. In truth, resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Texas came to the floor of the House for a vote in 1955 and again in 1957. These resolutions were not adopted. The final in a series of articles published by the Texas Observer sets out a most interesting history of these resolutions and how they were defeated.

An additional word about this series of articles: As I said when I called attention to the first of the series—on March 21—the Texas Observer is a most unusual newspaper. It is to be highly congratulated for bringing to the public's attention the issues on this extremely important subject. I know of no other newspaper which has done so.

Following this, the final of the series of articles, is included in part, a summarizing editorial from the Texas Observer on this subject.

The following article and editorial appeared in the Texas Observer of February 5, 1960:

BANK PROBE ASKED, KILLED

AUSTIN.—PATMAN first proposed an investigation into the Nation's money and debt systems in 1955. The Republicans made a party issue of the matter and defeated the resolution with the help of some Democrats. Only 1 of the 203 Republicans in the House voted to investigate.

In 1957, PATMAN tried again. Speaker RAYBURN stepped down to pay tribute to PATMAN and asked the House, "Why should not the great House Committee on Banking and Currency be given the authority to make this study?" The House vote "no," 225 to 174. Only 2 Republicans voted to investigate; only 38 Democrats opposed investigating.

Last year PATMAN contented himself with putting his arguments in the RECORD. "This administration has mobilized all of its forces to prevent an investigation," he said.

Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin refused, PATMAN said, to let him inspect certain crucial parts of the System's internal audits. "These," PATMAN said, "are the portions of the reports dealing with the conduct of the officers and directors of the banks, their financial interests and, if any, their speculations in the bond and securities markets. Nevertheless, those portions of the audit reports dealing with more routine operations of the banks and with the conduct of the lower echelon personnel revealed some almost unbelievably shocking things."

Scouring through the Federal Reserve's audits of its own banks, PATMAN alleged extensive waste and some fraud. Out of taxpayers' money, he said the banks have developed welfare programs, subsidized cafeterias, and "amusement, entertainment of all kinds, and banquets. They pay for gifts to people who are not even employees of the

bank; they send employees to school and pay for their training."

His indictment of the Federal Reserve on the basis of the audits he had examined ran to 30 legal, single-spaced, typed pages. His point was simple: an investigation was justified.

"The last time there was a full investigation and study of our monetary system," he said, "the Federal Reserve System was set up. Nearly half a century has passed since that investigation was made . . . new types of financial institutions have come into being. Other types which then handled only unimportant amounts of savings and investments now handle gigantic sums. Many of these, such as the insurance companies, the investment trusts, and the savings banks appear to have close working relationships in and among themselves, and with the commercial banks and the investment bankers. Just what are their interconnections?"

In 1935, he said, the Congress put the five bankers' representatives on the open market committee, which "has all the resources of the Federal Government—all of the gold at Fort Knox—at its disposal and discretion." It trades in secret with a portfolio of \$25 billion in Government securities to the tune of about \$10 billion a year with a small group of private dealers and speculators. Trading with foreign central banks totals \$5 billion and is also secret.

The trading, PATMAN said, "runs to fantastic amounts," and is "under the counter." There were only 17 dealers in 1956; the 10 biggest ones account for 88 percent of the trading. Since the trading is considered secret, there is no way the Congress or citizens can find out what a few men are doing with the Government's securities.

"The biggest dealers," PATMAN declared in his August 27, 1959, newsletter, "are the top New York and Chicago banks, and these banks help finance the other dealers. . . . Five of the largest New York banks jointly own the biggest 'dealer'."

He called the secret trading in Government securities "Wall Street in action" and said that it helps speculators make huge profits. In the first half of 1958, he said, amateur investors lost \$500 million, "but one man's loss is another man's gain—the 'professionals' cleaned up."

"The open market committee of the Federal Reserve has more power over our economy than Congress has," he said. Now and then, "we should investigate what they have done. But there has never been an investigation of the Federal Reserve Banking System or of its open market committee. It has handled hundreds of billions of dollars of our printed money, and yet we have had no audit."

"Why not investigate?" PATMAN asked. "What objection can there be to making the facts known?"

TEN BILLION DOLLARS "FOR FREE"

PATMAN's theories led him inevitably to his charges of a \$10-billion theft in the year 1958.

That year the Federal Reserve decided to increase the money supply by \$10.5 billion. PATMAN has explained that if this is accomplished by the purchase of Government securities, the money supply is expanded but the interest returns to the Treasury. If the "reserve requirements" of the banks are changed to let them create the money, they get all the interest on it.

In November, 1957, the banks had a total of \$57 billion in Government securities. As part of its antirecession program, the Federal Reserve, on three different occasions, made available more reserves to the banks—that is, gave them the power to create more money, ostensibly to increase loans and thus increase business activity. The new reserves came to a total of \$1.5 billion, which let the

banking system create new money up to \$14.5 billion.

"The official reason" for giving these reserves, PATMAN said, was "to help the banks meet business needs for credit. Actually, there was no expansion of business loans during the year, but rather a reduction of \$1.5 billion. The money which the banks created was, as I have indicated, substantially all used to acquire interest-bearing obligations of the United States."

The \$10.4 billion thus given the banks, PATMAN said, was a great deal more money than the cost to the Government of all the farm price-support programs in the whole quarter of a century such programs have been in effect.

The banks, he said, will be able to collect between \$300 and \$400 million annually on the bonds they were in effect given, "without any additional investment, not a penny."

Federal Reserve Chairman Martin testified, PATMAN said, that the Federal Reserve made available enough money in 1958 for the banks to extend credit amounting to about \$10.5 billion. "Mr. Martin did not know himself," PATMAN said, that the banks did not use the money to extend credit, but instead bought Government bonds with it.

PATMAN charged that 2 or 3 percent of the banks received about \$7 billion worth of bonds. Eighteen New York City banks got \$2.3 billion worth.

Last year PATMAN also rose to warn the Congress that he believed a friendly-looking little bill was going to give the Federal Reserve permission to give the private banks about \$15 billion worth of Government bonds which the Government had already paid off but had not yet cancelled. He quoted Alvin Hansen, a Harvard professor, warning that most of the "windfall," which Hansen estimated at \$9.8 billion, would go to the major banks.

Managers of the challenged bill assured the Congress it would not be used to give the bonds away, and it passed. PATMAN regarded the assurance as a victory.

"IT'S YOUR MONEY"

The fight, though, which has taken up most of PATMAN's time has been rising interest rates. He has unrelentingly opposed the administration's demand that Congress repeal the 42-year-old 4 1/4 percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. He reasons that the bankers will not buy bonds at the present rate simply because they expect the rate to go up; if the Government would announce it will not raise the rate, the bankers would buy at the going rate.

Robert Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury and another Texan, argues that the Government cannot control interest rates. All the long-term ceiling is doing, he says, is forcing money into the short-term bonds market.

PATMAN argues that Government creates the interest rates by its massive influences on the money market.

High interest is a leading political issue this year, and defenders of high interest are taking to the press. For instance, UPI's financial editor on January 29 quoted "the money experts" to the effect that high interest rates "benefit many more people than they hurt." Who?

"The American Bankers Association," said UPI, "lists the beneficiaries of high interest rates as the 87 million owners of savings accounts in banks, the 23 million owners of shares of savings and loan associations, the approximately 40 million persons who own U.S. savings bonds, and the 112 million who own life insurance."

PATMAN's—and the Democrats'—argument takes two directions. High interest, they argue, causes economic contraction as businessmen draw in and invest less. As PATMAN says:

"The farmers are in a depression. They have been suffering from a situation largely

caused by tight money since 1951 The home builders are in distress and, more important than that, the people who want to build homes are unable to get the money with which to build these homes because of the hard-money-high-interest policy. This will eventually cause a shortage in housing units and an increase in rents. So we have these groups: Small business, farmers, and home builders, who are really in distress"

The second argument is that high interest falls hardest on consumers, homeowners, and taxpayers.

"When the Federal, State, or local government issues bonds to build highways, schools, and other facilities and pays a 4-percent rate, the cost of the facility to the taxpayers is doubled if the money is borrowed for 17 1/2 years," PATMAN has said. "When a family buys a home and pays 5 1/2-percent interest, the cost of the home is doubled in only 13 years."

In 1959, he says, farm income ran about \$12 billion while personal income from interest ran \$22 billion. "Naturally, wealthy people like the administration's high interest policy."

In his newsletter this week—dated February 4—WRIGHT PATMAN carried on his feud with the bankers. "It's your money they're after," he began. He quoted Gov. Pat Brown of California, "that a rise of 1 percent on an FHA home mortgage of \$15,000 means a whole year's income of the average home buyer. In other words, it means 1 whole year of a man's productive life will go to pay increased interest just to buy a home, and it's probable that he will devote 1 or 2 more years of his productive life to pay the added toll on autos, TV sets, and other durables, to say nothing of higher grocery bills."

Just how higher grocery bills crept into the picture, one cannot be sure; but one can be sure PATMAN will go on flaying the moneyed interests until he dies.

REFORMS GET SUPPORT

Though PATMAN did not get the House investigation of banking he wanted, an investigation was authorized by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress into employment, growth, and price levels. On January 27 this year the reports were in, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS reporting for the Senate side, PATMAN reporting for the House members of the committee. Controlled by the Democrats, the committee's report gave an idea of PATMAN's influence on his party.

The committee agreed that the Federal Reserve has been decreasing the money supply in relation to the gross national product and that price increases have flowed more from the decisions of economic giants than from an excess of money in circulation. Interest rates are too high, the committee reported. The Federal Reserve should institute competitive bidding in the Government-securities market. The Treasury should depend on its own staff instead of on financial groups in deciding interest rates and securities issues. To create new money, the Federal Reserve should buy Government securities, not reduce reserve requirements.

PATMAN disagreed with some of the report—mainly where he did not think it went far enough. He advocated abolition of the open market committee and a maximum interest charge program by the Federal Reserve. He wanted the trading in Government securities distributed around the country instead of concentrated with 17 New York dealers. The Government securities market itself should be placed under Government supervision, he said. Bank reserves should be, not merely held steady as the committee recommended, they should be increased. PATMAN said, for merely holding steady "will not return to the Government the tens of billions of dollars in Government securities which the Federal Reserve has given away

since 1951 as a part of its program of reducing required reserves."

Over on the Senate side, Senator DOUGLAS, the Illinois Democrat, was presenting the same report.

"I have played my part in trying to help the banks prosper," said DOUGLAS. "I am ready to let them have five-sixths or six-sevenths of the gain to be made through the expansion of credit and money."

"I am not advocating that the Federal Government should take all of this (the new money). My good friend, Representative PATMAN, points to the fact that the Constitution gives to the Congress the power 'to coin money, and to regulate the value thereof.' Those are the exact words. The coining of money carries with it the creation of money. The creation of money is a public function which we have delegated to the Federal Reserve Board, which in turn has delegated to the banks."

"I am not proposing to disturbing that relationship," DOUGLAS said. "Let me make that clear. I am not proposing 'green-backism,' or 'credit-backism,' though I think Representative PATMAN has a case for which his critics have not given him due credit. I am simply proposing that at least we do not lower the existing reserve ratios, and that from future increases the Treasury and the people should get from one-sixth to one-seventh of the money assets and collect the interest for delegating this constitutional power to the private banking system. Is that not moderate? I am not even proposing that the reserve ratio be increased. I am simply saying, 'Hold steady. Do not lower it still further.'"

DOUGLAS seemed to mean that he was asking for less than it was reasonable to ask for in the public interest. Finally he said this as plainly as he could, without undercutting his own position:

"Let the banks expand credit by \$80 billion—I am simply proposing that we should allow the banks to have \$67 billion of that expansion instead of the full \$80 billion. All I am asking is that the people receive \$13 billion."

"My friend, Representative PATMAN, would want to have the people get more than that. I do not think he should be denounced for that. On the contrary, I think he is a pretty brave man. In many ways I admire the position he takes. But I am not advocating that."

PATMAN does not often express his disillusion with his own party on the subject of money policy, but last summer he let it slip into his column. "Control of money" has been the basic difference between the two parties since Andrew Jackson's first term, he said, "Yet, somehow, the historic difference between the two parties seems suddenly to have disappeared."

"There is hardly a murmur of protest from any Democrat," he said. The administration asks for a new interest ceiling. "No protest." "The old J. P. Morgan & Co. merged with the second biggest Wall Street bank—an event which must have Democrats of old standing up in their graves—but today there is little notice of it; all the committees of Congress are too busy even to investigate and the Justice Department refuses."

"All the Republican money policies," PATMAN said, "are being accepted with hardly any dissent, except a very few feeble voices including my own."—R.D.

MONEY AND BANKING

While reserving judgment until there has been full investigation and debate, no careful reader of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN's thoughts on money and banking can fail to be alarmed by the possibility that the public are being stolen blind by the bankers.

The Federal Reserve System, Representative PATMAN avers, has become the tool of the bankers. The vital open market committee of 12 members is set up, by law, so that private bankers designate 5 of the mem-

bers. Billions of Government securities are traded behind the public's back by this bankers' committee, acting for the Government.

Mr. PATMAN takes a straightforward approach to the Government's debt financing. The source of the strength of the money system is the Government's credit; the Constitution specifies that Congress has the power to issue money; why in the world doesn't the Government issue its own credit, instead of (1) creating debt bonds, (2) giving the bonds to the banks, and (3) paying the banks interest on the Government's own credit. Unless this cycle of reasoning can be broken, it is essentially true that the Government gave the private bankers \$10 billions in 1958.

The bankers are now inundating the public with propaganda in defense of high interest. It is obvious to students of modern American economics that high interest inhibits investment, home buildings, and consumption—thus brakes economic activity—thus slows down economic growth. The bankers clean up; the economy stalls out. Russia's economy is growing now at 7 percent a year; we grow 2 percent a year. This trend, too, Mr. PATMAN and other classic monetary liberals fight valiantly, and without success.

The people do not entirely realize—though many dimly guess it, and many believe it as a matter of basic suspicion—that the election of the Republicans to run the country means the bankers run it, and plain people, small businessmen, consumers, homeowners, are drained or buying power as a direct result.

WRIGHT PATMAN represents the best in the Democratic Party's heritage on this issue. Let us hope the national Democrats, too, are smart enough, and bold enough, to take up money and banking as an issue of the first importance in their Los Angeles convention and carry to the people the fight for fair interest and an investigation of the Federal Reserve System.

Outrageous Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial which appeared in the Dothan Eagle on March 24, 1960:

OUTRAGEOUS MEDDLING

Here, as they came off the same wire on the same day, are three significant dispatches:

"JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Police today readied their guns in fear of new race riots after a day of terror in which they killed 62 Africans and wounded 208 demonstrating against South Africa's white supremacy policy."

"WASHINGTON.—The United States condemned Tuesday violent measures used by police in South Africa against Negro mobs protesting South African white supremacy laws. The action, an admitted intervention in the domestic affairs of another country, seemed certain to be strongly resented by the South African government."

"WASHINGTON.—The State Department is reported preparing another apology to the Fidel Castro government because of an unauthorized flight Monday of a private plane from Florida to Cuba."

Cuba is the country, about 90 miles from the U.S. mainland, where upwards of 500 Cubans were executed by the Castro Government during the first 3 months following his successful revolution. The files show no official condemnation by the U.S. Government but bulge with condemnation of the U.S. Government by the Castro government.

Obviously, our State Department is pulling boners in series now. This meddling with the domestic affairs of South Africa is the third in recent weeks. First, there was the bowing to Uruguayan protests concerning the scheduled execution of Caryl Chessman in California. At State Department request, Gov. Pat Brown granted a reprieve (the eighth) although this was strictly a California matter. The intervention didn't bring the desired results, either, as Uruguayans demonstrated during President Eisenhower's visit anyway and had to be subdued by police using tear gas.

Next the State Department interfered in a traffic case in an Oakland, Calif., police court in which a grandson of Nationalist China's President Chiang Kai-shek was involved. The grandson was charged with doing 80 miles an hour in a 65-mile-an-hour zone. The first judge to try him found him guilty despite State Department warning that a conviction would have international repercussions. At State Department urging the case was transferred to another city court where the second judge handed down a conviction after saying he was subjected to the same pressures. The grandson's attorney said all the time that he was guilty as charged.

Now the State Department has sent a message to the Union of South Africa, with whom we have always had cordial relations and no trouble, saying: "The United States deplores violence in all its forms and hopes that the African people of South Africa will be able to obtain redress for legitimate grievances by peaceful means. While the United States as a matter of practice does not ordinarily comment on the internal affairs of governments with which it enjoys normal relations, it cannot help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa."

Such a message is inexcusable arrogance, failure to mind our own business and inconceivable presumptuousness. Even the generally objective AP chronicled it as an "extraordinary action." That is an understatement. Much stronger words could and should apply to this outrageous intervention.

Of course, people regret terrible things happening to other people. But such is the business of the government and the people involved. At this distance it is impossible for us to appraise the events and the reasons therefor. But we are not the judge anyway. That country is an independent nation with a right to run its own affairs and a right to enforce its laws. It is not for us to meddle.

This sort of interference in South Africa's internal affairs may be good politics for politicians in the United States but if we persist in such outrageous performances we will be setting ourselves up as judge of all governments and handling their internal affairs as a self-appointed international court.

Our State Department is in need of a new Secretary or tighter controls over underlings, plus persuasive evidence that it has acquired sounder judgment and a greater grasp of responsibility. If, from the Secretary on down, the personnel has forgotten what the word "diplomacy" means it had better learn and apply that knowledge to the everyday run of business.

The present pace has carried this country from indiscretion to error and now to colossal blunder. What next?

Why Keep Living With TB?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New Mexican under date of March 16, 1960, which editorial I think reflects much common-sense with regard to the tuberculosis problem in this country. I think it is well worth reading by all of our colleagues:

WHY KEEP LIVING WITH TB?

"If the opportunity to end tuberculosis is not seized now it may be lost indefinitely. Medications that are effective today must be applied broadly before the tubercle bacillus develops resistance to these drugs. Otherwise, in a susceptible population, the disease may rise again to a point which defies control." That quotation is from the February issue of Public Health Reports, published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is part of a report on a national meeting of authorities on tuberculosis control—a meeting which stressed that drugs and treatment techniques are now available to wipe out tuberculosis in the United States. The authorities also stressed that the program to stamp out this terrible disease should be pushed without delay before the opportunity is lost.

If the medical experts are right—and there seems no reason to doubt them—it is within our power to eliminate a disease which has been the scourge of New Mexico for countless generations. But we would be willing to bet our bottom dollar that the required effort is not expended.

Instead the proposed program will receive a moderate amount of lip service, an endless array of sensible-sounding excuses will be expressed by those in authority here and there, and New Mexico will go right on having a tragically high rate of tuberculosis.

The excuses will be valid, as they always have been in the past. There isn't enough money, the money available is needed for a variety of other programs, there is a difference of opinion between this board and that one, and not enough nurses here, and an unhappy county medical society there.

We hope all those unfortunates who receive the ghastly news this year and next year, and the year after that, that tuberculosis bacteria are destroying their lungs will find comfort in the excuses.

There are TB patients sweating it out in State hospitals today who wouldn't be there except for the buck-passing and foot-dragging of 2 years ago which nullified plans for effective use of tuberculosis drugs on a broad scale. We hope they can be happy in the thought that the delay in providing drugs for the person who infected them saved the State some money and prevented possible hard feelings between the various authorities.

New Mexico should be at an end of its patience with tuberculosis and with the halfhearted attitude toward it. On an average 600 to 700 new cases of this old-fashioned preventable disease have been reported in this State for the past several years. That's a lot of death, pain, divided families and ruined lives and is definitely something to be taken seriously.

Yet an odd lethargy seems to exist all down the line concerning tuberculosis. At the national level, the administration chopped its budget for Federal aid to States for TB control 25 percent this year. At the other end of the scale, students in county schools haven't been tested for tuberculosis since 3 years ago.

We would like to see a nationwide crash program to find every TB carrier, assure treatment for every one, and check this scourge once and for all. We have little hope for that happening. But short of a national effort, New Mexico could at least take care of its own.

Senator Talmadge on "Meet the Press"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, one of the most sincere, and able Senators in this body, the junior Senator from Georgia, recently—March 6, 1960—appeared on the NBC network's "Meet the Press." On this program, with his characteristic logic and convincing reasoning, he presented many of the key reasons why the pending civil rights legislation should be defeated.

In a subsequent column—March 15, 1960—the distinguished journalist, David Lawrence, commented on this program, the scant attention paid to it by the northern press, and then quoted liberally from Senator TALMADGE's presentation—made extemporaneously in answer to searching, and sometimes hostile, questions of members of the panel. As Mr. Lawrence said, he did a "masterful job."

For the benefit of Senators who did not have an opportunity to hear the program, and for the general public, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "Meet the Press" for March 6, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO. PRESENTS—
MEET THE PRESS

(Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak—Guest: Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia)

ANNOUNCER. Now "Meet the Press," produced by Lawrence E. Spivak. Remember that the questions asked by the members of the panel do not necessarily reflect their point of view; it is their way of getting the story for you.

Mr. BROOKS. Welcome again to "Meet the Press." Our guest today is Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, one of the leaders in the battle by southern Democrats against civil rights legislation. Tomorrow the Senate begins the second week of its record-breaking debate after 6 days of day and night speechmaking. There is only a faint prospect of a compromise. Senator TALMADGE held the floor last night as the Senate recessed after 82 hours of continuous session. His own speeches this week total more than 6 hours. In 1959 Senator TALMADGE took an active part in the southerner's

battle to preserve the Senate tradition of unlimited debate. He began his career in politics by managing the governorship campaigns of his father, the late Eugene Talmadge. He himself served for 6 years as Governor before his election to the Senate in 1956. He is an attorney and a businessman, but he prefers to be known as a farmer. He owns two large farms in Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Senator, what will be the result of this great debate? Don't you think the southerners will have to accept some legislation, at least on voting rights for example?

Senator TALMADGE. I don't think anyone can foretell what the ultimate conclusion will be at the present time. I would say that there are adequate laws already on the statute books, both State and Federal, to guarantee the right of any citizen to vote, provided he is legally qualified in accordance with his State laws.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Do you think the longer and more strenuously the South fights this harsher the legislation will be when it finally comes and the more outbreaks of disturbances you will have in your own part of the country?

Senator TALMADGE. I would hope, of course, that the Congress of the United States would not follow the efforts of some to enforce the second reconstruction on the South. I am very happy that in my own State we have had no outbreaks of violence of any kind. I hope that that situation continues.

Mrs. MCCLENDON. You say we don't need any more laws to protect the civil rights of Negroes in the South. Then, what can people like yourself, who don't believe in persecuting Negroes, do to insure that the people in your own State don't keep Negroes from voting, like the people in Alabama kept the Tuskegee professors from voting?

Senator TALMADGE. I would say in answer to your question that here are 17 pages of Federal laws that guarantee every citizen in America the right to vote. There are three different remedies. In my own State we have approximately 175,000 to 185,000 Negroes who are registered and who do vote. They have elected officials within my State. Frequently they are the balance of power in mayors' races and local races of all kinds. The Negroes in Georgia do vote in very substantial numbers. In some counties in Georgia we have a greater percentage of Negroes registered than we have of the white population. In three counties in Georgia we have more Negroes registered and voting than there are white people. So that is wholly misinformation that you have received.

Mrs. MCCLENDON. Yes, but there are other areas where you have it gerrymandered so there are just a few Negroes, or if there are more Negroes, they don't get credit for their votes.

Senator TALMADGE. We have no gerrymandering anywhere within my State.

Mrs. MCCLENDON. Don't you think you should conduct a campaign to get the people to get out the Negro vote?

Senator TALMADGE. The junior chamber of commerce in my State usually has an annual project to urge all citizens to register and get out the vote. All citizens who are qualified have been encouraged to vote. We can't help it if some citizens don't exercise that right. My colleague, Senator RUSSELL, inserted in the RECORD this past week a statement by the leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Cleveland, Ohio, which stated that only 25 percent of the Negroes in Cleveland were registered and that of that 25 or 26 percent only about 25 or 26 percent of them voted. We have a much higher percentage than that who are registered in Georgia and a far higher percentage vote in Georgia.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. We have always considered Tennessee and Texas to be Southern

States, and yet we find that the Tennessee Senators, KEFAUVER and GORE, and those from Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON and YARBOROUGH, are giving you no help in your southern filibuster against the civil rights bill. Could you tell us why that is?

Senator TALMADGE. I wouldn't presume to suggest what other Members of the U.S. Senate ought to do. Sometimes it is difficult to determine my own course of action, and certainly every Senator is entitled to vote and to follow his ideas as he sees fit in the Senate.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. Speaking of LYNDON JOHNSON, there are some reports that he is losing some of his southern support for the presidential nomination because he is working for a civil rights bill. Do you think he has really been hurt or does he still have a chance for the nomination?

Senator TALMADGE. I have been so busily engaged in fighting this iniquitous, obnoxious, and unconstitutional proposed legislation that I haven't had any time whatever to think of presidential candidates a long time in the future.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. Could you think of one for yourself, Senator? Suppose there is a movement in the South as we hear there will be, to have independent electors in some of the States, including Georgia. Could you be drafted to be that candidate?

Senator TALMADGE. I certainly am not a candidate for President or any other national office except the U.S. Senate. I am a realist. I have no illusions about my being elected President or to a lesser office nationally at the present time. I hope I can continue to serve responsibly in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. WILSON. You have undertaken to make it appear here that Negroes are not denied the right to vote in the South, citing your own State of Georgia. The Civil Rights Commission has come to an entirely different conclusion—made an original recommendation on the basis of which some of the legislation now is proposed. Was the Civil Rights Commission completely wrong? Didn't they get the right information on the situation in the South?

Senator TALMADGE. We don't live in a Utopia. I would suggest that our law is not enforced 100 percent everywhere. The Civil Rights Commission did point out that there are several hundred thousand Puerto Ricans who are disenfranchised in New York State because they cannot speak or write the English language.

Mr. WILSON. What has that to do with Negroes voting in the South?

Senator TALMADGE. You were using the Civil Rights Commission as a final authority in this situation. I wanted to say some of the other things that they reported also. Now, the Senators from New York admit that that situation is true, but they say that they have qualification laws there, and I think New York State ought to have its own qualification laws. We have the same type laws in Georgia and in other Southern States. We have literacy qualifications. The Civil Rights Commission proposed a constitutional amendment that would even permit people who were lunatics and idiots and imbeciles and convicted felons to vote. I don't consider that very authoritative evidence when they make such a recommendation.

Mr. WILSON. You might not consider it authoritative, but wouldn't you have to agree that the overwhelming majority in the U.S. Senate today wishes a new civil rights bill—wishes the 1957 act to be strengthened? Would you agree?

Senator TALMADGE. I would say that in this presidential election year when we elect a President, when we elect a Vice President, and one-third of the Members of the Senate and all of the Congressmen and a great many Governors and statehouse officials, a

large number of politicians do pander to the self-interest vote of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and they would like to vote for virtually any legislation that contains the label or the slogan "Civil Rights," regardless of its nature.

Mr. WILSON. Yes, but there was no presidential election in 1957 when the act which is now proposed to be strengthened was originally passed.

Senator TALMADGE. Of course, they anticipate elections. They are ready to appeal to that vote at any time, but they are particularly anxious to appeal to it in a presidential election year.

Mr. WILSON. You just want to go against the overwhelming majority of the Senate, is that your feeling?

Senator TALMADGE. As long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate I am going to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. I am going to represent my State and my Nation as I best see fit. And I know that this illegal, obnoxious legislation is not in the best interests, to grant authority to a centralized government in Washington and take it away from the people on the local level.

Mr. WILSON. Let me ask you another question on that particular point: You say this is obnoxious. A large majority of the Senate you admit does not think it is obnoxious. How long do you think that large majority is going to permit what some people call a spectacle to continue?

Senator TALMADGE. I don't consider it a spectacle. As long as I am physically able to continue, I am going to do so, and I can assure you that there are a great many Members of the U.S. Senate who feel likewise. One hundred years following the War Between the States is no time to reenact reconstruction legislation in a much more heinous form than Thaddeus Stevens ever dreamed of himself.

Mr. WILSON. Yet, the Attorney General, the majority of the Senate, a large body of the opinion in this country, do not agree that this is Reconstruction legislation.

Senator TALMADGE. I did not come to the U.S. Senate to practice conformity. I came here to represent my constituents and my country, and I intend to do so.

Mr. WILSON. Nobody is asking you to practice conformity. All people are asking for, as I understand it—and let me ask you this in the form of a question—is an opportunity to vote on the issue. That is all that is being asked for in the Senate?

Senator TALMADGE. There has never been any good legislation defeated by unlimited debate. On the contrary, many, many vicious bills have been defeated by the use of that strategy. During the War Between the States they tried to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. Unlimited debate defeated it in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. WILSON. You do not think it is going to defeat this bill, though, do you?

Senator TALMADGE. I do not presume to guess what it might do. I can tell you as long as I can fight it, I am going to do so.

Mr. BROOKS. Senator, I wonder if we could return to Mr. van der Linden's question about Senator JOHNSON and his presidential ambitions. If the southerners turn thumbs down on JOHNSON for President as a result of his activity in this fight, who might be their candidate?

Senator TALMADGE. I would not presume to know. I have no personal candidate. I do not think my own State delegation has made any choice. I think any thinking in that regard at the present time would be premature.

Mr. BROOKS. Any of the presently avowed candidates, are they softer on the question of civil rights than JOHNSON?

Senator TALMADGE. No. All of the presently avowed candidates for the Democratic

presidential nomination support proposals along the lines now pending before the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BROOKS. Should there be a move to cut off debate and that move should be supported by Senator JOHNSON, do you think that might further lose strength for his presidential candidacy?

Senator TALMADGE. I wouldn't want to anticipate "if" questions. Right now our problem is fighting this legislation, and right now it requires 24 hours of our time, and certainly we can't take time out to wonder about a presidential candidate July 11.

Mr. BROOKS. Some of your colleagues have expressed alarm over the physical strain of this thing. How are you bearing up?

Senator TALMADGE. Pretty well. Of course, it is a great torture to be put on the grill 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, but fortunately my health is good, and I have been holding up very well under the strain.

Mr. BROOKS. How long do you think you can keep going?

Senator TALMADGE. I think I can keep going indefinitely. I found that during my service in the Navy I could work 7 days a week with about 4 hours sleep a day, and I think I can do as well in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Senator, you compared the figures in Georgia a while ago with the figures in Cleveland. According to the Civil Rights Commission, about 75 percent of the white eligible voters are registered in your State and something around 25 percent of the nonwhite eligible voters are registered. Is that a commendable figure as it stands, do you think?

Senator TALMADGE. Of course, we have literacy qualifications in my State that apply to white and colored prospective voters alike, and no one can make someone assume the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship against their will. In some areas, our white people don't register as well as they ought to. In some areas, our colored people don't register as well as they ought to. But I hold in my hand a photostat of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Monday, February 29, 1960, and it has a picture of Charles H. Holmes and Harold B. Williams, the officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Cleveland, Ohio, and they say that only 26 percent of the Negroes over 21 are registered to vote and that only 26 percent of those registered actually vote. Now we do much better than that in Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. According to the Civil Rights Commission, you don't do much better, but aside from that, do you think two wrongs make a right?

Senator TALMADGE. I certainly don't, but there is no way on earth that anyone can make you register and vote against your will, and I wouldn't presume to try. That is a responsibility and an obligation but no citizen can be forced or coerced to register and vote, and then not all of them have the literacy qualifications. A good many of our white people don't have them.

Mr. MCCORMICK. In that connection, 23 Georgia counties, according to the Civil Rights Commission, have a Negro registration of less than 5 percent of eligible people. Isn't that a tremendous reflection on either your State's educational system or your ability to work up a little enthusiasm for democracy among your people?

Senator TALMADGE. I would say that if it is, there are adequate remedies in our State law, and here are 17 pages of guaranteed voting rights under the Federal law. There are three different rights under the Federal law. First, any citizen who thinks that he is being illegally deprived of the vote can go into the Federal court; he can get an injunction; he can recover damages against the registrar. Second, there is a criminal law. He can be indicted; he can be convicted and sentenced to the Federal penitentiary and

And thirdly, there is the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that authorizes this group to have the Attorney General of the United States of America file a suit in the name of the United States of America as their tax-paid private lawyer to enforce their rights. If those remedies aren't sufficient, there are no laws on the face of the earth that will be.

Mr. McCORMICK. Just one more thing, Senator. I don't have to point out to you that it was in Terrell County, Ga., that the voting director, or whatever you call him, has in effect defied the Civil Rights Act of 1957 in the face of the Supreme Court decision upholding its validity. How can existing laws get around this open defiance?

Senator TALMADGE. I read his statement. I happen to know that gentleman. He is a graduate of the Harvard Law School. He stated that he would follow the Georgia voting laws, and in doing that, of course, he is performing his duty under the law.

Mrs. McCLENDON. The Long amendment this past week guaranteeing that the Dirksen substitute bill would not interfere with free speech was voted down in the Senate. I wonder if you feel that the Dirksen bill or the administration bill would cripple the liberties of all the people in the land while attempting to give civil rights to some?

Senator TALMADGE. Why, of course, it would. The very theory of civil rights, that is the present theory of bills now pending before the Congress—and I might say there are over 200 bills in the Senate alone, the last time anyone weighed them they weighed something in excess of 8 pounds; they have quit counting them now, they just weigh them—but it grants rights to one group of citizens that it denies to others. For instance, the Civil Rights Act of 1957: You can't have the Attorney General of the United States as your tax-paid lawyer, yet members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People can. You can't have your rights litigated by the chief law enforcement officer of the country. You can't have your defendant rights to a jury trial denied because the Attorney General filed the suit in the name of the United States, but that is what we passed in the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Mrs. McCLENDON. Do you mean to tell me that under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that a Negro filing a complaint, has the Attorney General to represent him and that he can do this and a defendant in that case does not have to have a jury trial?

Senator TALMADGE. You have put your finger exactly on it. His right to a jury trial is conditioned by whether the fine exceeds \$300 or the jail sentence exceeds 45 days. That is true notwithstanding the Constitution of the United States of America, guaranteeing the right of trial by jury in not one, not two, not three, but in four separate places.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. A moment ago I mentioned the move in about half a dozen Southern States to set up machinery whereby they could cast their votes for independent candidates for President if they didn't like the ones produced by the two major conventions. This has seemed to be so alarming to Mr. Paul Butler, the Democratic National Chairman, that he has recently issued a warning to your State and 5 others that they had better not do that because their credentials at the convention in Los Angeles would be challenged. Do you think Mr. Butler's statements like that would be acceptable to your people, or do you think maybe he ought to just quit?

Senator TALMADGE. I doubt if Mr. Butler can speak for the Democratic Party. He has rendered a great disservice to the party already. The party would be much better off if he resigned. It is the duty of the chairman of any political party to try to keep down breaches within the party, to try

to heal wounds, and assuage injured feelings, but Mr. Butler has made war on one section of the party. My judgment is he won't last long after the Democratic convention in Los Angeles, come July 11, and the quicker he leaves the party, the better off the Democratic Party will be.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. The first part of the Dirksen civil rights bill would make it a Federal crime to obstruct a court order, but only in these school integration cases. Do you know why the court order in only the school cases should be singled out?

Senator TALMADGE. Of course not. It makes it a crime to violate that court order, and that court order alone, when a violation of it is already subject to contempt procedure, but every other court order wouldn't be a crime. But there is one even worse than that. In the second section here, flights to avoid criminal prosecution—where they bomb a church building or a school building. Under that act, it is so discriminatory that someone who fired a five-inch firecracker in a school building in Washington, D.C., and crossed over into Virginia could be tried under the terms of that act. But if some anarchist killed every member of the Supreme Court with a bomb, every member of Congress with bombs, the President of the United States with bombs, he would be exempt. It is a ridiculous thing in the extreme. If it was made uniformly applicable, if it was made constitutional, I could vote for that, where it affects all heinous crimes, but I certainly wouldn't make it apply to a child who shoots a firecracker in a school building and exempt someone who assassinates the President of the United States.

Mr. WILSON. I haven't got it clear yet whether you think there will be any kind of a political backfire in the South this year. Will there be any third party formed? Will there be any kind of an organization to oppose the Democratic nominee in case he is one of those who seems to be a prospect at the present time?

Senator TALMADGE. I think that is premature at the present time. I sometimes wonder how long the Southern Democrats who established the Democratic Party and have nurtured it through all of its years, lean as well as good years, are going to be made the political whipping-boy, year after year, purely for political purposes. Some of these times they are going to begin to resent it, and my judgment is that it is possible this year.

Mr. WILSON. There are 18 of you in the Senate taking part in this filibuster, is that right?

Senator TALMADGE. I don't know that I can speak for any other Senator. I have made speeches at considerable length on the subject, and I am going to do so in the future. All other Senators are better qualified to speak for themselves than I am for them.

Mr. WILSON. The point that I am getting at is that you are really a pretty small minority, and you never have been able to make yourselves effective in national politics for years, not since the two-thirds rule was put through by Roosevelt and Farley, or repealed. The South hasn't been a force in national politics since then, is that right?

Senator TALMADGE. I wouldn't say that the majority is always right. The majority crucified Jesus Christ. The majority is wrong as often as it is right.

Mr. WILSON. Do you mean the majority is trying to crucify the Constitution in this case?

Senator TALMADGE. That is right. Of course, they are. They're trying to crucify the Constitution; they are trying to crucify the South; they are trying to establish a second reconstruction in the South, even more heinous in many forms than the first reconstruction.

Mr. WILSON. No provision in the Constitution for the right to vote without regard to race, creed, or color?

Senator TALMADGE. There are 17 pages of laws that I have demonstrated to this panel; this is the third time. So that is a phony issue.

Mr. WILSON. But the Civil Rights Commission says you are completely wrong Senator.

Senator TALMADGE. I don't accept the Civil Rights Commission report with the same degree of finality that I would the Ten Commandments handed down by the Lord to Moses.

Mr. BROOKS. Senator, I am afraid you are going to have to accept the finality of the program, because our time just ran out. I am sorry to interrupt. Thank you very much, Senator TALMADGE, for being with us.

Speech by Lt. Gov. Garland T. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Garland T. Byrd, Lieutenant Governor of Georgia, delivered an address to the Georgia Vocational Association on March 18, 1960, in Atlanta, that is worthy of the attention of everyone interested in vocational education.

Lieutenant Governor Byrd is an outstanding young man, and is dedicated to sound education. I am proud to claim Lieutenant Governor Byrd as a constituent of the great district I have the pleasure to represent in Congress. His address is inspiring and yet so practical that it deserves a place in a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address is as follows:

SPEECH BY LT. GOV. GARLAND T. BYRD, AT ANNUAL BREAKFAST OF GEORGIA VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, MARCH 18, 1960, AT DINKLER PLAZA HOTEL, ATLANTA

Mr. Ginn, Dr. Hubbard, Mr. Martin, members of the Georgia Vocational Association, and guests, I am grateful for the very generous and kind introduction by Mr. Martin.

I am also grateful—extremely grateful—that you permitted me to address this annual meeting of Georgia's vocational teachers.

It is a high honor, to be asked to be your speaker.

But, I appreciate even more the opportunity which you have given me, to be here with you, and to talk about a matter in which I am intensely interested, and have been, for many, many years.

Right at the beginning, please let me say this:

To you, who are engaged in the field of vocational education, I pledge my full, complete, and unqualified support, in striving to reach your goal of excellence in vocational education.

I offer you my personal support and assistance, and I also assure you that in my capacity as Lieutenant Governor, and President of the Senate, I shall give you my official support.

To me, as a private citizen, and as a State official, there is nothing more important than preparing our young people adequately, so that they may achieve to the fullest the opportunities which are before them.

We all know that we are living in a progressive State. Each year, our expanding economy sets new records.

In industry and manufacturing—in trade and commerce—in service and in government—and in agriculture—we are moving ever forward, growing and expanding, achieving new heights.

And, my friends, we have just started. We have only begun.

In many areas of economic advancement, we lead the Nation in rate of gain.

But, we are not satisfied. We can't afford to be complacent. We know that there are still many areas in which we are lagging. We know we can't stop. And, we shall not stop, or even slow down.

Please permit me a few personal remarks at this point.

I said that from a personal standpoint, I appreciate immensely the opportunity to be with you.

I grew up in a school teacher family, living on the farm.

My mother was a school teacher, and so was my wife.

I had vocational agriculture courses in high school.

So I think I should be entitled to claim to know something of what I am talking about, when I speak of vocational education.

Since my entry into the world of business, and, more recently, into public office, I have had the opportunity to learn a great deal more about vocational education.

My approach, in these most recent years, has been much broader—I assure you—than it was back when I was in high school.

Then, I only looked to see how what I could learn would benefit me and my family.

Today, my concern is for each and every Georgian—young people, and, yes, adults, too—for vocational education, certainly, is not limited to young people.

COMMITTEES

I have had the opportunity, in the past year, to work with two committees of the general assembly, which have made searching, thorough, factual studies involving education and our economic development.

One of these committees was a joint study group, composed of the education committees of the senate and house.

Under the leadership of Senator Wallace Jernigan and Representative Battle Hall, the two chairmen, this committee prepared one of the most significant reports yet to come from any legislative group.

The committee's assignment was to look to see if we were adequately preparing our young people—in high schools—to take their proper and rightful place in our economy.

This committee found that there is indeed, a pressing need for expansion of vocational education. It recommended an expansion in our facilities, particularly the establishment of area vocational schools, throughout the State.

The other committee, which also prepared a noteworthy and significant report, was the government operations committee of the senate.

The government operations committee last summer began a study to determine if the State government could provide additional help in our industrial and economic development.

This study is still going on.

But, in its initial survey and investigation, the committee found that one of the most important ways in which the State government could aid economic development would be by the better training of young people for new jobs in the new business and industries which are coming.

Let me just mention this:

Georgia has not shared in this Nation's two newest industries: electronics and space missiles.

Why?

Well, one reason is that we do not have an adequate number of adequately trained people for jobs in plants which are producing these new, scientific products.

Right there is one of the most urgent needs.

We've got to look toward training our young people to fill jobs in this new age of nuclear energy and space.

No longer can we say such an age is in the future.

It is here, at this moment.

Our Nation is producing fantastic devices and machines, which just a few years ago we thought were only the product of the imagination of comic strip authors.

I'm sure you all can remember—I can—when you'd run outside and look if you heard an airplane flying over.

Not long ago, I flew three-fourths of the way across our continent in a jetplane, in a matter of four hours.

You don't have to fight traffic on the South expressway any more, to get from downtown Atlanta to the airport, to board your jet plane for New York or Europe or the Orient.

You can catch a helicopter taxi, downtown, and be there in five minutes.

Now, back when you and I were in high school, who'd have imagined you could watch a world Series game, being played out in California, in full color, on a gadget called a television set, right in your own living room?

And, listen, my friends—while I am still amazed that I can get to Denver in four hours by jetplane—it gives pause for some serious and sober thought—when you realize it doesn't take that long for a missile fired from Soviet Russia to reach Washington, D.C., or Atlanta, Ga.

STATISTICS

Now, the fact that I speak of imperative needs before us does not carry any implication whatsoever that I am critical of what we have already done.

Not at all.

Rather, when we review the record of accomplishment in vocational education in Georgia, we should be proud.

And, we should be encouraged, for, we know, when we examine what we have already done, that no challenge is too great.

We can anticipate the future, with confidence, for we know already our record of achievement.

So let me talk a few minutes about what we already have done in vocational education.

Even though all of you are closely connected with vocational education, you still may not be completely up to date.

Let me quote the figures.

In Georgia, at the present, there are a total of 75,700 persons enrolled in vocational agriculture courses. Of these, 48,000 are adults, and 27,700 are high school students.

In business education, there are 85,100 enrolled; 9,500 are adults—and listen—75,500 are high school students.

In distributive education, there are 7,400 enrolled; 6,500 are adults, and 900 high school students.

In homemaking, there are 74,000 enrolled—20,300 adults—and 53,800 are high school students—and, I think we should note that those in the homemaking courses are girls.

In industrial arts, there are 13,100 enrolled—all high school students. There are no classes for adults, at present.

In trade and industrial education, the total is 25,500 including 21,500 adults and 3,600 high school students.

Altogether, there are 280,400 class enrollments in vocational education—and 174,600 are high school students—105,800 adults.

I think I should point out that the term "adults" also includes a great many young people. All who are past high school are included in this group. A great many vet-

erans are enrolled in vocational classes. In fact, the veterans educational program has contributed greatly to the development and expansion of our vocational program in Georgia.

We now have more than 1,700 full-time vocational teachers in Georgia, and also some 500 part-time teachers.

We have two State owned and operated trade and vocational schools. One at Clarksville and another in Americus.

In addition, there are many locally operated vocational schools throughout the State.

Recently, the State board of education approved 22 sites as locations for area vocational-technical schools. The State has provided matching funds to supplement local funds for construction of six of these schools. These will be in Rome, Augusta, Columbus, and Albany.

It is imperative that we establish the other 16 schools as quickly as possible.

CHANGES

I mentioned, a moment ago, our urgent need for trained people to take jobs in the newest scientific and technical fields.

That's not the only need.

The economy of our State has changed tremendously in the past 20 years.

The number of farms in our State has been decreasing at the rate of some 4,000 a year. Forty years ago, there were more than 300,000 farms in Georgia. Today, there are only 160,000, a decrease of 50 percent.

In the past 10 years, 115 Georgia counties have lost population.

People are moving from the farms to the cities.

Today, more than 50 percent of all Georgians live within city limits. Another 30 percent earn their living in town.

Our farms are more scientific, more highly mechanized.

Modern machines, modern fertilizers, modern methods, mean fewer hands are needed to produce a crop.

But, although there have been these changes, the farmer still is caught in a cruel squeeze, is in a depression.

The farmer gets less for his products, while the cost of production is ever increasing.

The farmer today has to be a combination mechanic, chemist, laborer—and businessman.

He must sell his products on a highly competitive market.

He's got to know something about packaging and processing, freezing and canning, distribution and marketing. He's got to be a good bookkeeper—he has to keep up with tax records of all sorts—and pay those taxes.

Now, agriculture is by no means a decadent industry, in Georgia.

The people who live in the cities have to be fed and clothed.

We must train farmers not only in the latest scientific farming techniques, but also in machine maintenance and in farm management. Because there are fewer farmers, each must be more proficient to produce the food and fiber needed.

Let's take a look at some other fields of vocational training.

The high cost of living has made homemaking even more of a business, these days. Our girls have to be well trained in home management—we must have wise consumers. And, too, that high cost of living has made it necessary for many women to work to supplement the family income, so they also need to have a vocation.

We need to train more people in the field of distribution. No matter how well we are producing farm products and industrial goods, if we have a poor system of distribution to the consumer, we cannot maintain a sound economy.

We've got to train additional people for business, and equip them with knowledge and skills in use of the new business ma-

chines and methods. Electric and electronic devices are becoming commonplace.

We've got to step up our training in the skilled trades and in training of technicians, to meet the demands of our industry and manufacturing. We need machinists, tool and die designers, electronic technicians, and so on.

It's not unusual for a new industry, moving to Georgia, to provide some of its own personnel, to help train skilled help so the plant can operate.

Whatever the field—business, industry, agriculture, distributing, home management—vocational education plays a most vital role in our total advancement and development.

Vocational teachers must meet the challenge for excellence.

If we are to train our young people, the teachers themselves must be trained.

You, as teachers, must continue to study, to keep up to date.

You teachers need to improve yourselves, professionally, and this you can do through active participation in your own Georgia Vocational Association.

You not only have to educate students, you also need to educate—to inform—the public on what you are teaching, and its value to the local community.

You, as teachers, must produce the best students possible, to meet your community's demand for excellence in your work force.

NEEDS

Yes, there are many needs.

Today, industry and manufacturing employ more people, than any other occupation in Georgia. Commerce and service comes next.

Then government, then agriculture.

And, even though we have a changed economy, and our standard of living has increased, our per capita income still is below the national average.

We've got to balance our economy, in Georgia, diversify, even more.

We need the right kind of industry in the right place, throughout the State. We need more smaller plants and factories, in the rural areas, to provide employment for those who can no longer earn a living on the farm.

We have to expand our high school vocational program, especially in the fields of trades and industry, industrial arts, distributive education, and office training—if we are to have enough people for the increasing number of jobs.

We must have expanded facilities in colleges, to provide the training for vocational teachers and personnel, who will do the teaching. If we are to teach more students, obviously we must have more teachers. If we are to teach technical and advanced courses, obviously we must have teachers who are trained in these fields.

Every community in Georgia should survey its own situation. Each city and town should take a close, searching look, to determine if it is providing the right kind of training, to aid its own local economy.

And, we need more adult training, in all fields, to upgrade adults in their present jobs, to aid them to move ahead.

CONCLUSION

I commend you, and I congratulate you, upon your selection of a theme for this meeting:

Excellence: The vocational image of the sixties.

As we enter this new decade, indeed, we should look to the future.

Look backward, yes, but only in order that we may survey and appraise.

Look backward, yes, to determine areas in which we may have failed, or may not accomplish all which we should.

Look backward, or look at the present, but, only so that we may see what we must do in the future.

Excellence, yes, let that be our theme, not only for this meeting, but for the sixties, and the decades to follow.

Let us have such an excellent program of vocational education that every Georgian is better prepared—that the youth who is in school today may be trained and educated, in order that he or she may take a more worthwhile, a more productive, a more significant role in life.

On the farm or in the city; in the home or in the business office; in the retail store or in the manufacturing plant; let our goal be excellence.

Our Future Is Dependent Upon a Stabilized Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time in the history of our country when economy in Government must be practiced it is now, more so than ever before. This was brought forcibly to the attention of the full House Appropriations Committee on January 20 last, when our Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, and our Budget Director, Maurice Stans, testified before our committee, during which time the following exchange, in part, transpired between Secretary Anderson and me:

Secretary ANDERSON. If the total world should lose confidence in the United States and withdraw gold for that purpose, then we would have an exceedingly serious situation with which to deal. Our obligation, in my judgment, is to be sure that we so conduct ourselves and our country that this does not arise. I think that we do have, as I say, the confidence of other countries, but I believe also that other countries are going to have us under much more critical examination than they have in the past because they are in the position of saying, "How well are you running my stake in your affairs?"

From the standpoint of our being the world's banker and also from the standpoint of how solidly do we maintain the reserve characteristics of our money, that is.

The important thing I would like to point out is that this is rather a new thing for the American economic mind to assimilate. We have gotten into this kind of a position and yet our position and the position of the free world is exceedingly important in relationship to it. We can maintain that confidence if we, from the standpoint of the Government, pursue policies which will lead others to believe that we are going to maintain the purchasing power of our currency and not allow it to erode away.

Mr. JENSEN. Is not the best way to keep the confidence not only of the foreign financiers and foreign nations but also the American people in the stability of the American dollar to spend frugally for Government business?

Secretary ANDERSON. That is part of it; yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a big part of it; is it not?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course it is.

Now, that being a fact, great responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Director of the Budget and on the Secretary of the Treasury, but an even greater responsibility rests upon the shoulders of Congressmen, and more especially on the shoulders of the

members of this committee, the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, where all appropriations are supposed to originate. That being a fact, it now becomes a national "must," to a greater degree than ever before in the history of America, that we not only defeat any attempts to increase the President's budget, but that we reduce it substantially in order to make sure confidence will be maintained in the stability of the American dollar. If such confidence is not maintained then all is lost. We will have rank inflation and we will lose the confidence of our friends across the seas and we will have chaos on top of chaos in America.

The best example of what takes place in the minds of the American people was exemplified last year when shortly after the opening of the Congress our liberal colleagues introduced many bills which provided for appropriating many, many billions of dollars over and above our regular budget.

The American people spoke out. They flooded their representatives in Congress, and when I say "Congress" I mean the other body also, with demands that expenditures be reduced to a minimum and that all waste and unnecessary expenditures be eliminated. The effect was that the Congress did it because the American people demanded that they do exactly what they had to do in order to keep the American dollar stable.

Mr. Speaker, by so doing the American people proved again that they are the masters of their own destiny.

I have today introduced the following bill which is a companion bill to the one recently introduced in the Senate by Senators BRIDGES, CURTIS, BYRD of Virginia, and COTTON:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. On or before the fifteenth day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimate of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall include an amount not less than \$500,000,000 for reduction of the public debt and which shall not exceed such estimate of the receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimate of the receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than three days at a time until such action has been taken as may be necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year, nor shall it take any such adjournment without having provided for reduction of the public debt during such fiscal year by at least \$500,000,000. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget and for reduction of the public debt for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding one year each.

"SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Now, Mr. Speaker, and my esteemed colleagues in the Congress, after you have read Secretary Anderson's statement I am sure you will understand how urgent it is that we do all in our power to reduce Federal expenditures to the bare necessities now and that we also pass this bill during this session of Congress.

I only wish space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would permit the inclusion of the entire hearing held with Secretary Anderson and Director Stans, a copy of which I have sent to every banker and a number of other interested people in the Seventh Iowa District upon request.

That hearing, entitled "The Budget for 1961" and available at the House Committee on Appropriations, contains only 135 pages. It should be read by every American who is concerned about the future of our blessed land.

Curtailment of Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in many points in North Dakota, star route truck mail service has been proposed by the Post Office Department. The people of North Dakota are objecting strenuously to this curtailment in mail service.

The following editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Wishek (N. Dak.) Star points out the objection to these proposals:

We don't like the sound of proposed star route mail service truck from Hazleton to Wishek.

Towns all along would be affected, as well as us. Here's what we see in our crystal ball.

The Post Office proposes it in the name of economy. The railroad is not too interested in keeping it since then they can eliminate daily service and run trains twice or three times a week and save money.

But who suffers? The general public, you and I. In storms we fail to get our mail because the plows won't go out until it quits blowing. So they use this to implement the railroad service, using both for a time—but it's only a move to stall until railroad mail is out altogether. This is history in other areas.

The Wishek Association of Commerce has gone on record as opposing this proposed change. It would be well if both businessmen and private citizen alike also protest to their Congressmen. This is a political year and they'll be more likely to act.

Both private citizen and businessmen will suffer curtailed service eventually, as we see

it. We see little improvement in service since we already have excellent mail service in and out of Wishek.

Write your Congressman—give him your side and the people's interest in this matter will be protected.

Otherwise it will not. It's up to us.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 26, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 26, 1960.

The social security law, due as usual for election-year changes, is before the Ways and Means Committee in executive session. The Forand bill (medical care for OASI recipients) has taken the spotlight, it is true, but other broadening extensions and increased costs will come up, too. Perhaps it is timely, therefore, to raise questions concerning the basic concept of the social security program. Implicit in such questions is the realization that basic fallacies or flaws could destroy the program, despite the well-intentioned hopes of its advocates. After all, many citizens depend on social security income totally or in part for their financial security.

Questions which suggest themselves concern: (1) Compulsion: There is no freedom of choice. Both the cost in OASI taxes and popular reliance on the program preclude individuals taking out private insurance or investing to provide their future income. However, there is no assured return of money, as there is with investment programs. If, in later years, outside income beyond a modest limit is earned, all social security payments must be forfeited by some. (2) The program at best is questionable as to actuarial soundness—as to whether enough tax money will continue to come in to pay the required benefits. Why? (a) The program assumes a continually high and/or rising income to our people. Declining income is not considered a possibility. (b) Another assumption is that there will be an increasing number of new entrants into the program to keep picking up the tab for the older people as recipients of benefit payments. Also, to whatever extent future population growth rate may decrease and longevity increase, our "average age" is getting older and the program more costly. (c) Higher and higher taxes must be levied continually to cover the increasing cost; (present 6 percent tax already slated to rise to 9 percent, presuming no further benefits are added). (3) The program is based on politics and Government paternalism, rather than sound economics. (Note the bi-annual changes—every election year.) At any time it can be changed as to taxes, benefits, or coverage; or it can be voted out.

Senator GOLDWATER, in a Dallas speech, presented a challenging view of our foreign affairs. In too-brief condensation, he said: (1) We must win any war, cold war included. (2) Our strategy must be to assume the offensive—to pick the places of engagement, the times, and the weapons. (3) We

must always strive for military superiority. (4) We must keep America strong economically in freedom. (5) We must always act strong. We want respect first, after which friendship will follow. (6) Foreign aid dispensed in enlightened self-interest, to gain our objectives. (7) We must declare world communism an outlaw movement and deny recognition to Russia. (8) We should encourage captive nations to revolt against communism. (9) We should encourage friendly nations to regain their homelands, as China. (10) We must always be prepared to risk war rather than further appeasement. It is all-out war against enslavement, or peace with freedom. There is no middle ground. The Russians want to destroy our will to resist so we will fall like a ripe plum.

Our defense capability provides some interesting figures. Here are some facts. We now have: (1) Over 1,500 SAC bombers (mobile nuclear missile launching platforms). (2) Over 1,000 jet B-47's. (3) Several hundred jet 52's. (4) 15 carriers with 50 planes each. (5) Hundreds of tactical bombers throughout Europe and the Far East. As for missiles: Between now and 1963, we will have 130 Atlas 6,000-mile-range missiles, 140 Titans for a total of 270 long-range missiles on hardened missile pads; (2) 128 Polaris missiles with range capability (aboard a nuclear-powered sub) of an ICBM; (3) 120 medium-range missiles, Jupiter and Thor, based in range of key Soviet targets. Minimum total of all these missiles is 518, any one of which is capable of destroying an entire Russian city. In contrast, by 1963 Russia is expected to have 300 long-range missiles capable of hitting U.S. targets.

The civil rights debate in the House has ended and the bill passed. Now it goes to the Senate for adoption and/or change. Amendments offered by southern members in the House were all defeated finally, as though southern sponsorship were enough to kill any change suggested. Some defeats included moves to: (1) Limit Federal court appointment of referees to elections involving Federal officials; (2) add a qualification that referees be learned in State and Federal election laws; (3) Delete provision for ex parte hearing of applicants by voting referees; (4) Retain State control over State election records.

The most unreasonable defeat to the southerners was the rejection of a "freedom of speech" amendment which would remove the words "or by any threatening letter or communication" from the bill. Here we are admittedly legislating in a field where Congress "shall pass no law." True, this is a controversy over word definition, even legal grammar (anyone know the difference between "attempts" and "willfully endeavors"?), but the emotional civil rights debate is a dangerous atmosphere for argument. Just one unresolved doubt as to jeopardizing free speech is dangerous. Amendments ruled out of order included: (1) Poll tax abolition; and (2) extending penalties for obstructing court orders to cover all areas, not just school desegregation.

The Byelorussian Story: A Spirit That Cannot Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 was the anniversary of that momentous

day in 1918 when a nation enslaved for centuries proclaimed independence for its people and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

Centuries of suppression by czarist Russia had failed, it was clear on that day, to plunder the ethnic and national ideals of those people. The new imperialistic regime of the Russian Communists, relentlessly trod over the Byelorussians just 3 years later, and once again subjugated them to dictatorial suppression.

What has taken place since then illustrates to the world that the Byelorussian hope of liberty and independence, whetted 42 years ago for just a brief span, is undying. Soviet Russia has been unable with its dictatorial forces and subtle propaganda to rob Byelorussia of its ideologies, language, culture, and hope for freedom.

In saluting this dauntless people today, we express hope that the time will not be long in coming when they will again enjoy the freedom which is their national destiny.

Ydigoras Governs on the Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted an excellent article on Guatemala's dynamic President Miguel Ydigoras which I feel should be called to the attention of the House. This article appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1960, written by Virginia Prewett. It follows:

YDIGORAS GOVERNS ON THE RUN
(By Virginia Prewett)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Guatemala's President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, actively pushing Central Americanism to answer communism's thrusts from Cuba, has a technique of government newer than Castro's.

Premier Castro, young, disorganized, rabble-rouses by television. President Ydigoras, mature, experienced, travels by motorcade to Guatemala's remote corners weekly, while directly capital affairs by two-way radio.

SHUNS SHOW

On these trips, Guatemala's president shatters precedent and protocol in taking government to a people long ignored by capital cliques playing bloodstained games with national power. Pointedly, Sr. Ydigoras refuses to occupy the opulent bullet-scarred presidential palace built by dictator Jorge Ubico.

Members of his cabinet usually accompany the "mobile government." President Ydigoras even summons foreign ambassadors to present their credentials in backland towns.

In Guatemala City, 5,000 people may constitute a party which will influence the country's 4 million. General Ydigoras' tours are politically activating a large inert provincial middle-class and peasantry lying between the numerous compactly-organized Guatemala City parties and the very large self-sufficient Indian population that plays no active role in national affairs.

Nowadays President Ydigoras is credited with wizardry for the strength he has developed in this sector. But inquiry reveals he was already known throughout Guatemala.

BASQUE

As a roadbuilding Army engineer, Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes became a general and cabinet minister under Dictator Ubico. Of Basque descent, humanitarian, tireless and nonconforming, he formed such wide provincial friendships that even Ubico came to fear him.

When the dictatorship disintegrated, he was one of the generals who guaranteed elections. Leftish President Juan Jose Arevalo won, and promptly sent him as ambassador to London, a polite form of exile.

General Ydigoras was exiled in fact during the Red-infiltrated Arbenz regime. After Arbenz' overthrow, he became President Carlos Castillo Armas' ambassador to Colombia.

As president, he invited all but the top leaders of exiled leftists to come home, though it meant political struggle. In his first 2 years he gambled on his country support—distributing land, building schools and roads—and he won. Today he is drawing more and more moderate liberals and moderate conservatives into his following from the capital's fragmented parties.

President Ydigoras' administration is characterized by political wisdom and courage. It takes both nowadays for a Central American leader to support the United States openly while allowing the extremes of right and left to agitate freely against him.

Just What's Going on in the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, another cavity is becoming visible in the hound's tooth.

The revelation over the weekend that the Federal Power Commission has reversed its position and may give a \$15,660,000 plum to a gas transmission firm after personal calls from an attorney who was not even the lawyer of record in the case is shocking indeed.

I believe that the events and disclosures of the past few days are the strongest possible arguments for the passage of my resolution, House Resolution 474, which directs the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to conduct immediate inquiry into the affairs, procedures, and policies of the FPC.

Or, if the Commerce Committee is already too overburdened with investigatory hearings to schedule the needed investigation at once, may I suggest that it be directed to the Government Operations Committee, and that this committee be empowered to conduct a full-dress investigation.

An investigation is needed, and it is needed now.

We cannot help but be disturbed by the facts that the Federal Power Commission has, in effect, set the stage for a whopping 7-percent return for the firm

represented by these visits from this lawyer, and that the same attorney's connection with the firm is so nebulous that the FPC itself could not allow his employer to pass his \$60,000 fee in another case on to the consumer.

I hardly need point out that utility stockholders are singularly free of the risks which characterize the operations of other, more competitive corporations. In view of this fact, it is really incredible that a 7-percent return could be justified by a Federal regulatory agency.

But this is just what the FPC—after secret visits from a lawyer mysteriously associated with the case—appears to be agreeing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell you who winds up the ultimate loser in this hopeless confusion of overlapping, temporary—and often unjust—rate increases. It is the public.

The public deserves protection from 7-percent earnings by any public utility. The public deserves absolute assurance that regulatory bodies are not being influenced by cloak-and-dagger phone calls and visits.

Most of all the public deserves a Federal Power Commission whose primary purpose is to protect and defend their interests, not the interests of the gas producers and transmission companies.

Twentieth Anniversary of Massacre of the Katyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an appeal from the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in the U.S.A. of Salem, Mass., which warrants the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress:

AN APPEAL MADE ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRIBLE MASSACRE OF THE KATYN

The long forgotten event of the massacre at Katyn again revives as a warning to the free nations on its 20th anniversary. This occasion is a reminder of the moment when the Communists with cruelty tortured the innocent officers of Poland making them victims of Communistic oppression.

Katyn—a word piercing one with horror, calling forth revenge from on high on those who so unmercifully tortured and murdered 11,000 Polish officers in the forest of Katyn. This action calls upon the conscience of the people of the entire world for a just tribunal and sentence upon those who fulfilled the command of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact.

Today when the break between the East and West is being felt, a moment when the world is being divided into two enemy camps, and when during these days we commemorate the 20th anniversary of this cruel action, that a feeling of sympathy and warning reminds the world again of the unmerciful and man slaughter committed by the Nero of the 20th century, who under

the name of Khrushchev prepares for the world nothing else but enslavement.

It was in the spring of 1940, that the Communists have put to death 11,000 officers, the most faithful sons of Poland, thus committing a brutal massive murder. This premeditated plan was carried out by the Communists in order to deprive the Polish Nation of its most faithful sons, trying to bring upon Poland a complete ruin.

If today, we are in thought returning to this crucial moment and sending forth an appeal to the highest political authorities in this country, it is for no other reason but to remind and warn against the grave danger of communism.

What befell Poland 20 years ago, tomorrow may endanger America if it does not enter upon a path of strength and action. We must put aside all patient waiting and expectation of a better tomorrow, and break all relationship and contact with communism, with its lies, perversities, unfaithfulness and fraudulence.

The West, and among them America should not fear Russia but from the present political-military defensive change to a determined offensive. A long relation and hope in a better tomorrow brings about a feeling of drowsiness and neglect in the vigilance of the democratic powers. This feeling and expectation does not help the enslaved nations but on the other hand makes the situation worse. The Soviets of today are not afraid of the military strength of the West but they fear the democratic ideology and its advanced cultural and economic status.

America is not permitted to believe in Soviet tales of a simultaneous coexistence because the bloody communistic scoundrels dream only of it to benefit and freely dispute with the enslaved nations, thus showing the West what they are capable of doing. America must not believe in their disarmament proposals for the Communists have never been more oppressive, aggressive, more active and unstable than they are today. We cannot think in terms of peace with the Communists, until they return to the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain the long-desired freedom and until these so-called Communists are ready to undo the damage they have inflicted bringing restitution for their injustices. The men of the West on the other hand should be alert while shaking the bloody hand of Khrushchev and smiling to the aggressive communistic ruler.

America, guarding the greatest good which is the peace of the world, must also take under consideration the good of the other nations, especially their freedom. Freedom for all nations must be our goal. During this conference of appeasement we must remain unfaithful to our suffering brethren.

When a few years ago, in the Congress of the United States a motion was made in regard to Katyn and a hearing of facts demanded, unveiling the terrible massacre of 11,000 Polish officers, the people were terrified and many Americans were greatly disturbed and sympathetic. Today the mere idea of the tragedy that befell the Polish Nation simply stupefies and terrifies the people. The thought of it is nothing more than a remorse of conscience which the Americans are trying to deaden within themselves. But it is this fact of forgetting that we are not capable of doing.

At present more than ever we must think of our enslaved brethren. We must support them with our good will, prayer and protests. In this way, we will enable the suffering nations to hold high the torch of freedom, which must not die out. Thus helping them to bear patiently the pain and torture of the loss of freedom.

We cherish our freedom and believe that a nation loving its freedom cannot die or

perish. We also believe that the will to live cannot be destroyed by oppression and aggression but all rulers of this oppressive regime will sooner or later perish and peace and freedom will again triumph.

For years, we witness one young country after another obtaining their independence, such is the feeling of the oppressed always yearning and looking forward to the day when their goal, namely, freedom, shall be obtained. This feeling is reenacted from all countries beginning with the European nations and extending to the bamboo nations of the Far East. The day will certainly come and perhaps sooner than we realize. Let us hope that when it really dawns, the great America will be an active member of this action. It is to you, honorables, men of America, its leaders and rulers that we appeal in the name of the enslaved nations. Our anticommunistic organization, the Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A., on this 20th anniversary appeals to you. Let not our voice be futile in its appeal but let it sound like a bell calling forth for the freedom of the enslaved nations.

Twenty years ago in the Katyn Forests the bloody hand of communism destroyed and murdered the flowery youth of the Polish Army. There was performed a tragedy not only for Poland but for many more nations of the world. For here the destructive communistic machinery put a stop to the birth of a United Nations. The Polish soldiers and officers murdered in the forests of Katyn were acknowledged by the world as heroes of the Polish nation and of the entire free world.

They were the first executed hostages of the captive nations.

Therefore we the people of Poland demand today not only the punishment of those found guilty of the murder but in the first place we demand that a break be made with all conferences to be held with Khrushchev and communism.

America has been and should continue to be a defender and guardian of peace not only within its bounds, but mainly the peace and freedom of the enslaved nations.

JOSEF MLOT-MROZ,
President.
JOSEF PAZDZIORYNY,
Vice President.

Multiple-Use of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an editorial from the Monte Vista (Colo.) Journal, on the importance of giving statutory recognition to the multiple-use objectives of our national forests. I am sure each Member of the House will enjoy reading this fine editorial on the multiple-use management of our national forests. The editorial follows:

WE MUST KEEP OUR FORESTS INTACT

This week in Washington a subcommittee of the House is holding hearings on a bill that would spell out statutory recognition of the multiple-use objectives of the national forests. With the growing value of national forest resources, their accelerated use and increased accessibility, pressure for

single use of specific national forest areas are growing tremendously.

H.R. 10465, along with several companion bills introduced by Members of Congress, would authorize and direct that our national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes. Passage of the measure will simply mean that our national forests shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed and wildlife and fish purposes by the Forest Service.

It is no secret that the Department of Interior's National Park Service has cast loving eyes on some choice areas of our national forests. They want these areas for single purpose management—recreation. Special or single purpose management of our national forests is a luxury the people of this nation can ill afford in the face of increasing needs.

Our national forests now possess the inherent capability to produce trees for lumber and wood fiber, forage for livestock and wildlife, suitable environments for outdoor recreation, water for domestic and irrigation use and minerals for industry. Today there is insufficient national forest land in the United States to meet current demand for these products should they be administered on a single purpose basis. And at our population growth trend the demand on our forests will probably increase tenfold in the next decade.

Natural resources on the national forests are intermingled. Frequently several resources overlap on an individual acre. A specific area of land may grow trees, grass, and shrubs, producing many opportunities for many different kinds of use. Space upon which to grow renewable resources is limited and will continue to shrink. So it stands to reason that every acre must be made to contribute somewhere near its optimum capability. This means that all uses and resources must share the land to the fullest extent possible.

Multiple-use management as practiced by the Forest Service contemplates several different kinds of uses, sharing the land together in combination and harmony. Multiple-use plans are designed to achieve a resultant benefit to people which in total is greater than had the uses been exclusive, uncoordinated, and uncombined.

Multiple use, as a concept of land management, was first adopted by the Forest Service in 1891. As a policy it has been actively pursued and tested well over 50 years. It is only short of a miracle the policy has survived the vagaries and uncertainties of changing administrations and special interest pressures. The measure now before Congress will give this time-tested policy the stature of legislative recognition and support.

Multiple-use management, as contrasted with primary purpose of preservationist management, is a dynamic program designed to use the renewable natural resources on a sustained yield basis, not unlike farming. Forest cover promotes favorable watershed conditions which reduce floods and permit regular flow of water. Regulated timber harvest can and has increased water yield from forest lands as high as 30 percent.

Multiple use is not a passive task of supply avoiding conflicts between national forest activities and uses. It considers the challenging concept of making more uses available to the public. Properly located roads to timber sale areas open up new country to the hunter, fisherman, and camper. Access permits better harvest of excessive big game population. New camping areas are available for all.

Our national forests have long been administered under the policy of multiple use and sustained yield. Let's keep it that way.

Friedrick an Outstanding Appointment to the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Jacob F. Friedrich, a Milwaukee labor leader, was appointed a few days ago, by Gov. Gaylord Nelson, to the board of regents of the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Friedrich is a fine example of what is right about the American labor movement. In a lifetime of service to the working people of Milwaukee, Jake Friedrich has not only fought for honest, responsible unionism, but he has also distinguished himself in many long hours of unpaid-time work for Milwaukee's community needs, in positions of heavy importance and responsibility.

In an era in which the vast majority of union officials throughout our country are honest, conscientious, hard-working men, it is good to see this ability recognized and put to even greater public service as Governor Nelson has done in appointing Friedrich.

The tiny proportion of racketeers and crooks in organized labor catch the headlines and proper public indignation. Certainly the solid contributions of the Jake Friedrichs of organized labor deserve, and should receive, far greater recognition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial hailing the Friedrich appointment, published in the March 26 issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. F. FRIEDRICK—AN EXCELLENT CHOICE FOR BOARD OF REGENTS

Governor Nelson's appointment of Jacob F. Friedrich of Milwaukee to the university board of regents will have the hearty approval of all those interested in the welfare of the university and the future of education in this State.

"Jake" Friedrich has long been an example of outstanding labor statesmanship in Wisconsin and a man who has concerned himself throughout his adult life with the problems of education. His main interest, of course, has been in the field of labor education where he has worked for so many years with such distinction.

The university itself recognized this 5 years ago when it conferred on him an honorary doctor of laws degree—the first labor leader to be so honored in this State.

Friedrich's training in labor came in an era when labor leaders were more concerned with the broad general welfare than with the narrow ends of labor itself, as so many labor leaders are today.

His philosophy was developed in association with such labor leaders of the past as Henry Ohl, Frank Webber, Jack Handley, and the others who brought high social ideals into the Wisconsin labor movement.

Though those ideals have been weakened in more recent years, Friedrich has yielded

none of the principles with which he was inspired in his early training.

He has a long record of public spirited contributions to the progress of Milwaukee and the State and has won the respect of all those with whom he has come in contact in his many public activities.

It has been a long time since organized labor has been represented on the board of regents. Over the past 20 years the emphasis has been on big business representatives.

But Friedrich will not be a voice for labor alone. He has shown in the past that he looks beyond narrow group interests and he will continue to do so.

It would be hard to find a more worthy representative of labor. It would be equally hard to find one who will work more devotedly for the welfare of education generally.

Admiral Session's Views on Countering the Soviet Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Naval Reserve Association News carries the following summary of the Soviet military threat and recommendations to counter it advanced by Rear Adm. William A. Sessions, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired:

Russia imposes the threefold threat of nuclear, general, and limited war. She has a spectacular land mass, has surrounded herself with satellite states she dominates. She has brought nuclear capability into balance, probably has excelled in missiles; has a first class air force with periphery bases for striking all European and Asiatic nations; has built a new fleet second numerically only to ours.

In case of nuclear war our defenses are massive retaliation. This presupposes a "Pearl Harbor" and if her missiles are as good as supposed our fixed bases are sitting ducks.

We would accomplish this massive retaliation by planes airborne at time of attack (they couldn't return if their bases were destroyed); land based guided missiles; movable bases—carriers; seaborne guided missiles—Polaris—which might be delivered through polar ice.

But such action is a stalemate, therefore the probabilities become general or limited war.

General war presupposes a long drawn out affair with heavy damage and loss, both civilian and military, on both sides.

With our allies we have forces (we hope) to provide uncontested landing places and to hold and inflict damage on the enemy until reinforcements arrived but large ground forces would have to be moved to combat theaters, munitioned, clothed, and fed; air and missile bases must be built, supplied, close by; we must deny the enemy access to the sealanes with fast carrier attack forces. The Navy now has 11 such carriers in commission, about one-half of World War 2 vintage with flight decks too short for modern planes—which we don't have enough of anyway.

One transport sunk can cause greater loss than major battles, with no enemy casualties to offset it; sunken ships also can ground planes. The active Navy has about 900 ships of all types; only 20 percent of our escort vessels are modern, equipped with up-to-date

detection gear; there are plenty in the mothball fleet if we can rely on the enemy using only World War II subs, which I don't think we can.

She has over 400 modern, highspeed (over 20 knots) submarines, some with guided missile capability, all with modern effective torpedoes. To combat them we have a few Hunter Killer groups of old carriers, with overage escort vessels. Finally, the threat of airborne nuclear attack at sea requires greater dispersal of our ships, which, in turn, requires more escorts around the periphery with longer submarine detection range.

Limited war hasn't and probably won't stop. For this we have four fleets ready in potential trouble spots, with marine forces well equipped with World War II weapons. They only have token amounts of the equipment their new landing force techniques require—two combination transports, helicopter, and plane close support ships converted from old carriers. After nearly 20 years' service, hulls and machinery are wearing out.

The German single chief of staff with almost unlimited power fought two wars and lost both. This concept, often proposed and always rejected, is rearing its ugly head again. All chiefs of staff select their own staffs of people who hold their own views, thus with this system we would lose the benefits of hearing all sides to the question.

We need opposition to the single chief of staff concept; modern carrier-seagoing landing field with the right planes to use it; more Polaris submarines and ships; modern antisubmarine vessels and equipment; large copters, modern equipment, modern ships for the Marine Corps.

The same issue of the NRA News also carries the following discussion of relative merits of submarine-based and land-based deterrent ballistic missiles:

The Air Force wants to keep 25 percent of SAC aircraft aloft at all times; place missiles in hardened, underground sites; put others on railroad cars; develop fully the B-70 manned bomber system.

The B-70's, with all the weaknesses of present bombers, could not get their first wing in operation until 1965 or 1966 at a cost of over \$11 billion. According to our intelligence Russia won't have the ICBM's to require keeping planes up for 2 or perhaps 3 years. That's when we should keep a portion of SAC airborne rather than waste money, wear out planes and crews now.

And why do they want the other three points? Because it's said 300 missiles could wipe out our SAC bases in 30 minutes; because they need mobility since their sites are well known. And, we add, because devastating attack on these sites would destroy untold American lives and property right here in the United States.

Let's get our deterrent retaliatory power to sea in Polaris submarines—away from the United States and our people, where it is always hidden, alert, moving, invulnerable to pretargeted attack, where attack on one would alert all others.

Two missile subs will be operational this year, nine have been authorized so far, three more are in the fiscal budget now before the Congress. A Polaris sub can fire at the rate of one a minute—each sub carries 16 missiles with a complement of about 100 officers and men. It takes 700 Air Force Personnel to man a 10-missile ICBM site—70 men per missile as against just over 6 for Polaris. And the sub's ability to evade attack obviates the necessity for hair trigger decisions on whether or not to launch our retaliatory missiles—a decision which could be wrong, yet could destroy civilization.

What is the cost of Polaris? James Elliot, writing in the Norfolk-Ledger Star, states

that the first Polaris was fired only 3 years ago and to date only \$2,742,648,000 has been appropriated for the entire program including the submarines. He further states that out of 49 shots with the Polaris, it has been successful 33 times, partly successful 14 times and unsuccessful only twice. The last 10 shots have all been without one single unsuccessful firing and the last 3 had the inertial guidance system installed and operating.

Tax Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Fairfield (Iowa) Ledger, Mar. 4, 1960]

IS THIS WHAT WE'VE BEEN ASKING FOR?

There was a time when every American could exercise his right to speak in his own behalf to his Congressman. He still has the right but limitations have been put upon him which should alert him to the fact that Government which he thought was his servant is becoming his master.

As we've abandoned our individual responsibilities and asked Government to take over we asked for what we are getting. It now becomes apparent that Government cannot do for you without doing to you.

A case in point is a recent regulation of the Internal Revenue Department that expenditures for lobbying purposes cannot be permitted as a business expense if done "for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes, including the support or opposition to any candidate . . . or for carrying propaganda relating to any of the foregoing purposes."

In the past it has been a recognized right to petition Congress and it has been generally recognized that Congressmen need to know what their constituents like or don't like.

You are still free to tell them but you are not free to spend any money in doing so and charging it to business expense. The Internal Revenue Department will crack down on you under a regulation which has come to have the force of law under the mandate we've given Government to do all things for us.

If somebody wants to spend the country into bankruptcy, if somebody proposes to tax a business out of existence, if somebody proposes to outlaw a labor union the parties against whom legislation is proposed are now told they can't publish their grievances and permit the Government to pick up a part of the tab by way of deductions on tax returns.

The proponents of big Government will not be alarmed about this. For those who may be alarmed there is something they can do. They can write a letter to their Congressman asking him to support a couple of bills which will restore their right of petition without a tax penalty.

But watch it. You must pay for the postage stamp with your own money. You must not (if you are in business of any kind) pick it up from the stamps you bought for business purposes. Bib Brother on the Potomac is watching you.

If you have to go to the post office to buy the stamp you are lucky. It will give you a little time to ask yourself the question "Is this what I've been asking for?"

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Mar. 23, 1960]

THROTTLING OPINION BY TAX REGULATION

U.S. Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana has asked Congress to support his bill to permit tax deduction of certain expenditures for legislative purposes, including advertising expenditures.

His bill would insert in the Internal Revenue Code on tax deductions for "ordinary and necessary" business expenses this short paragraph:

"Expenses lawfully incurred in supporting or opposing or otherwise influencing legislation in the Congress or in a State's legislature or in the legislative body of a county or other local governmental agencies or in submission of proposed legislation to the voters, shall be allowed as proper deductions from gross income."

A new regulation of the Internal Revenue Service provides that expenditures related to a business or the production of income are nonallowable for tax purposes if used for lobbying, propaganda, or advertising in connection with legislation or candidates. The Internal Revenue Service issued this regulation last December 29.

The regulation is not fair. It prevents a public utility, for instance, from presenting its side of the power question in advertisements as a deductible business expense. It tells every business that it cannot spend money to tell its side of the story at Pierre or Washington and deduct it as a business expense. It very likely may prevent tax deductions of such expenditures related to a business, or payments to a union organization or business association.

The regulation would make suspect as "propaganda" any advertisement or similar expression of views which an Internal Revenue agent may decide is in some way connected with the promotion or defeat of legislation. Why should the Internal Revenue Service or anyone else become judge and censor of opinion?

At the same time the regulation takes no cognizance of the biggest lobby in the world: the Washington bureaucracy. This bureaucracy is supported by the taxpayer's money. The Washington bureaucrats lobby their pet projects on the taxpayers' time and money. There is no Internal Revenue Service regulation holding them back.

It has always been a part of the American way to let each side have its say. To interfere with that expression of opinion by increased taxation is not in keeping with our ideals. Why interfere with a business, a labor union, or anyone else who wants to protect his own interest by lobbying or advertising?

Our country and our economic system have become great because its citizens have been able to exert influence on legislation and the conduct of affairs by the Government. If a citizen doesn't like the law or the legislators, he has the chance to change them.

There are abuses in lobbying. Too often legislators hear only one side of a story—from the side that can afford to present it. There is no lobby for the common people in Pierre or Washington. The legislators are their representatives. Our system requires that we depend upon their good judgment to look after the people, even if they aren't present at committee hearings or in the lobbies of the Capitol. It is not up to the Internal Revenue Service to attempt any changes in the lobbying system.

Legislators cannot operate in a vacuum. To say that they should be insulated from the ideas of business, labor, or anyone else undercuts the American way.

Congress should pass Representative Boggs' bill. If it does, it will take the Government's nose out of at least one place where it doesn't belong.

Sympathy for Secretary Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release and a letter which I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton on March 25, 1960. The Al Sarena mine is in my congressional district.

The March 23, 1960, meeting of Texas oil millionaire H. L. Hunt, Secretary of the Interior Seaton, House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, Republican, Indiana, and Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, Illinois, as reported by a wire service in the Washington Post and Times Herald, drew a letter of condolence from Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, Oregon.

In his letter to Secretary Seaton PORTER said he sympathized with him and added "may Heaven protect you from your friends." The meeting followed the Interior Department's recent rejection of five bids for oil and gas leases that Hunt made on 25,000 acres in the Outer Continental Shelf of Louisiana. The Department said the bids were too low.

The usual appeal to such a decision is through the Bureau of Land Management. Hunt filed a notice that he would appeal directly to the head of the Department. Reportedly this would be the first such direct appeal made under the circumstances.

Representative PORTER's letter sympathized with Seaton's predicament and commended him for being unavailable for comment and suggested he remain forever unavailable for comment on the interview. PORTER suggested Seaton have a private chat with his Republican friends on the Hill and advise them "Fellows, I'd say, 'lay off. I don't care if it is an election year. This business of your squiring a litigant into my private office is embarrassing and even more so when you leave him there with me as though we were a couple of reluctant lovebirds.'"

The Oregon Congressman told Seaton "I feel sure that you did nothing improper. I remember appreciatively your attitude on Al Sarena." (On an unusual appeal to then-Secretary McKay the lower departments were reversed and title to valuable timber was given to private parties having mining claims. Later Secretary Seaton said no such special appeals would be allowed in the future.)

PORTER recommended that Hunt's attempt to appeal be rejected and that usual procedure be followed. PORTER sent copies of his letter to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, Colorado, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The full text of Representative's PORTER's letter to Secretary Seaton follows:

MARCH 25, 1960.

HON. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is a letter of condolence. You remember the old saying, "I can take care of my enemies but Heaven protect me from my friends." If you have enemies, I don't know of them. The friends to whom I refer are my distinguished colleagues, the affable and obliging minority leaders of the House and Senate, Representative HALLECK and Senator DIRKSEN.

You probably saw the United Press International story in yesterday's Washington Post: "Texas oil millionaire H. L. Hunt, accompanied by the top Republicans in Congress, called yesterday on Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton." The top Republicans were, of course, HALLECK and DIRKSEN.

Your friends said the meeting was "nothing of any consequence—just a personal call on the Secretary" and "just a casual thing, only a pleasanter." Busy as they are, they would have probably done the same thing for any big contributor to the Republican Party.

Tycoon Hunt himself said the meeting was a "routine matter on which I will not make any disclosure at present." He added that he was an old acquaintance and "I am an admirer of his." You, the story noted, were not available for comment.

In sympathizing with you I've tried to figure out just what you could say under these circumstances: "Yes, I know Mr. Hunt. Yes, he was brought to my office by Representative HALLECK and Senator DIRKSEN whose good opinions I cherish. Yes, Mr. Hunt has appealed Interior's rejection of his bids for certain oil and gas leases and he is appealing directly to me, bypassing the Bureau of Land Management. Yes, this has never been done before. Yes, they were with me 40 minutes, then DIRKSEN and HALLECK left and Hunt was with me for another 25 minutes."

So far, so good. But then what? Do you say, "No, I made no deal with him. No, we didn't discuss his appeal." I feel sure that you did nothing improper. I remember appreciatively your attitude on Al Sarena. Oil and some of your predecessors (for example, Teapot Dome) did mix, with scandalous repercussions.

If I were you, I think I would remain forever unavailable for comment on this interview. I would, however, have a private chat with my Republican friends on the Hill. "Fellows," I'd say, "lay off. I don't care if it is an election year. This business of your squiring a litigant into my private office is embarrassing and even more so when you leave him there with me as though we were a couple of reluctant lovebirds."

It may be that the Post story is incomplete in some respects. Perhaps you had arranged for Bureau of Land Management officials to be present throughout the conference although I'm not sure your friends would have liked that. It would have seemed unfriendly for a "personal call" that was a "casual thing" and "only a pleasanter."

I sympathize with you. I have confidence in your integrity and in the integrity, although not the judgment, of Representative HALLECK and Senator DIRKSEN. It is my hope that Mr. Hunt's appeal directly to you will be routed back to the Bureau of Land Management for disposition in the usual manner with the usual safeguards for both the public and the private interests involved. And may Heaven protect you from your friends.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

AFL-CIO Opposes H.R. 10590

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Andrew J. Biemiller,

director, department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, in opposition to the President's effort to breach the 42-year-old 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1960.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: On February 15, I wrote to you explaining why the AFL-CIO opposes the President's effort to breach the 42-year-old 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds. Recently, the Committee on Ways and Means approved a so-called compromise (H.R. 10590) which would foist an unnecessary and intolerable burden on future generations of taxpayers.

I hope you will read the following brief analysis of the committee's proposal, which supplements our earlier statement, before your own decision is finally made on this vital issue.

If you vote "yes" for the Ways and Means four-point compromise:

(1) You will be putting your seal of approval on unlimited Treasury power to buy in old unmatured low-interest rate bonds and to swap for them new bonds that can yield, and in certain cases will yield, interest rates in excess of the statutory ceiling of 4½ percent.

For example, on March 11, 1960, a 2½ percent bond maturing in 1961 sold at 96 and yielded 4.42 percent. This bond could be exchanged for a new one extending the maturity perhaps 7 or 8 years and yielding rates of interest higher than the original 2½ percent coupon rate. The new yield rate can go to an unlimited level as long as the new bond does not carry a coupon rate in excess of the statutory ceiling of 4½ percent. This process will aid the owner of the bond who bought at par and is still getting only the 2½ percent coupon rate and not the yield rate of 4.42 percent to receive a higher rate of interest. While the new bond will enable the bond owner to get a higher rate of interest, it will result in higher interest costs to the Treasury for a longer period of years.

Of course, this kind of discount selling will breach the historic 4½ percent ceiling—but without the face of the bond saying so. Thus, the administration's objective will be achieved by indirection. However, this proposed refunding operation may ultimately add billions more to the already fantastic \$9.4 billion burden we are now paying in interest charges alone this year on the Federal debt.

(2) In addition, you will be voting to permit the President to issue almost \$6 billion in bonds yearly (equal to 2 percent of the total debt) at any interest rate over 4½ percent he may choose. Never before has any President been granted the unrestricted power to fix interest rates which this "compromise" now asks Congress to approve.

We are told that items (1) and (2) must be enacted to "stretch out" the Federal debt and to fight inflation. Yet, from 1953 until recently, the administration was doing very little to stretch out the debt during years when interest rates were far lower.

To lock into the debt structure now for many years peak interest rates—rates that have already been ratcheted up by this administration and the Federal Reserve Board to a 30-year high—is hardly prudent management of the public debt.

Moreover, items (1) and (2) would encourage a one-way direction for interest rates on U.S. long-term bonds—up. It is noteworthy that no requirement is included that the Treasury call in overpriced loans when interest rates are going down.

As for inflation: Since 1953, the administration and the Federal Reserve Board have had available a variety of fiscal and monetary tools with which to fight higher prices. However, except during the recessions of 1954 and 1957-58, they have shown an almost exclusive fondness for higher interest rates as a price stabilizing device. Now, although prices have been almost stable for 2 years, the Treasury is demanding permission to raise interest rates once again in order to fight what is, concededly, a phantom inflation.

Apparently, this administration opposes increasing the prices of everything, except money.

(3 and 4) You will be voting for a "sweetener" calculated to entice the unaware. This part of the compromise proposes interest rates higher than 4½ percent for issues of Government obligations invested in special U.S. trust funds and for E and H U.S. savings bonds. Of course, this provision would be appropriate and only fair if the rest of the bill is passed. However, the Government is now paying substantially less than 4½ percent on its obligations owned by its trust funds, and as for savings bonds, only 3¾ percent in interest is currently being paid, although up to 4½ percent is permissible under existing law.

If the administration really wants to stretch out the federal debt, it should first use its power to sell savings bonds at a higher rate and take other steps to make these bonds more attractive and salable. Why should small family savers perpetually be entitled to less for lending money to their Government than bankers and others receive? Furthermore, it would be much wiser to try to extend the long-term portion of the debt via greater sales of saving bonds and without scrapping the 4½-percent interest ceiling (as proposed in items (1) and (2)) than to pierce the 4½-percent ceiling and thus pressure all public and private interest rates yet another notch higher, as a consequence.

It is the view of the AFL-CIO that the so-called committee compromise is actually abdication. Because the issue so vitally affects the welfare of every American, we urge you to strenuously oppose enactment of H.R. 10590.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

The 42d Anniversary of Proclamation of Independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, March 27 marks the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

More than 10 million Byelorussians have been so completely isolated in the Soviet Union and have been so firmly sealed off from the free world that we in the west seldom hear of them. Just as they were almost lost in czarist Russia, so they seem to be today in Communist Soviet Russia, and one seldom hears or reads about them except on rare occasions. March 25 offers such an occasion,

for that day is their Independence Day.

For centuries these stouthearted people had suffered under the autocratic regime of Russia, but they had not given up hope for their eventual freedom and independence. Toward the end of the First World War when the czarist regime was shattered, Byelorussians felt free to proclaim their independence, and this they did on March 25, 1918. Then for about 2 years they worked, fought, and lived freely in their reconstituted Byelorussian National Republic. But the new state, surrounded by foes, could not survive the powerful onslaught of the Red Army. Early in 1921 the country was overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the free and independent Byelorussia, but it still survives in the lives and memories of millions of liberty loving Byelorussians in and out of their homeland, and they celebrate March 25 as their national holiday, their Independence Day.

Nixon to Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, George Dixon today writes in the Washington Post that Vice President Nixon is planning a trip to Red China. According to Columnist Dixon, the Vice President thinks that such a trip would give him a boost politically.

I hope that Nixon is allowed to go and that Senators ENGLE and MAGNUSON are allowed to go too. We need more public attention on our relationships with Red China. Such attention will make the failure of our present "containment by isolation" policies clear beyond argument.

It was Nixon who, with the help of a Republican-dominated press and other Republicans, told the Nation that Chiang's defeat on the mainland of China was the fault of Acheson and other Democrats. This assertion would also become better known as an untruth once public attention is focused on this area of our foreign relations.

Red China must be a part of any effective disarmament scheme. Red China is the nation most likely to commit the rash act which would start world war III. These stark and vital facts make it imperative that we increase our communications with Red China, even if it seems to mean that RICHARD NIXON will gain a temporary political advantage.

Under unanimous consent I include the Dixon column:

WASHINGTON SCENE—Will Nixon Go to Red China?

(By George Dixon)

RICHARD M. NIXON built so much political character for himself with his trip to the Soviet Union he now wants to duplicate it with a visit to Red China. But if the Republican Vice President is the only U.S. po-

litico allowed to go to Peiping the Democratic Senator from his State, CLAIR ENGLE, is going raise "unshirted hades."

Senator ENGLE will be joined in his heck-raising (my Nice-Nellyism) by the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, WARREN G. MAGNUSON. Senator ENGLE and Senator MAGNUSON want to visit Red China to study the possibilities of trade in nonstrategic materials. They have sounded out our State Department but the soundings have produced only stony silence.

The junior Senator from California and the senior Senator from Washington have been tipped off that the Red China excursion for Nixon already is in the works. According to their information, the State Department has given its nonpartisan blessing, and Secretary of State Christian A. Herter is unofficially lending his good offices to clear it at the other end with Red China's political boss, Mao Tse-tung.

Both MAGNUSON and ENGLE swear that if the Vice President is allowed to make such a trip for purely political reasons and they are barred from a factfinding study from which they can derive no possible political advantage they will "tear the roof off."

The Vice President thinks that a trip to Red China within the next few months would boost his political stock back to where it was after his historical quarrel with Nikita S. Khrushchev in a Red Russian kitchen.

Mr. Nixon subscribes to the theory that if it worked once it can work twice and that if he can achieve a breakthrough into the forbidden country that holds one-fourth of the earth's people his "image" will be so gigantic he'll overshadow any stay-at-home Democratic opponent.

Senator ENGLE has been making unofficial representations to the State Department to help him get cleared into Red China ever since last fall when he accompanied a Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce survey expedition to India, Australia, Indonesia, Thailand, Israel and Jordan. The solon declared he could get no cooperation whatsoever from the State Department although he explained, in both English and the language of diplomacy, his sole purpose was to make a trade study of a potentially sizable customer.

Senator ENGLE told me he is maintaining a daily alert to see if the State Department is more cooperative with the Vice President.

"If DICK NIXON is cleared into Peiping to build him up politically and 'Maggie' (Senator MAGNUSON) and I are barred from a trade study that is long overdue," said the colorful Californian, "I promise to really cut up rough."

I am betting on Senator ENGLE to keep his promise.

Trading Jobs for Low-Wage Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting and enlightening report showing the effect of the total 1959 imports from Japan and Hong Kong as compiled by the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, of Nashville, Tenn. I sincerely hope that this perilous situation will be remedied in the very near future for the protection of

our long-established domestic industry and the retention of those employees dependent upon that particular type of employment.

The report follows:

SOUTHERN GARMENT
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Nashville, Tenn., March 24, 1960.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The enclosed is released today in order to explain the results of a study just completed showing the effect of the total 1959 imports from only two countries, Japan and Hong Kong, of shirts, blouses, pajamas, trousers, brassieres, gloves and similar garments.

As busy as you are, we can only hope you will find a minute or two to look at it. The summary of the study is attached.

We have tried to just give you the facts, since you are close to your people, and if men like you do not feel it is necessary to influence the use of a little commonsense in carrying out the reciprocal trade policy, people in this, one of the large and vital industries of the country, have little in the way of encouragement before them. Our industry is cotton's largest customer.

The State and Commerce Departments are deaf to our pleas to put on the brakes a little and not allow this situation to worsen to the point of driving a substantial percentage of these plants to foreign countries and make ghost towns of hundreds of communities this industry sustains. The State Department says that, frankly, they are not interested. Escape clause proceedings are completely impractical.

Any suggestion or comment you care to offer would be most welcome.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON MCKELVEY,
Executive Vice President.

TRADING JOBS FOR LOW-WAGE GOODS

Asserting its support of the reciprocal trade policy as interpreted by its author, the late Cordell Hull, the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association today pointed out that American workers have not much time left to decide if they want to sacrifice their high level of purchasing power through high wages and steady employment in order to save a few pennies here and there in buying foreign-country low-wage-made goods. The association today released the results of a study just completed showing the effect of 1959 imports from Japan and Hong Kong of blouses, shirts, trousers, brassieres, pajamas, gloves, and other similar wearing apparel which the association stated, proved the contentions it has consistently made that a depression is in the making when the Government goes beyond the intent of the reciprocal trade program and permits the markets of a long line of industries to be taken over by foreign-country low-wage manufacturers.

"In other words, Mr. and Mrs. American Workers, you are 'saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung-hole' every time you buy a foreign-country low-wage-made article instead of one made in a U.S. plant."

In its detailed summary, the association shows that in 1959, based on reports made to the State Department by the Ambassador to Japan and the consul general in Hong Kong, and reports of the Bureau of the Census, imports of these items amounted to approximately 11 million dozen, or more than 128 million separate garments.

With the aid of skilled engineers determining the man-hours and man-days involved in the production of this enormous quantity of garments, these figures show that more than 24,000 employees would have been paid in excess of \$50 million to spend in the thousands of communities where they

work, if these garments had been made in the United States, that the livelihood of some 73,000 people in the United States was affected by these imports.

Even of more alarming proportions, on the basis of an average of 250 employees per plant, the study shows that 97 plants in the United States would have been required to manufacture these garments. "This many plants would represent the entire production of this industry in the State of Tennessee, or the State of Georgia, the State of North Carolina, or the State of Texas. That many plants would represent the approximate production of this industry, in many cases, of 2 or more States," the association's statement related.

It was pointed out that in some congressional districts, this industry predominates in the way of employment. Thus, Members of Congress are confronted with the realization that an entire industry, sometimes the largest employers they have in their districts, are being brought closer and closer to short-time operations and layoffs, with all the economic consequences that must fall on the communities which have enjoyed the benefits of having this industry, and, in numerous instances where the community has no other means of absorbing the displaced workers, it was further said.

The association feels that it is the policy of the present administration and the reluctance of the Congress to face up to this problem that is building an economic collapse, which could easily break any day, with consequent wholesale industry stagnation in one of the largest and most vital industries in the United States, with part-time and full-time unemployment for thousands of employees, and the crippling of hundreds of towns, particularly small communities.

"This industry and its association do not advocate unreasonably high tariffs or a policy of shutting out all competitive imports. On the contrary, this industry believes in, and supports, the Reciprocal Trade Policy championed by the late Cordell Hull as being a healthy program for the economy of the United States and all nations participating therein, but that belief and advocacy is based on the true intent of the Reciprocal Trade program as enunciated by the late Mr. Hull, a policy that did not contemplate total submission of our markets to the demands of foreign country low-wage manufacturers, and consequent demoralization of hundreds of American communities, unemployment of thousands of workers, destroyed purchasing power, forcing American manufacturers to transfer their plants and capital to these foreign low-wage countries or quite business entirely", the association emphasized.

SUMMARY

For the period January-December 1959,¹ Japanese and Hong Kong imports of the above items amounted to 10,704,652 dozen or, 128,455,824 units.

Total direct labor man-hours to produce the above quantity of apparel items are 37,451,629, which represent 4,681,454 man days. On the basis of 50 weeks of production, it would require 18,726 direct labor employees to produce the above quantity. On the basis of \$1 per hour labor, the payroll would be \$37,451,629.

Five thousand six hundred and eighteen indirect labor employees would be required at a payroll of \$11,236,000 or a total payroll of \$48,687,629.

The above quantity of apparel items is the equivalent of a \$285,586,984 a year wholesale volume; 18,726 direct labor employees and 5,618 indirect labor employees, or a total of

24,344 employees, and on the basis of an average of 2 dependents per employee, accounts for a total of 73,032 people's livelihood being affected, for a period of 50 weeks.

The importation of the above quantity of the various apparel items listed, represents the production of 97 plants in the United States, with an average of 250 employees per plant.

The above figures include direct and indirect manufacturing labor, salesmen, shipping, warehousing, etc.

H.R. 11313

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 11313, which amends the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection against unfair competition from corporate agriculture to the American family farm, and protection for the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers in the United States in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico.

Hearings on legislation similar to my bill are presently being held before the Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture.

In order to explain to the best advantage the provisions of my bill and the purposes of its introduction, I wish to include my statement presented to the Agriculture Subcommittee in support of this measure:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS M. PELLY, BEFORE THE EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, AND MANPOWER SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11313, MARCH 28, 1960

I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 11313. As the sponsor of this bill, I would like to explain briefly the considerations which led me to introduce it.

For some time I have been deeply concerned because of the deep-seated problems created by the presence each year of about half a million foreign farmworkers. From their wartime introduction, when it is true they were most necessary, their numbers have swelled from 90,000 to nearly 500,000 last year. I am convinced that their consistent appearance, year after year for nearly two decades, and in greatly increased numbers, has had a most serious effect upon the employers involved, upon our seasonal domestic workers, and upon certain segments of our agricultural economy.

Recently I have had the occasion to read the report of the consultants appointed by Secretary of Labor Mitchell to review carefully and independently the operations and the effect of the Mexican labor program. This carefully written, dispassionately presented analysis by individuals with no self-interest at stake is a most persuasive one which, I believe, might well present a general avenue for congressional action.

I would call your attention particularly to what is known of the effect of the large-scale use of Mexican workers upon our own farm labor force. I am told that we have a surplus of farm labor in this country—that there is more underemployment in the agri-

cultural worker occupation than in any other major occupational group. I know from the Department of Agriculture reports that farmworker wage rates are far below those paid by any other major industry. I know that agricultural workers are a class apart so far as the protection of many of our labor standards and protective laws are concerned—workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, minimum wage, and even in protection of the right to organize.

Yet this class of impoverished, underemployed, unprotected workers at the bottom rung of the U.S. economic ladder are the only group of U.S. workers exposed to systematic, Government-arranged competition by a large mass of temporary foreign contract workers. It takes no economist to persuade me that this type of competition, augmentation of the labor supply, can have no effect but to delay improvement of employment opportunities for U.S. farmworkers and to delay or to prevent improvement in the wage structure which might otherwise occur through the influence of labor shortages. That a U.S. Government program is contributing in this manner to the prevention of the welfare of such a group of U.S. workers is, I assert, a tragic, indefensible miscarriage of justice and a blot on the conscience of all thinking Americans.

In passing I would observe that this is not a matter only of our own conscience; it is importantly a matter of the appearance that we Americans give to the rest of the world and particularly to the peoples of the underdeveloped nations—the peoples in whose hands the future of this civilization may rest. These underdeveloped nations have a predominance of their population on the land—often themselves the victims of incredible hardship, deprivation and exploitation. We seek to encourage these populations and their leaders to look to western ways—to the example of U.S. democratic and economic methods. We seek to demonstrate to them that our way to economic development is better than and as fast as the way of regimentation by Communist overlords. Then the example that we hold forth to them is that of what the distinguished Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has called the "excluded Americans" deprived of all normal protections, paid such low wages that wives, children, grandmothers, and every able-bodied family member must work, and deliberately placed in competition with the hungry millions of underdeveloped Latin Americans. I understand that already this situation has not gone unnoticed in the halls of the United Nations.

In passing, also I must observe that the employers of my own State of Washington who depend almost exclusively on U.S. workers and who commonly pay from \$1.25 per hour up have considerable reason to object violently to the price-lowering effect of production in large quantities elsewhere by foreign labor brought in at wages as low as 50 cents per hour and even less. I am amazed that the farm organizations do not better represent the interests of the farmers of the northern half of the country where the use of Mexican workers is relatively minor and wage rates for domestic workers, relatively more adequate.

These are a few of the reasons which have led me to introduce H.R. 11313. These considerations have persuaded me that the only proper position for those interested in economic justice and the application of Christian principles to daily affairs is to oppose continuation of the Mexican labor program for any period of time—unless it is substantially amended. The amendments which I suggest in the bill before this subcommittee are generally parallel to those recommended by the consultants to Secretary of Labor Mitchell.

My bill is different in one respect which I wish to emphasize. In setting out a pro-

¹Except pajamas, T-shirts and gloves, which included January-September 9-month period.

posed termination date of July 1, 1969, I am not suggesting that as the time at which the future of the program should again be considered. Rather I am suggesting that date as a final termination date for this program—placed far enough in the future to give ample notice to all economic interests affected. Enough time to develop the domestic labor supply capability which through atrophy some growers and communities may have lost is, in my opinion, of vital importance.

My bill provides that the program may be tapered off during that period. I have chosen not to suggest a rigid percentage reduction each year, preferring to leave to the Secretary of Labor the judgment as to when the decline would be sharper and when it should be less sharp than a straightline trend. I do not regard the 1969 date as necessarily sacrosanct; what I do regard as fundamental is that without further delay a final termination for this program be agreed upon and made the basis of planning by all interested parties.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for permitting me to offer this explanation.

Is the Labor Boss for or Against the Aged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is growing public recognition that all public enemies are not necessarily on "The Ten Most Wanted List" maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There is a developing realization that certain detractors from our American way of life skillfully operate on the fringes of lawful activity so that it is difficult to attach criminal culpability to them. These new public enemies have been working in our midst for many years bent on the destruction of our national greatness and dedicated to the socialistic glorification of mediocrity.

The type of public enemy to which I refer need not be a gangster, although he frequently comes from such a background; he need not be a Communist, although people of his ilk frequently are; he need not be avowedly anti-American, although he frequently works to further anti-American causes that are contrary to our Nation's military and economic strength. The new public enemy to which I refer is the labor boss who seeks for his own selfish aggrandizement to distort the record on important national issues confronting our people, to reward the slothful by taking the industrious, and to influence public opinion along the lines of the socialistic thinking in which he professes belief.

These labor bosses preach civil rights while condoning segregation in the ranks of their own labor organizations; they advocate equal economic opportunity while interfering with the rights of American citizens to work; they preach the principles of democracy while practicing totalitarian rule in union office.

These labor bosses deal in distortion and demagoguery to fill the public record with false and misleading statements and are quick to resort to vilification and abuse against anyone who seeks to set the record straight or who has the courage to disagree with them.

Over the weekend the press attributed a statement to United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther that was critical of the President of the United States. Mr. Reuther is reported to have criticized President Eisenhower because of the latter's opposition to a proposal pending before the Congress designed to launch a national health insurance program financed by a compulsory payroll tax imposed on our working population. Mr. Reuther, in effect, said that the President has always had his medical bills paid for by the Government. The truth of the matter is that President Eisenhower through great personal sacrifice has rendered more than 40 years of his life in unparalleled public service in behalf of the citizens of our Nation and against the threat of totalitarian enslavement of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall similar public service by Mr. Reuther. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 20, 1958, my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr], documented by Mr. Reuther's own admission the fact that the President of the UAW was a Socialist. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1941, that great statesman from the State of Georgia, the late Honorable E. E. Cox, placed in the RECORD evidence that Walter Reuther at the time he was President of an Automobile Workers local with a membership of 30,000 filed a statement that he could not afford to pay for medical examination and treatment for himself and his wife and that he received such examination and treatment at the expense of the city of Detroit. On August 2, 1955, our patriotic and esteemed colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD documentation of the machinations by this same Walter Reuther to avoid military service during World War II. Mr. HOFFMAN also called attention to the fact that the Reuther brothers while studying in Russia wrote a letter to close friends on January 20, 1934, in Detroit admonishing them to "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America."

Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the AFL-CIO expressing opposition to some 175 bills that are currently pending before the Committee on Ways and Means having the effect of liberalizing the retirement test in the social security program so that our citizens who have paid for protection under Social Security could continue to engage in more realistic partial employment after they reach age 65. On page 6068 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 24, 1960, my distinguished and courageous colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred to labor boss opposition to the liberalization of the retirement test, and I call your attention to his well considered remarks. Mr. CURTIS

in effect said that if the labor bosses were really interested in the welfare of the aged, they should support a liberalization of the retirement test instead of trying to force our still potentially productive citizens out of the labor market.

Mr. Speaker, the labor boss is now supporting H.R. 4700, a bill to provide Government payment for certain health care costs incurred by the aged at the expense of our present working population. This labor boss support is in the face of the facts that H.R. 4700 is discriminatory in its application, would impose an excessive cost on the American people, and would detract from rather than improve the quality of the medical care available to our aged.

Dr. H. I. Fineberg has recently written a very excellent analysis of the Forand bill which appeared in the March 27, 1960, issue of the Long Island Press. I will include Dr. Fineberg's comments on this legislation as a part of my remarks:

THE DOCTOR'S CORNER—LAW WON'T PROVIDE BETTER MEDICAL CARE

(By Dr. H. I. Fineberg)

In recent weeks, the Forand bill, has come to the foreground more than ever.

Since we discussed this proposal a few weeks ago, I have been deluged with mail from people in this community—who have accused me of being "anti-old age." Nothing could be further from the truth. I have often declared that every sick person must be taken care of regardless of age, economic status or creed. There must be only one type of medical care—the best that we have available. Everyone, rich or poor, young, middle aged or elderly, must have it. In this city and State no one needs to forego the services of a doctor of medicine because of inability to pay.

My concern over the legislation recommended by Congressman FORAND is that it would establish a system of medical care under which all of us—the patient, the doctor and the hospital—would take orders from the Federal Government. As Dr. Frederick C. Swartz, chairman of the national medical society's committee on aging, has pointed out—the result would be poorer, not better, health care for the people of our country.

Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the American Medical Association, voices our opinion when he says that the interests of the aged could best be served by encouraging further development of voluntary health insurance; by replacing compulsory retirement and age discrimination in employment with more realistic and flexible systems; by curbing inflation; by encouraging construction of nursing homes and other facilities designed to care for the long-term patient efficiently and economically; and by increasing reimbursement of hospitals by local and State governments for care of the needy of any age. We still insist that the voluntary way is the best way—unhampered by bureaucratic control.

Last month, a British physician spoke about the importance of telling the American people of the back-breaking tax load that can result when a government enters the medical care field.

In a speech before Blue Shield people in Chicago, Dr. John B. Reckless reported that, prior to the National Health Service in Britain, the public in that area did not fully realize that a government can levy costs for services not only directly by taking a contribution from a person's income but also by direct and indirect taxation. He stated that the taxation per head in the United States is estimated to be 24 percent whereas in Britain the direct taxation is at least 40 percent.

In addition, Dr. Reckless revealed some examples of Britain's indirect taxation. Their sales tax is as high as 66 percent on automobiles and there is a tax of 100 percent on luxury items such as electrical appliances, iceboxes, television sets, furs, jewelry, cameras, etc.

Government medicine is expensive medicine and it results in overutilization of services. According to Dr. Reckless' figures, in the first 3 years of the government-controlled program in Britain, a country which has 50 million people, the following were issued: 609 million prescriptions and drugs, 7 million sets of dentures and 700,000 appliances. Costs skyrocketed and the government was so embarrassed that they had to impose restrictions.

When the National Health Service was started in Britain, it was estimated that it would cost \$500 million a year. Within 3 years, this figure rose to \$1.2 billion and now it is \$2 billion a year.

Closing of Westinghouse Nuttall Plant in Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently after a few comments I introduced into the RECORD a letter from Albert J. Fitzgerald, of the United Electrical Workers.

This letter dealt with the conditions surrounding the closing down of a plant owned by the Westinghouse Corp., known as the Nuttall plant.

Apparently the Westinghouse Corp. felt that that was their side of the story left untold and have addressed to me over the signature of Dale McFeatters, vice president, their position in this matter.

In fairness to all, I am submitting for the RECORD the letter from the Westinghouse Corp. so that both sides may be studied:

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 23, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DENT: We appreciate having brought to our attention the letter which Albert J. Fitzgerald, general president of the United Electrical Workers Union (UE), wrote to Congressmen regarding the closing of the Westinghouse Nuttall plant in Pittsburgh.

While the subject may not be of immediate interest to you, and those who have knowledge of the situation will recognize Mr. Fitzgerald's letter as a misrepresentation of the facts, we want you to be fully informed regarding the Nuttall plant.

The Westinghouse gearing division, located at the Nuttall plant, has for some time been an unprofitable operation, despite intensive efforts to remedy this situation. We tried to improve the volume of the plant by introducing new products. In the past few years we spent \$1½ million on new equipment and plant rearrangement, in an attempt to create a successful operation. Despite these efforts, the division continued to lose money, and prospects for the future were in no way encouraging. Therefore, there was no alternative but to cease op-

erating at this plant and fold the activities into other plants.

The welfare of the people whose jobs are to be discontinued was—and remains—a first consideration of the company. As soon as the decision was made to close the Nuttall plant, we focused full attention on a plan of action to meet three objectives: (1) to place as many employees as possible at other Westinghouse locations in the Pittsburgh area; (2) to help locate jobs for our people at other companies in the area; (3) to provide a program of special and liberal benefits to assist any who are separated from the company.

Under our policy, managers of all other Westinghouse locations in the Pittsburgh area are taking a personal interest in the matter of finding jobs for these people; no one is to be hired at any Westinghouse location in this area until after the Nuttall people have been given full consideration for any available job. The first layoffs at Nuttall began only last week—and a relatively small number was involved—so it is too early to estimate how many will be accommodated in this phase of our plan.

It must be recognized, of course, that each manager's first obligation in increasing his force is to recall any of his own people who may have been furloughed. Also, it is obviously essential that skills be matched with jobs. Another complication in moving an employee from one location to another is the matter of seniority. The unions at some locations naturally want to protect the seniority rights of their own people, and in some instances insist that a transferred employee start with no seniority. This, of course, would make the transferred employee subject to early layoff in the event of a subsequent reduction in force. In other situations, there is objection to bringing long-service employees into a plant for it reduces the employment security of present employees. The UE does not represent employees at any other Westinghouse plant in the Pittsburgh area.

In spite of these complications, we are hopeful that a number of employees can be placed in jobs at Westinghouse locations in this area. Already we have arranged for 25 moves. At the same time, we have been diligently pursuing our second objective, to help locate jobs our people might fill at other companies in the area. Again, because only a few people have been laid off at Nuttall, it is too early to judge the effectiveness of this effort. Incidentally, this phase of our efforts has been made more difficult by the recent announcement that a steel plant in the same neighborhood will shut down, laying off nearly twice as many people as are employed at Nuttall.

The third phase of our efforts in behalf of the gearing division employees was to offer a special benefits program, to assist those who would be separated from the company. This program provides allowances amounting to as much as 20 weeks of pay (the amount being based on years of service and the employee's level of earnings—many will amount to \$2,500). The program also continues the employee's personal insurance coverage for as long as 6 months after the date of separation. The benefits are in addition to unemployment compensation, whose cost—as you know—is also chargeable to Westinghouse.

This special benefits program would provide up to three quarters of a million dollars for the approximately 400 men and women employed at Nuttall. I believe you will agree that this is not a "meager" amount, as claimed by Mr. Fitzgerald. It is also difficult to imagine how the program can be called "discriminatory," when the amount of separation pay is directly related to the employee's years of service.

The special benefits program we have proposed for Nuttall employees was accepted after brief negotiations by the union representing salaried employees at the plant. It is the same program, incidentally, which was accepted by both the union representing hourly employees and the union representing salaried employees at another Westinghouse location last year. In direct contrast, repeated attempts to negotiate an agreement with Local 601 of the UE—the union headed by Mr. Fitzgerald—have been wholly unsuccessful. Instead of making any earnest attempt to bargain on the company's proposal, the local 601 leaders continually have resorted to misrepresentations and irresponsible statements of the type displayed in Mr. Fitzgerald's letter.

It is hard to conceive just what purpose Mr. Fitzgerald and other UE leaders expect to serve by continuing to deride the proposal and reject it for their members. It is quite apparent that in so doing they are not reflecting the wishes of their membership. For example, here are statements from a letter received by the company just last week:

"I am a Nuttall worker with better than 20 years of service. In Saturday's Pittsburgh Press I was surprised to read about the charge of unfair labor practice filed by Local 601 of the UE. I think the Westinghouse management has been very fair with their attempts to aid us.

"At our last meeting one of our members made a motion to accept the benefits offered by the company. Before the motion could be voted upon, Mr. Gibbs (Local 601 president) told the member he was out of order. This is the way all of our meetings are conducted. I can honestly say that better than two-thirds of the Nuttall workers are in favor of signing for the benefits and the severance pay."

If the UE is sincerely interested in the welfare of the employees it represents, it would be better advised to assist management in putting the liberal aid program into effect, and to seek the cooperation of other unions in the Pittsburgh area in accepting UE-represented people when jobs are available. One very real problem is that the UE's own reputation is not helping in the task of placing people.

Throughout Westinghouse, the day-to-day actions of all members of management are guided by a Westinghouse creed, which begins with the statement: "We believe that the most important asset of Westinghouse is its people—in every plant, office and community, wherever they work and live." I can assure you that our adherence to this belief has been faithfully reflected in our handling of the Nuttall situation. We have done, and we will continue to do, everything reasonable to help locate other employment for these people, and to provide the assistance of special benefits for those who may be separated from the company.

I trust the above adequately covers any questions you may have regarding the Nuttall situation.

Sincerely,

DALE McFEATTERS,
Vice President.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 139 years ago, on March 25, 1821, Greeks

rose in arms against the Ottoman Empire which had oppressed them for four centuries. In a long and difficult struggle the Greeks regained their freedom. They have maintained it intact through many difficult challenges to this day.

It is hardly necessary to say that the Greeks are a freedom-loving people. Much of the heritage of Western civilization, including much of our concepts of personal and individual freedom, are in their genesis Greek ideas. Indeed, it is hardly possible to point out an aspect of what we Americans hold to be good and worthwhile in which there is not some important historic root in Greek experience, Greek culture and above all, Greek thought, passed down to us through the ages. It was the ancient Greeks who conceived of the "good life" as the high expression of man's existence and who elaborated the conditions and reasons for the "good life," which have been so pervasively influential in Western civilization.

Greek ideas are by no means confined to Western civilization; their influence has been truly universal. The thought of the ancient Greeks civilized and informed the early Arab empires and traveled through the Arabs to the West; Greek ideas and Greeks informed the Persians, the Indians and traveled through Russia and into China. That a people capable of such brilliance and such contribution to civilization should have fallen under the domination of an alien power was to be deplored. Equally, their reemergence to freedom, the anniversary of which is celebrated on March 25, is a cause of celebration not only for the Greeks.

Greek War of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly fitting and proper that we commemorate the 139th anniversary of the Greek War of Independence against the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The glory and grandeur that was ancient Greece passed away and was followed by a long period of oblivion and foreign control of the Greek Peninsula. The successful battles that the fiercely independent people of Greece waged were productive; complete independence was achieved and universally recognized in 1832. Today, Greece stands as one of the bulwarks of the Western world against the ever-dangerous menace of communism.

Equally notable was the heroic work of the Greek people in World War II, and the period immediately following. They fought vigorously and effectively against the Fascist invaders and Nazi hordes, and in the postwar period struggled relentlessly to free their country from armed Communist rule.

However, Mr. Speaker, we do have an area in which our continued interest is necessary in relation to our friendly

contacts with Greece and its people. Greece, as much as any other country, suffers from the inequities in the immigration and refugee laws, and President Eisenhower should be commended for his earnest plea to produce a practical revision of immigration quotas. When Congress tackles this situation, the Greek quota will be one that fairness dictates should be greatly revised.

I am heartened by the great number of Members who recall this Greek independence day, which remembrance symbolizes the appreciation of the American people to a loyal partner in the lineup of free nations.

The Future for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Congress will shortly be considering legislation now in the Ways and Means Committee, dealing with the problems of the aged, I believe the Members will be interested in a series of articles prepared for Ray Henry, which appeared in more than 100 newspapers throughout the country during January and February.

The first and summary report follows:

THE FUTURE FOR THE AGED

(By Ray Henry)

Retirement will lose much of its sting in the 1960's.

Big improvements in pensions and retirement security can be expected. Medical care will be better and easier to get. More adequate housing will be built. Scientists will find new and important ways to provide better health in old age.

I feel safe in painting this sunny picture for this reason:

The Government, business, labor, and health organizations have combined their efforts in the past 10 years to make old age more secure and worth while. Those efforts, now starting to pay off, are still being expanded.

The biggest changes in recent years have occurred in retirement security. And, it's in this area that major improvements will be made in the 1960's.

Retirement security has largely come in two forms since the beginning of the 1950's: Improvements in social security and the other government retirement programs and the addition of many private pensions plans for employees.

Here's what can be expected in the 1960's from these two forms of old age security:

Social security will be expanded a number of times. People in the higher income brackets will find more of their income taxed and, as a result, be entitled to higher retirement payments. People now getting social security, particularly those getting relatively small payments, will find their payments more than keeping up with changes in the cost of living.

The benefits of private pension plans will be raised and many employers will start providing—for the first time—pension benefits for their employees.

Railroad retirement will be improved along with social security, but military retire-

ment and Civil Service retirement—already excellent programs—won't be changed much. In fact, military men may be required to contribute to the cost of their retirement program.

Added together, the changes in the retirement security programs will mean that a larger chunk of an individual's working income will be replaced by retirement income.

Thus, instead of retiring with an income which is only about 25 percent of what a person was receiving from his work, he'll have 35 or 40 percent replaced in retirement income.

Now take the other areas of concern for older people:

Health: Two big improvements will come in this area. Scientists will find ways of preventing ill health and in treating illness when it occurs. Prepaid health insurance plans will cover many more older people.

From research which started in the mid-1950's, scientists are beginning to find answers to the diseases which come with old age and to the riddle of what causes people to age.

Out of this research, will come ways to treat the diseases and to prevent them.

In one way or another, the Government and private industry will find ways to provide medical care at low cost for retired people in the 1960's. It's almost sure to come in the form of health insurance coverage.

The chances are good that the basic protection will be provided under the social security program, just as the basic protection against economic want is now provided.

In addition, the Nation's medical doctors will add geriatrics—the treatment of the diseases of old age—as a specialty to their medical schools and profession.

Housing: Many more older people will be able to find good housing especially adapted to their needs. This includes apartments, individual homes, retirement villages and nursing homes.

This will result because retired people—due to better incomes—will be able to afford better housing and because home builders will find such housing a lucrative market.

The Government will establish controls on the conditions under which nursing homes will exist, both as to the construction of such homes and their operation.

The Government will also provide both financial assistance and mortgage guarantees to older people wanting to build or buy housing to suit their needs.

Employment: With improvements in private pension plans and higher social security benefits, fewer older people will want to continue working after their normal retirement age. And, employers will be less willing to let them work.

There will be an increase in the programs under which employers will allow their employees to gradually retire. But, it's doubtful whether this practice will become widespread in the 1960's.

Older people wanting part-time employment to supplement their income will find additional opportunities, beyond those which existed in the 1950's. But, most oldsters who want to continue working will have to set up their own businesses.

U.S. Space and Missiles Programs To Advance U.S. Security and Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning, in the Science and Astronau-

tics Committee, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army, retired, made an excellent and timely statement on U.S. space and missile programs to advance U.S. security and our economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am including this statement which I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people:

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED) BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 28, 1960

First, let me say how pleased I am to have this opportunity to appear before this committee. Few things are more important to our country, and in fact to the Western world, today than a well administered, adequately supported space program. It has been most reassuring to have seen the increased support given our space program during the past year. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Keith Glennan, has been doing a splendid job and if given adequate support, he will, unquestionably, in my opinion, close any gap that now may exist between our own program and that of the Soviets.

The purpose of my being here, as I understand it, is to testify on the proposed bill amending the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, H.R. 9675. I have personal views on the act and I am pleased to have the opportunity to present them. In doing so, however, I would like to express the view that the administration of the act usually will reflect the methods and manner of doing business of the Administrator. Dr. Glennan has been doing an exceptionally fine job within the framework of the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. His recommendations for change, therefore, must be given our most serious consideration. I have no doubt that, with the changes made as he suggests, he will continue to carry on as successfully as he has in the past and, undoubtedly, more successfully. Nevertheless, since I have been asked to present my personal views, I am doing so, not in any sense as a criticism of the present administration, but in an effort to strengthen our administration of our national space programs in the future. In doing so, I would like to comment on specific points.

The first point that I would like to discuss is quite fundamental and it has to do with military and nonmilitary space activities. I realize that the proposed bill is intended to see that "responsibility for planning and directing nonmilitary space activities is placed directly and unequivocally in one agency, NASA."

I agree entirely that this is what we should seek to do; assign responsibility for planning and directing to one agency. I am of the view, however, that there is but one space program and that one cannot physically separate the nonmilitary and the military space activities. In this respect our space endeavors parallel closely those in our atomic programs. We must have one overall space agency adequately supported from which we will take for military application all the technical information that appears to have military usefulness. I would add that there is only this aspect of the space program that is in common with our atomic program. I recall, several years ago, frequently hearing the observation that we should set up a "Manhattan" type project for space. This was really impracticable because our space programs had, in fact, already begun, and contributions were being made to our space programs by hundreds of industries scattered throughout the country. Our atomic program, however, began from an idea, and all

the work could be initially isolated. Our space program began in the Department of Defense and only because of failures in judgment and decisionmaking did it become necessary to establish NASA. Since there is now a "military" program in being and also a "nonmilitary" program under NASA, the assumption seems to be that these should be continued in this manner. Actually, except for what is essentially product improvement, little progress will be made in the Pentagon without drawing upon the technology, materials, and systems developed by NASA in the future. And, in the foreseeable future, if in fact it is not partially true today, the frontier of knowledge will be pushed back by NASA's funding and endeavors almost exclusively. It is important therefore that NASA be given the full responsibility for our space program and that its efforts be so organized as to enable it to provide whatever is necessary for our military program from its own research and development work. I would not recommend considering two separate programs. This will surely mean continued duplication and lack of coordination. Furthermore, if the decisionmaking process in the Pentagon continues under the present JCS system, as they have in the past, it seems reasonable to assume that some essential military programs will be held back, programs that otherwise would be aggressively advanced under the sponsorship of NASA.

I agree entirely with the elimination of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. One can understand why it was established, looking back upon the immediate post-sputnik I period. However, I do not believe that its composition was such as to enable it to contribute a very great deal to the efforts of NASA. I do think that the Administrator of NASA should have available to him the advice of the best council that could be appointed. The Administrator of NASA is charged with the expenditure of funds, the planning and administration of a sizable amount of money. I think that it would be in the interest of the Administrator of NASA, Congress, and the country as a whole, to provide a council consisting of our most able men who are technically well informed in matters concerning NASA. I would point out the parallel between the practice of industry in which a board of directors is made available to top management. To draw another parallel, the commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission fill a somewhat similar role. In brief, therefore, I agree with the elimination of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. However, I do believe that there should be established a space council that is immediately responsive to the needs of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In making this recommendation, one can anticipate the objection of conflict of interests that may be raised. I believe, however, if the composition of the Board were in the main scientific rather than defense industry oriented, that this objection could be dealt with. In any event, the objection of "conflict of interests" is potentially present in almost every situation involving a citizen who comes to Washington to serve the interests of the country as a whole. The fact that this conflict exists should not be cause for unfavorable action on this recommendation, in my opinion.

If my observations on the need for one overall, well-supported space program are valid, then I believe that there is a need for a civilian-military liaison office. This should be established to assure the smooth flow of scientific and technical information from NASA to the Department of Defense. A comparable office has existed between the AEC and the Department of Defense and it has been most successful. This I know from personal association with it for a number of years.

I agree with the changes in the Patent Law. The present law acts to discourage industry from working for NASA.

I believe that it would be well to consider carefully, and to discuss thoroughly, the problem of "in house" work. When the AEC was established, it was anticipated that the technical information coming from the fundamental and applied research of the AEC would be made available to American industry. This seemed to be a very sound approach to the problem because of the very great cost of undertaking research and development in nuclear physics. Our experience, to date, suggests that while there has been some flow of information, there has been a lot less than American industry has anticipated. In fact, there is a strong feeling on the part of some industries that "in house" work has continued to grow and expand far beyond that anticipated when the AEC was established. There is a fundamental problem involved here, that of whether or not we can meet the challenges of the space age through the free enterprise system or whether or not we must rely upon Government research, development, and production of all the materials and systems that will go into an adequate space program. If we are to support the free enterprise system, then a consistent and clear effort must be made to place contracts with industry for research, development, and production. It is realized that sufficient "in house" research must be done to provide yardsticks to the Government that will be used to measure the adequacy of nongovernmental work. But this should be the limit of the "in house" work and the objectives should be to maximize the amount of work placed with industry. I would like to add a final point in connection with this discussion. A true space age will only be realized when our entire economy reflects the technology of the space age in consumer products that will come out of the space age programs, and they will number in the thousands in time, and will have tremendous impact upon our overall standards of living. From these consumer products will come ideas that can, in turn, be applied to our space technology. This regenerative process can be continued to the betterment of both programs and through its continuance we will be able to develop an economy that will, in turn, be able to support an adequate space program. To follow the Soviet system of doing all work in government facilities with a maximum concentration upon a "nonconsumer" technology would be very shortsighted indeed.

Trujillo's Policy of Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago when I spoke out against Trujillo's policy of murder, the Washington, D.C., police urgently recommended that I carry a gun. They had had experience over many years with Trujillo's gangsters.

The astute United Press International Latin American reporter, Henry Raymond, writes in today's Washington Daily News about the most recent Trujillo murder plot to come to light.

It is no wonder that Trujillo refused to allow the Inter-American Peace Com-

mission to cross his borders. He knew they would find evidence of terror, torture, and murder. I hope that the Organization of American States will soon make a formal statement to deplore this lack of cooperation and the jungle morality imposed by Trujillo in the so-called Dominican Republic.

The seconds are ticking away. Trujillo and his policy of murder will soon be but dark and bloody pages in a history book.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I include hereafter the text of Mr. Raymont's story:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 28, 1960]

**DIPLOMAT ORDERED TO SLAY COLLEAGUE—
PEACE GROUP HEARS OF DOMINICAN PLOT**
(By Henry Raymont)

The Inter-American Peace Commission is studying evidence purporting to show that the Dominican Republic is operating a vast espionage net in the Americas, using terror and murder against its opponents, it was revealed today.

The evidence was supplied by Pablo Giudicelli Velezquez, who resigned last month as second secretary of the Dominican Embassy in Costa Rica after disobeying alleged orders to kill his superior, Chargé d'Affaires Alfredo Fernandez Simo.

Photostatic copies of the document sent confidentially to the Commission were made available to the United Press International.

PLAN

They accused Col. John W. Abbes Garcia, former chief of the Dominican Military Intelligence Service, of ordering Senor Giudicelli to shoot Senor Fernandez on the Embassy grounds and then invoke diplomatic immunity for himself. The reasons given were that Senor Fernandez refused to return to the Dominican Republic and was "going over to the enemy."

Senor Giudicelli replied he could not understand the order, especially in the light of a letter from Vice President Joaquin Balaguer indicating he was sympathetically considering a critical report on Government activities submitted by Senor Fernandez.

Another message from Ciudad Trujillo came the following day saying:

"Do what you were told in earlier cable and then you come. Cable from Chancery is nothing but a smokescreen to keep that traitor quiet and allow you to act. John Abbes."

When Senor Giudicelli stalled and asked to come home for more specific instructions, another message signed by Abbes followed: "January 24—in reference to today's cable. Do not return without executing operation. John Abbes."

The documents recalled allegations that Jesus de Galindez, missing Columbia University instructor who was an avowed foe of Dictator Rafael L. Trujillo, was kidnapped and killed in 1956 on orders of the Dominican Government.

Sources reported that the Dominican code book given to the Commission contains the word "Galindez" but no explanation was offered of the context in which it appeared.

In his letter to the Commission, Senor Giudicelli said that the Dominican Embassy in Costa Rica shielded a huge network of espionage in that country as well as in many others in the Americas.

The 28-year-old diplomat now living at the Venezuelan Embassy in San Jose offered to testify before the Peace Commission. But he urged that steps first be taken to protect his relatives in the Dominican Republic from reprisals.

Senor Giudicelli said he and Senor Fernandez received numerous anonymous threats

since they resigned from their embassy posts February 4. Senor Fernandez has left Costa Rica for Colombia.

The Peace Commission is studying Venezuelan charges that the Dominican Republic has committed flagrant violations of human rights which are contributing to the unrest in the Caribbean. When the group last week asked to make a factfinding visit to the island, the Dominican Government turned it down arguing that such an investigation was a violation of its internal affairs.

Colonel Abbes has denied the report in a statement released in Ciudad Trujillo.

Medical and Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, March 23 I placed in the Appendix of the Record, page A2634, a speech that I gave before the American Academy of General Practice—physicians—at Kansas City, Mo. Three weeks later I gave the same speech before the convention of Missouri insurance agents in St. Louis, Mo. As I stated when I placed this in the Record, I prepared this speech to be delivered to these seemingly diverse groups. In this speech I discuss the general background of the problem that our society faces of medical care and hospital care for the aged.

I had expressed the belief in that speech that the tremendous progress made in our American society in advancing the well-being of all American citizens had made ineffective the demagogery which was based upon using the Federal Government as a means of transferring wealth from the have to the have-nots. This belief is right now being placed to a more severe test than I had anticipated. I am wondering if indeed it is true that we can have a rational national debate on the subject of Federal spending.

A pressure group which is probably the most effectively organized for political action of any group in our society today has apparently decided to use the problem of medical and hospital care for the aged as an issue to test whether or not this kind of demagogery can still be used successfully. This group is the Americans for Democratic Action, of which the most powerful segment is the Political Committee on Education of the CIO-AFL, dominated by Walter Reuther, a member of the ADA executive committee. The COPE of the CIO-AFL apparently has decided to abandon the issue of the Landrum-Griffin bill for the 1960 campaign and see whether or not they cannot make the Forand bill which professes to meet an aspect of the problem of the medical and hospital care for the aged do in its stead.

Those eligible for disability benefits would not be covered, nor would the measure provide for payments to mental or tuberculosis hospitals.

Despite the fact that old age is relative, and based upon physiological changes, the Social Security Act bases it on birthdays—65 for a man, 62 for a woman.

By this standard, there are now some 15.5 million Americans over 65 who can be called aged.

This group is living evidence that we have the finest system of scientific medicine in the world, and that our standards of living are unparalleled in history.

Each year, our older population will increase. And by 1970 this fortunate Nation can expect to have 20 million people over 65.

But the growing numbers of our aged have, to some extent, caught us unprepared. For example, we are only beginning to understand the waste of human resources involved in arbitrary retirement of these people because of their chronological age.

And so millions of men and women—many of them as healthy and as capable as they were at 40—are shelved long before they should be, long before they want to be.

With retirement, cash income usually drops. And at the same time, the need for health care services increases until it is about twice that of the younger adult.

It is this combination of lower income and greater need for health services that has led some well-meaning people to believe that medical expense is the most critical problem besetting our aged population.

In their opinion, only the Federal Government can provide an adequate answer.

Against this background, let us examine the premises upon which the supporters of H.R. 4700 base their arguments.

Although the health needs of our older people may be greater than those in other age groups, are the aged too poor to pay for their own medical care?

The answer is that some are, but the overwhelming majority are not.

We are told that three-fifths of all people 65 and over have less than \$1,000 annual income.

Although in one sense accurate, it would be hard to find a more misleading statistic.

It is equally accurate and just as misleading to state that in 1957—the most recent year to which that misleading figure applies—63.7 percent of all Americans had incomes of \$1,000 or less per year.

In 1957 almost half of those persons over 14 years of age also had incomes of \$1,000 or less per year. And 47 percent of those between the ages of 14 and 65 had incomes below \$1,000 a year.

Supposing we organize a social club with only two requirements for membership: First, that no wives had incomes of their own; and second that all husbands earned at least \$25,000 a year.

If we used the same statistical techniques as those employed in compiling the figure of "three-fifths of all people 65 and over have less than \$1,000 annual income," we could come up with this statement:

Half the members of this social club have incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. Obviously, the money income figure cited by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for those 65 and over is of little help to us in considering the financial problems of the aged.

Income drops after retirement, yes. But no age group is likely to have as favorable a liquid asset position as the aged, 74 percent of whom now own liquid assets in one form or another.

Furthermore, the needs of the aged person are usually modest. The heavy expenses of raising a family are behind. For the most part, homes are paid for. In fact, according to OASI, "almost three in every four beneficiary couples owned their own homes—most of them free of mortgage—and the median equity in nonfarm homes for the homeowners was \$8,360."

Only 4 percent live in the homes of relatives.

A survey in 1957 by the National Opinion Research Center determined that only 9.6 percent of those interviewed would be unable to pay a medical bill of \$500.

And so when we consider the financial resources of the aged, we can do it sensibly only if we know how many have income from employment, social security, pensions, annuities, savings, investments, insurance, or other assets.

We can only measure financial resources intelligently if we consider them in terms of family income and assets, not individual income and assets.

And when we attempt to figure out the number of people who cannot afford adequate health care, we must know how many already receive it from a religious group, a fraternal group, through membership in a union, as ex-seamen, as members of the Armed Forces, as professional courtesy, as members of specific religious orders, as veterans entitled to compensation and care.

We know, for instance, that 16 percent of the aged are public welfare recipients. As such, under federally aided public assistance programs, they are eligible to receive medical care.

We do not know the answers to questions like these:

How much do the families of the aged help out? And how many of our older people are affluent?

My point is that the economic problems of older people are not only complex and diverse, but difficult to analyze precisely. Yet it is suggested that we take a serious and irreversible legislative action, with tremendously important consequences, with no real guideposts.

We are being asked to grope our way through the statistical darkness on the off-chance that we will stumble into an effective solution.

No one denies that there are instances of severe hardship among our older people—or among any other age group, for that matter. Such cases do exist, although to what degree we can only guess.

Certainly the weight of sound evidence seems to suggest one conclusion: The financial and health problems of the aged have been considerably exaggerated by the proponents of Forand-type legislation. And on the basis of

the facts as we presently know them, it is impossible to justify the creation of a massive Federal mechanism for compulsory national health insurance—even though that mechanism would deal only with a single and somewhat artificially determined category.

Implicit in the thinking of those who support H.R. 4700 is the belief that the health care needs of older people can be conveniently separated from their other needs. Nothing could be a greater mistake. Some of our aged have many needs—in housing, in recreation, in preparation for retirement, in finding acceptance, and understanding within the community, in developing new interests, in using talents, and capabilities.

As an example of how interrelated the needs of the aged can be, a former housing commissioner of the State of New York has pointed out that hospital confinement of older people could be reduced by 20 percent if adequate housing were made available for them.

PRIVATE NURSING HOME LAW WHICH I SPONSORED

Further, the Nation's doctors have repeatedly stated that no person, regardless of age, needs to forgo a physician's services because of inability to pay.

Expert medical testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee establishes another point: the aged have individual health needs. As Dr. Frederick C. Swartz told the Ways and Means Committee:

Care for any segment of our population—the aged included—calls for a cooperative attack on the problem by nurses, doctors, hospitals, social workers, insurance companies, community leaders, and others. It requires flexibility of medical technique—an ingredient which would unquestionably vanish the moment Government establishes a health program from a blueprint calling for mass treatment.

In the case of the aged, their health problem primarily involves acute illness and the so-called degenerative diseases. In a very large percentage of cases, the main need is not for an expensive hospital stay or a surgical operation, but for medical care at home or in the doctor's office. In other cases, the important requirement is nursing care in the patient's home, or the home of relatives. And in still others, custodial care in a nursing home, or public facility may be the only answer. The point is that the medical needs of this particular segment of the aged are subject to countless variations.

The Forand bill, let me point out, wishes not only to grant the aged population most needy assistance but also to move the Federal Government into the very area of medical care where private insurance is now most effective—the area of hospitalization and surgery.

Forty-second Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has acted not only like a

powerful steamroller smothering and pulverizing everything within reach, but it has also been like a deadly and devouring monster, putting an end to the hopes and aspirations of helpless neighboring peoples by enslaving them. The Byelorussians were one of the first victims of Russian communism in the 1920's, and they have been suffering under its tyranny since then.

For centuries these liberty-loving and rugged fighters for freedom have lived under Russian autocracy, but they have not bowed their heads to their oppressors. They had long fought, but had not been successful in their unequal struggle against imperial Russian forces. In the First World War, when the czar's autocracy was overthrown, and the people felt free, they proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, and founded the Byelorussian National Republic. That was the beginning of a new era for the Byelorussian people. In their free country they worked hard, prepared to defend their freedom and enjoyed life under their democratic republic. But from the outset their very existence as a free people was under serious threat, and the Red Army of the Soviets was the deadliest of these. Early in 1921 Byelorussia was attacked, overrun, and soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus, at the end of more than 2 years of freedom and independence Byelorussians once more lost their freedom. Fortunately, however, even under the most ruthless of tyrannies, these people have not given up hope for their freedom and they still cherish the memory of their independence of those 2 years. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day, we wish that they may attain freedom and happiness in their homeland.

Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.: What a Difference a Decade Makes—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my series of insertions in the RECORD on the general topic of "Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.," I would like to introduce further excerpts from the Fairfield County Trust Co.'s economic newsletter and fact sheet on the growth and development of the county.

Today's excerpt from the company's August-September 1959 issue follows:

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A DECADE MAKES
Ten years ago, Fairfield County boasted 488,000 residents. They had buying incomes of \$883 million and "plunked" down \$518 million for retail purchases. Today some 632,000 people call the county home, a gain of 30 percent. Between the end of 1958 and mid-1959 alone, population rose 3.3 percent. Buying incomes total \$1.6 billion now, up 82 percent from 1948, placing Fairfield County 28th among the big income counties of the Nation. A decade ago, it was 32d. Those

retail purchases—\$961 million last year—ranked the county 30th largest in the Nation, a spurt of 86 percent over 1948 when the county ranked 40th.

On the basis of buying incomes per family, Fairfield County now holds the No. 2 spot nationally—topped only by Montgomery County, Md., in the Washington, D.C., suburban area. Ten years ago, Fairfield ranked 10th richest. The changes on a per capita income basis are even greater. A decade ago, Fairfield ranked 19th nationally; now it stands second in the Nation, with San Francisco first.

BUILDING FAIRFIELD COUNTY

By the looks of the first half, residential construction in Fairfield County may easily match the big boom years of 1952-55, when more than 6,000 dwelling units were put up annually.

In the first 6 months of 1959, some 3,000 dwelling units were added, compared to 2,000 for the same time a year ago—a 50 percent jump. Both private homes and apartments shared in the gain, with 2,300 houses under way in the 1959 period compared with 1,700 last year. The 700 new apartment units topped the 1958 period's 300. Cost of new residential building soared 63 percent—from \$35.5 million for the January-June 1958 period to \$57.5 million this year.

Indications are that this heightened level of residential building will continue. July showed Fairfield County mortgage recordings of \$35 million as against \$19.5 million a year ago. Deeds numbered 1,540; July 1958 showed 1,000.

Nonresidential building is booming, too; \$33.5 million worth of commercial, manufacturing, educational, and science buildings, plus public works and utility projects, were constructed in the first 6 months of 1959, according to the F. W. Dodge Corp. The figure last year was \$24.5 million.

Since the 1950 census, masons, electricians, and carpenters have plastered, wired, and hammered away at 56,000 new dwelling units in Fairfield County, according to the Connecticut State Housing Division. In April 1950, a count of noses showed better than 154,000 private homes and apartments in the county. As of mid-year 1959, the number had leaped to over 210,000—a jump of some 36.6 percent.

BULGING PURSES

Fairfield County far outstripped the Nation in retail sales performance in 1958, according to the latest report of Sales Management, the "bible" of the retailers. The county's increase in total spending between 1957 and 1958—a period hobbled with economic blues—amounted to 4 percent, the United States as a whole managed 0.3 percent. Recession or no, families continued to spend. Per household retail sales rose from \$5,229 to \$5,360. Every retail line except autos shared in the gains. But the auto sales dip was well below the national average, 8 percent compared to 12 percent for the United States.

The county's "up-tilted" income-distribution pattern helps explain this resiliency in sales. Four-fifths of Fairfield County families had buying incomes of \$4,000 or better in 1958. This compares to three-fifths of families throughout the Nation. Matter of fact, better than one-third of Fairfield County families had spendable incomes of \$7,000 or more, versus one-fifth for the United States.

And they spent. This market—whose population equals New Hampshire's and whose income matches Rhode Island's—spent as much as the entire State of Montana in 1958. The food bill of Fairfield County residents was as great as Vermont's and North Dakota's put together; its gas and oil sales matched Nevada's; its auto sales were as much as Idaho's; its lumber and building

sales equaled New Mexico's, and its furniture and appliance purchases amounted to Utah's.

Checks that Fairfield County businessmen and residents write to pay employees and buy goods and services are an important measure of economic activity. July totaled \$423 million, 10 percent over \$385 million in July 1958. Precession July 1957 checks were \$389 million. Stanford's gain was 16 percent, Bridgeport's 7 percent. U.S. increase was 14 percent.

For the first 7 months of 1959, Fairfield County's debits hit \$2.8 billion, versus \$2.5 billion a year ago. Stamford was up 17 percent, Bridgeport 7 percent, the county 10 percent, the Nation 9 percent. Meanwhile, county residents continued to stash away dollars in commercial banks, savings banks and savings and loan associations. Yearend 1958 total was \$945 million, up 12.5 percent from 1957.

Statement of Policy of the National Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been awakened to the unfortunate fact that military training manuals have gone well beyond in subject matter what most of us feel properly belongs in such publications.

I have before me a letter—and I am sure this communication has been received by every Member of Congress—setting forth the views and position of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

This communication should have the widest possible circulation because it will add to a better understanding of the action taken by the Secretary of the Air Force in the training manual fiasco, and of the basic principles and concepts involved in the matter.

I insert at this point in the RECORD, the letter from the Reverend Roy G. Ross, general secretary of the national council, accompanied by an attachment listing those representing denominations which give wholehearted endorsement of the national council's statement of policy:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., March 22, 1960.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The prompt action taken by the Secretary of the Air Force closes its training manuals to infiltration by propaganda against churches and religious institutions. However, the appearance of such defamatory matter in Government publications heavily underscores the extreme dangers to the American principles of freedom. The dangers lie in the lending or employment of governmental power or media, at any official level, to induce or coerce regimentation of expression or to make some pattern of civic thought or religious opinion a test of loyalty, or to equate con-

cern for the rights of men with infidelity to the American ideal.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and its constituent communions are and always have been unalterably opposed to communism. Its unqualified conviction was expressed in the council's policy statement of May 19, 1953, that:

"No body of people is more concerned to combat communism than the church groups of our country" and "these churches are the greatest bulwarks of freedom in the United States."

Such conviction was reasserted in the recent resolution of the council's general board adopted last June—"reaffirming the consistent position of the National Council of Churches expressed in many official actions opposing the evils, the violation of human rights by Communist and other tyrannies."

For the very reason that the National Council of Churches and its constituent communions hold this unalterable and consistent opposition to communism in any part of the world, the council, with equal determination, also opposes and condemns—and will continue to oppose and condemn—all efforts, official or private, subtle or overt, intended or otherwise, to use agencies of any branch of Government or media of mass communication under Government regulation to defame church institutions or leaders, to subject church loyalty to the poison of innuendo, to differentiate between religious groups in point of patriotism, and thus to undermine religion itself, the centuries-old nature of the American people as a religious people, and the essential unity of our Nation in its life and freedom.

Such efforts and practices not only are a patent violation of the free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, but also are violations of that amendment's guarantees of freedom of expression and opinion and of every citizen's right to discuss openly and without fear the practices and policies of his Government. They set a pattern which is profoundly un-American and which, unless opposed and checked, can inculcate familiar totalitarian methods for manipulating the people's mind.

The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to secure religious liberty and those associated liberties from the invasion of civil authority, and to place them beyond the reach of political or official control, or of private malevolence insinuating itself into media operating under Government sanction.

Precisely because of the national council's unalterable loyalty to these American constitutional principles, it insists not only on the right but also on the duty of the churches and of religious communions and their members to study and comment upon issues, whether political, economic, or social, which affect human relations, the dignity of the individual, and the right of all men everywhere to liberty under law and justice.

To serve these noble and thoroughly democratic and American ends, the national council conducts itself as the cooperative medium through which 33 Protestant and Orthodox communions in the United States focus the light of the Christian faith on all phases of American life and American concern. That it may so serve fully and loyally, the national council will continue to oppose not only communism and any other form of tyranny over the mind of man, but also all efforts public or private, to subject the churches of America and their representatives to any ordeal of suspicion, innuendo, and hysteria.

Sincerely yours,

ROY G. ROSS,
General Secretary.

APPENDIX A

We, the duly elected and authorized representatives of denominations, as indicated, fully and wholeheartedly endorse and support the statement of policy of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. as set forth in the attached letter dated March 22, 1960, by Roy G. Ross, general secretary, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.:

Norman J. Baugher, Church of the Brethren; Zoltan Beky, Hungarian Reformed Church in America; Eugene Carson Blake, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; Archbishop Bokdan, the most reverend metropolitan, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America; Gaines M. Cook, Disciples of Christ; Charles J. Darlington, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends; Franklin Clark Fry, United Lutheran Church in America; Most Rev. Leon Grochowski, Polish National Catholic Church of America; Kenneth G. Hamilton, Moravian Church; James E. Hoffman, Reformed Church in America; Fred Hoskins, general council, Congregational Christian; Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America; J. H. Jackson, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.; Alfred Jensen, American Evangelical Lutheran Church; Arthur Lichtenberger, Protestant Episcopal; James A. Millard, Jr., Presbyterian Church in the United States; Reuben H. Mueller, Evangelical United Brethren; Glenn A. Reece, Five Years Meeting of Friends; Roy H. Short, Methodist; Sion Archbishop, Primate of the Diocese of the Armenian Church of America; B. Julian Smith, Christian Methodist Episcopal; Edwin H. Tuller, American Baptist Convention; James E. Wagner, United Church of Christ Evangelical and Reformed; W. J. Walls, African Methodist Episcopal Zion.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*-----Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*-----Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.

Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*-----
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*-----
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*-----
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*-----
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*-----
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*-----
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*-----
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*-----
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*-----The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*-----

Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*-----
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*-----The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*-----Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*-----
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*-----
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*-----4635 Mass. Ave.

Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*-----2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*-----
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*-----
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*-----
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*-----
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*-----

Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*-----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*-----
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*-----
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*-----
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*-----5101 Macomb St.

Ellender, Allen J., *La.*-----
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*-----
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*-----
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*-----5519 Uppingham
St., Chevy Chase,
Md.

Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*-----
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*-----
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*-----
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*-----
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club
R. I.

Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*-----
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*-----
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*-----
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*-----
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.

Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
way, Chevy Chase,
Iowa, Md.

Hill, Lister, *Ala.*-----
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*-----Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*-----
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.

Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*-----
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*-----
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*-----
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*-----
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*-----

Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*-----3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*-----4929 Hillbrook
Lane

Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*-----
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*-----
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*-----
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*-----
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*-----
Long, Russell B., *La.*-----
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*-----

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*-----2930 Chesapeake
St.

McClellan, John L., *Ark.*-----
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*-----
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*-----
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.

Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*-----
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*-----4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okla.

Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thurston B., *Ky.*-----
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*-----
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*-----122 Schotts
Court NE.

Murray, James E., *Mont.*-----The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*-----

O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*-----
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*-----
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*-----
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*-----
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*-----
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*-----

Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*-----2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F.,
Kans.

Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*-----
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*-----
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine.*

Sparkman, John, *Ala.*-----4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*-----
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*-----
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*-----
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*-----

Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N. J.

Williams, John J., *Del.*-----
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*-----
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*-----Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*-----

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church,

Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.

Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.

Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.

Mr. Justice Whitaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.

Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.

Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.

Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.

Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whitaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whitaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by Hon. A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma, at the 60th Annual Dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Providence, R.I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, March 17, 1960, the Society of Friendly Sons of Providence, R.I., gathered for its 60th annual dinner. This dinner is the central secular function of St. Patrick's Day, always religiously and enthusiastically observed in the State of Rhode Island.

The society's toast to the United States indicates the patriotic tone of the dinner; and from this U.S. Senate in years past have gone our colleagues to add luster to the night, and oratory to this toast to our Nation.

To call the roll of only a few, the names of Senators Kennedy, Symington, Mansfield, McNamara, O'Mahoney, and Truman come to mind. Glowing comments on the appearance this year of the junior Senator from Oklahoma are summed up in the delighted expression of the president of the Society of the Friendly Sons, Mr. Nelson G. Burke. "The address of Senator A. S. Mike Monroney," President Burke writes, "was most inspiring and the rapt attention of his audience was in itself a tribute."

As if it had been planned that way, the Senator from Oklahoma's emphasis on our weapon of faith in this nuclear age was in perfect balance with the address of the Most Reverend Paul Hagarty, bishop of the Bahamas.

Bishop Hagarty spoke of the world revolt of the underprivileged, seeking freedom from ignorance, freedom from starvation, freedom from the tyranny of economic pressure. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] spoke of the material power of "the scientific sixties" to lift the underprivileged—fortified by our religious faith to win the confidence, the minds, and hearts of men.

I request that the address by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a document of encouraging science, sound economy, and inspiring philosophy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY BEFORE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK, PROVIDENCE, R.I., MARCH 17, 1960

What an honor it is to be chosen as the one to respond to the traditional toast of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick to our own United States.

What an additional honor it is to be chosen as one of the members of such a distinguished panel of participants as the Most Reverend Paul Hagarty, bishop of the Bahamas; the Most Reverend Russell J. McVinnay; Rev. Francis P. Brady; Hon. John P. Hartigan, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals; Hon. Edward B. Hanify, attorney and corporation counsel; and your many other distinguished guests.

Sixty years, sure; and 'tis a long, long time for the Irish to be getting along together. And it is as significant a milestone in the history of the United States as it is in the history of your fine association of Friendly Sons. It runs the gamut of life in these United States. Your 60 years parallel the milestones of our Nation's great progress—from shilleaghs to Chevrolets—from leprechauns to lace curtains—from Shamrocks to solar space.

I am so glad to be in home State of two of our greatest and friendliest Senators: Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and Senator JOHN "O'PASTORE." Theodore's great good humor and the sharp, inclusive wit and eloquence of Johnny make them the Senate's top Democratic team.

Sixty years—a fabulous 60 years in the life of the United States and of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick—is but a tiny dot over the centuries of recorded history. But in these 60 years which you celebrate tonight the dot of the 60 years in history's span is as huge as our planet itself in our progress.

Frontiers of which your founders never dreamed are crossed every hour on the hour. From terrestrial to celestial is the signet of the scientific sixties. Traffic is getting so heavy in outer space that they'll be wanting traffic lights between the moon and the sun and the stars to avoid disastrous collisions.

Your founders, all progressive men, could not be heard in voice beyond this room. Tonight we hear the "beep beep" of Pioneer V's voice from 675,000 miles away—in a few months, perhaps, from the far side of the sun.

The vision of your founders—seafaring men though they might have been—was limited on a clear day to Martha's Vineyard or Nantucket from a few miles offshore. Today we can see from the dark side of Tombstone, Ariz., on our TV or to the dark side of the moon.

Mankind is on the move. We are breaking out of our two-dimensional world and into the third dimension—that of the vertical. For the tens of thousands of years of man's progress from his caves, he has spread out to find new paths to faraway points, as our Pilgrim Fathers did in settling a new continent. As transportation from the covered wagon grew to the train and steamship, his world widened.

With the crossing of each new frontier they sought out the new. That was the spirit that our forefathers brought to this coast and carried on the whaling ships that sailed the Straits of Magellan as they rounded the Horn to the broad Pacific.

Their sons kept on until all the oceans were charted and explored—and then started to explore the jungles, the swamps, and the poles. We've climbed the highest mountains in the world, gone up the Amazon, reached the darkest of Africa. We've crossed the North and South Poles so often that the path looks like a superhighway.

Progress in the pioneer spirit is the stuff of which America is made. But in reality, until the past two decades, with all his travels and explorations, man had scarcely gone farther in one direction than his cave-man ancestor. That was in the direction of the third dimension—the vertical.

Since the Wright brothers first powered flight in 1903 at Kitty Hawk, that dimension has been expanding—first, timidly, to 100 feet—to 500 feet. And now we see at long last man challenging the voids and the vacuums of outer space—venturing into a new dimension with courage and ingenuity.

In the last year we have seen spectacular new things happen in the field of the vertical: referring to Z-52, KC-135, X-15 (Scottie Crossfield—150 miles into outer space), and B-70.

And now we train the astronauts for space. This is not an idle jest or something out of the science comics. It is real. Today we know—or soon will know—more about what man will meet in outer space than Columbus knew about what he would meet as he sailed westward across the Atlantic.

But as we get the signal loud and clear of the scientific sixties, it is not—we are finding—entirely a blessing. Electronics have shrunk distances and put the whole world within range of voice, sound and sight. I could have flown to Paris and back to Newfoundland by jet in the span of time I took to come from Washington to Providence by train today.

And with this constantly shrinking globe have come to mankind powers from new energy sources undreamed of 15 years ago. Rockets with thrust to reach the moon and the sun and the stars. Explosives that can annihilate entire States with their blast. Speeds of ICBMs from outer space that can reach Providence from Moscow—or from the United States to Moscow (it's as short either way) in 19 minutes. These fantastic speeds make interception or defense unlikely, and only by equal power of destruction through retaliation can we make reasonably certain that this catastrophic attack by thermonuclear warfare does not occur.

To be prepared requires our Nation to have the ability to retaliate in equal and certain destructive capacity. Then, and only then, can we feel any sense of security from attack.

Thus, in the dawn of the scientific sixties we find as our forefathers found when they landed on this continent that only the strong can be secure. Then it meant survival of a few dozen lives from Indian attack. Today it means the survival of tens of millions from destruction in the first 10 hours of an atomic war.

I do not mean to make this speech a grim one. I would be less than frank if I did not remind you that at no previous time in our great history have we been as vulnerable to a catastrophic attack if we let weakness erode our strength or our position of leadership in the free world.

This is the challenge to this generation. One-third of the world's people are behind

the Communist Iron Curtain. They total slightly over 1 billion. One-third (another billion) are in the neutral area of the world. And slightly less than one-third reside in the free world.

Both the free world and the neutral world depend perforce upon the leadership of the United States. If we fail ourselves—we fail them as well.

As I see it, we cannot win the cold war with arms—atomic or conventional. We might—yes, we must—prevent it from becoming an atomic world war III. Our decisive strength in weapons alone will not be enough, however, either to prevent the shooting war or win the cold war.

It seems to me that we have one weapon that the Communists can never have. It is the weapon to bridge the chasm between the destructive side of science and the hope for the best era of Christendom. This is the weapon of our faith—of our belief in an Almighty and Divine Power—and that mankind was made in the image of this holy and Supreme Being. It is the belief that we are our brother's keeper. It is our belief in "right makes might" and not in "might makes right." Without that faith, a godless, materialistic power, even with modern arms, cannot achieve a victory. The mind, morals, and spirit of man must control science or else a Frankenstein of science will destroy us.

Given the strength and courage to hold off the destruction of nations by atomic war, we can change the heading emphasis of "science for death" into "science for life." If we have the faith and the determination to serve—as this generation must serve the peoples of the world—we can and will win.

Instead of beating our swords into plowshares we must beat the atom bomb into mankind's greatest servant. Today more than 100 diseases which have plagued mankind since history began are yielding to diagnosis and treatment with atomic isotopes. Through our research in "science for life" we are attacking cancer and other killers that have heretofore been called incurable.

In the field of agriculture, experiments are under way that may produce entirely new food products, through the use of atomic isotopes. New fruits, vegetables, even superior breeds of livestock, may result from these agricultural experiments in changing nature to work better for mankind.

Engineering uses may revolutionize recovery of energy from coal and oil veins through controlled underground explosions of small atomic bombs. Harbors can be opened in many parts of the world, such as South America and Africa, where no ports are available today, through gigantic underground blasts of atomic energy. Canals or reservoir sites likewise may one day yield huge benefits from the conversion of atomic energy from war to peace.

This one-third of the world that is neutral—looking either to the Communist way of life or at our free way—today is in the darkness of the 18th or 19th century. Ordinary fuel such as coal or oil must be shipped halfway around the world to supply the fuel for electrical generators. Consequently, in such countries as Thailand I have seen them burning teakwood and mahogany beneath the boilers of their generators to supply the low current to burn the electric lightbulbs in the tourist hotels. The people there have thus far missed this 20th century.

But with the magic of atomic energy, low-cost atomic reactors can, and someday will be built that can bring an electrical world to the darkest of Africa and to the villages of India. No longer will it be impossible to generate electricity because of the high cost of shipping fuel halfway around the world. A package of uranium, no larger than a package of cigarettes can light and heat a village of 5,000 for an entire year.

Yes, even the miracle of fresh, pure water may be created by breakthroughs with atomic energy. Millions of acres today are desert because the scant supply of surface water is insufficient or out of reach of irrigation works. Yet I have seen the desert of the Middle East transformed in Israel by irrigation into a land as fertile as the Garden of Eden. The magic of water can make the desert bloom and can offer hope for the tens of millions of hungry people who now barely subsist.

Yet at the shoreline of the oceans, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Pacific, and the Atlantic is the world's largest storehouse of water. Its salt content makes it kill instead of grow the produce of the land.

We are nearing breakthroughs with conventional fuels on desalination of this sea water at costs comparable with surface irrigation. When this is achieved, and it is not far away, we can hold out hope to these millions that low-cost machinery either with conventional or atomic power can bring them the water they need to turn their dry, parched lands into rich orange groves and fertile acres to produce food in abundance.

These are but a few of the things that the scientific sixties hold out for us to do. We must retain the faith of our forefathers to pioneer, to show the true and kindly face of Uncle Sam, and to carry out message of faith and good will to the underprivileged people of the world.

This we can do with the same kind of courage, hard work, and sacrifice that America has shown through our long history. The oppression of hate, of distrust, and destruction can be conquered if we use the tools of the scientific sixties as well as our pioneering forebears used the crude tools of their day. Victory will come when we win the hearts and minds of the men of the world, and only faith in our religious life, in our tools and in ourselves will bring it.

To cry out that we must draw back—to be too timid to dare to risk some of our substance for spectacular new gains tomorrow—will mark us, as it has marked many nations during the past 60 years of this society's existence, as powers of the past and not as world powers of tomorrow.

Faith, courage, and work hold out to a nation—willing to strive hard enough for the goal—the eternal blessings of the world's people.

May they say of this generation of Americans that:

We kept the peace through strength and courage.

We lit the lamp of science to shed its brilliance for all mankind.

And thus we blazed the path to a better life for all of the world's people.

Tight Money Policy and High Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put in the RECORD the following resolution on tight money and high interest rates adopted recently by a unanimous vote of the delegates to the annual meeting of the National Housing Conference. It is, I believe, further evidence of the growing concern across the Nation with

regard to attempts to drive interest rates still higher and restrict money even more tightly:

RESOLUTION ON TIGHT MONEY POLICY AND HIGH INTEREST RATES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 15, 1960, BY DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE

The National Housing Conference deplors the tight money policy of the present administration which stifles our whole economy and inflates the cost of housing to home-seekers, homeowners, and tenants and adds to the public cost of servicing existing programs. This tight money policy is pricing millions of families out of the housing market by artificially burdening the public with high interest rates. The FHA rate now is 5½ percent plus one-half percent premium, or an effective rate of 6¼ percent. This compares with the rate of 4¼ percent, plus a one-half percent premium prevailing in 1953. These excessively high interest charges on housing have the effect of taking new housing out of the financial reach of 5 million families who are seeking adequate housing.

We regard the tight money policy as inflationary, unsound, and unfair to home buyers of moderate means. Its effect is to restrict the essential growth of the whole economy.

We call on the administration and on Congress to reverse the tight money policy and to adjust the interest rates down to a reasonable level.

Tribute to L. G. Hardman, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the March issue of Modern Textiles magazine pays tribute to one of Georgia's most outstanding industrialists and business and civic leaders, Hon. L. G. Hardman, Jr., of Commerce, with a cover photograph and an excellent biographical article by Editor Jerome Campbell. Mr. Hardman has been one of the most diligent and able promoters of a vital and progressive textile industry in my State of Georgia and this tribute to his many outstanding accomplishments is richly deserved. I commend Modern Textile magazine for saluting this stalwart Georgian and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the article entitled "Forward-Thinking Hardman of Harmony Grove" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORWARD-THINKING HARDMAN OF HARMONY GROVE

(By Jerome Campbell)

Harmony Grove Mills of Commerce, Ga., is essentially and understandably in the business of manufacturing cloth as a profit-making organization. Its management, however, has always regarded the mill as fulfilling the equally important function of providing jobs and good cash income for the people of the little northeastern Georgia rural community where the mill is located. It was for this purpose mainly that the mill was built back in 1893 by Hardman's grandfather, Dr. William B. J. Hardman, in asso-

clation with several other businessmen of Commerce. The original mill was equipped with 10 spinning frames and 60 looms powered by a wood-fired 150 horsepower steam engine.

In those beginning days, when fabric manufacturing was almost unbelievably simple compared to the complicated present, Harmony Grove Mills turned out sheetings and shirtings which were sold as gray cloth through New York agents. The first sample of cloth made in the mill, deemed good enough for marketing, was sent to Wilkins & Giles in New York. Later its output was sold through Ribinson & Shackleton, a firm some oldtimers may still remember. Early records show that the mill's first cotton was bought at 6 cents a pound; burlap for wrapping the cloth cost 5 cents a yard.

In 1898, Dr. W. B. J. Hardman's son, Dr. Lamartine Griffin Hardman, also a practicing physician, became president of Harmony Grove, a position he held until his death in 1937. Serving as president of the mill was only one of his activities; he practiced medicine with great distinction, being at once a practical country doctor and one of the most skilled and sought-after surgeons in Georgia; he entered politics and was elected Governor of the State for two terms (1927-31).

His son and namesake, L. G. Hardman, Jr., now president of Harmony Grove, spent his boyhood in commerce close to the mill and millworkers. After he graduated from the University of Georgia in nearby Athens in 1930, he worked for a few years supervising the Hardman family farms and orchards. It was in his heart, however, to make a career in textiles. To acquaint himself with the mill's operations, he made it a practice to work in the mill 2 hours or so every night after putting in a full day at his other duties. For this work as a mill trainee he received no pay, but did learn by doing the basic operations in making cotton yarn and cloth.

In 1932 he went to work full time in the mill as assistant to the president with duties encompassing its general operation and management. Within a few years the directors were so impressed with his devotion to his job and his increasing skill as a manager that they put him in full charge of the mill with the title of vice president. Upon his father's death in 1937 at the good age of 81, young Hardman was made president.

Even before he was given that title, Hardman had been doing some serious thinking about the future of Harmony Grove Mills. He had come to the conclusion that the mill was badly in need of thorough modernizing and reequipping. "What we had," he recalls now, "was a 1903 model mill and the year was 1937. We had to modernize to survive."

The task of modernization which Hardman set for the mill and for himself was a not an easy one. Harmony Grove was a small outfit, and modernization is always expensive. The older men among the officers and directors, as old people often are, were inclined to be satisfied with the way things were and to resist the idea of change, especially when change meant incurring substantial expenses. So Hardman carried out his modernization program step by step at a pace sometimes far slower than he liked, but one which was dictated by the circumstances of the mill.

AN EYE ON THE MARKET

As he bought new equipment, he studied the market for fabrics looking for a place where Harmony Grove, with its relatively small production and limited resources, might operate profitably. He found it in the continued making of sheetings for the bag trade and drills for the industrial market; for many years the mill concentrated on these goods.

In the 25 years since Hardman first began his modernizing efforts he has kept at it knowing that modernization is a never-ending process and not something that can be finally achieved and then forgotten. Harmony Grove Mills today is as neat and modern a mill for its kind of production as can be found in the textile industry. Hardman and his associates in management, C. W. Hood, Jr. (whose father and brother were among the mill's original founders) and Johnston McCorkle, superintendent, take an understandable pride in saying that not a piece of machinery in the mill predates 1942 with the exception of a few cards and a couple of spinning frames that have been rebuilt and modernized. Most of the major equipment of cards, spinning frames and looms is far newer, of course; and the process of keeping the mill modern still goes on and will continue to do so, Hardman is determined.

Just as the plant and its equipment have been expanded and modernized, so have the fabrics manufactured been changed to keep up with the times. About 10 years ago the inroads of paper made the production of cloth for the bagging trade increasingly precarious. Hardman and his associates gradually shifted over to apparel fabrics. Today the mill weaves cotton drills, twills and sateens largely for converters and for the work and sports clothing trade; it also makes a range of industrial fabrics.

With a total of 29,000 spindles and 600 looms all manned by some 600 workers, Harmony Grove, while not a giant operation, is nevertheless too big and substantial to be considered a small mill. Hardman, Hood and McCorkle are quite willing to regard it as a medium-sized mill and they are content that it will remain so.

It is their pride and satisfaction, that regardless of size, Harmony Grove is a reasonably profitable operation and that it fulfills, on a scale greater than ever, its original primary function, envisaged by its founders 67 years ago, of serving as a source of employment and wage-earning prosperity for the good people of Commerce (population 3,350) and the surrounding rural areas of Jackson County, Ga.

It is also the pride and satisfaction of Hardman and his associates that Harmony Grove Mills is truly a community operation. Many of the millworkers and their parents were delivered at their births by Hardman's father, Dr. L. G. Hardman, Sr. and his uncle, Dr. W. B. Hardman. For many of them, their jobs in the mill, important as such jobs are, are only one of their breadwinning occupations. Workers at the mill have their own farms which they till in their spare time; many are poultry breeders—an important rural industry in Jackson County.

These mill and country people regard the mill president, L. G. Hardman, Jr., as one of them. He has known most of them all their lives; he and his wife visit them in their homes; and they are accustomed to seeing Hardman in and around the mill day and night. As a past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute (1957-58) Hardman is active in the broad affairs of the textile industry and finds himself on these and other matters doing a great deal of traveling.

But he is never away from Commerce for long. Often on returning from a business trip at night, he will take time to walk through the mill seeing how things are going and chatting with workers on the night shift. He rarely takes a vacation; his business interests including the operation of the mill and the supervision of the Hardman family farms and orchards give him, he says, all the diversion he needs.

A MAN WHO LOVES TEXTILES

Hardman has a great enthusiasm for the textile industry and a warm sense of grati-

tude toward it for providing him with an interesting, and challenging career. He looks back upon his year as president of the ACMI with keen appreciation. It was, he says, one of the happiest years of his life. He is grateful for the opportunity his service as an officer of the association gave him to meet and work closely with other leaders of the industry whom he regards as the finest group of men in the world; men of unsurpassed integrity and good sense.

With so great an enthusiasm for textiles, it goes without saying that Hardman is optimistic about textiles' future. He looks forward to a day when the changing relation of productive capacity to a growing demand will make textile manufacturing more profitable than it has been during his three decades in the industry.

But like all thoughtful leaders of the industry, he is deeply concerned over the growing menace of low-wage foreign competition. He considers the only practicable solution to this danger would be a system imposed by U.S. law of equalizing foreign production costs with production costs in this country. We must give our textile industry and the people who depend on it for a livelihood an opportunity to compete on an equal basis with foreign producers, he says. How such equalizing legislation can be put on the statute books is admittedly a difficult task. But we must all work to achieve it, if our industry is to survive, he firmly believes.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the fact that in the first session of this Congress I introduced H.R. 7687 to restrict the printing of extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The following editorial by Edward Kennedy, assistant editor and publisher of the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula Herald, which appeared in the October 9, 1959, issue of that paper, points up the need for such restriction:

NEWS COMMENTS—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Congress adjourned on September 14. Since then the Senate and House Chambers have been empty and silent. The lawmakers have gone home.

One might expect the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official journal of what is said and done in Congress, to suspend publication with adjournment.

Not so. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD continued to come out daily until October 5—for 3 weeks after adjournment. During that period it was bulkier than usual, the daily issues running to well over 200 pages.

The cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is estimated at more than \$300 a page. So you can see that a lot of the taxpayers' money has been poured into the publication of the activities of a no longer existent session of Congress.

The reason why the RECORD continued to appear daily after Congress had closed shop was to publish the "extension of remarks" of Members of Congress. Theoretically these "extensions" are speeches that Congressmen made. In actuality most of them were never made at all as speeches. They are simply

verbose statements submitted for publication in the RECORD.

Many Congressmen put into the RECORD their "news letters" to their constituents. Since these tracts are intended for the voters at home, it is difficult to see why a Congressman should find it necessary to put them into the RECORD for other Congressmen to read. But apparently they do.

Consider, for example, the lengthy report of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle of Illinois, which begins thus:

"DEAR FRIENDS: As I write my closing newsletter of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the leaves of Washington trees are turning yellow, the grass of the Washington parks and lawns are putting on their fall coats of brown, and eight of my kiddies are back in school, seven in Arlington, Va., and Pat, the oldest, matriculated at Loyola University in Chicago. * * *

Since the adjournment the RECORD has devoted three columns to a description by the Honorable GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota of the annual sun dance of the Ogala Sioux Tribe of Indians at the Pine Ridge Reservation in his district. He says it attracted a lot of people.

The RECORD has also published a moving memorial eulogy by the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULLEN to "a great Bulgarian, Nikola Petkov."

The RECORD has published three columns from the Honorable JOE HOLT, of California, in praise of the part played by the Marquardt Corp., in the industrial development of the San Fernando Valley.

The RECORD has published three columns devoted to a letter from the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, to her constituents on what happened during the session.

"A great historical achievement of this session was the passage of statehood for Hawaii," writes Mrs. BOLTON, who apparently doubts that either her constituents or her fellow Congressmen read newspapers.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD of Michigan took no less than nine columns to tell what happened during the session.

"As I have in the past, I intend to continue my policy of talking things over with my constituents," Mr. BROOMFIELD writes. You bet he will, and at the taxpayers' expense.

The Honorable GERALD R. FORD JR., of Michigan took 2½ pages to set forth his voting record during the session—although his votes had been recorded in the RECORD after each rollcall.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, took a column to attack those who have complained that mail service is slow. His Democratic colleague, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, took 14 columns to publish a speech he delivered in Chicago.

The Honorable GERALD T. FLYNN, of Wisconsin, took six columns to justify his vote against the labor racketeering bill.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, took a column and a half to list the 19 members of the Chicago White Sox who live during the playing season in hotels in his district.

We have rather carefully perused all the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published after the adjournment. We read them at the Monterey Library.

Our considered judgment is this: There is not a word in all this trash that was worthy of publication at the taxpayers' expense. It was just money down the drain.

So much has been wasted in this manner that perhaps a couple of columns more of type won't matter much. So we shall ask our Congressman, Representative CHARLES TEAGUE, to put this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—E. K.

History of Augusta Minutemen Company in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to a history of the Augusta Minutemen Company covering their activities in Augusta County, Va., during World War II, published in the Daily News-Record, of Harrisonburg, Va., on March 22, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL ROLLER GIVES HISTORY AUGUSTA MINUTEMEN COMPANY

(By Gen. Charles S. Roller, Jr.)

PORT DEFIANCE.—Before this generation passes away I would like the people of Virginia, especially the Shenandoah Valley, to know something about the Minutemen companies organized in 1942 and 1943 to guard strategic places in Virginia—the railroads, highways, rivers, and especially train bridges.

We organized our Minutemen which should be called the Virginia Militia, as authorized by the Virginia General Assembly. I was captain of Troop 8 and we had no trouble in forming the largest company in the State.

At the same time, I was also a lieutenant colonel of the National Guard and helped to train men in other features for World War II.

ORDERS FROM RICHMOND

In our Minutemen we had the finest professional and businessmen and farmers. I was contacted daily by special telephone from Richmond. We could not tell about our assignments then.

One of our first calls was for a platoon to hurry to both ends of the Chesapeake & Ohio tunnel between Waynesboro and Charlottesville. The officer carried pistols and the men any kind of rifles or shotguns. We were on duty 14 hours. We saw one suspicious element which was carried to Richmond. We never were told what the results were.

Another night we were ordered to the turn at Buffalo Gap. It was late but we walked the C. & O. tracks looking for bombs or obstacles. The world was not aware then of the precautions which had to be taken against our enemies.

One night when we were having a get-together in the A.M.A. camp on Middle River a messenger arrived at 7 p.m. saying suspicious characters were seen going up on the hill. After wading and swimming the river we formed a company of 75 and climbed that steep hill. We covered all the terrain and found a suspicious automobile. Half way up the steep climb one of our members gave out because of heart condition. Six of our best men carried him to the top.

NIGHT SOLDIER TEST

As a test, on another occasion, our commander in Richmond ordered me to assemble the company in a building. A message directed us to proceed west until we hit the woods. Those whose name were in the first half of the alphabet would go south and the other half north.

No two men were allowed to go together. I was to go into the center where they would disperse. A lieutenant would check the men as they arrived at the A.M.A. gym to see what kind of a night soldier they were. They all arrived except two. A squad was sent after them. One of the men had fallen into a creek and sprained an ankle. The other had heard his yells and had gone to his assistance.

NORTH RIVER BRIDGES

On another occasion we were ordered to protect the railroad and highway bridges on North River. Thousands of troops were being moved from the South to Baltimore and New York for embarkation. We guarded those bridges and roads for 24 hours.

There were many other occasions where we were of service. I never heard a man gripe and they often went through rough times to carry out their assignments.

As captain of that great organization, I am planning to give them a banquet in Staunton. We must report, however, that 26 members since the war have answered the last call.

While all manpower was scarce, we responded to all calls for fires and fought at many home and barn blazes during the 5 years we were in existence.

NEVER MUSTERED OUT

After the surrender of Japan in August 1945, the men voted never to be mustered out. No. 8 is the only company in Virginia still in existence.

Governor Tuck once telegraphed me if the company was available during a threatened strike. We would have been ready in 2 hours but were not needed.

We are at the Governor's service at any time. In recognition, I suspect, of that service, on January 27, 1960, Governor Almond promoted me to a brigadier general in the State militia. He issued some beautiful citations for my service.

It is nice to know that we have one company of about 125 men who today are always ready to go to the aid of their country, State and county.

OTHER OFFICERS

Other officers of the company were: R. E. Christian, first lieutenant, a sergeant in World War I and graduate of AMA; J. Eddie Rannels, second lieutenant, a captain at AMA; John Givens Fulton III, first sergeant, a graduate of AMA and officer at VPI; Boyd Van Pelt, supply sergeant, cook, ordnance sergeant, a graduate of AMA; H. I. Todd, sergeant; Hugh H. Kerr, first sergeant. Corporals: E. Russell Cover, AMA graduate; John Ed Shipplett, graduate of AMA; Dr. A. Griffith, age 86; W. L. Kerr, 82, AMA graduate.

FIRST PLATOON MEMBERS

The surviving members of the first platoon with their addresses at the time of enlistment include:

Joseph Alexander, Staunton; R. C. Almarode, Mount Sidney; William E. Armstrong, Staunton; Charles R. Armstrong, Staunton; John P. Austin, Mount Sidney; James S. Banks, Jr., Norfolk; Stanley J. Bernstein, New York; Eugene C. Bell, Norfolk; William J. Bodie, Staunton; George W. Brand, Staunton; Robert P. Brown, Jr., Mount Pisgah; Jacob C. Bosserman, Mount Sidney; Earl Daves Cabaniss, AMA; John R. Catlett, AMA; Arnold G. Clemmer, Staunton; Hugh A. Christian, Mount Solon; Robert E. Christian, Deerfield; Luther M. Church, AMA; James H. Clemmer, Staunton; Letcher P. Clemmer, Middlebrook.

Ellis Coffee, Staunton; Harry M. Cooke, Verona; E. Russell Cover, Staunton; William B. Crawford, Jr., Fort Defiance; William C. Coulton, Waynesboro; Lee A. Cupp, Sanger-

ville; Henry B. Davis, Waynesboro; Harry B. Dice, Burkettown; John J. Dudley, Staunton; Charles H. Echols, Staunton; C. M. Eddy, Staunton; Ben F. Ellis, AMA; Arthur A. Epstein, AMA; C. B. Engleman, Fishersville; Garnett C. Farrer, AMA; Donald G. Fauber, Staunton Draft.

R. C. Fitch, AMA; Earl D. Flory, Verona; Arthur C. Frank, Burkettown; John Givens Fulton III, Mount Meridian; Patrick H. Georger, Warrenton; Edgar P. Hanger, Verona; Eugene G. Hanna, Mount Solon; Tracey Harman, Mount Sidney; Paul E. Harman, Mount Sidney; Alexander R. Harris, AMA; Thomas G. Hawpe, Greenville; Herbert S. Hulvey, Fort Defiance; John N. Jackson, Churchville.

FROM MANY AREAS

Guy C. Kelster, Verona; Hugh H. Kerr, Staunton; Levy B. King, Staunton; Fay K. Koiner, Waynesboro; Jack K. Lambert, Deerfield; S. Hugh Lambert, Deerfield; Ashby D. Lanram, Staunton; George E. Lawson, Staunton; Robert T. Linstone, AMA; Herbert W. Lucas, Mint Spring; Dominick Marino, Staunton; Dr. Fred E. Markley, Staunton; Albert J. Mehler, New Hope; W. W. Meyerhoeffer, Laurel Hill.

C. L. Miller, Staunton; Benjamin A. Morgan, Jr., Staunton; William Lewis Morrison, Staunton; Sam F. McClure, Spottswood, Wallace McCutcheon, Fort Defiance; Echols A. Quillen, Waynesboro; Clarence W. Redner, Waynesboro; Charles S. Roller, Jr., Fort Defiance; Finley H. Rosen, Mint Spring; Richard F. Rushmore, Jennings Gap; C. L. Sheets, Verona; John E. Shippelt; Mount Sidney; A. D. Shinaberry, Deerfield; Peter Shover, Mint Spring.

Jack S. Sneed, Mint Springs; Louis Spillman Jr., Waynesboro; W. W. Stogdale, Staunton; James B. Taylor, Staunton; Cecil W. Thompson, Verona; Houston I. Todd, Staunton; Wm. W. Trimble, Swoope; Wm. W. R. Trimble, Swoope; Finley Tynes, Staunton; Boyd A. VanPelt, Verona; Frank S. VanPelt, Verona; Harry Van Ripper, AMA; Frank Villanova, AMA; Samuel S. Wales, Ft. Defiance; James F. Walker, Mt. Defiance; Tom Watson, AMA; Claude A. Weaver, Staunton; Charles K. West Jr., AMA; Melvin A. Wheeler, Deerfield; Francis G. Wishart, AMA; Frank W. Young, Waynesboro; Walter A. Zimbro, Deerfield.

AMONG THE DECEASED

Among the deceased members are: M. M. Alexander, Mt. Sidney; Robert E. Balsey, Staunton Draft; Dudley Brooks, Ft. Defiance; Wm. B. Bourland, Ft. Defiance; Clarence DeBaun, Staunton; Dr. Guy R. Fisher, Staunton; Wayt A. Irvine, Staunton; Walter L. Kerr, Laurel Hill; Guy S. Miller, Crimora; Dr. Wm. A. Murphy, John D. Palmer, Ft. Defiance.

John F. Patterson, Ft. Defiance; Louis T. Peck, Waynesboro; Dr. Wm. C. Roller, Mint Spring; James E. Runnels, Jr., Staunton; Kenneth B. Sensabaugh, Staunton; John H. Shafer, Staunton; Edward McC. Sites, Ft. Defiance; Ernest P. Sutton, Verona; Earl Van Fossen, Staunton; Dr. W. S. Whitmore; Dr. Ralph Crosby, Staunton; C. V. Perkins, Ft. Defiance; J. C. McCue, Sr., Verona.

The 2d platoon was made up entirely of AMA cadets.

The Bishop James Edward Walsh Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to read in the papers that

the United States has delivered through the appropriate channels a definite and strong diplomatic note to Red China protesting the imprisonment of that great humanitarian, Bishop James Edward Walsh, of the Roman Catholic faith. This man, who has devoted much of his lifetime to the relief of suffering and distress among the Chinese people, has been rewarded by the brutal Communists with contempt and unspeakable human treatment. It is only one more incident in the indictment against Red China in their desire for admission to the community of the United Nations. This is proof of their insensibility to the cause of justice and as the note of the State Department says, it is a showing of their "complete indifference to humanitarian principles and callous disregard of universally accepted standards of international law and behavior among civilized nations."

It is to be greatly regretted that the Governor of my State of New Jersey, Robert E. Meyner, recently advocated the admission of this international pirate, Red China, into the fellowship of the United Nations. I submit that this is a realm of internationalism where a politician, ambitious for high office, had better keep out until he matures and has a wiser and better appreciation of the differences between "humanitarian principles and callous disregard of universally accepted standards of international law."

Opposition to Senate Resolution 94— Resolution by Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, in which the council outlines its reasons for objecting to the passage of Senate Resolution 94.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1960.

We, Americans of Polish heritage, assembled at Pulaski Legion Hall, Jackson and Linden Streets, Wilmington, Del., in the annual meeting of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and of the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress, as delegates of our organizations and the Veteran Post of the Polish Army, on Friday evening, January 29, 1960, passed a motion to give the executive committee of the executive board the power to prepare a resolution in opposition to the repeal of the Connally amendment.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the United Nations World Court is composed of 15 judges, only one of these judges can be an American. Nine of these judges constitutes a majority of the quorum

which is enough for a decision. From that decision there is no appeal; and

"Whereas the International Court of Justice, commonly referred to as the World Court concerns every American who cherishes and wishes to retain the form of government recognized as existing in the States and established in the Federal Government under the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas Senate Resolution 94 is designed to strike out the words of the Connally amendment—'as determined by the United States.' It proposes that our country subject itself without reservation to judgment by Communist judges; and

"Whereas the World Court operates under decrees of the United Nations—not under the Constitution of the United States. In this country the U.S. Constitution guarantees peaceful assembly, free speech, right to petition, trial by jury and the right to own property and other basic freedoms. Individual guarantees and rights of this type are not found or are severely limited in the United Nations Charter; and

"Whereas the World Court judges take no oath of office to any principle. There are no uniform United Nations qualifications for World Court judges—not even a legal degree, several of the judges now serving are from countries that have not accepted any jurisdiction of the World Court—even on international matters. And yet these judges would (if the Connally amendment is repealed) be able to rule on domestic issues in the United States; and

"Whereas with men and women in high places in Government advocating the repeal of the Connally resolution, being in favor of policies designed further to destroy our independence as a nation, it behooves each truly patriotic citizen to become alerted to the dangers that lurk in the forthcoming months of 1960 as a citizen of the Republic to an extent never before required of him. * * * For never before in its history has our Nation faced so many perilous dangers as seem bent on its destruction at this moment; and

"Whereas could any Senator and Congressman who has taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States treat his oath so lightly as to submit any part of our Constitution to the fiat of a World Court? Could our elected trustees of our constitutional liberties so betray their trust as to offer these liberties to be limited or destroyed by a small group of men, some of whom may be appointed by powers that seek our destruction? and

"Whereas one of the principle reasons the great legislative body of the U.S. Senate was created, to act as a special guardian for the basic rights of this country, its individual States, and the people therein, and to guard against precipitate or emotional legislative action. It is our sincere hope that the U.S. Senate will live up to that purpose and will kill any attempt to repeal the Connally amendment; and

"Whereas it is safe to say that the Founding Fathers of our Nation never envisioned that the Constitution would some day be bypassed and that the fate of American citizens would be placed in the hands of 15 judges, only 1 of whom is an American; and

"Whereas the repeal of the Connally reservation or its mutilation by amendment would surrender the right of the American people to self-government. For it would subject the United States to the dictates of whatever nations happen at any time to constitute the members of the International Court of Justice. In that Court we would never have more than one vote, and sometimes we have none. It is the attempt to soften up the American people for this final betrayal. Finally its a question of world government, with world law—a question whether American freedom is to survive; and

"Whereas there is only one defense that the citizens of the United States have against

the internationalists who wish to make the United States a mere satellite of Communist Russia—and that is preserve the Connally amendment, which protects the national sovereignty of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress, emphatically opposes the Humphrey resolution (S. Res. 94) which would scrap our State and national sovereignty and place the United States of America under a world government, in which 170 million Americans would virtually have no control, giving to the World Court exclusive authority to determine any matter affecting the rights of citizens and the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, Senators J. WILLIAM FULLER, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., and to Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., the press, radio of Wilmington, Del."

CASIMIR CHETKOWSKI,
President.
VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

Hire Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, older workers in this country are discriminated against by employers and there is no basis in fact for such discrimination. Two recent newspaper articles emphasize this point. The first reprinted below is from the Los Angeles Examiner and the second from the Los Angeles Mirror News:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

JOB BANS ON ELDERLY DEPLORED
(By Gobind Behari Lal)

SAN FRANCISCO, January 20.—Advancing age is an unjust stigma keeping able and efficient people from employment, the Regional Conference on Aging was told today.

Prompt action is needed to stem inflation and eliminate artificial handicaps imposed on the aging by an unthinking public, Dr. J. Fale Ludwig, Los Angeles, told the conference, adding:

"Employment restrictions are based on the assumption that the older worker is not as good a worker, is not productive, is not dependable. Yet, study after study has shown that the average older worker is just as good as, sometimes better than, the younger."

Dr. Alfred Auerback, San Francisco psychiatrist, deplored "worship at the shrine of youth and beauty" in American culture and the brushing aside of older citizens as "non-productive members of society."

Respect for age, he said, must immediately be inculcated to balance the American philosophy of life.

Seriousness of the burden of inflation on older people was described by Dr. E. Vincent Askey, Los Angeles surgeon and president-elect of the American Medical Association.

Rising hospital costs pose serious problems to the aged who must, Dr. Askey pointed out, suffer health impairments.

He said the consequences of inflation might well present a clearer picture of what faces us in the 1960's than the fanciful predictions for "a leisurely push-button life, a pioneering life on the moon, or even a manufactured life in a test tube."

He urged that 1960 be the year of decision and called upon Congress to halt inflation through a balanced economy and a stable dollar so that elderly people may benefit from health insurance.

[From the Los Angeles Mirror News]

RX FOR OLDSTERS: STEADY WORK

One of the cruelest and most idiotic taboos in our present socioeconomic pattern is the virtual ban on hiring older workers.

Pressure from ambitious workers to force early retirement of long-term workers to "make room" for younger men is shortsighted and costly and denies industry the valuable know-how of skilled veterans.

Back in 1880, when the German Government set up the first extensive plan, 65 years was fixed as retirement age.

But life expectancy was only 38 years in 1880. Now it's 70 years, thanks to giant advances in medicine.

What was a sound retirement age in 1880 is sociological nonsense today.

There is extensive agitation in Congress for expanded medical aid to oldsters. It will be costly, and younger workers will have to pay it unless we take a second look at the taboo against employing older workers.

Happily, the American Medical Association is making just such a survey of the problems of the aging.

Dr. J. Fale Ludwig, speaking at the AMA conference in San Francisco, urged "a vigorous program to eliminate employment barriers placed before older citizens."

That's the vital key.

Elderly citizens actively employed remain mentally alert and physically hale far longer than forcibly retired workers. They solve their own social, medical and economic problems, without becoming a tax drain on the whole economy.

Commonsense and pocketbook wisdom together argue for employment of those older workers who want to work and are capable of production norms.

Wisconsin Delegates to White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the sixth annual White House Conference on Children and Youth is under way.

The major purpose of the conference is to assess the needs and conditions of the Nation's children, to resolve the problems in this field, and to promote opportunities for children and youth to realize their full potential for a creative life, in freedom and dignity.

As I understand it, more than 7,000 persons are in Washington attending the Conference.

At this time, I would like to commend these fine individuals, participating in this Conference, who are constructively attempting to resolve the problems con-

fronting youth nationally, and in their home communities.

Following the meeting, it is hoped that these dedicated leaders will be able to return to their communities, better equipped to promote youth-development programs and to brighten the outlook for the youth of America.

Particularly, we in Wisconsin have a fine group of representatives at the Conference.

Reflecting the splendid traditional spirit of public responsibility by American citizens which has helped to make this country great, I ask unanimous consent to have the list of delegates attending this fine Conference printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN DELEGATES TO WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AS OF MARCH 22, 1960

Attorney General John W. Reynolds representing Governor Nelson.

Mrs. Otto L. Falk, Route 4, Oconomowoc. President's Conference Committee and program participant.

OFFICIAL STATE DELEGATES

A. B. Abramovitz, Madison; Richard F. Armstrong, Chippewa Falls; Charles Asher, Jr., Sturgeon Bay; Phil Bandt, Madison; Miss Sybil Berntson, Madison; Thomas Blanchard, Madison; Miss Elizabeth Burr, Madison; Armand F. Cirilli, Hurley; Rev. H. Bruce Connell, Park Falls; Stuart B. Crawford, Madison; Dr. Helen C. Dawe, Madison; James G. Frechette, Keshena; Mrs. Marion Freeman, R. N., Appleton; Mrs. Grant Gordon, Milwaukee; Mrs. Lois O. Guest, Neillsville; Miss Muriel Hamilton, Madison; Miss Agnes M. Hansen, Madison; Miss Agnes M. Haughey, Superior; Richard C. Helmsletter, East Troy; Miss Sue Holthusen, Stevens Point; Mrs. E. E. Homstad, Black River Falls; Dr. Amy L. Hunter, Madison; Mrs. Hyman Israel, Waukesha; Dr. Ralph G. Iverson, Menomonie; Gordon B. Jaeger, Merrill; Mrs. Robert C. Johnson, Milwaukee; F. X. Joswick, Pulaski; Val Karan, Madison; Mrs. A. M. Klaus, Two Rivers; Mrs. Karl L. Kleinpell, Cassville; Miss Karen B. Kritz, Wauwatosa; Chester A. Krohn, Marinette; Miss Jenny J. Lind, Madison; James Linderman, Eau Claire; Miss Patricia McGinnity, Madison; Miss Gladys Mollart, Watertown; Mrs. Carl J. Neess, Wausau; Edgar W. Nell, Algoma; Rev. Arnold H. Nielsen, Janesville; David Nyhus, Ashland; Miss Carol O'Loughlin, North Fond du Lac; Mrs. Charles J. O'Neil, Milwaukee; Mrs. David Palmer, Madison; Mrs. John Parkin, Marshfield; Dr. George A. Parkinson, Milwaukee; Allen Paschen, Baraboo; Miss Norma Rathbun, Milwaukee; Harold Reinecke, Fond du Lac; Miss Ione M. Rowley, Madison; Mrs. John H. Schleifer, Benton; R. H. Schmidt, Clintonville; Christopher Scott, Tomah; Ralph Sherman, Dousman; Rev. William J. Spalding, Green Bay; Miss Carolyn Spargo, Mineral Point; Mrs. E. K. Steul, Madison; James Leroy Stewart, Lac du Flambeau; Bernard Stumbras, Appleton; Dr. H. Kent Tenney, Madison; Miss Gertrude R. Thurow, LaCrosse; Hon. Eugene A. Toepel, LaCrosse; Mrs. Clarence Underwood, Racine; Mrs. Ruth B. Walker, Kenosha; Franklin Walsh, Hebron, Ill.; George E. Watson, Madison; Russell S. Way, Green Bay; Richard W. Whinfield, Madison; Hon. David Willis, Green Lake; Capt. Michael S. Wolke, Milwaukee; Rev. G. Aubrey Young, Waukesha.

¹ Youth.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Msgr. Norbert P. Dall, LaCrosse; Miss Mary Julia Denton, Madison; Robert L. Erdman, Milwaukee; Rev. Benjamin A. Gjenjvick, Milwaukee; Max J. Hays, Madison; Miss Clarice Kline, Waukesha; John David McLain, South Milwaukee; Frank Newgent, Madison; Dr. Lloyd M. Simonson, Sheboygan; Harvey A. Stevens, Madison; Miss Dorothy Waite, Madison.

DELEGATES REPRESENTING NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Jerry Baker,¹ National Federation of Settlements Neighborhood Centers, Milwaukee; Miss Lynn Bratley,¹ Y.W.C.A., Racine; Miss Barbara Brero, Elva; Miss Catherine Carnes,¹ International Juvenile Officers Association, Madison; Robert M. Carnes, International Juvenile Officers Association, Madison; H. Roderick Daniels, Evangelical Lutheran Church, Stoughton; Mario Dieckmann,¹ Boy Scouts, Milwaukee; John Guy Fowlkes, Madison; Richard H. Harris, National Federation of Settlements, Madison; Miss Viola M. Hunt, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Madison; Chester W. Harris, American Educational Research Association, Madison; Harold L. Hawkins, Volunteers of America, Milwaukee; Guy Keshena,¹ Arrow, Inc., Keshena; Bertram McNamara, United Steel Workers, Milwaukee; Miss Doris Moulton, A.L.A., Milwaukee; David J. Nolte, Volunteers of America, Madison; Sanger B. Powers, American Corrections Association, Madison; Arnold Quaerna,¹ National Association of Student Councils, president, Janesville; Wilbur J. Schmidt, director, APWA, State department of public welfare, Madison.

FOREIGN VISITORS ATTACHED TO WISCONSIN DELEGATION

Miss Homal Dubash, India, Chicago, Ill.; Miss Novlet Hunter, Jamaica, Madison.

OTHERS

G. W. Bannerman, representing Melvin R. Laird, Wausau; Fred W. Braun, representing Melvin R. Laird, Wausau; Ralph M. Gibson, representing Senator Proxmire, Middleton; Mrs. Carl Nordhagen, representing Lester Johnson, Whitehall; Karl Smith,¹ technical consultant, Baraboo; Mrs. Eleanor K. Thomas, volunteer worker, Ladysmith; Attorney A. L. Tilton, bar association, and Senator Wiley, Milwaukee; Morris L. Perman, director of education, representing Congressman Henry S. Reuss, of Congregation Emanu-El B'nai Jeshurun of Milwaukee.

¹ Youth.

What Happens When the Tariff Commission Turns Down a Local Community Hard Hit by Unemployment by Quibbling Over Technicalities—Or a Study in Local Impact When the Commission Fails To Do Its Job for a Small Local Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Tariff Commission turned thumbs down flatly on a plea by the

glove industry and the citizens of Fulton County, N.Y., in my congressional district, for urgent relief from the serious economic impact of cheap foreign glove imports. Ignoring the heavy unemployment in this community, the Tariff Commission—acting, in my judgment, in defiance of the clearly expressed intent of Congress—threw out this complaint from an entire community largely on a technicality, the inability to produce specific unemployment figures for only one fraction of the overall glove industry. This action may have been clever as an exercise in legal niceties, but what about its impact on the local community itself, and what about its much broader implications for determining whether the Tariff Commission has outlived its usefulness in dealing with what is surely the most important aspect of the whole matter of foreign imports.

To present a graphic picture of this local impact I include herewith an editorial from the *Gloversville (N.Y.) Leader-Herald* of March 26.

The editorial follows:

IT'S BIGGER THAN FULTON COUNTY

After suffering so many setbacks in modern times, Fulton County probably doesn't display the shock it should at the Tariff Commission's decision not to recommend to President Eisenhower escape clause relief through the enactment of specific import quotas and withdrawal of tariff concessions.

It may be that "defeatist attitude" which is being talked about in many quarters or it may be that we are too close to the situation to realize just how much the glove industry is being discriminated against by our national leaders who devote more time to being internationalists than being servants of the people who elected them.

In any event, the last has not been heard of this. Immediately jumping in to defend the glove industry were Senators KEATING and JAVITS and Representative STRATTON. They had some pertinent comments on the whole situation and it would be decidedly unfair to even suggest their concern is motivated by political ambitions.

It seems a shame that greater protection can't be given to the employers and employees in such small industries as the glove business. To many of those in Washington who decide the fate of such things and who are accustomed to dealing with problems much bigger than this, the future of the glove industry probably holds little significance.

But the same thing has happened to other industries and will continue to happen to still more industries until the problem gets the attention and action it deserves. Unemployment on the scale we have seen it first hand does not present a pleasant picture. And when it spreads—and it certainly will if greater protection from imports isn't afforded American industries—what will be in the end result?

Our potential military enemies won't need bombs to defeat us. They will have used a more potent weapon—that of stirring up discontent to the extent that it has destroyed morale and affected the clear-thinking abilities of many loyal Americans.

More than the glove industry, more than Fulton County is involved in this whole mess. But when will our fellow Americans in powerful places come to realize that?

Centennial Celebration of Cameron County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commemorating the centennial celebration of Cameron County. It is fitting that the Senate should take note of this event. Simon Cameron, for whom the county was named, was a Member of the U.S. Senate during the 35th, 36th and 37th Congresses. For a time he served as Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Abraham Lincoln. Cameron County may well look back upon the past 100 years as a century of progress and prosperity.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MADE AT CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, CAMERON COUNTY, PA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 26, 1960.

On March 29, 1860, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania took 401 square miles of land area from portions of the counties of Clinton, Elk, McKean, and Potter, created the 66th county of the Commonwealth and named it Cameron, in honor of Simon Cameron, then a U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, and later a short-time Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Abraham Lincoln.

Because of its terrain it is known as "the Land of Endless Mountains." Its foothills lead into the Continental Divide of the East. Its Indian paths were a portage from the Susquehanna to the Allegheny waters. Within its borders are the greatest table lands on the Atlantic seaboard.

Often referred to as Pennsylvania's last frontier, it has played an important part in the history of the State and Nation.

Spars from the timber of its forests supported the masts of many a commercial and combat vessel. Flagstone from its quarries was used in the Arlington National Cemetery and in the esplanade at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Hunting, fishing, and recreation constitute a substantial segment of its economy.

Dynamite with which the Panama Canal was blasted into being was manufactured there. For a time in the teens and the twenties, powder and munitions so dominated its economy that Emporium was known as Powder City.

At Emporium was founded Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., which industrial acorn has grown into the giant industrial oak of today with plants in all parts of the United States and affiliates in many foreign countries. During World War II, its laboratories at Emporium gave final laboratory perfection to the VT fuse shell, acknowledged and rated as the No. 2 weapon of the war. During the war the predominance of female labor at the plant was such that Emporium became known throughout the Nation as "Girls' Town, U.S.A." and was so featured in an article in Collier's magazine. Today, as an affiliate of General Telephone & Electronic

Corp., it has assumed its leadership in the electronic and space age in which we live. Within its borders are also located a part of Quehanna operations of Curtiss-Wright engaged in matters affiliated with the jet and space age.

In 1861 hardy lumbermen, also expert as backwoods riflemen, pinned tails of buck deer to their hats, converged from the surrounding areas upon Driftwood, from whence they transported themselves by raft down the river to Camp Curtin at Harrisburg where they enlisted for service in the Civil War as the Bucktail Regiment. Their fighting fame is recorded in the history of that war. A monument now stands to their valor at the point of departure at Driftwood.

In World War II, four-star Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, a native of the county, served as Deputy Chief of Staff, supreme allied commander of the Allied Forces in the Mediterranean theater of operations, and succeeded general of the armies, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in the European theater for the demobilization of the American forces.

When history was being made with the advent of the voyage of the atomic submarine *Nautilus* under the North Pole, Harry Thomas, a Cameron County boy, was on board as a communications officer.

Hon. C. J. Goodnough, representative from Cameron County, was twice elected and served as speaker of the house of representatives. The field of entertainment records the name of Tom Mix.

Cameron County operates on a balanced budget and has no indebtedness, bonded or otherwise.

The first 100 years of the life of Cameron County may truly be viewed through the eyes of history as displaying a pageant of progress. The strength and courage of its people have kept pace with the times and they stand ready to face the future with the same spirit. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That in recognition of the centennial celebration of the creation of Cameron as the 66th county of the Commonwealth, this house of representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby extends its congratulations and best wishes to said county and its people for continued prosperity, success, and happiness and that the celebration of the centennial during the period of July 2 to 9, 1960, not only reflect the glories of its past, but also project its future role in the history of the Commonwealth and Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Cameron County Centennial, Inc.

Dismissal of Student by Vanderbilt University Divinity School—Protest by Faculty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Mr. Glenn D. Everett, the Washington correspondent for the Religious News Service, has brought to my attention a statement by the faculty members of the Vanderbilt University Divinity School, protesting the dismissal from the school of a student, Mr. James Lawson, because of his participation in a recent lunch counter demonstration in Nashville, Tenn.

The statement is signed by 15 of the 16 faculty members of the divinity school.

It points out:

Whether or not we approve his strategy, we believe that Mr. Lawson has endeavored to follow his Christian conscience and we see no adequate justification for his expulsion from the divinity school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY DIVINITY SCHOOL, NASHVILLE, TENN.

Divinity student James Lawson has been dismissed from the Divinity School of Vanderbilt University by action of University Chancellor Harvie Branscombe and the university board of trustees.

Mr. Lawson participated in the recent lunch counter demonstration in Nashville in which some of our Negro citizens requested service in establishments which have refused them service because of their race.

The undersigned, representing 15 of the 16 faculty members of the divinity school, wish to protest this action. We have adopted the following statement expressing our convictions in this matter:

"Our seminary community consists of men of various consciences and witnesses who acknowledge an ultimate loyalty to God alone.

"The responsibility of this community is to bear witness to this ultimate loyalty.

"Whether or not we approve his strategy, we believe that Mr. Lawson has endeavored to follow his Christian conscience and we see no adequate justification for his expulsion from the divinity school.

"We have had no part in such action. Mr. Lawson has been a respected student and we continue to hold him in respect."

Gordon D. Kaufman, Leander E. Kech, Arthur L. Foster, Lou H. Silberman, Paul S. Sanders, S. Everett Sander, Everett Tilson, James D. Glasse, Langdon B. Gilkey, George N. Mayhew, Herman A. Norton, Bard Thompson, Ronald E. Sleath, Frank Grisham, James E. Sellers.

Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following results of my annual questionnaire as well as certain charts showing the occupational breakdowns which should be of interest to Members of this body:

POLL RESULTS

(By ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Congressman, Eighth District, Mich.)

Out of some 30,000 questionnaires which were sent out in January, 7,632 were returned for a gratifying percentage of 25.4 percent. Here is the way the eighth district voted:

1. The problem of labor-management conflict, resulting in situations such as the steel strike should be dealt with by the Congress. Along which of these lines do you think the Congress should consider legislation. (1) Compulsory arbitration, 12.7 percent; (2) prohibition of industry-

wide strikes, 17.4 percent; (3) factfinding boards with power to make recommendations, 19.6 percent; (4) application of anti-trust laws to big labor, 27.9 percent; (5) Government regulations of both wages and prices, 10.9 percent.

2. The question of a continued deficit in our international balance of payments and the resulting loss of gold and dollars is one of the most serious problems that faces the new Congress. One aspect is the low-cost foreign competition which we face at home, as well as abroad. What alternatives would you suggest to meet this situation: (1) Subsidize American exporters to meet the difference in labor costs, 3.9 percent; (2) raise tariffs and impose import quotas to protect our industries against low-cost foreign goods, 33.8 percent; (3) prevent U.S. companies located abroad from exporting their products here, 37.2 percent; (4) reduce dollar expenditures overseas by cutting back on our troop commitments abroad and limiting foreign aid, 33.5 percent; (5) require dollar loans and grants abroad to be spent in the United States, 45.5 percent.

3. The problem of our defense effort being behind the Soviet Russians in certain aspects concerns many people greatly. Do you think we should: (1) Go all out to match the Russians in every phase of defense regardless of cost even if it means higher taxes, 11 percent; (2) continue our present levels of defense spending for a balanced program, 37.6 percent; (3) make every effort to reach a workable agreement with the Russians for disarmament, 38.2 percent.

4. The social security tax rose to 3 percent on employers and employees alike on January 1 and is scheduled to reach 4.5 percent by 1969. Should the program be amended to include the following benefits even if higher taxes are required: (1) Lowering the retirement age, 32.7 percent; (2) increasing the present limit of \$1,200 on outside earned income, 44.9 percent; (3) providing hospital, nursing care and surgical benefits to eligible persons, 32 percent; (4) tying social security benefits to living costs, 37.2 percent.

5. Consideration is being given in Congress to eliminate all present tax deductions (except the \$600 exemption) and then reducing the present rates about 40 percent with the minimum rate at 12 percent, and the maximum at 55 percent. Some of the deductions which might be removed include expense accounts, long-term capital gains, local and State taxes, interest payments, income splitting for married couples, tax-free interest on bonds of States and cities and charitable contributions. Social security benefits might be taxed and personal exemptions for old and disabled persons would disappear. Depreciation allowances would end but corporation taxes might be cut to 44 percent. Net rental value of house would be treated as income. Would you favor eliminating all these deductions in return for lower tax rates: Yes, 23.2 percent; no, 64.9 percent.

6. Are you in favor of: (1) More Federal aid for education and to boost teachers' pay, 15.6 percent; (2) Federal aid to local public works, 4.1 percent; (3) Federal aid for depressed areas, 28.4 percent.

7. Do you think that Federal credit should be extended to veterans, 12.3 percent; farmers, 5 percent; small businessmen 12.7 percent.

8. What should Congress do to solve the farm problem: (1) Raise supports and tighten production controls, 2.3 percent; (2) gradually decrease supports and controls, 41.7 percent; (3) eliminate all supports and controls at once, 28.2 percent; pay farmers the difference between the market price and the support price with production controls, 4.2 percent; (5) gear supports to farm production costs, 10.9 percent.

Question 1

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	141	11.6	106	8.7	279	22.9	205	16.8	311	25.5	177	14.5
Worker.....	2,023	194	9.6	319	15.8	278	13.7	563	27.8	399	19.7	270	13.3
Business.....	866	115	13.3	91	10.5	151	17.4	119	13.7	325	37.5	65	7.5
Profession.....	972	94	9.7	125	12.9	130	13.4	167	17.2	419	43.1	37	3.8
Housewife.....	448	60	13.4	56	12.5	92	20.5	103	23.0	96	21.4	41	9.2
Office worker.....	719	67	9.3	103	14.3	124	17.2	149	20.7	218	30.3	58	8.1
Other.....	1,385	205	14.8	166	12.0	274	19.8	192	13.9	359	25.9	189	13.6
Total.....	7,632	876	11.5	966	12.7	1,328	17.4	1,498	19.6	2,127	27.9	837	10.9

Question 2

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	157	12.9	61	5.0	328	26.9	498	40.9	376	30.8	550	45.1
Worker.....	2,023	148	7.3	82	4.1	804	39.7	897	44.3	652	32.2	938	46.4
Business.....	866	111	12.8	23	2.7	297	34.3	248	28.6	312	36.0	396	45.7
Profession.....	972	153	15.7	11	1.1	218	22.4	261	26.9	368	37.9	418	43.0
Housewife.....	448	59	13.2	17	3.8	173	38.6	148	33.0	115	25.7	184	41.1
Office worker.....	719	67	9.3	25	3.5	208	29.1	239	33.2	254	35.3	314	43.7
Other.....	1,385	164	11.8	75	5.4	488	35.2	549	39.6	483	34.9	675	48.7
Total.....	7,632	858	11.1	294	3.9	2,576	33.8	2,840	37.2	2,560	33.5	3,475	45.5

Question 3

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	173	14.2	96	7.9	464	38.1	486	39.9
Worker.....	2,023	247	12.2	281	13.9	746	36.9	749	37.0
Business.....	866	118	13.6	78	9.0	341	39.4	329	38.0
Profession.....	972	107	11.0	114	11.7	403	41.5	34	3.5
Housewife.....	448	62	13.8	49	10.9	157	35.0	180	40.2
Office worker.....	719	81	11.3	86	12.0	289	40.2	263	36.6
Other.....	1,385	226	16.3	133	9.6	468	33.8	558	40.3
Total.....	7,632	1,014	13.2	837	11.0	2,868	37.6	2,913	38.2

Question 4-A

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	230	18.9	315	25.8	497	40.8	313	25.7	395	32.4
Worker.....	2,023	164	8.1	1,056	52.2	838	40.9	739	36.5	723	35.7
Business.....	866	123	14.2	240	27.7	466	53.8	204	23.6	268	30.9
Profession.....	972	117	12.0	218	22.4	523	53.8	234	24.1	381	39.2
Housewife.....	448	54	12.1	113	25.2	205	45.8	174	38.8	170	37.9
Office worker.....	719	69	9.6	233	32.4	377	52.4	207	28.8	295	41.0
Other.....	1,385	221	16.0	321	23.2	534	38.6	575	41.5	606	43.8
Total.....	7,632	978	12.8	2,496	32.7	3,430	44.9	2,446	32.0	2,838	37.2

Question 4-B

	Total	No answer		I am		I am not	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	164	13.5	167	13.7	888	72.8
Worker.....	2,023	210	10.4	97	4.8	1,716	84.8
Business.....	866	80	9.2	45	5.2	741	85.6
Profession.....	972	83	8.5	42	4.3	847	87.1
Housewife.....	448	49	10.9	96	21.4	303	67.6
Office worker.....	719	60	8.3	57	7.9	602	83.7
Other.....	1,385	194	14.0	702	50.7	489	35.3
Total.....	7,632	840	11.0	1,206	15.8	5,586	73.2

Question 5

	Total	No answer		Yes		No	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	148	12.1	186	15.3	885	72.6
Worker.....	2,023	223	11.0	496	24.5	1,305	64.5
Business.....	866	69	8.0	230	26.6	567	65.3
Profession.....	972	77	7.9	306	31.5	589	60.6
Housewife.....	448	73	16.3	96	21.4	279	62.3
Office worker.....	719	74	10.3	217	30.2	428	59.5
Other.....	1,385	241	17.4	244	17.6	900	65.0
Total.....	7,632	905	11.9	1,774	23.2	4,953	64.9

Question 6

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	641	52.6	124	10.2	48	3.9	406	33.3
Worker.....	2,023	966	47.8	380	18.8	93	4.6	584	28.9
Business.....	866	504	58.2	136	15.7	41	4.7	185	21.4
Profession.....	972	523	53.8	181	18.6	33	3.4	235	24.2
Housewife.....	448	212	47.3	72	16.1	16	3.6	148	33.0
Office worker.....	719	338	47.0	121	16.8	32	4.5	228	31.7
Other.....	1,385	776	56.0	174	12.6	50	3.6	385	27.8
Total.....	7,632	3,960	51.9	1,188	15.6	313	4.1	2,171	28.4

Question 7

	Total	No answer		Veterans		Farmers		Small businessmen	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	879	72.1	148	12.1	123	10.1	69	5.7
Worker.....	2,023	1,324	65.4	333	16.5	91	4.5	275	13.6
Business.....	866	647	74.7	47	5.4	21	2.4	151	17.4
Profession.....	972	752	77.4	56	5.8	32	3.3	132	13.6
Housewife.....	448	309	69.0	68	15.2	18	4.0	53	11.8
Office worker.....	719	438	60.9	118	16.4	36	5.0	127	17.7
Other.....	1,385	997	72.0	170	12.3	57	4.1	161	11.6
Total.....	7,632	5,346	70.0	940	12.3	378	5.0	968	12.7

Question 8

	Total	No answer		(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer.....	1,219	164	13.5	55	4.5	352	28.9	280	23.0	84	6.9	284	23.3
Worker.....	2,023	243	12.0	53	2.6	791	39.1	646	31.9	85	4.2	205	10.1
Business.....	866	75	8.7	9	1.0	423	48.8	290	33.5	16	1.8	53	6.1
Profession.....	972	94	9.7	16	1.6	551	56.7	221	22.7	27	2.8	63	6.5
Housewife.....	448	69	15.4	11	2.5	197	44.0	103	23.0	26	5.8	42	9.4
Office worker.....	719	76	10.6	9	1.3	338	47.0	203	28.2	31	4.3	62	8.6
Other.....	1,385	248	18.0	20	1.4	535	38.6	410	29.6	49	3.5	123	8.9
Total.....	7,632	969	12.7	173	2.3	3,187	41.7	2,153	28.2	378	4.9	632	8.3

Camden Speaks Up for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we citizens have been paying more and more attention in recent weeks to the problems confronting our aged and aging citizens. In Camden recently a plea from the Camden (N.J.) Polish American Citizens Club added new data and new urgency to our concern about the future and programs for the future.

An editorial in the March 26 issue of the Camden Courier Post describes that appeal and gives additional viewpoints.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The plight today of senior citizens living on fixed incomes, mainly social security and pensions, leaves little doubt that something has to be done—in fact, is going to be done—to aid them.

Demands for relief from the ever-increasing cost of living, particularly in the tax field, are valid. And it is evident that relief must come not only from the local level, as was the subject of pleas at the recent public hearing on the city's 1960 budget, but from the national level as well.

Just what form the needed relief will take is not so readily apparent.

That the problem is steadily becoming more pressing was evidenced in the greater number of persons who presented that view at the budget hearing. Additionally, there

was a plea from the Polish American Citizens Club, which said 340 of its members were over 60 years of age and 247 were on pension.

"Such incomes are becoming more inadequate with each succeeding year to cope with the increasing cost of living and higher taxes," the club noted. It added:

"The rising tax structure is making greater demands on the fixed incomes of these senior citizens, causing them anxiety and alarm as to their ability to meet rising tax costs and retain possession of their properties on which they have paid taxes for 30 to 40 years."

Nationally, the number of elderly persons in proportion to the population is growing. And therein may lie a factor which could provide a major portion of the answer to their growing problem. The answer could be in the elderly themselves—their vast number. And that means political strength.

As soon as the elderly recognize that strength, they can weld themselves together as a unit and a powerful voice. They can

unite behind sensible legislation in their own behalf. The sooner they do, the sooner they will get it.

The hope then would be that the legislation is, indeed, sensible and not a wild visionary scheme like some proposed in the past.

Polaris Shot Opens Crucial Test Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 28, 1960, regarding the Polaris missile:

POLARIS SHOT OPENS CRUCIAL TEST SERIES

(By Richard Witkin)

COCOA BEACH, Fla., March 27.—The Polaris ballistic missile, the weapon around which a new Navy is being built, has begun a series of three critical tests.

The first was conducted this afternoon at San Clemente Island off the California coast near Los Angeles. A Polaris was launched beneath the sea by a charge of compressed air.

This had been done many times before. But today for the first time an attempt was made to ignite the missile after it had emerged from the water. This procedure will be followed in normal operations.

It was not immediately known, however, whether today's ignition attempt was successful.

The second test will be conducted within the next few days a few miles offshore from the launch site at Cape Canaveral, Fla. The launch pad will be a regular Polaris tube installed aboard a converted merchant ship, the *Observation Island*.

Except that the *Observation Island* will not be submerged, the shot will practically duplicate an operational shot. It will be the first firing to use all the navigation, guidance, and fire-control equipment required for a bona fide launching from Polaris submarines.

WILL TEST FULL CAPACITY

The third test will dispense with simulation and demonstrate the Polaris' capabilities of its true environment.

For this test, the *George Washington*, first of the Polaris submarines, will sail here from New London, probably in July. She will stow a Polaris in 1 of her 16 vertical launch tubes, cruise out to sea and submerge, and then aim the missile down the Caribbean range.

To the team directing the Polaris development—its chief is Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr.—the critical nature of the tests is more political than technical.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., indicated at a news conference on March 10 that a decision on Navy proposals to expand the Polaris program would hinge largely on the outcome of these three tests.

The admiral and his staff have shown no worry about encountering any serious technical defects. They are satisfied from previous tests that the Polaris design is sound.

Whatever the outcome of the two remaining tests, and related budget deliberations, the Navy expects to meet its autumn timetable for dispatching the *George Washington* on regular operational patrol. The Patrick Henry—built, as was the Washington, by the Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn.—is due to join her sister ship on patrol duty before the end of the year.

If the two-ship schedule is met, it will be a remarkable achievement.

GO-AHEAD GIVEN IN 1956

It was not until December, 1956, that the Navy was authorized to proceed full speed with the Polaris missile, a 28-foot two-stage bird powered by solid propellants. Until then, the Navy had been working on a sea-going version of the Army's single-stage liquid-propelled Jupiter.

There were several reasons for the switch-over. Basically, it was decided that liquid propellants were much too dangerous for shipboard use.

While planners were coming to this conclusion, propellant makers were increasing the power of solids, and the Atomic Energy Commission was compressing the size of required warheads.

These advances made for a solid-propellant Polaris design of very attractive size and weight.

The original timetable for sending a Polaris submarine to sea was sometime in 1963. But in December, 1957, a year after the go-ahead for a solid Polaris, the already tightly paced program was further accelerated.

The target date for the first ship on station was advanced to late 1960. It was expected that sacrifices would have to be made in initial range (1,380 instead of 1,725 statute miles), reliability and accuracy. (Tests indicate that there will be no sacrifice in accuracy; it is too early to gage the missile's reliability.)

DOUBTERS NUMEROUS

Ever since the decision on 1960 deployment, a horde of doubters have been dismissing the ostensible speedup as Navy propaganda.

Today, 7 months before the target date, all signs indicate that the Navy's promise to have ready-to-fire Polaris on station in 1960 will be fulfilled.

There are broader issues—broader than the issue of the deployment timetable—on which the Polaris concept is being seriously questioned.

This is not to suggest that any responsible official, even in rival service, does not want the Polaris in the Nation's arsenal. It is almost universally acclaimed as an important and highly desirable weapon system.

The main questions being asked are these: How meaningful will be the deployment of the initial Polaris submarines, in view of the limited range of first-round missiles?

Is the Polaris submarine as immune to enemy attack as its proponents assert?

Have the difficult problems of navigation and communications been surmounted?

Finally, and perhaps most important, is not the Navy seeking to invest too high a proportion of the Nation's military funds in a weapon system with too limited a punch?

TWO AND SEVEN-TENTHS BILLION SO FAR

Funds appropriated for the program through the fiscal year ending June 30 total \$2,742,433,000.

It is expected that the 1961 budget will provide at least another billion dollars.

The dollar figures, too large for ready comprehension, take on meaning when one looks at what they have bought.

This included huge production buildings put up by such contractors as the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (missile frame and over-all coordination), the Aerojet-General Corp. (fuel and propulsion), and the General Electric Co. (guidance and fire-control); nine \$100 million submarines, three times the size of the largest ones in World War II, already launched or under construction. Also, a \$26 million missile-assembly facility that will help transform Charleston, S.C., from a backwater Navy station into a major Navy port; and the multimillion-dollar conversion of a conventional submarine tender,

the Proteus, to enable it to unload and load missiles in Polaris submarines in port.

Patrols are expected to last 2 to 3 months. With their nuclear power plants, the Polaris craft will be able to stay submerged the entire time.

The Navy builds its case for the Polaris around two words: concealment and mobility. Admiral Raborn states it this way:

"Since we would normally be in the position of firing back, not firing first, the concealment and mobility of the Polaris system is what best suits our needs."

HARD-TO-FIND TARGET

"No instrument made by man is as hard to find as a nuclear submarine if it really wants to keep its position secret."

"On land our military installations are known. Most of them we don't even try to keep secret."

"Polaris launching sites, on the other hand, can't be 'zeroed in' for two excellent reasons. One is that the location will not be known in advance. And the second is that the location is constantly moving."

Additional advantages are attributed to the Polaris submarine. It will have a low vulnerability to sabotage. It will stay only a short time at an overseas base—when it meets the Proteus or other tender between patrols.

As a result, it will run little risk of being overrun in an invasion.

The most immediate question raised about the Polaris is the degree of usefulness of the initial 1,380-mile missiles. It is suggested that a very restricted number of potential targets could be covered within that range.

It is suggested, too, that with its operating area so narrowed, the Polaris would be much more likely to be detected and followed by Communist antisubmarine forces than the Navy admits.

The Navy acknowledges that these initial shorter range missiles reduce its flexibility. It will be happier with the 1,725-mile missile that will be available in 2 years, and the 2,875-mile missiles for which it hopes soon to obtain development funds.

The Navy insists, however, that more than three-quarters of potential targets can be covered from friendly waters by the first-round missiles. It gives low rating to the current potential of antisubmarine detection techniques.

An additional point is made by the doubters. In a war, Polaris submarines would give away their position to patrol planes when the first of their 16 missiles broke the surface. They might be attacked and sunk before many more missiles had been launched.

SCHEPTICS ARE DISPUTED

The consensus among qualified neutral observers appears to be that the vulnerability of Polaris submarines will be much lower than skeptics suggest, though not so low as the Navy likes to think.

Has the Navy surmounted admittedly tough communications and navigation problems?

It insists it has. Communications will be accomplished primarily by a "very low frequency" system able to penetrate a certain distance into the water. This will be supplemented by a worldwide high-frequency net transmitting signals that a Polaris submarine can pick up by sticking a small antenna just above the waves.

Navigation is critical since an error at the launch point will mean an error at the target end.

There remains one overriding to consider. If the Polaris is primarily a destroyer of cities rather than what the Air Force calls a counterforce weapon—a weapon powerful and flexible enough to take out tough or mobile military targets—is the Navy seeking too large a Polaris fleet?

GOAL IS 45 SUBMARINES

The Navy says it would like a fleet of 45 Polaris ships, each with 16 missiles. Air Force sources think 15 or 20 vessels would be sufficient.

In addition to Polaris ships, the Navy is pressing for installation of Polaris missiles on surface warships.

The Navy is disturbed by what it fears is a campaign to concentrate an overwhelming proportion of the Nation's deterrent strength in the Polaris.

Naturally, the higher the portion of limited strategic funds invested in Polaris, the less available for such Air Force weapons as the Atlas, Titan, and the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles and manned bombers.

At the root of the debate over the size of the Polaris force is the question: what type or types of nuclear war are likely to erupt?

Here are some points made by Air Force observers concerned lest the Polaris be over-emphasized:

The Polaris could be whittled away, ship by ship, without provoking a major war. This would be exceedingly dangerous if the Polaris force constituted the bulk of the Nation's strategic strength.

POWERFUL FORCES WANTED

The Air Force leans to the notion that powerful forces must be available to seek out the enemy's military might (buried command centers; buried and mobile missiles) rather than "soft" city and industry targets.

Air Force strategists do not dismiss the idea that this Nation might someday feel compelled to abandon the current idea of accepting the first major blow before retaliating. They talk of "preemptive" response to limited enemy provocation.

The Navy does not reject the need for some counterforce weapons. But it puts far less stress on them than the Air Force.

The Navy appears to question how an enemy could attack major land targets without crushing population centers in the process. That would provoke retaliation of attacks on cities and industries by the Polaris.

Moreover, the Navy argues, Polaris submarines, would have the best chance of any weapon of surviving an enemy blitz. They are therefore the most effective deterrent.

Import Quota To Control the Import of Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] ably represented his State at a hearing of the U.S. Tariff Commission on March 22, 1960. Much of what he said concerning the sheep industry in Wyoming is applicable also to the sheep industry in Idaho, and I have vigorously joined with him in urging the Tariff Commission to adopt an import quota to control the import of lamb, mutton, and live animals which is threatening to ruin the domestic industry.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McGEE's statement to the Tariff

Commission may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE, WYOMING, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, MARCH 22, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I am here today to support the action of the sheep industry in seeking relief from certain foreign imports of lamb, mutton, and live animals. These imports have reached the point where they are causing considerable distress to the sheep industry, a very vital industry to my State. I feel confident the position of the industry as a whole has been or will be adequately reflected by representatives of the national associations. Therefore, I should like to confine my remarks today to the problem which is facing our people in Wyoming.

Eighty-five to ninety percent of the lambs produced in our State are feeder lambs. The general market for these lambs tends to be the west coast for the lambs produced in the western part of the State; while those produced in the eastern part of the State are generally shipped into the areas of Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas.

Last July the price for feeder lambs in Wyoming was 19 cents per pound. When it was announced the Delino interests were importing sheep into the California area, the price of feeder lambs in western Wyoming immediately dropped to 17 cents a pound. If we compute an average weight of 70 pounds per feeder lamb, this means there was an immediate loss to the producer of \$1.40 per animal. For a grower selling 1,200 lambs, the size of an average band, this means a loss of \$1,680. This price drop was also reflected in the lambs grown in the eastern part of my State, and it was extremely detrimental to the economy of the State of Wyoming.

Let us next consider the old ewe market. In 1958 old ewes sold for an average price of \$10 per head. Last year because of imports, the price was \$5 to \$7 per head with very little market for old ewes. When we consider the fact that 70 percent of our mutton which is used in manufacturing meat was imported, it is quite easy to ascertain why the old ewe market suffered extremely in 1959.

On the dressed lamb market, there were many instances where lambs imported from Iceland were retailed on the east coast for 39 cents per pound. The wholesale price in most other areas amounted to at least 39 cents per pound; and considering a 30-percent gross markup for retail, the effect on the domestic price was quite drastic.

The announced price for New Zealand and Australian dressed lambs has ranged from 25.5 cents to 38 cents per pound, with the majority being in the area of 27 cents to 28 cents. At the same time, because of increased costs of production in the United States, the price per pound of a dressed domestic lamb ranged from 37 cents to 50 cents. Since a price of 47 cents to 50 cents for the domestic lamb is required in order to show a profit for the producer, the American grower is in an extremely unfavorable position.

The Congress has recognized the problem facing the domestic sheep industry by passing the National Wool Act. Notwithstanding this and other congressional action, it is my feeling the industry is still in jeopardy.

The alternatives with which we are faced at the present time are to increase the tariff on imports or to provide for import quotas. I feel that a certain amount of imports could properly supplement the domestic industry by sustaining a year-round market for lamb and allowing the people of the United States to eat this delicacy at all times of the year

rather than the various seasons as it has been so often in the past. These imports, however, should not be allowed to the extent where they completely ruin the domestic industry; and for this reason, I would like to recommend the adoption of an import quota based upon some historical volume of imports, such as an average for the past 5 years. This would include years of low import, such as 1956, and also years of high import, such as 1959; and I believe that would be a good balancing factor. I hope the members of this Commission can approve an action of this type.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my views on this very important subject.

Tabulation of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed the tabulation on a questionnaire which I mailed to every boxholder outside of first-class postoffices and to all addressees receiving their mail in first-class offices in my congressional district. I am inserting the results in the Record in order that all Members of Congress and others reading the Record may know how the people of western South Dakota feel on some of the most important issues.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, did about 8 percent complete their returns, but most of them took advantage of space provided in the questionnaire to express their opinions and to explain their stand on specific questions and issues.

I have saved for future reference many quotes from these comments, a few of which I should like to pass on. For instance, a number questioned why we should spend such large sums on the space program, one said, "We don't need another planet to subsidize."

There were a large number of farmers who demanded a repeal of the present farm program, saying "It is only making the large farmers larger and the small farmer smaller," or "What chance does a young man have to get a start under the present program?" Another said it this way, "Neither the Middlewest nor the Nation can afford to experience a serious depression resulting from low farm prices, and we cannot afford to continue to build up surpluses and spend billions in storage. No fair-minded foreign nation should complain if we put our house in order by using tariffs and quotas."

On the subject of foreign aid, one man said, "Christ performed miracles to teach the people to care for themselves, but he did not start feeding all the hungry people of the world."

On the subject of small business one man said, "The small businessman is being put out of business with high taxes—yet he is the backbone of the Nation." Another said, "The small businessman can work out his own problems if he is not taxed to death."

On the need for a balanced budget and reducing Federal regulation and control, one said, "It seems that our people have been convinced that the only way they can be prosperous is to gradually surrender their freedoms to Government control." Another said, "If the present rate of Federal expenditures continues, our children will see the day when the Government is taking their entire income and giving them a planned program from the cradle to the grave; all that then remains is to deny them the right to vote and they have had it."

The same thought was said this way, "I am for balancing the budget. I am

against spending money we do not have for benefits that do not benefit." Another said, "If you want your father to take care of you, that is paternalism; if you want your mother to take care of you, that is maternalism; if you want Uncle Sam to take care of you, that is socialism; if you can take care of yourself, that is Americanism."

On Federal aid to education one said, "The farther money gets away from home, the less comes back." Another said, "The States and local governments should handle their own problems rather than crying for Federal help for every project that arises." Another put it this

way, "Federal aid is inherently dangerous and absolutely unnecessary. The States can and will take care of their own school problems if left alone. The United States of America has the best all-around educated population in the world—what more do we want?"

I would close the quotations with this final shot, "A citizen's only recourse is profanity and a letter to his Congressman; the Congressman's only recourse is profanity and the burden of writing a sympathy letter back to the citizen."

Following, Mr. Speaker, is a complete tabulation on a percentage basis of the answers to the questions asked:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Not certain		Yes	No	Not certain
1. Do you believe sufficient emphasis is placed on our missile and space programs?	59	19	22	6. Has the Federal Government given sufficient attention to the problems of the small businessman? (Please comment).	20	35	45
2. Do you consider our defense budget to be adequate?	64	11	25	7. Do you believe the Federal minimum wage should be raised?	22	65	13
3. Should we continue our mutual security military and economic aid to friendly nations?	62	13	25	8. Should labor unions be brought under the antitrust laws?	79	8	13
4. To bolster farm income, do you favor—				9. Do you favor reducing the national debt before tax cuts are made?	78	12	10
Increased crop supports and controls?	15	62	23	10. Do you favor legislation to tighten taxation on cooperatives?	61	20	19
Enactment of domestic parity program for wheat with allotment based on bushel rather than acreage quotas?	43	25	32	11. With respect to education, should the Federal Government:			
Preventing foreign competition with tariffs and quotas?	50	24	26	Consider it a local and State problem?	68	19	13
5. Do you favor an increase in gasoline tax even though failure to pass would slow down the interstate highway program?	37	52	11	Give aid for school construction?	43	43	14
				Help pay teachers' salaries?	22	61	17
				If you favor Federal aid, should a tax levy be made to cover the cost rather than add it to the national debt?	48	17	35

Those who indicated their business as farming answered question 4 as follows: 4(a) 35 percent said "yes," 55 percent said "no," and 11 percent "uncertain"; 4(b) there were 68 percent who said "yes," 21 percent "no," and 11 percent "uncertain"; on 4(c) 66 percent said "yes," 14 percent said "no," and 20 percent "uncertain." On question 9, 87 percent said "yes," 7 percent "no," and 6 percent "uncertain."

The ranchers were even more definite on question 4 with only 13 percent answering "yes" on 4(a), 79 percent saying "no," and 8 percent "uncertain"; on 4(b) there were 49 percent answering "yes," 34 percent "no," and 17 percent "uncertain"; and on 4(c) there were 73 percent who said "yes," 10 percent "no," and 17 percent "uncertain." On question 9 there were 86 percent who said "yes," 11 percent "no," and 3 percent "uncertain."

Of those who classified themselves as farmer-rancher, on 4(a) there were 27 percent answering "yes," 49 percent "no," and 24 percent "uncertain"; on 4(b) a total of 55 percent said "yes," 21 percent "no," and 24 percent "uncertain"; and 4(c) found 64 percent answering "yes," 10 percent "no," and 26 percent "uncertain." On question 9 there were 72 percent answering "yes," 18 percent "no," and 10 percent "uncertain."

An interesting category was the teachers on question 11. On 11(a) there were 37 percent answering "yes," 39 percent saying "no," and 24 percent "uncertain"; on 11(b) there were 63 percent answering "yes," 18 percent "no," and 19 percent "uncertain"; on 11(c) there were 48 percent answering "yes," 34 percent answering "no," and 18 percent "uncertain"; while on 11(d) there were 60 percent of the teachers answering "yes," 8 percent "no," and 32 percent "uncertain."

tain." These returns indicate that the teachers themselves are divided on the subject of Federal aid to education and a large majority feeling that if any such program is instituted there should be a tax levy to cover the cost.

Wilson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we who work in Washington, D.C., are often made keenly aware of the sharp differences of opinion which often arise when we discuss new buildings, new civic improvements, new memorials to our great men.

On January 21, when I introduced a bill to establish a Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, it was already clear that there was no single opinion on the form the monument could take. Many feel that it should be a "living memorial," that is, a functional building such as a library, an international center, and so forth. Others believe that it should be a monument similar in concept to those which already honor Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Such discussion is, I think essential if the proposed memorial is to serve its purpose as well as it should. When Americans become concerned about an issue, their discussion brings improvement and innovation. The Memorial Commission would certainly have a formidable and rewarding task.

The latest discussion about the memorial concerns members of President Wilson's family, and it is discussed in a Newark, N.J., news editorial of March 21.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON MEMORIAL

Woodrow Wilson's family is divided on the form of the proposed memorial to be erected to him in Washington. His last living daughter disagrees with her brother-in-law and her stepmother.

Dr. Francis S. Sayre suggests it should be an international house for the reception of foreign visitors, particularly those participating in cultural exchange programs. Mrs. Edith Bolling Wilson concurs.

But, in response to an inquiry by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, sponsor of legislation to create a memorial commission, Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo has expressed preference for a monument.

Many favor the "living memorial" idea, among them President Eisenhower. But there are strong arguments for a nonutilitarian monument, and Mrs. McAdoo's are among them. She points out that Mrs. Wilson plans to give the President's house on S Street to the Nation as a shrine. Another building dedicated to his memory would not be needed, she feels. But Mrs. McAdoo's most important reason is that a monument could be seen by every kind of American who might hesitate to visit an education and orientation center.

Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers, feels the same way. He has said that as between a memorial of real beauty and a fussy center, no matter how nobly conceived, I would certainly pick the memorial.

The Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and the Jefferson Memorial are beautiful. It is not required of them that they be useful. They express the grandeur that invests the memory of great Presidents. Their noble lines inspire reverence in the beholder, which is what memorials are supposed to do.

Managing One of Our Greatest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of Washington State, which I have the honor to represent, is blessed with an abundance of forest land. The major portion of this land is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.

These timber resources play an important role in the economy of this area and, thus, proper management is of vital importance. The Forest Service, under the able and conscientious direction of Chief Richard E. McArdle, has provided this sound management. Their purpose has been to manage the forests in line with the multiple use or "best for the greatest number of people" concept. Under this plan, everyone benefits rather than just a chosen few.

I would like to enclose an editorial which appeared in the March 21 edition of the Spokesman-Review Newspaper, Spokane, Wash., entitled, "Forest Use Policy Statute Supported." This editorial, I believe, sums up the general feeling among the people of our area regarding the proper management and utilization of our forest resources.

The editorial follows:

FOREST USE POLICY STATUTE SUPPORTED

Some progress is being made in the National Capital toward the enactment of a statute that would assure the management of national forest lands on the basis of multiple use.

Thanks to the stimulus of Representative WALT HORAN of Washington's Fifth Congressional District and other Congressmen well aware of the need for a policy declaration by the Congress, a bill outlining such a policy has been getting favorable treatment to date in Washington, D.C.

Among those who testified before a House Agricultural Subcommittee last week the chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Richard E. McArdle; spokesmen for various land-use associations, and Congressmen of both political parties.

Their testimony has emphasized the aim of the Forest Service to carry out administrative multiple-use policies which affect timber operations, grazing, fish, and wildlife, general agriculture and varied recreational interests.

There have always been some minor irritations over the carrying out of national forestry policies. But that is to be expected in a country as large as ours and with such great variations in the location, size and other economic and geographic factors that condition the effects of administrative regulations. In general, however, there has been no attempt on the part of the Forest Service to confine its public services solely to forestry.

Yet the recent threat of legislation that would compel the Forest Service to abandon its principles of multiple use of public lands—this threat has now made it desirable, if not necessary, that Congress provide official and legal authorization for the multiple-use concept.

It will take relatively fast action for the bill now under committee consideration to win enactment and White House approval at this session of Congress.

There should be no letup in the effort to secure a sound multiple-use statute this year. Individuals and organizations which favor multiple use of forestry lands over the proposed "lock-up" or single-use plan should continue to raise their voices of approval at this time.

Judge Oscar Dancy, Cameron County Commissioners Court Favor Shrimp Import Quota Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was my recent privilege to join the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, and others in cosponsorship of a bill to establish country-by-country import quotas on shrimp and shrimp products.

Enactment of this quota measure would, I believe, help relations between American and Mexican fishermen in Gulf of Mexico fishing. Establishing quotas will let foreign fishermen know exactly what part of our market they can expect to supply.

A study of the record shows that under our Federal aid programs we are advancing money to some 50 countries across the Atlantic and Pacific to increase their shrimp imports into the United States. Unfortunately, this is reacting against the interests of fishermen of our own country and our good neighbors of the Americas.

Few Americans understand the advantage and desirability of strengthening our mutual understanding with our friends below the border as well as our city and county officials in south Texas. Two such officials are Judge Oscar C. Dancy, the honored, beloved and distinguished judge of Cameron County, Tex., and his county clerk, Mr. H. D. Seago, likewise with a long and distinguished record. Recently the commissioners court of Cameron County passed a resolution favoring establishing a country-by-country import quota on shrimp and shrimp products. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution of the Cameron County commissioners court on shrimp imports.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the greatest concentration of deep sea shrimp trawlers in the world is based in Cameron County, Tex., and the shrimp industry is a vital part of the economy of such county; and

Whereas shrimp in vast quantities are reported off the coasts of various foreign countries, especially in the Far East, and shrimp from such countries are for the first time in history being made accessible to the markets in the United States due to the introduction into these countries within recent times of

power-driven, well-equipped modern fishing vessels and especially due to the construction in such countries (often with funds originating in the United States) of modern freezing plants; and

Whereas the labor in many of such foreign countries is cheap, and the standards of living of labor in such countries is far below that in the United States; and

Whereas the shrimp industry of the United States is threatened with disaster from the uncontrolled and unregulated flood of cheap foreign shrimp into the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commissioners Court of Cameron County, Tex., in meeting duly assembled on this 21st day of March 1960, a quorum being present and voting, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, that full support be, and it is hereby, given to H. R. 8769 now pending in the Congress of the United States placing a country by country quota on shrimp imports.

In testimony whereof, said Cameron County, Tex., has caused this resolution to be subscribed by its county judge, and attested by its county clerk, this 21st day of March 1960.

CAMERON COUNTY, TEX.,

OSCAR C. DANCY,

County Judge.

Attest:

H. D. SEAGO,

County Clerk.

We're Up to Front Row Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the exploits of Pioneer V have emphatically brought before the people of this country the very real accomplishments of our scientists in space exploration. In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a very fine editorial which appeared in the March 18, 1960, issue of the Bethlehem Globe-Times of Bethlehem, Pa., on this matter:

That's a happy sound in the signals being sent back over more than 500,000 miles of space from Pioneer V, America's space rocket heading for an orbit around the Sun and a near rendezvous with Venus.

It will be a greater victory for American scientists still if the tiny radio powered by solar batteries keeps functioning as anticipated until the 95-pound windmill satellite disappears from range months from now and 50 million miles away in the lonely heavens.

The signal is now setting a new record for distance transmission through space each time it comes through. That in itself is welcome news to a nation afflicted with a national inferiority complex. It means we are making a major contribution to man's exploration of the vast void that comprises our planetary system.

The United States still has to accept an unaccustomed and uncomfortable back seat to the Soviet Union in the realm of sheer power in rocketry. For accuracy in aiming and skill in the immensely complex and abstract arithmetic of space ballistics, the Russians have forced the best scientists whom this country could gather from here and abroad to do their utmost just to keep pace.

But Pioneer V is a tangible demonstration that the United States has something to show the world in the important area of instrumentation. American rockets are truly space scouts capable of collecting and sending back an unprecedented amount and variety of data to expand man's sphere of celestial knowledge.

Electronics and the Future Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on March 17, 1960, Gen. E. R. Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, made an address before the Electronics Industries Association, at the Government-industry dinner at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C. General Quesada touched upon some very interesting points in the program to modernize the electronics part of our airways.

Since I believe that my colleagues will be interested in this address, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRONICS AND THE FUTURE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

(Address by E. R. Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, before the Electronics Industries Association government-industry dinner, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 17, 1960)

I am indeed happy to be with you tonight and to discuss some of the more challenging problems facing us in the aviation community. This evening I hope to give you an up-to-date report on our plans and programs to provide safer and more efficient aviation facilities for the Nation.

Aviation and electronics have come of age during the lifetime of many of us here tonight. What's more, the two industries have grown up together. The years following Orville Wright's historic 12-second flight at Kitty Hawk have been years of phenomenal progress for both aviation and electronics. Electronics has had its impact on the growth of the aviation industry. Likewise the electronics industry has benefited from the inexhaustible market generated by the air age. Manual and mechanical systems and devices in aircraft have been replaced by smaller, lighter, less expensive and more efficient electronics packages. The remarkable progress in electronics in the last decade is a tribute to engineers and scientists of the world who have dedicated their efforts to research and development. And, I might add, a tribute to the electronics manufacturers for their efficiency in producing the products of research and development for distribution to the users. In this regard, your organizations have promoted, not only our Nation's productivity but have furthered the well-being of its individual citizens as well.

As we look now to the future, aviation will rely on the efforts of men such as you to an increasing extent to provide the neces-

sary airborne devices, navigational aids, and communications equipment that are the lifeblood of a safe and efficient air traffic system. Your steady growth over the past several years reflects the increasing dependence that we are placing upon your industries in helping us reach our objectives. And I would say, without hesitation, that the electronics industries, big as they are, are only beginning to tap their productive potentialities. Your greatest years still lie ahead.

Now what are the objectives of the Federal Aviation Agency? There are many, but there is one that takes No. 1 priority—air safety.

We must attain air safety to the most absolute degree possible, for every type of aircraft that uses the navigable airspace, whether large or small, jet or piston-engine, whether flying under visual or instrument flight conditions, from takeoff to touchdown.

I believe we have made excellent progress in the field of safety, through more and better navigational and communications equipment, through research and development activities, improved flight standards and air traffic control regulations and procedures, higher medical standards and pilot qualification, and many other related factors. This progress has been due to the efforts of not one agency or one group, but rather to the cooperation and hard work of the entire aviation community.

The aviation picture today is rapidly becoming more complex. The airspace, which was more than adequate when I started my flying career 35-odd years ago, is literally shrinking as the result of increasing air traffic and the introduction of bigger, faster, and higher-flying transport planes and thousands upon thousands of business and private aircraft. Today we have over 100,000 active aircraft in the United States. Of this number 70,000 are civil. We estimate that by 1965 we will have 83,000 civil aircraft in our national inventory. In terms of hours flown, we expect general aviation aircraft to jump from its current rate of 12 million hours per year to 16 million by 1965. This will be an increase of 33 percent in the next 5 years. These statistics are staggering in themselves, but when we consider the fact that next year we will have 225 jet transports operating in our system, the immensity of the task we face strikes home with stark reality. Now then, what are some of the specific problems associated with modernizing our national system of aviation facilities? First, to accommodate increased numbers and complexity of aircraft in smaller blocks of airspace, and still maintain safe separation between aircraft, we must provide a measure of flexibility in our air route structure to permit the more efficient utilization of our precious commodity—airspace. This requires improved navigation devices both on the ground and in the air. Our ultimate goal is to provide a navigation reference throughout the airspace from the ground to the highest altitude at which aircraft will fly. This means that we must provide facilities which will permit aircraft to be flown off-airways—off the established air routes—a system in which aircraft are not necessarily required to fly from navigation aid to navigation aid.

There are available today, in various stages of development, many navigation systems that will permit off-airways, point-to-point flight. At our National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, in Atlantic City, we are currently experimenting with Doppler navigators, pictorial displays, self-contained dead-reckoning computers and other techniques to determine how this equipment can be used in a system based on ground-referenced devices. The accuracy of position information required for air traffic control demands at this time that self-contained airborne navigation systems be updated periodically by reference to a ground navigation facility. The VORTAC network being implemented throughout the country will provide accurate azimuth and distance information to facilitate this updating.

I would emphasize here that radar, our primary surveillance tool, plays a most important role in increasing the number of aircraft that can be safely flown in a given block of airspace. In addition to our own radars, the FAA has controllers at 38 Air Defense Command sites to provide radar advisory service under a joint use arrangement.

So far, my discussion has been pretty much directed to separation problems in the lateral plane. Of no less importance, and of at least equal complexity, are the problems associated with maintaining vertical separation between aircraft.

The ground-determined height of aircraft has long been a missing dimension in air traffic control. We are currently developing an air height surveillance radar. A "receiver only," passive system, it uses an S-band air surveillance radar as the target illuminator. The antenna system is a 160-foot high structure, consisting of three antenna arrays, arranged to form an equilateral triangle, 80 feet on each side. The height-finding radar is designed to furnish comparative heights of aircraft within 50 miles of the airport complex.

We also need altitude information on aircraft that are in the en route area, beyond the reach of our height-finding radar. There are several possible means of obtaining this information. One method we are investigating involves the use of the radar beacon system. A radar beacon, of course, is by nature a data link. The radar beacon system can provide the four essential bits of information required for positive air traffic control: range, bearing, altitude, and identity. The beacon system which the FAA is implementing presently provides three of the four, and we are now in the early stages of developing the capability of obtaining aircraft derived altitude information via the radar beacon link. Although our operational beacon capability today is limited, we are rapidly implementing beacons in our high density areas. By July of 1962, we should have operational coverage of the navigable airspace over the entire country, with over 50 beacons operational.

Another difficult problem facing us today is the ever-increasing demand for radio spectrum utilization. As more and more aircraft are introduced into the system, the overcrowded air traffic control and air navigation frequency bands will reach saturation in high density areas. We do not foresee any significant increase in aviation's share of the spectrum. We must live with what we have and to do this, the FAA will do everything possible to insure that the bands of the spectrum allocated to aviation are assigned and used effectively. We are modernizing voice procedures and seeking ways to improve voice intelligibility. We are working to achieve improved techniques and better frequency stabilization.

We are well aware of the fact that the communications bottleneck must be overcome. We have developed and are currently testing a high-speed, automatic ground-air-ground communication system known as AGACS. AGACS is an experimental tool with which we will determine the design characteristics for a two-way data link adaptable to the requirements of all users of airspace. Within a 2-minute rollcall cycle, AGACS handles up to 500 two-way messages. These messages are contained within a single-frequency channel, as is presently used for voice communications. Routine flight instructions and advisory information from pilot or controller are transmitted to the aircraft or control station. Here they are converted into direct reading

displays. Voice radio will still be used for nonroutine and emergency communications.

Implementation of radar beaconry, data link, VORTAC, and the host of other improvements to the overall air traffic control environment will provide the air traffic controller with the information he needs to move air traffic safely and expeditiously. To be of maximum value to the controller, this information must be correlated and applied swiftly and efficiently. The FAA is developing a Data Processing Central designed to relieve the controller of many of his routine clerical chores and allow him to spend more of his time in his decision-making capacity. The Data Processing Central will automatically print and update flight progress information. It will probe for, detect, and display potential conflicts between aircraft in the system. It will assist the controller in scheduling aircraft for landings. The Data Processing Central will be available for use in the New York area in 1963.

Another extremely important area in which we are making progress is the development of a blind, or all-weather, landing capability.

Last year alone, the airlines forfeited \$23 million in revenue because they were not always able to deliver their passengers and cargo to destination airports. The military needs the all-weather landing capability to insure a full retaliatory combat potential. We are currently evaluating systems developed by the Navy and Air Force for their applicability to civil operations.

The introduction of this all-weather landing capability must, of course, be an evolutionary process. Our program is divided basically into three phases. In the first phase, our attention is directed to the improvement of the present instrument landing system (ILS) and the ground control approach (GCA). The second phase of the program involves the testing of an all-weather landing system for interim application where the need is urgent. And, finally, we will develop new techniques for a landing system suitable for the future air traffic environment.

Our National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center is today a full-fledged experimental facility complete with instrumented laboratories, high capacity computer and simulation facilities, and is staffed by a dedicated group, and technically recognized experts in all fields of the informed aviation world. We are in the final phases of the development of improved standard airport lighting. We are evaluating 5 different visual glide slope systems. We are actively investigating aircraft arresting devices. We are making excellent progress in our program to automate weather measurements and provide for their automatic transmittal to forecast centers. We are actively pursuing a program to collocate high altitude air traffic control and air defense functions in the SAGE Super Combat Center.

In our long-range planning, we must envision the effects on our control system of the eventual introduction of supersonic and ultrasonic aircraft in the air carrier inventory. When this takes place the human limitations of pilot and crew to control their aircraft will become more apparent. It will be necessary to turn to automatic devices for the airborne environment to achieve maximum safety in flight. The quantity and the complexity of the electronic gear that will go into future aircraft will be greater than what they are today.

Future flight environments will require electronic equipment with greater operating extremes to cope with the variety of new problems created by supersonic speeds. This will not necessarily present new problems in design because much work in this area has been done in the missile programs. It will involve application of known principles and techniques to new equipment.

Powerplant performance and structural fatigue under high temperature conditions will have increased importance to safe operation. These problems will require close monitoring. Sophisticated electronic recording devices may be necessary to accomplish this monitoring.

Control of a supersonic airplane by a so-called autopilot, requires more precise and rapid sensing of airplane deviations from the flight path. Greater speed and accuracy will be demanded in the performance of the necessary corrective actions by the autopilot than are required in the autopilots of current turbine-powered airplanes.

Since the performance of a supersonic airplane is so critical and its instrumentation and control systems are so complex, the pilot will need information on flight parameters faster than can humanly be determined or computed. Therefore, the pilot will need assistance from sensing systems fed into a computer. The computer in turn will provide rapid answers to the pilot.

It is conceivable that ultimately the pilot will only monitor control of the airplane. The intelligence from the computer will be harnessed to provide actual control of the plane. All the parameters for a given flight might be fed into a computer before the takeoff and the entire flight to the end of the landing roll would be controlled automatically. The airborne portions of the VOR and DME systems would furnish some of the intelligence used in such a flight control system.

Coupled with flight control, would be automatic control of the various systems in the aircraft, such as engine fuel management, pressurization, anti-icing, and deicing systems. This would appear to be the ultimate and will not all come at once. There will need to be intermediate stages in which only a portion of such control is utilized.

Since the takeoff of a high speed aircraft is perhaps the most critical portion of a flight, information to show whether to continue the takeoff or to abort is very important. This involves sensing of engine power, aircraft speed, outside air temperature, and so forth. The computer will compare this data with ideal parameters and give the pilot information needed. This might logically be one of the first steps in the intermediate stage.

It is easy to see that systems such as I have just described would have to have extreme reliability and fail-safe performance. FAA will determine minimum performance and reliability standards. The equipment will have to meet the standards originally and be maintained so as to continue to meet them.

As you can see, electronic needs for future aircraft will be great.

In addition to the automatic control systems mentioned, the present day navigation equipment such as VOR, DME, LORAN, and DOPPLER will have to give way to more sophisticated electronic equipment to handle future navigation problems. This does not mean that the basic system will change, but rather equipment of those types will need to be redesigned to take advantage of improvements in the state of the art—to increase reliability and simplicity and to reduce size, weight, and cost.

Our progress to date is in large part attributable to the outstanding contributions of the electronics industries to our programs. Our continued progress and leadership in aviation will require sustained and imaginative research, development and productivity. They will require vitality, creativeness, and the application of new skills and techniques on the part of science, management, and government.

As a regulating agency we cannot cope with the problems which will confront us in the future without your continued help and guidance. I urge that you continue to

assist us in whatever manner that is at your command. We will require advice and assistance on performance standards for the new types of equipment. Such standards in the past have been prepared to a great extent under the auspices of the Society of Automotive Engineers and the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics. Many of your member companies have furnished technical assistance on the working committees of those organizations. Continued technical support by working either directly with us when we ask for collaboration or as members of SAE or RTCA will be of great assistance. Knowing of your past record, I look forward to your future support with confidence.

The Wilderness Bill and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the general public in California is particularly interested in legislation to preserve and protect the wilderness resources now in Federal ownership. They join with millions of Americans throughout the land in urging a reorganized Federal wilderness system.

There is wide agreement that this generation has a duty to preserve and pass on a heritage of wilderness in an untrammelled natural state.

The wilderness bill first appeared in 1957, based on studies started about 1948. Pending now are various measures in both Houses of Congress. The Government's major land-managing departments have endorsed the pending legislation provided that minor amendments are adopted. Hearings have not been held by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this Congress, but have been completed by the other body.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Mirror-News:

THE WILDERNESS BILL AND YOU

"The world," mourned the poet Wordsworth, "is too much with us; late and soon."

What's worse, a geographic "togetherness" is making it impossible to fend off this encroaching world, even briefly. Urbanism grows. Wilderness vanishes.

Yet here in America some scattered fragments of true wilderness remain, which might be saved for ourselves and future generations.

SOME PLAIN TALK

Interior Secretary Seaton, a plain-talking midwesterner, says:

"The important thing is that those places of high intrinsic value for public refreshment, enjoyment, and inspiration be quickly identified, and steps taken to protect and preserve them * * * before they are irretrievably lost to other uses."

Seaton gives the United States 10 years at most to complete a program of wilderness sanctuaries that would be safe from commercial exploitation.

Such a project must start immediately. Lengthy surveys by governmental and private agencies have pinpointed some 55 million acres scattered from Cape Cod to our own Pacific coastal forests.

All lie now within Federal domain. No new lands would have to be withdrawn.

There's a measure before the U.S. Senate (S. 1123) which would do the job.

Quite simply, this wilderness bill would forever retain these last unspoiled regions in their primeval state.

Every major U.S. conservation group has joined the Eisenhower administration in urging passage of such an act. Who's against it? Mainly those with a special, selfish interest in exploiting these hitherto "untouched" areas.

Our own highly respected Sierra Club, founded in 1892 by John Muir, stands in the forefront of this fight. They've just issued a breathtakingly beautiful book called "This Is the American Earth." Its photographs by famed Ansel Adams and its poetic text by Nancy Newhall present the wilderness case better than a dozen senatorial orations.

"A tragic loss" says Sierra Club director David Brower, "could be prevented if only there could be broader understanding of this: that the resources of the earth do not exist just to be spent for the comfort, pleasure, or convenience of the generation or two who first learn how to spend them; that some of the resources exist for saving, and what diminishes them diminishes all mankind; that one of them is wilderness."

LAST DITCH BATTLE

We firmly believe this last ditch battle to preserve a semblance of our wilderness heritage should be joined by thinking people throughout the country. We urge it wholeheartedly.

For as Miss Newhall concludes in her commentary in the Sierra volume.

"Were all learning lost, all music stilled, Man, if these resources still remained to him, Could again hear singing in himself And rebuild anew the habitations of his thoughts."

Sharing With Those in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 27 was a day during which three religious American overseas aid agencies appealed for funds. This appeal during World Refugee Year had particular significance. It was a reminder to us in this Nation that we can never forget others no matter how secure we feel ourselves to be.

The Cape May (N.J.) Star and Wave paid notice to this effort in a moving editorial on March 24, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARING WITH THOSE IN NEED

The current World Refugee Year has focused the attention of people in America and in other United Nations countries upon the plight of the homeless throughout the free world—refugee victims of war, disaster, and political displacement.

It is important to note in this connection that in all privately inspired effort to

help these stricken peoples, the preponderance of the work is done, has been done, and will continue to be done through our great religious faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

This is as natural as it is fitting, because compassion for our fellow men is basic in the Judeo-Christian ethic and inherent in religious precepts.

For years our American religious communities and their counterparts in other lands have labored to relieve suffering among the homeless and uprooted, sustaining widespread programs of resettlement, constructive development, rehabilitation, and vocational training.

In addition, to lessen suffering both among the refugees and among the many, many other millions of needy overseas, they maintain year-around distribution of food and clothing, assist orphanages, schools, and hospitals, and carry on housing, tuberculosis, and other health projects.

Currently the American religious overseas aid agencies are appealing to our people for funds with which to continue their works of mercy.

On Sunday, March 27, in Protestant and Catholic churches throughout America, responses will be made to the Protestant One Great Hour of Sharing appeal and to the Catholic Bishops' Relief Fund appeal.

Similarly, our national Jewish community will be giving support to the United Jewish Appeal, a continuing effort with special emphasis at this season.

This sharing with those in need abroad is in the highest American tradition. Voluntary assistance to the suffering, neighbor helping neighbor, is a basic spirit of Americanism. And in today's world every man—everywhere—is a neighbor.

Let us, each through his own faith, share our abundance with our neighbors in need.

Crowdus Baker, Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in common with many citizens of Massachusetts, and in particular Greater Boston, I was delighted and truly gratified to learn of the recent election of the distinguished Mr. Crowdus Baker to be president of the world-renowned business and merchandising establishment of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

The selection of Mr. Baker to this high and honorable post is not only a most impressive tribute of confidence by the leaders of this great firm in his character, ability, and his superlative qualifications, but it is another striking example of the opportunities for advancement to highest posts of responsibility in the business affairs of our Nation which are implicit in our great and incomparable free enterprise system.

Mr. Baker's brilliant career is another very impressive and striking instance of steady rise from the ranks by dint of great ability, industry, devotion to duty, and superlative general qualifications, to top leadership in one of the greatest business organizations in the world.

Born in Dallas, Tex., February 27, 1906, of stalwart American folks, Crow-

dus Baker was graduated from Terrell Preparatory School in that beautiful city and later from the famous Austin College in Sherman, Tex., class of 1928.

Setting his sights on loftiest peaks of achievement and willing to work hard in order to gain his objective, he joined the Sears company in 1929.

It was not long before his industrious habits, fine traits of character, winning personality, agile mind, and fine qualities of leadership deeply impressed his superiors and in 1935, he was assigned as operating superintendent of the large Sears mail-order house at Seattle.

From that time on, Baker's promotion to more and more responsible posts was surprisingly rapid. The company came to regard him as one of its most able and promising young executives and in 1939, named him to become superintendent of the huge Boston mail-order house which covers the entire Northeast section of the country. In 1945, so well had he handled his assignments and duties, he was designated general manager of Sears operations in Boston, after having served as operating superintendent of a similar unit in Philadelphia.

It was here in our great Massachusetts city of Boston that I first had the privilege and pleasure of knowing this great American and watching his unusual and outstanding work in his own company and his remarkable contributions, far beyond the call of duty, to many worthwhile activities in the civic, charitable, and business-development life of our historic capital city. His tireless energy and his ever-willing and ever-ready response to many demands made upon him to take part in community betterment projects became a source of wonder and admiration to those of us familiar with the many facets of his very busy life.

In a sense, the progress which Crowdus Baker has made in his career has been truly phenomenal. But it certainly comes as no surprise to those of us who were in a position to observe and note the broad sweep of his talents, the obvious and outstanding qualities of leadership he possesses and his special aptitude for inspiring confidence and making friends wherever he went.

Crowdus Baker is a man of exceptionally broad horizons, possessed of the drive, spirit of determination and resourcefulness, adaptability, so often necessarily a part of the makeup and attributes of leaders in every field.

Kindly and generous of impulse, warm and sympathetic in nature, he never hesitates to join with others in improving the opportunities and bettering the lot of those who struggle and toil.

He is endowed with practical vision and marked powers of decisive action and is known for his sense of fairness and his ability to make sound judgments.

All these qualities admirably equip him for the high post of responsibility he has assumed because they mark him indelibly as a man who has his feet on the ground and who knows how to deliver the goods in the literal, as well as the figurative, sense.

The famous firm of Sears, Roebuck has not only made a wise choice but it deserves to be heartily congratulated for recognizing merit, character, and ability

in making this appointment. It is in instances like this one where young men starting at the bottom can by their own powers and industry work their way to the top that the American people are constantly refortified in their faith in our great productive economic system. This particular appointment is notice to the world that there are no frontiers of opportunity in this country, that everyone who has the ability and is willing to work can reach highest levels in American business life.

Of course, everyone cannot be president of Sears, Roebuck, and everyone possessed of gifts and talents cannot necessarily attain highest leadership. There are unpredictable elements of chance, fortune, personality, and other factors that come into advancement and progress in any field. But it is very refreshing to know that in the main, American boys starting from scratch can and do work their way to the top by virtue of their own gifts, their own spirit of resolution, and their own hard work.

The many friends of Crowds Baker in the business, civic, and social community of Boston join me, I am sure, in rejoicing with him in this well-deserved recognition of Crowds Baker's outstanding abilities. And we hail him, not only as an outstanding business leader, who has demonstrated his capacity for getting things done, but as a warm, considerate, and generous friend, a humane personality, vitally interested in American life, in the American people, and in helping to solve the great problems of the hour.

I am happy indeed to extend my heartiest congratulations to him, to his family, and to his company, which I think has demonstrated great wisdom in making this appointment. In succeeding President Charles A. Kellstadt, Mr. Baker will have no easy task. He will have to live up to a very high standard of performance indeed, one that has deeply impressed the Nation and that portion of the world familiar with it. He is succeeding a great, a worthy, and another distinguished business leader who has left a proud and indelible imprint upon his company and the history of our times.

I wish for Crowds Baker long life and continued good health, great and steadily increasing success in his vital work, and all those choice blessings of the Lord which come from family, friendship, and the joys of sincere loyal living. And I wish for him and his dear ones most abundant measures of happiness in the years to come.

Bishop Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the entire free world is shocked at the action of the Chinese Communist regime

in incarcerating Bishop James Edward Walsh.

We have made strong protests, including a statement by Secretary of State Herter, and I understand that our Government made the strongest possible protest to the Chinese Communist representative at the meeting of March 22 at Warsaw.

The Communist ideology does not permit any opposition. This brave and sincere disciple of the church, by remaining loyal to his flock, has become an inspiration to all who are true to their ideals. He is a man of the greatest integrity and has gained the widest recognition through his 30 years in China. He has become a symbol, because the citizens of the free world are being made increasingly aware of the Communist theory of destroying that with which they disagree.

It is my hope and prayer that his sacrifice of personal safety will not be in vain, and that he will be released in good health to continue his dedicated service.

American Farm Bureau Supports "Ike" on Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article taken from the Amboy News of Amboy, Ill., under date of March 24, 1960:

SHUMAN SAYS IKE'S GUIDELINES ARE CONSISTENT WITH FARM BUREAU POLICIES

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said last week that the "three guidelines for farm legislation set forth by President Eisenhower in his special farm message are consistent with policies developed by Farm Bureau members."

The head of the Nation's largest general farm organization—with 1,602,117 member families in 49 States and Puerto Rico—expressed gratification that "the President has slammed shut the door on Brannan-plan-type direct subsidy schemes and the various multiple-price proposals."

A multiple-price plan for wheat, Mr. Shuman noted, not only would be unworkable for wheat; it also would dump many of the wheat farmer's problems on the growers of corn and other feed grains as well as livestock, dairy, and poultry producers.

He said the President's comments on payments-in-kind as a part of the conservation reserve program are well considered.

"We, too, would have to oppose a payment-in-kind program that would depress market prices," he said.

"The President's recommendation that the program for corn and feed grains be continued is in line with the expressed wishes of Farm Bureau members. This program—which was passed by Congress with bipartisan support in 1958, and approved by corn farmers by a 3-to-1 vote in a referendum—is a big step in the right direction.

"We're happy to see the President reflect the views of a great majority of our members in stating that most farmers want fewer rather than more governmental restraints."

Splitting Atoms on the Farm: Jerome Spitzner, Nation's Top Young Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about the revolution on the farm. A final touch has now been added. A young constituent of mine is splitting atoms on the farm.

This week, as thousands of delegates from around the Nation convene in Washington for the White House Conference on Children and Youth, it seems appropriate to review the story of Jerry Spitzner, the 17-year-old farm boy scientist from St. James, Minn.

A few weeks ago he won a \$7,500 scholarship and captured top honors as the 19th annual science talent search among 29,000 of the Nation's high school seniors culminated here in Washington.

It was my privilege and honor to meet Jerry at a dinner honoring the winners, and he is certainly one of the Nation's most promising young scientists.

In these critical days we hear much about the great contest that is being waged by our Communist adversary, and we realize more fully the value of young men and women who have, not only the natural ability, but the disposition to improve themselves. In the field of science, manpower can do much more than congressional investigations, and it will be young men such as Jerry Spitzner who will be the contributing factor in the supremacy of the free world's scientific achievement.

Jerry lives on a farm near St. James, Minn., in Watonwan County. He has learned to work, and to practice thrift and endeavor. His wholesome contributions to his church and school made a mark in his community, long before his name hit the headlines across the country.

I believe we can learn a great deal about the enduring values of this country by looking at the simple story of Jerry Spitzner and the factors in a rural community which shaped his life. For this reason—and to make a tribute to Jerry Spitzner a part of the Record of the Congress—I am inserting excerpts from newspaper accounts of Jerry, which I recommend to my colleagues for study.

The Mankato Free Press of March 8, 1960, in an article by Don Heinzman, described Jerry Spitzner's winning entry as follows:

A homemade atom-smasher fashioned from such materials as a Christmas tree bulb, refrigerator, and parts of a milking machine pump helped win the honor for young Spitzner.

He built his "spherical ion accelerator" in a "shack" laboratory on his father's farm during the summer.

His machine is an experimental device intended as a possible trailblazer in the discovery of new methods of producing nuclear power.

With it he is able to accelerate ions (electrically charged atoms) and to bombard them with other elements. His was the

only original entry in the 40-student field during the 5-day finals held at Washington, D.C.

Jerry explained he is able to accelerate ions between two concentric spheres, one being the Christmas tree bulb.

With the apparatus he is able to achieve processes which include antielectricity and antilight. One of his processes will even erase radio signals.

At Washington, D.C., Jerry demonstrated how his machine can heat a thin ribbon of hot gas to a million degrees in a conic chamber, which is actually two small aluminum funnels placed together.

He successfully did this experiment by fusing lithium and hydrogen ions, thus achieving the heat of the sun and using the same type of heat used in the explosion of a hydrogen bomb.

When informed he was the winner Jerry said: "It's been a great experience. It's hard to believe. I'm afraid it will all go away when I wake up tomorrow."

The honor student and senior class president, who is described as being as humble and sincere as a boy can be, first entered the contest by writing a paper on the results of using the spherical ion accelerator.

In addition to being an honor student and president of his class, he is an outstanding halfback on the St. James high school football team and a member of the wrestling team. He has had some athletic scholarship offers from major universities.

School officials said he has read all the books he can lay his hands on. He has read every book on science in the Traveling Science Library.

Each morning he studies physics and chemistry over television and Saturdays he attends a physics course at Gustavus Adolphus college.

At his farm home he has built and launched rockets with homemade fuel, designed an aerial camera that has a parachute release from the ground and is working on a digital computing machine.

He is also working on a sodium lox rocket and investigating low temperature fusion through antiparticles.

Jerry is described by his principal Richard Madison as "humble and as sincere as a boy can be."

Jerry's hometown paper, the St. James Plaindealer, published by Les Curtis, had the big story bannered on page 1 of its March 10 edition, and it provided valuable and penetrating detail on the makings of an outstanding young man.

Excerpts follow:

JERRY IS TOP FUTURE SCIENTIST

Jerome George Spitzner, 17-year-old St. James High School senior class president and sports star—better known as "Jerry" to his hundreds of acquaintances in southern Minnesota—became an important national personality Monday night.

His \$7,500 scholarship, awarded by Westinghouse Foundation, is symbolic of recognition of Jerry as the Nation's outstanding future scientist among the 1960 high school graduates.

A constant source of amazement and admiration for his friends, teachers, and especially his family, Ronnie and Lucille Spitzner and their four other bright children, Jerry won the top award of \$34,250 in scholarships presented at the climax of a 5-day science institute in the Nation's Capitol.

While the award climaxed the institute, it only turned the first rays of national limelight on the broad-shouldered St. James youth.

FUTURE PLANS

His winning the top award in the national science talent search, a \$7,500 grant from Westinghouse Foundation, also is expected to refresh activity in the field of college

scholarships, of which he had a wide assortment even before his recent national fame.

Jerry has indicated that he plans to attend the University of Minnesota. A strong influence in this direction, and an indication of the esteem and importance of the University of Minnesota, was the fact some of the Nation's top scientists in Washington, D.C., advised Jerry "don't overlook the University of Minnesota."

Easily embarrassed anyhow, and known by his classmates and instructors as "the politest guy we've ever known," Jerry apologized at a press conference for an error in spelling—an oversight through haste in preparation—on one of the signs identifying his exhibit. He had detected the error, omission of the letter "p" in the word "spherical," and kept it covered at the exhibit in Washington, but there it glared across the Nation when he and the exhibit were featured on the Dave Garraway TV show Wednesday morning.

LIKE A DREAM

Jerry admitted to a sinking feeling as the names of the prize winners were announced—very dramatically—at Washington, D.C., Monday night. He said he had hoped to win one of the big prizes, but felt disappointment when his name had not been called for fifth or fourth prize. Announcement of his name as the top prize winner left him stunned.

Reflecting on his trip east, his first trip to that region and first major trip away from Minnesota, Jerry said it left him with "a closed-in feeling." He explained that the East seems to be one big, sprawling city, with very little countryside of the kind most familiar to him.

Summing up his impressions of his hectic week in the national limelight and winning of the top prize competed for by more than 29,000 outstanding high school seniors, Jerry says:

"It's kind of like a dream; just fantastic enough to be believed."

HIRED MAN HAS ROUGH WEEK

Ronnie Spitzner, father of the now nationally famous St. James High School senior scientist, Jerry, admits his participation in the farming operation pretty well stopped Monday night when the news was received that Jerry had won the \$7,500 top award in the national science talent search.

"Our hired man, Leslie Anderson, is having a rough time of it, and it looks like he'll have at least a couple more days of it," Ronnie admitted to an invading newsmen between telephone interruptions in the modest farm home northwest of St. James Tuesday noon.

He said he'd tried to help with the farm chores Tuesday morning, but just couldn't get started before being called to the telephone repeatedly, and commented that he'd had to leave Anderson in a predicament with the cows being milked and water running in the stock supply system simultaneously.

SOLVES TUITION PROBLEM

Ronnie and Lucille Spitzner and their children are mighty proud of Jerry's latest achievement. They admit, too, that it is timely. Last year's corn crop wasn't too good, and it looked lean for Jerry's college planning, because a college education costs a lot of money, particularly the first year. The \$7,500 award solved that problem.

Mr. Spitzner may have feared his brilliant son would be a victim of economic circumstances, a situation he knows from experience. Mr. Spitzner finished eighth grade in the nearby District 28 school, and at that time farming wasn't having a good time of it.

"My dad gave me a choice, he'd sell the farm so I could go to school, or I could stay home and help on the farm. I stayed, and

later attended high school in St. James, taking bookkeeping and typing. That's about 20 years ago," Mr. Spitzner said.

Mrs. Spitzner, the former Lucille Lunz, grew up in the same neighborhood and attended the same school. She had the opportunity to complete high school, graduating from St. James in 1940.

FAMILY TRADITION

Both Jerry's parents agree they enjoyed mathematics while in school, and point out the mathematics and science courses offered them were far removed from the opportunities today's students have.

The senior member of the Spitzner clan is still active at age 73. He is George Spitzner, who left the farming enterprise to move to St. James a number of years ago.

The Spitzner mechanical aptitude was proven long before Jerry started experimenting with radio, rockets, electronics, his prize winning atom smasher, and currently a digital computer housed in an old dresser.

Grandpa Spitzner has always been handy with tools. Ronnie was one of the first young farmers to buy his own welding equipment.

DISTRICT 28 SCHOOL

The Spitzner family is native to the St. James community. Ronnie and Lucille grew up within 2 miles of their present farm 4 miles northwest of St. James, and both attended District 28 school. They were pupils, as their three elementary school age youngsters are now, and as Jerry was, of Miss Sigrid Larson. The Spitzners are proud of their relationship with Miss Larson, and rate her the foundation of the educational accomplishments of Jerry, with a special knack for putting across the basic education and going beyond, in guiding adept students to extra study in fields of interest. Extremely modest about her role, Miss Larson said she thinks publicity about her is sheer nonsense, and "I don't like it one bit."

She says the pupils in District 28 are quite outstanding, and very nice to work with, because they apply themselves very well. Miss Larson admits she enjoys teaching. Reflecting to the years when she had both of Jerry's parents, Ronnie and Lucille (Lunz) as students, she said both were good students. Like Jerry before them, the three Spitzner children currently attending District 28, Monica, 10, James, 9, and Richard, 7, are all "straight A" pupils.

Jerry is no problem at home. Mrs. Spitzner said he states his dislikes, and does a wonderful job of regulating his heavy schedule. Jerry has adopted a regular routine, and made it conform to training rules required for athletics, despite being up bright and early in the morning to take advanced college courses in television, and traveling to Gustavus Adolphus college every Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Spitzner's achievement sparked hundreds of editorials in newspapers across the country. Here's an example from the March 8 edition of the Washington Daily News:

TOP SCIENTIST—AT 17

Our remarkable national shift to emphasis on science is neatly illustrated by the lad who won top prize in the \$34,500 Westinghouse scholarship competition, just completed here in Washington under supervision of Science Service.

Jerome G. Spitzner is a 17-year-old Minnesota farm boy, coming from a small high school. His prize-winning exhibit, judged first in an original field of 29,000 entries, was a homemade ion accelerator which he put together with such things as a Christmas tree ornament and a float from a pig watering trough.

Young Spitzner gained his distinction, naturally, by industry and brains. In addi-

tion to his high school training, he took television courses in chemistry and physics. But he is no mere double-dome. He was captain of his school football and wrestling teams and had time for a dip into dramatics. And he works on his dad's farm.

While he copped first prize, Jerry Spitzner was typical of the 40 other finalists who exhibited here. Each had distinguished himself (including the nine girl finalists) in several areas of science and also was normally active, or better, in other school affairs.

We are embarked on an explosive era of science, just ahead. These youngsters, and their counterparts around the Nation, will be the men and women who will lead the way.

Let's Not Strangle Our Poultrymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, some 20 bills have been introduced in this House that would have the effect of strangling many of the poultrymen of my State and the rest of the country in a chicken-wire labyrinth of Government controls.

The sponsors call these bills the Family Farm Income Act of 1960 but I have a feeling their definition of income and the definition the free farmers of my State place on income are quite at variance.

Poultrymen have repeatedly resisted attempts to impose Government production control on their industry. These bills provide for such controls whether the poultrymen of my State want them or not. If two-thirds of the poultry producers in the Nation decided they wanted regimentation by government, it wouldn't matter what the local and regional wishes of large numbers of poultrymen, hatcherymen, feed suppliers, processors, marketing agencies and consumers thought was best.

For instance, the act specifies a price target for eggs. At present, in order to achieve this target, about 50 percent above current levels, egg production would have to be cut back 40 percent on a farm-by-farm, producer-by-producer basis.

The poultry industry, by resourcefulness and ingenuity, has greatly expanded its market. The industry has greatly increased the consumption of poultry meat and of eggs by putting on the market a high-quality product at a reasonable price. By so doing, the industry has greatly increased its own income and much improved the diet of the American consumer.

The proposal in the family farm income bill would turn back the clock and put this industry on the basis of scarcity rather than abundance. It would curtail the income of the industry, reduce the quality of the American diet, and increase the costs of doing business. All of this would be contrary to the often-stated preference of the people in the poultry industry themselves.

It is clear that those who framed the family farm income bill of 1960 were either unaware of the facts regarding this industry, or they have deliberately set about to regiment a group of people who have steadfastly adhered to the principle of freedom and responsibility.

Mission and Responsibilities of the U.S.

Army Command and General Staff College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by Maj. Gen. Lionel C. McGarr before the congressional command and operations group:

MISSION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Lionel C. McGarr, commandant, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., before the congressional command and operations group, March 29, 1960)

Members of the congressional command and operations group, gentlemen, I was both pleased and honored when Col. Bob Sikes, after attending our Senior Officers Nuclear Weapons Employment Course last November, felt it worthwhile to invite me to discuss with you the job we are doing at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and its impact on the progress so vital to our Army's readiness and combat effectiveness.

As men who live and make history, I am sure you know that the historic Oregon and Santa Fe Trails—former lines of communications in our westward surge of exploration—converge at Fort Leavenworth. As military men, I am sure you are aware that today the USACGSC is a focal point where new ideas and concepts on the optimum tactical use of the weapons of this astounding technological age in which we live, meet, are evaluated, correlated, and built into forward-looking viable military doctrine—the blueprint for military operations on future battlefields. The college, charged with providing doctrine for the Army in the field and education for its officer corps, is dedicated to the precepts of service and sacrifice for our Army and our country in the defense of "our way" of life—a way founded on the simple truths our Saviour taught.

The grim, continuing struggle between opposing ideologies in this tension-laden, nuclear missile mach-speed era follows the historic Communist pattern of ruthless employment of varying types of force for objectives which have, so far, been carefully calculated to be short of those for which they feel we would risk all-out war. Fission and fusion have made absolute security impossible and along with missiles and space satellites, they have placed the military might of the aggressor within range of our heartland—while the ideological fallout from his cold war weapons systems has been falling on our very doorsteps for sometime. Equally important, the Soviets consider the conference table an extension of the battle-

field, with propaganda, concessions, and world opinion as the military objectives. This combination of hot and cold war weapons systems, to include subversion, penetration, and economic warfare, is the real stuff of which Soviet foreign policy is fashioned and which we must counter if our freedom is to survive. Regardless of reasons or consequences, our country has become the leader of the free peoples of the world and the hope of those who wish to be free. To cope with the complex and continuing nature of the threat, our military students and indeed our Nation as a whole must understand both the purpose and nature of international communism. We must out-perform this "ism" in both purpose and dedication. The required knowledge can come only through education and an understanding of the major components of international security—a composite of international relations, national morale, and balanced defense.

Within this context, I would now like to go into some detail on my job as Commandant of the USACGSC, show you how we mesh into the overall Army educational system, how we capitalize on innovation and technology in our work, and the factors and decisions behind our curriculum development and design.

Today's educators, both civilian and military, face a monumental problem. For education must be vital and aggressive in providing basic information, and it must be presented in such a way as to motivate the student to meet the inevitable challenge of change—while at the same time enlightening his mind and instilling mental discipline. Specifically, the challenge to the military educator is to stimulate and inspire the mental approach, and to develop the thought processes of our officer corps to keep it not only abreast but ahead of current developments. This requires discernment, objective thinking, toughness of mind, and mental discipline—not to mention "mental mobility" of the highest order—and it leaves no place for complacency.

Concurrent with my arrival at the college in 1956, a number of important events occurred which highlighted both the advisability and necessity for a complete modernization, reorganization, and rewrite of the entire college curriculum to ensure the required progress in adjusting to and moving forward to meet the requirements of the technological age. Even more important was the need to "build in" the growth potential so necessary for continued improvement in our fast-moving age—if the college were to remain the Army's "idea factory."

For example, both doctrinal and instructional improvement in the vital area of administrative support, which includes logistics, personnel, and civil affairs, was a major objective of our 1956 modernization program. This was because changing strategic and tactical conditions in modern war had significantly altered the traditional approach to both tactics and its supporting twin—logistics. As you know, future wide dispersal of units, together with the attendant aspects of rear area security and area damage control, has resulted in unprecedented and increasingly difficult problems in the development of adequate and realistic user-oriented logistical doctrine. In this respect, the college now develops doctrine and instruction in tactics and its supporting logistics as an entity—as they logically would unfold on the battlefield. We are convinced that tactical plans which do not adequately consider logistical support are as unsound as logistical plans which do not adequately support tactics.

Another major objective remains, the continuing development in our students of the traditionally high ethical and moral standards required of our future military leaders.

Even more important is instilling in them the balance, sense of duty, and moral courage to apply these high standards regardless of consequences. The higher the level of responsibility, the higher is the obligation of the leader in this respect. For war is not merely a science of inanimate patterns of mechanical, chemical, and nuclear forces and energies, but more especially of human beings. Certainly, we cannot afford to be more concerned about building accuracy, integrity, and reliability into our new weapons systems than about strengthening similar required qualifications in our leaders who will have the authority and responsibility for employing these weapons. Of course, the Army selection system insures high personal student standards. However, we are convinced that the student "integrity index" can be further developed and strengthened by practice, study, and examination—and this we accomplish by our problem design and instructional philosophy.

An additional area mandating modernization was that all the college problems in 1956 portrayed only general war set in Western Europe and in a basically World War II or pre-nuclear type environment. This, together with the change to pentomic divisions, required a rewrite of the great majority of our problems in order to modernize our instruction. Equally important, was bringing our operational concepts into consonance with the Chief of Staff's national military program—not only on forms of war but also on geographical locales for problem settings as well.

And finally, as a soldier who has seen too many white crosses planted in two wars, I have long been determined to improve our fighting organizations and procedures, to include the psychological conditioning of our officers, by drawing on my own experience as well as that of others, in educating and motivating the Army's future leaders entrusted to my care.

The shield, the chevron, and the eagle of the college coat of arms depict its martial character. The three lamps of learning represent the major components of our great "one Army" team—the Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserves. They also symbolize the concept that no victory in American history has ever been won by a single arm, service, or military component. Victory in battle has always been won by the combined arms and services team of our Army functioning as an eminent member of the triservice defense team. Appropriately, our motto is "Prepare in peace for war."

The original Leavenworth Lamp was presented to the college by the Kansas City Chapter, Military Order of World Wars, and symbolizes the traditional "Lamp of Learning." The mailed fist clenching the sword, the rifle, and a guided missile connote the past, present, and future of military knowledge.

Here we have the overall Army educational system. During the first 8 years of commissioned service, our officers advance through a series of troop and branch school assignments. Following this, about 50 percent of the Army's officers are specially selected by the Department of the Army for attendance at the USACGSC—the keystone of the Army educational system. About 50 percent of Leavenworth graduates are later selected for the highest level of military schooling—the Armed Forces Staff College and the various war colleges. Thus, at Leavenworth and beyond, military schooling becomes wholly selective.

The overall scope of our instructional and doctrinal mission is division, corps, and field army to include their logistical systems, the theater army logistical command, and the theater army replacement and training command. The missions of the college are three-

fold (instruction, doctrine, support of training).

The very heart of our mission is the instruction of selected officers from all components of the Army for duty as commanders and general staff officers, plus the development of doctrine, both current and future. To insure that our instruction and its supporting doctrinal development are realistic and user-oriented, college personnel regularly participate—armywide—in command post exercises, field training exercises, and field tests. In addition, the college regularly exchanges visits with field agencies and tactical units.

The present college organization was preplanned and developed in consonance with the precepts of sound management procedures and is really nothing new or novel— weird or wondrous. Basically the organization is designed to provide:

- (1) Better management controls and more effective personnel utilization.
- (2) Functional organization of instructional departments.
- (3) A coordinating type staff with a principal staff officer for each major element of the college mission.
- (4) Decentralization to instructional department directors of responsibility and authority for development of both doctrine and instruction in their respective functional areas. Thus allowing each department director to plan, prepare, and present his specific course of study—and, even more important, to develop its doctrinal basis as a cohesive entity—under well-defined, overall college supervision and control.

This organization fully supports our present college curriculum and instructional philosophy which places primary emphasis on developing logical and original reasoning ability in the student—rather than on the merits of any single skill or solution.

As the proponent of the combined arms and services team approach, Fort Leavenworth is responsible that the various combat arms and the supporting services of the Army are taught to fight as a balanced, coordinated, cohesive battlefield team. In this way branch and service pride, as has always been so in wartime, is subordinated to the overall battlefield team effort. Thus, we teach our students to think objectively, decide logically, and operate effectively in applying the all-important military principles—rather than merely memorizing or learning by rote. In other words, we must produce military problem solvers and decisionmakers—not "rule of thumbs" and rationalizers.

In the highly important doctrinal phase of our mission, the college develops doctrine within concept guidance furnished by our boss, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, the C.G., USCONARC. This college definition emphasizes that doctrine must not be allowed to become rigid dogma. We feel that doctrine—the lifeblood of instruction—must be dynamic and forward looking, while at the same time realistic and practical. In addition, it must be based on an accurate understanding of the broad spectrum of future warfare—both military and nonmilitary. With respect to improved doctrine, if has been truly said that we have over 2,000 years of recorded military history to prove that the only thing more difficult than getting a new idea into the human mind is getting an old one out. And let us remember that the tactical concepts which carried Guderian's Panzers from the Rhine to Dunkirk were developed, not in the crucible of war, but in peacetime general staff councils and the classrooms of the Kriegs Academy at Potsdam.

Now let us discuss a few of the purely military factors which, together with nonmilitary factors, must be considered in developing adequate, viable doctrine—doctrine

which becomes the very foundation of battlefield techniques and procedures.

Firepower plus mobility, plus communications (to include logistical support), over terrain, times leadership, equals critical force at the point of decision is a fair encapsulation of the art of war. So now let us examine the elements of this equation—both tangible and intangible.

First the tangibles. The recent quantum breakthrough in firepower which dwarfs that of the past 15 centuries needs no explanation to this group. The problem is to determine its optimum use and insure sufficient flexibility so that it can be used at the right time, in the proper volume, and wherever and however needed. In this respect, overemphasis or overdependence on nuclear firepower alone can result in an inadequate nonnuclear capability which might well face us with the unhappy choice of accepting defeat on a limited front of the enemy's choosing—or risking general war. As our mission is to train officers with equal facility in both nuclear or conventional type war; college instruction covers both types of actions to include variations thereof.

Little Phil Sheridan of Cavalry fame said of mobility: "If we can move—we can whip 'em." Basically, I feel that mobility is a state of mind and that "mental mobility" is all important—for men must first learn to think in new patterns before they can act in new patterns. Our national strategy and the tactics which implement that national strategy must insure the requisite built-in mobility. Of course, mobility of weapons and troops has been a military necessity down through the ages—today's fast-breaking changes make this flexibility doubly necessary. Also we should remember that while strategic mobility is important, tactical mobility is no less so—from the Army's air and ground vehicles to the "shank's mare" of the "doughfoot."

The role of communications is an indispensable factor in the equation. I am sure there are none here who do not have a problem in communications every day—actually communicating your thoughts and ideas to others. During the confusion and disorder naturally existing in the deadly business of kill or be killed, this problem from both the mechanical and human sides becomes increasingly difficult. In the conduct of modern battle, it may well be decisive, for only by timely communication of his directives to his fighting forces can the commander's will be brought to bear against the enemy. I might point out here, that one of our principal educational objectives is to turn out graduates who are trained in the art of personal communication by emphasizing effective speaking and writing throughout our instruction.

Terrain while not so directly affected by technology as the other elements continues to be of paramount importance and the countless variations of its effect on battle makes it an appropriate "denominator" in our equation. More than ever before, faulty choice, or enemy enforced acceptance of terrain for joining battle, as well as inadequate use of terrain features during the fighting, can be fatal.

The final element is an intangible—leadership. It is the most important because it is the measure of the commander's ability to get men to do what he wants done because they want to do it. The great captains of history have all had this ability as well as other well-known leadership qualities such as courage, knowledge, competence, integrity, and humility. These leaders who have stood on history's stricken fields—and won by the fighting fury of their troops in spite of seemingly insurmountable odds, because they had instilled their own unconquerable spirit into their men—were all men of great moral courage. This is because the

only motivation which can sustain men under great stress and responsibility is that of a spiritual or moral nature. Leaders such as these can be counted on the fingers of one hand—and, significantly, these leaders of moral courage have all had physical courage as well. Today's military leader faces a challenge significantly greater than those of yesterday. For today, his knowledge must transcend the former purely military facets of leadership. He must understand the political, economic, and psychological aspects of the world in which we live, as well as the newly evolving technological aspects of warfare.

Real leaders also understand that the mental and psychological motivation of men who fight is all important. The fine cutting edge of the great battlefield units of history has been a composite of knowledge and training, reinforced by that all important nebulous factor, morale—morale composed of individual and unit pride, pride of service, personal confidence, and faith in its commanders. This mental and psychological conditioning cannot be turned off and on like a water faucet. It must be developed and nurtured during the so-called peacetime years in military units and especially in the schools and colleges of the Army educational system so that it will always be combat ready. From time immemorial, military discipline and combat readiness have been built on mutual respect and confidence between the leader and the led. Anything which lessens this confidence and respect, decreases our all-important combat effectiveness. Impairment of esprit or pride of service impacts adversely on each loyal and dedicated fighting man and could well be detrimental to future commanders who must motivate and inspire men to fight and die for the Army's ideals of service and sacrifice. This is because the catalyst which makes the battlefield equation work—is the will and determination of the fighting man—backed by the faith of his country.

Now let us look at our equation in practice at division level. The division commander in the vast future battle arena operating under the concept of highly mobile, self-contained, hard-hitting units, must operate under the ever-present threat of enemy nuclear attack. His increased responsibility areawise over World War II, as a result of technological advances is shown here. Firepower available to a single future division commander will be greater than that available to all past division commanders, which of course, compounds the attendant problems related to mobility, communications, terrain, and leadership. More important, the terrific impact of nuclear weapons, as well as new type, conventional weapons, has reduced the all-important decision and reaction time of the commander to an absolute minimum. Therefore it follows that only the most highly motivated, dedicated, and well-trained officers can lead successfully on future battlefields.

I shall now discuss briefly the scope of our instructional mission. Our regular and associate classes are the foundation of our instruction. The regular course of 38 weeks has an annual student strength of 750 students, which this year includes 81 allied officers from 43 countries. This alltime high was made possible by the completion of J. Franklin Bell Hall, our new academic building—which was dedicated a year ago.

The associate course, of 16 weeks' duration, is presented twice each year, with each class numbering 400 officers. The present associate class, as did its counterpart last fall, contains about 45 National Guard and USAR officers on active duty for training status. The remaining officers, less 31 allied students from 10 countries, are career reservists and Regular Army.

Because of its higher age limitations and biannual presentation, the associate class

has proved to be extremely useful to all components are the Army in fulfilling military educational requirements. We consider it an excellent and necessary course, which neither competes with nor could replace the much longer regular course. Also graduation from either the regular or associate class is identical for assignment purposes, promotion, and subsequent higher schooling.

The special information course, hosted by the college for the first time last year, is a DA course sponsored by the Chief of Information. Each of these two courses provided approximately 50 selected reserve component officers with a wide variety of authoritative information concerning current and future U.S. Army trends and developments. Last year's courses were so successful that they are being continued again this year—as the "special orientation course"—a more descriptive title.

The college annually conducts separate 1-week refresher courses for principal officers of National Guard Divisions, Army Reserve Divisions and Maneuver Area Commands, and Logistical Commands. The far-reaching value of these courses is indicated by the fact that commanding generals and principal staff officers from an average of 21 National Guard Infantry Divisions, 6 National Guard Armored Divisions, 22 Army Reserve Infantry Divisions, 24 Army Reserve Logistical Commands, and 2 Maneuver Area Commands, receive instruction annually at Fort Leavenworth on the latest tactical and administrative support doctrine to include new organizations and new weapons systems.

The nuclear weapons employment course is a 5-week course which trains the "prefix 5," or nuclear weapons employment officer, for duty at general staff level. Additionally, this course provides a prototype course for the "prefix 5" instruction conducted by the Infantry, Artillery, Armor, Air Defense, Engineer, and Chemical Schools.

The SONWEC, or senior officers nuclear weapons employment course, is designed to provide instruction for senior commanders and their principal staff officers in the tactical and logistical doctrine, techniques, and procedures applicable in employing the Army's nuclear weapons—to include training in the technical considerations and operations involved. We believe this course also serves as an excellent advanced refresher course for senior personnel. Student reaction has been most gratifying, and I feel that this course is a valuable adjunct to any officer's military education.

The allied preparatory course is designed to assist allied officers ordered to the regular course by developing their proficiency in military English, oral comprehension, and reading. It also presents some basic military instruction and orients them on U.S. Army organization and doctrine.

The college started the fifth year of U.S. Army Reserve active duty for training at Fort Leavenworth, involving all six ZI armies, in 1958. This has given significant impetus to the U.S. Army Reserve school program as it affords additional classified instruction and also integrates the off-campus student body with the college itself. This brings these dedicated officers who are graduating from the U.S. Army Reserve command and staff courses to Fort Leavenworth for their fifth year of instruction and for their formal graduation.

These nine major resident courses of study will graduate about 4,300 students this school year—with a rank spread of captain to major general in the Reserve component refresher courses and lieutenant colonel to lieutenant general in our SONWEC.

We consider our allied officer program as one of our most important missions since it affords a golden opportunity not only to educate these allied officers in our military concepts but to further international un-

derstanding and good will by fostering allied contacts with the American way of life. Since 1908, 2,000 allied officers from 62 countries have attended the college. At present we have 112 allied students from 43 countries—51 of whom come from countries which border on the Sino-Soviet dominated bloc. It is also significant that allied students at the college this year represent countries with a collective population of a billion and a half people—about half the population of the world—while 64 of these students come from the so-called underdeveloped countries of the Middle East and Africa.

Now, in addition to our resident courses, our nonresident, or offcampus program, reaches over 15,000 students, most of whom come from that important element of our modern one army—the Reserve components. We take great pride in our close and continuous association with these dedicated Americans and feel that the significant, 100 percent, increase shown in the offcampus student enrollment is the result of our continuing curriculum modernization. We consider this area highly important as it concerns the professional education of the top levels of leadership of the National Guard and Army Reserves.

As you know, this nonresident mission is accomplished in several ways. For example, our extension course program which normally takes 5 to 6 years, has actually been completed in less than 12 months of concentrated work by several of our students.

The college also supports the U.S.A.R. schools with which you are familiar. This year 176 of these schools, covering the entire country, include command and general staff departments. These schools are staffed by Reserve officers not on active duty and supervised by appropriate corps commanders. The college provides all instructional material, grades examinations, maintains student academic records, and furnishes staff advice to the various corps commanders and to the school commandants. Students in these Reserve school courses, as in the extension courses, are drawn from graduates of branch advanced courses.

A refresher course has been prepared for nuclear weapons specialists and, in addition, staff training materials are made available to senior units of the Reserve components.

In 1958 we also instituted a new correspondence course—"the Leavenworth preparatory course"—to assist students in preparing for attendance at our resident courses. Although initially beamed towards Reserve component and technical and administrative service officers, it is interesting to note that the majority of this year's regular and associate students, to include allied officers, availed themselves of this course.

This year two new correspondence programs are being instituted. First, a "short refresher course" is being made available to all graduates of the college, including allies, for the purpose of keeping our alumni up to date on new organization and doctrine; and second, a "nuclear weapons employment correspondence course," which, when combined with a 2-week period of active duty for classified instruction, will train qualified nuclear weapons employment officers so urgently required by our Reserve components.

For both resident and nonresident instruction, the red dots indicate the worldwide problem coverage of our present curricula which familiarizes the student with actual worldwide locales in which he may some day have to fight. The reduction of problem settings in Western Europe from 89 percent for the 1956-57 course to 11 percent for the current course indicates the trend of our present day global interest.

We feel that this is a significant step in acquainting the student with the impact of

Global politico-military implications, which are responsive to the continuing machinations of international communism.

Note that the bar chart under "Forms of War" indicates a 4-year reduction from almost 100 percent to 35 percent which we consider a valid ratio of general war instruction for the present. Of course this has been accompanied by increased instruction in situations short of general war such as Korea and the situations short of actual war—such as Lebanon. Thus, although our instruction adequately emphasizes the employment of nuclear weapons, conventional warfare is also given appropriate emphasis.

In addition to insuring that our graduates are fully capable of doing their assigned duty upon graduation, we also must lay the foundation for their continuing future self-study and professional improvement. The long and tortuous path of military history is strewn with the bones of commanders who failed to keep abreast of their art—and it is an art, not an exact science. It is an art which requires mental mobility and the thinking direction of the commander—not a set of "pat" solutions for any eventuality neatly wrapped, tied with a blue ribbon, and stored in his personal "memory file" to be spewed out when a mental storage button is pushed.

The necessity for keeping up to date is emphasized by advances in technology which are so "shrinking" the world and "compressing" time that they place military tactics in the realm once occupied exclusively by military strategy. This is all important in curriculum design, especially as we are the Army's Senior Tactical School. Even though the Army officer does not engage in politics—and rightly so—he must understand the impact of political decisions on the overall practice of his art. For, more than ever, national policy decisions impact on the manner in which the tactical commander must eventually fight. For these reasons, it appears important that the thinking of military men be considered in the councils of decision, and conversely that military men in authoritative positions fully understand the overall political ramifications.

It is generally conceded that the greatest battle since the dawn of history is for the mind, the heart, and the soul of man. The college is convinced that its military contribution must be toward a better way to use man—man who is the one constant in the equation of battlefield success. This, as I have indicated previously, requires the continuing development of the moral as well as the mental, physical, and psychological aspects of the student.

In conclusion, history shows that most unsuccessful battles are first lost in the mind of the commander before the battle. In this respect, I feel we all agree that the Communists have made considerable progress in hawking their "ism" in the diplomatic, economic, military, and opinion-forming market places of the world. We must nurture and strengthen our dual capability to fight the "frigid or flaming" war in either a conventional or nuclear context—as dictated by the enemy's moves on the vast chessboard of power politics. The enemy remains the determinant. And although I am convinced that history is a guide—not a god, all recorded history proves that tensions can best be lessened by negotiating from a position of strength. We must be strong and confident in support of a national purpose in which we all believe—we must accentuate the positive. We must be willing to fight for the privileges of Americanism, lest we lose the understanding of their values and thus through "mental and moral erosion" lose the freedom we now enjoy. The road to the decline of a civilization starts in the mind and in the moral fiber of its people. It is as

unsound to overestimate our enemy as it is to underestimate him. We have the best "ism" in the world—Americanism—but it requires willing service and sacrifice together with a national determination to make it work. The citizen, particularly the soldier, must face the future with confidence—confidence born of belief in his own individual ability, the ability of his outfit, and the ability of his nation. Even more important, as individuals or as a nation, we cannot compromise with principle.

Those of us who are privileged, as members of the staff and faculty of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, with the awesome responsibility of molding the minds of our future leaders in the direction of progress feel not only a grave sense of duty, but a terrible sense of urgency as well. It is our sacred trust, our proud duty as soldiers, that the college—by the worth of its instruction, doctrine, and example—continue to furnish top battlefield leadership for our country. For as Carl Schurz has so truly said: "Ideals are like stars; you cannot reach out and touch them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and in following them you reach your destiny." If, God forbid, we must fight again, both sides will have fulfilled their destiny, but only one, the most highly dedicated, the most highly motivated and the best led, will have won victory—this is the mission of the USACGSC.

Thank you.

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very potent and thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Western Hills Press, Cheviot, Cincinnati, Ohio, for March 24, 1960:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

We reported last week that Purcell Council, Knights of Columbus, had adopted a resolution opposing Federal school aid legislation pending in the House of Representatives on the grounds that it discriminated against parochial and private school citizens.

The bill in question proposed a Federal grant of \$20 per student per year for the purpose of school construction and teachers' salaries. The resolution suggested that "students attending parochial and private schools be excluded from the count and an income tax credit in like amount be given to persons who send their children to such schools."

We would carry the Knights of Columbus' suggestion a step further. Why not give all parents a \$20 income tax credit for each schoolchild on presentation of a receipt for that amount paid as a special tuition assessment to a local school system, public or private?

This would obviate the need for all Federal school aid as now proposed, thereby eliminating the threat of Federal controls of education while assuring the schools of receiving the full amount of payments without the customary shrinkage of tax dollars returned to local communities via Washington and State capitals.

Won't work, huh? Too simple and no provision for bureaucrats, who, after all, in our scheme of things, are more important than students, teachers, and taxpayers.

Yarborough Asks AEC To Come Clean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we who are Members of the House who represent districts which border on the Atlantic seaboard and the gulf coast, together with Senators who represent Atlantic and Gulf Coast States, have become increasingly disturbed concerning proposals to dump radioactive waste close to our beaches in these areas.

Many of us have reported these proposals to our people back home and I for one have told my people that I will oppose any dumping of radioactive waste in our coastal waters until we can get unqualified assurance from the Atomic Energy Commission that this radioactive material will not adversely affect the marine life, marine environment or our people.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has forthrightly gone on record by challenging the AEC to "prove beyond the shadow of a doubt" that dumping radioactive waste in the gulf would not be harmful. I believe that Senator YARBOROUGH has expressed the deepest feeling of the overwhelming majority of Texans living close to the gulf—the people who could be most directly affected by an irresponsible plan of disposal of radioactive waste.

The Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise has heartily commended Senator YARBOROUGH for his challenge to the AEC and has taken a cue from the Senator in stating:

It's now time for the Commission to come clean with the public, even if such honesty involves a confession of ignorance.

I know the people of the Second Congressional District are pleased, as I am, that Senator YARBOROUGH is helping us lead this fight for the truth about disposal of radioactive waste material, and I would commend to the membership of the House the Beaumont Enterprise editorial of March 19, 1960, on this vitally important subject:

KEEP IT UP, SENATOR

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH is fully justified in asking the Atomic Energy Commission to "prove beyond the shadow of a doubt" that dumping atomic wastes in the Gulf of Mexico would be unharmed.

And the millions of Texans he represents in the upper Chamber of the National Legislature insist that he keep on demanding this proof. If satisfactory assurance can't be provided, the whole idea should be abandoned.

YARBOROUGH said in a Senate speech that a study of atomic waste disposal at the AEC's Oak Ridge, Tenn., plant indicated the

wastes affect fish life and cause radioactive deposits in the bones of fish.
It's now time for the Commission to come clean with the public, even if such honesty involves a confession of ignorance.

Housing Future for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Congress has amended the Housing Act to provide better housing for the elderly. I wish to include here an excellent first-hand account of what can be done under these laws by Mr. Carl T. Mitnick, president of the National Association of Home Builders.

This is the second in a series of articles written for Ray Henry, which appeared in more than a hundred newspapers throughout the country earlier this year. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

HOUSING FUTURE FOR THE AGED

(By Carl T. Mitnick, president, National Association of Home Builders)

One of the biggest developments in housing in the 1960's will be an increase in the production of homes for retired people. Home builders have barely scratched the surface in meeting the need for such housing.

We must, and I am convinced we will, build at least 100,000 more homes a year for older people during the next 10 years. This rock-bottom minimum of 1 million may well be exceeded.

For one thing, it is just good bread and butter business for a builder to construct homes for senior citizens. They are the best risks, as a group, in the world.

They know what their assets are, they know how to budget—and they know how to live within their means.

Today, we have a certain percentage of the elderly who do not have the means to be self-supporting and must have institutional or family care.

But, with social security benefits and the increasing trend toward pension plans, I believe that very soon the elderly person without the income to support himself will not exist.

The housing industry will do its part in building the homes the elderly need but the Government must provide some of the necessary vehicles. Above all, this means putting into effect title II of the 1959 Housing Act. This part of the law contains the provision on housing for the elderly—but they have never been implemented.

For instance, this unused section includes a program of FHA insurance for rental housing for retired persons. It does little good to have a law on which the "go" sign is withheld.

Congress raised from 60 to 62 the age at which an elderly person could qualify for this type of rental housing. To my mind, that was a mistake. I would like to see the age limit lowered to 60.

Home builders need, too, more statistics and research in the field if they are to plan wisely for housing older people. The Government could provide a helping hand here.

President Eisenhower has shown a special interest in this overall area by the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Housing the Elderly, of which I am proud to be a member, and the calling of a White House Conference on the Aging in January 1961.

I would expect the executive department to follow through with needed tools, or why set up the committees in the first place?

Up to now, most of the housing for the elderly has been single unit homes. They will continue to be built. But there will be a vast increase in multiunit dwellings for persons of 60 or over. There will be both high-rising apartment houses and garden type structures.

These multiunit structures will, for the most part, be built in the heart of cities, replacing blighted and slum areas. Some will be rental units.

One thing I have found in building for the elderly—they understandably like living where they have roots. They want to live, when possible, within easy reach of their children and grandchildren.

It is my experience also that the elderly do not want to be entirely segregated. They enjoy living in a community in which there are younger people.

At North Cape May, N.J., where I have built 1,550 homes, 925 of them are occupied by retired people. The seniors enjoy the younger families with children, with whom they strike up warm friendships. And I've noticed the elder women welcome a chance to do some babysitting again.

Although there will be a vast increase in senior housing in these next 10 years, the units themselves will not be too different from other homes. It is my experience that a retired person does not want a home that everyone can see from the front door has a stamp: "For the Older Person."

As to size, I believe apartments will range from efficiencies to one and two bedroom units. Single homes will run to two or three bedrooms, for all want a place for the children when they come to visit and many like a room that can double as a little den or a bedroom.

The big increase in elderly housing will come in low-cost units but there will be a selection to meet larger purses. I've said it is sound business for the builder to build for the elderly. Let me give you some figures to show why I say this.

I have studied the case histories of 393 retired persons over 60 who bought modest houses, ranging in price from \$5,490 to \$11,000 that I built.

Of these, 109 or 27.7 percent paid for their homes. Another 85 or 21.6 percent paid off their mortgage in 5 years or less. Ninety-six or 24.4 percent paid 40 percent down and took a conventional mortgage. Only 59 or 15 percent made a down payment as low as 10 percent and a mere 44, or 11.3 percent, had a maximum mortgage.

In the 393 cases, there was but one default—a relative broke a promise of financial help. In this case, we took back the property and returned the money. I believe the record explains why builders like doing business with senior citizens.

The evidence from NAHB clinics and regional conferences is that the increase in housing for the elderly will be nationwide in the sixties. Homebuilders in every part of the country will do their part. It is inconceivable to me that the Government would merely give lipservice to the challenge at hand.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, with a heart filled with sadness, I with others join in paying a brief but sincere tribute

to our esteemed colleague and friend, the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK of Washington. His passing was saddening and shocking to us all and evidence of the very transitory nature of life, indeed.

I admired RUSSELL MACK immensely and valued his friendship greatly. We came to the Congress together—both of us being Members of the class of the 80th Congress—and for a time our offices were adjoining. I learned to know RUSSELL MACK soon after coming to Congress and I always respected and admired him greatly. There was no more dedicated and devoted Member of the Congress than the gentleman from Washington. He was a conscientious and faithful representative of the people—of his district, State, and Nation.

Although we were of opposite political parties we cooperated on many matters, particularly in the area of public works—which he especially championed.

I know that my wife joins me in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Mack in her bereavement.

A High Price To Pay for Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 21, 1960, regarding Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN's protest to the two public relations jobs created by the Postmaster General in connection with the Department's drive to halt the use of the mails for sending obscene literature.

I am happy to comment that my colleague on the Post Office Committee, Mrs. GRANAHAN, is very active in behalf of postal and Federal employees. We are all aware of the great menace that has invaded our mails in the way of pornographic material, and she was selected to head the subcommittee which concerns itself with these matters.

Mrs. GRANAHAN is doing a superb job in this field as witnessed by the nationwide coverage she has received in recent months. I am sure she will leave no stone unturned in seeking to eradicate this menace from our mails.

The editorial follows:

A HIGH PRICE TO PAY FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS
Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania Democrat, makes a pretty strong argument when she characterizes the hiring of two Republican women for two especially tailored jobs in the Post Office Department as "pure political patronage."

Her fire was directed at Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for hiring Mrs. Mae Simpson, widow of a Republican Congressman, and Mrs. Carroll D. Kearns, wife of a Pennsylvania Republican Congressman, at \$50 a day to do work which easily could be handled by almost any employee in the Department.

Specifically the two women will speak before women's clubs seeking information on

the department's drive to halt the sending of obscene material through the mails.

In denouncing the hirings, Representative GRANAHAN said: "I am appalled that Postmaster General Summerfield, while seeking a postal rate increase and fighting for a small wage boost for rank-and-file post office workers, would put these women on the payroll."

Unquestionably the Postmaster General will find it difficult to convince Congress that he needs additional funds when he can afford to spend \$50 a day for the unneeded services of two novice employees.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANDALL S. HARMON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TIME FOR ACTION

There is no longer any question that the helicopter has finally achieved technical maturity and is ready to take its proper place as a strong, full-fledged member of the air-transport team. Development of turbine powerplants has produced substantial operating economies, boosted load capacity, and speed.

Operating expenses will be cut about in half. Today's largest piston transport helicopter can carry about 15 passengers at a cost of 20 cents a mile for each passenger. The turbine helicopter and other VTOL aircraft will be able to handle a minimum of 25 passengers at a cost of 10 cents a passenger mile or less.

The American Legion has a strong interest in the progress of the helicopter manufacturing and transport industry. One of the most important handicaps to bringing the advantages of the helicopters to full fruition is the lack of municipal planning for adequate landing areas—heliports and helistops.

During the 1958 convention in Chicago the Legion adopted a strong resolution. One clause stated:

"In some municipalities ordinances and regulations have been adopted in such a way as to prohibit the landing of helicopters within the municipal limits and prohibit the flight of helicopters beneath a certain minimum altitude while over municipal limits, thus depriving the citizens of those municipalities of the great benefits offered by the helicopters."

"The American Legion . . . does recommend that we nationally encourage our posts to support the adoption of only such ordinances and regulations as will give the helicopter freedom to serve our communities and as will not unduly restrict the establishment of heliports and the operation of helicopters."

Certainly these words can be repeated today, and much has been done to encourage helicopter operations.

The U.S. Senate last year unanimously passed a joint House and Senate resolution calling for a survey of the District of Columbia for the purpose of recommending sites for helicopters. The resolution has not yet come to a vote in the House, so nothing has been done about the study.

There is an imperative need that action be taken by the House so that this survey can get underway. Its usefulness goes far

beyond the needs of Washington, D.C. The Nation's Capital is typical of major metropolitan centers that need and eventually must have adequate helicopter service. The findings of the inexpensive survey could serve as a model for other cities.

The heliport problem has been studied by the Federal Aviation Agency in its Project Hummingbird. Lt. Col. Fred Goodwin, an Army helicopter expert on loan to FAA, states:

"The greatest problem is heliports or landing area complexes within the metropolitan areas. You can't build just one big heliport in the middle of the city, because if these commuter, interurban and short-haul or feeder line systems are all feeding into this area, they will soon saturate even the largest heliport conceivable."

"This then calls for some national standards and a complete nationwide education program covering the need for more liberal zoning laws. . . ."

The requirement for sound, forward-looking planning for helicopter service to our cities goes far beyond its primary impact as a prime transport tool. The civil defense uses of the helicopter are incalculable. This has been recognized by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization which offers State civil defense organizations the right to purchase a helicopter, with the Federal Government picking up half the cost.

Military experts have stated that only the helicopter can perform many of the emergency evacuation tasks if our cities should be attacked.

Finally, there has come strong support of helicopter landing facilities from Representative RANDALL S. HARMON of Indiana. Representative HARMON has introduced legislation in the House calling for the inclusion of a helicopter landing area on top of the new House Office Building now under construction. The Congressman said that the heliport would be invaluable for getting busy Congressmen to and from airports in the Washington area, particularly the Dulles International Airport in Virginia which is now under construction. And the Dulles airport designers have already made provision for the construction of four helicopter landing areas.

The tide is running swiftly in favor of appropriate legislation so that we can have the advantage of the helicopter. But time is running out equally swiftly. The time for action is now.

Forty-second Anniversary of the Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, March 27, marked the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. This occasion is important for many reasons, but especially because it serves to remind us once again, as we always need to be reminded, that the Soviet Union continues to hold in subjection millions on millions of people who deserve to be free and have a right to be free, and in whose freedom we in America have a deep and abiding stake.

Although the Soviet Union has paid lipservice to this burning desire for independence on the part of 10 million people of Byelorussia by incorporating them into the Soviet Union as a separate republic, no one of course is fooled into thinking that this procedure really represents anything but complete subjection to the Communist dictatorship.

Forty-two years ago, on March 25, 1918, the people of Byelorussia first tasted freedom after decades of oppression and tyranny under the czars. But this freedom was short lived. After 2 short years the flame of freedom was extinguished and the earlier tyranny of the czars was replaced by the darkness of an ever more vicious tyranny of Soviet communism.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of these unhappy events, the hope of freedom still lives on in the memory of the people of Byelorussia and I join with them today on this 42d anniversary in hoping that the day will not be far away when freedom will come again to the Byelorussian people.

Seventh President at Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record, Friday, March 25, 1960:

SEMINARY INAUGURAL

This afternoon at 2:30, Benjamin Hopkins Moses will be inaugurated as seventh president of Wyoming Seminary at ceremonies in Kingston Methodist Church. When Mr. Moses accepts the badge of office from Z. Platt Bennett, president of the school's board of trustees, his name will be officially linked with those of a select company of administrators which the 115-year-old school has been fortunate to attract to its service.

The talent he has displayed as an administrator at Syracuse University, Harpur College, and Yale University indicates that Mr. Moses has those qualities of leadership demanded by the exacting task of educating American young people. In addition to his 25 years' administrative experience, Mr. Moses has another important quality which recommends him to the post. As a graduate of Wyoming Seminary, he is familiar with the history and traditions of the institution and can be depended upon to perpetuate those ideals which have helped raise it to the front rank of private secondary schools.

A native of the neighboring county of Lackawanna, Mr. Moses entered Wyoming Seminary during the presidency of the late Dr. Levi L. Sprague. As a student, he came to know both President Emeritus Wilbur H. Fleck, then dean, and his immediate successor, Ralph W. Decker, who also was a student in the school at that time.

With sincere wishes for a long and successful tenure, the community takes pleasure in welcoming Benjamin Hopkins Moses as seventh president of Wyoming Seminary.

U.S. War Heroes To Revisit French Battlefields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 members of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor, including wives and children, plan to leave Boston by plane on September 2, 1960, for visits to London, Paris, and the French battlefields—and perhaps also West Germany, Belgium, Italy, and Greece.

The Legion of Valor was formed in 1890 by Civil War Veterans who had been recipients of America's most honored military decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Following World War I, its charter was amended to admit as members holders of the DSC and Navy Cross. Its present national commander is Col. Paul H. Hines of West Roxbury. The organization will hold its 70th national convention in Boston shortly before leaving for Europe on September 2.

I include as part of my remarks a statement by National Commander Paul H. Hines about this trip, which I feel sure will be of interest to Members of Congress and others:

STATEMENT BY PAUL H. HINES OF WEST ROXBURY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR, REGARDING THE TRIP ABROAD NEXT SEPTEMBER BY MEMBERS OF THAT ORGANIZATION

The Army and Navy Legion of Valor has been invited by the Greek Government to visit Greece during its trip to Europe in September, according to an announcement by its national commander, Col. Paul Hines. The Legion of Valor is composed of holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, and the Navy Cross, the three highest American awards for valor in face of the enemy in time of war.

More than 200 members of the Legion of Valor, including wives and children, have already made reservations to make the European tour. According to its present schedule the delegation will leave Boston by plane on September 2 for a 2 weeks sojourn at London, Paris, and the French battlefields on which most of the members won their honors.

If the plans of the President's People-to-People Committee, sponsors of the tour, materialize the group will also visit West Germany, Belgium, and Italy and in view of the invitation received from the Greek Government will probably also journey to Athens, Greece.

The invitation to visit Greece, transmitted through Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of Greece at Washington, reads as follows: "This Royal Embassy has been informed that members of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor are planning a trip to Europe this forthcoming summer. Therefore, I have been requested to extend, on behalf of the General Staff of Greece, an invitation to the Army and Navy Legion of Valor to include Greece in the schedule of their proposed trip to Europe."

"May I suggest," says the letter to Commander Hines, "that you further contact directly Lt. Gen. A. Frondists, chief of the

general staff, through the U.S. Embassy in Athens, for all necessary arrangements and further details."

Hines also announced that the British Legion, the veteran servicemen's organization of Great Britain, has invited the Legion of Valor to partake of its hospitality during its stay in England. Among its members are the holders of the Victoria Cross, the highest military honor awarded by that nation.

High among the hopes of the leaders of the Legion of Valor is that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, its most famous member, now recuperating from an abdominal operation at a New York hospital, will have recovered sufficiently to make the trip. MacArthur is one of the few general officers holding the DSC, awarded to him during World War I for courage and bravery over and above the call of duty.

Prior to its "jump off" for Europe in September, the Legion of Valor will hold its 70th national 3-day convention in Boston. Members will be here from all sections of the Nation. The organization was formed in 1890 by Civil War holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Following World War I its charter was amended to admit as members holders of the DSC and Navy Cross.

Hon. Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death of my warm friend RUSSELL MACK of Washington has come as a great shock to me. RUSSELL MACK and I came to the 80th Congress together, and we became members of the House Public Works Committee at the same time in 1947. Throughout the years, we developed an intimate acquaintance.

RUSSELL MACK was a skillful legislator, patient and always objective. His reasoning was never disturbed by impulsiveness nor was it ever motivated from prejudice. He possessed the great attribute of leadership and was a man of refinement, poise and warm demeanor. He always had a well-founded knowledge of the legislative matters that he dealt with, and this fact accounted for his capable leadership and legislative skill.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, RUSSELL MACK labored continuously in support of legislation which has brought about the multibillion dollar development of the great Columbia River Valley in the Northwest. This multipurpose program means so much to the people of that area in terms of flood control navigation, power development, and conservation of the soil and forests. He has also effectively supported legislative measures for needed development of the rivers and harbors throughout the Nation. All of these splendid contributions will stand as a monument to his long and distinguished service on our committee and in this House.

RUSSELL MACK's passing at this time is a source of profound shock, grief, and sorrow to all of us who knew him here.

Indeed, a great statesman has passed from this scene. At this time, we pay our personal tribute to RUSSELL MACK for his great legislative career, and we extend to his dear wife, Laura, our heartfelt sympathy and personally share with her in this great loss.

Foreign Bid for Electric Locomotives Contract for Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some self-explanatory material bearing on the award of a contract for electric mules for the locks of the Panama Canal.

I know nothing whatsoever about the American low bidder in this case but the telegram I received from the concern in question prompted my inquiry to the Secretary of the Army and I include that along with Mr. Brucker's reply.

I believe there will be widespread interest in this matter among those Members—and I believe there are many of them here in the House—who have had incidents of this nature affecting firms in their own districts.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I was, of course, very interested in the Ohio firm's protest and in getting the facts about it. I should point out, however, that I acted on this without consulting the other members of the subcommittee, so it should be clearly understood I did so in my capacity as Representative from a heavily industrialized congressional district and not as chairman of the subcommittee.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 16, 1960.

Subject: Procurement of 39 towing locomotives by Panama Canal Company.

Hon. Mrs. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Your assistance sought in communicating with Army Secretary Brucker and Panama Canal Company urging subject contract not be awarded to foreign bidder at the expense of American public interest.

We understand decision on this procurement imminent and feel it imperative that the Canal Company and its sole stockholder, Secretary Brucker, give full and proper consideration to all factors bearing on the public interest, which we believe dictates this procurement be awarded the lowest domestic bidder, Plymouth Locomotive Works of the Fate-Root-Heath Co., a small business.

To date the SBA, Commerce Department, and House Select Committee on Small Business have written Army Secretary Brucker, Army Assistant Secretary Roderick, and the Canal Company citing relevant portions Executive Order 10582 (Buy American Act) pertaining to preferential treatment for

small business and authority to reject foreign bids not consistent with the national interest.

To summarize pertinent arguments briefly:

In addition to Plymouth two major subcontractors are also small businesses: Culen-Friestadt Co., of Chicago, and Jackson Gear of Pittsburgh.

Most of the materials for Plymouth Locomotive will come from Critical surplus labor areas of Pittsburgh, Buffalo and Detroit.

This procurement would provide over 1 million direct manhours of employment for American labor.

Funds recaptured through Federal, State and local taxes alone will more than offset price differential between the bids of Plymouth and Mitsubishi of Japan.

Also consider it extremely important all concerned authorities recognize that Plymouth is the only remaining American company devoting its principal efforts to the design, engineering, and production of industrial locomotives of the size and type required in this procurement.

Plymouth has been building industrial locomotives since 1908 and has supplied over 1,000 to the U.S. Government, many of which are still in use today.

In recognition of Plymouth's specialized industrial capability, Army Transportation Corps has placed considerable dependence on Plymouth's facilities in its war mobilization plans.

The vital importance of the Canal Zone to U.C. commerce, shipping, and national defense certainly is of significant public interest, especially since these new towing locomotives are expected to have a useful life of nearly 40 years, therefore making access to an assured American source of supply for spare parts, maintenance and servicing, a most important consideration.

It has been repeatedly acknowledged by responsible Canal Company officials and the Army that the Plymouth proposal is the most acceptable and responsive to the needs of the canal operation.

Considering the above we believe you will agree that awarding of this procurement to Plymouth is the only decision consistent with the best public interest.

We respectfully request your expression of interest in this matter be directed to Secretary Brucker and the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. J. Lasplia, our Washington representative, may be called at Sterling 3-8555.

MILES CHRISTIAN,
Vice President, Plymouth Locomotive Works, Plymouth Ohio.

MARCH 17, 1960.

The Honorable WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRUCKER: It has been called to my attention that a Japanese firm is the low bidder to the Panama Canal Company for 39 towing locomotives and 3 cranes to be used in locking ships through the canal. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I am, of course, interested in seeing to it that the Canal Company operates efficiently and economically. However, as a Member of Congress who has had this same situation occur time after time to firms in my own district, I am deeply concerned over the practice of awarding multimillion dollar contracts by our Federal Government to foreign firms when domestic concerns and their employees can perform the same work at reasonable cost.

Can you tell me how far, if at all, the bid of the Plymouth Locomotive Works of \$4,741,867 exceeds the differential required

under the Buy-American Act? Are there other factors which should be taken into consideration, such as the availability of spare parts and the prospects for maintenance know-how over the many years that these electric mules could be expected to remain in use? It is my understanding that the Small Business Administration, the Department of Commerce and the House Select Committee on Small Business have all intervened in this matter on the side of the lowest responsible American bidder. Is that correct?

Could I have an early report on this matter so that if the subcommittee were to desire to take up this matter it could be done prior to the awarding of any contract?

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.)

SULLIVAN,

Member of Congress, Third District of Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1960.
The Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Your letter of March 17, 1960, to the Secretary of the Army in regard to the invitation for bids for towing locomotives and cranes to be used at the Panama Canal has been referred to me for reply.

An invitation for bids to supply 39 towing locomotives and 3 cranes was issued by the Panama Canal Company in December 1959. The low bid received was submitted by Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., in the amount of \$3,829,900. The next low bidder was the Plymouth Locomotive Works in the amount of \$4,741,867. International General Electric was third bidding \$5,170,200 and Fairbanks Morse bid \$7,152,111.

This procurement is subject to the Buy American Act and the invitation for bids contained a provision that for evaluation purposes the following amounts would be added to bids proposing manufacture outside the United States: (a) \$115,000 to cover additional costs of inspection and increased administrative costs; (b) 10 percent to the total bid price; and (c) 6 percent of the total price if the lowest responsive bidder offering domestic materials will produce substantially all such materials in areas of substantial unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The Plymouth Locomotive Works has advised since the opening of the bids that all component parts of the locomotives will be manufactured in areas of substantial unemployment. Applying all three additives specified in the invitation the evaluated bid of the Japanese firm would be \$4,557,684, or somewhat in excess of \$184,000 less than the Plymouth bid.

Detailed comparison and evaluation of the bids have not yet been completed by the Panama Canal Company. Concurrently careful study is being given to the terms of the Buy American Act and the implementing Executive order and regulations to determine whether there is any basis for award to the low domestic bidder notwithstanding the comparatively favorable price quoted by the foreign bidder. These studies include consideration whether award to the domestic bidder is necessary in the national interest from a security standpoint or whether such award would not be inconsistent with the public interest as that phrase is used in Executive Order No. 10582. I assure you that all relevant factors, including those discussed in your letter, will be carefully weighed before an award is made.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. RODERICK,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (FM).

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy has just issued a statement signed by its 54 members, which I recommend for careful consideration by the Congress:

SUPPORT URGED FOR FEDERAL SURPLUS, DEBT REDUCTION, AND A FULL GOLD STANDARD

We, the undersigned, members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, urge firm support for a program of Federal surplus and public debt reduction such as that proposed by the President in his budget message to Congress on January 18, 1960.

The President's call to financial responsibility, hopefully sounded for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, is already drawing fire, within and without Congress, both openly and directly as well as furtively and indirectly. There is acute danger that these recommended steps toward efficient management of the public purse may be further frustrated in the sectionalism, partisanship, and turmoil of an election year. For this reason, we believe it of paramount importance to understand, and to act in the light of, the following facts:

Our national debt has increased approximately 13 fold since abandonment of the gold standard in March 1933—from \$21.4 billion as of March 1933, to over \$291.5 billion as of January 28, 1960. During this time the population of the United States has risen by approximately 42.4 percent—from 125,690,000 in 1933 to 179,013,000 as of December 1959.

This accumulation of debt, resulting from deficit spending of the National Government, has been a potent cause of the loss approximating 58 percent in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, as measured by the index of wholesale prices.

Long continued living beyond its current means by our National Government is evidenced in part by the huge volume of Treasury securities held by Federal Reserve and commercial banks, and serving artificially to enhance bank reserves and lending potential in terms of depreciating money.

By stimulating lending and borrowing in this and other ways, without corresponding increase in the savings of the people, and, by competing with business for the use of these savings through its own extensive demands upon the capital market, the fiscal policy of our Government has contributed greatly to the present tightening of credit and the rise of interest rates.

This tightening of credit and higher cost of money, natural results of the demand for capital increasing faster than its supply through savings, very generally accompany rapid advances in prices and costs. These results cannot be legislated away, either for Government, or for businesses and individuals. In the long run they can be corrected only by reversing the above process—that is, by encouraging savings and by keeping governmental and nongovernmental demands upon the capital markets within the limits of these savings. Interest rates, like other prices, are subject to the forces of supply and demand.

It follows that strict control of the public debt, involving retirement when possible

from budgetary surpluses, is essential for protecting the purchasing power of the dollar, easing credit stringency, moderating interest rates, and permitting progress toward a sound monetary, credit, and fiscal structure at the base of which a full gold standard, at the present statutory rate, should be instituted and maintained.

Charles C. Arbuthnot, professor emeritus, Western Reserve University; Willard E. Atkins, professor emeritus, New York University; John W. Beck, Santa Cruz, California; James Washington Bell, professor emeritus, Northwestern University; H. H. Beneke, professor emeritus, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; William A. Berridge, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City; Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University; Grant I. Butterbaugh, University of Washington; Wilbur P. Calhoun, professor emeritus, University of Cincinnati; Cecil C. Carpenter, University of Kentucky; Lewis E. Davids, Sr., University of Georgia; Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., Marquette University; Raymond de Roover, Boston College; Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University; James C. Dolley, the University of Texas; Fred R. Fairchild, professor emeritus, Yale University; Roy L. Garis, University of Southern California; Alfred P. Haake, economic consultant, Largo, Florida; Donald M. Halley, Tulane University; E. C. Harwood, director, American Institute for Economic Research; George H. Hobart, professor emeritus, High Point College; John Thom Holdsworth, the University of Miami; Harold Hughes, Grove City College; Frederic A. Jackson, Morgan State College; Robert V. Jones, Chicago, Ill.; Emil Kauder, Illinois Wesleyan University; James H. Kelleghan, economic consultant, Chicago, Ill.

Donald L. Kemmerer, University of Illinois; Arthur Kemp, Claremont Men's College; J. L. Leonard, professor emeritus, University of Southern California; A. Wilfred May, executive editor, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle; faculty member, New School for Social Research, New York; Constantine E. McGuire, Geneva, N.Y.; David H. McKinley, the Pennsylvania State University; Austin S. Murphy, Canisius College; Russell M. Nolen, University of Illinois; Melchior Palyi, Chicago, Ill.; W. A. Paton, University of Michigan; Robert T. Patterson, American Institute for Economic Research; Clyde W. Phelps, University of Southern California; Chester A. Phillips, the State University of Iowa; Charles L. Prather, the University of Texas; Leland Rex Robinson, New York City; Martin E. Rooney, North Texas State College; Olin Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Charles Schertenleib, Georgetown University; Arthur O. Sharron, Duquesne University; Murray W. Shields, University of Florida; Walter E. Spahr, professor emeritus, New York University; Gilbert R. Stonesifer, Mount Union College; James B. Trant, dean and professor emeritus, Louisiana State University; Rufus S. Tucker, Westfield, N.J.; V. Orval Watts, economic consultant, Altadena, Calif.; Edward J. Webster, professor emeritus, American International College; G. Carl Wiegand, Southern Illinois University.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of RUSSELL V. MACK we have lost a very companionable colleague and a

sincere, extremely capable legislator; and personally I have lost a close personal friend.

It has been my pleasure to have known RUSSELL MACK for many years. As a legislator he had the happy faculty of fighting hard for what he believed but never, even in the hottest debates, did he ever stoop to personal accusations.

He was a most unusual and extremely kind individual. In my legislative and social experience with him, I cannot recall ever hearing him pass an unkind remark about any individual. If he could not say something good about them, he kept his own counsel.

We are all saddened by this sudden taking of our colleague, and I wish to extend my personal sympathy to his bereaved wife, Laura.

Political Medicine Says AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial that appeared in the February 26, 1960, issue of "The People's Voice" of Helena, Mont.:

THIS TIME AMA IS CALLING IT "POLITICAL MEDICINE"

A decade ago the American Medical Association succeeded in killing prepaid national health insurance for all Americans by labelling the Murray-Wagner-Dingell enabling legislation as "socialized medicine".

That time, by a million-dollar Madison Avenue campaign of fear and smear, they delayed the day when the United States would join all other major nations of the world in providing its people with an insurance program to meet medical and hospital costs of illnesses. The fact that Murray-Wagner-Dingell was in no wise related to "socialized medicine" did not deter the AMA in its massive resistance. Facts went out the window in the brain-washing blitzkrieg AMA unleashed upon the American public.

Today another threat to the AMA's "all the patient can pay" philosophy looms in the Forand bill (H.R. 4700), to provide prepaid hospital, surgical, and convalescent home costs for Americans retired on Social Security.

The Forand bill, like Murray-Wagner-Dingell, like the National Tuberculosis Act, like Social Security itself, finds Mid-Victorian oriented AMA again mounting the hustings to spread far and wide dire predictions for the future should H.R. 4700 become law. This "Political Medicine Is Bad Medicine", a new pamphlet by the AMA pontificates. Furthermore, say the "bosses" of the "Doctors' Union", there's no need for the bill; America's aged are getting along very well under voluntary health payment plans (which, by the way, the AMA opposed bitterly just a few years ago. Blue Cross was, for example, castigated as "a half-baked scheme . . ."). Other such plans were blasted as "socialism, communism—inciting to revolution."

AMA also contends:

1. Over 60 percent of the Nation's aged have sufficient assets to meet a hospital or medical bill of \$500;

2. Hospitals would become overcrowded should H.R. 4700 become law;

3. The Government would interfere with "your relationship with your family physician";

4. The costs would be astronomical on the social security system.

AMA makes one further contention in its new pamphlet, a contention aimed at further confusing the issue, when it asks how "would the Forand bill help the indigent aged . . .?" and then answers its question by saying it "would not help the indigent" because most of them are not eligible for social security. These people, AMA says, are provided for through various welfare programs.

As for the above-mentioned voluntary insurance coverage, AMA asserts that currently 60 percent of the aged "needing and wanting health insurance" are thus protected.

This is an oversimplification. It is downright misleading. Of that 60 percent, few retired people are able to afford health insurance remotely resembling comprehensive coverage. According to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, three-fifths of the Nation's 15 million citizens over 65 have annual incomes of less than \$1,000.

The most nearly comprehensive coverage generally available to the aged is Blue Shield or Blue Cross. The cost of this for a couple averages over \$15 a month—or \$180 to \$200 a year—an amount entirely beyond the reach of most of the more than 9 million aged with incomes of less than \$1,000 a year.

Of the 60 percent AMA says are covered only a small fraction have the needed comprehensive coverage. For perhaps 90 percent of those covered, the insurance provides no protection against doctor's home and office calls, dental care, nursing home care, drugs and a host of other essential items which looms extraordinarily large in the medical cost budget of the elderly.

Looking at the other points raised by AMA:

1. "Sufficient assets to meet a bill of \$500." What does \$500 buy today in medical and hospital care? A semimajor operation, 1 week in the hospital, and a part payment on such extras as anesthetic, operating room, etc.?

A major operation and hospitalization for any person, not just those over 65, will cost \$500 or more. With the elderly, recuperation is a slower process, more postmedical care is required, and frequently several weeks in a convalescent home after hospitalization. Few of the elderly not provided for by welfare programs or private help, can ever hope to get out of debt from a major illness.

The Forand bill would provide, through social security, for surgical and hospital care up to 60 days, plus the cost of convalescent home care. This 60-day maximum is sufficient to cover all except the most extreme cases.

2. Overcrowding of hospitals: This AMA assertion in itself is an admission that presently many of our aged forego needed health care because they do not have the means with which to pay the bill. In effect, the AMA favors letting the aged die because of inadequate care rather than for the world's richest Nation to meet the overcrowding problem by building more hospitals. (In terms of education, a similar philosophy would advocate letting a sizable percentage of our children remain ignorant rather than build needed classrooms.)

3. The old bogey of interfering with the doctor-patient relationship has been used by the AMA in every instance over the past half century when efforts have been put forth to improve the public health, whether the Red Cross blood bank, TB control methods, or compulsory vaccination against contagious diseases. The AMA fought every

one of those programs as interfering with the doctor-patient relationship.

AMA notwithstanding, the Forand bill specifically provides that surgical operations performed in a hospital shall be by the patient's choice of surgeon.

4. That "cost" item. If medical and hospital costs for the aged were not soaring toward the moon faster than any American missile thus far developed, would there be the intensifying nationwide demand for the passage of the Forand bill?

Actually, the cost of providing the hospital-surgical service called for under H.R. 4700 would be only 25 cents a week per individual worker covered by social security. Financing the program would amount to an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the social security withholding against the first \$4,800 of an employee's annual income.

In total, the program would cost approximately \$1 billion per year—or one-fortieth of the military's annual "take" from the Federal budget.

The AMA's "red herring" about the Forand bill not helping the indigent aged is irrelevant. As the AMA admits, most of these people are taken care of under various welfare programs, whereas most social security recipients are not eligible for public assistance.

Here in Montana, the State board of health estimated, as of last July 1, that there were 65,000 people 65 years of age or older. According to information secured from the Helena social security office approximately 37,600 of that 65,000 total are drawing social security retirement benefits. Twenty thousand are covered by other pension plans or are self-sufficient. Seven thousand seven hundred draw public welfare payments. The average social security payment for those 37,500 Montanans is \$72 a month—or less than \$1,000 a year.

Each and every one of those 37,500 people are potential major surgery patients. Unlike the estimated 7,700 aged Montanans drawing public welfare and therefore eligible for medical and hospital care as "indigent aged," few of the 37,500 Montanans receiving social security have the financial means to meet the cost of prolonged recovery from major surgery. They either go without, or doctors and financially hard pressed hospitals do not get paid. The Forand bill, by broadening the scope of social security, would make it possible for social security retirees to receive hospital and surgical care at least equal to that we now provide elderly people who are on public welfare.—H.L.B.

Inspector Anthony Richitt, a Fearless Enforcement Officer, Is Retiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker during my experiences as a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I have met many of the public officials of the District. In order to understand the problems, I have communicated with and had lengthy conversations with members of the police department and other agencies. One of the persons who has given me invaluable information as to

the problems of the police department in the District of Columbia and with whom I have become very friendly is Inspector Anthony Richitt. Mr. Richitt has served 35 years on the police department and his record for law enforcement is an outstanding one. His experiences are invaluable, and when I read of the proposed retirement from the police department of my friend, Inspector Richitt, I recognized that the District of Columbia was losing a valuable servant and a fine gentleman. I wish Mr. Richitt the greatest success in whatever endeavor he seeks to pursue, and I recognize industry's gain will be the District of Columbia Police Department's loss.

Mr. J. Theodore Crown, staff writer of the Washington Star, reported on the contemplated retirement of Mr. Richitt from the police department. This article sets forth some of the experiences of Mr. Richitt and some of the important roles that he has played during this 35 years of police service. The article by Mr. Crown follows:

COLORFUL CAREER ENDING FOR INSPECTOR
RICHITT

(By J. Theodore Crown)

Inspector Anthony Richitt, one of the most colorful and controversial members of the Metropolitan Police Department, today appeared before the Board of Police and Fire Surgeons.

Indications are that he will retire for physical disability by the end of April. He declined to disclose the nature of his disability.

In his 34-plus years as a policeman, Inspector Richitt has become well known to thousands of government officials and citizens, particularly because of his onetime command of the third, or "White House" precinct, and the circumstances growing out of his transfer.

He is a jovial ex-marine who made a name for himself as a daredevil motorcycle rider and stuntman during early years in the traffic division, and later as a suave, high-ranking officer in the uniformed force. He also is the only flying inspector in the department.

HEADS FIRST DISTRICT

His present command is inspector in charge of the first, or "downtown" district, comprising the first and second police precincts.

Inspector Richitt is known widely as "Tony" and his last name is mispronounced, sometimes even by himself, as "Ritchie." He was born in Grove City, Pa., 56 years ago and joined the Washington police in 1925 after a Marine Corps hitch.

His first assignment was as a foot patrolman in the fourth precinct, where he met the late Pvt. Joe Comiskey, who instilled in him a love of boating and water sports that has never flagged.

Soon the powers that be put the young policeman on a motorcycle, where he spent his active duty for the next 18 years. He was transferred to the Traffic Division in 1929 where—after being warned by the late Inspector Milton D. "Chinny" Smith for stunting risks on the motorcycle—he was placed in charge of the department's first stunt team.

Lieutenant Richitt became a captain in 1948, but he was swiftly transferred to the Third Precinct. Two years later he was the subject of one of the police department's biggest family fights. It started on March 2, 1950, when he was transferred from the coveted White House precinct to command of the outlying Eighth Precinct. The rea-

sons given were disrespect for superior officers and failure to carry out duties.

Captain Richitt, it was indicated, was hard to find at his desk. He has always felt he could accomplish more on the street than he could tied to a desk. Captain Richitt didn't take the transfer sitting down.

At the end of his first day in the Eighth Precinct, he called a press conference to give the real reason for his transfer. He said it was his private disclosure to a House District subcommittee investigating crime of certain matters concerning gambler Emmitt Warring and Police Chief Robert J. Barrett.

There was a good deal of commotion, including a recommendation by Special Assistant Corporation Counsel Daniel B. Maher that Captain Richitt face trial board charges. But the whole controversy ended in a huddle at Major Barrett's office with Captain Richitt stating, "I regret the incident ever occurred." Major Barrett said that was that, and everybody went back to work.

In 1951, he took up flying, largely because his son Donald, a Naval Academy graduate, had become a military aviator.

The veteran policeman was promoted to inspector in May 1953 and has been in charge of the first inspectorial district ever since. He and his wife, Juanita, live at 2500 Q Street NW.

Great Strides Made in Civil Defense Program in Luzerne County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in many parts of this Nation there is uncertainty and confusion regarding civil defense.

I am, therefore, delighted to announce that Luzerne County, which comprises my congressional district, clearly understands the importance of civil defense.

This program, Mr. Speaker, has become increasingly important because in hearings before my committee, the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, experts have emphasized the fact that we have not perfected any antimissile defense. We have no defense at this time against intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM—attack.

All of the experts have further testified in hearings before my committee that this being the case, then the emphasis for defense rests in the establishment of shelter programs since the civil defense program no longer calls for the evacuation of entire communities. It rests, moreover, on the efficient operation of local civil defense organizations such as that in Luzerne County.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am very much gratified and delighted with the outstanding work being done in this vital field by the Luzerne County Commissioners and the entire civil defense organization in my county. My congratulations go also to the many thousands of men and women in my district who are giving of their time, efforts, and abilities to make the county organization the outstanding one that it is.

As an extension of these remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 27, 1960, in which this entire program as carried out in Luzerne County is explained in some detail:

COUNTY'S CIVIL DEFENSE ORGANIZATION OUTLINED BY COUNTY COMMISSIONER—GREAT STRIDES MADE

Majority County Commissioners Edmund J. McCullough and Jarrett W. Jennings released a detailed report yesterday showing the great strides that have been made in setting up a Luzerne County civil defense organization under the capable direction of Lt. Col. Frank Townsend.

Colonel Townsend has as his key assistants Herman A. Wagner as deputy director, Nicholas H. Souchik, administrator, and Mrs. Bowden W. Davis as secretary. In all there are approximately 29,000 volunteers enrolled in this vital program. These volunteers include 1,000 auxiliary police, 250 volunteer firemen, 750 radiological instrument readers. Women of 75 churches have been organized and trained in mass care service, and several thousand have received first-aid training.

At present Luzerne County has a director for civil defense in 72 of its 73 municipalities, the one exception being the city of Wilkes-Barre, which is in the process of appointing a director.

HAD DIFFICULTIES

The all-inclusive report of the county commissions on the civil defense setup in the county points out that its organization was not without difficulties since Colonel Townsend was appointed to the post by former Governor Leader on July 9, 1956.

The report points out that for 5 or 6 months Colonel Townsend attempted to set up a successful organization, but was unable to do so. The administrator, John Shively, either refused to cooperate or was not available to perform the duties expected of him. At this point Townsend requested the former county commissioners to allow him to appoint a civil defense administrator and a secretary, and asked that these people not be involved politically in any way.

In September of 1957, the report explains, Nicholas Souchik was appointed administrator at a salary of \$4,500 per year and Bronwen W. Davis was named secretary at a salary of \$2,700 a year.

MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Since that time, Luzerne County Civil Defense has accomplished the following:

1. A council, comprising 22 civic and business leaders, was formed for the purpose of assisting in any disaster work.

2. A staff, numbering 40 volunteers, has been assigned to the various services of Civil Defense, to train and operate their particular service.

3. Seven 200-bed emergency hospitals have been stored throughout the county, each valued at \$36,000, at no cost to the county. These hospitals are stored at: City Hall Building at Hazleton, Pennhurst State School at White Haven, Retreat State Hospital at Retreat, Northwest Jointure School outside of Shickshinny, Nanticoke State Hospital at Nanticoke, The Elementary (Public) School at Noxen, and St. Michael's School for Boys at Hoban Heights.

4. Five emergency medical supply units, each valued at \$10,000, at no cost to the county, at the Red Cross Building, Wilkes-Barre; City Hall Building, Hazleton; Lehman Township High School, Lehman; Dallas Borough School, Dallas; Wright Township High School, Wright Township.

5. A radio net, operated by an amateur radio group of 50 volunteers, has been set

up with 27 radios located throughout the county. The county purchased eight of these at an approximate cost of \$1,800. This net is self-sustaining regardless of whether power is available.

CONNECTING LINES

6. A Conelrad line has been installed, connecting the courthouse with radio station WBRE, for use in the event of an emergency. The work was done by U.S. Air Force at no cost to the county. However, the county purchased microphones and accessories for the operation of this line at a cost of \$150. Four radio stations, WBRE, WBAX, WPTS, and WAZL, have been tied into a Conelrad cluster and, in time of emergency, will be broadcasting through these four stations from the courthouse.

7. Twelve telephones, six incoming and six outgoing, are installed in the Civil Defense Control Center at an optional rate from the Bell Telephone Co. This item is financed on a matching fund basis with the Federal Government so that the annual cost to the county is approximately \$248. These telephones are operated, during an alert—and will be in the event of an emergency—by 25 Civil Defense volunteers who are members of an organization known as The Insurance Women of Wilkes-Barre.

8. Luzerne County purchased 50 radiological instruments, at an approximate cost of \$250, and subsequently received 110 free instruments from the Federal Government, due to the activity of the local Civil Defense Organization. Fifty-four high schools throughout the county are in receipt of 11 instruments each. Because the science and physics teachers of these schools have been trained, by Col. Leon Beisel of the county organization, to operate these instruments—and they in turn have taught the operation to the students in their respective classes—the instruments were acquired without cost.

9. Luzerne County owns one rescue truck, purchased by the county. Recently three additional rescue trucks were received from the State Council of Civil Defense for the county's use. This is in recognition of the activities of the Civil Defense Rescue Service.

EQUIPMENT PURCHASED

10. Several items have been purchased through the Surplus Property Program, such as: A 5-ton tractor, one jeep, five 1-ton trailers, two van-type trailers, one generator, 83 hospital beds. The Red Cross purchased 106 hospital beds through the county Civil Defense organization. Throughout the county, many Civil Defense organizations, activated by this office, have participated in the Surplus Property Program and purchased a great deal of merchandise.

11. This office has also undertaken the preparation of all matching fund applications for all political subdivisions in Luzerne County. In this way there is no confusion and there has not been a single application rejected by the Federal Government on any matching fund request made. Items such as sirens, pumps, police equipment, rescue equipment, radiological instruments, radios and generators have been purchased by various municipalities for civil defense.

All communications sent to higher headquarters from local political subdivisions go through the County Civil Defense office, including requests for services, literature, surplus property and any general information. Thousands of copies of literature are distributed each year to residents of Luzerne County through the county office. One hundred thousand copies will be distributed this year at the Wyoming Valley Parade of Progress where we plan to have a shelter display, handled by volunteers.

TRAINING PROGRAM

During the past 2 years more than 1,000 auxiliary police throughout the county have been trained by Frank Flynn, 750 radiological instrument readers by Col. Leon Beisel and 250 volunteer firemen by Edward Jacobson. The women of 75 churches have been organized and trained for mass care service by Mrs. Gordon Bell. A year-round medical program is conducted by Dr. Gordon Bell and Mr. Souchik at each of the local hospitals.

Every Monday night during the year volunteers in the communications service both new and regular members, are given training in the operation of radio communications equipment for Luzerne County.

First-aid training has been given to several thousands of people through civil defense and the Red Cross within the past 2 years. This program has been accelerated to such a degree that classes must wait for instructors, although six additional instructors were trained last fall.

Meetings for sector and local directors are held at least once a year in their respective sectors. Each year a visit is made to each of the 73 political subdivisions in Luzerne County, to discuss civil defense with the proper officials, by either the county director, Colonel Townend, the deputy director, Herman Wagner, or the administrator, Mr. Souchik.

TWENTY-NINE THOUSAND ARE ENROLLED

At the present time there are approximately 29,000 volunteers enrolled in civil defense in Luzerne County.

This office handles all speaking engagements, which normally run about 100 annually.

When Colonel Townend was appointed county director, there were 23 political subdivisions with appointed directors. At the present time, Luzerne County has a director for civil defense in 72 of its 73 municipalities, the one exception being the city of Wilkes-Barre, which is in the process of appointing a director.

A survival plan and the evacuation complex have been prepared and distributed.

Each year two alerts are held by civil defense officials at the county control center in which approximately 75 people are involved. All phases of disaster work are covered during these tests.

Contact has been established and working agreements completed with the following:

All Wyoming Valley hospitals, American Red Cross chapters, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Civil Air Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment, Pennsylvania Department of Health, Pennsylvania National Guard, U.S. Army Reserve, U.S. Naval Reserve, U.S. post office.

CONTINUE PLANNING

Plans for 1960 include erecting evacuation signs on all evacuation routes, assignment of industry and transportation for disaster responsibilities, and establishment of survival officers and survival units.

Civil defense activities, under the present system, costs the county about \$10,000 per year.

Apparently this department has been well run, and an effort has been made to keep it clear of the control of the Republican party machine once Shively was deposed.

The County Director Townend and Deputy Wagner are appointed by the Governor on recommendation of the county commissioners. The administrator and secretary are hired by the county commissioners. The Civil Defense Council and county staff are appointed by the director.

A Golden Age Club for Your Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Clayton E. Anderson, State director of recreation in Oregon, is a good friend of mine who used to live in Springfield, Oreg. When I saw him recently in Oregon he gave me a pamphlet entitled "A Golden Age Club for Your Community, Life More Abundant for the Senior Citizen."

It was so timely and so well done that I cannot resist making it available more widely through insertion in the Appendix. Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including the text of this pamphlet herewith.

A GOLDEN AGE CLUB FOR YOUR COMMUNITY—
LIFE MORE ABUNDANT FOR THE SENIOR
CITIZEN

FORWARD

A significant challenge and certainly one of the most worthwhile and satisfying opportunities for community service is the establishment of a senior citizens club for your community.

Because of the basic needs which the Golden Age Club program fulfills and because of the desire and need for participation, this activity is usually successful from the very beginning. Not only it is popular, it is one of the easiest programs to establish and administer. There are just three basic elements required—leadership, a meeting place and program. Every community can fill the bill on these necessities.

There are few experiences as rewarding as helping to form a Golden Age Club and later attend a meeting and see the results in terms of human happiness.

In this handbook we would propose to point out the way. (Clayton E. Anderson, State director of recreation.)

THE NEED

The age group over 65 years is increasing $4\frac{1}{2}$ times as fast as any other age group.

The need for providing interesting and enjoyable leisure time activities is more of a problem for the senior citizens because he has more spare time due to retirement, may never have learned to play or may have forgotten how, has reduced income because of retirement, family has grown up, is quite often alone.

The inactivity and lack of stimulation often results in all manner of physical, mental and social problems either real or imagined.

One of the greatest problems is that of loneliness.

Recreation—a Golden Age Club—can be a big help in providing the needed stimulation, activity and good fellowship which everyone needs.

THE BENEFITS

"The Golden Age Club is just wonderful. Now I have something to look forward to each week." (Mrs. Vaughn, Willamalane Golden Age Club.)

"Our Senior Citizens Club means a lot to me. Why? It has taken 10 to 15 years off my age." (Mrs. Susie Woolfolk, Grants Pass Senior Citizens Club.)

"Establishment of an active hobby and participation in active recreation, which adds breadth to life, is essential for rehabilitation. The Golden Age Club can make a valid contribution in this respect." (Arthur

C. Jones, M.D., director, Rehabilitation Institute of Portland.)

"Participation in the Golden Age Club dispels loneliness, promotes feelings of usefulness, and creates a favorable climate for good mental and emotional health of the senior citizens." (John Waterman, M.D., director, Mental Health Section Oregon State Board of Health.)

"I know the Golden Age Club program can be of real benefit to the individual in terms of enjoyable participation and companionship, but the community also benefits greatly. The senior citizen becomes an active participating force for community betterment and this interest and participation results in a high level of community spirit." (Edward C. Harms, Jr., mayor of Springfield, president, League of Oregon Cities.)

GETTING STARTED

The local recreation department can organize the club, but will need help and participation. The first step is to:

Call a meeting of interested and influential citizens.

Discuss the problem.

Decide on a course of action.

Appoint committees.

Secure a sponsoring group.

Sponsoring group

If there isn't a local recreation department to organize and give the necessary assistance and guidance, then you will probably need a sponsoring group.

This group will advise, assist in financing and offer volunteer assistance with transportation, refreshments, etc. The actual leadership should be left to the club members.

The sponsoring group will need to publicize the meeting, provide transportation, refreshments, and a meeting place. Once the project is successfully underway the sponsoring group should remain in the background and participate only as needed.

Sponsoring groups in other Oregon communities have been: City or county recreation departments, civic or service clubs, veterans organizations, lodge groups, YM or YWCA's, church groups.

The meeting place

The meeting place needs to be centrally located. There is always some place available: The community recreation building, lodge hall, veterans' building, union halls, Grange hall.

It is best to have the following: (a) Ground-floor location, (b) convenient to transportation, (c) kitchen available, (d) good lighting, heating, ventilation, (e) restrooms on same floor as meeting place.

Meetings

Most clubs meet once a week and the club members generally prefer meeting in the afternoon or starting at lunch time. Evening meetings are not as popular, but now and then one should be held to add variety.

Publicity

Publicize the organization and meeting in every possible way. Use radio, TV, newspaper, church bulletin. Talented members of the group might be used on radio or TV.

The most successful method of building interest is through personal contact with prospective members. Take the time necessary to invite those people who are eligible and once the club is underway the membership committee should continually be on the lookout for those who haven't heard of the Golden Age Club.

GOLDEN AGE CLUB ORGANIZATION

Keep the organization as friendly and informal as possible. Keep business and procedure to a minimum, and concentrate on fellowship and sociability. It may be well to run the program for several months on an informal basis with a temporary chairman selected by the group.

Leadership

Chairman: Elected by the group. It is his job to conduct the meetings. He needs to be a respected and experienced leader who can keep things going on an even keel.

Other officers: Of course you will want a vice president, secretary, and treasurer.

Program chairman: This is one of the most important positions—it is well to have the first one appointed and make certain this person can do a good job planning, recruiting, and conducting the program.

The terms of office should not be over 1 year and some clubs prefer a 6-month term. Some groups (Grants Pass) leave all business up to the executive committee composed of officers of the club and just get a short report from them on action taken or proposed. This eliminates the necessity of taking valuable fun meeting time for conducting business.

Be sure to avoid partisan politics, denominational religious activities, pressure groups, or any other matters of a controversial nature. The purpose of the Golden Age Club is fellowship, sociability, and community service.

Finances

The best plan is to have the club sponsored through the public recreation department. Actually not much of a budget is required. The major items are: Rental of hall (should be free of charge), refreshments (nearby grocery may be happy to supply coffee), secretarial supplies, name tags, U.S. flag, songbooks; and postage.

Expenses can be defrayed by passing a collection plate with the usual contribution set at 10 cents. Membership fees of 10 to 50 cents per month can be charged. Inability to pay this fee should not hinder one's membership. A small fee is desirable, and any major expenditure should be underwritten by the sponsoring agency. A large buildup of funds should be avoided. Some clubs set a maximum limit on the amount of money that can be attained.

Membership

Membership is open to any interested man or woman above the age of 60 in most clubs. If a man or woman qualifies, his spouse is also eligible.

In some groups 50 is the beginning age and in a few, membership starts at 65. The Willamalane Golden Age Club of Springfield set their minimum age at 60 so as not to let in a bunch of "half-baked kids."

It is especially important to invite the handicapped, the residents of homes for the aging—and ambulatory patients in nursing homes.

Committees

Here are some of the committees which have been appointed (by the chairman) in Oregon clubs:

Publicity: To tell the Golden Age story to press and radio.

Refreshment: To provide the goodies which add to the enjoyment of the meeting.

Membership: See that every eligible person in the community is invited to join.

Program: Develop an interesting and lively program for each meeting. Rely on talent from the club members.

Cleanup: So you will continue to get the hall rent free.

Good cheer: Maintain contact with and visit sick members.

Transportation: Coordinate transportation needs with members and sponsoring group.

The program

Most of the members of a Golden Age Club are interested in the same things and have the same abilities to a greater or lesser degree, as any other age group.

There is a need for variety which permits a wide freedom of choice. There is a need to provide useful things to do—a program full of creative opportunity.

The program at club meetings should be conducted by members of the group and as far as possible the program presented by members. There is generally a world of talent in this group—musicians, poets, humorists, and singers. It is the program chairman's job to uncover and encourage the talent.

During the year special activities should be encouraged—such as picnics, tours, community sings, concerts and hobby shows.

Then on days other than the regular meeting day, it might be well to have a craft session, a card playing day, a day each month to visit shut-ins, and perhaps some time to work on community service.

It should all add up to sociability and fellowship.

ADDITIONAL HELP

You will find that any of the many successful Golden Age Clubs in the State will be more than happy to give you the enthusiastic help you need to get underway.

A sample Golden Age Club constitution and other helpful material may be obtained from the following: State Council on Aging, Post Office Box 5197, Eugene, Ore.; State Director of Recreation, State Parks and Recreation Division, Highway Building, Salem, Ore.; Dave Talbot, recreation director, City Hall, Grants Pass, Ore.; Dorothea Lensch, Bureau of Parks and Recreation, Portland, Ore.

Address of Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle at Pulaski Foundation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I including the following address delivered by Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, the adjutant general of Pennsylvania, at the Pulaski Foundation dinner held Monday evening, March 28, 1960, at the Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D.C. I had the honor of serving as toastmaster for that affair and it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to have General Biddle's fine address inserted in the RECORD so that it may receive the widest possible distribution that it indeed should have.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. A. J. DREXEL BIDDLE, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE PULASKI FOUNDATION DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 28, 1960

The privilege of addressing so distinguished a gathering is one of which I am humbly proud.

Out of Poland's past rise the illustrious names of her gallant sons and daughters, who sacrificed so much on the altar of freedom. In a number of cases, treasured mementos, and even the birthplaces of some of these patriots have been guarded.

Yet, those in search of the birthplace of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the gallant hero of two continents, would find a gloomy, forsaken, even pathetic spectacle.

In the little town of Warka—not far from Poznan—the museum and other buildings at the site of the birthplace of this stalwart in the fights for Poland's and subsequently for our freedom are going to rack and ruin. They are in sad need of repairs.

I believe most of us are aware that, when General Pulaski came to these shores, and offered his services, he was given the rank of general by the Continental Congress, but no money to equip his cavalry corps. He consequently devoted some \$50,000 of his own funds toward outfitting his command.

It is, therefore, with enthusiasm that I greet the proposal that the people of the United States express their appreciation of General Pulaski's contribution of life and fortune in our cause, by erecting a useful memorial at his birthplace in Poland. The proposal is a worthy one, for it envisages the establishment of a combined medical, educational, and civic center, and a home for the aged and an orphanage in Warka.

A memorial consisting of these things, that are so sorely needed by the war-weary, but valiant Polish people would, indeed, be a fitting way to render tribute to their indomitable spirit, as well as to express our thanks to them for Pulaski's valued aid to us, in time of need.

These are tangible things that would serve as a significant and effective reminder of our continuing interest in them, and in their welfare.

And remote from the West, as they are, they urgently need to be reminded of our faith in their spirit and fortitude in their dedication to the things that ennoble human life.

This is the kind of encouragement required to help them survive their present ordeal.

The ideals, for which they fought so courageously are anathema to any who would venture to repress what is finest in the Polish people, and to subvert the Polish nation to their own purposes.

In light of the grim hardships they have sustained, it would be understandable, if Polish hearts were gripped with despair.

Yet, it is part of the noble heritage of mankind, that the human spirit can conquer over almost insuperable odds, and that the human yearnings for freedom can never be completely extinguished.

The history of Poland offers excellent testimony to this truth.

In modern history no other great nation has been so torn and rendered, by warlike neighbors, nor has any been subjected to so many alien conquerors.

From these experiences the Polish people have derived a deep and passionate love of freedom. They realize, as few peoples do, that freedom is not something that is ours by luck or circumstances, or by some magic gift of fate. It is a prize dearly won and vigorously defended by generations of brave men.

Spiritually and culturally, Poland is a western window looking east.

In large degree, it is to the valiant role of the Polish mothers, as well as of the wholesome influence of the church, that the spirit and devotion to a free Poland is attributable.

For, as in the days of Poland's partition of more than 150 years under the Austrians, Germans, and Russians, the mothers of our time teach their children, as they say their prayers in the evening at their mothers' knees, the word of God, the spirit of the family, the love of country, the respect for Polish traditions—and thus instill in them that sense of indomitable Polish nationhood.

All, and there have been many, who have tried to crush that spirit, have failed.

As Ambassador to Poland several years prior to the outbreak of war, and during the war in Poland, and later to the Polish Government established first, in France and subsequently in London, I shared the pride of both Americans and Poles in the achievements of the free Poles, who refused to give up the fight.

My continued assignment at the side of

the Polish Government, when it moved its seat from Poland to France, and later to London, was in the nature of a salute by the United States to the Polish people in occupied Poland—people who had thus been deprived of the ability to act on their own behalf. It was, in effect, an indication to them that we considered their cause not a lost one, but one in abeyance.

At the close of the Polish-German conflict, many thousands of Poles found their way to France to reconstitute the Polish Army, and to carry on the fight from there.

When France was defeated in the battle of 1940, again thousands of these Poles reassembled in England. Polish divisions distinguished themselves in the fighting in World War II in various parts of the world. Polish airborne and armored units were in action in Europe. Polish pilots achieved an outstanding record in the RAF, as did Polish naval units at sea.

The battle cry of those fighting Poles was the motto of the Polish uprising of 1830, "For your freedom and ours." This motto is particularly meaningful to us Americans. We realize full well that, if freedom is attacked anywhere, it is threatened everywhere. This has never been truer than today, nor so clearly understood by the American people.

The strength of America, as a hope for the free world, lies not only in our having a convincing unchallengeable military capability, and the will to use it, if need be, but in our devotion to freedom, in our respect for the inherent dignity of man, and our belief in the right of every man to worship God freely, to work out his own destiny in his own way, so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of his neighbors.

It would seem appropriate at this point, I believe, if we were to let our thoughts revert for a moment to that dauntless Pole, whose memory is revered both by the Polish and by the American people.

General Pulaski's life ended in a blaze of glory before he could fulfill his vast potential, but he left behind him a legacy of honor and courage that will never fail to be a source of inspiration to the two great nations he served so well.

If one were to search the annals of history for a hero who combined nobility of character, rare personal courage, and a true, profound love of freedom, one could not fail to consider Casimir Pulaski, fighter for freedom on two continents, a commander in chief of Polish patriot forces, and a general officer in the services of the United States—all before completing his 32d year of life. What makes his life particularly noteworthy is that he fought against what was hopeless odds, and never saw his cause triumphant. Yet, he fought willingly, uncompromisingly, and unflinchingly.

In 1768 he joined with his father and brothers in forming the Confederation of Bar, to drive the Russians from Poland, and to restore to Poland her independence. Although he was only 20 years old, he threw himself with all the ardor at his command, into the struggle against the potentially overwhelming power of Russia, and of the forces of the Polish King they controlled.

In the years of warfare that ensued, he became a national hero, and a world famous soldier.

By the time he was 21 he had defeated the Russians in several battles, and at 24 his name was famous throughout Europe.

I may add that a technique that has importantly, indeed, significantly figured, as a part of Russian foreign policy and strategy, since the time of Peter the Great, has been the employment of an ideology for the promotion of power politics.

To return to Pulaski's career, when he heard the electrifying news from America of the Declaration of Independence, and of the

struggle for liberty that was being waged on the other side of the Atlantic, he saw an opportunity in the New World to contribute toward the cause of freedom, that was denied him in the Old.

Once again the struggle seemed one against hopeless odds—in the early days of the Revolutionary War—but his fearless and adventurous spirit rose to the challenge.

He devoted to the cause of the Americans his undoubted skill and military capability, and his unquenchable love for freedom.

From 1777 until his death on October 11, 1779, he achieved an outstanding record of pure valor.

"Perhaps a braver man than Pulaski never drew a sword" is the way one authority described him. His dash and daring, his unparalleled horsemanship and swordsmanship, his propensity to charge into the thick of the battle at the crucial moment, made him the foremost cavalryman in America, and justly earned for him the title of "the father of American cavalry".

Finally, at the Battle of Savannah, he was shot from the saddle by a blast of grape shot, and died at sea aboard an American warship. It is perhaps fitting that his grave should be the broad Atlantic, which was his highway between the countries he served so gallantly. He had achieved the death he sought, in the cause of freedom.

He knew the fullest meaning of Macaulay's immortal passage:

"And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his Gods."

By Pulaski's devoted service he also established a tradition of Polish and American friendship, which has existed to the present day, and, which has been strengthened and invigorated in each generation by the effective contributions of Americans of Polish descent.

Surely, it would be a worthy and fitting gesture to establish at Warka a memorial that would render useful service to the Polish people.

It would serve to express our thanks to them for the services Pulaski so gallantly rendered us in our time of need—and it would thus enable us to honor the memory of this great Pole who gave true meaning to that chivalrous Polish motto: "For Yours and Our Freedom."

Some Considerations Affecting the Sugar Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Cuba, and especially the virulent anti-American campaign now in progress down there, have dramatically focused national attention on the U.S. Sugar Act, legislation which in part underwrites a substantial financial subsidy to Cuba. Because the President of the United States has recently requested certain amendments in this act, each Member of the House will want to take the time to examine the effect of this act in general. In that connection, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful editorial from the Bing-

hamton Press of March 26. The editorial follows:

WRONGFUL SUGAR QUOTA SYSTEM

Burning of sugarcane fields by opponents of the Castro regime raises the question whether Cuba will be capable of supplying the 3 million tons of sugar the United States buys at a \$150 million premium above world prices each year.

Inasmuch as U.S. consumers should be protected in their supply and from gouging prices that would result from a shortage, the case is bolstered for giving the President discretionary power to deal with the Cuban quota. It is not a matter of economic reprisal that U.S. consumers should be secure in their normal sugar supplies.

Beyond the question of assuring U.S. sugar supplies is the ever-lingering doubt that the United States should be subsidizing a regime that appears to be yielding an area strategic to the United States over to Communist infiltration, or worse, to use as a base for anti-U.S. propagations and activities.

The sugar quota system, gouging U.S. consumers as it does, should be abandoned for its wrongful objectives and departures from free enterprise. The purpose is to guarantee a market at higher than world prices for U.S. sugar beet growers. It is only incidental that the system also subsidizes the Castro dictatorship.

Even if the Cuban quota were reduced, the United States could contract for adequate supplies of sugar from friendly countries such as Peru, Mexico, Brazil and possibly even the Philippines. World sugar is in surplus, not in shortage, and it is wrong that U.S. consumers should be forced by their Government to pay an excessive price for it. Serving farm interests, the Government engages in wrongful monopoly and exploitation of fixed consumer need.

Predatory farm interests have dug in their heels, standing against both reasonable measures for dealing with Castro and for equitable relief for U.S. sugar consumers.

If the situation should develop to the point of a sugar shortage, perhaps anger of the public would force Congress to adopt measures that it should adopt in normal opposition to monopoly, price gouging, and exploitation of the many by the few.

The Case for the Student Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who will oppose efforts to remove the loyalty oath requirement from the provisions of the National Defense Education Act believe that the great majority of American college and university students have no objection to the loyalty oath requirement in the act.

It is evident that most, and possibly all, loyal and patriotic young men and women believe that the loyalty oath requirement is a good thing and should be continued.

One of the best articles which I have seen on this subject was prepared recently by Mr. David Franke, a native of Houston, Tex., and an undergraduate college student. This article, which

is entitled "The Case for the Student Loyalty Oath," first appeared in "The Individualist" and was reprinted and distributed on one or more college and university campuses, including Harvard University.

Even though the opposition to the loyalty oath and anti-Communist affidavit requirements has been vocal and well organized, it is encouraging to know that these organized efforts of a small minority have not been successful in brainwashing college students generally.

Mr. Franke has done an excellent and objective job in giving his views on this subject. It is encouraging to believe that his article reflects the thinking of the great majority of loyal young Americans.

It is with pleasure that I include, with his permission, his statement:

THE CASE FOR THE STUDENT LOYALTY OATH (By David Franke)

A major battle has developed over that provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires students to file a loyalty oath and an anti-Communist affidavit. The opposition to the oath and affidavit is vocal and well coordinated. Its defenders, so far as reported in the press, have been scarce. The issue, moreover, is considerably confused by the pretzel logic and ambiguous rhetoric of many of those entering the fray.

What rational position, in the midst of such confusion, can be taken by the student who believes in limited government and individual freedom—and who is eternally suspicious of extensions of governmental power? In an attempt to reach such a decision, let us first look at the facts behind the controversy.

On September 5, 1958, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. Provisions were included in this act for \$295 million in Federal loans to students in higher education, and for a minimum of \$36.3 million in National Defense Fellowships. Recipients were required (1) to file an affidavit stating they were not members of, and did not believe in or support, "any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods"; and (2) to take the following oath: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." Since passage of the act, 12 colleges have withdrawn from the aid program because of these requirements.

In attacking the loyalty clause, some of the opponents are careful to use language and phrases which appeal to conservatives and libertarians. Secretary Arthur S. Flemming of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asserts that the provision "results in unnecessary expenditures on the part of the Government," and the affidavit is being classified by many as an example of Federal control of education. Then there are the various arguments that the clause infringes upon freedom of belief and conscience.

Upon close examination, however, all of these arguments prove to be either false or irrelevant. The increase in Government expenditures is negligible, and if the Secretary is that concerned with economy he has many other areas in his Department in which to wield the axe. Besides, we have the admission of one of his subordinates, Dr. Homer Babbidge, that "some [colleges] such as Yale and Harvard, can afford to withdraw because sufficient funds are available from

other sources." Why offer Federal funds to colleges which have no need of them? Is this not a greater waste of money?

Nor does the complaint that "freedom of belief and conscience" are violated stand under close scrutiny. The act does not require an anti-Communist affidavit of students per se, but only of those seeking financial help from the Federal Government. This is certainly a legitimate claim for the Government to make, especially when we recall that the National Defense Education Act was passed during the panic which followed the alleged launching of the first Soviet Sputnik, and the very title of the legislation reveals it is a defense measure.

By what conceivable twist of logic can it be held that citizens who are loyal should be taxed to help an unloyal student through college as a defense measure? Nor does the student who is loyal, but ashamed to declare his allegiance, have a claim to the taxpayer's assistance. It is only the student who is proud to declare his loyalty who will readily fight for his country when the cold war turns hot—and this is the only student who has any conceivable claim to assistance from his government.

The "freedom of belief" argument, moreover is based on a false theory of individualism which tends to separate freedoms from responsibilities, and on a species of relativism which admits to no moral standards or absolutes outside the individual. We are reminded of Prof. Richard Weaver's observation that for four centuries every man has been * * * his own professor of ethics, and the consequence is an anarchy which threatens even that minimum consensus of value necessary to the political state.

The true individualist is not this type of academic beatnik, who places his egotistical notions above the freedom of his fellow man; rather he is the man of discrimination, who limits government in order to preserve and develop his personality, but allows it the necessary function of protecting the citizenry against subversion and aggression. He realizes that freedom of belief and conscience does not—cannot—include the right to destroy the freedom of others.

As Leonard E. Read warns, in "Government—An Ideal Concept," "It is incorrect to think of liberty as synonymous with unrestrained action. Liberty does not and cannot include any action, regardless of sponsorship, which lessens the liberty of a single human being. To argue contrarily is to claim that liberty can be composed of liberty negations, patently absurd."

Others have objected to the oath-affidavit clause on the basis that it is discriminatory in its application. Harvard University announced it was withdrawing from the program because the clause "singles out students alone in our population—and among students the neediest—as subjects for special distrust." The National Education Association believes such requirements are discriminatory when applied exclusively to special groups. And the Washington Star adds that the affidavit imposes no obligation on the man who can afford to pay his way through school.

What would these critics have Congress do? Impose a loyalty oath on the entire population, in order to avoid discrimination? This certainly would come closer to a witch hunt than the present system. The argument defies all logic. Discrimination of this sort is unavoidable simply because persons are different, have varying occupations, and participate in a wide range of activities.

Students enrolled in the Reserve Officers Training Corps have always had to take a loyalty oath. Does this discriminate in favor of non-ROTC students?

Persons who work for the Federal Government must take a loyalty oath. Should all citizens be required to take the oath, to avoid ferreting out Government employees as

subjects for special distrust? The answer is obvious.

The oaths required of ROTC students and Government employees are not the only precedents in this field. The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 included a loyalty oath and affidavit identical to the one now in the National Defense Education Act. To date more than 12,000 applicants have signed the affidavit to qualify for graduate science fellowships totaling \$43,250,000. Yet no educator has questioned the propriety or necessity of the oath and affidavit in the science program.

The labor reform legislation enacted by Congress this summer prohibits any person who has been a Communist Party member in the previous 5 years from being on the staff, except in a clerical capacity, of a labor union or of an association of employers dealing with any labor organization.

Two additional arguments leveled at the loyalty clause deserve consideration: Secretary Flemming's contention that since such person as Communists "have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath," the requirements are useless; and the claim that they constitute "Federal control of education."

It is obvious that Communists would not hesitate to sign a loyalty oath, if it is to their advantage. But this is precisely why an oath is necessary; many times the only way to prosecute a Communist is by means of a perjury indictment. Consider the famous case of Alger Hiss, who was exempt from prosecution under the existing laws, but was jailed for perjury when he lied under oath to a congressional committee.

Likewise, in 1949 Fulton Lewis, Jr., disclosed that Hans Freistadt, a graduate physics student at the University of North Carolina and an avowed Communist, was receiving a \$1,600 fellowship from the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC had an FBI report on the student, but was unable to revoke the funds because loyalty oaths were not required of fellowship recipients. Further congressional investigation revealed that another Communist was receiving a \$2,000 grant from the Government.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, neatly summarized the need for a student loyalty oath when he declared that "such an oath provides the Government with the right to withdraw the funds and to suspend the scholarship and perhaps capture what has been spent, if indeed a Communist agent takes advantage of these funds, because it becomes an abrogation of contract, he has perjured himself and is in violation of the law."

But does the student oath and affidavit constitute "Federal control of education"? Yes, it does, in a way which is unavoidable whenever the Federal Government provides subsidies.

Congress, if it is to avoid reckless squandering of the taxpayer's money, must specify both the qualifications of the recipients of its grants, and the general regulations governing the particular subsidy. In the National Defense Education Act, therefore, Congress allots money for specific purposes (strengthening of science, mathematics and foreign language instruction), places restrictions upon its loan recipients (need and capability), and allows for "such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States."

If the loyalty oath constitutes Federal control of education, so do these stipulations; yet they were welcomed by many of the same people who are opposing the oath. What justification have they for accepting all the controls which inevitably follow the largesse—except the one demanding loyalty? It is only fair to demand consistency, and to remind those who are seriously concerned that the surest way of guarding against Federal control is to remove the subsidy.

Editorial in the Catholic Transcript on the Imprisonment of Bishop Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the whole free world is ablaze with indignation over the imprisonment of Bishop James E. Walsh, of the Maryknoll Fathers, by the rulers of Communist China.

No more eloquent statement of the issues involved has been made than that in an editorial published in the current issue of the Catholic Transcript, which is published in Hartford, Conn., and has a wide readership in the archdiocese of Hartford, the Diocese of Norwich, and the Diocese of Bridgeport.

Under unanimous consent, I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House this editorial from the March 24 issue of the Catholic Transcript:

THE CROSS OF CHRIST FOR BISHOP WALSH

To us in the free world, the Church of Silence is like an abyss wrapped in darkness. We know it is there, but usually can see nothing of it, and so come to think of it as empty or under paralysis. But periodically a shaft of light plays over the abyss, picking out and enabling us to see momentarily now one bit of the unknown land, now another. Though brief and fragmentary, these glimpses are enough to show us that the impression of emptiness, immobility is false. For we perceive that, in the darkness, in the silence, people are suffering for Christ, enduring for Christ, sharing a portion of His Passion, draining the bitter cup which was pressed to His lips.

In the last few days, for example, we have all heard of the fate of Bishop James E. Walsh, of Maryknoll. For several years it was known of him only that he was somewhere in Communist China, but whether living or dead, whether at liberty or in some verminous hole, no one could tell. Now the Red news agency informs us that he still lives, but has, in his 70th year, been sentenced to 20 years in prison. Spotlighted for a moment, the bishop again disappears.

Unquestionably he expected what has now come about. More than 40 years have passed since he first went to China. He has been in the midst of all the changes which the country has experienced in that interval. He contributed signally to the remarkable growth of Christian missions there. He knew at first hand the shudder of apprehension which ran through China when the Japanese began hacking away at it in the 1930's, saw the scattering of the missions during World War II, their brief revival thereafter, and then the spread of the Communist blight.

He chose to return to China in 1948, and, ever since, has firmly declined every suggestion that he depart. Four years ago he said that he intended to remain, to give by his presence what help he could to the Chinese priests, who could not leave. "I don't wish to do anything to separate myself from them of my own volition * * *. Internment and death are simply the normal risks that are inherent in our state of life, a small price to pay for carrying out our duty, in our particular case a privilege because it would associate us a little more intimately in the cross of Christ."

These words lack the passion, the flaming eloquence of Ignatius of Antioch as the latter

went forward to martyrdom at the end of the first century. But in their quiet way, so characteristic of Bishop Walsh, they breathe the same spirit as animated Ignatius and many another martyr in many another age. Suffering and death are no more than the normal risks inherent in the vocation of witness to Christ. They are the very cross of Christ here and now, as it comes to a participant in His priesthood. And, as was the case on Calvary, the defeat will issue in victory; the tree of death will bear fruit, an incredible abundance of fruit over and over and over again.

We are, of course, stirred to the depths of our souls by such Christian heroism and such dramatic evidence that, in our day, the warfare and wonder of Good Friday continue unchanged. But, while we rejoice in the priestly fortitude of Bishop Walsh and what it augurs for the future of the Church of Christ, we must not forget that all is not yet over for him. He needs, and has a right to, our prayers, that he may endure what remains of his ordeal without faltering.

The Problem of Medical Costs After Age 65—A Thoughtful Discussion by the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, judging from the mail which many of us in the House have been receiving lately, there is deep concern on the part of many, many people in this country about the pressing problem of meeting medical costs for persons over the age of 65—persons who become more prone to illnesses at the very time of their lives when their own earning power is at a minimum.

Whatever may be the best legislative approach to deal with their problem, I believe we will all agree that the problem itself is a serious one. In that connection, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of the House, a very able discussion of the impact of this situation which appeared recently in an editorial in the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, of March 17. The editorial follows:

MEDICAL COSTS AFTER 65

It may be true, as has been charged, that the approaching political campaign is responsible for some of the interest in proposals to make it easier for those over 65 to pay medical bills. But there is more to it than that.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aging reports that 80 percent of the 16 million Americans now over 65 have an annual income of less than \$2,000, while 60 percent of them get less than \$1,000. That does not leave much for medical bills which tend to rise in the later years of life.

Nor are the members of the subcommittee the only ones concerned with this serious problem. A bill has been introduced in the House to help make it possible for our elder citizens to make both ends meet. Here in New York State, Governor Rockefeller has urged the legislature to make all group insurance convertible to individual coverage for retired citizens. He also has proposed

improved State care, especially for the mentally ill.

While the extension of social security, as proposed in Congress, would provide the widest coverage, it might be less than adequate unless supplemented by other insurance or pensions. It does, however, make sense, to encourage the individual's incentive to provide for himself.

One way or another, some means must be found to help those over 65 to help themselves. Meanwhile, it might be wise to adopt plans along the lines suggested in Washington and in Albany. Either plan would be more economical and certainly much more dignified than care in public institutions or government handouts.

Brotherhood 52 Weeks a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 24 edition of the Independent Press pays a well deserved tribute to the New Jersey region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and to its well known director, Howard J. Devaney. I might mention that I know Howard Devaney personally, and that the activities outlined here are only one more example of his outstanding and dedicated work in civic affairs.

The editorial follows:

BROTHERHOOD 52 WEEKS A YEAR

Any successful organization depends on active citizen support, effective programing and able professional leadership. The New Jersey region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews has all three of those important ingredients plus some added elements that make it so successful. And a good portion of the credit goes to the professional leadership of our neighbor, Glen Ridge resident Howard J. Devaney, the Regional Director.

Each year the New Jersey region has a number of institutes on human relations in cooperation with many police departments throughout the State. A highlight of this year's activity is the 6-session course now underway in cooperation with the Asbury Park police department. This Institute on Community Relations has 79 police officers with one session devoted to "The Policeman's Role in Labor-Management Relations" and another on "Police-Press Relations."

Devaney has good background for his emphasis on police-community relations. For 8 years he was president of the New Jersey Police Benevolent Association and was also first vice president of the National Conference of Police Associations. His past training and current experience have placed him in demand for speaking engagements and professional consultation.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews activity list, although sprinkled with police programs, does aim to help everyone understand the other person. Youth programs are expanding. One week each summer the regional office sponsors a Brotherhood Camp. Last summer the camp held in conjunction with the New York region was so successful that this year's, to be held at Stokes State Forest, will have an enrollment of young people from the entire east-

ern seaboard with seven NCCJ offices cooperating. In addition, the national conference helps sponsor 1-day youth institutes; an example is the Elizabeth Youth Good Neighbor Council's to be held at Rutgers University School of Education on April 23.

Teacher training continues as long as teachers actively teach. The national conference recognizes this fact and sponsors workshops through which teachers can continue their professional training. This spring teachers in the Somerville area are meeting every week for a workshop in human relations, jointly sponsored by Trenton State College and the national conference. In addition, the 1-week and 3-week summer workshops at Rutgers University draw large numbers of teachers.

The national conference tries to keep abreast of new ideas in programing. Devaney has just returned from a 2-day annual meeting of Girl Scout professional workers from New Jersey and New York at West Point. There he served as coordinator of a program which involved top business personnel for the purpose of evaluating attitudes of professional workers.

The New Jersey region aims to make brotherhood more than just a week a year theme. With Howard J. Devaney as director, the region is developing important lay support and conducting worthwhile, meaningful programs. These three factors blend together to advance brotherhood. Congratulations to the National Conference of Christians and Jews are very much in order.

New President of Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, March 25, 1960:

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CHIEF

We salute a young man of devoted leadership—Albert G. Albert of Loomis Street—who became the 23d president of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday night. Mr. Albert joined the Greater Wilkes-Barre Jaycees in May of 1958 and within a year became a member of the board. He continued his climb.

He has headed numerous projects for the group and recently initiated a program to have Jaycee representation on all 18 committees of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce, a program designed to promote the community-mindedness of the future leaders of the valley.

Mr. Albert has a record of outstanding achievements not only in the Jaycees but also in many civic and religious organizations in this area. A young man of 29, he is general manager of Bloomsburg Metal Co. in Wilkes-Barre.

Among his affiliations are the Kassab-Joseph Post, CWV 1487, secretary; YMCA Toastmasters Club; CYC membership committee; BPO Elks, 109; and we can add participation in the Camp Acahela drive and on the United Fund committee.

Mr. Albert's accomplishments symbolize the creative and energetic type of young men throughout our country who actively promote the Jaycee movement. His outstanding record indicates an even more progressive year ahead for the Greater Wilkes-Barre Jaycees. He has our best wishes.

Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues realize, there are two principal facets to the predicament in which our country finds itself today in regard to gold. The first is the alarming decrease in the gold bullion stock of the United States caused by adverse trade balances which have been payable either in gold at \$35 per fine ounce or in dollars, which under present policy may be invested in this country but later redeemed in gold upon demand. When we note that our gold bullion on hand has gone down from \$40 billion at the end of World War II to about \$19 billion now, it gives us pause. When we discover, however, that the foreign dollar credits of which I spoke come to about \$16 billion for which gold could be demanded at \$35 per fine ounce, the only possible reaction is one of shock, for we see that there would be only \$3 billion worth of our gold bullion left in our hands if foreign countries were to reduce all of their present dollar credits to gold. Now I do not expect such a run on our bank, so to speak, but what I say highlights the seriousness of the situation.

The other facet is the plight of our gold mining industry which is rapidly going out of business because the price of gold has not risen above \$35 per fine ounce since 1934.

Bills introduced in Congress in recent years to raise the price of gold from \$35 to \$70 per fine ounce or to subsidize its production or to allow its sale on a free world market have gotten absolutely nowhere, in the face of opposition from the U.S. Treasury. The Treasury has insisted that any such move would upset the presently stabilized basis for settling trade balances throughout the free world, cause inflation by increasing the base for credit expansion, and bring about worldwide repercussions. Accordingly gold bills introduced last year by some of my colleagues and myself to help our gold miners are hopelessly bogged down in committee. This situation prompted me a month ago to seek a formula which would relieve the depressed condition of the gold mining industry without changing the Treasury's price. This led to the idea of a bill to stop the Treasury from selling gold for use in the arts and industries, and letting our gold producers sell their gold on a free market basis direct to anyone licensed by the Treasury to purchase gold for artistic or industrial purposes or for resale for such purposes.

In preparing to have this idea drafted in bill form, a study of existing regulations disclosed that placer gold miners may now sell unretorted, or otherwise unprocessed placer gold, directly to manufacturing jewelers, industrial users, or anyone in the United States without restriction. However, there does not seem

to be much of a market for placer gold in its natural state, even though the Treasury does not stock such gold in the form of nuggets and gold dust and is therefore not competing with placer gold miners in the sale of such gold. On the other hand, persons offering processed gold for sale may sell only to licensed dealers, refiners, or industrial users at any price which the market will afford or, in the alternative, to the U.S. Treasury at \$35 per fine ounce. Of course, in making sales of such processed gold to the dealers and industrial users the producers are competing with the Treasury which sells to such users at one-fourth of 1 percent over \$35 per ounce.

At first blush it would appear from the foregoing that barring the Treasury from making further sales of gold bullion to industrial users would enable the producers of processed gold to get a much better price. Another look, however, discloses that the free world price hovers close to \$35 per fine ounce—as shown by the London market which fluctuated during the last year between a low of \$35.0429 and a high of \$35.1407. With licensed private dealers and refiners and industrial users allowed to purchase gold on the free world market, the gold miner would gain little by the discontinuance of sales by the U.S. Treasury. What it all boils down to is the fact that the present gold policy of the United States in fixing the price of gold at \$35 per fine ounce, and settling our international trade balances on that basis, and making sales of gold to foreign central banks at that figure has substantially stabilized the price of gold throughout the free world at close to \$35 per fine ounce.

After going around the circle, so to speak, I have arrived back where I started, which is, in effect, that the only perceptible way to get the miners a meaningful increase for their gold would be to change the law to raise the price to \$70 per fine ounce or thereabouts, or provide a subsidy large enough to accomplish the same result.

My study on the gold problem has brought to light certain significant figures for 1958, not as yet published by the Treasury, showing that industrial uses for gold in the United States now exceed domestic production. This will aggravate the problem of our decreasing stock of gold. The figures for 1958 follow those for 1957 which I use for contrast:

	1957	1958
Value of gold produced in the United States.....	\$63,000,000	\$61,565,000
Scrap rebought by Treasury, dealers, and private refiners.....	27,716,220	26,924,135
Total gold receipts.....	90,716,220	88,489,135
Sold for arts and industrial uses:		
By Treasury.....	21,136,850	27,008,450
By private refiners and dealers.....	57,329,370	64,079,470
Total so sold.....	78,466,220	91,087,920
Net gain in gold during 1957.....	12,250,000	
Net shrinkage in gold during 1958.....		2,598,785

Thus in the year of 1958—the industrial need for gold in this country increased by \$14½ million over 1957. The figures for 1959 are not yet available. To conclude this discourse on gold, let me express my opinion—held by many others—that with gold production going down, industrial uses for gold going up, the amount of gold in hand becoming disproportionately small as compared to our ever increasing volume of outstanding currency and credit, and our gold bullion stock shrinking to where it will have reached the vanishing point in a very few years, something has got to give in the not too distant future.

I do not know the answer, but suggest that all of us had better start thinking about it and formulating some appropriate action as soon as possible.

Health and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial from the Washington Post today, March 29, 1960, entitled "Health and Politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HEALTH AND POLITICS

Medical care for the aged is evidently going to become an issue in the presidential election campaign. We think that President Eisenhower has put his party not only on the unpopular side of this issue but also on the wrong side of it. No one should have been surprised that the three avowed candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination were unanimous in endorsing the Forand bill when they spoke together on Sunday at a rally of 10,000 members of the United Auto Workers Union. No one should have been surprised that they were roundly cheered and applauded for their stand. No one should have been surprised that the President was booed for his opposition to the Forand bill.

The Forand bill, to quote its title, is a bill "To amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits." It would increase social security contribution rates of employers and employees by one-fourth of 1 percent each and of the self-employed by three-eighths of 1 percent. It would operate in much the same way as private insurance programs now operate—except that it would provide insurance for the period of old age when insurance is least readily obtainable and most difficult to pay for. Eligible persons would receive services from any qualified surgeon or any hospital or nursing home which agreed to participate and to be paid for services insured under the plan. The surgeon would be chosen by the patient.

Why the American Medical Association, like the National Association of Manufacturers, should oppose this sensible form of prepayment for the inevitable costs of illness in

later life is hard to understand—save as a symptom of the kind of occupational obtuseness which has become a characteristic of the AMA on such issues. Why the doctors should call this system of insurance socialistic passes all understanding. As Senator STAMMINGTON observed, "There is nothing in it that would affect the American system of free medicine. This plan deals only with how medical bills are paid. The doctors, the hospitals, the nursing homes, the way medical care is provided—they are all left alone."

Why automobile workers—and wage earners in every other trade and industry—should be enthusiastically eager to pay during their productive years for this kind of protection in old age should be readily understandable to anyone in political life. There is no more compelling aspect of social security.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia is the vast country extending from the eastern borders of Poland to the approaches of Moscow. It is a cold, but fertile land, and its inhabitants are rugged and rustic rural workers. These people, though numbering a bare 10 million today, have been living in that country from time immemorial. There they led a simple life and were fairly content with their lot, until several centuries ago their country was overrun by the Moscovites, as the Russians were then called. They were brought, much against their will, under the rule of autocratic Russian czars. During that time they were neither free nor happy. They were oppressed, and the czarist government did its best to obliterate all traits of nationalism or national feeling among them, but the Byelorussians persisted in their opposition. They struggled against that regime with all the means at their disposal, and successfully maintained their national identity. And, in 1918, when the czar's government was overthrown, they had their chance for freedom and independence.

Byelorussian leaders seized upon this opportunity and in March of that year proclaimed their independence and established the Byelorussian Republic. Then for about 2 years these unfortunate but brave souls waged wars on many fronts for the preservation of their independence and for their national existence. But the forces opposing them were formidable. Even if they could settle their differences with the Poles on the west and others on the south, they could not cope with the aggressive and constantly advancing Red army of the Soviet Union. In 1921 the country was overrun by Communist Russian forces and it was made part of the Soviet Union. Thus came to an end the free and independent Byelorussia after a brief and precarious existence of about 2 years.

Today these struggling and hard-working Byelorussians are held down in their

homeland by Communist totalitarian regime and do not enjoy any of the freedoms which many of them regard as their hard-earned reward, a reward which was taken away from them by heartless Russian Communists 39 years ago. On the observance of the 42d anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day, one can ardently hope that these deserving people will once more regain their freedom and enjoy it in their homeland.

Resolutions Adopted by and Concurred in by the National Association of Postmasters, Sixth Indiana Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to bring before the House the following series of resolutions adopted unanimously by the postmasters of the Sixth Indiana Congressional District of the National Association of Postmasters.

It is the very reasonable and far-sighted wish of the postmasters of the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, which I have the distinct privilege to represent, that these resolutions shall serve as guidelines for the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolutions are designed to express what I believe to be fair and equitable goals and I commend them to the attention of the respective committees.

A copy of the resolution adopted by and concurred in by the National Association of Postmasters of the Sixth Indiana Congressional District. This meeting was held in the American Legion hall in the city of Crawfordsville, Ind., on February 17, 1960. The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

"Be it resolved, That section 211 of Public Law 85-426, 85th Congress, H.R. 5836, dated May 27, 1958, which is titled "Determination of Class of Post Office and Compensation of Postmasters and Certain Employees," be rescinded and that 100 percent of gross receipts be used as the determining part of gross receipts in the counting of such receipts toward the compensation of postmasters and certain other employees, whose salaries are predicated to some extent upon the gross receipts of the post office in which they work. We feel that this section of this law is aimed directly at postmasters and as such, works an extra hardship upon this class of employees. For this reason, we think that it should be repealed.

"Be it resolved, That the 2½ percent of salary, which was given to postal workers on a temporary basis, be made permanent at this session of Congress. This salary raise of 2½ percent will expire during this term of the Congress. We honestly believe that the postal workers of this country are entitled to this 2½ percent salary raise on a permanent basis rather than upon a temporary basis.

"Be it further resolved, That an additional 10 percent raise in salary rates should be

made effective at once to compensate for the rise in living costs and to keep all postal employees and other Government workers on a comparable basis with the employees of private industry.

"Be it resolved, That Congress made available sufficient funds that a 40-hour workweek for postmasters may become a reality rather than a vision. If this idea can be accomplished without legislation, it is our sincere hope that the 40-hour workweek may be put into practice immediately, however, if legislation is necessary to accomplish this end we ask that the Congress move immediately to this end in the hope that a 40-hour workweek for postmasters may become a reality immediately."

Why We Must Abolish the Army, Navy, and Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Congress presumably unified the Armed Forces to get rid of duplication it achieved something else. It got triplication and quadruplication instead of unification.

Our colleague from Connecticut—Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, a retired U.S. Army colonel with 33 years of continuous service as infantry commander, battalion and regimental commander, Chief of Training, G-3, European theater, and later Deputy Military Governor of Japan under General MacArthur, first commandant of the Army Command Management School until his retirement in 1958—has written an excellent statement of the case for true unification. I have found both junior and senior officers of the Armed Forces, as well as numerous enlisted men, firmly convinced that only a complete unification will be adequate to meet the needs of the American people for a unified defense force. The next President, whatever his name, will certainly want to reexamine the organization of the Department of Defense.

I believe that Congressman KOWALSKI has made a brilliant contribution to this reexamination, not only in his bill, H.R. 9874, but in an article appearing in the April 1960 issue of *True*, written in cooperation with Martin L. Gross, which I commend to the attention of the Members. He writes:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—If war should erupt tomorrow, the Army's crack airborne divisions at Fort Bragg, N.C., and Fort Campbell, Ky., are poised and ready for combat anywhere in the world on 2-hour notice. There is only one drawback; they don't have enough planes.

Repeated Army requests to the Air Force to equip these units with transport planes have been turned down, as have their pleas to at least earmark specific planes for emergency call. According to testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the planes available now could airlift only one of the three strategic divisions.

To the Army, the additional planes would mean the difference between a crippled out-

fit and a fully integrated fighting force; the Air Force, however, sees the Army request as an attempt to usurp their hard-won status as an independent service. This Army-Air Force battle is, at present a stalemate.

This type of pettiness between the armed services has contaminated almost every aspect of our defense structure, from budget to Reserve training, supply, missile warfare, and even air defense. In fact, the independent existence of our three major fighting forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—has created a meaningless miasma of waste, rivalry, inefficiency, and duplication that is uselessly devouring a huge chunk of our \$41 billion defense budget, and could eventually destroy us.

In the Mediterranean area, which I visited last summer, the Navy has built two air bases of its own—Rota Naval Air Base in Spain and Port Lyautey in Morocco—while several Air Force bases in the sector, equipped to handle the same planes, are often half used. In fact, one giant base in Morocco is completely deserted.

Not long ago, the Air Force initiated a frantic and expensive campaign to recruit and train fighter pilots for air defense, while at the same time the Navy and Marines were discharging some of their trained pilots as part of a reduction in force.

The waste, in men and money, is often patently ridiculous. At the Middletown air materiel area, the Air Force had accumulated \$8,400,000 of excess helicopter parts, which they planned to sell off as surplus at a fraction of the original cost. Meanwhile, the Army was placing new orders for the same parts, with the same manufacturer, for the same model helicopter. Only the fortunate interference of the General Accounting Office helped salvage part of this amazing fiasco.

In the missile field, after wasting half a billion dollars and perhaps a year's time by producing duplicate IRBMs—the Air Force Thor and Army Jupiter—we have now learned that, despite the well-meaning last minute intervention by the Defense Department, not even the rocket engines are interchangeable.

During the development of the rockets, according to congressional reports I have secured, both the Air Force and Army hoarded scientific information from each other almost as scrupulously as from the Soviets. When the Defense Department ordered the rocket engines made by the same contractor (the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation) the two services jealously insisted on making individual minor design changes. The contractor was simultaneously—and expensively—making two different rocket engines for the Government for the same job.

Neither are the men interchangeable. Now that operational control of the Jupiter has been shifted to the Air Force, trained Army missile artillerymen at Huntsville, expert in Jupiter firings, have been replaced simply because they wear the Army's olive green instead of the Air Force's blue.

And, to take an even more ridiculous example, the Air Force is now claiming that Air Force personnel should be stationed aboard the Navy's new ballistic-missile submarines in order to shoot off the Polaris missile. "Anything that flies belongs in the Air Force" seems to be their theory.

Another scene of the interservice battle is Fort Hamilton, an Army base in Brooklyn, where duplication is costing the taxpayers a cool \$10 million a year. Four hundred soldiers, 50 officers, and 400 civilians operate the fort for the sole purpose of processing Army men coming in and leaving the country by air—a job which was already being done efficiently for the other services at McGuire Air Force Base in nearby New Jersey.

In addition to paying for the useless Hamilton, the Government is also forced to maintain a special Military Air Transport

lounge at Idlewild (\$18,000 a year) for these men, bus service from Hamilton to the airport, and a duplicate force of 23 airmen at Idlewild to reprocess this separate Army shipment.

The Army's arguments for this \$10 million pork barrel are transparently thin—the lack of sufficient transient space at McGuire (even though Fort Dix is next door) and the statement that Air Force doctors do not require medical exams prior to takeoff, while the Army does. Even a former commanding officer of Hamilton recently told me that he considered the fort to be a complete waste of money and manpower.

During the last 5 years, the three services have avariciously fought each other for the lion's share of almost \$200 billion spent in defense funds—each firmly convinced that the Nation would be completely secure if only their individual projects could be accomplished.

The combined result of their efforts is easy to state, but difficult to swallow: (1) an ill-equipped miniature Army of 14 divisions; (2) a Navy—whose only modern weapons are a few nuclear-powered submarines—weighted down with the outmoded concept of surface ships and outnumbered 4 to 1 by the Soviet sub fleet; and (3) an Air Force of relatively slow SAC bombers vulnerable to fighter plane and antiaircraft attack, and 40 exposed SAC bases lacking even a system for keeping bombers in the air around-the-clock.

Our meager supply of ICBM missiles (three at this writing) are stretched skyward at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California unable to fire without a 15-minute leadtime and vulnerable to a nuclear hit even a hundred miles away. "Hard" (concrete-emplaced, underground stored) solid-fuel ICBM's are still years away, even though we have already sunk billions into the missile program.

The answer to the riddle of how to extricate the world's leading power from so mismanaged a defense picture—an answer that unfortunately has vociferously been blocked by certain nearsighted admirals, generals, powerful lobbyists for retired officer groups, administration leaders, and even some Congressmen—is the complete unification of our three services into one U.S. Armed Forces, with one job and one uniform.

I have recently introduced a House bill, H.R. 9874, that will eliminate the three services and reorganize the new Armed Forces along the lines of "function" instead of the outmoded concepts of land, sea and air, which have become ridiculous in an era of missile-launching submarines and paratroop infantry.

In dollars and cents, I believe full unification could mean a saving of \$7 billion a year—a straight 15 percent of last year's \$46 billion defense expenditure.

"The interservice rivalries are worse than before," the head of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee recently commented. The reason, one of the best arguments for unification now, is the shameless battle for the defense dollar and control of sophisticated weapons—part of each service's strategy to make themselves indispensable, and immune to destruction by the others.

As a result, instead of three services, we have more like a dozen, each with its own costly overhead. Each service flies combat planes, each has missile arms, and the prime offender—the Navy—has its own surface fleet, its own missile service both above and under water, its own army (the Marines), and its own Air Force, both land and sea based.

My bill will unite these diverse groups into one, with branches logically organized according to jobs that have to be done. One of the two major branches would be planning, staffed by professional military planners trained from college on. They will develop military plans for the entire Armed

Forces on every level for today, 5, 10, even 25 years ahead.

The second branch would be combat, in charge of the operations of all field units, whether they are surface vessels, land troops, or ICBMs. Assisting these two major groups would be seven military agencies—Research and Development, Training, Personnel, Procurement, Transportation, Service, and Inspection, all of which might be incorporated into a third major group support.

In a typical military situation—air defense, for instance—the planning group would determine what was required in terms of men, weapons, and strategy. Research and development, in coordination with procurement, would have the weapons designed and built. Personnel and training would provide the skilled men who, together with the weapons, would then be delivered to combat for operational use.

Compare this with the circus-like squabble between the Air Force and Army that is now fouling up our weak air defense capability; a power struggle that vividly dramatizes the tragic failings of our present military organization. Air defense has historically been divided between Army antiaircraft and Air Force fighter planes. However since missiles have replaced both of these techniques, both services have been building parallel antiaircraft missile systems that have thus far cost us \$3 billion and have still not provided us with proper air defense.

The still-unresolved tussle revolves around the Air Force Bomarc, an expensive, long-range (400 mile), quick-firing (30 missiles in 2 minutes), 2,000-mile-per-hour ground-to-air missile, and the Army's Nike-Hercules, a shorter range (75 miles), relatively inexpensive, but slower firing (one-third of a squadron in 15 minutes) weapon. At the height of the fight, the opposing contractors—Western Electric for Nike, and Boeing for Bomarc—took full page newspaper ads on the virtue of their system, while the services slugged it out in congressional halls. The Army sent Congress a strong memo while the Air Force leaked the top secret—and unfavorable—results of a Nike-simulated-combat test.

A controversy that would have been settled in planning in a unified service has now split the U.S. Congress and even reached the White House. The Senate Armed Services Committee recently declared that the Nike was virtually obsolete, while the House decided that the Army plan was cheaper and slashed the Bomarc budget. The dilemma was thrown into the lap of the President who has announced a now common, but potentially dangerous military compromise—a little of each.

Service bickering touched the ridiculous recently when Army suggestions to build the \$10 billion Zeus antimissile missile were pooh-poohed by the Air Force as visionary—only to have a top Air Force general back the Army's argument. Lt. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, Air Force head of the North American Air Defense Command, states that he has an urgent requirement for the Army's anti-ICBM Zeus, and has asked the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs to reverse their stand against developing the weapon.

The missile war between the services points up the gain unification would make by creating a single research and development division, headed either by a civilian or military man. (In the new Armed Forces I am proposing, only combat and training groups need be uniformed military men.) R. & D. is a \$14.5 billion a year weapons business, spurred on by private contractors who supply 70 percent of the weapons ideas and who help the competing services multiply the number and duplication of projects.

The waste is monumental. According to the House Committee on Government Operations, \$2.3 billion was spent last year on antiquated weapons projects. Services start,

then phase out before completion, projects that probably would never have been initiated under a unified R. & D. setup—follies like the quarter-of-a-billion-dollar Navy jet seaplane, the P6M. Its sole memorials are six delivered airplanes and a \$12 million base in North Carolina.

Recently the Air Force and Navy eliminated overlapping projects to develop high energy boron aircraft fuels—after spending \$232 million. At the same time, the Air Force was being refused—on the grounds of economy—an equivalent amount needed to keep 68 SAC bombers in the air around the clock to prevent total destruction of our retaliatory forces while still on the ground.

A single efficient procurement and supply department, instead of our present three agencies, would save more millions. Twenty-six recent contracts of the Navy and Air Force analyzed by the General Accounting Office showed Uncle Sam had been overcharged \$42 million. In the Air Force cases, the Accounting Office placed the blame at their procurement group's "inadequate analysis of contractor's figures" and a naive tendency to accept their word for fact.

The mere existence of separate supply agencies, reluctant to talk to one another, has created some ludicrous examples of not only duplication but even hoarding of supplies. In one case the Navy was able to ship JP-4 fuel from Perth Amboy, N.J., to Florida while the Air Force planned a shipment of the same fuel from South America to New England. When they learned of the comical situation they attempted to make an exchange, but negotiations finally broke down. The two ships sailed in opposite directions on a \$33,000 nonpleasure voyage for the American taxpayer.

The lack of liaison is unbelievable. Once when the Federal Government was disposing of a mass of hacksaws and frames at a fraction of cost the Navy was buying thousands of new hacksaws from the same manufacturer at full price. Army supply then graciously repeated the incident, this time with hammers. In addition, each of the services insist on minute differences in "specs," even on such things as folding chairs, needlessly raising the cost for all.

A new byproduct of the supply snafu has been a tendency by the services to hoard—to buy more than they need as a possible hedge against lean budget days for their branch. A Department of Defense survey of supply management recently found that inventory of general items was "long" by 34 percent—or \$100 million worth. There is an overlap in distribution patterns, duplicate items stockage, and cross backhaul, the report states unemotionally.

Two dramatic cases of hoarding were uncovered. The Air Force promptly canceled \$46 million in contracts when millions of dollars in excess electronic equipment were found in four supply bases, including ones in San Antonio and Oklahoma City. The Navy was found "collecting" a surplus of 793 spare aircraft engines, at a cost of \$68 million, yet they had orders in for 204 more.

To their credit, the Defense Department has recently attempted to make the services coordinate their supply efforts—but without success. As of today, only 20 percent of our defense needs are being supplied through centralized procurement.

Unfortunately, the waste can be tallied in more than money and missiles. Our lack of unification has been equally harsh with vital manpower, often doing the same job in three different services.

In all, I estimate that total unification of the services would release 500,000 "duplicate" and useless servicemen who could make up the enlarged muscle of a single fighting force.

In post offices and stores throughout the country 7,000 recruiting personnel from four services (counting Marines) are doing a job 2,000 could handle in a unified service.

Thousands of more men operate three entirely separate communications networks in Europe, Africa, and the Mediterranean. The Navy, when queried by me on this, merely stated that they "were studying it."

I have received letters from our security agents, especially CIC men in Japan, complaining that they were doing the same work—often on the same case—as Air Force Intelligence. The reserve situation is equally befuddled. Each service maintains staffed but only partially used armories and reserve training centers in almost every major city—instead of a single civilian training facility.

In Europe, I visited large hospitals for servicemen and their dependents, each operated by separate services with its own administration—and each ultimately headed by a different two-star surgeon general and his staff in the Pentagon. The waste of trained enlisted men and officers in the administration of three separate transportation, judge advocate, special services, engineers, ordnance, finance, and other groups, is virtually unbelievable.

If unification is so desirable, why hasn't it been accomplished heretofore? The answer, I believe, is the false confidence the Nation has gained from a series of phony plans in the name of unification. One of the greatest obstacles has been the creation—and failure—of the Joint Chiefs of Staff idea.

"It seems quite apparent in this regard," says a House Committee on Appropriations report, "(that) the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a corporate body, is not providing the kind of advice and leadership which this country requires." Gen. Maxwell Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff, reiterates this, pointing out the Joint Chiefs spend much of their time in useless and wasteful fighting for their individual services.

My unification bill, by eliminating the separate services, dissolves the Joint Chiefs. Instead, the Secretary of Defense, a civilian, will be aided by a deputy secretary chosen from among the Armed Forces and limited to a 4-year term. Their council of war will be made up of the chief of planning, the chief of combat, and either the chief of support or any of the seven chiefs of the supporting groups—training, procurement, transportation, R. and D., service, personnel, inspection—whose advice is needed.

The chiefs of combat and training will necessarily be commissioned officers, but all other chiefs may be career civilians with years of experience in their specialty. All chiefs shall be appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, and shall serve 4 years unless reappointed. The combat chief, however, shall not be reappointed. All deputy chiefs shall be chosen from the ranks of commissioned officers.

In my bill I have carefully avoided the establishment of a single, all powerful Chief of Staff as proposed by General Taylor and other fellow critics of our military organization. Not only is it uncalled for in a single service dominated by a Secretary of Defense and chiefs of functions—but we should be wary of creating a potential "man on horseback" who might overshadow the President and possibly seize power in an emergency.

Specialization will be a key factor in the new U.S. Armed Forces. Unlike World War II when, according to a Pentagon-supported study, "The Ineffective Soldier," whole divisions were lost because of misuse of skills, the new service will train men in a specialty and try to keep him there with proper incentives. Although combat and training groups will be uniformed, career civilians will be used whenever possible—especially since they ultimately cost less, are often better trained, and can have a lower turnover rate.

Interservice fights, now the bane of our system, will be eliminated. Strategy conflicts—say between air-to-ground missiles and conventional nuclear bombs—will be de-

cided by the Chief of Planning, while operational clashes will be arbitrated by the Chief of Combat. To them it will be an objective military problem, not an emotional defense of a partisan service viewpoint.

"We'd be better off if we all wore the same uniform," Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, reportedly stated. I concur and will suggest to Congress that a unified service be outfitted in a single new uniform, a symbol of the discarding of old loyalties. We should also eliminate two other divisive elements, the separate promotion lists and the separate service academies. The present promotion system makes it imperative for an ambitious young officer to agree with his service viewpoint, even if he is not convinced it is in the national interest.

The three service academies—West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs—should properly be campuses of the same Armed Forces Academy. New traditions, common to all three, should be developed and the curriculum of future officers revamped from its archaic emphasis on naval boiler-room engineering or the strategy of General von Clausewitz. Whenever possible we should use civilian campuses to train cadets in electronics, geopolitics, business administration, and missile engineering.

In my 33 years of Army service, I have spoken to hundreds of career men who agree on the urgent need for total unification. Public opinion polls show the majority of Americans have a similar viewpoint. Yet all unification attempts have been thwarted—mainly by a skillful clique of men that centers around the U.S. Navy. After playing such an important role in World War II, the tradition-laden Navy is deathly afraid they will be overpowered under full unification and loose control of the Marines and Navy air groups.

Former head of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Radford, was an outspoken foe of unification, and current attempts to block unification are being aided by powerful lobbyists including the Navy League, a pressure group of retired naval officers and businessmen, and by a group of powerful pro-Navy Congressmen on key committees.

Back in June 1941, a proposal to unify the services because of impending war was vigorously opposed by the Navy. In 1944, the Richardson Committee recommended one Defense Department with a general staff and a single commander, but it was vetoed by Admiral King, then Joint Chief of Staff, despite support by the Army and Air Corps. Since then, the Navy stand on unification has not varied.

There have been a series of paper reforms drafted since World War II, which have actually delayed effective unification. In 1956, the Military Air Transport Service was ordered to become the central transport group for all services. But today, the Navy, SAC, and others still run their own transport planes.

In 1958, Congress—at the President's request—passed the Defense Reorganization Act which reshuffled some of the Pentagon chain of command and further entrenched the Joint Chiefs. During 1959, when the act was supposed to reduce interservice squabbles, fights like the Bomarc-Hercules tiff ranged louder than ever before. These have undoubtedly been honest attempts to improve the situation, but I believe time has shown that patchwork reforms only further delay the creation of a unified Armed Forces.

Eliminating the Army and Navy—gallant services that have existed since the founding of the Republic—is not a trivial task. But replacing them, and the Air Force, with a single modern integrated fighting force—stronger and larger and richer at its very birth than its combined predecessors—may well be the one stroke of action that will insure our Nation's survival.

Dry Potomac Forecast Unless Dams Are Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to a recent news story in the Evening Star. It concerns the important study now underway by the Corps of Engineers regarding development of the Potomac to meet growing needs in metropolitan Washington and the surrounding area:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 23, 1960]

DRY POTOMAC FORECAST UNLESS DAMS ARE BUILT

A Potomac River bone dry at Chain Bridge and a miasmal salt-water swamp at Hains Point within 15 years was envisioned yesterday by the Army Engineers' top water expert for the middle Atlantic seaboard.

Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Lipscomb painted the ugly picture in a talk before some 100 delegates attending a session of the Potomac River Development Association at the Willard Hotel.

He bolstered his dire prediction with charts based on years of study of the Potomac River Basin and predicted population growth in the Metropolitan Washington area.

However, he said the situation could be avoided by construction of 2 dams in the Great Falls area and 10 others in the upper regions of the stream at a total cost of \$230 million. The project would take care of basin water supply and pollution needs until the year 2010, he declared.

EXTRA FACILITIES

An extra \$70 million will be needed if recreation and flood control facilities are to be included, General Lipscomb said.

General Lipscomb heads the Army Engineers North Atlantic division. The section embraces streams and water supply for the vast population complex strung along the coast from Connecticut to Norfolk, Va.

The military engineer said the metro area now contains about 2,100,000 persons. At the present time rate of growth this figure will be 3 million by 1975. When that day arrives the populace will be consuming water as fast as it flows into the two dams now serving the city and surrounding suburbs.

The water intakes are located at Great Falls and Little Falls, just above Chain Bridge.

PERIODS OF NO FLOW

General Lipscomb further explained that during dry summer months, when the river is at its lowest and demands are greatest, no excess water will flow over the dam crests.

Consequently, from Chain Bridge to Little Falls the river would be bone dry. Below the bridge the river would be filled with tidal water from Chesapeake Bay. Bay tides he said, reach only to Chain Bridge.

This would leave the river from Washington's waterfront to the bay nothing but a salt water marsh loaded with effluvia that would float in with the morning tide and out again at night.

The dire water situation, the Army officer declared, has been brought about by a "phenomenal population growth." It ran contrary to all predictions by census experts made in the 1940's when the Corps of Engi-

neers undertook to study water needs for the area.

NEW STUDY UNDERWAY

The unexpected increase has caused Congress to order a new survey that is currently being undertaken by his office. It will be completed within a "year or two," General Lipscomb said.

So far, the Army engineer stated, his survey probed the following solutions:

1. Erection of two dams above Great Falls to meet only the needs of the metro area at an estimated cost of \$120 million.

2. Construction of a total of 12 dams including the two above Great Falls costing \$230 million. These would take care of the entire Potomac Basin water storage and pollution needs.

3. Expenditure of an extra \$167 million to include recreational facilities and flood control, much of it for dikes in the vicinity of Washington's river front.

4. Tapping of groundwater sources. This would cost \$140 million; would meet only a fraction of projected needs and would not provide for pollution abatement.

5. Desalting water taken from Chesapeake Bay. While possible, it would cost in excess of \$2 billion; would not provide for pollution abatement and would set the wholesale price of water at 10 to 20 times that drawn from reservoirs.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we stand with bowed heads in the presence of the Divine intervention which has taken from our midst a dedicated public servant and a stalwart friend in the person of RUSSELL MACK.

To have known RUSSELL MACK was to have enjoyed the rare privilege of his genial personality and the wealth of his years of experience in the field of public relations. To have served with him as a legislator was to have observed his conservative approach to the problems of the day and to have particularly noted the fine distinction he made between those areas that are best served by the Federal Government and the States, respectively.

RUSSELL MACK was a staunch defender of our American way of life and a prime advocate of States' rights. His continuing concern was always related to preserving the dignity of the United States within the commonwealth of nations and within that framework to see that the Congress remained truly the voice of the people.

We shall greatly miss this stalwart defender of freedom and truth and our heartfelt sympathy goes out to those who are left to mourn his untimely passing. May our heavenly Protector wrap these bereaved ones in the mantle of His divine care and may they be assured that their beloved now rests on a sunnier shore, there to greet them when they too have crossed over.

U.N. Supervision of South Korean Elections: Fact or Farce?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various letters, articles, and editorials describing acts of corruption and brutality that have brought Syngman Rhee's South Korean regime into disrepute.

Prompted by news reports of these statements, numerous Americans in Korea have written me detailed, thoughtful letters chronicling deplorable conditions there. This morning's mail included a long letter telling of a bridge that was paid for but never built, factories constructed but not opened, public projects operated for private gain, and other abuses of our aid.

The writer, who has reliable credentials, states flatly that our poorly supervised aid program is utilized by dishonest Korean officials to maintain their power. He points out that because our aid is misused the average Korean is coming to view Americans with mixed—or even hostile—emotions.

Also, after describing election-eve violence, the writer, who for obvious reasons must have the protection of anonymity, provided some penetrating views on the much-publicized supervision of recent Korean elections by United Nations inspection teams. Since Rhee and his supporters so often point to this U.N. supervision as a reply to their critics, this description of the U.N.'s role is telling indeed.

An excerpt describing U.N. activities is reprinted below, together with an editorial from the March 17 issue of the Washington Post and an article from the March 28 edition of Time magazine—all this material emphasizes the farcical nature of Rhee-controlled South Korean elections.

[From a U.N. report]

The Government propaganda sheet boasts that every vote here is U.N. supervised. The U.N. actually sent around five teams of two men each to cover the whole country in a whirlwind 1-week tour. For example they whizzed into this town in a jeep. Called upon the chief of police and the gun-su (county manager) and the Government chairman of the election committee. Through an interpreter, they received assurances that the elections would be free, etc., and then hopping into their jeep they sped to the next large town 30 miles distant to perpetrate the same farce. Of course, as one U.N. official admitted, they are really in a dilemma here. Unlike the diplomatic missions here, whose reports to their respective governments on the recent elections here will remain secret documents, the U.N. must file a report which they know will be made public in the U.N. General Assembly. If they tell the truth about the terrorized atmosphere and the fraudulent way in which the so-called free elections were conducted, then this report will be of great propaganda

value to the Communist bloc in the U.N. that in this showpiece of U.N. sponsored democracy we have a totalitarian system that differs but little, if at all, from the systems condemned by the U.N. But if on the other hand, the U.N. mission here, submits a report innocuous enough not to be of major propaganda value to the Communist bloc, then it must of necessity suppress and distort the true state of affairs. The proper thing to do would be: not to go through the pretense of observing the election, avoid the semblance of honesty to the travesty, and consequently submit no report.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1960]

TAINTED VICTORY

With a certainty as predictable as an eclipse of the sun, President Syngman Rhee's forces in Korea have bulldozed another election victory. The amount of coercion, intimidation, and repression would be incredible if it were not attested by foreign observers. Beatings leading to murder, police "persuasion," plans for translucent ballots and box stuffing, the grossest discrimination in law enforcement—all figured in the reelection of Dr. Rhee and the election of his Liberal running mate, Lee Ki-poong.

The lead pipe procedures are the more remarkable because the disorganization of the opposition Democratic Party had given the Liberals an insurmountable advantage. Dr. Rhee had no direct opponent because of the death of the Democratic presidential nominee, and the major Liberal efforts were concentrated on unseating the present Democratic Vice President, John M. Chang, who fought an extraordinarily courageous contest. A London Times correspondent wrote the other day that Dr. Chang "would be almost certain to win if the elections were held in the same comparatively free atmosphere as the 1958 parliamentary election."

It is sometimes asked why Korea should be held up to censure when there are other authoritarian States in Asia. The answer is that the free world should expect more of Korea. The Republic was launched as a United Nations ward, and thousands of Americans and other soldiers shed their blood to preserve it. Korea is relatively more sophisticated than other new countries; it has developed a loyal opposition, an independent press and a widespread desire for fair and honest elections. But the sad fact is that under Dr. Rhee's inordinate demand for power the country has retrogressed markedly in political freedoms from the situation 2 or 4 years ago.

All of this becomes of direct interest to the United States because American aid has been used by the government to strengthen its political hold. The State Department raised a timid admonitory finger in public about violence on the eve of the election with no discernible effect because the dirty work had already been done. Korean political choices are the business of the Korean people, but the situation suggests the need for a much more critical look at the way in which American aid may be used to defeat the objective of representative government.

[From Time Magazine, Mar. 28, 1960]

SOUTH KOREA—VICTORIOUS METHODS

Unopposed, 84-year-old Syngman Rhee won a sweeping fourth-term victory—even though perhaps 10 percent of the voters cast their ballots for his only opponent, who had died a month before.

But there still had to be a get-out-the-vote campaign to elect Rhee's running mate, ailing Lee Ki Poong, who has difficulty walking and speaking because of a nervous disorder, and did not make a single campaign speech. So Rhee's liberals set to work. Election day brought many complaints of voter

intimidation and open ballot fixing, of 6-foot-high boards outside some polling places showing voters how to mark their ballots for Rhee and Lee. Green-shirted members of Rhee's Anti-Communist Youth League lounged outside the booths as voters arrived, often in organized teams of three (so that the man in the middle could make sure that the other two voted correctly). The result was a decisive victory (76 percent) for Invalid Lee over U.S.-educated (Manhattan College) John M. Chang, who had beaten Lee easily in the last election.

Tension ran high in many areas, and in the normally peaceful town of Masan voting was still in progress when a disgruntled crowd raised the cry, "Dirty polls!" It was like a spark in dry straw. Suddenly, 200 angry citizens raced to a police station, set it afire, fled with captured weapons. Another mob, 2,500 strong, gathered before the town hall, stoned firemen, who vainly attempted to hook up their hoses to fight back. After tear gas failed, scores of police arrived from nearby Pusan. One lowered his carbine and fired into the screaming crowd, a signal that led other cops to do the same. When it was all over, at least 10 were dead, some of them schoolchildren, scores were wounded, and hundreds were pushed into police vans and hauled off to jail.

Outmaneuvered at the polls, the opposition Democrats stomped out en masse when the National Assembly met to hear the formal election results, and darkly talked of challenging the act of theft in court. But in Syngman Rhee's Korea they cannot hope to do any better in the courts.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of RUSSELL V. MACK, the distinguished Representative from Washington, who came to the Congress 12 years ago, was a sad event for all who knew him.

It was my privilege to serve with him on the Public Works Committee of the House. His knowledge of committee affairs, combined with his amicable approach to all problems before that body, made him an invaluable asset. The effectiveness of his work and the benefits of his judgment helped motivate much of the legislation for which the Public Works Committee was largely responsible.

Russ Mack, besides being a remarkably fine Member of the Congress, informed, articulate and persuasive, was to me a cherished friend.

Broad in his outlook, generous in his sentiments, and possessed of a gentle kindness, it was a pleasure to be in his company.

Mrs. Dooley and I spent many hours and days with Russ Mack and his charming wife, and those days shall ever be remembered.

We share her grief in RUSSELL's untimely death. The Congress and the country have lost a rare man.

Committee Endorses Provisions of H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the following is a portion of the report submitted by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate.

The committee toured the width and breadth of the country conducting local hearings in seven cities, and visited nursing homes, hospitals, homes for the aged, and various types of living arrangements for the elderly.

The following is that committee's recommendation on financing the provision of health services:

THE AGED AND AGING IN THE UNITED STATES: A NATIONAL PROBLEM—SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The pages that follow describe in considerable detail one of the most dramatic stories—and challenges—of 20th century America. This is the story of the men and women who, having reached and passed the age of 65, find themselves arbitrarily classed as "aged." Today, they number approximately 16 million persons, or 9 percent of the population. But they are not the only participants in this story. There are the millions whom we call "aging" and other millions who have aged parents and close relatives. In short, this is a story of all America.

The challenge is how America will act to meet the problems that the process of aging and our modern civilization create. The problems are many, and they, too, reach out and touch all Americans. There is the young couple with aged parents to support; the middle aged who find employment opportunities closing to them; those about to step over the threshold into the strange and uneasy world of retirement; and the aged themselves who, having reached the alleged "golden years," find them a badly tarnished imitation.

It is no longer possible, as it once may have been expedient, to ignore or shrug off these problems and the urgent need to solve them. The 16 million Americans who are over 65 will become 20 million just 15 years from now. Additionally, the life expectancy beyond age 65 is increasing. Obviously, this is not a trend that will halt or reverse itself. America, in fact, is faced with a new "population explosion" at the other end of life's cycle.

The responsibility of seeking solutions to the many problems that are inherent in this population explosion is not one that can be handily assigned. It is no more the sole responsibility of the Federal Government than it is of the town where an aged person happens to reside. Rather, the challenging task is a matter of joint responsibility, utilizing all levels of government, private organizations, and individuals. Only through this partnership approach can we hope, in time, to solve the problems of aging.

The Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging was established by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the assignment to conduct a complete study of the problems and needs of the aging, the programs of various agencies in meeting their needs, and the extent to which additional Federal programs should be undertaken to

help solve the problems of America's senior citizens. In carrying out this assignment, the subcommittee felt it had an additional duty of helping to focus national attention on these problems and, to arouse national interest in solving them.

It was self-evident that the major problems of the aged and aging fall generally into such broad categories as financial, medical, housing, employment, and meaningful use of leisure time. Yet, even knowing the scope of the problems in a general way hardly prepared the subcommittee for the gigantic, complex range of problems and their intricate relation to one another that would be uncovered.

For 8 months, the subcommittee served as a collection agency for information, as an investigator of conditions, as a sounding board for ideas and recommendations, and frequently as a sort of father confessor to the aged themselves. The subcommittee conducted hearings in Washington and in seven cities across the Nation. It gathered testimony from the experts, public officials, organizations, and individuals. At its field hearings, the subcommittee instituted the "town meeting" where elderly Americans were given the opportunity to personally relate their problems, their hopes, and their fears. Visits were made to older people in nursing homes, housing projects, senior centers, homes for the aged, and retirement hotels.

It was, overall, an enlightening experience and a sobering and humbling one when the magnitude of the problems emerged. Perhaps the greatest difficulty of the subcommittee following completion of its survey was in attempting to isolate the problems and assign them recommendations and priorities for action. Thus, recognizing the limitations of even its own intensive study, the subcommittee herewith presents a summary of the major problems of the aged and aging, and its recommendations for priority action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Financing the provision of health services

The No. 1 problem of America's senior citizens is how to meet the costs of health care at a time when income is lowest and potential or actual disability at its highest. Its solution should have top priority for legislative consideration in 1960.

The record of the subcommittee is replete with poignant and often tragic testimony from local officials and from senior citizens themselves, on their concern for medical, hospital, and drug bills which either cannot be met out of income, or would wipe out small savings or other liquid assets. Many older persons testified that they could manage to live respectably on their modest incomes if they could eliminate the impact of heavy health costs.

Recent increases in the numbers of the aged with commercial and nonprofit insurance have been marked, but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has pointed out that by 1965 at least 8 million aged persons will not have any type of health insurance—including 2 million who will receive their medical care under a means test through old-age assistance.

1. As its first recommendation for action in 1960, the subcommittee recommends that legislation be enacted to expand the system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include health service benefits for all persons eligible for OASDI.

Such a solution to the problem of financing health service costs, takes account of the following crucial points:

First, it would meet the financial requirements of as many of those at present retired as possible, without reducing them to a pauperized state.

Second, it takes into account the fact that practically the entire younger and middle generations are now covered by OASDI; they too will one day reach retirement age and will expect to be adequately covered by health insurance. Small premium payments during their working lives can provide paid-up health insurance on retirement.

Third, the use of the social security system for retirement income is a well-established American principle and now covers almost 10 million aged beneficiaries. Its extension to include the financing of medical care for older persons would be relatively inexpensive to administer.

In the administration of the program consideration may be given to the employment of private, nonprofit health insurance groups and to cooperative arrangements with State and local health and welfare agencies.

The benefits to be considered under such a system of financing should include diagnostic and preventive health services, treatment for acute and chronic illness, and rehabilitative services.

The prevention of illness, its early diagnosis, and a restoration to health are the primary goals of an adequate health service. Diagnostic services and home care programs under supervision can be effective in reducing the high cost of hospitalization and institutionalization. A new, emphatic approach to organized home care services, particularly for chronic illnesses and for preventive efforts may reverse the rapidly rising costs of hospitalization as well as improve the health of America's older citizens.

Honorary Degree Presented to Congressman Mike Kirwan

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to warmly congratulate our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN, upon his receiving the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from Oklahoma City University.

Though MIKE has served well the 19th district of Ohio since the 75th Congress, some 24 years, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues would be very much interested in learning that MIKE was born and raised in my congressional district, the 11th Pennsylvania, and we hold MIKE in great esteem and respect for the fine career which he made in the halls of Congress.

In my district we consider MIKE KIRWAN as one of our own and we are delighted that he has received this distinction from Oklahoma City University. Moreover, that university should be congratulated for its wise selection of candidates to whom it awards such degrees.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of this body join me in these remarks to our colleague from the Buckeye State.

American Housing and America's Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Housing Conference, at its annual meeting here, directed considerable attention to the pressing need for more housing for the moderate income family. A careful analysis of future housing needs of the whole Nation was offered by Mr. Boris Shishkin, secretary of the housing committee of the AFL-CIO, and I think this address will prove most interesting to my colleagues.

Following is Mr. Shishkin's address to the National Housing Conference on March 14:

AMERICAN HOUSING AND AMERICA'S GROWTH (By Boris Shishkin)

Our country is growing and growing fast. Most Americans want it to grow. They don't want this growth to be achieved through a series of ups and downs. They don't want economic expansion through a succession of booms and busts. What they want, what they strive for and what they insist on, is steady and stable growth.

Americans want growth in which the rise in population is matched by a rise in the standard of living of the people. To them, economic expansion means better communities, more and better schools, more and better health services and, above all, more and better homes.

The need for housing is the central, the most fundamental fact of our economic life. Making this need known to the general public, putting into focus for legislative guidance of our statesmen, our elected representatives, is our responsibility, the responsibility of housers brought together here under the banner of the National Housing Conference.

To be sure, housing is a technical subject. It is technical from the point of view of economics, social requirements, financing and even statistics. Too often even we housers get so wrapped up in the technical details of housing that we forget the real basic concepts underlying our whole approach to the problem.

Too often we forget that when we talk about title I or section 213, the very people we are trying to reach and whose support we must have, haven't the faintest idea of what we are talking about. So, let us stick to fundamentals. The most important fundamental of our national housing policy is the need for housing.

For it is the need for housing, not abstract projections, not vague aspirations, but the real and measurable housing need, that must determine the types of action our civic leaders and our statesmen will have to take, if the economic growth we seek is to be achieved and sustained.

Everybody is talking about economic growth, but not enough people are doing anything about it. And even fewer, among those who are in a position to do so, are taking timely action to make sure that our economy continues to expand, and that it expands not by fits and starts, but at a steady pace.

If, up to now, we as a nation, have failed to take actions necessary to provide for the

kind of a future that we look for, it is not because we don't know enough.

We know how fast our population is growing. A glance at the population clock at the Bureau of the Census in Washington, will tell us that, every minute, there are eight additions to the American family right now. The net increase in population currently is 8,000 per day.

We know also that, in order to meet the national housing need in the years immediately ahead, we must build at least 2.3 million new homes a year. If the need is to be met, between now and 1975 we must build at least 35 million new homes.

This solid, rockbottom, estimate of America's future housing need is based on hard facts.

It is a fact that, right now, some 15 million American families live in houses which do not meet the minimum standards for family living. These families live in substandard homes now.

We know also that, in addition, about 7.5 million families are living in houses which are suitable now, but will deteriorate by 1975.

This means that, by 1975, better housing will have to be provided for 22.5 million families occupying substandard housing. Only about 5 million of these houses can be fixed up to provide livable accommodations. And at least 17.5 million will have to be replaced by new construction.

In addition, 2 million dwellings which are not substandard will be removed from the housing supply by fire, storm and other forms of disaster, or by demolition to make way for highways, cloverleaf approaches, schools, office and commercial buildings and other types of nonresidential construction.

The fact, then, is that, by 1975, about 19.5 million units now occupied or to be occupied during the next 15 years will have to be replaced.

But still, this would not provide a single house for the new families we will have by 1975. And by 1975 we will have 14.5 million new families to house.

More than that, by 1975, an additional million units will be needed to provide separate accommodations for families now forced to double up with other families.

Add up these figures and you will find that, between now and 1975, we must provide at least 35 million housing units, or at least 2.3 million new units a year.

These are our housing needs over the next 15 years.

We express these needs in statistical terms, but again, we should not let the statistics obscure what these bare figures stand for.

When we talk about the need for a given number of housing units, we are really talking about the need for that many good American homes. We are talking about the American home—the most important physical factor in the lives of American families. What we are talking about is whether the people concerned will have an opportunity for a rewarding family life, or whether for them family life, as we in America like to think about it, is pretty well licked from the start.

We are talking about whether the kids will have good places to grow up in, to play and study and to find it good to be with the rest of the family, or whether their whole outlook on society will be warped and stunted right from the start. It is these things that our statistics stand for.

Let me say a word about these housing statistics. It is a shocking state of affairs that our Government feels no responsibility to determine America's housing needs.

This is a major dereliction on the part of our national Housing Administration.

Because of this dereliction on the part of our Government, we in the AFL-CIO have

twice within the past decade prepared our own estimates of the Nation's housing requirements.

Let me say that these are firm, sound estimates, based on unassailable analysis of all available facts. They were prepared under the direction of the Nation's leading housing economist, Bert R. Seidman.

In 1953, we found a need for building at least 2 million units a year. As we all know, the actual record has fallen far short of this level. That is why, when we recently revised our estimates, we determined our minimum need to be for 2.3 million new houses a year.

This need is for almost a million more housing units annually than the actual construction rate maintained in recent years. This means that approximately 35 million new homes must be built between now and 1975, if the national housing need is to be nearly met.

To recap, let me note at this point how the figures add up to this total. To replace the existing substandard housing, we need 15 million units. To replace housing becoming substandard between 1960 and 1975, we need 7½ million units. This gives us the total need for providing good housing in place of bad housing, of 22½ million units. We estimate that, of this total, 5 million units can be brought up to the minimum standard of livability through rehabilitation. This, in turn, leaves a total of 17½ million substandard units to be replaced with new housing construction.

In addition to these 17½ million units, 2 million dwellings which are not substandard will be lost due to fire, storm and other disasters, and will have to be replaced with new housing. This brings the total replacement need for 1960-75 to 19½ million units.

Beyond all this necessary replacement, we must provide 14½ million new units to take care of the increase in the number of families between 1960 and 1975. But, in addition, we must provide another 1 million units to undouble the doubled up families and thus assure to every family privacy in its home.

This gives the total need for new housing construction between 1960 and 1975 of 35 million units. And it means that, between now and 1975, average annual volume of housing construction will have to be maintained at 2,300,000 units.

How are we going to build 35 million homes by 1975? We can do so only if we begin to build far more houses for low- and moderate-income families than we have been building.

The trouble with FHA and other existing housing programs is that they serve primarily the upper income groups, the groups whose housing requirements have already been best satisfied.

Let me cite just one set of figures. In 1958, the latest year for which data are available, it took about a \$9,000 yearly income for a family to buy a new FHA house without committing more than 20 percent of the family income to the housing expense.

We know that, in 1950, substantially less than 20 percent of families had incomes as high as \$9,000. And we know that in 1958, close to 12 million multiple-person families, coming to more than a quarter of all multiple-person families, had annual incomes below \$4,000. In 1958 also, about 3½ million multiple-person American families, or about 8 percent of the total, had annual incomes below \$2,000.

And, while we are at it, let us take a look at how the unattached individuals were faring in 1958—I mean the bachelors, the old maids, the widows and the widowers. Of the 10 million unattached individuals in 1958, more than three-fifths had annual incomes below \$3,000. About two-fifths were below \$2,000, and nearly one-fifth had incomes below \$1,000 a year.

It is clear that virtually all low-income families and most moderate income families are priced out of today's housing market.

And it is clear, also, that if modern America is to achieve balanced growth, this critical imbalance in our Nation's housing supply will have to be decisively corrected.

How can this urgent, insistent problem be best solved?

Despite all the charges that have been leveled at the public housing program the truth is that it is still the only effective way that ever has been devised to give low-income families a chance to obtain good, decent homes. Undoubtedly improvements in this program can and should be made. In many places improvements are, in fact, being made in this locally initiated and locally based program.

But the basic idea is as sound today as it was 23 years ago, when Congress first authorized the public housing program.

And today, as in the years ahead, publicly assisted housing, serving the housing needs of low-income families, is, and must continue to be the cornerstone of America's national housing policy.

Yet, it is increasingly clear that if the total housing need is to be met, and if our country's economic growth is to be sustained, we must also develop a new approach to deal effectively with the central problem of this generation—how to bring good housing within the financial reach of the average American family.

I am speaking of the need for availability of moderate-priced housing to the moderate-income families.

Of course, what level of income constitutes "moderate income," or, as some call it, "middle income," will vary from one area to another. What is more, not everyone is in agreement on the precise range of incomes to be included in this grouping.

What I have in mind primarily, is families who, in average cities, have incomes in the general range of between \$4,000 and \$7,000 a year. In most cities, as the annual survey of the National Housing Conference has shown so well, there are very few homes that these families can buy or rent without overextending their family budgets.

Yet, if financial charges and rents could be reduced to reasonable levels, many more moderate-income families could obtain good homes within their means without subsidy.

Unfortunately, the administration, to reinforce its overall tight money policy, has been raising residential financial charges higher and higher. The result is that more and more potential homebuyers of moderate means are being priced out of the market. Instead of sustaining economic growth, this wrong-headed policy is producing an artificially tight housing market and artificially forcing an economic slump.

Consider the person who gets a typical \$12,000 mortgage this year, at the current 5.57-percent rate (plus ½-percent insurance charges). His mortgage will cost \$3,204 more over its total life than if 1952 FHA rates still prevailed. The cost is up \$1,620 over 1957 just in added interest charges during the life of the mortgage.

Or, take a typical conventional mortgage, at the present average amount of \$14,000. Because of the jacked-up interest rates now in effect, this year's average conventional mortgage will cost \$1,876 more in its 20-year life than the same \$14,000 mortgage cost 7 years ago.

Taken together, the higher cost of interest with which the homebuyer has been saddled, will amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars just in extra interest payments this year alone. Several billions of dollars will be spent by homebuyers for extra interest before these mortgages are fully paid.

It is noteworthy that the cost-conscious administration has been silent regarding this heavy and extravagant cost.

But, actually, this is not the whole story. To secure funds in today's money market, FHA mortgages must be discounted from 2 to 7 percent, the average running about 3.6 percent at the end of 1959. This discount, of course, is passed on to the ultimate consumer. On the typical FHA mortgage, this discount will have the effect of adding \$457 to the cost of the house. To pay off this added cost at 5 percent, plus premium, will require \$35 a year over the life of the mortgage.

All told, the present tight money policy has had the effect of increasing the annual payments on a typical new home by \$175 per year over the 27.3-year life of the mortgage, or an aggregate increase of \$4,777.

On the basis of the generally accepted rule that the annual housing expense prudently requires an annual income five times the expense, we must conclude that the increase of \$175 a year in annual mortgage payments requires a family income \$875 greater than would be necessary at the previous lower interest levels.

In the distribution of family incomes for 1958, this difference of \$875 corresponds to an 11-percent population group, or about 5.3 million families. This means that the present tight money policy excludes from the market for new housing some 5.3 million families who could be served if former interest levels were restored.

What can be done to reverse this trend, inimical to America's economic growth, and threatening its prosperity?

First, our national policy objective, must be reversed. Instead of deliberately and artificially pushing the average American family out of the housing market, the national housing policy should be to bring the American family of moderate income into the housing market, by making housing available to it on more reasonable terms.

Monthly financial charges can be reduced by lowering the interest rate, by extending the repayment period or both.

Suppose a family wants to buy a \$14,000 house with a \$2,000 down payment? It would then have to pay off a \$12,000 mortgage.

If the mortgage terms are 6 1/2 percent interest payable over 30 years, the current best available terms for FHA-insured mortgages, the monthly financial charges (excluding other housing expenses, such as taxes, maintenance, etc.) will be \$73.89. This figure does not include the additional cost of the discount on the FHA mortgage, which the purchaser does not usually even know about, but which he pays, nevertheless. The same mortgage at 3 percent, repaid over a 50 year period, and also figured without discount, requires a monthly payment of only \$38.84.

High level housing activity, assuring construction of at least 2.3 million dwellings a year should be the recognized goal of the national housing policy.

As stated in the housing resolution of the 3d constitutional convention of the AFL-CIO, unanimously adopted last September:

"Achievement of this objective will require a fundamental redirection of national housing programs to assure that the major share of the new homes constructed is made available within the means of ordinary American families who are priced out of today's private housing market."

The AFL-CIO has advocated the enactment of a sound housing program for moderate income families, a program without any direct subsidies, since 1950. There has been a succession of good middle-income housing bills introduced in Congress since that time.

Notable in this succession of proposals were the Lehman bill of 1956, and the sub-

sequent bills introduced by Senators CLARK and JAVITS. Other approaches to the problem were made in the bills offered by Congressman RAINS and Senator SPARKMAN.

We in the AFL-CIO are not wedded to a particular formula. The important thing, as we see it, is to reduce the financial charges so that average American families can obtain good homes on reasonable terms. This can and must be done.

Let us get enacted a sound and positive program to bring good homes within the financial reach of the American family of moderate means. Let us make this a major objective in our drive for the enactment of a comprehensive housing law in 1960. Only by attaining this objective can we advance toward our goal of a good home for every American family.

Labor looks to NHC and the friends of NHC as its staunchest allies, determined to win not only this crucial battle for better housing, but also to win the larger prize of sustained economic growth that will bring better living conditions to all Americans in the years to come.

Mailbag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1960, in the Austin (Tex.) American, on the editorial page under the title of "Mail Bag" there appeared an excellent editorial concerning the letters which Members of Congress receive from their constituents back home. The editorial emphasizes that letters from our constituents are not to be discouraged but emphasizes that a Congressman still has to do his own thinking.

Because I know that the Members of Congress will be interested in seeing the editorial, under unanimous consent I ask that it be included with my remarks. The editorial is as follows:

MAILBAG

There is a slighlight on what the people are thinking, or at least what they are thinking about, in reports from Congressmen on the trend of the letters they get from constituents back home.

A reporter's sampling, which included some of the Texas Congressmen along with those of other States, brought out the fact that the mail from home has been little concerned with the House and Senate wrangles on civil rights, or with the debate about the Nation's defense status.

But when the Forand bill for Federal medical care of the aged, and the Democratic package bill for additional Federal benefits for the aged, came up, there was a deluge of mail on the Members' desks. Naturally it was divided in support of both sides of the issue. If a Congressman reads all his home-district mail on the subject, he will be able to come up with the firm conviction that some of them want either or any of the Federal aid proposals and others don't want any of them.

The controversial issue of the Air Force manual, which was withdrawn which asserted that Communist influences had infiltrated some segments of the Protestant church was naturally the source of a deluge of mail. It was found that the greater vol-

ume of these letters from citizens had gone to the Defense Department, but Congressmen still were nearly swamped as a by-product of the controversy. Many of the comments, it was said, urged that an investigation by some impartial tribunal, be made into the substances of the charges. This idea was advanced by people who resented the charge and wanted to see it disproven on the record, as well as by those who simply wanted to know the answer, and of course by some whose opinions were in line with the accusations.

People always are being urged to write your Congressman; and it is not to be discouraged. But we imagine that with the diversity of views he gets, a Congressman still has to do his own thinking; and we're sure he finds that in many cases, other than sudden emotional issues, he finds most of the letters come from organized and self-interested groups.

Resolution in Opposition to Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Women's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society, in opposition to the Forand bill. I am the sponsor of identical legislation. The Women's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society has joined the insurance companies, the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, the American Medical Association, and the organized undertakers in opposition to this desperately needed humanitarian legislation.

The resolution follows:

Whereas social security cash benefits now go to 13.7 million;

Whereas private pension plans, increasing savings, and liquid assets are all combining to improve the economic resources and the purchasing power of the group over 65 years of age;

Whereas many positive-action programs, including improved nursing homes, home-care services and homemaker services are being advanced;

Whereas the boards of the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association recently adopted a resolution dedicating their full resources to accelerate the development of adequately financed health care programs for needy persons, especially the aged needy;

Whereas any plan which benefits a selected group, social security beneficiaries, to the exclusion of other equally or more needy citizens, at the expense of the taxpayer is discriminatory;

Whereas medical-care programs for indigent citizens, especially those over 65 years, are improving;

Whereas proof of need does not require Federal action, nor does Federal action promise to resolve the problem;

Whereas need cannot be proven until the findings of the White House Conference on Aging in 1961 are known and studied;

Whereas adoption of a plan for Federal control and payment of medical care for our

citizens would hinder the progress of medical science, kill voluntary health insurance and force our really ill citizens to compete for hospital space against malingers. Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Woman's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society on this 10th day of March 1960, That the Forand bill must be labeled (1) unwise, (2) discriminatory, (3) burdensome, and (4) failing its stated purpose; and further

Resolved, That the Woman's Auxiliary to the Michigan State Medical Society is unalterably opposed to any legislation which makes a governmental body responsible for the medical needs or expenses of U.S. citizens or any subdivision of its citizens.

Constituent Calls Economic Depression Republican Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from a constituent who tells of the economic plight of the communities of Mar Vista and Culver City, located in my district, which I sincerely hope is not an omen of harsher things to come, or an omen that the depressed areas of our Nation will continue to stagnate, without hope, because of opposition by this administration to depressed areas legislation.

We have heard many of our colleagues speak on the House floor of the depressed economic conditions in their States. We are particularly mindful of the fact that many regions have been on the depressed areas roll for a long time, a situation which the Eisenhower administration refuses to tackle head on.

While my State of California does not face the extreme problem, say, of West Virginia, the fact remains that there are noticeable pockets of economic depression.

My constituent's letter sets forth the situation with clarity. Her letter again proves that a vicious cycle is generated when a single family is hit by economic setbacks. The loss of income by one family affects the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker. When this is multiplied within a community the results are obvious.

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows—a letter ending with this comment: "This is Republican prosperity."

Mrs. GEORGE J. SCHICK,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 21, 1960.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Being in the 26th district and a member of the Mar Vista Democratic Club, I feel a little more free to bring to your attention (and I am rather certain that you are already somewhat cognizant of the fact) that this area is in a very definite depression. The following is a rather personal example:

My husband is a general building contractor. He has had few calls and no con-

tracts for work since the first of February. Money is so tight and loans for this area seem to be unavailable for the remodeling which is his main kind of work. Consequently I am the only one bringing in any income. So we have retrenched to a nearly bare-cupboard. I let my weekly cleaning woman go. She depends very much on the \$10.30 which helps make the payments on the house she was forced to buy when her two eldest daughters went to work and she had to give up her home in the "Project" which was the only place where a family with 12 children could find room to live. I also let the little old "dally" go which was another \$10 a week of lost purchasing power. My gardener too, at \$30 a month plus the supplies he bought from the local nursery has lost out.

I was in a yardage shop on Saturday morning and the owner pointed out that in spite of the advertisement which he expected to bring in a goodly number of customers (Indianhead at 57 cents a yard—no profit) the store was doing no business and if it weren't for his wife's breadwinning ability, they wouldn't be eating. He told me that McMahon's Furniture Store manager said that if business didn't pick up, they would probably pull the store out of this district. Marketbasket Market said their grocery sales were down 17 percent. The locale of this series is Culver Center and at 11:30 on a beautiful Saturday morning, the sidewalks of the center were practically empty.

The layoffs at Hughes, Douglas, and Air Research have become very serious and advertisements for skilled technicians are now stressing "Not a Defense Plant."

This is Republican prosperity.

Very truly yours,

HELENE SCHICK.

Debunks American Medical Association Argument That the Forand Bill Pro- vides for Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the AMA, which is spearheading the opposition to my bill H.R. 4700 has labeled it "socialized medicine." They use the term loosely, as appears in the printed hearing on this bill. I asked the AMA representative to give the Committee on Ways and Means the definition of the term "socialized medicine" as used by the AMA and he admitted they have never had a specific definition of the term.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered in New York a few days ago by Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler of the AFL-CIO, wherein he properly debunks the arguments of the American Medical Association.

In his address Mr. Schnitzler breaks down the AMA argument completely. His address follows:

This is, by scientific standards, the best and fittest audience I have ever faced. One of the basic laws of nature, according to the scientists, is the survival of the fittest. You have survived. You have lived through the

industrial revolution, through two World Wars, through epidemics and pestilence, through major and minor economic depressions and survived one of the most hectic spans in the history of mankind. Congratulations on having proved that you've got what it takes.

Fortunately, you share this distinction with many other Americans. The official records show there are more than 16 million men and women in this country who have reached and passed the age of 65.

Can they afford to be 65? That has become a national problem of growing dimensions. According to official estimates, there will be 20 million people over 65 by 1970 and 30 million by the end of the century. How can this army of working men and women, who have earned honorable retirement, live out their days in health, decency, and comfort? How can they be protected in their old age from the crushing costs of illness? That question forms the basis for our discussion here today.

First, let us examine a few fundamental facts. After a full year's investigation, a congressional committee headed by Senator PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan, submitted a report on the problems of the aged only 2 months ago which contained these shocking facts:

1. At least half of the aged, about 8 million people, cannot today afford decent housing, proper nutrition or adequate medical care, whether preventive or acute.
2. Three out of five people over 65 have an income of less than \$20 a week.
3. In 1959, two out of five aged families had liquid assets of less than \$200. Two out of three had less than \$2,000 that they could put their hands on to meet any emergencies or to cover daily living expenses.

It is difficult to believe that such conditions exist in modern America, but the facts are unchallengeable and must be faced if we hope to arrive at any effective solution for the health problems of the aged.

Undoubtedly, in many foreign countries conditions are much worse. What does that prove? Can that make us complacent about our own shortcomings? Every once in a while, explorers discover jungle tribes who kill their older people. They believe execution is kinder than to let the aging die a slow death from starvation and illness. How much more civilized are we in America than such barbarians?

Remember, it was only 25 years ago that we established social security in America. Before that, old folks without savings or family resources had to depend upon private charity or go to the poorhouse.

Nowadays, social security is universally accepted. It is hard to believe that anyone ever could have seriously objected to it. The social security program has accomplished so much good and has prevented so much needless suffering, that it has become an indispensable part of the American way of life. Yet tremendous opposition had to be overcome to get it started.

Yes, only 25 years ago, reactionary politicians and business leaders loudly denounced the very idea of social security as a menace to freedom. They condemned it as a "socialistic" dole. We were warned that it would destroy private initiative and bankrupt the insurance companies.

Experience has proved how baseless those dire predictions were. American business and the free enterprise system itself have been strengthened, rather than weakened. The insurance companies have grown and prospered beyond their wildest dreams, because more people became insurance conscious. And the American people as a whole are immeasurably better off as the result of the social security system.

You would think that this experience would convince even the most hard-bitten

reactionaries. But today they are once more in full cry. They have dragged out the same moth-eaten and ridiculous arguments all over again to oppose with undiminished bitterness proposals to extend the social security system into the vitally necessary field of health insurance for the aged.

We are not surprised that the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce should take this position. They have been wrong on every issue affecting the well-being of the American people since the turn of the century. If these organizations of big business were on our side, we might have reason to suspect that perhaps we were off base. We are encouraged, rather than frightened, by their opposition.

But the thing that shocks and amazes every thinking citizen is how the American Medical Association can align itself with such allies against a plan which would enable millions of citizens to obtain medical care which they urgently need but cannot now afford.

Is the American Medical Association a proper and authorized spokesman for the doctors of this country who are dedicated to healing the sick? Or is it just another big business front, more interested in maintaining the status quo than in advancing the interests of doctors and their patients?

Today the American Medical Association is the one formidable enemy standing in the way of passage by Congress of the Forand bill.

The Forand bill, now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, would provide an adequate system of medical, surgical, hospital, and nursing insurance for people who have retired under social security, now and in the future.

This plan is simple and practical. It has the full support of the trade union movement. It is likewise strongly endorsed by social agencies, by many eminent physicians, by leaders in our public life, and by progressive citizens everywhere.

Of course, the AMA calls it socialized medicine. It is nothing of the sort. The charge of socialism against the Forand bill is just as empty and meaningless and vicious as it was against social security 25 years ago.

The Forand bill would not put the Government in control of medicine. It would not in any way change the present structure of the medical profession. Doctors and hospitals would continue to practice just as they do today. Patients would be completely free to choose their own doctors. The only difference brought about by the Forand bill would be simply this—millions of elderly people would be able to get the medical treatment they need and the bills would be paid by an insurance system set up by the Federal Government.

"That's terrible," says the AMA. "That's socialized medicine. Private insurance groups should handle this."

Let's take that apart.

First, until a few years ago the AMA was denouncing private, nonprofit health insurance plans like the Blue Cross with equal fervor as socialized medicine. It was not until threatened with antitrust prosecution that the AMA reluctantly accepted any form of health insurance.

Second, organizations like the Blue Cross and the Blue Shield are the first to admit they cannot adequately meet the health insurance needs of the aged. Neither can commercial insurance companies. Both have the built-in disadvantage of relying upon current payments by the aged themselves to give them coverage. This makes the insurance far too costly. Because the risks are greater in age brackets over 65, the premiums must be raised beyond the reach of the people who need this insurance. Otherwise, the

protection is too limited to make the insurance worthwhile.

This is indisputable fact, not argument. It is attested to by every study that has been made of this subject. Let me quote an outstanding authority, Dr. Basil C. MacLean, who recently retired as president of the National Blue Cross Association, and who is also past president of the American Hospital Association. He says:

"A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of the care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged."

There speaks a doctor who knows the score, a doctor who cannot be impeached by the American Medical Association or be intimidated by it. He heartily endorses the Forand bill as the only practical way to solve this problem.

The big advantage of the Forand bill is that it spreads the risk and thereby makes possible full coverage at low cost. This is the basic principle of any effective insurance program.

Of course, it will cost a great deal of money—about a billion dollars a year at the outset. This money would be provided by increasing social security taxes by one-quarter of 1 percent a year, or \$12 a year from insured workers and their employers.

"Unfair," cry the reactionaries. "You are making younger people pay for the oldsters." But when we ask them how else medical care can be provided for retired elderly people, they say "Let the children and grandchildren pay the bills."

That's just what we propose to do under the Forand bill, with this saving benefit—the people who will have to pay the taxes now will themselves become the beneficiaries of the insurance protection under this program when they reach retirement age.

We all know about the wonderful new discoveries of science in the field of medicine. With antibiotics, vaccines, X-rays, and new surgical techniques, the life expectancy of the average American citizen has been greatly expanded. In the foreseeable future, when the scientists find ways to prevent or cure cancer and heart disease, people will be able to live far beyond the Biblical span of three-score and ten.

But what good are these advances in the healing arts when they are priced beyond the reach of the great majority of retired workers?

Take the case of a retired couple who have saved some money during their working years and enjoy a modest income over and above their social security pensions. They plan for a reasonably comfortable and dignified old age. But if one or both become seriously ill, bills for doctors, hospitals, drugs, and appliances can add up in a relatively short time to thousands of dollars. Their whole foundation for retirement is swept away. For fear of such loss, many couples postpone seeking medical attention until too late, with tragic results.

It is true that doctors and hospitals provide free care for those who cannot afford to pay. To qualify for such care, however, the patient must go through a means test. If he owns a small house or a car or even a television set, he has to sell it, use the proceeds and take a pauper's oath before getting free care.

We all know of cases where elderly people, afflicted with serious illness, have literally killed themselves with worry over the burden the cost of their medical care was imposing upon their children or relatives.

The American Medical Association appears to have little concern with such human problems and certainly has suggested no way out. We sincerely believe there is a way out—the Forand bill.

It is more than 3 years now since the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations began its pioneering crusade for this legislation. Progress at first was slow. But we are now rapidly gaining widespread support.

This, we are convinced, can be the decisive year. In November there will be a national election. Candidates for Congress and even the White House cannot escape the responsibility of making a public commitment on this issue.

Here is the great opportunity for you, the elderly citizens of this country, to make your voices heard and to obtain the results to which you are entitled. Write to your Congressman and Senators. Write to the candidates for the Presidency. Tell them in your own words how urgently the Forand bill is needed. Inform them of your determination to go to the polls on election day and vote for candidates who support this essential reform.

One thing is certain—you may be getting on in years, but you are still full-fledged American citizens. In a democracy like ours, your right to vote is your most powerful weapon. Use it and use it wisely.

I can assure you that the AFL-CIO will back you up to the hilt. We took on this fight knowing the odds against us, but convinced that the goal was worth the struggle. Now that we can see that goal almost within reach, we are determined to redouble our efforts for this great victory for humanity.

Soil Productivity a Basic Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, the Newark Advocate, one of the fine daily newspapers in my congressional district, published a special edition heralding the advent of a soil improvement program undertaken by many farmers of Licking County under the leadership of Robert Havener, in charge of the Extension Service, Kenneth Thomas of the Soil Conservation Service, Russell Hoar of the Licking County Agronomy Committee, and the lime dealers in the county. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as an operator of a small cattle farm of my own, I heartily endorse the efforts of all those participating in this worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, America today is essentially an urban Nation. Seven out of every eight people live in cities and towns, and the proportion is growing larger every year.

This does not mean that farming is any less important than when we were predominantly a rural people. Of every eight persons, the seven who live in town depend upon the eighth who stays on the farm to grow the food and fiber they all must have to live. And the commerce involved in getting the produce of the lone farmer to the seven

urban consumers accounts for nearly 40 percent of the Nation's economy.

Let us not imagine, either, that the urban dwellers are entirely unaware of their debt to agriculture. Many, like myself, remember their beginnings on the land. From my childhood in neighboring Knox County, where I attended a one-room country school, I have an almost instinctive reverence for fertile soil and bountiful fields. It is natural, then, that I applaud the Newark Advocate on its special edition dedicated to sustained soil productivity.

Central Ohio has been an area of pioneering developments in soil conservation and soil improvement. One of the earliest soil erosion experiment stations was located at nearby Zanesville, where scientific studies soon showed that more crop nutrients are lost by soil erosion than are removed in the crops themselves.

Research at this station also emphasized that the correct use of fertilizers could reinforce soil conservation practices. Since a dense plant cover is the best defense against erosion by water, a high level of fertility makes soil protection easier.

Other important lessons in runoff control and soil management have been learned at another nearby research station at Coshocton. The Soil Conservation Service now maintains a training center there for its employees who serve the northeastern part of the United States.

Farmers of Licking County were quick to organize a soil conservation district through which they could make use of the skills of trained conservationists and other public services to apply modern farming methods to their own land. In fact, 95 percent of the agricultural land in Ohio is now in soil conservation districts.

The complete conservation plans that conservation farmers follow make most efficient use of fertilizers and keep soil at its top productivity. Erosion control measures prevent wastage of plant nutrients in runoff water; good soil tilth makes moisture and fertility most readily available to crops. Fertilizers in turn make the combination of good farming practices more effective.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to farmers who thus acquit themselves as good husbandmen and assure our Nation a continuing bounty of food.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial contained in the aforementioned edition of the Advocate which points up the importance of soil testing:

[From the Newark (Ohio) Advocate, Mar. 19, 1960]

DON'T GUESS—SOIL TEST DURING FERTILITY WEEKS

One of the main concerns of a Licking County farmer is the productivity of his soil. The greater the soil's fertility, the greater, both in quantity and quality, are the products he can take to market. During the next 2 weeks, every Licking County farmer has the opportunity of knowing more about the productive capacities of the soil on his own farm. Every farmer should take advantage of this opportunity and ask for a soil test.

The farmer's responsibility in our way of life is not to himself alone. Upon him depends the very life of all of us; for without him our food supply would be practically nonexistent. It is the farmer's responsibility, then, not only to produce efficiently for the sake of his own profit, but for the sake of a growing and expanding American population. Upon the farmer rests the problem of producing not only for today, but for thousands of tomorrows as well.

With the cooperation of the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Licking County Agronomy Committee and the lime dealers all over the county, Soil Fertility Weeks have been set up to help farmers test their soil—to determine its present ability to produce and to determine how it can better be used in the future. Taking a soil sample is simple and takes very little time. Elsewhere in this special agricultural edition of the Advocate, soil sampling stations have been listed for easy reference.

It has been proved that millions of dollars more can be added to Licking County's farm income yearly. We have scarcely begun to get production out of our soil that lies there. It is clearly the responsibility of every Licking County farmer to increase his production by improving his own operation and efficiency for the benefit of us all.

Don't guess—soil test during Soil Fertility Weeks.

Democratic Party of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico is building up a great Democratic Party which, I predict, will in the near future play a vital role in public affairs on that island. The chairman of the Puerto Rican Democratic Party is my very dear friend, Jose A. Benitez, a very capable and alert young man with fine leadership ability. He will some day go far in Puerto Rican politics.

For the first time in the history of Puerto Rico, the Democratic Party has been officially registered and will actively participate in the local elections next November. The party was registered on March 19, 1960. Leading its slate of candidates in the coming elections will be Carlos Chardon, a note scientists and public planner, who has been nominated for Governor.

The Democratic Party of Puerto Rico is now on record in favor of statehood and its delegates to the Democratic National Convention in July will undoubtedly request that the 1960 Democratic platform include a plank in favor of Puerto Rican statehood.

As the author of a bill, H.R. 7003, on the admission of Puerto Rico as the 51st State of the Union, which has been favorably reported by the Department of Defense, I want to congratulate the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico and its chairman, Jose A. Benitez, on the occasion of the steps just taken to bring the party officially to the attention of the people, and to convert it into a mass political movement. May this prove to be

a most auspicious beginning and may they go from strength to strength.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article from the San Juan Star, of San Juan, P.R., published on March 21, 1960, on the subject:

[The San Juan Star, Mar. 21, 1960]

DEMOCRATIC PARTY DEBUTS ON CULEBRA REGISTRATION

(By Harold J. Lidin)

The nascent Democratic Party registered Saturday in Culebra, the tiny island of the east coast of Puerto Rico where a total of 283 persons voted for Governor in the last general election.

Because of its small size, Culebra is a favorite launching pad for new political parties.

The Culebra registration is believed to be the first by the Democrats since that group announced its entry into the November election fray 2 months ago.

The Democrats registered 31 persons, 3 over the 28 signatures needed. The Commonwealth's election law requires that new parties must register at least 10 percent of the number of those voting for Governor in the last previous election to get on the ballot.

The Culebra signatures were sworn before Justice of the Peace Frederick Fishbach, at the request of the Democratic Party.

The latter recently announced that the Democratic gubernatorial candidate in November will be scientist and public planner, Carlos Chardon, with Lawyer Orland Antonsanti slotted for Resident Commissioner.

The Democratic platform calls for Puerto Rican statehood, when economic conditions permit. Also, Chairman Benitez has stressed in his campaign talks the alleged need for the insular political parties to work closely with the national political groupings.

Benitez, who claims he has a guarantee that the national Democratic Party will include statehood in its 1960 platform, predicts that the Democratic Party will be instrumental in securing statehood for the island.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to the many others paid to my friend and colleague, RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington.

RUSSELL MACK came to the Congress shortly after I did, so I have known him for high on 14 years. He was in every way a good Congressman, hard working, careful and fair to all the people of his district, and speaking only on the subjects he knew and on which he had all the facts.

I went once to RUSSELL MACK's district and was deeply impressed by the sincere regard and affection in which he was held by his constituents, their grief and sense of loss at his passing will be very great indeed. To Mrs. Mack and his bereaved family I want to send my heartfelt sympathy in these tragic hours, and hope that they may find some consolation in the thought that he died at his post doing his duty for our country.

Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.:

A Whale of a Tale—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in my series of insertions on "Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn." I have been endeavoring to point out the economic importance of the area I represent.

It is highly interesting to point out that if Fairfield County were a State, its population would top New Hampshire's, buying income would make it a Rhode Island, total retail sales would top Montana's, food bill would exceed Vermont's and North Dakota's, gas and oil sales would match Nevada's, auto sales would equal South Dakota's, lumber and building sales would rank it with New Mexico, furniture and appliance outlays would surpass Utah's.

The source for these comparisons, Mr. Speaker, is Sales Management magazine, the bible of the selling world.

Those, I maintain, are impressive comparisons, Mr. Speaker. Fairfield County, No. 2 in the United States in buying income per family, obviously is a national leader in many other indicators of dynamic development.

Take a look, for example, at the following excerpt from the Fairfield County Trust Co.'s economic newsletter and fact sheet on the growth of development of Fairfield County for December-January, 1960:

RETAIL SALES: A WHALE OF A TALE

Buying power of Fairfield County families is growing and growing.

County merchants rang up \$827,151,000 in sales in 1958, according to the U.S. Commerce Department's latest survey—17 percent more than 1954, when the last count was taken.

Familywise, Commerce found an average of \$89 a week going for food, autos, clothing, home furnishings, and gas and oil to run their cars. Fairfield County householders are currently top spenders in the State, about 8 percent more than Connecticut's \$82 average, and 19 percent better than the United States' \$75.

Higher incomes—and higher prices—show up dramatically in what county families have been budgeting over the years. Back in 1948, they could figure about \$71 a week for their wants. By 1954, it had climbed to \$83.

United States, Connecticut, and Fairfield County retail sales, percent gains, 1948-58 and 1954-58

	1948-58	1954-58
United States.....	54	17
Connecticut.....	54	14
Fairfield County.....	59	17
Bridgeport.....	16	6
Danbury (city).....	62	19
Fairfield.....	(1)	54
Greenwich.....	(1)	17
Norwalk.....	67	16
Shelton.....	65	4
Stamford.....	71	9
Stratford.....	(1)	21

¹ Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Of every retail dollar spent in Connecticut in 1958, some 28 cents was spent in Fairfield County's 6,609 stores. Since these stores comprise 26 percent of the State's total, it means that slightly more dollars pass over the average county counter. These mountains of sales provided 30,954 retail sales jobs and paychecks totaling \$93.5 million.

From 1948 to 1958, retail trade in the Nation rose 54 percent while Fairfield County gained 60 percent. Local increases ranged as high as 71 percent for Stamford and 67 percent for Norwalk.

Banking in Fairfield County: Deposits in Fairfield County commercial banks have swelled by \$136 million in the last 5 years. By the end of 1958, total had risen to \$732 million, up nearly one-fourth since the end of 1954. U.S. gain was one-sixth. During 1958 alone, Fairfield County's banks added over \$38 million in deposits.

Uncanceled orders: The Post Office's first volume order for automatic mail handling equipment has been awarded to Pitney-Bowes in Stamford. The \$2,250,000 contract calls for 75 automatic facing and canceling machines. Pitney-Bowes just finished its own \$8,500,000 expansion and modernization program.

Insurance hi-lifers: Based upon data from the Institute of Life Insurance, the average Fairfield County family has some \$15,300 in life coverages. That adds up to some \$2,750 million in force. Average for all Connecticut families is nearly \$13,700. Both top U.S. mean of \$9,600.

Homes sweet homes—and apartments too—continued to go up at a brisk pace in Fairfield County last year. Total new dwelling units authorized by permits came to over 5,600, against less than 5,000 in 1958. Slowed in the second half of the year by a tight mortgage market, residential building was still up 13 percent from 1958, 21 percent from 1957, and matched boom year, 1956.

Advisory Council on Public Assistance
Endorses H.R. 6422

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to bring to the attention of the House the recommendations of the Advisory Council of Public Assistance and to point out that the only legislative proposal now pending in the House which would implement the majority recommendations of this expert group is the comprehensive Public Welfare Act, incorporated in H.R. 6422, introduced by me in this session on April 15, 1959. This bill is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee, where I hope it may shortly receive serious study in the light of these recommendations.

The Advisory Council on Public Assistance was established under section 704 of Public Law 85-840, the Social Security Amendments of 1958, "for the purpose of reviewing the status of the public assistance program in relation to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, the fiscal capacities of the

States and the Federal Government, and any other factors bearing on the amount and proportion of the Federal and States shares in the public assistance program." As required by the law, its findings and recommendations were submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Congress on January 1, 1960, and will shortly be available as a public document.

The following individuals served as members of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance:

William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., Chairman.

Frank Bane, Consultant to the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

Harry A. Bullis, former chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

John E. Burton, vice president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Wilbur J. Cohen, professor of public welfare administration, University of Michigan, School of Social Work, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Miss Loula Dunn, director, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Katherine Pollak Ellickson, assistant director, Department of Social Security, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

Raymond W. Houston, commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare, Albany, N.Y.

Bernard Lander, associate professor of sociology, Hunter College, New York, chairman, Commission of Family and Youth Welfare of the Synagogue Council of America.

William R. MacDougall, general counsel and manager, County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.

William H. Robinson, chairman, Illinois Commission on Public Aid and Assistance, Chicago, Ill.

Charles J. Tobin, Jr., secretary, New York State Catholic Welfare Committee, Albany, N.Y.

Rev. William J. Villaume, executive director, Department of Social Welfare, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York, N.Y.

I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations of this representative group be inserted in the RECORD at this point and would like particularly to draw attention to recommendation 1 and 2 relating to aid for all needy persons with an optional plan whereby States might choose to establish a single comprehensive plan of administration or continue the present categorical system; 4, requiring the abolition of restrictive residence requirements; 7 and 14, urging equitable treatment among the categories; 12, providing a more equitable distribution of Federal funds; and 13, raising the Federal maximums—all of which would be achieved under H.R. 6422.

The official text of the recommendations approved by the majority—three members dissented on certain recommendations—follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE OF FINANCIALLY NEEDY PEOPLE

The Social Security Act should be amended to add a new provision for Federal grants-in-

² Dissented on certain points.

aid to States for the purpose of encouraging each State to furnish financial assistance and other services to financially needy persons regardless of the cause of need (including, for example, the unemployed, the underemployed, and the less seriously disabled).

Excluded specifically from the present public assistance categories are persons in nonmedical public institutions, patients in hospitals for tuberculosis or mental diseases, patients in medical institutions as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis, and children in foster homes and in public or private institutions. These exclusions have been in the law for some time, and should be reevaluated and studied. In the meanwhile, the new legislation should retain them.

2. OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO STATES

States should have freedom of choice in determining whether public assistance should be administered as a single program or as separate categorical programs. States should have the following options:

(a) Establishing, under a new title, a single category for financially needy persons to include all those covered under the existing programs and additional groups of needy persons not now covered, thereby eliminating the separate categories;

(b) Continuing the present categorical programs and adding a new category of general assistance under the new legislation;

(c) Retaining one or more of the present federally aided categories (for example, aid to the blind, which, in a few States, is administered by another State agency) and consolidating the remaining groups of needy persons in a single category; or

(d) Expanding the existing federally aided categories to include additional needy persons.

3. EXTENSION OF AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

Under the existing provisions for aid to dependent children, Federal grants-in-aid are available to the States only for the assistance of children deprived of support or care because of the absence, death, or incapacity of one parent. As an ironical result, in many States, destitute children living with two able-bodied parents are actually penalized. On the premise that a hungry, ill-clothed child is as hungry and ill clothed if he lives in an unbroken home or if he were orphaned or illegitimate, the program for aid to dependent children should be expanded to include any financially needy children living with any relative or relatives "in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home."

4. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

The great majority of States have residence requirements that, with much resultant hardship, exclude many financially needy persons from public assistance. Federal grants-in-aid should be available only for those public assistance programs imposing no residence requirement that debar any needy person in the State from help to which he would otherwise be entitled.

5. ADEQUACY OF ASSISTANCE

(a) In view of the evidence of unmet need, steps should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments toward assuring that assistance payments are at levels adequate for health and well-being.

(b) The Federal Government should exercise greater leadership in assuring that assistance payments are at levels adequate for health and well-being. It should promote greater public understanding as to what constitutes a level of living sufficient to maintain health and well-being, and the relationship of present payments to such level. As specific steps toward these ends, the Federal Government should exercise leadership in (1) developing up-to-date bud-

get guides, for typical families, showing the items of living requirements and their costs necessary to sustain a level of living adequate for health and well-being; (2) making these budgets available for the guidance of States in evaluating their own budgets; (3) requiring periodic State reporting on budgets in use, and on actual individual payments in relation to these budgets; and (4) publishing periodically information on budgets in actual use in individual States and other data significant in indicating adequacy of appropriations and assistance payments in each State.

6. ADEQUACY OF MEDICAL CARE

(a) Since it appears that future public welfare costs may increase largely because of increasing medical care needs and costs, Federal and State Governments, in cooperation with nongovernmental agencies, should take a more active role in stimulating more comprehensive medical services of high quality, including preventive services.

(b) Steps should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments toward assuring that health services available to public assistance recipients are comprehensive in nature and of high quality. Improvements in medical care should not be accomplished by reducing money payments to recipients.

(c) The Federal Government should exercise greater leadership in stimulating and encouraging States to extend the scope and content and improve the quality of medical care for which assistance payments are made to or on behalf of needy individuals. As specific steps toward this end, we recommend Federal leadership in (1) developing guides to States for evaluating and moving toward improving their programs of medical care; (2) requiring periodic State reports on types and amounts of medical care for which assistance is paid; and (3) publishing periodically comparative State data secured from these reports and other information that will promote greater public understanding about needed medical care.

(d) The Federal agency should establish a broadly constituted Medical Care Advisory Committee to advise it on all aspects of medical care in public assistance.

7. EQUITABLE TREATMENT AMONG CATEGORIES

Currently there is an often striking disproportion in payments in the same State among the public assistance programs; for example, old-age assistance payments tend almost everywhere to be relatively more adequate than aid to dependent children payments. States should be encouraged to apply the same assistance standards to all categories of needy persons, and to ensure that similar treatment is accorded to persons in similar circumstances, regardless of the particular form of public assistance. By similar we do not, of course, mean identical. Obviously there are differences in the living requirements of, for example, a 66-year-old public assistance recipient living alone in a large industrial city and a 4-year-old child living with a rural family. But determination of the extent of need and the amount of assistance, including payments for medical care, can and should be realistically related to known facts about these differences, without partiality for one categorical group as compared to another.

8. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND USE OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The Federal Government should encourage each State to (a) stimulate public interest and increase public knowledge of the role of public welfare programs; (b) establish appropriate advisory committees; (c) utilize services of voluntary agencies, when available and qualified, to serve recipients of public assistance; and (d) involve private as well as public organizations in studying problems of family disintegration and

breakdown, and developing coordinated programs for strengthening family life.

9. THE FEDERAL SHARE

Under present conditions, the proportionate Federal share of total public assistance expenditures, including general assistance, for the Nation as a whole, should not be less than is currently provided under the Social Security Amendments of 1958. For the present, the overall average Federal proportion for all States combined, for all public assistance expenditures, including general assistance, should fall between approximately 50 and 60 percent.

10. THE FEDERAL AMOUNT

To enable the public assistance program to expand or contract sensitively with changing conditions, the amount of the Federal appropriation should remain "open-end"; that is, the amount should be the total necessary to match State-local expenditures for public assistance under the formula specified for Federal financial participation, with no limiting predetermination of what the total shall be.

11. THE STATE SHARE

All States should exert fiscal effort for public assistance commensurate with their ability to do so in relation to their State-local resources.

The States should take steps to modify the financial burden on localities for public assistance if the availability and adequacy of assistance is adversely limited by local financing or resources.

12. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The specifications of the Federal formula determining the Federal proportion for individual States should recognize variations among States both in fiscal ability and incidence of need to a greater extent than the present formula does. The Federal percents for individual States should be related to interstate variations in fiscal ability and need for the total of assistance expenditures in which the Federal Government participates, instead of only part of such expenditures as under the present formula. The Federal provisions should specify limits to the range among States in Federal percents; that is, the minimum and maximum percents to be received.

13. FEDERAL MAXIMUMS

(a) Maximum amounts of assistance expenditures in which the Federal Government will participate should continue to be specified, as now, in terms of an average amount of all assistance paid per recipient, including both money payments to recipients and payments to suppliers of medical care.

(b) The specified maximums should be high enough so as not to hamper State efforts to provide assistance at levels adequate for health and well-being and to meet rising costs of basic living requirements and medical care. Current Federal maximums should be raised accordingly.

(c) Any difference in Federal maximums specified for different groups of needy people (for example, per adult and per child), should be reasonably related to available knowledge about differences among the groups in the cost and content of their living requirements. The current Federal maximums for aid to dependent children do not meet this criterion, and should be raised to an equitable relationship with the other programs.

14. SINGLE FEDERAL MATCHING FUND

To promote equitable standards among the different categories a single formula for Federal financial participation should be used, to apply to all categories of assistance and to all assistance expenditures.

15. TRANSITION PERIOD

In the event that a revised formula would result in reduced Federal funds for any State, a transition period should be pro-

vided to permit States to adjust to such changes, either by postponing the effective date of revised legislation or by building into the formula a device for gradual reduction in the Federal share over a period of years.

16. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The Federal share of administrative costs for public assistance should remain at 50 percent for the Nation as a whole, and for each State.

17. TRAINING AND PERSONNEL

(a) In order to improve administration, promote social rehabilitation, and help prevent dependency, States should increase the numbers and raise the qualifications of personnel administering the public assistance programs.

(b) To assist States in increasing the number of their qualified staff, the existing Federal matching provisions for educational leave programs should be amended to provide 100 percent Federal funds for training of public welfare personnel, as is provided in other specialized fields.

(c) As an aid to increasing generally the present short supply of social workers, it is recommended that, in addition to grants for other groups, 100 percent Federal funds be made available to accredited graduate schools of social work for the training of persons in such fields as strengthening family life and caring for the needs of the aging.

(d) States should take such action as is necessary to assure that the salaries of public welfare personnel are established and maintained at levels required to obtain and retain competent personnel, in order to provide the services required by public welfare recipients.

18. STRENGTHENING FAMILY LIFE

(a) Funds authorized by the Congress under the Social Security Amendments of 1956 should be appropriated for grants for research and demonstration projects such as those relating to the prevention and reduction of dependency, coordination between private and public agencies, and improvements in social security and related programs, and research leading to strengthening family life.

(b) We recommend the establishment of a national institution which would have the responsibility for studies and demonstration programs leading to strengthening of family life.

19. STRENGTHENING SOCIAL INSURANCE

The Council supports the generally accepted principle underlying the American social security system that the social insurance programs should provide the primary defense against the common risks to economic security. The Council regards the strengthening of the social insurance programs as an important objective of public policy. Because of the close relation between any extension or improvement in social insurance and the extent of need for public assistance, the Council has taken note of the major proposals for changes in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and in the State unemployment insurance programs that have been advanced in recent years. It has not attempted to resolve the issues relating to all of these proposals; it has, however, reached conclusions regarding some that would have an immediate impact on public assistance. As desirable steps, the Council recommends the following:

(a) Coverage under the contributory wage-related program of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance should be extended to include as many additional workers as possible not now covered under any public retirement system; in particular, the program should be extended to such additional farm and household workers as it is feasible to cover.

(b) The proper Federal authorities should take all feasible measures to assure that everyone who is covered by law under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program does in fact have his covered earnings reported and recorded to his credit, so that he will receive the full amount of benefits to which he is entitled. Additional effort in this respect seems to be particularly necessary for migratory farmworkers.

(c) The provision that disability insurance benefits can be paid under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program only to people age 50 and over should be eliminated; benefits should be paid to qualified disabled workers regardless of age.

(d) Benefit levels under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program should be adequate and kept in line with the growth of the economy; to this end, increases in wage and price levels should be appropriately reflected both in benefit amounts and in the maximum amount of earnings taxable and creditable toward benefits.

(e) The Federal-State unemployment compensation system should be extended to improve its protection of the unemployed.

(f) Continued attention should be given to strengthening the contributory wage-related social insurance programs with particular view toward reducing need for public assistance.

20. PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAM

The status of the public assistance programs, including their adequacy in promoting health and well-being, the formula for Federal financial participation in public assistance costs, and their relationship to social insurance programs should be reviewed and reevaluated by an advisory council at least once every 5 years. The Social Security Act should be amended to authorize such a council.

Forest Amsden on the Need for Good Political Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Forest Amsden, the executive editor of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, one of the leading newspapers in Oregon, has been spending this session here in Washington as a political science fellow. As will appear in his piece that follows under a previous consent, Mr. Amsden is not impressed by the job of political reporting done by newspapers, radio, and television. He believes that:

The trouble is that political reporters become so wound up in their own theories of what constitutes political reality that they make it impossible for public figures to get through to the public.

This is indeed a regrettable state of affairs in a country that depends on an informed electorate. Here is his Letter from Washington as it appeared in the Coos Bay World for March 1, 1960:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON—POOR UNITED STATES CAN'T AFFORD DEFENSE, SCHOOLS, WATER

(By Forest Amsden)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Eisenhower's veto of the water pollution bill made for fascinating reading.

The President termed our rivers and streams a priceless national asset. Then he went on to maintain that preservation of this priceless national asset is strictly a local problem, not calling for anything so insidious as Federal funds.

But he did see some hope. He planned a conference at which the States could discuss how they could cooperate with each other in cleaning up interstate streams. The U.S. Government would thus fulfill its part—that of sort of a penniless fairy godfather.

It now appears we not only can't afford to defend ourselves, and can't afford to educate our children, but we also cannot afford to clean up the sewage before we drink it.

This doesn't seem much of a problem in southwestern Oregon, nor in the whole Pacific Northwest. In the East it is a terrible problem, however.

The cities are turning increasingly corrupt water into their mains. Streams are becoming increasingly polluted by industrial and human wastes.

Washington, D.C., is one of the worst examples. The beautiful Potomac River is little more than an open sewer above the city and far worse below. Washington's drinking water is hazy. It's up to you to guess what it is hazy with.

Maybe the talk at President Eisenhower's interstate pollution conference will help settle some of that stuff in Washington water and that of hundreds of other municipalities facing the same problem.

If democracy is to work, the people surely must be informed of the issues they face.

If a democracy is to elect adequate officials, it must know the candidates, what the candidates represent and how candidates propose to attack problems.

If that be true, this democracy is in sorry shape.

As a newspaperman I am appalled at the performance of the newspapers (with a few notable exceptions) in reporting political events. With even fewer notable exceptions, radio and television are doing as sorry a job.

The trouble is that political reporters become so wound up in their own theories of what constitutes political reality that they make it impossible for public figures to get through to the public.

A candidate attempts to outline his beliefs in a speech. The next morning he looks at the papers to discover the writers have ignored the speech and seized upon something completely irrelevant.

Two recent examples occurred in California where Senator JOHN KENNEDY and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY addressed the same meeting. Both talks were excellent outlines of what each man believed. Both talks were extremely well-received by the live audience.

But both HUMPHREY and KENNEDY took the first 30 seconds of their talks to mention the fact that they did not approve of RICHARD M. NIXON. Both did this more or less as an aside, as if to warm up a partisan audience, and then went on to the weight of the speech.

The papers headlined: "HUMPHREY and KENNEDY Attack Nixon." The stories under the headline reiterated that an "attack" had had been made, period. Nowhere in the story is there an indication that either speaker went on for 40 or 50 minutes with an exposition of principle and platform.

Net effect is that the people of California, or at least the State's newspaper readers, think all KENNEDY and HUMPHREY have to offer is an attack on the Vice President.

This falling of the press is not restricted to Democrats. Unless Mr. Nixon strikes out with a personality attack, his press clippings are not notable.

This remains true even though Mr. Nixon can count on fuller treatment of what he says by virtue of being a Republican.

LABEL IS A LABEL IS A LABEL

It's easy to get all fouled up with labels. Once a label is attached to something, its meaning seems to begin changing. This results in the need for a new label.

Example: The National Park Service is casting about for a new label to put on its parkways. As envisioned by the Park Service, parkway meant a road along which people could drive slowly, communing with nature. The road was not meant to hurry, in fact. But the public is beginning to regard a parkway as a four- or six-lane express highway, because the States of New York and Florida—and perhaps some others—have taken to labeling their turnpikes "parkway."

One Congressman is anxiously seeking a new word for "multiple use" as it is applied to national forest lands. The term means the use of a forest area for recreation, grazing, timbering, and other purposes. The public seems to think it means every acre of any given forest area is to have multiple use. Furthermore, recreationalist opponents of grazing and timbering in some areas are beginning to bristle at mention of the label "multiple use."

AFTER RIGHT TO WORK?

Those who favor establishment of diplomatic relations with Communist China are beginning to shy from the word "recognition." True, recognition of a country does not mean that the recognizing nation approves of the nation recognized. Yet to Americans, the word "recognition" seems to imply a cheery hello, a slap on the back and approval. So "I'm in favor of recognition of mainland China" is going out of the political lexicon in favor of "I'm in favor of establishing of diplomatic relations with mainland China."

Many have observed the rapidly changing terminology to label laws or constitutional amendments banning union or closed shops.

Originally, most such proposals were called, by their proponents, antiunion shop propositions. After a few years this came into such general disrepute that the name became "right to work." By now, "right to work" is in growing disfavor and antiunion forces are, it is reported, casting about for a different label.

In many ways, it isn't what something is, but what it's called.

In Memory of Russell V. Mack

SPEECH
OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the House of Representatives have been saddened by the sudden and unexpected death yesterday, here on this floor, of our colleague from the State of Washington, the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK.

Naturally, those of us from his own State feel that we knew him best, although his friends indeed were legion. We knew him as a conscientious and hardworking representative of the people of his district and State, and yet one capable of the longer view which places the welfare of the Nation as a whole above sectional and political considerations. This, after all, is the ultimate test of a good public servant.

Mr. MACK served 13 years in this body, always with strong dedication to duty. Despite the seriousness with which he approached his work here, he was in personal relationships easygoing and outgoing, which in part explains the host of friends he acquired here and back home during his lifetime. I say in part, because the basis of an unusually high number of lasting friendships always must be the recognition of an innate strength of character, the capacity for making people instinctively know that here is a good man.

Mr. MACK had that capacity, and we who live on say today: "A good man is gone."

If he had to go, we are grateful that his passing came without prolonged pain, but this does not still the voice of sorrow within us, his friends.

Mrs. Magnuson joins me in expressing heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife, Laura, and to the other members of their family.

Report From Iowa, More Art Than Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, quite often people are inclined to overlook the Middle West when it comes to art and culture. Sunday's New York Times carried a fine article by Emily Genauer which refutes this idea.

I was so proud, when she began her discussion of Midwest art in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the largest city in my district.

The article follows:

ART: JOURNEY TO THE MIDWEST—REPORT FROM IOWA: MORE ART THAN CORN

(By Emily Genauer)

There was a moment the other morning when, without straining at all, I could have imagined myself in midsummer in a city in the French provinces—Aix, maybe, or Toulouse. The setting and the props were all there. Guidebook in hand, I found myself in front of a wonderfully satisfying church, studying its proportions and detail. I had just been to see some stained glass windows in another building. I'd already taken in one fine exhibition that morning, and was scheduled to see some others before driving on to the next town.

Only the guide book was not Michelin. It was the WPA-prepared "Iowa, a Guide to the Hawkeye State." The city wasn't Aix, but Cedar Rapids. The church was no soaring Gothic structure but the daring, circular St. Paul's Methodist, constructed by Louis Sullivan, master of Frank Lloyd Wright, back in 1913, and very similar to the circular auditorium at Wright's Guggenheim Museum. The stained glass windows were by Grant Wood, in the Cedar Rapids City Hall. The exhibition, in the two art galleries of Coe College, in the same city, was of such caliber as to make for a major event in New York, including paintings by artists like Tamayo, Matta, Leger, Lansky, Stuart Davis, Ben Shahn, Hans Hofmann, Arthur Dove, Marin, Kuniyoshi, Hopper, Menkes, Tobey, Weber. The sculpture was by Jacques Lipchitz, David Smith, Reg Butler, Kenneth Amitage, Jose de Rivera.

The next town I was heading for was Ames, and after Ames, Des Moines. And in each I saw exhibitions no less distinguished. Plus some more handsome modern architecture (Saarinen's Des Moines Fine Arts Center) and some that was striking, but not as successful (Saarinen's several buildings for Drake University). Plus acres of mural (including a huge Stuart Davis abstract wall in the student's cafeteria at Drake).

Plus private collections of such quality as to make the eyes of a jaded New Yorker pop. (Imagine walking casually into a pleasant but unpretentious house in a city like Cedar Rapids, owned by someone whose name has not been publicized among the country's big, stylish collectors, and finding a smallish living room hung with exceptionally handsome canvases by Picasso, Gris, Matisse, Kandinsky, Munch, Villon, Braque. In other rooms were first-class examples by Leger, Delaunay, Friesz, Chagall, Soutine, Dufy, Bonnard, Valadon. Lining the halls and staircase walls were prints by Rembrandt and Goya.)

EAGER AUDIENCE

More important than the exhibitions, the buildings, the murals, even the collections, was the excitement about art in those small midwestern cities. At Coe so many students turned out to hear a lecture by a visiting art critic very few could ever have heard of before, that the whole affair had at the last moment to be moved into a larger auditorium to accommodate standees. At Iowa State University, which is an agricultural and technical school without a fine arts department at all, the audience of students and faculty waited patiently in the auditorium for over a half hour while my car plodded along highways running alongside cornfields now buried under heavy snows.

And just as important as the eagerness was the knowledge. There couldn't be any doubts, from the questions students threw at me, that not only were they familiar with the last word in modern art, but that they had no predisposition to accept anything simply because it was the last word. (I'll never forget the pretty girl in the first row who raised her hand and asked, "But why is abstract art the art of our times?" Or the boy who asked, "But don't you consider emotional states to be as much a part of reality as the things you can see?")

I shouldn't have been surprised, really, at all that's been going on in the Midwest, especially in Iowa and Illinois. For years I've been receiving catalogs of college exhibitions out there, known the caliber of their presentations, and of their art staffs. Especially I've been aware of a healthy skepticism in these areas, a resistance to any brainwashing by New York dealers and museums. In Texas, for instance, I've long observed that exhibitions and collections have been weighted in favor of the chic and the avant garde. In Iowa, on the contrary, one has always felt, even in the exhibition catalogs, the presence of questioning open minds.

In the current Iowa State exhibition, for instance, the students, who are normally occupied with agriculture, technology, home economics, architecture, are confronted by a collage by Marca-Relli, but also a Walt Kuhn acrobat; an abstraction by Kienbusch, but also a landscape by Edward Hopper; a thread-string-paper-and-leaf construction by Sue Fuller, but also a Reginald Marsh drawing; a slashing Hans Hofmann abstraction, but close to it a watercolor by John Marin. The Des Moines Art Center is currently hung with a beautiful exhibition called "The Painting of Light," which starts with a 14th-century Florentine Crucifixion, and ends with abstractions by Ropelle and Stamos, including, en route, works by artists ranging from Bonington to Reuben Tam, de Hooch to Robert Henri, Rubens to Rattner, de la Tour to Morris Graves.

WAS I RIGHT?

I think maybe the real reason I went off to the Middle West this week was to satisfy my conscience. In a recent lecture at the Museum of Modern Art entitled "Economics, Art, and Environment," Harvard Professor John Kenneth Galbraith stated that the aesthetic response has always been nourished by secure well-being. He then went on to cite American agriculture as a field still especially burdened with economic necessity, and concluded that, as a result, "we expect" the modern practicing farmer to be beyond the reach of "artistic imagination." Having heard what was going on in the Corn Belt, I wrote a column taking strong exception to his statement.

But I've been uneasy about the whole business. Now I know. I couldn't tell how many of the students I talked to intend to become farmers, even among those at Iowa State. Most of them come from farm communities and will function in a farm economy. I don't even know, not being an economist, that the area is really as prosperous as it seems. Perhaps it is burdened with economic uncertainty. But one thing I'm certain, as a result of my trip, there's an astonishing amount of culture along with agriculture in Iowa.

And maybe there has been for a long time. What were we doing in the East 50 years ago when Iowans were commissioning a rebel like Louis Sullivan to design for their churches and banks, buildings, which even today look fresher and more modern than the new structures lining Park Avenue? We were commissioning pseudo-Greek temples, that's what.

Flood Control Progress in Southeast Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, Maj. Gen. W. A. Carter, was scheduled to speak before the annual meeting of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, held at Caruthersville, Mo., on Friday of last week. He prepared for that meeting an address which went into great detail explaining the development of the St. Francis River Basin, citing the planning and construction work along the Mississippi River and its tributaries, in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas which has taken place during the past several years and which has resulted in creating one of the richest agricultural areas in the world.

Because of the thorough manner in which General Carter has explained what has been done in the past through the cooperation of local interests with the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and what is planned for the future to complete the plan which will protect our area of the country from the devastating effects of floods which have wrought such havoc in the past, I have requested permission to include as a part of my remarks, the address, prepared by General Carter, but which was actually delivered by Col. Marvin Jacobs, district engineer at Memphis, who was called upon at the last

minute when General Carter received an emergency call to come to Washington on the day of the meeting.

I know I am expressing the appreciation of all of the fine people I am privileged to represent, when I say that we are indebted to General Carter, to Colonel Jacobs, and the other competent officials in the Corps of Engineers who have tackled this problem with sympathetic understanding. Because of the importance of this project, it is difficult to refrain from being impatient at times, but I want to say that I have confidence in the plan and want to pledge my full cooperation to its completion at the earliest possible date. May I also express my appreciation to my colleagues in Congress without whose cooperation could not be maintained.

Here is Major General Carter's address:

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRESS IN SOUTHEAST MISSOURI

While I was in Washington during the latter part of February, your esteemed Congressman, Mr. PAUL JONES, asked that I attend your meeting today and that I give you a talk concerning that portion of the St. Francis project which affects southeast Missouri. I am genuinely pleased to be able to accept that invitation and to have the opportunity to talk with you concerning major drainage works directly affecting your area.

Let me first review the tremendous strides which have already been made in flood control and drainage projects affecting southeast Missouri. Less than 75 years ago this fertile land was largely swamp, covered by dense growths of oak, gum, cypress, and willows. It was subject to frequent flooding from, not only the Mississippi, but also other rivers and, because of its flat terrain and the lack of any well-defined channel to serve as a drainage outlet, very little of the land could be cultivated even during dry seasons. The miraculous change which has taken place since that time can be attributed to a very satisfactory partnership between the levee and drainage districts in southeast Missouri and the Corps of Engineers for the Federal Government.

Prior to the time the Corps of Engineers did any work in your area, your levee and drainage districts had started flood control and drainage works which have had a most profound effect on the fertile but then largely untillable lands in southeast Missouri. They had constructed a headwater levee in the vicinity of Cape Girardeau and associated diversion works of sufficient magnitude to prevent some of the more frequent flooding. It is reported that local people had spent something in the vicinity of \$2,500,000 on these levee and diversion works and benefits were realized not only by the people in southeast Missouri but also those in Arkansas as far down as Helena. As a result of the Flood Control Act of 1928 the Corps of Engineers expended \$3 million on improvement of the headwater levee and the associated diversion works to the point where they now protect the vast area of southeast Missouri and eastern Arkansas from Mississippi River waters of great magnitude, the so-called project flood.

There are 122 miles of Mississippi River levees between Cape Girardeau, Mo., and the Missouri-Arkansas State line. These levees, together with the 20 miles of the Little River headwater diversion levee, have been raised to project grade and section and now protect about 992,000 acres of rural and urban lands in southeast Missouri from a Mississippi River project flood.

The St. Johns Bayou project consisting of

a controlled outlet culvert structure just above New Madrid, Mo., is complete. It prevents the entrance of Mississippi River backwater into the St. Johns Bayou drainage area of southeast Missouri. The control structure and closure levee provide the link which makes possible the continuous levee from Cape Girardeau to the State line.

Therefore, we enter the present with a feeling of tremendous accomplishment with respect to protection of southeast Missouri from its most disastrous source of floods, the Mississippi River. This protection has been provided at a cost of \$21½ million by the Federal Government and the expenditure of many millions of dollars by those who live in the protected area.

What are we doing today to improve the area?

There is one God-ordained fact which we are forced to recognize in determining the order in which we will accomplish flood control and drainage projects. It is the very simple and unassailable fact that water flows downhill. It is for this reason that we follow a firm policy of constructing levees from upstream downward, and channels from downstream upward.

With the protection from Mississippi River flooding of southeast Missouri, additional protection can only be provided by improved runoff of local rainfall. This in turn demands the construction of major drainage channels from downstream to upstream on the St. Francis and Little Rivers along with complementing levees. The immediate past has witnessed the accomplishment of major construction works of this type. In contrast with the long construction time on the headwater and Mississippi River levee protection for southeast Missouri, the channel work is approaching that area rapidly. Instead of being started some 75-odd years ago, this channel work was started in the form of the Madison to Marianna floodway in 1953. In 1960, just 7 years later, we are preparing to start work on the link which will carry the channel into Big Lake, and which will provide an adequate outlet for Big Lake and the area which drains into it. As we move north, more and more good will be done up here. With this statement, I am ready to discuss the present construction program.

At the present, the major obstacle in the path of an adequate outlet for southeast Missouri drainage is Big Lake. We are therefore forced to focus our attention on this area which, unfortunately from the viewpoint of those who live in Missouri, is in another State—Arkansas—and is, in addition, an area in which the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission and Federal fish and wildlife organizations have profound interest.

The Big Lake area is like a funnel, narrow at the downstream end and wide at the upstream end; and like a funnel, to be effective it must have an adequate outlet, it must have sides of sufficient strength to confine the weight of water inside, and it must be free of internal obstructions. Of these three requirements, one has already been met, one other is about to be met, and one presents many difficulties. Confining levees on each side of the funnel have been constructed to grade and section and are known to be effective. The below Pettyville ditches, which will be started in the near future and will be completed in 12 to 18 months, will mean that an adequate outlet will be waiting and ready for use by the time interior construction has been completed in the Big Lake area. This leaves for resolution only the subject of appropriate flood control and drainage works to carrying the floodflows which are dumped in the mouth of the funnel.

There has been talk that the corps has no plan to accomplish that purpose. Such statements are completely and grossly and grossly inaccurate. We do have a definite

plan, and we are confident that it is engineeringly sound, economically feasible, and that it will work.

The main features of that plan are two ditches, one following the east side levee and one following the west side levee.

Let us look first at the east side ditch. This ditch is expected to vary in width from 100 to 150 feet and to have a depth of 10 feet. The bottom elevation of this ditch at the lower end of the Big Lake funnel is expected to be 218 feet. Remember that figure, 218, because I will later want to contrast its elevation with other ditch elevations in the area. This ditch will intercept and drain the Belle Fountain ditch and the State line ditch and will therefore provide for drainage from the area in Missouri, east of Elk chute and from within Elk chute itself. Construction of this ditch already has been authorized by Congress.

The bottom width of the ditch up the west side of the Big Lake funnel will vary from 100 to 120 feet, will be 10 feet deep, and will also have an exit elevation of 218 feet, the same 218. For a distance of about 1 mile below the mouth of the Big Lake funnel, this ditch will have a levee on its left as well as on its right. This levee is required to keep water from backing up in your ditches. From there on down, the spoil on the left or inside of the ditch will be shaped to form a continuous bank at an elevation low enough to permit flood waters from the west ditch to spill over the spoil bank and into the floodway. At its upper end the west ditch will connect directly into ditch No. 81 which drains 17 percent of the area drained by the battery of ditches which flow down the west side of Elk chute.

Now what will these drainage ditches accomplish? First, during nonflood periods the large accumulation of water in ditch 81 will flow unhindered to the sea through a very large ditch with an outlet bottom elevation approximately 15 feet lower than presently provided. Similarly, the flows from Belle Fountain ditch, State line ditch, and from within Elk chute will go down the east side ditch which can readily carry these flows and will also dump its load at an elevation of 218 feet. The remaining ditches coming in at the top of Big Lake will continue to drain as they do now through the central existing ditch (No. 28), the old Little River channel and the existing natural channel in Big Lake. Water will be available from these to fish and wildlife interests to replenish lake losses and to maintain the lake level.

During major floodflows, on the other hand, the waters from these same ditches can spread out over the entire width of Big Lake from confining levee to confining levee and make their way to the leveed floodway below Pettyville and below Highway 18.

During the preparation of our report on the St. Francis Basin which has just been submitted to the Chief of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service presented a central ditch plan which was supposed to solve the Big Lake problem. It was worked up in cooperation with some of the local people. Their plan consists of a central ditch, about 160 feet wide, with a three-way control structure at its head, and a sill dam at elevation 233.3 at the Pettyville end. This is 15.3 feet above the outlet elevation we propose. We studied this plan most carefully. It could not take care of the water which the west ditch (81) would carry, nor would it adequately handle the east ditch water. Its cost was slightly over \$4 million, and its construction would add practically no flood control or drainage benefits to the Little River area. The benefits to fishing and hunting were sizable, but our most careful appraisal gave the central ditch plan a benefit-to-cost ratio of only 0.4 to 1. The trouble comes from the elevation of the sill dam at the lower end. The facts and figures on these plans are contained in the report

now under review by the Chief of Engineers. I am convinced that the plan we recommend will do the job. What I want to do is to get on with the job. I do not object to the construction of the central ditch in addition to the two that are required to give you the drainage you need. However, since the benefit-to-cost ratio is less than unity, I cannot recommend it.

As I said earlier, much of the money allocated to the St. Francis Basin is being used south of you to get the outlets ready downstream as our work moves upstream. This year we are doing a small amount of work in southeast Missouri on the levee and drainage district on the eastern and northern side of Elk chute.

In fiscal year 1961 we are getting closer to you. There is \$925,000 set up in the fiscal year 1961 budget for work directly concerned with Little River drainage. Much of this is still in the Big Lake area, and \$280,000 is provided to complete the Big Lake floodway ditches below Pettyville; \$170,000 is provided to open up the trestles across the Big Lake floodway at Hornersville and Pettyville. We will start the Big Lake east ditch with about \$93,000. About \$122,000 will be used to degrade levees at Hornersville, State line, and Big Lake which are interfering with the flood drainage out of the Little River drainage district. We will spend about \$104,000 on new levees, levee enlargement, and channel work on the headwater diversion channel and levee. There are some funds included for rights-of-way and, of course, funds included for engineering and design and supervision and administration. There is also an item of about \$283,000 for construction of levees in the Inter-River Levee District, Butler County, Mo.

This does not appear to be a high percentage of the \$4,600,000 included in the budget for the St. Francis Basin. However, almost \$3 million of that money is provided for the channels and relocations in the lower end of the valley to provide the necessary outlets for the flood waters of the whole basin. I can assure you that as the work progresses, the percentage of funds for the basin which will be utilized directly in the Little River area itself will increase.

Now what does the future hold for additional construction work in the Little River watershed of southeast Missouri? Main ditches of the Little River system are to be improved. The Elk chute ditch and ditch No. 81, as well as ditch No. 9 are to be improved, and enlarged. The Elk chute levees are to be completed. At the headwaters of the Little River, the Castor River is to be cleared and ditch No. 24 is to be improved. On the main stem of the St. Francis, additional levees are to be built in Dunklin and Stoddard Counties.

In broader terms, the St. Francis Basin project as now authorized will cost \$86,700,000. To June 30, 1959, project costs amounted to \$30,531,000, and we expect costs this fiscal year to exceed another \$4,900,000. During the year beginning July 1, 1960, expenditures are expected to exceed \$5,900,000.

Upon completion of authorized works, annual benefits returned by the St. Francis Basin project in its entirety will result in a benefit-cost ratio of more than 2 to 1.

Additional works recommended in a current review report would increase the estimated total cost of the St. Francis Basin project to about \$112,871,000.

In summary, I have pointed out that the people of southeast Missouri working in partnership with the Corps of Engineers and through their local levee and drainage districts have freed their extremely fertile and productive lands from the devastating floods of the Mississippi River. They are now in process of providing additional relief to this area from the less devastating but still costly flooding caused by local rainfall. Construction works associated with that relief are proceeding in an orderly fashion and, by con-

trast with past experience in construction of flood control and drainage works, at an extremely rapid rate. We in the Corps are very sensitive to the need for expediting relief for southeast Missouri from these floods.

The immediate focal point of construction activity is Big Lake. We have an economically feasible plan for this area. We are confident of its workability. Those of you who know me, will fully understand that I cannot recommend a plan which is uneconomical and will not consider one which will not provide the drainage and flood control you need.

Finally, the reports that an unfairly small portion of the total funds provided for the St. Francis Basin project is being spent in southeast Missouri is not fundamentally accurate. A definite part of every dollar spent on the St. Francis watershed below the Missouri-Arkansas line helps to benefit those who live in Missouri. Those dollars have unrolled major channel and flood control levees almost to the doorstep of southeast Missouri. The proportion of work to be done right in Missouri will rapidly increase. The work your Representatives in Congress have done to help us proceed at an increased rate should be deeply appreciated by all of you here.

1959 Crop Price-Support Commodity Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I have been including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information on loans made under the 1959 crop price support program by the Commodity Stabilization Service of the Department of Agriculture.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9303, to limit these loans to not more than \$50,000 to any one person in a year.

You will recall I stated that the \$50,000 limitation which I proposed is higher than desired. It should be reduced to \$25,000 or less, but from a practical standpoint the opposition to my limitation among the Democratic Members of Congress dictates the position of suggesting a \$50,000 limitation if one is hopeful to have such passed.

The following are the 1959 crop price support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000 by producer. This report covers commodities except wheat for the loanmaking period terminated on January 31, 1960; and the amounts shown represent loans made, without regard to whether the loans have been repaid or will be repaid before maturity. The loans for wheat were listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1960.

If the limitation as suggested in my bill were reduced to \$25,000, the Federal Government would not be required to make similar loans next year. These loans result in a loss to the taxpayer, because it is not required that the repayment be made in money, rather repayment can be made by commodity. This results in a loss of millions of dollars to the taxpayer.

The table referred to follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

1959-crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer

BARLEY (BUSHELS)

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
ARIZONA				CALIFORNIA—continued			
C. P. Gould	Tolleson, Ariz.	46,470	\$39,499.50	D and A Togninali	Stockton, Calif.	32,645	\$27,095.35
C. L. Stephens	Buckeye, Ariz.	37,096	31,531.60	Jackson & Reiert	Paso Robles, Calif.	31,460	26,741.00
H. Collier	Tempe, Ariz.	34,859	29,630.15	WASHINGTON			
CALIFORNIA				Virgil J. Feezell	Mabton, Wash.	30,793	26,790.13
C. T. Dearborn	Calipatria, Calif.	34,453	30,317.66				

BEANS, DRY EDIBLE (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

CALIFORNIA				MICHIGAN			
A. J. Glaw & Sons	Greenfield, Calif.	5,851	\$35,457.06	Mabel Graham	Breckenridge, Mich.	4,011	\$25,793.75
H. R. Johnson	Chualar, Calif.	5,847	35,191.82	WYOMING			
Harry E. Nichols, Jr.	Chico, Calif.	5,743	34,228.28	Harry Leonhardt, Jr.	Emblem, Wyo.	5,390	30,345.70

FLAXSEED (BUSHELS)

CALIFORNIA							
J. H. Benson	Brawley, Calif.	15,425	\$42,418.75				

GRAIN SORGHUM (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

ARIZONA				TEXAS—CON.			
Sulphur Springs Valley Farms, Inc.	Willcox, Ariz.	20,238	\$34,202.64	Browder Bros.	Sunray, Tex.	24,778	\$33,698.39
Dink Conner	do.	18,230	30,842.34	O. W. Machen	Banquete, Tex.	17,537	32,268.08
J. L. Kidd, Jr.	do.	15,916	26,898.80	Flake D. Thurman	Priona, Tex.	21,504	31,826.51
C. P. Gould	Tolleson, Ariz.	14,293	26,441.22	McEachern Bros.	Kress, Tex.	21,271	31,480.49
KANSAS				Geo. E. Bennett	Dimmitt, Tex.	21,032	31,127.36
Willis Christian	Ulysses, Kans.	20,211	28,901.03	L. S. T. Farms	Banquete, Tex.	16,732	30,786.50
Nelson Kilburn	Sterling, Kans.	19,492	27,678.64	Gordon Brown	Bishop, Tex.	16,467	30,298.78
C. H. Bunton	Moscow, Kans.	19,312	26,264.05	Cecil Rousser	Kress, Tex.	20,246	29,963.93
NEBRASKA				Readhimer Farms, Inc.	Bovina, Tex.	20,213	29,915.83
Roger Kreutz	Giltner, Nebr.	19,995	28,992.75	Verney Towns	Farwell, Tex.	20,065	29,696.50
NEW MEXICO				L. Dean Butler	Tulla, Tex.	20,000	29,600.00
Clarens and W. T. Meeks	Palmer, Tex.	20,309	30,057.25	W. H. Parker	Hart, Tex.	20,000	29,600.00
E. C. Murrell	Clovis, N. Mex.	18,470	27,335.01	Don Kimball	Wilderado, Tex.	19,979	29,568.92
E. E. Fahsholtz	Texico, N. Mex.	17,422	25,785.29	H. M. Rorick	Bushland, Tex.	22,000	29,490.00
TEXAS				H. G. Ritchie, Jr.	Taft, Tex.	15,651	28,797.03
O. A. and C. E. Webb	Lubbock, Tex.	32,309	47,817.62	H. N. Smith	Lockney, Tex.	19,449	28,784.08
John H. Goodwin	Sunray, Tex.	35,046	47,661.89	O. V. Wilson	Kress, Tex.	19,332	28,611.51
Sloan H. Osborn	Priona, Tex.	27,972	41,398.56	Pegues & Laird	Crystal City, Tex.	17,243	28,450.95
Meyer Bros.	Wildorado, Tex.	27,679	40,964.77	H. L. Marble	South Plains, Tex.	18,916	27,995.00
William E. Armstrong	Lubbock, Tex.	27,671	40,952.49	C. M. Phipps	Priona, Tex.	18,772	27,782.56
H. H. Moore	Navasota, Tex.	22,339	39,540.03	H. G. McKamey	Taft, Tex.	14,976	27,555.66
John A. Smith	Hereford, Tex.	26,694	39,607.71	Willis A. Hawkins, Sr.	Hart, Tex.	20,192	27,460.78
Bruce Parr	Priona, Tex.	26,665	39,464.20	Walter B. Little	Muleshoe, Tex.	18,490	27,365.13
Carl H. Kuper	Dalhart, Tex.	27,524	38,808.46	Herman Grusing	Amarillo, Tex.	19,300	27,212.44
A. R. Dillora	Hereford, Tex.	25,457	37,676.36	Buddy Jones & John Aldridge	Farwell, Tex.	18,355	27,165.40
J. E. & W. G. Laney	Hale Center, Tex.	25,221	37,327.67	R. B. Haydon	Hart, Tex.	18,260	27,024.80
R. L. Porter	Spearman, Tex.	26,000	37,180.00	Hugh Bowers	Bishop, Tex.	14,575	26,817.21
Albert and Maggie Kastner, Richard Maxwell, Joseph P. Johnson	Sinton, Tex.	20,121	37,022.64	P. P. Stubblefield	Kress, Tex.	18,071	26,744.78
J. H. Burkett	Sunray, Tex.	27,190	36,978.69	Walter Richter	Agua Dulce, Tex.	14,522	26,720.02
Ranza B. Boggess	Priona, Tex.	26,906	36,860.56	Leon Billingsley	Farwell, Tex.	18,053	26,718.14
H. H. Briggs	Muleshoe, Tex.	24,371	36,071.08	Buddy Jones	do.	17,970	26,595.60
J. W. Taylor Estate	South Plains, Tex.	23,780	35,194.99	D. E. McEachern	Kress, Tex.	17,910	26,506.80
Tom Moore	Navasota, Tex.	19,703	34,874.31	A. F. Spear	Alice, Tex.	14,394	26,485.73
Rodney Smith	Hart, Tex.	23,520	34,810.04	H. Joe Schwartz	Ropesville, Tex.	17,872	26,450.86
Harold Joe Wells	Priona, Tex.	23,104	34,193.92	J. O. Gilbreath	Dimmitt, Tex.	19,591	26,447.31
Leroy Copell	Hereford, Tex.	22,836	33,797.38	Ed Foreman	Lubbock, Tex.	17,716	26,219.68
Harvey Milner	Tulla, Tex.	22,819	33,772.43	Chester Minyen, C. M. Hicks	Hereford, Tex.	17,648	26,119.06
				Morgan Sturgess	Tulla, Tex.	18,371	25,902.83
				W. M. Sherley	Lazbuddie, Tex.	17,446	25,819.78
				Peyton Barrington	Hale Center, Tex.	17,420	25,781.01
				S. R. Bennett	Hart, Tex.	17,326	25,641.89
				J. T. Parr	Robstown, Tex.	13,809	25,408.20
				California Packing Corp.	Crystal City, Tex.	15,333	25,299.78
				M. K. Fisher	Hale Center, Tex.	17,045	25,226.75
				Billie Wayne Sisson & Hugo Kinkler	Littlefield, Tex.	17,000	25,160.00
				H. E. Frizzell	Lockney, Tex.	16,963	25,104.65

OATS (BUSHELS)

MISSISSIPPI							
Pantherburn Co.	Pantherburn, Miss.	53,663	\$31,661.17				

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—Continued

1959-crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer—Continued

RICE (HUNDREDWEIGHT)

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
ARKANSAS				MISSISSIPPI—continued			
George S. Rodgers, Jr. & George S. Rodgers, Sr.	Stuttgart, Ark.	9,215	\$48,197.46	A. R. Mann, Jr.	Skene, Miss.	7,029	\$34,326.36
Leo Wilson & Co.	Wilson, Ark.	9,716	45,351.86	Benoit Bros.	Benoit, Miss.	6,641	33,841.27
Chas. D. Brown	Hughes, Ark.	9,186	44,764.21	Cleveland, Miss.	Cleveland, Miss.	6,114	31,464.24
Charles J. Peacock, Jr.	McCrory, Ark.	9,887	44,145.22	Ruleville, Miss.	Ruleville, Miss.	6,065	30,085.30
Emmett C. Wampler & Son, T. W. Arnol, G. L. Morris.	do.	8,818	43,384.56	Shaw, Miss.	Shaw, Miss.	6,572	30,034.04
George Smith & R. C. Currie	Dewitt, Ark.	8,013	41,908.05	Ruleville, Miss.	Ruleville, Miss.	5,675	29,339.75
Louie Schisler	Weiner, Ark.	8,922	41,419.12	Merigold, Miss.	Merigold, Miss.	5,525	29,254.32
W. A. Baker, George Birmingham	Pine Bluff, Ark.	7,892	39,139.36	Shaw, Miss.	Shaw, Miss.	5,362	29,123.37
Harlow Sanders, George Guenther	do.	7,914	38,740.04	Cleveland, Miss.	Cleveland, Miss.	6,002	28,362.13
Moore Bros. Farms, Inc.	Walnut Ridge, Ark.	7,835	38,060.00	Banks, Miss.	Banks, Miss.	5,554	28,054.38
J. T. Carathers, Evelyn W. Thudium	Lake Village, Ark.	7,591	38,006.81			4,746	25,491.70
C. E. Norris, W. F. Hurley	Swifton, Ark.	8,576	37,449.68				
R. D. Wilman & Sons, Inc.	Diaz, Ark.	7,033	36,964.48				
Gibbs & Miller & Gibbs, Thomas G. Lyle.	Brinkley, Ark.	7,330	35,580.33				
Howarth E. Taylor	Hickory Ridge, Ark.	7,564	35,327.84				
Ben Dowson, W. F. Hurley	Amagoro, Ark.	6,987	33,555.06				
C. O. Wofford, Ervin Wright	Weiner, Ark.	6,248	32,308.02				
George R. Milleken	Stuttgart, Ark.	6,792	32,673.65				
F. K. Bradshaw, Jr. & F. K. Bradshaw, Sr.	Hamburg, Ark.	6,732	32,170.44				
Lovett Farms	Grady, Ark.	6,179	31,947.48				
David N. & James D. Ford	Sherrell, Ark.	5,758	31,734.82				
Howard Scroggins, Floyd Harbison	Hamburg, Ark.	6,459	31,618.28				
Elmer A. Ferguson	Dewitt, Ark.	6,421	31,272.37				
H. M. Davis, Lloyd Engelkes	Hamburg, Ark.	6,434	31,204.64				
F. F. Twist Plantation	Twist, Ark.	6,190	31,122.96				
Pinchcock Planting Co.	Grady, Ark.	6,399	31,076.61				
Abe Jones, W. F. Hurley	Newport, Ark.	6,841	30,753.85				
Ryland & Lovett, Henry E. Sparks	Grady, Ark.	6,171	30,693.19				
Harold Bynum	Dermott, Ark.	6,230	30,216.06				
J. R. Tanksley	Cash, Ark.	6,068	30,077.12				
Frank Hyneman	Truman, Ark.	6,151	29,632.17				
Sam Abowitz & Sons	Arkansas City, Ark.	5,933	28,975.91				
Chas. J. Peacock, Jr., V. H. Breckenridge, Jr.	McCrory, Ark.	5,571	28,799.54				
Wesson Farms, Inc.	Victoria, Ark.	6,032	28,772.64				
Austin F. Barr, Jr.	White Hall, Ark.	5,894	28,705.68				
Alice Sidney Farms	Jerome, Ark.	5,856	28,669.97				
George Smith, Wayne Fly	Dewitt, Ark.	5,647	28,622.24				
Collier & Son	Gillett, Ark.	5,240	28,327.26				
Goodart Bros.	Hickory Ridge, Ark.	5,647	26,985.11				
S. L. Simpson, Guy Beane	Jonesboro, Ark.	5,279	26,711.74				
V. W. Williams	Monroe, Ark.	4,597	26,634.01				
Don S. Caplinger	Harrisburg, Ark.	5,339	26,165.67				
L. W. Schlenker	Tichnor, Ark.	5,320	26,083.98				
David Knoll	Stuttgart, Ark.	5,025	25,977.39				
George Smith, Cecil Stephenson	Dewitt, Ark.	5,000	25,898.18				
R. A. Greer	Weldon, Ark.	4,773	25,842.78				
R. J. Bornhoft	Walden, Ark.	4,264	25,801.52				
J. Babbitt & O. Micklish	Jonesboro, Ark.	4,700	25,514.80				
CALIFORNIA				TEXAS			
Thomas Mezger	Woodland, Calif.	7,939	33,026.24	Roy Davis	Canada, Tex.	10,408	46,258.66
Gerald and Mildred Hahn	Williams, Calif.	7,073	31,545.58	Marsalia Bros., P. D. Gertson.	Eagle Lake, Tex.	9,901	45,445.59
Gray Bros.	Rio Linda, Calif.	7,048	31,434.08	N. J. Bollich	Winnie, Tex.	7,464	44,731.18
LOUISIANA				B. D. Fussell	Eagle Lake, Tex.	9,342	41,943.88
J. S. Morgan & Sons	Tallulah, La.	6,481	35,386.26	O. C. Devillier, Jr.	Winnie, Tex.	8,464	41,749.05

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—Continued

1959-crop price-support commodity loans under \$50,000 but more than \$25,000, by producer—Continued

SOYBEANS (BUSHELS)

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
ARKANSAS				IOWA			
Ray Bros.	Brinkley, Ark.	26,590	\$40,988.88	Middletown Mills	Burlington, Iowa	16,719	\$30,930.15
W. D. Thomas	Harrisburg, Ark.	25,798	46,952.36	MISSISSIPPI			
Ragland Plantation	Hughes, Ark.	25,579	46,553.78	C. P. Owen	Robinsonville, Miss.	20,625	36,817.62
Adolph Pirani	West Memphis, Ark.	22,856	41,369.36	M. S. Knowlton & Co.	Perthshire, Miss.	18,127	32,901.15
Waterloo Farms, Inc.	Wabash, Ark.	22,656	41,233.92	J. C. O'Neal	Cleveland, Miss.	16,071	29,179.88
White Oak Farms, Inc.	do.	22,656	41,232.92	W. L. Craig	Greenwood, Miss.	16,194	28,827.42
Tillar & Co., Jane Rogers Cockrill, Martha Rogers Mercer, A. Cockrill, Trustee for Rogers Trust.	Tillar, Ark.	21,893	39,788.29	Martha B. Lowe	Glendora, Miss.	14,014	25,505.48
Miller Lumber Co.	Marianna, Ark.	19,457	34,964.09	OHIO			
Richard C. Twist	Twist, Ark.	18,481	33,635.42	Chaswil Farms	Sabina, Ohio	13,924	25,480.92
Howe Lumber Co.	Wabash, Ark.	17,981	32,725.42	SOUTH CAROLINA			
R. H. White	Heth, Ark.	16,650	30,969.30	Kirkland & Best	Ulmer, S. C.	15,207	26,715.81
The Lake Plantation	Hughes, Ark.	15,922	28,978.04	TEXAS			
J. M. Leach & Son	Marion, Ark.	15,205	27,673.10	Thompson & Thompson	Plainview, Tex.	17,705	32,046.05
J. C. Ranier III	West Memphis, Ark.	14,530	26,444.60				
J. G. Adams & Sons	Hughes, Ark.	13,868	25,793.55				
Nickle Bros.	do.	13,717	25,513.30				
Willard C. Wilson	Harrisburg, Ark.	13,843	25,194.29				

A Summary and Legislative History of Area Redevelopment—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, before this session of Congress ends it is my hope and the hope of many of my colleagues that the House and the Senate will have agreed upon an adequate and effective bill to aid the many U.S. communities suffering from chronic and persistent unemployment.

It is also our hope—and this hope is shared by thousands of Americans living in these distressed areas—that President Eisenhower will not again see fit, as he did in 1958, to veto jobs for Americans who want to work but who, because they live in these areas of continuing depression, cannot find work.

The Area Redevelopment Act, sponsored as S. 722 by the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS in the Senate, was passed on March 23, 1959, by the Senate by a 49 to 46 rollcall vote.

This legislation was revised by the House Banking and Currency Committee and favorably reported on May 14, 1959. Since that time, more than 10 months ago, it has been awaiting action by the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues and with thousands of unemployed Americans throughout our Nation the fervent hope that the House will soon have an opportunity to act upon this proposal.

One of the groups which has led the fight for area redevelopment legislation is the Area Employment Expansion Committee, of 99 University Place, New York 3, N.Y.

Recently this organization prepared an excellent summary and legislative history of the fight for area redevelopment legislation. I should like to list the table of contents of this fine and comprehensive piece of research work:

- I. Introduction.
- II. History of Federal Action Respecting Distressed Areas.
- III. Legislative History Relating to Area Redevelopment Bills.
- IV. Legislation: Principles and Comparison of Bills.
- V. Need for Area Redevelopment Legislation.
- VI. Response to Opponents of Area Redevelopment.
- VII. Positive Features of Bill.
- VIII. Organizations Which Support the Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in the opportunity to bring this fine research to the attention of Members of Congress by joining with several of my colleagues to insert the entire text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I. INTRODUCTION

Proposals for area redevelopment legislation have been before the U.S. Congress for more than a decade. The basic principles have been endorsed by both parties in convention and by their leaders. Differences have involved the amounts of the assistance, the need for integrating rural and urban area redevelopment, the proposals for loans and grants for public facilities, the provision for subsistence grants for the unemployed who are being retrained and the administrative machinery for carrying out the program.

The needs of the chronic labor surplus areas are most urgent. Their problems become more intense and their solution more complicated the longer they persist. The human, social and capital waste is high. The cost is a tremendous burden upon our communities and State and Federal Governments.

It should be emphasized that in virtually every case these local communities have exerted the maximum effort of which they are capable toward their own economic rehabilitation. Residents of the stricken com-

munities have literally given 'til it hurts to raise money for industrial site preparation, plant construction and other services necessary to attract industry. The simple truth is that, in most cases, local financial resources have been exhausted.

So long as these communities remain unassisted in their efforts at redevelopment the Nation is neglecting its commitment under the Employment Act of 1946 to achieve maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

The American people have undertaken to finance economic redevelopment of the distressed and underdeveloped areas in foreign countries. It appears appropriate that we establish a similar program for our own people confronted with comparable problems. If a point 4 program is a good program for us to carry on overseas, it is doubly worthy for us to carry on at home.

II. HISTORY OF FEDERAL ACTION RESPECTING DISTRESSED AREAS

A. Urban areas.

The initial interest in the problem of distressed areas can be traced back to the recession of 1949. There have been persistent subsequent efforts to provide some assistance to these communities, but these steps have been largely temporary and inadequate.

1. The E area program (1949-50).

The executive branch of the Government ordered that aid be given to the E labor market (very substantial labor surplus) by channeling regularly budgeted Federal activities, primarily procurement and construction, to these areas. In all, 62 areas became eligible at one time or another but only 36 shared in the modest consideration. Some observers doubt that any substantial priorities were given these areas.

2. Defense manpower policy No. 4 (February 1952).

This policy was designed for labor surplus communities adversely affected by the cessation of military contracts. In the 85 months through March 1959, contracts amounting to only \$213 million were allocated to these areas by virtue of DMP No. 4.

3. Extra accelerated tax amortization (November 1953).

The program for rapid tax amortization for investments in facilities needed for the Nation's industrial mobilization base was further liberalized first for chronic and later for all substantial labor surplus areas. Through April 1959, only 71 facilities were

located in 38 areas, for an investment of \$318 million, providing jobs for approximately 16,625 workers. This program ceased functioning at the close of 1959.

4. Buy American Act.

American producers supplying goods substantially all of which are produced in areas of substantial unemployment may enjoy a price differential of either 12 or 20 percent depending upon the formula. No data are available on the benefits.

5. U.S. Employment Service.

Since 1949 this Service has helped a number of communities in their developmental activities by providing information on the local labor markets and labor supply but it has been limited by inadequate staff resources.

6. Office of Area Development (U.S. Department of Commerce).

This Office has provided technical pamphlets and statistical studies to all communities seeking help and information to attract new industries without regard to their employment experience.

7. Urban planning grants (HHFA).

Section 701 is designed to aid long-term planning by communities of less than 50,000 population and counties of less than 25,000 population suffering from major natural disasters or rapid urbanization following Federal installations. No special provision is made for distressed areas.

8. Urban renewal (HHFA).

This program aids communities to eliminate slums and blight in predominantly residential areas. No special provision is made for distressed areas.

9. Community facilities (HHFA).

(a) The program for public facility loans may be used by a community of less than 10,000 population for water and sewer systems if it has been denied credit by at least two lending institutions and submits evidence of an ability to repay. No special provisions are made for distressed communities.

(b) The program for interest-free advances for public works planning, which have gone primarily for sewage and water systems, is limited in amount. There is no special provision for distressed areas.

10. President Eisenhower in 1960 set up an interdepartmental committee "coordinate Federal urban area assistance" which is staffed by the Office of Area Development of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

B. Rural areas.

A rural redevelopment program was instituted in June 1955 to increase productivity of low-income farm people; increase prospects for employment in part-time and non-farm jobs by encouraging nonagricultural outlets in rural areas; increase opportunities for young people to secure training; and raise the social and economic standards in low-income rural areas. The primary responsibility is lodged with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Appropriations consisted of \$2,061,645 in fiscal 1957 distributed among the Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation, Agricultural Research Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, Farmers Home Administration, and some information and administrative offices.

In the fourth annual report covering the years 1958-59 the Secretary of Agriculture reported that some 200 counties in 30 States and Puerto Rico had been included in the rural development program areas.

In October 1959, the President formally constituted a committee for rural development programs, supplanting the earlier committee which had been operating informally.

Thus the need for rural redevelopment has long been recognized. The program estab-

lished by S. 722, described later in this document, insures that this recognized need will be adequately met.

A Summary and Legislative History of Area Redevelopment—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the text of an article prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee on the subject of area redevelopment legislation:

III. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY RELATING TO AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILLS

A. S. 281 introduced in 1949 sought to implement the Employment Act of 1946 and in title V provided specific aids to areas of serious unemployment. After certification such areas would be examined and measures for economic adjustment would be recommended for them. It provided for placement of Government contracts in these areas; RFC loans to private industry; an unemployment emergency reserve fund; retraining facilities; relocation funds; maintenance allowances for trainees.

B. In 1950 a similar measure was introduced, entitled H.R. 7444.

C. Republican candidate Eisenhower in his 1952 speech at Lawrence, Mass., promised to help hard-hit communities.

D. The March 1955 report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report urged that loans and technical assistance be extended to distressed areas. The committee declared that "we are very concerned with distressed conditions which persist in certain industries and regions, even in an expanding economy. We believe that action is required now and that much can be done through public works to assist these communities. The Federal Government should recognize its responsibility to those areas and industries by promoting research to discover new products and new processes. Consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the unemployment compensation programs to meet the special problems of retraining and readjusting facing these areas. Loans, technical assistance and, as the President recommends, an expanded area development program should be provided for these areas to help them to adapt to changed economic conditions." The Democratic members of the committee criticized the Economic Report of the President for identifying the problem as a local rather than as a national one. The committee itself declared that "we must recognize and deal with unemployment as a local as well as a National and State problem. The failure of the executive branch to show sufficient vigor in its approach to this problem disturbs us. It should have occupied a high place in the Economic Report." (Statement of supplemental views of Senators DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN and O'MAHONEY, Representatives PATMAN, BOLLING, MILLS and KELLY.)

E. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS introduced the Distressed Areas Act (S. 2663) in July 1955 to provide assistance for distressed areas.

F. The Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report recommended in January 1956 that "there be established in the ex-

ecutive branch of the Federal Government a central group with the responsibility of preparing a coordinated comprehensive program aiding currently depressed industrial and rural areas."

G. The President's Economic Report for 1956 reversed its position of the prior year and concluded that the "fate of distressed communities is a matter of national as well as local concern," and recommended special legislation. The report further added that "although these (administrative) programs have proved helpful experience demonstrates that bolder measures are needed. To this end, a new area assistance program is recommended for aiding a community that experienced persistent and substantial unemployment."

H. Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, introduced the administration's bill (S. 2892) entitled "Area Assistance Act of 1956."

I. The Senate in the 84th Congress, 2d session, passed a revised Douglas bill. It was reported out by the House Banking and Currency Committee but it died in the House Rules Committee.

J. Both major parties in their 1956 platforms called for Federal legislation to aid economically distressed areas.

K. In the 85th Congress, Senator DOUGLAS and cosponsors introduced a slightly revised version of the bill considered in the preceding Congress (S. 1433) which was followed by another administration bill (S. 9641). Hearings were held in the first session. A clean bill (S. 3684) was reported out in the second session by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill passed the House with some slight amendments and was finally sent to the President at the end of the session. The President pocket vetoed the bill on September 6, 1958.

L. In the 86th Congress, Senator DOUGLAS introduced a similar bill (S. 722) which was followed by the administration bill called "Area Assistance Act of 1959" (S. 1064). After some modifications, S. 722 was passed by the Senate. The House Banking and Currency Committee revised the Senate bill and asked for a rule from the House Rules Committee. The report of the House Banking and Currency Committee was filed May 14, 1959 and is House Report No. 360.

M. The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems conducted a series of hearings on unemployment in many major centers at the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960. These hearings brought to light the plight of the distressed areas. The recommendations of this special committee can be obtained by contacting the committee in Room 357 of the Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

N. The Joint Economic Committee conducted an extended series of hearings on "Employment Growth and Price Levels" during 1959. Both the staff and committee reports urged action on distressed areas.

1. The staff report declared that "Federal leadership is needed to assist the recovery of a number of chronically distressed areas. Both technical and local-term financial aid will probably be required. Assistance programs should be of sufficient scope to justify the expectation that the areas will become self-sustaining within a reasonable period. While some nonrecoverable costs may be incurred by the Federal Government in this effort, a well-planned program for reviving the chronically depressed areas should result in a net economic and social gain to the country" (Staff Report, p. xlix).

2. The Joint Economic Committee in its report concluded that "a program of assistance to chronically depressed areas should be started. Both technical and long-term financial aid will be required to help these areas to become self-sustaining and to help themselves. Where necessary, retrain-

ing of workers should be undertaken, particularly where the long-term outlook for an area is poor" (Senate Rept. No. 1043, p. 54).

O. The 1960 Economic Report of the President declared:

"Legislation is needed, however, to supplement and strengthen these efforts to help areas of persistent unemployment create new job opportunities. Such legislation should stimulate and complement efforts of communities to help themselves, should promote maximum participation by private financial institutions and by State and local agencies, should encourage the creation of new job opportunities rather than the mere transference of jobs from one area of the country to another, and should encompass technical aid for the economic diversification of rural low-income areas and single-industry communities."

A Summary and Legislative History of Area Redevelopment—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the text of an article prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee on the subject of area redevelopment legislation:

IV. LEGISLATION: PRINCIPLES AND COMPARISON OF BILLS

A. Principles.

1. To meet the needs of these distressed areas, redevelopment legislation is required. Similar legislation has been adopted for humans in the form of physical rehabilitation and retraining. Physical slums in cities are being redeveloped under the urban renewal programs. The present proposal relates to the need of redevelopment of entire economic areas.

2. The legislation must provide a program broad enough in scope and in the techniques it provides so that it can be of assistance to the variety of communities which have been affected.

B. Comparison of area redevelopment bills.

Provision	S. 722 adopted by Senate	S. 722 House revision	Administration bill
1. Title.....	Area Redevelopment Act (sec. 1)	Same as Senate bill.....	Area Assistance Act of 1959 (sec. 1).
2. Purpose.....	Declaration of purpose (sec. 2)	do.....	Declaration of purpose.
3. Administration of program.....	Independent agency "Area Redevelopment Administration." Administrator appointed by President and confirmed by Senate.	do.....	Commerce Department with Administrator equivalent to Assistant Secretary (sec. 110; sec. 101).
4. Advisory Board.....	1. Cabinet level Advisory Board. 2. 25-man National Public Advisory Committee from all walks of life. 3. Ad hoc industry (including agriculture) conferences (sec. 4).	do.....	Cabinet level Advisory Board (sec. 112).
5. Criteria for area eligibility.....	1. Industrial areas. Shall designate as redevelopment areas those determined by Administrator to have substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. Designation for labor market areas where the nontemporary unemployment meets 3 conditions: (a) Rate is currently 6 percent, and (b) Rate has averaged at least 6 percent: (1) For 3 out of preceding 4 years and has been 50 percent or more above the national average, or (2) For 2 out of preceding 3 years and has been 75 percent or more above the national average, or (3) For 1 out of preceding 2 years and has been 100 percent or more above national average, and 2. Rural areas: Areas with largest number and percentage of low-income families, and substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment would be designated, and use percentage of residents receiving public assistance.	1. Industrial areas. Designation discretionary for any area with substantial and persistent unemployment over extended period of time. Designation mandatory for any area with following unemployment levels: (a) 12 percent for 1 year. (b) 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding. (c) 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding. (d) 15 percent for 6 months if unemployment is not temporary in nature. 2. Rural areas: Areas with largest number and percentage of low-income families and substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment, and use percentage of residents receiving public assistance. Designation mandatory for any county: (1) Which is among the 500 counties of the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or (2) Which is among the 500 counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than \$2,500 worth of products for sale annually.	1. Industrial areas: Designation discretionary for labor market areas where the nontemporary unemployment meets 3 conditions: (a) Rate is currently 6 percent, and (b) Rate has averaged at least 6 percent: (1) For 4 out of preceding 5 years and has been 50 percent or more above national average, or (2) For 3 out of preceding 4 years and has been 75 percent or more above national average, or (3) For 2 out of preceding 3 years and has been 100 percent or more above national average, and (c) Nonagricultural employment has declined, or has increased less than in the country as a whole, during preceding 5 years. No area shall be excluded by this requirement if unemployment in area for 3 out of last 4 years exceeds 8 percent (sec. 102).
6. Loans for private projects:			
(a) Revolving fund or funds total.....	\$100,000,000 for industrial areas, \$100,000,000 for rural areas.	\$75,000,000 for industrial areas, \$75,000,000 for rural areas.	\$50,000,000 for industrial areas.
(b) Maximum Federal participation.....	65 percent (subordinate to other loans)	Same as Senate bill.....	35 percent (may be subordinate to other loans).
(c) Minimum State or participation.....	10 percent.....	do.....	15 percent (subordinate to Federal claim).
(d) Minimum private participation.....	5 percent.....	do.....	None.
(e) Maximum period.....	40 years (50, if extended)	do.....	25 years (35, if extended).
(f) Purpose of loans.....	Purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial usage, construction and improvement of plants.	do.....	Same, except cannot be used for machinery or equipment.
(g) Interest rate.....	Rate paid Treasury plus $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent (34 percent to be allocated to sinking fund against losses).	do.....	Rate paid Treasury plus factor to be fixed by Secretary to cover administrative expenses and reserve.
(h) Application approved by.....	Agency of State or political subdivision concerned with economic development (34 local committee in the absence of such agency), and finding by State or agency of consistency with area economic development program approved by Administrator (sec. 6).	do.....	State or agency thereof concerned with economic development, and finding that program is consistent with overall program approved by the Secretary (sec. 107).
7. Loans for public facilities:			
(a) Revolving fund.....	\$100,000,000	\$50,000,000	None. Gives priorities for existing community facilities program to eligible areas.
(b) Maximum Federal participation.....	65 percent (subordinate to other loans)	Same as Senate bill.....	
(c) Minimum State and local participation.....	10 percent.....	do.....	
(d) Maximum period of loan.....	40 years	do.....	
(e) Interest rate.....	Rate paid Treasury, plus $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent (sec. 7).	Not greater than average annual interest rates on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States plus $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent.	
8. Grants for public facilities.....	\$75,000,000 authorization for appropriation (sec. 8).	\$35,000,000 authorization for appropriation.	None.

Provision	S. 722 adopted by Senate	S. 722 House revision	Administration bill
9. Funds for loans:			
(a) Amount	\$300,000,000	\$200,000,000	\$50,000,000
(b) Source	Borrowed from Treasury	Appropriated	Appropriated
(c) Interest rate paid Treasury	Not greater than current average yields on outstanding marketable U.S. obligations of comparable maturities at end of preceding month (sec. 9).	Not applicable	Annual payments based on current average market yields of outstanding marketable U.S. obligations of comparable maturities (sec. 108).
10. Information	Information to be supplied to designated areas and to Government procurement divisions (sec. 10).	Same as Senate bill	Generally comparable provision for advice and consultation with designated areas (sec. 101(c)(1)).
11. Technical assistance grants	\$4,500,000 per year authorization for appropriation (sec. 11).	do	\$1,500,000 per year for designated areas, and \$1,500,000 per year for towns predominantly dependent on 1 industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas (sec. 106).
12. Powers	General corporate and administrative powers (sec. 12).	do	Comparable corporate and administrative powers (secs. 111, 116).
13. Termination of eligibility	Provision for termination of designation as redevelopment area (sec. 13).	do	No specific provision.
14. Urban renewal	1. On request of Commissioner, Housing and Home Finance Agency may give financial assistance to municipalities in industrial redevelopment areas without regard to residential requirement. 2. Grants must be within 10-percent limit provided by sec. 110(c) for projects under sec. 110 (sec. 14).	do	On request by Secretary, Housing and Home Finance Agency may give financial assistance to municipalities in designated areas without regard to residential requirement (sec. 103).
15. Urban planning grants	Authorized planning grants to designated areas having population of 25,000 or more (sec. 15).	Grants must be made within 10-percent limit of total capital grants under table I after January 1959.	Same (sec. 105).
16. Vocational training	Increased Federal assistance for vocational training authorized; to be furnished through State vocational education agency where it can provide the facilities and services needed (otherwise, through public or private institutions), except authorization clearly limited to training needed for new jobs in area (sec. 16).	Same as Senate bill	Substantially same, except assistance must go through State vocational education agency (sec. 102).
17. Retraining subsistence payments	Subsistence payments to unemployed being retained and not entitled to unemployment compensation. \$10,000,000 authorization for program (sec. 17).	do	No.
18. Penalties for fraud	Yes (sec. 18)	do	Yes (sec. 114).
19. Restrictions on expeditors and employees	Yes (sec. 19)	Yes	No.
20. Davis-Bacon Act	Yes (sec. 20)	do	Do.
21. Annual report	Yes (sec. 21)	do	Yes (sec. 117).
22. Authorization for appropriations	Yes (sec. 22)	do	Yes (sec. 118).
23. Use of other facilities	Yes (sec. 23)	do	Yes (sec. 115).
24. Records and audit	No	No	No.
25. Federal procurement	do	do	Do.
26. Corporate budget and audit	do	do	Yes (sec. 109).
27. Federal Reserve banks as depositories and agents	do	do	Yes (sec. 113).
28. Public utilities	Restriction on loans or grants to municipality for utility competing with private utility.	Same as Senate bill	

C. Benefits under House bill for redevelopment areas.

	Millions
Technical assistance (annual appropriation)	\$4.5
Public facilities appropriations:	
Grants	35.0
Loans (revolving fund)	50.0
Industrial loans appropriations:	
Rural areas (revolving fund)	75.0
Urban areas (revolving fund)	75.0
Vocational training grants (annual appropriations)	1.5
Retraining subsistence payments	10.0

(As noted, the public facilities and industrial loan appropriations are almost entirely repayable with interest to the Treasury.)

A Summary and Legislative History of Area Redevelopment—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the text

of an article prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee on the subject of area redevelopment legislation:

V. NEED FOR AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

A. Urban Areas.

1. Unemployment persistently concentrated in chronically distressed areas in good and bad times.

(a) Unemployment persists in chronically distressed areas.

(1) The number of labor markets with substantial labor surpluses (6 percent or more unemployment) fluctuates with the rise and fall in business activity but distressed areas continue with substantial labor surpluses.

Areas of substantial labor surplus (unemployment of 6 percent or more of the labor force)

	January	March	May	July	September	November
1960:						
Major	31					
Smaller	107					
1959:						
Major	76	74	60	46	35	32
Smaller	183	197	177	143	124	112
1958:						
Major	145	170	185	189	189	183
Smaller	72	121	161	182	195	189
1957:						
Major	19	19	21	24	124	124
Smaller	59	59	59	61	62	62

Areas of substantial labor surplus (unemployment of 6 percent or more of the labor force)—Continued

	January	March	May	July	September	November
1956:						
Major	19	19	23	23	24	20
Smaller	64	65	65	60	59	57
1955:						
Major	144	143	35	31	26	19
Smaller	100	113	106	101	94	74
1954:						
Major	120	134	144	153	151	148
Smaller	81	46	73	88	94	97
1953:						
Major	18	17	16	16	18	18
Smaller	19	18	18	23	24	24
1952:						
Major	18	21	23	21	19	18
Smaller	5	14	27	30	26	22
1951:						
Major					14	15
Smaller					5	5

¹ Recession months between start of decline and return to prerecession levels of industrial production.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

(2) The chronically distressed communities (with 6 percent or more unemployment for at least 18 months out of the last 24 months) persist. Even in periods of general prosperity they have substantial labor surpluses. Chronic unemployment is only slightly relieved even when unemployment is low in the Nation as a whole.

The number of chronically distressed labor markets has continued to rise. The recent recession created a new group of chronically

distressed labor markets, because of dislocations in the automobile and aircraft industries.

Labor markets	1957, August	1958		1959		
		January	July	January	May	November
Areas with substantial labor surplus (total).....	89	117	250	259	246	177
Major areas.....	24	45	89	76	57	31
Small and very small.....	65	72	161	183	189	146
Chronically distressed labor markets (total).....	65	70	75	119	179	172
Major areas.....	12	18	21	22	32	29
Small and very small.....	53	52	54	97	147	143
Chronically distressed labor markets as a percentage of all labor markets with substantial labor surplus.....	73	60	30	43	73	97

¹ Exclusive of Alaska labor markets.

Source: Area Employment Expansion Committee. These data include more smaller communities than are listed by U.S. Department of Labor.

(b) Unemployment unduly concentrated in chronically distressed labor markets.

The rate of unemployment continues to be unduly high in the distressed labor markets. In November 1959 the total unemployed in the 172 distressed labor markets (exclusive of the 5 in Alaska) numbered 923,000. Though these areas had 13.7 percent of the civilian labor force, they included 25.1 percent of the unemployed. The rate of unemployment in these areas was 9.8 percent as compared with a national rate of 5.3 percent.

Unemployment in the United States and in distressed areas, 1959

	January	May	November
United States:			
Civilian labor force (thousands).....	67,430	69,405	69,310
Unemployment (thousands).....	4,724	3,389	3,670
Percent unemployed.....	7.0	4.9	5.3
Distressed areas:			
Number.....	119	179	172
Civilian labor force (thousands).....	7,552	10,079	9,465
Unemployment (thousands).....	812	1,091	923
Percent unemployed.....	9.3	10.8	9.8
Civilian labor force as percent of United States.....	12.9	14.5	13.7
Unemployment as percent of United States.....	17.2	32.2	25.1

(c) Chronically distressed labor markets suffer from substantial labor surpluses for long periods.

The principal characteristic of unemployment in the chronically distressed communities is that the substantial labor surplus continues to fester for long periods of time. Recovery is not quick. Even the labor market which is later graduated out of the distressed condition takes many years for significant improvements to occur. In some areas the relief has come from the outmigration of people and the reinvigoration of existing rather than new enterprises. But where these alternatives are not easily available the recovery is particularly slow in coming. It has taken some communities a decade or two of the most aggressive local action to effect a measurable reduction in unemployment. The reason basically is that the community may have failed to redevelop itself properly to provide the base for a new industry.

Evidence of the length of the time of the persisting substantial labor surplus is provided by the following table, which enumerates the time of the start of the most re-

cent period of continuous substantial labor surplus.

Date of start of last period of substantial surplus	Total	Distressed labor markets		Number with prior period of substantial labor surplus
		Major	Smaller	
1951.....	1	1	0	0
1952.....	18	6	12	0
1953.....	8	1	17	0
1954.....	10	1	9	1
1955.....	11	0	11	1
1956.....	17	1	16	5
1957.....	75	15	60	30
1958 (October or before).....	26	7	19	8
Total.....	166	32	144	45

Some labor markets with more recent starting dates for their chronic distress had suffered prior periods of substantial labor surpluses. The revival was short lived and these communities fell back again into the category of chronically distressed.

(d) Few chronically distressed communities graduate out of classification.

The vague hope that many communities will be able to graduate out of the chronically distressful conditions is not justified by experience. On the contrary, the best available data appears to confirm the conclusion that only a small group of distressed labor markets have lifted themselves to a better status.

Of the total of 116 labor markets which between July 1953 and March 1958 became chronically distressed, only 41 were not so classified in March 1958. Of the remaining 75 labor markets, 64 were continuously distressed from the time their economic difficulties began and they continued unrelieved in this condition of substantial labor surplus. The remaining 11 experienced a temporary period of economic revival.

The 41 labor markets which were not classified as chronically distressed in March 1958 included 19 which had a substantial labor surplus in January or March 1958.

Labor markets chronically distressed, July 1953-March 1958:

1. Total chronically distressed labor markets, 112.

2. Number of labor markets suffering continuous distress from time of origin, 64.

3. Markets which experienced partial revival but chronically distressed as of March 1958, 11.

(a) Chronically distressed in prior period of labor surplus, four.

(b) substantial labor surplus but not chronically distressed in prior period of labor surplus, seven.

4. Labor markets formerly distressed markets but not so classified in March 1958, 41.

(a) Areas with a substantial labor surplus in January or March 1958, 19.

(b) Areas not classified as having substantial labor surplus as of March 1958, 22.

(c) Structural unemployment core of unemployment problem in good times.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor Charles D. Stewart declared recently that "one-third of the unemployed in periods we usually regard as one of full employment fall in this (structural unemployment) category."

2. Chronic unemployment in distressed areas is caused by longrun economic changes.

A. Types of economic changes causing chronic unemployment.

1. Industries have declined because new products or services have captured the markets.

(a) Oil has challenged both anthracite and bituminous coal and has preempted many significant markets.

(b) Diesel power has supplanted steam-power on the railroads with far-reaching effects, seen in the reduction of the number of repair stations and in the amount of railroad equipment built by the railroads and other service industries.

(c) The railroads have lost out to trucks, passenger cars, and airplanes so that number of spur lines has been reduced and the volume of passenger traffic dropped. Employment has decreased.

(d) Synthetic fibers have made tremendous inroads on silk and wool. The former has been practically eliminated except for specialized restricted uses.

(e) The change in the types of refrigerators has resulted in the closing of a number of older plants.

2. Regional migration has denuded older areas of plants.

(a) The migration has been particularly marked in the soft goods industries. Where there has not been any significant migration, the relative rates of growth in various areas has differed strikingly.

In the textile industry, many mills moved South during the twenties. While the number of such shifts has since been small, the rate of attrition has been high in the North, whereas mill closings in the South have been the exception until recently.

(b) The apparel industry has been subject to violent shifts in location since the beginning of the century. The movement out of the large cities to new markets has been frequently recorded. Recently the so-called newer markets and areas have been losing plants to southern locations.

(c) The electronics parts industry, originally located in the large cities, has been standardized so that production units could be moved to outside lower wage areas. Such migration has taken place at an impressive rate during the last decade.

(d) The automobile industry has been highly decentralized as assembly and parts plants have been placed nearer the consumer markets. As growth of the industry has been halted, the older areas have witnessed many plant closings.

3. Some industrial changes result in plant closings.

(a) The amount of subcontracting by the automobile industry resulted in the shutdown of many parts plants.

4. Changing military requirements have left many communities stranded.

(a) Military installations have been closed as the size of the Armed Forces has been reduced.

(b) The substitution of missiles for armed aircraft has had many significant effects.

It has resulted in a severe reduction in the aircraft industry. Some plants have been converted to electronics and become part of the missile industry. The full impact has not yet been felt as increased civilian demands for jet planes has helped fill part of the gap.

The new military defenses require less warehousing and storage facilities, resulting in the closing of depots.

5. Automation and increased mechanization and efficiency have resulted in lower labor demands.

(a) Man-hour productivity is constantly rising. This is effected through mechanization, automation, better management, better materials and standardization of processes. Almost every industry is affected.

(b) Industries in which output is not rising or is declining and yet are experiencing considerable advances in gross productivity are necessarily reducing manpower needs; as witness the textile industry.

(c) New processes may render older plants obsolete and demand a change in the location of the operation as exemplified by the meat packing industry.

(d) Automation will reduce the needs for warehouses, branch offices and shipping facilities.

6. Import competition is accelerating the decline or forcing the shrinkage of some industries.

(a) Imports have captured the markets for some industries such as leather and knit gloves, watches and clocks, flatware, tubular brass plumbing, rope, chinaware. As a result they have caused plant closings in these industries.

(b) Raw material industries have found that lower foreign prices make them non-competitive and some mines have been affected by this competition. These include flourspar, lead, zinc, antimony, copper and iron ore industries.

7. Depletion of natural resources.

(a) Lumber and other raw material product industries have in some areas been affected by sheer exhaustion.

B. Scientific, technical, product, and economic changes will continue.

1. America's investment in scientific research and development is rising. In 1957 it had increased to \$10 billion of which about three-quarters was done by private firms. This research is constantly stimulating new products, new industries, and new consumer demands, rendering older ones obsolete.

2. The rate of man-hour productivity is rising. The National Bureau of Economic Research has declared that "the long-term pace of advance in output per man-hour has been speeded up." The average annual output per man-hour increased, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 4 percent in 1909-19 and 2.9 percent in 1939-58. The rate for 1947-58 was 3.1 percent.

3. The rate of increase in productivity in many industries is even higher than the national average: candy, 19.8 percent; cigars, 18.1 percent; copper, 10.7 percent; iron ore, 9.4 percent; flour, 7.5 percent; synthetic fabrics, 15.2 percent; bituminous coal, 6.8 percent; railroads, 6.2 percent.

4. Dr. Arthur Burns has concluded that "the life histories of industries are becoming shorter . . . (the) increased birth rate of new products means an increase in death rate of old products and a decline in the average life span of individual industries."

5. The continuance of these changes spells the obsolescence of different parts of our economy and the displacement of workers. Where one or another industry provides a substantial part of the employment, the industry when declining will cause a labor surplus. If the community is itself not immediately ready to fit into the newer industrial and economic trends, it will suffer from long-term chronic unemployment.

C. Industries primarily responsible for heavy unemployment in chronically distressed labor markets.

Area Employment Expansion Committee Fact Sheet 42-A lists the industries primarily responsible for heavy unemployment in chronically distressed labor markets and the specific areas affected.

A Summary and Legislative History of Area Redevelopment—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the text of an article prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee on the subject of area redevelopment legislation:

The industries listed in this fact sheet are: mining: Anthracite, bituminous, flourspar, iron ore, lead and zinc, copper, and antimony; quarrying: limestone; fishing and seafood processing; oil refining; tobacco; textiles; apparel; logging and lumber; shoes; leather; metal and products: fabricated, brass, clocks and watches, air conditioners, refrigerators, textile machinery, electrical equipment, other machinery and railroad equipment; automobiles; aircraft; ordnance; railroads and repair shops; stone, clay, glass, pottery; chemicals; Federal and military installations; shipbuilding; agriculture; construction; natural resources industries.

D. Cycles of major industries in difficulty. The distressed area problem has gained particular attention because of the tendency for adversity to hit a group of communities dependent upon the same major industry at relatively similar periods. The concentrated effect tends to highlight the problem.

In recent years, the contracting cycles have been associated with important American industries.

(1) The reverses in the anthracite and coal industry beginning in the thirties.

(2) The liquidation of northern textile mills in the twenties and fifties.

(3) The closing of railroad repair shops and contraction of railroad employment beginning in the thirties.

(4) The decentralization of the automobile industry during the fifties.

(5) The substitution of the missiles for manned aircraft in the fifties.

3. Communities in distressed and chronic condition of substantial labor surplus.

(a) The communities adversely affected by these economic trends are with few exceptions centers of advanced industrial development. Otherwise they would not have attracted high concentration of population and enterprises. Being urbanized communities they have not only the core industries upon which their development was founded but all of the service and auxiliary developments with which to supply the needs of the people. They are communities in which there are vast investments of private, commercial, and industrial capital.

(b) Most of the distressed communities are dependent upon one or two industries which have suffered reverses. In some there has been a concurrent drop in a number of interrelated industries as has occurred in

the communities dependent upon the automobile industry.

(c) There are among the distressed communities a large number of single industry communities.

There are many other similar communities in the United States. A study of the U.S. Census of Manufactures for 1954 indicates that of the 3,103 counties, there were 1,986 or 64 percent in which the largest 2 companies accounted for 50 percent or more of the manufacturing activity in these counties. The proportion in the counties with less than 1,000 manufacturing employees was 70 percent indicating the high dependence upon two employers.

(d) No community is safe from the above reverses. It is clear that the high dependence on a limited number of industries increases the chances of reverses, but complete diversification is not feasible or economically sound. It is better to deal with the problem in realistic terms of establishing provisions for handling the reverses when they come. There can be no insurance policy against adversities.

4. Migration from distressed areas is no general solution.

(a) It is often quite casually suggested that the solution for the distressed areas is the outmigration of the people to other communities. This well-meant suggestion ignores the difficulties standing in the way of this solution.

(b) Some people do move out of the distressed areas. As a matter of fact there are considerable disadvantages in such outmigration. First, it deprives the community of many younger aggressive and ambitious persons. Second, these people tend to return as they face reverses in the newer communities aggravating the lot of the distressed community at a time when it is least able to face the problem.

(c) There is a large volume of migration taking place in the United States which already taxes our national facilities and skill. There is a movement from rural to urban and from urban to suburban areas and other purely personal shifts. People move for various reasons including the desire for advancement, preferred jobs in terms of wages, benefits and prospects.

Surveys on migration already indicate that each year, 7 percent of the population changes its place of residence across county lines and 3 percent across State lines.

A study of unemployment shows that 10 percent of unemployment is accounted for by voluntary shifts, 20 percent by seasonal factors, 20 percent by new job seekers, 30 percent by structural changes and 20 percent by the mobility of people for personal reasons.

A study of population changes from 1940 to 1950 indicates that 1,051 counties lost population, 1,535 had a stable population and 430 showed a fast rate of growth in population.

(d) The people who are not readily moving are reluctant to move because of the difficulties it would entail either to them personally, their investments or both.

People don't want to move because of their strong attachments, social ties, home ownership, possible losses from the sale of houses, advanced age, fear of distant parts, dependents, fear of adjustment, and differences in ethnic backgrounds. Housing problems may be encountered. Moreover jobs in the new community are tentative and uncertain.

Businessmen and people with investments cannot move easily since their livelihood is often completely tied up with a specific locality.

(e) There are no real shortage areas in the United States. In January 1960 there were no major labor markets classified in group A. The occupational shortages relate to skilled professional and clerical jobs.

(f) The cost of migration is sufficiently high as to discourage workers.

Migration can be of help to individuals, and may assist individual communities where redevelopment will not be adequate to absorb the total displaced, but it is not the answer to the problem of chronic unemployment.

5. Local efforts for redevelopment are insufficient.

(a) Most of the recovery experienced in distressed areas has been due to expansion and revitalization of existing industry or outmigration or commutation, often at very high cost to the individual and community.

(b) The three presently available approaches to redevelopment are inadequate.

(1) "Realtor Approach." This is a common one which seeks to find an employing tenant for existing vacant space.

(a) This approach is inadequate because it relies on existing space which is obsolete and attracts tenants who want low-price floor space. These may not be energetic and expanding companies.

(b) If the tenant is successful, he will want to expand and find modern space. Otherwise, he is likely to close up.

(2) "Diversification Approach." This has been endorsed by the U.S. Department of Commerce and many developers. The purpose is to bring in new industries. This approach may not be economic since there may not be a justifiable base for diversification. Economic advantage may not support it. Diversification is no guarantee against chronic unemployment.

(3) "New Commercial and Industrial Structures." This approach seeks to build a new plant and to secure a tenant for it.

(a) This approach may net a tenant but there is no assurance that it will be sufficient to stop the decline in employment or that the new plant will become the nucleus for new economic growth. Many communities with new plants find that they have no multiplier effect.

(b) Local communities and state groups may exhaust their financial resources to build plants.

(c) Local programs often falter and fail. The reasons for these failings are:

(1) They may lack sufficient funds for the project as resources are drained by their local recession and as tax capacity dwindles. The longer the distress, the more limited are the resources.

(2) They become discouraged at the meagerness of the results.

(3) Local vested groups often resist expansion and the appropriation of funds to pay for it.

(4) The people may become resigned to the patterns of unemployment and underemployment.

(5) Local leadership is often lacking after the major industry leaves.

6. Neglect of distressed urban communities conflicts with Employment Act of 1946.

(a) The act prescribes "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." The tolerance of chronic unemployment defeats this end. Economic growth depends upon the optimum use of our resources.

(1) The neglect of distressed communities means the deterioration of manpower, entrepreneurial skills and experience; public and social capital; private commercial, personal, and industrial capital.

(2) The development of new communities demands costly investments in new facilities which duplicate existing ones. We already have a tremendous backlog resulting from the unfinished development of our suburbs. The completion of these communities should have a high priority on our capital investment.

(3) Many new or rapidly growing communities already have difficulty in absorbing new population. The cost of facilities is very high.

(4) The conservation and renewal of existing communities through redevelopment is cheaper and wiser, since much of it involves renewal rather than clearance for redevelopment.

(b) Neglect of unemployment areas is costly.

(1) Large scale unemployment means high costs of poverty in the form of costs of relief, unemployment high rate of dependence, slums, social evils, and other problems.

(2) Chronic distress means business bankruptcies.

(3) Disuse brings deterioration of public and private capital.

(4) Low income means deterioration of public services for raising young (low standards of education, hospitals, welfare facilities.) This places a burden on the nation as a whole.

(5) Unemployment spreads pessimism and disaffection.

(6) Unemployment depresses wage scales generally.

B. Rural areas.

1. Rural unemployment, underemployment, and low income widely known.

There is little dispute about the prevalence of rural poverty and underemployment. Studies by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and the Department of Agriculture highlight these facts.

One of every three commercial farms in this country had in 1954 gross sales below \$2,500. One quarter of the farm families had an annual income of \$1,000 or less.

The greater preponderance of the counties in which unemployment is chronic and in which low standards of living prevail is in the Southern States, particularly Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Additional low-income counties are to be found in Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, and New Mexico.

2. Characteristics of rural distressed areas.

a. These are communities in which population increases have outrun local resources.

b. Population has increased faster than outmigration.

c. Nonfarm jobs tend to be limited.

d. Farms are small and underdeveloped with low capital investment.

3. Rural redevelopment program is inadequate.

The present program sponsored by the Department of Agriculture is inadequate. It rests primarily upon voluntary cooperation and little or no funds are provided the areas. In the period from 1958-59, the budget provided \$15 million for the Farmers Home Administration for additional local authorizations in the pilot counties or about \$150,000 per county and \$2.6 million for the special services and research activities by public agricultural agencies assisting the program. No funds have been provided for industrial development.

4. Local resources are not sufficient to remove rural poverty.

The National Planning Association declared that "to place exclusive emphasis on private initiative and local initiative is unrealistic and self-defeating. If a century and a half of dependence on local initiative has failed to eliminate America's low-income rural regions, it seems futile to depend only upon such initiative to solve the same rural poverty problems still before us."

5. Rural redevelopment requires outside capital and experience.

VI. RESPONSE TO OPPONENTS

A. Program is not expensive.

Of the total of \$249.5 million provided in benefits, \$200 million is in the form of loans to be repaid to the Treasury with interest. Only \$6 million is called for in annual appropriations; \$45 million is to be a one-time appropriation.

With the reduction of unemployment, various costs will be cut and tax revenues will be raised.

By reducing unemployment in these distressed areas to the national average, the savings on unemployment insurance would more than offset the total cost.

The additional savings in relief, both public and private, will raise the total to more than offset the cost.

B. Bill prohibits pirating of industry.

The bill expressly states that assistance would not be granted "to develop new employment opportunities" which substantially reduce employment in other areas of the United States.

C. Bill is not discriminatory.

The bill is designed to help communities suffering from chronic unemployment. They are a class of beneficiaries affected by structural unemployment. The treatment required by these communities must be different from those affected by a general business letdown.

If we undertake to help communities affected by a national recession, it appears equally proper to help communities which are affected by structural unemployment.

D. Bill upholds States rights.

The bill has been opposed on the grounds that it infringes upon States rights. The bill, however, provides that only applicants approved by an agency of the State or political subdivision in which the project is located may receive aid. Furthermore, the bill prohibits assistance if the project is inconsistent with State and local laws.

E. Bill is not an antirecession measure.

The bill has been opposed on the ground that it is an antirecession measure. This is not the case. The requirement for designation of "industrial redevelopment areas" is that "there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time." The period varies from 12 to 24 months, depending upon the degree of unemployment, except where the Administrator determines that the principal causes of such unemployment are not temporary in nature.

The purpose of the bill is to deal with the problems of structural unemployment; i.e., where the economy of an area has been weakened by fundamental deficiencies in its industrial structure. A recession may aggravate the problems of such areas but the passing of the recession cannot be expected to solve the basic economic weaknesses from which they are suffering. These will continue unless a fundamental reorientation of their economies is effected. It is toward this end that the bill is directed.

F. Bill encourages private initiative.

The bill has been attacked as socialistic. This is a "red herring" argument which has no validity. Socialism implies a centralization of economic power in the hands of the Government. The bill places the responsibility for initiating and formulating redevelopment plans on local groups approved by the State or its instrumentality. The bill is not a substitute for self-help; it is designed to make it possible for self-help to achieve genuine improvement in the area.

The role of the Federal Government under this program is limited to those functions which local resources are inadequate to handle. By furnishing technical and financial assistance, the Government will seek to make it possible for distressed communities to create a climate in which private enterprise can flourish. This is the very antithesis of socialism.

G. Bill does not obligate the United States by contract in advance of appropriation.

An informal opinion from the General Accounting Office on the question of whether or not the bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to obligate the United States by contract in advance of appropriations for retraining subsistence payments stated:

"There is reasonable basis for the view that the contractual authority is intended to be contingent upon the enactment of future appropriations. * * * Moreover, it could be argued that the contractual authority of section 16 * * * imposes on the United States obligations so indefinite and uncertain as to bring the contracts within the class of prohibited contracts. * * * Thus the Government would not be obligated in advance of appropriations.

H. Assistance to redevelopment areas is anti-inflationary.

Inflation occurs only when there is a competitive demand for scarce resources. The proposed program deals with areas where there are unused resources and manpower. Their employment does not involve already-utilized resources. Increased production will offset any inflationary pressures. Finally, if there are alternative claims, it is important that the highest priority be assigned to the redesign and redevelopment of these distressed areas for they are major economic cancers in our economy.

VII. POSITIVE FEATURES OF BILL

A. Not a "handout."

The bill has been described as a "handout." Actually, \$200 million of the \$251 million the bill calls for is in interest-bearing loans to be matched in part by State and local funds. An interest subsidy is not provided by the bill. Rather, industrial borrowers are required to pay a premium of one-half of 1 percent above the average interest rate paid by the Treasury on its borrowings.

B. Prevents use of Government resources to drive down wage rates and the standard of living.

The bill insures that wages paid on projects undertaken by public applicants under the bill shall not be less than those prevailing on the same type of work in the immediate locality and will include time and a half for work in excess of 40 hours. This prevents the use of Government resources to drive down wage rates.

C. Flexibility in eligibility requirements. The flexibility provided in the requirements for eligibility under the bill would be advantageous to communities suffering from prolonged unemployment relieved only by a seasonal pickup. For example, the lumber communities of Oregon have experienced prolonged unemployment. They would not be disqualified for assistance because of a seasonal respite in the summer.

D. Subsistences while retraining. Those persons who are undergoing retraining and have exhausted unemployment insurance or are not eligible for it, will receive subsistence payments. Such payments are necessary if the retraining program is to be effective. Proposed funds for this purpose are limited to \$10 million in 1 year.

E. Attract industry by having modern facilities available.

By having modern, efficient plant facilities readily available and calling them to the attention of potential users, the distressed areas will have greater success in attracting industry.

F. Program is based on principles of point 4 program.

The Administration and America have found fit to help underdeveloped, low-income, poverty-stricken and distressed foreign countries. We have spent billions of dollars to help Europe recover from its economic waste following the reverses of the Twenties and the devastation of World Wars I and II. There is no reason why we should not do as well by our own people.

VIII. ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORT THE LEGISLATION

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, Area Employment

Expansion Committee, National Farmers Union, the National Grange, American Municipal Association, Southern State Municipal Leagues and Cities, Conference of Mayors, Local Development Councils, Local Councils and Legislatures, National Planning Association.

He Wants To Go in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the Centerburg Gazette, one of the fine weekly newspapers in the congressional district it is my honor to represent, carried an editorial comment in its March 24, 1960, edition which points up one of the reasons why the conservation reserve, a new version of the soil bank, as proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the Farm Bureau Federation is unacceptable to farmers, businessmen, and consumer alike. I make this statement even though I believe there is merit in the conservation reserve idea, providing it is properly designed and programmed.

The Farm Bureau-Benson bill suggests amending the Soil Bank Act by taking some 60 million acres out of production over a 3-year period by authorizing payments in cash by the Government of \$400 million for 1961, \$465 million in 1962, and \$530 million in 1963. Many businessmen on Main Street and particularly those who deal in farm implements, fertilizer, seed, insecticides, gasoline, oil, and other goods and services required by farmers, are strenuously opposed to this proposed legislation because it permits the taking of entire farms out of production. Some have gone so far as to suggest that such a law would make "ghost towns" of many small cities in rural areas. It is also believed by those who have carefully studied the Farm Bureau-Benson's proposal would have little or no effect on the most serious aspect of the present farm problem—that of the huge stocks of surplus commodities now held in ships, bins, and warehouses all over the country and the case of wheat alone, costing the taxpayers a thousand dollars a minute. One of the reasons for this conclusion arises out of the fact this proposal provides for payments in cash, instead of in kind as provided by the Levering bill. Payments in kind, as you know, refers to payments in grain and other commodities out of surplus stocks.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to be agreed on both sides of the aisle that by reason of the dire situation on agriculture, particularly among the family type of operation, a new bold and realistic farm program should be adopted promptly to reverse the present trends under existing programs which are fast leading us to conditions as bad or worse than those we experienced in the 1930's. We need

to take action now before the distress in agriculture takes a greater toll on the general economy. But we also know as a practical matter that we must have a bill which will merit the support of all the people—the consumers, which of course includes farmers. In this connection many of our colleagues have frankly stated they cannot get backing from their constituents to vote for the conservation reserve if payments thereunder are to be made in cash, and particularly if the program does not effectively come to grips with the problem of cutting the outrageous cost of storage by disposing of present stockpiles.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial comment from the Centerburg Gazette which dramatizes the policy of paying money to landowners be they farmers or whatever, for doing nothing. The item follows:

HE WANTS TO GO IN BUSINESS

(A reader gave us the following letter that some of you may find amusing.)

To the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My friend Smith received a check for \$1,000 from the Government for not raising hogs. So I am also going into the not raising hogs business. What I want to know is: What is the best kind of hogs not to raise? I would prefer not to raise razorbacks, but if necessary will just as gladly not raise Poland Chinas or Durocs.

How much will you pay me for not raising 100 hogs? And will the same rate apply if I increase my nonraising capacity to 1,000? Also, will you pay me for not raising 10,000 bushels of corn, which I will not feed to the hogs which I am not raising? Please answer soon, as this looks like a fine year for not raising hogs. By the way, can I raise a couple of hogs on the side, so we can have a little ham and bacon to eat?

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker this is a very sad day for the Congress. A distinguished and beloved colleague has been struck down in the discharge of his duties. The strain and pressure under which each of us must work has produced many such casualties in our midst over the years. Others of our colleagues have also paid with their lives after leaving the Halls of Congress for their devotion to the duties imposed upon us. Others have paid in broken health as a result of their service to the Nation.

Our colleague, RUSSELL MACK, was a man easy to know and to admire. He was sound in his views and in his principles. His service here was capable and constructive. His was a loyal and dedicated work which benefited all the Nation.

My earnest sympathy is extended to his widow and his family.

Effect of Federal Minimum Wage and Hour Law on Hotels and Restaurants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is one of the most persuasive and thoughtful statements and explanations I have heard on the effect of placing hotels and restaurants under the Fair Labor Standards Act and setting up a compulsory minimum wage and hour scale for these service establishments:

THE KENWOOD ARMS
MOTOR HOTEL,

Springfield, Mo., February 23, 1960.

HON. MORGAN MOULDER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MORGAN: As you requested during your stay here at the Jackson Day celebration, I have developed some information concerning the effect of the proposal to place hotels under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

A few of our employees are now making in excess of \$1 per hour on a 48-hour week. A majority are not. However, when we raise the minimum wage to \$1 per hour, this necessitates, of course, a raise in the rate for the more highly skilled employees. In the proposed new rates that we feel we would have to pay, the rates will range from \$1 minimum to \$2.75 maximum for non-executive employees. This compares with the present 58 cents minimum and \$2.40 maximum, excluding from consideration the tip employees who make less in wages but receive gratuities for their services.

Wage rates and payroll costs are extremely important to us because they are our largest single item of expense. In the overall hotel operation salaries and wages will consume approximately one-third of the dollar sale. Moreover, hotels are a service business. Some motels and restaurants have reduced their payroll costs by letting the customer serve himself, but having gone through this trend most operations now find a tendency toward increased services. For example, the Master Hosts Association, to which we belong, requires bell service and room service. This is primarily an organization of very first-class motels.

Automation has had very little effect on this industry. True, there are automatic elevators, radaranges for faster cooking, and a variety of other kitchen aids. However, in the main these mechanical devices are so expensive as to make their costs nearly prohibitive for the smaller operators. Too, at present wage costs, the payout on the equipment through wage savings is too slow to make it practical; but this would not necessarily be the case if wages were raised materially. As an example of the installation costs which I speak of, several years ago I investigated revising the elevators of the Tiger Hotel in Columbia to make them automatic. Using part of the present equipment, the installation was estimated in excess of \$30,000 per elevator. The installation would have saved us about \$2,400 yearly, thus would have paid for itself in 12½ years, assuming no financing charges. Using a \$1 per hour wage rate, that same elevator installation will pay for itself in something over 5 years, and it suddenly becomes an excellent investment. It will, of course, eliminate several operators from our payroll.

I have compared our present wage rates with the projected rates that we feel would

apply if we were put on a basis of \$1 per hour minimum, 40-hour week. Leaving tip employees at their present rates but raising all others will increase the payroll in our rooms department by 28.6 percent, and in our food department by 22 percent. If tip employees are also raised to the minimum wage the rooms department payroll will increase by 48.8 percent of what it is now, and the food department payroll will increase by 35.6 percent.

In a good year, hotels will normally net from 6 to 10 percent of sales before income taxes. It is obvious that with a net profit of this size, they cannot absorb a wage increase of the size indicated above. The situation is even more acute because hotels are suffering declining occupancy rates every year. The big city hotels, who generally are already paying in excess of the proposed minimum wage, are holding their own. But the hotels in the smaller towns are having serious occupancy problems already, and these are the ones that would be primarily affected by these proposals. The occupancy problems that I mentioned can be amply supported by statistics from Horwath and Horwath or Harris, Kerr, Forster; both of which are hotel accounting firms. I am sure that these statistics have been previously presented in testimony by representatives of the American Hotel Association.

The economics of the situation are obvious, I think. Faced with a wage increase of this magnitude that will surely cause a substantial loss at present day sales rates, the hotels would have one of two choices. Increase prices to cover the increase in wages, or eliminate many employees. Assuming that tip employees remain at their present rates, I estimate that it will require a price increase of 10.5 percent and 10.8 percent on rooms and food respectively simply to cover the cost of the increase and maintain departmental profits where they are. If tip employees are included, it will require even more. To maintain wage costs in their same percentage relationship to other costs will require even more. This is a factor not to be overlooked, because costs of other commodities that the hotels use may be expected to increase due to increases in wage rates of wholesalers and retailers who will also be included under this same bill.

With declining occupancy rates the general rule, as I pointed out above, this course of action does not appear to be feasible. Thus, many of the aged and disabled people who work for hotels (and there are many) will, of necessity, be replaced by younger, more physically able people who are more efficient producers. Services will have to be curtailed, and the machines of which I wrote earlier will replace people wherever possible. This is a course of action not to be desired, but one that will become most necessary if minimum wage legislation is extended to cover hotels.

I believe I also mentioned to you in our discussion our opposition to the arbitrary figure of \$500,000 in sales as being the determining factor of whether a hotel shall be included or excluded from the law. It occurs to me that this is a matter that has been substantially overlooked in previous testimony on the bill, and which we believe is highly important.

We are most flattered, of course, to be considered "big business" because our relatively small hotel (125 rooms) will probably exceed the \$500,000 figure in 1960. However, there are several very nice motels here in town that are smaller in size and their sales will not exceed the figure and they will not be included in the bill. The same is true of our restaurant in comparison with other restaurants here in town. A new 100 room motel has recently opened here, but their food department is leased out to a com-

pletely different corporation, so the motel's only income from the food operation is the rental. I know from my experience that it is virtually impossible for that hotel or restaurant, considered individually, to exceed \$500,000 in sales per year. And yet, we will be in direct competition with them and other hotels, motels, and restaurants at wage rates exceeding theirs, which obligation will be imposed on us by law. This does not seem to me to be fair. This one provision of the law creates a discriminatory factor against us, which it will be well nigh impossible to overcome.

I cannot stress too highly that, in the event Congress does decide to extend minimum wage coverage, this unfair provision must be eliminated. If they're going to extend coverage, then it should be to all employers in the industry on an equal basis, and not on a discriminatory basis established on volume of sales. This would most certainly be an inducement to quit expanding anyone's business.

I hope that I have provided you with information which will be helpful to you, and we will certainly appreciate any help you can give us in this matter.

Sincerely,

E. THOMAS MOULDER,
Manager.

The President's Budget, a Political Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the January 19 issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times carried an editorial which does much to clarify the folly of the President's budget:

THE PRESIDENT PROPOSES TO LOAD MORE
TAXES ON LITTLE FELLOW

If the public is confused about State finances, it must be utterly mystified about the budget presented to Congress Monday by President Eisenhower.

The President called for a one-half-cent-a-gallon increase in gasoline taxes and another increase in postal rates of 1 cent for first-class mail and airmail.

At the same time he proposes to load these increases on to the average citizen, he announces that the budget will result in a \$4,184 million surplus, which, he says, holds out the hope for a tax reduction next year.

We are sure that the ordinary citizen will wonder with us why it is necessary to increase postal rates and gasoline taxes if it is to result in a surplus to make a future tax reduction possible.

Why not leave the rates and gas tax where they are and let us keep the money instead of the President's promise?

If the President is so anxious for a surplus we suggest that he can get it by plugging some of the loopholes by which pampered interests in this country are evading billions in taxes and are getting rich at the expense of those who will be paying the postal and gas tax increases.

If the President wants to raise more money from the production and use of gasoline he might take a look at the millions the oil interests are getting out of the 27½ percent exemption on their earnings.

The high interest rates his administration fostered have jumped the cost of financing

the national debt to \$9 billion a year—\$12 out of every \$100 paid in taxes. This is second only to defense spending in the amount it takes from the taxpayer.

The big bankers, who had their best year in 1959, get the benefit of this for they buy most of the bonds and the people who will pay the new postal costs and gas tax are paying the higher interest rates.

If the President is interested in postal rates, he might take a look at the second-class mail subsidy under which the big newspapers and magazines are distributing their products at a cost of about \$200 million-a-year to the public.

Figures supplied to a congressional committee showed that the following subsidies were handed to these magazines in 1955:

Saturday Evening Post.....	\$6,069,000
Reader's Digest.....	4,809,000
Life.....	9,494,000
Look.....	3,482,000

The President might show some interest, too, in cracking down on business interests who are piling up enormous "costs of operation" by charging personal living costs and entertainment to corporations and leaving to individual taxpayers to pick up the load.

There is also the need for more personnel to enforce the tax laws and the proposal to apply withholding to dividends, as it is applied to salaries.

These are only a few of the ways that the President can get the surplus he wants, instead of piling an even greater load on those who are already carrying most of the burden.

We Challenge the Future With the Lessons of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered at the dinner meeting of the board of governors of the New York State Association of Young Republican Clubs, Saturday, March 26, 1960, at the Sheraton Inn, Binghamton, N.Y.:

WE CHALLENGE THE FUTURE WITH THE LESSONS OF THE PAST

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege for this middle-aged Republican to be asked to speak to this fine gathering of young Republicans from all over the Empire State. The abundance of enthusiasm and spirit that is evidenced here tonight bodes well for the cause of Republicanism in this crucial presidential election year as well as for the future.

It is my understanding that this year also marks the silver anniversary of the young Republican organization. My congratulations to you. Seldom has a fledgling political organization come into existence with less favorable prospects than did yours. Twenty-five years ago, the New Deal and the man who was its chief symbol were indeed riding high. It even looked for a time—when "as Maine went so went Vermont"—as though the Grand Old Party might be headed for extinction. Happily, however, that did not come to pass and one of the salient reasons why it did not was the tenacity and dauntless enthusiasm of those early young Republican founders and members who nurtured this organization into the thriving opera-

tion it now is. By their example, they proved to their elders that there was still plenty of life left in our party, plus the resiliency to come back again and again despite repeated maulings by F.D.R. and the divergent groups he managed to hold together within the Democratic Party.

Now, as you young Republicans pass your 25th birthday and move into your second quarter-century, your Nation is also entering into a new decade—one that promises to be even more changeable and challenging than the last. In a few months, we Republicans will be asking the people to give our candidate for President a new 4-year lease on the Executive leadership of this country, and to return the Federal legislative processes to Republican guidance. I do not think it out of place to say that the very survival of this Nation may well depend upon the success of our appeal.

The major challenge confronting us today is, of course, the persistent and relentless drive of communism toward a unchanged goal—a Communist-controlled world. This threat is real and formidable. It encompasses all fields of human endeavor. It is military, political, economic, and psychological.

Last fall the chief spokesman for the Soviet Union boldly and brazenly presented the nature of this challenge to us as one would throw a gauntlet at a rival's feet. His words were backed by the force of some rather spectacular achievements. This experience undoubtedly served to help shake all of us out of a mood of something closely akin to apathy, and to replace such a mood with one of critical self-analysis, in a too-long-delayed attempt to find out not only where we stood, as a nation, but whither we were going.

Although the first half of that double-barreled question should be the easiest area in which to find common agreement, one will find considerable difference of opinion even as to where we are. From a purely materialistic standpoint, it would seem as though we are in a rather enviable position.

As a people, we have more of almost everything than anyone else, whether we are talking about bathtubs, telephones, or even debts, both public and personal. From a spiritual standpoint, however, I have confessed to a considerable sense of uneasiness, along with many others, when such vexing problems as racial discrimination and juvenile delinquency are viewed by far too many Americans as things we can worry about tomorrow; when the philosophy of a womb-to-tomb security has quite common acceptance as a proper national goal, and when many of our citizens seem more interested in television scandals and tallfins than in such obvious essentials as education and scientific and medical research.

And yet, for all of the more obvious defects that may exist in our way of life, America, with less than 7 percent of the world's population, is looked to for protection, aid, and leadership by almost every other nation on earth—both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln referred to America as "the last, best hope of mankind." If that was true a century and more ago, what would Lincoln say today, as he would see, with us, the growing threat of communism, a billion people under the iron heel of Communist oppressors, and the ravages of socialistic experiments in Great Britain, France, and Italy, to say nothing of the United States.

It is human to pause in gratitude for the blessings that have flowed from our American heritage. In some 183 years, we have managed to attain a greater degree of freedom and a higher standard of living for the great mass of our people than was ever dreamed possible in 10,000 years of recorded history. Our wealth and our industrial ca-

capacity have been the deciding factor in two world wars, though other nations have had as much or more territory, and many nations have had greater natural resources.

What, then, caused this miracle that has been America?

I believe it was due to the vision of the men and women who founded this Republic, and to the free enterprise system of government that they created—a republican representative government unique in all history. Regardless of the commonly accepted definition of a liberal today, I also believe that those early geniuses were the true liberals of the ages—that they were as god inspired as the prophets of the Bible, and that their concepts of Government are as true and as binding today as they were in 1776 and 1789.

Is there an epoch in human history more inspiring or more intellectually absorbing than that in which freedom was launched in our American experiment? Through it we broke the authority of the church over the state, and kept the human mind free to find its own approach to God. We denied the right of the state to tax without the consent of the taxed. We drew a fine line of distinction between the freedom of the individual and the authority granted to his chosen representative. "Freedom is to be a slave to nothing," was the overzealous ambition of the Founding Fathers. Out of it all we set about to place in the hands of Government a minimum of power, and authority only to establish rules of the road over which we were to travel. In no case did we consent to become slaves or wards of Government. The very heart of our delegation of authority was limited to the "consent of the governed." We were consciously concerned with that critical point where our representatives might take over the authority vested only in the voters. This was, in truth, an obsession in the minds of the men who fashioned the Articles of Confederation, and later the Constitution itself. "That government is best which governs least," and "the closer government stays to the people the better the government," was the epitome of their plan, and in their minds such a premise was strong enough to endure the test of time.

These things, plus a belief that individual responsibility is a corollary of individual freedom, are our heritage, and now is a timely moment to stop and ask ourselves if we are worthy of it.

These concepts of government brought to our shores men and women who wanted opportunity rather than security. They still do, even though to many Americans our heritage has become only a cloak of respectability and decency which we wrap around our frailties and our selfishness. These concepts of government, together with the incentive for a man to retain for himself and his children, in the Horatio Alger tradition, the wealth he created, brought forth this hitherto dynamic society of ours and opened new horizons for civilization. They can continue to do so, unless we forget that such ideals, if not zealously maintained, will drift into impotence or even destruction.

The ironic fact today is that we Republicans who would hold fast to these principles—truly the most "liberal" in history—are frequently labeled "reactionaries" by self-styled "liberals"; whereas many of these "pseudoliberals" are diametrically opposed to most of the basic concepts of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and the other Founding Fathers.

It is no coincidence that during the past 26 years of which 22 have seen the Democratic Party firmly in control of Congress, we have travelled back a long way toward European paternalism and collectivism, and the farther we travel that road the more impossible it becomes to turn back.

I see this reflected in many of the letters I am receiving from my own constituents,

even though they are, I think, by tradition more conservative in their thinking than people from many similar areas. Taken by and large, it seems quite obvious that to more and more of our citizens Uncle Sam is taking on what a psychologist would call a "father image"—that, to them, our Federal Government should be, and was meant to be, not only the "great protector" but also the "great provider." Riding the crest of this trend, the Democrat majority in this, the 86th Congress, is striving to further expand such a governmental role into areas wherein, no matter how acute the seeming need, we would be creating new Federal responsibilities. I am thinking here of such things as Aid to Depressed Areas; Federal Aid for Education, not just for construction purposes where there is a demonstrable financial need, but for across-the-board construction and even, perhaps, to subsidize teacher salaries; acceptance of the responsibility to pay hospital, surgical and nursing-home costs for social security retirees, and so on. To the proponents of such legislation, the idea that private enterprise or local government has either the incentive or the capability to solve any of such problems is unthinkable.

At the same time, in the field of business, that same Democrat majority seeks to further push the long nose of Government into new areas of decision and control. I am thinking here of such things as a broad extension of minimum wage-and-hours laws far beyond the original intent and meaning of the "Interstate Commerce" clause of the Constitution, establishment of Federal standards for unemployment insurance which responsibility more appropriately belongs to the several States that are cognizant of their own local conditions, and so on. It is as if the proponents of such legislation have forgotten what our forebears knew so well: That any government can become a dictator, not just an umpire, when it tries too hard to control our lives.

Many of the decisions that this and future Congresses will be making will be motivated by a desire to ensure our survival—not only our physical survival in this Atomic Age, which is a story in itself—but our economic survival, and by a desire to "guarantee", as if that were possible by governmental dictate, a rate of economic growth that will exceed or outstrip that of the enemy that has boasted it will "bury" us.

Now survival is not a partisan issue but it is up to the people to decide which of the two approaches toward that goal offers the best hope of longlasting success. In considering such a decision, I submit that the people should take note of the fact that, while we used to refer to ourselves as a free people, we now customarily refer to ourselves as a free Nation. This must mean that, without even realizing it, we have been taking incentive and freedom from the individual and nationalizing those qualities, in a selfish effort to meet our wants as well as our needs, in what may well prove to be a vain grasping for security rather than survival.

The difference between the two major political parties, although blurred at times in military or foreign policy areas, has never been more apparent than it is on this particular subject. I have briefly mentioned the Democratic approach. The Republican Party, on the other hand, stands four-square behind the proposition that this Nation's greatness has come, and can only continue to come from the tremendous God-given strength in each of us that is unlocked when a man is his own master, reaching for his own destiny, with the opportunity to move constantly toward a better life. To restore the American principle of individual and community incentive and thus to mobilize that strength for the Nation's good is the Republican road to a stronger America.

In a sense this means that we must urge the people to consider the Nation's need for a concept of self-denial, something that, admittedly, has no more political appeal than does a snowball in this community that has seen altogether enough snow to last it until next winter. But aren't you growing a little tired of watching too many of the various segments of our economy, of late, led to the top of "Democrat hill" and shown the "promised land" which will be theirs—at the expense of every other segment of the economy—if only they will vote right next November?

There are side aspects of this Democratic approach that likewise cause me concern. During my 3 years in Congress I have seen very few of my Democratic colleagues from areas other than the South who seem to have the slightest awareness of the fact that our national debt is in the neighborhood of \$300 billion and that other built-in obligations of the Federal Government, which will fall due automatically in the not-too-far-distant future, boost that indebtedness to close to three-quarters of a trillion dollars.

And yet how can any legislator who calls himself responsible ignore the fact that the interest on that public debt alone now amounts to over \$8 billion a year—a sum greater than all the income that came into the Federal Treasury as late as 1941 and all Federal expenditures as late as 1936.

In seeking to promote economic growth by the magic of massive injections of Federal moneys into our economy, as most of these same Democratic colleagues of mine say they are willing to do at the risk of creeping inflation, they seem totally unaware of the historically-proven fact that inflation is like an opiate that, in its early stages, may produce a sense of well-being and prosperity but, like any other drug, also requires increasingly large dosages to produce the same stimulation and, after continued usage, produces moral decay, social injustice and eventual economic stagnation. One of the better examples of that sort of social injustice is cheerfully ignored by those who now promote the extension of hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits through the social security system for a minority of our senior citizens, as if that was the sole problem those citizens face, when, in fact, their real problem is how to maintain any sort of a decent standard of living in the face of increasing costs not only for those items but for housing, food, clothing and a modicum of entertainment, under the damper of steadily higher tax rates, Federal, State, and local. Of course, there is a genuine crisis in providing health services to retired persons, but, in treating that alone, we would be seeking only to alleviate one of the many effects of deficit financing rather than trying to diagnose and cure the cause thereof. It's a little like taking aspirin for a cold—the cold sufferer may feel better for awhile, but he still has his cold.

That same Democratic majority in Congress also clings to the obsolete failure of a grim fairy tale that is our farm-subsidy program, under which the American taxpayer shells out over a million and a half dollars every day just to store our harvests of insanity, because to eliminate it and liberate the farmer might be a costly political action.

Did you know that, under this wasteful hodgepodge, your family and mine each owns surplus products worth an estimated \$233.33, including 60 pounds of cotton, 14 bushels of wheat, 21 bushels of corn, 300 pounds of grain sorghum, a fifth of a pound of tobacco, a peck of soybeans, 4 pounds of resin, nearly 5 pounds of assorted dairy products, and 1½ pounds of shelled peanuts?

So you see, the more we lean on Uncle Sam, the greater the habit becomes. All of our Federal programs to "help" someone, or to meet a need that is more fancied than real, start small and end big, and the bureau-

set up to administer them multiply like rabbits and are even harder to kill off.

These are but a few examples of the signposts along the road that we have been following under Democratic guidance since the organization of the Young Republicans 25 years ago. To a considerable extent, each of us, through our own apathy and selfishness may have contributed to our movement down that road, but with courage and sacrifice for the things we believe in we can still reverse our direction.

We can help America reject self-indulgence and demand self-sufficiency.

We can help America return to those principles of thrift, industry, incentive and person-to-person charity which conquered this once hostile continent and made America the goal and the beacon-light for all free men and women, everywhere.

This is your challenge as well as mine. As interested and spirited young Republicans it will be your job to carry a portion of the campaign for Republican candidates this fall. The aid of your feminine members can be most effective not only because they are the best salesman our party has, but also because, for the first time in our history, the women's vote perhaps will outnumber that of men.

This will be a soul-searching year of debate and decision for all Americans. The future of this Nation belongs to you, even as does the future of this party. You will play a great part in shaping both.

Near the beginning of my remarks, I gave you a quotation from Lincoln. I would like to close with another. In an earlier time of decision, not unlike that we now face, he said to the Americans of his day: "It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again (he said) to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you (the people) is the question: Shall the Union and the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?"

Ohio's Michael J. Kirwan

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to join with my colleagues in adding a word of tribute to the distinguished gentleman from my State of Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] in connection with the conferring upon him of an honorary degree of doctor of humanities, by the Oklahoma City University.

I never think of this good man—an honest to goodness self-made man—a fighting man with a heart of gold, who made his way from a breaker boy of 7 years of age, picking slag in the mines, to the greatest legislative body in the world, without taking increased pride in our American system that recognizes the freedom and the ability of the individual. MR. KIRWAN is a living testimonial of this great democracy in which we live.

Because our colleague to whom we pay our respects today did end his formal schooling at an early age, we know that not all education is found in schools. Congressman KIRWAN is a graduate of

the college of hard knocks, where the class colors are black and blue. Long before I was elected to this body, I learned from my father-in-law, Usher L. Burdick, a former Member from North Dakota, that MIKE was a real pillar in the House. I leave it to my colleagues as to whether former Congressman Burdick is a judge of men.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no degree more fitting than that of doctor of humanities to be bestowed on our friend and colleague. Congressman KIRWAN is known to all of us as one of the outstanding conservationists of our time. He, not only champions the preservation of our natural resources of soil, water, timber, and wildlife, but he is on the firing line year after year for the protection of human resources. I will never forget the calm that came over the House on September 8 last year when the gentleman walked into the well on the question of flood control funds in the public works bill and said:

We must remember that we also have a responsibility to take care of our own country. I saw thousands being put out of their homes last January—families with children being held in the arms of their parents in zero weather looking at the water coming in the second-floor windows. I urge everyone here to do something for your country. God gave us this country. God gave us the soil, the rocks, the mountains, the woods, the streams. Let us do a good job protecting and preserving them. Let this be one of the times in history that we do something in and for America.

Mr. Speaker, with all the honors his country has bestowed upon him MIKE KIRWAN is a man of humility. In words suggested by Kipling our friend has walked and talked with Presidents, but never lost the common touch. He can "fill the unforgiving minute with 60 seconds' worth of distance run" and "the earth is his and everything that's in it," because he is a man, my friends.

Cranberry Catsup From Bandon, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ruralite which was reprinted March 21, 1960, in the Coos Bay, Oreg., World. It tells of the ingenuity of Mrs. Paul Colgrove, who lives near Bandon, in my district. Mrs. Colgrove makes diversified use of cranberries. One of her products—cranberry catsup—is described in the following article:

THE LATEST: CRANBERRY CATSUP FROM BANDON

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following item is reprinted from Ruralite, a publication of Northwest electric cooperatives, with the permission of the Coos-Curry Electric Co-op.)

The community of Bandon calls itself the "Cranberry Capital of Oregon," and

with good reason. Of late, though, there's a further reason for Bandon to lay claim to this title, and this is the birth of a new one-woman industry known as Hazel's Cranberry Kitchen.

Hazel is Mrs. Paul Colgrove, a Coos-Curry Electric cooperative member who lives on the Bills Creek road just out of Bandon. The major product of Hazel's Cranberry Kitchen nowadays is a unique cranberry catsup which adds an exciting dash of cranberry flavor to the flavor of catsup. Taste it and you'll agree there's just nothing like it.

It is not the only cranberry product out of Hazel's Kitchen, for she has been experimenting for years with various cranberry recipes. It is, however, the only commercially sold item, and one which shows a great future.

"I'm convinced there's a good market for it," says Mrs. Colgrove. During the past 3 years she has sold everything she produced. During 1959 she produced about 400 bottles, almost all of which were snapped up by the Coquille Valley Dairy Cooperative for inclusion in their holiday gift boxes. Previously she had sold just about everything locally through advertisements in the Bandon newspaper.

Other products from Hazel's Kitchen include cranberry candy, cranberry pie, cakes, jams, jellies—all with cranberries added in one form or another. All these (and more) items Mrs. Colgrove has entered in the annual Bandon Cranberry Festivals down through the years. "Each year," she says, "I sit down and try to dream up something different."

And this is how the cranberry catsup got its start. Mrs. Colgrove had whipped up a batch of catsup for the cranberry festival.

"Somebody tasted it and said it would sell. That did it. I've been plugging away at it ever since then. In 5 years I've made about 1,000 bottles of it, although I didn't start selling it until about 3 years ago."

The reactions of people have been gratifying, says Mrs. Colgrove. Many helped her perfect the recipe by being unofficial tasters. At first, the catsup was a little too sweet and a little too spicy, the tasters thought. Mrs. Colgrove adjusted the recipe accordingly and has what now appears to be the perfect combination. "The trick," she says, "is to keep the cranberry color in the catsup, and still have the taste of cranberries in it."

Just how this is accomplished is a trade secret, of course. Suffice it to say that your official Coos-Curry Electric co-op cranberry catsup taster tried it, and approves.

Mrs. Colgrove, a vivacious, dark-haired mother of three, comments about the catsup by Dutch Randleman, of Bandon among those that pleased her most: "I didn't put the catsup on nothing," said Randleman, "I just ate it with bread and butter."

Another satisfied customer wrote that the family had never tasted ham so good as when they poured the cranberry catsup over it and then baked it.

A woman declared that "you don't know what a cheese sandwich is until you've eaten one with cranberry catsup."

All of these comments, plus the fact that individuals and organizations such as the Coquille Valley Dairy cooperative are willing to pay hard cash for her product, have encouraged Mrs. Colgrove to the point where she may soon embark on a mass production venture. The one-woman home kitchen method is just a bit tedious (it takes 6 hours of work to produce a case of 12 bottles). Sometime in the near future Mrs. Colgrove hopes to get going on an assembly line basis, and looks forward to an eventual goal of producing 500 bottles a day.

Even so, the catsup would continue to be produced in small quantities at a time, in order to maintain the flavor. The catsup

would probably be produced in a small stainless steel drum.

For the moment, however, the production continues to be on a small scale. Mrs. Colgrove has a number of other interests to keep her busy, including a 4-H rockhounding club, tourist beach trip by jeep during the summer, and her family. Her husband, Paul, is a logger and lifelong resident of the area; their oldest daughter, Colleen (who was queen of the cranberry festival in 1956) is married and living at Greenacres; son Bruce is a 1959 graduate of Bandon high school, and Paula, age 6, is in the first grade of school.

In 1953 Mrs. Colgrove was selected the "woman of the year" in Bandon by the Bandon Women's Civic Club. Her pet project at the moment is beach trips wherein she takes tourists via jeep to little known spots on the Bandon beaches. She does it "just for fun—I've never taken a cent for it because I enjoy going." The tourists enjoy the trip, too. "You have no idea how much it means to them," she says. "And then about this time of year when it gets to storming, they think about us and how much they enjoyed their visit to the Bandon beaches."

It's possible that in the future Bandon may be remembered from its cranberry catsup, too. "I keep thinking how Knotts berry farm down near Los Angeles got its start—in a home kitchen just like mine," says Mrs. Colgrove. Only time can make a future comparison, but meanwhile it's safe to say that the recent cranberry blowup, wherein it was alleged that some Northwest-grown cranberries contained a harmful chemical, has not affected the cranberry catsup industry.

"It was kind of a jolt to some of the growers," Mrs. Colgrove admitted, "but I think that after the smoke had cleared away, it wasn't as hard on the growers as they originally thought. It certainly hasn't made one particle of difference as far as my work is concerned."

Multiplicity of Gas Rate Increases Collected Under Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I enter in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut concerning multiplicity of gas rate increases collected under bond:

MULTIPLICITY OF GAS RATE INCREASES COLLECTED UNDER BOND—PETITION AND RESOLUTION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT PERTAINING TO H.R. 10309

It appearing, that under present provisions of the Natural Gas Act, natural gas transmission companies may obtain rate increases under bond while the reasonableness and need for prior rate increases already being collected under bond have not been determined by the Federal Power Commission; and

It appearing further, that as a result of the foregoing, many Connecticut gas distribution companies are currently purchasing gas under rate schedules containing successive rate increases being collected under bond; and

It appearing further, that H.R. 10309, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would amend the Natural Gas Act by providing that no further rate change may go into effect subject to bond while there is already in effect a rate or charge being collected under bond; and

It appearing further, that adoption of this amendment to the Natural Gas Act would rectify the intolerable situation which has been brought about by the multiplicity of natural gas rate increases being collected under bond, without determination by the Federal Power Commission of the need for such increase, all of which have been detrimental to Connecticut users of natural gas:

Now, therefore, we, the undersigned, comprising the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, petition and memorialize Connecticut Representatives and Senators in Congress that enactment of H.R. 10309 should be supported in order to eliminate this patent inadequacy of the Natural Gas Act.

We hereby direct that a copy of this petition and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of this commission to each Connecticut Representative and Senator in Congress.

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 23d day March 1960.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
EUGENE S. LOUGHLIN,
HENRY B. STRONG,
BASIL P. FITZPATRICK.

HARTFORD, March 23, 1960.

Attest:

GEORGE J. GRIFFIN,
Executive Secretary, Public Utilities
Commission.

Bishop Howard J. Carroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a good and great religious leader was laid to rest. Bishop Howard J. Carroll, whose sudden death last week cut short a brilliant career, is mourned by everyone of all denominations in the area embraced by the Altoona-Johnstown Catholic diocese, and by the many friends and acquaintances that he made elsewhere along the way in the service of God.

The Most Reverend Howard Carroll was a native of western Pennsylvania. One of the many institutions of learning he attended was St. Vincent Seminary, the stately edifice outside Greensburg whence so many noted members of the clergy have come to teach the precepts of the Saviour.

I had the pleasure of Bishop Carroll's friendship, of chatting with him on numerous occasions. He was a quiet, unassuming, modest individual, but of magnetic personality, warmth, and quick humor. Beneath his gentle, almost reticent, outward character was a driving, energetic spirit striving incessantly to accomplish the utmost for his God, his church, his people, and his community. The attitude of this holy man as a neighbor to those of all faiths was effec-

tively expressed in these paragraphs from an editorial in the March 22 edition of the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat:

BISHOP CARROLL

The death of Bishop Howard J. Carroll of the Altoona-Johnstown Catholic diocese, only 2 years after his installation and at the peak of his ability, comes as a shock to this area and community.

The relatively young prelate—he was only 57—came here after a distinguished career in the church. He had taken his doctorate in theology at the University of Fribourg, and subsequently took additional special work in education at the University of Pittsburgh. Among other high positions, he had been general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington; and was invested as a papal chamberlain in 1942.

Bishop Carroll, during his too brief tenure in this diocese, had begun an ambitious program of new construction and improvements, and his plans for the diocese were far-reaching. Active and energetic, he had raised great expectations throughout the Altoona-Johnstown area. Shortly after his installation, some 3,000 persons, representing various religious faiths, greeted him at the Johnstown war memorial.

At that meeting, Bishop Carroll pledged himself to be a good neighbor to all, regardless of religious beliefs, and to work for a peaceful, happy, and harmonious community—a pledge that he carried out to the best of his capacity. Now the good neighbor and good friend has been removed, and the whole community, equally regardless of religious beliefs, grieves over his sudden departure.

We had looked forward to many years of close association with Bishop Carroll, as he was a relatively young member of the church hierarchy. But we bow to the will of God in His decision to remove a dedicated and unselfish spiritual leader from our midst.

On my meeting with him at his first public appearance in Johnstown, Bishop Carroll whimsically referred to the diocese as his "constituency." While we shall miss him dearly, there is reassurance in the realization that he—in his new exalted position in God's heavenly realm—will keep a watchful eye out for us whether or not we are actual "constituents" of the faith he represented so magnificently.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I was present when my good friend RUSSELL V. MACK passed into the Great Beyond. This is an experience I shall not soon forget.

It has been a rare privilege and a pleasure for me to have served in the Congress with RUSSELL MACK for so many years. I learned to admire and respect him more and more each day. I shall miss him very much in the days that lie ahead.

RUSSELL MACK was a fine legislator who constantly had the welfare of his constituents and his country in mind. He was a true patriot and a great American. He served well his day and generation.

Death Claims Most Reverend Howard J. Carroll, D.D., Bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese of the Roman Catholic Church in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1960, in Providence Hospital, Washington, D.C., death came unexpectedly to the Most Reverend Howard J. Carroll, D.D., Catholic bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese in Pennsylvania. The late prelate was enthroned as bishop January 23, 1958, at which time the Altoona diocese was renamed the Altoona-Johnstown diocese.

In the 2 years and 2 months that Bishop Carroll served in Pennsylvania as spiritual shepherd of over 150,000 Roman Catholics in an 8-county area he endeared himself to adherents of his faith and to many non-Catholics by his pleasing and dynamic personality. As a result of the popular esteem in which he was held his death is mourned by people of all religious faiths who extend sympathy to the clergy, members of religious orders and lay communicants of the Catholic church in the loss of a noted churchman and civic-minded citizen.

It was my pleasure to meet Bishop Carroll shortly after his enthronement as bishop of Altoona early in 1958. He impressed me by his knowledge of the needs of the renamed Altoona-Johnstown diocese and talked of social and economic conditions on which subjects he was an authority based on his 14 years of service as general secretary in Washington, D.C., of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The death of Bishop Carroll is a source of sorrow and I expressed my sympathy to the Catholic people of the eight-county area in a telegram sent on March 22 to the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen A. Ward, vicar general of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese.

As a further tribute to the memory of Bishop Carroll, I wish to include in my remarks the following news articles from the March 22 issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, an editorial titled "Energetic Leader" appearing in the March 23 issue, together with an account of the funeral services on March 28, and a copy of the funeral sermon delivered by the Most Reverend George L. Leech, Roman Catholic bishop of the Harrisburg, Pa., diocese:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Mar. 22, 1960]

BISHOP CARROLL DIES OF STROKE AT CAPITAL—FUNERAL FOR PRELATE TO BE HELD IN CITY—HEAD OF 150,000 ROMAN CATHOLICS WAS UNDER TESTS AT THE HOSPITAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Bishop Howard J. Carroll of the Altoona-Johnstown, Pa., Roman Catholic diocese, died of a stroke early today at Providence Hospital here. He was 57.

The hospital said Bishop Carroll was admitted last week for a physical checkup

and suffered a cerebral vascular accident early Saturday. Hospital officials said he failed to respond to treatment and died at 1 a.m. today.

On January 2, 1958, Bishop Carroll was consecrated as the fourth bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese in rites held in Washington's St. Matthew's Cathedral.

BROTHER ALSO BISHOP

During the ceremony, the new bishop's brother, Coleman F., then auxiliary bishop of Pittsburgh, served as junior co-consecrator to Archbishop Amelio Giovanni Cicognani. Coleman F. Carroll since has been elevated to bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese at Miami, Fla.

In his consecration sermon Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle of Washington praised the Altoona-Johnstown diocese's new bishop for his 20 years of work with the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

"Few American priests have been asked to shoulder such a heavy load of responsibility," the archbishop said at the time.

ELDEST OF THREE BROTHERS

Howard J. Carroll was the eldest of three brothers who entered the priesthood. Besides Coleman F. Carroll there was Walter Carroll, a monsignor who preceded Howard in death by several years.

Bishop Carroll was officially installed as titular head of 150,000 Roman Catholics in the Altoona-Johnstown diocese on January 23, 1958, in Altoona's Blessed Sacrament Cathedral.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Mar. 22, 1960]

BISHOP CARROLL SERVED HERE FOR ONLY 2 YEARS

Bishop Howard Joseph Carroll, who died today in Washington, D.C., served 2 years and 2 months as head of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese of the Roman Catholic Church.

He was enthroned as bishop of the renamed local diocese on January 23, 1958. He had been consecrated as bishop on January 2 in rites at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C.

He assumed spiritual leadership of more than 150,000 Roman Catholics less than 3 months after the diocese had been renamed to include Johnstown in the title. The diocese embraces eight counties in southwest central Pennsylvania.

Bishop Carroll was the fourth bishop of the diocese, which embraces Blair, Bedford, Cambria, Huntingdon, Centre, Somerset, Fulton and Clinton Counties. His appointment by Pope Pius XII was announced in Washington December 11, 1957.

During his brief reign, Bishop Carroll had been carrying a heavy schedule of work. It included supervision of an unprecedented building program throughout the diocese. These included completion of the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament in Altoona and the erection of the new Altoona Catholic High School.

Bishop Carroll went to Washington last Wednesday to consult with a longtime friend and physician. He was advised to enter Providence Hospital for medical tests. His condition, at first not thought serious, worsened last Friday and Saturday.

With him at the time of his death were his brother, the Most Reverend Coleman F. Carroll, bishop of Miami, Fla., and the Very Reverend Francis B. McCaa, chancellor of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese.

A pontifical Mass of requiem for Bishop Carroll will be celebrated at 10 a.m. tomorrow at St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D.C. The body of the bishop will be returned to Altoona following the Mass.

Celebrant of the Mass will be the apostolic delegate to the United States, Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi. Preacher will be his ex-

cellency, Bishop Lawrence J. Sheehan of Bridgeport, Conn. The archpriest will be Msgr. Paul F. Tanner, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Other participants will be: Deacon, Msgr. George G. Higgins, head of the social section department of the NCWC, and sub-deacon, the Reverend Francis L. Hurley, assistant general secretary of the NCWC.

St. Francis College will offer a solemn Mass of requiem at 9 a.m. tomorrow for the late Bishop Carroll. Celebrant of the mass will be the college president, the Reverend Columba J. Devlin, T.O.R. The deacon will be the Rev. George Wuenschel, T.O.R., dean of the college. Subdeacon will be the Rev. Anselm Storck, T.O.R., treasurer of the college.

The Mass will be offered in the Immaculate Conception chapel on the college campus and music will be provided by the college chapel choir, under the direction of the Reverend Alfred O. Schendel, T.O.R.

In attendance at the mass will be the Franciscan community, the faculty and student body. Classes will be suspended at 9 a.m. for the mass. The college is in official mourning.

The bishop was a close friend of the Loreto Institution.

Millions of dollars required by the expansion and modernization program of the diocese had been raised in the year prior to the death of his predecessor, the late Bishop Richard T. Guilfoyle, who died June 10, 1957, of coronary thrombosis.

Bishop Carroll, a native of Pittsburgh, was one of the best known prelates in the United States when he was appointed. He had been general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington since 1944 when he was elevated.

As general secretary of the welfare conference for 13 years, he had taken part in important meetings and conventions in all sections of the country. He had represented the U.S. archbishops and bishops on various occasions.

Bishop Carroll was born in Pittsburgh, August 5, 1902, the son of William J. and B. Margaret (Hogan) Carroll, both of whom are deceased. He was one of three sons, all of whom became priests. In addition to Bishop Carroll of Miami, who was with him when he died, the third brother was Msgr. Walter F. Carroll, who served as papal secretary of state at the Vatican in Rome.

Bishop Carroll attended Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, St. Vincent's Seminary in Latrobe and the Albertinum University of Fribourg, Switzerland. He was ordained in St. Nicholas Cathedral, Fribourg, on April 2, 1927, by the late Bishop Marius Besson of Lausanne, Fribourg and Geneva.

After his ordination, he took his doctorate in theology at Fribourg in 1928 and following his return to the United States took special studies in education at the University of Pittsburgh.

He served as curate in Sacred Heart Parish, Pittsburgh, from 1928 to 1938, and taught philosophy part time at Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh, from 1930 to 1938.

Bishop Carroll went to Washington, D.C., as assistant general secretary of the NCWC in 1938, a post which he held until named general secretary in 1944. He was third general secretary in the history of the NCWC.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Mar. 23, 1960]

ENERGETIC LEADER

For the fourth time in the 60-year history of the Altoona diocese of the Catholic Church, recently renamed the Altoona-Johnstown diocese, embracing eight counties with Altoona as the Cathedral See, death has sorrowed the large membership. The unexpected passing of his excellency, Bishop Howard J. Carroll, at the age of 57, came as a profound shock when received early Monday morning.

The passing of the spiritual leader of 150,670 members, and its suddenness, has saddened the communities in which he served most efficiently for the past 2 years. At the time of his death he was dedicated to the completion and formal rededication of the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament and to the completion of more than a dozen schools in his province.

The Catholic members severely mourn the departure of their beloved prelate, for his activity since his enthronement as bishop on January 23, 1958, has been marked by great advances in Catholicism. He was most energetic, a true leader and most beloved, not only in his church, but in the numerous communities in the eight counties.

Sorrowed for the fourth time since the founding of the Altoona diocese, which established the Episcopal See in Altoona in June, 1901, members are deeply saddened by the death, for Bishop Carroll was in apparent good health, active in his associations until he went to Washington, D.C., for a physical checkup. His death stunned the area.

Messages of condolences have been received from leaders in the church and in government and from prominent officials and citizens, all attesting to his popularity, his ability and his fine leadership.

A pontifical Mass of requiem was held this week at St. Patrick's Church, Washington, with a solemn Mass of requiem for the late bishop being held at St. Francis College. All churches in the diocese will hold a requiem Mass with the final obsequies in the mother church, the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament, with the consecration and burial to be made in the bishops' mausoleum in the cathedral.

Altoonans generally mourn the passing of a beloved leader of the church and this community expresses the deepest sympathy in the church's loss.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Mar. 28, 1960]

MANY PRESENT AT FUNERAL FOR BISHOP CARROLL—CATHEDRAL OF BLESSED SACRAMENT IS FILLED TO CAPACITY FOR THE FINAL RITES

The Roman Catholic Church today performed the last rites for the fourth bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Howard Joseph Carroll, who died of a stroke early last Monday in Washington, D.C.

The solemn ceremonies for a prelate of the church were held in the not-quite-finished Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament, in the completion of which the late bishop had a consuming interest. It was held before an overflow audience of the faithful over whom Bishop Carroll had reigned only 2 short years.

The pontifical mass of requiem was the final act in a mourning period during which thousands of Roman Catholics filed before the prelate's bier at the rectory until Saturday, when it was moved to the cathedral to lie in state.

MANY CLERGY PRESENT

Filling the cathedral for the services were clergymen, not only from the Altoona diocese, but from others through the Eastern United States, as well as representatives from the sisterhoods, many of whom knew the late bishop during his years as general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference at the Nation's Capital.

But the majority were Roman Catholic laity from the flock under Bishop Carroll's spiritual guidance.

Services began at 10 a.m. today with the chanting of the final portions of the office of the dead, the first part of which was conducted at the time of the transfer of the body to the cathedral.

Chanting of the last section of the office of the dead covered a period of some 45 min-

utes, during which the choir sang psalms and the lessons pertaining to the dead were sung by Msgr. Thomas E. Madden, administrator of the diocese; the Reverend Gerald Ream, and the Reverend Richard Hovaneco.

GOVERNOR ATTENDS

Gov. David L. Lawrence attended the last rites for Bishop Howard J. Carroll. He headed a list of public officials which included Mayor Joseph Barr, of Pittsburgh, and Mayor George R. Walter, of Johnstown, as well as Mayor Roy F. Thompson, of Altoona, and the four councilmen. Governor Lawrence flew into Martinsburg Airport last evening and stayed overnight at the Penn-Alto Hotel.

BROTHER CONDUCTS MASS

Celebrant for the solemn pontifical Mass of requiem which followed immediately was the late bishop's brother, the Most Reverend Coleman F. Carroll, bishop of Miami, Fla.

The extremely solemn Mass, which includes the consecration and the Holy Communion, was sung prior to the funeral sermon which was delivered by the Most Reverend George Leech, bishop of Harrisburg, who eulogized the late bishop's service for the kingdom.

Then followed the fivefold absolution by the four bishops who assisted Bishop Coleman Carroll. They were Archbishops John F. Dearden of Detroit, John Mark Gannon of Erie, and Patrick A. O'Boyle of Washington, D.C., and Bishop Emmett Walsh of Youngstown, Ohio.

DISTINGUISHED CLERGY

Distinguished visitors included: Cardinal Francis Spellman of New York City, Bishop Howard Furlong, military vicar of New York; Bishop James H. Griffiths, auxiliary bishop of New York; Archbishop F. P. Keough of Baltimore, Archbishop Karl Alter of Cincinnati, Ohio; Archbishop John M. Gannon of Erie; Archbishop Joseph Hurley of St. Augustine, Fla.

Bishops Edward P. McManaman, auxiliary of Erie; Joseph McShea, auxiliary of Philadelphia; Leo C. Byrne of Pittsburgh; Nicholas Eiko of Pittsburgh, Byzantine rite; Stephen Kociskio, auxiliary of Pittsburgh; George J. Biskup, auxiliary of Dubuque, Iowa; Michale W. Hyle, coadjutor of Wilmington, Del.

Bishops John W. Colmber of Mary Knoll; John J. McGuire, auxiliary, New York; Bishop-elect William Connare of Greensburg; Vincentos Brizgys, refugee bishop of Lithuania who resides in Chicago; Archabbot Dennis Strittmatter; the Very Reverend Adrian Vlegle and the Very Reverend Rupert Langenstein, both of Loretto.

ASSIST IN MASS

Others assisting in the mass included: Archpriest, the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas E. Madden, administrator of the local diocese; deacons of honor, the Reverends Michael Mackowiak and John Hacala; deacon of the mass, the Reverend Patrick Fleming; subdeacon, the Reverend Eugene O'Malley Bradley; master of ceremonies, the Reverend Roy F. Kline, assisted by the Reverends Edward McConnell and John Lafferty.

After the Mass was concluded early this afternoon, the body of Bishop Carroll was moved to the crypt in the cathedral to lie beside his predecessors of the Altoona-Johnstown diocese.

Pallbearers at the burial were the same who officiated at the transfer Saturday from the cathedral rectory. They were: Jeldo J. Engelisto, Edward W. Garlena, Elias J. Mangiacarne, George Strobert, Jr., Joseph H. Stephens, and Robert J. Nagle.

OPENS WITH PROCESSION

The rites were preceded by an impressive procession of clergy from the cathedral school, across 13th Avenue, to the large gray stone edifice.

First in line were the altar boys, in their cassocks and surplices. Then followed more than 300 priests in the various colorful robes of their offices, followed by the various monsignori, after whom walked 18 bishops. Then came the officiating clergy for the mass.

During the mass itself, the bishops and monsignori sat in the sanctuary and the contingent of priests in the forward rows of seats in the cathedral. Bishop Carroll occupied the episcopal throne, flanked on either side by a knight.

Chaplains for the bishops of absolution were the local diocesan deans; the Very Reverends Charles W. M. White, Thomas Kelley, Joseph A. Banik, J. P. Flynn, Thomas Cawley, and John Hackett and the Reverends Edward Daly and John Palfy.

MUSIC FOR THE MASS

Music for the Mass was sung by the diocesan priests' choir, directed by the Reverend Joseph Krishock.

Black crepe covered the portal and other sections of the cathedral, which will not be finished until late this year. The bishop's coat of arms was the center of black crepe which draped the altar.

Doors to the cathedral were opened at an early hour and the church quickly was filled to capacity.

TEXT OF FUNERAL SERMON DELIVERED BY BISHOP GEORGE L. LEECH, OF HARRISBURG, IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE BISHOP HOWARD J. CARROLL, AT THE CATHEDRAL OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

"Most gladly I will spend myself and be spent for your souls" (2 Corinthians 12, 15).

In the church, as our divine Saviour established it, there is no substitute for the bishop, the authentic and qualified successor of the apostles who is placed in local and immediate contact with the members of the mystical body, of which Christ Jesus is the head.

As our Lord's own vicar on earth, successor of Saint Peter, the prince of the apostles, is the pontiff supreme of the church universal, so, by the free choice, and under the jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff, in the local subdivision of the church known as a diocese, it is the bishop, the local ordinary as he is technically called, who has primarily the power, the authority and the burden of teaching, feeding, and governing the faithful of Christ.

The episcopal office itself, which is of our Lord's own making, is so vastly more important than any one of us poor mortals who are vested with it, that we can speak about it quite impersonally and objectively even while we exercise it. We bishops come and go, but the apostolic office endures and will endure because it is essential in the church of Christ as He established it. There is simply no substitute for the bishop.

This elementary fact is pointedly evident when the bishop of a diocese dies. The chair from which he has taught and fed and governed is vacant. The full functioning of the church is impeded and, as it were, suspended. The age-old law is significant as well as stern, "While the chair is vacant, let nothing be altered."

In the emergency, only what is necessary for the adequate care of the flock is carried on. Interim officials there are, of course, duly constituted, but the full life and mission of the church in the diocese will not be resumed until the bishop returns to the chair in the person of another man bearing the apostolic mandate. Then will revive formally throughout the diocese the spiritual authority and the jurisdiction which it is for the bishop to share or to withhold.

The vacancy of the bishop's chair, therefore, is always an affliction to a diocese. And, when it comes through the loss of a spiritual shepherd of the quality and stature of Howard Carroll, it is an affliction indeed,

and a veritable occasion of mourning. This is the painful plight of the church of Altoona-Johnstown today. And, is there any need on my part to try to express in words to you, the clergy, the religious, and the laity of the diocese, and to you, dear Bishop Coleman, the profound condolence which we of the hierarchy and our brethren are implicitly manifesting as we join with you around the altar in these solemn obsequies.

If we ever had in our ranks an example of head and heart combining to make a servant of God and man, we had it in Bishop Howard Carroll. Servant indeed, with his faith and vision and charity and zeal drawing upon and exhausting his energy in the church and of Nation, and always in terms things that make for the prosperity of of souls.

I should say that his motto might well have been St. Paul's "Impendam et superimpendam"—"I will spend myself and be spent for your souls." And, after all, was not that the bishop's own literal fulfillment of his motto "In nomine Domini"—"In the name of the Lord who washed us from our sins in His own blood." (Apocalypse, 1, 5.)

Yes, head and heart combining, after the pattern of Christ, and driven by a consuming love for God and neighbor without counting the cost—that was Bishop Howard.

Is not that what they saw back in Pittsburgh in his earlier years? Is not that what we bishops saw when he was the servant of all of us in Washington, and what you, the personnel of the welfare conference saw? Is not that which we ordinaries of this province of Philadelphia have been seeing, as he brought his distinguished talents and experience into our common councils? And who has been able to see it more intimately than you, his very own of the diocese, with your phenomenal record of reorganization, of dreams realized, of institutional expansion, of prudent planning, of steady deepening of your sterling spiritual life, all crowded into these 2 short years of diligent shepherding and loyal following in this church of Altoona-Johnstown?

How the heart of Bishop Carroll was poured into the completion of this great Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament, and naturally so, for it would be the prize and pride of any diocese. Leading his loyal priests and people and building upon the fine achievements of Bishop McCort and Bishop Gullfoyle, and their generations, he spent himself and was spent in fulfilling this dream of splendor for God's own glory and the rightful pride of a believing and generous people.

Here you will come and be at home. Here you will worship. Here your wearied spirits will find inspiration and refreshment. Here you will rejoice to see how the good works of your faith have been turned into a thing of beauty and grandeur before God and man, and, under God, it will be so largely due to the prudent management and the keen esthetic sense of Bishop Carroll.

So much accomplished in so little time, yet so many blessed works whose fulfillment it will be for others to behold. With St. Paul we embrace the adorable will of God today. Truly, "how incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways" (Romans 11: 33). We bishops come, we bishops go, but the bishop will remain to teach and feed and govern. Each of us in our turn can say with Paul, "I have planted, Apollo watered, but God has given the growth" (1 Corinthians 3: 6). And what does it matter as Bishop Carroll himself would often say, as long as the saving mission of Christ goes on and the sheep and the lambs are fed.

God rest our beloved Bishop Howard. Was it not a grace and a joy to have him as father and brother and neighbor and friend? To all of us he is a loss, a painful loss. But, brethren, in the household of the faith is not suffering our Christian heritage and in-

strument, as we "fill up those things that are wanting in the suffering of Christ?" (Colossians 1: 24) The holy will of God we embrace, therefore, and, in the light of the faith we live by, we pray with St. Paul, "Blessed be the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies and the God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our afflictions" (2 Corinthians 1: 3, 4).

May the angels lead thee into paradise. May the martyrs welcome thee at thy coming, and lead thee into Jerusalem, the Holy City. May the choir of angels receive thee, and mayest thou, with the once poor Lazarus, have rest everlasting" (Rit. Rom.).

The Correct Pronunciation and the Origin of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the correct pronunciation of the name of the State in which I was born and raised and part of which I now represent in the House of Representatives, is Orry-gun, not Orry-gawn.

Two years ago when we were out at the Naval Gun Factory and the Sea Chanters with the Navy Band were making a stirring rendition of our State song, I told them to remember that they were in a gun factory to manufacture a few guns when they pronounced the name of my fair State.

Where did the name Oregon come from? Where did William Cullen Bryant learn of this word when he wrote "where rolls the Oregon?" Under a previous consent I am including an editorial from the Albany Democrat Herald and an Associated Press story from the Grants Pass Courier both of which shed some light on the origin of the name Oregon.

[From the Albany Democrat Herald, Mar. 1, 1960]

WE STILL AREN'T SURE

Origin of the name "Oregon" has thus far been undetermined authentically. Until recent years the source was believed to be Spanish, from the word "Orejon" or "Oregones," Spanish names for big-eared men. If this had been true the term must have alluded to some big-eared Indians found by Spanish explorers in what is now Oregon.

Another suggestion was that the origin may rest in the word "Origanum," name of a wild sage found in this State. In Chinese Tartary is a river named Oregon, which could have been picked up by early American or British adventurers in the wilds of the Pacific Northwest.

It had also been thought that Oregon may be a modification of the Shoshone Indian word "Oyer-un-gen," meaning a place of abundance; of "Aura Agua," meaning in Spanish gently falling waters; of the French word "Ouragan" for hurricane or of "au-re-gan," Algonquin word for "beautiful water."

A University of Oregon assistant professor of history, Prof. Vernon F. Snow, has now come up with a somewhat different theory on the background of "Oregon."

His research into etymology of Indian

words has convinced him with reasonable certainty that Oregon is of Indian origin. He has found that "auragon" was the name of a dish that Indians made out of birch bark, and surmises that these vessels may have been used in trade between Indians of the interior and of the North Pacific coast. "Auragon" is quite similar to the Algonquin word "au-re-gan" in form and sound though not in meaning.

Professor Snow recounts how in 1765 a Maj. Robert Rogers used the name "Ourogan" to designate a river he suggested to King George III might be linked with other waterways to make up the much sought-for Northwest Passage, for which explorers of that era were continually searching. In subsequent letters he spelled it "Ourigan" but his associate, Jonathan Carver, wrote in 1778 of "the river Oregon, or River of the West," speaking undoubtedly of the Columbia. And then, of course, everyone knows that William Cullen Bryant must have been thinking of what we know as the Columbia, when he wrote "where rolls the Oregon."

Whether Oregon was derived from the Algonquins, Crees, or Shoshones, we can agree with Professor Snow that logic if nothing else points to the source of our State name as Indian, though it is hard to understand why the Columbia River, at least, did not retain whatever name by which it was known to the Indians who navigated it.

In any event we suspect historians will look askance at the theory offered at the 1959 Albany First Citizen Award banquet. For benefit of the guest speaker, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, his introducer ascribed the name to "that great Irish patriot, Mike O'Regan."

[From the Grants Pass Courier, Feb. 27, 1960]

INDIAN WORD FOR BIRCHBARK DISH BELIEVED ORIGIN FOR STATE'S NAME—DEBATED NAME SOURCE THOUGHT SOLVED

PORTLAND.—Vernon F. Snow, assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon, thinks he has determined the origin and meaning of the word "Oregon."

The source of the word long has been debated.

Snow believes the word was commonly used by Indians in central North America in the 17th and 18th centuries to mean a dish or drinking vessel made of birchbark.

Writing in the Oregon Historical Quarterly, he cites:

A report by LeJeune, a French missionary, in 1633 that the Great Lakes Indians "cooked their meat in bark dishes which they called ouragans."

Another Jesuit later in the 17th century wrote that the Indians of the upper Mississippi Valley "eat from an ouragan that is seldom clean or washed" and "drink from an ouragan that is usually quite greasy."

The word was used by Cree Indians and other tribes of the Algonquin family all the way from the Alleghenies to the Rockies.

Snow said Maj. Robert Rogers, leader of Rogers' Rangers, probably first used it as a place name, writing in 1765 for permission to explore westward to "the river called by the Indians Ouragan."

How the word came to be applied to the river, Snow does not know.

"Perhaps the birchbark dish was a trading commodity between the natives of the Mississippi Valley and those of the West."

"Perhaps the Indians referred to the birch-lined valley of the upper Snake River or the bowl-like Jackson Hole. Perhaps some striking physical characteristic or configuration of the western river or its valley resembled an 'ouragan.' Or perhaps the native contemporaries possessed reasons for naming the river which defy historical analysis."

"Yet our ignorance of the Indian's mind and its inner motives does not mean that he lacked an explanation," Snow said.

Has Inflation Been Checked?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the battle against inflation is one of the most important before us if this Nation is to remain economically strong. This is a matter of direct concern to every citizen of the United States and indirectly affects a great many people all over the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the U.S. News & World Report of April 4, 1960, on the subject of inflation, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

HAS INFLATION BEEN CHECKED?

(By David Lawrence)

For several years now many people in America who believe in a sound economy have been waging a battle against inflation. In simple terms, inflation means an artificial pressure to raise wages and consequently to raise prices. This causes the purchasing power of the dollar to go down and imposes hardships on pensioners and others who live on fixed incomes.

Some segments of the working force can get their wage scales moved up faster than others. Those who lag behind feel the pinch. Similarly, prices cannot be immediately raised by some businesses, and during the interval of transition they suffer losses.

The Eisenhower administration—inheriting an inflation forced by World War II and then by the Korean war, which ended in 1953—was not able until after several years of readjustment and recession to begin its main fight against inflationary pressures. The demand of the President in December 1958 for a balanced budget won wide acclaim throughout the country as the Nation started to realize that the time had come to get its finances in order.

Despite the predictions of disaster made during the 1957 recession by the "spenders" in Congress who advocated larger outlays by the Federal Government in the face of a \$12 billion deficit in the budget, the administration weathered the storm. A budget surplus now is in sight for the coming fiscal year, and the outlook is for a stabilized economy.

The word "stability" is little appreciated in the precincts of the politicians. The talk is either of a "big boom" or a "deep recession."

There is nothing static, however, about stability. Actually, it means an opportunity for a steady expansion and a widening of economic markets. It could mean enlarged profits through the sale of an increased volume of goods that the average man can afford to pay for out of his income.

"Stability" is not as familiar a term as "prosperity" in modern politics, but it can have a much more far-reaching effect on the Nation's economy. A period of stability could be more lasting than a "boom" because it is built on a sounder foundation.

What are the prerequisites to a period of economic stability in America? Plainly, the most important requirement is a sense of restraint with respect to prices and wages.

Fortunately, the consumer has a veto power against higher prices. He merely refuses to buy what he can't afford now and what he cannot eventually pay for out of his income. Installment-buying may help cer-

tain sales temporarily, but inevitably, if incomes are not increased, the sales of products suffer and the consequences are widely felt.

It is, therefore, essential that, more than any other factor, the wages of the American worker should be given equitable consideration. He cannot be expected to work indefinitely at the same wage when profits continue to increase. He cannot be expected to pay the rising cost of medical care or live on a pension unless weight is given to what sometimes are called "fringe benefits."

American management has shown an enlightened attitude toward progressive increases in the workers' income. The tirades of the union leaders too often give a misleading impression that businessmen are all selfish individuals without human feeling.

But the facts show that this is a misguided and erroneous impression and that, while there are exceptions to all rules, the tendency of the businessmen of the country on the whole has been to go along with steady increases in wages as long as the public is able to absorb the higher wages as reflected in the cost of goods offered for sale.

Today, however, prices have risen to a point beyond which it may be dangerous to go increasing wages without substantial increases in the productivity of labor. Foreign competition in several categories has begun to threaten American products in our markets.

Many analysts are saying that "inflation is over." What they really mean is that, logically and on the basis of sound economics, it ought to be over.

But has inflation really been checked? The answer must be sought not from economists but from the politicians and the labor-union leaders. Have they abandoned the drive they have been making for higher and higher wages without regard to what happens to prices and consumer resistance?

The kind of Congress elected next November means a great deal to the business future of America. Labor-union leaders do not hesitate to collect big sums to influence voters. They seek a majority in Congress to do their bidding—to increase the power of the labor monopoly and to increase Government spending.

Has inflation been checked? Will there be a period of economic stability? Or are we headed for a crash to be brought on by the reckless demands of the forces of organized greed?

These are questions still unanswered.

Mother Marie Gerard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the death of the mother general of the Sacred Heart of Mary was a shock. It is a loss to the community of which she was the superior general—a worldwide institute of learning for girls. This world-renowned institute was furthered by her foresight, determination, and valiant efforts. Her philosophy was based on the meaning of true patriotism in an understanding of all peoples. This international movement is now a phenomenon of the present day, Mr. Speaker, I would like history to record

the efforts of one who sought to achieve that which all of us are attempting to achieve in this era—the international understanding of people.

The death of the Very Reverend Mother Marie Gerard is a personal loss to me, not only because of the close bond of love I held for her and hold for the entire community of the religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, but also, I humbly admit, much of the understanding that I, my sisters, and my daughter possess was developed under the training of the members of this community.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

MOTHER MARIE GERARD

TARRYTOWN, N.Y.—Very Rev. Mother Marie Gerard Phelan, 88, superior general of the worldwide Institute of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, died here early Tuesday after a short illness.

Born in Kilkenny, Ireland, in 1872, Mother Gerard was received into the congregation in 1893, and served as Headmistress of Seafield Convent of the Sacred Heart of Mary in Liverpool, England, before coming to America to aid Mother Marie Joseph Butler in founding Marymount's Tarrytown school in 1907. She became a naturalized citizen in 1928.

Thereafter she served as dean and later president of Marymount College. She was also named successively superior and provincial of the Institute's North American Province, established in 1877 with the founding of the order's first American school at Sag Harbor, Long Island.

In 1946, Mother Gerard was elected superior general at a general chapter of the Institute at Beziers, France, to succeed Mother Butler who died in 1940. She was reelected to the office in 1952. Mother Gerard was the sixth superior general since the congregation's foundress, Mère St. Jean Cure-Pellissier.

Widely known as an outstanding educator and administrator, Mother Gerard received her Ph. D. from Fordham University in 1922. She also pursued studies at Oxford, the Sorbonne, and Catholic University of America.

In 1952 she was awarded an honorary LL.D. from Fordham University as the first of its graduates "to be called to the government of a religious order spread over many parts of the world."

Working closely with Mother Butler, she revised in 1937 the entire course of studies for Marymount schools in order "to integrate it more realistically with women's enlarging sphere of activities in a rapidly changing society."

Under Mother Gerard's guidance, the congregation expanded its educational activities in America and throughout the world, establishing 28 schools and colleges in Bogota, Medellin and Barranquilla, Colombia; Barcelona, Spain; London, England; Umtali, Africa; Dublin, Ireland; Fatima, Portugal; Montpellier, France; Porto Alegre, Brazil; San Francisco and Los Angeles, Calif.; Richmond and Arlington, Va.; Quebec, P.Q.; Cuernavaca, Mexico; St. Louis, Mo.; and Miami, Fla.

In 1947, centenary of the congregation's founding, Mother Gerard supervised the establishment of Marymount College's City Campus in New York's former Junior League building at 221 E. 71st Street.

The congregation now operates 145 schools and colleges in 11 countries. In New York City and environs alone, there are 13 educational establishments administered by the religious order.

During Mother Gerard's administration as Superior-General, the causes of beatifica-

tion of Pere Gallhac and Mother Butler were formally proposed at Rome to Pope Pius XII. Shortly after his elevation to the Pontificate, His Holiness Pope John XXIII assumed the title of Cardinal Protector of the Institute of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary.

As the congregation's executive administrator, Mother Gerard was active in her duties until her final illness. At her death she was engaged in planning further expansion of Marymount for her congregation.

Solemn funeral services for Mother Gerard held at Marymount-Tarrytown's Butler Memorial Chapel on March 25, at 11 a.m., Cardinal Spellman presided. The body will be interred in the crypt beneath the chapel, which also contains the body of Mother Butler.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Poisons—The Creeping Killer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Poisons—The Creeping Killer," by Arthur H. Carhart as reprinted from Sports Afield for November 1959:

POISONS: THE CREEPING KILLER

(By Arthur H. Carhart)

Warning: Your future hunting and fishing are in jeopardy.

Probably that statement doesn't faze you. You've heard it when legislatures try to raid game and fish funds. Or when an industry pollutes a stream. Or when a Government agency encourages a big drainage project.

You've heard also about new, fantastic poisons spread over land and water to "control" weeds and insects and that these poisons kill fish and game. Of course—everyone knows DDT, 2,4-D, chlordane and a lot of other insecticides, herbicides, rodenticides, fungicides, homicides—

Hey. Homicide means killing human beings.

It sure does, podner. Probably you just haven't collided with the grisly fact that poisons killing wildlife can kill you. You're interested? You better be interested.

You don't know the total effects of the widespread poisoning of weeds, insects and such? Don't be self-conscious about it. Nobody else does either. Nobody knows for sure how ghastly destructive many of these poisons can be. Scientists do know some of these killers can be thrown off fairly readily if less than a killing dosage is taken at any one time. They also know that other poisons are accumulative. A tiny bit each day can stack up in your system. And one day it becomes a lethal quantity.

Shall we dig deeper into this poison problem? OK, let's dig.

Let's stick to probing first what happens to wildlife when poison hits the land and water. What might happen to you, your kids, your neighbors is reflected in what these poisons do to other living things.

Half a century ago, the limited types of sprays and dusting put on fields and orchards posed no gigantic threats to life. Modern poisons, with fearful and tenacious potency, came along about the time of World War II.

Sodium fluoracetate, commonly known as 1080, was among the first of these poisons to be put in action. I tried it out before it was generally available, on white-footed mice. Then I heard of a man in Montana who used 1080 to kill rats in his granary. His three valuable dogs died after eating poisoned rats. I heard also of a family in California that had feasted on meat from a bear shot while still alive. But earlier the bear had fed on carrion of an animal in which 1080 was present. Tasteless, and odorless, and al-

most indestructible, 1080 gave no warning to those who ate the bear meat tainted with the poison. Several people died.

I got so scared of this poison that I burned all of the remaining poisoned grain and went back to traps as a means of mouse control. I'm still scared of 1080. That stuff is deadly. There is enough poison in 1 ounce to kill 50,000 rats, and enough in each dead rat to kill a dog.

Now let's consider the case of 1080 and the Klamath Basin geese.

On Sunday, March 9, 1958, the Portland (Oreg.) Journal carried headlines that shouted "Poison Kills Wild Geese in Tule Lake Area." The famous Tule Lake Federal Wildlife Refuge is in that general area. It is a place where migrating waterfowl in flight between Alaskan nesting grounds and Mexican waters stop to rest and feed.

A few days later another headline, another story by Tom McAllister, the Journal's outdoor editor, told of another poisoning of migrating geese. This time the known kill, tallied by wildlife officials cruising fields where birds had died, amounted to 2,500. The first 500 were killed by 1080. The second kill was by another "rodenticide," zinc phosphide. How many birds, beyond the 3,000 dead ones tallied, flapped away to die somewhere else is anybody's guess.

How could such a calamity happen? Well, here's how.

In the late winter of 1958 the field mouse population in Klamath Basin "erupted." There were so many mice they were causing severe damage to grain crops. A sort of hysteria seemed to start up among those concerned with this problem.

Without reckoning all consequences, the poisoning campaign went into high gear.

An estimated 65 tons of poisoned grain were bought from local agricultural supply stores. It was showered on mouse-plagued fields from an airplane or by a mechanical spreader. With a singleness of purpose they spread that poisoned grain—if a little was good, gobs of it would be better.

Of the 3,000 geese known to have been killed in Klamath Basin in March, 1958, 75 percent were snow geese, 20 percent were white-fronted geese, and 5 percent were Ross' geese—"plus an undetermined but lesser number of dark geese."

I have seen 1080 in use, and I've noted its effects on livestock ranges of the West.

In 1915, Congress cleared the way for the old Biological Survey to carry on a campaign against wolves, coyotes, and other varmints alleged by stockmen to be killers of sheep and cattle. Wolves have disappeared from almost every last pocket of wild country in the West. Coyotes have been all but rubbed out over vast areas of plains and mountains. Legislation devised by livestock interests allows herds and flocks of domestic animals to be taxed to provide a special fund, and money so collected is combined with Federal appropriations in a "cooperative fund" to underwrite the continuing poisoning on western range and forestlands.

The wolves had been killed out by the time 1080 arrived on the scene. Coyotes had learned about guns, traps, and strychnine in pellets of fat, and they were increasing. This poison, 1080, plus a deadly device named the "Coyote Getter," stepped up the campaign against the little wolves until few people now hear that eerie music of the coyote's hunting song at moonrise.

The old-time wolfer matched traps, guns, and wits with his quarry. With 1080 and the Coyote Getter the pattern of attack changed. It was possible to travel by truck or jeep on back-country roads and throw out a string of poison stations or a few score of Coyote Getters and really wallop the predators.

In addition to coyotes and their kind, what did the new poisons do to other wild species?

"Few other animals or birds are killed by our poison stations," say those in charge of this activity. "We enforce rigid control of poison stations."

So? I submit a photograph I took only a short time ago.

In the foreground is what's left of a dead horse. It was placed there the previous autumn or early winter. On the fencepost is a tattered warning sign. It is illegible but a sign is required to warn all comers that poison is at large in the vicinity. Beyond the fence is the residue of a horse carcass a year older than the one seen in the foreground, and beyond the second is an even older stack of bones, hide and effluvia of a third dead horse placed there to set up a "poison station."

Also in the foreground is the carcass of a bobcat. It dropped dead after feeding at the "freshest" dead horse.

I showed the photo to officials engaged in the predator "control" program. "Of course," they remarked, "you may find these old carcasses where they were placed. They are only lure bringing in curious predators. The poison is inside fat pellets placed adjacent to the dead horse. Field men go the first thing in early spring to gather up every poisoned bait there."

For some reason the bobcat didn't know that. He located poison, somewhere. Fact is, a friend, whose truthfulness is absolute, told me the horse had been killed by bleeding, and as it had died, as blood drained from an artery, a solution of 1080 was fed into a vein of the horse to be pumped to every part of the body before the heart failed.

The Coyote Getter is a metal tube, about half an inch in diameter, which is driven into the ground. A .38 caliber cartridge containing a dose of sodium cyanide instead of a lead bullet is placed in the upper end of the metal tube. A piece of animal hide doped up with fetid scent stuff is fastened over the exposed top of the tube. With the trigger set, anyone or anything touching that stink-wad of hide, or sometimes cotton, will explode the cartridge. The coyote is supposed to open his mouth carefully close his jaws exactly over the scent wad, and the cartridge is supposed to blow cyanide into the coyote's mouth. Often it does.

Valuable dogs have been killed, livestock have licked the scent wad and died, and at least one report tells of a trapper accidentally exploding one of these Coyote Getters, and although he survived, he was crippled. What it could do to a curious youngster on a Boy Scout hike gives you shudders.

In 1941, the F. & W.S. issued Research Bulletin No. 4, titled "Food Habits of the Coyote." It summarized the foods found in 8,263 coyote stomachs, collected from Michigan to the Pacific Coast and analyzed by the Denver Laboratory of the Section of Food Habits of the Division of Wildlife Research.

On a year-round basis this is what coyotes had eaten: Rabbits made up 33 percent,

carrion 25 percent and rodents 18 percent. Coyotes' stomachs examined contained 13 percent of sheep and goat meat. That particular percentage could be questioned. The stomachs examined came predominantly from where trapping and poisoning had been going on; where sheep were being grazed. Out of the 8,263 stomachs reported, 7,520 were from 11 public land States of the West, where sheep graze on permit issued by the Federal Government agencies. Lesser percentages of the food coyotes ate were: deer 3 percent, birds 2 percent, insects 1 percent, and other animal matter 1 percent. Within the past few years, the California State Game and Fish Department ran similar tests on coyote food habits. The general pattern of food taken was that demonstrated in the F. & W.S. study.

A real shocker to most livestock people occurred when the Toponas Cattleman's Association put up signs protecting coyotes on their grazing areas. It now is the Toponas Grassland Protective Association. A sudden realization that gophers were ruining the meadows in high mountain valleys hit the Toponas community. Coyotes eat a heap of rodents. Better have coyotes than rodents. Now other stockmen's associations have taken the same biological approach to gopher control in the mountain pasture country.

These records of poisonings in the West are only a mild introduction to poisoning programs, more deadly, more widely spread. Death has run rampant in some locations, with public agencies responsible for unleashing vast quantities of the most lethal poisons we now have. They don't kill only the things they are aimed at. They kill, and kill, and kill, anything alive.

You know about DDT? Sure you do. Who doesn't know that old standby bug killer? You can buy it anywhere. Kills insects, doesn't it?

It does kill insects—and can kill most every type of living organism. This poison lurks, and sneaks in on its victims, and unlike the lead bullet, it spreads an enveloping blanket of death.

DDT kills sunfishes when it is 1 part of poison in 2 million parts of water.

When DDT is applied to waters, or to lands from which rain may wash it into streams and lakes, the smaller life, the little organisms that are the first link in the chain of aquatic life die.

DDT paralyzes crawfish in doses less than those that kill fish. In Pennsylvania, when DDT was sprayed on trees to kill gypsy moths, 70 to 80 percent of stream insects in the treated area were killed. Fish still alive in the stream moved out. No food.

It probably is important to mention here, and now, that all the other poisons being offered for control of something or other in rangeland, farm, orchard or garden, are often classified as being more deadly than DDT—or less so. It is something of a standard, and you have had a glimpse of its performance as a killer.

There is no possible chance of listing even the more publicized among the new poisons. Dr. Clarence Cottam, director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation, Sinton, Tex., formerly the top man in migratory waterfowl management of the F. & W.S., states there are 6,000 well-known brand-named poison formulations sold over the counter. And that in 1958, \$500 million were spent to spread such poison on 100 million acres, or approximately a sixth of all the croplands in the Nation.

Among the many names of poisons, aldrin and dieldrin are fairly well known; they often are in the dusts and sprays your wife uses in the flower garden. Pheasants that picked up as little as one two-hundred-thousandths of an ounce of aldrin or dieldrin, did not die. They lived, but their eggs hatched out far fewer chicks, and those that

hatched died in greater numbers than normal.

Other birds have died. Quail fed a diet containing one-twentieth of 1 percent of DDT for a period of 28 days—died. The poison was accumulative.

Some of these hotshot poisons are so deadly the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Administration prohibits the interstate movement of foods containing even traces of such poisons. Foods containing as little as one part per million cannot be shipped legally. One part per million is equivalent to about 1 ounce per 30 tons.

Probably the most fantastic outbreak of wholesale killing has been based on the fire ant problem in Southern States. Whoever started the brainstorm that led to the spreading of poison to eradicate these imported ants from States they had invaded, touched off a rigadon of death. And such apparently useless killing it was.

In the first place, Dr. Kirby Hays, assistant entomologist at the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, after studying the fire ant in its local habitat in Argentina, reports that insects, and not farm crops or birds or animals, are the principal natural food of the fire ant. He found these ants in cotton fields killing and eating boll weevils. One night 200 boll weevils were placed in a cage near a fire ant mound; next morning not a weevil was left. In a laboratory test, 29 different species of insects were fed to the ants and they chomped down every insect offered. Argentine farmers consider the fire ant rather worth having on their properties.

But someone had poison to sell; and the agricultural interests of the South got sold by someone on the idea these ants were about to take over and devastate Dixie.

Poison was flung about, high, wide, and lethal.

J. H. Moody, Alabama beekeeper, had his bees practically wiped out; declared a money loss of \$7,887.50.

Other checkups showed not only ants were killed but the host of beneficial insects that are a part of producing crops, keeping down pests and parasites that attack such crops—the poison does not discriminate and they were killed, dead. How soon may these tremendously valuable organisms be reestablished? Nobody knows.

The "treatment" with poison was with heptachlor and dieldrin, granules, broadcast by air and ground equipment, at the rate which would average 7 to 12 granules every square inch of soil. Hold your fingers an inch apart, think of 10 granules of death in a square of that size, and figure how any bird or animal could walk across a field so treated and not come in contact with death, for such poisons as these kill through contact.

In Alabama the conservation department obtained affidavits from residents of 36 homes in a "treated" area, with losses reported due to poison including 697 dead chickens, 20 turkeys, 11 cats, 2 ducks, and upward of 50 dogs.

And this also happened in Alabama: A 10-acre area of field, woods, and fencerows, located in Autauga County, Ala., was treated with an aerial application of 2 pounds per acre of technical heptachlor in granular form. Two conservation officers, Joe Cook and Willie B. Golden, Ralph H. Allen, biologist with the department, Game Farm Manager Earl Moses and George M. Kyle, editor, Alabama Conservation, picked up the dead, during a 2-hour period, and 8 days after the poison was spread.

"Estimates were," Kyle stated to me, "that these birds and animals represented from 75 to 100 percent of the population present on the area at the time of chemical application."

And Dr. George J. Wallace, professor of zoology at Michigan State University, who

began in 1955 testing effects of a chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticide on birds on that school's campus has made this statement:

"The current widespread and ever-expanding pesticide program poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced—worse than deforestation, worse than market hunting and illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought, or oil pollution, and possibly worse than all of these decimating factors combined."

Now do you want to consider just where you, yourself, fit into this picture?

DDT is stored in fatty tissues. A random sampling in Los Angeles of people who had no reason to believe they carried DDT showed they had it as much as 33 parts per million. Picked up from fruits and vegetables?

Some poisons generally rated more deadly than "good old DDT," particularly chlordane, toxaphene, aldrin, dieldrin, and heptachlor cannot be washed off most foods even with hot water.

It was found that the poison carrying the name BHC (benzene hexachloride), an insecticide, caused brain tumors when used on human beings.

A booklet titled "Clinical Memorandum on Economic Poisons," published in 1957 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, tells of a worker who had his clothing splashed (not soaked) with parathion concentrate, who died therefrom. Several others have died from contacts with diluted solutions of parathion. Yet poisons of this class are being spread with slight regard to or knowledge of damage they may do.

A fiendish property in these killers is their universal deadliness. Another frightening fact is that many are accumulative.

I will be charged by some with being sensational, of exaggeration, of presenting only the bad side of all this poisoning and not tell of the billions of dollars saved or other benefits of broadcasting death. But I am scared. You can't be anything but scared when you dig just a little way into what goes with poison in the United States of America.

You can do two things to help offset this which we, and all citizens, face in this poison.

First, write now, to your congressional delegation, urging adequate funds be allotted to investigations, State and Federal, of the effects of these fierce poisons.

Second, there's a whole blazing light of hope if we have enough gumption to insist that instead of kill, kill, kill, as much attention be given to control of pests by natural, biological methods, as we have put into this poison business.

These are things you can do, now—and you'd better do 'em.

Capital Times Hails Senator Williams of Delaware as Champion of Honesty in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the unusually able and resourceful Washington correspondent of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times has recently written an article published in our Wisconsin paper about the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Capital Times is a militantly liberal paper. It enjoys a great national reputation of fighting for the underdog and championing liberal economic reform in government.

The Capital Times also deeply believes in honesty and responsibility in government. This is why the Capital Times' citation of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], a champion of prudent, conservative, and ardently honest government, is so significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article documenting some of the great contributions to government made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE CRUSADES AGAINST WASTE—HERE'S A SENATOR WHO STANDS FOR HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT

(By Ronald W. May)

WASHINGTON.—A skinny, mild-mannered, 55-year-old chicken farmer, who never went to college, was recently voted the best Republican Senator.

Many are convinced that if the diplomatic professors of the American Political Science Association—who did the voting—had awarded a grand prize covering both parties, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS would have copped that, too.

WILLIAMS, probably the worst speaker in the Upper House, attracts a near full-house of his colleagues on the rare occasions when he has a short address to make.

The speeches deal with waste and corruption in Government. WILLIAMS finds it, exposes it, and sees that it's stopped.

Last week a colleague—a Democrat—said: "I figure every one of WILLIAMS' speeches has saved the taxpayers a million dollars." The figure may be too low.

WILLIAMS was first elected in 1946. For a time, as he recalls with his usual modesty, he had difficulty finding anything to do that wasn't being done better by others. He did a lot of reading, listening, and questioning: The homework drudgery that the average self-important Congressman won't stoop to do. He concentrated on agriculture, the field he knew (so well, he had become a millionaire from farming and chicken raising, later feed selling).

But in the Truman administration he got a series of tips from Delawareans in Government that sent him off on what has become a personal crusade. The tip told of corruption in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Internal Revenue Service.

WILLIAMS set to work without investigators or inside sources. Before he was through, in 1952, more than 200 Federal officials had been fired, and some were later tried and convicted.

Now the tips came faster. If he was a scourge to the Democratic administration, he has been the same to the Eisenhower Republican administration. Since January 1953, when Ike's new broom began "cleaning up the mess in Washington," the man from Delaware has been merciless. Here are just a few of his exposures:

The Commodity Credit Corporation had permitted itself to be overcharged \$124,000 by railroads shipping livestock feed to drought-stricken farmers. WILLIAMS saw that the 14 railroads returned the money.

The Maritime Administration paid tens of millions of dollars to shipping lines for old ships that had already been fully depreciated under tax arrangements. WILLIAMS said the administration sometimes paid 30 to 50 percent more for the old ships

(then theoretically worth nothing) than the ships had cost years earlier. "This is nothing more than an outright gift of the taxpayers' money," he said. The practice was stopped.

Republican politicians were telling the voters that a tax cut was in the offing. WILLIAMS said such talk was irresponsible and that until "widespread waste and corruption was stopped, and until the budget was balanced, a tax cut would be dangerous."

The Alcohol Tax Division of the Treasury had been making special deals with bootleggers, permitting them to pay only a portion of their tax deficiencies, and then in installments. WILLIAMS called it cheating honest taxpayers, and stopped the practice.

As much as 85 percent of defense contracts have been negotiated, instead of let by bid. WILLIAMS said such contracts are not a matter for friends to work out among themselves.

The Bendix Corp., of Baltimore, sent a crew of men and their families to Hawaii under a cost-plus Government contract, only to find someone had "goofed" and the men were not needed. WILLIAMS used this as an example of "sloppy" administration under cost-plus contracts, and brought a reduction in the number of this kind.

Junketeering Congressmen and Government officials have long spent millions of dollars a year in counterpart and other funds, without an accounting. WILLIAMS' persistent efforts to make such records public has partially succeeded.

More than \$1.2 billion in counterpart funds are "hidden" abroad. WILLIAMS demands that the public be told how these sums are being spent.

Senators HOMER CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, and JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, have been getting Federal payments on their farms. WILLIAMS revealed that he had never accepted such funds, although entitled to them, and forced the disclosure that his two colleagues had received more than \$1 million over a period of years.

Officers in the CCC and RFC had been firing themselves and friends, then hiring them back after payment of discharge bonuses. WILLIAMS saved more than \$3 million, according to one estimate, by stopping the practice.

The Delta and Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., got \$1,216,700 in Federal farm payments last year. WILLIAMS objected on the grounds the farm was wholly owned by a group of wealthy Britishers.

Almost 5.5 million acres, or 23 percent, of all land in the soil bank never would have been in production anyway. WILLIAMS forced a reexamination of the program.

More than half of farm benefits go to absentee owners. WILLIAMS cited the figures.

Three children under 12 years of age received a total of \$50,000 last year not to farm a farm they were listed as partly owning. In the same family, subsidies went to a 14-year-old brother, a father, and a grandfather, for a grand total of \$165,000. WILLIAMS called this ridiculous waste. He said real farmers were not the ones benefiting from Secretary of Agriculture Benson's programs.

The Senate passes on 1,500 postmasters a year, selected by the White House on the advice of State Republican organizations. WILLIAMS called this "disgraceful politics" and "the same old patronage game" and recommended that the post office be taken out of politics. GOP leaders screamed, but he persisted.

The House recently passed a bill, expected to sail through the Senate, too, to let Members of Congress send out unlimited amounts of "junk mail," addressed to "occupants" and "boxholders." WILLIAMS attacked the "unfair" scheme so vehemently it is considered dead.

"Whispering Will" (so called for his weak voice) was surprised to learn a few months

ago that the Internal Revenue Service and other agencies whose inefficiencies and corruption he had exposed were screening their employees for "leaks." Suspects were given lie-detector tests and ostracism. An undisclosed number were fired. But WILLIAMS says none were guilty.

This year, over strong opposition from some in his own party, WILLIAMS won appointment to the Foreign Relations Committee. Said he: "I haven't any fast views on foreign policy except that the alternative to meeting (with the Russians) is fighting."

What makes WILLIAMS so different than the run of politicians here? Well, he likes to say about himself that he may not have a good education, but does have common sense. Others say his most unusual quality is a conscientious dedication to good government, a quality not as common in Washington as some believe.

Unions Look at Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of Congress, particularly those who supported the labor reform bill last year, will be interested in the article, reprinted below, by Arthur A. Hagman which appeared in the February 1960 issue of the Great Lakelands magazine, formerly Inside Michigan:

UNIONS LOOK AT LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL

Recent statements appearing in union publications indicate that much of the opposition expressed in Washington previous to the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill, actually did not represent the opinions of large segments of organized labor. In fact, passage of the Landrum-Griffin reform legislation has aroused frankness and determination among many union officials, unheard of during the past decade.

For example, John L. Cooper, president of the Los Angeles Joint Executive Board of the Hotel, Restaurant and Bartenders Union made the following observations in a speech on the west coast recently.

"In my opinion, had the Landrum-Griffin bill, as first passed by the House of Representatives, been submitted by secret ballot referendum to only members of organized labor, union members would have voted in favor of this legislation by an even greater majority than when this bill was first adopted in the House of Representatives. . . .

"I have come to the conclusion that we, in an effort to get labor's side of the story to our readers and the public, have frequently employed tactics that are as reprehensible and even more restrictive than those employed by the public press. Too often policy positions are dictated by union authority, far removed from direct membership control, and the labor editor prints these positions and censors out any news item or membership comment that may challenge such ideas.

"Yet, I call to your attention the fact that in almost every daily paper in this country there is published a 'Letters to the Editor' column where letters from readers are printed representing widely divergent opinion, often in conflict with the paper's editorial policy. . . .

"It seems to me a sad commentary that one of the most reliable sources of objective news regarding both labor and management

in America today is to be found in the Wall Street Journal.

"If censorship is reprehensible and violates principles of democracy, how can it be an honorable or effective weapon for us to use in our continued fight against anti-labor censorship?"

The speech by Cooper was more than an exposition of one union official on the west coast. Other versions were published in union publications far removed from the State of California.

The Chicago Federation of Labor devoted an entire page of its weekly publication to excerpts from the speech under a bold banner line: "Let's Cure Labor's Internal Weakness by Restoring Faith of Our Members."

The labor publication added other of Cooper's remarks by stating, "I think we must recognize that the directed union policies we rigidly publish in our labor press, and the censorship that is employed to try and win adherents to our cause, are having the opposite effect. More and more I have come to believe in the moral principles stressed by Gandhi and Nehru that wrong means never attain a good end."

The Baltimore Labor Herald, a well-edited weekly, also denounced excessive and misleading statements made by top spokesmen for organized labor. The Labor Herald says of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill:

"The AFL-CIO officials bitterly opposed the new law. They contended it was so far-reaching that it would destroy the legitimate activities of labor unions, and tip the balance of economic power in favor of business and industrial management.

"When the venom and its hatred have been truly estimated, the high officials of the labor unions will wonder why they became so aroused over L-G provisions. The hypocritical cant of the backers of the bill is outmatched only by the deplorable stupidity of those of the House of Labor who predict it as the 'killer' bill of unionism. * * *

Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Traverse City, Mich., coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin bill, has always maintained that much of the pressure for labor reform legislation came from local union officials and rank and file members. This fact seems to be verified by the statement of Cooper that, "had the Landrum-Griffin bill * * * been submitted by secret ballot referendum to only members of organized labor, union members would have voted in favor of this legislation by an even greater majority than when this bill was first adopted in the House of Representatives. * * *

Congressman GRIFFIN now finds himself a target for the top echelon spokesmen of the Michigan labor movement. He is in a position similar to that of the late Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, who had coauthored the Taft-Hartley Act in the late forties and as a result became the target of union leaders. Senator Taft won his last bid for the U.S. Senate by an overwhelming majority of 430,000 votes, an indication that rank and file members were even then seeking labor reform.

The Landrum-Griffin bill represents needed reform.

ARTHUR A. HAGMAN,
Publisher.

The 3-Mile Limit and Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the clearest statements to come to

my attention concerning the vital significance of the conference now in progress at Geneva on the law of the sea was published in the March 27, 1960, issue of the Washington Sunday Star under the byline of Mr. John Barron.

Mr. Barron has made a very thorough study of the issues involved and ably suggests the motives which have inspired the Soviet Union and its satellites to press for an extension of territorial waters to 12 miles instead of the traditional 3 miles.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has sent an observer to the Geneva Conference. The State of Washington and the State of California also have observers there, as perhaps do some of our other coastal States. In any event, the decisions to be made at this conference are of paramount interest not only to our Nation as a whole, but also to the several States on the Pacific, Atlantic, and gulf coasts, and to Alaska, which is bounded by both the Pacific and Arctic Oceans and by the Bering Sea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Barron's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-MILE LIMIT AND OUR STRATEGY (By John Barron)

In Geneva the United States now is fighting one of its most important postwar actions to preserve freedom of the seas.

There, representatives of 84 countries are trying to agree how far into the sea national sovereignty should extend.

The vastness of the oceans and controversy over fishing rights have helped obscure the real issue of the conference and the gravity with which this country regards it.

The Soviet Union and its satellite nations are trying to force expansion of territorial waters from the traditional 3 miles to 12 miles.

In their efforts, they have had the exasperating support of countries considered friendly to the United States (including Canada and Mexico) and of neutralist powers with deluded concepts of national security and prestige.

The current conference, convened March 17 by the United Nations, is a continuation of one which recessed in 1958 after failure to achieve agreement about the breadth of territorial waters. Since then, the Soviet Union subtly has tried to foster worldwide acceptance of the 12-mile limit.

"DISASTER" FEARED BY SOME

The U.S. delegation, headed by Arthur H. Dean, prominent New York attorney who helped negotiate the Korean armistice, and retired Vice Adm. Oswald Colclough, acting president of George Washington University, has asserted that the 12-mile limit is "fraught with disaster" for the West.

This is why this country thinks so:

There are 116 straits and ocean passages narrower than 24 miles. All now are open to warships and merchant vessels of every country. But adoption of the 12-mile limit would make them territorial waters and, under international law, subject to regulation by the countries exercising sovereignty.

Much of the deterrent peacetime value of the American 6th and 7th Fleets results from their ability to steam swiftly to the scene of a crisis which threatens war.

Should nations which might be neutral or unfriendly in time of future crises acquire the right to deny American warships

use of key straits, they could delay for days or weeks arrival of our flotillas at the site of embryonic conflicts.

The 12-mile limit also could be manipulated to increase the cost of ocean transport upon which most Western nations heavily depend.

International law grants each country the right to regulate movement of merchant vessels in its territorial waters if it considers the movement "prejudicial to the peace, good order or security."

MIGHT DENY PASSAGE

Should a neutralist or unfriendly nation invoke this power to delay passage of freighters through its territorial waters, it could force shipowners to choose more expensive circuitous routes around straits that might be closed.

The Sino-Soviet bloc conducts most of its transport by overland means. It thus has everything to gain by restricting the right of Western nations to use the sea.

The Soviet Union, together with a minority of other nations represented at Geneva, already has asserted claim to a 12-mile limit. The Russians declare no contractual international agreement specifying breadth of territorial waters have been concluded and that they thus have the right to adopt the 12-mile limit in interests of security.

Non-Communist countries are supporting the Russians at Geneva for different reasons.

One might be called a delusion of grandeur. Indonesia, for instance, has advanced the claim that its sovereignty reigns for 200 miles from its coasts. Other nations also seem to feel a heady sense of power at the thought of owning huge stretches of water.

A more dangerous delusion is the belief, to which some Americans have fallen victim, that extension of territorial waters somehow promotes national defense.

Territorial waters, of course, will not deflect missiles, submarines, ships or aircraft sent to invade them. In peacetime, a submarine or plane assigned to reconnaissance or some clandestine duty will, if necessary to its mission, disregard territorial waters no matter what their extent.

In wartime, territorial waters can attract conflict to the shore of neutral nations.

SUBMARINE SUBTERFUGE

Soviet submarines, for instance, might attempt to get safe passage beyond the patrol of American ships by hugging the coastline of neutral countries.

Under international law, a neutral nation must deny a belligerent military use of its territorial waters. If it fails to do so, the opposing belligerent has the right to intervene. Most smaller nations do not have the military capacity to keep submarines or strong naval units out of their waters.

Some countries evidently are supporting restriction of freedom of the sea out of perverse pleasure at the difficulty it would cause the United States.

Some Western nations are advocating adopting the 12-mile limit with the intention of getting for themselves exclusive rights to coastal fishing grounds.

Increasingly efficient methods of mining the sea have sent fishing vessels farther and farther from their native countries and in some instances into areas only a few miles from foreign shores.

These incursions especially have alarmed such countries as Iceland and Canada in whose economies products of the sea are vital.

The United States is entirely sympathetic to problems of countries involved in conflicts over fishing rights.

But it considers that the conflicts best can be solved through separate compacts among the disputing nations, rather than by diminution of the right of all countries to use the oceans.

SUGGESTS COMPROMISE

At the current conference, the United States has proposed a compromise whereby territorial waters would be extended to 6 miles and exclusive fishing rights to 12, subject to such compacts.

Any international agreement binding all countries requires approval by two-thirds of those represented at Geneva. At the 1958 session, the same American compromise proposal failed by seven votes to achieve such a majority.

Some commentators writing about the present conference have stated that the existing 3-mile limit is obsolete or dead. This is not necessarily true. A majority of the major maritime powers still recognize it. The Soviet-supported 12-mile limit does not have the sanction of tradition, logic or widespread recognition. At this time, the Russians probably cannot muster enough votes to enforce its adoption.

If no agreement is concluded at Geneva, disruptive conflicts among Western nations and with the Soviet bloc will continue. But the United States is prepared to accept these in preference to dangerous curtailment of the historic freedom of the seas.

Boom in Bonds Solves Treasury's 4 1/4-Percent Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Leslie Gould as it appeared in the New York Journal American of March 24, 1960:

BOOM IN BONDS SOLVES TREASURY'S 4 1/4-PERCENT PROBLEM

(By Leslie Gould)

The recovery in the bond market has made for the moment academic the argument over lifting the 4 1/4-percent ceiling on long term governments.

Government issues which were yielding 5 percent or better a few weeks ago are now returning less than 4 1/4 percent, even in yields based on maturity.

The bond market is based on yields—the return to the investor. When bonds rise, the yields go down, and vice versa.

FIVE-PERCENT RISE IN VALUES

Bond prices in general have advanced 5 percent in value—some even a little better than this. This is so for corporate issues as well as for the governments.

In discussing the doubts as to stock market's trend 5 weeks ago, this column wrote: "The \$64 question is what happens now?"

"Until you find that answer, better buy a few bonds."

A lot of investors have been doing just that for the last couple of months, particularly so since the stock market's big January-February drop.

An additional factor in the recovery in bonds is the easing money, partly by some relaxing of its restraints on credit by the Federal Reserve and also from some slackening in business.

FEB SAVED FROM BONER

At the start of the year—when there was "massive optimism"—the Federal Reserve was preparing to boost the discount rate from its present 4 percent to 4 1/2 percent.

Commercial banks were hinting at a rise in prime rates from 5 percent to 5 1/2.

The only thing that saved the Federal Reserve from another boner—as in 1957—when it jacked the discount too high—was the imminence of heavy Treasury financing. It didn't want to upset the money market. Otherwise it would have boosted the rate.

Those who ignored the Federal Reserve and bought bonds beginning late in January, have substantial profits, as the accompanying table shows.

Treasury bonds

	Latest bid	1960 low
2 1/4% December 1959-62	96.2	92.16
2 1/4% November 1960	99.12	97.27
2 1/4% December 1960-63	98.26	95.16
2 1/4% September 1961	98.28	96.6
2 1/4% November 1961	98.8	95.8
2 1/4% August 1963	95.22	91.8
2 1/4% February 1965	94.0	88.30
2 1/4% March 1965-70	86.24	80.10
3% August 1966	95.2	89.24
2 1/4% September 1967-72	80.2	78.30
2 1/4% December 1967-72	86.12	79.12
4% October 1969	99.30	94.4
3 1/4% November 1974	98.2	92.12
3 1/4% June 1978-83	88.14	82.8
4% February 1980	99.14	93.10
3 1/4% May 1985	88.6	82.4
3 1/4% February 1990	91.6	84.10
3% February 1995	86.24	79.10

Decimals equal thirty-seconds of a point.

Other bonds

	Offering price	Latest bid
Gen. Ill. Lt. 4 1/4% 1990	99.609	102 3/4
Ch. Pt. Md. 5 1/4% 1996	101	104 1/2
Con. Nat. Gas. 5% 1985	100.712	102
Dayton P. & L. 5 1/4% 1990	100.381	103 3/4
Duke Pwr 5 1/4% 1990	102.40	103 1/2
Duquesne Lt. 5% 2010	100.922	102 3/4
Gen. Tel. Fla. 5% 1990	99.25	102 1/2
Kans. City P. & L. 5% 1990	100.777	104 1/4
La. Gas Serv. 5 1/4% 1985	101.64	103 3/4
Pac. Tel. 5 1/4% 1993	101.198	103
Pub. Serv. Ok. 5% 1990	98.75	101 1/2
Tex. Elec. Scr. 5 1/4% 1985	102.106	104
CIT Fin. 5 1/4% 1980	98.46	104 3/4
Coast Gas. 6% 1980	100	106 1/2
Com'l Cred. 5 1/4% 1986	100	106
Dayton R. Ov. 5 1/4% 1980	100	99 1/4
Gen. Accept. 6% 1980	100	101 1/2
GMAC 5% 1981	99.50	103 3/4
New B'n's P. 5 1/4% 1985	99.65	102 1/4

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, last November it was my great privilege, along with several other Members of this body, to represent the United States at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in Canberra, Australia. The Honorable S. A. Pakeman, acting secretary general of the association, has written me commenting on the report which was submitted by the U.S. delegation, and I therefore ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT,

London, March 28, 1960.

Hon. J. A. FREAR, JR., B.S.,
U.S. Senator from Delaware,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FREAR: Dr. Galloway has kindly sent me a copy of the admirable and interesting report of the U.S. delegation which attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Canberra last November. I am very glad indeed that you and the other members of your delegation were able to come, and it was a great pleasure to meet you, even for so short a time. I am sure that your report will further the idea put forward by Sir Howard d'Egville during his visit to Washington last year of placing the "Associated Group" in the U.S. Congress on a firm footing.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

S. A. PAKEMAN,
Acting Secretary General.

Modernization of the Mail Handling Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an informative article from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, March 24, 1960. This article deals with the promise of further economy and efficiency in the Post Office Department through modernization of mail sorting processes.

The article follows:

MECHANIZING MAILS: CITIES, STATES TO GET ELECTRONIC CODE NAMES—CHANGE WILL SPEED SORTING; HOW BABY CHICKS HELP BAR SWITCH TO FULL AUTOMATION

(By Robert P. Dorang)

WASHINGTON.—Within a year or two, the post office may start putting curious new marks on your letters—dull gray bands, down in the lower right-hand corner of the envelope. These marks will signal the closing of a critical gap in the 11-year-old effort to mechanize mail handling.

Meaningless to the ordinary human eye, these imprints will tell a skillful mechanical mail-sorter how to direct letters into post office bins faster and better than mere man alone can do.

The gray band will duplicate the letter's city-and-State address—in code. It will consist of ink in which tiny magnetic filings are arranged in telltale patterns, much as on magnetic recording tape. The resulting magnetic impulses will instruct the sorting machine electronically. Such a city name as Pierpont, S.D., would first be abbreviated to P-R-P-T, S-D. Then each of the six letters would be represented on the gray band by a combination of tiny vertical lines and spacers.

The operation will still depend in part on human hand and eye, however. The coding job will be done by operators seated at key-boards. As letters are conveyed before them, they'll read addresses and tap out on the envelopes the required patterns. Although an additional machine operation will be added, post office officials claim they will achieve an overall gain in speed.

The sorting machines are capable of far greater speeds than they attain now with human operators sitting at their keyboards and striking the appropriate keys. Use of coded letters will enable the machines to run at speeds much closer to their maximum. More importantly, perhaps, coded letters will flow through the machines continuously, avoiding the stoppages that occur when human operators change shifts or break for coffee.

READING HANDWRITING

The coding operation itself, ironically enough, may later be bypassed by more dramatic devices. By next fall, the Post Office will have a prototype of a machine that will read printed or typed addresses and send instructions directly to sorting machines; one such device has already been developed. Later on, machines may even read handwritten addresses. The Post Office Department already has given Intelligent Machines Research Corp., of Alexandria, Va., a contract to develop such a reader.

Thus the technological revolution in the postal system is at last gathering some momentum. This "conventional" modernization is going ahead regardless of the fate of the more futuristic "fax mail" plan. This plan involves sending letters from coast to coast almost instantaneously by facsimile transmission, in which an electronic device "reads" a letter, flashes the image to a receiver by wire or radio, then reproduces the image on paper. And, after 11 years, the limited mechanization actually accomplished is finally beginning to pay a few dividends, in terms of savings of money and manpower and increased mail-handling capacity.

The ultimate goal, in theory, is nothing less than full, untouched-by-human-hand automation within each postal office. "We want a system," says one researcher, "into which you dump a sack of mail at one end and have it come out pouched for dispatch at the other."

This bold aim may someday affect the letterwriter in surprising ways. As some high Government officials envision things, the Post Office may eventually encourage the use of a standard-size envelope, easily manageable by machine, by offering senders some sort of a discount. The traditional form of address may vanish in favor of a series of code numbers, something like today's way of long-distance telephone dialing; postal zone numbers may be just the start of such a system.

COPING WITH GREATER VOLUME

The need for action is certainly compelling. Apart from any hopes for automation-born economies, officials say modernization is a necessity to keep the postal system from being engulfed in future tidal waves of mail. Within the next 25 years the annual volume is expected to double the 66 billion pieces of mail calculated for the fiscal year ending this June. On top of the impact of population increases, "higher living standards," it's predicted, will lift the per capita flow above this year's 370 pieces.

So far, the massive mechanization job is only beginning. Exactly four of the all-important electronic sorting machines are, or soon will be, on duty—two of them here in Washington, one in Detroit and one in Postmaster General Summerfield's hometown of Flint, Mich. Seven more are on order from Detroit's Burroughs Corp. for late-summer delivery. The first real model of postal mechanical efficiency—a new \$15.5 million Providence, R. I., Post Office that was planned from scratch for automation—will open next fall.

Even in planning, crucial gaps remain. Still lacking, for instance, is a device to collect letters from individual city bins after sorting; clerks must pick them out and put them in pouches. The ultimate of full automation may never come, anyway. "How do you 'machine' a box of baby chicks?"

asks the Post Office Department's research and engineering chief, Wade Plummer.

Yet some signs of success can now be glimpsed. The main Washington Post Office was largely modernized last year, at a cost of \$3.7 million. The biggest single improvement was a conveyor system not unlike those long common in food-processing plants. Result: In last December's Christmas rush, the Washington Post Office handled 337 million pieces of mail, a 16 percent increase over the like 1958 period, with slightly fewer man-hours. Each year, modernization is supposed to chip about \$370,000 off the \$35 million annual cost of operating the capital's main postal building.

A simple conveyor system for mail transport in the Detroit office has yielded an annual saving of \$173,696 on a budget of \$40 million.

Postal modernization really began in 1949. In the fiscal year ended on June 30 of that year, the research hunt for new methods and machines began to toddle along on a mere \$49,000. This fiscal year, research spending is expected to total \$11.5 million. As machines have been developed, capital expenditures have climbed—from under \$13 million in the year ended in mid-1949 to over \$142 million this fiscal year.

REPLACING TRUCKS

But up to now, much modernization money has gone for such workaday needs as replacement of the truck fleet and refurbishing of old buildings. Less than \$40 million has actually been spent on the research program since 1949.

Now some 165 Post Office Department engineers and about 150 private engineers working under Government contracts have taken over the upper floors of the Department's building here. Another 160 engineers and researchers are working at postal installations around the country. Together, they guide the Department's research and the efforts of about three dozen cooperating companies, including International Telephone & Telegraph Co., Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Rabinow Engineering Corp., Farrington Manufacturing Co., and Jervis B. Webb Co.

For a glimpse of the postal future, follow the mail through Washington's main post office, as it is and as it will be. At present, mail collected from all over the Capital is dumped on a moving belt where a crew of clerks feverishly try to cull out all mail that is not first class: Publications, advertising matter, packages. The ideal result would be a flow of letters ready for canceling. Actually, considerable non-first-class mail gets by the clerks.

This imperfect, man-power-eating effort will soon be taken over by a culling machine. Mixed mail will first be dropped on a wide, flat, moving belt which shakes it into a level layer. This layer of mail then tumbles into another belt which slopes at the sides. Letters will slide down the slopes through letter-size slots onto other belts which whip them to a stacking mechanism. Packages, too large to pass through the letter slots, fall off the belt into a special hopper.

BUNDLES FOR CANCELING

Today, hand-culled first-class mail is dumped on tables where women clerks square it into little bundles for canceling. Then the facer-canceler takes over. This machine, a product of Pitney-Bowes, electronically scans each envelope to find the stamp and then positions the letter before a die that applies the postmark. Canceled envelopes streak out at a rate of more than 30,000 an hour.

Once canceled, letters are sorted in the Washington Post Office either by hand or by machine; a sorter made by Bell Telephone Manufacturing Co., and I.T. & T. subsidiary, went on duty here in 1958. Letters move one by one, address side up, before six operators at keyboards. The operators strike keys caus-

ing the letters to drop into small bins corresponding to 300 destination cities. A typical rate: 55 letters a minute. In speed alone, the machine can outdo a half-dozen hand sorters by some 27 percent, and the hand sorters can handle no more than 84 destinations.

New sorting machines seating 12 operators apiece have been ordered from Burroughs Corp. and Cadillac Gage Co., a subsidiary of Detroit's Ex-Cell-O Corp. They will, naturally, roughly double the capacity of the six-seaters. Even then, the speed of sorting will still be limited by the operator's reading speed. Once magnetic ink coding is perfected, however, sorting speed will be limited only by the machine's own velocity.

Packages present special mechanization problems. Once pulled from other mail, they're sorted in the Washington Post Office by a complex two-story machine developed by Detroit's Jervis B. Webb Co. From a conveyor belt, the parcels are deposited on trays riding around on the edge of a second belt, something like passengers on a merry-go-round. Just before, say a Chicago-bound package reaches a tray, an operator at a keyboard reads its address and taps out, electronically, instructions that tell the tray when to tilt and spill off its package. When the merry-go-round has brought the tray around to the right spot, the tray dumps the package down a chute to a mail sack destined for Chicago.

At best, old structures like the Washington Post Office are poorly suited for modern machines. The goal is custom-tailored buildings like Project Turnkey, the new post office rising at Providence. It will be a long, one-story structure, without the columns that interfere with placement of machines, to provide something like a continuous flow of mail.

The project is being handled entirely by an I.T. & T. subsidiary called Intelix Corp. Turnkey is to be capable of handling from 1.5 million to 2 million pieces of mail a day, about 50 percent more than Providence's main post office can manage now.

Beyond Turnkey lies Project Gateway, a plan to build at Oakland, Calif., the most modern postal facility possible. The design contractor is Food Machinery & Chemical. Rollin Barnard, Assistant Postmaster General for facilities, says: "Almost all the equipment to go into Gateway has yet to be invented."

Farm Labor and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday, March 28, the New York Times printed a stirring editorial on the American farm laborers. In the last session, with my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduced S. 1778, a bill to provide for registration of crewleaders. This bill was introduced at the request of Secretary of Labor Mitchell. The measure would require that the approximately 10,000 crewleaders involved in migratory agricultural employment file information regarding conduct and methods of operation on the job, their financial responsibility, transportation, wage arrangements, housing, and other working conditions concerning migrant workers in each crew.

This and other similar measures are under consideration by a Senate Sub-

committee on Migratory Labor under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Department of Labor feels S. 1778 would be extremely helpful in checking the exploitation and abuse of our migratory agricultural workers.

I am pleased to see that the New York Times paid a well-deserved tribute to Secretary of Labor Mitchell's leadership in a very important field of American labor, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial which paid that tribute printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM LABOR AND CONGRESS

It is difficult to conceive of a more helpless group, in terms of economic and political power, than the roughly half million migratory farmworkers in this country. Their labor, usually performed with bent back under a broiling sun, is likely to be unpleasant and physically taxing. Yet they are among the poorest paid persons in our society, have less Government protection than any other significant group of our wage earners, and—since they have no effective unions and usually cannot meet residence requirements for voting—are almost totally incapable of defending their own interests.

Moreover, in some areas of the country the wages and working conditions of these workers are depressed by competition from Mexican workers imported annually with the sponsorship of our Federal Government. Their employers, on the other hand, are typically prosperous and well-organized farmers who exert effective pressure on their own behalf in the marketplace and before Government agencies.

A House subcommittee headed by Representative E. E. GATHINGS is currently holding hearings on a bill to extend beyond June 30, 1961, the present program of importing Mexican farmworkers. These hearings last week developed into a crucial battle between those religious and other groups concerned with helping the most helpless workers in our society and groups of employing farmers who approach the problem from the point of view of minimizing their labor costs and maximizing their profit. Unfortunately, the subcommittee has been showing more sympathy for the representatives of the strong than for those who plead for the weak.

To his credit, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has been providing leadership for those who believe that American farm laborers deserve the same protection as Americans who work in any other occupation. Secretary Mitchell is scheduled to testify before the subcommittee this week. It is to be hoped that he will persist in his advocacy of a square deal for the migrants. And it is to be hoped, too, that Representative GATHINGS and his colleagues will understand that the situation of these workers is a blot upon our Nation and needs to be improved, not further depressed.

Giving Americans Longer Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I retire from the Congress next Jan-

uary, after 37 years of service on Capitol Hill, I shall do some writing. Among the Congressmen I must remember is JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who in his 20 years in the House has become our country's greatest legislative authority in the matter of Government funds for medical research.

Our United States now leads the world in providing funds to knock out the dread disease killers of mankind. This is due in large part to this young crusader whose first speech in the House I shall never forget. JOHN FOGARTY and I came into the House together in January 1941. Early in the session he arose to make a brief appeal for support of a humanitarian cause and I heard him begin with these words:

Mr. Speaker, less than 3 months ago I was laying brick in the streets of my home city of Providence. I have my AFL bricklayers' local card in my pocket * * *.

Let the following article from the Pas-saic (N.J.) Herald-News of March 29, 1960, tell more of the Fogarty story:

GIVING AMERICANS LONGER LIFE—THAT'S CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY'S MISSION

(By Don Oberdorfer)

WASHINGTON.—This year, for the first time, more than half of all the medical research in this country is financed by the Federal Government.

In this milestone year, researchers are getting Federal dollars to study such things as the circulatory system of the octopus (\$24,292) and the effect on mealworm beetles of the age of their parents (\$9,884).

Federal employees at the Government's Rocky Mountain lab have succeeded for the first time in giving encephalitis to garter snakes.

And Federal health officers have just informed Congress about special studies of influenza in an isolated Bering Sea community, a mumps epidemic in an Eskimo colony and rare eye disorder troubling Indians in Halifax County, N.C.

Some of these studies may sound silly, but one of them may save your life.

For example, the officials in charge say the octopus data may be important in human heart research.

Snakes are now believed to be passive carriers of encephalitis, which killed 21 people recently in New Jersey. And epidemics in isolated places offer unusual chances to determine just how a disease spreads.

Such projects as these, plus more ambitious and expensive studies in cancer, heart and other fields, have helped produce an important advance:

An American baby boy born in 1940 could expect to live 61 years. By 1957, medical progress had added 5 years to his expected life.

This is deeply satisfying to Representative JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, a 47-year-old former bricklayer who is the man most responsible for the Government's booming medical research program.

This is his 11th year as chairman of the House subcommittee in charge of health appropriations. He has lectured, wheedled and coaxed reluctant administrators and his fellows in Congress into higher and higher appropriations for medical research.

"When I came to the committee I found the Federal Government was spending only \$2 million a year for medical research, but that \$100 million was being spent for agriculture studies to find out what kills plants and animals," FOGARTY says.

This year the Federal Government is spending an estimated \$376 million for medical research, double the amount of just 3 years ago.

All U.S. private medical research is officially estimated to total \$335 million this year.

This includes the research spending of private industry (mainly drugs), the States, foundations and voluntary health drives.

The private research has been growing rapidly, too.

FOGARTY expects the Federal total to continue to rise, and is pushing a new appropriations bill to beef up the Federal effort.

The increase in Federal research importance doesn't bother FOGARTY. "Somebody has to do these things. So often, we find they are just not being done."

When FOGARTY discovers such a situation, things often happen fast.

He learned at a meeting in his home State 6 years ago about the need for research to help mentally retarded children.

"I found out there was virtually no Federal research program. We gave them \$750,000 for the first year and told the doctors to go to work," he recalls.

This year's program: \$11 million for study of mental retardation and related disorders. Outlook for next year: An increase from FOGARTY's committee.

The Federal money has played a major role in advances in this field. Several types of mental retardation can now be prevented.

As the FOGARTY era rolls along, the National Institutes of Health plan to acquire a new farm for the experimental animals so important to medical knowledge.

The expected "population" in 5 years: 200,000 mice, rats, guinea pigs, and rabbits; 1,500 monkeys; 1,000 cats and dogs, and colonies of Japanese quail and marmosets, all used to extend human life in the ever-increasing Federal research program.

Operation of Soil Bank in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the challenge of finding a lasting solution to our problems in agriculture, I believe, still hinges upon the adoption of a realistic program for creating a supply-demand balance of farm commodities.

We realize, of course, that gearing production to achieving a national consumption-utilization goal is difficult—particularly when the production plant is owned and operated, for the most part, by millions of independent farmers across the country. On a voluntary basis, the farmer would find it difficult, to say the least, to proportionately gear production to the national volume of consumption-utilization.

Despite these difficulties, however, I believe that we must, in the interests of the farm and overall economy, continue efforts to achieve a supply-demand balance.

Meanwhile, it is necessary to keep chopping away at surpluses, crops, and production.

As we know, a major program, designed to take cropland out of production, of course, has been the conservation reserve of the soil bank.

According to estimates, the conservation reserve will take about 28 million acres out of production in 1960.

Overall, the program has two major purposes: First, reduction of crop outputs, particularly in heavy surplus commodities; and second, conserving the soil for future needs of the ever-expanding population of our Nation.

The conservation practices, also, involve tree plantings, under 10-year contracts, currently including nearly 2 million acres.

However, this program, alone, cannot be expected to solve the surplus crop program.

Nevertheless, it is making some headway toward reducing surplus crops at a substantially lesser cost than the price support program.

Recently, Thomas A. Hamilton, an outstanding agriculturist of Wisconsin, who is administrator of the soil bank, reviewed the impact of the soil bank upon our Badger State. In addition to reduction of crops normally in surplus, Mr. Hamilton feels that the program is also reducing dairy herds—thus making a contribution also toward a supply-demand balance in milk production.

Reflecting the operation of a program upon which Congress soon must make decisions, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Wisconsin State Journal outlining Mr. Hamilton's views, as well as a fact sheet from the Department of Agriculture on the scope of the conservation reserve of the soil bank, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Mar. 25, 1960]

SOIL BANK HELPS STATE, U.S. OFFICIAL SAYS HERE

(By Robert C. Bjorklund)

The top administrator of the Nation's soil bank program said here Thursday afternoon that the program of taking land out of production has helped reduce dairy cow numbers in Wisconsin.

Thomas A. Hamilton, the Westfield farmer who moved to the Washington post 3 years ago, said it was his personal belief that the high number of whole farm units put into the soil bank's conservation reserve resulted in the sale of producing herds.

Hamilton spoke at the 48th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Livestock Breeders Association at the East Side Businessmen's Association clubhouse.

He made frequent references to unfriendly press reports on the soil bank, but noted that for every dollar invested to remove cropland from production has resulted in a \$2 to \$6 reduction in crops, most of it surplus.

PAYMENTS NOT LARGE

While numerous press reports emphasize that only big farmers get any benefit from the program, the payments per farm for the 300,000 farmers in the program are not large, he asserted.

"Last year about 22.4 million acres of productive cropland was put into the soil bank's conservation reserve at an average payment of \$11.50 per acre," he continued.

Hamilton said that out in the Great Plains where wheatlands were opened because of the pressure of wartime production, 8 million acres of that land had been returned to native grasses.

"We count that as a real achievement and sooner or later that achievement will be recognized," he declared.

In the old cotton country of the southeastern United States, soil bank lands are going into trees and, because of rapid growth, pulpwood harvests can be made in 12 to 15 years, Hamilton told his audience of more than 100 persons.

He said that the wildlife aspects of the soil bank were an extra dividend and the program had gained the support of major wildlife organizations.

The association honored three men for their contributions to the livestock industry. Plaques were presented to Nick May, Mineral Point, pioneer cattle feeder and Angus breeder; Ralph Reynolds, Lodi, top Short-horn breeder and judge; and Lewis C. French, Milwaukee, retired Milwaukee Journal farm writer.

Rex Whitmore, Burlington, was reelected association president. T. J. Griswold, Livingston, was picked as a new director and vice president; and Ralph Wilson, Burlington, elected new director and treasurer.

Other new directors picked were Otto Johnson, Rio; and Glenn Richards, Lodi.

The association is composed of beef, swine, and sheep breeders in the State and is sponsor of the junior livestock shows.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE CONSERVATION RESERVE OF THE SOIL BANK

The conservation reserve of the soil bank is a program in which farmers voluntarily sign contracts with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to retire general cropland from production and devote it to conservation uses. The contracts provide that the USDA will make an annual payment to the contract signer and will assist in establishing the conservation use on the land.

During the 1959 crop season about 22.5 million acres of cropland on nearly 250,000 farms were under conservation reserve contracts. About 5 million new contract acres are expected to be added during the current signup period, bringing the total acreage for 1960 to around 27.5 million acres.

Conservation reserve contracts may be for 3 to 10 years, depending upon the conservation use to be established on the land and the wishes of the farmer. Land on which there is an acceptable vegetative cover at the time it is placed under the program may be contracted for 3 to 10 years. Land on which a vegetative cover (grass, legume or a grass-legume combination) is to be established may be contracted for a 5- to 10-year period. If the contracted land is to be established in forest trees, the contract period must be for 10 years. Land on which ponds, or other water-impounding practices, or wildlife cover is to be established may be contracted for periods of 5 to 10 years.

Grass cover is being established or maintained on 20.4 million acres—15.4 million new acres planted and 5 million acres to be maintained. The Great Plains area of 422 counties accounts for 7.7 million acres being planted to grass.

Trees and shrubs are being established on 1.8 million acres of conservation reserve land. Forest tree cover is particularly popular in the Southeastern and the Great Lakes States.

Plantings of cover, especially for the benefit of wildlife, are established on 212,000 acres of conservation reserve land. These plantings include shrubs that provide protective cover and also shrubs that produce seed for feed. In addition, there are also general benefits to wildlife from forest plantings and grass cover being established on conservation reserve land.

Ponds and other water-impounding structures to be built on conservation reserve land total 6,800, covering 26,600 acres. These structures impound water for fish, waterfowl, and other wildlife.

Of the 22.5 million acres of cropland in the conservation reserve during 1959, 66 percent (14,766,000 acres) is on farms on

which all the eligible land has been placed in the program. Since all the crop-producing land has been taken out of production on these farms, the production adjustment accomplished cannot be offset by more intensive crop production on other land on the same farm.

The farms on which all the eligible land (14,766,000 acres) has been placed under conservation reserve contracts retired from production 1.8 million wheat-allotment acres, 439,000 cotton-allotment acres, 57,780 peanut-allotment acres, 7,650 tobacco-allotment acres, and 4,860 rice-allotment acres. In addition, these farms took out of production 905,000 acres which were assigned as corn-allotment acres in 1958.

White House Conference on Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this year will mark the 50th anniversary of the First White House Conference on Dependent Children which was called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909.

This anniversary provides an opportunity to recall the contributions to American social work of one of the men selected by President Roosevelt to be a vice chairman of the 1909 conference, the late Thomas M. Mulry, of New York City, who was the maternal grandfather of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGHAN].

Mr. Mulry was an unusual man. He was a banker and at his death was president of the Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank in New York City. He was also a devoted and unselfish worker in charitable causes, devoting the major portion of his efforts to the cause of Catholic charities in general and the St. Vincent de Paul Society in particular.

This society was and is devoted to aiding the poor and the unfortunate and Mr. Mulry from the days of his youth gave his principal efforts to the success of this organization. So successful were his labors that he rose to become national president of the society and for his efforts was made a Knight of St. Gregory, was given an honorary degree of doctor of laws by Catholic University, and was awarded the famous Laetare Medal by the University of Notre Dame.

In a time when publicly financed welfare institutions had scarcely begun to develop, Mr. Mulry did yeoman work in developing cooperation between the many private charitable organizations which had hitherto pursued their independent courses. He worked for and developed joint efforts by groups of differing religions and between religious and nonsectarian societies. He was a leading figure in the movement to remove dependent children from the almshouses to which they were then sent, to proper child-caring institutions.

Mr. Mulry was one of the founders of the National Conference of Catholic Charities and one of the organizers of the New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections. He served as a member of the Conference of Charities of the City of New York, the Charity Organization Society, the State Board of Charities and the Commission of Public Hospitals of the City of New York. He was one of the moving spirits in the founding of the School of Social Science and Fordham University where his brother, Rev. Joseph A. Mulry, S.J., was president.

Mr. Mulry was essentially a simple man. He was a man of strong religious faith and of exemplary life. He and his talented wife, who was a graduate of Hunter College and an accomplished linguist, were the parents of 13 children. Mr. Mulry served his God in serving his fellow man and his interest was ever given to those who were least fortunate and least influential—the out-cast children.

Mr. Mulry's life and accomplishments are in the best American tradition. They set a high standard of performance for those who come after him in the field of social service and this anniversary of the conference which he helped to organize is an appropriate time to recall them to mind.

Mrs. Eric H. Schwartz: A Life Dedicated To Service Through Mary Eleanor Brackenridge Clubs; Public Benefactions of Mary Eleanor Brackenridge and Col. John Brackenridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently was my honor and privilege to speak to members of the National Mary Eleanor Brackenridge Club of Washington, D.C., at their annual international friendship day luncheon.

Meeting with this group was of special significance to me and my wife, Opal, for both of us have long recognized and respected the inspiring influence of the great Brackenridge family of Texas on education in our State, and in encouraging international friendship among peoples of the world.

All of us know that we have gotten to a point in history where international friendship and understanding is no longer only a desirable state of affairs but has become an absolute necessity. In this age of speed beyond the sound barrier and awesome atomic power, we must learn to live together or else run the very real risk of annihilating life as we know it.

Mary Eleanor Brackenridge was a member of the original board of regents of Texas Women's University and remained a member until her death, a

period of a score of years. Mary Eleanor Brackenridge was responsible for so many benefactions that space will not permit their enumeration here. Her distinguished brother, Col. John Brackenridge, donated Brackenridge Hall, in which I resided as a student to the University of Texas, and served it as a regent for nearly a quarter of a century. One of the leaders in the National Mary Eleanor Brackenridge Club of Washington, D.C., is a former Texan, Mrs. Eric H. Schwartz, widow of a noted doctor. Recently one of Washington's best known and respected columnists, Texas Easley of the Associated Press, devoted one of his "Texans in Washington" columns to the work of this kindly lady. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Mr. Easley's column printed in the February 28, 1960, edition of the Moore County News, Dumas, Tex., under the heading "Brackenridge Has Special Meaning for Noted Widow."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRACKENRIDGE HAS SPECIAL MEANING FOR NOTED WIDOW
(By Tex Easley)

WASHINGTON.—The name Brackenridge, known to countless thousands who have strolled through San Antonio's famed Brackenridge Park, has a deep significance for Mrs. Eric H. Schwartz, 75-year-old widow of a noted doctor.

She has dedicated a lifetime to perpetuating the memory of M. Eleanor Brackenridge, and in doing so has spread a bit of good will among many peoples throughout a troubled world.

Her inspiration stemmed from financial aid received as a student at old C.I.A. College for Women in Denton more than a half century ago. The aid came from one of the scholarships established by Miss Mary Eleanor Brackenridge. Miss Brackenridge, whose family gave the park to San Antonio, was a member of the C.I.A. board of regents.

Upon leaving C.I.A. in 1910, the then Annie Andrews taught high school English in Beaumont for 5 years, then went to the University of Illinois for advanced work.

Soon she became Mrs. Eric H. Schwartz, wife of a physician and surgeon who did pioneering cancer research after they moved to Washington in 1916. One of their two sons is Dr. Eric H. Schwartz, now a practicing physician in Waco. The other is Navy Cmdr. George Schwartz.

Since she left college, Mrs. Schwartz has helped organize many M. Brackenridge clubs over the country, all dedicated to setting up scholarships for international student exchanges.

Each year on March 7 these clubs observe "Friendship Day" in honor of the birth of Miss Brackenridge. She was born March 7, 1837 and died in 1924, just short of her 88th birthday.

The National M. Eleanor Brackenridge Club will celebrate the occasion here 2 days early this year. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, Texas, is the scheduled speaker at a luncheon gathering. Representatives of the Brazilian and some other embassies are expected to attend.

In some years the Voice of America makes a recording of the annual "Friendship Day" talks and broadcasts them to various parts of the world.

Mrs. Schwartz, born in Big Spring, where her father, Tom Andrews, was the first prosecuting attorney, lives in a home overlooking the Potomac River.

She spends her spare time delving into historical matters—she's a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Recently she learned that in the building of a sprawling new hospital on the old Soldiers' Home grounds here, a few graves in an old cemetery had to be moved.

One of these graves was that of the grandfather of Miss Eleanor Brackenridge. Born in 1769, he was the first Presbyterian minister to hold a pastorate in the District of Columbia and he also served as a chaplain in Congress.

In her research, Mrs. Schwartz learned that Rev. John Brackenridge as a boy had seen his mother and father and sister slaughtered by Indians in a remote Pennsylvania community. His son, John Adams Brackenridge, the father of Miss Eleanor, moved to Jackson County, Tex., just before the Civil War and died soon thereafter. The family then moved to San Antonio.

Why I Am Proud To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is responsible for many praiseworthy patriotic activities. Among these is an annual essay contest for high-school students. From the State of Ohio, 12 winners are selected and awarded a trip to Washington, D.C., and I am proud to say that one of these this year is from the district I represent. I think the words written by this young lady, Miss Lorena Seebach, a 10th-grade student from Forest, Ohio, are well worth recording and calling to the attention of all my colleagues in Congress. Miss Seebach speaks for me and I am sure millions of our citizens when she tells us "Why I Am Proud To Be an American":

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Lorena Seebach)

Why am I proud to be an American? There are many reasons. Our country's storied past, its prosperous present and its promising future all give each American citizen many reasons to be proud.

Our American heritage is something of which every citizen can justly be proud. Our Nation was made by its people. Not only by famous men like Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln but by all the other "common" people who, though not mentioned in history, have built a great Nation.

I am an American most probably because one of my ancestors became tired of being pushed around or wanted new opportunities which he could not find in his birthplace, or wanted to own land for himself. He came to a new land and there he helped to make real the dream that became America. Someone bought my share of America at a price. This gift was not given to me without conditions. That which has been won by courage must be kept by courage and that which has been achieved cannot be enjoyed without new achievement.

America is a promise—a promise of freedom. The first Americans asked only freedom to worship God in their own way. Later their children asked the freedom to govern themselves. Today we look forward to these freedoms and also to freedom from

many of the other problems which have plagued people from the beginning of time. It is this freedom and this idea of a growing freedom that is the promise of America.

As for government, we rely upon the ballot and the legislative hall to settle differences of opinion and not upon secret police and slave camps. Democracy was not built upon the supposition that we have to keep a close watch on the loyalty of our neighbors. Democracy was built on faith—faith in ourselves and faith in others. Freedom applies to everybody in this land at all times and in all places. It applies to those with whom we disagree as well as to those with whom we agree.

Americans conquered a continent and built a Nation. Our land frontier has passed; however, the frontier of science and a better understanding of human welfare are barely opening. This new field of science will not be conquered except by men and women of free spirit and free mind.

The moral and spiritual qualities which rise only in free people will fulfill the meaning of the word "American" and with them will come centuries of further greatness for our country. The future of America; indeed, the future of the world is in our hands. It is our duty as the American citizens of today to give to the citizens of tomorrow a heritage of which they can also be proud.

Regional Forester Connaughton Praised by California Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, those of us who are in the public service are more often hit by criticism than by praise. It is therefore always gratifying to read a laudatory comment on the work of a public official. The Bakersfield Californian recently gave some well deserved recognition to Mr. Charles E. Connaughton, California's regional forester. In a March 14 editorial the paper calls attention to Mr. Connaughton's annual report and points out that "the soundness of the multiple-use concept of forest land management has been well demonstrated by Regional Forester Connaughton and his force in the 17 national forests in California, which contain the major portion of the watershed, timber, mineral, recreation, and grazing lands in the State."

I want to congratulate Mr. Connaughton and his staff on the success of their operation and to commend the Bakersfield Californian for its excellent editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGIONAL FORESTERS REPORT INTERESTING

That 1959 was an extremely busy and productive year for the U.S. Forest Service in California is the point well emphasized and supported by the annual report of the regional forester, Charles E. Connaughton, whose administration has contributed much to the advancement of the State's great resources in the national forests within its borders.

The soundness of the multiple-use concept of forest land management has been well demonstrated in the development by Regional Forester Connaughton and his force in the 17 national forests in California, which contain the major portion of the watershed, timber, mineral, recreation, and grazing lands in the State. Upon the wise management and use of these lands depends the very existence of California's population.

Mr. Connaughton observes in his report that "the practical workability of the multiple use concept of National Forest administration is now being tested on a scale and to an intensity beyond anything we have experienced in times past. Wood, water, forage, recreation, scenery, habitat for fish and game will be provided to the maximum of the land capability on a sustained yield basis."

The mounting difficulties faced by the Service in accomplishing this objective are growing with the pace of population and the concurrent burdens on the national forests, with conflicting interests providing added troubles; but the Service, holding fast to the concept outlined by the regional forester, has endeavored to adjust these conflicts so that the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run will prevail. In so doing, it deserves the steadfast and earnest support of the public.

Mr. Connaughton also observes that the dilemma between present consumption and future use is ever with us. The new program for the national forests, made public during 1959, contains our best estimates of what provisions we think are necessary to help meet the needs of the Nation. Management must become progressively more intense and more adequately supported by research findings if the national forests are to keep pace with economic needs and national growth.

California legislators in Congress have expressed their warm support of this program, with enthusiastic support from their constituents, and should be encouraged in persisting in their demands that the administration provide the forest service with the funds to do the work.

Forest areas were used in 1959 by an increasing number of persons for recreation, with millions going several times a year for hunting, fishing, riding, skiing, picnicking, camping, swimming, and other purposes. More than 13,500,000 visits were recorded in the national forests in California during the past year, amounting to 23,451,000 man days of use, according to the regional forester's report.

Flood control, soil and water surveys, brushland management, range vegetation, range analysis, timber sales and management, reforestation, fish and wildlife management, fire suppression and control, mineral examinations and many other phases of the Forest Service work are reported in the report submitted by the regional forester to the people of California, and a study of it will reveal the high quality of work and dedicated devotion to duty that are to be found in the operations of Mr. Connaughton and his force.

Sgt. Alvin C. York Still a Hero— Still a Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Alvin C. York is one of America's greatest liv-

ing war heroes. Perhaps no American fighting man ever displayed greater personal courage or made a greater single-handed contribution to the country for which he fought than did Sergeant York—the greatest hero of World War I.

Alvin York grew up in the hill country of Tennessee, near Jamestown, in Fentress County, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. On returning from Europe and the battleground where he single-handedly killed 25 and captured 125 of the enemy, he received a befitting hero's welcome. The Tennessee sergeant could have turned his war deeds into a huge fortune but rather than accept the many glamorous offers which were urged upon him, Sergeant York chose to return to Fentress County and to settle on a small farm there and to make his contributions to his home community.

He helped to start two schools in the community where he lived, and more than 20 years after the war, when he was convinced that the story of his life and military career would be treated with proper dignity, he sold his rights to the books written about him and consented to have his life story filmed. He gave the proceeds from the sale of these rights to one of the schools which he started—a Bible school for youth—York Institute. He has continued to live on his farm and enjoy the rural life which he had always known. After the sergeant had donated the money he received from the filming of his life story, the Internal Revenue Service asserted that he owed \$85,442 in income taxes as a result of the movie, even though in other cases the Internal Revenue Service has allowed capital gains tax and other benefits for those who have received sizable amounts from film rights or from books.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that a rule or a law is not fair if it applies to one citizen and not to all citizens alike. I am informed that while Sergeant York was denied the right to count his income from the filming of his life story as capital gains President Eisenhower was allowed to count his income from the sale of his book, "Crusade in Europe," as capital gains and thus pay much less in taxes than if counted as straight income. Here we have a law interpreted by Tax Bureau officials one way for a general of World War II and the same law interpreted in another way for a sergeant of World War I.

Sergeant York has never been able to meet the demands of the Internal Revenue Service and his present financial status indicates that he will never be able to pay this back tax without selling his farm and perhaps bankrupting this citizen-soldier. He recently has been granted social security benefits. His income, I understand, includes \$32 monthly social security benefits, a \$60 monthly disability pension, and a \$10 monthly payment as a Medal of Honor winner, plus a small income from his farm.

Although stricken and ill and confined to bed and wheelchair, this great Tennessean is still bright, cheerful, and still a hero.

Mr. Speaker, it should be made clear that neither Sergeant York nor any member of his family has requested that I assist him in any way and that my remarks on behalf of Sergeant York is entirely voluntary. Just as he requested no help in fighting the battles of World War I, he has requested no help in fighting the tax battles since his return. Others feel, however, that the Internal Revenue Bureau is unusually severe in handling his case.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, Inez Robb, a columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, has written a column pointing out Sergeant York's present plight and urging that his so-called taxes should be forgiven.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this writing, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 29, last, be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SERGEANT YORK'S TAXES SHOULD BE FORGIVEN
(By Inez Robb)

It is with real sorrow that I read that Sgt. Alvin Cullum York, superhero of World War I, old and ill, has at last been forced by circumstances to apply for such social security benefits as are due him as a self-employed farmer. For the past 6 years the sergeant, 72, has been bedfast, following a stroke. And it has been hard for him to farm the 400 acres in Fentress County, Tenn., given him by a grateful State when he returned from World War I, the outstanding popular hero of that conflict. The Medal of Honor was tucked away in his luggage, and so were decorations from a half dozen other governments.

Sergeant York became the darling of the Nation, as no man has since, with the possible exception of Charles A. Lindbergh. Single-handedly, the sergeant put a German machinegun battalion out of action, killed 25 of the enemy, captured 125 Germans and marched them back to the allied lines.

RETURNED

He returned from the war to a hero's adulatory welcome. On the pier to meet him was a covey of business representatives, waving fat contracts under his nose. The sergeant could have cashed in for a fortune if he had been willing to exploit his heroism. The sergeant said, with finality and the instinctive good taste that marks him, that his services to his country were not for sale.

So the hero went back to the hill country of Tennessee to his old home in Fentress County.

He made some money by occasional dignified lectures and by writing. With the proceeds he started a school where the boys in the district would learn not only to read and write, but improved agricultural methods and the girls the latest in domestic science.

And he started a second school, dear to his heart, a Bible school. Hollywood kept trying to buy his life story. But it was not until 1940-41, when he was convinced that the story would be treated with dignity, that he consented to its filming. And that is the juncture at which Sergeant York began having trouble with Uncle Sam.

All the proceeds of the film about the man the late General Pershing described as "the greatest civilian soldier" in World War I were devoted by that civilian to his Bible school. He and his family continued to live with their usual simplicity on the farm. He was still unwilling to make money for himself out of his service to his Government.

But now Uncle Sam says the older sergeant owes \$85,442 in income taxes as a result of the movie. Like another ex-soldier, this

time of World War II, Joe Louis, the sergeant just hasn't got it. And now, he has applied for social security benefits.

I wish Uncle Sam could find it in his heart to forgive him his alleged tax indebtedness, a sum the Government doesn't really need, and let the old hero end his days in peace and honor.

Mass Transportation Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the crisis the people of New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York face in maintaining our mass transportation facilities continues unabated. Very recently, I had an opportunity to meet with several commuter and municipal and county railroads in my State.

Included in the group were former Mayor Thomas T. Taber of Madison, N.J., chairman of the Morris County Railroad Transportation Association; Joseph Harrison, Newark attorney, who is counsel for the association; Mayor Edward Tiller of Garwood, chairman of the Mayors' Committee of the Inter-Municipal Group for Better Rail Service; Augustus Dreier, counsel of that group, and F. T. Richardson of Mendham, vice chairman of the Morris County Railroad Transportation Association.

At the meeting I proposed, and the group agreed, that the U.S. Senate should undertake a friendly inquiry into the reasons why the Port of New York Authority has found it impossible, to date, to undertake any role in solving our mass transportation problem.

The purpose of such an inquiry, which, I hope, could be undertaken by the Senate Commerce Committee, would be to place on the public record steps which might be taken both by the railroads and the port authority to get this job done. Under no circumstances would such an inquiry be a punitive one, and for this reason, I believe the port authority would welcome the opportunity to air its views.

Subsequent to our meeting, I received resolutions from the executive committee of the Morris County Railroad Transportation Association and the Inter-Municipal Group for Better Rail Service, both of which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MORRIS COUNTY RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED MARCH 24, 1960

Whereas the residents of Morris County, N.J., are dependent on suburban railroad passenger service because of the distance to New York; the highway congestion; and for other economic and social necessities; and today these taxpayers are faced by the threat of the discontinuance of this essential public transportation service unless the

existing inequities and discriminatory practices against the railroads performing this needed service are ended and without further delay; and

Whereas the existing inequities and discriminatory practices have caused the railroads a great loss of revenue because of the fact that competitors have been able to take much freight and passenger traffic from the railroads, due to the modern, tax-free facilities and services provided for their use by the Port of New York Authority, which has done nothing comparable or of benefit to the injured railroads; and

Whereas the original bi-State pact which created the Port of New York Authority, and subsequent legislation relating to that body, all of which were approved by the Congress of the United States, have, among other matters, charged the said Port of New York Authority with the duty of developing, improving, coordinating, and making better use of the existing facilities, equipment, and services of the railroads which are located in the area, but to date the Port of New York Authority has failed to take constructive action to comply with the legislative mandate; and

Whereas it appears that the failure to do so is in a large measure due to a lack of desire, both by the Port of New York Authority and by the railroads in the area, to get together, to cooperate, and to work harmoniously and constructively for the desired objectives; and

Whereas the presently existing lack of cooperation between the Port of New York Authority and the railroads, is contrary to the national and public interest, and should not be permitted to continue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Executive Committee of the Morris County Railroad Transportation Association, That inasmuch as the original bi-State pact, and the proper development of the port of New York, including the railroad freight and passenger facilities and services within the port district are matters of great importance to the United States of America, we do respectfully request our U.S. Senators, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE and the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and our 14 Representatives, Members of the House of Representatives, to initiate the action necessary to hold a public hearing in Washington, for the purpose of ascertaining and getting on the record the specific reasons of the Port of New York Authority for its failure to comply with the mandate contained in the bi-State pact, and subsequent legislation requiring it to work for the development and improvement of existing railroad facilities and services within the port district, and be it further

Resolved, That the railroads operating within the port district be asked to attend the hearing, and there give their reasons for any failure to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Port of New York Authority in seeking to achieve these desirable objectives, and be it further

Resolved, That since this matter is of grave importance to the national as well as public interest, that the hearing be held as expeditiously as possible, and that interested official or public groups be invited to attend.

THOMAS T. TABER,
Chairman.

Attest: JOHN H. ZIEGLER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF INTERMUNICIPAL GROUP FOR BETTER RAIL SERVICE ADOPTED

Whereas the municipalities of Union, Somerset, and Middlesex Counties, their residents and taxpayers are confronted with an increasingly serious threat of loss of passenger rail service unless certain inequities and dis-

crimination treatment under which railroads now operate and compete with other forms of subsidized transportation are remedied without delay; and

Whereas the Port of New York Authority was charged by the original compact between the States of New York and New Jersey and the enabling legislation adopted by the legislatures of both States and approved by the Congress of the United States with the duty, function, and purpose of promoting the development of passenger and freight rail service as well as other means of transportation; and

Whereas, according to charges and claims made by the Port Authority, it has made numerous efforts and advanced many proposals to the railroads serving the New Jersey-New York area for more efficient and economic operation during the past 28 years all of which have been rejected or frustrated by said railroads; and

Whereas the railroads serving the New Jersey-New York area have on numerous occasions charged and claimed that the Port Authority has failed to cooperate with or assist the rail carriers but, in fact, has in many ways aided competing forms of transportation, to wit, busses, trucks, and airlines; and

Whereas the lack of cooperation between the Port Authority, which has demonstrated its constructive capacity in the promotion, development, and operation of transportation facilities other than rail, and the railroads, whose existence depends on their enterprise and capacity to carry out their functions and duties in meeting transportation needs, passenger as well as freight, of the public in the area served by them, has contributed to, and, indeed, caused the passenger transportation crisis in the New Jersey-New York area; and

Whereas there is much that can and should be done by the Governor and legislature of the State of New Jersey to ameliorate the crisis, the problem is essentially one that affects interstate commerce between New York and New Jersey and other States served by said railroads, and demands the attention of the Federal Government and more immediately the Congress and its appropriate committees; and

Whereas the continued impasse between the port authority and the railroads has a harmful effect upon the economic welfare of the most densely populated area of the country as well as upon the national security; and

Whereas representatives of the Inter-Municipal Group for Better Rail Service, representing municipal governments in Union, Somerset and Middlesex Counties, on March 16, 1960 met and discussed the impending passenger rail service crisis in this area with the General Doyle and his staff of the Study Group of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and later with the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE, senior Senator from New Jersey; and

Whereas Senator CASE at said meeting indicated the desirability of an effective public hearing at which the Port Authority would be afforded an opportunity to explain or justify its policies and efforts with respect to complying with the mandate of the legislation creating it relating to railroad passenger as well as freight service, and

Whereas, to obtain a full public airing of the apparent feud between the port authority and the railroads, it would appear necessary to have the railroads appear at such a hearing to present their explanations and justifications, if any: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,
1. That Senator CASE be commended for taking the initiative in recommending a hearing for the purpose of publicly recording the Port Authority's reasons for not comply-

ing with its statutory duty in the field of rail passenger transportation.

2. That such a hearing should be expanded to afford the opportunity to the railroads serving the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area to explain their position with respect to cooperation with the Port Authority.

3. That such hearings be scheduled at an early date in view of the emergent nature of the problem involved.

4. That the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., the junior Senator from New Jersey, who has shown a sympathetic interest in the rail problem be requested to give his full support to the calling of such a hearing without delay.

5. That all members of the House of Representatives from New Jersey be requested to join in the efforts of Senators CASE and WILLIAMS to bring about an early airing of the feud between the Port Authority and the railroads which has adversely affected the public interest.

The Reverend Dr. James Iley McCord Inaugurated as Fourth President of Princeton Theological Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the Reverend Doctor James Iley McCord was inaugurated as the fourth president of Princeton Theological Seminary, in Princeton, N.J.

Representatives of more than 100 colleges, universities, and theological schools attended the ceremonies, which were held in the chapel of Princeton University. Among those present were Governor and Mrs. Robert B. Meyner and most of the leaders of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Among the speakers was Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University, who hailed the new climate in which theology is no longer excluded from university life.

Dr. Goheen also pointed out the interrelationships between the various scholarly disciplines as taught in colleges and universities these days, noting that students of Chaucer were now reading St. Augustine, and that Greek drama is no longer viewed wholly as a secular art form.

I include two articles from the New York Times of March 30, 1960, which report on the inauguration of the Reverend Dr. James Iley McCord as fourth president of the largest training school for ministers of the United Presbyterian Church.

McCord Installed in Princeton Rite—THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH GETS FOURTH PRESIDENT
(By George Dugan)

PRINCETON, N.J., March 29.—The Reverend Dr. James Iley McCord was inaugurated here this afternoon as the fourth president of Princeton Theological Seminary.

Representatives of more than 100 colleges, universities, and theological schools clad in

academic gowns marched in solemn procession and then heard the 40-year-old, Texas-born clergyman accept his investiture as the head of the largest of the Presbyterian Church's eight seminaries.

The ceremony was held in the chapel of Princeton University, although the seminary has no official connection with the college. Its locale, however, was significant in that in most of the preinaugural functions the theme of increasing friendly relations between seminaries and universities was uppermost.

At a dinner last night in the Princeton Inn, Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University, hailed what he described as a "new climate" in which theology was no longer excluded from university life.

INTEREST SEEN SHIFTING

He said that while he detected no "sweeping urge to worship" there was a "significant rehabilitation" of theological pursuits.

In this connection Dr. Goheen noted that students of Chaucer were now reading St. Augustine and that Greek drama was no longer viewed wholly as a secular art form.

Another speaker at the dinner, Dr. Charles Taylor, director of the American Association of Theological Schools, spoke in a similar vein. He pointed out that a seminary "needs a university as much as a university needs a seminary."

Among the dinner guests were Gov. and Mrs. Robert B. Meyner and most of the leaders in the 3,000,000-member United Presbyterian Church.

As fourth president of Princeton seminary Dr. McCord succeeds the Reverend Dr. John Alexander Mackay, who served in that capacity from 1936 to 1959.

Between 1902 and 1936 the seminary had two presidents, Dr. Francis Landey Patton and Dr. Joseph Ross Stevenson.

From 1812, the year of the founding of the institution, until 1902 the seminary was administered by the chairman of the faculty.

In his inaugural address this afternoon, Dr. McCord echoed some of last night's observations.

Princeton seminary, he promised, is committed to the "closest cooperation possible with the university and other institutions and to doing its part in building up the strongest possible intellectual community."

He expressed the conviction that "we are entering a new stage in the evolution of the theological seminary in American higher education and in the life of the church."

"The period of relative isolation and protection, when seminaries were expected to live a sheltered existence, has passed," he asserted, "and we are challenged to emerge into the world, with confidence and integrity, and to work out our authentic role vis-à-vis the church, the academic world, the new age that is dawning and the ongoing theological task."

Inevitably, Dr. McCloud said, adjustments will involve "nothing less than a basic rethinking of all our patterns and habits and a willingness to give up vested interests, no matter how dearly purchased, in order to achieve the best possible result."

"PERSONAL DIMENSION" ASKED

He urged a restoration of the "personal dimension" to theological education that would make possible a "continuing dialog between student and teacher."

In addition to the dinner, the preinaugural activities included a service of worship this morning, a seminar on the relation of the seminary to the church's mission and a lecture by the Reverend Dr. H. Richard Niebuhr of the Yale Divinity School.

Before coming to Princeton Dr. McCord was for 15 years dean and professor of systematic theology at Austin Theological Seminary, Austin, Tex.

He was graduated from Austin College and later attended Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va. He received his divinity degree from Austin Seminary.

He is married to the former Hazel Thompson of Sherman, Tex. They have three children, one son and two daughters.

OPEN-DOOR THEOLOGIAN—JAMES ILEY McCORD

PRINCETON, N.J., March 29.—The Reverend Dr. James Iley McCord, who was inaugurated today as fourth president of Princeton Theological Seminary, is a rare theologian. He makes sense to his theological peers as well as to the man in the pew. Last fall when he came to Princeton seminary as a successor to the Reverend Dr. John Alexander Mackay, Dr. McCord was just 39 years of age, one of the youngest men to head a major seminary. He observed his 40th birthday last November.

As president of Princeton seminary, Dr. McCord, who likes to be called Jim, holds down one of the top posts in Presbyterianism. The seminary here is the largest of the church's eight training schools for ministers.

President McCord is a pipe- and cigar-smoking theologian with a bouncy personality that unfortunately is seldom associated with church leaders. Some of that personality will help to raise millions of dollars for the seminary.

CAMPUS "WHEELS" HAPPY

Built like a football tackle, Jim McCord lives on campus in a beautiful old Gothic cottage called Springdale that he and his personable wife Hazel have completely rehabilitated.

The McCords have three children: Vincent, 16, a junior at Phillips Exeter Academy, and two daughters who go to high school here, Allison, nearly 15, and Marcia, 13.

Campus "wheels" are happy about Dr. McCord. They say it by praising new faculty appointments and dreaming about new buildings.

One of them noted today that the new president always had a hearty hello and that his door was always open, not only for outgoing decisions but also for incoming requests for guidance and counseling.

Before coming to Princeton Dr. McCord was for 15 years dean and professor of systematic theology at Austin Theological Seminary in Texas. A native Texan, he was graduated from Austin College, attended Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va., and took his divinity degree back at Austin seminary.

Here are some of Dr. McCord's views on theology that have made some old heads wag sadly and some new heads nod approvingly:

"Presbyterianism in the United States has abdicated theological primacy. We have not yet faced up to many of the issues raised by the 19th century, to the questions posed by the new sciences, and to the church's obligation to do her theological task for every generation. The result is that theology has become largely irrelevant in many quarters and often incredibly dull.

"The task of the church and seminary in every age is to see that the word of God is free of rationalistic accretions, traditional incrustations, human wrestling and twisting in order that it may accomplish its purpose.

"The church in her theology in recent decades has been too preoccupied with matters ecclesiastical, has become introspective, has developed an esoteric jargon, and is thus cut off more and more from the world.

"Presbyterianism is still too largely a bourgeois phenomenon. It has not yet touched the masses, nor has it challenged a rising generation of intellectuals."

San Antonio Light Answers Postmaster General on Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although we voted substantial increases in postal rates only last session of Congress, the administration is once again calling for another raise in postage rates.

Increases are typical of this administration. It is writing itself down in history as the administration of all sorts of rate increases—such as interest rate raises, cost-of-living rate increases, and even unemployment rates increasingly high during so-called periods of prosperity.

Recently the San Antonio Light, one of Texas' better daily newspapers, published an editorial opposing the administration's demands for postal rate raises. More importantly, it stated its reasons for its position in a forceful argument on the historic role of the post office in America. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the San Antonio Light for March 20, 1960, entitled "Postal Facts."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL FACTS

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which are easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence, the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore, mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the Post Office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in everyday fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

True, it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal judicial system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted, but the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become an issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about \$2,500 million a year. No other Government department produces anywhere near as much revenue.

But because the Postal Establishment costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Postal rates actually are a form of taxes. The Post Office does not keep the money it gets for selling stamps, but turns it into the Treasury. Thus, in urging a postal rate

increase, the administration is seeking an indirect tax increase.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense.

Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska?

Would a business operate a branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, many of them losing money because of slight patronage?

Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

We suggest Mr. Summerfield ought to stop proclaiming (and complaining) how much his department has lost and concentrate on getting the mails delivered as speedily and economically as possible.

And Congress ought to ignore the request for another boost in rates.

Learn More About Us, Students Told by H.S.T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very fine article written by Howard Hill, publisher of the Richmond (Mo.) News, and one of the ablest editors whom I know. The article describes a unique contribution to young Americans being made by former President Harry S. Truman.

The article follows:

LEARN MORE ABOUT US, STUDENTS TOLD BY H.S.T.

It is a rare privilege to be able to talk with a former President of the United States.

To be able to engage in a give-and-take discussion with the only living ex-Democratic President of the United States is an even more unusual experience.

I am a Democrat. I also believe that President Harry Truman will be accorded a place in history among our four or five greatest Chief Executives.

But after talking with Mr. Truman privately and hearing him speak on American government to the student body of William Jewell College in Liberty, I believe that all Americans, regardless of party loyalties, can agree that he is performing a valuable service to the country in what he calls his "campaign to make young people aware of their Government and history."

That was Mr. Truman's purpose in being in Liberty. He had been invited by Dr. Walter Pope Binns, president of William Jewell, to give the talk to William Jewell students that he had already given in recent months at Harvard, Columbia, California, and Southern Methodist Universities.

Displaying the experience of a real professional at talking to audiences of all types, Mr. Truman developed his theme lightly and quickly.

The student's reaction, which they showed by frequent laughter and applause, was to reciprocate Mr. Truman's wit and good humor.

But through it all his theme was serious and dignified: Americans are blessed with having the most remarkable institutions of

government in the world and young Americans should know more about them.

Mr. Truman's exceptional knowledge of American history and the history of American political development was demonstrated very quickly.

He cited the Bible as one of the main sources of guidance for the Founding Fathers of the American Republic and urged the William Jewell students to use the Bible more for interpreting their own government.

Mr. Truman's talk was over quickly, and he got into the question-and-answer period with relish, which he readily admitted was more fun to him than any other part of the program.

The students, who were not all Democrats by any means as I learned by eavesdropping among them, were eager to ask their questions.

Mr. Truman fired his answers back with equal speed.

Once again his complete familiarity with his chosen subject was impressive.

Mr. Truman also revealed that he had a quick mind and a facility with words which was lacking in his early years as President. Later Dr. Binns and I discussed the Truman talk, and we agreed that regardless of what one thinks about his tenure as President, Mr. Truman is an exceptionally intelligent and well-informed man.

The comments of the students as they filed out of the auditorium indicated to me that they too had been impressed in the same way, although there were many who expressed their allegiance to the Republican Party.

In the long run, Mr. Truman's conviction that young Americans should in these times know more about their government, and his determination to do something about it, may be his greatest contribution to American history.

Improving and Expanding National Library Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as our Nation—and its people—face the problems of today and the challenge of the future, the libraries of America, I believe, play an increasingly important role.

For the third consecutive year, observances will be held, April 3 to 9, in recognition of National Library Week throughout the country.

What is National Library Week? The objective is a better read, better informed America. Among the meritorious goals, the program attempts through national and local events to:

Provide a dramatic focus for continuing community reading development programs throughout the year. Among the 5,000 communities participating in Library Week last year, most have undertaken long-range programs.

Attract wide attention to library services. Last year, 10, 20 and 30 percent increases in library circulation and registration figures were consistently reported; many libraries reported record

breaking circulation leaps of 40 and 50 percent.

Increase awareness of the importance of libraries as a major community resource and build support for their expansion.

Foster reading activities in homes, schools, clubs, businesses. Last year, Library Week attracted the participation of the entire public school systems; hundreds of colleges and universities; local chapters of organizations of all kinds including women's clubs, fraternal and business organizations, religious groups.

Inspire more people to more thoughtful reading.

As we know, the Library Services Act, adjusted in 1956, provided assistance through Federal funds to help expand our library services. Providing a shot in the arm to State and local efforts, this legislation has contributed to the following achievements:

Thirty million rural people now have new or improved services available as a result of this cooperative State-local-Federal program.

Approximately 200 new bookmobiles are traveling rural routes bringing brightness and information to people in remote areas.

Over 200 separate project activities to extend and develop rural library services were included in plans for 1959.

Although these are only a few of the accomplishments, they represent the kind of constructive work being carried forward in this field.

However, there is still a good deal of work to be done. For example, 25 million people in rural areas in 1959 still are without any public library service; 21 million more still have had no opportunity to benefit directly by cooperative local-State-Federal library development projects; and 253 counties still have no public library service within their borders.

In the face of these challenges, we recognize that there is a real need for further improvement and expansion of our library service program.

As I understand it, consideration is now underway in committees in both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Recognizing the merits of this program, I believe the Congress should: First, approve adequate funds—at least at the \$7.5 million level—to assist State and local efforts in meeting present needs as well as expanding services for the future; and, second, establish the program on a longer range basis—up to 5 years—to enable States and local communities to undertake extended plans to provide better library service for our people for the future.

I want to emphasize, however, that realistic expansion of such services cannot be accomplished only by appropriation of funds. Rather, the program needs the guidance of farsighted, constructive, creative individuals dedicated to their profession. Particularly, the librarians themselves are now serving as inspirational leaders in this field.

Recently the American Library Association bulletin published a constructive

and informative article by Margaret R. Thoreau, an outstanding librarian of the La Crosse Public Library, La Crosse, Wis. The article delineates the splendid way in which the services of the library are being creatively utilized to serve the public in that fine community.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article for National Library Week, entitled "A Local Library Goal of the Public Library of La Crosse," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLW AND LOCAL LIBRARY GOALS—1959 IN LA CROSSE

(By Gertrude R. Thuro)

What is there about National Library Week that sets it apart from the host of national weeks, such as Pickle Week, Pencil Week, Domestic Rabbit Week, Smile Week, or any of the other 85 national weeks sponsored by the trade promotion division of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Advertising Council? One salutary feature is that we create an awareness in our public for books and the manifold resources and services of the library, but equally important are the unique opportunities this special occasion provides for the library to recognize, pay tribute to, and encourage the activities and accomplishment of individuals who have furthered the cause of education and merit special community awareness.

A COMMUNITY SEAWAY PROGRAM

How to proceed in planning such a program? Coupled with community sensitivity and an awareness of its resources and talents are the needs expressed, the needs implied, the needs unmet, in addition to experiences shared. In La Crosse, sharing became the keynote. A member of one of our adult discussion groups insisted at the program planning meeting that one program be included on the St. Lawrence Seaway and its implications for La Crosse. The expressed need was accepted, but this program was deferred until spring because much new seaway material was just then becoming available.

And then we conceived the idea. It is this library's policy to plan larger public information programs on new subjects or those on which the community desires more information, whether it be a city manager workshop type of program or one on understanding the satellites. Here was the need for seaway information so we asked the adult discussion group if it would share this meeting with the community. They liked the idea. We wrote, among others, to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation at Messena, N.Y., for literature, and contracted with them for the film "The Fourth Seaway"; but better still, we had a natural for a speaker on the subject. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY was actually "The Father of the Seaway"; furthermore here was a Senator who had always espoused the cause of education and libraries loyally and vociferously. He was the man in whose honor the channel had been named the Wiley-Dondero Channel, but Wisconsin had not generally acknowledged his great efforts in behalf of this project. All it required was a letter. Senator WILEY agreed to speak if the meeting could be held before the Easter recess. Thus we decided on a prelude for National Library Week—the week before.

A local radio station brought its mobile unit up to the station to welcome Senator and Mrs. Wiley, enabling the Senator, the librarian, and the announcer to hold an on-the-spot interview. S. Janice Kee, executive director of the Wisconsin Free Library Commission, made the opening address at the

meeting. The climax came after the meeting when the Senator's press releases, "WILEY Proposes Expansion of U.S. Libraries," went over the Nation's wire service. When all the Seaway excitement broke loose in June, with the Wileys accompanying the presidential party on the Columbine to the Seaway dedication, we in La Crosse felt that we had had a sneak preview during National Library Week.

MODERN ART

Another library-sponsored group, the Library's Modern Art Study and Discussion Group, was responsible for the next public adult program of the week. The group was challenged to assist us with a public program, accepted, and appointed three committees—one for program, one for the exhibit, and one for the reception. Walter Quirt, artist in residence at the University of Minnesota, was secured as guest speaker and presented "Art and the Community," an illustrated lecture combined with chalkboard demonstration. This was followed by an art exhibit and a coffee hour at the library. To everyone's amazement, over a hundred paintings by local artists were exhibited. Artist met artist; the public met the artists; and the artists took Mr. Quirt to their paintings to ask for constructive criticism. The general spirit of that evening and the camaraderie can be indicated but cannot be shared in an article.

The National Library Week Sunday afternoon kickoff event was an autographing party for children. Here was an opportunity to pay recognition to our area author, Emil Liers, author of "An Otter's Story," and of "A Beaver's Story" illustrated by our own local art teacher, Ray Sherin. This was no run-of-the-mill autographing party. Here were the Liers book characters—living and lively trained otters—performing their stunts. Illustrator Sherin had the original sketches and drawings, including the book jacket, on exhibit. When it became obvious that someone or something "had to give" because of overflow crowd, some adults obligingly left to make way for children and their parents.

And then there was youth. Youth in our community had been working hard for several years earning money by car wash and shoeshine projects, and with student-faculty games, to raise money for the American field service exchange program. We found five of these teenagers who had worthwhile experiences in this program, but most of our community had not realized nor profited by them. Would they do an evening program for National Library Week? In their typically enthusiastic fashion "they'd be delighted to," and they did delight. The exchange student from Germany was there; one of our girls had spent the summer in Finland, one in Switzerland, and one had been a member of the teen overseas project to Europe; a boy had been in Germany. Here were firsthand good-will builders. Here was international understanding at its best. At the conclusion of the program the adults were envying them, not only their fine experience, but their poise and dispatch in sharing them with us.

The La Crosse County youth group's water sports and water safety program was held on the Saturday of National Library Week. The fact that the librarian is a member of the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth made the library's role in this program planning an especially active one. Shortly before this meeting community agency heads from the fire department, police safety department, and Red Cross had served as preview consultants to the library for a film on rescue breathing. These men later consented to help with the youth safety program. The resuscitator squad of the fire department staged a demonstration; the police traffic and safety representative talked on rules of the water lanes and introduced

the film, "Rescue Breathing." Actual swimming pool demonstrations by youth, and rescue methods and lifesaving techniques were a novel attraction. Supplementing the program were a book exhibit, lists of safety and lifesaving methods books and materials available at the library, and a pamphlet distribution.

Three of the youth group assisted the librarian on the weekly "Your Library Speaks" radio program, which was devoted to youth on this Saturday. A half-hour telecast with patrons and the librarian discussing adult books was the adult contribution. A mobile unit broadcast from the librarian's office about National Library Week events completed the broadcast series.

HOBBY SHOWS AT BRANCH LIBRARIES

At the branch libraries the hobby shows draw an enthusiastic audience. This has become an annual spring feature looked forward to by the public and the hobbyist. With 60 different exhibitors manning their tables to explain their hobbies, share their enthusiasm, and show others which of the library's books and magazines had been most helpful in pursuing the hobby, this has become an exhilarating event. Demonstrations of weaving, fly-tying, gem-cutting, and woodcarving attracted great interest. Sharing their skills, enthusiasm, and results with fellow citizens is always the highlight, as was demonstrated when one woodcarver said to me: "I was afraid you weren't going to get here this time. I wanted you to see how much I've improved since last year. This book was a dandy guide. See, I've made this exactly like the model in the book." With this tangible proof of the efficacy of the printed word, they "sell" our books along with their enthusiasm for their hobbies. At one branch library the historical society put on an antique show. Since it has no museum, the society looks forward to this annual public exhibit. Here, too, the youth science exhibit projects were on display. Is it worth while? Will we continue? We almost have to until some other local group takes over, because each year the branch librarians report that people come up to them to report what they plan to exhibit the next year.

The terminal Sunday had to be included in National Library Week for the observance of the 70th birthday anniversary of the Main Library and the 90th of its forbear, the Young Men's Library Association. To our great pleasure the Business and Professional Women's Club accepted our invitation to serve as hostesses for the anniversary open house tea, reciprocating in a measure for a legislative workshop the library had helped them sponsor during their district convention. Their surprise for us was a unique centerpiece—a huge birthday cake in the form of an open book with the names of the five head librarians inscribed with frosting on the open pages. As if this were not enough, they said that they had never been more proud of any public project they had undertaken.

THEN THERE WAS MUSIC

Music finally came into its own at this program when the local college octette performed, and our local pianist, Don Jonson, recently returned as a Ted Mack semifinalist, rendered several piano numbers. Heartening was his declaration that it was finally his "privilege at last to do something for the library which has served me for so many years."

Reflections and evaluations after the week found the librarians humbly grateful. National Library Week had truly been citizen's week in our city. The library was the innovator, leading and suggesting, but the citizens came to the fore with the actual execution of the projects that went into making our continual library objective of adult

learning through libraries a vital force. Our patrons and friends were selling our wares all week in a myriad of living demonstrations. Implicit in all of the activities was the fact that books and the printed word are basic and vital, but they also illustrated how the educative process can be stimulated and vitalized with the aid of films, lectures, discussions, exhibits and hobbies, demonstrations, and radio and TV broadcasts with art and music.

It made us realize how important it is to keep mending and improving this two-way highway on which the library goes out into the community to serve it, with the citizens and friends of all ages and talents coming in to us to help us with our program—citizens and friends doing the job effectively, enthusiastically, and proudly.

You and Your Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to bring before the House the following material compiled by our distinguished colleague from New Mexico, the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS. This material will be of tremendous benefit to the many high school graduates who might otherwise not be able to continue their education. I think he should be commended for his efforts. The following represents considerable research and I consider it a privilege to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

YOU AND YOUR FUTURE

FUTURE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

A democratic society such as ours is dynamic and growth is a necessary part of the system. With this growth more opportunities are available for well-qualified young people today than ever before in our entire history. Because our Nation is not producing an adequate number of men and women with sufficient qualifications, thousands of interesting and highly salaried positions remain unfilled. Let me illustrate this point with some figures: The Department of Labor surveyed 200 large firms, one-half reported they were unable to hire enough research scientists and engineers; industry needs one engineer and five highly trained technicians for every 40 workers; in 1958-59 it is estimated we were short 135,000 qualified teachers; the journalism and newspaper field has an acute shortage of qualified people.

We live in a civilization and world that requires education. Your future depends on you becoming well educated. The job applicant with advanced training will have a better opportunity to get and hold a job than his untrained fellow worker. During the most recent recession, nearly 1 in 5 unskilled laborers experienced unemployment, while only 1 in 50 professional and technical workers were jobless. White collar workers, who generally have to meet higher educational requirements, were relatively steady in their employment.

By the time you are 25, there will be millions of new job openings in our economy, but most of them will go to persons with a solid educational background. There will be a decline in the number of jobs for unskilled workers and it is estimated that

the United States will have one-half million fewer such workers in 1967. Irregular employment and lower wages will face the uneducated in the economy of the future. Yet past experience shows us that many of the 2 million high school graduates of 1960 will not go on to college, and will slip out of the stream of education. In fact, only 45 percent of those who graduate are expected to continue their formal education, either in an institution of higher education or business or vocational school. Are you to be in the 55 percent group and let your education stop?

The Department of Labor estimated that in the next 10 years, business and industry will need about 13½ million additional workers, including 5.1 million skilled and semiskilled workers, 3½ million professional and technical workers, and almost 6 million managerial and other white collar workers. By 1965 there may be a shortage of skilled workers and because of this gap, rapid advancement will be possible for workers with good preparation. In addition to those needed for replacement, we will need 45,000 new doctors, 75,000 college-trained nurses, 485,000 more elementary and high school teachers, 120,000 more college teachers, 80,000 more natural scientists and 100,000 engineers. Education will be the foremost qualification for these additional workers.

The desire for you to get a job this summer and forget about higher education will be appealing but let me remind you that your economic gain and social satisfaction are merely temporary. The 1960's hold the promise of a decade of historic significance in the development of this Nation and in achieving a better way of life for our citizens. As tools and methods become more and more complex, they offer increasing opportunities to give a better and safer life for all. But, at the same time, they place increased demands upon the worker. He must be prepared to cope with the changes in the nature of work that new machines and methods create. With each change, he must be prepared to enlarge his own knowledge and skill to keep pace with technological progress. Education is the basic equipment which helps a man to grow with his job and to move on to better opportunities. A nuclear physicist and a tool maker need difference amounts of education but both need the same basic education. They then move on to the particular areas of study required for their respective fields. Only by becoming qualified through a better education will you insure the realization of your greatest ambition.

EDUCATION EFFECTS EARNINGS

Dr. Paul C. Glick, Chief Social Statistician of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, has analyzed lifetime earnings of American and compared them with years of schooling. The following findings show how smart it is to be educated.

Years of schooling:	Lifetime earnings
1 to 4.....	\$72,000
8.....	116,000
4 years of high school.....	165,000
1 to 3 years of college.....	190,000
4 or more years of college.....	268,000

He also found that in families headed by grade school graduates, the median annual family income was \$4,386 as compared with \$5,667 for high school graduate households and \$8,143 for college graduates. Education, of course, has far more value than a dollar tag can show. It opens the way to more interesting kinds of jobs and a much more satisfying life.

APTITUDES FOR FURTHER EDUCATION

Many students do not go on to college because they are afraid they do not possess the

necessary ability. Perhaps they are a trifle slower than their classmates in grasping things and maybe find it more difficult to comprehend the basic subjects than many of their friends. Those of you who feel this way may, after reading the foregoing statements, think more strongly than ever that there is no place for you in the upper echelons of our highly complex society. Nothing could be further from the truth. Read the following.

Dr. S. Strauss, a teacher in Washington, D.C., conducted a study of the backgrounds of more than 600 Americans who were awarded the Ph. D. degree in recent years. He found that 43 percent had a high school IQ below 120, and several were down in the 90's. One boy with a reported IQ of 94 had been placed in a nonacademic program in his high school by a counselor. Dr. Strauss found that two-thirds were below the top 5 percent of their class, and one-half were below the top 10 percent. He hates to make a sweeping generalization but is inclined to believe that academic progress can be stated as a formula: ability plus effort equals success. The greater the ability, the less effort is needed, and vice versa.

Many an able youth never continues his education because he is unwilling to subject himself to the necessary rigorous discipline or because he strives for other goals. I hate to think of the talent that is wasted because individuals underestimate their abilities. You should consider the above before deciding not to continue your education. If you have average abilities and are willing to work hard at your studies, there is a future and a college for you. Just because a student has to work harder than many of his fellow students does not mean that he shouldn't plan to continue his schooling. On the contrary, very often the so-called slow student outstrips his more gifted classmates, simply because he has to work harder to get what he seeks. So, don't give up. Concentration and effort are, in themselves, qualities in great demand.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES

It is true, costs of attending a college or university have increased a good deal and particularly in the last 10 years. Many students and families, after looking at the cost of a 4-year college education, are inclined to give up the idea of going to college. However, never before have so many sources of money been available to assist students in meeting expenses. Scholarships, loan funds, and gratuities are available by the thousands, ranging from small prizes offered by a local organization to fellowships worth several thousands of dollars. About one student in five receives scholarship aid in some form from universities, colleges, foundations, private organizations, labor unions, and Federal and State legislatures. During 1959-60 more than \$120 million is available for assistance to students. In actual practice, a large number of the available aids go unclaimed. The interested and qualified student who conducts an exhaustive search can usually find a program either general enough or tailored to fit his own need. The ultimate benefit will outweigh the difficulties of obtaining aid.

PART-TIME WORK

Most of the colleges give part-time jobs to deserving students who are not able to meet all expenses. In fact, more students earn part of their college expense by on-campus jobs than the number receiving institutional scholarships. In New Mexico during the 1955-56 school year, 1,758 students earned an average of \$355 per month on part-time jobs while only 1,165 scholarships were given with an average of \$207. Indeed, one of the most effective ways a student may earn money for his college education is through summertime employment.

DEFERRED PAYMENTS, "LEARN NOW—PAY LATER"

Since the burden of paying higher costs for an education at a college or university is much greater today, some colleges have seen their need to allow payment of expenses on an installment basis rather than in a lump sum. Generally, tuition must be paid at registration unless special arrangements have been made with the institution. However, nearly all room and board charges may be paid in installments. There are several tuition payment plans that help parents meet college expenses on a monthly basis, such as the Tuition Plan, Inc., 347 Fifth Avenue, New York 16; Insured Tuition Payment Plan, 112 Water Street, Boston 9, Mass.; Midland Time Plan for Education, Marine Trust Building, Buffalo 5, N.Y. Certain banks have also made arrangements for deferred payments with colleges in their communities; for example, the Indiana National Bank, in Indianapolis, has a system where the parent contracts to pay a fixed amount monthly and the bank meets all the college bills when due, up to a certain amount, with payments spread over a 6-year period.

CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Children of veterans who died as a result of disease or injury incurred while in service should write to the New Mexico Veterans Service Commission, Santa Fe. If service was entered from New Mexico, free tuition to New Mexico State schools plus \$300 maximum for matriculation, board, room, fees, books, and supplies is offered to those selected on basis of need and merit. National scholarships available for children of veterans are described in the booklet, "Need a Lift?" which may be obtained by sending 15 cents (to cover the cost of printing and postage) to the National Child Welfare Division, the American Legion, Indianapolis 6, Ind. For scholarships and funds on the State level, contact the American Legion, 3205 East Central Avenue, Albuquerque.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Previously, undergraduate eligibility for Federal support for educational purposes was determined almost exclusively by past military service, commitment to future service, or orphanhood resulting from a parent's death from service-connected injury or disease. These are all still available to those who are in these categories. However, under the new National Defense Student Loan Program, any student who is enrolled on a full-time basis can apply for a loan. It is up to the college to set its own eligibility, but financial need and ability to make good marks are important items that each institution considers. Those students who plan to study teaching, science, mathematics, engineering or modern languages are given special consideration. There is a limit of \$1,000 for each school year and \$5,000 for an entire college career, however, it is likely that most loans will be in small amounts. One can repay the loan in installments, starting a year after training is finished and be repaid within 10 years. If you become a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school, the loan will be cancelled out at 10 percent for each year you teach, up to a maximum of 50 percent. The interest on the loan is 3 percent starting when the repayment schedule begins. Further information may be obtained from the college you elect to attend.

As of February 29, 1960, New Mexico institutions had made loans totaling \$289,230 to 742 students. The 1959-60 school year allocation to New Mexico under the law is \$149,545, matched in part by the universities.

FEDERAL STUDENT TRAINEES

The Federal Government participates in and operates certain educational programs in a wide variety of national and interna-

tional educational activities. However, other than the Education Act, nearly all of the foreign and Federal Government programs require college work before consideration is given. After you have entered college, more information concerning advanced Government programs can be obtained from the dean of students of the Government department responsible for the area of study in which you are interested.

The Government does have a cooperative work-study program which provides an integration of academic study with practical work experience and training on the job in an organized program, usually of 5 years duration, under which students alternate periods of attendance in college with periods of employment. In addition, there is another program which is the vacation work-study plan, where the student is employed by a Federal agency during the vacation period in locations throughout the United States, with offerings in nearly every field imaginable. These programs give you the opportunity to work under the guidance of professional personnel and help you decide if a particular field is all that you had hoped it would be. Interested students should contact your nearest civil-service office for further information and watch for trainee examination announcements.

There is a student Army nurse program that is available during the third year of a 3-year nursing program or for the third and fourth years of a 4-year training program. Participants are able to continue their education while receiving full pay and allowance as either officers or enlisted personnel in the Army Reserve. For further information write to the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington 25, D.C.

NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

Apprenticeship training is a practical answer to the need for maximum development of skills and technical abilities. Training in the skilled trades is good insurance.

New Mexico has an apprenticeship law which provides for a statewide apprenticeship program. The law is administered by the Labor and Industrial Commission, Santa Fe, and a management-labor council act on policies, with the entire program an integral part of the national program.

There are more than 90 apprenticeable trades, most require at least 3 years training and many others 4 or more. In New Mexico we have more than 900 in the building-trades program, and only 155 in other trades such as machinists, printers, electrical workers, pressmen, and auto mechanics.

The need for skilled workers and technicians is pressing. Those of you who want to learn a special skilled trade, receive training, while earning and working, contact the Labor Commissioner, New Mexico Apprenticeship Council, Labor and Industrial Commission, Post Office Box 1726, Santa Fe, or State Supervisor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Department of Labor, room 234, 610 Gold Avenue SW., Albuquerque.

LOAN FUNDS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

You should establish your eligibility to enter the school of your choice and then qualify your financial need if some form of educational aid is required. You or your parents should be prepared to supply evidence that such a need is the case. The college bulletin or catalog lists scholarships and funds available. If more information is desired, ask the dean of the college you plan to attend what is available in the way of scholarships, loan funds, and student employment. However, remember that many awards are made on national scholastic and competitive standing, such as the National Merit, Westinghouse Science, and the General Motors scholarships.

Loan funds, either emergency or long-term up to a year, are maintained by most colleges to assist worthy students, who have evidence

of ability to repay. Agreements usually have to be assigned. It is well to remember that many banks will make loans for tuition, room, and board to students who demonstrate ability and promise.

It is difficult to list all of the many different funds available, with so many varied requirements, all of which are changing constantly. For example, Yale has available funds for boys whose last name is DeForrest; the University of New Mexico has a scholarship for a worthy graduate of a New Mexico high school who is selected on the basis of financial need, interest in engineering, high-school record, and participation in athletics. New Mexico State University awards a scholarship annually to an entering freshman who majors in the dairy field. At Eastern New Mexico University, certain honor students are selected to receive scholarships; New Mexico Military Institute has a scholarship for a young man whose interest in military affairs will assure him a commission; New Mexico Highlands University awards a scholarship to an outstanding high school student who is planning a teacher career. New Mexico Institute of Mines and Technology awards a full tuition scholarship to entering freshman who have shown superior scholastic ability in high school. To students who show an active interest and ability in drama, New Mexico Western College grants tuition scholarships; St. Michael's College has provision to assist students who have the intellectual ability to do college work but lack adequate finances. College of St. Joseph administers a scholarship based on a competitive examination.

In addition, the International Mineral & Chemical Corp. in Carlsbad offers a \$600 4-year scholarship to a resident of Eddy County; Jones Graphic Arts Products Co. of Albuquerque gives a tuition scholarship to a high school graduate from New Mexico or Arizona; the New Mexico Library Association in Roswell, gives a \$300 scholarship to a girl interested in the field of library work; New Mexico Motor Carrier Association in Albuquerque gives two competitive scholarships of \$500 each to qualified applicants planning to attend New Mexico colleges. The AFL-CIO gives six full scholarships, administered by the National Merit Council, three of which are limited to members' children. These are only a few of the many and varied funds available.

It is not necessary for the applicant to have a brilliant high school record. Frequently, the chief purpose of a scholarship fund is to assist a student who has a good, but not necessarily outstanding record, and who can be expected to profit from a college education but is prevented for economic reasons from obtaining one.

After looking over the array of opportunities for scholarships, I suggest you investigate those for which you have a special qualification of special interest. As an example, the education and manpower committee of the New Mexico section of the American Chemical Society sponsors awards to the students making the three top grades on a chemistry examination administered by the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology and given by the local high school science teacher. Sears, Roebuck Foundation provides scholarships for freshmen students majoring in agriculture or home economics, who would have had financial difficulty in attending college. This scholarship is administered by the New Mexico State University.

Loans are available to those students who desire to become nurses but lack funds. Write directly to the Bergen Foundation, 6536 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood 28, Calif., after you have established that you meet the entrance requirements of the hospital where you want to train. The Committee

on Careers, National League for Nursing, 10 Columbus Circle, New York 19, has valuable information for prospective nurses. The University of New Mexico has a College of Nursing and several scholarships are available. Contact the dean, College of Nursing. The College of Pharmacy grants freshman scholarships to New Mexico high-school graduates who enter the pharmacy program at the university. For information, apply to the dean, College of Pharmacy, University of New Mexico. The National Foundation, 800 Second Avenue, New York 17, offers 4-year college scholarships for graduating high school seniors entering accredited B.A. programs in physical therapy, occupation therapy, or professional nursing.

Perhaps the State department of education in Santa Fe can give you additional information concerning scholarships and loan programs designed for students planning to become teachers. For those interested in medicine, you should contact the State board of health in Santa Fe or, for more detailed information, the Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill. In most medical schools, there were loan funds available in excess last year. However, bear in mind that you have to be accepted by a medical school before most of the loan funds and scholarships can be considered.

For information relating to foreign scholarships, write to Information and Counseling Division, Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21.

ARMED FORCES EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

U.S. service academies: Because the opportunities afforded by each academy are as varied as the service they represent, interested students should write to the following:

Army: The Registrar, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

Air Force: Director of Admissions, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Navy: Chief of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D.C.

Coast Guard: The Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Washington 25, D.C.

Merchant Marine: Registrar, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y.

January or February is usually the deadline for applications for the next school year for most of the academies. However, the student who prepares himself beyond the high school level will be in a better position to compete for the entrance examinations for future years. In fact, many of those accepted for some of the academies have had training beyond high school.

Reserve Officers Training Corps. Several universities have established ROTC Units, with a program of instruction that leads to a commission as a second lieutenant, as you receive your college education. For more detailed information consult the college catalog.

INDIAN STUDENTS

"Higher Education Aids for Indian Young People" is the title of a pamphlet which outlines all available financial aids for Indian students. It can be obtained without charge from the Haskell Institute, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Lawrence, Kans.

The Federal Government, through the Agency Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, administers three means of assistance. Grants: Each area annually grants small supplementary aids to those who have good records and who need assistance. Working scholarships: There are boarding schools located near colleges which furnish room and board in exchange for 14 hours of work each week. One is located in Albuquerque. Education loans are maintained for emergency cases.

For girls who are financially unable to pursue nurses' training, scholarships are given by the National Society of the Co-

lonial Dames of America. Contact your Bureau of Indian Affairs for complete information. The Indian Board of Home Missions of Congregational Churches of America assists Indian students without regard to religious affiliation or tribe. Many Indian tribes assist their young people. The Jicarilla-Apache has a substantial scholarship program, as do the Navajo, and Mescalero-Apache Tribes. Contact your tribal governing body.

CHOICE OF SCHOOL

The counsellor or principal in your high school is the best source of information about the choice of a college or university as well as for scholarships offered by local companies or individuals. He has an extensive file of college catalogs and other descriptive publications concerning the facilities of the various institutions. If some of the information you desire is not available through him, the references below list suggested sources of information for prospective college students, their parents and their counsellors. Consult your local library or any library in some of the larger towns for additional information.

CHOICE OF CAREER

If you are undecided as to what field you would like to enter, the American Legion booklet, "Need a Lift?" mentioned above, has compiled a list showing career organizations which will provide helpful information about job opportunities, subjects required, where to get training and other related topics. Also consult the career planning references below.

A special word for those who may be thinking of an agriculture career. Do not overlook it. It is and will remain the Nation's basic industry. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture estimates that about 15,000 new jobs are created each year for college graduates and only 8,500 to fill them. Dr. R. B. Corbett, President of New Mexico State University, recently stated, "Years ago the common saying was that engineers were a dime a dozen—there is no future in engineering. Yet today men trained in engineering are the scarcest and most demanded in our economy today." He suggests a parallel between engineering and agriculture. The manpower demand is declining in agriculture, but it is changing from a way of life to an exact science. The farmer will need to have a good working knowledge in many fields of science—chemistry, pathology, genetics, and business management. Demands for agriculturally-trained people are needed off the farm as well as on, such as agriculture research, industry, business, education, communication, conservation. There will continue to be jobs for properly trained farm youth.

Please do not forget this is only a part of the vast information available and that I am not a professional educator. The alert student requiring financial assistance to attend college or vocational school, those choosing a career or searching for a training school, will explore many sources not mentioned. Remember that many social and fraternal organizations, denominational and religious groups, foundations, professional associations, labor unions, and some of the larger industrial companies supply financial aid to worthy students.

SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP REFERENCE MATERIALS

"American Foundations and Their Fields," seventh edition, New York, American Foundations Information Service, 1955.

"How to Finance a College Education," Craig, W. Bradford. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959; 79 pages; \$1.95, paper.

"Handbook on International Study," a guide for foreign students on study in the United States and for U.S. students on study

abroad. New York, Institute of International Education.

"Lovejoy-Jones College Scholarship Guide," Lovejoy, Clarence E., and Theodore S. Jones. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1957; \$3.95, cloth; paper, \$1.95.

"Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences," third edition, 1960-61. Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges, 1959; 220 pages; \$3.75.

"Information on Science Scholarships," National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957; 6 pages (NSF-57-34).

"U.S. Veterans' Administration," questions and answers on the war orphans education program. Washington, Veterans' Administration Information Service.

"Federal Aid to Students for Higher Education," U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956; 191 pages.

"Government Programs in International Education," House Committee on Governmental Operations. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959; 251 pages.

"Financial Assistance for Students in Higher Education," pamphlet, Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C., 1960.

"Medical Scholarship and Loan Fund Program," Council on Rural Health, American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 10, Ill.

"Social Work Fellowships and Scholarships in the United States and Canada," Council on Social Work Education, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N.Y.

"Education Grants and Awards in the Field of Music," Music Educators National Conference, NEA Education Center, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"Information About Business Training and Scholarships," National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"Credit for College; Student Loan Funds in the United States," College Life Insurance Co. of America. Indianapolis, The Company, 1959.

"National Register of Scholarships and Fellowships," volume 1, scholarships and loans. New York, World Trade Academy Press, Inc., 1958.

REFERENCE MATERIALS LISTING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

"Accredited Higher Institutions," Office of Education Bulletin No. 1, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956; 109 pages; 55 cents (1960 edition in preparation).

"American College Counselor and Guide," by Benjamin Fine, New York; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; 413 pages; \$4.95.

"American Junior Colleges," fourth edition, edited by Jesse P. Bogue, Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, 584 pages; 1956 (1960 edition in press).

"American Universities and Colleges," seventh edition, edited by Mary Irwin, Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, 1956; 1,210 pages; \$12 (1960 edition in press).

"The College Blue Book," ninth edition, New York; Christian E. Burckel, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1959; 1,168 pages; \$22.50.

"The College Handbook," 1959-61, by S. Donald Karl and Barbara L. Kiehl; College Entrance Examination Board, 425 West 117 Street, New York 27, N.Y., 1959; 556 pages; \$2.

"Education Directory, Part 3: Higher Education 1959-60," Office of Education, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959; 205 pages; 70 cents.

"Junior College Directory," 1959, by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Washington, D.C.; American Association of Junior Colleges, 1959; 52 pages; \$1 (1960 edition in press).

"Lovejoy's College Guide," fifth revised edition, by Clarence E. Lovejoy. New York; Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1959; 290 pages; \$2.50.

REFERENCE MATERIALS ON METHODS OF SELECTING A COLLEGE

"Choosing the Right College," by Annette Turngren, New York; Harper and Bros., 1952; 149 pages; \$2.50.

"College Bound," by Samuel C. Brownstein; Barron's Educational Series, Inc., Great Neck, N.Y., 1957; 214 pages; \$1.98.

"College and You," by Calvin S. Sifford. Bloomington, Ill.; McKnight & McKnight Publishing Co., 1952; 214 pages; \$2.50.

"How To Choose That College: A Guide for Students and Parents," by Clarence C. Dunsmoor and Oliver C. Davis, Boston, Mass.; Bellman Publishing Co., Inc., 1951; 52 pages, 90 cents.

"Looking Ahead To Go or Not To Go to College: Deciding for College," Ira M. Smithless Strang Associates, 3376 Washtenaw Avenue, Ann Arbor, Mich.

"How To Get Into College," Frank H. Bowles. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1958. 157 pages, \$2.95.

CAREER AND EMPLOYMENT PLANNING

"Planning a College Education," Bucher, Charles A., New York, New York Life Insurance Co., 1958 (indicates college tuition rates and other college fees).

"Lovejoy's Vocational School Guide," New York, Simon & Schuster.

"Guide to Correspondence Study," National University Extension Association, Division of Correspondence Study. Minneapolis, the Association, University of Minnesota.

"Careers in Home Economics," Guide Lines. February 1959; U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

"Teaching as a Career," pamphlet No. 122, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

"Cost of Attending College," bulletin 1957, No. 9, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

"Helping Rural Youth Choose Careers," miscellaneous publication No. 771, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

"Employing College Students; a Guide for Bank Management," American Bankers Association, Committee on Executive Development. New York, American Bankers Association, 1959.

"Job Guide for Young Workers," 1958-59 edition; U.S. Bureau of Employment Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Occupational Planning and College," 1954. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Federal Jobs Overseas," pamphlet No. 29, January 1959, U.S. Civil Service Commission. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Career Opportunities in the U.S. Foreign Service," Department of State publication No. 6506, February 1958, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Girls' and Women's Occupations," selected references, July 1948-September 1954. (Vocational Division Bulletin No. 257.) U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"After High School—What?" 1954, leaflet No. 8; U.S. Women's Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Careers for Women in the Armed Forces," revised edition; U.S. Women's Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Future Jobs for High School Girls," pamphlet No. 7, 1959; U.S. Women's Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Career Opportunities in Government," 1958, Institute of Public Affairs, the University of Texas, Austin.

The Future for the Aged—Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Act is 25 years old this year. Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, who has had a great deal to do with the administration and revision of the act, has written an article for Ray Henry, summarizing social security goals for 1970.

This is the third in a series of articles which appeared in over a hundred newspapers throughout the country. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

THE FUTURE FOR THE AGED—SOCIAL SECURITY (By Wilbur J. Cohen, professor of public welfare, University of Michigan)

The financial problems of the aged, the disabled, widows, and orphans are part of a picture of persistent poverty in the midst of plenty.

The United States can, if we wish, accomplish the abolition of poverty and financial dependency before any other nation.

This objective, like flying to the moon, has been a dream in the past. There is no reason why the United States should not make as goals the accomplishment of both objectives during the 1960's.

During the next 10 years, our productivity should continue to grow due to automation, research, inventions, new processes, products and services.

Therefore, it should be possible for our country to afford improvements in our social security system from these increased resources so that every aged and disabled person will have sufficient income to enable him to live in health and decency.

I look forward to a series of legislative changes by Congress which, by the end of the decade, will result in:

1. An increase in social security benefits averaging about 40 to 50 percent above present levels so that average benefits will be about \$175 a month for a couple;

2. An increase for widows somewhat larger than the average because their incomes are now the lowest among the aged;

3. Family insurance benefits improved so that when a breadwinner dies his children will not be dependent on charity or relief?

4. The social security system taking on a major share of the responsibility of financing hospital and nursing services for the aged and disabled.

In addition, I believe the social security system by 1970 should:

1. Provide a regular income to persons totally disabled for any extended period of time, irrespective of age or type of disability.

2. Finance a disabled person's retraining so he may recover his economic security and independence.

How and why do I think all these changes will or should be made?

The decade of the 1960's should be a period of continued economic growth.

For the continued health of the Nation, we must make sure this increasing production is equitably distributed to the aged, disabled, widows, and dependent children and to the unemployed and their families.

Social security is one of the essential institutions that assures there will be a fairer distribution of goods and services in the economy. It is not a handout; it is a co-operative program that attempts to accomplish both economic and moral objectives.

Thus, it's only natural that in the next 10 years we should use the system for distributing the fruits of our increased production.

Even those who have vigorously opposed basic provisions of the program in the past will now admit it is here to stay; that it will be expanded and strengthened.

As part of the distribution of our increasing production in the 1960's, I see the social security system taking on a big share of the financing of hospital and nursing services for the aged and disabled.

Hospital costs have risen by 100 percent in the past 10 years and will probably continue to skyrocket during the coming decade. The demand by the American people for access to the highest quality of medical services will continue to grow.

By financing the increasingly heavy cost of such medical care for the aged and disabled through social security, the burden will be spread over their entire working life and over the entire Nation. And, they would have access to the medical care they need as a matter of right and not as charity.

In this way also, additional funds should become available to raise the standards of nursing home care and to adequately compensate nurses and other medical personnel. Visiting nurse services should become available to everyone who might need them. Hospital deficits should decline.

Neither the doctors, hospitals, or patients will be socialized nor will the Government intervene into the personal doctor-patient relationship. Moreover, private insurance, thrift, and private enterprise will continue to expand.

Rabbi Plaut's "The Jews in Minnesota—First 75 Years"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in St. Paul we are privileged to have among us a distinguished scholar and great teacher, Rabbi W. Gunther Plaut of Mount Zion Temple.

He has recently brought great honor to both himself and St. Paul by writing an important book, "The Jews in Minnesota—The First 75 Years."

It gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to submit for the RECORD a highly complimentary review of Rabbi Plaut's work which was printed in the March 18, 1960, issue of the Jewish News of Detroit, Mich.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RABBI PLAUT'S "THE JEWS IN MINNESOTA—FIRST 75 YEARS"

Jewish scholars in a number of American cities have undertaken the task of writing the histories of their communities. A number of such historical compilations already have made their appearance. The Jewish Publication Society published the history of Philadelphia 2 years ago. The Utica, N.Y., story was published recently. There are plans afoot to publish the history of Detroit Jewry.

An impressive work in this field of research is the new volume issued by the American Jewish Historical Society (3080 Broadway, N.Y. 27) on "The Jews in Minnesota—The First 75 Years," by Rabbi W. Gunther Plaut.

In a sense, the Minnesota story is a vital part of the history of the United States, in view of the important role played in American history by a number of the characters delineated in this volume.

The most important American Jewish family history recorded in this interesting book is that of the descendants of Mordecai Manuel Noah, the eminent American who served as U.S. consul in Tunis and who dreamt of establishing a Jewish State, actually setting up a foundation for it near Buffalo. While his dream never extended beyond the stage of planning and of establishing a "foundation," he is rightfully considered the first American Zionist.

Rabbi Plaut's book provides a record of the early Jews in Minnesota, the first rabbis, their successors, the institutions they established, the "spiritual journeys" of Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative Jews, the battles against anti-Semitism and the contributions by Minnesota Jewry toward the advancement of the highest American ideals of justice and equality.

Women's place in the State's history is given a due accounting.

In an epilogue, Rabbi Plaut declares that "as the 1920's marched toward climax and calamity . . . the gap between old and new settler had narrowed; soon it would disappear altogether. . . . The leadership of the community was passing into new hands; soon a different corps of men of varied backgrounds would come to the fore. Jews had begun to plan together and build together for their common needs. . . . The old neighborhoods were thinning out. As they deteriorated they would be overtaken by the process of urban renewal and people would be moving farther away from the center of town. Jewish religious life had been built on solid foundations. . . . Jews had learned their first lessons in fighting against bigotry. In the years to come this struggle would take them into the broader arenas of civil rights and human relations."

These are conclusions and analyses that can undoubtedly be applied to most American Jewish communities. Research men in many of them will find Dr. Plaut's book a valuable guide in the preparations of histories of their respective communities.

March 25: Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is celebrated in this country and throughout the world as the anniversary of Greek independence. The struggle waged by the people of Greece over a century ago to free themselves from the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire served to inspire the hearts and pens of the day; their victorious struggle presaged the wave of liberal revolution that swept the continent of Europe in the first half of the 19th century. It also inspired the genius of Lord Byron, who took the struggle of the Greeks as his own.

The inspiration of that valiant people should not be lost on us today. The blessings of independence, for which they were willing to fight and die, are as real today as then. And they are as well worth fighting for now as then.

We may count this spirit of independence among the many invaluable contributions that have come to the world from Greece, contributions that span the breadth of human activity, contributions from its glorious past and from its equally illustrious present.

Hemispheric Security—Congress Must Reaffirm Our Historic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the recent tour by the President to Latin America has focused national attention on the rising dangers to the south, especially in the Caribbean. In that area the great island of Cuba, close to the United States and located on the northern Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, have become a Soviet satellite and its Government an articulate instrument for Communist subversion in other Latin countries.

The situation thus presented has been noted and understood in high circles in our Government. This is shown by statements of the President of the United States in his address on February 24, 1960, before the Congress of Brazil at Rio de Janeiro.

In that speech he emphasized the great issue of our time, freedom or slavery and warned against return to the unenlightened system of tyranny of what he called the age-old fatalistic concept of the omnipotent state and omnipotent fate.

Then in an obvious appeal to all nations of this hemisphere, he stated that the people of the United States would consider it intervention in the internal affairs of an American state if any power, whether by invasion, coercion or subversion, succeeded in denying freedom of choice to the people of any of our sister republics. These ringing words, clearly implying a reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine, evoked sympathetic notes among all free peoples.

However favorably this appeal may have been interpreted, a Presidential statement to the Congress of another country is not sufficient. To be effective a declaration of such significance must be made to the Congress of the United States with a call for congressional action, and in words so clear that the entire world will know that our country is dedicated to the principles of constitutional liberty and opposed to those of the conspiratorial movement known as international communism. In default of this initiative by the President, the Congress should not wait but should give its serious consideration toward taking declaratory action in this grave matter.

Launched in 1917 in the territory of Russia by invaders from Western Europe and elsewhere, international communism has used that unfortunately dominated country as a base of operations for pro-

motion of world revolution. It also employs the national territory of Russia as a testing ground for criminal, social, and economic experiments that this system of Asiatic despotism intends to impose on the entire world.

The operations of this diabolical conspiracy are planned many years in advance by what might be called a general staff, and it is one of outstanding ability.

Applying the time-tested lessons of warfare, its strategists use the combination of hanking and conquest through subversion as the prime method for gaining power over vast areas without actual warfare. Its ultimate aim is global domination.

To illustrate, it seeks to gain control of strategic routes and areas such as the Dardanelles, the Suez, and Panama Canals, the southwest Pacific, the Near East, northern Africa, and the Caribbean.

The increased Soviet influence over the Dardanelles and Suez Canal areas was fostered by the eviction of British forces from the Suez Canal Zone and establishment of regimes in Egypt and other Near Eastern and north African countries more friendly to the Bolshevik Revolution.

In the southwest Pacific, the setting up on Amboina Island in Indonesia of a major Soviet naval intelligence base is suggestive of the famous maritime plan of the Japanese prior to World War II. It can be expected that these Soviet operators will be helping to alienate the Papuans of New Guinea from the Dutch toward Communist oriented Indonesia. The same plan of revolution will be applied to the Maoris of Tasmania and New Zealand.

These and other subversive activities in the southwest Pacific are obviously aimed at erecting a Communist controlled island barrier southeastward from Asia to separate the Pacific and Indian oceans, and toward the ultimate conquest of Australia.

In Cuba, the Communist conspiracy has secured a strategic beachhead convenient for attacks on the United States. Moreover, this was accomplished under the leadership of a man who owes his freedom to the Secretary of State of the United States who intervened in his behalf under pressures from sources not yet explained. Its purpose is the creation of more and more trouble throughout Latin America, especially in the Caribbean, and Central American countries. This we recognize as part of the often mentioned program for obtaining control of the Panama Canal.

Procurement planners tasted blood at Suez. They have now made the Panama Canal a key target for another propaganda offensive against continued U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

It thus becomes imperative that the Congress, as the ultimate authority under our constitutional system in questions of national policy, should exercise without further delay its legislative powers to promote the safety of the continental United States and, by so doing, of the entire Western Hemisphere.

The situation in the Caribbean, on which I have addressed the House many times, becomes more critical every day. There is no time to be lost. Hence, I

urge, in line with the President's declaration at Rio de Janeiro, that the Congress pass the resolutions now pending to extend the Monroe Doctrine and to reaffirm our Isthmian Canal policies.

Again I ask: "Why wait for new blows to fall?"

The indicated resolutions follow:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 445

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an inter-oceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes

was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only to the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, once again it is floodtime in the Midwest, and those

of us who live in the Wabash Valley are keeping our fingers crossed for fear that the uncontrolled Wabash will sweep away our topsoil, destroy our homes, and endanger our lives. Our real hope lies in the construction of projects which are approved and only need the appropriation of funds to cause flood control to become a reality for us.

I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the March 27 issue of the Kokomo Tribune which very realistically reflects the attitude of the people of my district as well as my own on the problem of flood control and its place in our Federal program:

WABASH FLOOD PROBLEM

If cities in the Wabash River Valley, such as Peru and Logansport escape a flood this spring they will be fortunate. There is always the danger that heavy rains may come after the long seemingly endless period of snows.

In the hope of obtaining further support for flood control, Peru citizens are going to Washington on April 16 to appeal to a House Public Works subcommittee for funds to start construction of dams on the Mississinewa and Salamonie Rivers.

Funds have been approved for the planning of three reservoirs. President Eisenhower asked \$125,000 for planning a reservoir at Huntington, \$156,000 to plan the Mississinewa reservoir and \$56,000 for the Salamonie project.

It probably is difficult for areas like Miami, Cass, and Huntington Counties to understand why Federal money can be sent overseas on certain projects but not allocated here at home. Why could not some of the lesser needed foreign aid projects be eliminated and the money diverted to pressing needs of American communities like the Wabash Valley?

If it is true that large sums are wasted on some foreign aid projects, Americans cannot be blamed for wondering why the money wasn't used for some such thing as flood control here in the United States. This is true especially if heavy flooding is going to recur each year in the Wabash Valley.

In the meantime, the local communities that face the possibility of floods could take steps of their own by strengthening dikes along the danger areas.

John J. Fitzgerald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am a better man for having known the late John J. Fitzgerald, a most characterful and rugged American, who had so much to do with the building of my home city of Paterson, N.J. When Mr. Fitzgerald was called away 3 weeks ago the Paterson Evening News paid him the following editorial tribute:

JOHN J. FITZGERALD

When any history of Paterson for the past 50 years is written, an imposing place must be reserved for John J. Fitzgerald, long-time secretary of the chamber of commerce, who has passed away at the age of 86.

John Fitzgerald was a dynamic figure who knew no obstacles when he charted a course of civic action. He was secretary of the

chamber when it was something less than popular and was subject to taunts by labor and Mr. Fitzgerald, by dint of his personality, rallied community strength behind it.

Keen of imagination and progressive concept, John Fitzgerald was a leader in the movements which helped bring Wright Aeronautical Co. to Paterson from New Brunswick; in the awakening of a civic consciousness to make possible erection of Alexander Hamilton Hotel and the Clark Street garage of the same name.

As an instance of his indomitable will, John Fitzgerald converted an anniversary of the electric industry into a colorful pageant of light and he had the entire city jumping with a gigantic parade, with colorful floats, and thousands participating, although there seemed to be no particular local identification with the project.

In addition to his intense pride which transcended his association with the chamber of commerce, Mr. Fitzgerald was a veritable fountain of information about Paterson and it was to him folks turned for encyclopedic intelligence about the city which gave him birth. He knew every nook and cranny and he knew its people, current and of the past.

In recent years, Mr. Fitzgerald had lived in retirement, but he continued to retain his lively interest in people and events, if only for his own keen self-enlightenment.

He was in every sense of the word a good citizen who was not content to let the tide flow without influencing its currents and its course. Thus he has left a fine impress on the community which even today affects our historical progress.

Trading Jobs for Low Wage Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it was with particular interest yesterday that I learned that the Japanese Ambassador has lodged a formal protest with our State and Commerce Departments in opposition to the petition that has been filed by the National Cotton Council with the Tariff Commission seeking relief from the serious condition that has been brought about in our textile economy by reason of textile imports.

Japan is one of the principal exporters of textile goods to the United States, and I regret to learn that the Japanese Government is formally pressing for a greater share of the American textile market at a time when American mills are experiencing severe economic difficulty.

It is also with a sense of regret that I note that our State Department has joined with the Japanese in opposing the National Cotton Council's petition with the Tariff Commission for relief. In that connection the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association of Nashville, Tenn., has prepared a report entitled "Trading Jobs for Low Wage Goods." The report brings into sharp focus what is taking place in our textile economy through the unrealistic attitude of the State Department with respect to textile imports.

I believe my colleagues in the House will find the report to be of great interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRADING JOBS FOR LOW-WAGE GOODS

Asserting its support of the reciprocal trade policy as interpreted by its author, the late Cordell Hull, the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association today pointed out that American workers have not much time left to decide if they want to sacrifice their high level of purchasing power through high wages and steady employment in order to save a few pennies here and there in buying foreign country low-wage-made goods. The association today released the results of a study just completed showing the effect of 1959 imports from Japan and Hong Kong of blouses, shirts, trousers, brassieres, pajamas, gloves and other similar wearing apparel which, the association stated, proved the contentions it has consistently made that a depression is in the making when the Government goes beyond the intent of the reciprocal trade program and permits the markets of a long line of industries to be taken over by foreign country low-wage manufacturers.

"In other words, Mr. and Mrs. American Workers, you are 'saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung-hole' every time you buy a foreign country low-wage-made article instead of one made in a U.S. plant."

In its detailed summary, the association shows that in 1959, based on reports made to the State Department by the Ambassador to Japan and the Consul General in Hong Kong, and reports of the Bureau of the Census, imports of these items amounted to approximately 11 million dozen, or, more than 128 million separate garments.

With the aid of skilled engineers determining the man-hours and man-days involved in the production of this enormous quantity of garments, these figures show that more than 24,000 employees would have been paid in excess of \$50 million to spend in the thousands of communities where they work, if these garments had been made in the United States, that the livelihood of some 73,000 people in the United States was affected by these imports.

Even of more alarming proportions, on the basis of an average of 250 employees per plant, the study shows that 97 plants in the United States would have been required to manufacture these garments. "This many plants would represent the entire production of this industry in the State of Tennessee, or the State of Georgia, the State of North Carolina, or the State of Texas. That many plants would represent the approximate production of this industry, in many cases, of two or more States," the association's statement related.

It was pointed out that in some congressional districts, this industry predominates in the way of employment. Thus, Members of Congress are confronted with the realization that an entire industry, sometimes the largest employers they have in their districts, are being brought closer and closer to short-time operations and layoffs, with all the economic consequences that must fall on the communities which have enjoyed the benefits of having this industry, and, in numerous instances where the community has no other means of absorbing the displaced workers, it was further said.

The association feels that it is the policy of the present administration and the reluctance of the Congress to face up to this problem that is building an economic collapse, which could easily break any day, with consequent wholesale industry stagnation in one of the largest and most vital industries in the United States, with part-time and full-time unemployment for thousands

of employees, and the crippling of hundreds of towns, particularly small communities.

"This industry and its association do not advocate unreasonably high tariffs or a policy of shutting out all competitive imports. On the contrary, this industry believes in, and supports, the reciprocal trade policy championed by the late Cordell Hull as being a healthy program for the economy of the United States and all nations participating therein, but that belief and advocacy is based on the true intent of the reciprocal trade program as enunciated by the late Mr. Hull, a policy that did not contemplate total submission of our markets to the demands of foreign country low-wage manufacturers, and consequent demoralization of hundreds of American communities, unemployment of thousands of workers, destroyed purchasing power, forcing American manufacturers to transfer their plants and capital to these foreign low-wage countries or quit business entirely," the association emphasized.

SUMMARY

Total imports from Japan and Hong Kong, January-December 1959 (blouses, shirts, trousers, brassieres, gloves, etc.)

For the period January-December 1959, Japanese and Hong Kong imports of the above items amounted to 10,704,652 dozen or 128,455,824 units.

Total direct labor man-hours to produce the above quantity of apparel items are 37,451,629, which represent 4,681,454 man-days. On the basis of 50 weeks of production, it would require 18,726 direct labor employees to produce the above quantity. On the basis of \$1 per hour labor, the payroll would be \$37,451,629.

Five thousand six hundred and eighteen indirect labor employees would be required at a payroll of \$11,236,000, or a total payroll of \$48,687,629.

The above quantity of apparel items is the equivalent of a \$285,586,984 a year wholesale volume; 18,726 direct labor employees and 5,618 indirect labor employees, or a total of 24,344 employees; and, on the basis of an average of 2 dependents per employee, accounts for a total of 73,032 people's livelihood being affected, for a period of 50 weeks.

The importation of the above quantity of the various apparel items listed represents the production of 97 plants in the United States, with an average of 250 employees per plant.

The above figures include direct and indirect manufacturing labor, salesmen, shipping, warehousing, etc.

The Late Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our distinguished colleague RUSSELL MACK, of the State of Washington, has shocked and saddened me. Thus it is with a profound feeling of sorrow that I utter these few words in praise of a fine Congressman and an outstanding citizen.

RUSSELL MACK and I were associated as members of the Committee on Public Works since he first entered the Congress in 1947. Over the years I grew to know him and to learn by daily contact with

him in committee work and on the House floor his ability as a legislator, but more important, his fine qualities as a person and a man.

He was one of the outstanding members of the Public Works Committee of which I now have the honor to be chairman. RUSSELL MACK had the keen mind of a trained newspaperman. He had a firm grasp of the many and varied problems that were presented to the committee, and his contribution to the legislation that was reported out of the committee was an invaluable one.

RUSSELL MACK was a warm human being with a faculty for adding to the enjoyment of the life of all those who had the privilege of coming in contact with him. He will be missed.

Thus it is with a deep sense of personal grief that I pay tribute today to my late colleague, for whom I held the highest respect, and express my heartfelt sympathy to his family in their great loss.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to insert the following speech in commemoration of the 21st anniversary of Slovak independence, which was celebrated on March 14 and throughout this month. The speech was written by Joseph G. Prusa, president of the Slovak Newspapermen's Association of America:

THE TRUE MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY—SLOVAKIA NEVER HAD A CHANCE—SHE PLEADS WITH AMERICA AND HER ALLIES FOR FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

(By Joseph G. Prusa)

While observing this 20th anniversary of the Slovak Republic, we as Americans of Slovak origin or descent owe it to our brethren in Slovakia to see to it that they get the freedom and justice to which they are entitled to.

Slovakia, unfortunately, never had a chance although its first attempt for full freedom and independence was formulated on American soil with the aid of our American Slovak organizations.

In order to fully understand the desire and aspirations of the Slovak people, let us review briefly their historical past.

The Slovak nation is not new among the civilized nations of the world, because history proves that it was a powerful entity during the Great Moravian Kingdom in the ninth century with its democratic form of government and diplomatic representatives in Rome, Constantinople, and other capitals of the world.

Slovaks, after settling in the United States and the Dominion of Canada some 4 score years ago, formed their own societies, parishes, organizations, newspapers, schools, etc., independently of Czechs.

Slovak educators like Jan Kollar and Pavel Safarik were noted Pan-Slavists, who were looked upon with admiration by all the leaders of other Slavonic nations, including the great Russia, where many Slovaks found

their home and achieved positions of great importance before World War I.

During World War I, when President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed freedom to all the oppressed nations, Slovakia was included among those nations on an equal basis with Bohemia, now known as Czechia. Robert Lansing, U.S. Secretary of State, in his announcement on September 3, 1918, recognized the two nations, Czechs and Slovaks.

Since it is an admitted fact even by President Thomas G. Massaryk, that it was Gen. Milan R. Stefánik, a noted scientist, who opened the door to him and Dr. Eduard Beneš to world diplomats for the recognition of their aspirations for the freedom of the Czech and Slovak nations; and since General Stefánik was a Slovak, no one can dispute the fact that all Allied leaders during World War I took it for granted that the aspirations of the Slovak nation for independence will be fully realized.

Unfortunately, guarantees for the full freedom of the Slovak nation as formulated in the Pittsburgh Pact were not fulfilled. On June 20, 1920, when the Treaty of Trianon was signed between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, Slovakia became a partner with Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia in a federated union, supposedly patterned according to our American democratic system which, however, never became a reality. Slovaks still had a chance to break away from the Czechs in 1920 and without Slovakia, there could not be a Czechoslovakia.

The 20 years of Czechoslovakia were the years of justified demands on the part of Slovaks for their full autonomy which, unfortunately, was not granted by the Prague government. Hitler took advantage of this weak link and used it as a weapon against Prague for its destruction.

The Pittsburgh Pact was ignored and Hitler's demands became dangerous to Czechoslovakia. After Lord Runciman's negotiations failed, the Czechoslovak Government on September 8, 1938, decided on a new and definite proposal for the settlement of the Sudeten problem and it granted far-reaching concessions in direction of autonomy.

Slovakia realized that it was surrounded by enemies, and was naturally looking for its salvation. And again when on September 21, 1938, British and French ministers at 2:15 a.m. demanded that President Beneš capitulate to German demands, the situation of Slovakia became even more dangerous.

These were the desperate days of struggle for survival. Our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt intervened and on September 26, 1938, sent a message to Berlin, Prague, London, Paris, Warsaw and Budapest, urging peaceful settlement. Instead of a peaceful reply, Hitler in his speech at Sportpalast denounced Czechoslovakia as a "lie", created by the "liar" Beneš.

On September 29-30, 1938 Hungary and Poland demanded certain portions of Slovakia. Mussolini and Count Ciano entered the picture. England and France informed Czechoslovakia that she can expect no assistance if she rejects the Munich decisions.

On September 30, 1938, Czechoslovakia accepted the Munich declarations and President Beneš resigned. A day later Germany's first soldiers crossed Czechoslovakia's frontiers.

On October 6, 1938, Monsignor Tiso was appointed minister for the administration of Slovakia in the Prague cabinet. A day later the Czecho-Slovak government accepted resolutions passed at Zilina for autonomy, or the granting of the Pittsburgh Pact signed in Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 30, 1918, with Monsignor Tiso as prime minister. (On October 18, 1938, Monsignor Tiso visited Munich.) Two days later the Communist party was suspended in Czechoslovakia.

This series of events continued step by step until November 19, 1938, when the Czecho-Slovak Parliament passed measures bestowing autonomy on Slovakia. Judge Emil Hacha was elected president of Czechoslovakia.

On March 9, 1939, the Czecho-Slovak Prime Minister Beran dismissed Monsignor Tiso, Slovakia's premier and all other ministers except two. Two days later new Slovakia's cabinet with Karol Sidor as premier was appointed. On March 13, 1939, Monsignor Tiso was requested to attend a conference in Berlin. Germany placed its demands and asserted that it will recognize Slovakia's independence.

Monsignor Tiso returned to Bratislava and placed the matter before the duly elected Parliament, which voted unanimously for Slovakia's independence and thus the Slovak Republic was born 20 years ago. It was recognized by 27 sovereign states, including Great Britain, France, Soviet Russia and the Vatican far before the outbreak of World War II.

When World War II broke out with Hitler's attack on Poland, we Americans began to give material aid to the stricken Allies.

After World War II, Beneš returned to Czechoslovakia. He had implicit trust in Soviet Russia and in a way, ran out on us Americans and our Allies after obtaining the necessary lend-lease and went to Stalin, to whom he swore loyalty.

In a statement to the Presidium of the Czecho-Slovak National Council, Prague, October 9, 1945, President Beneš stated:

"There are some individuals who asserted that we are in the hands of the Soviets, but the governments look upon us in a different way. We are the allies of the Soviet Union and we shall remain faithful to the Soviets. We are friends of the West and shall remain friends. In the form of our alliance with the Soviet Union we proceed and shall proceed in our own way * * *

On January 9, 1947, Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, before the Chamber of Commerce of New York State in New York City laughed at the Iron Curtain stating: " * * * We hear a great deal about the Iron Curtain. I assure you there is no Iron Curtain."

Beneš and Jan Masaryk trusted the Reds, who took over Czechoslovakia in February of 1948. And before taking it over, on April 13, 1947, Msgr. Tiso, president of Independent Slovakia, went to the gallows in Bratislava just to please Stalin.

Msgr. Tiso never had a chance—and neither did Slovakia and the Slovaks.

During World War II I had the honor to receive numerous communications from many leading Americans. I treasure the one from Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, who wrote: "Every nationality, no matter how small, has an inherent right to its own nationhood. If that principle is not carried out after this war, then the conflict has been in vain."

And, sorry to say, that this principle has not been fulfilled so far as the Slovak nation is concerned.

It was the second time that the people of Slovakia were disappointed.

The first time, when World War I was waged for the freedom of the oppressed, according to the principles of President Wilson's 14 points. Justice for Slovakia was not meted out and such eminent Americans like the late Col. Stephen Bonsal, personal interpreter to President Wilson during his administration and at the Peace Conference, author of the "Unfinished Business," Pulitzer prize winner and "Suitors and Suppliants," stated this after World War II:

"Today, the lovers of truth and justice are promised another chance through the United Nations. The failure to do justice to the Slovaks at the Peace Conference, after World War I, was the piece of unfinished

business, which I most regretted: I hope to see it redressed."

Colonel Bonsal is the father of the present U.S. Ambassador to turbulent Cuba, Hon. Phillip W. Bonsal.

Now that Slovakia is in the clutches of Soviet Russia, which is exploiting its natural resources by creating there an atomic arsenal as a potential enemy of the Western democracies, we plead the case of its enslaved people before the free world. We do so especially for the reason that there is a relative in almost every American Slovak home who lives in Slovakia. The oppressed people of Slovakia are seeking our moral and material aid and especially freedom and justice.

This, therefore, is the true meaning and significance of the observance of the 20th anniversary of the Slovak Republic, whose creation came about on March 14, 1939, when, unfortunately, the great nations left Slovakia to the mercy of Hitler.

Under such desperate conditions, when Poland on one side demanded a slice of Slovakia's territory, and Hungary's army on the other side, even before Monsignor Tiso was summoned to Berlin, already waited on the border of Slovakia to march in and take over the other large portion, which it later did, especially such important historic cities like Košice and Komárno, Slovakia acted like a good mother to save its homeland from being partitioned among its enemies.

Under such incomprehensible circumstances, Slovakia proclaimed its independence on March 14, 1939, by the duly elected Parliament, whose validity was ratified in Prague on November 19, 1938.

From March 14, 1939, and on, Slovakia, which accepted Christianity in 863 A.D., or 50 years before the Czechs; 150 years before the Poles; and 200 years before the Hungarians, had its first Christian church in Nitra consecrated in 833 A.D., was recognized as a government both de jure and de facto by Great Britain, France, Soviet Russia, Vatican, and 23 other countries.

Slovakia, with its almost 4 million inhabitants, is larger than Albania, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Honduras, Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Norway, Panama, Salvador, Transjordan, and New Zealand. She has nearly as many inhabitants as Bolivia, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, Iraq, Venezuela, Yemen, and Switzerland.

Slovakia's area of 49,000 kilometers makes it larger than Albania, Belgium, Estonia, Haiti, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Switzerland, Salvador, and Israel.

On the basis of these facts and human justice, inspired by the declaration of President Woodrow Wilson, who said in 1918 when the freedom for Slovakia was being guaranteed that "The Declaration of Independence is a practical document for the use of practical men. It is not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for the tyrants; it is not a theory of government, but a program of action."

Fortified by this statement we feel that we should take action and thereby declare that one of the world's greatest masterpieces, the United States Declaration of Independence, inspired the freedom loving Slovaks to declare and to establish independent Slovakia, for we believe with Abraham Lincoln that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."

And the people of Slovakia never gave their consent to Soviet Russia or the Communist Prague to govern them. They demand, as it was already presented to the U.S. Congress by the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, that Slovakia be granted a right to a free election under the supervision of the United Nations.

I conclude with the statement by that great American, the late U.S. Senator Robert A. Taft, whose father, the illustrious Presi-

dent William H. Taft signed a bill to give Slovaks and other ethnic groups in the United States in 1910 census an opportunity to register their mother tongue and thus the forgotten ethnic groups were recognized.

Senator Taft stated emphatically: "I agree entirely with your position and believe that the Slovaks should be permitted to set up an independent nation."

In this spirit and in all fairness and justice, in accordance with our American democratic traditions, we are observing the 20th anniversary of the Declaration of the Slovak Republic, pleading with the freedom loving people of America and the free world to give Slovakia its deserved chance—its precious freedom and independence.

Threat of Transfer of Postal Installations and Custodial Employees to General Services Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the president of the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, Mr. Alfred De Matteo, has addressed an appeal to Members of Congress regarding the pending threat of transfer of postal installations and custodial employees to General Services Administration.

Because of the urgency of the matter, I am including in the Appendix of this RECORD, Mr. De Matteo's appeal letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
POST OFFICE CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES,
March 22, 1960.

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
Congressman
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, its officers and its membership are again faced with the threat of additional transfer of postal installation, and its custodial employees, to General Services Administration.

Due to reorganization plan 18, of 1950, which then effected the transfer of approximately 218 post office buildings to General Services Administration. Now, 10 years later, it again threatens to swallow up an additional 250 post office buildings.

In 1950, under the effected transfer, many of our post office custodial employees were either downgraded or forced to retire—where and when, will it end.

We feel that our Government will not sanction undue hardship to its faithful career employees especially our custodial employees who are in majority veterans of World Wars I, II and Korean war, and many with more than 20 years of faithful postal service, to be denied at the stage of the game—full retirement benefits; loss of seniority rights; loss of take home pay (due to General Services Administration wage hour board scale of pay); and possible job abolishment with the ever prominent issue of possible contracting of janitorial; elevator; and guard force to private contractors.

It could end right now, if the Congress would enact legislation to stay fast, all post office custodial employees, and postal buildings, and permit the Post Office Department to maintain its own buildings exclusively.

Sincerely,

AL DEMATTEO.

White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the White House Conference on Children and Youth, presently in convention here in the Capital City, is in my opinion something of a misnomer, if I read the newspaper accounts correctly. In the first instance reference to the White House has only served to arouse Messrs. Meaney and Carey of the CIO and their ilk to launch a series of diatribes at the administration and by indirection to accuse the occupant of the White House of gross dereliction in his duty. In the second instance, the presumably basic concern for children and youth is almost lost in the raucous clamor for such things as expanded public housing, urban renewal, Federal aid to education, to name a few, which are related to juvenile welfare only in the abstract.

The bleeding heart volunteers and the hard-boiled professionals who sit up nights trying to drum up new apologies for wayward juveniles are met here to talk interminably all around the subject and with a careful avoidance of truly corrective measures which can only be effectively applied in the home and by the youngster's parental mentors.

This business of thinking up excuses for delinquent youth was met head on yesterday by the Reverend Daniel Eagan, a Catholic priest from New York. Father Eagan lead off with the observation that teenagers are being encouraged to say, "It's not my fault" and then made the further comment that, "The young people are excusing themselves because we are excusing them too easily."

A representative of the National Probation and Parole Association challenged Father Eagan with this specious argument:

Few of these kids decided where they were to be born, where they would be brought up, what churches they would be brought up in.

To this Reverend Eagan replied:

You are suggesting that a 16-year-old boy who knifes someone is not responsible because he has a drunken father. This philosophy of excuse is * * * encouraging youth to say, "It's not my fault."

And then Father Eagan went on to comment:

I favor every type of treatment, but boys and girls have free will to do right and wrong. They are responsible for their actions.

This leads me to observe—as a former sheriff who has had some acquaintance with delinquent juveniles—that our primary concern should be directed toward delinquent parents and that there is no substitute for parental failure to set the proper example and take corrective measures. And in that observation I am referring only to those homes which are neither broken by divorce nor menaced by adult dereliction, but from which come so many young people who end up

on the wrong side of the law. And as corollary to that observation I think it is high time that we abandon this silly business of refusing to identify by name and family these teenagers who are detected in crime, thereby condoning the crime and encouraging its reputation.

Logic and Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, some people consider themselves liberal intellectuals, but they give their support in public affairs to programs which have an emotional appeal rather than logical justification. They identify themselves with popular pressure groups rather than to think independently as intellectuals presumably would. They display the same kind of intolerance and arrogance as the most illiberal members of our society in holding rigidly to theories and judgments of a generation or more ago.

Recently an editorial appeared in the Mesa Tribune, Mesa, Ariz., on this subject which I think deserves careful consideration, and I am bringing it to the attention of the House:

LOGIC AND LIBERALS

Not all liberals are intellectual, nor are all intellectuals properly defined as liberals. Yet generally the most articulate and aggressive liberals place themselves—and are placed by others—in this category.

It is something of a curiosity, therefore, that when looking about for public figures to embrace and to champion, they are not content to give their allegiance to those who qualify as intellectuals pure and simply. They want something else.

The quality they seek they usually call "heart." If they do not believe a man's mind is balanced by a warm heart, they are thoroughly distrustful. Anyone they consider to be coldly analytical they almost automatically assume to be coolly calculating and self-serving.

No sensible human being can possibly quarrel with this insistence upon genuine warmth of spirit. Man at his best obviously is both a feeling and a thinking machine.

Nevertheless, many liberal intellectuals seem unwilling to search much below the surface for evidence of this balance. They want the heart worn on the sleeve if they are to give their support.

The political or other public figure they are most likely to espouse is the one who can shout their causes in emotion-charged tones, who will loudly declare war on the illiberal enemy and promise his defeat momentarily. To this they will respond with cheers.

In the cold light of the reason which they believe they possess more than most men, these liberal intellectuals may understand that their causes will not ordinarily be won so decisively—if at all. They may also appreciate that the issues which cut so deep with them may not in fact be so clearly defined as they, at fever emotional pitch, like to believe.

Yet if a public figure, an intellectual, stands before them and calmly and detachedly lays out these real prospects, they are not won. His rationality may in truth be balanced by well-governed emotional con-

cern. But if they do not see it quickly, if they do not hear this in a supercharged voice which exhorts and declaims, they distrust him.

Looking on from a distance, one would imagine this was the very kind of well-balanced, well-governed individual they would most cherish as at once eminently practical and still encouragingly idealistic.

That they do not is a paradox that may in some part explain why the influence of liberal intellectuals is less in this Nation than they think it ought to be.

Nixon To Build on Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Monday night Vice President Nixon delivered a challenge to the Democrats in a forceful speech at the Lincoln, Nebr., Founders Day celebration. To those of us who from the very beginning were convinced that Dick Nixon would be our best bet for 1960, his remarks were simply a reaffirmation of what we expect from him. In addition to promising a positive and aggressive campaign in every State, he made a special point that he would not be content to stand pat on the enviable record of the Eisenhower administration but that "a record is something to build on, not to stand on."

Gould Lincoln in his "Political Mill" column appearing in the Evening Star on Tuesday, March 29, discusses the Vice President's speech, and I should like to include it at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1960]

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

NIXON'S CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATS

Democrats who have been suggesting Vice President Nixon will wage a pussyfooting campaign for the Presidency, trying to play both sides of the street, should know Mr. Nixon better. They have had opportunity to see him in action time and again. Just because he is sticking to his job in Washington—the job of helping to get the best possible legislation out of the Democratic Congress—and Republicans in Congress—and because he has not flung himself into campaigns in the presidential primary States, is no reason for these Democrats to believe they will not have a real fight on their hands if Mr. Nixon becomes the Republican presidential candidate, as now appears virtually certain.

In one of his rare trips out of Washington these days the Vice President told a Lincoln, Nebr., Founders' Day celebration last night exactly what he proposed to do should he be the GOP nominee. He also gave notice to the Democrats what they may expect. He has rejected completely the advice of public relations experts who believe that television has made person-to-person campaigning relatively obsolete and ineffective. By plane, by train, and by bus, the Vice President will carry his campaign into every State, city, and town he finds time to visit. Judging by his past campaigning performances, he will hit many of them. Further, he has again made it clear his will be no standpat attitude in the coming campaign. He proposes

to wage a campaign looking to the future of the American people. Declaring that the Republican Party will be proud of the record of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Nixon continued: "A record is something to build on, not to stand on. Standpat, hold-the-line thinking is not enough to meet the great challenges confronting the American people at home and abroad."

Calls farm policy stymied

This is no attempt to draw away or disassociate himself from the Eisenhower administration's record over more than 7 years, in which Mr. Nixon has played an unusually important role for a Vice President. Nor is it so interpreted by President Eisenhower. For the President, despite his Democratic critics, is no standpatter, nor does he expect Mr. Nixon to be one. Speaking as he did to an audience in one of the great mid-west farm States, the Vice President frankly said he was not satisfied with the existing farm programs. The farm problem, he added, has been stymied in recent years because a Democratic-controlled Congress has been unwilling to go along with a Republican President who was seeking a solution in the interest of the farmers. And here Mr. Nixon laid down a real challenge to the present Democratic Congress—just as the President has done. He pointed out that the President has taken an unprecedented action, sending to Congress a message saying that he will approve any bill the Congress will pass if it meets certain basic standards he lays down.

"It is time," Mr. Nixon said, "for the Democratic leadership in Congress to fish or cut bait. If they fail to act, or act irresponsibly during this session of Congress, they will have made it clear they prefer a farm issue to a farm solution. And it is high time they quit treating the farmer as an issue and recognize him as a person who is not getting his fair share of America's prosperity." Mr. Nixon then made it clear he would present a farm program of his own to the voters—if Congress fails to act, and to act responsibly, and that he would expect his Democratic opponent to come forward with a plan, too, so that the electorate could decide between the two.

Sees economy big issue

Another issue—the economic development of the United States—the Vice President has insisted will be a major one in the coming campaign. And closely wrapped in with this issue, he contends, will be the ability of this country to meet Communist economic competition. Democrats, in Mr. Nixon's view, have engaged in a lot of loose talk—similar to Russian Soviet talk—to the effect that American economy is fat, complacent, stagnant, and on the downgrade. This despite the fact that our economy produces more jobs for more people at higher wages than any other country in history. He pointed out that this country is ahead of the Soviet Union in every major product, and that our total production is more than double theirs; that we have achieved in a great measure the economic objective of abundance under our system that the Communist theory merely promises.

To emphasize the difference with the Democrats who are seeking their party's nomination to oppose him, Mr. Nixon promised he would not fall for "phony schemes for Government promotion of economic growth." The American people, when they go to the polls next November, he insisted, will have an opportunity to choose between "two basically different economic philosophies." He meant, of course, the Republican and the Democratic.

The pressure is on for Republicans to close ranks—and back Mr. Nixon for President. It is also on to convince many independents and Democrats the country will fare better with Mr. Nixon in the White House than

with any of the Democratic aspirants for the Presidency. In this connection, it is well to consider the most recent comments by former Governor Dewey, of New York, who has declared himself a staunch supporter of Mr. Nixon for President—and Governor Rockefeller for Vice President. Such a GOP national ticket, Mr. Dewey said, would be tremendous.

Negro Minister Attacks "Sitdowns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking statement by a Negro minister of Montgomery, Ala., in which he deplores the methods adopted by his own race in the current "sit-downs" controversy. This letter was published in a recent issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger, and I think it is worthy of public notice:

SITDOWNS, ETC.—NEGRO MINISTER ATTACKS METHODS

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—Negroes were given some hard-hitting advice by a Negro minister in a letter to the editor of the Montgomery Advertiser.

A clipping of the letter was sent to Editor T. M. Hederman, Jr., of the Clarion-Ledger. Pertinent portions of the letter are reproduced below:

"As a Negro minister who is in discord with the recent action of the leaders of the Montgomery Negroes who advocated the meeting on the capitol steps for mock prayer, I would like for you to please print this on your editorial page.

"For some time now I have been observing the racial problem in our State, Nation, and Southland. I have watched the thinking and strategy of our leaders, and I have the highest admiration for some of them, but then the stupidity of some others is most disgraceful.

"Now, I know that it is the God-given right of every human being to be free; I know that with our form of Government, it is the right of every citizen to vote, pay taxes, and uphold the Constitution. In striving for our constitutional rights, I believe that we have overloaded individual rights. There is a vast difference between a person or individual's willingness to accept and being forced to do so. No person should be forced to mix or to live together if they do not want to.

I know that in order to get freedom and full citizenship some pressure must be applied, but I can't see where marching, singing, and fake praying on the capitol ground will bring any of this about. Have we as men (white or black) lost our abilities to reason with each other, live together, and defend America from its outside enemies."

MOCKERY OF PRAYER

"I believe we as Negroes are overlooking or disregarding the basic facts of our troubles, and in many cases, we are misusing the Bible to mislead our people. For example, praying in the streets to be seen on TV and heard on the radio is far from Christian like, and proves little if anything. It is to me making a mockery of prayer and most undignified. Read over what Jesus says about

street praying in Matthew 6: 1-18. There are no ifs, ands, buts, and maybes the meeting of Montgomery Negroes to pray on the capitol yard was a disgrace before God, a shame on the Negro race, and mockery to the cloth all over the earth.

"Seeing as how the Bible is the yardstick, let us take one or two verses of it and see if we can justify some of our action as being Christian and in keeping with the teaching of Christ. Let me again call your attention to the book (Luke 6: 41-42). Herein is the crux of the whole matter.

"The Negro has been mistreated, yes, and for a long time. But he has a beam in his eye, and the white man has a mote in his. But we as Negroes are so busy getting the mote out of the white man's eye that we have overlooked the beam in our own. Let us now face the beams or facts first, and if I am living, we will take up the motes at a later date."

LACK OF RACIAL PRIDE

"First of all there is race pride. We do not have very much race pride. As soon as we get a clean shirt and 20 cents, we rush across the race line to Canada and marry a blonde, get in the Jewish faith, and say, 'I am not a Negro anymore.' Or we go to a nightclub and when some see us for the pig that we are, we start throwing things. We were born black, and we shall die the same way.

"Secondly, there is cleanliness. The truth is as a race we are not clean. We will not clean up our homes, our yards, our churches, our children, or ourselves. We still hold that the best use for water is drinking. If we do not have the best of clothes, we can at least wash the ones we do have. For God's sake keep clean.

"Our third beam is religion. We have been playing church for about 50 years, make believe Christians. We live between 30 and 70 years and we spend all this time in run-down churches, with part-time ministers, strutting, singing, and hollering, 'Going to heaven when I die, get our wings, eat milk and honey, sit down and tell God all about it.' When are we going to teach our people how to live here on earth; how to make ends meet; how to save; build homes; take care of our children; budget our money; clean up our homes, and most of all go back to God?"

AND MORALS

"Our fourth beam is morals. Will somebody please tell me where they are? We beat, knock, kill, cut, and shoot our wives, children, and husbands. We spend our first money after pay day on liquor and gambling, thus leaving the baby home crying for milk. We owe every loan shark in the land; we do not know where our children are at night, nor they us. We send them to school unclean, without food, and sometimes without anything to get food with. Yet, we call them bad.

"Our women are by no means saints, and sometimes they can carry themselves in a most unreligious, unfeminine way, drunk, disorderly, and using profanity in the presence of children, not carrying their children to church, not cleaning up their homes, not preparing meals, rags on their heads, mud on their feet, and snuff in their mouths."

LAZINESS

"Our fifth beam is laziness. Many of us who could vote are too lazy to register or pay taxes. We veterans, men who are tax exempted, are often nonvoters, thus we are noncitizens after having fought for it. When we get jobs instead of doing our best work, we are slothful, doing just enough to get by. I know our schools need much in the way of improvement, but we are doing a poor job with what we do have.

"My grandmother could spell 10 times better than I can, and she only went to the

fifth grade. Why? Our Negro teachers are doing two things, watching the clock and the calendar for payday."

USING GOD

"Our sixth beam is talking. In general we, as a group, talk too much. Someone once said, 'Little minds discuss people, great minds discuss ideas.' We spend too much time talking about simple things and other people. We talk down our race and its businesses; we run and tell everything that is said in our meetings.

"You can talk about sit-in and sit-out all you want to, but a vote-in and vote-out, within the next 5 years, would do the job. You are not going to change the racial problem overnight anyway. The hearts and minds of men will have to change first. If you want to talk, then talk up some more votes."

THE WAY IS CLEAR

"I have named six of the many beams that stand between the Negro and full citizenship. There are others, but if we are ever to become first-class citizens, we must do first things first.

"Now, the only way to really lick every excuse for race discrimination is to:

"Have pride in our own black race.
"Vote up, clean up, keep up, live up, look up—do your work jam up."

Rev. W. T. HUDSON.

Engineer Predicts Potomac Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent news story regarding the address of General Lipscomb of the Corps of Engineers to the annual meeting of the Potomac River Development Association. General Lipscomb called attention to the increasingly serious situation in this area with regard to water supply, pollution abatement, and other aspects of water resource management.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1960]

ENGINEER PREDICTS POTOMAC DROUGHT

(By Jerry Landauer)

A top Army engineer called yesterday for prompt action to head off the possibility that parts of the Potomac River near Washington will be dry by 1975.

Under "average circumstances," it will take 10 to 15 years to plan, finance, and build the system of reservoirs that probably will be recommended by the Corps of Engineers, said Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Lipscomb.

By that time, he said the ever-increasing demands of households and industry will strain a supply depleted by diversion of water in the upper river basin.

Lipscomb, the corps' North Atlantic Division engineer, spoke of the race to develop water storage capacity costing hundreds of millions of dollars in a talk at the first annual meeting of the Potomac River Development Association.

He said the water supply situation is serious even now and will get progressively worse for the entire Potomac Basin.

"By 1975, we note that the demand for water supply alone is equal to the dependable flow and the river would be dry below

the intakes (below Little Falls Dam)," he said.

"Even today, should a 1930 drought re-occur, there would not be sufficient flow to satisfy both the water supply needs and the desired flow for pollution abatement," he said.

Lipscomb said the political and financial problems involved in building a reservoir system are so staggering that easy and early decisions are not probable.

"The history of similar projects does not give promise of completion in less than 10 or 15 years," he said adding that the Potomac project will require prompt and effective cooperation of State, local and Federal agencies.

In other developments:

A House Appropriations Subcommittee released a transcript of hearings in which the administrator of the Soil Conservation Service told how spreading "urbanization" of the Washington area adds to silt pollution.

The administrator, D. A. Williams, said a "very high percentage" of all sediment flowing into the river comes from topsoil that has been ripped up by bulldozers and denuded of cover.

The Potomac Electric Power Co. received authorization from the Maryland Water Pollution Control Commission to discharge hot water into the Potomac from its generating plant near Dickerson, Md.

FBI Helps Restore Stolen Valuables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the Sunday Star for March 20:

TIPS TO FBI TURNS UP \$772,533 IN PLUNDER

When a confidential informant gives the FBI information about a local crime, what happens to the tip?

During 1959, data furnished to the FBI by confidential informants and passed on by the FBI to other law enforcement agencies resulted in arrests of 2,294 persons and the recovering of stolen or contraband valuables totaling \$772,533.

This was revealed yesterday in a survey of FBI services to other law enforcement agencies.

Tips from confidential informants have ranged from gambling operations to storehouses of obscene literature.

PRINCE GEORGES CASES

Cited was the tip to the FBI resulting in the arrest of 122 persons in Prince Georges County, Md., last August on a variety of charges including operating a disorderly house, gambling, illegal sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages and disorderly conduct.

Other mass arrests, stemming from informers' tips relayed by the FBI to other law enforcement agencies, included the November arrest of 115 persons in Manatee and Sarasota counties, Fla., on gambling and liquor violation charges with the recovery of \$17,000 in contraband; the December arrest of seven persons in New York on charges of possessing obscene material with intent to sell it and vagrancy and the recovery of obscene literature valued at \$25,000 and the 1959 arrest of 34 persons in Mobile, Ala., on bootleg whisky and gambling charges.

The survey showed the range of FBI services to other law enforcement agencies in training, locating wanted men, providing scientific aids to crime detection, identifying disaster victims reporting crime and mobilizing law enforcement efforts against certain types of crime.

HIGHLIGHTS NOTED

These were highlights of the survey:

The FBI laboratory's work, available free to all American law enforcement agencies, rose about 80 percent in the past decade to an alltime peak of 184,993 scientific examinations in the 1959 fiscal year.

Among many reference files available to local officers is the national fraudulent check file. This file, rated as the national clearinghouse for fraudulent checks, at year's end contained nearly 90,000 specimens of bad checks.

The FBI's Identification Division, central repository for fingerprint identifying data, closed the decade of the 1950's with 154,363, 719 fingerprint cards on file. When a local law enforcement agency requests it, the FBI will place a stop notice in its fingerprint files on a wanted man. By this method, 16,967 fugitives were identified for local law enforcement agencies in 1959.

AIR CRASH WORK

The FBI's disaster squad of fingerprint experts, during 1959, was called on to identify victims after airplane crashes in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Texas, Virginia, and the Gulf of Mexico. In two cases, the crash near Charlottesville, Va., on October 30, and the Gulf of Mexico crash on November 16, the squad successfully identified 100 percent of the available victims.

An alltime high of 1,149 fugitives were located by FBI agents during fiscal 1959 under the Fugitive Felon Act, which authorizes the FBI to go after criminals who have fled across State lines to avoid prosecution for the most serious crimes.

During the 1950's, the FBI assisted in 27,418 police training schools in the United States. During the decade, regional law enforcement conferences sponsored by the FBI throughout the country spotlighted attacks on such crime problems as auto thefts, thefts of transit goods, interstate trafficking in stolen property, bombing and bomb threats, bank robbery, fleeing felons, organized crime and racketeering.

Federal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I have presented the following statement to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of legislation which would provide a pay raise for postal workers and other Federal employees:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT E. COOK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE IN BEHALF OF POSTAL PAY INCREASE LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the enactment of legislation in the present session of Congress to provide a pay raise for our postal and other Federal employees. Such a raise is long overdue. It would raise the wages of these employees to the level of wages in private industry.

The correspondence from my district reveals instance after instance of financial hardship for these local representatives of

our Federal Government. The average letter carrier's salary of \$4,640 is hardly enough to meet the present-day high costs of food, clothing, shelter, and medical expenses.

If we expect these trained workers to remain in Federal service, this Congress must face up to their financial problems and vote them a needed pay increase.

I have introduced H.R. 11231 calling for these needed increases. It is similar to the so-called Morrison bill, and I hope its principles will receive the favorable consideration of your committee.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8801) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice in opposition to the proposed civil rights bill—the so-called Celler-McCulloch bill—because I believe it is loaded with danger to the very fundamentals upon which our Government is based. My fears are not simply a reflection of the so-called southern viewpoint, nor do I see the threats to be just against southern institutions. Rather, I see in this bill a weakening of some of the very foundations of our Constitution—foundations that we all have been sworn to protect.

I cannot in a few moments go into the full details of the objectionable features of the bill, though I will touch briefly on one of its provisions that particularly concerns me. First, however, I would like to say to those who are pushing it through that, even if what they were trying to accomplish were for the general good, this is the wrong way to go about it. For, in my judgment, the bill is out of joint with its purpose. It will not amplify the civil rights that now prevail nor will it insure their enforcement. It will on the contrary retard and obstruct and embitter. The bill is out of true relation to the climate of opinion that prevails in the United States, making it seem as if we were in the midst of some kind of internecine war between our Negro and our white populations. It will be no more successful in accomplishing the intended purpose than the prohibition amendment was during the 1920's. As did that attempt to legislate social customs, it may make the problem worse than it is at this time.

For the problem is being solved—slowly, it is true, but no major social change can take place too rapidly without revolution, and I am sure no one wants that. Anyone who reflects can see the tremendous strides made by our Negro population during the past few decades—and that progress is continuing at an accelerated pace. One needs only to observe the increasing number of well-dressed and well-housed members of the Negro race in any city, in-

cluding those in the South. One only needs to note the rising literacy rates, the increase in the number of professional people, and the increasing influence of colored voters.

There are Negroes—and I am glad of it—who are Members of this very House. There is a Negro who is the president of the Borough of Manhattan. One of the foremost members of the United Nations staff is an American Negro. They hold, as they should, positions of esteem in the South as their talents permit. Of course in certain quarters there are some hardships, even humiliations. But then I suppose I would not be welcome in a meeting of Democrats even if I sought an invitation, and I can imagine meetings of that political persuasion where I would be grabbed by the seat of the pants and the scruff of the neck and booted out of the place. In some parts of our country this religious grouping is not kindly disposed to that religious grouping.

There may even be errors of decency and taste and fairness that we all deplore. But can it be possible that at this late date—anno Domini 1960—the problem, instead of diminishing, as I certainly believe it has, has grown to such gargantuan proportions as to call for this overwhelming hullabaloo of legislative agitation and excitement?

Instead of fostering steady development, this bill would shake the very foundations of our Constitution in an attempt to hurry the process. It would usurp important rights of the States in the control of elections, and not merely the rights of the Southern States. Of equally grave concern, this bill would constitute an important breakthrough in the field of Federal control of education.

Hidden behind the smokescreen of civil rights, the original bill would grant the Federal Government authority to seize local educational institutions and administer them. Although restricted by amendment, some of this authority remains. Most interesting is the basis for determining which schools can be taken. Only those can be taken which have been built with partial Federal contribution under the federally impacted aid legislation. Yet, proponents of Federal aid, in every debate or speech on the subject, always point to a clause included in the bills insuring that the Federal Government will in no way interfere with local educational systems.

I say let us stop this thing, recognizing as we must that the ill-conceived law enforcement techniques in this bill reach out into the future. They inflict injustice instead of preventing it and they bring with them pain and offense that after two World Wars and Korea we had done so much to blur and appease. We in the south along with our friends in the north will find paths for the adjudication and the amelioration of wrongs that do exist and permit time and maturity to wipe them out. The process may be slow but it is sure and it is enduring. This crude enforcement method is a way of turning back the clock of history and returning to the use of force and vengeance where reason and tolerance had been proved so successful.

Physicians and Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, several months ago my esteemed friend and colleague, JOHN P. SAYLOR, of the 22d District of Pennsylvania, arranged for me to attend a meeting in Johnstown, Pa. The meeting was sponsored by the Cambria County Medical Society and as the principal speaker that evening I discussed with the distinguished membership of that organization the issues involved in the question of federally sponsored health care. It was also my privilege to inform that group of the outstanding contributions their able and respected Congressman, JOHN P. SAYLOR, was making to the considerations of responsible government and free enterprise.

I found the doctors of this medical society extremely interested in national affairs. I also found them with renewed awareness of the urgent need to be solidly back of their Congressman.

During the course of that meeting I met many of the doctors present on a personal basis including the society's then president, Dr. Joseph C. Hatch. Several months later there came to my attention a February 1960 copy of that society's monthly publication "The Medical Comment." I noticed the remarks of Dr. Hatch as he brought his term of office to a close in January 1960.

I believe Dr. Hatch's observations bear the consideration of every American citizen and for that reason I will include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Honored guests and distinguished colleagues, tonight is my valediction as the president of the Cambria County Medical Society. I leave an office that I have held with great pride and I hope with some usefulness.

In the past year our county society has had many accomplishments resulting not from my stewardship, but from the effective work done by individuals and by the society's committees under the guidance of dedicated committee chairmen. In this connection I would specifically mention—

Dr. D. George Bloom for his commendable work with the State board of licensure.

Dr. Paul McCloskey for his work on the State economic committee.

Dr. Victor Bantly and his economic committee for their work on the fee schedule.

Dr. Reginald Davis, Dr. John B. Lovette, and Dr. George Hudson whose activities in the house of delegates were extremely valuable.

The members of the Cambria County Academy of General Practice whose leaders for the year 1960 are President Dr. Yale S. Lewine, Vice President Dr. Raymond L. Dandrea, Secretary Dr. Charles F. Reeder, and Treasurer Dr. George Hay.

Our devoted and untiring board of directors which kept the ship of state at an even keel through the year and finally,

Our executive secretary, Mr. Robert Lynch, whose endless capacity for work has enhanced the reputation and efficiency of this society. Without his tireless efforts and

those of Dr. John Cwik we would still not have our Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan.

That I do not enumerate other outstanding work is not an indication of disregard or unawareness on my part of the significance of that work. It is instead in consideration of your time and in deference to events that are to follow on this evening's program. I would, however, express my heartfelt appreciation to my fellow officers of this past year who did so much to keep me from more frequent mistakes; I would also thank the society's membership for its support. Without that help and support, nothing would have been possible.

In my remarks this evening I propose to comment briefly on an important but often neglected aspect of a physician's daily life—citizenship. In terms of public service the activities of our profession are exceeded by no other; in terms of service to country in behalf of good government, our contribution falls considerably short. Except in time of war, our service to country is too often confined to paying our taxes and to infrequent trips to the voting booth. In the past three decades as a consequence of this neglect of citizenship we have found our taxes rising and our influence at the polls declining.

I have mentioned the trend of three decades, a period comprising less than a single generation. That is all the time required to bring our profession, and more importantly—our Nation to a position of critical juncture with respect to historical ideals and concepts of human liberty, economic opportunity, and individual incentive. It is in this 30-year period that freedom has been weakened by the inroads of bureaucratic governmental paternalism.

Why do I, a doctor of medicine, presume to talk to you about such things? As recently as 12 months ago I would not have done so. My interests at that time were entirely confined to the practice of my profession and keeping abreast of the rapid changes in medical scientific lore. A year ago an event occurred to distract me from my preoccupation. I assumed the office of president of your society.

This event imposed upon me responsibilities that directed my attention to new vistas of physician interest—vistas that in a scientific sense may have no direct relationship to medicine but which have a very marked potential impact on medical practice and health progress. This impelled exposure to socioeconomic affairs made me acutely aware of the price of our citizen neglect. It is to the end of impressing upon you the need for a renaissance in citizenship on the part of the American physician that I direct the balance of my remarks.

In our professional preoccupation with medical ills we have overlooked our Nation's No. 1 malady—"Federalitis." This is a disease that manifests an insatiable craving for revenues—that is exceeded in intensity only by an intemperate desire to spend. There is an involvement of bureaucratic hypnosis that produces the hallucination that the mere existence of a problem demands solution by the National Government. The disease causes a schizophrenic type of Americanism that flourishes on class prejudice and seeks to glorify mediocrity by rewarding the idle with the productivity of the industrious.

Federalitis has existed in the United States for 30 years and we have done little or nothing about it. We have thought too much of the rights of citizenship and too little of the duties of citizenship. As the 18th century statesman and political scientist Edmund Burke put it, "The only thing the forces of evil need for victory, is for enough good men to do nothing." Because we have been content in the last 30 years to do nothing, Federalitis has flourished.

I do not mean to suggest that the blame is exclusively attributable to the medical

profession. In our neglect of citizenship we have been joined ingloriously by other citizen groups. However we must recognize that physicians occupy a position of prestige and influence in their respective communities. This position gives unique opportunity to contribute to the formulation of sound public opinion on the important issues confronting our people.

Let us now turn to a brief examination of some of the consequences of citizen neglect in the past 30 years and then consider the problems presently confronting our profession to see how we can use our citizen status to help solve them.

The abandonment of citizen responsibility to Government bureaucracy in the past three decades has not been without its cost. In the last 30 years—

Our Federal Government has operated in the red in 24 years or 80 percent of the time;

Our Federal spending and tax collections have increased more than 25-fold;

Our Federal public debt has increased \$270 billion;

Our daily lives have been encroached upon and made less free by Government bureaucracy;

Our Nation's security has been made less secure by tragic ineptness in the conduct of our foreign affairs;

Our State and local governments have joined with the Federal Government in vain fiscal folly to spend us rich, smart, and secure.

This enumeration of bauble and blunder is not the cry of an alarmist. The facts are all too real; the dangers are all too present. Because of the limits of allowable time let me take only one of the things I enumerated for further analysis.

The national debt increased \$270 billion in the last 30 years. So what difference does it make? It makes this much difference. The United States has 20 percent more debt and 43 percent less income than all the other nations of the world. It means higher taxes and consequently fewer jobs because our free enterprise society is that much less able to compete on favorable terms with the economic endeavors of the nationals of other countries. Our existing national debt requires annual carrying charges of \$9 billion. This item constitutes the largest single non-defense-related expenditure in our Federal budget. That \$9 billion amount is more than the combined Federal, State, and local taxes paid by all the businesses and individuals in Pennsylvania. We have now reached the point where we cannot wait until it is convenient to pay our own way. It is urgent that we achieve budgetary surpluses so that a sustained program of debt reduction can be accomplished.

This onerous public indebtedness has been created despite the imposition of unprecedented tax burdens on our free enterprise society. In regard to taxes, we have reached the point where Federal, State, and local tax collections take one-third of our net national product. Thus we have gone one-third of the route toward the total socialization of the economic endeavors of our citizens.

Historians tell us that no great nation has ever been conquered from without until it has first destroyed itself from within. I submit to you there is no middle ground in dealing with the grave issue of our Nation's fiscal affairs. Sound fiscal principles are not divisible.

As was true in the case of fiscal matters, so it is true with regard to so-called social progress, that voter apathy has had its cost. The accomplishments of the past 30 years have been accompanied by a curtailment of economic opportunity and by the sacrifice of individual liberty to Government bureauc-

racy. Too often social legislation has been for the benefit of an organized vocal minority at the expense of a majority of our people. Too often we have acted in too great haste, forgetting that generally a social program is not reversible or correctable even though experience demonstrates a major part of that program to be a mistake. Too often we have overlooked the fact that the Government can only give to the people that which it has first taken away from them.

Under the guise of social progress the labor boss has exploited citizen indifference through acts of power-seeking endeavor so that he now has the authority to deny the right to work to our people and the ability to weaken the economic fabric of our country. This position of special privilege was not thrust upon the labor boss but was seized by him through diligence and vigilance while the rest of us basked in apathy and enjoyed the solitude of indifference.

The cost of citizen neglect has even manifested itself in the life and death area of international affairs. Our national leaders once made the political judgment that the American people were interested in the easy way out with the consequence that International communism in the thirties and forties accomplished landgrab after landgrab. In recent years our foreign policy has tended to be productive of intended results. Progress has been slow and arduous but encouragingly, progress has been achieved. Summarizing the cost of 30 years of citizen neglect we find that on the fiscal-economic front we have had mounting taxes that have been exceeded by rising spending and growing public indebtedness with its destructive inflationary impact; on the social front we find the labor predator achieving a totalitarian preeminence that is limited neither by law nor by patriotism; we find that on the international front communism has become the greatest threat to the freedom and welfare of mankind since the Middle Ages.

Turning our attention from the past three decades to future events we find many important issues that must be resolved in the challenging period ahead. The manner in which these issues will be disposed of may depend in important measure on the extent to which our time is devoted to them. It is obvious that neglect produces mistakes, and our Nation and its people cannot endure three more decades continuing the errors and socialistic trends of the past 30 years.

Governmental matters that are of interest to physicians that will receive consideration in the months ahead include the level of Government spending that is to be authorized, the Simpson-Keogh bill to alleviate the present tax discrimination against the self-employed by allowing them to provide for retirement on a tax-deferred basis, the coverage of physicians under social security, the Forand bill which would tax billions from the present working population to pay medical and hospital care costs of only some of the presently retired, the pending Senate inquiry with its political overtones into pricing practices with respect to the life saving drugs, and the question of whether or not Federal funds shall be available to the States for educational purposes.

Study is also likely to be given to the closed-panel type of medical practice that is subject to the coercive, nonprofessional regulation of third parties. Such a panel arrangement is in derogation of the principle of freedom of choice with respect to the selection of a physician by any American citizen.

Each of these is a matter on which much more time than is available to me tonight could be spent. We have discussed them in the past; many of them have been subjects on which we have had speakers this past

year. These are all matters that are of genuine concern to every medical practitioner because they affect our profession; they affect the quality of medical service we are able to render to our people; they affect the health of the Nation.

So what do we do to assure that the professional medical point of view is taken into account in disposing of these important considerations?

First, I propose that as individual members of our county society we work in diligent support of our State and National organizations by informing ourselves with the facts and then by informing others as to what the facts are. If the American people know the truth, they will not fall prey to the demagog.

Second, I propose that as a part of our citizenship we work individually in behalf of the principles of government in which we believe and in behalf of candidates who stand for those principles. I do not intend to make a partisan plea, but I will make a specific observation. Our Congressman, JOHN SARLOZ, who is with us tonight, stands closer to our principles than any of his past opponents, but how many of us have endeavored to help him expose the demagogues and social planners who have opposed his candidacy. We have been free with our criticism and too frugal with our help. I would remind you that it is easier to elect someone to office who believes as you do than it is to change someone to your point of view once he has been elected.

Third, I propose that our county society carefully consider the establishment of a government affairs committee. It would be the duty of this committee to advise the society with respect to governmental matters that are of interest to the membership. It would also be a function of this committee to outline a program whereby the medical practitioner could become a more influential voice in behalf of sound American government. I know of no other professional organization that has a committee of this type. If we could successfully develop such a committee, it could serve as a prototype of similar activity elsewhere.

In closing—

Let me thank you for the honor you have given me this past year as your president.

Let me warn you that crucial days are in store for our Nation, for our fellow citizens, and for our profession.

Let me admonish you that we cannot afford an attitude of accommodation toward the forces of evil that threaten our American way of life.

Finally, in closing, let me remind you of the words of the Italian poet, Dante, who more than 700 years ago said, "The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crises, maintain their neutrality."

Roll Call Conducts Poll on Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, has on its front page my article entitled "Congress Seen As Best Judge of Candidates' Qualifications." In this article I discuss the qualifica-

tions we look for in a candidate who seeks the Presidency and I then propose a poll of all those on Capitol Hill, including Senators, Representatives, and Hill employees, to cast their ballot since they are best able to judge the candidates and their qualifications on the basis of firsthand knowledge and association with them.

Mr. Sidney Yudain, the very capable editor and publisher of Roll Call, has taken up my proposal for such a poll to determine the ideal presidential candidate among the present group seeking the nomination in both parties. I wish to call this poll to the attention of all Members and their staffs, as well as committee staffs.

On its last page, Roll Call publishes ballots marked for Senators, Representatives, and Hill employees. The poll will be secret, only the total vote will be disclosed. No one need sign the ballot. Merely fill in the name of the candidate who, in your opinion, possesses the necessary qualifications for President, then check the ballot which applies to you—Senator, Representative, or congressional aid—and mail it to Roll Call, 433 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD my article as published in Roll Call and also a news story from the same issue of March 30 announcing the congressional poll:

CONGRESS SEEN AS BEST JUDGE OF CANDIDATES' QUALIFICATIONS

(By Representative VICTOR ANFUSO)

At the moment the question uppermost in many minds—and probably next in importance to the question as to who will succeed Mr. Eisenhower in the White House next January—is this: What qualifications should a candidate for the Presidency possess? Or to put it in another way, What kind of a President do we want?

Our history can point to strong men in the White House and to weak men; to men who rose above partisan considerations, and those who pursued a strong partisan course during their incumbency; to men who were eloquent speakers and able administrators; and men who did not cherish being too much in the public eye and preferred to leave matters of administration in the hands of trusted assistants; to men who were forward looking and progressive in their approach to dealing with the Nation's problems, and men who were satisfied not to "rock the boat" and merely drift along.

What kind of qualifications in a President does the Nation seek in 1960?

Life magazine recently conducted a poll on the qualifications for the Presidency and came up with the following list:

1. He must be a man of conviction who is willing to fight for his principles, but at the same time he must be able by conciliation and compromise to avoid fights.
2. He must be a man who is above partisan considerations.
3. He must be a man with a common touch.
4. He must be a vigorous and decisive man who can make up his mind, one who can get things done, and who will not be pushed around by other people, especially by the Russians.
5. He must be a man with wide experience of foreign affairs.

This is a good list to begin with. Surely, there are other qualifications which are no

doubt equally important. In his book "The Splendid Misery," Jack Bell writes that "fundamentally the people want a President with the integrity of Washington, the guts of Jackson, the unwavering purpose of Lincoln, the energy of Theodore Roosevelt, and the flexibility of Franklin Roosevelt."

We could perhaps add a few other qualifications in determining a person's fitness for the highest office in the land, for example, his capability as a leader of men, his mature judgment of public affairs, his assumption of duties and the fulfillment of responsibilities entrusted to him. He must be able to forge unity of the Nation, rather than division of forces. He must believe in progress and continued growth in every phase of our national life, for to believe otherwise would mean stagnation, loss of our moral, political and economic positions in the world, and our retrogression to a second-rate power.

At the same time, the American people is mature enough by this time to avoid such dubious qualifications as the place of a potential candidate's birth or his religious convictions. His creed or his birth above or below a certain imaginary border should not be factors in determining qualifications, for these are sectional and divisive factors.

The candidates for the Presidency in both major political parties this year appear to be endowed with many of the qualifications listed above. With the exception of possibly one or two, the public is not yet fully acquainted with all of the candidates to be able to judge which one of them possesses the best qualifications. Under those circumstances it would be almost an impossible task to pinpoint the results of such a poll or to establish the image of the one candidate who above all others possesses the necessary qualifications to succeed Mr. Eisenhower in the White House.

The people who, at the present state of affairs, would seem best to know the qualifications of the various candidates are those who are working on Capitol Hill. Senators, Congressmen, and employees of the legislative branch of the Government know the men seeking the Presidency, they know their qualifications. They observe them at close range, their approach to people, their tactics, their viewpoints. They know what political campaigning represents since they live and breathe politics every day in the year.

If so happens that practically all candidates aspiring for the Presidency in 1960 are from Capitol Hill as Members of the Senate, or in Mr. Nixon's case as presiding officer of the Senate. One of the leading darkhorse candidates is a Member of the House.

It would seem then that the most logical, because it could prove to be the most accurate, poll of the candidates possessing the best qualifications for the Presidency would be right here on Capitol Hill. A poll of this type should be conducted in an objective manner, the individual preferences or opinions should not be disclosed, and the emphasis should be strictly on qualifications. The results of such a poll would be most interesting and arouse considerable attention throughout the country.

CONGRESSIONAL POLL ON PRESIDENCY BEGINS

Representative VICTOR ANFUSO's article on page 1 today has prompted Roll Call to undertake a vast poll of the Congress to determine the ideal presidential candidate.

Senators, Representatives, aides, secretaries, and committee staff members will be eligible to vote for the man who in their opinion embraces the five qualities listed on page 1 as most desirable in a President.

Ballots appear today on page 12. No names are required on the ballot, but voters are asked to enter no more than one ballot each.

Ballots are categorized into three divisions: Senators, Representatives, and staff members. Voters are asked to use the ballot which represents their status.

Votes should be cast only for nationally acclaimed candidates including: Vice President Nixon, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator STUART SYMINGTON. Although Adlai Stevenson and Nelson Rockefeller have flatly declared they are not candidates their names will be acceptable.

Voting is restricted to Congressmen and staff members.

Ballots should be sent to Roll Call Poll, 433 New Jersey Avenue SE.

Since all of the major potential candidates emanate from the Congress, the Roll Call poll takes on added importance, since the vote will reflect the opinions of voters personally acquainted with the gentlemen and who have seen them in action over a long period of years.

It is hoped that the votes will be based on the five qualifications which, according to the Life magazine poll, the ideal President would possess.

More About Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph R. Slevin as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 24, 1960:

U.S. ECONOMIC FRONT—DROP IN RATES QUIETS FEARS FED COULDN'T FIGHT A DTP

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—A sharp drop in interest rates has quieted fears that the Federal Reserve System won't be able to fight the next recession by making money easier.

A number of worriers had been warning that an antirecession shift to easy money would immediately spark a large and damaging outflow of gold from the United States, but recent developments indicate that it won't happen that way.

Interest rates are the key to the problem. A move toward easy money would bring about lower rates and the doubters figured that investors would respond to a drop in U.S. yields by transferring their funds to European countries that offer a bigger return.

The events of the last 10 weeks have tested the theories of the doubters and they have been found wanting.

Interest rates have been skidding here just as they would in a recession even though the Federal Reserve System has not adopted an easy money policy and even though business activity does not seem to be turning down.

EUROPE RATES VARY

Rates in European money centers have been firm in some instances and rising in others just the way they would be if the worst fears of the doubters were realized and the United States entered a recession while European business activity continued to expand.

But gold has not been pouring out of the United States and into European vaults. While there has been some outflow since the

beginning of the year, it has been modest and no larger than the payments that the United States normally would be expected to make to help finance its continuing balance of payments deficit with the rest of the world.

One reason for the unexpectedly small size of the gold outflow seems to be that the doubters greatly overestimated the amount of money that flows from one country to the other in search of high interest rates. The best guess of financial officials here is that there probably is no more than \$500 million of hot money invested in the United States at any time.

Another important factor has been the willingness of foreign central banks to hold short-term U.S. Government securities as investments.

GERMAN EXAMPLE

Consider the case of a West German private investor who sells U.S. Treasury bills and reinvests his money in Frankfurt because he can get a higher return. He obtains the deutsche marks from the Bundesbank in exchange for the dollars he received when he sold the bills. There is a drain on the U.S. gold reserves only if the Bundesbank then demands gold for its recently acquired dollars.

But the Bundesbank and other European central banks apparently have been using their dollars to buy Treasury bills. The private investor's sale of bills and the central bank's purchase thus cancel one another and there is no outflow of gold from the United States.

Instead of weakening the U.S. bill market at a time of falling rates, the foreign central banks actually have been strengthening it.

They not only have been reinvesting the dollars they receive from their nationals who sell bills, but they have been using a large part of their earnings from balance-of-payments transactions with the United States to buy bills.

What all of this means is that the central bankers have confidence in the value of the dollar.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the tabulated results of my latest questionnaire which was mailed recently to every home in the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan. The heavy response to this questionnaire far exceeded my expectations and the results, tabulated by IBM, clearly indicate that very careful thought and consideration went into the answers.

To me, the results of this questionnaire emphasize the deep concern many people have on matters of national importance.

The percentage tabulations of the answers on the questionnaire I have just conducted are included below. I trust the results will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

Questionnaire results

(In percent)

Questions	Yes	No	No opinion	Questions	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you support the President's demand for a balanced budget?	89	6	5	The farm problem: Government investment in surplus now \$9,500,000,000, storage and other costs, \$1,000,000,000, each year. Should price supports and controls be—			
Do you approve of a tolerant attitude toward Cuba's Castro?	36	47	17	Increased?.....			Per- cent
Should Congress enact laws to protect the public against the potential dangers of labor-management stalemates, such as the recent steel strike?	81	13	6	Decreased?.....			1
From what you have read and heard, are we moving as fast as we could in missile and space efforts?	35	42	23	Unchanged?.....			27
Should the social security program be broadened, as provided by the Forand bill, to include medical and hospital benefits, with the added cost shared by both employers and employees?	46	42	12	Abolished?.....			7
Do you approve of Ike's exchange of visits with Khrushchev?	85	9	6	No opinion.....			53
Should Congress provide financial aid for school construction?	39	49	12	Would you favor a plan to use surplus crops, instead of cash, to pay farmers for taking land out of production?	64	14	22
If Russia persists in refusing a reliable inspection system, should we continue our self-imposed ban on atom tests?	64	22	14	In your opinion, are our military defenses adequate?	49	25	26
Should the 44-percent limit on interest rates for long-term U.S. bonds be removed to aid debt management?	35	33	32	Do you approve of the President's conduct of foreign affairs?	76	12	12
Do you favor Federal grants and loans to assist areas of "chronic and persistent" unemployment?	35	51	14	If next year's budget has a surplus, as estimated, should we—			Per- cent
				Cut taxes?.....			19
				Reduce debt?.....			69
				Spend on projects?.....			12

White and Colored Races Working Together for Negro Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of March 19, 1960.

I am grateful to Mr. W. W. Bryant of Crystal Springs, Miss., for calling this editorial to my attention and I commend it to my colleagues. It follows:

WHITE AND COLORED RACES WORKING TOGETHER FOR NEGRO ADVANCEMENT

Despite the hysteria and hullabaloo about civil rights, the truth is that colored citizens of Mississippi and the South are enjoying more progress and happiness here than in the other sections of America where intolerable racial tensions exist. Our thoughtful Negro leadership generally realizes this.

J. W. Jones, colored publisher of a newspaper at New Albany, Miss., has pointed out some facts deserving nationwide attention. In an editorial recently featured in his paper, he said:

"Why should we be disturbed by the outside propaganda when we are in a better fix than the Negroes are in the States which are producing the propaganda? If equal school buildings are what the NAACP keep up so much racket about here in Mississippi, they should send a man over our State to see what we Negroes have and also see what is in the process for Negro children.

"We are more satisfied and less disturbed with segregation in Mississippi than the Negroes in States where there are integrated schools. When we lie down to sleep at night we are not uneasy that our house will be destroyed by dynamite before the sun rises.

"We are not only at ease but we are progressing under a segregated system. Statistics show that 27,746 Negroes own farms, holding titles to 1,772,414 acres of land valued at \$95 million. We have in Mississippi 7,217 Negro teachers drawing a total salary from State funds of almost \$19 million, in addition to what we get on a local level.

In addition there are 12,061 professional and technical workers. This includes everything from accountants to dental technicians. Other Negro job classifications include craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers. Any Negro who is reliable can get anything he needs in Mississippi."

The New Albany colored editor goes on to say that the story of Negro progress in Mississippi has never been sufficiently told and that the enemies of the South are trying to take advantage of unthoughtful members of his race. Editor Jones truthfully declares that there is less conflict between white and colored people in the South than in other sections.

Mississippi still offers the greatest opportunities for colored advancement, within the framework of established customs. We believe in providing the best possible schools, housing, employment, and living standards for Negroes because it is clearly realized that if our colored citizenry lacks adequate purchasing power, we cannot have a prosperous economy.

Hon. Russell Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of this House in their shock and sorrow at the death of the late Representative RUSSELL MACK. His sincere hard work in nearly 13 years in which he represented the people of southwestern Washington earned him a place of deserved respect in this Chamber.

It is significant, in the light of his dedicated service to the country in this body, that he should die while in the performance of this service. RUSSELL MACK was a fine man and an able Member of Congress. It was as recent as 3 weeks ago that I had occasion to make excerpts from one of his speeches delivered on the floor of the House in order to explain a matter of some complexity to the people of my district. His guidance and coun-

sel will be missed by those of us who had learned we might rely on his ability, his efforts, and his integrity.

The Soviet Proposal for a Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are deeply concerned with the proposal recently made by the Soviet Union for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. I am sure we realize the heavy burden of responsibility placed on President Eisenhower in making a decision on this matter. I am sure all of us also recognize the desire of the American people for world peace and for an elimination of the threat of nuclear warfare. Certainly we do not want to do anything that would jeopardize the achievement of this splendid goal.

On the other hand, I am sure that all of us recognize too that if we were to enter into an agreement which did not accomplish what it professed to accomplish, and in which one side could violate the agreement with impunity, then we might well jeopardize the security of our great country and indeed contribute to the outbreak of the kind of warfare we most earnestly want to prevent.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, two articles appeared in this morning's New York Times which I believe merit the attention of my colleagues as well as the Nation as a whole in reflecting on this difficult subject. One of them is by the distinguished military editor of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. The other is by the chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include both of these thoughtful articles:

TEST BAN'S DRAWBACKS—SOME U.S. AIDS FEAR WEST'S DEFENSES MAY SUFFER AND RESOLUTION BE SAPPED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The agreement yesterday between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan seems to pave the way for a formal accord between the Soviet Union and the West on halting nuclear testing.

The two Western leaders agreed to accept the recent Soviet proposal on banning small underground nuclear tests as soon as the Russians have signed a treaty banning weapons testing that includes provisions for on-site inspections.

Tests in the atmosphere and under the seas would be prohibited by treaty, with an agreed policing system. Underground and high-altitude tests would not be resumed by mutual agreement for a limited period, but there would be no control or enforcement mechanism to detect violations.

The new Washington policy will undoubtedly be greeted as good news by world public opinion and by most governments.

But many responsible officials in the U.S. Government—particularly in the Atomic Energy Commission and in the Defense Department—view the decision with pessimism and alarm for several reasons.

FURTHER TESTING FAVORED

They believe the United States has not developed so-called small, or tactical, or "clean" nuclear weapons of adequate variety or in sufficient quantity. They believe missile warheads could be materially reduced in size and bulk with further testing.

They feel it essential to carry out further nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes—in the high altitudes for scientific knowledge and military byproducts, underground for harbor or canal excavation or other reasons.

These officials believe that the United States will honor the moratorium, whereas there is concern that the Soviet Union may violate it secretly. They fear the ultimate effects of such a ban upon the U.S. present position of nuclear superiority—one of the country's greatest advantages in military strength in relation to the Soviet Union.

In sum, therefore, the objectors, feel that the United States has been maneuvered by propaganda, worried world public opinion and skillful Soviet diplomacy into a position that many commit the country to an indefinite test cessation but without the means of detecting some types of violations.

The background of this point of view is little known to the American public.

Some time ago the Secretaries of State and Defense, the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency and the President's scientific adviser, acting as "the principals" of a committee to guide policy for the Geneva conference on halting nuclear tests, unanimously recommended to the President that there not be a complete cessation of experimental explosions.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS NOTED

Their advice was based on the findings of a scientific committee that studied the chances of detecting concealed underground blasts. In some cases—depending upon the size and location of a blast and other variables—the chance of detecting a secret underground explosion by any detecting system within present technical competence was reckoned as 1 in 100,000.

Subsequently, though no new technical facts have been produced to indicate a higher probability of detection, some of the key members of the advisory committee reversed their previous recommendation.

It was this reversal that led to President Eisenhower's agreement with Mr. Macmillan.

Most observers, however, are less worried about the possibilities of undetectable violations of the projected test ban and the

technical slowdown it may cause in nuclear arms development than they are about the psychological and political consequences of such an agreement.

WESTERN LETDOWN FEARED

An agreement to halt nuclear testing, signed with a flourish at the summit conference, could lead to the same sort of psychological relaxation in the West as occurred after the summit conference in Geneva in 1955. Western military defenses might suffer. It might be difficult to maintain the strength and unity of the West if another era of seeming "sweetness and light" were initiated by the agreement.

Fear that such a ban might establish a precedent for uninspected and uncontrolled arms limitation agreements also, is expressed. Officials observe that any inspection and control system of 100 percent efficiency is impossible. Delegates at the disarmament and test-ban conferences in Geneva have been talking only about "deterrent" inspection and control systems, which might provide only a small chance of actually detecting violations.

One of the basic issues in any arms limitation discussions is how much of an inspection and control deterrent is necessary. A major danger of a voluntary and unpoliced test ban is that it might encourage the further weakening of a deterrent inspection system in other and more important fields than that of nuclear test cessation.

WASHINGTON: THERE'S LESS HERE THAN MEETS THE EYE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—When George Catlett Marshall was Secretary of State, he used to say to his associates, "Don't ask me to agree in principle: that just means that we haven't agreed yet."

This about sums up the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks on suspending nuclear test explosions. They agreed in principle with each other and with the Soviet formula for ending the tests, which means that they haven't really agreed at all.

What the two leaders did today at Camp David was to buy time, and they can use it, for they are still far apart in their estimates of the diplomatic and scientific aspects of the problem.

First, in the diplomatic field, Macmillan gave our officials the impression that he was much more willing than Eisenhower to take risks to reach an agreement with Khrushchev.

Second, in the scientific field, there is still no agreement—indeed there is the widest disagreement—among both United States and British scientists on what constitutes "adequate inspection" of any test ban.

OPTIMISTS AND SKEPTICS

Macmillan's assumption was that Khrushchev really wanted an arms suspension treaty and that he would agree to a system of adequate inspection and control to get it.

President Eisenhower is reported to have been much more skeptical. His attitude was that he would believe it when he saw it, but only after the Russians had come to grips with the hard details of allowing 20 to 30 on-site inspections, observation flights over the Soviet Union, the composition and rights of the control commission, and the explosion of nuclear weapons under ground to test the detection devices.

It was not that the President and Prime Minister disagreed on objectives, but merely that the President put the emphasis on the means of reaching an agreement, and Macmillan put it on the objective.

The problem of getting together, even within the United States, on the definition of "adequate inspection" is equally complicated.

For example, Hans Bethe, former director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and

now a professor of physics at Cornell, argued in a letter to the New York Times today that the Soviet test suspension offer "is a major step forward," which provides a suitable basis for a treaty "provided the details can be satisfactorily clear up."

But Freeman J. Dyson, a physics professor at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, contends in the current issue of Foreign Affairs that only after a great deal more experimentation will it be possible to reach a rational conclusion about modern weapons and the capacity to conceal or detect underground nuclear explosions.

Professor Dyson argues, for example, that the possibility of detonating a hydrogen bomb without the use of a nuclear bomb trigger has changed the whole problem.

THE DETECTION PROBLEM

"My personal opinion," he writes, "is that nuclear explosions in the kiloton range could be concealed very completely. That is to say, I believe it will be feasible to build a building, looking externally like a normal industrial structure, within which kiloton explosions can be contained."

"The cost of such a facility may not be exorbitant, and the earth tremors which it produces may be no larger than those produced by normal industrial operations. . . . Concealment of this sort could be detected only if the international control authority were empowered to travel everywhere and open all doors."

Thus, what is "adequate inspection" to Professor Bethe is not adequate to Professor Dyson, and what are "details" to Professor Bethe and some of the British scientists are "fundamentals" to the President and Chairman McCone of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It will no doubt take considerable time to resolve these differences, and in this one important sense both the British and the Russians got what they wanted. For the fact is that there is a ban on testing now. It has been going on for 17 months, and Macmillan started a process here that will make it extremely difficult to begin testing again for many months.

This was the real agreement "in principle." The bomb tests are stopped and the diplomatic tests go on. But beyond this, there is less in the communiqué than meets the eye.

Utah Dairy Products Excel in Purity and Flavor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to express the pride and satisfaction which I, along with countless other Utahans, feel over the accomplishments of the Utah dairy industry.

We would all agree, I think, that the well-being of this Nation has been richly enhanced by the vast and wonderful stream of dairy foods which Americans enjoy. No other industry has made a greater contribution than have the dairymen to the well-being of our people.

Utah has made, and continues to make, a two-fold contribution in this field.

First, the grade A milk, the fine cheeses, and the other wholesome products which the Utah dairy industry pro-

duces are enjoyed not only by thousands of Utah families but by their neighbors in many States.

Second, the Utah dairy industry has achieved standards of purity, flavor, and quality by which it makes an important contribution to the general excellence and the steady improvement of the dairy foods which nourish this Nation.

In recent years the grade A milk supplied the Provo, Salt Lake, Ogden, and Logan markets has consistently placed upon the honor roll of the United States Public Health Service. Right now the grade A milk supplied Salt Lake, Ogden, and Logan is on this honor roll, and the milk in the Provo market is in the process of being rated.

In the tabulations which the Public Health Service makes on the milk which interstate shippers produce and distribute, Utah's pasteurized milk has ranked, and today, ranks with the finest in the Nation.

In 1957, all 48 fluid milk processing plants in Utah achieved an honor roll rating by standards of the U.S. Public Health Service. At the time of that rating, Guy P. Stevens, supervisor of dairying for the agricultural department of the State of Utah, observed: "So far as we have been able to determine, Utah is the first State in the Union to complete ratings for all its fluid milk plants and their supplying farms." A score of 90 or better is necessary to achieve honor roll status.

Items considered in the rating include: Quality of milk received from the farms, and milk quality after processing; type of processing; sanitation on farms and in plants; type and condition of equipment used; processing records; and the quality of administration and enforcement being applied in each area.

At that time Mr. Stevens said further: "Utahans can be very proud of their milk supply. Our State's milk ranks with the Nation's finest and is in heavy demand both in and out of the State. While tests are based primarily on safety and sanitation, the flavor quality of our milk is outstanding. We found milk plants across the State spotlessly clean. These ratings are not only a tribute to our fluid milk processing plants, but also to Utah's dairy farms."

During Utah's June Dairy Month commemoration in 1959, George S. Bulkley, of Los Angeles, chairman, national June Dairy Month committee, visited Utah. Mr. Bulkley at this time was chairman of the board of directors of the National Dairy Council.

This statement was made by Mr. Bulkley during his visit: "America's dairymen are now milking only 77 percent as many cows as they were in 1944 when the cow population reached its peak. Yet, the fewer cows are producing a total milk output 7 percent greater than in 1944. In Utah, your average cow yields 17 percent more milk than the national average."

According to figures released by Welby W. Young, president of the American Dairy Association of Utah, there are now approximately 8,000 dairy farm families in Utah, with a total of 100,000 milking cows. These cows last year produced approximately 750 million pounds of milk. Approximately 60 percent of Utah's milk production last year was from grade A farms. In 1959, 20 percent of Utah's milk output went into the manufacture of cheese, and the balance of the State's milk production was made into high-score butter, cottage cheese, evaporated milk or dry milk powder, and ice cream.

Utah's cheese has become a growing favorite from coast to coast, and for some years has been served at the famed Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The State's evaporated milk is sent to broad markets in the Western States, and traditionally has been of superior quality.

Utah's ice cream and butter similarly have scored high in tests for flavor and texture.

While Utah's dairy products have won national acclaim, the State's dairy leaders have also been known for their progressiveness and for their major roles on the national dairy scene. Merrill N. Warnick of Pleasant Grove, Utah, served two terms as national president of the American Dairy Association, which represents approximately a million American dairy farmers.

In March 1959 Mr. Warnick was appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to a 3-year term on the 18-man National Agricultural Advisory Commission.

Welby W. Young of Heber, Utah, currently president of the American Dairy Association of Utah, was recently named to the national board of directors of the National Dairy Council. He is also chairman of the important national research committee of the American Dairy Association.

Walter R. Holdaway of Provo is a member of the board of directors National Milk Producers Federation, and is also president of Federated Milk Producers Association, Utah's largest grade A dairy farmer association.

Utah's dairymen have been among the Nation's leaders in cooperative public relations and advertising. For approximately 10 years they have had an aggressive cooperative plan in Utah, in addition to giving full support to the national program of the American Dairy Association.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the performance of the Utah dairy industry and its members reflects the best traditions of my State. The diligence, the perseverance, and the desire to excel which have been hallmarks of the Utah people since they carved their farms, homes, and industries from the mountain wilderness more than a century ago are demonstrated in the achievements and high standards of Utah's dairy industry.

Retired Officers and Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer this splendid news article by Jack Steele of the Scripps-Howard papers and an editorial which accompanied the story in the Washington News.

There is no necessity to comment on either piece, but I do take the occasion to say that I am quoted accurately and correctly by Mr. Steele and that I subscribe in the fullest to the editorial.

This is an issue the House will be given the opportunity of resolving next Wednesday when this bill is called to the floor for action.

Here is the article and editorial:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 30, 1960]

HÉBERT WILL FIGHT HOUSE BILL ON MILITARY SELLING—WOULD ENCOURAGE INFLUENCE PEDDLING

(By Jack Steele)

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, Louisiana, charged today that a proposed House bill would legalize and encourage influence peddling by retired military officers.

The measure denounced by HÉBERT has approval of the Armed Services Committee, but faces a fight on the House floor next Monday.

Representative HÉBERT heads the Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee which last year inquired into the role of retired officers in the munitions lobby and drafted a tough bill to curb their selling to the military services.

But Chairman CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, and other committee members—apparently as a result of objections from the Pentagon and retired officers—insisted on watering down the bill before sending it to the House.

AMENDMENTS

Representative HÉBERT announced today that he will offer amendments Monday to restore criminal provisions to the bill so as to bar officers from selling anything to the Defense Department within 2 years after they retire.

His amendments would provide penalties of up to \$10,000 in fines and a year in jail both for retired officers who violated this 2-year ban and for defense contractors who hired them.

Representative HÉBERT pointed out that the committee-approved bill provides only one penalty for officers who take selling jobs with defense contractors within 2 years after they retire—temporarily loss of their retirement pay.

He said this loss of retirement pay would become, in effect, the fee that a retired officer would pay for the privilege of selling to the Defense Department for 2 years.

PROFITABLE

And he noted that many officers would find it profitable to give up a few thousand dollars of retirement pay temporarily to take \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year jobs with defense contractors.

"The committee-approved bill simply would not prohibit retired officers from selling their influence to these contractors," he said. "Instead, it would legalize, encourage, and promote such influence peddling."

"A high ranking officer, within 24 hours after he retired, could be right back in the Pentagon using his influence on behalf of a contractor. As long as he was willing to give up his retirement pay, the committee bill would not touch him."

Representative HÉBERT also noted that laws already on the books provide the same pay-loss penalties for retired Army and Air Force officers as the committee bill, and require the Navy to deprive its officers of retirement pay if they sell to the Navy anytime after they retire.

EX-OFFICERS AND INFLUENCE

When a House subcommittee headed by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, was investigating the "munitions lobby" last year, it turned up the names of 1,453 retired military officers who had taken jobs with the 100 biggest contractors doing business with the Pentagon.

On the other side of the Capitol, Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois revealed similar findings.

This year, as a result, Representative HÉBERT sponsored a bill to bar all military

officers from selling anything to the Pentagon within 2 years of their retirement. He put some teeth in the bill.

The Armed Services Committee, headed by Representative CARL VINSON, extracted the teeth and reported a bill Representative HEBERT says would curb none of these practices, but actually would "legalize and encourage" influence peddling by retired officers.

Representative HEBERT will try to get the fangs put back in his bill when it goes before the House next week. He will be up against a potent lobby. The Pentagon in general has opposed the bill, and the retired officers—although they also are drawing retirement pay from the taxpayers' till—naturally are against it. We hope the House agrees with Representative HEBERT.

Even the Vinson committee, in its report, concedes that influence can be "prejudicial to the free and unfettered decisions of the Government," although the bill it recommends does nothing to prevent it.

The Defense Department is planning to spend nearly 25 billion taxpayer dollars on procurement next year. If the zeal of contractors hungry for huge slices of this cake influences the decisions which lead to this vast spending, rather than the strict merits of the projects, the taxpayers are bound to take a licking. And the defense program to suffer in proportion.

House Members voting next week on the influence bill shouldn't be permitted to forget this.

Funds for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am submitting for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the best statements I have ever read on the importance and significance of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial being constructed jointly by the Federal Government and the city of St. Louis on our great riverfront park along the Mississippi River in the Third Congressional District of Missouri.

The statement I am referring to is an editorial which appeared Sunday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Gateway of the West."

It is most encouraging to know that the Senate in passing the Department of Interior appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year has agreed to provide the funds needed to maintain an effective rate of progress in construction of the memorial. Thanks to the efforts of our two Missouri Senators, the bill contains \$4,663,125. This is a substantial increase over the amount provided in the President's budget. It is an amount, however, which can be spent efficiently and which must be available for disbursement in the coming fiscal year if we are to have any chance at all of completing this project by the target date set by the Secretary of Interior and the Director of the National Park Service, as well as by the mayor of St. Louis, that is, by 1964 when the city observes the

200th anniversary of its beginning. I am very hopeful that the conferees from the House of Representatives on the appropriations bill will agree to the amount provided by the Senate.

I am sure if they read the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch they will see and recognize why this money is so important:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 27, 1960]

GATEWAY OF THE WEST

"We're going West tomorrow, where the promises can't fail.

O'er the hills in legions, boys, and crowd the dusty trail."

—Stephen Vincent Benet.

"Napoleon Bonaparte, like Milton's Satan on his throne, sat unapproachable in his bad eminence." So Henry Adams begins his characterization of the enemy who "had to be faced and overawed by the gentle optimism of President Jefferson." Talleyrand, "who never forgave himself for having once believed in a popular revolution," had persuaded Napoleon to "pacify Europe and turn the energies of France toward the creation of an empire in the New World and was the more sure of success because, in the reactionary spirit of the time, he commanded the sympathies of all Europe in checking the power of republicanism in its last refuge."

It seemed that "10,000 French soldiers, trained in the school of Hoche and Moreau, and commanded by a future marshal of France, might have occupied New Orleans and St. Louis before Jefferson could have collected a brigade of militia in Nashville." The Federalists blindly cried for a war against France—a war which probably would have reestablished French power along the whole length of the Mississippi, which might have brought about the secession of the territory between the Appalachians and the river, and which would have entrenched British and Spanish power on the young nation's flanks.

Americans, too, rarely recall how their country was almost confined to the Original Thirteen States—divided by slavery—on a continent under European control. The prudence, the vision, and the daring of Jefferson overcame this dark threat. Through the Louisiana Purchase he made possible the expansion of the United States from ocean to ocean as a world power. This work must stand in the first rank of American accomplishments. Surely the people, especially western people, will insist that it be commemorated by the national monument which has been started on the St. Louis riverfront.

The riverfront national park—to be dominated by a 619-foot stainless steel arch symbolic of the Gateway of the West—was suggested by a committee of St. Louis citizens appointed December 15, 1933, by Mayor Bernard F. Dickmann and headed by the late Luther Ely Smith. Franklin D. Roosevelt responded with enthusiasm. On June 15, 1934, he signed a congressional joint resolution establishing the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the monument. St. Louis was proud to join in financing it on the basis of \$1 for each \$3 of Federal money. On September 10, 1935, the voters approved a \$7,500,000 bond issue. And on December 21, 1935, the President made available \$6,750,000, matched by \$2,250,000 in city funds, for the acquisition of the 41-block site.

From the beginning this was a national project. Three Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives had to be among the nine members of the Memorial Commission. Title to the site was given to the Government. The development was put in charge of the National Park Service. St. Louis made its bargain with Washington because, after all, it was on the St. Louis river-

front that Capt. Amos Stoddard took over the Louisiana Territory from the French. Here was the starting point of Lewis and Clark, Pike, Ashley, Fremont and the "mountain men" who blazed trails to Oregon, to Santa Fe, and to California. And it was the jumping-off point for the settlers who went west in their mover wagons.

Enthusiasm was high a quarter of a century ago. The preliminary work was pushed along rapidly. By May 1942, all buildings had been cleared from the site and from the city's tax books. The beautiful old courthouse—in which Dred Scott started his suit for freedom—was added to the site by the city. The war, however, forced a halt until 1945 when St. Louis citizens raised \$225,000 for an architectural competition for the design of the memorial. The winner was the conception of Eero Saarinen which Aline B. Loucheim praised in the New York Times as "a noble, symbolic monument, fitting, beautiful, and impressive."

The arch and the other elements in the Saarinen design were approved by the Federal authorities on May 25, 1948. But the war's delay, the use of the area as a vast parking lot, and the reluctance of the railroads to relocate their riverfront tracks gave objectors in Congress and elsewhere their opportunity. President Truman did dedicate the site on June 10, 1950, but it was not until May 17, 1954, that Congress authorized construction. And it was not until 1956 that it voted \$2,640,000 for preliminary work. But slowly enthusiasm was rekindled, and the National Park Service set 1964, the bicentenary of St. Louis, as its target for completion of the arch.

With this assurance that the Government would keep its part of the bargain, public and private interests in St. Louis committed themselves to the enhancement of the areas adjacent to the national memorial. Almost 50 additional blocks are to be cleared. New approaches have been built. A new bridge across the Mississippi, a stadium and accommodations for visitors to the memorial have been given the green light. In all, St. Louis will expend far more in the neighborhood than it will cost the Government to finish the memorial. Yet now Washington again threatens to allow the work to come to a money-wasting halt. The administration's budget includes only \$1,650,000 for the project. A minimum of \$4,603,125—to be supplemented by \$1,534,375 in city funds—is needed to keep the work on schedule.

The St. Louis delegation in Congress is making a fight for this appropriation. This is not a grab for "pork." It is a request that the Government honor its pledge. And St. Louis, we trust, will have the support especially of all the Representatives in Congress of the trans-Mississippi West. The national park is a memorial to those who made the West a part of the Nation. It seems inconceivable that Congress—which has freely commemorated lesser men and lesser events—will not raise this monument to Jefferson and those others who laid the foundation of the grandeur and the power of the United States.

Another Member of the Eisenhower Clean as a Hound's Tooth Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

herewith include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the subject of conflict of interest in the Eisenhower administration.

On Monday last I made remarks in the House referring to a Meet the Press appearance of the former Governor of New York Thomas E. Dewey. With these remarks, I inserted an editorial from the Post-Dispatch listing members of the Eisenhower Republican Clean as a Hound's Tooth Club.

The editorial herewith presented adds another name to the membership in that club:

AN UNEVEN DOZEN

We hereby amend a recent editorial listing 11 cases of conflict of interest during the Eisenhower administration. Earl C. Corey, former director of the Agriculture Department's commodity office in Portland, Oreg., has told Senators that he made an \$83,250 profit from a silent partnership in a company storing Federal grain, and owned stock in three other grain companies. Mr. Corey swore that he never heard of the conflict-of-interest regulations until mid-1959. He did not resign until January 22. The announcement of his resignation by Secretary Benson did not come until a Senate subcommittee scheduled a public hearing a few days ago. For the record, now there are 12.

Need for Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, in the March 15 edition of the Willoughby News-Herald, of Willoughby, Ohio, the following article appeared which shows the findings of the Citizens Hospital Study Committee of Cleveland, concerning the need for hospitalization of the various age groups in our society. I think it of great significance that the report shows our elderly citizens are frequently hospitalized for extended stays. In many instances, this group is the least able to meet the present day high costs of adequate medical care and hospitalization.

OLDER YOU GET, MORE HOSPITAL CARE YOU NEED

The older you are, the more likely you are to need hospital care.

By the time you reach 65 years of age, you are in a group requiring seven times the amount of hospital care needed by youngsters under 15.

You will spend as much time in the hospital after your 47th birthday as you did in the entire preceding 46 years if you are typical.

From findings such as these, the Citizens Hospital Study Committee of Cleveland today traced to advancing age the chief responsibility for increasing the average adult's need for hospitalization. The number of persons in each age group has great importance in community hospital planning, the committee pointed out.

Detailing further findings from its analysis of 52,289 hospital cases, the committee indicated the average need for hospital care begins to climb from a low point reached at

about 15 years of age. Thereafter, it mounts steadily throughout the balance of life, except that the peak in obstetrical cases affects women in the childbearing years between 20 and 35.

In general, the report showed:

Large variation in the extent of hospital care by age.

Young people requiring hospital care and old people a great deal.

Many young women in their twenties and early thirties rendered obstetrical care, but with relatively short lengths of stay.

Few teenagers hospitalized and those few not staying long.

Old people to be frequently hospitalized and for extended stays.

"These facts are of greatest importance both in planning our community's needs for hospital beds and in making proper provision for our increasing proportion of older people," the committee report stated.

For all types of cases in short term hospitals, the average patient remained in the hospital for 8.3 days, according to the report. For obstetrical cases the average stay was 5.3 days; for medical and nonoperative cases the average was 9.7 days; and for surgical cases, 8.9 days.

Battle for the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an article written for the magazine, *Purchasing*, by our able colleague, the Honorable THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri. In his very keen, analytical manner, Mr. CURTIS has pinpointed the one overwhelming issue of today—the battle for the free enterprise system. Unless we win that fight and stop the headlong rush toward socialism, then our efforts in other fields are futile. I commend Mr. CURTIS' article to every thoughtful American:

TOO MUCH RELIANCE ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SOLVE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—CURRENT CONGRESS WILL PUSH TREND TOWARD SOCIALISTIC STATE

(By Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri)

There are many issues which face the 2d session of the 86th Congress which are delineated economic. Many of these issues stem from the expressed desire of professional economists, businessmen, and politicians to have continued healthy economic growth coupled with maximum employment and reasonable price stability.

The Joint Economic Committee has recently completed a concentrated 10-month study into various aspects of these three goals—not without regard to whether the goals themselves are mutually inconsistent and, if they are inconsistent, which goals should bear the sacrifice in resolving an inconsistency.

I will list a few of the subjects upon which the Joint Economic Committee will make comments throughout the year. The farm program, antitrust legislation with particular reference to a phenomena which many economic observers claim to have seen and others claim does not exist—administered prices, Federal debt ceiling and interest rate

ceiling on Federal securities, Federal Reserve Board policies on monetary policies and their relation to debt management, standby controls on credit and prices, legislation relating to the problems of industrywide strikes, Government purchasing policies, Federal expenditures for depressed areas, education, community facilities, health and public works, and a balanced budget.

The longer I serve in Congress, concentrating as I do on economic matters, the more concerned I become about the inarticulateness of those who believe in the private enterprise system—particularly vis-a-vis those who profess to believe in it and yet are constantly undermining its basic structure.

STUDY PROBLEMS

The staff of the JEC's study of employment, growth, and price levels is a case in point. The purpose of the studies of the JEC is:

(1) To take an objective look at our political-economic structure to try to discover the problems that exist.

(2) To bring into the open the various proposals that had been made to solve the problems.

(3) To subject these proposals to criticism.

I find that though the hearings and the papers prepared by the panelists do just that, the staff's report sets out its own particular series of solutions instead of the alternative solutions advanced by the panelists and others. The staff's solutions, almost without exception, rely on increased Federal Government activity and disregard whatever additional activity there might be in the private sector of the economy. The staff's analysis, in my judgment, shows a lack of understanding of what the private enterprise system is about or a basic distrust of it.

The significance of the staff's report is that the members of the staff are outstanding, hard-working, and honest scholars. The question that therefore disturbs me the most about America and its future is this: Has scholarship in America reached a point where scholars do not know how to approach a subject to study and write about it objectively?

I shall call attention to just a few points:

1. The staff avoids the use of the term "administered" prices, which is commendable because the term begs the question. But its report, instead of discussing the economic issue involved, supplied another term, "market power," which just as effectively begs the question.

The question at issue is this: In certain industries, is there such a concentration of market power that prices can be set without regard to the economic consequences? If so, is this a matter that should be within the scope of the antitrust laws?

During the hearings, when this issue became the subject of discussion, I asked why the industries accused of "administering" prices were frequently the very industries that spent more time and money on market analysis and customers' buying habits than other industries. If these industries were trying to get information so that they could pay attention to the laws of economics (not try to abuse them) then the so-called "market control" they possessed would appear to be healthy, commendable, and a matter for other businesses to emulate—not something to be held up as against the public interest.

2. The staff report consistently ignores real cost factors in discussing price increases. For example, what has been the economic cost in steel resulting from the depletion of the Mesabi Range, if any? What has been the cost in medical care arising from increased cost of doctor training, advanced type hospital equipment, increased research and development in drugs, etc?

It is almost axiomatic that rapid technological growth has increased costs through making much equipment and many skills

obsolete. The staff report advocates more money—and Federal money to boot—in the field of medical research and development, without commenting upon the basic fact that we are in an economic imbalance today resulting from the technological revolution we are still experiencing in health matters.

3. Although the price of living indices have advanced most rapidly in the area of services, the cost factors underlying services remain unexamined and receive little or no comment. In this conjunction also are the economic factors underlying "tight" money. Essentially there is a shortage of investment capital, resulting from increased demand. It seems axiomatic that demand for investment capital is bound to increase rapidly.

4. The staff pays little or no attention to the question of determining what is economic growth and what proves to be economic waste. Little attention is paid to the limitations we experience in the tools we use in measuring economic growth.

Economic growth may be unhealthy and misshapen growth. The gross national product includes economic mistakes as economic growth. The GNP fails to measure production capacity; it weighs only actual use of capacity in a given year. Rome was not built in a day, so it is true that no economy was built in 1 year. What we have from the past which is still usable is as important as what we might build in a given year. That becomes a part of the accumulated capital plant which the measurement of annual growth fails to compute.

Essentially, the staff report fails to recognize the keystone of the private enterprise system—which is the use of the marketplace as the tester of economic ideas, as opposed to the use of select groups of men to judge new economic ideas.

The private enterprise system is to the science of economics what the trial-and-error system, the laboratory system, has been to the physical sciences. The planned economy system is what the scholastic system was to the physical sciences in the Middle Ages, when chemistry was alchemy and astronomy, astrology.

Until those who believe in the private enterprise system really understand that which they believe in to the extent that they can become articulate about it, the battle for the private enterprise system being fought in the Halls of the Congress will continue to go against them. This second session of Congress will provide no change in this pattern. The logistics and strategy have already been set. Tactics at this time cannot win the battle, although they may delay things until the proper logistics and strategy are developed. I won't predict in which areas the marketplace will be replaced by political bureaucrat decision by the action of Congress, but when the session has ended we will have moved closer to the socialistic state.

Centenary of William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appears in Labor, the official weekly newspaper of Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, on April 2, 1960. The article entitled "Anniversary Recalls Famed Battles by Bryan for Labor," follows:

ANNIVERSARY RECALLS FAMED BATTLES BY BRYAN FOR LABOR—MILLIONS WERE SWAYED BY 'GREAT COMMONER'

Many newspapers during the past week carried feature stories on the late silver-tongued William Jennings Bryan to mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of the "Great Commoner." Most of the stories stressed his leadership of the "silver bloc" and his famous "Cross of Gold" speech at the 1896 Democratic Convention which led to his nomination as candidate for President.

Few, however, mentioned the fact that during his career he was a friend of labor, and in most of his campaigns he had strong labor support.

When he died in July 1925, the secretary-treasurer of the AFL at the time—Frank L. Morrison—pointed out that Bryan's voice "was always heard in favor of legislation urged by organized labor."

As an example, he cited a battle by Bryan to assure for labor the right of a jury trial in contempt cases. Also, he declared that Bryan's "most efficient work" in labor's behalf was usually done "in conference."

Morrison recalled a significant instance of that in 1914 when labor was pressing for enactment of the Clayton amendment to the Sherman Act, so as to curb the use of anti-trust legislation for union-busting purposes and to free unions from rule by injunction.

President Woodrow Wilson was being pressed at the time by industry and by reactionary elements in his own party to oppose the Clayton amendment. Morrison said the officers of the AFL appealed to Bryan (then Secretary of State) for help, and within the Cabinet, the Commoner swung Wilson and the administration behind the drive to pass the Clayton Act.

"CROWN OF THORNS"

Bryan gained his first fame during his two terms in Congress from 1892 to 1896, as Democratic Representative from the normally Republican district of Lincoln, Nebr. He became a leader of the fight for the "free coinage of silver" at a 16 to 1 ratio with gold—an issue that stirred immense enthusiasm in the West, where "hard money" spelled hard times, but Bryan aroused the fury of the gold standard advocates in the East.

It became the main issue in the State-by-State battles for election of delegates to the 1896 Democratic Convention. At that convention, Bryan swept the delegates with the famous speech, in which he proclaimed: "We will answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

LOST THREE TIMES

The speech insured his nomination as presidential candidate. In the campaign that followed, Bryan stirred great fervor, but also great opposition. Frightened financiers and industrialists poured vast sums of money behind William McKinley—and the latter beat Bryan by a big majority.

Twice thereafter, Bryan went down to defeat as the Democratic nominee, but he played a big role in the 1912 convention in putting over Woodrow Wilson. When Wilson won, Bryan was rewarded with the post of Secretary of State.

As the Nation's leading orator on the chautauqua circuit, he continued to sway big audiences, but public sentiment shifted sharply when, as one of the last acts of his career, he choose to aid in the Tennessee prosecution of John T. Scopes, a science teacher accused of violating the law against teaching of evolution.

In that famous trial, Attorney Clarence Darrow, defense counsel for Scopes, shredded Bryan's fundamentalist views. The trial became a laughing stock for many Americans, though Scopes was convicted, and Bryan died 5 days later.

Sweden's Action Concerning Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives very properly adopted House Concurrent Resolution 465, expressing its profound sense of indignation and shock at the epidemic of desecration of places of worship and other sites.

During the recent outbreaks of anti-semitism in many countries, it was said that the headquarters of the movement was located in Sweden. The Swedish Minister of Justice, Mr. Herman Kling, on January 27, 1960, told the Swedish Parliament what measures had been taken and would be taken to prevent and punish manifestations of racial discrimination in Sweden. He and his country are to be commended for their intelligent and vigorous approach to the problem.

I commend the minister's remarks to the attention of our colleagues. They are as follows:

REPLY GIVEN BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE TO INTERPELLATIONS BY MESSRS MUNKTELL AND RIMMERFORS, MEMBERS OF THE SECOND CHAMBER OF THE SWEDISH RIKSDAG, CONCERNING OUTBREAKS OF ANTISEMITISM IN SWEDEN

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the chamber Mr. Rimmerfors has asked me whether I consider that the antisemitic demonstrations which have occurred in Sweden should lead to legislative or other steps calculated to check the propaganda activity which is detrimental to Sweden's reputation abroad and is still apparently being carried on.

Mr. MunkteLL has also asked the Minister of the Interior whether he is prepared to inform the chamber what measures have been taken to ascertain whence the latest outbreaks of antisemitism in Sweden emanate and what measures have been taken or will be taken to prevent and punish such manifestations of racial discrimination and persecution in the future.

In view of the close connection between the two interpellations I propose, by agreement with the Minister of the Interior, to reply to both of them at the same time.

To begin with, I would emphasize in the strongest possible way how abominable I consider every form of racial persecution and inflammatory propaganda directed against people on the grounds of their origin or their religion. I am convinced that there is a very broad basis of public opinion in our country which strongly condemns antisemitism and other phenomena of that kind. The part that antisemitism played under the Nazi regime in Germany and the terrible fate which many millions of people suffered as a result are still fresh in everyone's memory.

At the end of 1959, as is well known, there occurred in various places in Western Germany a number of antisemitic demonstrations and other incidents of a more or less serious character. The details of these happenings were quickly taken up as topical items by the press, the radio and the television. Within a short time similar phenomena made their appearance in other countries all round the world.

In Sweden the first incidents occurred shortly after the new year and since then antisemitic demonstrations have occurred at a comparatively large number of places in this country. To an overwhelming extent these demonstrations have taken the form of daubing up swastikas and antisemitic inscriptions; in a few cases, however, the demonstrations have been of a more serious character.

In some of these cases it has been possible to apprehend the perpetrators. In these cases the persons concerned proved to be youths of school age or slightly older who have got involved in the demonstrations out of mischievousness and lack of understanding. Two 15-year-old boys—one of them had run away from his home and the other had escaped from a reformatory—have stated that they were led to do what they did by the recent statements in the press about anti-Semitic activities. They declared that they had no anti-Semitic feelings and were not interested in politics. In another case the swastika-painting was done by a person who was probably not fully accountable for his actions.

According to information furnished by the police it is not, at any rate in Sweden, a question of any organized action. Mainly it seems to be a matter of acts by mischievous youths and other immature persons who have probably been inspired by statements in newspaper articles and television and radio broadcasts about the demonstrations in other countries.

Nevertheless I would not wish to belittle what has happened. Even if it is correct, as the police consider, that these actions are the expression of an epidemic of mischief-making, this is serious enough. That Swedish youths should be so badly informed that they can be infected by such a phenomenon is highly deplorable and constitutes something that we must combat with all our strength.

This is one side of the matter. But there is another side, too, and that is the Nazi and anti-Semitic propaganda which is being disseminated in print both inside and outside Sweden by certain circles operating in this country. We have a number of fanatical individuals who have long been carrying on anti-Semitic propaganda both here and abroad. And I must state with deep regret that some of the propaganda material which has recently come to light abroad emanates from Sweden.

In those cases where the printed propaganda is in such a form that it is covered by penal provisions, action has been taken. A number of prosecutions on these grounds were instituted by my predecessors in office. And only a few days ago, when after a rather long interval a number of anti-Semitic pamphlets were submitted for scrutiny to the Commissioner for the Freedom of the Press, I handed these over to the Attorney General for prosecution. In some of these pamphlets the name of the publisher is that of a person who has long been known for anti-Semitic propaganda and who has already been convicted several times for such activities.

It is hardly necessary to say that the incidents which have occurred in our country have led to searching inquiries. All the data in the particular cases are examined centrally by the police and collated with what is otherwise known concerning the political tendencies of various organizations and of certain individuals. In view of the nature of the matter, I cannot go into details about how this work is being done, but I can assure the chamber that a very thorough investigation is being carried out and that the development of events is being followed with the very greatest attention.

If I were asked how such repulsive phenomena as racial hatred and inflammatory propaganda can be countered, my answer would be that the most effective means, at

any rate in the long run, is information and education of the rising generation in respect for human values. But as will already have appeared from what I have said, it has proved necessary also to take legislative measures. Under the impact of the persecution of the Jews in Germany before and during the Second World War and the manifestations of anti-Semitism which occurred in our country in connection with that persecution, provisions were incorporated in the penal code in 1948 providing for punishment of incitement against any group of the population. Under these provisions "anyone who publicly threatens, slanders, or insults a group of the population having a certain origin or holding certain religious beliefs," is liable to punishment by fine or imprisonment. This protection is not limited to groups consisting of Swedish citizens; it applies to any group of the population having a certain origin or holding certain religious beliefs. As concerns propaganda disseminated in print, provisions in the ordinance on the freedom of the press insure that incitement against any group of the population as defined in the penal code can be prosecuted as an offense against the freedom of the press.

We now ask whether our present legislation is sufficient. So far as propaganda through printed publications—which, of course, constitute by far the most important means of disseminating propaganda—is concerned, I wish, first of all, to emphasize that one of the basic principles in our system of protection of freedom of the press is that no censorship preceding printing and no prohibition of printing may be imposed. Thus the dissemination of publications calculated to stir up racial hatred cannot in Sweden be countered by the authorities through obstacles set up in advance but only through action taken subsequently, insofar as such publications are deemed criminal. In these circumstances it is urgent that the reaction of the penal system should be such that it achieves the necessary inhibitory effect. As I have just mentioned, the punishment for instilling hatred against groups of the population consists of fines or imprisonment. As a result, the courts have generally imposed fines, which perhaps have been paid by financiers who have been behind the person announced as the publisher. So far as I know, imprisonment has been imposed in only one case. In the proposals for a new penal code which, at the instance of my predecessor in office, have been submitted to the Council on Legislation the provision on incitement against groups of the population has been incorporated in what is essentially the same form as before, apart from a revision, due to technical reasons, of the latitude of punishment. Having regard to what has happened recently, however, I consider it justifiable to consider whether the latitude of punishment for incitement against groups of the population should not be revised, for example, in such a way that imprisonment would be made the normal punishment and that fines would be imposed only if the offense is not of a serious character. It is my intention to take up this question in connection with the reviewing of the draft penal code for the new submission to the Council on Legislation which is at present proceeding in the Ministry of Justice.

In practice it has often proved to be difficult to take action against printed propaganda of this kind, partly owing to the legislation on the freedom of the press, but also owing to the fact that the printing firms which allow themselves to cooperate in this propaganda do not always observe the regulations on the liability to submit copies of printed matter for scrutiny and owing to the fact that this propaganda material is often printed in widely differing parts of the country. I have therefore given consideration to the measures which might be taken to coordinate and render more ef-

ficient the supervision which at present exists in this sphere. Here I refer not only to purely anti-Semitic propaganda but also to other forms of inflammatory propaganda and nazism.

In addition to legislative and supervisory measures it is of course, as I mentioned a little while ago, information and education that in the long run constitute the best and most effective means of counteracting racial persecution and inflammatory propaganda. The essential thing is to teach young people to understand the importance of the common human values. Parents, schools, newspapers, the radio and the television have a great responsibility here.

To take the schools first of all, it is of course important that efforts should be made to try to combat all tendencies to racial prejudice while the children are still young. I have also satisfied myself that the board of education is very much aware of this question. In the instruction in history and citizenship, care is taken to see that the Second World War and the events leading up to it are studied and the text books are continually examined with a view to removing anything which could in the least way operate in a wrong direction and also to introducing adequate information about the phenomena we are now concerned with. But in the religious instruction, too, the schools should be on the watch to see that racial prejudices are not instilled into the very young.

The newspaper press, the radio and the television obviously have an important function to perform in the service of information. It is gratifying to be able to note the strong reaction against the recent anti-Semitic demonstrations which has been evoked in the Swedish press. It is important that our newspapers should continue on this path, but they should at the same time be aware of the risk of presenting and apprehending these phenomena only as sensational news material.

I also mentioned the great responsibility of the parents. And in this connection I would express the desire that all parents should take an active part in the efforts to counter inflammatory propaganda. Let us explain to all our children the meaning of what they have been seeing lately in the newspapers and on the television. Let us tell them what the swastika has been and is the symbol of. Let us tell them that millions of people died because of the inflammatory propaganda which the Nazi regime in Germany conducted before and during the Second World War, and that all this suffering was inflicted on innocent people merely because they were considered to belong to another race. Let us teach them that tolerance toward other groups of the population and toward those who think otherwise than we do is one of the principal marks of democracy and the best basis on which to build our future.

If all democratic forces unite to work together in support of these measures we shall be able to increase our vigilance against anti-Semitic and Nazi propaganda in the best and most effective way.

Unrequited Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial written by Mr.

Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times:

UNREQUITED LOVE

Teamsters in this area who have no great love for their boss may be encouraged by the knowledge that there are others of their brethren who seem to feel the same way.

Jimmy Hoffa started out after the recent convention of his 1,776,000-member union, the biggest and roughest and strongest in the country, to demonstrate that the rank and file "love Jimmy." He appeared before 13 local unions from Tampa, to St. Louis, to Chicago and Milwaukee to New York.

The New York meeting was to be the climax. With 150,000 Teamsters in the metropolitan area, arrangements were made to fill Madison Square Garden's 15,000 seats. Loudspeakers were attached for the expected overflow outside and police were set to detour traffic for blocks around the hall.

It was a great idea, only the rank and file did not turn out. Those who did, together with members of many of their families, barely filled half the auditorium. As a demonstration of affection and loyalty it was a blooper.

Hoffa told the few who came to hear that he plans to build a web of union alliances covering millions of workers as an answer to the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. He said he would have all unions arrange common expiration dates for their contracts to bring them into line with those of the Teamsters. Thus, they will be able to circumvent the law's ban on secondary boycotts.

In spite of the lack of affection for the boss by union members, Hoffa's power must not be overlooked. Through coercion and other tactics he has control of the membership and his threats carry a lot of weight. The only way to curb him and others of his ilk is for the membership to get rid of such leaders and the best way to make this possible is for the voters to insist that legislation give control of unions to the rank and file and that unions be subjected to the same laws that govern other corporations.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

A Blueprint for American Space Leadership: Rockets for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my distinct pleasure and honor this afternoon to speak before the American Rocket Society, National Capitol Section. The talk which I gave was entitled "A Blueprint for American Space Leadership: Rockets for Peace."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICAN SPACE LEADERSHIP: ROCKETS FOR PEACE

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, before the American Rocket Society, National Capitol Section, on March 31, 1960, Washington, D.C.)

Ladies and gentlemen, appearing here today before this distinguished group of industry representatives, military brass and scientific high-brows, I must confess that I know only little about high military strategy, or the complexities of space engineering. Neither am I running for the Presidency as an expert on these matters. Yet, I am very pleased to respond to your invitation and meet with you, because you are the actors and the directors of the most colossal—and as a thrifty Republican let me add, most expensive—human adventure drama, ever.

Since the days of antiquity, man has constantly been moved by his innate restless spirit to explore the unknown about him. What would human life and human history have been without this constant search and thirst for discovery—this determination to know what is beyond the horizons—physical and spiritual?

In world history, Homer's *Odyssey* still stands out as a symbol of man's search. My ancestors, the Vikings, continued this search in their daring explorations—which in all likelihood brought them to this continent long before Columbus. The American West gave our own youth, during last century and this, another frontier for discovery. And now, as if to guarantee that the youth of tomorrow may not be deprived of its own unknown frontiers—nature is beginning to unlock the unbound horizons of space. The inquiring mind is on the go.

THE MILITARY ASPECTS OF SPACE

Space has many uses: Peaceful and martial, constructive and destructive. In recent weeks I spent long hours listening to testimony after testimony on the U.S. defense program before the joint sessions of the Senate Space and Preparedness Committees.

We had many experts before us. Somebody jested that it was obvious they were all experts—because they disagreed with each other.

I heard much debate about whether there is or there is not an American "space lag". There was much debate—yet there was the basic agreement that we have nuclear weapons that far exceed the destructive power of U.S.S.R. weapons, and that our total carrying capacity for a long range delivery of a nuclear attack far exceeds theirs.

I also feel it incumbent upon myself in this connection to stress that I do not always agree with the "military mind," which too often equates security with numbers. I do not necessarily believe that in order to possess security and military deterrence this country must match every Soviet ICBM, submarine, tank and cannon, one for one. Security and deterrence against aggression consist of much more than mere numbers.

We must give full credit to the strength and determination of our allies. We must recognize the moral, psychological and economic force of the new uncommitted nations who cry for peace in order to survive and flourish. And we need remember, furthermore, that the one billion people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are constantly striving—because such striving is inherent in human nature—to better their lives, to have their voices heard—and to keep out of war. These and other factors must be taken into account in determining whether this Nation is sufficiently equipped not only to defend itself, if the need may arise, but also to deter any aggressor from undertaking such a dangerous escapade.

Yet, this is not what I want to discuss with you today. This meeting today between you, the technical experts, and myself, a representative of the people and one of their political spokesmen—offers an excellent opportunity to discuss not merely the technical and military aspects of the space challenge—but some of its political and philosophical implications.

SPACE—A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The challenge of space is not new. In fact, it is probably as ancient as man himself. For since the beginning of time there has never been a period when man has not been actually aware of space and of certain manifestations of space—the vastness of the sky, the sun, the moon, the myriad stars, the alternation of day and night, the procession of the seasons, and the vagaries of the weather. Man has always felt it his destiny to conquer nature; but while he was able to make the land and the water serve his purpose, the realm of the air and the vastness of the universe that might lie behind seemed denied him.

Now, only some 190 years after Watt's invention of the first effective steam engine, and 50 years after the first heavier-than-air flying machine, the dream of space knowledge, travel, and conquest may become a reality. American and Russian breakthroughs in recent years now suddenly make the whole wide horizon of space open for human exploration.

You, physicists, engineers, and space experts of all types will guarantee—I am sure—that progress continue. But to me, technical space progress does not suffice. I am constantly concerned not merely about whether

the launching of our next rocket will be a success, but also about what this technical progress will mean to society, to this Nation, and to the individuals inhabiting this earth and this big country.

Recently we heard much discussion and much propaganda about peaceful coexistence, arms curtailment, and even total disarmament. Disarmament is a fine concept and an aim worth striving for.

Still, disarmament by itself, if effective, is merely a passive act—one which guarantees what the nations will not do. Disarmament fails, however, to provide for an active constructive substitute. But I ask: What will take the place of the arms race? Let me give you an example from every day's life—from the memories of my youth and of yours.

Disarmament between nations can be compared to two boys who have been quarreling for a long time and who have finally been made to put down their clubs. Yet, there is nothing to prevent them from picking up these clubs again at any time, or from engaging in a fist fight, or from expressing their hostility in any other manner. To have peace between these boys it is not sufficient merely to have the club put down; what is more important is to give these boys an undertaking in which they could both participate. To accomplish true disarmament and lasting peace, it is likewise important to give the nations an undertaking in which they could all participate—in which their youth could take part; towards which their ingenuities could be utilized, and in which their pent-up energies and ambitions could find release. It is for such positive and productive peaceful endeavor that I am calling here today.

ROCKETS FOR PEACE

Rockets have long been terrifying symbols of warfare and destruction. In the last days of the Hitlerite empire, Nazi rockets became a symbol of world conquest and subjugation. Of all frightening sounds, the high-pitched whistle and cry of the V-2 was the most terrible to the ears of the inhabitants of London. Rockets meant indiscriminate destruction, dismemberment, death. And worse yet—they meant fear, terrible fear. At this time again, rockets are a potential threat to the life of every citizen of this world, in military uniform, and without uniform, on the front lines and on the home front.

Fear has again become an overpowering element in human life. But in the language of a recent best-seller and motion picture—"On the Beach"—I would like to say to you today: "It is not too late, brother." It is not too late to have fear changed into hope, to have destruction replaced with construction.

Here is an opportunity for statesmen to break through the manmade barriers of distrust and hate. We must not, in this exploratory age, repeat the mistakes of the past centuries when the nations explored and warred and bled. Wars were then the order of the day. Cannot this great desire to know be made a vehicle that will bring the human family together?

It is especially because of the tremendous destructive potential of rockets that an emphasis on their peaceful utilization can be most dramatic. The same equipment that can be used to launch warheads can also be used for useful scientific research in space.

The same wealth and manpower that can be wasted on schemes of destruction can be used for a worldwide program of space cooperation and construction. To me, the future of closer international cooperation lies more in a positive and aggressive program of this type than in a mere preventive program of disarmament.

The new horizons of outer space, which all nations share, offer new frontiers for cooperation on a supernational level. In the progress of mankind from its less complex social organization to the elaborate modern state—each new structure was designed not to replace those already existing, but to supplement them. The future of international cooperation lies, therefore, not in an endeavor to supersede the family, state, or nation—but in an effort to provide new structures and tools for enterprises that require the mental and physical resources of many nations.

Future international cooperation will thus be most effective in the development of regional economic units, in international planning of social and economic developments, and in the maintenance of a machinery for the preservation of peace. But unparalleled opportunities are offered by new scientific endeavors which would require the combined skills and resources of our whole planet.

The atoms for peace program, initiated in 1953, is an excellent example in point. More exciting yet, is the opportunity for close international cooperation in space. The unlimited territories of space make us realize more than anything else the unity of this globe. They emphasize the need for all nations to work as a team in order to conquer outer space for the benefit of the race.

This is why I am proposing here today the formal adoption of a rockets for peace program as a national goal. This program that I now propose, and for which I shall endeavor to obtain the support of my colleagues in Congress, will be designed to emphasize the peaceful uses of space. It will be designed to provide America and the free nations with their own independent space programs—regardless of what the Kremlin may be doing or planning, though we feel the job is big enough to wipe out differences, even with the Kremlin.

ROCKETS FOR PEACE—A PRACTICAL PROGRAM FOR SPACE LEADERSHIP

The rockets for peace program will be devoted to the study of climate, its forecasting and its improvement. Last year I made a proposal for the setting up of an international weatherman. I said at that time that we could build a satellite for weather forecasting, and make available to all people our code of communication with it. Thus, meteorologists the world over could direct their inquiries to the satellite and obtain whatever information they desire. By advanced warnings such a satellite could save lives and property the world over. I am now informed that a weather satellite will soon become a reality.

Recently the Russian papers carried a proposal for the creation of eternal spring on this planet—through the sprinkling of chemicals in space. But before we treat this proposal seriously, let us first look to see how much it is going to cost—remember, this is election year—and what eternal spring will do to the temperament and energies of our people.

Peaceful space research could be utilized for the improvements of communications. Communication satellites offer the promise of relaying interference-free transmissions between any two points on the globe at any time. They can make transatlantic television a reality. But I am sure you know more about the technicalities of this than I do.

Research vehicles will be able to make measurements in space, and report on the

various extra-terrestrial hazards that man must face when he follows these instruments into the heavens. Space stations serving as laboratories will also offer us an opportunity to conduct experiments that will better reveal to us the mysteries of plant and animal origin, growth and change. Possibly, changes in plant and animal life which may require thousands or millions of years to accomplish on earth, could be undertaken in hours or days under space conditions.

Space is the frontier of tomorrow. How shall we conquer it? I believe that in calling today for a rockets for peace program as a national goal, I am proposing a practical program. As part of this program I envision the following:

1. Close cooperation between the Government and scientists of America and other countries in establishing satellite observation and tracking posts.

2. Making training facilities in this country available for promising space scientists from this country and from abroad.

3. Cooperation between American scientists and scientists of other nations in an international braintrust.

4. Cooperation between American scientists and American Government with the existing space research agencies in the United Nations and elsewhere.

5. Making small scientific rockets available to other nations to conduct their own experiments; some of the scientific rockets are very small and inexpensive. We can make them available at cost to other nations—who may proceed to use them and thus add the obtained information to the total store of space knowledge.

6. Provisions for cooperative international projects in the launching of rockets and missiles. NASA, I understand, has been negotiating for such projects with several other nations, including England, Australia and Canada. More should be forthcoming.

7. The establishment of a space academy to train both those going into space and those directing such missions.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we undertake cooperative peaceful projects that make the fruits of space research available freely to all nations—we could well maintain a national pride in our space efforts, and in international prestige essential to the position of world leadership which we now enjoy, and which we have no intention of relinquishing.

It has been said that whether we like it or not we are engaged in a worldwide prestige race with the Soviets. Our competitor in the space race is tough and determined. He is willing to deprive his people of consumer goods in order to channel more resources into space research. Can we afford to be second best? Should we not channel our riches to exploration and improvements rather than luxury? Or should we not see if the Kremlin would go along in a cooperative effort to widen the horizons of the human mind? They have not usually joined us in our previous international cooperation programs—but possibly we could get their cooperation this time.

This country is in an economic and political position to marshal the scientific resources of the free world for such peaceful uses of outer space. Surely, the other nations and the other people will be enthusiastic and local partners when they are invited to share in this great human adventure—and the push into space, into the wonders and mysteries of the origin of matter and of life, can offer an unbound challenge.

SPACE—A FRONTIER FOR MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL EXPLORATION

We all realize that, as yet, we do not fully know and cannot fully predict what space exploration may mean in years to come. In future years, it may well be said of our space pioneers what was once said of Columbus:

"When he started out he didn't know where he was going, when he got there he

didn't know where he was, when he got back, he didn't know where he had been, and he did it all on borrowed money."

We may not know exactly where we are going, or what we may find. Yet, there is a great feeling of exuberance and a great sense of human mission in the work that lies before us. Let us make sure our aims are high and our purposes worthwhile.

Rocket expert Wernher von Braun recently said:

"It is impossible to predict the nature of all these discoveries; their cumulative effect will be tantamount to a scientific revolution. But it will also be a revolution of human perspective. We need not fear that future space explorers on their heaven-storming journey will lose their humility. The heavens will surround them as an eternal reminder that there is a force greater than the thrust of their rocket ships and a spirit greater than the cold logic of their computers."

It is on this note that I want to close today.

We have, up to now, been discussing material rockets for peace. But let us remember that the biggest rockets in the world today are ideas. Someone once said:

"Beware of a man with an idea, he will turn the flank of history." We have seen how ideas have changed the course of history. Our own concept of popular government has overturned kingdoms and empires and brought into the hearts of the discouraged and the have-nots hope for a better day.

Today we are adventuring out beyond the horizons of yesteryear in every direction, we are plumbing the depths of the sea, the far reaches of the sky. We are talking about putting the human being on the moon, or further still, on some of the other galaxies. While we are doing that let us always remember what Browning said:

"That life has meaning and to find its meaning is man's meat and drink."

Let us remember that the meaning of the real life lies not only in the exploration of the material frontiers but in the exploration of the things of the spirit.

We must, therefore, match our material discoveries with spiritual counterparts, or else we will find out that we are spiritually poor in a world of material plenty. For spiritual rejuvenation we need a new type of rocket. Some that will pierce the minds of mankind, cleanse them of daily weaknesses and petty blindnesses, so that man can venture free from creeds and limitations to find the meaning of life and God.

A few years ago the publisher of a small weekly newspaper in a small North Carolina town proposed that to counter the Soviet Sputniks America send up a special type of satellite: one that has no practical mission—one that will be designed to merely shine in the skies and serve as a symbol of hope and good will. I can think of no more dramatic a means for launching our rockets-for-peace program than the sending up of such new star of hope—possibly in time to shine aloft and to symbolize our spiritual inspirations—during the coming Christmas season, this year yet.

Ladies and gentlemen, it was a great pleasure meeting with you today.

An Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Farm and Ranch magazine

which is, by all means, the leading magazine on the business of farming in the Southeast, conducted a survey among the farmers recently which I feel should be called to the attention of the Members.

The results of this poll, as can be readily observed, substantially support the agricultural program of Secretary Benson and this administration. Sixty-one and two-tenths of the farmers believe in a free agriculture, and 70.8 percent want no support or none except in an emergency. Another significant fact is that 86.8 percent of those polled own, rent, or operate a farm.

The editor of Farm and Ranch, Mr. Thomas J. Anderson, Nashville, Tenn., is rendering a great service to the farmers in the areas which his magazine covers. The areas covered by this poll include West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and smaller areas of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

The survey follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

Gentlemen, let's face it: You are not farmers. You never have been, you never wanted to be; and you never will be. You know very little about it.

You stand on a stump sometimes and "play like" you are a farmer * * * because you may now own a farm, or dream of days you spent on a farm as a boy. But the facts are, you inherited your farm or bought it after you got the money some other way. You usually pay somebody else to run it; and use it as a handy tax-deduction gimmick. You still look on farming as a way of life; and talk stupidly about sustaining the farmer. You know very little of it as a modern science or business. How could you, since you lack both experience and the necessary time to really study the problem.

No. We're not guessing. One of your own Members checked it out for us. And the men who rifled your records could find only one Senator and six Congressmen who are anything close kin to being a farmer (names upon request), and only three of these are on either Agriculture Committee. These seven and no more—the other 530 of you can just quit pulling our legs.

Two years ago we explained in a survey that we want you to keep your clumsy, tax-grabbing, pittance-paying hands out of our business. Last year readers of another farm magazine repeated the demand—and corn farmers emphasized it by voting 3 to 1 against controls, when given a choice between freedom and a program of high supports with controls. Now we tell you again.

In preliminary results of a new Farm and Ranch reader survey—with approximately 2,500 returns in—the votes went this way: 61.2 percent for "no supports, no controls—a free agriculture"; 6.4 percent for "flexible supports with moderate controls"; 12.5 percent for "high, fixed supports and rigid controls"; 9.6 percent for "no controls or supports, except disaster payments in emergency"; 5.0 percent for "direct payments (compensatory) in cash"; 2.8 percent for "price supports based on a percentage of the previous 3 years' market price."

(NOTE.—70.8 percent want no supports or none except in emergency; 86.8 percent of voters own, rent, or operate a farm.)

Going on past performance, we expect you to ignore this plea again. Evidently you can't bring yourselves to believe that the majority of farmers are against socialism—in agriculture as well as in the other segments

of our economy. Get the Government out or we'll get you out.

(Signed: the majority of us (farmers) who answered a recent survey in Farm and Ranch.)

The Truth Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Commerce at the Executives Club of Chicago on March 25, entitled "The Truth Gap."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH GAP

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller before the Executives Club of Chicago, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., March 25, 1960)

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us."

Every student has read that introduction to "A Tale of Two Cities" by Charles Dickens.

He was describing other times. Yet, any reader of today's headlines and today's political speeches might conclude that history is repeating itself, for current talk also swings in sharp contrasts.

The important question about present conditions is simply this: What is the truth?

For the shortage of the year is the truth gap in many discussions on both our economy and our defense.

I believe that an honest doubting Thomas will find in the sum total of facts this assuring answer: The United States is not on the skids—a washed-up, has-been nation.

The United States is first in military power, first in economic power and first in capacity to hold the lead against any competing combination. We are continuing to build unprecedented power to strengthen both prosperity and peace. The American people are not standing still or retreating. They are going forward under the wise, strong, capable leadership of President Eisenhower.

Only self-generated fear or folly can hold back our progress. Only our own tongue can dig our grave. Only blind eyes can fail to see our overall capability and our gigantic means already in gear for tremendous growth.

I would refrain from such a credo of confidence did I not believe I have evidence to back it up. I propose to present some of that evidence for your appraisal—and let the chips fall where they may.

Are we on the verge of a recession?

Not down a big no to that one.

Recent flip-flops of the stock market have produced a bit of indecision in temperamental Wall Street. Some are wondering if New Year forecasts need to be sharply revised downward.

Wall Street, however, is not Main Street. The stock ticker is a barometer of its own balliwick's feelings. It may accurately re-

fect reaction on stocks. It does not pretend to measure the entire production, development and mood of 180 million Americans. It could be that the market is merely getting back to normal after a lost weekend of inflationary boom talk.

Today's well informed businessman doesn't chicken at the growl of a Wall Street bear.

While it is important to watch the big board, it is even more important to watch the trustworthy national economic indicators. Many of these are collected by the unbiased statisticians and economists of the Commerce Department—taking the economic pulse of the entire Nation.

These objective surveys are more reliable than Wall Street blues, winter worries, and the home-brewed pessimism of certain self-seeking politicians.

The overall reading clearly indicates the vigorous health of the economy. We are not rushing into a frenzied inventory grab through fear of impending inflation. We are not shooting up in the roller coaster of boom which might later plunge down into a bust. That would not be good.

Instead, the indicators show that we are running along at a much higher level of business activity than last year and the outlook is for continuous progress for the year as a whole.

Where do we stand now?

Let's start our economic checkup with exports, a subject now very much in the news since President Eisenhower launched a national promotion campaign to sell more goods overseas. An adverse factor in the economy is the continuing deficit in our balance of international payments. The new export drive is designed in part to help correct this situation. The value of exports has climbed from \$16.3 billion last year to an annual rate of \$18 billion so far this year. The drive should help keep up the pace. Sales abroad reward business and make jobs at home.

The initiation of residential housing is a major area where there has been some decline since the middle of last year with a consequent sag in business in this particular segment. This has meant a letup on financial pressures in the mortgage field and has been one of a variety of influences which has resulted in the easier tendency noted today in interest rates.

An evidence of economic muscle is that 64.5 million people had jobs in February—up 1.8 million over last February and at an alltime record for the month. The job total figures were higher than January, even though record snowdrifts and ice kept farmers and construction workers indoors.

By far, the most revealing indication of the economic state of the Union is our recently published report from businessmen on their plans for investment in plant and equipment. They expect to boost capital outlays from \$32.5 billion last year to \$37 billion this year—an increase of \$4.5 billion.

This uptrend in spending means more business for the industries supplying the basic materials and equipment—more employment and more purchasing power which will find reflection in markets generally. This is the sort of economic activity that spells real growth.

One of the broad benefits flowing from capital outlays is the greater and improved technical capacity of plants to turn out a wider choice of better quality products, thus further raising the level of living and adding fresh strength to the economy.

The survey also gives us another set of predictions. In addition to asking businessmen their investment intentions, we also inquire what they estimate in the way of company sales during the year.

The composite answer we received is that major industries anticipate favorable sales

for 1960. Trade companies foresee a 5-percent sales increase over 1959 and manufacturers look forward to an 8-percent rise.

How have we fared so far this year?

The answer is, "Very well."

When in the New Year period the press at various times asked for my opinion on the outlook, I replied that upon appraising the then foreseeable facts I expected the gross national product to reach the record peak of \$500 billion by midyear.

Some scoffed and suggested I was wearing rose-colored glasses. But my forecast is becoming a fact. It is 3 months this side of midyear. And yet the GNP already has reached an annual rate of close to half a trillion dollars, the highest national economic peak in the world and in all history.

The GNP has made a sharp spurt in these 3 months from the year-end 1959 quarter, when total output of goods and services was approximately \$484 billion.

And, remember, the GNP is the most inclusive of all the measurements of the economy.

The substantial rise in output from the last quarter results in part from the removal of the steel-strike shadow, but it also demonstrates a firm foundation of business strength. As compared with early 1959, the current output is 6 percent higher.

Income in this first quarter is moving up along with output—with consumer purchasing power also running some 6 percent better than a year ago. This rise in income has not been fully reflected in retail sales which, thought up, have been curtailed by unusually bad weather in many sections.

You may have read reports that department store total sales have not been doing so well lately. But here again blizzards in some cases even shut down large suburban stores and the blocked roads kept women customers at home. But once the ice and snow melts, increased income is bound to have a favorable impact on consumer purchasing and business sales.

Prices generally are stable and current advances in production and consumption are mainly volume increases valued in constant currency and not in rubber dollars.

Now, let's turn from economic data officially collected by the fact-finding agencies of the Federal Government to the prospect for 1960 as seen by the Nation's outstanding business executives.

How do business leaders themselves size up the situation?

This meeting of the private industry leaders of America's great Middle West gives me the opportunity to share with you the latest expert opinion of the members of the business advisory council, representing a cross-section of the Nation's foremost business executives, who assemble periodically in Washington to give the Secretary of Commerce advice on the business situation.

As heads of great enterprises involving huge investments, mass production and big payrolls, they have access to the best possible fact-gathering resources—far removed from guesses or rumors. As successful heads of giant industries, their judgment has to be tops.

At their regular March meeting last week, the consensus for 1960 was as follows:

The mood: Down-to-earth optimism.

The outlook: Substantial business progress.

The length: All through the year.

Reports of council members added up to a 1960 first quarter well ahead of both a year ago and the 1959 last quarter, with improving sales and income. The consensus was that the announced 14 percent increase in capital outlays over last year—to which I referred earlier—represented firm commitments under steady price conditions.

They reported that severe weather had put a recent crimp in some retail sales, but that buying in stores generally was good. The business leaders were of the opinion that,

with consumer income up some 6 percent over 1959, this gain would be reflected in store sales once spring really gets into business.

The importance of controlling costs was recognized, but the difficulties of such control were stressed.

As executive after executive gave rundowns on the prospect for his specific industry, a unified pattern of progress emerged. None forecast a superheated boom of such proportions as would complicate progress through price instability. But the general expectation was for a better year than 1959—and, remember, last year made an all-time record in prosperity.

After reading unbiased government indicators and hearing the voice of expert business, what's the verdict?

I would sum up the outlook in this short phrase: "Not a boom, but another record."

Let's consider another truth gap of the day—in respect to overall national defense.

Are we now second-rate in military power?

The facts prove otherwise.

The United States is the most powerful nation on earth with the capacity at hand today not only to survive a sneak attack, but also to hit back and destroy a suicide-bomb aggressor.

It is a commendable patriotic attitude for the American people to be very much interested in defense. They have every right to ask searching questions and to insist upon complete factual answers not only from those in authority, but from every other person in or out of Government who sets himself up as an expert on the subject—be he sincere zealot or deplorable scare-monger.

The more truth the American people get on the whole subject, the more firm will be their conviction that the guardianship of peace is still in the strong hands of the greatest economic and military power in the world, the United States of America.

Constructive criticism is wholesome. But the American people are the real losers whenever anyone of prominence carelessly, ignorantly or deliberately uses one piece of the jig saw picture and omits the rest.

For this truth gap might cause uneasiness among our allies and dangerous miscalculations as to our true strength among our foes.

We hear talk from some quarters that President Eisenhower's administration considers a balanced budget more important than national security. Ignorance or infamy could make no more unfair charge.

The same general who successfully led the great crusade that saved civilization from Nazi desolation today is leading a peace crusade to save the world from the unspeakable horror of nuclear war. To him no goal is too daring, no price too high, no sacrifice too great to build an impregnable defense for that peace.

And that is what he has built—despite the irretrievably lost time in long-range missile development he faced in 1953.

Let everyone clearly understand that the Eisenhower administration believes strongly in the importance of intercontinental ballistic missiles—now and in the future. We are rapidly making up for previous neglect.

The former administration obligated \$800,000 for long-range ballistic missile programs in fiscal year 1952. We obligated in fiscal year 1960 \$3.3 billion for IRBM's and ICBM's alone, and for all missile programs about \$7 billion. We are now spending each day 10 times as much as was spent for the entire year in fiscal 1952. And in the fiscal year 1961 budget now before Congress we are recommending \$3.4 billion for IRBM's and ICBM's and a total of about \$7 billion for all missile programs. We're building an ever-increasing long-range ballistic capability for the future.

The critics of military policy, for the most part, center their fire on one single segment,

the intercontinental ballistic missile, overlooking everything else in our diversified arsenal of defense—a balanced capability which I will describe in a moment.

They say that our salvation depends entirely on matching the Soviet Union in this one category. Our chief military and scientific advisors disagree strongly with that shortsighted argument and have experience and logic to back up their case.

You will remember the tragic lesson of recent history. The brave French put their eggs in one basket. They concentrated their defense almost entirely in what they sincerely believed was the ultimate, all-powerful single defense system, the Maginot line, and neglected other fully as vital branches.

In contrast, their enemy had a balanced military system of great strength, variety and dispersion. The Maginot line was not enough—and gallant France went down in defeat. We don't intend to be trapped that way.

We do have missiles—many kinds—but unlike the Soviet Union we have not been forced because of geography and other factors to rely primarily on a single weapons system—the ICBM. The long-range missile may be the best weapon capable of maximum use by the Soviet Union—not so with us. Since it is against our principles to launch a surprise war, we will not try to get a sneak jump on an enemy. Therefore, although we have missiles on the alert they are diversified and not restricted to the intercontinental type.

Some Atlas missiles are on the firing line right now, but how often do you hear of our intermediate range missiles? Right now the allied forces in the United Kingdom are equipped with 60 IRBM's, each with a nuclear punch many times more powerful than the first atomic bomb. These missiles carry a big payload and give us a deterrent capability almost equal to that provided by missiles launched from this hemisphere. What about the Snark, Regulus, Matador, Mace, and other missiles in our arsenal, any one of which can deliver nuclear havoc, all formidable weapons, but still not our first line of defense. We must rely more on manned bombers and other means for the bulk of our protection and the extent of our retaliatory power.

Our strategic striking forces include over 2,000 long-range bombers, greatly outnumbering their Soviet opposite numbers. The force is highly trained, fully equipped, many on 15-minute ground alert, with some actually airborne all the time.

A B-52 can attack several targets, not one to which a missile is limited, and can load up for successive attacks. Each of our bombers can deliver nuclear blows many times the destructive power of an ICBM. A large number of these bombers are deployed at our worldwide bases within close range of potential targets.

We have 14 aircraft carriers—difficult targets because they can move—whose planes could hit about every area of the world with nuclear bombs many times more destructive than those used in the last war.

The Soviets, no doubt, are not standing still. Neither are we. We are ahead now and plan to stay ahead. We're adding this year two atomic-powered submarines with more to follow and each to be equipped with 16 Polaris missiles.

By 1963 we'll have 13 Atlas ICBM squadrons and others with the Minuteman ICBM. Our B-52 bombers will soon be equipped with Hound Dog missiles, enabling the bomber to reach heavily defended targets by softening up the air defense system with nuclear blasts from several hundred miles out. The first ballistic missile early warning system becomes operational this year, making it almost impossible for a mass attack of enemy missiles to reach here undetected.

Added soon to our already massive forces will be a whole arsenal of supermodern missiles and many other weapons.

One final point sometimes raised by earnest questioners: "Is the President so preoccupied with other weighty matters that he does not give enough attention to study and action on defense?"

This great career soldier did everything necessary to win the last war. Do you really think he now would neglect the same effort to win the peace?

His is the final decision on our massive balanced defense policy. But he has the advice of the Nation's best informed and best qualified authorities with widest experience in the entire subject, including the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other great military and scientific authorities and intelligence experts.

As of yesterday, the President has presided at 296 out of 326 meetings of the National Security Council, the Nation's topmost policy forum. And he also has daily contact with others with high responsibility in America's safety.

But military competence and command is not the President's only dedication to national security. The greatest war deterrent on earth is the spirit embodied by this sincere man.

He circles the globe—reinforcing the bonds of unity and power of the free world's unnumbered millions—convincing even those behind the Iron Curtain that America always will go "the second mile" for peace with freedom and justice.

Under President Eisenhower's inspiring leadership and without lowering our guard, all-powerful America is using disarmament conferences, summit meetings, and other promising steps in a never-ending effort to replace mankind's dread of nuclear disaster with a strong, fresh hope of universal good will and lasting peace.

Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn., Growing Industrial Areas Outstrip U.S. Gains—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the fourth and last of a series of insertions in the RECORD on the general subject of "Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn."

I have introduced these remarks to bring to the attention of Congress a profile of the great district I represent, a district in which I have tremendous pride.

Fairfield County, Mr. Speaker, is not an ordinary county, I assure you.

It is a very diversified area, the diversity of which is highlighted and emphasized by these statistics:

Fairfield County has some 632,000 people living in 214,000 homes, having annual incomes of \$1,604 million and spending \$961 million.

It has 1,315 plants employing 103,000 people with payrolls of \$543 million and

turning out \$925 million worth of goods annually.

It has 180,000 families owning 287,013 automobiles and paying a \$266 million annual food bill and with 35 percent of the wage earners making more than \$7,000 a year.

In concluding these remarks about "Progress U.S.A.—Fairfield County, Conn.," I would like to introduce the following excerpts from the economic newsletter and fact sheet on the growth and development of Fairfield County as prepared and distributed by the Fairfield County Trust Co. in its February-March issue:

THE MOVING CENTER—GROWING INDUSTRIAL AREAS OUTSTRIP U.S. GAINS

Fairfield County industry is rapidly changing its center. From a one-time hub of metals and durables in coastal Bridgeport, it's been spreading south and inland.

The switch to trucks and good roads have spurred the growth of the Danbury area, for instance, where employment has jumped 47 percent since 1947. The county gain was 14 percent meanwhile. Jobholders in the Norwalk area number 50 percent more now, with Stamford's gain about half that.

Close after World War II, Bridgeport accounted for two-thirds of all manufacturing jobs in the county. Gains in the three newer growth areas—Stamford, Norwalk, Danbury—have cut that to 57 percent now.

In fact, since 1947 these three regions together have outstripped the Nation in manufacturing job increases—16 percent against 6 percent. In the last 5 years, expansion has been even more dramatic, up 11 percent, compared to 1 percent for the United States.

At the same time, the employment "mix"—the different kinds of industry in the county—has changed greatly. Danbury, for example, known mainly for hats, now turns out a wide variety of goods including plastics, scientific instruments, ladies' handbags, magnetic tape, pencils, ball bearings, electronic devices, and furniture.

The inland country has proved choice terrain for research centers. Two-fifths of the State's 358 are in the county, employing 27 percent of Connecticut's 12,000 scientists and technicians.

And with the tremendous rise in suburban living have come the service, retail and construction trades boom: Carpenters, waiters, barbers, sales clerks, insurance agents, advertising executives, research scientists, TV repairmen, masons, floor waxers, baby sitters and bark tellers.

This has been true generally for the Nation. In this era of greater machine productivity, more people are doing things for each other, less people are needed to make things. But in Fairfield County, the gains in the non-manufacturing job area have been much heavier since 1947: Up about 40 percent against 27 percent for the Nation. The better life has really taken hold.

The county manufacturing pattern is still in a state of transition. As the center moves away from Bridgeport, most observers see the Danbury and north county area as fertile ground for growing plants. Anticipating the move, the State is building a north-county east-west expressway and two north-south routes connecting the Connecticut Turnpike and Merritt Parkway.

Up and over. By 1965, Fairfield County incomes should reach \$2.3 billion, according to Sales Management magazine. Sales are expected to hit \$1.4 billion. This means incomes will swell by \$700 million and sales by \$400 million. These gains are one-third higher than those projected for the Nation as a whole.

Fairfield County: Income and retail sales, 1958 and 1965

	Income		Retail sales	
	1958	1965 (forecast)	1958	1965 (forecast)
Fairfield County.....	Billions \$1.6	Billions \$2.3	Billions \$1.0	Billions \$1.4
Connecticut.....	5.7	7.5	3.3	4.3

Projected gains, 1958-65

	Income	Retail sales
	Percent	Percent
Fairfield County.....	43	44
Connecticut.....	34	32
United States.....	33	31

Source: Sales Management.

Liquid, Solid, and Prepackaged Rocket- Propulsion Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, those of us who are laymen have been very much confused during the past year by the discussion of the relative merits of solid, liquid and prepackaged rocket-propulsion systems. The advantages and disadvantages of each, of course, are somewhat technical, but for those of us in Congress who are necessarily concerned with the missile program, this is a fundamental and important question.

Because of the interest that many Members of Congress will have in this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article by V. H. Bryce Wilhite, director of technical operations of Thiokol Chemical Corp., which was prepared for Space Business Daily, explaining the place each of the propulsion systems has in our missile arsenal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIQUID, SOLID, STORABLE?—THERE'S ROOM FOR ALL THREE

(By V. H. Bryce Wilhite, director, technical operations, Thiokol Chemical Corp.)

Pressures and publicity resulting from the missile gap (sic) have produced an unwise and unwelcome byproduct—the indiscriminate comparison of solid, liquid, and prepackaged propulsion systems.

This is unwise because there is obviously room for all three. It is unwelcome because it forces systems less suited to a particular mission to compete with systems better suited to that mission, with the result that effort and dollars are expended in areas of competition rather than to perfect each particular propulsion unit for its best use.

For example, higher thrusts, lower costs, longer storage life, and the logistic savings

resulting from onsite continuous propellant processing indicate an obvious advantage for large solids as boosters. Prepackaged liquids, because of their higher specific impulse and their ability to yield a finer degree of velocity control at cutoff than the solids, seem best suited for use as upper-stage boosters. On-site loaded liquids appear most feasible for orbital transfer and landings, since they permit thrust variation and start-stop-restart action.

Perhaps this can be best understood if we survey a vehicle designed for a manned round trip to the moon. We will assume that the problems associated with sustaining life in space and selecting a pattern for a soft moon landing have been solved.

At least two large solid-propellant boosters are required, one for initial launch and another for the take off from the moon. We will place these as the first and fourth stages of our 5- or 5½-stage vehicle.

The second-stage unit will be a prepackaged liquid engine capable of increasing vehicle velocity to the magnitude of 15,000 feet per second. This propulsion type is indicated because of its impulse advantage and its longer action time, when compared with a solid, and its logistic advantage over the onsite loaded liquid-propellant propulsion unit.

The third-stage propulsion unit would be an onsite loaded hyperbolic liquid-propellant engine with a variable thrust design similar to that used in the XLR-99 which powers the X-15. This unit would accelerate the vehicle to its required escape velocity, shut down, and then be restarted to effect the moon landing. Its variable thrust would permit better control for optimum intercept with the moon's orbit.

Assuming all fuel from the third stage is expended in flight and during landing, and accepting the danger that the third-stage engine may be damaged when landing, a fourth-stage solid-propellant booster would be used for the moon launch.

The fifth-stage propulsion unit would be similar to the third-stage engine. The versatility of this unit would permit a retro-rocket reentry and landing, or the use of a slip-glide reentry path followed by capsule release for either a glide landing or ballistic reentry.

Although clusters may seem a possible thrust solution for stages 1, 2, or 4, they, like segmented solids, have been dismissed because of added weight and lower reliability factors.

The design of this moon-exploration vehicle is possible within our present technology. However, it demands the concentration of design effort to adapt each propulsion source for its specific mission.

This can be done.

This should be done to save time and costs, close the space gap (sic), and take fullest advantage of our present rocket technology.

St. Patrick's Day Sermon by the Very Reverend Father Robert J. Slavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a sermon delivered at St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D.C., by the Very Reverend Father Robert J. Slavin, O.P., S.T.D., president of Providence

College, Providence, R.I., on the occasion of solemn pontifical Mass celebrated on St. Patrick's Day by His Excellency the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., archbishop of Washington, and presided at by the Most Reverend Egidio Vagnozzi, apostolic delegate to the United States.

As Father Slavin well said in his sermon, "May we ever carry in our lives the fighting spirit of St. Patrick."

The sermon follows:

"The memory of him shall not depart, and his name shall be in honor from generation unto generation."—Ecclesiasticus 39: 13.

May it please Your Excellency, the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate; Your Excellency, the Most Reverend Archbishop; Your Excellencies, Bishop McNamara and Bishop Hannan; Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignori; Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, devoted Sisters; Mr. Justice Brennan; the Honorable Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. John W. McCormack; representatives of Government; members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; beloved of the Faithful; friends of St. Patrick.

God is wonderful in His saints. How fitting it is to make this reflection in extolling the strength and glory of one of the greatest noblemen of the human race—one of God's own patricians, St. Patrick, apostle of the Irish and father of a progeny of saints countless as the stars of heaven. On a day such as this, well might we pause to catch some of the inspiration of Patrick, who with courage and faith fought to bring the peace of Christ into the hearts of men and women.

Patrick has been compared to Abraham—who left his father's house and the land of his people and passed into the land which God would show him to become the father of faithful people.

Patrick has been compared to Jacob—who wrestled with God through prayers and penances to secure blessings for his people.

Patrick has been compared to Joseph—destined by God to save Egypt and to become the savior of his people. Patrick, too, was a captive, persecuted like Joseph, yet raised a heathen people from their paganism, fed them the words of life and made them a great Catholic nation.

Patrick has been compared to the Apostle of the Gentiles—who became all things for all men to win souls for Christ.

In the course of history, Roman civilization was turned over to the ravaging Goths. Hordes of barbarians conquered and established themselves throughout Europe. When Christianity converted these barbarian peoples, the real inner life of the spirit became known. The Christian religion gave to them a power that lifted them up from their pagan past. These refinements while brought about by the grace of God were accomplished through the instrumentality of His church. In the life of the church history attests that at the beginning of these great nations there was present a missionary who brought the teachings of Christ and enlightenment to souls ready and willing to receive them. Pre-eminent among these spiritual warriors we find St. Patrick. He came into Celtic society and established a lasting spiritual empire. As a man of deep faith and complete confidence in God, he had at the same time a brotherly love for these people. He implanted a devotion to God which even today permeates unnumbered millions throughout the world.

It is said that all good Irishmen love a fight, but in St. Patrick we have not a native son, but one brought to Ireland first as a captive and who later returned to preach Christ to this stouthearted people. Certainly a characteristic note of the Irish before the time of Patrick was the joy of battle for the

sake of battle. Here was a race in whom the passion of daring was outstanding. St. Patrick used these native qualities and refined them so that their fighting spirit turned into apostolic zeal for the faith. He fought not with a chip on his shoulder but with the wood of the cross in his arms. He was assured of being crowned victorious for the cross of Christ will never be defeated.

Patrick was not a fanatical, radical leader nor was he callous to the needs of his people. He was a normal red-blooded fighter, who left behind him a gold-flecked path that should be an inspiration to our world. He was on fire with the zeal of God—12 times taken captive—once sentenced to death. In the face of these trials he was no coward because where the rights of God were concerned the issue was clear. When betrayed by his closest friend, he journeyed to Rome not to vindicate himself but the church in Ireland.

It was this characteristic as a fighter which brought peace to his heart. But how could there be peace when he was fighting enemies? Let us look at Christ. He came into the world as the Prince of Peace. Every event of his earthly life from the silent hour when Mary became the living tabernacle of the Most High, until she was a childless mother at the foot of the cross was an attack on the enemy of peace, anarchy. Peace demanded death. What a paradox. Does not peace mean living in harmony with ourselves and with our fellow men? If only Christ had compromised instead of fighting for truth. He would have been spared the agony and struggle of that bitter, horrible death. He would not have had to endure the hatred and malice of those who cried for His blood. Misunderstandings, betrayals, sufferings, fighting against enemies—why these things seem to destroy all possibilities of peace. Yet, these are the very tools with which Christ forged the peace no man can take from us.

How easy it is to misunderstand this peace of Christ. How hard it is to realize that the victory of peace is not something handed over to us without a struggle. It is fatal to imagine that the peace of Christ is the laziness of inaction, the stagnation of cowardice, the surrender of defeat. It was not to weak, spineless men that He addressed words that seem to our age to be filled with calmness and resignation: "My peace I give to you". He knew what was ahead of His followers—He saw the trials, the persecutions, the bloody rivers of hate through which they must walk, and yet He gave His peace to them. What an open rebuke to those who think that peace brings with it a refusal to fight, a weak man's resignation in the face of mounting obstacles. The peace of God is not the peace of selfish men. Men use the word "peace" in their speeches and at times put it into treaties; but all the while in their hearts they cherish anger and hatred. With God it is precisely the contrary. He allows the thunder to roar and the lightning to flash around us, but all the while He, the God who has overcome the world and death itself, is flooding the souls of strong men and women with the peace that no one can take away from them.

We need the strength to fight, and where will we get it? From the same source Patrick did—from Christ. Patrick said: "Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ". To the kings of Munster, Minster, Ulster, and Connaught, to Brian Barue, King Cormack, and King Carroll, Patrick delivered the challenge of following Christ. He wished to die for Christ, but in a larger and wider sense, he lived for Him.

That same challenge is given to us today. This of course demands real courage on our part. Above all we need a live, vital, throbbing faith in Christ and His Church.

In Christ—Christ came to teach uncommon commonsense. When He filled hungry bodies with food, filled empty hearts with

Joy or healed broken limbs with the unction of His hand, the crowd swarmed about Him. Teaching starved minds was another matter. Today the hard things of Christ meet the same cowardice in the hearts of people. Fearful of the challenge of His doctrine, they hug closer to themselves the ease on which they have staked their all. Again do we need faith in the courage of Christ. Christ's courage derived its heat from the burning coals of the flaming furnace of love in His heart. It was the cry of that love "strong as death" and of that zeal "hard as hell" spoken of by Solomon. He had a job to do—His Father's business—and He would do it until His breath was stifled by His own blood. One incident shows this clearly. Christ was in Galilee which was then ruled by the puppet king set up by Rome. While He was preaching, the Pharisees pretending to be anxious about His personal safety, came to Him and said: "Depart and get Thee hence for Herod has a mind to kill Thee". Oh, what courageous words He hurled at them: "Go and tell that fox that no one takes My life but I lay it down of myself." Go tell that fox—he does not hedge or squirm or compromise; this crowned impostor, this coward and murderer, this tyrant grinding under his heels free children of God; this quivering of another century, scheming to play the Jews against the Romans, is openly challenged by Christ. What a glorious example of courage He gives to those who with weakness and tepidity of soul think they can serve God by being cowards.

His church—our church carries on the traditions of Christ. The church is not always an original speaker for she explains the traditional truths of Christ. The church is not a novel speaker for she delves among doctrines coated with the noble age of 2,000 years. The church is not an emotional speaker for she desires not to excite feelings but to convince the intellect.

The need of today is for a personal devotion to the church. What can one man or one woman do against the ranks of anti-Christians? Patrick was accustomed to speak to his followers: "Moses was one, Elias was one, David was one. We can all be instruments of furthering the work of Christ if we would live Christ in our own lives."

As St. Patrick found paganism in the heart of Ireland, so may we find it in the heart of our country. Love of self, refusal to sacrifice, neglect of God. When the trumpet sounds the alarm, we must fight for our life, for our soul. When we win battles of this kind, we know what Patrick meant when he said: "Eternal life is worth this and much more." We need more for happiness than mere protection from evil. We need a philosophy of life which will motivate us to search for love and peace. What life means, whither, it goes, the simplest answers to the simplest questions—all these stump the thinker without faith and leave him in a state that is thick and dark with fog. A man without faith stands like a puzzled child before a merchant clamoring a thousand wares. The man of faith is not puzzled for above him, as he stands on the bridge of that bark that is Peter and the Church, he sees the dogmas of faith radiant and true; and by them he guides his course knowing the port to which he is going is eternal happiness. From birth to death the strength of Christ flows about him in steady currents. He is united through the Sacraments with the unconquerable Savior, strong with His strength as were those who died bravely for the truth; as Patrick who lived bravely in the face of trials and difficulties that came from the enemies of Christ.

The turning point in the history of Ireland came when on Easter morning, St. Patrick struck two pieces of flint to make a fire with which he burned the pagan idols. A turning point in the history of the world

can take place if people would rub the flint of the rock which is Christ against the flint of stubborn wills and thus start a blaze which would set fire to the idols of materialism and secularism; a blaze that would inflame our hearts to fight for the faith, fight for the truth.

But where did Patrick receive his inspiration to carry on? That Patrick loved Mary, the mother of God, can be seen by the abiding love of the Irish for her. It was Mary who protected Ireland in the battle of the faith. Our country has been dedicated to Mary under the title of the "Immaculate Conception." We have seen the external completion of the noble monument of the national shrine dedicated to Mary Immaculate and are witnessing at the present time the interior decoration of this beautiful tribute to Mary. If we will only place our confidence in her, we may look for protection for ourselves and our country.

In the 28th chapter of Jeremias, we read the story of one citizen of Juda who tried to stir up the people to a revolution. Jeremias in protest to such tactics walked about with a chain of wood hanging around his neck as a sign of submission to authority. In fury, a loud-mouthed and critical citizen tore the chain from his shoulders and snapped it in two. God came to the prophet and said: "Go tell that man that since he has broken the chain of wood, he will be bound with the chain of iron." We have the choice between the yoke of liberty and the iron chain of slavery; the choice between the yoke of virtue and the iron chain of vice; the choice between the yoke of Christ and the iron chain of sin. St. Patrick would tell us which yoke to choose. To carry the yoke of liberty, the yoke of virtue, the yoke of Christ demands more courage and fighting spirit than to be weighed down by the yoke of slavery, the yoke of vice, and the yoke of sin. May we ever carry in our lives the fighting spirit of St. Patrick. We pray this great saint to drive from our country the serpents of evil which attack us. May the great apostle of Ireland make us ever mindful that we are signed by the sign of the most blessed Trinity which he preached under the symbol of the shamrock. May he give us the courage to live and to fight for our faith in God and His Church.

Ignace J. Paderewski: A Worthy Addition to the "Champions of Liberty" Stamp Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made that the incomparable Ignace J. Paderewski of Poland be included in the "champions of liberty" series of stamps issued by the Post Office Department. I have enthusiastically endorsed this proposal on several occasions to the Postmaster General.

Paderewski's name is legend with all freedom-lovers and is of special significance today because of the subjugation of his noble homeland by the Communists. He symbolizes the finest in Poland's traditions and heritage, and had, of course, close ties with the United States.

Because of my deep conviction that he would make an admirable and fitting addition to the "champions of liberty" series, I have taken this idea up with the Post Office Department a number of times. In his most recent response, Postmaster General Summerfield assured me, on March 18, that careful consideration is being given to the inclusion of this great statesman of the world in the series. I am extremely hopeful a favorable decision will be forthcoming and to that end I intend to continue my active interest in this proposal.

In this connection, I was pleased to receive recently a resolution endorsing this idea from the Polish Falcons of Rochester, N.Y. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH FALCONS OF AMERICA, ROCHESTER, N.Y., RESOLUTION

Whereas Ignacy Jan Paderewski was a man of broad and deep vision, who distinguished himself during the 20th century and particularly during World War I, as a champion of freedom; and

Whereas Ignacy Jan Paderewski was an outstanding world personality in the field of music and acknowledged world statesman as evidenced by facts that he was one of the signatories to the Treaty of Versailles and was a delegate to the League of Nations; and

Whereas Ignacy Jan Paderewski, by his untiring efforts on behalf of freedom for all European countries during and after World War I, and by his devotion to the cause of freedom for the country of his birth gave rise to the establishment of the Republic of Poland; and

Whereas during the time Ignacy Jan Paderewski was Premier of Poland, he continued to champion the cause of freedom and democracy believing them to be inseparable; and

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignacy Jan Paderewski occurs on September 8, 1960, and no more appropriate date can be found to honor the memory of this great world personality and truly outstanding champion of liberty and of his many deeds in the struggle of the world for freedom, liberty, and democracy.

Therefore we do hereby earnestly urge that the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignacy Jan Paderewski be commemorated by the United States of America by the issuance by the Post Office Department thereof 4-cent and 8-cent commemorative stamps on the 6th day of September 1960.

PETER A. MAJEWSKI,

President.

Recapitulation on Foreign Aid Funds Available for Expenditure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C. April 1, 1960.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appro-

priations, it has been my practice to prepare an annual verified and simplified recapitulation on foreign aid funds available for expenditure. The current recapitulation is attached hereto.

Many billions of dollars in foreign aid funds are not carried in the mutual security bill. The aggregate not carried in the bill exceeds the amount carried in the bill. Therefore, you may wish to ascertain from the proper agencies the total amount of other aid programs such as grants and loans under seven separate lending institutions not carried in the mutual security bill, the amount available under Public Law 480, oversea military construction, and the billions in accumulated local foreign currencies which may be used.

The total foreign aid cost, including interest on what we have borrowed to give away, now exceeds \$10 billion annually.

Our committee is working against tremendous odds in an endeavor to write a reasonable bill. The pressure and propaganda from many quarters are shocking. The 43,000 employees and 10,000 trainees of the mutual security program scattered in 76 nations of the world; the White House and its prestige; the State Department and its prestige; the Defense Department; scores of large manufacturers who profit from the program; colleges and universities which also profit from the program; church organizations; much of the press and radio; and literally hundreds of other organizations which have been misinformed are whipping it up for more foreign aid. It is indeed amusing to observe departmental witnesses who have spent unlimited time preparing answers to anticipated questions. In a great many instances their replies

sound reasonable, although they are not even good educated guesses as related to facts.

Your committee will continue to resist the unwarranted propaganda and pressure for an excessive amount of foreign aid. Your support of the committee's efforts to bring this grandiose, worldwide spending program under control will be appreciated. With your cooperation, the committee will report a bill that will provide adequate funds, one based on need and not on desire.

The comptroller general has stated that the weakness of the program is too much money, not too little.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

Mutual security funds by program and amount (available for expenditure (fiscal 1960))

		Total available for expenditure			Total available for expenditure
1. Military assistance:			12. Atoms for peace:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	\$2,547,998,755		Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	\$9,280,648	
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	1,351,247,000		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	1,500,000	
Sale military material, fiscal 1960.....	30,200,000	\$3,909,445,755			\$10,780,648
2. Defense support:			13. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, unexpended, June 30, 1959.....		1,088,558
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	787,500,953		14. Intergovernment Committee for European Migration:		
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	695,000,000		Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	10,829,222	
Sale military material, fiscal 1960.....	500,000	1,483,000,953	New funds, fiscal 1960.....	7,371,000	18,200,222
3. Development Loan Fund:			15. U.N. Refugee Fund:		
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	782,010,480		Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	1,200,000	
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	550,000,000		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	1,100,000	2,300,000
Loan repayments, fiscal year 1960.....	15,700,000	1,347,710,480	16. Escapee program:		
4. Development assistance, unexpended, June 30, 1959.....		97,768,490	Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	6,887,757	
5. Special assistance:			New funds, fiscal 1960.....	4,632,000	11,519,757
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	173,389,255		17. U.N. Children's Fund:		
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	245,000,000		Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	8,925,635	
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960.....	100,000	418,489,255	New funds, fiscal 1960.....	12,000,000	20,925,635
6. President's Asian fund, unexpended, June 30, 1959.....		85,840,438	18. U.N. Relief and Works Agency:		
7. President's contingency fund:			Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	8,956,957	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	139,789,149		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	25,000,000	33,956,957
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	123,753,000	263,542,149	19. Ocean freight:		
8. Technical cooperation, bilateral:			Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	1,662,992	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	158,717,287		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	1,910,000	3,572,992
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	150,000,000		20. Control Act, unexpended, June 30, 1959.....		119,101
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960.....	700,000	309,417,287	21. Administrative expenses, ICA:		
9. Technical cooperation, U.N.:			Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	\$4,956,497	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	8,292,101		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	38,000,000	43,796,497
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	30,000,000		Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960.....	800,000	
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960.....		38,292,101	22. Administrative expenses, State:		
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States:			Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	708,341	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959.....	1,307,960		New funds, fiscal 1960.....	8,100,000	8,808,341
New funds, fiscal 1960.....	1,200,000	2,507,960			8,111,521,750
11. Joint control, unexpended, June 30, 1959.....		472,167	Total.....		

RECAPITULATION

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1959.....		Total available for expenditure
New funds, appropriated, fiscal 1960.....		\$4,837,708,750
New funds, other, fiscal 1960.....		3,225,813,000
		48,000,000
Total.....		8,111,521,750

National Student Traffic Safety Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, within the past few days many legislators here have had the pleasure of greeting participants from the White House Conference on Children and Youth. It has been a very worthwhile experience; we have heard from many persons who have chosen particular areas of interest in matters concerning the young people of this Nation.

I was particularly happy to receive in my office today a young senior from Princeton High School in New Jersey. He is Martin McGuinn, of 23 Shadybrook Lane in Princeton. Mr. McGuinn is the president of a group which, it seems to me, demonstrates how well our high school students respond to challenge, and how seriously they consider problems of concern to the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this description of the program of the National Student Safety Association. I think that all citizens will be interested in this account. It shows how our young citizens and our experts in national safety can work together on a project for the benefit of all.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL STUDENT TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM

Junior and senior high school groups in all 50 States participated in the 1958-59 national student traffic safety program. Planned as a service of the National Education Association's national commission on safety education and supported by a grant from the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., the program is designed to encourage and assist youth to attack the problem of traffic accidents which have taken more lives in their age group than in any other.

Although the individual student groups select their own projects, the program is directed by a business-industry and education advisory committee. Members of this committee are: Mr. Edward D. Burks, administrative assistant, public relations, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; Mr. M. R. Darlington, Jr., managing director, Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee; Dr. Floyd M. Farmer, assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum, Wichita public

Resolution of Texas Office Machine Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I have the honor to submit a resolution adopted recently by the Texas Office Machine Dealers Association in opposition to the 30-percent duty on typewriters which two domestic manufacturers have requested of the U.S. Tariff Commission. The threatened imposition of this restrictive tariff has prompted the adoption of similar resolutions by numerous associations of dealers in typewriters and office machines throughout the United States. The resolution of the Texas Office Machine Dealers, I understand, was the first of these to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great many pious statements about small business being the backbone of the American free enterprise system. But as I know only too well, from my years of experience as chairman of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, there has been a dearth of action. Indeed, small business is continually engaged in a hard struggle to survive. It is bad enough that we do not do enough to help small business; this least we can do is to take every precaution to avoid aggravating the problems they face and with which they have to contend for their very survival. The resolution and other statements inserted herewith should be given very careful consideration.

The following is a true-extract copy of the minutes of the Texas Office Machine Dealers Association board of directors meeting, held at 9 a.m., January 18, 1960, at the Driskill Hotel, Austin, Tex.

The motion was made by R. C. Brewington, seconded by Tom Bradley, that we adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas a minority of the U.S. typewriter industry has filed a complaint with the U.S. Tariff Commission seeking to restrict imports of typewriters;

"Whereas TOMDA believes its membership and the Nation benefits from a maximum of free competition;

"Whereas the continued growth and development of the independent dealers of office machines depend in large part on the maintenance of satisfactory dealer relationships with manufacturers wherever located;

"Whereas the requested 30-percent duty on imported typewriters, which have been duty free since 1913, would unduly raise prices and restrict consumption;

"Whereas the established policy of our Nation is to encourage a maximum of world trade, in our national interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That TOMDA opposes the imposition of any tariffs or other restrictions on imports of typewriters;

"That this resolution, duly subscribed, be forwarded to the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C.; and

"That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators from the State of Texas, to NOMDA, and to counsel for the typewriter importers.

"Dated this 18th day of January 1960. Motion carried with a 12 for, and 1 against vote."

I certify that the above is a true and exact extract copy of the minutes.

TEXAS OFFICE MACHINE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
C. W. Voss, Secretary-Treasurer.

[From American Surveys]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Hundreds of small businessmen throughout America are up in arms because of a potential threat to their only dependable source of supply, according to returns in from a nationwide survey conducted among independent typewriter dealers.

The survey was undertaken to gather facts in response to an application filed with the U.S. Tariff Commission by Royal-McBee, and Smith-Corona. These firms, a minority of domestic typewriter manufacturers, are asking for a 30-percent duty to be slapped on imports of foreign typewriters. The case opens here today (Tuesday, March 29). The applicants also ask that minimum duty on any machine be \$10 a unit.

Imported typewriters are sold almost exclusively through independent office machine dealers. At the grassroots level, the dealers—and there are about 5,000 of them—are heavily on the side of the importers, who are responding to this tariff entreaty through the special typewriter importers group of the National Council of American Importers.

Twelve office machine dealers, from a cross-section of U.S. cities, will testify at the hearings. Included in their testimony will be the findings of the nationwide survey. A tabulation of the first 870 responses, from approximately 2,000 received to date to the questionnaire sent out by the importers' group, shows that 78 percent of the dealers report they depend on imported typewriters for 50 percent or more of their typewriter sales. Many dealers say that a duty on imported machines would virtually put them out of the retail typewriter business. They stress that they have been driven out of handling U.S. machines because they cannot compete price-wise with discount houses, which have become an important outlet for American typewriter manufacturers.

Imported typewriters from Europe, the questionnaires indicate, have retail prices that are equal to or slightly higher than the American machines. A stiff tariff would price the foreign typewriter out of competition.

The American importers point out that most new features found in today's typewriters were originated by foreign manufacturers, U.S. makers began to adopt some of these new features only after being forced to become competitive.

In 1953 the imported machines began to rise in popularity and 75,000 units entered this country. They are coming into the United States now at the rate of 450,000 a year. However, it is significant that one-third of today's imports are produced by U.S. manufacturers who have plants abroad. Countries leading in typewriter production abroad are: West Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Sweden. The Netherlands is also an important typewriter exporter to the United States but its manufacturing facilities

schools, Wichita, Kans.; Dr. Garold D. Holstine, dean, College of Education, University of Nevada; Miss Elizabeth V. Lloyd, executive secretary, Student Cooperative Association of Virginia; Mr. Martin McGuinn, president, National Student Safety Association and student advisor to the advisory committee; Mr. Horace D. Milhorne, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; Mr. Ira Rogers, director of Rural and Education Division, Automotive Safety Foundation; Mr. Lawton K. Smith, director of safety and driver education, Portage Township schools, Portage, Mich., and president, American Driver and Safety Education Association; Dr. Gerald R. Wallace, superintendent of schools, Corvallis, Oreg.; Mr. Ed Williamson, consultant, driver education, Florida State Department of Education; and Mr. Albert Willis, executive secretary, Illinois High School Association.

Eighty-eight high schools received recognition for high-quality safety programs in the 1958-59 national student traffic safety program: 25 received plaques and 63 received certificates. Schools receiving these awards are located in 34 States.

More than 60 different types of traffic-safety projects were undertaken in the 1958-59 program. An additional 40 non-traffic-safety projects were reported. These are listed on the attached yellow sheets. The projects were evaluated by State evaluation panels on the basis of the quality of each school's program in light of its probable influence on the behavior of students and adults in the school community. The projects are examined for the degree to which they reflect student activities which are sound and in agreement with generally accepted purposes of education programs in the schools.

Nearly 1 million students have been enrolled by approximately 1,000 schools in 50 States and the District of Columbia in the 1959-60 national student traffic safety program. Through safety committees of student organizations, driver education classes, teenage safe-driving clubs, and other student groups, boys and girls across the Nation are conducting motor-vehicle safety checks, surveying safety needs of the school and the community, and promoting safer living for all.

In August 1959 the first national student traffic safety conference convened in Kansas City, Mo. One hundred youths, representing each State, attended. These teenagers formed the National Student Safety Association, of which Martin McGuinn, of Princeton, N.J., is the first president. A second conference will be held this summer. The student delegates will be chosen from schools selected by the State evaluation panels as having outstanding safety programs.

In February 1960, the NSTS TIPS & CUES, newsletter for the program, made its debut. It will be published monthly throughout the school year for students. It will contain news of program activities, as well as short notes on what student groups across the Nation are doing to promote safer living.

Because the national student traffic safety program is an ongoing activity, schools throughout the Nation are now enrolling in the 1960-61 program. It is hoped that each year will result in wider acceptance of safety activities as important and integral parts of modern living.

ties are owned by two American producers. The largest is Royal, one of the two American companies pleading for relief from import competition, even though Royal is this country's second largest importer of typewriters.

European manufacturers were the first to seize on color as a means of expanding the market for typewriters. Other features, first introduced in foreign machines, which have found tremendous acceptance among American consumers include: smart styling; spring-loaded keys which take the effort out of typing; light-weight portables; a larger portable keyboard containing more characters; and a painted, rust resistant undercarriage.

In replying to claims made by Royal and Smith-Corona, the importers' group points out that American manufacturers are not losing sales of manual typewriters to European manufacturers. American electric typewriters are fast supplanting manuals for use in offices. The largest manufacturer of electric is International Business Machines, which is not joining in the application for tariff subsidy.

The opposition of America's independent typewriter dealers to the threat of a tariff on imported machines has been underlined in scores of resolutions recently adopted by State and local dealer organizations throughout the country. These resolutions and testimony before the Tariff Commission from representative dealers promise to reflect the serious impact that imposition of the proposed duty would have on American home-town businesses.

[From American Surveys]

FACT SHEET—BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE TYPEWRITER CASE BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION BEGINNING MARCH 29, 1960

PARTICIPANTS IN THE HEARING

Royal-McBee Corp., of Port Chester, N.Y., and Smith-Corona Marchant Inc., of Syracuse, N.Y., are applying to the Commission for an escape-clause investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. The other U.S. typewriter manufacturers (Remington Rand, Underwood, R. C. Allen, and International Business Machines) have not joined in the application.

The Special Typewriter Importers' Group of the National Council of American Importers is replying to the application of the domestic manufacturers for tariff relief.

Independent office machine dealers throughout the United States have shown unusual interest in this hearing—since imported machines now form the bulk of their typewriter retail business. Twelve dealers from a cross-section of American cities and one importer will testify, protesting the tariff request.

TYPE OF HEARING

Conducted under provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, commonly known as the Escape Clause. It provides for the imposition of duties and/or quotas if actual or threatened serious injury to domestic industry is found to exist due to increases in imports as a result of tariff concessions granted under the reciprocal trade agreements program. The Tariff Commission makes the investigation and the President makes the final determination.

APPEAL FOR TARIFF SUBSIDY

Royal-McBee and Smith-Corona are asking that a duty of 30 percent be imposed on imported typewriters which have been duty-free since 1913. They are not requesting any change in the duty on parts.

AMERICAN OWNED PRODUCTION

From 1947 to 1957 U.S. typewriter production fluctuated between 1 million and 1.6 million units, with many ups and downs.

In 1958, largely as a result of the U.S. recession, the output dropped to 1.2 million units. In 1959 it inched up to nearly 1.3 million.

During this period, however, American companies transferred portions of their production capacities into foreign countries. These subsidiary plants—outside the U.S.—today produce approximately 600,000 units a year. When this foreign capacity is added to domestic capacity of U.S. plants, it is clear that American firms still control 50 percent of the world's production of typewriters.

ONE-THIRD OF IMPORTS INTO UNITED STATES ARE AMERICAN BRANDS

Of the approximately 450,000 imported typewriters which came into the United States in 1959, one-third are imports of U.S. brands produced abroad. These came mostly from the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Canada.

AMERICAN ELECTRICS REPLACING AMERICAN MANUALS

The importers' group points out that the sale of American-produced manual typewriters has dropped primarily because electric typewriters are replacing manuals. IBM's domination of the electric machine market has cut sharply into the business of old-name typewriter manufacturers. Imports are not a factor in the electric typewriter business.

IMPORTS ARE EQUAL OR SLIGHTLY HIGHER IN PRICE THAN U.S. MAKES

European typewriters are not cheaper than American-made products. Their retail prices are usually slightly higher than American-made machines. These typewriters come largely from West Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Sweden.

CONSUMER BENEFITS FROM IMPORTS

The importers' group maintains that the American consumer has benefited from foreign competition in the typewriter business. Typewriters originated abroad have been first with many new features including: color; light-weight portables; spring-loaded keys which take the effort out of typing; and a larger portable keyboard with more characters. American makers adopted some of these features only when forced by competition to do so.

Students, homemakers and other women, and business men who travel a great deal have been especially receptive to the European portables. Since most foreign makers do not advertise, the widespread acceptance of the imports can only be attributed to the improved design and function of the machines.

INDEPENDENT U.S. DEALERS PROTEST TARIFF PROPOSAL

Imported typewriters are sold almost exclusively through independent dealers throughout the United States. A tabulation of the first 870 questionnaires, from some 2,000 received in response to a nationwide survey of the dealers, shows that 78 percent of the dealers depend on imported typewriters for 50 percent or more of their typewriter sales; 80 percent of the dealers report that the retail price of imports is equal to or higher than domestic machines; 82 percent claim that the imports require less service than American makes; 82 percent claim that the imported machines are of better quality than the American typewriters.

The survey was conducted by the Special Typewriter Importers' Group.

TWELVE INDEPENDENT DEALERS TO TESTIFY IN BEHALF OF IMPORTS

A number of resolutions have been passed by U.S. regional groups of office machine dealers protesting the proposed duty on imports. Many dealers say that a duty on imports would virtually put them out of the retail typewriter business. Because of dis-

count houses, mail order houses and other cutrate firms, which have become significant outlets for American typewriters, the dealers can no longer sell the American makes at a profit. Twelve independent dealers from a cross-section of U.S. cities will testify in behalf of the importers' group.

AVERAGED SALES FIGURES OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS CONTINUE TO RISE

According to U.S. Department of Commerce statistics, sales of U.S.-produced typewriters have been:

U.S. sales of typewriters

[In thousands of units]

	1948-50	1951-53	1954-56	1957-59
Portables....	488.7	588.0	508.7	740.0
Manual.....	464.4	527.3	429.6	361.2
Electric.....	44.8	80.3	148.8	212.0
Total.....	997.9	1,174.0	1,180.3	1,313.7

* The totals include some specialized typewriters not tabulated in the breakdown above.

BEGINNINGS OF THE TYPEWRITER

It is difficult for any one country to lay claim to the invention of the typewriter. British Patent Office records show that a machine fitting the description of a typewriter was patented as early as 1714. Henry Mill, an English engineer, was the inventor. The first American patent relative to the typewriter was granted to William Austin Burt of Detroit, in 1829. In 1867 Christopher Latham Sholes of Milwaukee perfected the first practical typewriter.

As Old as Our Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, interest in the problems of the aging and the aged has increased with great speed in recent months, and particularly in the weeks since a Senate subcommittee issued its landmark report on that subject.

In New Jersey recently, Dr. David B. Allman, a former president of the American Medical Association, discussed this social question and made a proposal of interest to all Americans.

A new story in the March 16 issue of the Atlantic City (N.J.) Press describes Dr. Allman's address.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. ALLMAN PROPOSES PROVIDING JOBS FOR THOSE OVER 65 YEARS

A nationwide movement to reemploy persons over 65 years old was proposed by Dr. David B. Allman yesterday. Speaking at a Rotary Club meeting in Hackney's Restaurant, the resort doctor, a past president of the American Medical Association, said the Nation is discarding quantity as well as quality by not putting persons over 65 back to work.

He said there are many thousands today who would be helped if they were put back

to work and in turn they would help the economy of the country.

A person has a right to be useful, as much as a right as to vote, the doctor noted, adding that many persons over 65 are better workers than some younger people. "We are as young as our self-confidence and as old as our fears," he remarked.

INCREASE RAPIDLY

There are many interested in the problems of the aged, "senior citizens," he said. He pointed out that in 1900 about 4 percent of the population was over 65. Today there are 16 million persons, about 8 percent of the population, over 65. By 1975 it is estimated there will be 25 million, about 12 percent, in the senior citizen bracket.

About 6,000 persons each day reach 65, the doctor noted. The senior citizens, plus infants, teenagers, and others, comprise a tremendous nonproductive group, he commented. The doctor questioned whether a rapidly expanding nation such as ours can support such a large number of nonproductive persons.

The vast majority of senior citizens want something to do, he said. Dr. Allman also remarked that he believes it is an unnecessary tax burden to support persons over 65, adding that it is estimated within 10 years employers will be paying as much in social security tax as they now pay in income tax.

"I believe every person able, willing, and fit should be put back to work—not only for their sake, but for the sake of the country," he remarked.

DIRECTORS NOMINATED

Vernon F. Stanton, president, directed the meeting. Two new members, Charles Tallman and John Lyons, were inducted by Arthur Broll.

Fourteen members were nominated for posts as directors. Seven will be elected at Tuesday's meeting. Nominated were George E. Fieldhouse, Frank L. Kearns, Bernard H. Strouse, John W. McNally, Frank H. McCue, Harry C. Moore, Jr., James H. Ennis, Joseph W. Hamilton, Frank A. Giordano, Frank P. Sanders, L. Edison Mathis, Jr., Jud L. Carey, John S. Adams, and Raymond L. O'Keefe, Jr.

Delegate Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the March 24, 1960, issue of the Watertown Times:

DELEGATE FARLEY

Political history in New York State seems to have come full circle with the news that Jim Farley is back in politics again. In terms of the position the former Democratic national chairman will seek, he is barely getting his feet wet, but the circumstances in which he finds himself may lead him into much deeper water in a short time.

James Aloysius Farley has had no major political role for so long that almost a generation has gone by since he stepped down from the commanding position he held in both the State and national Democratic organizations. Perhaps quite unfamiliar to a throng of young adults, he has never been forgotten by those of either of the principal political persuasions who used to follow his

vigorous and wonderfully happy approach to the business of politics.

Now, at 71, he has agreed to run for Democratic convention delegate in Manhattan's 17th Congressional District, averting the likelihood of a bitter election year primary fight by permitting both the DeSapio-Tammany regulars and the Roosevelt-Lehman-Finletter reform group to unite in asking him to run. He replaces the regular organization choice, Henry Silverman, whom the insurgent reform group has challenged, and will join the reform group's Thomas K. Finletter, former Air Force Secretary, in representing the key New York City district at Los Angeles.

It will be the 10th National Democratic Convention for Mr. Farley, whose return to the arena each time evokes recollections of him as the 1932 convention's kingmaker. He directed the drive for Franklin D. Roosevelt's nomination then in the same way he had practiced politics since his start in the field in 1912. Carefully and thoroughly cultivated friendships from top to bottom, and utterly thorough groundwork as floor leader of the Roosevelt organization brought off the victory.

His management of the party in the State and Nation continued until his break with Roosevelt over the third term in 1940, when he left the national chairmanship and his cabinet post of Postmaster General. He held the State chairmanship until 1944, although he did not continue his unbroken political successes through all that time.

The periodic reappearance of Farley on the political scene, the political operator whose reputation for honest dealing and dependability has left him unscarred by the usual train of enemies, is refreshing. What may happen now in that Democratic battleground, New York's 17th District, and elsewhere in the State could also be interesting.

Golden Idaho: A Panhandle State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, for many years Mrs. Elta M. Arnold of Grangeville, Idaho, was the superintendent of schools of Idaho County. Idaho County is the largest county of the State of Idaho in area, extending from Oregon and Hells Canyon on the west to the Bitterroots and Montana on the east. Idaho County is almost as large in total area as the State of Massachusetts. Mrs. Arnold visited the county schools in the early days of our school system by horseback when the trip could not be made in a day.

In her later years she has remained active, and she now has a weekly radio program over station KORT at Grangeville, Idaho. In this program she expresses her own positive opinions and she edifies the people of the area with her encyclopedic knowledge of and great love for Idaho's history.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent script she used, having to do with the early history of Idaho, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN IDAHO: A PANHANDLE STATE

(By Elta M. Arnold)

"O, the mountains in the morning,
When the thin blue smoke is rising!

O, the peaks beyond the pine trees,
Where the snows lie white forever!

O, the pleasant upland meadows,
Where the camas flower blossoms!

O, the timbered drinking places,
Where the deer trails come together!"

This poetic description of Golden Idaho by Talbot Jennings, an Idaho poet, is both fitting and profound and is appropriately adapted to the long past or present interim.

Idaho, the Redman's "Ee-dah-how" meaning "The Light Coming Down the Mountains," was birthed March 3, 1863; when President Abraham Lincoln, willingly and gladly, signed the Territorial Organic Act, which later became the basis of Idaho's constitution. He had long been interested in the Oregon Territory and had been strongly tempted to accept her governorship when it was offered him by President Zachary Taylor. But fate, unknown to the world, had marked him for a greater task—that of emancipating the southern slaves.

Idaho was a part of the vast Oregon Territory and when Oregon assumed her present boundaries, Idaho became a part of the Washington Territory. Four years later, she was created a Territory in her own right with an area exceeding that of Texas, since it included both Montana and Wyoming.

All Territories were blocked out in Washington, D.C., and the Surveyor General was directed to make them rectangular according to parallels of latitude and longitude, as far as could be done, conveniently, but to follow landmarks of mountains and rivers wherever possible. This was done on Idaho's western boundary, where the Snake River had been followed as long as it kept a northerly course. Idaho's southern boundary had long been established on the 42d parallel of latitude which is an extension of the southern boundary of Oregon.

The surveyors were instructed to begin where parallel 111 crossed the southern boundary and survey north to the Canadian line, thus, making Idaho rectangular like her sister States. They began as directed and continued north until they had almost reached the northwest corner of Wyoming when they veered west and followed the crest of the Bitterroot Mountains instead of continuing due north. This was the "Big Blunder" that made Idaho a panhandle State.

When they had followed the Bitterroot Mountains for about 300 miles they notified the Surveyor General that if they continued they would come to a sharp point before they reached the Canadian line. Communications were slow. At last they received instructions to strike due north from wherever they were. They did so. Thus, the panhandle, which is only 50 miles wide instead of 300 miles.

This survey was made in 1868, after the rich gold mines of Alder Gulch and Helena had been discovered. It has been hinted that the surveyors visited a leading mining town of Montana and were induced by the citizenry to follow a mountain divide instead of keeping the northerly direction, thus, giving Montana—which had become a territory 4 years earlier with Bannack City the capital—some of the richest gold mines in the world. Also the mining officials may have known of Montana's silver prospects which came into production soon after. Both the gold and silver mines, but for the "Big Blunder" would have been in Idaho as would the town of Butte—which is located on the richest copper hill in the world.

The following story illustrates Idaho's territorial changes: A family of three children

were born in the same log cabin, which was never moved. Each child was born in a different State, rather a different territory. The first, a boy Charles White, was born in the Oregon Territory before Idaho was taken from it. The second, a girl Lillian, was born in Idaho Territory just before Montana was taken from it. The third child was born in Montana. This cabin stood in Old Hell Gate, near Missoula, Mont.

You may be surprised to know that there were plenty of politicians in these new territories—many of vehement desire. Civil War debates, especially on States' rights, waged everywhere and often ended in knifings and killings.

Several of the territories wanted to break away from the Union and set up new republics. In 1855, because of strong opposition to slavery there was a rumor of a Pacific Republic, with 10 States, including all the territory west of the Rockies. It lost force because of slow communication. The second rumor was squelched before it gained headway. The third was silenced by the Civil War.

A bill to annex the 10 northern counties of Idaho to the Territory of Washington passed Congress. President Cleveland killed it with a pocket veto. The Governor of Idaho, who realized the great need of north Idaho taxes and also feared that the southern part of the State would be annexed to Nevada, wired him that public opinion in north Idaho had changed. This was, perhaps, the biggest prevarication that Idaho has ever known.

During her first territorial years Idaho covered 326,000 square miles, the largest territory with the exception of the new State of Alaska, that the United States has ever known. It now covers approximately 84,313 square miles and was the 43d State admitted to the Union. Its capital is Boise. It is divided into 44 counties and is the only State in the Union that is bordered by six sister States and a foreign country.

Idaho was explored by those two dauntless captains of destiny: Capt. Meriwether Lewis or Long Knife and Capt. William Clark or Redhead, whose explorations gave to the United States the second or clinching claim to the Oregon Territory. This heroic expedition spent several weeks within our boundary and knew Idaho, as it will always be known—"The Gem of the Mountains."

Idaho is still an empire; larger than all the New England States combined. An empire whose foundation was gold, silver and lead; whose desert was transformed into a garden by the magic of irrigation; whose great dams stay the overflow of her rivers; whose 10,000 miles of canals distribute her rushing waters over more than 5 million acres of reclaimed areas.

Historian Bancroft wrote of Idaho: "Taken altogether it is the most wonderful, romantic, mysterious part of the domain enclosed within the Federal Union."

Idaho speaking: "I was born to the purple with a golden spoon in my mouth, on March 3, 1863. President Lincoln was my Godfather. In the House of Representatives I was called Montana, but in the Senate I was christened Idaho."

I am one of the Liberty States for I reached my majority July 3, 1890, when I was admitted to the congressional family and given the right to vote on the laws of the land.

My golden key to the future is conservation of my natural resources: soil, minerals, forests, waters, and wildlife.

My greatest loss was a Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

My goal—raise more potatoes than the State of Maine.

Kullo. ("That is all" in Nez Perce.)

Pawnshops Waiting for Sunrise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Pawnshops Waiting for Sunrise":

PAWNSHOPS WAITING FOR SUNRISE

(By Frank C. Porter)

"I'm proud of my business," says Jerry Livingston, known far and wide as the dean of Washington pawnbrokers. "After all, if it weren't for us, Columbus would never have discovered America. He had to pawn Queen Isabella's jewels to buy his ships."

The term pawnshop—long the butt of burlesque comedians and associated in the minds of the uppercrust with penury—doesn't phase Jerry. In the Dictionary of the American Language, Henry L. Mencken found that our nice nellyism had transformed almost all pawnshops into "loan offices." But to Livingston a pawnshop is still a pawnshop.

His pride is shared by his competitors—there are some 10 legal pawnbroker establishments in the District with an annual volume of \$1.6 million in pledges—but they find this pride under continual strain. For one thing, most of them were practically in hock themselves a year ago; every licensed shop in the District went into the red in 1958 except Livingston & Co. For another, they complain of being wallflowers as far as the public is concerned.

"They don't even know we exist," says Murray Levine, who runs Capitol Pawnbrokers as a sideline to his real estate business, in a hurt tone of voice.

The public can't be blamed. For years the only legal pawnshop was run by Livingston & Co., owned by Jerry's father, Bernard, in conjunction with its jewelry store. Earlier brokers quit the District to a man after the so-called Loan Shark Act of 1913 reduced the permissible interest rate from 3 to 1 percent a month. Meanwhile many of the city's several hundred secondhand dealers dealt in sub rosa pawnbrokerage (some still do), charging as much as 25 percent a month.

In 1956, as Jerry Livingston puts it, "I had the audacity to go to Congress and get a law." He spent months on the Hill, testifying, arguing, wheedling, cajoling. The bill finally passed with the support of the District of Columbia Commissioners, who argued it would produce revenue, make it easier for residents to obtain immediate small loans and stop unregulated money lending.

The law put pawnbrokers under strict regulation. One provision even permitted police to seize pawned articles they believed stolen even if they lacked positive proof. The annual license fee was put at \$500 compared with \$50 for secondhand dealer permits.

But it provided what Livingston had fought for—a raise in the allowable interest rate from 1 to 2 percent monthly on loans up to \$200 with a minimum interest charge of \$1. The old 1 percent rate continues on loans more than \$200.

The new law brought pawnbrokers back to the District; there were six in business by 1958. But the higher rate wasn't enough to keep them solvent.

Two percent a month—or 12 percent a year—may appear usurious to a layman but to a pawnbroker it's slim pickings. Loans under \$100 comprise 90 percent of his volume. A \$20 loan for 4 months, the term of the usual pawn ticket, will net him only \$1.60 before expenses. Most brokers obtain their capital from banks at a current interest rate of 6 percent annually. Added to this are rent, wages, store overhead, losses from property picked up by police and auction expenses. In Virginia, for instance, pawnshops may charge 10 percent a month on loans up to \$25, 5 percent on loans from \$25 to \$100 and 3 percent on loans greater than \$100.

In the old days, an unlicensed pawnbroker could make out well on unredeemed collateral. A customer, for example, might put up a \$100 watch for a \$25 loan. If he failed to redeem it, the broker might sell it for \$50, assuring him a gross profit of 100 percent.

The present District law requires that all unredeemed articles be put up for public auction after the owner has been notified. The auction is designated to establish title to the article and to protect the customers, according to C. T. Nottingham, District of Columbia superintendent of licenses and permits. If an article brings a price well in excess of the loan on it, the difference between the loan plus interest and the selling price is refunded to the customer, Nottingham explains.

The pawnbroker is permitted to enter an initial bid to protect his interest and he is free to return an article to his shop if there is no higher bid.

Jerry Livingston produces figures to show that the District's six pawnbrokers suffered a collective net loss of \$25,700 in 1958 on gross operating income of \$128,300 and total volume of \$1.6 million. The only one to show a profit was Livingston himself. His firm netted about \$15,000 after taxes on a gross of \$1.1 million (about two-thirds of the city total). It suffered a \$4,000 net loss on public auctions.

Last year the Commissioners recognized the pawnbrokers' plight and raised permissible monthly charges up to 3 percent on loans up to \$100, 2½ percent up to \$200, 2 percent up to \$500, and 1 percent up to \$1,000. The previous rate of 8 percent annually on amounts above \$1,000 remains.

The pawnbrokers haven't finished totaling up their 1959 books yet but Nottingham, who supervises the industry, says he expects most will break even or possibly show a small profit.

The brokers themselves feel that the key to getting on their feet is expanded volume. Livingston, who has about \$350,000 out in loans at any given time, figures that the breakeven point for the smaller operator is about \$34,000 in outstanding loans.

Levine, who bought the building next to his shop to expand and is renovating it for a total cost of \$60,000, says, "If I don't increase my volume tenfold, I'm wasting my time."

To aid their cause, the operators have formed the Pawnbrokers Association of the District of Columbia with Jerry Livingston as president. The aim is to set up a standard of ethics for themselves, police the industry, advertise collectively, and reduce expenses by possibly hiring their own auctioneer.

Among their better friends is Nottingham, who says he finds the pawnbrokers just about the easiest group to deal with under his supervision. Only one violation of the pawnbrokers law has occurred since it was enacted in 1956, Nottingham testifies. And he feels the brokers perform a useful economic function—loaning to persons who can't get credit elsewhere.

Address by Constant Mierlak at Byelorussian-American Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia, an address of commemoration was delivered at a mass meeting on March 27 in New York City by Constant Mierlak, national president of the Byelorussian-American Association.

In view of our richly deserved admiration for the courageous people of Byelorussia, now under the cruel yoke of Communist tyranny, and because of our devotion to the cause of their ultimate liberation, I ask unanimous consent that the address to which I have referred, together with the resolution adopted at the mass meeting, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF CONSTANT MIERLAK, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 42d ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, ON MARCH 27, 1960

Your Excellencies, distinguished guests, and representatives of friendly nations, ladies and gentlemen, 42 years ago, on March 25, 1918, in Minsk, the capital of Byelorussia, the Executive Council of the Rada (Parliament), which was elected at the All-Byelorussian Congress in December 1917, by its Third Constitutional Act, proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic—in the following words:

"... We, the Rada of Byelorussian Democratic Republic, are liberating our country from the last vestige of state dependency ... From now on, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is proclaimed a free and independent state ..."

This magnificent act in Byelorussian history we gathered today to commemorate and also to pay a tribute to the heroic generation which has already passed. Byelorussians of that generation envisioned a free and independent Byelorussian State.

Only now, a generation later, looking from the political prospects of today, can we understand the significance of this act—and appreciate the determination of Byelorussian statesmen to build democracy on the ruins of the disintegrated imperial Czarist totalitarian regime of Russia—and their courage in defending the freedom and independence of its people from a new men-act, Russian imperialistic communism.

Courage and determination to such an extent do not exist today in the statesmen of the free world, although they have been witnesses to the enslavement of 20 nations in central-eastern Europe and Asia.

The 42d year of Byelorussian independence is full of political paradoxes:

The statesmen and leaders of the United States and Western World, on one hand are helping to gain independence, to build democracy and to defend freedom and human rights in Asia and Africa, and on the other hand they help the Russian communism to fortify their grip on once free and independent nations, already subjugated by brutal

force. The physical and psychological disarmament of the free world, especially America, is implicit in the policy of peaceful co-existence. My implementing and promoting this policy, these statesmen are actually furthering the aims of Communist ideology—world revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are placing the neck of the free world under the yoke of Communist domination.

For those who have a doubt how the Russians interpret the policy of coexistence I will quote from a statement made by Nikita Khrushchev in Warsaw in April 1955. "We must realize that we cannot coexist eternally, for a long time. One of us must go to his grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They (meaning us Americans) do not want to go to their grave, either. So what can be done? We must push them to their grave."

And we Americans must realize that Khrushchev means business, and he puts in practice what he says.

When Stalin and later on Khrushchev realized that they coexisted pretty long with the Byelorussians, they just pushed them to the grave, with the help of NKVD or MVD. The Soviet census of 1959 reveals that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in 20 years lost a population of more than 5,800,000 and at the present time Byelorussia is losing about 400,000 of population yearly due to the Moscow's genocidal extermination policy.

From this single example we see how the Russians extirpate a people in the path of mashing Russian imperialism. The Byelorussian people are one of many others who continuously resisted actively and passively Russification, never recognized the Soviet system imposed upon them by force, and perennially strive for freedom and independence.

We also must realize, that besides pushing to the grave more than 400,000 of Byelorussians yearly, Mr. Khrushchev does the same thing with other nations like the Ukrainians, the Baltic States peoples, Georgians, Armenians, Cossacks, Turkestanis, and more than a dozen others, not omitting the brutal destruction of Hungarian patriots in November 1956. Notwithstanding this, he was invited to the United States and officially was received here as a honorable statesman. Is it not an irony of Providence?

Now, we who experienced the benefits of Soviet system and the advantages of progressive and peoples democracy, and knowing exactly what coexistence means, being conscientious citizens of this great country, we have a sacred duty to raise our voices and point out the dangers America may soon run into. We must do everything possible to prevent this country from meeting that disaster, from which our old country could not escape.

It is also our duty, in this year of Byelorussian independence to call attention to a very important action taken by the U.S. Congress and the President. The U.S. Congress in its joint resolution (Public Law 86-90) provided for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and for the first time officially uttered truths about Russian Communist imperialism. This law stated that "The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the peoples of the United States and other peoples," and further on it says:

"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive."

The President in his proclamation on Captive Nations Week stated: "It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples

of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence," and further on Mr. President says: "I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

These are really two great documents of which the Americans should be always proud, because, these are the principles which make the America great.

We fully support the U.S. Congress and the President on this issue, and we are ready to obey the law in observing it accordingly, and if need be we are also ready to die in defending these principles, because, in defending them, we defend America and the whole humanity from destruction and slavery.

With great regret, but for the benefit of the national security of the United States, I will not fail to point out that many Americans and even some official agencies and private committees ignored the contents of these two dignified documents; moreover, they, in transmitting them to these captive nations, censored and distorted the real meaning of the resolution and proclamation, thus showing their contempt of the President, Congress, and of the principles on which American people stand.

Ladies and gentlemen, by commemorating the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic we pay our modest tribute to that nation's long and unabating struggle for liberty, and to her enormous sufferings and sacrifices. These 42 years of active and passive resistance to tyranny are a great contribution to the common cause of human freedom; as such it should not pass unnoticed.

We Americans of Byelorussian descent are resolved to support the Byelorussian movement for liberation in every possible way and by all means at our disposal, and thus to help defend this country against Communist penetration and aggression, so help us God.

We strongly believe that truth and justice will ultimately triumph over oppression, that Byelorussia will be free and independent, and will live in peace with other nations. We also believe that this great country, the United States of America, will be preserved by providence forever.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION

(Sponsored by the Byelorussian-American Association, unanimously adopted at the mass meeting commemorating the 42d anniversary of Byelorussian independence on March 27, 1960, at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.)

Whereas the people of Byelorussia, one of many victims of Communist Russia aggression, have been forcibly deprived of their national sovereignty, their religious, political, social, cultural, and economic liberty, and are now subjected to an inhuman policy of oppression, terror, mass deportations, russification, economic slavery, and colonial exploitation;

Whereas the Soviet 1959 census reveals, Byelorussian S.S.R. in the past 20 years shows a deficit of 5,800,000 of which 2 million are due to the losses suffered in World War II, the rest of 3,800,000 is the direct or indirect result of the planned permanent genocidal policy of Red Russian imperialism with the purpose of exterminating the Byelorussian people;

Whereas the present government of the Byelorussian S.S.R. and its United Nations delegation are not democratically constituted

representatives of the Byelorussian nation, but executors of the will of Russian colonial administration only, will not and cannot, therefore, protect and defend Byelorussian people;

Resolved, That this meeting appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and the Members of the U.S. Congress with the request to do everything possible, to see:

1. That the liberation of Byelorussia and other countries subjugated by Russian communism be included in the program of the American foreign policy and in the negotiations at the summit conference.

2. That the U.S. Government does not enter into any agreement which would condone any past, present, and future Soviet aggressions;

Resolved, That to ask U.S. Representative to the United Nations Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge and all member representatives of the free world nations to bring to the attention of the next General Assembly of the United Nations the fact of mass exterminations of Byelorussian people carried on by the U.S.S.R. Government with Nikita Khrushchev at the head, charging with flagrant violation of the United Nations 1948 Convention on International Crime Genocide, in order to make the U.S.S.R. Government answer for and in order to protect the defenseless Byelorussian people from further extermination.

Resolved, That we shall continue to support the Government of the United States in its effort to achieve a durable peace with freedom and justice for all men and all nations in the world.

Public Health and Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading authorities on highway safety in the Nation recently presented a very interesting proposal regarding traffic regulations to the National District Attorneys' Association midwinter conference at Miami Beach, Fla., which I wish to call to the attention of Members.

The paper, delivered March 17, 1960, by Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan, director, New York State government research project, Maxwell graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, is as follows:

The most puzzling, yet revealing, aspect of the traffic safety problem is that it has been with us for so long and we have learned so little about it. The automobile is a mechanical device of the 19th century. It was in common use half a century ago, and has not changed in any essential design feature since that time. Automobile injuries reached epidemic proportions a generation ago. Today, Dr. McFarland at Harvard estimates that during a 15-year period, approximately 10 percent of the population may be killed or injured in a highway accident. Yet our efforts to control the problem are still largely based on a hodgepodge of supposition and inference derived from assumptions we have never verified, which, more significantly, we have never seriously tried to verify.

If one considers the amount of professional inquiry that has been devoted to other fields

of public health such as tuberculosis or poliomyelitis, to other problems of public administration such as social welfare, or to other areas of law enforcements such as parole, it is staggering that we have devoted so little effort to the study of the epidemic on our highways.

The most tenable explanation for this absence of serious inquiry is that our attitude toward traffic safety has in fact been ambivalent. We have and have not wanted anything done about it. A familiar way out of such predicaments is to attack the problem in a manner that ensures minimum results.

If this seems an odd way to behave, it is yet no different from our approach to drinking during prohibition, or to gambling in more recent years. Closer study would probably reveal many similarities in the emotions involved in drinking, gambling, and driving a highpowered automobile. The uniquely American sport of drag racing manages to combine all three. Certainly there is much similarity in the public's attitude towards violating the laws which purport to regulate these activities.

In these circumstances we might expect to go on indefinitely with our present round of slogans and slaughter. Possibly we will. More likely not, however, for it appears the public attitude toward the problem is changing. The automobile is steadily losing ground as an object of our national affection. For more and more persons it is becoming little more than a means of transportation: if restrictions are necessary to make it a safe means of transportation, more and more of these persons will accept them. This process will be hastened if it is true, as I suspect, that the problem is getting worse.

There could hardly be a better example of our lack of information about this problem than that we don't really know if it is getting worse or not. The question is confused at the outset of our emphasis on deaths and the death rate. For a generation the number of traffic fatalities has remained stable at about 37,500 deaths per year. As the total mileage driven has increased, the death rate per hundred million miles has correspondingly declined. This has been going on all over the world. The most likely explanation is simply that doctors are getting better at keeping people alive, while the increasing number of motor vehicles has probably increased the speed with which injured persons get to the doctor, and vice versa.

Automobile injuries are not, however, primarily fatal. For every fatal injury there are upward of 125 nonfatal injuries. The total number of injuries, rather than the tiny fraction of fatal injuries, is the true measure of the problem. Here we find anything but stability. Of 31 States for which I have been able to obtain detailed injury statistics for the decade 1948 to 1957, 17 showed an increase in motor vehicle injuries of over 100 percent. Florida showed an increase of 486 percent. In New York the total went up 125 percent and the rate of injuries per 100 million miles traveled increased 44 percent. It would be wrong to put too much faith in motor vehicle statistics compiled by State governments, but these figures surely indicate something is going on.

If it is true the public attitude toward safety is changing, if we are going to encounter a serious demand that something be done about the problem, we are headed for a crisis because it is most unlikely that our present laws or our present means of enforcing them can effectively respond to this demand.

For 4 years, as an assistant to the Governor of New York State, I was concerned with the formulation and execution of traffic safety policy. Latterly I served as chairman of the State's policy body in this field. I

came gradually to feel we were all involved in a monstrous deception, designed to conceal our ignorance from the public and ourselves. So far as the motor vehicle laws are concerned, in New York State, as elsewhere, the logical fallacy of petitio principii has been elevated to a way of life. With minor exceptions, the basic assumptions on which the laws are based are simply taken for granted. This results in a circular system of reasoning which continually proves itself. Thus we declare driving over 50 miles per hour to be unsafe. We know that 36 percent of the automobiles on State roads are always going faster than 50 miles per hour. Whenever any of these are involved in accidents, we do not have to inquire why. We have already legislated the explanation: speeding.

By explanation, of course, I mean that the police know who to arrest, the courts know who to fine, the State knows whose license to suspend. Thus we satisfy the primitive need when anything unpleasant happens to identify and punish the guilty person. This makes everybody feel better, but there is no way to know whether it prevents accidents, because we have not proved either of our major assumptions: that speeding causes accidents, or that punishing persons for speeding will prevent them from doing so.

All of our traffic laws are based on assumptions as to how accidents happen and how they can be prevented. Yet we have never troubled to verify most of these assumptions by the rigorous, scientific methods we take for granted in other fields of public health. It may be that most or even all our assumptions will prove correct. But until we have proof, are we not really acting like muddled peasants locking the windows against the infection of the night air?

I think particularly of the problem we had in New York State with this question of speeding. Across the border, in Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff had begun an heroic crackdown on speeders. The whole Nation was impressed by the courage this took. Licenses were being suspended wholesale. And, sure enough, the number of deaths went down a bit and so did the death rate. But the number of accidents increased, and the number of injuries increased. Most distressing of all, the rate of accidents and injuries increased. In 1955 there were 210 injuries per hundred million vehicle miles traveled in Connecticut. By 1958 there were 227. After 4 years of crackdown the chance of getting injured had increased 8 percent for every mile traveled.

These results became particularly distressing in the light of a vast study of speed and accidents on the open highway carried out by the Federal Government during these very years. This study, sponsored by the Bureau of Public Roads, was incomparably the largest of its kind ever undertaken. It covered 3.7 billion vehicle-miles of travel in 11 States, and accidents involving 10,000 vehicles. Roadside interviews were conducted with 290,000 drivers. The Federal Government found that for speeds from 35 miles per hour to 65 miles per hour the faster you drive, the fewer accidents you have. Cars going 35 miles per hour were involved in 600 accidents per 100 million vehicle miles of travel. Cars going 65 miles per hour were involved in fewer than 100 accidents for the same exposure. At 65 miles per hour the involvement rate began to rise. But even at 80 miles per hour it was only one-quarter the rate of 35 miles per hour.

Could it be that the State of Connecticut, by forcing its citizens to drive more slowly, has forced them to have more accidents? We know that an enormous effort has been made to make them drive more slowly. We know the Federal Government has found that accident rates at low speeds are much greater than accident rates at high speeds.

We know that in Connecticut, while speeds presumably have gone down, the accident rate has gone up. I assuredly don't know for certain what is the explanation, I don't know if in fact speeds went down, but is it not time we took a closer look at this question.

Of course, this is not so much a problem for us in New York State. We have a 50 mile speed limit, but we don't enforce it. We pretended to enforce it and hundreds of thousands of drivers are arrested each year for violating it, but as I said earlier, 36 percent of the vehicles traveling are always violating the law. Incidentally, one of the pillars of our traffic safety program is the point system under which we take away the licenses of persistent violators of the traffic laws. Oddly enough, in 1954, for example, with over 600,000 reported traffic convictions, barely 2,000 drivers got caught speeding 3 times in 18 months. This isn't bad considering that over a third of our 5 million drivers were speeding every day. Unhappily for these poor fellows, they were labeled persistent violators and stripped of their right to drive for varying periods.

This whole question of accident-prone drivers, and persistent violators very much wants a closer look. Certain types of drivers seem to have high accident rates. The very young and the very old have more accidents than those in between. People who get into trouble with the criminal laws get in trouble with the traffic laws. People with family troubles incline to have automobile troubles. We can make these correlations, but what can we do about them? These are not superficial qualities to be altered by a safety poster or a traffic court fine. And even supposing you could take all these drivers off the highway, what would you have left? You would have left the overwhelming majority of drivers—and accidents. Teenagers, for example, are involved in accidents at a rate in excess of two and one-half times that of all drivers. But altogether they only account for 6 percent of the accidents. Incidentally, the Bureau of Public Roads found that on the open highway teenagers have over four times as many accidents at 30 miles per hour as they do at 60 miles per hour. Does this mean we should urge juveniles to drive faster? I think it is time we checked.

Try as we will to identify some particular kind of conduct or person to blame for the problem of traffic safety, we keep coming back to the central fact that the overwhelming number of accidents involve what we call normal people acting in a routine manner which suddenly fails them.

At first it would seem the conclusion to be drawn from this is simply that a certain number of accidents will occur for any given amount of exposure to accident possibilities. And if, as we are told, 1970 will see 100 million motor vehicles traveling a trillion vehicle miles, we may expect it will also see 20 or 25 million vehicle accidents.

This is not necessarily so, however. We have also found rather startling differences between the accident experiences of different groups of people which cannot be entirely explained by factors such as age or sex or other immutable qualities. For example, the Bureau of Public Roads found that two-door sedans had accident involvement rates 4 times as great as hard tops; convertibles, 2 times as great as station wagons. The Bureau found that cars over 10 years of age have nearly 2½ times the accident involvement rate of newer cars. It found that during the day local drivers have a 75 percent higher accident involvement rate than out-of-State drivers, and at night the difference rose to 250 percent. We have long known the great difference in the rate of accidents of different types of highways.

We have found similar differences between the geographical locations, even esthetic sensibilities.

Clearly there must be an explanation of these differences, something about one type of highway, or automobile, or person makes for safer driving. Perhaps there is a single factor, more likely a kind of safety syndrome which produces this result. If we could identify these single or multiple factors, it may be they will prove transferable. Obviously, this is so in the geometric design of highways. Perhaps it will be so between, say, occupation groups.

We do have evidence that you can affect driving performance rather dramatically. For example, the brilliant research group at Dunlap & Associates of Stamford, Conn., brought about an 80 percent drop in personal injury accidents at one Air Force base by means of a scientifically designed safety program.

Nor does this kind of research necessarily involve vast undertakings. You may have noticed the New York Times report of the study conducted last summer by the distinguished epidemiologist, Dr. William Haddon, Jr., of the New York State Department of Health. With a handful of associates, Dr. Haddon stopped 212 persons on the streets of Manhattan and when he was done produced perhaps the first accurate knowledge of pedestrian fatalities we have ever had.

Here is where the district attorneys of the Nation come in. I am suggesting we must undertake a general revision of our traffic laws to establish them on the basis of a systematic, continuing, study of driver behavior and automobile design. The object of our traffic laws must not be to punish crime, but to prevent accidents and injuries. I can conceive of no more important force in bringing about this revision than for the chief law enforcement officers of the Nation to begin demanding that they be given effective laws to enforce. I can think of nothing more potent than for the district attorneys to begin asserting that if they are to ask that citizens be fined, imprisoned, and punished for violating the traffic laws, both parties have a right to know that there is some scientific evidence to show that these laws should have been obeyed in the first place.

This is the first thing you can do. The second thing is to make a special effort to be of help whenever any research activity is taking place in areas under your jurisdiction. The kind of research that pays off in this field involves all manner of legal obstacles and hazards for the researchers. It is almost impossible to perform successfully without the full cooperation of the police and the law enforcement agencies. A fine example of what can be done is the way the officials in the Boston area are co-operating in the exciting research on fatal highway collisions being carried out by the department of legal medicine at the Harvard Medical School.

The third proposal I will make to you as district attorney is a more complicated one. It concerns the whole nature of the traffic laws.

If our laws are to be revised, more than just the public ambivalence about traffic safety will have to change. Even a willing public will not be an informed one. We must expect that in the future, as in the present, a powerful force of special interest and general ignorance will oppose any serious effort to investigate or do anything about the problem of traffic safety. Such efforts are easily obstructed, because they involve the legislative process which is simply not suited for the enactment of technical regulations governing an activity of half the population on the one hand, and the

most powerful economic interest in the country on the other.

I have, therefore, a simple proposal to make. I propose that traffic regulations be removed from the area of statutory law, and be made part of the public health code, to be promulgated by the public health authorities of the State governments. As far back as the 18th century we have had public health regulatory agencies for the purpose of establishing sanitary regulations to control and prevent epidemics. It is time the same step be taken to control the epidemic on our highways. Within general outlines established by the legislature, the medical authorities of the various State governments should be given authority to establish the requirements for driver licenses and the rules for driver behavior and be given general surveillance over highway and automobile design.

This would put responsibility in the hands of persons capable of exercising it. What is the point of asking a legislature to determine how much a person may drink before driving, or what kind of eyesight he must have to get and keep a license. The legislative antics that ensue debauch and stultify the whole democratic process. These are matters that should be left to the experienced judgment of persons trained in the medical and related sciences.

This would put responsibility for action in the hands of persons who are least subject of the pressures of special interest and general ignorance of which I have spoken.

Finally, this would put responsibility in hands the public has learned to trust. Clearly, the public has little faith in the present system. Twenty million traffic cases a year go into court with no noticeable effect. But if the courts began enforcing regulations which had sanction of the medical profession behind them, might not the public come to feel these regulations were designed to protect the motorist, not to oppress him? Is it not true that few persons hesitate to violate a speed law today, but most would think twice before drinking water a county health officer had declared impure?

Important as are the three measures I have mentioned to you, I feel they lead to a further development of even greater importance. By establishing driver regulation on a scientific basis, we may then move on to the point where we ought really to have started, which is the regulation of the design of the automobile.

Any rational approach to the problem of traffic safety would not start with the driver. There are just too many. We already have 82 million. In a decade we expect 100 million, driving a trillion miles. When we can get half this number to vote for a President once every 4 years we think democracy has triumphed. It is idle to suppose very much can be done about the driving behavior of all or most of them. Something, yes, but not a great deal.

With the automobile, however, there are enormous possibilities for improvement. Here there are probably not more than a dozen people who need to be persuaded in order to bring these improvements about. These improvements fall into two general categories.

First, it is becoming apparent that much can be done to improve the design of our automobiles so they can be driven more safely. This does not necessarily mean making them simpler, it could mean making them more complicated so as to keep the driver alert, but one way or another the techniques of effective machine manipulation can be applied here.

Some automotive design improvements would be relatively simple. As our cars are designed with lower and lower silhouettes,

we will shortly be driving flat on our backs. This is hard to do with maximum safety. The average eye height is already below the recommended level, but there would be no problem restoring it. Other improvements would be more complicated. For example, we need to find out what is the effect of planned obsolescence on older cars. Do the brakes give out at the same time the chrome begins to rust? Should we encourage manufacturers to produce a basic car which is not changed from year to year, which they can get the kinks out of, and which will not fall to pieces like the one hoss shay in 7 years time? Or perhaps we should ask for a car which will be sold on the explicit understanding that after a certain point it will be unsafe to drive.

Second, it has for some time been apparent that enormous improvements could be made in the interior design of automobiles so as to minimize the injuries which result from accidents to make accidents safe. This is the principle known as "packaging" the driver. It was clearly stated by Dr. C. Hunter Sheldon in the Journal of the American Medical Association:

"The accidents may occur as the result of speed, inadequate highways, poor judgment, or mechanical failure, but none of these actually causes the passenger injury. The injury occurs primarily as a result of faulty interior design of the automobile. 'Faulty' is actually a gross understatement, as there is almost no feature of the interior design of a car that provides for safety. The doors, seats, cushions, knobs, steering wheel, and even the overhead structure are so poorly constructed from the safety standpoint that it is surprising anyone escapes from an automobile accident without serious injury. The elimination of the mechanically hazardous features of interior construction would prevent approximately 75 percent of the fatalities, or 28,500 deaths each year."

For some years the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association have been pressing the automobile manufacturers to do something about this problem, but with very little success. I would suggest it is neither reasonable nor fair to expect success. The single objective of the automobile manufacturer is to make money by selling automobiles. They do this by reminding customers of the joy of motor-ing and by making the driver feel powerful and secure inside his automobile. Is it reasonable to expect the manufacturers will at the same time equip their machines with padded dashboards, seat belts, and the other safety features that are apt to remind potential customers that, apart from war, the automobile is the one experience of violent death and injury which civilized man must still endure?

I do not suggest that the design of automobiles be made subject to direct government regulation, but I think it is apparent that a massive effort must be made to determine which are the safest designs and by persuasion to induce the manufacturers to adopt them. Here again I feel this is a task which we could, with confidence, entrust to the public health profession.

All these possibilities inspire the hope that we are soon to see advances in the field of traffic safety, not only in our understanding of the problem but in the uses to which we put our understanding. It is particularly encouraging that this issue is receiving the attention of our Nation's district attorneys who are admired for many things, but first of all for courage.

White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, all Americans have a stake in the White House Conference on Children and Youth now underway in Washington. Like many others, I hope that its discussions and recommendations will result in clearer understanding and action where action is needed.

I am particularly happy that I am represented at the conference by Mrs. Joseph Lerner, of Newark. An article in the Newark Star-Ledger recently described just a small part of Mrs. Lerner's qualifications for the assignment. It said:

Mrs. Lerner, who hopes to come away from the White House Conference with some positive recommendations for the youth of New Jersey, helped organize the Citizen's Committee with her husband (former Newark Magistrate Joseph Lerner) in 1955. Members of the committee included police, psychiatrists, teachers, and social workers.

A former social worker, Mrs. Lerner says the committee found over and over again there is no one answer to combat juvenile delinquency, but a combination of answers.

"And that the most important single factor is a good home," she declares.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 21 Newark Star-Ledger which discusses the Conference.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two other items relating to our youth. One, an article from the March 23 issue of the New Brunswick Home News, describes the clearheaded purposefulness of a New Jersey student who wishes to enter public service.

The other item is the short speech made by Ronald G. Bressler, on behalf of the Bayonne (N.J.) Board of Education on March 22 when that community welcomed Miss Sandra Dee, the 18-year-old actress who has already started a career before motion picture cameras. I am told that 5,000 persons attended the welcome, and I believe that Mr. Bressler's remarks express the pride a community feels in the achievements of one of its young people.

All New Jersey is proud of the other talented young men and women who represent New Jersey so adequately in so many fields. It is always a pleasure to read the lists of scholarship winners in the many national competitions, because we usually find New Jersey students well represented on those lists, for instance. And we usually find that young people from the Garden State are well represented in any creative and constructive

effort that occurs to them or is brought to their attention.

There being no objection, the editorial, article, and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Mar. 21, 1960]

IN PERSPECTIVE

The White House Conference on Children and Youth, which opened last night, will draw a lot of attention to the problem children. How to combat juvenile delinquency, for instance, will be a prominent subject.

However, it would be wise not to lose sight of the fact that problem children and juvenile delinquents make up only a small fraction of the youth of the country.

President Eisenhower, in opening the conference, pointed this out when he warned against "a tendency to generalize pessimistically about our youth—to attribute to the many the failures of the few."

On the other hand, too much complacency would be just as unwarranted. It may be difficult to get things in their proper perspective. But that's the first step toward devising effective solutions.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, Mar. 23, 1960]

HE KNOWS WHERE HE'S GOING

WASHINGTON.—James Weiss, a senior at Highland Park (N.J.) High School, believes in looking ahead.

In the past two days he's visited officials at the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration. His object, to plan a career in public service.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, arranged the appointments after he received a letter from R. Richard Johnson, principal of the Highland Park High School.

The principal's letter said: "James has developed in this past year an interest in the general area of public service. More specifically, the governmental service in international relations and diplomatic service. Jim developed this interest through his participation in the American field service student exchange program. In the past 2 years he was active in this program in Highland Park High School and helped generate enthusiasm among the students for this plan. This past summer he was selected as our American field representative to a German home. Since his return he has been even more enthusiastic and interested in the general field of Government service."

"Jim will graduate high in his class; has played varsity basketball, and has a fine disposition and personality. He is also an accomplished musician. I know there isn't a student or teacher who would give him other than the very highest recommendation."

WILLIAMS, impressed by Weiss' qualifications, sent information to him and suggested that he visit here to receive on-the-spot information about the qualifications he will need. Jim, 17 years old, who will be graduated this June, lives at 19 Grant Avenue in Highland Park.

MISS SANDRA DEE

Dr. Phillips, Dr. Merity, guest of honor. Miss Sandra Dee, ladies and gentlemen: I have the privilege of paying tribute to a great talent of our own city, Miss Sandra Dee. Returning to Bayonne, Miss Dee brings with her the personification of the best of our American way of life. The living example of the spark of ability in a free society, she

adds much dignity, and, if you will, pride to our city. The tributes accorded this young lady can be none too great for the many hours of arduous effort that surely has gone into her success. Miss Dee set forth across this Nation for a mark of achievement from which she has emerged with the respect and admiration of millions. The dignity and pride she has bestowed upon her hometown, I feel certain, will ever be treasured by all our citizens. In speaking for all of our former classmates, Miss Dee, I would like to close by wishing you only the best of health and the greatest continuing success.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Congress will be interested in seeing how young people view the importance of rural development. Therefore, I am placing in the RECORD the speech of Waymon Lard, a member of the Future Farmer Chapter of Hardin County High School in Savannah, Tenn., who won the west Tennessee public speaking contest.

Mr. Lowell Phillips, vocational agriculture teacher, is chapter adviser. State Representative James I. Bell is the supervisor of vocational education for Hardin County schools and Mr. H. F. Snodgrass is superintendent of education.

In this connection I wish also to give recognition to Mr. Con Welch, a prominent banker and civic leader of Savannah who is the chairman of the rural development program committee in Hardin County, Tenn. The program in this county has been so successful—as a demonstration county—that it has not only attracted statewide attention but is pointed to as an example of success by the leaders of the national program.

The speech follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Waymon Lard)

I am grateful for the opportunity as a Future Farmers of America member to speak on a subject that has been one of my main concerns since I enrolled in vocational agriculture as a freshman. This is the complex, deep-rooted problem of widening opportunities for our underdeveloped rural areas. Fifty-six percent of our Nation's farmers produce only 9 percent of the Nation's marketed agricultural products. This large number of rural people have incomes so low they cannot afford the goods and services most of us take for granted. Many of them need special assistance if they are to improve their standard of living.

The poverty existing among this group of people—in good times and bad—has a weakening effect on the entire Nation. Production lost because of lack of education and skills, poor health, insufficient employment, and lack of resources can never be recovered. It remains a stumbling block, increasing indebtedness from year to year. The social conditions arising from low production and low income often generate an apathetic attitude. Community, educational, religious and civic affairs suffer. Confronted with the

overwhelming handicaps of chronic poverty, many people with very low incomes see no possibility of improvement using the inadequate resources and few opportunities available to them.

The development of agriculture's human resources is one of this Nation's most important economic and social problems. According to U.S. Department of Labor projections, employment of farmworkers and farmers will decrease about 15 percent during the next decade. Perhaps one reason behind this migration is the low-income factor. Very low incomes—that is, incomes in the range of \$1,000 a year, or less—are concentrated in agriculture. Less than one-fifth of the farmers in my county produced and sold \$2,500 worth of products in 1955. Investment in land and buildings is only about one-third of what it is elsewhere. Average schooling of adults on farms is 6 years. There have been few outside jobs for this low-income group, while the national figures show that 30 percent of the income of farm families comes from sources other than the production of their farms.

To be more specific, there are still too many farms of low production and too few outside farm jobs for their underemployment problems. Families on these low income farms have not shared in the remarkable advance of agricultural techniques in recent years. They have gained almost nothing from price support programs. Many of their farms are too small for the mechanized techniques of today. Much of their soil is unproductive, not even carrying its tax burden. In my county more than half of the farmers depend on such farms for their livelihood. In spite of Government and private programs of aid to agriculture, improved farming techniques, and the increased national income of the last decade, a sizeable segment of our agriculture has been unable to raise its earnings. In fact, many of that number have increased their indebtedness from year to year.

President Eisenhower recognized this fact when he requested early in 1954 that special attention be given to the problems of farm families with low incomes. It was apparent then that something more should be done to help this group of our people break the deadly cycle of low production leading to poverty.

In thinking about this problem, the greatest factor in reaching for solutions seems to rest in the hands of our youth. They are in the best position to improve their standard of living. Given a chance through good educational programs it is up to these youths to literally lift themselves up by their bootstraps.

Farms with very low incomes are found everywhere in the Nation, but most of them are concentrated in the South and my county is no exception.

This area has been an economic paradox. Even though a large part of the Nation is enjoying full employment and high economic activity, chronic underemployment best explains their situation.

What can be done about low rural incomes in our county and communities? What is the answer? The answer comes from within the county itself, from the people who make up the county. Our Future Farmers of America chapter is working with adult farmers in securing new cash crops to supplement regulated cotton crops. Some of the new cash crops that have been successful are strawberries, okra, snap beans, and pimento pepper. Swine production in the county has been improved by the addition of a purebred boar (meat type) in each community. These boars, bought by the local banks, are being supervised by each F.F.A. chapter in the county and community organizations. Community clubs have been organized in most of the community areas. School surveys have been taken showing educational strengths

and weaknesses. The ministerial association has conducted a county revival meeting with a different denominational speaker each night. The White Oak Creek Watershed Project has been surveyed, under which over 122,000 acres can be drained. An industrial committee is diligently trying to secure new industries to furnish employment for our underemployed rural people. A teenage country club has been organized to furnish recreation for the teenagers. It is the overall aim of this so-called "Teen Town" to promote and foster supervised recreation for the teenagers of our county and surrounding counties. This "Teen Town" is operated by the teenagers themselves and involves many decisions they will have to make as tomorrow's citizens.

As a pilot county in the rural development program, Hardin County is striving toward creating opportunities for its rural and urban citizens. These opportunities should create a more favorable situation for our people in relation to the high economic situation of our Nation.

In reality this is a transfusion of life, using the energies of home folks to make Hardin County a better place in which to live.

Tight Money on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we here have argued the merits and demerits of the administration's tight money policy at some length. Many in the majority have made hypothetical cases to buttress arguments that tight money results in an economic slowdown. We have also quoted statistics and pointed with some concern at "trends."

An article in the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News of March 13 gives a specific example of one effect of high interest rates. It shows how building on a nine-county area of New Jersey has fallen off because, according to the article, builders "are now spending their time shopping for mortgage money at interest rates they can afford."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING BLOCKED BY TIGHT MONEY

(By Andre Briod)

A potential rental housing construction boom in northern New Jersey is being forced to await the breakup of a bottleneck resulting from the current tight money market, according to Federal Housing Administration officials here.

Figures issued by Peter J. Longarzo, head of the FHA's regional office in Newark, indicate that northern New Jersey could enjoy more major apartment construction than at any time since World War II—if prospective builders could borrow money at rates they are willing to pay.

Longarzo, whose office covers the 13 northern New Jersey counties, said plans in various stages which have reached his office would produce apartment projects in his

region worth approximately \$150 million and housing for about 8,000 families.

Most of the builders are now spending their time shopping for mortgage money at interest rates they can afford, he said, and the current tight condition of the money market makes it a difficult search for them.

CAN'T FIND MONEY

Longarzo said there are now 15 commitments for mortgage insurance issued by his office, but for which the prospective builders cannot find the money at prices they can afford. Those commitments, if exercised, would produce 1,550 units worth about \$30 million.

His office is currently processing applications for another 15 commitments which would produce an additional 2,100 units worth about \$40 million, Longarzo said. Those applicants, like those who already have their FHA insurance commitments, are still out shopping for money, according to Longarzo.

Beyond that, the Director said, his office has made preliminary feasibility studies on a host of other projects under consideration which would produce an additional 4,500 units of rental housing. These, he calculated would be worth together at least as much, if not more, than all of those for which formal applications have been filed or on which commitments have been issued.

FHA records show that during the 3 years from the beginning of 1956 to the end of 1958, commitments were issued by the FHA on projects totaling 3,860 units, worth just under \$50 million. That amounts to considerably less than half of what is now in the hopper.

Longarzo pointed out that the figures through 1958 included a single commitment of over \$15 million to Metropolitan Corp. of America for the construction of 1,240 units between Broad Street and Clifton Avenue, which is a title I urban renewal project.

CAN TURN TO FNMA

The projections for the near future, Longarzo said, do not include anticipated applications for mortgage insurance to cover the big block of title I apartment construction Newark hopes to achieve within the next few years. Redevelopment officials hope that at least 1,500 units, and maybe more, will be started during 1961.

Longarzo said that title I project sponsors will not have as difficult a time getting their money, because they can turn to the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), a Federal agency which is authorized to buy title I first mortgages.

The FHA regional chief, who took his post here in 1957, attributed the ballooning interest in major apartment construction in this area to one primary factor, consumer demand. He added that the prospective boom has been encouraged by what he said is an understanding on the part of builders that FHA financing terms are more to their advantage than they realized at first.

highest caliber. The junior Senator from Hawaii, the Honorable OREN E. LONG, recently discussed the qualities which make up the kind of leadership now so urgently required. His remarks, delivered at the March 13 Founder's Day celebration of the Washington Club of Phi Sigma Kappa Fraternity here, were based on a near half century of experience as an educator, administrator, and legislator. Because of their pertinence, under unanimous consent, I include Senator Long's remarks on this occasion in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

LEADERSHIP

An anniversary is always an interesting event. It is also significant. It deals with beginnings, reviews accomplishments, and most important, points to the future. And so it is with the 87th anniversary of the founding of Phi Sigma Kappa. Ours is a fraternity dedicated to three cardinal principles—brotherhood, scholarship, and character.

When I stop to consider what these principles mean, I realize our fraternity's great potentialities for developing leadership—the type of leadership upon which the future of our society and our Nation depends. It is from such groups as the Lambda chapter here at George Washington University that our future leaders are being groomed for the big tasks that lie ahead.

There is a chronic demand for new leaders with new approaches to continuing problems. Each year our Nation grows in population, wealth, and complexity. Government, business, the arts all require capable leadership.

Increasingly, as in the field of rocketry and nuclear physics, there is recognition that highly gifted people can assume leadership at an early age. Senator KENNEDY is hoping to have the advantage of this realization as he seeks the nomination of the Democratic Party for the Presidency at the age of 42. Of the 34 Presidents, only Teddy Roosevelt was that young when he assumed office—and even Teddy had less hair on his head than does Senator KENNEDY.

On the basis of my near half-century in public service, including teaching, administration and legislative experience, I would like to offer a few observations on "leadership"—observations which I hope may be of particular interest to the younger members of our fraternity.

A leader is one who goes before, to guide or to show the way—a person who proceeds or directs in some action, opinion or movement. He coordinates the efforts of other men, inspiring them to accept responsibility and to use their judgment and initiative.

He has an analytic mind, organizing ability, capacity and willingness to develop others. A leader will have as his duty not only to satisfy human wants and to meet the needs of the community, but to anticipate these wants and needs.

Leaders are people who never know that a thing cannot be done. Rather, they say: "It can be done—it must be done. Let's see that it is done." And then they jump in and do it.

Leadership is not merely a question of seeing ahead; it is a matter of going ahead, of being big enough and brave enough to grasp every little detail as well as seeing the proposition as a whole and then executing it.

Men readily follow a leader who is always there before they are, clearly visible, and just where they expect him. They are especially eager to go forward with a man who never sounds a retreat. A leader must be always advancing, always struggling to make things better, to carry out some needed activity, to develop an idea.

And there is a pleasure in leadership.

Most men would cease striving when young if it were just a question of making money or of attaining a place of prominence—but leadership in itself is the big thing.

Leadership comes to those who can shoulder it, to those who know how to use it, to those who are willing to assume responsibility.

There is another thought in connection with leadership that is important: One cannot become a real leader who has not learned how to be a good follower. And that is where brotherhood is so important.

There are certain traits of leadership that are almost essential if it is to be effective.

One of these is optimism—a belief in humanity and in the society of which the leader is a part. We hear a great deal about problems of the world. There will always be prophets of doom. We need to hear more about the good that is in the world, and the opportunities that are with us.

Our world today is far from being a perfect world. It may be a hungry world, a bankrupt world, a selfish world, a worried world, a saber-toothed world, a fearful world, an uncertain world. But we should never forget that it is a world that has much of hope and of encouragement.

Some time ago, I read a magazine article that might have been called a study in pessimism. The author pointed out that records of the last centuries—a total of 18 generations—show that each generation was obsessed with the idea that its problems were just a little more serious than the problems of any preceding generation and, in all too many instances, the accepted leaders raised serious questions as to whether their social order would continue to exist.

We certainly think that we are living in a period of stress, turmoil, uncertainties and dangers. Perhaps we are. But so have other generations and they continued on their way. In spite of problems, civilization has survived and expanded.

A good many years ago, Charles F. Kettering, vice president in charge of research, General Motors Corp., wrote an article entitled "Age of Opportunity." I think his observations are equally pertinent today. He wrote:

"This world we live in today," he said, "is not done—is, instead, only begun—and the builders of tomorrow's bright new world will have a host of advantages when they come to grips with the questions it will bring.

"Young America is coming into a world that is only begun, a world that despite the accumulated toll of centuries, still admits want, disease, hardship. When today's young men and their sons and grandsons of tomorrow have finished with it, we'll be a little nearer the kind of world we ought to have.

"When they tell us in research that a thing can't be done, that's our cue to go ahead and do it.

"Progress doesn't come in leaps. It's a slow, weary, laborious process.

"Not so long ago, I was awarded an honorary degree by one of our eastern colleges. I went east for the commencement exercises. The alumni met in 10-, 25-, and 50-year groups, and I happened to be thrown in with the 25-year group when this thing happened:

"A well-dressed, successful-looking man stood up to address the 25-year alumni. In his hand he held a letter, yellowed with the years. 'I wrote this letter to my father on graduation day,' he said. 'And in it I bewailed my lot for having graduated into a world that held forth so little opportunity.'

"When the speaker finished, the president of the college arose. He had a thick book in his hand. To the speaker he said, 'In this book we have collected letters from our students over a period of 150 years. Each letter in each succeeding year, laments the passing

Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, faced as it is with the problems of the cold war and the complexities of the new age of intercontinental missiles, atomic energy, and the exploration of space, sorely needs leadership of the very

of opportunity, the dire plight of the student who was thrown out into such a dreary world. I should like to add your letter to our collection."

"So there you are. This doubt and uncertainty is ageless. And today, more than ever, it is entirely groundless."

"The trouble with most of us is that we seek to back into the future, like the famous bird that always flew backwards because it wasn't interested in seeing where it was going, just wanted to see where it had been."

"You can't go through life on a futarama. Too many of us just want to sit down and ride along surveying the world that is to come. Well, if many of us do that, the sights we'll see will still be those of the world today."

"I don't think there was ever a man born who wasn't born into an 'age of opportunity.' The main thing to remember is that opportunity is within us, offered to rich and poor alike, is entirely democratic. But we dare not back into it, for we need to keep our eyes and our hands ahead."

There is another quality that the leader should have—a complete acceptance that growth presupposes change.

When we talk about conserving our American institutions, we do not mean keeping them as they are. The very essence of democracy is growth. Failure to recognize this is rank stupidity. The glory of our American way of life is that it provides for change, for orderly change in our institutions.

No institution has validity or sanction except as it serves all the people. Any loss of the power of the people to bring about change or the loss of the will to change means that democracy has been lost. Even the loss of interest in change is fatal. It can mean only stagnation. Extreme fear of change leads inevitably to servility.

A willingness to face new conditions is basic in leadership. If there hadn't been change, we would be nomads of desert and forest, of mountain and stream. If it hadn't been for revolution, the vast majority of humanity would be in servitude.

Without this willingness to face change, even to demand change, there would have been no Magna Carta, no emergence from feudalism, no birth of an independent republic in the New World, no freeing of the slaves.

The real leader will be a reformer. The reformer is one who, when he becomes aware of injustice, of intolerance, of ugliness, sets about to improve these defects. But the true reformer is seldom a revolutionist. He is content with growth, with evolution. He allows for the past, recognizes the limits of the possible and impossible, is cautious with the changes he proposes, and thus paves the way for the future.

In a society as complicated as ours has become, and in a world that is characterized by uncertainties, it is essential that we hold fast to our traditional institutions, but that under wise leadership we make changes necessary to improve and, in reality, to maintain the best of everything in our national life.

There is another point at which I hope you young men as leaders will be realistic and exceedingly wise. Everyone of us is aware of sharp differences of opinion that exist in our community and in our national society—even in the Senate of the United States. Never before was there greater need for understanding and tolerance. The glory of America has been that men can be as liberal as Jefferson and Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, or as conservative as Adams and Hamilton and Cleveland and McKinley and Hoover and great Americans.

They can hold viewpoints in regard to labor and management as widely separated as Sam Gompers, William Green, Philip Murray, and John L. Lewis, as compared

with Andrew Carnegie, James J. Hill, E. H. Harriman, John Raskob, or Charles E. Wilson and yet be great Americans. That's the glory of America.

In relation to our American institutions, we want to keep the circle big enough for all who are devoted to the American concept of freedom and democracy. In this society there is no place for the philosophy of hate. The attitude of hating the boss is socially unsound and can result only in weakening our community life and national life, and the philosophy that makes every officer of the union a crook, a subversive, a wholly selfish manipulator, is equally dangerous to our happiness and well-being. There is so much good in America and so much good in all the individuals and the organizations that love America, that the development of understanding and good will must be a conscious objective of everyone who is a leader.

There is much more that might be said on an occasion like this, but I wish to close at this point by stating that I believe in our fraternity because it is made up of men who believe in themselves, in their fellow men, in their community, in their nation, and who believe above all that the real glory and strength of a man or of a fraternal organization or of a nation lies in spiritual values rather than material values.

High Praise for Zablocki's Work in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the ablest and finest Members of the U.S. Congress is the dean of our Wisconsin Democratic delegation—the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin's fourth district, that is Milwaukee.

CLEM ZABLOCKI recently was the object of a well-deserved testimonial dinner here in Washington for his vital role in pushing a Polish Children's hospital.

In one of the most impressive displays of popularity seen in a long time—more than 100 Members of Congress turned out to honor CLEM ZABLOCKI, including Speaker SAM RAYBURN and House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK. The Speaker spoke for many people who have known ZABLOCKI when he called him "a man with a headful of commonsense." JOHN MCCORMACK called ZABLOCKI, "one of the finest legislators I have ever known."

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the Milwaukee Journal article describing the event be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PULASKI GROUP PAYS TRIBUTE TO ZABLOCKI—MILWAUKEE DEMOCRAT GETS AWARD FOR ROLE IN PROMOTING POLISH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Pulaski Foundation gave a testimonial dinner Monday night for Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Milwaukee, to honor him for promoting better understanding between the peoples

of the United States and Poland. ZABLOCKI was awarded Polonia's "man of the year" award for his role in providing funds for a \$4 million children's hospital and pediatric center in Cracow, Poland.

PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS

As a high ranking and influential member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ZABLOCKI quietly inserted a necessary one line amendment into the foreign aid bill last year.

The amendment makes it possible to use for the hospital about \$2,500,000 from funds in the form of Polish zlotys that are accumulating to the credit of the United States in return for our sale to Poland of surplus farm products.

The remainder of the money is being raised from private contributors in this country by the American Research Hospital for Children Committee.

The presence of more than 100 Members of Congress among the hundreds of diners at the swank affair at the Mayflower Hotel attested to ZABLOCKI's popularity among both Republicans and Democrats. It was a remarkable bipartisan show of affection and respect. It also demonstrated why he was able to get his amendment through Congress. They let it go through "as a favor to Clem."

Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, told the diners that he was happy "to be here to pay tribute to a great young American who has established a reputation of rare intelligence and boundless patriotism."

"HEADFUL OF COMMONSENSE"

RAYBURN, certainly one of the most powerful men in this Capital, called ZABLOCKI "a man with a headful of commonsense." Turning to the Congressman from Milwaukee's south side, RAYBURN concluded:

"I'm glad, CLEM, that you're being honored, and that's why I'm here."

In the same vein, the House Democratic leader, Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said that talking about ZABLOCKI was a "pleasant task," because he epitomizes everything that is noble and sincere.

MCCORMACK, who rarely attends dinners, praised ZABLOCKI for his high ideals and called him one of the most outstanding Americans I have ever served with.

"CLEM ZABLOCKI is one of the finest legislators I have ever known," MCCORMACK went on. He praised him for idealism and said he was humble but distinguished.

Senator MORTON, of Kentucky, chairman of the Republican National Committee, sent a message of best wishes to ZABLOCKI from the committee, noting that the children's hospital would help carry out President Eisenhower's people to people program.

Speaking for the Republican lawmakers present, Representative DERWINSKI, of Illinois, said the hospital project was a great accomplishment of ZABLOCKI's.

The principal speaker of the evening was Maj. Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, adjutant general of Pennsylvania and former Ambassador to Poland.

After the speeches were over, Representative FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, the toastmaster, asked ZABLOCKI whether he had any opposition back home this year.

"We certainly have the varsity out for you tonight," FLOOD told ZABLOCKI.

ZABLOCKI, deeply moved, accepted the award with sincere humility. He insisted that the credit for proposing the project in the first place should go to W. O. Biernacki-Poray, architect, of Montclair, N.J.

Biernacki-Poray also was to have been honored, but he is in Poland working on the hospital which he designed.

The Pulaski Foundation is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the rebuilding of the birthplace in Warka, Poland, of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero.

Employment Future for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gradual increase in flexible retirement policies during the next decade will be encouraged by legislation adopted at this session of the Congress. The background of this problem is discussed in an article by Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor. This is the fourth in a series of articles prepared for Ray Henry, which appeared in more than a hundred newspapers throughout the country earlier this year. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

EMPLOYMENT FUTURE FOR THE AGED

(By Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor)

The 1960's will see an unprecedented rise in the number of workers in the United States. The Government looks for an increase of 13½ million in the labor force between 1960 and 1970.

However, the big story is not so much in the sheer size of the increase, substantial as it is, but who the 13½ million will be.

About 50 percent of the new workers will be people under 25 and about 40 percent will be 45 and older. The remaining 10 percent will be between 25 and 34 years of age. There actually will be a decline in the number of workers between 35 and 44.

Because nearly all the new workers will be at the younger and older ends of the age scale, our interest in these groups has increased.

And a good part of this interest is focused on what will happen in the 1960's to people 65 years of age and over, those who have reached what is often called the conventional age of retirement. How many of them will be working? At what will they be working?

Five important points can be made about the outlook for employment among people 65 and older in the next decade:

1. One of the overriding trends in the American labor market since the beginning of this century has been the persistent and substantial drop in the percentage of men 65 and over who worked.

Back in 1900, two out of every three men 65 or older were still working.

Now, with the transformation of our country from an agricultural to a nonfarm industrial economy and with the great growth of public and private pension plans, only one out of every three of the men 65 years and over is a worker.

There is nothing in the offing for the next 10 years which would reverse this trend.

As a result, we expect the percent of these men in the labor force to decline further—to a little over 30 percent. Because of this continued decline, the actual number of men workers 65 and over will show only a very small increase, despite a big rise in the number of men in this age group.

2. The employment outlook for women 65 or over is quite different. The percentage of older women workers has been edging up slowly in recent years until we now find that 1 out of every 10 women 65 or older works. We expect this proportion to go up.

By 1970 something like one out of every eight older women will be in the labor force.

Back in 1950 there were about half a million women workers 65 and over. The figure

is now about 1 million. By 1970, it will be closer to a million and a half.

3. For older people who remain in the labor force, employment opportunities ought to be very good, especially if we continue to enjoy relatively high levels of economic activity.

There are at least three reasons for this favorable outlook:

In the first place, the shortage of workers between 25 and 44 to which we have already referred will accentuate the need for more mature personnel for responsible positions in business, industry, government, teaching, etc.

Second, all of the evidence points to a continuation of the relatively greater growth during the 1960's in the professional, managerial, clerical, and related fields—exactly the occupations in which the older worker predominates.

For example: Almost two out of every five women 65 and older who now work are engaged in these white-collar job fields; this ratio is almost exactly the same for men workers in these age groups.

Thirdly, we expect a continued increase in the amount of part-time work available. This, of course, is important to the older man and woman who may not be able to work full time.

Our estimates show that part-time employment will increase by more than 30 percent during the decade of the 1960's, as against a less than 20-percent increase in the labor force as a whole.

4. The favorable trends mentioned above will not come about automatically.

They depend on the growing realization that discrimination on account of age does not pay off, especially in view of the almost unique kind of manpower distribution we are going to have during the 1960's.

5. Another important consideration in looking at the 1960's is whether there will be a change in the age at which workers will be expected to retire; whether retirement will continue to be compulsory at a given age—such as 65—or will become flexible depending on the individual worker involved.

This is basically a matter of resolution between labor and management.

However, we expect a gradual increase in flexible retirement during the 1960's for at least two reasons: The growing understanding that ability to continue to perform is not a worker's age alone and that there is an enormous variation among individuals in this respect; the need for able older workers in view of the expected shortage in some of the younger age groups.

The Late Honorable Russell Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of RUSSELL MACK has been a great shock to all of us, but it was especially distressing to the members of the Public Works Committee, on which he served as an outstanding leader for many years. We were fellow members of this committee from the beginning of my service in the Congress, and we had many pleasant hours together on inspection trips and committee hearings in all parts of the United States.

RUSSELL MACK was a devoted legislator who made a major contribution to all the important legislation that came before our committee. We often had sharp differences about some of the proposals, but we were able to differ without rancor. It will be difficult indeed to replace him.

Mrs. Smith and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Mack.

Boy Scout Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Boy Scouts of America have just observed their 50th birthday, and it has been a half century of proud achievement and expansion into a worldwide youth movement.

We in New Jersey are proud to have the national headquarters in New Brunswick, which serves 3,700,000 boy members and 1,340,000 adult leaders. The benefits of scouting as a force against juvenile delinquency are well known. However, no less an accomplishment is the encouragement of self reliance, of a love for the outdoors and a respect for natural resources.

Dr. E. DeAlton Partridge, president of the Montclair State College, and an active staff director in the Boy Scouts of America, has written a most interesting and informative story about the Scouts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the Sunday Newark News on February 7, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY CANDLES DECORATE SCOUTING'S ANNIVERSARY CAKE

(By E. De Alton Partridge)

Fifty years ago tomorrow, on February 8, 1910, the Boy Scouts of America was incorporated in the District of Columbia. Today there are 3,700,000 boys in more than 130,000 Scout groups in the United States. More than 31 million persons have belonged to this movement in America as leaders or members since 1910.

Probably no youth movement in history has had the universal appeal of the Boy Scouts. It started humbly, almost accidentally, and spread like a prairie fire from one country to another until it circled the earth. Except in totalitarian countries, it has practically universal approval of all religious, racial, political and economic segments of society.

What is the secret of this amazing movement? Why did it develop so rapidly, spread so fast, and why has it kept its almost universal appeal for men and boys in 70 countries throughout the world?

The answers to these questions are not easy to establish. Certainly for any movement to meet with such continuing success it must have been spawned in a favorable climate. It must have had the elements of a rewarding and practical program and it must have had unusual leadership. Only

a combination of these factors could have resulted in the explosive growth since 1910.

At the beginning of the 20th century when the early designs of the Scout movement were taking shape America was a country ripe for the launching of an attractive program for boys. Growing industrialization was eating at the natural resources and changing the character of communities, large and small.

More and more youths were living in cities or villages with an increasing amount of leisure time on their hands. There was no organized recreation program and many of the traditional forms of recreation were becoming more difficult to practice. The "ole swimmin' hole" which at one time was available to almost every community was often the victim of suburban expansion or stream pollution. Parks and playfields were yet to come in any great number.

In those days amusement and recreation had to come from one's own wits. The motion picture theater was not yet a common community facility. The only means of transportation available to the average youngster were his legs, a bicycle or for some a horse. Excursions to distant places were, therefore, difficult and time-consuming.

Fifty years ago the schools had a limited curriculum dominated by the three R's. There were no gymnasiums and few public libraries. Schools did not often offer opportunities to play in the band or orchestra or sing in a glee club. Basketball, while invented in 1892, was still not a commonly played sport. Practically no church had a recreation hall.

While today the long family vacation together is a common thing, in the early days of this century it was unheard of except for the well-to-do. Even for those who could afford it, going away for a few weeks of fun in the country was a major undertaking which required days and days of planning and arrangement.

In a society like this, active, eager, energetic boys were more than ready for some program which would capture their imagination. And there were other forces at work too. The pioneer tradition was fresh in the land. Men and women were still alive who had trekked across the plains in covered wagons. The U.S. Army was still engaged in putting down Indian uprisings in some parts of the West. Some vast areas still awaited human settlement.

The natural resources of North America, which had seemed almost unlimited, were bleeding from many wounds. Wildlife was being pushed farther and farther from the settled areas. Forests had been stripped and streams muddied by ruthless cutting of timber. Men in high places were crying out against the waste and exploitation.

Early in the first decade of the century there was in the White House a President who personified the rugged outdoor life. Theodore Roosevelt had become a national hero as a result of the exploits of his Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War. He had lived outdoors in the West and learned to love it.

There was a growing agitation to preserve our natural resources. Joining in the campaign were men of influence like Gifford Pinchot. The Nation was ready for a program that would have as one of its objectives the training of boys in conservation practices.

It is evident that not only in America, but in other parts of the world as well, there was the proper climate to encourage the growth of a boys' movement headed toward the open spaces. Indeed, before the appearance of the Boy Scout program as outlined by Lt. Gen. Robert S. S. Baden-Powell, of the British Army, there were other active programs flourishing in various countries not unlike the scout idea.

In America, for example, two artist-writers were producing books about the out of

doors and both had ideas of organizations for boys. Ernest Thompson Seton had achieved wide popularity just after the turn of the century with his books. The "Two Little Savages" and "Rolie in the Woods" were widely read by boys. He had also outlined an organization which he called "The Tribe of Woodcraft Indians." As early as 1901 he wrote a handbook for this organization which he titled "The Birchbark Roll."

The other artist-writer was Daniel Carter Beard, a truly romantic figure who was recognized as an outdoorsman by men and boys alike shortly after 1900. Dan Beard, as he was affectionately known, was an artist of great distinction, friend of Mark Twain and popular writer. In 1905 he organized the Society of the Sons of Daniel Boone, and wrote a handbook which he called "The Boy Pioneers." He also outlined local organizations of boys with officers named after great American scouts.

Camping and hiking, both of which are an important part of the Scout program, were growing in popularity before 1910. The YMCA had an active boys' division by this time and was operating no fewer than 400 summer camps which reached a total of 15,000 youngsters. The first of these, Camp Dudley, was organized in 1884.

In Europe, too, there were interesting developments that antedated the Boy Scout movement. The Boys' Brigade, for example, was said to have had 54,000 members in 1905 and during that year Baden-Powell reviewed 17,000 of them in Glasgow, Scotland. Later, the leader of this movement strongly endorsed Scouting.

The Boy Scout program as conceived by Baden-Powell grew out of a plan he developed to train young men in the British colonial forces. As a commander in these forces he recognized early the need for instruction in some of the fundamental and even primitive methods of survival away from the base of operations. The young men who came into the army from the towns and cities of England were woefully lacking in self-reliance and skills of woodcraft.

Drawing upon a variety of sources, Baden-Powell set up a series of skills, graduated in difficulty and designed to make of the individual a first-class scout * * * or one who could go out on his own and secure information. As candidates passed these tests they were given insignia to indicate the degree of skill they had acquired.

So successful was this plan that Baden-Powell prepared a manuscript, "Aids to Scouting," which was designed for use with the armed forces. The proofs of this book were corrected in 1899 during the siege of Mafeking in the Boer War. During this siege boys were organized as runners and trained in some of the skills outlined for army scouts. The success of this training among boys must have made an impression upon their organizer.

The successful resistance to the Mafeking siege made an international hero out of Baden-Powell, and this had a great deal to do with the later success of the scout movement. When he returned to England he found, much to his surprise, that "Aids to Scouting" was being widely used as a handbook by groups of boys, with or without adult leadership.

In view of this, he was urged to prepare a book for boys and to outline a program for them. Drawing freely upon a variety of sources, including Ernest Thompson Seton and Dan Beard, he wrote "Scouting for Boys" but did not publish it until he had formed an experimental troop and camped with them at Brownsea Island in August 1907.

The desire to be self-sufficient is almost universal, and the scout program was designed to encourage this desire with a graduated series of steps leading toward it. Add to this an attractive uniform with insignia to advertise the level of proficiency and you

have a combination that is hard to beat. In addition, however, is one other factor—and an important one—the idea of the patrol.

There is a tendency for adolescents and preadolescents to form into gangs. Association with one's peers is a vital necessity at this age. By recognizing this tendency and giving it a direction, Baden-Powell made it a very easy and natural transition from the street gang to the Boy Scout patrol and troop.

Another thing that contributed to the rapid growth of the movement in America is the policy of institutional sponsorship for Scout groups. Under this plan every troop is affiliated with a church, school, service club or some other adult group. This insures continuity of leadership and a meeting place. To these institutions also, Scouting provides a ready-made program for restless boys.

That the Boy Scout program gained almost immediate popularity and continued to enjoy it for over 50 years is a tribute to the genius of Baden-Powell and the energy and resourcefulness of those who have followed him.

Librarians report that books about the out-of-doors are gaining in popularity. Churches, service clubs and schools are including out-of-door experiences as a regular part of their programs. A number of school systems now own and operate camps to which youngsters go for extended periods with their own teachers during the school year. New Jersey has several examples of this. Nearly every State in the Union has at least one such program.

Scores of teacher colleges own and operate camps to train teachers in out-of-door education techniques. National Camp, near Matamoras, Pa., is operated by the Outdoor Education Association. Here courses are offered during the summer for church leaders, teachers and school administrators to instruct them in the philosophy and techniques of education away from the classroom. This program has been in operation for 20 years.

New Jersey now operates a similar training center. Located in Stokes State Forest, this center is used by local school systems for class groups going to the woods with their own teachers during school time. The demand is so great that only a small number of the requests for the facilities can be granted.

In addition to accommodating public school groups the camp facilities are used 9 months of the year by the six State colleges. Both undergraduate and graduate students go there for periods from 1 to 6 weeks and take credit-bearing courses in field science, geology, conservation, rural sociology and similar subjects.

The climate is just as favorable today as it was in 1910 for organized programs that take youth into the woods and away from the artificialities of city life.

As the highways become more crowded, cities larger and more complicated and the restlessness of youth finds expression in antisocial activities there is even more need today for the Baden-Powell idea which grew into the greatest youth movement of all time.

Madison Avenue, USP—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is one of the Ben Zinser articles in the Long Beach Independent

Press-Telegram on extravagant promotion by the drug industry resulting in higher prices to consumers which was referred to me in my remarks on the floor today under the above title:

BIGGEST MEDICINE SHOW ON EARTH—DRUG FIRMS BRIEF DOCTORS

(By Ben Zinser)

The young man in the dark gray business suit had scarcely seated himself in the doctor's waiting room when the receptionist said:

"Doctor will see you now."

Picking up a valise, the crew-cut visitor strode briskly past a waiting line of patients into the doctor's office. The doctor, feet on desk, was waiting.

"Bad day, so let's hurry," the doctor said.

Opening his sample case, the visitor plunked several small vials into the desk.

"It's our new one—Supercetin," the young man said. "Knocks hell out of staph."

"Any contraindications?"

"None as yet."

"OK, go ahead and detail me."

The young man, known as a detail man in the pharmaceutical industry, proceeded to outline the dosage schedule for his new antibiotic, its chemical structure and its possible undesirable side effects. The entire visit took about 10 minutes. Average cost to the drug industry for such a visit: \$12.

All over the land this scene is enacted daily in doctors' offices. About 20,000 detail men are employed by the U.S. pharmaceutical industry to brief the medical profession on its products. The average physician sees about five detail men each week. (Note: Some doctors, however, refuse to talk to any.)

Although the pharmaceutical industry will spend about \$190 million this year on research to find new and better medications, it will put out between \$250 and \$300 million to keep the physician informed about existing drug products. Almost half of this amount will go to finance detail men.

This is a report to you on the drug industry's private advertising campaign—the biggest medicine show on earth. Despite the size of the campaign, its audience is limited. The multimillion dollar prescription-drug pitch is restricted to your physician.

Most doctors believe this intense promotional campaign is one of the major factors that make drugs costly to their patients.

The drug industry, however, contends that mass production of medicines would not be possible without heavy advertising. Drug costs to the patient would be enormous were it not for mass production, industry spokesmen say.

The typical detail man does not have a medical degree. He does have a college degree and a good background in scientific subjects. And, insist the detail men, "we are not salesmen."

"A drug salesman," detail men explain, "is the man who represents 'bathtub' or 'me too' houses."

A "bathtub" house is a pharmaceutical firm that doesn't do medical research.

"These firms buy the prescription product from another outfit and put their own label on it," says a detail man. "Sometimes the product is inferior."

A detail man explains:

"For instance, say we have a pep pill called Antisnooze. Our plant comes up with a substandard batch—one that won't meet our advertising claims for potency. So we sell this batch to a 'bathtub' house which promptly labels it something else and pushes it in direct sales to the physician."

Even though detail men are costly to the drug industry, their future is bright. A survey conducted for the American Medical Association reveals that two-thirds of all doctors say detail men are their most important source of product information. About half

the doctors say they got the information which led to their prescribing their last new drug from the detail men.

When detail men aren't knocking at doctors' doors, the Nation's physicians are hearing constantly from the drug industry through the pages of medical journals. The drug manufacturers are the journals' main advertisers. The industry also rains a constant shower of direct-mail advertising onto the doctor's desk.

The AMA survey reveals that doctors have mixed emotions about the drug companies. Some findings:

More than two-thirds of all doctors think that pharmaceutical advertising increases drug prices.

Nearly a third of the doctors think that 50 percent or more of the money spent on pharmaceutical advertising is wasted.

One-fourth of the doctors think that the drug manufacturers make too much profit. (Yet half cannot even guess what percent of profit on sales the industry makes.)

Half the doctors think that the drug companies are overly competitive in their marketing and promotion.

Only one-fourth of the doctors think the drug industry is more interested in helping the physician than in making money.

On the other hand, doctors almost unanimously think that drug company promotion and advertising make an important contribution to the postgraduate education of physicians.

"The price of medical journals would be prohibitive if they had to be published without advertising revenue," one Long Beach physician comments.

One of the biggest critics of the pharmaceutical industry is Dr. Louis Lasagna, head of clinical pharmacology at Johns Hopkins University. He says that some drug-industry advertising is downright sleazy.

Some of his objections:

"Badly scissored quotes." Too often, he says, drug advertisers cite only those parts of medical manuscripts that laud a product, deleting the less favorable comments.

"Pharmaceutical numbers racket." Physicians are told, for example, that a new compound is more potent than an older drug because only 10 milligram dosages are required compared to 100 milligrams for the old. What is usually meant, he says, is that both drugs do the same job at the respective dosages. Watch those numbers, he warns his colleagues.

"Reprint articles." Drug houses circulate thousands of reprints of medical journal articles, and this practice is putting the doctor-author on the spot.

Madison Avenue, USP—No. 2

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is one of the Ben Zinser articles in the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram on extravagant promotion by the drug industry resulting in higher prices to consumers which was referred to in my remarks on the floor today under the above title:

ALL ADS TO PROMOTION COSTS—SAME DRUG, ONLY THE NAME IS DIFFERENT

(By Ben Zinser)

In a recent medical journal the first advertisement in the magazine regales the

physician-reader about the advantages of a diuretic drug called Esidrix.

On the very next page appears an ad praising another diuretic called Oretic.

The coincidence: Each is the same drug. Esidrix is the Ciba Co.'s trade name for the drug hydrochlorothiazide. Oretic is Abbott Laboratories' trademark for hydrochlorothiazide. Chemically both drugs are the same. Furthermore, Merck Sharp & Dohme sells the same preparation under the name Hydrodiuril.

Another example in the same issue of the journal: One ad tells of Decadron, marketed by Merck Sharp & Dohme. Another promotes Gammacorten, sold by Ciba. Yet both are the same drug—an anti-inflammation hormone known as dexamethasone.

Still another example: The tranquilizer Miltown and the tranquilizer Equanil, often advertised in the same issue of a medical journal, are one and the same: meprobamate. But Wallace Laboratories sells Miltown; the Wyeth Co., Equanil.

And so it goes. The antibiotic tetracycline, for instance, is marketed by different firms under the trade names of Achromycin (Lederle), Pammycin (Upjohn), Polycycline (Bristol), Steclin (Squibb), and Tetracyclin (Pfizer.)

What with hundreds of drugs offered for prescription, you can readily see the advertising bill involved. Some 5,000 medical journals appear annually in the United States, and most have columns that make a promotional pitch to the doctor-reader.

The confusing thing is that one firm usually has a patent on any one of the new drugs.

One company will patent Superdrug and immediately license another drug company to market the same compound under another name, say Duperdrug.

So here are two firms spending money—and freely—to get the doctor's attention. One ad says, "Prescribe Superdrug." The other insists, "Designate Duperdrug."

The question: Who pays in the long run?

Furthermore, another cost that is undoubtedly passed on to the consumer is that prompted by the mere existence of the same drug under different trade names. The retail druggist must stock all of them. Under penalty of law he cannot make a substitution. If the doctor prescribes Aristocort, the druggist cannot substitute Kenacort—even though both are the synthetic hormone, triamcinolone. Both must be kept on the shelves.

Advertising is a necessity, the drug industry insists. A recent survey shows that although 37 percent of doctors first learn of new drugs through drug company detail men, most doctors are persuaded to try new drugs by journal advertisements or articles.

The survey discloses that few doctors are influenced by the detail man in their continued use of a drug. But nearly 40 percent say journal advertising is an important factor in deciding to keep using a certain preparation.

There are now almost two dozen advertising agencies that specialize in promotion of ethical (prescription only) drugs. Some have staffs ranging from 50 to 250 persons, including several physicians, as consultants.

Launching a new drug can be extremely expensive. When the antibiotic Aureomycin was introduced, its manufacturer mailed out \$2 million worth of samples to more than 140,000 physicians, according to one drug-industry biographer. Research and development of Terramycin cost about \$4 million, but the first 2 years Terramycin was on the market, the manufacturer reportedly spent \$7½ million in advertising and promotion.

Many drug firms resort to "gimmick" advertising. One drug house sent red golf balls to doctors. Reason: It had a large red

cold pill on the market. The golf ball is supposed to remind the doctor of the pill.

Another has mailed out mounted butterflies, comparing them to an antibiotic and saying both are unique in nature.

Pharmaceutical houses have swamped doctors with fountain pens, desk calendars, desk decorations (example: miniature skeletons), and even pencils attached to tiny bedside urinals.

But even the "gimmicks" can be too "gimmicky," the industry admits. Thomas M. Rauch, vice president of the marketing division of Smith Kline & French Laboratories, recently told Los Angeles County physicians in their association magazine how S.K. & F. spiked one promotion idea.

"Someone had a wonderful idea for a mailing on Cytomel, which is our synthetic, thyroid-like product," he said. "The mailing was to be on Cytomel's use in infertility, and our people came up with the bright idea of the sample being enclosed in a facsimile egg."

"There is no doubt in my mind this would have been an attention-getter which would have increased Cytomel's sales significantly. But in the opinion of our advertising people and others—and I certainly agree with them—this mailing, on the basis of good taste, was too tricky, too smart, too undignified."

"It was never sent out."

Madison Avenue, USP—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is one of the Ben Zinser articles in the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram on extravagant promotion by the drug industry resulting in higher prices to consumers which was referred to in my remarks on the floor today under the above title:

DRUG ADS PLAGUE DOCTORS—SAID HIKING
PRODUCT COSTS
(By Ben Zinser)

The average doctor in the United States receives more than 50 pieces of advertising mail each week from pharmaceutical companies.

That figure—"more than 50"—is the finding of a survey conducted by Ben Gaffin & Associates, Inc., of Chicago, for the American Medical Association.

Purpose of mailing: To attempt to get your doctor to write a certain trade name on his prescription blank when it comes time to order medication for his patient.

Estimated cost per mailing to each physician: 10 cents.

It all adds up when you remember that the manufacturers of ethical (prescription) drugs aim their promotion at more than 100,000 physicians.

The AMA survey infers that much of this type of advertising is money down the drain.

Reports the survey:

"Nearly two-thirds of all doctors say that half of this direct mail is for types of products that are as unrelated to their practice as eyewash is to the practice of an orthopedic surgeon."

Only 15 percent of the Nation's doctors read all of their advertising mail. Another 15 percent refuse to look at any of it.

One Long Beach physician became so enraged at the glut of mail that he wrote each major drug manufacturer asking to be taken off its mailing list.

Some of the direct mail, however, is helpful. Especially popular are Ciba's "Medical News" and Upjohn's "Scope Weekly." These are medical newspapers offering more up-to-date information than most medical journals; the journals have a time lag of weeks to months between acceptance of articles and publication.

Among other high-class publications mailed to doctors are "What's New?" (Abbott Laboratories), "Pictoclinic" (Ames Co.), "Review of Nutrition" (Borden Co.), "Rheumatology Reviews" (Geigy), "Image" (Hoffman-LaRoche), "Physician's Bulletin" (Lilly), "Diuretic Review" (Lakeside), "Seminar Reports" (Merck Sharp & Dohme), "Therapeutic Notes" (Parke, Davis), "Spectrum" (Pfizer), "Science Bulletin" (Schering), "World-Wide Abstracts" (Warner-Chilcott).

Despite the objections by many doctors to advertising mail, the drug industry believes that such advertising helps sales.

"We measure physician reaction in dollars and cents," says Thomas M. Rauch, vice president of the marketing division of Smith, Kline & French Laboratories. "For 15 years we have tested different types of campaigns to evaluate their effectiveness."

"For example," he says, "on one of our products we sent out four sample mailings in a year. Then we wondered what would happen if we doubled the number of mailings. Would this merely increase our advertising expenditures and have no effect on use? Or would the additional sample mailings transmit enough information to the physician to increase his prescribing of our product?"

Rauch's finding:

"We tried it and found we had a net increase in sales of 40 percent by the end of the fourth year."

The firm experimented further. Next it doubled the number of sample mailings. Finding: 16 samples produced no increased use over the 8-sample results.

Promotion of prescription drugs isn't limited only to company detail men, journal advertising and direct mail programs.

Some pharmaceutical firms give luncheons and cocktail parties at medical conventions. They set up elaborate display booths at the conventions. They pay a doctor's expenses to tour their plant. They purchase prizes for doctors' golf tournaments.

All these events seem to be free. But are they?

Dr. William B. Bean, of the University of Iowa Medical School, recently commented in the AMA Archives of Internal Medicine:

"These cocktail parties and lavish dinners are supported by increasing the cost our patients pay for drugs."

Some doctors think another unnecessary expense is that resulting from too many drugs—literally—on the market.

"A company will bring out a drug called Bigshow," one doctor complains, "and before you're detailed on it they'll alter a chemical bond in the drug and start promoting its chemical relative under a new trade name, like Reallybigshow. The whole thing is ridiculous."

Meanwhile, the drug industry points to the scientific closed-circuit television programs it sponsors, to the technical motion pictures it produces. These services have a definite educational value for the physician, the industry argues.

And what about the free drug samples it distributes? What about the research it sponsors? What, in short, would the doctors do without the drug houses?

But it's still the patient who takes the pill—and what a bitter one it is, what with

the drug industry spending much more on advertising than it does on medical research.

The answer: Perhaps another National Institute of Health—say a National Institute of Pharmaceuticals. Creation of another U.S. Public Health Service agency such as this might be the solution. The agency could regulate—to a degree—the manufacture of prescription drugs. For one thing, it could eliminate the multiplicity of drugs that now exists—a multiplicity that is proving costly to the patient.

There is no reason why regulation could not be achieved without endangering the profit potential of the individual drug manufacturer.

Other possible improvements: The corporate tax bite of drug company income could be reduced so the companies would not have to advertise at full tilt.

The consumer should be relieved of paying tax on "necessity" drugs.

It's had enough to have to take a pill. If only the pill could be sweetened somewhat.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Franklin Square Bulletin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of real achievement, it is my pleasure to insert the following in the Appendix of the Record:

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FRANKLIN SQUARE BULLETIN

In February 1940, when Jim O'Neill was 15 years old, he told his dad that Franklin Square, N.Y., was big enough for a newspaper of its own. John J. O'Neill, who had given over 20 years of work to the progress of Franklin Square, agreed, but with the provision that the merchants of the community must be consulted. A canvass of the town followed and the decision to found a local paper was made. Shortly thereafter, on March 14, 1940, the first issue of the Franklin Square Bulletin appeared and in these 20 years it has never missed an issue.

Jim O'Neill is a prominent Nassau County newspaperman, today. Mrs. Margaret O'Neill, wife of Publisher John J. O'Neill, in addition to serving as society editor, has contributed to the Franklin Square Bulletin each week a column dealing with the newly published books available at the local public library.

The Franklin Square Bulletin has held to its early decision never to print a word of sensational news or anything that might hurt or offend any person. It has remained independent in its views, although it supports the policies of the county and town administrations, in the operation of the largest and fastest growing communities in the Nation.

Last week's edition marked the start of the 21st year of publication. When it reached the newsstands a flood of congratulatory messages was received by Mr. O'Neill. They came from the many friends the Franklin Square Bulletin has made over these 20 years and I know the sender of each message feels as I do, that here is a fine little newspaper representing honesty and decency. I am very proud of it, proud of the O'Neills, and proud of Franklin Square, whose history has been recorded in the pages of the Bulletin. My congratulations to those who made this paper a reality and to the many people who have supported it.

What Loyalty Day Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. James A. Farley which appeared in the March issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine.

WHAT LOYALTY DAY MEANS TO ME

(By James A. Farley)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jim Farley, because of his integrity, ability, and abiding respect for American principles, has been described as the ideal public official. Born in Grassy Point, N.Y., in 1888, he began his political career at the grassroots bottom as town clerk. He is remembered politically for the decade, 1930-40, when he served as Postmaster General of the United States and, concurrently, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee (1932-40). Since 1940 he has been chairman of the board of the vast Coca Cola Export Corp.)

After more than 175 years as a nation, the newness and shine of this continent are still on it. But nowhere in the world is there a deeper feeling of one-with-country than in these United States of America.

What is it that makes 180 million people stand as a unit in loyal—and sometimes tear stained—salute? Not just the knowledge that giants like Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson have been the ancestors of our traditions—heroes who make you eager to be counted as a descendant, if not by blood at least by brotherhood and purpose. Not just the memory that several frightful wars and countless brave men have blended us together with the soil of our country. Not just the thought that famine and drought are minimal, that forests are filled, that nowhere in this wide country of ours must one man starve because another man cannot give him bread. Not just because the soil has been kind even when the elements have been mighty or terrible. It's because of all these things, and more, that our people are bound together in timeless loyalty.

Loyalty is not some special wonder that is added to a man. It is part of a man—if he is a man. Loyalty is no passive thing. It is day-by-day living, in brotherhood and industry, so that the country of our birth, the friends of our choice, the progeny of our blood may live in simple freedom.

America is a melting pot of many colors, many sizes, many shapes, many beliefs, but it is hard to find here an honorable man who is not one with his flag, however quietly.

It is seldom that we are asked to rise and be counted, but sometimes a declaration of feeling impresses even the declarer with his own message. That's why expressing what Loyalty Day means is a privilege, and one more opportunity for me in this land of endless chances.

To this country that has given me much, I can return many tangible things—but nothing that will count more than the loyalty I feel and, I hope, show. The forces that oppose us are loud and persistent. A low whisper or mental agreement is no answer to the relentless crusade of communism. We must actively support every project that brings us nearer to security of freedom in our time.

The men who are the stewards of government at every level must know they have

the cushion and support of citizens to accomplish their objectives for the citizens. They must know that we feel what they feel in their desire to keep this country free—and its people secure.

You can't feel loyalty until you know what you are loyal to—so it would seem to be a particular duty of every American to know what is happening around him, to participate at the local level in school, civic, and church programs, to voice his favor or dissent before things go beyond control to produce a generation of errors. And, out of this participation, grows a particular kind of loyalty that welds together—not only men to their country—but men to men in a true brotherhood that defies division.

Missile Age Demands on America's Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1960, Mr. Tom Killefer, executive director of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, delivered a speech which I think should be read by every Member of Congress. In his speech Mr. Killefer outlines several courses of action which could be taken by Government and industry to increase American exports and shipments on American-flag vessels.

These proposals have been very well received and extensively quoted in much of the maritime press.

The speech follows:

MISSILE AGE DEMANDS ON AMERICA'S MERCHANT MARINE

(By Tom Killefer, executive director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, before the Foreign Trade Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, March 15, 1960)

Tonight I should like you to consider for a moment two new rapidly developing problems in this foreign trade area, problems caused by the demands placed on us by the missile age. And then I should like to suggest at least the beginnings of a solution for them.

The first of these is the challenge of the new Soviet merchant marine, designed, as Premier Khrushchev put it, to "bury us" economically.

The second is the increasing tendency of American exports and imports to move in foreign ships, rather than by our own merchant fleet.

These problems are both economic and political. They are tied in with the whole bundle of our national policies; Buy American, foreign trade, aid to underdeveloped countries, and so on. We either face up to their challenge or we will end up a second-class power. And when you are competing with the Soviets, second is not good enough—this is no Winter Olympics—it is our struggle for survival.

The Russian leaders recognize that the Achilles heel of the West lies in the sea. They evaluate power problems of the next decade and realize, with greater clarity perhaps than our own Government has done to date, that the sea is the key to world power in the nuclear age, as it was in the day of Nelson.

According to the latest edition of "Jane's Fighting Ships," Russia is fashioning a combined merchant marine—Navy, capable of denying the United States and Great Britain control of the seas. "In particular," writes Editor Raymond Blackman, "the Soviet Union's 500 submarines represent a formidable threat to the allied control of the seas, and they could wreak havoc on the 25 million tons of American and 20 million tons of British shipping."

Already, as a seapower, the Soviet Union is second only to the United States, now having replaced Great Britain, our traditional guardian of the seas.

But, Russia's military might may not be the real threat. Maybe we can't see the sea for the seaweed. My point is that it is on the economic front where the war for survival rages—and right now. A recent merchant marine study headed by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, concludes that "the most serious threat during the next 15 years is expected to be the political-economic war in which the military services are not directly involved." The report goes on to urge that we have a strong U.S. controlled merchant marine "as a means of exerting positive economic pressure against the Sino-Soviet bloc."

Here are some reasons why:

The Soviet merchant marine has shown steady and impressive growth in recent months. It now amounts to about 800 merchant ships. By the end of this year, 1960, the combined Communist bloc fleets will probably total over 6 million deadweight tons, of which over 4 million tons will be under the Soviet flag; another million tons under satellite flags, mostly Polish, and the rest under the flag of Communist China. If the experts are right, the Communist bloc merchant fleet will more than triple in size in the next decade or so.

The numbers of Soviet ships trading with Central and South America, Southeast Asia, north Africa and the Middle East are increasing. The Russians have delivered merchant ships to underdeveloped areas and provided the crews to man them. Their Merchant Marine Minister Viktor Bakaev said a few weeks ago that Red-flag merchant vessels in 1958 had hauled cargo to more than 60 countries, touching as many as 500 foreign ports.

The U.S.S.R. has already entered into 36 trade agreements, the most recent a vast trade pact with Prime Minister Fidel Castro, making the Soviet Union Cuba's second largest customer behind the United States. This assures Russia of a firm foothold in the critical Caribbean area from which it may be able to extend its penetration into the rest of Latin America.

The ship-led economic offensive can produce circumstances under which the Sino-Soviet bloc would seriously disrupt ocean commerce in selected areas. By concentrating shipping on a few trade routes, the Communists could haul free world cargo at less than compensatory rates and drive out their Western competitors.

How can the United States meet this economic attack?

We can do it best through a fast, front-line American merchant marine. The members of our committee are meeting the challenge head on. In the next decade or so these companies will replace nearly 300 World War II built ships, at a cost of \$4.6 billion. Already four new passenger ships representing a \$100 million investment are in the Caribbean and South American service and 41 freighters have been launched or contracted for under the program. These ships are the last word in marine design, in fast and efficient cargo handling, in safety and navigational aids. New technological advances are being incorporated as soon as

they become tested and commercially feasible.

The 14 privately-owned lines of our committee operate under Government contracts obligating them to give regular and frequent worldwide service on essential trade routes. They are required to man with American crews, buy American supplies, repair and replace their ships in American shipyards. In return, the Government agrees to make up the difference on certain items of operating cost, mainly wages—the differential between cost of wages paid to American seamen and those paid to crews on ships of our foreign competitors.

This operating subsidy puts us on a parity with the foreigner as to these costs, but it does not guarantee a profit. It is no substitute for cargo. American ships, like their foreign competitors, must move freight and passengers to live, and this brings me to the second problem we face.

Our exporters and importers generally, are interested first in buying and selling, and only second in the nationality of vessels moving their goods. So long as U.S. products are sold abroad in volume, and the level of foreign goods imported into the United States remains high, at reasonable freight rates and compensatory prices, to the freight agent and to the manufacturer, business is good. Our businessmen have no compulsion or suggestion or Government pressure placed on them to designate vessels of American registry. If the foreign buyer or consignee specifies a foreign-flag line to move our goods, why shouldn't the American seller comply with the request? And he does. And the goods move abroad on foreign ships. Similarly, when we buy goods abroad, the foreign seller traditionally selected the ocean carrier—and traditionally it is a foreign carrier. There may even be pressure, direct or indirect, brought on the foreign seller to designate ships of his own nationality. And these ships may be controlled by his government, in lesser or greater degree.

The net result is patent. Whether the goods move in the export or in the import trade, although American and foreign freight rates are generally the same, there is a strong tendency for cargoes to move on foreign vessels. This is true historically and it continues to be true today, to the substantial detriment of American lines.

Operating subsidy does not touch this problem. It is no answer to the American shipowner that his higher wage costs are equated with those of his foreign competitor. He must have cargoes to survive.

Somehow this pattern must be broken away from our foreign trade. In some way the American freight agent must be helped to increase his control over the routing of traffic and to move an adequate share over American-flag lines, or the American merchant marine will continue to dwindle in size and importance on the international scene.

The problem is acute and it is urgent. In 1958 American-flag ships carried 14 percent of our oceanborne foreign commerce, and this dropped during 1959 to less than 11 percent. This compares to 28 percent in 1936 when the Merchant Marine Act, the charter of our modern shipping programs, was enacted.

The objectives of the act were and are to develop and maintain a merchant marine owned and operated by American citizens, with American crews, adequate to carry a substantial portion of our waterborne foreign commerce and to be available for the national defense. We should be lifting, at minimum, 50 percent of our foreign commerce, a figure consistent with Government policy.

How are we to carry out these objectives and policies, in the face of this adverse trend in our foreign commerce and the economic threat of the Soviet merchant navy? Before

suggesting a solution, let me touch on one more facet of the same situation.

The balance-of-payments problem for several months has been preoccupying the minds of Americans interested in foreign trade. The President of the United States in his recent state of the Union message expressed concern over what he terms, "the strain on our international balance of payments."

So much prominence has been given to this factor in our foreign trade and defense policy that it deserves an appraisal in relation to our merchant marine.

In 1959 American-flag vessels either earned or avoided disbursement in foreign exchange balances of, roughly, \$1 billion.

Putting it in simple terms, this means that if there had been no American merchant marine last year, the balance of payments deficit would have been about \$5 billion, instead of \$4 billion. This \$1 billion amount is a significant contribution to our intangible national exports, one that can become of increasing importance and impact over the coming years. It could be a real help to us in avoiding an acutely unfavorable balance of trade that might result in devaluation of the dollar.

Two beneficial moves we can make, among others, to knock out the sizeable deficit in our total foreign payments, are to expand our exports, and to increase the proportion of our export-import traffic moving on American ships. The more American shippers specify that their export and import cargoes and passengers go American, the more the deficit will be reduced.

This brings us back to the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act. What can be done to increase carryings on American-flag ships and assure them of a "substantial portion of our foreign commerce"?

The solution lies in a section of the law that, curiously enough, has never been acted upon by the Maritime Administration. It is explicit enough to permit the Maritime Administrator to take key steps to reverse the trend of foreign-flag preference and help bring more cargoes to American ships.

Section 212 of the act authorizes and directs the Administrator "to study and to cooperate with owners in devising means by which the importers and exporters of the United States can be induced to give preference to vessels under U.S. registry." It also directs the Administrator to maintain "liaison with such other boards, commissions, independent establishments and departments of the U.S. Government, and with such representative trade organizations concerned with any movement of commodities in the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, for the purpose of securing preference to vessels of U.S. registry in the shipment of such commodities."

Here is a crystal-clear mandate to act so as to resolve the problems we have outlined tonight. Yet this law has never received any attention. No action, no study, no liaison with Government agencies or trade organizations.

Congress clearly foresaw the problem and provided the machinery for its solution. Now is the time for the Maritime Administrator to carry out the mandate, to set up machinery by which exporters and importers can be approached and urged to use American ships in the carriage of their cargoes and passengers. It is in the national interest that that activity be increased in this area, and that the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Administration, and other interested Government agencies promptly undertake the necessary planning and programing, to be followed up by specific action, as originally contemplated by Congress.

A current national theme is "Buy American." Let's have another theme, "Ship American" or "Go American."

Once we can impress upon our citizens the importance, and the national interest involved, in asking that their goods and passengers travel by American ship, we will be well on our way to what our foreign competitors have been achieving all along—the carriage of a substantial portion of our own foreign commerce in our own ships.

We must have a modern American-flag fleet in peacetime, to maintain reliable access to our foreign markets—and to needed sources of raw materials.

The United States cannot expect foreign maritime nations to provide American shippers, in an economic crisis, with the same reliable service they give their own nationals—particularly if those nations covet the same customers also served by our shippers. So long as America retains an effective fleet of its own it can stave off discriminatory practices. Without such a fleet we would be at the mercy of foreign maritime powers. They would not hesitate to use their fleets to further their own world trade aspirations, and ultimately send our freight rates soaring.

Today, more than ever, our merchant shipping is an essential instrument of national policy. It serves the entire country, inland as well as coastal, by moving oceanborne goods that strengthen our domestic economy. It forges ties of trade that bind us economically and politically to the free world nations. And it is ready to move and supply fighting national defense forces if need be.

The words still ring true today, as they did in another age of desperate world struggle: "He who would be secure at home must be supreme at sea."

Action Voted March 17, 1960, by the Simpson College (Iowa) Faculty Concerning the National Defense Student Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a report on action taken by the faculty of Simpson College at Indianola, Iowa, urging Congress to delete the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act:

ACTION VOTED MARCH 17, 1960, BY THE SIMPSON COLLEGE FACULTY CONCERNING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN FUND

For significant reasons that have been frequently enunciated, the faculty of Simpson College hereby formally registers its official concern about and opposition to the affidavit required of all students who qualify to secure national defense loans for educational purposes. We are deeply opposed to the affidavit as contrary to the American spirit and the spirit of research and learning as well as because it is discriminatory. At the same time, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the exceedingly valuable action of the Federal Government in making such useful loans available to students in order to foster the indispensable values of expensive and intensive higher education for the young people of our Nation.

While encouraging the elimination of the affidavit, we want at the same time to indicate our strong support of the national de-

fense student loan program and our desire at this time to continue to participate in it in order that scores of needy and often promising students and the Nation as a whole may secure the benefits of this far-sighted loan program. We continue for the present in the loan program because we think that each individual student is entitled to make his own decision concerning his personal participation.

It is nevertheless our strong hope that the Members of this Congress will support the deletion of the affidavit requirement.

The Scandal of Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Reader's Digest for April.

I am afraid that the article is quite factual as its author, Mr. Kenneth O. Gilmore, spent over a year studying the problem and uncovering the mess.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of thing is an outrage against our law-abiding, honest, taxpaying citizens. The situation will grow worse instead of better unless strong measures are adopted to plug up the many loopholes that make these abuses possible.

The article follows:

THE SCANDAL OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(By Kenneth O. Gilmore)

In July 1957 a 65-year-old man bade a last farewell to colleagues at an industrial plant in Pittsburgh. His long career completed, he looked forward to a leisurely retirement, well-fixed with a monthly \$188 pension from his company, an \$1,800-a-year slice of a deferred profit-sharing plan, plus his regular social security pension checks. Yet immediately he registered as a job seeker at the local U.S. unemployment office, knowing full well that nothing would be available to him as long as younger men were seeking work in his specialty.

During the next 7 months this man picked up \$35 every week without doing a lick of work. Then, after a wait, he automatically qualified for another effortless \$33 a week for 30 more weeks. It added up to over \$2,000, all tax free, and all in addition to his regular retirement income.

This is not an isolated case. Despite crude attempts of Federal authorities to cover up and conceal, the fact cannot be hidden that today our unemployment-compensation apparatus is in horrible disrepair. The solid planks on which it was built years ago have been so warped by the pressures of our growing welfare bureaucracy that hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted on loafers, quitters, honeymooners, schemers, parasites and a host of others for whom it was never intended.

When Congress enacted social security legislation 25 years ago, requiring every State to set up basic unemployment compensation laws, the objectives were straightforward and simple. To qualify, unemployed workers had to be "ready, willing, and able to work." Benefits were to go to legitimate wage earners who had clearly lost jobs

through no fault of their own, to tide them over until they could find employment.

The collapse of these standards is shocking. All types of freeloaders have joined the unemployment-aid roster:

In Wisconsin, a mine-hoist operator demanded sick leave for arthritis, only to go touring country fairs as a sulky-driver in harness races. Eight weeks later, when he showed up for work, he was fired for misconduct. At that point he applied for benefits, and it was finally ruled that his behavior should not prevent him from receiving compensation.

There's the girl who worked in a musical comedy in New York for about a year, then took a vacation in Miami. She stayed on as a nightclub dancer at \$100 a week for 6 weeks. When the show headed for Las Vegas, she quit and went back to New York. Her homecoming was sweetened with jobless aid.

After classes let out for the summer vacation, a Georgia schoolteacher who was paid by the year collected unemployment in North Carolina. He claimed that his monthly school checks were for work he had done in the school term.

In Hollywood, a 12-year-old child actor spurned parts as an extra paying up to \$28 a day, yet was declared eligible for unemployment benefits. Why? The youngster was accustomed to speaking roles at \$100 to \$150 a day, so lesser parts were beneath him.

These are recent, documented cases, summarized in bulletin form at the U.S. Department of Labor and distributed by the hundreds to keep State unemployment officials abreast of legal precedents. In every one of them, benefits were granted even though all the facts cited here were brought to the attention of authorities. They epitomize an untold number of instances in which unemployment protection has been stretched beyond belief.

The result is a multibillion-dollar colossus that continues to expand in all directions. Of the \$23 billion in jobless pay handed out during the past two decades, nearly half has been eaten up in just the last 5 years. In 1959 1 out of every 12 members of our civilian labor force collected an unemployment check.

Set up as a Federal-State insurance system, unemployment compensation has long been dominated by Federal officials bent on building up a Washington-run welfare apparatus. Along with their continual efforts to cut down the authority of the States, they have waged a relentless campaign—with bulletins, speeches, memorandums, letters, and a flood of statistics and literature—for larger, longer, and laxer benefit payments.

Under this pressure, benefit protection for four of every five workers has been boosted over 200 percent since the system began. In Connecticut, claimants can collect as much as \$1,742 over a half year; in California, \$1,430. People have been able to draw compensation for 40 or more weeks in 21 States, beyond 50 weeks in 7 States.

The money for all this comes directly from the 2 million employers who are taxed by each State according to the size of their payrolls. However, they must send in additional millions of dollars to the Federal Government, where it is appropriated to the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security (BES), a Federal supervisory agency within the Department of Labor. The BES then channels cash back to the States for their administrative expenses, retaining an average \$6 million a year for its own expenses. That's not the half of it, however. Every cent collected from employers may be impounded in Washington if States do not bow before BES and Federal rule, and employers may be penalized with a Federal tax that is 10 times greater.

Says Dr. Edison L. Bowers, professor of economics at Ohio State University and chairman of Ohio's Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation, "We have been gradually approaching a complete Federal system by the back door—a system in which the State legislatures and the State administrators relinquish their rights and responsibilities in return for administrative funds."

In Pennsylvania, where many of the favorite BES concepts have been faithfully followed, legal problems have created an appalling mess. The official record there shows that workers who had retired on pensions were showered with \$20 million in unemployment payments during a 3-year period; and further, that in 4 years more than \$45 million had been squandered on persons who voluntarily quit work or were fired for misconduct. On top of that, a recent investigation by the State chamber of commerce revealed that in one 3-month period some \$2 million was given to students, pregnant women, retired and seasonal workers, and numerous borderline wage-earners.

In one city, for instance, 85 women, mostly housewives, work 8 months of the year at a factory that makes chocolate bunnies, chicks and eggs for the Easter season. In the spring the plant closes down for the summer. Since no other factories in the area have openings, these women can collect as much as 30 weeks' compensation. Many of them have accumulated enough wages to draw the maximum benefits. Result: a 4-month paid vacation.

One of the worst abuses in Pennsylvania is a scheme of benefit distribution whereby certain claimants can collect for two 30-week periods without lifting a finger in between. They draw the double bonus because of a loophole they have discovered in an extremely technical provision of the State law. Significantly, the chamber of commerce study disclosed that one-half of all benefits paid to these "double-dippers" goes to retired workers. Yet efforts to halt this practice have failed, and little headway has been made toward a cleanup.

Employers can contest benefit claims which they consider unjustified, but they have fared badly before administrative tribunals in Pennsylvania. In a recent 12-month period more than two-thirds of their appeals to referees and the board of review were turned down. Consider the case of an inspector in a plant handling defense work. Because he failed to check the measurements on an important machine, \$2,000 worth of material had to be scrapped. He was fired. Nevertheless, benefits were granted by a board of review even though the record showed that the inspector had been issued previous warnings by the company because of his carelessness.

Pennsylvania's unemployment finances are in a shambles. Last April it had to borrow \$96 million from Washington to keep from nose-diving into the red. In addition to that, it lapped up over \$80 million from a gigantic recession fund created by Congress in 1958. For 6 months every person on the rolls who had run through all his compensation hauled in an additional 15 weeks of benefits.

Contrast this situation with that in Ohio, a large industrial state like Pennsylvania. Last fall Ohio's unemployment fund stood at a solid \$407 million, without any loans from Washington. Nevertheless, Ohio's Bureau of Unemployment Compensation has been sharply criticized by the BES. Why? One complaint: Ohio should purge from its list a section which barred benefits to persons sent to jail or discharged from jobs for misconduct or dishonesty. Let 35 days roll by, said the BES, and then permit the dishonest person to collect aid. It reasoned that the average unemployed man in Ohio located a job in 5 weeks; therefore, why not grant

compensation to the jobless crook after that much time had elapsed? Somehow, by then his dishonesty would have no relation to his unemployment.

Such is the incredible logic of the BES giveaway experts whose welfare philosophy has been thrust on other States besides Ohio. The Bureau has urged every State to limit to a mere 6 weeks' disqualifications for all cases of voluntary leaving, discharge for misconduct, and refusal of suitable work. So, in New York a secretary quit her job for no reason, waited out 42 days of disqualification, and then climbed on the unemployment bandwagon.

In just this way millions of dollars are slipping out to persons who sit out short penalty periods, then rake in benefits. Indeed, BES-promoted laxity has become so flagrant that only 18 States now bother to impose heavier disqualifications for aggravated misconduct such as forgery, larceny, embezzlement, arson, intoxication, sabotage, or dishonesty.

Alfred L. Green, executive director of New York's division of employment, has pointed out that this situation is "typified by the case of the man who received unemployment benefits after he was fired for stealing \$25,000 from his employer. Under penal law that's larceny. Under the unemployment insurance law it is misconduct in connection with his employment, and benefits are paid after a suspension period. When the employer was notified that the benefits had been charged to his account, he was, to put it mildly, irritated."

The BES hacks away at restrictions set up by States to prevent compensation from becoming an outright grab bag. It has notified all States that it is "unnecessary as well as undesirable" to have legislative provisions which exclude women from jobless aid because of pregnancy or marriage obligations. The result? In Rhode Island a woman clerk married a man from Mississippi and quit her job to live in the South. When she claimed unemployment compensation, her employer objected—but an administrative ruling declared that it is a woman's duty "to live where her husband designates." For that reason she got unemployment benefits.

In New York Mrs. Sheila Shaw drew 9 weeks of unemployment compensation after she quit her \$45-a-week clerk-typist job to become a bride. Her employer appealed. When the case finally reached the State supreme court appellate division, the employer was turned down. The court put marriage in the same class "as an illness or other event of important personal consequence to the worker."

Snapped Albany's Knickerbocker News: "If employers are going to pay for honeymoons, they should do it outright—not with under-the-counter payoffs through the unemployment insurance fund."

BES has also notified States to write their laws "in broad terms with no specific requirement that claimants be actively seeking work." As a result, workers all too often just register at the local employment office and relax while paid specialists do their job hunting for them.

In scores of labor disputes strikers collect benefits completely contrary to the original intent of the law. In New York last fall, 25,000 striking steelworkers pocketed \$9 million in benefits because compensation is allowed in that State after a strike lasts 7 weeks. "It's outrageous for an employer to have to finance a strike against himself," says John A. Williams, chairman of the New York State Conference on Unemployment Insurance. "It makes a mockery of the fundamental principle that States should not take sides in disputes between employers and employees."

In defense of this practice, New York's chief compensation administrator counters that after 7 weeks a striker's reserves are likely to be exhausted and "since today we don't let people starve, the government is going to provide funds" in either "unemployment insurance or relief."

Is it reasonable to believe that New York steel strikers would have starved after 7 weeks without compensation? Did they starve in other States? The United Steelworkers of America has (or did have before the strike) a huge unemployment fund. Other national unions chipped in to help the steelworkers take care of its own. The millions in unemployment compensation money handed out to the New York steel strikers was in addition to funds received from their own unions.

While all the rackets mentioned thus far have beaten the system within the law, unemployment assistance is also plagued by illegal abuses. In the last three recorded years 170,000 cases of fraud were officially reported. Yet BES statistics show only 32,000 prosecutions and 25,000 convictions. The officially admitted take by gypsies: more than \$12 million.

States have a variety of methods for cross-checking the validity of claims, some better than others. But in thousands of cases benefits are granted solely on the word of the applicant. How much fraud thus slips by is not known, despite the millions of dollars BES has spent financing 30,000 detailed investigations of claimants in 41 States. BES simply refuses to disclose the total amount of fraud found in any one of these States.

Now the situation threatens to grow worse. Legislation before Congress would put the States completely under the thumb of BES by imposing mandatory Federal benefit rates in all States to run 9 months for anyone who qualifies for jobless aid. Big unions are already beating the drum for this Federal takeover of jobless assistance.

Even more disturbing, a majority of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, a group of citizen consultants handpicked by BES and the Labor Department, has called for Federal benefit requirements.

Not only must this not happen, but Federal invasion of State unemployment compensation must cease. "It seems inevitable that, if present trends continue, the States will be reduced to the status of rubber stamps or the system will break down of its own complexity," warns William Papier, director of research and statistics at Ohio's Bureau of Unemployment Compensation.

No one questions that jobless assistance is a necessary and important program for the protection of legitimate workers made idle by conditions beyond their control. But it's time for unemployment compensation abuses to be cleaned up.

What can you as a citizen do about this? Here are suggestions:

If you know of any cheaters, report the facts to employment officials or to your local newspaper.

Find out if your State law needs to be tightened to prevent what you consider unjustified payments. If you decide that something should be done, communicate with your legislator. Write your governor. Get your neighbors interested.

Find out if your Congressman intends to support national legislation that would turn over unemployment compensation entirely to the Federal Government.

Most important, take a personal stand against the insidious "get it if you can" philosophy that keeps abuses alive. Just because it's technically legal to dip into the public till, don't let yourself be persuaded that it's the right thing to do.

This last is the real test. For America's moral fiber will be fatally weakened unless we as responsible citizens take action ourselves. We cannot afford to become a nation of loafers, system beaters, and dole grabbers.

Nuclear Sub "Sculpin" Launched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a milestone in the history of shipbuilding on the Gulf of Mexico was passed at 11:45 this morning when the *Sculpin* slid down the ways of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. shipyard in the bustling city of Pascagoula, Miss.

The *Sculpin*, SS(N)-590, the second submarine of any type ever built on the gulf coast, is the first of four nuclear-powered attack-type boats being built in my hometown for the U.S. Navy, and I hail its launching with, I hope, pardonable pride.

The "590" is of the *Scamp* 588 class. Its design follows the prototype of the radically new attack submarines, the *Skipjack*, SS(N)-585, whose bullet-nosed bow, bulbous-shaped hull, and single propeller, driven by a nuclear powerplant, have won for her the title of the fastest submarine in the world. The primary mission of the attack submarines in the event of war will be to seek out and destroy enemy ships of all types.

The *Sculpin* is expected to be capable of performing at high speeds both on the surface and at great depths beneath the sea. It is designed to stay submerged for long periods of time, thus giving her great advantage in both offense and defense over the conventional type submarine. Incidentally, the last of the old fleet type submarines, the *Blueback*, was also built by Ingalls and was recently commissioned, with Lt. Comdr. Robert H. Gautier, a native of Pascagoula, as its skipper.

The christening of the *Sculpin* is the culmination of 4 years of planning, research, and training by the personnel of the very efficient Ingalls shipyard. It is also a token of the faith of the people of Jackson County, Miss., in spending several millions of dollars in the development of the Pascagoula Harbor, an effort in which the Federal Government last year joined.

Speakers at the launching ceremonies were Hon. Cecil P. Milne, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Material, and Rear Adm. M. J. Lawrence, U.S. Navy, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Field Activities.

Others participating in the colorful ceremonies were Messrs. Robert I. Ingalls, Jr., chairman of the board of Ingalls; Monro B. Lanier, Ingalls, vice chairman of the board; Fred J. Mayo, president of Ingalls; and Capt. R. W. Johnson, U.S. Navy, supervisor of shipbuilding at Pascagoula.

The ship was christened by Mrs. Fred Connaway, widow of the commander of the first *Sculpin* when it was lost on its ninth war patrol in the Pacific on November 19, 1943. Mrs. Connaway's daughter, Mrs. Joseph D. Pope, was her matron of honor.

Increased Productivity in Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to a most interesting study of productivity in the Federal Government by Henry D. Lytton.

Mr. Lytton served in the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Second Hoover Commission. He has undertaken a study which is a pioneer first in this field and it seemed to me his work should be brought to the attention of the Congress. We are always assailed with the undocumented but tacit assumption that our Government is inefficient. Well here is someone who has really done some research on the subject and he comes up with just the opposite conclusion. He maintains that there is definite proof of rising productivity per man-hour in the Government agencies he studied.

According to Mr. Lytton's report covering the productivity of more than one-half the employment in the nondefense agencies of the Federal Government for the period, 1947-57, output per man-hour increased at an average annual rate of 2.2 percent. Mr. Lytton claims that his studies show annual productivity increases varied from 15.5 percent for the Veterans' Insurance Division to 1.2 percent for the Post Office Department. Increasing productivity in Government agencies means that paperwork is being processed more efficiently. However, much of the improved productivity can be attributed to large outlays on capital equipment—electronic computers and other types of improved office equipment. The increased productivity in Government agencies is, nevertheless, encouraging. We should not lose sight of the possibility that improved productivity in Government can hold down budgets and their burden on taxpayers.

The productivity trends traced in this report might have important implications for business and the U.S. economy as a whole. It is apparent from the experience of the past that productivity increases require substantial capital expenditures, whether by farmers, industry or government. Experience in recent years indicates that capital expenditures must rise steadily if gains in productivity are to be accomplished.

Some of our thinking about inflation, too, may be altered as a result of addi-

tions to our knowledge on productivity. Mr. Lytton's study of productivity in government indicates that there has been more real work accomplished by Government employees and less inflation in the cost of public services than previously supposed.

Government services—such as mail delivery—are an important part of the gross national product. It has been thought that salary increases granted to Government employees were not offset by increased output, but merely represented higher costs for the same amount of services. Lytton's work, however, suggests that recent salary increases in Government have been partially offset by productivity gains.

This is a particularly timely study for me when as a member of the House Post Office Committee I am required to determine much needed postal wage increases.

Experts tell me that pioneering work in any field should always be studied with care and caution. But great credit is due to Mr. Lytton for his splendid work and we may hope for further development of specific data and corroboration by others of his findings.

Therefore I ask to have printed a review of Mr. Lytton's work from the Harvard University "Review of Economics and Statistics" and a summary of his report:

[From Review of Economics and Statistics]
GOVERNMENT PRODUCTIVITY FOUND TO RISE FROM YEAR TO YEAR, AS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY—2 PERCENT NORMAL GROWTH RATE SEEN

In what is believed to be the first analysis ever made of Federal employee productivity rates, a consultant, writing in the November issue of the authoritative quarterly Review of Economics and Statistics, edited by Seymour E. Harris for Harvard University, reports that average productivity—or efficiency of the typical American civil servant increased approximately one-sixth over the dozen years ending with the 1958 business recession. Leaving out 1958, the increase was nearly 20 percent. The author of the Review article, Henry D. Lytton, economic and management analyst of Washington, D.C., takes issue with prevailing concepts of productivity measurement and the estimation of America's total economic growth.

Private industry's output and productivity have always been estimated by starting with a dollar value and then dividing by a cost index to arrive at nonmoney terms. This may have given rise to the prevalent idea that a dollar sign always has to be placed on global output (production) figures. Mr. Lytton's analysis avoids the problem of price-tagging the work of Government employees, and expresses the total output of entire bureaus by means of a production index. When the production index is divided by an employment index for that same bureau, a productivity, or output per person, index is the result. But both indexes in this case based on the fiscal year 1947, output rose 29½ percent and employment rose 8½ percent by the 11th year. This automatically means a 19½ percent increase in productivity for the period.

Previous economic analyses have started with the implicit need to arrive at a money value for Government work; and the knowledge that Federal, State, and local civil servants and the uniformed military and protective forces cost the American taxpayer about \$40½ billion a year. Being unable to discover any way to price this work at a figure other than the same \$40½ billion,

economists traditionally have canceled out the two figures and settled for no increase in productivity at all over the years. Thus, as one economist writes: " . . . it is assumed that there is no change in the efficiency or output per man, so that all increases in salary are, in effect, increases in the price of Government gross product."

To Mr. Lytton, who spent considerable time recently measuring the efficiency trends of 11 categories of workers, numbering into the thousands, in one Federal bureau, this was unrealistic. As a test, he expanded his study to include as many as 793,000 officials and employees. With this sample constituting two-thirds of all domestic nondefense agency employees of the Federal Government, Mr. Lytton obtained results believed sufficient to refute the popular impression.

To estimate the global outputs of the agencies and bureaus involved, the analyst counted the number of times that 52 different kinds of operations were performed, or end products produced, in two agencies and one bureau during each of the years. Then he "weighted" the various production totals by their relative working time requirements, average cost, or other simple measure. Two bureaus themselves performed this weighting process for 87 other items, making 139 items tallied altogether. Total production was obtained by simple addition, and overall governmentwide output, by weighting and averaging the five agency and bureau production indexes. These data, together with the manpower data already available, gave the productivity indexes for the parts as well as the whole.

Among the places studied were the Post Office Department and Veterans' Administration, the Internal Revenue Bureau (collecting taxes) in the Treasury Department, the Social Security Administration (paying benefits) in the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Commodity Stabilization Service (farm benefits) in the Department of Agriculture. The VA was also studied separately as to hospital, insurance, and general benefits (GI loan, GI training, compensation and pension) operations.

Mr. Lytton finds that efficiency in his sample agencies advanced at a rate of about 2.2 percent per year, compounded annually, during the 11 years prior to the 1958 recession, while the private economy rate of productivity growth was 3.1 percent in the same time. Making estimates as to the possible productivity advance of all the 11-million-strong government manpower, Mr. Lytton concludes that our national output growth year after year may be from 3 to 4½ percent greater than we have heretofore believed.

GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY AND ITS MEASUREMENT: A PROBLEM FOR THE ECONOMIST, THE MANAGEMENT MAN, AND THE PUBLIC

(By Henry D. Lytton)

(Henry D. Lytton, economic and management consultant of Washington, D.C., is the author of a report on this subject in the Review of Economics and Statistics. He has been on the Econometric Institute and Hoover Commission staffs, advised industry and Government on markets, operations, and development programs, and recently served as deputy supervision chief for a bureau with 25,000 field employees.)

In 1900, one out of every 24 employed persons in the United States worked for the Federal Government, or for a State, county, municipal, or other local government. Recently the ratio was one out of every six, and it is still growing. Yet little is known about how these government staffs operate. Consequently, in making up the "national accounts" of the United States, "It is assumed that there is no change in the efficiency or output per man, so that all increases in salary are, in effect, increases in the price of Government gross product," to

quote Professor and Mrs. Richard Ruggles' 1958 study paper for the Joint Economic Committee.

If the population's participation in government is growing, so is the government budget problem. In the United States, the Federal Government's operating funds are obtained each year through Congress voting appropriations bills. According to Prof. Arthur Smithies, in his Budgetary Process in the United States, "the appropriations process serves the dual purpose of reviewing the past and of programming for the future, and is . . . satisfactory in neither respect." To remedy this, Professor Smithies would divide the process into two parts: a performance review, to "focus attention on economy and efficiency," and a program review, "related to policy objectives."

The actual trend of efficiency, or "productivity," of the governmental part of the economy of either a developed or underdeveloped nation is, therefore, becoming more and more important for society to know. It is also the first in a series of questions one must answer in trying to discover how wisely a nation's tax receipts are being spent, and how efficiently the funds for governmental salaries are being put to use. What the problems provoked by these matters (and their possible solutions) might be will be discussed below. The writer will first give the results of an exploratory study he made of the recent trends of "productivity" in this field. For "productivity," the simplest definition—production per capita (or output per man)—was used in this study.

It was decided to investigate what might have been done in the past on government productivity trends. In the United States, a basic analysis of the Post Office's productivity trend had been made by Dr. Witt Bowden of the Department of Labor, in 1932. Many more recent "work-measurement" systems were found, in various other agencies, comparing the aggregate production of groups of workers with their standard-performance rates—but they used no "common language." No other information on year-by-year trends reflecting the productivity of the combined personnel of any other agency, or indeed of any bureau within any other agency, was discovered, except for almost complete data for parts of two smaller bureaus over most of the post-World War II period.

The writer then saw that he could complete the latter data, modernize the Post Office study, and perhaps add other bureaus and agencies to this nucleus. There are altogether some 11 million persons in governmental work—including uniformed defense forces and civilians in the Defense Department. Of this total about half are in Federal and about half in State and local work. However, the nonmilitary Federal area would be a good enough subject for this first study. In the end, the writer succeeded in getting data on five agencies in this field which employed 793,000 persons within the continental United States in 1958. This was a two-thirds sample of the 1,183,000 total of employment by all Federal civilian agencies in the same territory and year.

This sample included all 539,000 Post Office Department personnel, all 171,000 Veterans' Administration employees, 51,000 of the 75,000-man Treasury Department staff (representing the tax-collection bureau), 24,000 of the 54,000 Health, Education, and Welfare Department workers (in the social security bureaus), and 7,500 (farm-benefits bureau) members of the 91,500-strong Agriculture Department staff.

After exhaustive investigations, the writer found this: The productivity of the average Government agency in this sample increased on the average about 1½ percent a year for the 11 fiscal years from 1947 to 1958. The variations from agency to agency (and within agencies) reflected differences in the nature, complexion, and novelty of the work

done, degree of mechanization, etc. (See table 1.) On account of the 1958 American recession, the average annual productivity increase was 1.8 percent for the first 10 fiscal years. (See table 2.) If veterans hospitals are omitted, the rest of the sample becomes more similar to private industry. The productivity gain of the rest of the sample was 2.15 percent for the first 10 fiscal years, while that for the entire private economy (using figures by Dr. John W. Kendrick, of the National Bureau of Economic Research) was 3.1 percent for the same 10 calendar years. Government productivity appears to have risen two-thirds as fast as its private economy counterpart:

On the other hand, the investigation of veterans hospital productivity had led to the study of American hospital and medical care as a whole. All comments and findings by authorities suggested that fields such as these often may show no gain—or even show losses—in productivity trends (considered as trends in quantity of work per capita), but without doubt often would show very large improvements in quality, or value of service given, if the latter could be measured on some numerical scale.

The method followed was essentially this: To find out the few major things done in each agency or bureau which were recognized as important enough to be recorded down through the years (there were 17 such in the postal service), and express them in terms of the single most important of those things (the delivery of a parcel equals the delivery of six letters, for example). Then to divide the equalized work done (so many letters or equivalent letters, for example) each year by the number of employees on the payroll that year. The resulting number of equivalent items per man gives the productivity level for the year, from which the productivity change from year to year can be calculated.

It is now seen that we must qualify any answer to the question: "What is the trend of governmental productivity?" If, by "government," we mean that part which is like most services and paperwork operations in the private economy, then the answer is: "Upward, and apparently similar to that of its commercial counterpart." If however, by "government," we mean public hospitals and other quality endeavors (education, research, defense, possibly foreign relations), the answer would be: "Negligible or downward, and apparently similar to whatever are its private-enterprise counterparts." (Prof. Werner Z. Hirsch reported a negligible public-education productivity trend in his 1959 study paper for the Joint Economic Committee.) Also, the quality trend in these cases would also have to be made a part of the answer.

Such productivity-trend studies should be made for every major Federal agency, bureau, and bureau activity, and similarly for all levels of State and local government, so that economists, managers, and the public could be informed.

To attack a second, broader question, "How wisely are tax receipts being spent?" one should note that the Federal cash budget expenditures (incorporating insurance-fund withdrawals and postal salaries—usually excluded) are now about \$99 billion a year; and that while \$22 billion of this is for salaries, an even bigger sum of \$77 billion is for programs. The latter carry out a nation's policy objectives, and are administered by the recipients of the farmer. Perhaps a new approach is now possible to the astronomical program costs—the costs of armaments, supplies, goods, and services; of grants and subsidies to agriculture, veterans, welfare, etc.; and of transfers of money from social security and other funds to social security and other beneficiaries.

Why not divide up the program costs in the same patterns followed in dividing up

agency work into bureau work, and bureau work into activities work (for matching against employee numbers) in the productivity-analysis process? (It was not mentioned before, but the veterans agency was divided into hospital-bureau, pension-bureau, and life insurance-bureau work; and each of the latter can be further divided into up-to-a-dozen activities of work. The same thing has been done by the two smaller bureaus in the study assembling their own productivity data; and can provisionally be done for the main activities within the postal service and tax collection bureau, as well.) The separate productivity trends and salary costs of each activity, as well as of each bureau and agency, can presumably be measured throughout the Government. This would make available, for each activity, bureau, and agency: (a) its program costs, (b) its salary costs, and (c) its productivity trend. With an eye on all three of these things one should then be able intelligently to investigate each of the bits and pieces making up the \$77 billion—from an economic, sociological, engineering, and accounting standpoint. One could consider whether each produces useful and necessary economic and social values (relative to each other and to alternative spending or saving choices), or merely involves "digging out holes and filling them up again."

To approach a third question, "How well are salary moneys being used?" one can be reminded of two things:

1. As the Labor Department cautions, gains in production per man cannot be ascribed to any one factor, but reflect the interaction of all factors. In private enterprise currently, according to Dr. Solomon Fabricant, of the National Bureau of Economic Research, labor (manpower) supplies about four-fifths of total resources used, but capital (depreciation charges and interest on investment) supplies the other one-fifth. Although few measurements of the trends of total-resource productivity—the efficiency of labor and capital in combination—have been made, they would furnish the only accurate yardstick by which to compare governmental and private economy efficiency trends. (Additionally, in quality-dominant fields, quality trends would have to be compared.)

2. In any case, just knowing the productivity (and quality) trend does not necessarily tell us anything about the actual, absolute productivity (and quality) level. To know the latter would require studying exactly parallel operations in government and industry, by engineering-accounting—as well as by socioeconomic—means. Some activities may be quite similar. Legal, personnel, finance, office, claim processing, account servicing, message handling, building maintenance, etc., would seem to be. A comparison of such parallel operations could help tell whether government productivity has been running roughly even with private productivity since 1947, only because it started way behind and has no intention of catching up, or because it conceivably started even and still is in a neck-and-neck race with it.

TABLE 1.—1947-58 average productivity change of selected civilian agencies of the U.S. Federal Government

	Percent
Post Office Department.....	+1¼
Veterans' Administration.....	+1½
Hospitals, etc. ¹	-¾
Pensions, etc.....	+4
Life insurance, etc.....	+15½
Internal Revenue Service.....	+3½
Social Security Administration.....	+5
Commodity Stabilization Service.....	+8
All 5 agencies.....	+1½

¹ Revised.

NOTE.—Data for first 3 or 4 years are missing for last 2 organizations.

TABLE 2.—Year-to-year productivity changes of 5 selected civilian agencies of the U.S. Federal Government, 1947-58

	Percent
1947 to 1948	+4¼
1948 to 1949	+¼
1949 to 1950	+1
1950 to 1951	+3½
1951 to 1952	+2¼
1952 to 1953	-1½
1953 to 1954	+2
1954 to 1955	+3
1955 to 1956	+1¼
1956 to 1957	+2
1957 to 1958	-1½
1947 to 1958	+1½

¹ Revised.

The Washington Star Endorses an Effective Bill To Deal With Employment of Retired Officers by Defense Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the influential Washington Star has joined the long list of newspapers in endorsing an effective bill to deal with the employment of retired officers by defense contractors. The Star, in its editorial March 20, entitled "A Question of Ethics," clearly points out that the bill on the subject reported out by the Committee on Armed Services is totally inadequate and will not reach the problem.

I thoroughly agree with the position of the Star, and, as is well known, I will introduce the proper effective legislation when the bill comes before the House next Wednesday for action by this body.

Everybody is familiar with the phrase: "When the man on the street wants to make a point or prove a point, he says: 'And furthermore, I read it in the Star.'"

Here is the Star, read it there:

A QUESTION OF ETHICS

Recent hearings before the House Armed Services Committee showed clearly the need for an effective conflict-of-interest law applicable to retired officers of all the Armed Forces. The present hodgepodge of restrictions on postcareer employment of former officers is confusing, discriminatory and sometimes ineffective. We doubt, however, that the bill recently reported by the committee is strong enough to cope adequately with the "conflict" problem.

Under existing law, Navy and Marine Corps officers upon retirement are permanently prohibited from selling anything to the Navy—but not from selling to the Army or Air Force. Neither the Army nor the Air Force has any such rigid restriction—although a law, practically never enforced, according to a Senate subcommittee, makes it a crime for retired military officers to make sales to the Army (only) during the 2 years immediately following retirement.

The bill awaiting House action would permit retired officers of all the military services to sell or to aid or assist in the selling of anything to the Department of Defense or an Armed Force of the United States without criminal penalty, but would require forfeiture of their retired pay while so employed

during the 2 years after retirement. After the 2-year period there would be no loss of pay.

However, if Congress really intends to deal adequately with conflict-of-interest abuses—rare though they may be among retired officers—something stronger than the bill sent to the House ought to be enacted. We believe that most retired officers are men of integrity. As such they should be as eager as anyone else to avoid the appearance of evil. And we think it is an abuse of an officer's privileges for him to move overnight, or even within a 2-year period, from official duties involving, say, procurement of defense items to a private job requiring him to sell or assist in selling such items to the Government.

We hope, therefore, that the pending legislation will be strengthened on the floor so as to place a positive ban on such abuses during the 2 years following retirement.

A Vicious Inequity in Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, of the many existing distortions in the Social Security Act, the limitation on earnings is one of the most objectionable. The existing law, as is well recognized, in effect, dictates how long a recipient of social security income can work and how much he can earn without being penalized. By imposing this limitation on earnings, we are in effect encouraging the early retirement of workers who can contribute substantially to the welfare of our society.

The injustice is further compounded since this limitation is only imposed on earned income, not on income received from dividends, interest, and rent. This provision runs counter to the American system of free enterprise in that it practices and compels discrimination. If our economy is to grow, we must encourage full employment of our human resources. Certainly, nobody believes that we should tolerate the damaging effect of laws which slow down progress and expansion of our national product.

In further reference to this issue, the comments of the distinguished columnist, Inez Robb, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1960, are most pertinent and valuable:

A VICIOUS INEQUITY IN TAX STRUCTURE

(By Inez Robb)

If a qualified jury were asked to choose the silliest law in the Federal tax structure, it would be hard put to select the really ultimate lulu.

However, I have a nomination: The majestic statute that now forbids anyone, between the ages of 65 and 72 and receiving social security, to earn in excess of \$1,200 annually. Any senior citizen with the git-up-and-go to earn in excess of \$1,200 is penalized by cuts in or loss of his social security benefits.

Now Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, former Secretary of Agriculture, has introduced a bill that would permit willing and able elders to earn \$2,000 annually before the penalties set in. Well,

I respect the Senator for trying to up the ante, but I wish he had tried for a touch-down instead of a place kick.

CRUEL, UNFAIR

It is not only silly but cruel and unfair to restrict the earning power of any free American citizen who is willing to roll up his sleeves and pitch in. It is a crazy infringement on the guaranteed liberties of the citizens to tell him what he can or can't earn, or how much he can work. Or to restrict him to a bare livelihood on the subsistence level that social security provides.

Social security is not a gift or a freewill offering of the Federal Government. Those who receive social security have, by law, contributed regularly to the fund, as have their employers. It represents part of the savings of the worker against old age and should be free of strings.

It is not only asinine but a waste of the Nation's skilled and experienced manpower to insist that the worker at age 65, who accepts social security, must for the next 7 years twiddle his thumbs. The Government graciously allows the oldster, after he reaches 72, to garner all the money he is capable of earning.

INEQUITY

Such restrictions on an American's right to earn not only plays ducks-and-drakes with his freedom, but there is a vicious inequity in the law. The Government is only interested in the earned income of oldsters between 65 and 72. The penalty is all on earned income; there is none on unearned income.

Thus, the retired citizen who has been able to save a fair share of his earned income during his working life and has an income, no matter what the amount, in addition to social security is not touched by these penalties.

As a result, the retired worker with an income of \$8,000 a year, in addition to social security benefits, suffers no penalties. Nor do I think he should perish forbid. It would be dastardly to penalize such a citizen.

But I am convinced it is even more dastardly to penalize the less fortunate man, whose earning power may never have been great at any time, by forbidding him to supplement his meager social security payments with as much as he is capable and willing to earn.

The "Dillon Era"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 30:

THE "DILLON ERA"

Two separate groups are now meeting in Europe to consider plans for replacing the Marshall era of American aid to Europe with the "Dillon era" of American-European partnership in trade. The term "Dillon era" was coined by President Hallstein of the Administrative Commission of the European Economic Community in honor of American Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon. It is intended to denote the new phase of Western economic development symbolized by the American plan presented by Mr. Dillon at an economic meeting in Paris in

January and approved by 20 nations. Under this plan the United States and Canada would join a dollar-strong Western Europe in a new trans-Atlantic organization for greater and economic cooperation and joint aid to underdeveloped countries.

A detailed blueprint for this new organization is now being worked out by a committee for presentation to a meeting of the 20 nations in Paris April 19. But these nations have found it advisable to meet in Paris at once in an effort to head off a threatened trade war between the European Economic Community of the Inner Six, headed by France and Germany, and the European Free Trade Association of the Outer Seven, headed by Britain. Such a clash would create a most unhappy initiation of the "Dillon era."

This issue is also being considered by the European Parliamentary Assembly, the precursor of a parliament of a united Europe, now meeting in Strasbourg. It has before it a plan to speed up both the reduction of the trade barriers between members of the Community and the formation of their customs union by an early start of their common tariff toward others on the basis of reduced rates. The United States has endorsed this plan for both its political significance and as a step toward trade liberalizations, even though it may initially discriminate against American trade. But the Outer Seven, whose free trade association, of course, also discriminates against outsiders, including the United States, see in the Community's move only discrimination against themselves and threaten reprisals. It must be hoped that the assurances given Prime Minister Macmillan by Secretary Herter and Mr. Dillon will help to prevent a development that could seriously impair Western solidarity.

U.S. Presidents: No Set Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I present herewith to your attention and the attention of my distinguished colleagues a very timely editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, March 25, 1960:

U.S. PRESIDENTS: NO SET PATTERN—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

This being a presidential election year, there is inevitably a deep interest in all probable candidates—their age, religion, residence, occupation, wealth, etc.

Stories, profiles, biographies of all current potential candidates pour off the presses in increasing number.

This column, in contrast, is a look not at this year's candidates but at those of the past—not so much to see what the historic pattern for Presidents might be as to disclose the variety and diversity of candidates for the country's highest office.

First, let us consider age. There has been no right age for a candidate. William Henry Harrison was 68 at the time of his inauguration. Theodore Roosevelt was 42. Andrew Jackson was the oldest on leaving office—nearly 70. Dwight D. Eisenhower will break that record by being 98 days over 70 when leaving office on January 21, 1961. William Jennings Bryan

was only 36 when he was nominated to oppose McKinley.

Also, there has been no dominant religious affiliation of the Nation's Chief Executives. The list includes: Episcopalians (9): Washington, Madison, Monroe, W. H. Harrison, Tyler, Taylor, Pierce, Arthur, F. D. Roosevelt; Presbyterians (7): Jackson, Polk, Buchanan, Cleveland, B. Harrison, Wilson, Eisenhower; Unitarians (4): J. Adams, J. Q. Adams, Fillmore, Taft; Methodists (3): Grant, Hayes, McKinley; Baptists (2): Harding, Truman; Members of the Dutch Reformed Church (2): Martin Van Buren and T. Roosevelt. Coolidge was a Congregationalist; Garfield belonged to the Disciples of Christ; Hoover is a Quaker. Three Presidents were of no specific denomination: Jefferson, Lincoln, Johnson.

The first Roman Catholic nominated for the presidency was not Alfred E. Smith, as is commonly believed, but Charles O'Connor, who was nominated in 1872 by a faction of the Democratic Party that refused to accept the nomination of Horace Greeley. O'Connor declined the nomination but received nearly 30,000 votes in the election. The only other Roman Catholic to be nominated was Al Smith in 1928 by the Democrats.

Only in the matter of occupation does there seem to be any dominant choice. Twenty-four Presidents were lawyers; one was a journalist; one an engineer; five were professional soldiers; and two (Johnson and T. Roosevelt) were public officials for most of their lives.

As for the wealth of Presidents, judged by the value of the estates they left, the job of Chief Executive has not been noticeably profitable or always led to financial success on retirement. It needs to be remembered, however, that a few Presidents had a certain inherited wealth.

It was unusual for a President, prior to this century, to leave an estate over \$100,000, though George Washington's estate was valued at \$530,000, Taylor's at \$142,000, and Polk's at something over \$100,000. John Adams left an estate of only \$30,000; John Quincy Adams left an estate of \$60,000; Lincoln's estate was valued at \$83,000; Johnson's at \$50,000. Jefferson, Monroe, W. H. Harrison, and Grant left no estates—though Grant's autobiography later brought in \$500,000.

The first sizable estate in the past century was left by Cleveland—\$250,000. Teddy Roosevelt left an estate of \$811,000; Taft, an estate of \$475,000; Wilson, one of \$600,000; Harding, an estate of \$487,000; Coolidge, one of \$500,000.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the first to leave an estate over a million dollars—\$1,085,500, to be exact. The financial condition of former Presidents Hoover and Truman and President Eisenhower are not matters of public record. But Mr. Hoover is considered to be a millionaire. Mr. Truman has earned sizable sums by his writings, and President Eisenhower may well be in the millionaire class with his writings and other assets.

Nor is there any particular State especially favorable to presidential candidates—though seven were residents of New York at the time of their inaugurations; six were residents of Ohio; five of Virginia; three of Massachusetts; three of Tennessee; two of Illinois; and one each of California, Indiana, Louisiana, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Eleven American Presidents, it is not always remembered, were elected without receiving a majority of the popular vote—although, of course, getting the necessary electoral votes: John Quincy Adams, James K. Polk, Zachary Taylor, James Buchanan, Abraham Lincoln (his first), Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Grover Cleveland

(both terms), B. Harrison, Woodrow Wilson (both terms), and Harry Truman.

There have also been several women nominated for the Presidency—an even dozen, though all by minor parties. The first woman candidate was nominated in 1872 to oppose President Grant. She was Victoria Claflin Woodhull of the Equal Rights Party. Her running mate in that election was Frederick Douglass, the first Negro candidate for the Vice Presidency.

Electricity Is Boon to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, since the Rural Electric Administration was established 25 years ago 95 percent of the farms in America have been electrified which demonstrates how free enterprise and a sympathetic government can work together to solve vexing and difficult problems for human beings.

Those who have been active in the REA movement know from the history of the agency that rural electrification has been a real fight, all during its history, and even before the Rural Electrification Administration was born. I did not know the men, but I knew of them, who had a hand in opening up rural America to electricity, and I should like to pay tribute to them. Foremost among them was Senator George W. Norris, the Independent of Nebraska, who for 25 years reigned supreme in the Senate as the man who thought the most about the future of his country. Among those early fighters there was a Congressman named John E. Rankin, of Tupelo, Miss., who no longer sits in the House of Representatives but still is remembered by the oldtimers there. John Rankin will always be numbered among the founders of the REA. And then there was Judson King, who died only a few months ago in his home outside of Washington. Judson King was a public relations man for the people. For most of his life, he battled, through his writings, for projects that would benefit all the people of this country, as opposed to ideas and ideals that were designed to help the few at the expense of the many. And, I am happy to report, my father-in-law, former Representative Usher L. Burdick, was in that valiant and limited group that originally fought the battles for rural electrification. I am also happy to report that Usher Burdick, although he retired from Congress at the end of the 85th Congress, still is alive and happy and as rambunctious as ever. While, as I noted, I did not know many of these men personally, I know them by reputation, and I am sure that there is today, among us, several individuals who may have known one or the other of them. It behooves us, I believe, to remember these stalwarts of other days, for we can gather strength from their struggles and their victories for the battles that may lie ahead.

In 1935, before the REA came into being, only 1 farm in every 10 in the United States had electricity. For all practical purposes, rural America was in the dark. Of course, there were kerosene lamps, and there were hand-operated water pumps, and other back-breaking tools and equipment on the farms throughout the land. Today, due principally to the foresight of the men who worked for the REA to be enacted in the law, we have seen electricity transform the rural home into a modern, convenient place to live.

In the past 25 years some 1,000 REA cooperatives—completed owned and operated by local people in as many communities—have borrowed and used about \$3 billion from the Federal Government to build modern electric power systems to serve rural areas. I doubt seriously if \$3 billion of Federal funds ever has been used more economically or with more lasting benefit to the comfort and welfare of as many people in the whole history of government anywhere on earth.

Back in 1935, when the REA experiment was just beginning, it was argued that all farmers who wanted electricity had it and that there was no market for power out in the country. Experience in the last 25 years has demonstrated how wrong this contention was. Rural people are using electricity at an ever-increasing rate, doubling their use of power every 5 to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the rural electrification program has been so overwhelming that many opponents no longer try to attack it openly, instead they are coming forth with proposals labeled "improvements" of the program. For the past few years the administration has asked Congress to jack up the REA interest rate. This is being done despite the fact that the evidence indicates that such an increase would necessitate higher electric bills for the consumers served and many co-ops, especially those in the thinner territories would be driven out of business. As we know, REA is prohibited by law from serving towns with a population of more than 1,500, which means that it is barred from participating in the cream of the electric industry market. There have been proposals recently to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to turn a part of the loan business over to the Wall Street bankers.

These proposals have been so drastic, however, that no Member is willing to fight for them.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that REA has been good not only for farmers but the country as a whole. An important result of the rural electrification program is the increased business it brings into rural communities. It stimulates private business both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities, the farmers invest \$3 to \$4 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances. Also, when power is available, the establishment of industry in rural areas is encouraged.

Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a fine article by Virginia Cruikshank contained

in the March 26 edition of the Delaware Gazette of Delaware, Ohio, which carries a graphic account of how REA has changed the "face of America":

ELECTRICITY IS BOON TO FARMERS

(By Virginia Cruikshank)

Some of us may have forgotten just how rugged life was in the rural areas before we had electricity.

Remember the coal stoves, kerosene lamps, washboards, water buckets, hand milking, and all the other hand-powered chores that made the farmer and his wife old before their time?

No one would want to return to that kind of rural living, although we may sometimes wax sentimental about the old days. We are even digging around in the attic and cellar for some of those items mentioned above because our city neighbors who are moving to the country prize them as antiques.

Electric power has changed the face of all rural America. Not only has it brought an end to a lot of the drudgery, but it has changed the entire outlook of rural people. They are no longer "country hicks." Their life has become the envy of many city people.

This year the Nation is paying tribute to its rural electric systems on the 25th anniversary of REA. President Roosevelt signed the Executive Order May 11, 1935, that brought the Rural Electrification Administration into being.

Use of electricity today has passed the wildest dreams of 1935. USDA researchers have found that there are 450 ways to use electricity on the farm and in the farm home. And just wait until we get all those bulk tanks installed around here in the next year. Consumption of power will zoom.

Only about 4 percent of the farms in the United States are still without electric power. In the territory of the Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, there are only two farms and two houses without power, but the company is willing to build the lines to them whenever the owners are ready.

Results of Questionnaire Sent to Cross Section of Residents of First Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I sent out a questionnaire on important national issues to a cross section of my constituents.

More than 6,000 replies or more than 20 percent of the questionnaires were filled out and returned to me. I sent these to be tabulated by an independent business firm that does this sort of work and the results are most interesting.

Organized letter writing campaigns can, and often do, give a distorted picture of home sentiment based on a Congressman's daily mail. On the contrary an actual public opinion poll of residents of an area brings the majority viewpoint into much better focus.

This situation showed up especially in the comparison of views from my mail as against the results of my questionnaire on a subject such as Federal aid

for teachers' salaries. I have received many letters urging my support of Federal aid for teachers' salaries. Only a few of my letters express opposition to such legislation. When it came to answering the question: Do you favor continued reliance on local and State support for teachers' salaries, rather than Federal grants for this purpose? My tabulation from the questionnaire was 3,641 in favor of continued local and State support as compared with only 1,007 against. A ratio of better than 3 to 1 opposed.

Another significant result was the figure in support of a firm stand on Berlin: 4,551 replied "Yes" only 173 replied "No," which certainly is worth noting right at this time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that in checking with my colleagues from the State of Washington, I find there is great similarity between mine and the percentages shown in the replies to my colleagues. Taking into consideration approximately 250,000 questionnaires circulated in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Sixth Congressional Districts of my State, the results on the two questions applicable to schools were as follows:

School construction

Congressional district	Percentages	
	Opposed to Federal aid	In favor of Federal aid
1st.....	55.4	44.6
2d.....	52.6	47.4
3d.....	64.1	35.9
4th.....	59.7	40.3
6th.....	51.9	48.1

Teachers' salaries

Congressional district	Percentages	
	Opposed to Federal aid	In favor of Federal aid
1st.....	78.3	21.7
2d.....	72.9	27.1
3d.....	74.2	25.8
4th.....	80.6	19.4
6th.....	69.8	30.2

This, Mr. Speaker, certainly insofar as my own State is concerned, is in complete contradiction to the percentages published by groups supporting Federal funds to States for education, such as the National Education Association which has stated that 70 percent of the citizens of this country are in favor of meeting our school needs by the use of Federal funds.

The willingness of my constituents to participate in this public opinion poll was most gratifying. Several of the questions I asked were difficult to answer with an unqualified "yes" or "no," and thus it was that many of those who answered set forth their views in more detail, and I found such additional comments most interesting. In fact, I have made an index by subject of these comments for further review.

A complete tabulation of my own questionnaire results in percentages is listed below:

	Percentages			Percentages	
	Yes	No		Yes	No
Foreign affairs:			General topics:		
1. Do you favor diplomatic recognition of Communist China?	21.6	78.4	1. Do you think more federally administered programs should be turned back to the States?	74.9	25.1
2. Should we continue military and economic aid to friendly nations?	83.5	16.5	2. Do you favor reduction of agriculture price supports?	89.6	10.4
3. Do you favor United States defense of Formosa?	80.1	19.1	3. Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include medical expenses, the increased cost to be paid by additional contributions by employees and employers?	54.3	45.7
4. Do you approve of a firm stand with respect to Berlin?	96.4	3.6	4. Do you believe the Federal Government should have more authority to regulate radio and television programs?	51.8	48.2
Schools:			5. Do you favor emphasis on a balanced budget in the coming year and applying any surplus on the national debt?	90.8	9.2
1. Do you feel the Federal Government should provide grants to States to meet school construction needs?	44.6	55.4	6. Do you believe the House of Representatives should continue the Un-American Activities Committee?	83.3	16.7
2. Do you favor continued reliance on local and State support for teachers' salaries, rather than Federal grants for this purpose?	78.3	21.7			
Taxes:					
1. Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten taxation of cooperatives?	79.4	20.6			
2. Should we allow parents to deduct from their income tax tuition paid for children attending college?	67.3	32.7			

Why H.R. 10590 Should Not Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter, dated March 25, 1960, which I received from our former colleague, the Honorable Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, AFL-CIO.

I am in full agreement with the views expressed in the letter:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1960.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MULTER: On February 15, I wrote to you explaining why the AFL-CIO opposes the President's effort to breach the 42-year-old 4½ percent interest ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds. Recently, the Committee on Ways and Means approved a so-called compromise (H.R. 10590) which would foist an unnecessary and intolerable burden on future generations of taxpayers.

I hope you will read the following brief analysis of the committee's proposal, which supplements our earlier statement, before your own decision is finally made on this vital issue.

If you vote "yes" for the Ways and Means four-point compromise:

1. You will be putting your seal of approval on unlimited Treasury power to buy in old unmatured low-interest rate bonds and to swap for them new bonds that can yield, and in certain cases will yield, interest rates in excess of the statutory ceiling of 4½ percent.

For example, on March 11, 1960, a 2½ percent bond maturing in 1961 sold at 96 and yielded 4.42 percent. This bond could be exchanged for a new one extending the maturity perhaps 7 or 8 years and yielding rates of interest higher than the original 2½ percent coupon rate. The new yield rate can go to an unlimited level as long as the new bond does not carry a coupon rate in excess of the statutory ceiling of 4½ percent. This process will aid the owner of the bond who bought at par and is still getting only the 2½ percent coupon rate and not the yield rate of 4.42 percent to receive a higher rate of interest. While the new bond will enable the bond owner to get a higher rate of interest, it will result in higher interest costs to the Treasury for a longer period of years.

Of course, this kind of discount selling will breach the historic 4½ percent ceiling—but without the face of the bond saying so. Thus, the administration's objective will be achieved by indirection. However, this proposed refunding operation may ultimately add billions more to the already fantastic \$9.4 billion burden we are now paying in interest charges alone this year on the Federal debt.

2. In addition, you will be voting to permit the President to issue almost \$6 billion in bonds yearly (equal to 2 percent of the total debt) at any interest rate over 4½ percent he may choose. Never before has any President been granted the unrestricted power to fix interest rates which this compromise now asks Congress to approve.

We are told that items 1 and 2 must be enacted to stretch out the Federal debt and to fight inflation. Yet, from 1953 until recently, the administration was doing very little to stretch out the debt during years when interest rates were far lower.

To lock into the debt structure now for many years peak interest rates—rates that have already been ratcheted up by this administration and the Federal Reserve Board to a 30-year high—is hardly prudent management of the public debt.

Moreover, items 1 and 2 would encourage a one-way direction for interest rates on U.S. long-term bonds—up. It is noteworthy that no requirement is included that the Treasury call in overpriced loans when interest rates are going down.

As for inflation: Since 1953, the administration and the Federal Reserve Board have had available a variety of fiscal and monetary tools with which to fight higher prices. However, except during the recessions of 1954 and 1957-58, they have shown an almost exclusive fondness for higher interest rates as a price stabilizing device. Now, although prices have been almost stable for 2 years, the Treasury is demanding permission to raise interest rates once again in order to fight what is, concededly, a phantom inflation.

Apparently, this administration opposes increasing the prices of everything, except money.

3 and 4. You will be voting for a "sweetener" calculated to entice the unaware. This part of the compromise proposes interest rates higher than 4½ percent for issues of Government obligations invested in special U.S. trust funds and for E and H U.S. savings bonds. Of course, this provision would be appropriate and only fair if the rest of the bill is passed. However, the Government is now paying substantially less than 4½ percent on its obligations owned by its trust funds, and as for savings bonds, only 3½ percent in interest is currently being paid, although up to 4½ is permissible under existing law.

If the administration really wants to stretch out the Federal debt, it should first use its power to sell savings bonds at a

higher rate and take other steps to make these bonds more attractive and salable. Why should small family savers perpetually be entitled to less for lending money to their government than bankers and others receive? Furthermore, it would be much wiser to try to extend the long-term portion of the debt via greater sales of savings bonds and without scrapping the 4½-percent interest ceiling (as proposed in items 1 and 2) than to pierce the 4½-percent ceiling and thus pressure all public and private interest rates yet another notch higher, as a consequence.

It is the view of the AFL-CIO that the so-called committee compromise is actually abdication. Because the issue so vitally affects the welfare of every American, we urge you to strenuously oppose enactment of H.R. 10590.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

"Congress Is the True Sampling of Citizens"—Editorial Appearing in the Los Angeles Times, Tuesday, March 22, 1960, by Holmes Alexander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to call to your attention, and the attention of my distinguished colleagues the very timely editorial in the Los Angeles Times, March 22, 1960, by Holmes Alexander:

CONGRESS IS THE TRUE SAMPLING OF CITIZENS

At the peak of a tiered platform which is climaxed by an impressive throne, Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee takes testimony on how to curb conflict of interest in the military services.

Down the hallway, amid similar trappings of solemnity and legislative authority, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee takes testimony on the same subject but on a broader front. It is not a new matter of congressional concern and inquiry, but it is a pressing one. It relates to public immorality that made headline stories of Sherman Adams, Charles Van Doren, payola, cheating students, bribed athletes and much else.

Possibly we need some new laws, although we already have far too many. Where Gov-

ernment treats with persons and corporations, as in giving out scholarships under the guise of national defense, there ought to be protections of the public purse, including non-Communist affidavits.

The Vinson committee is looking over a bill, H.R. 9632, by Representative EDWARD HÉBERT. The measure would lay down ground rules for retired military officers to become representatives of companies which sell to the Defense Department. The Celler committee is examining the whole spectrum of conflict of interest in Government fields. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York has just produced a mammoth study on the matter which is now being piped as testimony into congressional minds.

Common to all legislation in this area is the use of frankness—such as making public the lists of persons who are legitimately trying to influence the Government.

The Hébert bill wants the Defense Department to set up an office of enrollment where certain officers-turned-salesmen must post information about their jobs. The Celler committee is receiving proposals for the confrontation of rival pitchmen in the game of bidding for Federal favors.

So it goes, and probably it's necessary, but you attend these hearings and you sense a peril. I found the danger expressed in a pretty maudlin letter, published in the March issue of *Coronet*, from novelist John Steinbeck to Adlai Stevenson. Steinbeck had been reading the papers at the time of the TV scandals last year, and news stories gave him an impression of "a creeping, all pervading nerve-gas of immorality which starts in the nursery and does not stop before it reaches the highest offices, both corporate and Government."

Well, this is the peril in the probing and the reporting, in the overstating and overmoralizing which follow these gross outbursts of materialism and cupidity. Steinbeck is right—but only partly and, I would hope, minimally.

The trouble is that when moral indignation goes berserk, heroic monuments get smashed, witches and witchhunters both get burned, the braying demagogues and the unctuous hypocrite get their innings in the seats of the mighty.

Things are bad, heaven knows, and we have not lived up to the opportunities of our freedom and wealth. We do have dishonest cops, rotten standards of family life, corrupt officials and power-grasping leaders in every phase of public life. But, however bad the record is, there is a redemption at hand. If you spend a decade or more in Washington, you come to conclude this—that the ruling trait in Americanism is not avarice but aspiration.

It has been said that the big success of Allen Drury's novel, "Advice and Consent," lies in its appeal to American Idealism. The same thing happened two decades ago when "Gone With the Wind" galloped straight past the objections of highbrow critics and became an American classic.

The American people have a way of recognizing and affirming true estimates of their character. Both these books say that, although inhabited by fallible persons and cluttered with cumbersome but often magnificent institutions, our American civilization is still groping for the stars. Often, at a distance, it may seem that congressional committees are muckraking and debunking. After all, probes into conflicts of interest are going to turn up conflicts, and searches for un-American activities are going to find these too.

But Congress is a true sampling of the American people. Over the years Congress expresses the aspirations for decency and achievement which lie in the American heart.

Goal of Kremlin Is World Communism Despite Talk of Disarmament and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we have just recently had a visit from Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the Federal Republic of Germany which has focused attention on the important problem of that country's reunification, and there are proposals and counterproposals for universal disarmament. These are serious problems which affect the complete future of the free world and the desire of most of the people on this earth for world peace. These problems are fraught with many pitfalls, and we must understand the constant threat of the rulers in the Kremlin who, while talking disarmament and peace, never forget their goal of world communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the translation of an article from Bulletin No. 1, dated January 5, 1960, of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn. This article was written by the Honorable Franz-Josef Strauss, Federal Minister of Defense, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

BULLETIN No. 1

(By Franz-Josef Straub, German Federal Minister of Defense)

One must realize that world communism and its representative powers, the Soviet Union and China, have so far not abandoned their aims to spread a world revolution and to extend the power of communism to all parts of the earth. This year, Mr. Khrushchev quite frankly expressed his opinion when he said "Sooner or later, communism will rule the world. We are living in the heroic days of the revolution." He was merely corroborating what he already affirmed in 1955, when countless people, prompted by false optimism, thought they could exploit the spirit of Geneva as the starting point for peaceful and happy times. Khrushchev, incidentally, at that time also said: "Certain people misinterpret the spirit of Geneva. They should once and for all bear in mind that we are not abandoning nor shall ever abandon our plans and our fight for the victory of communism." Khrushchev announced this year in Stettin that he was interested not so much in the Oder-Neisse frontier for Poland, but, rather, in the sacred western frontier of communism on the Elbe and the Werra, and he boastfully assured his audience at the Leipzig Workers' Conference that this frontier would continue to exist until the whole of Germany was part of the Communist realm.

We must not venture to hope that we are heading for peaceful and untroubled times. The Federal Government does not intend to conceal the truth from the German people and make them believe that they are being led toward glorious times. We realize the full significance of the fact that Khrushchev on his return from America said that the coexistence policy was in no way a renunciation of the Communist claim to world domination, and that official Soviet

sources described the discussion of the Hungarian tragedy in the United Nations as a blow against the spirit of Camp David, or decried the assurances given during Eisenhower's visit to Italy regarding the strengthening of the NATO, as a violation of the attempt to ease international tension. So far, the Soviets have not given up regarding the liquidation of the cold war, in the first place, as the liquidation of the resistance against communism.

But there is one thing that we can take for granted in the case of the Soviets, which they have in common with us, though for a different reason. They do not want to risk a third world war and thus involve themselves in certain suicide. They, too, have a very concrete interest, though it may not be a moral one, in seeing to it that the Soviet Union does not become the victim of an all-destructive war. And for this reason they are prepared to discuss disarmament. In the interests of humanity we must take them at their word and must discuss serious disarmament proposals, including disarmament measures and effective control, with them. In view of the modern science of armament, disarmament and control measures are only likely to prove effective if they are extended to cover the whole world, even though their execution may be carried out in stages. But we do not intend to harbor any doubts about the fact that it is not simply rearmament that has caused the tension and unrest in the world. For Western rearmament, the rearmament of the German Federal Republic and the setting up of the defense organization of the NATO have not come into existence of their own accord or as the result of any rash decision. They are the result of the policy pursued by the Soviets in Europe and Asia.

Hence, true peace and order and a genuine easing of international tension will only prevail in this world again when all individuals and all peoples are conceded the rights which, according to the will of the Divine Creator, are inalienable and natural; namely, human dignity and freedom of the individual and the right of self-determination for peoples. Neither the Berlin question, nor the German question as a whole, which is connected with the former, can be solved by an artificial and compulsory structure or, according to the Soviet proposal, by the setting up of a free city for half of Berlin, but solely by recognition of the right of self-determination for the entire German people. Unrest and fear, insecurity and tension will only disappear when the dreadful Iron Curtain, which separates people from one another against their will, is removed again by those who have arbitrarily set it up.

It is therefore imperative that the Soviet rulers should be made to realize and believe that we want a genuine peace, that we are prepared to support and carry out all the necessary measures to cut down armament gradually and under control, but that we intend to retain the means of our self-defense as long as we are obliged to protect ourselves against the global claims to power of a despotic system. The Soviet rulers must likewise be made to realize that we intend to oppose all further expansion of communism determinedly. We must show them that we refuse to allow ourselves to be misled and lulled in our vigilance, and they must be made to realize by words and deeds that only the renunciation on the part of every system, including the Communist system, too, of world revolution, world conquest, and world domination plans will bring genuine peace and a permanent easing of international tension. They must, above all, be made to realize that the way to a complete disarmament leads via a change in policy and that this change in policy is in the interests of all peoples, their survival in this

age of nuclear weapons, their economic and cultural aims and their further development.

And it is precisely for this reason that we must realize that we have a price to pay for freedom and security. We must do our share of the tasks justly allotted to us, in order to establish and preserve the unity, solidarity, and strength of the Atlantic pact. We are the next to be snatched by the Communist claim to power; we are the next to foot the bill if the noble ideal of a European union and of Atlantic solidarity should go to pieces; we are the last who, on the threshold of the year 1960, can afford to cherish illusions and confuse wishes with reality.

But if we recall how we worked our way up again out of the abyss of the catastrophe of 1945 and the hopelessness and despair of the years that followed, and if we look around today and see how trade and life are prospering and how new and modern towns have grown up on the ruins of the old ones, then we venture to hope that this policy, which is based on moral principles and on a feeling of responsibility to God and man, will continue to help us to cope successfully with the great tasks which confront us. And in view of the prospect of a new era, we understand the profound meaning of the words of the Christmas message, with its comfort and its obligation—"Be ye not afraid."

Political Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the terms "liberals" and "conservatives" today label opposing philosophies concerning the role of Federal Government in our lives. Out of the clash of these opposing ideologies comes the legislation we pass in Congress.

Nothing has been more controversial than civil rights and nothing, some Members think, has been a phonier issue. True, political expediency in any controversial issue muddies the water of honest difference of opinion, and could be termed phony. Equally true, there are sincere dedicated men of strong conviction on either side of the civil rights controversy and for that matter on other controversial issues. Yet of all the controversial issues today, civil rights in my mind is the least understood by either side because of emotional prejudice and political expediency.

So it was that I found the editorial "Political Hypocrisy," by Balfour Jaymes of the Shreveport Journal of February 27, 1960, most interesting. I have tried to understand the liberals point of view, perhaps not as much as I should, but nevertheless have made the effort and will continue to do so. Others on the conservative side, I know, have done the same. This editorial highlights a fundamental contradiction within the liberal ranks, it seems to me, and I submit it for the RECORD for the attention of all who are also interested:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, Feb. 27, 1960]

TWO KINDS OF RIGHTS—POLITICAL HYPOCRISY (By Balfour Jaymes)

Strange, indeed, are the ways of politicians, particularly the liberal variety.

With these politicians, truth is something to be stretched, distorted or completely ignored, depending upon the purpose to be served.

This sort of hypocrisy now is rolling in high gear in the Halls of Congress.

The liberal Members of Congress are kicking up a noisy and hypocritical fuss about the civil rights voting bill. They loudly contend that certain minority groups are being denied the right to vote and this injustice must be remedied at once.

Obviously, this is a political device calculated to win votes.

If the liberals were really interested in the protection of human rights and personal liberties, they would raise their voices in favor of the right of a person to work whenever and for whomever he chooses.

But the liberal is painfully silent on this issue. In fact, most of them openly oppose any law guaranteeing the right of a person to work. This right, they brazenly contend, is a union-granted right.

This is hypocrisy at its worst; for a basic human right is at stake.

As the liberal politician sees it, a person should not be denied the right to vote, but he sees absolutely nothing wrong in denying the same person the right to work.

What can be more important to a person than the right to work when and where he finds satisfactory employment?

Does not the Constitution guarantee that right?

Of course, it does.

How does it happen, then, that a person is denied his constitutional right to work?

In recent years, the law of the union has supplanted this constitutional right. No longer can a person work whenever and wherever he chooses if his employment conflicts with the employment of a union worker.

Does this violation of personal rights disturb the liberal lawmaker?

Not at all.

The law of the union provides:

"You can work if you join the union, pay your dues and assessments and submit to the rules, regulations and orders of the union."

The union member realizes that the law of the union is supreme and that he must submit to it, or else he doesn't work. And what's more, that he may get kicked and beaten besides.

The law of the union, as interpreted by its leaders and some of its members, provides drastic and cruel methods of punishment for nonunion and union workers alike, who defy its rules, regulations and policies.

These methods consist of harassment, coercion, intimidation, crime and violence. Thousands of law-abiding Americans, both in and out of unions, know what it means to defy the law of the union. They and their families are hounded day and night, their automobiles damaged or destroyed, their homes shot up and bombed.

Does this violation of personal rights disturb the political liberal?

Not at all.

The law of the union calls for terror tactics whenever there is any troublesome conflict between union and nonunion workers or whenever there is resistance to the demands of the union.

Of course, the union bosses deny this. But the evidence is clear and convincing. Recent and current strike violence at Albert

Lea, Minn., Henderson, N.C., Portland, Oreg., are a few cases in point. There are many, many others. In each of these strikes there has been destruction of property, shootings, stoning, and bombings. Anarchy has existed because the law of the union was permitted to supplant the law of the land.

What have the liberal Members of Congress, who are kicking up such a wordy storm over the right to vote, done about the right to work of these law-abiding Americans?

You guessed it. Absolutely nothing.

And obviously they have no intention of doing anything about it until such times as the 50-million nonunion workers make it clear that they will no longer tolerate this rank injustice. There's one thing that the liberal politician heeds quickly—it's votes, for he is primarily motivated by the basic urge of perpetuating himself in office.

He carries the favor of labor because the labor bosses, who are militant and ruthless, deliver the vote so long as the political liberal submits wholly and completely to their demands.

The law of the union provides for mass picketing, which is another term for mob violence.

The liberal politicians are angered and horrified whenever there is any mob violence, especially if it occurs in the South. That is, unless it is labor mob violence, which they apparently regard as a right of the union, since the law of the union is above the law of the land.

As the liberal politician sees it, there's nothing wrong with labor mob violence, stoning, shooting and bombing. But it's a vicious brutal crime if any other group of people resort to mob violence.

This is cheap, shameful hypocrisy.

Labor dictatorships, like all dictatorships, are ruthless and monopolistic. They tolerate no dissent. Their policies are not to be questioned or disobeyed.

Any union member, or any politician, who deviates from the demands of the labor bosses is condemned as an enemy of labor. There must be complete submission; total subservience.

The liberal politicians know all of these things—and much more—about the ruthless tactics of the law of the union which deprive law-abiding Americans from work when and where they choose.

They know that mob violence by unions is anarchy.

They know that labor dictatorship regards itself as above the law of the land.

They know that the right to work is just as important as the right to vote and that it is a constitutional right.

Since the liberal politician is aware of these things, it is rank and shameful hypocrisy for him to profess an interest in the preservation of human rights and personal liberties.

To sacrifice principle upon the altar of political expediency is a tragic price to pay for votes.

It's hypocrisy at its very worst.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the records will show that during the past 2 weeks of

debate on the issue of civil rights, I have refrained from participating in any of the arguments and discussions.

There was a good reason for this. The entire debate centered around the various conceptions and interpretations of applicable law and the constitutionality of the various titles.

I left this burden to be carried by those amongst us who are practicing attorneys.

However, now that the legalistic smoke has cleared away, and in the calmness of the tranquil waters of pure logic, I want to add a few thoughts to the many already expressed.

The need to clear away the roadblocks that have prevented, in many cases, the Negroes' right to vote is of course paramount if we are to finally make our colored citizens, citizens in fact as well as in name.

The economic status of the Negro in all sections of the country leaves a lot to be desired.

If this Nation is to measure up to its worldwide billing as the "greatest place on earth, in which to live, to work, and to prosper," then it behooves all of us to look into some phases of the economics of the labor conditions insofar as the American Negro is concerned.

In most instances, they are relegated to the most menial tasks with the lowest possible wages.

In many cases, both north and south of the Mason-Dixon line, they are huddled into modern ghettos. Few can really move into the more desirable residential areas regardless of their economic standing.

It is my sincere conviction that the only answer is one that must come from equalization, equalization of opportunities. This will lead not to the mixture of the races but, in reality, will let each racial group find and raise its own standards and levels of living socially, economically, and in their conditions of labor.

There are always barriers in the social calendar, and nothing ever done by Congress will change this.

So long as human beings remain human, each will seek his or her own company.

No better example of complete understanding and freedom of action, regardless of race, color, or creed, can be found than in our newest State, the 50th, the State of Hawaii.

The day will come when the Negro has found his place politically by the intelligent and free use of his voting franchise. This will be followed in an orderly fashion by the complete integration of the Negro into our American economy.

To show how bad conditions can get when the economic level of the wage earner reaches a rate below subsistence grades, one need only look at the records submitted to our subcommittee on minimum wage laws.

These testimonials show just about how the Negro fares in the field of economic competition.

The answer and solution to the problem lies in the hearts of men and, in my opinion, the best road to success is through our Christian doctrines and religious revivals.

Hearing Scheduled on H.R. 8146, Affecting Panama Canal Construction Workers With Less Than 3 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House have spoken to me or have written to me in recent days to inquire about the status of H.R. 8146 now pending before the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am placing this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of other Members who might also be interested in this matter. Hearings on this bill are scheduled to commence Tuesday, April 12.

A word of explanation might be in order, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal I am happy to explain the background of this matter.

Over a period of many years, Congress received requests from construction workers who helped build the canal a half century ago to provide some sort of annuity in recognition of this service. In 1944 Congress enacted a law extending annuities to all Roosevelt medalholders who had served at least 3 years on the isthmus during the construction of the canal. Ever since, the Congress has received requests from other Roosevelt medalholders with more than 2 but less than 3 years of service to have the act amended to include them, too.

This proposal was considered last June 2 and turned down, on the grounds that if the minimum period of service for these noncontributory annuities is reduced to 2 years, it will still cause arbitrary hardship to those with almost but not quite 2 years of service, and eventually, it would have to be extended in all fairness to everyone who spent any time at all on the construction job. I am merely citing the arguments used against the proposal, not prejudging the issue.

Last year when I set up a hearing on this issue, time was provided to all who wished to be heard. All phases of the controversy were covered in detail. A spokesman for the group which seeks to be included testified for almost the entire morning, covering every conceivable argument in favor of the change. Immediately thereafter, the subcommittee voted unanimously to table all bills before us on this subject for the remainder of this Congress. Later in that session, H.R. 8146 was introduced. It is similar to the bills we tabled.

This year a new drive was undertaken by the persons who would be recipients of annuities under a relaxation of the service requirements, and Members of Congress were in receipt of many letters complaining that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, was preventing H.R. 8146 from being considered. I

would never want to be pictured in that light. I have tried to make clear to the people involved that the entire subcommittee felt the issue had been thoroughly explored and that there was therefore no chance of any legislation being enacted on this matter in this Congress. However, I said if the subcommittee wanted to reopen hearings, I would certainly schedule them.

As a result of the letters received by many Members of Congress urging action on this legislation, our subcommittee has decided to schedule new hearings, if only to assure all concerned that we never have a closed mind on any subject. However, unless new facts are presented above and beyond the information we have received in previous hearings, I doubt very seriously that the results will be any different.

If any Members wish to testify or submit statements for the record, we will be glad to receive their testimony. Furthermore, we have issued an open invitation to the former Panama Canal construction workers to submit any additional facts they may have on the merits of their case.

Birthday of Hans Christian Andersen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 2 marks the 155th anniversary of the birth of Hans Christian Andersen, Denmark's most famous author. As we pause to celebrate this day we feel particularly close to our good friends and allies, the Danish people. Indeed our toast to Hans Christian Andersen is also a toast to Denmark and to the Danish people because this great author and his country are so closely tied together in the minds of most Americans.

Hans Christian Andersen is so beloved by Americans because generations of our people have grown up knowing the joy and adventure that are found in Andersen's fairy tales. Who among us as children has not laughed when he read the story of the emperor's invisible new clothes and later in life reflected upon the insight into human behavior shown in some of these simple tales. "The Snow Queen," "The Red Shoes," "Great Claus and Little Claus," and "The Ugly Duckling" are all familiar to American readers as they are to children in many other lands.

Hans Christian Andersen wrote much that was fine besides his fairy tales. But these have become so famous that it seems fair to say that they are common to the experience of growing up anywhere in the Western World. The fairy tales by Hans Christian Andersen have thus become woven into the cultural heritage that is the common memory of Western civilization.

It is well that we take a moment on the birthday of this great man to express this slight tribute.

Postal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 28, 1960, entitled "Postal Facts." I believe that this editorial summarizes the salient facts regarding postal service and postal rates. I commend it to the attention of the membership of this body:

POSTAL FACTS

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which is easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the Post Office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in every day fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

It is true it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal Judiciary system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted. But the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about \$2½ billion a year. No other Government department produces anywhere near as much revenue. But because the postal establishment costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Postal rates actually are a form of taxes. The Post Office does not keep the money it gets for selling stamps, but turns it into the Treasury. Thus, in urging a postal rate increase, the administration is seeking an indirect tax increase.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense. Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska? Would a business operate a branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, most of them losing money because of slight patronage? Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

We suggest Summerfield ought to stop proclaiming (and complaining) how much his Department has lost and concentrate on

getting the mails delivered as speedily and economically as possible.

And Congress ought to ignore the request for another boost in rates.

Small Business Investment Act Amendments, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1960, it was my privilege to appear before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the Small Business Investment Act Amendments, 1959. My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 13TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to appear before my own committee or a subcommittee thereof as a witness and to give my colleagues a chance to go after me as I go after some of the witnesses who appear before us.

May I first, Mr. Chairman, apologize for not having a prepared statement. I just haven't had the time to get it up and I will try to be very brief.

I think I should direct the attention of the committee to the fact that while the Small Business Committee of the House, under the distinguished chairmanship of the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], did submit a report which was unanimously adopted by the Evins subcommittee, and the full committee did adopt the report unanimously, that unanimous adoption of the report was the action of those who attended the meeting.

Unfortunately I was unable to attend the meeting and although I did put in writing to the chairman of the subcommittee some of my objections to the report, the report was adopted that way by the committee, and that is one reason why I wanted to be heard here.

In that report, which incidentally was rather a well prepared report and the result of much hard work and intelligent effort, there nevertheless are some things recommended that I disagree with, and I want to briefly refer to those matters here.

First, there is a recommendation that loans be made to unincorporated small businesses. I think that is a very unwise recommendation. It is no problem and it's a matter of small inconvenience and expense to any small businessman or any small firm, to incorporate today.

Now, it may be that the tax law should be amended so as to give to the small businessman who is incorporated the same tax privileges of reporting as an individual or as a partnership, instead of as a corporation, if part of his stock is owned by a small business investment company. It has been pointed out that the exemption permitting a small business corporation to file a return and pay the taxes as though it were a partnership, does not apply in the event some of the stock is owned by a small business investment company.

If that is the only objection to making loans to corporations rather than individuals, I think the remedy should be by chang-

ing the tax law, and not by permitting loans to be made to unincorporated businesses. As you know, whether it is a partnership or an individual proprietorship, upon death the business must be liquidated and, where you are making long-term loans, that is an extreme disadvantage. I doubt whether any intelligent lending officer will make a long-term loan to a partnership or individual, having in mind that in the event of the accident of death he can't continue the business to pay off his loan, nor is there any successful management that can come in.

The business must either be liquidated or sold to new owners, whereas in making the loan in the first instance he has taken into account the competency of management, and he might not be willing to make the same loan to other management.

Your hands are tied if you are lending the money to an unincorporated business in the event of, as I say, the accident of death. There is nothing to do except liquidate the business and do the best you can to get your money back unless you want to let other management come in that you might not approve of.

So I say the provision in the regulation is a wise one, that these loans and these investments be made only to, and in, corporation.

Now, I hope the committee will have in mind that the purpose of this bill, the Small Business Investment Company Act, was to attract long-term loans which would be in the nature of equity capital and which would not be actually loans, but investments. You should not broaden this statute now so as to make this a general lending agency.

I think we had in mind when we enacted the bill that we didn't want to set up any new banks or any new private lending agencies as such. We didn't want these new small business investment companies to go into general competition with the banks and other financial institutions that are already operating.

We had in mind that the banks and other lending institutions were not making money available for long-term loans and equity capital, and we set this institution up to make that money available. We ought to keep that in mind as to any amendments we are going to offer to this law. That brings to mind the suggestion that we strike out of the act the word "primary" when referring to equity capital.

I think the statute now provides that the primary purpose of the law is to make equity and long-term loans and the suggestion has been made that we strike out "primary."

If you do that, you are just going to convert this into a general lending agency; and that is not, I am sure, the present congressional intent.

It would also open the door to the banks invading this field through the back door. You have already heard that there are some 29 banks which now control these small business investment companies, and if you are going to give them the opportunity to say to a customer coming in for a loan, "You go next door to the small business investment company that we control and make your arrangements there, and then come in here and we will give you subsidiary financing," they are going to evade the intent of this act.

Mr. PATMAN. Isn't there any encouragement in the law for that, Mr. MULTER, in that a 100-percent tax deduction is allowed on losses on convertible debentures purchased by the bank's subsidiary small business investment company, whereas if the transaction was in the form of a loan made directly by the bank it would not get the benefit of that deduction?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Therefore, your statement, I think, is entirely correct that the inducement will be to refer loans to the SBIC.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, and that also brings to mind the situation that I think the chairman has indicated he is concerned about, and which gives me considerable concern. That is the fact that we already have about one-third of the small business investment companies controlled by banks.

Now, if we intended that the banks should be able to set up these small business investment companies, or if the Congress intends that that be permitted to be done, then let's be forthright about it and change the statute.

We said in the first instance that it requires at least 10 individuals to form a small business investment company. In every one of those 29 instances where a bank has formed a small business investment company, the bank named 10 dummies, and the bank controls the corporation, and the bank names the directors.

Now, if that is what we want, let's change the law. Let's not have them do by indirection what they should be permitted to do directly.

On the other hand, if we intended what we said, that this requires 10 individuals, then let's make sure it is 10 individuals who are putting in their own money and who are going to elect the directors and run the institution.

Now, maybe the banks can come in and make a good argument as to why they should be permitted to own, control, and operate these small business investment companies. If they can make such an argument, let's change the law and let them come in through the front door. Don't have a law, as we have now, which says that there must be 10 individuals, and permit a bank to come in through the back door and name 10 dummies.

I don't think we intended that, and I don't think we should permit it to go on. I think we ought to say something in any report that may accompany any bill coming out of this committee on that point.

That brings us to the question of whether or not additional loans should be made without the consent of the small business investment company.

If they are going to the small business investment company for long-term financing, and it is going to be just that—long-term financing; not interim financing—and on top of that they are going to go to the bank which controls the small business investment company and get subsidiary financing, you can be sure that somewhere along the line we are going to run into trouble. If the bank is in a position to do this subsidiary financing, it should certainly be in a position to do it as primary financing.

They shouldn't put the small business investment company that they control in a position of making the primary financing, at, as you have heard, up to 15 percent interest, and they take the secondary financing at 5 or 6 percent.

If that loan is good enough for the bank as secondary financing at 5 or 6 percent, they ought to make the primary loan at 5 or 6 percent instead of letting the small business company grab off the cream and let them hold the subordinate financing.

There has been a suggestion that the so-called cross-stream loan provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 be waived to permit a bank that is a subsidiary of a holding company to invest in a small business investment company owned by the same holding company.

I think we may have gone too far already in permitting bank holding companies to establish small business investment companies. I did not realize the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 would have that result, and I find it a little difficult to follow the complicated interpretations of the 1958 act, the Bank Holding Company Act, and

the Revised Statutes which lead to that result. This interpretation may be the opening wedge to destroy the Bank Holding Company Act's prohibitions against banks engaging in nonbanking businesses. We may be going right back to the days when all the trouble in the banking field was caused by allowing investment bankers to own and control commercial banks. This must not be permitted to spread.

Mr. PATMAN. Is this the only exception you know of, Mr. MULTER? Is this the only instance in which a bank holding company is permitted to own a nonbanking business?

Mr. MULTER. There are, of course, limited exceptions under section 4(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act, but none which violate the basic principles of the act as I think this does.

But there is another basic principle of the Bank Holding Company Act which so far has not been violated, and it is embodied in section 6 of the act. Section 6 prevents a holding company from forcing one of its subsidiary banks to make loans to another of its subsidiaries, or to invest in any other fashion in another subsidiary. When we enacted that prohibition, we had before us at least one concrete example of the abuses which can result from self-dealing between two subsidiaries of the same holding company. The best way to protect a subsidiary bank from being forced into making a bad investment in another subsidiary is to prevent such dealing altogether.

So I cannot go along with the argument that the proposed amendment would simply treat holding company subsidiary banks the same as other banks. This self-dealing situation does not arise for other banks. If they invest in a small business investment company, they do so at arm's length. But the subsidiary bank is not dealing at arm's length with the small business investment company when they are both under the common control of a holding company. I think perhaps we have already gone too far in breaking down the sound restrictions of the Bank Holding Company Act when we permitted bank holding companies to form small business investment companies. Let's not go any further with it; let's not take this proposed next step of creating a situation where their subsidiary banks can be forced to invest in their subsidiary investment companies.

Now, there is one other suggestion that has been made, and that is that we grant the small business investment company an exemption from the Investment Company Act.

Now, the only reason to do that is to permit the small business investment company to issue stock options. I think there is nothing worse in the field of corporate law—and that includes banks and insurance companies—than this granting of stock options, usually done by the directors for the benefit of the officers, who are in control of the situation, most of the time without notice to the stockholders.

It is an unfair way of diluting the capital, or diverting capital of a company to those who control it. If they are under the Investment Company Act, they would at least have to make the disclosures required by the Investment Company Act. I urge you not to amend this Small Business Investment Company Act so as to grant that exemption.

That, in the main, is my statement, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. MULTER. We value your judgment on these matters, and what you have said will receive very careful consideration by the members of this subcommittee.

Are there any questions, gentlemen?

If not, thank you very kindly, Mr. MULTER.

If you desire to supplement your remarks and extend them to include anything germane, you may do so.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You are always very kind.

Save Our River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared recently in the *Evening Star*. This editorial emphasizes the need for accelerated completion of a thorough study of the Potomac River, lest the present very-serious situation becomes a real emergency before corrective action can be carried out.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Evening Star*, Mar. 24, 1960]

SAVE OUR RIVER

A slow death for the Potomac River during the next decade or two is foreseen by an Army engineer—unless remedial measures are taken soon. This is a prospect too alarming to permit of further dillydallying by Congress on appropriations to avert such a disaster. Yet Congress in recent years has seriously hampered the engineers' survey of the river—a necessary preliminary step toward planning and building water-famine safeguards for the Washington area.

The outlook for a dried-up Potomac at Chain Bridge and a stagnant salt-water marsh in the tidal section along the city's waterfront was described to the Potomac River Development Association by an outstanding authority, Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Lipscomb, chief of the Army Engineers' North Atlantic Division. It could happen by 1975, General Lipscomb declared, unless, in the meantime, adequate water-storage facilities are built above Washington's water intake.

This is the strongest warning on the plight of our ailing river yet to come from the Army, which has responsibility for insuring the Nation's Capital of an ample supply of water, even in times of drought. General Lipscomb explained that the situation is becoming critical because of the phenomenal expansion of population in the Washington metropolitan area. He estimated that the "metro" population will rise from today's 2 million to 3 million during the next 15 years. Then the city and suburbs will be using water as fast as it is collected by the present water-supply dams at Little Falls and Great Falls. There will be nothing but a dry gulch between the Little Falls dam and tidewater, according to the Army water expert. And the stagnation of sewage-polluted tidewater in Washington's front yard would be an intolerable nuisance and health menace.

Congress would not want such an emergency to develop any more than anyone else. But the risk of dangerous conditions is increasing as the Army Engineers' survey of the basin continues to lag not only for want of sufficient funds but because of restrictions placed by Congress on the extent of the engineering study. For example, Congress last year cut the engineers' request for \$500,000 to \$392,000 and decreed that none of the money could be used in planning dams for flood control. Yet flood control and water

supply are so closely related that joint storage facilities might serve both needs.

Congress, in weighing appropriations for completing the river survey, must pay attention to the solemn warning issued by General Lipscomb concerning the threatened deterioration of the Potomac. There should be an end to this foolhardy business of slashing survey funds and imposing stupid and illogical restraints on the surveyors.

The Tragic Death of Attorney Harry Meyers of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1960

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it was well said by the sages through the ages that—

You who mourn the loss of loved ones, let there come the comfort that, though the dust returns to the earth as it was, the spirit returns to God who gave it. Death is not the end. Our dear loved ones have passed through the gateway of life into the peace of the hereafter that endureth always. We know that all of us must tread the same path, though we know not when the hour may strike. Let us so live that the coming of that hour shall find us unafraid. May our deeds do honor to the memory of our beloved whom Thou has taken unto Thyself. In unshaken trust in Thy wisdom and loving kindness, we give praise unto Thy name.

And so these reflections are so befitting to alleviate the great pain and sadness befalling the relatives of my distinguished friend and celebrated lawyer, Harry Meyers, who for many years practiced law in the city of Chicago.

It was his sad fate to meet death as a victim of the midair disaster in the explosion of the Northwest airliner turboprop Electra jetplane near Tell City, Ind., in the Ohio River Valley, while en route to Miami. He was a bosom friend of the distinguished jurist, the Honorable John A. Sbarbaro, and had accompanied him on that ill-fated journey.

They always traveled together. Their loss was mourned by the bench and bar of Illinois.

He was a calm, gentle person, whose depth of understanding in the law marked him as a leader at the bar. He was accepted as an authority in his chosen field—the criminal law. He was kindly to and considerate of his fellow humans. It was a natural thing that he and Judge Sbarbaro were attracted to one another in a close bond of friendship.

The completeness of this great tragedy in the consummation of the mortal remains of all the passengers—attests to the suddenness of the disaster.

As though in this life they were reduced suddenly into the fading shadows of another world—a world of everlasting grace, where the soul retains the identity

of the individual in his corporeal existence upon the earth. In the world of men we cannot but accept the belief that everlasting life is the reward for these who have kept the faith. These two friends inseparable in life were inseparable in death—God knows.

With prayers and sincere condolences to the eminent physician Dr. Max Meyerovitz, of Chicago, who practiced for 50 years near my home at Taylor and Racine Avenue, and his good brother Ben. May God give them strength in this their saddest hour. We, their friends, pray with them for his soul—may he rest in peace.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, to those of you whose constituencies are not plagued by pockets of unemployment, I ask that you consider the circumstances of thousands of your fellow American citizens in various areas of the several States where there are not enough jobs to go around. Many are without proper nourishment for themselves and their families. Homes are without repair. Children are improperly clothed. It is a shameful reflection on a Nation which boasts of the world's highest living standards.

Our people want a chance to recover their status as members of the economic community. Congress can provide this opportunity by enacting the depressed area legislation which I and numerous other Members of both the House and Senate have introduced and long supported. I realize that some of these bills have been tampered with in normal political maneuverings, but I am confident that a majority of the Members of this legislative body will cast affirmative votes if the leadership of the House will present a reasonable measure intended to stimulate business and industrial activity in chronically depressed regions.

I have time and again pledged to support sound legislation of this nature regardless of authorship. Many excellent bills introduced by our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have been awaiting action for more than a year. I would be happy to vote for passage of any one of these particular measures. And I firmly believe that there are a sufficient number of members of both parties, concerned about the prevailing pockets of unemployment in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, to pass a distressed area bill without hindering political amendments if we are but given a chance.

Mr. Speaker, is it asking too much to expect the Rules Committee, which is in control of the Democratic side, to bring out the distressed area bill now before it?

The Oregonian Criticizes Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the March 26 issue of one of the leading newspapers of my State of Oregon, the Portland Oregonian. This editorial clearly describes the ridiculous situation created by the American people's self-appointed protector. Postmaster General Summerfield not only tries to protect us all from the salacious wiles of the pornographers, but he also protects us from whatever foreign reading matter he considers unsuitable for us.

As the editorial points out, our great free press was quite active in reporting Khrushchev's every word while he was visiting our country, but delivery of the same words mailed from Russia to an individual is held up until the addressee is notified and affirms his desire to receive the mail.

This is not only ridiculous and expensive, but it infringes on our rights as American citizens.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Mar. 26, 1960]

POST OFFICE CURTAIN

Although William H. Ehrman did not receive delivery on the magazines mailed to him from Russia, he has performed a signal service for his fellow Portlanders: His experiment with an exchange of periodicals with the Russian people has exposed to local readers the ridiculous Federal policy of intercepting whatever postal authorities interpret to be "political propaganda" from abroad.

Bureaucracy, aiming its shotgun at subversion, has, as is not uncommon, peppered holes in the shrinking fabric of American personal liberty.

It is not conceivable that the Soviet Government is conducting its worldwide espionage system through the pages of a picture magazine. Thus it must be concluded that the U.S. law which supports such interceptions in the mails is designed to protect the American addressee from contaminating himself and his neighbors by reading the Red line.

How silly. Mr. K. travels through the country and his every word of political propaganda is relayed to readers by a free press. The U.S. Government, itself, has agreed by contract with Russia for the distribution here of a picture magazine, U.S.S.R., which is full of sweet-coated propaganda. Such magazines as Britain's New Statesmen and Nation are well spiced with "political propaganda" of a sort. Is any of this seriously harmful to the national security? Would it endanger the national security to permit Mr. Ehrman or any of his neighbors to read the magazine Soviet Union? Of course not.

The shocking thing is that the U.S. Government has adopted tactics strictly out of the Soviet book. A postmaster's interception of a citizen's mail on such flimsy and offensive grounds does more damage to American liberty than could possibly accrue from the widest possible U.S. distribution of Soviet literature.

Jane Addams

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the centennial of the birth of a great and dedicated woman whom Chicago claims as its very own—Jane Addams of Hull House.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in Congress today in paying tribute to this remarkable woman who made such a significant contribution in the field of social welfare when she pioneered many social reforms for the aid and assistance of the indigent and the unfortunate.

Hull House, on the near West Side of Chicago, stands today as a memorial to this woman's deep understanding of the problems confronting our society. Miss Addams had charted a new concept in the field of social welfare and has brought living meaning to the gallant people of her profession who are making such a profound contribution, particularly in the field of human relations.

Her name has become a symbol of social reform throughout the world. Her followers are legion and her philosophy has become an inspiration for this growing profession of social workers.

Jane Addams had the unique faculty of analyzing human frailties and she possessed the bold determination to do something about those frailties.

Miss Addams confronted our society with new concepts of social conscience at a time when too many people had looked upon social workers as strange phenomena that should be judged with extreme care and caution. She made her mark at a time in our history when a large segment of our society insisted upon viewing the problems of the indigent as a natural order of things. It was through her stubborn insistence that organized society finally began to recognize the needs of its less fortunate neighbors and developed concepts reflecting a social conscience and moral awakening in America.

Miss Addams was born in Cedarville, Ill., on September 6, 1860. Since Congress will not be in session on the actual date marking her birth, I think it is fitting that we pay tribute to her great contribution at this time.

Early in life, Miss Addams was exposed to the social injustice of slavery through her father's active participation in the abolitionist movement.

It was this personal contact with one of the most inhuman practices of our history that inspired Miss Addams to heights of social reform equalled only infrequently by her contemporaries.

Her many years of dedicated work in Chicago in developing programs to deal with juvenile delinquency; programs designed to help immigrants understand the concepts of democracy; projects which to this day are helping those from broken homes, and many other endeavors, have won her the eternal gratitude of the people of Chicago.

When Hull House opened in 1889, at the corner of Polk and Halstead Streets, it was Jane Addams who provided the inspiration and guidance to bring together the polyglot community of immigrants into a unified area of Americans. She knew well the problems that these immigrants encountered in trying to adjust themselves to their new way of life. Moreover, she knew the great difficulties that had to be overcome because of language barriers. Through prodigious patience, Jane Addams welded all of these people into an inspiring community of Americans determined to make their own children produce a worthwhile contribution to this Nation.

It is fitting that we should pay tribute to Miss Addams today when the White House Conference on Children and Youth is being held in the Nation's Capital.

The fact that more than 7,000 social workers and others dedicated to the field of social welfare are meeting here in Washington this week, the largest number ever to attend such a conference on youth, serves to reflect on the impressive contributions which Miss Addams herself brought to the social workers' profession.

Thousands of Americans are today proudly carrying the banner as social workers because of the high esteem that Miss Addams has won for their profession.

The social worker of the past, frequently insecure and unjustly misunderstood, today can take pride in his profession because of people like Jane Addams who had elevated this profession to a new standard of respect for all America.

We in Chicago are proud to be able to claim Miss Addams for our very own. May the principles and dedication which she made so thoroughly a part of her life, long serve as a symbol of inspiration to those who are carrying on her magnificent ideals today.

The Late Russell V. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be in my congressional district on official business last Monday. Therefore, I was spared the personal shock of witnessing, as so many of my colleagues did, the sudden and tragic death of my friend and colleague on the Committee on Public Works, Russell V. Mack. But the shock I experienced on hearing this sad news on Tuesday morning was nonetheless real.

I think this was because Russ Mack was such a vibrant person, full of the joys of living, drawing strength and vitality from the challenge of the responsibilities he shouldered so well. He was a champion of and a stubborn and dedi-

cated fighter for the things in which he believed. He fought with equal determination and skill against those other things which he believed to be wrong. There were times, during our committee work together, when we disagreed, once rather sharply, but all of us who have ever found him on the other side of our own position, whatever it might be, have respected his boundless integrity, his candor and honesty, and, most of all, the friendly arm he put upon our shoulders after the battle was over.

John Donne wrote, years and years ago—

Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a man or thy friends or if thine own were; any man's death diminishes me.

It is quite true that the work of our committee and of this Congress will go on, as we close ranks together, almost as if nothing had happened. And yet the strength of our Committee on Public Works of this Congress and of this Nation have been "diminished" by the loss of a man of the stature of Russ Mack. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, my heartfelt sympathy is extended to Mrs. Mack and to the other members of the family.

Postal Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Times of Monday March 21, 1960:

POSTAL FACTS

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress urging another postal rate increase presents one of those seemingly plausible arguments which is easily demolished by facts. Let's consider the facts.

In essence the President says the Post Office is losing a lot of money. Therefore mail rates should be raised to wipe out the loss, or at least come close.

This position, which apparently came to the President special delivery from Postmaster General Summerfield, is based on a fallacy.

It is the error of assuming the post office is a business. In reality, in historical precedent, and in every-day fact, it is a public service. It cannot possibly be conducted as both.

Certainly it costs taxpayers money to run the Post Office Department. It also costs taxpayers money to run the White House, the Commerce Department, the Federal judiciary system, the FBI—almost every Federal activity.

The costs of such public services are taken for granted. But the costs of the postal service are labeled "deficit" and become issue.

Why? The answer is that the Post Office takes in a great deal of money, about \$2½ billion a year. No other Government de-

partment produces anywhere near as much revenue.

But because the postal establishment costs more to operate than it takes in, and because a law requires annual reports comparing receipts with costs, the Post Office is singled out and charged with operating at a deficit.

Postal rates actually are a form of taxes. The Post Office does not keep the money it gets for selling stamps, but turns it into the Treasury. Thus in urging a postal rate increase, the administration is seeking an indirect tax increase.

Finally, the theory that the Post Office is a business doesn't make sense. Would a business charge the same fee to deliver a message across the street as it does to handle a letter from Florida to Alaska?

Would a business operate a branch office in every hamlet in the Nation, most of them losing money because of slight patronage? Would a business take on sideline jobs without remuneration, like selling duck stamps or registering aliens?

The Post Office is an essential public service, worth what it costs to operate.

We suggest Mr. Summerfield ought to stop proclaiming (and complaining) how much his department has lost and concentrate on getting the mails delivered as speedily and economically as possible.

And Congress ought to ignore the request for another boost in rates.

The Issue Outlined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1960

Mr. IRWIN, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the February 13 edition of Business Week which outlines the issue of medical assistance for our older citizens. The editorial:

WHAT THE AGED NEED

It's obvious that the swift increase in the number of older people in our population poses new economic and social problems. These problems are now undergoing the most thorough and searching examination ever.

There was a time when providing a basic pension program was the great need—a need fulfilled in the main by establishment of social security in 1935 and by the widespread development of private plans in later years. Now the most pressing need of this population group is medical care, especially assistance in case of major, crippling illnesses.

Medical expenses of older people are at least three times those of younger citizens. While many can cope with the normal run of illness, few oldsters have the financial resources to meet the cost of catastrophic illnesses.

Many had hoped that the private health insurance companies and medical groups could meet this problem by coming up with some sort of health insurance plan at rates older people could afford. But they haven't, and even President Eisenhower and Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Flemming, who were so anxious for just such a solution, now feel there's no recourse but for the government to step in to provide coverage against catastrophic illness.

The cost would probably be financed by a supplement to the social security payroll

tax. At the same time, individuals would be encouraged to continue their basic health insurance policies on into retirement to defray normal medical costs.

If the government steps in to provide insurance against catastrophic illness of the aged, it will not be moving in where private industry can do the job. It will be assuming responsibility in an area where industry has found it cannot offer the protection needed.

Support Is Found for Benson View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Monday morning quarterbacking seems to be a prerogative of the American people. In the case of the problems facing agriculture, politicians, pundits, and polltakers all have their pat little answers.

Many of those answers have been predicated on the premise that the policies of the Republican administration and, more specifically, Agriculture Secretary Benson, just will not work.

It is always difficult for those wedded to the politics of agriculture to take a long, searching look at the economics of agriculture. This is why the premise of criticism is so frequently found to be false.

This was clearly pointed up by the latest crop report on indicated acreage plantings of our major crop commodities. And at least one columnist offered an extremely able analysis of just what the crop report implies.

I ask that the March 21, 1960, New York Times financial page article by one of the Nation's most able reporters, Edwin L. Dale, Jr., of the Times' Washington staff, be inserted in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1960]

SUPPORT IS FOUND FOR BENSON VIEW—BACKING REPORTED FOR THEORY THAT FARMERS GROW LESS AS SUPPORTS ARE CUT—UNNOTICED QUIRK CITED—PECULIARITY OF 1959 LAW ON CORN ACREAGE LED TO CROP RISE AS PROF WAS PARED

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Could Ezra Taft Benson be right after all?

This question was being asked here last week as a result of some new evidence on the impact of changes in price supports on what farmers do and do not grow.

At issue is the major theoretical and practical dispute over the proposals of Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, for solving the farm problem. Mr. Benson thinks the road to a solution is lowered price supports, to bring production into line with demand.

The opponents of the plan—quite apart from farmers who do not like to see lower prices—have had one major criticism. It is that as price supports go down, farmers probably will grow more, in order to keep their total income from declining. Thus, the Benson plan, besides being painful to farmers, would just make the situation worse.

The new evidence is not conclusive. But it indicates that the Benson opponents may be wrong, at least on this key point.

UNUSUAL FACTORS NOTED

The evidence relates to plantings of corn and feed grains last year and this year. Because of a widely unnoticed quirk in the corn situation, last year's plantings were regarded by the Benson foes as a vindication of their stand. Actually, according to officials, both last year's actual results and this year's planting intentions prove no such thing.

Last year, corn plantings rose sharply at the same time as an apparent sharp reduction in price supports, under a new law ending acreage controls and reducing supports. Actually, corn price supports for the great majority of growers rose last year, rather than fell.

This is because most farmers had not complied with acreage controls and thus had received supports at the noncompliance level. Under the new law, the support level was sharply lower than the old compliance level, but a little higher than the old noncompliance level. Thus, to most farmers, Uncle Sam was guaranteeing an increase in prices. Plantings rose.

Plantings for the other feed grains, on which support prices were cut last year, were reduced.

CORN A CASE IN POINT

This year, corn supports fell slightly from last year's level. Nationwide planting intentions reported last week, were essentially unchanged from last year—no decrease, but no increase, either.

Moreover, there was an important geographical shift. There were more plantings in the traditional and efficient corn-growing area, the Midwest, and lower plantings elsewhere. The reduced price supports may have removed the incentive to produce corn in the case of growers who traditionally had not done so.

In the feed grains there was no change in price supports this year, after last year's reduction. Plantings overall for the four grains were slightly reduced.

For soybeans, which have had a high price in the market, plantings rose.

None of this evidence proves that lower supports will greatly reduce production, although last year's feed grain performance was suggestive. What the evidence does indicate is that lower supports do not bring increased production. Mr. Benson and his backers feel that price-support reductions have not been pushed far enough to induce the cut in plantings needed to solve the surplus problem.

The Late Honorable Russell V. Mack

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I was ever as shocked in my life as I was not many minutes ago when our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington, Hon. Russell V. Mack, collapsed and died here in the well of the House. This tragic death should be a warning to all of us who work so hard at our congressional duties that there comes a time when we must slow up. Russell Mack never slowed up since he was first elected to the House of Representatives about a dozen years ago. He was a devoted public servant and the

second ranking minority Member of the House Public Works Committee. His untimely passing is a great loss to the people of his district, his beloved State of Washington, and the Nation.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his devoted wife in her bereavement.

Minshall Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to the home of every registered voter in Ohio's 23d District. The questions are based on some of the vital issues coming before the Congress. The response has always been excellent, and helps me sound out the sentiment of the voters on these important questions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the Minshall poll for the 2d session of the 86th Congress be included in the RECORD:

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

DEAR FRIENDS: On previous occasions, I have sent out questionnaires seeking expression on pending issues before the Congress. Your response has been excellent. Again I am requesting your opinions on these vital issues. Having the benefit of your views will better enable me to represent you in Congress.

Please place this card inside an envelope marked "Minshall poll" and mail to me at Post Office Box B-221, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C. Your views will be held in strict confidence.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Do you consider the proposed \$41 billion defense budget adequate? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

2. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

3. Do you favor Federal aid to raise teachers' salaries? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

4. Do you believe we should continue our foreign aid program? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

5. Do you favor the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

6. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance? No opinion ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐

7. Who is your choice for the next President of the United States? -----

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than

six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.